

UCLA

UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

The Development of the Liturgical Services to SS. Feodor, Davyd and Konstantin of Iaroslavl' in the Context of Early Russian Hymnography

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0cv098m2>

Author

Yefimenkov, Vitaliy

Publication Date

2024

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

The Development of the Liturgical Services
to SS. Feodor, Davyd and Konstantin of Iaroslavl'
in the Context of Early Russian Hymnography

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy
in Slavic Languages and Literatures

by

Vitaliy Petrovich Yefimenkov

2024

© Copyright by

Vitaliy Petrovich Yefimenkov

2024

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

The Development of the Liturgical Services to SS. Feodor, Davyd and Konstantin of Iaroslavl'
in the Context of Early Russian Hymnography

by

Vitaliy Petrovich Yefimenkov

Doctor of Philosophy in Slavic Languages and Literatures

University of California, Los Angeles, 2024

Professor Gail D. Lenhoff, Chair

Having produced a number of works on historiography and veneration of early Russian saints, the scholarship of medieval Russian literature, until recently, had often overlooked their hymnography. Modern day academia does witness an increasing interest in church services, yet in most cases it focuses on textual analysis. This dissertation presents a liturgically-based approach to studying the manuscripts.

The investigation of 30 services to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin of Iaroslavl' (13–14th centuries) from the earliest in 1468/9 to the most recent ones and the analysis of the correlations between their four variants is carried out on three levels. The textual source search reveals how the services originated and which associative principles were used in their making. The liturgical analytical approach demonstrates the evolution and changes in the saints' cult over

the centuries. The socio-historical observations and inferences are drawn from investigating the selective wording of the hymns. Contributing to the previous scholarship, I propose an updated reconstructed chronology of the liturgical veneration of the holy princes and the historical development of their veneration.

As Iaroslavl' joined Muscovy in the 1480s, the cult of the holy princes enjoyed a rapid rise while simple early services were replaced by the solemn ones. Their popularity spread across the new realm can be seen from the growing number of 16th century manuscripts. While the festal rank was later slightly downscaled to make this service more accessible to broader Russian congregations, the original hymns to SS. Feodor, Davyd and Konstantin were edited to invoke them as pan-Russian intercessors rather than solely the patrons of their town, thus promoting Iaroslavl' as an important center for the Moscow tsardom.

The practical significance of this dissertation is in the methodologies employed hereby that may provide a model for future scholarly research of the unstudied services to early Russian saints, thus contributing to a better understanding of the hymnographic creativity and adaptation in medieval Rus'.

The dissertation of Vitaliy Petrovich Yefimenkov is approved.

Ronald W. Vroon

Vadim Sneyder

Peter S. Cowe

Gail D. Lenhoff, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations.....	vi
Acknowledgements.....	vii
Biographical Sketch.....	viii
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1.....	18
Chapter 2.....	34
Chapter 3.....	95
Chapter 4.....	151
Conclusion.....	166
Bibliography.....	173

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Chud.	Sobranie Chudova Monastyria (collection of GIM)
Cod. Slav.	Codex Slavicus (Vatican)
Egor.	Sobranie E. Egorova (collection of RGB, f.98)
GIM	Gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii muzei (Moscow)
IaMZ	Iaroslavskii muzei-zapovednik (Iaroslavl')
Ios.	Sobranie Iosifo-Volotskogo monastyria (collection of RGADA, f.1152)
Kaz.	Nauchnaia biblioteka imeni N. I. Lobachevskogo Kazanskogo federal'nogo universiteta (NBLKFU)
KB	Kirillo-Belozerskoe sobranie (collection of RNB)
KhGNB	Khar'kovskaia gosudarstvennaia nauchnaia biblioteka imeni V. G. Korolenko
Luk.-Mark.	Sobranie Lukashevicha-Markevicha (collection of RGB, f.152)
MDA	Sobranie Moskovskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii (collection of RGB f.173.I)
MGU	Nauchnaia Biblioteka Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta
NBLKFU	Nauchnaia biblioteka imeni N. I. Lobachevskogo Kazanskogo federal'nogo universiteta (see Kaz.)
Pog.	Sobranie M. P. Pogodina (collection of RNB)
PSRL	Polnie sobranie russkikh letopisei
RGADA	Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov (Moscow)
RGB	Rossiiskaia gosudarstvennaia biblioteka (Moscow)
RNB	Rossiiskaia natsional'nai biblioteka (St. Petersburg)
Or.	Sobranie Otdela rukopisei (collection of RGB, f.218)
Rum.	Sobranie N. P. Rumiantseva (collection of GIM)
Shchuk.	Sobranie P. I. Shchukina (collection of GIM)
Sin.	Sobranie Sinodal'noi biblioteki (collection of GIM)
TODRL	Trudy otdela drevnerusskoi literatury
TSL	Sobranie Troitse-Sergievoi Lavry (collection of RGB f.304.I)
Und.	Sobranie V. M. Undol'skogo (collection of RGB, f.310)
Uvar.	Sobranie A. S. Uvarova (collection of GIM)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In addition to the divine intercession of SS. Feodor, Davyd and Konstantin of Iaroslavl', this dissertation would not have been possible without the contribution of the following archival directors and scholars to whom I am sincerely grateful: Elena Vladimirovna Ukhanova of National Historical Museum (GIM) and Tatiana Ivanovna Gulina and her colleagues at the Iaroslavl' Heritage Museum (IaMZ) who allowed access to some of the most important manuscripts used in this study and offered their invaluable personal assistance; El'mira Iskhakovna Amerkhanova of Kazan University Archive (NBLKFU) who digitized and made available the earliest known service to SS. Feodor, Davyd and Konstantin which I was able to study and publish; Boris Mikhailovich Kloss and his exceptional expertise in dating a significant part of the manuscripts used in this work. I am thankful to Priest Dimitrii Pchelkin, a cleric of the Iaroslavl' Dormition Cathedral for taking time to provide me with the details on modern liturgical veneration of the three holy princes. I am deeply indebted to Professor Roman Ivanovich (Ronald) Vroon, the former Chair of the UCLA Slavic and Eastern European Languages and Cultures Department – for his continuous support and encouragement since the first day of my studies at this university, as well as for allocating the funds that implemented my seminal archival trip to Russia in 2019 and acquisition of important manuscripts. I would also like to extend appreciation to my good academic friend and colleague, Dr. Sean Griffin – for his advice to engage my liturgical experience and pursue enrollment in the UCLA Slavic Department specializing in the Medieval Russian Studies. I thank Professors Peter Cowe, Aleksei Pilshchikov and Vadim Schneider for being on my dissertation Committee and their valuable remarks on my research. Finally, my foremost gratitude goes out to Professor Gail Lenhoff, my Dissertation Committee Chair and the world expert in the topic of the Three Iaroslavl' Princes – for her tireless professional guidance and patience that proved instrumental in bringing my previous liturgical knowledge to new levels of academic achievement and excellence.

This study could not have been executed without the UCLA Graduate Division's generous funding in the form of Graduate Summer Research Mentorship (2014 and 2015) and the Dissertation Year Fellowship (2021-22).

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Born in a family of Russian-Ukrainian pedagogs, Vitaliy Yefimnkov was exposed to multilingualism, multi-culturalism, and respect for Eastern Orthodoxy since childhood. Upon his immigration to the U.S., he had joined the local Russian and Ukrainian Church communities that set him off to continue developing his talents in at a Christian Orthodox theological seminary, which in addition to theology trained scholars in Slavic history, liturgics, literature, church music. Living, working, and praying next to Orthodox monks at this secluded upstate monastery, Yefimnkov experienced the traditional medieval Rus' daily liturgical church cycle, and was trained to use Church Slavonic books and conduct the church services, ultimately earning his Bachelors in Theology and a Certificate of Church Precentorship.

Yefimnkov had returned to Los Angeles to work for a Russian Orthodox Cathedral as a choir director, theology/culture teacher and an editor/translator. Here he befriended Professor Ronald Vroon, Chair of the UCLA Slavic Department at that time, who inspired him to enroll in this university's Slavic PhD program.

After his reception of Master's in Slavic Languages and Literatures from UCLA, Yefimnkov's collaboration with Professor Gail Lenhoff and writing a chapter for her book on a 13th century Russian Saint Feodor of Iaroslavl' led him to select his current dissertation topic. Having attained his professional liturgical church training from a renown seminary and his degree in Slavic literature from one of the leading U.S. universities, Yefimnkov is determined to continue contributing to the field of Slavic historical liturgics and hymnography which only recently had begun to draw more attention and readership.

Among Yefimnkov's publications: liturgical, theological and historiographic articles in Russian and English published by well-known Russian Orthodox religious centers of the diaspora in Jordanville, N.Y., Pontificio Istituto Orientale in Rome, and Institute Theologique Ste-Serge in Paris, as well as theological seminaries in Russia (Iaroslavl') and Ukraine (Odessa). His chapter in Lenhoff's seminal book "Kniaz' Feodor Chernyi" (2019) had received acclaim from historians and scholars of liturgy.

INTRODUCTION

Pre-Revolutionary scholarship produced a number of works on historiography and veneration of early Russian saints,¹ yet only a handful of their services were actually published and most remain unstudied. The first compiled and liturgically-oriented monograph on the subject was produced by an émigré liturgist and theologian, Feodosii G. Spasskii, who presented over 80 saints of medieval Rus' and consulted a number of their services from his contemporary Menaia, discussing the emergence and history of their cults.² Post-Soviet academia has seen a gradual rise of interest in church hymnography that is ever increasing.³ General Menaion services (*obshchie*

¹ Historiographic information on the early Russian saints has started with Makarii (Bulgakov), mitropolit, *Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvi*, vol. 4 (St. Petersburg: Tip. Iuliia Bokrama, 1866), 251–61; V. O. Kliuchevskii, *Drevnerusskie zhitiia sviatykh kak istoricheskii istochnik* (Moscow: Izdanie Soldatenkova, 1871); Sergii (Spasskii), arkhiep., *Polnyi mesiatseslov Vostoka* (Moscow: Tip. Sovremennykh Izvestii, 1875–76); Nikolai P. Barsukov, *Istochniki russkoi agiografii* (St. Petersburg: Tip. M. M. Stasiulevicha, 1882; reprint, Leipzig: 1970); Filaret (Gumilevskii), arkhiep., *Obzor russkoi dukhovnoi literatury* (St. Petersburg: Izd. I. L. Tuzova, 1884); Vasilii Vasil'ev, *Istoria kanonizatsii russkikh sviatykh* (Moscow: Moskovskii Universitet, 1893); Evgenii E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia kanonizatsii sviatykh v Russkoi Tserkvi* (Sergiev Posad: Tip. A. I. Snegirevoi, 1894; reprint, Moscow: Universitetskaia tipografiia, 1903); Arsenii P. Kadlubovskii, *Ocherki po istorii drevnerusskoi literatury zhitii sviatykh* (Varshava: Tip. Varshavskago Uchebnago Okruga, 1902); Nikodim (Kononov) arkhim., *K voprosu o kanonizatsii sviatykh v Russkoi Tserkvi* (Moscow: Imp. ob-vo istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete, 1903); Evgenii (Mertsalov), arkhim., *Kak sovershalas' kanonizatsiia sviatykh v pervoe vremia sushchestvovaniia Russkoi Tserkvi* (Murom: Tip. M. Akinfiieva i I. Leont'eva, 1910); Nikolai I. Serebrianskii, *Drevnerusskie kniazheskie zhitiia* (Moscow: Imp. ob-vo istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete, 1915).

² Feodosii Georgievich Spasskii, *Russkoe liturgicheskoe tvorchestvo (po sovremennym mineiam)* (Paris, YMCA-Press, 1951; reprint, Moscow: Izdatel'skii sovet R. P. Ts., 2008).

³ We find significant the following works on the topics related to Slavic Service Menaia (*sluzhebnaia mineia*), its evolution and its particular aspects: Aleksandr Kh. Vostokov, "Opisanie Novgorodskoi Sofiiskoi minei XI v.," *Uchenye zapiski Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk po Vtoromu otdeleniiu*, kn. II, vyp. II (1856), 126–28; Izmail I. Sreznevskii, "Drevnii russkii kalendar' po mesiachnym mineiam XI–XIII v.," *Khristianskie drevnosti i arkheologiiia*, III (1863), 2–22; Konstantin Nikol'skii (protoierei), *O sluzhbakh Russkoi Tserkvi, byvshikh v prezhnikh pechatnykh bogosluzhebnykh knigakh* (St. Petersburg: Tip. T-va "Obshchestennaia pol'za," 1885); Ignatii V. Iagich, ed. *Sluzhebnye Minei za sentiabr', oktiabr' i noiabr' v tserkovnoslavianskom perevode po russkim rukopisiam 1093–1097 g.* (St. Petersburg: Tip. Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk, 1886); Nikolai F. Churilovskii, "Novaia bogosluzhebnaia kniga: Minia dopolnitel'naia," *Pribavleniia k Tserkovnym vedomostiam*, №51–52 (1914): 2441–47; Vitalii M. Markov, ed. "Putiatina Mineia kak drevneishii pamiatni russkogo pis'ma, Slavia," *Casopis pro slovanskou filologii*, rocnik XXXVII, sesit 4 (Praha: Ceskoslovenska Akademia Ved, 1968), 548–62; Nataliia A. Nechunaeva, "Problemy istochnikovedeniia v Minee," *Vostochnaia Evropa v drevnosti i srednevekov'e. Problemy istochnikovedeniia* (Moscow: 1990), 101–05; Natalia A. Nechunaeva, *Mineia kak tip slaviano-grecheskogo teksta* (Tallinn: TPÜ Kirjastus, 2000); Aleksei M. Pentkovskii, *Tipikon patriarkha Aleksii Studita v Vizantii i na Rusi* (Moscow: Izd. MP, 2001) – discusses early Russian Menaia in their connection to the Studite Typicon; Fedor B. Liudogovskii, "Sovremenni tserkovnoskavianskii mineinyi korpus: sostav i struktura," *Lingvisticheskoe*

sluzhby) had been addressed in important articles by South Slavic scholars, such as B. Shalamanov,⁴ B. Angelov,⁵ M. Iovcheva⁶ and S. Elesievich.⁷ A recent Russo-Polish project has yielded a monograph on historical development of a Menaion as a liturgical type.⁸ While a number of scholars have published on the canonization and vita texts devoted to various Russian saints, considerably less has been written on their liturgical services, and usually on a single manuscript to saints such as Olga,⁹ Vladimir,¹⁰ Leontii of Rostov,¹¹ Metropolitan Petr,¹² Sergii of

istochnikovedenie i istoriia russkogo iazyka, 2002–2003 (Moscow: 2003), 500–31; Georgii Krylov, protoierei, *Knizhnaia sprava XVII veka. Bogoslužebnye Minei* (Moscow: Indrik, 2005); Aleksandra Iu. Nikiforova, *Problema proiskhozhdeniia sluzhebnoi Minei: struktura, sostav, mesiatseslov grech. Minei IX–XII vv. iz monastyria sviatoi Ekateriny na Sinae* (Moscow: RAN, 2005); Liudmila V. Moshkova, “K voprosu o sostave Pereslavskikh minei pervoi chetverti XV v. (sentiabr’–oktiabr’),” *Drevniaia Rus’. Voprosy Medievistiki*, 23 (2006), 64–70; Anna A. Pichkhadze, “O iazykovykh osobennostiakh slavianskikh sluzhebnykh minei,” *Bibel, Liturgie und Rrömmigkeit in der Slavia Byzantina: Festgabe für Hans Rothe zum 80. Geburtstag* (München; Berlin: 2009): 279–308; Iskra Khristova-Shomova, “Dve iuzhnoskavianskie minei v sravnenii s Novgorodskimi mineiami,” *Drevniaia Rus’. Voprosy Medievistiki*, 38 (2009), 44–62; Vittorio S. Tomelleri, “Vostochnoslavianskaia” sluzhebnaia mineia. Problemy izucheniia i izdaniia, *Europa Orientalis*, 34 (2015): 317–46; Nataliia A. Nechunaeva, “Rukopisi slavianskikh minei XI–XIV vv. i printsipy ikh klassifikatsii,” *Pelaeobulgarica* 38, 4 (2014): 45–56; Nataliia A. Nechunaeva, Aleksei V. Nechunaev, “Tipologii rukopisei slavianskikh minei XI–XVII vv. i metody informatsionnogo poiska,” *Slavistica Vilnensis* 63 (2018): 355–63. A comprehensive bibliography of works on Slavic hymnography from 1985 to 2004 is compiled in: Roman N. Krivko, “Slavianskaia gimnografiia IX–XII vv. v issledovaniakh i izdaniakh 1985–2004 gg.,” *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 50 (2004), 203–33.

⁴ Blagoi Shalamanov, “Neizvestni khimnografski proizvedeniia ot Kliment Okhridski,” *Spisanie na B’lgarskata Akademiia na Naukite*, Godina XXXIII, kniga 1 (Sofia: 1987), 51–67 – describes and traces several of the early Slavic services from the General Menaia.

⁵ Boniu St. Angelov, “Kliment Okhridski – avtor na obshti sluzhbi,” *Iz starata b’lgarska, ruska i s’rbska literature*, kn. III (Sofia: 1978), 17–37.

⁶ Mariia Iovcheva, “Vozniknovenie slavianskikh sluzhebnykh minei: obshchie gipotezy i tekstologicheskie fakty,” *Scripta & e-scripta* 6 (2008), 195–232; Mariia Iovcheva, *Starob’lgarskiiat sluzheben minei* (Sofia: Izd. tsentr “Boian Penev” 2014), 20.

⁷ Snezhana Elesievich, “K issledovaniiu obshchikh sluzhb v slavianskoi kirillicheskoi pis’mennosti,” *Drevniaia Rus’: Voprosy Medievistiki*, 34 (2008), 5–17.

⁸ Elena Potekhina, Aleksandr Kravetsky, ed. *Minei: obrazets gimnograficheskoi literatury i sredstvo formirovaniia mirovozzreniia pravoslavnykh* (Olsztyn: Univ. Warminsko-Mazurski, 2013).

⁹ Elena A. Osokina, *Problemy sootnosheniia gimnografii i agiografii na pamiat’ kniagini Ol’gi* (Moscow: RAN, 1995).

¹⁰ Mikhail Slavnitskii, “Kanonizatsiia sv. knaizia Vladimira i sluzhby emu po pamiatnikam XIII–XVII vekov,” *Strannik* (St. Petersburg: 1888, iiun’–iiul’): 197–237; Vladimir M. Kirillin, “O proiskhozhdenii teksta 1-i redaktsii pervoi sluzhby Vladimiru Velikomu,” *Drevniaia Rus’. Voprosy Medievistiki*, 81 (2020), 68–82.

¹¹ Andrei A. Titov, “Zhitie sviatogo Leontii episkopa Rostovskogo,” *Chteniiia v Imperatorskom Obshchestve istorii i drevnostej rossiiskikh*, kn.4, otd.1 (1893), 1–35; Gail Lenhoff, “Canonization and Princely Power in Northeast Rus’: The Cult of Leontij Rostovskij,” *Die Welt der Slaven*, XXXVII (1992), 359–80.

¹² Rimma. A. Sedova, “Sluzhba mitropolitu Petru,” *TODRL*, 45 (1992): 231–48; Rimma A. Sedova, *Sviatitel’, Petr mitropolit moskovskii v literature i iskusstve Drevnei Rusi* (Moscow: Russkii mir, 1993), 48–77.

Radonezh,¹³ Kirill of Beloozero,¹⁴ Makarii Kaliazinskii,¹⁵ Arsenii of Tver',¹⁶ and to the Kazan Icon of the Theotokos.¹⁷ Studies of multiple services include those to SS. Boris and Gleb¹⁸ and Feodor of Iaroslavl' with his sons Davyd and Konstantin.¹⁹ A recent dissertation by O. Svetlova on services to St. Olga is perhaps the only thorough study of the entire complex of services to one particular saint, which traces their linguistic, stylistic, liturgical and socio-cultural development.²⁰ However, in most cases scholars focus on textual analysis rather than liturgical patterns and formulas, while the services to widely venerated saints such as Antonii and Feodosii of the Kiev Caves, Aleksandr Nevskii, and Metropolitan Aleksei remain unexplored altogether.

¹³ Snezhana Elesievich, "Sluzhba prepodobnomy Sergiiu" shviashchenoinoka Pakhomii Serba i ei predshestvuiushchie gimnograficheskie formy, *Troitse-Sergiva lavra v istorii, kul'ture i dukhovnoi zhizni Rossii. Materialy III Mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii 25–27 sentiabria 2002 g.* (Sergiev Posad: 2004), 121–32; Snezhana Elesievich, *Sluzhba uspen'iu prepodobnog Sergija Radoneshkog: Istorija nastanka, kn'izhevnouumetnichke vrednosti i trajan'e dela* (dissertation, Beograd: 2005).

¹⁴ Ol'ga P. Likhacheva, Liudmila A. Churkina, "Sluzhba, zhitie i pokhval'noe slovo Kirillu Belozerskomu," *Drevnerusskoe iskusstvo* (Moscow: 1989): 353–55; Al'bina N. Kruchinina, "Pesnopeniia v chest' prepodobnogo Kirilla v rukopisnoi traditsii Kirillo-Belozerskomo monastyria," *Peterburgskii muzykal'nyi arkhiv* (St. Petersburg: 1997), 60–67; Tat'iana B. Karbasova, "Dopakhomievskaiia Sluzhba Kirillu Belozerskomu," *TODRL* 63 (2014): 67–87.

¹⁵ Anna E. Smirnova, *Sluzhby Makarii Kaliazinskomu: rukopisnaia traditsiia, problemy istochnikov, datirovki i atributsii*, Russkaia agiografiia. Issledovaniia. Publikatsii. Polemika (St. Petersburg: IRLI-RAN, 2005), 332–95; Galina S. Gadalova, "Kanonizatsiia prepodobnogo Makarii Koliiazinskogo, sluzhby i zhitii sviatogo," *Drevniaia Rus'. Voprosy Medievistiki*, 9 (2002), 85–90; Galina S. Gadalova, "Sluzhby prepodobnomy Makarii Koliiazinskomu: k voprosu o kompleksnom podkhoe v izuchenii pamiatnikov," *Russkaia agiografiia. Issledovaniia. Publikatsii. Polemika* (St. Petersburg: IRLI-RAN, 2005), 396–427.

¹⁶ Galina S. Gadalova, "Sluzhba na Obretenie moshchei sviatitelia Arseniia Tverskogo," *Drevniaia Rus'. Voprosy Medievistiki*, 41 (2010), 27–36.

¹⁷ "Sluzhba Kazanskoi ikone Bogoroditse po Kazanskomu ekzempliaru XVI veka," *Drevniaia Rus'. Voprosy Medievistiki*, 7 (2002), 116–24.

¹⁸ Dmitrii I. Abramovich, "Zhitii sviatykh muchenikov Borisa i Gleba i sluzhby im," *Pamiatniki drevne-russkoi literatury*, 2 (Petrograd: Tip. Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk, 1916) – locates, publishes and compares eight services. G. Lenhoff, *The Martyred Princes Boris and Gleb: A Socio-Cultural Study of the Cult and the Texts*, UCLA Slavic Studies, 19 (1989) – studies four main redactions of early services. Single services to Boris and Gleb are studied in: Sergei A. Bugoslavskii, "Ivanicheskie mesiachnye minei 1547–49 gg. i soderzhashchaisia v nikh sluzhba sv. muchenikam-kniaz'iam Borisu i Glebu," *Chteniia v Istoricheskom Obshchestve Nestora Letopistsa*, kn.14, vyp.2 (1900), 29–70; Petr V. Golubovskii, "Sluzhba sviatym muchenikam Borisu i Glebu v Ivanicheskoi minee 1547-49 g.," *Chteniia v Istoricheskom Obshchestve Nestora Letopistsa*, kn.14, vyp.3 (1900), 125–66.

¹⁹ Gail Lenhoff, *Early Russian Hagiography. The Lives of Prince Fedor the Black* (Weisbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1997), 122–46, 368–85 – describes five services and publishes two of them; Vitalii P. Efimenkov, "Sluzhby kniazuiu Feodoru i ego synov'iam," in Gail Lenhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor Chernyi v russkoi istorii i kul'ture* (Moscow; St. Petersburg: Al'ians-Arkheo, 2019), 164–66 – where I present thorough liturgical and source analysis of the three earliest services.

²⁰ Ol'ga V. Svetlova, *Istoriia teksta i iazyka sluzhby kniagine Ol'ge. Iz Srednevekov'ia v XXI vek* (St. Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2019).

The primary objective of this dissertation is liturgical and textual source study of the Orthodox church services to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin of Iaroslavl' with an intent to trace the development of their veneration from the local to the national level and observe the techniques and the typological associations employed by the creators of their offices. The methods used in the course of this survey may be applied to the studies of a broad range of services to Russian saints. Our conclusions and observed patterns²¹ can be compared with and contrasted against the findings on other medieval services. A number of questions addressed in this work may be applied in the research on hymnography honoring other early Russian saints: a) How were the services created in the medieval Rus'? b) How may the textual sources explain the associations the hymnographers used to categorize the particular rank of saints? c) How were the services liturgically adapted over time to accommodate their place in the church calendar? d) How can the liturgical analysis contribute to the understanding of the cult?

Chronology of Veneration

Understanding the evolution of church services is greatly enhanced by the knowledge of each particular saint's history of glorification (or canonization),²² as well as regional and national

²¹ Although, due to the volatility of the manuscripts' dating and origins, it is often impossible to make concrete assertions, it is the surveillance of the common patterns that becomes the primary means of testing the theories.

²² The process of canonization/glorification in the Christian Church has not changed significantly since its earliest days and was for the most part (except for the martyred saints) centered around the alleged saint's thaumaturgic manifestations (Vasil'ev, *Istoria kanonizatsii*, 47–50; Golubinskii, *Istoria kanonizatsii*, 40–43). This act involved assignment of a yearly date to commemorate the saint (usually the day of their repose or finding of relics), as well as composing of the liturgical service and a Prologue reading for such commemoration, which was often followed by the writing of a longer biographical account (*vita*, *zhitie*). Entries were added to the church calendars (*Menology*, *mesiatseslov*), and the services were published in the Monthly Menaia or Trefologia (Spasskii, *Russkoe liturgicheskoe tvorchestvo*, 292–93). The relics, if present, were brought up and reburied with honor in the church in the act called translation (*prenesenie moshchei*). At times, however, it was the strong popular veneration that led to the canonization, bypassing the requirement of miracles, such as in the cases of SS. Prince Vladimir and Antonii Pecherskii (Vasil'ev, *Istoria kanonizatsii*, 76–83, 109–11).

reception. The most recent and comprehensive attempt to reconstruct the chronology of veneration of the Iaroslavl' princess is presented in Gail Lenhoff's monograph *Kniaz' Feodor Chernyi v russkoi istorii i kul'ture* (2019),²³ and may be summarized as follows:

The earliest documented mention of the Rurikid Prince of Smolensk and Iaroslavl', St. Feodor, is found in the end-of-fourteenth-century Prologue, which lists his commemoration under September 19: "*V tozh den' prestavlenie blagovernago I bogoliubivago kniazia Feodora.*"²⁴ Per the oldest-surviving vita, St. Feodor reposed on September 19, 1299 having been tonsured a monk on his deathbed at the Iaroslavl's Spasskii Monastery.²⁵ The Vologda-Perm chronicle reports that in the year 6971 (1463) at the Spasskii Monastery the remains of Feodor – along with his two sons, Davyd (d.1321) and Konstantin (d. unknown), – who passed away in the monastic order ("*v mnisheskom chinu prestavishasia*") – were discovered to be incorrupt ("*tsely vsi i nichim zhe vrezheny*"), after which Archimandrite Khristofor moved them to the main church and placed them in one common tomb.²⁶ Per the second redaction of his vita, when the clergy and the local prince Aleksandr Feodorovich gathered to bury the relics in the ground with honors ("*da soshedshesia polozhat ikh s chest'iu v zemliu*"), the miracles came forth immediately and continued throughout the weeks to come, commencing local veneration. The ruling Archbishop Trifon of Rostov was not convinced by the ensuing investigation and treated the new thaumaturges with skepticism for which he was smitten with an illness that led

²³ Lenkhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 41–69.

²⁴ Rossiiskaia natsional'naia biblioteka (hereafter RNB), sobr. M. P. Pogodina, №59, f.28v; cited in Ol'ga V. Loseva, *Zhitiia russkikh sviatykh v sostave drevnerusskikh prologov XII – pervoi poliviny XV vekov* (Moscow: Rukopisnye pamiatniki drevnei Rusi, 2009), 127–28.

²⁵ Gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii muzei (hereafter GIM), sobr. N. P. Rumiantseva №305 (1470s), f.260–265 v.; cited in Lenkhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 173–75.

²⁶ *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* (hereafter *PSRL*), vol. 26: Vologodsko-Permskaia letopis' (Moscow; Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1959), 221.

him to retirement in August 1467, thus prolonging the official recognition of the saints.²⁷ His successor, Archbishop of Rostov Vassian (Rylo), was installed on December 13 of that same year,²⁸ and evidently favored the local canonization of St. Feodor, since the first liturgical service and the vita to him had appeared in a Menaion service by September 1468/69 (discussed in Chapter 1).²⁹

The earliest liturgical texts to mention all three princes together as saints are the five hymns under September 19 dating to 1470s (discussed in Chapter 2),³⁰ whose headings differentiate between the commemoration of Feodor's repose and the translation of relics of all three princes. The first *full* service honoring the three saints dates to 1480s³¹ and appears under September 19 (Chapter 2). Having undergone several variations, it was soon adapted to accommodate liturgical rubrics for the feast of the Elevation of the Cross (discussed in Chapter 3).³²

Even though the first hymns to the holy princes' relics' Inventio are dated as early as 1470s,³³ the first actual full service with the name "Translatio of the saints' relics" ("*Prinesenie moshchem sviatykh*") appears only in the beginning of 1500s and is placed under March 5³⁴ rather than September 19, revealing for the first time the date when the translation originally occurred (Chapter 4). Although the September 19 and March 5 services are for the most part identical,

²⁷ Iaroslavskii muzei-zapovednik (hereafter IaMZ) №15522, f. 354–357; cited in Lenkhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 43–44, 181–84.

²⁸ *PSRL*, vol. 24 (Tipografaskaia letopis'), 186–187.

²⁹ GIM, sobr. P. I. Shchukina №331, f.61–67v.; first published in Lenkhoff, *Early Russian Hagiography*, 368–81.

³⁰ RNB, Kirillo-Belozerskoe sobranie (hereafter KB) № 6/1083, f. 190–192; first published in Lenkhoff, *Early Russian Hagiography*, 382–85.

³¹ Nauchnaia biblioteka imeni N. I. Lobachevskogo Kazanskogo federal'nogo universiteta (hereafter Kaz.), №4635, f. 1–21; first published by us in Lenkhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 291–308.

³² The earliest of this variant of services is: GIM, sobr. Troitse-Sergievoi Lavry (hereafter TSL) №617, f.1–9v.

³³ RNB, KB № 6/1083, f. 190–192 – on the dating of this manuscript see footnote 116 in Chapter 2.

³⁴ GIM, Sobr. Chudova Monastyria, №333 (early 1500s), f. 132–140v.

several sixteenth century anthologies include both texts, thus differentiating between the two. Later vitas would confirm the date of March 5, 1463 as the day of the relics inventio.³⁵

The cult of the first patrons of Iaroslavl' reaches Moscow by first half of the sixteenth century as attested by the entry of the princes' names and vitas into the Great Menology (*Velikaia Mineia Chetiia*)³⁶ and the Book of Royal Degrees (*Stepennaia kniga*, 1555–1563).³⁷ Tsar Ivan IV and other members of the Moscow aristocracy embark on religious pilgrimages to Iaroslavl', begin bequeathing gifts to the Spasskii monastery and build churches dedicated to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin in various towns of the new Moscow realm.³⁸ The service to the saints beginning from the second half of the sixteenth century becomes relatively standardized and in this form (with only minor corrections) prevails to this day – as do the local veneration practices in Iaroslavl' itself where the princes' relics lay preserved.

Archbishop Vassian's enthronement in late 1467 and the first service to St. Feodor dated to September 1468/9 led G. Lenkhoff to conclude that the local Iaroslavl' "glorification festivities" of St. Feodor (if not all three princes) most likely occurred "on September 19, 1468 or 1469".³⁹ This hypothesis will be tested and qualified in the course of this dissertation.

Research Methods

³⁵ Rossiiskaia gosudarstvennaia biblioteka (hereafter RGB), sobr. Otdela rukopisei, №209, f.95; cited in Lenkhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 254.

³⁶ Uspenskii copy of the Great Menology donated by Metropolitan Makarii to the Kremlin Uspenskii Cathedral in 1547, GIM Sin. 986, f.578–588v.; cited in Lenkhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 58.

³⁷ Nikolai N. Pokrovskii; Gail D. Lenkhoff, ed. *Stepennaia kniga tsarskogo rodosloviia po drevneishim spiskam. V trekh tomakh*, vol.1 (Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2007), 550-59.

³⁸ Additional research discussing the geographic spread of the Iaroslavl' princes' cult includes: Tatiana V. Iur'eva. *Fedor Chernyi – chelovek i ikona (Kanonzatsiia Iaroslavskikh sviatykh v kul'turno-tipologicheskoi aspekte)* (Moscow; Arkhangel'sk: Institut Upravleniia, 2011), 138, 144–58; Aleksandr G. Mel'nik, "Pochitanie iaroslavskikh sviatykh Feodora, Davida i Konstantina za predelami Iaroslavlia v XVI v.," *Makarievskie chteniia*, vyp. 20 (Mozhaisk: 2013), 118–23; Sergei V. Gorodilin. "Kul't sv. Fedora Iaroslavskogo: sotsial'nyi i politicheskii konteksty vznikenii i razvitiia," *Srednevekovaia Rus'*, vyp. 13 (Moscow: 2018), 125–80.

³⁹ Lenkhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 49.

Church hymns dedicated to the first canonized patrons of Iaroslavl' princes Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin comprise an important chapter in the corpus of Russian hymnography. The manuscript compilation had been initiated in 1866 by Metropolitan Makarii (Bulgakov)⁴⁰ and continued by N. Barsukov.⁴¹ By the 1980s, over 80 handwritten services have been located,⁴² and the list continues to be expanded.⁴³ The first attempt at describing the service to the saints was undertaken by F. Spasskii, who made several preliminary observations of their services in late pre-revolutionary Menaia based on his expertise in broader church practice.⁴⁴ Five of the earliest manuscripts were transcribed, characterized and published by G. Lenhoff.⁴⁵ The earliest service to all three saints was acquired, analyzed and published in the course of this dissertation's writing.⁴⁶

The present study is an attempt to classify and group the available church services to the Iaroslavl' saints and trace their development from the earliest (1468/9) to the most recent ones put out in the last decade. We will focus on services from 1468 through the late sixteenth century, when they stabilized and obtained a form identical to modern texts.

The investigation of the manuscripts and of correlations between their variants will be carried out on three levels: source study, liturgics and socio-historical context. This approach, as we will show, yields the following results:

⁴⁰ Makarii, *Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvi*, 8:39 (footnote 50 presents 6 manuscripts).

⁴¹ 43 manuscripts are listed: Barsukov, *Istochniki russkoi agiografii*, 600.

⁴² 37 additional manuscripts are presented in: Shalamanov, "Kliment Okhridski," 55.

⁴³ Boris Mikhailovich Kloss, *Izbrannye trudy. Vol. II: Ocherki po istorii russkoi agiografii XIV–XVI vekov* (Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 2001), 252–327; Lenhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 164–66.

⁴⁴ Spasskii, *Russkoe liturgicheskoe tvorchestvo*, 142–44.

⁴⁵ Lenhoff, *Early Russian Hagiography*, 122–46.

⁴⁶ Efimenkov, "Sluzhby kniaziu Feodoru," 124–34, 291–308.

- a) The source search will become a key factor in understanding how the services to these early Russian saints were created in the fifteenth century and which associative principles were used by each composer. While large portions of St. Feodor's service are traceable to the General Menaion service to the venerable father(s), some hymns to all three princes appear to have been composed specifically for their feast, while others were borrowed from earlier canonized Russian saints. Comparison of the originals with the target texts allows us to identify changing epithets that reflect development of local and national veneration.
- b) The liturgical analytical approach allows us to evaluate the festal rank of each service and to trace the evolution and changes in the saints' cult as the centuries passed. In several instances particular methods of each writer's approach can be observed. The errors, omissions and rubrical (Typicon) inconsistencies appearing in the services allow us to derive certain hypotheses pertaining to these services' place in the liturgical calendar and the possible origin of the earliest full service to St. Feodor.
- c) Socio-historical observations and inferences can be drawn from investigating the wording chosen for and omitted from the hymns. Tracing the changing phrases and metaphors – though borrowed – tell us how the saints were viewed at any given time.

Liturgical Terminology and Classification

The analysis of church services must be accompanied by several preliminary provisions on the details of liturgical Typicon-based rubrics of the Russian Orthodox Church:

- a) The Typicon (*Ustav, Tipikon*) is a collection of rules for monastic life as well as directives (rubrics) for the liturgical services. Its predominant part contains liturgical rubrics that regulate the execution of the daily, weekly and yearly services in church, whereby most attention is dedicated to the orders of Vespers and Matins (Vigil), the texts for which are found in the Menaion (*Minea*), Triodion (*Triod' postnaia*) or Pentecostarion (*Triod' tsvetnaia*). While the Studite Typicon regulated the church services in early Rus', it was replaced ubiquitously by the Jerusalem Typicon by the fifteenth century, when the first services to St. Feodor appear.⁴⁷ Although the Jerusalem Ustav in the Russian Church has seen only minor changes over the past six hundred years, some of its regulations were elaborated or recorded later, for which reason this research will consult the Typica and other liturgical books as close as chronologically possible to the saints' services being analyzed.
- b) The types of individual hymns that compose the services of Vespers, Matins and Liturgy. Historically, the Troparion and Kontakion are considered the most indispensable hymns, without which no festal service to a saint can be complete within the Jerusalem Typicon's realm.⁴⁸ Summarizing the essence of the feast in several lines, these are sung and read multiple times during the liturgical date.⁴⁹ The Troparion and Kontakion play a key role in the initial stages of the veneration process as they are usually the first to be composed chronologically. The Panikhidas for the departed righteous person(s)⁵⁰ give way to

⁴⁷ Sergii (Spasskii), *Polnyi mesiatseslov Vostoka*. Tom 1: Vostochnaia agiologiya:190. Spasskii, *Russkoe liturgicheskoe tvorcestvo*, 88–92; Pentkovskii, *Tipikon Studita*, 227–28; Aleksei M. Pentkovskii, "Ierusalimskii ustav," *Pravoslavnaia Entsiklopediia*, vol. 21 (Moscow: Izd. "Pravoslavnaia entsiklopediia," 2012): 504–05.

⁴⁸ Mikhail Skaballanovich, *Tolkovyi Tipikon*, vyp. II (Kiev: Tipografiia Imperatorskago universiteta, 1913; reprint, Pskovo-Pecherskii monastyr': 1994), 180–82, 283–84; Vyp. III, 19–20.

⁴⁹ The Troparion and Kontakion are sung at all major services of the daily cycle: Vespers (only Troparion), Matins and Liturgy, and are read at first, third, sixth and ninth Hours.

⁵⁰ The pre-canonization commemorations of the souls of the departed princes at commemorative memorial (*Panikhida*) services is discussed in: Tatiana Shablova, "Formy pominoveniia v russkikh kniazhestvakh po

Molebens⁵¹ and water blessings.⁵² In case the Troparion, Kontakion and sometimes the Ikos (which thematically complements the latter⁵³) have not been composed, the generic ones ought to be used from the General Menaion.⁵⁴

- c) After the Troparion and Kontakion, the next step in veneration – either official canonization, or informal local glorification – is accompanied by a full service to the saint(s). As was often the case prior to Metropolitan Makarii’s Moscow Councils of 1547/49, the local saints did not require official canonizations,⁵⁵ and their services could either be sung from the General Menaia (in which case their names were simply filled in the blanks),⁵⁶ or composed individually by local hymnographers.⁵⁷ Before these early hymns and services entered the Trefologia and the mainstream Menaia, they often circulated locally in a form of separate handwritten liturgical pamphlets (*tetradki*).⁵⁸
- d) Jerusalem Typicon attributes six ranks of solemnity to all Menaion services, identifying which plays a major role in understanding the evolution and the level of veneration of each particular saint. These ranks, their marked signs⁵⁹ and their features are listed below

istochnikam XIV–XV vv.” In *Kormovoe pominovanie v Uspenskom Kirillo-Belozerskom monastyre v XVI–XVII vv.* (St. Petersburg; Renome: 2012), 22–33.

⁵¹ Golubinskii, *Istoriia kanonizatsii*, 42, 138.

⁵² Such Molebens to St. Feodor are mentioned in the Anonymous (Menaion) vita redaction, e.g. IaMZ 15522 (beginning of sixteenth century), f. 356, 358v., 359v., 361.

⁵³ Ikos is closely tied to the Kontakion and often ends with the same phrase/refrain (see Konstantin Nikol’skii (protoierei), *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava bogosluzheniia Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi* (St. Petersburg: Sinodal’naia tipografiia, 1907), 300 (footnote 5). As a pair, both appear at Canon’s ode six, and sometimes at ode three.

⁵⁴ Spasskii, *Russkoe liturgicheskoe tvorchestvo*, 30, 143.

⁵⁵ Golubinskii, *Istoriia kanonizatsii*, 90–92, 97, 288–89.

⁵⁶ F. Spasskii posits, based on a note by Archbishop Filaret, that St. Feodor’s celebration was already in place in 1463, that “the celebration assumes some sort of a service” and that this service “could be served from the General Menaion,” and proposes that “the primary service fully followed the General Menaion, whose texts were gradually substituted the new hymnographic compositions (Spasskii, *Russkoe liturgicheskoe tvorchestvo*, 143). Such was the case with the feast of St. Olga (Golubinskii, *Istoriia kanonizatsii*, 57).

⁵⁷ Identical process is noted by G. Lenhoff in regards to the development of veneration of SS. Boris and Gleb (Gail Lenhoff, *The Martyred Princes Boris and Gleb: A Socio-Cultural Study of the Cult and the Texts*, UCLA Slavic Studies, vol. 19 (Columbus: Slavica Publishers, 1989), 60.

⁵⁸ Spasskii, *Russkoe liturgicheskoe tvorchestvo*, 13, 60, 292–93.

⁵⁹ Special signs representing each rank were placed next to the service’s calendar date as early as first half of fifteenth century (e.g. TSL 239, ff. 79v., 194v., 213v.) and became more widespread by the sixteenth century (e.g.

according to their increasing festal order, whereas the more significant services contain greater number of hymns and are carried out with more solemnity.⁶⁰

1. Simple (*prostaia*) service [no sign] is the shortest and simplest service, the minimal requirement for which is three stichera on “Lord I call” at Vespers and a Canon at Matins. A customized Troparion and/or Kontakion to the saint may or may not be present, but a personal Sedalion is usually placed after the third ode of the Canon.
2. Six-sticheron (*shestirichnaia*) service [black tri-circle sign with three dots] may be as short as the *Simple* rank, but the stichera at “Lord I call” are prescribed “on six,” which is attained by either repeating each one of the three available stichera twice, or by singing six specially-composed new stichera. A customized Troparion and/or Kontakion to the saint may or may not be present. Often, a ‘Glory’ verse to the saint would be added at the Vespers Aposticha, while the Matins Aposticha are still taken from the Octoechos. The Great Doxology at the end of Matins is read.
3. Doxology (*slavoslovnaia*) service [red tri-circle sign with three dots] embellishes the *Six-sticheron* rank by prescribing the Great Doxology at the end of Matins to be sung rather than read. A personalized Troparion and Kontakion are always present. A set of special Aposthicha stichera is added at Vespers as well as the

TSL 242, multiple folia). At times the prescribed ranks were spelled out in the beginning of the services (TSL 239, ff. 201v., 209v., 218v., 239; TSL 259, f. 20). However, often these ranks had to be personally evaluated by each precentor (*ustavshchik*) based on their contents.

⁶⁰ *Tipikon, siest' Ustav* (Moscow: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1906; reprint, Kiev: UPTs, 1997), chapters 3–5, 15, 47. Detailed description and examples are given in Nikol'skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 488–523.

Praises stichera at Matins. A second Canon may be present as well. The end-of-Matins Aposticha are cancelled due to the festal ending of Matins.

4. Polyeleos (*polielei, mnogomilostivo*) service [red cross sign] replaces the regular daily Vespers kathisma with singing of “Blessed is the man” (*Blazhen muzh*), the singing of the Polyeleos sequence (Psalms 134 and 135, Magnification, Sedalion, festal Antiphon “From my youth,” Prokimenon, Gospel reading, Psalm 50 and post-Psalm 50 sticheron). Often there are two Canons to the saint(s) preceded by a short Canon to the Theotokos. A festal Katavasia is prescribed at the end of each Ode of the Canon, and one special festal Theotokos sticheron (Theotokion, *bogorodichen*) is prescribed at the end of “Lord I call,” the Aposticha, and the Praises. The festal Theotokion Troparion is to be sung at the end of Vespers and beginning of Matins which is to match the tone of the Troparion of the celebrated saint.
5. Vigil (*bdenie*) service [red cross in semi-circle sign] adds the Lytia (*litiia, na iskhozhonii*) stichera set before the Vespers Aposticha, during which the clergy proceeds to the Narthex or the church-porch to bless the loaves, wine and oil. The Troparion to the saint is followed by “Rejoice O Virgin Theotokos” at the end of Vespers. Originally, the Vespers and the Matins for this rank were combined, extending this service to last all night, earning it the name of Vigil (*vesnoshchnoe bdenie*). At times a special Small Vespers (*malaia vechernia*) – a shortened version of the regular Vespers – is added to the text before the regular (Great) Vespers, comprising a set of different stichera at “Lord I call” and the Aposticha.

6. Great Feast (*velikii prazdnik*) service [red cross in circle sign] is usually assigned only to the twelve major feasts and several minor feasts to the Lord and Theotokos. One exception is when the local church is dedicated to the celebrated saint, in which case that saint's memory is carried out similar to one of twelve major feasts.⁶¹ In such instances even a *Simple* or *Six-sticheron* service to a saint should be augmented to a *Vigil* rank, which the *Great Feast* rank highly resembles. In a few instances one may encounter a note in the Typicon or the Menaion: “ashche khram, ili voskhoshchet nastoiatel’ – tvorim bdenie/agripniiu”.⁶²
- e) Finally, it should be noted that Menaion contains a number of saints – particularly from Rus’ – who over time had obtained secondary feasts in addition to their original repose dates. These may include Inventio (aka Finding, *obretenie*)⁶³ and Translatio (aka Translation, *prenesenie*)⁶⁴ of their relics, although these designations are on a rare occasion interchanged.⁶⁵ Such additional feasts usually merit a composition of new hymns, ranging from an entirely new service to a mere Troparion-Kontakion set.⁶⁶ One

⁶¹ The so-called “Temple Chapters” (*khramovy glavny*) regulating the order of such services developed later into a separate section of the modern Typicon (*Tipikon*, 1906, f. 543v.–564; Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 117).

⁶² Directives of this sort may be found in the fifteenth and sixteenth-century Typica and Menaia, e.g.: TSL 480, f. 211v. (October 26), TSL 516, f.261 (January 20). One fifteenth-century Menaion for the service to SS. Boris and Gleb (July 24) directs: “Ashche khoshchet nastoiatel’ tvoriti vsenoshchnoe sviatym...” (TSL 577, f. 167 v.). Similar directives sometimes appear next to the services of Russian saints, such as Mikhail and Feodor of Chernigov (Sept. 20), Varlaam Khutynskii (Nov. 6), Mitropolit Aleksii (Feb. 12), Leontii of Rostov (May 23), Ignatii of Rostov (May 28), Kirill Belozerskii (June 9) – see RGB, f.344 (sobr. Shibanova), №110.

⁶³ TSL 548, f.313 (Leontii of Rostov, May 24), TSL 608, f.480 (Mitropolit Aleksii, May 20).

⁶⁴ TSL 623, f.240v. (Nicholas the Wonderworker, May 9); TSL 558, f.9 (Boris and Gleb, May 2); TSL 618, f. 223 (Mitropolit Petr, Aug. 24); GIM Chud. 333, f.132 (Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin of Iaroslavl’, March 5).

⁶⁵ E.g. July 5 feast to St. Sergii of Radonezh appears interchangeably with the names *obretenie* (TSL 619, f.238) and *prenesenie* (TSL 568, f.256).

⁶⁶ Some examples where the saints’ Repose services differ (entirely or predominantly) from their Inventio or Translatio services include: Nicholas the Wonderworker (Dec. 6 / May 9), Boris and Gleb (July 24 / May 2), Feodosii Pecherskii (May 3 / Aug. 14), Mitropolit Petr (Dec. 21 / Aug. 24), Sergii of Radonezh (Sept. 25 / July 5), Mitropolit Aleksii (Feb. 12 / May 20). In several instances the Translatio services borrow a Canon and occasional other hymns from the Repose services: Makarii Kaliazinskii (March 17 / May 26), Aleksandr Nevskii (Nov. 23 /

example of the latter are the two feasts in honor of the Iaroslavl' princes – September 19 (the day of St. Feodor's repose) and March 5 (the Inventio/Translatio of their relics).

While virtually the same service is listed under both dates, each celebration has a separate Troparion and Kontakion dedicated to it.

Hymnographic Sources

In order to demonstrate the processes occurring in the fifteenth–sixteenth century services to the Iaroslavl' princes and to avoid anachronisms, all sources referenced in this research are contemporary or slightly preceding the manuscripts in question. These sources include the liturgical texts to the Russian saints which might have influenced the early services to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin. A significant number of the codices cited are from the digitized collection of Trinity–St. Sergius Lavra (TSL) available online at <http://lib-fond.ru/lib-rgb/304-i/> (access: 3/1/2024). The following descriptions of the church books (in addition to the Typicon described above) consulted hereby as reference materials may be found of use by the reader:⁶⁷

1. Menaion, or Monthly service Menaion (*Mineia, Sluzheblnaia Mineia*) – the twelve monthly volumes containing the services to daily saints, arranged by month and day. On occasion, from two to six months' worth of services appear bound in one tome.
2. General Menaion (*Obshchaia Mineia*) – a collection of generic services to saints of various categories created for venerating the newly-glorified saints or the saints whose

Aug. 30). The Inventio service sometimes copies its Repose counterpart (aside from sparse newly-composed hymns such as the Troparion and Kontakion), as in the case of St. Daniil of Moscow (Mar. 4 / Aug. 30).

⁶⁷ Most fifteenth and sixteenth century services to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin appear in the Anthologies, Trefologia, and Service Menaia.

hymns are not found in the Monthly Menaia. These services are sometimes found appended to the Psalters or Typica.

3. Festal Menaion (*Prazdnichnaia Mineia*) contains select services to the more celebrated feasts and saints throughout the year. Sometimes designated as *Amfolog(ion)*.
4. Trefoloi, or Trefologion (*Trefolog, Trefoloi*) – a name adopted since the fifteenth century to the anthologies of services to especially-venerated saints from the church calendar. Often includes a large number of Russian saints.
5. Anthology, Collection, Miscellany (*Sbornik*) – any collection of liturgical and/or scriptural texts, hymns and prayers, bound in one book for ease of the local usage. At times this vague title was assigned to a book by the archival cataloguer who was not able to properly identify it.
6. Lenten Triodion (*Postnaia Triod'*) – a collection of daily Lenten services, usually the nine weeks preceding Palm Sunday.

Categorization of Manuscripts and Chapter Partition

Due to the uncertainties as to the provenance, exact dating and chronological correlation of most manuscripts, it is difficult to speak of “redactions” of the services in the medieval Russian Menaia. The services to the Iaroslavl’ princes have been categorized therefore primarily according to their liturgical features and divided into the following versions and sub-variants:

1. V1 (Chapter 1): service to St. Feodor alone under the date of September 19;

2. V2 (Chapter 2): services to all three princes under September 19, which carry no traces of Cross-Elevation rubrics; this version includes two variants: a) *Vigil* rank, and b) *Polyelei* rank;
3. V3 (Chapter 3): services to all three princes under September 19, which contain the rubrics for the Cross-Elevation feast; the two variants include: a) *Vigil* rank, and b) *Polyelei* rank;
4. V4 (Chapter 4): services to all three princes under March 5, all of which belong to the *Polyelei* variant.

It was not our intent to analyze the text of each separate service or to comprehensively trace their textual variations. Instead, we studied the most common service within each version and then noted the liturgical differences of every consecutive variant of that service, analyzing any new hymns that were not encountered previously.

CHAPTER 1

VARIANT 1: SEPTEMBER 19 SERVICE TO ST. FEODOR

The earliest surviving service to any of the three Holy Princes of Iaroslavl' is dedicated solely to St. Feodor⁶⁸ and is preserved in a Festal Menaion copied in 1468/69 in Pereiaslavl'-Zaleskii at the request of Andrei, Hegumen of the Aleksandrov Monastery⁶⁹ in the neighboring Vladimir diocese.⁷⁰ Titled "Pamiati sviatago chiudotvortsia kniaz'ia Feodora Iaroslav'skago novoiavlennago," this service is unique among all others in that it does not mention his sons, SS. Davyd and Konstantin. This places it in a category of its own – Variant 1 (V1) – to which this chapter is dedicated.⁷¹ The text presents the complete movable cycle of hymns written out in liturgical order for Vespers and Matins, which does not include the vita. The service also alludes – but often omits their full texts – to the theotokia governed by the Jerusalem Typicon.⁷² The texts of Vespers include: 1) three stichera on "Lord I call" with their 'Glory' verse (Doxastichon, *slavnik*), 2) three stichera on Aposticha with their 'Glory' verse, and 3) a Troparion. The Matins comprises: 1) two kathisma sedalia (sessional hymns), 2) a Canon consisting of 9 (8) odes⁷³ with

⁶⁸ GIM, sobr. P. I. Shchukina №331 (hereafter cited as Shchuk.), f.61–67v. – first published with preliminary analysis, historiographic overview and English translation in: Lenhoff, *Early Russian Hagiography*, 125–31, 368–81. The texts from the Shchuk. 331 service below are cited from the appendix to the 2019 edition: Lenhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 282-90.

⁶⁹ Lenhoff, *Early Russian Hagiography*, 368 (footnote 1). For more thorough description of this manuscript, see: Aleksandr I. Iatsimirskii, *Opis' starinnykh slavianskikh i russkikh rukopisei sobraniia P. I. Shchukina. Vyp. 2* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo P. I. Shchukina, 1897), 30–31.

⁷⁰ Our new findings show that Alexandrov Monastery was in fact a monastery of SS. Boris and Gleb, founded in the mid-thirteenth cent. by St. Alexander Nevsky (hence the name). It belonged to the Vladimir diocese until its transfer to the Moscow diocese in 1742. See: Vitalii P. Efimenkov, "«Raduisia, svetil'nik Iaroslavlia»: pervaiia i zabytaia sluzhba sv. kniaziu Feodoru Iaroslavskomu," *Vestnik Iaroslavskoi dukhovnoi seminarii*, vyp. 3 (2021), 83–84.

⁷¹ This commemoration of Feodor alone is also seen in the earliest Prologue entry and two initial vitae most frequently copied in manuscripts (Lenhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 84-88).

⁷² The entire texts of the theotokia and troparia are not given with the exception of the Canon odes and the Photogigicon (*svetilen*).

⁷³ Ode 2 of the Canon is omitted (not composed at all) with the exception of certain penitential Triodion services of Great Lent.

four troparia per ode, a Kontakion and an Ikos after the 6th ode, 3) a Photagogicon (*Svetilen*)⁷⁴ with its Theotokion, and 4) three Praises stichera with their ‘Glory’ verse.

Following the order of the service, the first liturgical directive, “On Lord I call,” appoint six stichera”⁷⁵ and the absence of the Old Testament readings (*Parimia*) attest to the “six-stichera” rank (*shestirichnyi*, sometimes marked with a black # sign) of the service. Other such traits include the absence of the Litia stichera, the Polyeleos, and of the Great Doxology.

All three initial “Lord I call” stichera follow similar texts from the mid-fifteenth century General Menaion’s service to one venerable father (hereafter cited as GMV1):⁷⁶

<p><u>“Lord I call” from GMV1 (2л[асъ] 8, под[обенъ]⁷⁷ ‘Мученици Господни’):</u> Преподобенъ и честень свѣтилникъ бжтвенный свѣтоносный подъ спудомъ житійския тлстоты не скрывается николиже, но на врѣсѣ его полагаетъ высокихъ чудесъ члколюбець. Того млитвами даруи людемъ твоимъ велію млость. (f.165)</p> <p>На рало възложилъ еси всчестный, дѣлания руку своею, дѣлающе выину божественая, невъзратися злѣ встяпъ, но быс въ царствіе управленъ, Христа vyplощашгося Бога въ спасеніе душамъ нашимъ. (f.165–165v.)</p> <p>Въ лоды телеснѣи възимъ кротькими дыханіи кроткаго духа, легко прешель еси житіискую пучину премудре, и на бисерѣ многоцѣннѣмъ своя имѣнія продавъ, и</p>	<p><u>“Lord I call” to Feodor (2л. 8, подобен ‘Что вы наречемъ’) (Shchuk. 331):</u> Преподобенъ честень явися божествены свѣтилникъ в Рустѣи странѣ, сия божественными чудесы, въ присносущемъ своемъ градѣ, многы страстныя недуги отгоняя, всѣхъ вѣрныхъ исцѣляя, молим ти ся, богомудры княже. Спаси душа наша. (f.61–61v.)</p> <p>Яко же на рало возложенъ еси, и всчестная своя дѣяния, божественныя твоя мудрыя подвигы, в мирѣ жительствуя благочестно, и сияя чудесными дѣтелми, всегда божественая, испраленая, и свои град сохраняя невредимъ, от невидимыхъ врагъ спасая душа наша. (f.61v.)</p> <p>Богомудрено пришель еси телесное чювьство кротькимъ дыханіи съмиренымъ духомъ, яко же на бисерѣ многоцѣннѣмъ своя имѣнія предавъ, нынѣ сояютъ многими</p>
--	---

⁷⁴ Historically, a daily or Lenten version of the more common festal Exapostilarion hymn that bears the same function.

⁷⁵ With only three stichera written out, it is expected that each one will be sung twice.

⁷⁶ RGB f.173.I, Sобрание Moskovskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii (hereafter cited as MDA) №77 (Miscellany, 2nd half of the 1400s). These stichera belong to the same tone 8, but the difference in the prescribed Prosomoion (*podoben*) melodies (“Muchenitsi Gospodni” vs. “Chto vy narechem”) may imply some intermediate text or a correction.

⁷⁷ *Podoben* (Prosomoion) – a hymn that is prescribed to follow its original *samopodoben* (Automelon), the special melodic variation within each specific tone designated by its initial phrase. For further reading see: Johann von Gardner, *Russian Church Singing*, vol. 1 (Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1980), 53–55.

<p>обрѣть его в себѣ удържалъ еси, блаженъ бывъ божственными сіяніи Его. (f.165v.)</p>	<p>чюдесы честное твое тѣло блаженое, всѣмъ вѣрнымъ подая исцѣленья неоскудныя, благодати наполнилъ еси свои град, <i>преподобне отче</i>, княже Федоре, спаси душа наша. (f.61v.–62)</p>
--	---

It is very important to note that in addition to Feodor’s name, all three target stichera demonstrate this newly-revealed saint’s treatment as a miracle worker through his relics and a patron of his city, while an attempt is made to present him as a “divine lantern in the entire land of Rus” (*bozhestvennyi svetil’nik v rustei strane*). Of especial note here – as in the title of this service and many of the subsequent hymns – is the fact that Feodor is ascribed the rank of a “venerable father” (*prepodobnyi*). This is also attested by the borrowing source for these initial stichera from the general service to a Venerable Father.

In the middle of the following ‘Glory’ verse the saint, who is appropriately being addressed in the second person (italicized) is incongruously referred to in the third person (in place of “your relics,” we find “his relics”). This could be a typical scribal error or it could indicate that the text was copied from various services:

“Lord I call” ‘Glory’ verse to Feodor (гл. 4):

<...> *Явился еси, отче*, съсудь святаго Духа <...> и божественымъ свѣтомъ осѣня с
 вѣрою, *ти* приходяще къ честынымъ его мощемъ, и честнѣ облистаемъ от
 живоносныхъ мощей *твоих*, нынѣ *ти* вѣрою припадаемъ <...> (f.62)

The two following Aposticha stichera do not correspond to any hymns from GMV1, and rightly so, since those general services did not include Aposticha at all. Despite the brevity of these stichera, the words “градъ” and “вѣрныхъ” appear twice in the first one, while “княже Федоре” repeats twice in the second Sticheron, revealing seemingly unedited or spontaneous composing

rather than copying. Another hint on their possible originality may be derived from the refrains that usually precede the second and the third stichera – in this case: “*Chestna...*” and “*Chto vzdam...*” While these refrains form a Prokimenon used during Matins and Liturgy for the venerable and hierarchs, they do not generally appear together as the Aposticha refrains.⁷⁸

The third Aposticha Sticheron has a different provenance than the first two, which can be deduced from its difference in length (it is twice as long, which usually occurs in the services with borrowings from various sources), and from the conflict of its initial phrase “Радуйся” with the melody of the 4th tone prescribed for all three stichera.⁷⁹ The parts italicized below may have been inspired by the “Lord I call” ‘Glory’ verse from the Small Vespers for the Inventio of St. Leontii of Rostov (May 23):

<p>“Lord I call” ‘Glory’ verse to Leontii (гл. 8): Веселися и радуися град славный Ростовъ, красуися и радуися церкви Божия и дивна вправду, в ней же лежитъ святая рака яже иматъ в себѣ даръ исцѣления благодати честное тѣло твое, святителю великий Леонтие. Ты бо смирение стежавъ и цѣломудрие твоими молтвами и пособиемъ; вѣрнии князи наши державу побѣждаютъ поганьни супостаты, тебе Христось свѣтило великое показа граду Ростову. Ты же похвала ему, ты и защищеніе, твой гробъ безмездна врачба предлежитъ; к нему бо слѣпшии приходяще вѣрою просвѣщаются, хромии влекущесе скачюще отходятъ, недужнии исцѣляются, бѣснующиися бѣсовъ избываютъ. Тѣмъ и мы днесъ вси почитающе честное твое обрѣтение, молимъ тыя преподобне отче: миръ мирови испроси</p>	<p>Aposticha 3 to Feodor (гл. 4) (Shchuk. 331): <i>Радуйся и вселися, славный град Ярославль, въсприимши в себѣ божественое съкровище. Многоцѣлебныя твоя, отче, мощи даровавьи граду нашему многа исцѣления и княземъ нашимъ похвала, и землѣ нашей великий помощникъ и многымъ странамъ заступникъ, молимъ тыя, отче, спаси душа наша, яко милостив. (f.62v.)</i></p>
--	--

⁷⁸ We were able to locate only one other such instance among early Russian saints – Mikhail and Feodor of Chernigov (September 20) in this very manuscript (f.69v.–70).

⁷⁹ Most, if not all stichera beginning with an exclamation “Raduisia” follow the 5th tone *podobn* melody “Raduisia zhivonosnyi kreste,” and therefore are not sung to any other tones/melodies.

душамъ нашимъ и велию милость. (f.57v.–58) ⁸⁰	
--	--

Although such similarities alone are not enough to presume direct borrowing, they should not be left unmentioned for several reasons. First, Feodor’s service concentrates heavily around his miracle-working relics, and it would be logical for an author of his service to consult with the one composed to honor the translation of St. Leontii’s relics. Secondly, these two saints were venerated in neighboring principalities of Northeast Rus’, which belonged to the same bishopric since the eleventh century⁸¹ and it is logical to assume that Leontii’s service would have been accessible to Iaroslavl’ hymnographers.

Feodor’s Aposticha ‘Glory’ verse borrows from Holy Metropolitan Peter’s service, as has been previously noted in the scholarship:⁸²

<p><u>Aposticha ‘Glory’ verse to Peter (гл. 8):</u></p> <p>Придѣте вси вѣрнии, съгласно въспоим Петра всеблаженнаго, благочестиа свѣтило, въздержанія правило, терпѣнію столпа, простотѣ съкровища, смѣрениа рѣку независтную, нищимъ утѣху, страннымъ странноприимника и истинныа любве Христовы дѣлателя воистину ближняго; и сѣну бо, и живѣ, и прѣшедь. Человѣкомъ заступникъ и спаситель показася, болѣзнемъ и страстемъ неисцѣльнымъ и всячѣскимъ напастемъ исцѣлитель; и Христа молитъ спастися душамъ нашимъ.⁸³</p>	<p><u>Aposticha ‘Glory’ verse to Feodor (гл. 8) (Shchuk. 331):</u></p> <p>Нынѣ тя <i>вѣрнии</i> молятъ Христова угодника богомудраго князя, божественнаго свѣтилника, ярославскаго чудотворца, русьскимъ княземъ велика помощника, <i>воздержанию</i> наставникъ, <i>терпѣнію</i> яко твердыи столпъ, <i>простотѣ сокровище</i>, <i>смирению</i> благопотребитель, <i>нищимъ утѣха</i>, <i>страннымъ</i> неоскудно податель, наполнился еси, княже, <i>Христовы любви</i>, явился еси <i>воистину врачъ</i> всѣмъ скорбящимъ людемъ и велможамъ наказатель, и мнихомъ наставникъ. Нынѣ ты вѣрою блажимъ, божественную твою память достойно почтемъ. (f.62v.)</p>
--	--

⁸⁰ TSL 613 (*Trefoloi* for May through August, 1400s), f.57v, 59v. The preserved relics of St. Leontii, bishop of Rostov (d. ca.1076 or 1077), were discovered in 1164; the earliest hymns are attributed to Archbishop Ioann of Rostov (end of twelfth cent.), while the earliest full service (May 23) dates to the mid-fifteenth century. See: Gail Lenkhoff “Kanonizatsiia i kniazheskaia vlast’ v Sever-Vostochnoi Rusi: Kul’t Leoniiia Rostovskogo,” *Iaroslavskaia starina*, vyp. 3 (1996): 15–19.

⁸¹ *Ierarkhi Rostovsko-Iaroslavskoi pastvy v preemstvennom poriadkie s 992 goda do nastoiashchago vremeni.* (Iaroslavl’: Tipografiia Germana Fal’k, 1864), 7–8; Pavel Stroev, *Spiski ierarkhov i nastoiatelei monastyrei Rossiiskoi Tserkvi* (St. Petersburg: Arkheograficheskaia komissiia, 1877; reprint, Moscow: Rukopisnye pamiatniki Drevnei Rusi, 2007), 328.

⁸² Lenhoff, *Early Russian Hagiography*, 128–29.

⁸³ Khar’kovskaia gosudarstvennaia nauchnaia biblioteka im. Korolenko (hereafter cited as KhGNB) №816281 (end of fourteenth cent.), cited from: Sedova, *Sviatitel’ Petr*, 69. See also: TSL 617 (*Trefoloi*, late 1400s – early 1500s), f.86v.

The Vespers conclude with Feodor’s Troparion which acknowledges the miracles from his relics and the patronage over Iaroslavl’, which repeats several phrases from two other hymns from this service:

<p><u>2nd Sticheron on “Lord I call” (гл. 8, под. ‘Что вы наречемъ’) (Shchuk. 331):</u> Яко же на рало возложенъ еси, и всечестная своя дѣянiя, божественныя твоя мудрыя подвигы, в мирѣ жительствуя благочестно, и сияя чудесными дѣтелми, всегда божественая, испраленая, и <i>свои град сохраняя невредимъ, от невидимыхъ врагъ</i> спасая душа наша. (f.61v.)</p> <p><u>Canon Ode 3, troparion 2 (Shchuk. 331):</u> <i>Изъмлада</i> предлежавъ вседержателевы, богоблажены княже, сохрани насъ от бѣсовскыя злобы, и <i>град свои сохрани невредимъ.</i> (f.63v.)</p>	<p><u>Troparion to Feodor (гл. 4) (Shchuk. 331):</u> <i>Изъмлада</i> явился еси, богомудрыи княже, божествены сосудъ невозбраненъ Богови, и нынѣ точиши намъ многа исцѣления от твоихъ честныхъ мощей, вся ереси потопляющи, спасая <i>свои град</i> и всѣхъ вѣрныхъ <i>сохраняя невредимъ от невидимыхъ врагъ</i>; вѣрою тя молимъ, преподобне отче, княже Федоре, спаси душа наша. (f.65)</p>
--	--

The Matins begins with two Kathisma Sedalia (Sessional Hymns). The first one essentially copies the Ode 3 Sedalion from the GMV1 Canon (matching its tone and podoben), while certain elements (italicized) are changed to reflect Feodor’s status and miracles:

<p><u>Ode 3 Sedalion from GMV1 (гласъ 4, под. “Скоро вари”):</u> Страстное поработилъ еси плотское мудрование, и горшее покорилъ еси лучшему, отче прѣславне, съкрушилъ еси бѣсомъ выя <i>постомъ</i>, въсиявшему в мирѣ яко солнечныхъ сиании твоя добродѣтели; и сего ради ты въспѣваемъ.⁸⁴</p>	<p><u>Kathisma 1 Sedalion to Feodor (гласъ 4, под. “Скоро [пред]вари” (Shchuk. 331):</u> Плотское мудрование поработилъ еси, <i>блаженне княже</i> Федоре, и горшее покорилъ еси, лучшее восприялъ еси, пресланыи отче, и скрушилъ еси бѣсомъ выя; и нынѣ восия си <i>чюдесе</i> яко солнечны лучь, в добродѣтель сияя <i>Божиею благодатью</i>. Того ради <i>велегласно</i> славимъ ты. (f.63)</p>
---	--

⁸⁴ MDA 77, f.166.

The second Kathisma Sedalion, while not corresponding to any text in GMV1, follows almost verbatim the Polyeleos Sedalion to Metropolitan Peter (December 21):⁸⁵

<p><u>Polyeleos Sedalion to Peter (гласъ 3):</u> Милостивому Христову угоднику, незлобивому и кроткому, вси тебе прилежно молимся и любовию зовем: “Раздреси межособную страстии наших брань, раздружи бесовскаа мечтания. Присноблажене, всяческих избави искушении, любовию воспевающих тя”⁸⁶</p>	<p><u>Kathisma 2 Sedalion to Feodor (гласъ 3) (Shchuk. 331):</u> Молимъ ти ся, преподобне отче княже Феодоре, <i>милостивому</i> богомудрому отцю, <i>прилѣжно</i> зовемъ, <i>разрѣши</i> ны, отче, <i>межиусобную брань страстеи нашихъ</i> и <i>вся бѣсовская мечтания</i> разоривъ, и <i>всяческихъ искушении</i> избави вѣроу чтущимъ память твою. (f.63)</p>
---	--

The Kathisma Sedalia are followed by the Canon “*преподобному единому*” which consists of 9(8) odes, each containing the initial phrase of its Irmos,⁸⁷ three troparia to the Saint, and the final Theotokion. Ode 6 includes the Kontakion and Ikos, while Ode 9 is followed by the Svetilen and its Theotokion. From the 24 total Canon troparia to Feodor, 19 correspond to their equivalents in the GMV1,⁸⁸ appending occasional details that allude to Feodor’s princely status, the miracles from the relics and the intercession for the entire land of Rus’, while six troparia are completely different. Careful comparison of the first 19 troparia with their GMV1 prototypes reveals two possible motives for the changes:

1. To adapt the monastic topoi wording to the princely-mundane life of Feodor, which is especially evident in the following examples:

<p><u>GMV1:</u> Отче Прилепился Христу</p>	<p><u>Feodor’s service in Shchuk. 331:</u> Княже (multiple instances) Христа возлюбилъ (1:1)</p>
--	--

⁸⁵ Spasskii, *Russkoe liturgicheskoe tvorchestvo*, 123 and 163 relates that the service to Metropolitan Peter’s repose (Dec. 21) already existed during the rule of Prokhor, Bishop of Rostov (d.1327), but was finalized by Metropolitan Kiprian of Moscow (d.1406).

⁸⁶ KhGNB 816281 – cited from Sedova, *Sviatitel’ Petr*, 70.

⁸⁷ The full texts of the irmoi are replaced by shortened initial phrase cues that were sufficient for the precentor (*ustavshchik*) to locate the corresponding full texts in the Irmologion – a book that was used specifically for singing these hymns (see Gardner, *Russian Church Singing*, 1:44).

⁸⁸ MDA 77 (*Shestodnev* and General Menaion, mid-1400s), f.65v.–67.

Плотскія страсти умертвивъ
 Все бѣсовскія злобы избегль еси
 Наказуя и учя, и приводя къ Божией воли
 Ангельски, отче, пожиль если
 Прешель отъ свѣта къ свѣту возсиявшему
 Тѣло твое... связавшееся веригами страсти
 –

Мірскія вѣщи посрамивыи (1:1)
 Сохрани насъ от бѣсовскія злобы (3:1)
 Вѣрныхъ сохраняюще от врагъ лукавыхъ (7:2)
 Ангеломъ съсельникъ, пожиль еси въ мирѣ благоугодно (8:1)
 Пришель спасти свои градъ и всѣхъ вѣрныхъ сохранить, и
 от всѣхъ недугъ исцѣлити (9:2)
 Связавши врага (9:3)
 Яко же в мирѣ жительствоваля еси (9:3)

2. To emphasize the presence of Feodor’s relics and intercession not only for his principality, but the entire land of Rus’:

GMV1:

Исполнился еси божественныхъ даровъ
 –
 –
 Врачуеша присупающихъ къ тебѣ
 –
 –
 Спасу тя вельми прославльшу

Feodor’s Service in Shchuk. 331:

Наполниль еси градъ свои божественныхъ чудесъ (1:2)
 И градъ твой сохрани невредимъ (3:2)
 Преселився, преславный княже, в градъ нашъ (4:1)
 Уврачуешъ... приступающе къ твоимъ честнымъ мощемъ
 (4:1)
 Покориль еси гордаго змяя лукаваго, воюющаго на градъ
 твой, и крестомъ сильнымъ отгналь еси дѣмонская воинства
 (7:1)
 Солнце в Русьстѣй странѣ (9:2)
 Господь тя весь миръ прославляше чудесными дѣлы (9:3)

Certain additions augment the status of Feodor’s sainthood: “Украшенъ еси всѣми дѣлы благыми” (4:2), “Престолу Владычню огнеобразному предъстоиши <...> благодарственно моляся своему Владыцѣ” (5:1). One example emphasizes the monastic heritage of the saint: “иночествующимъ наслѣдникъ” (9:1).

Troparion 4:3 adds what seems to be a biographical detail – “*dushu tvoiu sobliud ia velitsyi arkhistratig*” – referring to an event of special intercession by one of the Archistratigoi (Archangels) – possibly Michael – not mentioned in any of the vitae.⁸⁹

Five troparia from GMV1 were not included in Feodor’s service due to the monastic references that did not apply to the prince, who was tonsured on his deathbed and never lived as a monk. Among the monastic leitmotifs that were edited out are: “стягнувъ тѣло свое веригами” (5:3) and “въ дому Божіи процвѣль еси” (7:3).⁹⁰ The other three Canon troparia (3:1, 6:1, 6:2) are very likely to have been especially composed and personalized with a liturgical reason in mind

⁸⁹ *Stepennaia kniga tsarskogo rodosloviia* (ca.1555-1560, stepen’ IX, glava 18) suggests that Archangel Michael was a patron of the family line of the Iaroslavl’ princes (Pokrovskii, Lenkhoff, *Stepennaia Kniga*, 1:554).

⁹⁰ GMV1 in MDA 77 lists this troparion as 7:2.

– to repeat them during the Divine Liturgy (since Canon odes 3 and 6 are the only ones that repeat during that service):⁹¹

3:1: Нынѣ тя молять, богомудрыи, гражане, преподобныи княже, *спаси град нашъ* и всѣхъ вѣрныхъ съхрани.

6:1: Процвела еси в мирѣ, блажене, яко многоцвѣтущее древо, и нынѣ *точииши граду своему монга исцѣления* от твоихъ честныхъ мощей вѣрою к нимъ припадающе, подая вѣрнымъ неоскудную благодать.

6:2: Спаси ны молитвы, княже, преподобне отче, вѣрою творяще память твою от всѣхъ бѣдъ, сохрани невредимъ *градъ свои*.

In this way, instead of the generic hymns, the Liturgy attendants could hear the specially dedicated ones extolling Feodor as a patron for their city and thus contributing to the solemnity of the saint's feast. In regards to the sources for these new Canon troparia, they have not been located in either the General Menaion services, or those to earlier Russian saints (Peter, Sergii, Leontii), which leaves us to assume their originality.

All eight Theotokos troparia of the Canon coincide with those in the GMV1 service. The last one (9:4) reveals traces of heavy editing⁹² and adds Feodor into the context, naming him the Virgin's servant: "*Prosveti nas, Devo <...> slaviti Tvoego ugodnika.*"

The decision to move the Ode 3 Sedalion from GMV1 to the Kathisma hymns in Feodor's service,⁹³ was most likely been driven by the desire to celebrate the ordinary Menaion service (*riadovaia sluzhba*) in conjunction with one to Feodor. In this manner, Feodor's Kontakion would be sung after Ode 6, displacing the daily saint's Kontakion and Sedalion to Ode 3.

⁹¹ The Jerusalem Typicon prescribes these to be sung during the third Antiphon, i.e. "The Beatitudes" (Nikol'skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 375–79).

⁹² The vocative address "Devo" appears here three times.

⁹³ As already mentioned, GMV1 Ode 3 Sedalion "Strastnoe porabotil" appears as a variation in Feodor's service as a first Kathisma Sedalion.

The metaphor of Feodor as a blossoming tree (“*mnogotsvetushchee drevo*”) in troparion 6:1 is echoed in the Kontakion, praising the prince’s exemplary life and spiritual fruits.

The Ikos is the only hymn in this entire service that is written in the first person. The humble invocation of the saint is carried out in a form of an Akathist Ikos with its common salutation “Rejoice” (“*raduisia*”). It begins with a plea for guidance in the author’s toil and concludes with a request for an intercession on Judgement Day. These personal attributes and the elements of Feodor’s life, along with the lack of parallels with any texts in General Menaia or the early Russian Saints’ services, leads us to an assumption of its originality. The Ikos ending matches that of the Kontakion – a common custom inherited from the Byzantines⁹⁴ – which attests to the author’s hymnographic aptitude and may well suggest common authorship.

Summarizing the Canon, the personalized Svetilen extols Feodor as an intercessor for both his home city and the entire land of Rus’. No similar texts have been located in GMV1 or any early Russian saints’ services. However, the Theotokion part of this Svetilen may have originated in one of the following services, and supplemented with “*s prepodobnym kniazem*”:

<p><u>Svetilen to Prophet Elias (July 20):</u> Иже отъ Бога мирови поданномъ благомъ, Ты вина бысть, Богородице; нъ и ныня моли о общемъ спасении благопремѣннаго Бога.⁹⁵</p> <p><u>Svetilen to Cyrus and John (June 28):</u> Иже отъ Бога мирови поданныъ благъ Ты вина еси, Богородице, но и нынѣ умоли о опщемъ спасении Благопремѣннаго.⁹⁶</p> <p><u>Svetilen to Spyridon (December 12):</u> Иже отъ Бога мирови поданнымъ благомъ Ты вина бысть, Богородице, но и нынѣ</p>	<p><u>Svetilen Theotokion to Feodor (Shchuk. 331):</u> <i>Иже отъ Бога мирови поданому благымъ Ты вина, нынѣ молися, Дѣво, о насъ общемъ спасении съ преподобнымъ княземъ, благопремѣннаго Бога. (f.66v.)</i></p>
---	---

⁹⁴ Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 300–01.

⁹⁵ TSL 576 (July Menaion), f.142.

⁹⁶ TSL 566 (June Menaion, end of 1400s), f.141v.

<p>милостива сотвори и о общемъ спасении благопрременнаго Бога.⁹⁷</p> <p><u>Svetilen to John the Merciful (November 12):</u> Иже отъ Бога мирови данныхъ благъ Ты вина еси, Богородице, но и ныня милостива сотвори за опыщее спасение благоувѣтливаго Бога.⁹⁸</p>	
--	--

In regards to the general canon-writing conventions, Feodor’s Canon keeps the lengths of the troparia similar to the length of the Irmos in each Ode (with three exceptions⁹⁹), and the number of troparia is strictly 3/1 (three troparia to the saint and one to the Theotokos) in all odes.

The Matins concludes with three Praises stichera and their ‘Glory’ verse. The first one is identical to the same hymn in the service to St. Nicholas, as well as to the already existing main Troparion Feodor given earlier in this service:

<p><u>Praises Sticheron 1 to Nicholas (гласъ 1, самогласен):</u> Възрѣвъ неуклонно на высоту разума и усмотрилъ еси безвѣстно премудрости глубину, учении миръ обогатилъ еси. О насъ присно Христа моли, святителю Николае.¹⁰⁰</p>	<p><u>Praises Sticheron 1 to Feodor (гласъ 1):</u> <i>Изъмлада предлежавъ Вседержителю, и взирая неуклонно на высоту разума, усмотрив благоугодно и постиже мудрости глубину, и нынѣ чудесы обогатил еси, спасай присно свой градъ от всѣхъ видимыхъ и невидимыхъ врагъ. Нынѣ тя [молимъ], княже Феодоре, спаси душа наша.</i></p>
---	--

The second Sticheron seems to echo the narrative of the above Aposticha ‘Glory’ verse, and therefore may have ties with the service to Metropolitan Peter.

⁹⁷ TSL 504 (December Menaion, end of 1400s), f.103v.

⁹⁸ TSL 492 (November Menaion, 1469), f.139v.

⁹⁹ The troparia 5:3 and 6:2 are shortened, while 7:1 is longer than others in that Ode. All three do not come from the GMV1 source and are presumably newly composed.

¹⁰⁰ TSL 504 (December Menaion, fifteenth cent.), f.58v; similarly, in GIM (sobranie Sinodal’noi Biblioteki, hereafter cited as Sin.) №257 (Festal Menaion, fifteenth cent.), f.67.

The third Sticheron does not seem to have any close analogues and reveals uncommon phraseology (italicized), which may be a sign of its original composition:

Православьское спасеное чудотворение преславное твое княже, милосердие предивное твое, богоспасеное исцѣление украсивыи чудесы своими преславныи град Ярославль, и нынѣ обоняеши, княже, лица и сердца челоувѣкомъ, наполнивъ градъ нашъ великого твоего чудотворения, всѣхъ вѣрныхъ спасаея и от всѣхъ недугъ исцѣляя вѣроу припадая къ твоимъ честнымъ мощемъ, просяще спасения душамъ нашимъ.

The ‘Glory’ verse at the Praises alludes to the texts already employed in this service, namely the ‘Glory’ verses at “Lord I call” and the Aposticha (see above). This concluding hymn, more than the previous ones, emphasizes Feodor’s pan-Russian and even ecumenical significance (“*preslavnoe ego zhit’e po vselenei rasprostranisia i prechudna ego pokaza Gospod’ v rus’stei strane*”), nominating him as a patron saint for “princes, noblemen, and all Orthodox citizens.”

At this, the Shchukin Menaion service to St. Feodor ends, without giving any directives to sing the Great Doxology or mentioning any hymns during the Divine Liturgy,¹⁰¹ both of which appear in the services of higher ranks. In a case like this, the precentor was to follow the General Menaion directives for the given category of the saint (venerable father).

The above analysis shows that approximately two thirds of the Shchukin Menaion service to St. Feodor is based on the General Menaion service to a single venerable father (GMV1), while remaining third either follows the Monthly Menaion services, or could have been newly-composed in honor of this new saint. When borrowing from the General Menaion, the scribe does not copy the texts verbatim, but uses them only as a base, while avoiding strictly monastic imagery and appending detail pertaining to Feodor’s princely rank. The sources from the Menaion belong largely to the other early Russian saints (Peter, Leontii, and possibly Sergii). Borrowing from the

¹⁰¹ Such as the troparia at the Beatitudes, Prokimenon, Epistle pericope, Alleliua, and the Communion hymn.

service to St. Nicholas the Wonderworker on one occasion might reveal the compiler's association of Feodor with this saint due to his miracle-working relics.

The texts that we presume to be original compositions¹⁰² – apart from the common hymnographic topoi of seeking Christ, striving to live an angelic life, acquisition of the Holy Spirit, prayerful intercession for the others – add references to Feodor's relics and miracles, while invoking his spiritual patronage over Iaroslavl' and beyond. The only irregularity might be seen in the Ode 6 Ikos that was composed in the first-person and is virtually a personal invocation to St. Feodor.¹⁰³

The Schukin Menaion service to St. Feodor allows us to make several general observations about its scribe/compiler, who is familiar with the hymnographical material, skillfully works with the topoi of various saintly ranks, knows the liturgical abbreviations (“Г^си возва^х ст^хры по^с с^х s,” “Ирмо^с воду,” “Свѣ^т По^л ДХОМЪ”) and the numerous final phrase truncations. The choice of sources for this new service demonstrates his associative skill.¹⁰⁴ At the same time, the evident musical discrepancies such as prescribing tone 4 to the stichera of the “Raduisia” podoben (Aposticha Sticheron 3) may mean that the scribe could have been a monk or clergymen, but not a chorister.

The themes of the personalized hymns to St. Feodor reveal certain traits of this saint's cult. Scattered throughout the service one finds references to the importance of the relics discovery for Iaroslavl' (“*bozhestvennoe sokrovishche*”), the glory of our princes (“*kniazem nashim pokhvala*”),

¹⁰² Based on the above analysis, these can potentially be: Aposticha stichera 1 and 3, Ikos, Praises Sticheron 3, Canon troparia 3:1, 5:3, 6:1–2, and 7:3.

¹⁰³ This hymn may be numbered among the ones that bear the “language of humility of the ancient services” (“*iazuk smireniia drevnikh sluzhb*”), which F. Spasskii attributed to the ancient Northern influence (Spasskii, *Russkoe liturgicheskoe tvorchestvo*, 69).

¹⁰⁴ The Menaion services consulted here are those to SS. Leontii and Sergii (July 5), which are, in fact, dedicated to the finding/translation of their relics.

and the intercession for the principality (“*zemle nashei velikyi pomoshchnik*”).¹⁰⁵ The service extends this veneration beyond the local diocese and bestows upon Feodor patronage over all Rus’,¹⁰⁶ placing him alongside the pan-Russian intercessors, SS. Peter, Leontii, and Sergii, and promulgating Iaroslavl’ as an important center for the new state (“*nyne siiiayet grad tvoi v Rustei strane*”).¹⁰⁷ The author/compiler does not stop here, but goes on to extol Feodor as “*vsemirnyi svetil’nik*,” who solicits “*i prochim stranam mnogaia istseleniia*,” resolving in the publically intoned Ikos refrain: “*Raduisia, vsemirnyi svetil’niche, kniazhe Feodore bogomudre*.”¹⁰⁸ It should also be noted, that despite numerous mentions of Iaroslavl’ and “*grad nash*,” the two never appear in the same phrase. On the contrary, the city of St. Feodor is often referred to as “*grad tvoi*” or “*grad svoi*,” suggesting that this particular manuscript was intended for a broader, perhaps inter-diocesan usage. Neither does the service ever mention Spasskii Monastery – a place of burial and finding of Feodor’s relics.

The dating and the context overview of the Shchuk. 331 service to St. Feodor allow us to derive certain historical observations:

- a) The original service to St. Feodor, later copied in this 1468/9 Shchukin Menaion, was composed not earlier than the relics’ translation event (presumably March 5, 1463), as attested by 26 references to his miracles and 9 to his relics’ finding;

¹⁰⁵ Cf. other local princely patrons venerated in fourteenth century, such as SS. Boris and Gleb in Kiev (see Lenhoff, *Boris and Gleb*, 53–54, 69), and Dovmont-Timofei in Pskov (see Serebrianskii, *Drevnerusskie niazheskie zhitiia*, 274–75 and Valentina I. Okhotnikova, *Povest’ o Dovmonte* (Leningrad: “Nauka,” 1985), 142–45).

¹⁰⁶ “Божествены свѣтилникъ в рустѣй странѣ” (“Lord I call” Sticheron 1), “русьскимъ княземъ велика помощника” (Aposticha ‘Glory’ verse), “русьскимъ княземъ помощникъ” (Ikos), “радуйтеся, русьстии князи” (Canon 7:3), “солнце в русьстѣй странѣ” (Canon 9:2), “велми ты прослави Господь чудесь в Русьтѣй странѣ” (svetilen), “его показа Господь в русьстѣй странѣ” (Praises ‘Glory’ verse).

¹⁰⁷ Canon 5:3.

¹⁰⁸ Additionally: “тя вѣсь мѣръ прославляше чудесными дѣлы” (Canon 9:3) and “его житѣ по вселенѣи распространися” (Praises ‘Glory’ verse).

- b) The veneration of the saintly princes Davyd and Konstantin was not yet in place in 1468/9, as all miracles mentioned in the service are attributed exclusively to Feodor;¹⁰⁹
- c) The discovery and translation of the relics in 1453 together with the Shchukin Menaion service (prior to September 1468/9) set the two terminus years for the composition of the first service to St. Feodor.¹¹⁰

Based on the above observations, it may be surmised that Shchuk. 331 service (or its original redaction) was composed after 1463, yet not with an intent to be sung at the canonization festivities due to its low festal rank.¹¹¹ Multiple allusions to Feodor's patronage over places outside of Iaroslavl' allow us to presume the extramural designation of this text.

One important liturgical observation pertaining to this service deserves special attention. St. Feodor's service in this Shchukin Menaion is placed under September 19, but does not follow the basic rubrics of the Cross-Elevation afterfeast (*poprazdnestvo*) that lasts between September 15 and 21. According to Jerusalem Typicon, special hymns to the Cross must be added to every service between these dates.¹¹² The *Polyeleos*-ranked service to SS. Mikhail and Feodor of Chernigov that directly follows St. Feodor's service on September 20 (f.67v.–74v.) and copied by the same scribe,¹¹³ is one example of such observance.¹¹⁴ On the contrary, St. Feodor's service not

¹⁰⁹ This can be substantiated by the fact that the earliest vitae to include the miracle accounts – the Anonymous Redaction (early 1500s) and Anthony's Redaction (1528/9) – attribute 11 out of 13 miracles to Feodor alone (Lenkhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 180–94; 208–29).

¹¹⁰ The canonization process was delayed, and presumably occurred between 1467 and 1469 (Lenkhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 48–49).

¹¹¹ Local canonization would require a service of at least *Polyeleos* rank.

¹¹² E.g. TSL 239 (Ustav, 1st half of fifteenth cent.), f.71–73; RGB, f.113 (Iosifo-Volotskii Monastery) №336 (Ustav, 2nd half of fifteenth cent.), f.73v.–75v.; TSL 46 (Psalter, Gospel and Ustav, ca.1500), f.227–30. For further information, see: Nikol'skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 519–22, 528–29.

¹¹³ Boris M. Kloss, "Arkheograficheskii obzor ispol'zovannykh rukopisei" in Lenkhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 164.

¹¹⁴ This service (f.67v.–74v.) prescribes the following festal hymns: first four at "Lord I call" (mention only), "Lord I call" 'Now and ever' (written out), first Kathisma Sedalion and second Kathisma Sedalion (written out), Svetilen 'Glory/Now and ever' verse (mention only). Among the more evident elements that are not written out here, but

only omits any mention of the Cross-Elevation , but directly contradicts the Typicon rubrics in several instances: the Aposticha Theotokion prescribes a non-festal “Богородичень по гласу,” the Kathisma 1 and 2 sedalia, and the Svetilen Theotokion contain texts to the saint instead of the festal ones, while the Praises Theotokion is a regular “Кто Тебе не блажить.”

The reason that St. Feodor’s service does not follow the Typicon may be that its protograph was originally written without a date designation and before the September 19 celebration was consolidated – or perhaps even before the official glorification (see footnote 56) – and was later copied into the September Menaion without due liturgical amendments. In the next two chapters we will see that a number of other services (type V2) followed the same trend until the error was addressed and the proper adaptations began to appear (type V3 services). In Chapter 4 we will present a theory that in the early days of veneration, St. Feodor and his sons might have been commemorated on the day of their relics’ Translatio – March 5.

known by any precentor and reiterated daily from September 15 to 21 are the festal Troparion, Kontakion, and Katavasia.

CHAPTER 2

VARIANT 2: SEPTEMBER 19 SERVICES WITHOUT CROSS-ELEVATION RUBRICS

The Shchukin Meanion service of the V1 category, as shown in our discussion in Chapter 1, is unique in important respects. Although it dates to 1468/9, the time when prince Feodor and his two sons were canonized as wonderworking saints, it is exclusively dedicated to St. Feodor and is the only surviving service with the low *Six-stichera* rank. This chapter will deal with Variant 2 (V2) services to all three Iaroslavl' princes – SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin – that appear under September 19, but do not yet bear any signs of Cross-Elevation rubrics. Variant 2 is represented in 14 copies currently in our possession, spanning from late fifteenth to mid-seventeenth century, i.e. within the first 200 years of the princes' canonization. This variant's frequency significantly diminished around the turn of sixteenth century when they were almost entirely replaced by Variant 3 that took V2 as a basis, but added the Cross-Elevation rubrics (see Chapter 3). The services in this chapter will be divided into two subgroups according to their festal ranks: a) V2a – those belonging to the *Vigil* rank (sometimes marked with a sign % in the Ustavs), and b) V2b – those of the *Polyeleos* rank (marked with \$). These services contain various divergences, they all follow the same pattern and generally share over 75% of the hymns.

The first full V2 service, Kaz. 4635 dating to 1480s (see below) remained isolated and was not used as a source for any of the following versions. Instead, as will be demonstrated below, the earliest version that has most hymns in common with the largest number of the subsequent services is Chud. 75. Dating to the end of fifteenth century,¹¹⁵ it is the first service to all three princes

¹¹⁵ GIM, sobranie Chudova monastyria (hereafter cited as Chud.) №75; dating by Tatiana N. Protas'eva, *Opisanie rukopisei Chudovskogo sobraniia*. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1980, 52.

accepted into the Monthly Menaion codex. For ease of reference, this chapter will begin with a table reflecting the order and texts found in Chud. 75, to which all the other versions will be compared (using a reference # sign to omit copious repetitions of hymns). Each service will be analyzed separately in the order that they are dated beginning with Kaz. 4645, which will also indicate the differences between V1 and V2. All presented V2 services will be compared at the end of this chapter with an attempt to trace the patterns and reveal the signs of liturgical development.

GIM, Chud. 75 Reference Chart for V2:

<i>Ref. #</i>	<i>Type of hymn</i>	<i>Initial words / Indication of text from Chud. 75</i>
VESPERS		
1	“Lord I call” Sticheron 1	Подобень “Что вы наречемъ”: “Преподобне отче Феодоре, просвѣщены благодатью”
2	“Lord I call” Sticheron 2	“Свѣтлости духовныя”
3	“Lord I call” Sticheron 3	“Грѣховный мрак от сердець”
4	“Lord I call” Sticheron 4	“Яко звѣзды всесвѣтлыя”
5	“Lord I call” Sticheron 5	“Преподобнии отцы премудрі”
6	“Lord I call” Sticheron 6	“Феодоре и Давыде, добрыми добродѣтели вышедше”
7	“Lord I call” Sticheron 7	“Ликом постническимъ”
8	“Lord I call” Sticheron 8	“Сіянии духовными”
9	“Lord I call” ‘Glory’ verse	“Равноангелское житие”
10	“Lord I call” Theotokion	“Царю Небесный”
11	Entrance and Prokimenon	-- (not mentioned)
12	Parimia Readings	i. “Праведныхъ душа въ руцѣ Божіи” (Wisdom of Solomon 3:1-9) ii. “Праведный аще постигнетъ” (Wisdom of Solomon 4:7-15) iii. “Праведници въ вѣкъ живутъ” (Wisdom of Solomon 5,15-6:3)
13	Litya Sticheron 1	“Постническую наготу”
14	Litya Sticheron 2	“Иже на земли ангела”
15	Litya Sticheron 3	“Преподобне отче Феодоре, измлада”
16	Litya Sticheron 4	“Преподобне отче Феодоре, твердаго”
17	Litya ‘Glory’ verse	“Преподобне отче Феодоре, гласъ евангельскій”
18	Litya Theotokion	“Въспойте людіе Матерь Бога нашего”

19	Aposticha Sticheron 1	Подобень ‘Радуйся’: “Радуйся постных”
20	Aposticha Sticheron 2	“Угль Богосвѣтлый”
21	Aposticha Sticheron 3	“Лѣствица небомѣрная”
22	Aposticha ‘Glory’ verse	“Преподобне отче Феодоре, не дал если сна”
23	Aposticha Thotokion	“Бгородице Ты еси лоза”
24	Troparion to the princes	“Яко звѣзды многосвѣтлыя”
25	Troparion to Feodor	“Яко цѣлителя”
MATINS		
26	Initial Matins designation	“Богъ Господь, Многомилостиве”
27	‘God is the Lord’ torparia order	--
28	Kathisma Sedalion 1	--
29	Kathisma Sedalion 2	--
30	Polyeleos Sedalion	--
31	Antiphon	-- (not mentioned)
32	Prokimenon	“Възвеселится праведникъ”
33	Gospel	“Вы есте свѣт миру” (Matthew, pericope 11)
34	Psalms 50 Sticheron	--
35	Canon 1 designation	“Канонъ святымъ, гл. 8, Воду прошедь”
36	Canon 1, Ode 1, troparion 1	“Мракъ грѣховный”
37	Canon 1, Ode 1, troparion 2	“Просвѣщеніемъ трисолнечнаго”
38	Canon 1, Ode 1, troparion 3	“Свѣтомъ благодати”
39	Canon 1, Ode 1, Theotokion	“Плотію рождши”
40	Canon 2 designation	“Инь канонъ, гл. 4, Отверзь уста моя”
41	Canon 2, Ode 1, troparion 1	“Вси вы Творца”
42	Canon 2, Ode 1, troparion 2	“Измлада Христа”
43	Canon 2, Ode 1, troparion 3	“Нынѣ, преблаженне Феодоре”
44	Canon 2, Ode 1, Theotokion	“Радуйся, Пресвятая”
45	Canon 1, Ode 3, troparion 1	“Неизреченныя тайны”
46	Canon 1, Ode 3, troparion 2	“Предстояще Господу”
47	Canon 1, Ode 3, troparion 3	“Напоивше души”
48	Canon 1, Ode 3, Theotokion	“Нива духовная”
49	Canon 2, Ode 3, troparion 1	“Яко свѣтозарное солнце”
50	Canon 2, Ode 3, troparion 2	“Измлада возрастъ”
51	Canon 2, Ode 3, troparion 3	“Креста Господня”
52	Canon 2, Ode 3, Theotokion	“Радуйся, Владычице”
53	Ode 3 Kontakion	--
54	Ode 3 Ikos	--
55	Ode 3 Sedalion 1	“Златыя заря”
56	Ode 3 Sedalion 2	“Твердостію разума украшаяся”
57	Ode 3 Sedalion 3	“Житийское море”
58	Canon 1, Ode 4, troparion 1	“Ты на земли”
59	Canon 1, Ode 4, troparion 2	“Духовный арганъ”
60	Canon 1, Ode 4, troparion 3	“Яко Христово смиреніе возлюблешии”
61	Canon 1, Ode 4, troparion 4	“Кадило благоуханія”

62	Canon 1, Ode 4, Theotokion	“Безсѣмени зачат”
63	Canon 2, Ode 4, troparion 1	“На земли степень”
64	Canon 2, Ode 4, troparion 2	“Исцѣленія содѣваетъ”
65	Canon 2, Ode 4, troparion 3	“Со врагомъ древле”
66	Canon 2, Ode 4, Theotokion	“Христа нам родила”
67	Canon 1, Ode 5, troparion 1	“Просвѣти твое житие... Церкви ты былъ еси...”
68	Canon 1, Ode 5, troparion 2	“Единой любви”
69	Canon 1, Ode 5, troparion 3	“Незлюбиви и кротцы”
70	Canon 1, Ode 5, Theotokion	“Воспоте вся земля”
71	Canon 2, Ode 5, troparion 1	“Законно молитвами”
72	Canon 2, Ode 5, troparion 2	“От юности возжадалъ”
73	Canon 2, Ode 5, troparion 3	“Гробъ честнаго”
74	Canon 2, Ode 5, Theotokion	“Всесвѣтлым украшена”
75	Canon 1, Ode 6, troparion 1	“Любовию и вѣрою”
76	Canon 1, Ode 6, troparion 2	“Молитвами варяя”
77	Canon 1, Ode 6, troparion 3	“Благими нравы”
78	Canon 1, Ode 6, troparion 4	“Благом законом исполнитель”
79	Canon 1, Ode 6, Theotokion	“Душеვნя ми страсти”
80	Canon 2, Ode 6, troparion 1	“Моли прилѣжно Господа”
81	Canon 2, Ode 6, troparion 2	“Удивися, блаженне, чудесемъ”
82	Canon 2, Ode 6, troparion 3	“Лукъ сильныхъ сокрушилъ”
83	Canon 2, Ode 6, troparion 4	“Всеблажене Феодоре”
84	Canon 2, Ode 6, Theotokion	“Изсушила еси”
85	Ode 6 Kontakion to Feodor	гл.4, На преставление Феодору, под. ‘Явися днесь’: “Явися веліе солнце... слава преподобным.”
86	Ode 6 Kontakion to the princes	гл. 8, На принесеніе мощемъ чюд.: “Явистеся свѣтилници... чтущим память вашу.”
87	Ode 6 Ikos to Feodor	“Свыше свое званіе... граду нашему Ярославлю великое упвержение.»
88	Ode 6 Ikos to the princes	“На высотѣ... слава преподобным.”
89	Canon 1, Ode 7, troparion 1	“Прилѣжныя ти подвиги”
90	Canon 1, Ode 7, troparion 2	“Оружіемъ вашихъ молитвъ”
91	Canon 1, Ode 7, troparion 3	“Постомъ и молитвою”
92	Canon 1, Ode 7, troparion 4	“Плоти ваша повинувше”
93	Canon 1, Ode 7, Theotokion	“Оружіе, Чистая”
94	Canon 2, Ode 7, troparion 1	“Блаженное житіе”
95	Canon 2, Ode 7, troparion 2	“Явился еси нынѣ”
96	Canon 2, Ode 7, troparion 3	“Хотѣніемъ от мірскихъ”
97	Canon 2, Ode 7, troparion 4	“Свершив течение”
98	Canon 2, Ode 7, Theotokion	“Без сѣмени заченши”
99	Canon 1, Ode 8, troparion 1	“К Богу прилѣжно”
100	Canon 1, Ode 8, troparion 2	“Любовью и вѣрою”
101	Canon 1, Ode 8, troparion 3	“Слезъ вашихъ капли”

102	Canon 1, Ode 8, troparion 4	“Вѣру и надежду”
103	Canon 1, Ode 8, troparion 5	“Подвизаетея добре”
104	Canon 1, Ode 8, Theotokion	“Мати Божія Чистая”
105	Canon 2, Ode 8, troparion 1	“Ликують не небесѣхъ”
106	Canon 2, Ode 8, troparion 2	“Помолися Христу”
107	Canon 2, Ode 8, troparion 3	“Чюдесы, святе, твоими”
108	Canon 2, Ode 8, Theotokion	“Из пречистаго Ти”
109	Canon 1, Ode 9, troparion 1	“Естество тлѣнное”
110	Canon 1, Ode 9, troparion 2	“На земли живѣ”
111	Canon 1, Ode 9, troparion 3	“Се отверзесе вамъ”
112	Canon 1, Ode 9, troparion 4	“Съкрушенымъ сердцемъ”
113	Canon 1, Ode 9, troparion 5	“Выспре к Богу”
114	Canon 1, Ode 9, Theotokion	“Пощади мя, Господи”
115	Canon 2, Ode 9, troparion 1	“Удивися во всемъ мѣрѣ»
116	Canon 2, Ode 9, troparion 2	“Да входятъ нынѣ»
117	Canon 2, Ode 9, troparion 3	“И нынѣ молитесь»
118	Canon 2, Ode 9, Theotokion	“Ангели, архангели”
119	Svetilen	“Господь ты прослви”
120	Svetilen Theotokion	--
121	Praises Sticheron 1	“Преподобне отче, досточудне Феодоре”
122	Praises Sticheron 2	“Чювьства вся наставле”
123	Praises Sticheron 3	“Вышняго мощію”
124	Praises Sticheron 4	“Вся чтущыя вѣрою”
125	Praises ‘Glory’ verse	“Преподобніи отци вси... поучившесе”
126	Additional Sticheron 1	“Доме Ефрантов, домъ” Verse: “Блажен муж бояся”
127	Additional Sticheron 2	“Радуися, Феодоре, апостоломъ” Verse: “Въсвѣлятся преподобніи во славе”
128	Additional Sticheron 3	“Приими нынѣ пѣніе”
129	Additional ‘Glory’ verse	“Приидѣте вси вѣрніи”
130	Additional Theotokion	“Радуися и веселися”
131	Great Doxology and Dismissal	-- (not mentioned)
132	Liturgy sequence	--
133	Vita	--

RNB, Kirillo-Belozerskoe sobranie (KB) № 6/1083

The earliest hymns in existence to SS. David and Konstantin are preserved in a liturgical

Miscellany of the Kirill-Beloozero Monasastery of the 1470s – RNB, KB 6/1083 – where they

are placed under the September 19 date.¹¹⁶ The contents of this Miscellany suggest that it was used for private cell use or semi-private singing at the molebens.¹¹⁷ However, as first suggested by Spasskii, it may have also been the case that these separate hymns were implemented in the church services in addition to the General Manaion hymns, before the full services were composed.¹¹⁸ We will analyze the hymns in the same order they are presented in this codex:¹¹⁹

1) The first Troparion (tone 8) to all three saints is titled “Na prenesenie moshchem chudotvortsem Feodoru i s chady ego.” Echoing its title, the hymn acknowledges the Translatio event, attesting also to the princes’ miracles. A quest for possible fifteenth century sources has resulted two possible prototypes for this Troparion: kontakia to Ven. Timothy of Symbola (February 21) and Ven. Abramuis the Recluse (October 29), both of which may have been intervowen to form the new text:

<p><u>Kontakion to St. Timothy, tone 4:</u> Яко звѣзда многосвѣтла от вѣстока вѣсиявъ, озариль еси въ сердцихъ вѣрныхъ добродѣтели чудесъ твоихъ, чудоносче Тимофѣе преподобне.¹²⁰</p> <p><u>Kontakion to St. Abramius, tone 3:</u> Въ плоти яко ангель на земли показася, и пощением насажденъ бысть яко древо при водах въздержанія напоень струями слезъ твоих, и скверну отмывъ; сего ради</p>	<p><u>Troparion to the princes, tone 8:</u> Яко звѣзды многосвѣтлыя от юности восиавше, освѣтили есте сердца вѣрныхъ пренесениемъ честныхъ мощей вашихъ. добродѣтелими чудесъ вашихъ.</p> <p>Во плоти, яко ангели на земли показастеся, и пощениемъ насажени бысть, яко древо при водах въздержанія, напоени струями слезъ вашихъ, и скверну омыете. Сего ради явитесь приатилице Божиа Духа, Феодоре и Давиде и</p>
---	---

¹¹⁶ F.190–92. Detailed description and general dating (as 1480s) – see M. D. Kagan, N. V. Ponyrko, M. V. Rozhdestvenskaia, “Opisanie sbornikov XV v. knigopista Efrosina,” *TODRL* 35 (1980): 144–72. We will be using the new dating of the folia 190–192 proposed by B. Kloss as 1470s (Kloss, “Arkheograficheskii obzor,” 165).

¹¹⁷ Besides the services of Needs (*treby*) and Octoechos, the sermons, prologue and apocryphal readings, Scripture interpretations, and prayers to certain saint, this Miscellany also contains texts to a number of Russian saints such as Sergius of Radonezh, Stefan of Perm’, Kirill Belozerskii, Varlaam Khutynskii, Boris and Gleb, Antonii Pecherskii, etc.

¹¹⁸ Spasskii, *Russkoe liturgicheskoe tvorcestvo*, 143. The author explains that as these early hymns developed into services, they entered the Supplementary Menaia (*Dopolnitel’nye Minei*) and eventually were incorporated into the standardized regular Menaia (*Sluzhebnaia Mineia*): 13, 60, 292–94.

¹¹⁹ These five texts were first published and described in Lenkhoff, *Early Russian Hagiography*, 382–85. For our recent liturgical analysis, see: Lenkhoff. *Kniaz’ Feodor*, 120–24.

¹²⁰ TSL 523 (February Menaion, fifteenth cent.), f.147.

явися приятелище Божиа Духа, Аврамие. ¹²¹	Константине, молити Христа Бога грѣхомъ оставление даровати душамъ нашим, миръ и велию милость. (f. 190)
---	--

Worth attention here is the grammatical inconsistency in number (singular vs. plural) in phrases “насажени бысть” and “явистеся приятелище” which demonstrates a pluralization attempt from a source dedicated to a singular saint. The original’s “chiudes tvoikh” is evidently changed to “preneseniem chestnykh moshchei vashikh.” The hymnographer preserves Abramius’s epithets characterizing the princes as angels incarnate, rooted in fasting with tears at the waters of abstinence. The final petition seems to be invented and doubled as it asks the saints not only to grant peace and mercy, but also to intercede for the pardon of our sins.

2) The Troparion (tone 4) to Feodor alone titled “Na prestavlenie Feodoru”:

Яко цѣлителя преизрядна и казателя богопріатна, мирскіи мятежь оставиль еси, и крестъ свои на рамо вземъ, божественымъ житіемъ пожиль еси, и воздержаніемъплоти оукрасиль еси, и к мощемъ твоимъ притѣкающе, съсоуд избранныи показа тя, всеблажене Феодоре, воспѣвающихъ твою память въ псалмѣхъ и пѣснех. Преподобне молися о душахъ наших: (f. 190–190v.)

The textual source for this Troparion has not been located, neither does it correspond to any hymns in the V1 service to St. Feodor alone in Shchuk. 331. The text captures important details about the saint such as relics and healings, while also dubbing him *vseblazhenne* and *prepodobne*.

3) Kontakion (tone 4) “Na prestavlenie Feodoru”:

Явися веліе слнце Христовѣ Церкви, просвѣщая ученія свѣтлостми всечестне, яко черпаломъ златымъ от кладязя неископаного чюдесь почерпль еси, от источника нестошимаго, на успеніи своемъ испиль еси, всеблажене Феодоре. И нынѣ всѣмъ даеши грѣхомъ прощеніе, слава преподобным: (f. 190v.–191)

¹²¹ TSL 480 (October Menaion, fifteenth cent.), f.262.

The quest for this hymn’s possible prototypes did not produce any evident sources. Alluding to Feodor as the “sun” that enlightens Christ’s Church with its rays, this Kontakion mentions Feodor’s repose (*uspenie*), while acknowledging his miracles and numbering him with the venerable monastics (*slava prepodobnym*).

4) Kontakion (tone 8) to all three saints “Na prenesenie moshchem chudotvortsem” bears close ties with the texts to SS. Chariton the Confessor (September 28) and Sisoes the Great (July 6):

<p><u>Kontakion to Chariton (tone 2):</u> Насладився, богомудре, въздержанія, и желанія плотская тыи обьустивъ, явися <i>върою</i> възвращаем, и яко живота древо райское процвель еси, Харитоне отче священныи.¹²²</p> <p><u>Troparion to Sisoes (tone 1):</u> Пустынны жителю и во плоти ангель и чудотворецъ явися, богоносныи отче нашъ, пощениемъ, бдѣніемъ и молитвами небесныа благодати приемъ, исцѣляеши болящаа и душа върою притѣкающим ти. Слава Давшему ти крѣпость, слава Вѣнчавшому тя, слава Дѣющему тобою всѣмъ исцѣленія.¹²³</p>	<p><u>Kontakion to the princes (tone 8):</u> <u>Явистесея</u> свѣтилници всесвѣтліи, во плоти ангели, яко живота древо райское, пощениемъ и бдѣніемъ <u>явистесея</u> върою <i>возвращаеми</i> и процвели есте молитвами своими, небесныа благодати приимы, врачеве крѣпки <u>явистесея</u>, исцѣляете недужных душа с <i>върою</i> <i>приходящих</i> к рацѣ мощей ваших, чудотворци <u>показастесея</u>, Феодоре и Давыде и Константине. Молите Христа Бога грѣховъ оставленіе даровати върою и любовію чтоушимъ память вашу: (f. 191)</p>
--	--

While attributing the miracles specifically to the princes’ relics, the hymn extols their monastic feats, similar to the troparia mentioned earlier. Evident signs of integration and editing are seen in the unnecessary repetitions of “iavistesia” and “pokazastesia.”

5) The Ikos – untitled, but dedicated to all three princes, follows almost verbatim the one to Ven. Athanasius of Athos (July 5):

¹²² TSL 465 (Menaion, early fifteenth cent.) f.303.

¹²³ TSL 576 (Menaion, fifteenth cent.), f.43v. This widely used Troparion for the venerable monastic saints may also be found in services to: Ven. Auxentius of Bethany (February 14), Basil the Confessor (February 28), Theodore the Sanctified (May 16), Simeon the Stylite (May 24), Tikhon of Amathus (June 16), and Dius of Constantinople (July 19).

<p><u>Ikos to St. Athanasius:</u> Съвыше свое звание приемъ преславне, бессмертную жизнь наслѣдова, с плотию бо на земли <i>бесплотных житие прошед, был еси страстми неприатен</i>. Тѣм же тя хвалим, отче:</p> <p>Радуися, свѣтлаа <u>инокующимъ славо</u>; радуися, ясныи цѣломудриа столпе; радуися, множеству явѣ сказателное познание; радуися, премудраго разума явление; радуися, правило растоателное правдѣ извѣстно; радуися, словом свершившу ти дѣяниемъ стремления; радуися, уме наслаждаея мысли неизреченныхъ; радуися, всю тварь благочестно удивль; радуися, им же посрамишася бѣсове; радуися, им же всяка страсть умертвися; радуися, источниче животных водъ; радуися, спаситель иже вѣрно ти въпиющимъ: радуися, отче Афанасие.¹²⁴</p>	<p><u>Ikos to the princes:</u> Свыше свое звание приемъ преславно, бессмертную жизнь наслѣдовали есте, с плотию бо на земли <i>бесплотных житие прешедшиа, были есте страстми не приати</i>. Тѣм же ваю хвалим, отци преподобнии:</p> <p>Радуитася, свѣтлая свѣтила, православным славо, ясныи цѣломудриа столпи. Радуитася, множество явѣ сказателное познание. Радуитася, премудраго разума явление. Радуитася, правило растоятелное правдѣ извѣстно. Радуитася, словомъ свершивша дѣяниемъ стремления. Радуитася, умы наслаждаея мысли неизреченных. Радуитася, всю тварь благочестно удивлеи, ими же посрамишася бѣсове. Радуитася, ими же всяка страсть умертвися. Радуитася, источници животочных водъ. Радуитася, спасители иже вѣрно вы вопиющим. Радуитася, <u>новоявлени чудотворци</u> Феодоре и Давиде и Константине. Радуитася, <u>граду нашему Ярославлю великое утверждение</u>. (f. 191–192)</p>
--	---

Apart from the truncation of the typical monastic “*inokuiushchim slavo*,” of importance are the addenda which reveal the treatment of the saints as the patrons of Iaroslavl’. Designating this city as “*grad nash*” attests to its Iaroslavl’ provenance. It is hardly unusual for such hymns to appear in the Kirillo-Belozerskii Monastery, since it belonged to the Rostov-Iaroslavl’-Beloozero diocese from 1389/90 until 1587 or 1589.¹²⁵ Another detail worth mentioning is that the last refrain of the Ikos does not resonate with either Kontakion’s ending, deviating from the old Byzantine tradition of matching the two.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ TSL 576 (July Menaion, fifteenth cent.) f.39. The resemblance between these two hymns was first noted in Ol’ga V. Loseva, *Russkie mesiatseslovy XI-XIV vekov*. Moscow: Pamiatniki istoricheskoi mysli, 2001, 375.

¹²⁵ Stroeв, *Spiski ierarkhov*, 331–33.

¹²⁶ See: Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 300. In the services to the Iaroslavl’princes this shortcoming will be corrected only by the third quarter of seventeenth century (IaMZ 15173, f.21–22). At the same time, the endings of kontakia and their ikoi do match in many of the early services to the Russians saints. E.g. TSL 617 (Trefoloi, end of

Conceptualizing the information in connection with these earliest hymns from KB 6/1083 allows us to infer the following:

- a) By 1470s the liturgical commemoration of SS. Davyd and Konstantin was already in place alongside their father St. Feodor;
- b) Two sets of hymns dedicated to two different feasts converge under one date in this anthology: the event of “prenesenie moshchem” (the actual date of their Translatio being March 5), and Feodor’s repose (September 19);
- c) The holy princes were venerated not only as patrons of Iaroslavl’ and the miracleworkers that gushed forth healings through their relics, but also as venerable fathers;
- d) In his choice of sources for these first hymns to the Iaroslavl’ princes, the composer used the old Byzantine services to the venerable monastic fathers rather than the “princely services” (s.a. SS. Constantine and Helen, Boris and Gleb, Vladimir and Olga);
- e) The presence of hymns to the Iaroslavl’ saints in the private Miscellany of the Kirillov Monastery puts the commemoration of these saints on the same level as SS. Boris and Gleb, Antonii and Feodosii of the Kiev Caves, and St. Serguis long before the Makariev Councils convened in Moscow in 1547 and 1549 to canonize the Russian saints.

fifteenth – beginning of sixteenth cent.) the endings match in 15 services to the Russian saints out of 16 total, whereby the only exception is the service to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin.

Kaz. №4635 [V2a]

Currently the earliest full service to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin¹²⁷ appears in a Festal Menaion/Miscellany to Russian saints (4°) dated circa 1480s: Kaz. 4635.¹²⁸ The service rank is a *Vigil*, attested by the presence of *Litya stichera*.¹²⁹ Compared to GIM, Shchuk. 331,¹³⁰ this service prescribes eight stichera on “Lord I call” (vs. only three in the Shchukin text) all of which are spelled out, three Parimia readings, eight *Litya stichera*, two new troparia to all three saints, a *Polyeleos* (“*Mnogomilostive*”) with the festal antiphons and Gospel reading. This service also presents two canons – one to St. Feodor, and one to the three princes. The Praises contain five new texts instead of the previous four, and the Great Doxology is added. The absence of the Small Vespers implies that this rank is lower than the *Great Feast Vigil* rank (*velikii prazdnik sign ^*), which sometimes is seen in the services to holy Metropolitan Peter and St. Sergius.¹³¹ Surprisingly, not one text from Shchuk. 331 (V1) – the earliest service to St. Feodor – was used in the making of Kaz. 4635, despite the tendency of medieval writers to copy as much as possible.

Three out of four initial stichera at “Lord I call” (V2 Reference Chart, #1-3) are dedicated to St. Feodor and are virtually identical to the earliest known Slavic stichera in the General

¹²⁷ While this service is considered the earliest of its kind, some findings in Uvar. 1037 later in this chapter suggest that there might have existed another, more primitive version of this text, that has not been preserved/found.

¹²⁸ Kaz. 4635, f.1–21. For description and dating (as sixteenth century) see: Aleksandr I. Artem'ev. *Opisanie rukopisei, khраниashchikhsia v biblioteke Imperatorskogo Kazanskogo Universiteta* (St. Petersburg: Arkheograficheskaia komissia, 1882), 125–32 (former number of the manuscript: №10183). Corrected dating, see: Kloss. *Izbrannye trudy*, 2:260. First academic publication of this service: Lenhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 291–308.

¹²⁹ On integrating these two festal ranks, see: Nikol'skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 300, 500.

¹³⁰ Shchuk. 331.

¹³¹ E.g. TSL 617 services to: St. Sergius (f.16v.), Gregory of Solun (f.43v.), Varlaam of Khudyn' (f.53v.), Dimitrii Prilutskii (f.97v.), Antonii of the Caves (f.148), Metropolitan Aleksii (f.171), and Leontii of Rostov (f.183v).

Menaion¹³² to the hierarchs and/or venerable fathers.¹³³ The fourth one (#4) is dedicated to all three princes. Stichera 5-7 (#5-7), almost verbatim, are taken from the General Menaion service to two or more venerable fathers (hereafter cited as GMV2),¹³⁴ and convey two events: the repose of St. Feodor and the translation of three princes' relics.¹³⁵ In the “Lord I call” 8 (#8), the author unexpectedly deviates from his sources in GMV2 (General Menaion’s service to two or more venerable fathers) and composes a text to St. Konstantin alone, adding a reference to the Holy Virgin, which only occurs in the theotokia. The ‘Glory’ verse (#9) is taken from a service to SS. Fathers slain in Sinai (January 13),¹³⁶ while the Theotokion (#10) prescribes a regular tone 8 Dogmaticon, “Tsariu Nebesnyi,” contradicting the Jerusalem Typicon’s afterfeast rubrics, as noted previously.

The directives for the entrance (“vykhod”), as often is the case, are not present since the entrance is expected at any festal service of Doxology and higher.¹³⁷ The regular daily Prokimenon mention is preserved, however. The three Old Testament readings, or Parimia, (#12) are taken

¹³² The earliest manuscript (attributed by scholars to the Kievan provenance) containing these stichera – Codex Vindobonensis (Codex Hankensteinianus, Codex Slavicus, hereafter cited as Cod. Slav.) № 37 (late twelfth – early thirteenth century); cited from: S. Stockij, “Ueber den Inhalt des Codex Hankensteinianus,” *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 110 (1886): 640. Compare to the Serbian copy in Sofiiskaia narodnaia biblioteka (hereafter cited as SNB) №122, dated as 1435 (four general services are placed on ff.315–317); cited from: Angelov, “Kliment Okhridski,” 32–33. For historiographical overview and classification, see: Snezhana Elisievich, “K issledovaniiu obshchikh sluzhb v slavianskoi kirillicheskoi pis'mennosti,” *Drevniaia Rus'. Voprosy medievistiki*. №4 (34) (2008): 5–6 (footnotes 1–3).

¹³³ It has been previously noted that during the Menaion’s formative stages, the categories of and hence the hymns to the holy hierarchs and venerable fathers were reciprocal: Aleksandra Iu. Nikiforova, “Rozhdenie Minei: Grecheskie Minei IX–XII vv.,” *Vestnik Pravoslavnoho Sviato-Tikhonovskogo gumanitarnogo universiteta*, vyp. 4 (22) (2010): 150.

¹³⁴ MDA 77, f.167–168v.

¹³⁵ The majority of the preserved manuscripts list both of these feasts under the day of Feodor’s repose, i.e. September 19.

¹³⁶ TSL 515 (January Menaion, fifteenth cent.), f.156v.

¹³⁷ Out of fourteen V2 services analyzed in this chapter, ten of the earliest ones do not mention the Entrance, although it is most certainly presumed as an attribute of the *Polyeleos* or *Vigil* ranked service (see Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 208).

from the General Menaion's services to venerable fathers and hierarchs, that was circulating in the second half of fifteenth century.¹³⁸

Kaz. 4635 presents eight Litya stichera, contrary to all other V2a services which include only the first four (#13-16). The eight stichera in Kaz. 4635 are divided into three parts by their tones, revealing different origins: the first four ("glas 2, samoglasen") address only St. Feodor as well as the next three ("glas 2, podoben Dome Efrantov"), while the eighth Sticheron ("glas 8") is dedicated to all three princes. The second and third Litya stichera (#14-15) copy the same texts from the ancient service to St. Anthony the Great (January 17),¹³⁹ but are also similar to certain hymns to St. Sergius (September 25).¹⁴⁰ The third Litya Sticheron (#16) resembles the one to Ven. Savva (May 5).¹⁴¹

The short stichera 5 through 7¹⁴² to St. Feodor alone are assigned a Nativity podoben "Dome Efrantov" and take root in the Aposticha of Metropolitan Peter's service on December 20,¹⁴³ which falls within the Nativity prefeast season. The sixth Sticheron alters the original's "sviatitelem pokhvala, sviashchennikom slava, pravilo inokom" to "apostolom pokhvala, i muchenikom slava, prorokom propoved'." Dedicated to all three princes, Litya Sticheron 8¹⁴⁴ changes the tone while its textual source shifts to GMV2.¹⁴⁵ The 'Glory' verse (#17) is identical

¹³⁸ MDA 77, f.215v.–216. Here the order of the Parimia is different: 1) "Pravednitsy v vek' zhuvut," 2) "Pravednykh dusha v rutse Bozhii," 3) "Pravednik ashche postignet..." These readings match those from the service to St. Sergii under Sept. 25 in TSL 641 (Miscellany, 1400s), f.231v.–234), although they do not correspond to this saint's services in other services, like TSL 617 and 640.

¹³⁹ TSL 518 (January Menaion, 1513), f.206. In the second Sticheron, Feodor's service takes out Anthony's epithet "i umnozhi stado Khristovo slovesnykh ovets'."

¹⁴⁰ TSL 641, f.238–238v. (Sticheron on Psalm 50) and f.263v. ('Glory' verse on Praises). The difference is only in the omission in Feodor's text the epithet "...i, iako kedr v pustyniu, *umnozhit esi stado Khristovo slovesnykh ovets' v prepodob'stve i pravde.*"

¹⁴¹ TSL 504, f.23v. Later this Sticheron will appear in the GMV1 service as Praises 'Glory' verse (General Menaion, Moscow, 1599–1600, f.111).

¹⁴² 5: "Dom dukhovnyi"; 6: "Raduisia Feodore"; 7: "Priimi nyne penie."

¹⁴³ KhGNB im. Korolenko №816281 – cited from Sedova, *Sviatitel' Petr*, 68–69. Similarly in TSL 617, f.86.

¹⁴⁴ 8: "Преподобни отци вси."

¹⁴⁵ MDA 77, f.168v. C.f. TSL 379 (*Shestodnev* and General Menaion, late fifteenth – early sixteenth cent.) where this 'Glory' verse is omitted (f.151v.)

to another Litya Sticheron to Ven. Anthony the Great (January 17).¹⁴⁶ The Theotokion (#18) is copied verbatim from the Dormition of Theotokos service (August 15).¹⁴⁷

It is important to mention that no other V2 services list stichera 5, 6, 7, and 8 at Litya. Nine of them that do include these hymns, place them exclusively at the end of Matins (#126, 127, 128, 125), where they are supplemented with special refrains. Because – as will be shown below – the usage of these stichera as the Matins Aposticha is a sign of the less festal rank and hence an earlier practice, we must assume that the composer of Kaz. 4635 (or its original protograph) was copying from the source that likewise listed these stichera at the end of Matins, as seen in Chud. 75 and many others. Since Jerusalem Typicon rubrics do not allow the Matins Aposticha in a *Polyeleos* or *Vigil* service,¹⁴⁸ this composer remains more faithful to the Typicon, yet does it at the expense of doubling the number of Litya stichera, which is usually limited to three or four.¹⁴⁹

A probable source for the first three Aposticha stichera (#19-21) is in the May 5th service to Ven. Sabbas (minor deviations are emphasized in cursive below). The first Sticheron begins by addressing Feodor, and then adds the plural endings to reflect all three saints. This suggests that originally the first Sticheron must have been dedicated to Feodor alone and was edited after the cult extended to SS. David and Konstantin. Notable is the retention of the word *coffin* (“raka”) in the last stanza:

¹⁴⁶ TSL 518, f.206. This text is also similar to a Litya Sticheron to Ven. Arsenius the Great, May 8 (TSL 558, f.40v.) and, with minor deviations, to the Praises ‘Glory’ verse for Ven. Chariton the Confessor, September 28 (TSL 465, f.307).

¹⁴⁷ E.g. TSL 586 (August Menaion, fifteenth cent.), f.110v.

¹⁴⁸ See discussion under Chud.75 and footnote 182.

¹⁴⁹ Although the amount of Litya stichera is not set by the Jerusalem Typicon, the *Vigil* services to the saints usually contain three or four, excluding the ‘Glory’ verse and the Theotokion. From the lists of the contemporary fifteenth and sixteenth-century services, such are the cases of: Apostle John on September 26 (TSL 465, f.269), Great Martyr Demetrius on October 26 (TSL 480, f.216v.), St. Nicholas on December 6 (TSL 504, f.42), Three Hierarchs on January 30 (TSL 515, f.330). Fewer services present six Litya stichera, such as Beheading of St. John the Baptist on August 29 (TSL 586, f.211). Among the services to the early Russian saints in the late 1400s, the anthologies present only two such stichera to St. Sergius (TSL 617, 643 and 644) and three to St. Leontius (TSL 313, 558, 613, and 617) prior to proceeding to their ‘Glory’ verses.

<p><u>Aposticha 1 to Sabbas (гл. 5, под. “Радуися”):</u> Радуися постничьскимъ воистинну подвигомъ благовонный съсудѣ. Крестъ бо на рамо вземъ, и Владыцѣ Христу себе прѣблаженне възложь, плоти попралъ еси долу влѣкущее мудрование, добродѣтели же душу просвѣтилъ еси, и къ божественому въперися желанию. Тѣмже всесвятую ти окруживше раку, прѣхвалне Саво, божественаго челоуѣколюбия просимъ получитьи твоими молбамы и мирови даровати велию милость.¹⁵⁰</p>	<p><u>Aposticha 1 to the princes (гл. 5, под. “Радуися”):</u> Радуися постныхъ воистину подвизании благоуханныи сосудѣ, крестъ бо на рамо взем, Владыцѣ Христу себе блажене возложил еси, долъгъретныи же смыслъ добродѣтели плотскыи покори^{ли} есте, душу же преосиавъ, и божественому воскрили есте рачению. Тѣм всесвятую вашю обѣступающыи всехвалнии раку, божественаго челоуѣколюбия просим получитьи вашими молитвами, мирови даровати велию милость. (f.5v.–6)</p>
---	---

The ‘Glory’ is identical to the “Lord I call” Sticheron 2 (tone 5) from the GMV1/2 service dated 1435.¹⁵¹ The change to tone 6 in the holy princes’ service may hint on a different variant of this general service. The Theotokion, as a general rule¹⁵² is chosen to match the tone of the previous hymn: “Bogoroditse, Ty esi loza...”¹⁵³

The Vespers is concluded by three troparia that bear no special designations. The first, “Iako apostolom soprichastni” (tone 4) addressing all three princes, occurs only in one other V2 text (Uvar. 1037, see below). Multiple thematic similarities can be observed with a Kontakion to St. Sampson the Hospitable (June 27):

<p><u>Kontakion to Sampson (tone 8):</u> Яко врача преизрядна и служителя богоприятна, къ рацѣ твоей божественѣи притѣкающе, Самсоне богомудре преподобне. Съшедшеся любовию, въ псалмѣх и пѣннихъ възрадуемъ, Христа славяще, Иже такову тебѣ подавшу благодать исцѣлением.¹⁵⁴</p>	<p><u>Troparion to the princes (tone 4):</u> Яко апостоломъ сопричастни, и врачеве предобри, служители богоприятни рацѣ вашей божественѣи притекающимъ святии, богомудри блаженнии, благочестиви княз[и] новоявлении чудотворци, Феодоре и Давыде и Константине. Сошедшеся любовию память вашу свѣтло празднуемъ в пѣснехъ и в</p>
---	---

¹⁵⁰ TSL 504, f.24v.–25.

¹⁵¹ SNB 122, cited from Angelov, “Kliment Okhridski,” 36–37.

¹⁵² Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 206–07.

¹⁵³ This common Theotokion could have entered here from the service of Thursday of the Third Week of Lent, as seen in TSL 385 (Lenten Triodion, fifteenth cent.), f.118v.

¹⁵⁴ TSL 566, f.134v.

	<p><i>пѣнии радующеся Христа славяще, таковую благодать доровавшаго вам исцѣлением, граду вашему Ярославлю великое утвержение. (f.6v.-7)</i></p>
--	--

It should be noted that this troparion’s concluding phrase “gradu vashemu” does not match the Ikos’s “gradu nashemu.”¹⁵⁵ Similar to the above text, the second Troparion “Iako zvezdy mnogosvetlyia” to all three princes (#24) and the third one to Feodor alone – “Iako tselitelia preizriadna” (#25) are identical to the same hymns in KB 6/1083.

Atypical to the Vespers’ conclusion is the insertion of “Slava” indicator between the second and third troparia. The very fact that there are three troparia on Vespers is incongruent with the Jerusalem Typicon; perhaps listing all three was simply meant to give the precentor a choice. Apart from a scribe’s error, this insertion of “Slava” may reveal copying from a certain original where all three were either placed in Matins,¹⁵⁶ or some local tradition to sing all three troparia at the end of Vespers.¹⁵⁷

The beginning of Matins avoids any directives for the order of troparia on ‘God is the Lord’ and immediately turns to the kathisma sedalia, uncommon for most V2a services (#28–29). The first one (“Zlatyia zaria”) is dedicated to Feodor alone, attributing to him the characteristics more suitable for a monastic saint (“въ подвизѣ твоємъ постомъ и молитвми своими со бдѣниемъ присно душу просвѣщая”) whose source hymn we were not able to identify. Its Theotokion “Vsekh Tvortsa” is an exact copy of the same hymn from the ancient St. Nicholas’s December 6 service.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁵ Ikos to Feodor “Svyshe svoe zvanie” in Kaz. 4635.

¹⁵⁶ The ‘Glory’ is sung on Matins either after the first or second Troparion. See: Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 272–75.

¹⁵⁷ For the *Vigil* ranked Vespers, Jerusalem Typicon prescribes a Troparion to the saint twice, followed by “Bogoroditse Devo” once, while for the *Polyeleos* or *Doxology*-ranked services the Troparion to the saint is sung only once. See: Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 220.

¹⁵⁸ TSL 504, f.44v. The tones correspond in both, while the Podoben to St. Nicholas is different (“Grob Tvoi”).

The second Kathisma Sedalion's ("Zhiteiskoe more") beginning invocation echoes Canon Ode 3 Sedalion from GMV2 service,¹⁵⁹ while its second part utilizes additional ascetical topoi and a supplication for David and Konstantin's intercessions. The omission of Feodor's name here is an irregularity that rarely occurs in V2 or any other versions of the Iaroslavl' princes' service. The following Theotokion "Upovanie khristianom" is a repetition of a widespread liturgical hymn.¹⁶⁰

Polyeleos Sedalion "Tverdostiiu razuma," relocated in many subsequent V2 services to Canon's Ode 3, is identical to Canon Ode 3 Sedalion to St. Leontius (May 23),¹⁶¹ while its Theotokion "Nebesnuiu dver'" repeats an already mentioned service to St. Arsenius¹⁶² word for word.¹⁶³

A short mention of the festal Antiphon and Stepenna hymn of tone 4 ("Ot iunosti moeia") is followed by the Prokimenon "Vozveselitsia pravednik" (#32) with its refrain "Uslyshi ny, Bozhe"¹⁶⁴ taken from the General Menaion's service to Fools-for-Christ (GMF2).¹⁶⁵

For the Gospel (#33), a reading from Matthew 5:14–20 (pericope 11, "Vy este svet miru") is given instead of the one prescribed for the venerable father(s) that urges one to take up Christ's yoke and find rest for the soul (Matthew 11:27–29, pericope 43).¹⁶⁶ The latter would be incongruent with the vitae of SS. David and Konstantin, of whose end-of-life monastic vows we know nothing.

¹⁵⁹ See: MDA 77, f.167v. and TSL 379, f.149v. – both listing it as tone 4, while the former also adds Podoben "Iavisia dnes'."

¹⁶⁰ E.g. in the service to SS. Aristarchus, Pudus, and Trophimus (April 15) in TSL 546 (April Menaion, 1400s), f.65v.

¹⁶¹ TSL 558, f.127v.

¹⁶² TSL 558, f.42.

¹⁶³ Later this Theotokion will enter into GMV1 Canon (General Menaion, Moscow: n.p., 1599-1600, f.68v.) and the Sunday Octoechos service (as first Kathisma Sedalion), but will be dropped from the services to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin.

¹⁶⁴ Possibly a copying error, or an older version of the verse "Uslyshi, Bozhe, molitvu moi" (as seen in the Menaion of 1599-1600).

¹⁶⁵ GMV1/2 Prokimenon states: "Chestna pred Gospodem smert' *prepodobnykh* Ego."

¹⁶⁶ See early fifteenth century Ustav's regulations in TSL 239, f.314. This trend is followed in the service to St. Sergius (e.g. TSL 466, f.287).

The next entry calls for the Psalm 50 Sticheron “Prepodobne otche, vo vsiu zemliu” borrowed from GMV1, but not used in any other V2 services.

Nearly half of the entire service is taken up by the two Matins canons. The first one (tone 8, “Vodu proshed,” #35) has an inconsistent number of troparia at each Ode (from 3 to 5, not counting the theotokia) and consists of 8 irmoi, 8 theotokia, and 31 troparia. Thematically, 13 out of these 31 troparia are dedicated to Feodor, 2 to David, and 16 to all three princes. Every Irmos and the first troparion of each Ode are identical to the reciprocal ones in the above-mentioned service GMV1/2,¹⁶⁷ and are dedicated to Feodor alone, while in the odes 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9 the second troparion also addresses Feodor. The first Canon’s Ode 7 troparion 3 (#91), Ode 8 troparion 3 (#101), and the Theotokion of Ode 8 (#104) also borrow from that same source.¹⁶⁸ Considerable resemblances can be seen between the theotokia of Ode 4 and the seventh Ode from GMV1/2. Minor discrepancies occur in troparia C1-3:1 (read: Canon 1, Ode 3, troparion 1), C1-3:2, C1-5:1 with their originals in GMV1/2. C1-5:1 (#67) also differs from the General Menaion service in Cod. Slav. 37, where it appears as two separate troparia: “Prosveti tvoe zhitie” and “Tserkvi ty byl esi.”¹⁶⁹

In the first Canon, C1-1:2 (#37) is based on GMV1,¹⁷⁰ while other troparia (except C1-6:3) and the theotokia of odes 1, 5, 6, 7 and 9 are taken from GMV2 text.¹⁷¹ Troparion C1-6:3 (#77),

¹⁶⁷ Cf.: “Kanon’ otsem’ obshch” in Cod. Slav. 37 – cited from Stockij, “Ueber den Inhalt,” 640–41; Canon from the “Obshchaia sluzhba sviatitelim” in SNB 122 – cited from Angelov, “Kliment Okhridski,” 33–36. The parallels with TSL 643 and later texts have been noted in Shalamanov, “Kliment Okhridski,” 55–56, who had no access to the earliest manuscripts. A similar Canon, although with different irmoi 8 and 9, is given in the service “Sviatitelem obshchim i sviatym” in Und. 100 (Trefoloi, second half of fifteenth cent.), f.217v.–219, that was kindly brought to our attention by G. Lenhoff. Other known East Slavic General Menaia (e.g. MDA 77, TSL 379 and 464, and the later General Menaion (Moscow: n.p., 1600)) do not contain this Canon.

¹⁶⁸ Cf.: Cod. Slav. 37 – cited from Stockij “Ueber den Inhalt,” 640–41 and SNB 122 – cited from Angelov, “Kliment Okhridski,” 35–36.

¹⁶⁹ Cited from Stockij “Ueber den Inhalt,” 640. This troparion also existed in a joint version (SNB 122 – cited from Angelov, “Kliment Okhridski,” 34).

¹⁷⁰ MDA 77, f.165v. and TSL 349, f.146v.

¹⁷¹ MDA 77, f.167v.–168v. and TSL 379, f.149–151v. This same Canon version was retained in the early printed General Menaia (Moscow: n.p., 1599–1600) and is used today.

on the other hand, resembles the GMV1/2 original only in its first phrase, but then changes the plural grammatical forms to singular in honor of Feodor alone. The Ode 3 Theotokion (#48) is reciprocal to the one in Ode 4 from the GMV1 service.¹⁷² Troparion “Napoivsha dusha nasha” known in all other V2 texts as C1-3:3 (#47) is absent from Kaz. 4635. Possible Iaroslavlian provenance of the first Canon may be suggested from its personalized Theotokion 9:4 (#118): “...ublazhaem vas verno, klaniaiushchesia ratse moshchi vashikh.”

The second Canon (tone 4, “Otverz’ usta moia,” #40) is composed of 8 irmoi, 8 theotokia and 25 troparia. The source for these troparia has not been located and leaves us to presume their originality, especially due to this Canon’s numerous irregularities. Unlike the theotokia in the previous Canon and most known canons to the saints, some of this second Canon’s theotokia are personalized with the names of the Iaroslav’ saints (odes 1, 3, 9). Moreover, while odes 1 through 6 contain three troparia each, odes 7 and 8 contain four, and Ode 9 only two. Feodor is addressed in 15 of these troparia, while all three princes are addressed in seven, David in two, and David with Konstantin in one. Perhaps the only stable feature of this Canon is its irmoi which directly mimic the irmoi set “Otverzu usta moia,” but even this raises questions, as these are generally used in the canons to the Theotokos or the ordinary Katavasia.¹⁷³

Rather than separately analyzing every single troparion of both canons, we have decided to analyze them collectively and draw attention to more curious details contained therein. Thus, the first Ode of the second Canon (Theotokion 4) may contain a hint about this Canon’s possible origins (italicized):

¹⁷² MDA 77, f.166 and TSL 349, f.147.

¹⁷³ The “ordinary” Katavasia consists of the irmoi sung at the end of each ode of the Canon during the regular Matins services throughout the year, outside the festal/lenten seasons (see: Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 297–99).

Радуися Пресвятая Богородице, ангелское удивление, пророческая проповѣдь, апостоломъ немолчная оуста, молися Сыну Своему и Богу нашему да сохранит *мѣсто сие, и ствятую обитель сию* преподобных молением.

Although any monastery could have considered the Iaroslavl' princes as its patrons, the additional elements contained in this Canon specifically denote Iaroslavl'. This city is mentioned as “grad nash” (Ikos after Ode 6, #88) and as “grad sei” (Ode 3, troparion 4, #52).¹⁷⁴ “Khram sei” is mentioned once (Ode 9, troparion 2, #116),¹⁷⁵ as well as one specification as to the relics' location: “...a zde chestnya tvoia moshchi boliashchikh istseliaeta...” (Ode 6, troparion 4, #83). We reckon this is sufficient evidence to posit the the second Canon of Kaz. 4635 was written in the Iaroslavl' Spasskii Monastery, where the miracle-working relics of the princes were discovered in 1453 and kept for centuries.

The second Canon also alludes to two biographical healing instances. Troparion 3:2 dedicated to Feodor (#50) states: “Izmlada vozrast vospriial esi, vo grade Smolenste po Khristovu poveleniiu na uspenie svoe prishel esi, vo slavnyi Iaroslavl'...” The second Canon's troparion 6:1 (#80), alludes to two miracles from the saint's relics: “nedvizhiushchagosia otroka tsela sotvorიაeshi” and “bezglasno prezhe Bozhiim promyslom pokazal esi mnogoglagoliva.” Both of these instances were already known to the early biographers,¹⁷⁶ and the author's decision to place this data in the most widely-used (due to its repetition at Liturgy) sixth Ode tells us that he held it in high regard. The uniqueness of these two vita-based mentions among the Canon troparia might also reflect the fact that by the time of its composition these were the only two known or confirmed miracles.

¹⁷⁴ Iaroslavl' is also metioned once as “grad vash” and once without any personal pronouns.

¹⁷⁵ Apart from the canons, this serice speaks of “khram vash” twice (5th Sticheron on “Lord I call” and second Canon's troparion 4:2).

¹⁷⁶ Both are mentioned in one of the earliest available vitas, IaMZ 15522 (Anonymous Redaction, early 1500s): “otroka, boliashcha nemoshchiiu telestoiu” that occurred on May 10, 1463 (f.354v.) and the undated “Chiudo o iunoshe kniaze Romane” from that same year (f.360–361v.). See: Lenkhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 181; 187–88.

The Kontakion “Iavistesia svetilnitsi” to all three princes, identical to that in KB 6/1083,¹⁷⁷ is placed after Ode 3, contrary to all other V2 services that list it after Ode 6 (#86). It is followed by the Ikos to Feodor – “Na vysote” (#88), again, in contrast to all other V2 services that place it after Ode 6. Apart from its ending “slava prepodobnym” and an epithet “chiudonosche,” this Ikos ascribes to Feodor one attribute more typical to hierarchs – proclaiming/defending the Trinitarian dogmas (“poklonenie Troicheskoe vo edinom Bozhestve chtiti”), which may point to the origins of this hymn in a service to an enlightener or a hierarch who fought heresies and established dogma.¹⁷⁸

Quite similar in topoi and matching the ending of the Ikos “Na vysote” is the Ode 6 Kontakion “Iavisia velie solntse” to Feodor alone (#85) previously seen in KB 6/1083.¹⁷⁹ Following the Byzantine hymnographic custom where a Kontakion constituted a compact version of its reciprocal Ikos, these two hymns likewise echo each other in their content and share the same final phrase.¹⁸⁰

Already seen in KB 6/1083,¹⁸¹ the Ikos to the princes “Svyshe svoe zvanie” (#87) that matches – and should have accompanied – the 3rd Ode Kontakion “Iavistesia svetilnitsi,” is placed after Ode 6. The ending not only names all three princes, but recognizes them as the newly-manifested Iaroslavl’ wonderworkers and “gradu nashemu Iaroslavliu velikoe udverzhenie.”

¹⁷⁷ Although mostly identical, the version in Kaz. 4635 contains fewer grammatical errors and repetitions.

¹⁷⁸ E.g. “...научиль еси славити въ Троицѣ единого Бога” (Canon Ode 4, Troparion 1 from Holy Metropolitan Peter’s service, December 21); “...быль еси пастырь Христовы Церкви, уча словесныя овцы вѣровати въ Троицу единосущную, во единомъ Божествѣ” (Aposticha ‘Glory’ verse from St. Isaia of Rostov’s service, May 15); “...труба духовная, вѣры насадителю, и отсекателю ересей, Троицы угодниче...” (Kontakion from the General Menaion’s Service to a Hierarch). Very similar Kontakion/Ikos set are found in a later May 2 service to St. Athanasius the Great (e.g. TSL 557, f.12; TSL 565, f.20).

¹⁷⁹ While KB 6/1083 lists this Kontakion (f.190v.), it does not contain the matching Ikos “Na vysote.”

¹⁸⁰ Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 300–01.

¹⁸¹ F.191–191v.

The placement of the two kontakia and the two ikoi in this service presents a hymnographic discrepancy. As already noted above, Eastern Orthodox hymnography prescribes the kontakia and ikoi resonate with each other and match in their endings. In Kaz. 4635 there is only one matching pair (Kontakion “Iavisia velie” and Ikos “Na vysote” with their matching ending “slava prepodobnym”), yet they are incorrectly separated so that the first one appears after Canon Ode 6, and the latter after Ode 3. The other Kontakion (“Iavistesia svetil’nitsy vsesvetlii” ending with “chtushchim pamiat’ vashiu”) and Ikos (“Svyshe svoe zvanie” ending with “Iaroslavliu velikoe utvershenie”), despite both being dedicated to all three princes, neither resemble each other, nor match in endings. This phenomenon may mean that the two hymns came from different primary sources, or that the author of these hymns did not follow the matching practice.¹⁸²

In several instances the troparia of both canons endow the holy princes with influence on a more global scale far beyond the Iaroslavl’ principality: “...prosveshchaeshi chiudesy, iako molniia vsiu vseleinniui” (Canon 2, troparion 1:2, #42); “luchami prosveshchaete vsiu podsolnechniui” (Canon 1, troparion 4:3, #60); “nauchi ves’ mir verno vospevati” (Canon 1, troparion 7:3, #91).

Two troparia from the first Canon have retained specific monastic-oriented phrases from their General Menaia’s originals: “Podvizastesia dobre, <...> i ko vsem prepodobnym prichtostesia; s nimizhe vas chtem prison” (troparion 8:5, #103); “Na zemli zhiv iako angel, s plotiiu iako besploten...” (troparion 9:2, #110). One troparion kept what seems to be hierarchical epithet: “Tserkvi ty byst’ propovednik...” (troparion 5:1, #67).

¹⁸² The same non-matching pair is encountered in KB 6/1083. This discrepancy was later noticed and corrected in some V3 services (see Chapter 3).

Although Kaz. 4635 venerates all three princes as patrons of Iaroslavl', one troparion addresses exclusively St. Davyd:

Явился еси нынѣ граду Ярославлю, Давыде блажене, столпъ непоколѣблем, и стѣна нерушимая, великое прибѣжище от тебе приемлюще, исцѣлением благодать нескудную.» (Canon 2, troparion 7:2, #95)

Finally, we should mention one example of imploring the holy princes for the local ruler – possibly the Iaroslavl' prince of the time:

Молитвами варя къ Богови и Тому предстоя со ангелы, за весь миръ помолися, брань неприазнену всюду потребити и побѣду извѣсту дати на супостаты князю нашему. (Canon 1, troparion 6:2, #76).

In the conclusion of the Canon part of the service, two unique remarks present in Kaz. 4635 and absent from all other V2 services should be mentioned. The first one is a brief entry calling for “Kanon Bogoroditsi na 6” prior to the two canons to Saints. The second short note “Katavasia ‘Otverz usta moia’” follows the first Ode of the Canon. Had it not been for the afterfeast of Cross-Elevation, both remarks would be congruent with the Jerusalem Typicon rubrics for a *Vigil* ranked service.¹⁸³ However, the Jerusalem afterfeast rubrics call for the first Canon and Katavasia of the Cross instead.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸³ By late fifteenth century, Ustavys had been already delineating the sequence for all the *Vigil* ranked services to the saints in the first church year *Vigil* service to St. John the Theologian (September 25). Composed on the first half of the fifteenth-century, the Ustav TSL 239 mentions, among other details, the Theotokos Canon on 6 to be sung prior to the Canon(s) of the saint(s), and reminds one that “sitse praznuetsia vsiak prazdnik sviatym, v nikhzhe byvaiut bdeniia” (f.75v.–76). Although the separate chapter on Katavasia did not yet take form in the fifteenth-sixteenth century Typica (later it will be known as Chapter 19: “O katavasiu”), the Katavasia rubrics were well known and prescribed in separate cases by various Miscellanea. An early sixteenth-century Irmologion, TSL 304 mentions both, Katavasia to the Cross (“Krest nachertav”), and the regular one “Otvazu usta moia” (f.1v.–2).

¹⁸⁴ *Tipikon*, 1906, f.33-33v. For more on Katavasia rules, see Nikol'skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 297–300.

The sources for the Svetilen (#119) to St. Feodor have not been located. A distant resemblance may be seen with the V1 Shchukin Menaion service, although it attests more to a common source rather than direct copying:

<p><u>Svetilen to Feodor, Shchuk. 311:</u> Велми тя прослави Господь чюдесь в русьстѣи странѣ, преподобнаго свѣтилника, крѣпѣкаго помощника граду нашему, спаси ны, княже, вѣрою блажаще память твою. (f.66v.)</p>	<p><u>Svetilen to Feodor, Kaz. 4635:</u> Господь ты прослави в чудесех всеблажене Феодоре, жива и преставлешася, избавил еси от смерти яко Своего угодника, сего ради чудес твоих память восхваляем: (f.20)</p>
---	--

No close sources can be verified for the next four Praises stichera to St. Feodor (#121-124), while the ‘Glory’ verse (#129) and the Theotokion (#130), similarly to several Litya stichera in this service, seem to emerge from the vesperal Aposticha to Holy Metropolitan Peter.¹⁸⁵ The ‘Glory’ verse adds “novago chiudotvortsia” while replacing Peter’s “Khrista molit spastisia dusham nashim” with “Khrista moli, *otche prepodobne*, spastisia dusham nashim.” This Peter’s Sticheron, as shown in Chapter 1, may have inspired several Shchukin Menaion ‘Glory’ verses (“Lord I call,” Aposticha, Praises), which therefore bear resemblance to the Praises ‘Glory’ verse in this V2 service to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin:

<p><u>Shchuk. 311, Praises ‘Glory’, tone 4:</u> Приидѣте все вѣрнии гражане, согласно ублажимъ псалмопѣнемъ преподонаго отца, богоблаженнаго князя Федора достоино почтем, еже бо изъмлада подвизавъся в добродѣтель прилѣжно. Явился еси, отче, съсудь святаго Духа, и нынѣ точиши намъ непрестанно, многи исцѣления божественная пространилъ еси, свои градъ сохранилъ еси, и божественнымъ свѣтомъ осѣня с вѣрою, ти приходяще къ честынымъ его мощемъ, и честнѣ облистаемъ от живоносныхъ мощей твоих, нынѣ ти вѣрою припадаемъ,</p>	<p><u>Kaz. 4635, Praises ‘Glory’, tone 8:</u> <i>Приидѣте вси вѣрнии, согласно</i> воспоем преблаженаго <i>Феодора</i>, новаго чюдотворца, благочестіа свѣтило, воздержаніа правило терпѣніемъ столпа, простотѣ сокровище, смиреніа рѣкоу независтноюю, нищимъ утѣхоу, страннымъ странноприемника, истинныа любве Христовы дѣлателя воистину ближняго; сеи оубо и живъ чловѣкомъ показася заступникъ и спаситель, по смерти же болѣзнемъ и страстемъ неисцѣльнымъ всяческимъ <i>исцѣлитель</i>. Христа моли отче <i>преподобне, спаситися душамъ нашимъ.</i> (f.20v.–21)</p>
---	--

¹⁸⁵ KhGNB 816281 (cited from Sedova, *Sviatitel’ Petr*, 69), TSL 640, f.134v., and TSL 643, f.210v.

It may be, however, that Metropolitan Peter’s Sticheron served as a protograph to both of these ‘Glory’ verses, that could have appeared independently.

This service ends with a directive to sing the Great Doxology and the dismissal, but no directives for the Liturgy. The additional end of Matins stichera common to most V2 services (#126-128) are not present.

A special word must be said about the vita reading that appears in this service (f. 10v.–14), designated in scholarship as “extended Prolog redaction.” The appearance of such readings in the East Slavic service Menaia prior to the sixteenth century is a rare occurrence in and of itself, because of their availability in other sources, like Prologs or Synaxaria.¹⁸⁶ Yet, the writer of Kaz. 4635 or its original may have included this prolog reading here because it was one of the earliest vitae to St. Feodor after his canonization and was not yet widespread.¹⁸⁷ It also reflects an earlier practice of placing the Synaxarion reading after the third Ode of the Canon rather than the sixth.¹⁸⁸

One trait that sets Kaz. 4635 apart from all other V2 copies described here (as well as V1 and V3 ones) is that the entire text of the vita is inserted into the very service, where it follows the third Ode of the Canon.¹⁸⁹ We know of no other V2 or V3 service that follows this pattern; instead the ones that include such readings at all place them at the end of Matins.¹⁹⁰ While this practice

¹⁸⁶ Anatolii A. Turilov, “Zabytye i maloizvestnye fakty iz istorii drevneishego perevoda Prologa u iuzhnykh slavian,” *Slavianovedenie*, №2 (2012): 12. Another exception is seen in the earliest service to Metropolitan Peter dated to late fourteenth century (KhGNB 816281 – cited from Sedova, *Sviatitel’ Petr*, 76).

¹⁸⁷ B. Kloss has located only five Prolog vita redactions that seem to predate the one in Kaz. 4635 (Kloss, “Arkheograficheskii obzor,” 137–39).

¹⁸⁸ Vitalii P. Efimenkov, “«Iaroslavliu velikoe utverzhenie»: zarozhdenie pochitanii i pervaiia sluzhba sviatym Feodoru, Davidu i Konstantinu Iaroslavskim.” *Vestnik Iaroslavskoi dukhovnoi seminarii*, vyp. 4 (2022), 73.

¹⁸⁹ Variants of this *Short version* of the Prolog Redaction (“Kratkii vid Prolozhnoi redaktsii”) are published in: Kloss, *Izbrannye trudy*, 2:258–59, and Kloss, “Arkheograficheskii obzor,” 173–76.

¹⁹⁰ Later we will encounter five V2 and one V3 texts that include a vita reading of one type or the other. The early service to Metropolitan Peter mentioned above in footnote 143 presents its vita after the sixth Ode of the Canon.

may have been adapted later for practical reasons (in order not to interrupt the office of Matins by several *vita folia*), Kaz. 4635 is more faithful to the sequence of the service and the earlier Jerusalem *Ustav* practice that prescribed the daily saints' readings after Ode 3 of the Canon.¹⁹¹

Summing up the sources which might have been used in the creation of Kaz. 4635, the foremost attention falls on a vast amount of material from the General Menaion services: those to a single venerable father (first three stichera on "Lord I call" and the 50th Psalm Sticheron), to several venerable fathers (stichera 5-7 on "Lord I call," *Litya* Sticheron 8, *Aposticha* 'Glory' verse, second *Kathisma Sedalion* and a portion of the first Canon's troparia), and the hierarchs (various troparia of the first Canon). Other hymns were borrowed from the existing services of the Russian saints: Metropolitan Peter (*Litya* stichera 5-7, Praises "Glory" verse), Leontii of Rostov (*Litya* Sticheron 4 and *Polyelos Sedalion*) and Sergius (*Litya* stichera 2-3. Several hymns from the venerable Byzantine fathers are copied verbatim: fathers of Sinai-Raithu ('Glory' verse on "Lord I call"), Anthony the Great (*Litya* 'Glory' verse), Sabbas the Sanctified (*Aposticha* stichera 1-3) and Nicholas the Wonderworker (*Theotokion* of the first *Kathisma Sedalion*). A certain number of texts, the close sources for which could not be located, may have been composed by the very author of this service, as evidence sometimes suggests: "Lord I call" stichera 4 and 8, *Litya* Sticheron 1, first *Kathisma Sedalion*, the entire second Canon, the *Svetilen* and the Praises stichera 1-4.

The total word count of the Kaz. 4635 demonstrates that more than half of its hymns are written for St. Feodor alone – namely 53 hymns. All three saints are mentioned in 35 hymns, while 7 invoke only SS. Davyd and/or Konstantin. An important liturgical feature attesting the

¹⁹¹ These readings were prescribed up to seven times during the Vigil, including after Ode 3 and Ode 6 of the Canon (Skaballanovich, *Tolkovyi Tipikon*, II:189). Vasilii P. Vinogradov, *Ustavnye chteniia*, vyp. I (Sergiev Posad: Tipografiia Troitse-Sergievoi Lavry, 1914), 142–43 explains that carrying out the Prolog readings after third Ode of the Canon reflects the earlier Jerusalem Typicon practice, while later these readings were moved to the sixth Ode.

the revalence of St. Feodor’s memory is the Litya stichera that are dedicated to him exclusively. Similarly, the Prologue reading is dedicated only to him, as well as the placement of this service under September 19 – the date of Feodor’s repose. Nevertheless, the stichera and troparia of this service are much more preoccupied with the finding of relics and the healings than the life or repose of the Iaroslavl’ princely father.¹⁹²

Based on the context of this service, there is high probability that it was composed in Iaroslavl’, and that the second Canon was created in the Spassky Monastery – the original place of rest of the princes’ relics.

In general, Kaz. 4635 service testifies that during its creation (or its protograph) SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin were venerated as miracle-workers and not yet as the righteous princes. The words “kniaz’/kniaz’ia” are used only once in the entire service, while “chiudotvortsy/chiudonostsy” are used eight times.¹⁹³ Similarly, the title of the service calls them “novoivlennii chiudotvortsy” without mentioning their princely rank. More widely yet the Iaroslavl’ saints are venerated as “pre-/vse-/blazhennii” (Feodor – 26 times, all three or only David/Konstantin – 13 times). Finally, the most widespread title is “prepodobnyi” (Feodor – 30 times, all three – 13 times). One Canon troparion directly classifies them as such:

Подвизастеся добръ, побѣдивше вражья вся дѣйства и наконецъ житиа вѣнчастеся мудри, и ко всѣмъ преподобнымъ причтостеся; с нимиже вас чтемъ присно. (Canon 1, troparion 8:5, #103).

GIM Chud. №75 [V2a]

¹⁹² Various forms of the words “raka,” “moshchi” and “grob” appear in this service 13 times; the forms of the word “istseleniia” – 19 times; “chiudesa” – 22 times. At the same time, the words “konchina” “prestavlenie,” “uspenie” and “smert” (in regards to St. Feodor) are encountered only 7 times in total.

¹⁹³ Five of these they are also called “novoivlennii.”

Dated to the end of fifteenth century,¹⁹⁴ Chud. №75 appears in a September Menaion under September 19 (f.132v.–144v.) and has the title “Новоявленныхъ чудотворцовъ ярославскихъ благовѣрныхъ князеи Феодора и Давыда и Костентина.” Being the first service to the Iaroslavl’ princes that reached the Menaion codex, Chud. 75, as will be shown below, became the most stable and widespread Version 2 text.¹⁹⁵ For this reason, the order of this *Vigil*-ranked Chud. 75 service was chosen as reference for other V2 texts’ comparison (see the chart at the beginning of this chapter).

Apart from the small textual deviations, the main differences with Kaz. 4634 are as follows:

1. No mention of the daily Vespers Prokimenon (#11);
2. Litya stichera are not assigned a specific tone;
3. The Litya has only four stichera (#13-16) before the ‘Glory’ verse, while the texts listed in Kaz. 4635 as stichera 5-8 appear here – and in many V2 services – as the additional end-of-Matins stichera;
4. The Troparion “Iako apostolom soprichastni” is absent;
5. There are brief mentions of ‘God is the Lord’ and Polyeleos in the beginning of Matins (#26);
6. Neither the kathisma sedalia nor the Polyeleos one are prescribed (#28-30); instead, “Zlatyi zaria,” “Zhiteiskoe more,” and “Tverdostiiu razuma” appear after Canon’s Ode 3 (#55-57), while the theotokia from Kaz. 4635 are dropped;
7. The directive of the festal Antiphon is missing (#31);

¹⁹⁴ Protas’eva, *Opisanie rukopisei*, 52.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. the rest of the fifteenth-century V2 services are essentially Trifoloi-type anthologies of services to the early Russian saints (Kaz. 4635, Chud. 152, TSL 643). The next closest Menaia that list any version of service to the princes are: TSL 466 (dated 1505, V3), Uvar. 710 (first half of sixteenth cent., V3), and Chud. 79 (mid-sixteenth cent., V2) – all described below.

8. Psalm 50 Sedalion is omitted (#34);
9. No mention of the first Canon to Theotokos is present;
10. No mention of the Katavasia is given;
11. New C1-3:3 Troparion “Napoivshe dushi” is present (#47, absent in Kaz.);
12. Instead of at Canon Ode 3, both kontakia and ikoi appear after Ode 6 (#85-88); Ode 3 lists only the three sedalia mentioned above (#55-57);
13. No Prologue vita is given or mentioned anywhere in the text;
14. New C1-6:4 troparion “Blagom zakonom” is given (#78, absent in Kaz.);
15. The Theotokion C2-9:4 in Chud. 75 (#118) presents a shortened variation omitting the words “s prechistoiu Ego Mater’iu za ves’ mir”;
16. The Svetilen Theotokion (#120) is neither present, nor mentioned;
17. Praises ‘Glory’ verse “Prepodobnii otsi vsi” (#125, known as Litya Sticheron 7 in Kaz.), is added at the end of four Praises stichera;
18. Three stichera appear at the end of Matins (#126-128) with their two refrains (known as Litya stichera 5–8 in Kaz.), and their ‘Glory’ verse.

The fact that each of the two services – Chud. 75 and Kaz. 4635 – contains texts not present in the other one leads us to conclude that they could not have been directly copied from one another, but rather demonstrate a parallel hymnographic development. For instance, certain exclusions in Chud. 75 may be justified by their self-evident nature (points 1 and 7 from the list above), while others may reflect local practices (points 6, 12, 13, 15, 19) or deliberate truncations (points 3, 4), or simply errors (points 2, 8, 9, 10, 17).

The new texts for Chud. 75 (points 11, 14) – apart for the clarifying directives (point 5) – are the two Canon troparia: C1-3:3 “Napoivshe dushi” to the princes (#47) is known from certain

GMV2 services as C-3:1,¹⁹⁶ while C1-6:4 “Blagom zakonom” to Davyd alone (#78) exists in GMV1 as C-1:2.¹⁹⁷ Neither of these is present in the same early General Menaia (Cod. Slav. №37 and SNB 122) that influenced a number of other Canon 1 troparia, as shown above (see footnote 151).

The presence of the three special stichera, their two refrains, and the ‘Glory’ verse at the end of Praises¹⁹⁸ (all of which are moved to Litya in Kaz. 4635 and provene from December 21 service to Holy Metropolitan Peter, as shown earlier), present a special liturgical interest. First, the Sticheron-refrain structure betrays their Matins Aposticha origin. Secondly, their placement in the text presents an improper blend of the two stichera sets: the Praises must have been first concluded by a ‘Glory’ verse and its Theotokion before the Aposticha could begin. Instead, the ‘Glory’ verse is followed directly by “iny stikhiry, gl. 2, pod. Dome Efr.,” the three stichera with both of their refrains, and an additional ‘Glory’ verse. Lastly, Matins Aposticha are not considered part of *Slavoslovie*, *Polyeleos*, or *Vigil* services according to Jerusalem Typicon.¹⁹⁹ The two most obvious explanations for these stichera’s superfluous appearance here is that they are vestiges of either an earlier non-festal service to Feodor (*Six-stichera* or *Simple*), or the one that fell during the season of Great Lent.²⁰⁰ The second scenario agrees more with our previous cues, such as the absence of

¹⁹⁶ MDA 77, f.167v.; TSL 379, f.149v.

¹⁹⁷ MDA 77, f.165v.; TSL 379, f.146v.

¹⁹⁸ This pattern is observed in 9 out of 13 complete V2 texts analyzed in this work.

¹⁹⁹ Examples of such can be seen throughout the Ustav and Menaion (Jerusalem Typicon-type), but it will suffice to name a few from the month of September: a) Slavoslovie service to St. John the Baptist’s Conception, September 23 (Ustav TSL 239, f.74), Slavoslovie on the Founding of the Resurrection Church in Jerusalem, September 13 (Menaion, TSL 465, f.154v.). At the same time, the services of the *Simple* and *Six-stichera* ranks do prescribe the Matins Aposticha: Martyr Mamas, September 2 (Ustav TSL 239, f.59), SS. Joachim and Anna, September 9 (Ustav TSL 239, f.64).

²⁰⁰ For the Menaion commemorations that overlap with the Triodion (Great Lent) season, the Jerusalem Typicon prescribes – even for the festal ranked texts – to end the Matins by reading (not singing) the Great Doxology, adding the Aposticha and the prostrations with St. Ephraim’s Prayer. See directives for the Matins of Annunciation, March 25 (e.g. TSL 241, f.195v.), as well as the *Polyeleos* service to Holy Forty Martyrs of Sebaste, March 9 (TSL 241 f.192). More thorough descriptions in Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 503, 556.

the Cross-Elevation rubrics in V1 and V2 services. The protograph might have been composed for the Relics Translatio (“Пренесение мощемъ”) feast on March 5 and contained the additional Matins Aposticha set, which the scribe of Chud. 75 either mistook for Praises, or consciously attached them here not wanting to discard these hymns. The writer of Kaz. 4635, however, took a different (and liturgically a more correct approach) by transferring these extra texts to the Litya, as shown above.

Another hint on the possible Lenten origins of V2 might be in the fact that the majority (9 of 14) and the earliest of them omit the directive to sing the Great Doxology at the end of Matins, despite the fact that it should be done for any *Polyeleos* or *Vigil* ranked saint, if outside of the Lenten Triodion.²⁰¹

Essential information is contained in the adjacent services to SS. Trophimus, Sabbatius, and Dorimedon (hereafter cited as St. Trophimus), preceding on September 19, and to SS. Mikhail and Feodor of Chernigov, following on September 20,²⁰² both of which do include rubrics for Cross-Elevation. The absence of such in the service to the holy princes signifies that it was copied here without any integrative revisions or liturgical editing.

GIM Chud. №152 [V2a]

An almost identical *Vigil* service appears in an anthology of services to Russian saints (GIM Chud. №152 under September 19) and titled “Prestavlenie novoiaavlennym chiudotvortsom” without their

²⁰¹ The directives to sing the Great Doxology are not uncommon in similar-ranked contemporary services: SS. Mikhail and Feodor (Shchuk. 331, f.74v. and TSL 466, f.230v.); St. Sergius (TSL 466, f.297v.); Metropolitan Peter (Shchuk. 331, f.300).

²⁰² “20 сент: святого муч. Евстафія... В тойж день святых новоявленных мученик и исповѣдникъ вел. кн. Михаила” – this Doxology-ranked service dedicates the first three stichera to the Cross-Elevation on “Lord I call” and three at the Aposticha. At the conclusion of the saints’ troparia, it prescribes “слава и ныне: празднику.”

names.²⁰³ The sequence of hymns is exactly the same, while the textual differences are minor: “Lord I call” Sticheron 4 (#4) is erroneously followed by an insertion of “i nyne”; the Aposticha Theotokion is “Bogoroditse Devo” instead of “Bogoroditse, Ty esi loza” (#23); an extra “Step glas 4” directive is inserted at Matins; C1-6:4 troparion (#78) is not included; C2-9:4 Theotokion (#118) adds a phrase “s Prechistoiu Ego Mater’iu za ves’ mir molitesia”; a Prolog Vita (short version) is given at the end of the service (f.109v. – 113).²⁰⁴ Although minimal, these mutual additions exclude the possibility of inter-copying between Chud-152 and Chud-75, while still allowing for a common prototext.

The Aposticha Theotokion “Bogoroditse Devo” mentioned here (and in some other V2 texts²⁰⁵) may have been mistaken for the original “Богородице, Ты еси лоза,” mentioned in others. However, tone 6 Octoechos does list a hymn starting with “Bogoroditse Devo” matching the tone of the Aposticha is probably the one in discussion.²⁰⁶

Also worth noting is the word “Prestavlenie” at the title of this service, which appears to be used by the editor as a contrast against “Pamiat’...” seen in Shchuk. 331 and Kaz. 4635.²⁰⁷ One possible explanation may be that the copier of Chud. 152 knew of the March 5 service to the Relics Translatio of the Iaroslavl’ princes and wanted to distinguish the two different feasts.

An observation should be also made in regards to this service’s place in the Chud. 152 Miscellany. While all other services to Russian saints are positioned here according to their church calendar chronology, the service to the Iaroslavl’ princes seems to be the only exception, as it

²⁰³ Protas’eva, *Opisanie rukopisei*, 81 dates it as end of fifteenth – beginning of sixteenth century.

²⁰⁴ This manuscript was not included in Kloss, “Arkhograficheskii obzor,” 137–38.

²⁰⁵ Namely, TSL 643, IaMZ 15483, Chud. 79, Und. 101.

²⁰⁶ TSL 313 (Psalter, late fifteenth cent.), f.220v. The more recent Lenten Triodion’s Week 3 Sunday Matins lists a very similar Theotokion at the end of the Canon Ode 3 sedalia, although it shows no signs here in the sixteenth century Triodia (e.g. TSL 27, f.45).

²⁰⁷ This rare feature is seen only in one other V2 service: Uvar. 1037.

appears between the texts to St. Leontii of Rostov (May 23) and Ven. Cyril Belozerskii (June 8). Even though previous descriptions of this manuscript²⁰⁸ do not mention any inserted quires or folia, we are inclined to think that the service to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin was inserted here later. The basis for such assumption is its varying handwriting (*skoropis'* with smaller characters in this case), and significantly larger top, bottom, and side indents compared to other texts in this anthology, as well as several blank folia preceding and following this service.

RGB TSL №643 [V2a]

TSL 643 (a liturgical Miscellany of the services and readings to the Russian saints,²⁰⁹ 4°, dated 1497–98 or end of fifteenth century)²¹⁰ contains a service to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin on f.3–21. This service follows the same order as in Chud. 75 and 152, yet has several significant deviations from both: “Lord I call” lists a different *podobn* “О преславное чудо”; the *Aposticha* *Theotokion* follows Chud. 152 by listing “Богородице Дѣво” in place of “Богородице, Ты еси лоза” (#23); “Степ глс 4, Антиф 1” directive is present (#31); troparion C1-5:1 (#67) is divided and listed as two different troparia – “Просвѣти твое житие” and “Церкви ты быс проповѣдник”; troparion C1-6:4 presents a variation “Глаголомъ и законном исполнителъ” (#78); troparion “Да входятъ нынѣ” listed in Chud. 75 and 152 as C2-9:2 (#116) is omitted; troparion C2-9:4 (#118) does not include a phrase “s Prechistoiu Ego Mater’iu za ves’ mir,” following Chud. 75; a Prolog Vita (“Пространный вид”)²¹¹ is given at the end of the service (f.21–

²⁰⁸ Protas’eva, *Opisanie rukopisei*, 81.

²⁰⁹ Other services to Russian saints in this Miscellany include: SS. Mikhail and Feodor (Sept. 20), Sergius (Sept. 25) with a vita, and Peter the Metropolitan (Dec. 21).

²¹⁰ Dated as 1497-8 (Ierom. Arsenii, ierom Ilarii, *Opisanie slavianskikh rukopisei biblioteki Sviato-Troitskoi Sergievoi lavry*, vol. II (Moscow: Moskovskii universitet, 1878-79), 221–22. Kloss, *Izbrannye trzdy*, 2:149 – extends this to the end of fifteenth century.

²¹¹ Kloss, *Izbrannye trudy*, 2:260.

25v.), similar to four V2 services. These differences minimize the probability of direct inter-copying with Chud. 75 or Chud. 152, although the common prototext scenario remains.

TSL 643 contains several unique or rare features among other V2 texts. Thus, the “Lord I call” *podobn* “O preslavnoe chudo” (vs. the general “Chto vy narachem”) does not occur in any other V2 or V3 services.²¹² The partition of C1-5:1 (#67) is observed in only two other V2 services (see below), yet retained in most V3 texts. The truncation of the troparion C2-9:4 “Da vkhodiat nyne” (#118) not observed elsewhere, is irregular, as it leaves Ode 9 with only 3 troparia (including the Theotokion) without substituting it for another. This may have been driven by a need to eliminate the invocation to enter Feodor’s “sviatyi khram sei k chestnym ti moshchem,” which the scribe thought not very appropriate if the service was copied for a diocese other than Iaroslavl’. Another partial phrase truncation is seen in the Theotokion C2-9:3: “*za ves’ mir molitesia*” that was part of Kaz. 4635 and Chud-152 (#118) is omitted here.

IaMZ №15483 [V2a]:

This Miscellany of vitae and services to primarily Russian saints²¹³ dated 1530s–1540s,²¹⁴ begins with the service to the three Iaroslavl’ princes, despite omitting SS. David and Konstantine from its title: “Кнзю Θεοδορου Ιαροσλαβскому.” The label neither names this service, nor gives a date for its celebration.²¹⁵ Beginning on f.1, this text is interrupted by seven folia from the service to another Russian saint, Dionisii Glushitskii listed as f.6 – 12v, then returning back to the holy

²¹² Although both *podobens* belong to tone 8, such a deviation might have been triggered by a melodic preference of “O preslavnoe chudo,” or unfamiliarity of the target choir with the melody for “Chto vy narechem.”

²¹³ The contents list only two other Russian saints, Zosimas of Solovki (April 17) and Dyonisius Glushitskii (June 1).

²¹⁴ Kloss, *Izbrannye trudy*, 2:297–98.

²¹⁵ The September 19 date is mentioned, however, on the cover verso of this book, and in the title of the vita that immediately follows this service (f.24).

princes' service. Two folia are absent (not reflected in the pagination) which contain the Canon parts from C2-1:2 through C2-3:2, and from C2-7:4 through C1-8:4 to the princes.²¹⁶

Although this text does not add anything new to the previously analyzed V2a services and has most in common with Chud-152 and Chud-75, it nevertheless contains several unique traits that distinguish it from all of the above. Unlike in any other service, the first four “Lord I call” stichera are lacking both the tone and the *podoben*. A directive “Таж прок дню” is inserted (#11). The Parimia readings (#12) are not written out, and a prescription “Paremii: napisany prepod Dionisiiu” sends the reader to another place in this anthology. Litya stichera directives have a later addition of “glas 6” on the sideline. The Vespers Theotokion is “Bogoroditse Devo” – a trait not seen in Kaz. 4635 or Chud.75 (#23). Canon troparion C1-5:1 “Prosveti tvoe zhitie” (#67) is joined with “Тsrkvi ty byl esi,” distinguishing it from TSL 643, while its C1-6:4 “Gl[agolo]m i zakonom” (#78) was not present in Chud-152 and read “Blagom zakonom” in Chud-75. C2-9:2 “Davkhodiat” (#116) is present, contrary to TSL 643. C2-9:4 (#118) follows the variation of Kaz. 4635 and Chud. 152 by adding “*so Prechistoiu Ego Meter'iu za ves' mir molitesia,*” which did not appear in Chud-75 or TSL 643. Two less significant liturgical copying mistakes include not labeling the second Ikos (#88), but instead placing “икос” in front of the Svetilen.

All these differences, although secondary, are substantial enough to exclude the possibility of inter-copying between the five V2 services previously analyzed.

The service is followed by a new type of vita not seen in the previous texts – the redaction of Hieromonk Antonii (f.24–61v.).²¹⁷

²¹⁶ Thus, the correct folia for this service should be f.1–5v. and f.12–23v.

²¹⁷ Variants and sources for this redaction (“Редакция иеромонаха Антония”) are published in: Lenhoff, *Early Russian Hagiography*, 242–81; Kloss, *Izbrannye trudy*. 2:289–303; Lenkhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 195–229.

GIM Chud. №79 [V2a]

This September-October Menaion from the mid-sixteenth century²¹⁸ contains another *Vigil V2a* service to the three princes (f.161v.–193), which is the first text of this variant to exclude the word “*novoiavlennykh*” from its title.²¹⁹ The fact that several other V2 services edit out this descriptor²²⁰ may mean that Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin were no longer considered newly-revealed saints.²²¹

This particular service resembles Chud. 152 and IaMZ15483, yet bears unique traits not seen in the previous texts.²²² Firstly, it contains new theotokia at the end of each Kathisma Sedalion (#28-29).²²³ The first one (“Молитвеницу тя стяжевшє к Богу”) is the Ode 6 Sedalion from the Monday Compline service from the tone 1 Octoechos.²²⁴ The second (“Радуися иже от анггла радость приємъшии”) is a widely used ‘God is the Lord’ dismissal Theotokion of tone 8, also on Monday.²²⁵ Although both kathisma sedalia already existed in Kaz. 4635, their theotokia were not copied here, making the possibility of copying from the Kazan Menaion highly unlikely.

The second unique trait, not common to any previous services, is the appearance of the Sedalion after the third Kathisma, “Rachiteli lubvi Khristovy,” with its Theotokion “Iako Devu v

²¹⁸ Protas’eva, *Opisanie rukopisei*, 52.

²¹⁹ The earliest service with this feature chronologically is Uvar. 710 (V3b) dating to the early sixteenth century, which will be discussed in Chapter 3.

²²⁰ E.g. Uvar. 1037, Uvar. 1102, MGU 721 – all dating to the sixteenth century (see below).

²²¹ Gorodilin, “Kul’t sv. Fedora,” 175.

²²² The absence of an additional four Litya stichera and the presence of the Matins Aposticha distinguishes it from Kaz. 4635; the presence of the Aposticha Theotokion “Бже дво” differs it from Chud. 75; the combined C1-5:1/2 troparion and the presence of C2-9:2 differs from TSL 643.

²²³ Although Shchuk. 331 (V1) and Kaz. 4635 (V2a) prescribed the theotokia, these particular texts appear only in Uvar. 752 (V2a) and Uvar. 1037 (V2b) amidst all V2 services. TSL 643, Chud. 75, Chud. 152 and IaMZ 14583 moved these sedalia to Ode 3 and contained no references to theotokia.

²²⁴ TSL 368, (Octoechos, 1497), f.35.

²²⁵ TSL 313 (Psalter, late fifteenth cent.), f.220v.

zhenakh.”²²⁶ This Sedalion appears to be an exact copy of the Canon Ode 3 Sedalion (same tone and podoben) to St. Theophanes the Confessor (March 12):

<p><u>Canon Ode 3 Sedalion to St. Theophanes:</u> Рачитель любви Исусовы бывъ, отразилъ еси сластей и житейский мятежъ. и иночествовавъ, пожилъ еси на земли яко нбсныи англь, и чудесъмъ точиши дарования прпдбне. тѣмже въ свѣтоноснѣи и стѣи твоеи памяти, вѣрно въсхваляемъ тя. съгласно вопиемъ ти бгносне Феофане, моли Ха Бга прегрѣшением оставление даровати чтущимъ любовью память твою. (TSL 533, f.77)</p>	<p><u>Chud-79 Sedalion to the princes:</u> <i>Рачители любви Хвы бысте, озарили [отразили – in Uvar. 1037] есте сладость и жетейский мятеж, иночество въ пожилъ еси на земли, якоже нбсны англь и чудес точиши дарованіа прпдбне Феодоре. Тѣмъ свѣтоностую стую вашу память вѣрно въсхваляемъ и съгласно вопиемъ вамъ бгноснии оци: молити Ха Бга даровати намъ велию млсть. Двж[ды]” (f. 170v.)</i></p>
---	---

The apparent fluctuations between the plural and singular addresses (italicized) reveal the scribe’s attempt to adapt the original to praise all three princes, although the monastic life and miracles seem to be attributed to Feodor alone.

The third Kathisma Theotokion “Iako Devu v zhanakh <...> poklaniauishchikhtisia Rozhdestvu Tvoemu” copies the tone 8 Theotokion of Canon’s Ode 3 from the services to St. Nicholas (December 6)²²⁷ or St. Athanasius of Athos (July 5).²²⁸

The presence of the third Kathisma here²²⁹ presents a liturgical problem. The Jerusalem Typicon does prescribe three Kathismas for the daily non-festal Matins services from September 22 through December 20, as well as the daily Matins during the Great Lent.²³⁰ However, since

²²⁶ Among the V2 services this third Kathisma Sedalion occurs only in Uvar. 752 (V2a) and Uvar. 1037 (V2b).

²²⁷ TSL 504 (December Menaion, end of fifteenth cent.), f.49.

²²⁸ TSL 569 (June-July Menaion, first half of sixteenth cent.), f.254v. Later this hymn will be transferred into the July 5 service to St. Sergius’s Relics Translatio, but it was not present there in the 1514 July Menaion (TSL 568, f.268).

²²⁹ This phenomenon is observed in only two other services: Uvar. 752 (V2a) and Uvar. 1037 (V2b).

²³⁰ TSL 239 (Ustav, first half of fifteenth cent.), f.9v. and TSL 241 (Ustav, mid-sixteenth cent.), f.14 both move the beginning date two days earlier: September 20 to December 20, although both in their September 21 rubrics prescribe to begin reading three Kathismas starting on Monday after the Cross-Elevation Leavetaking (f.73v. and f.88 respectively). For additional explanations on Katavasia, see: Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 185–87.

September 19 does not fall under either time frame, the third Kathisma Sedalion in Chud. 79 may be considered a remnant from a protograph service that might have belonged to the Lenten season, i.e. March 5.

Another rare hymn, common to only other two V2 services (Uvar. 752 and 1037)²³¹ is the Polyeleos Sedalion:

Хви въследовали есте, мира отрешагося и плоти покорили есте поздръжаніемъ ясно всеблаженнии отци Феодоре и Двдѣ с Костянтиномъ славным. Постомъ и млтвами оукрашесе и ннѣ же вѣчнымъ обителемъ приселитесе. Молитесе ѿ нас восхваляющихъ память вашоу. (f. 171v.)

The Theotokion that follows – “Pod krov Tvoi vse Devo pribegaem” – already existed in the Byzantine service to St. Sabbas the Sanctified (December 5, Second Kathisma Sedalion).²³²

Yet another previously unseen feature shared only by the same two above-mentioned V2 services, is the Matins Prokimenon “Chestna pred Gospodem [smert’ prepodobnykh Ego]” replacing the common “Vozveselitsia pravednik [o Godspode]” (#32). By using this particular Prokimenon, these three services seem to shift the emphasis of the three princes from the rank of the righteous (“pravednye”) to that of the venerable ones (“prepodobnye”).²³³

Lastly, it should be noted that this service is followed by a *Polyeleos* rank service to SS. Mikhail and Feodor (September 20) reflecting all Cross-Elevation rubrics absent in the service to the Iaroslavl’ princes, as well as the *Vigil* service to St. Sergius (September 25) containing Small Vespers and Litya.

²³¹ Kaz. 4635 was the only other V2 service that had prescribed the Polyeleos Sedalion, but it was a different text – “Tverdosti razuma” – ruling out the borrowing possibility.

²³² TSL 504 (December Menaion, end of fifteenth cent.), f.26.

²³³ It is worth noting that this change was later adapted by many V3 services and finally solidified in the modern variant of the the princes’ service.

GIM Uvar. №707 (856) [V2a]

This Trefoloi (1^o) “for the September part” (September-February) from the sixteenth century²³⁴ contains a *Vigil* service to the Iaroslavl’ princes on f.43–57. Retaining “novoiavlennykh” in its heading, Uvar. 707, and is unique in clarifying that Davyd and Konstantin were “dву synove ego.”

In its content, Uvar. 707 continues the trend of Chud. 75, although it bears numerous signs of liturgical developments and clarifications, while also presenting several novelties. Among the obvious clarifying addenda, absent from the previous V2 services, are a reminder of “Blazhen muzh” and “Vykhod. Prokimen dniu” at Vespers – both of which were undoubtedly carried out in the past, yet were often left out of the services for self-evident reasons.²³⁵

An absolutely unique element, which has no precedent or consecutive examples in any variants of the princes’ service, is the tone 1 podoben of “Prekhvalnii” prescribed for the “Lord I call” stichera, despite the fact that the stichera texts remain the same as in other V2 or V3 types. Similarly, the prescribed “Lord I call” Theotokion “Vladychitse priimi molitvu rabov...” stands completely alone among other services, although it is a very common tone 8 Theotokion.

More strikingly, Uvar. 707 acquires a completely new major hymn – a Troparion not seen anywhere else until much later,²³⁶ presented as a third Troparion at Vespers with the title “in trop

²³⁴ Arkhim. Leonid, *Sistematicheskoe opisanie slaviano-rossiiskikh rukopisei sobrania grafa A. S. Uvarova; v chetyrekh chastiakh*, vol. II (Moscow: Tipografiia Mamontova, 1893), 147. This Trefoloi probably belongs to the first half of the sixteenth century, as it does not contain any services to the newly-canonized saints at the Makaryev Councils of 1547/49.

²³⁵ See footnote 126 above. Also, Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 190, 208.

²³⁶ Although no V2, V3, or V4 services dating to the fifteenth–sixteenth centuries copy this Troparion, it has been revived in the more recent services both under September 19 (Miniia: mesiats septemvrii, Kiev: Tipografiia Kievopecherskoi lavry, 1893, f.189) and March 5 (Mineia: Mart, Moscow: Izdatel’skii Sovet Moskovskoi Patriarkhii, 2002, 165).

chiudotvortsem, glas 4.” Presumably original, this text distantly echoes the Kontakion to St. Sergius (September 25):

<p><u>Kontakion to St. Sergius, tone 8:</u> Христовою любовию уязвивъся, преподобне, тому невъзвратномъ желаниемъ послѣдовалъ еси. всяко наслаждение плотское възненавидѣ и яко солнце отечеству си возсиялъ еси. тѣмъ и Христос даромъ чудесъ обогати тя. поминай нас, чтущих пресвѣтлую память твою да зовем ти: радуйся, Сергие богомудре. (TSL 643, f. 66v.)</p>	<p><u>Uvar. 707 third Troparion to the princes, tone 4:</u> Иже от юности Христови прилѣпившеся, святїи, и усердно законы и оправданїа того съхраняющи, отнюдуже и чюдесными дарованїи обогатистеся и исцѣленїа истачаете иже вѣрою вас почитающих. Тѣмже молитѣ Христа Бога спасися душам нашим” (f. 46)</p>
---	---

Additionally, this hymn presents a highly unusual phenomenon of writing out three troparia consecutively, observed only in Kaz. 4635 (V2a), although this third Troparion is unique to Uvar. 707. All three are prescribed to be repeated not only during ‘God is the Lord’ at Matins, but also “...i po Mnogomilostive tezh tropari” – which is an evident error.

The Sticheron at Psalm 50 “Prepodobne otche, glas...” that appeared earlier on Litya (#17, 34), is not written out once more, but supplied with an instruction: “pisan nazadi, perekini list.”

The two ensuing canons follow the same ones in Chud. 75 with two exceptions: a) The Kontakion “Iavisia velie” and Ikos “Na vysote” (#85, 88) both have “i pokhvala” added to their endings, seen only in IaMZ 14927 (V3a, see Chapter 3); b) Canon troparion 7.1.4 “Ploti vasha” (#92) is divided into two troparia, which is not seen anywhere else.

Similar to the “Lord I call,” the Praises stichera (#121-125) are the same as in Chud. 75, yet the tone and the podobnen are different – in this case, tone 5 and podobnen “Raduisia,” seen only in Uvar. 1102 (V3b, see Chapter 3). The additional set of Matins “iny stikhiry” follows (#126-130), similar to Chud. 75 and TSL 643. What this service adds is the mention of the

obvious “Slavoslovie velikoe i otpust” (#131) and a directive for the Liturgy: “Na liturgii sluzhba iakozhe nastoiatel proizvoli” (#132) – neither of which appeared in any earlier V2a services. The last one is completely unique among any other V2, V3, and V4 variants.

One omission that might reflect a copying error can be seen in the absence of the Litya stichera (#13-16) that would normally follow the given directive “Na Litii Feodoru” still present here. What follows instead is the ‘Glory’ verse and its Theotokion (#17-18).

Similar to numerous other V2 versions, this service to the three princes lacks any Cross-Elevation rubrics despite the fact that the following September 20 service to SS. Mikhail and Feodor includes them.²³⁷

GIM, Uvar. №752 (844) [V2a]

The last *Vigil* ranked commemoration of the “Novoiavlennykh chiudotvoretz iaroslavskikh” we will mention is the one found in a more recent seventeenth century September Menaion, GIM Uvar. №752 (1^o) (f. 157v.–174).²³⁸ Its Vespers texts and order virtually copy those of Chud. 75 (V2a), while Matins deviate from it and adds several hymns seen only in Chud. 79 (V2a) and Uvar. 1037 (V2b – see below). These include the three kathisma sedalia (“Zlatyu zaria,” “Tverdostiiu razuma,” and “Rachiteli luibve”) and their matching theotokia (“Molitvenitsu Tia nashiu,” “Raduisia izhe ot angela,” and “Iako Devu v zhenakh”), as well as Poyelei Sedalion “Iavi posledovali este” with its Theotokion “V krov Tvoi svi Devo” (all described as part of Chud. 79). The Matins Prokimenon “Chestna pred Gospodem” differentiates these three services

²³⁷ Other services to Russian saints in this Miscellany include: Sergii (Sept. 25), Varlaam Khutynskii (November 6), Metropolitan Peter (December 21), and Metropolitan Aleksii (February 12).

²³⁸ Leonid, *Sistematicheskoe opisanie*, II:139. The fact that this seventeenth-century service still mentions “Novoiavlennykh” while many other services starting from mid-sixteenth century eliminate it (as will be shown below), tells us that this service was copied from an older pre-1550s source.

from all other V2 texts which list “Vozveselitsia pravednik” instead (#32). The Canon most closely follows Chud. 75 and Chud. 152, yet contains one rare copying error in the Theotokion troparion to the first Canon’s Ode 8 – “Sviati Bozhiia” instead of “Mati Bozhiia” (#104) – not seen in the holy princes’ services of any variants apart from Uvar. 1037 (V2b).

The end-of-Matins order (Praises and the additional stichera, #121-130) follows the standard sequence found in the previous V2a services and Chud. 75, the only difference being that the Praises Sticheron “Vsia chtushchaia” (#124) is hereby omitted, and that the vita is absent from this text.

In regard to the adjacent texts, it should be said that not only the September 20 service to SS. Mikhail and Feodor contain the Cross-Elevation rubrics, as in many other instances, but more so, the regular September 19 service to St. Trophimus and his companions (f.147).

* * * * *

In addition to the *Vigil* services to the three princes devoid of the Cross-Elevation rubrics, Variant 2 includes those belonging to the *Polyeleos* rank. The majority of them are of a later origin and the earliest ones found are predated by at least three V2a versions (Kaz. 4635, TSL 643 and Chud. 152). This inadvertently testifies to the scaling down of the earlier *Vigil* rank to *Polyeleos* by the later commissioners/scribes. The reasons for such rank reduction are obvious and still practiced today in the Orthodox Church: when a venerated saint in a local diocese reaches church-wide popularity, their names are inscribed into the national menologies and calendars, while their services enter the pan-Russian Menaia next to the original/primary daily commemorations, but are not obligatory and are left for the discretion of the local

rector/precentor.²³⁹ In our case, it would be logical to assume that the *Polyeleos* variants of the services to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin were written for a broader audience in the areas more distant from Iaroslavl’ and where no special veneration of the princes existed.

As noted above, the vast majority of the V2b services follow the structure of Chud. 75 (V2a) – with the main difference of omitting the Litya stichera, – we will continue using that service and the chart above as the basis for their description.

GIM, Uvar. №1134 (858) [V2b]

This Trefoloi of services to various Russian saints from the sixteenth century (4^o)²⁴⁰ contains a *Polyeleos* service of the “Novoiavlennykh chiudotvoret” (f.28–39), which follows the structure of Chud. 75, adding the following liturgical clarifications:

- a) The mention of “Blazhen muzh” at Vespers;
- b) The mention of the Matins Stepenna of tone 4 and the Antiphon (#31);
- c) The inscription calling for the “Slavoslovie velikoe i otpust” to the end of the Matins (#131);
- d) The directives for the Liturgy: “Apostol chiudotvortsem glav. 213. Evangelie ot Mf. glav. 136. Prichasten ‘Raduitesia’.”

Uvar. 1134 does not write out the Parimia (#12), but instead gives the following reference:

“Pisany na Sergiev den’, sentiab[ria] 25.” More importantly, Uvar-1134 is among the first

²³⁹ A full *Vigil* service might still be published with an inscription leaving up to the rector/precentor to decide the rank (e.g. IaMZ 14898, see Chapter 3).

²⁴⁰ Leonid, *Sistematicheskoe opisanie*, II:149. This Trefoloi contains the following services to Russian/Slavic saints: Mikhail and Feodor of Chernigov (Sept. 20, *Polyeleos* with Cross-Elevation rubrics), Serguis (Sept. 25, *Polyeleos*), Savva of Serbia (Jan. 14, *Vigil*), Dimitrii of Vologda/Prilutskii (Feb. 11, *Vigil*).

services to recognize the error behind the additional end-of-Matins stichera (presumably, the remnants of the Matins Aposticha from the small-feast *Six-stichera* rank service) that were included in all the previous V2 texts (#126-130) apart from Kaz. 4635, and edits them out.²⁴¹

The most significant deviation in Uvar. 1134 from Chud. 75 and other predecessors is its unique attempt to blend the two canons (to Feodor and to three princes) into one. This is achieved by taking the first Canon to Feodor “Tone 8, Vodu proshed” as a base and adding select troparia from the Canon to the three princes, known in other V2 services as “Tone 4, Otverzu.” Thus, all four troparia at each of the odes 3, 5, and 7 are transferred here from the second Canon, although all three beginning irmoi belong to the first Canon. Apart from this, the remainder of the Canon remains similar to Chud. 75: three sedalia at Ode 3 (#55-57), two kontakia with their two matching ikoi at Ode 6 (#85-88), and a Svetilen (#119). However, the Ode 8 Irmos is different – “Tsaria nebesnago” – and was not present in either of the two canons.

Although the exact reason behind this Canon alteration may never be known, the most plausible hypothesis may lie in the intent to decrease the number of hymns to the Iaroslavl’ princes in order to integrate their commemoration with the daily September 19 service to Trophimus, Sabbatius, and Dorymedon. This would imply that the previously major *Vigil* ranked service to the Iaroslavl’ saints was now being scaled down and carried out as a *Polyeleos*, not on its own, but as a part of the regular daily commemoration.

RGB, f.310 (Sobr. Undol’skogo) №383 [V2b]

²⁴¹ The only other two V2 services with this feature available to us are Und. 383 and Shib. 154, described below.

RGB f.310, sobranie Undol'skogo (hereafter cited as Und.) №383 belongs to a previously unseen category of small pamphlets (*tetradki*) dedicated to one particular saint or group of saints. It is a size 4° Miscellany containing only 80 folia. Titled “Blagovernnykh i khristoliubivnykh kniazei novoivlennykh chiudotvortsev smolenskikh i iaroslav'skikh Feodora i Davyda i Konstantina,” it was later designated as “Sluzhba i zhytie.” It belongs to the end of sixteenth century²⁴² and begins with the *Polyeleos* ranked service (f.1–30v.) followed by the vita of Antonii's redaction (f.31–80).

Although Und. 383 follows the general V2 sequence and introduces no new texts, it does not closely copy any particular source, but instead seems to borrow elements from various services. Thus, its inclusion of the kathisma sedalia “Zlatyi zaria” and “Tverdostiiu razuma” (#28-29) is typical only to Kaz. 4635, Chud. 79, Uvar. 752, and Uvar. 1037, although the latter three also add the third Kathisma Sedalion and contain a different Matins Prokimenon. The presence here of a Psalm 50 Sticheron (#34) is only seen in Kaz. 4635 and Uvar. 707, although the actual hymns differ in all three cases. The single Sedalion at Canon's Ode 3 “Zhitiiskoe more” (#57) is seen only in Uvar. 1037, while other services have more than one sedalion and/or kontakion here. Omitting the additional end-of-Matins stichera assimilates Und. 383 with only three other V2 services, Kaz. 4635 (V2a), Uvar. 1134 and Shib. 154 (both V2b). This similarity in pattern reveals Kaz. 4635 as one of the probable sources for Und. 383, although there are enough divergences to rule out a hypothesis of direct copying.²⁴³

²⁴² Vukol M. Undol'skii. *Slaviano-russkie rukopisi V. M. Undol'skogo* (Moscow: Universitetskaia tipografiia, 1870), 260.

²⁴³ E.g. differences in the Aposticha Theotokion and the kathisma sedalia, the absence in Und. 383 of the Troparion “Iako apostolom soprichastni,” as well as its transfer of Kontakion “Iavistesia svetilnitsy” and Ikos “Na vysote” to Ode 6 instead of Ode 3, and the absence in Kaz. 4635 of the Canon troparion 3:1:3 “Napoivshe dusha.”

Liturgically speaking, Und. 383 contains several previously unseen directives that demonstrate its conscious liturgical editing. Firstly, its mention of “Bogorodichen po glasu” at the end of the Aposticha and Praises may have been introduced to avoid the discrepancies in previous sources that list either “Bogoroditse, Ty esi loza” or “Bogoroditse Devo” for the Aposticha (#23), and “Raduisia i veselisia” or “Kto Tebe blazhit” for the Praises (#130). Secondly, both kathisma sedalia (#28-29) are followed by “Slava i nyne, tozh,” thus avoiding the Theotokion that generally follows the Sedalion. This could be explained either by a copying error, a deliberate simplification (in case the author was copying a source that did not include the text of the Theotokion), or a reflection of a local custom.

Another element that sets this service apart is the inscription “Na liturgii sluzhba prepodobnicheskaia.” Even though there are several other texts within the V2 type that spell out the order during the Liturgy (Uvar. 1134 and Shib. 154), they simply list the Prokimenon, the readings, and the Communion hymn without associating the Iaroslavl’ princes with the venerable fathers as we see here.

Among the minor peculiarities of this service is the separation of Canon 1 Ode 4 troparion 2 (#59) into two separate troparia (“Dukhovnyi argan” and “Troitsiu iasno”). Additionally, the text “Prepodobne otche Fedore, ne dal esi sna...” is copied here twice – as the ‘Glory’ verse at the Aposticha (#22), and as the Psalm 50 Sticheron (#34). The fourth Praises Sticheron (#124) is missing the initial phrase “Vsia chtushchaia veroiu” and begins with “Spodobi molitvami tvoimi,” while its ending integrates the words “Prepodobnii ottsi vsi...” which in all other variants are part of the ‘Glory’ verse. Instead of this ‘Glory’ verse (#125), the scribe places another one (“Ravnoangelskoe zhitie pozhivshe”), already seen as the “Lord I call” ‘Glory’ verse in this very service (#9).

GIM, Uvar. №1037 (868) [V2b]

This Miscellany (4^o) contains the services to the newly-revealed Russian miracle-workers.²⁴⁴ The presence of commemorations to such saints as Arsenii of Tver', Makarii Koliiazinskii, and Mikhail Klopskii newly canonized at the Makarii's 1549 Moscow Sobor,²⁴⁵ allows us to correct the previous generalized dating of sixteenth century²⁴⁶ to no earlier than that year. The codex begins with the September 19 *Polyeleos* service to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin (f.1–31) titled: “*Prestavlenie* blagovernago i khristoliubivago kniazia Feodora... i synov ego...” The omission of “*novoiavlennago*” in the title may be due to the more recent saints mentioned in this anthology.²⁴⁷

Apart from the absence of the Litya, the main differences with Chud. 75 are as follows: Uvar. 1037 adds a note on Vespers “Tazhe prokimen dnevnyi” (#11) and presents a new Troparion “Iako apostolom s'prichastnii” with an addendum “Bogorodichen po glasu” in addition to the other two ubiquitous troparia (#24, 25). At Matins, Uvar. 1037 – similar to Chud. 79 and Uvar. 752 – adds the three kathisma sedalia sets (“Zlatyu zaria,” “Tverdostiiu razuma,” and “Rachiteli luibve”) with their matching theotokia (“Molitvennitsu Tia nashiu,” “Raduisia izhe ot angela,” and “Iako Devu v zhenakh”), as well as the Polyelei Sedalion “Dvi v'sledovali este” with its Theotokion “V krov Tvoi vsi Devo” (see Chud. 79 above). Similar to these two

²⁴⁴ The title page of the codex names it “Sbornik sluzhb novoivavlennym chudotvortsam.” Other services in this Miscellany include: Mikhail and Feodor (Sept. 20, *Polyeleos*), Evfrosinia of Suzhdal' (Sept. 25, *Vigil*), Avraamii Bogoiavlenskii (Oct. 29, *Vigil*), Paul the Confessor (Nov. 6, *Vigil*), Stefan Surozhskii (Dec. 15, *Polyeleos*), Peter Metropolitan (Dec. 21, *Polyeleos*), Pavel Obnorskii (Jan. 10, *Simple*), Mikhail Klopskii (Jan. 11, *Polyeleos*), Iakov of Rostov (Feb. 6, *Simple*), Vsevolod-Gavriil (Feb. 11, *Six-stichera*), Arsenii of Tver (Mar. 2, *Vigil*), Makarii Koliiazinskii (Mar. 17, *Vigil*).

²⁴⁵ “Sobornaia gramota” from Feb. 26, 1547 cited in the mid-sixteenth century Typicon TSL 241 (f.1–2v.).

²⁴⁶ Leonid, *Sistematicheskoe opisanie*, II:160.

²⁴⁷ This omission is also present in Chud. 79, Uvar. 710, Uvar. 1102, and MGU 721.

services, the usual Prokimenon “Vozveselitsia pravednik” (#32) is replaced by “Chestna pred Gospodem.” Only in Uvar. 1037, a peculiar podoben “Znamenasia na nas” is prescribed for the Canon Ode 3 Sedalion “Zhitiiskoe more” (#57), not observed anywhere else. Contrary to Chud. 75 and most other V2 services, Canon 1 troparion 5-1 (#67) is divided into two separate troparia: “Prosveti tvoe zhitie” and “Tserkvi ty byst’,” resembling only TSL 643 (V2a) and a later Und. 104 (V2b – see below).

As for the Canon, a significant number of troparia found in Chud. 75 and most other V2 services are missing from this service: “Blagim zakonom” (#78), “Luk sil’nykh” (#82), “Khoteniem” (#96), “Slez vashikh” (#101), “Podvizastesia” (#103), “Iskrushenym” (#112), “Vyspre” (#113). Probably to match the new title of “Prestavlenie” dedicated to Feodor, only one Kontakion and Ikos remain at the Canon – those to Feodor alone (#85, 88).

For the Svetilen (#119), the added side-inscription directs to read/sing it “dvashchi.” The regular Praises stichera (#121-124) are present as well as the additional end-of-Matins ones (#125-130). The last difference with Chud. 75 is that Uvar. 1037 publishes a short Prolog Vita at the end of Matins (f.27v.–31v.).

Probably the most noteworthy feature of Uvar. 1037 is that it is the only V2 service that resembles Kaz. 4635 (V2a) in including the Troparion to the three princes “Iako apostolom”:

<p><u>Troparion, tone 4 (Kaz. 4635):</u> Яко апостолом сопричастни, и врачеве предобри, служители богоприятни рацѣ вашей божественѣи притекающим святии, богумудри блажени, благочестиви княз[и] новоявлении чудотворци, Феодоре и Давыде и Константине. Сошедшеся любовью память вашу свѣтло празднуемъ в пѣснех и в пѣнии радующеся, Христа славяще, таковую благодать доровавшаго <i>вам</i> исцѣлением,</p>	<p><u>Troparion, tone 4 (Uvar. 1037):</u> Іако іапостолом съпричастнии и врачеве <i>чюдніи слижели</i> благоприятний. к рацѣ вашей божественѣй притекающимъ святии богумудрии блаженни, <i>іако</i> благочествий князи новоявленнй чудотвореци Феодоре и Давыде, и Костянтине. Сошедшеся любовью память вашу <i>праздноуим свѣтло</i> в пѣснех и пѣниихъ радующеся: <i>и</i> Христа славящи, таковую благодать даровавша</p>
--	---

граду вашему Ярославлю великое утвержение. (f.6v.–7)	исцѣленіем: и граду нашему Ярославу великое оутврѣждение.” [f.8v.–9]
---	---

The comparison suggests that Uvar. 1037 does not follow the 1480s Kazan manuscript verbatim, but copies another more primitive – hence, older – text, which may have originated from a local Iaroslavl’ source, as attested in “gradu *nashemu* Iaroslavliu.”

Lastly, it should be mentioned that the service to SS. Mikhail and Feodor in this Miscellany (f. 52) includes all proper Cross-Elevation rubrics, contrary to that of the Iaroslavl’ princes.

RGB, f.152 (sobr. Lukashevicha-Markevicha), №57 [V2b]

An unusual liturgical compilation, RGB, f.152, sobr. Lukashevicha-Markevicha (hereafter cited as Luk.-Mark.), №57 dates to 1550s–1560s²⁴⁸ and begins with a collection of separate services to various Russian saints from different parts of the year.²⁴⁹ This section is followed by a September Menaion chapter that is truncated at September 25 and restarts with the beginning of that month. Varying in their handwriting and format, the services of the first part of this Miscellany are evidently sewn into a single binding from different sources.

The Iaroslavl’ princes have not a single, but two services dedicated to them under this binding, both belonging to the *Polyeleos* rank and bearing no reference to Cross-Elevation. The first one (f. 112–134) is presented without a date in its title, and because it is followed by the

²⁴⁸ Iaroslav N. Shchapov, *Sobranie I. Ia. Lukashevicha i N. A Markevicha: opisanie* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennaia biblioteka imeni Lenina, 1959), 50.

²⁴⁹ These include the services to the following saints: Iakov of Rostov (Nov. 27, *Six-stichera*), Savva Storozhevskii (Dec 3, *Polyeleos*), Isidor of Rostov (May 14, *Polyeleos*), Vsevolod-Gavriil (Feb. 11, *Six-stichera*), Stefan of Perm’ (July 26, *Vigil*), Arsenii of Tver’ (March 2, *Six-stichera*), Ioann Novyi (June 2, *Vigil*), Feodor, David, and Konstantin (presumably March 5, *Polyeleos*), Antonii, Ioann, and Evstafii (April 14, *Six-stichera*), Prokopii of Ustiug (July 8, *Polyeleos*).

April 14th service of SS. Antonii, Ioann, and Evstafii, we will attribute it to the March 5 date, and will describe it in Chapter 4 as a V4 type.

The second service for “Novoiavlennym chiudotvortsem” (V2b) is located in the September Menaion section under the 19th of that month (f. 420v.–440v.), preceded by a standard September 19 service to St. Trophimus, and followed by the September 20 service to SS. Mikhail and Feodor, both of which include the rubrics to Cross-Elevation. The Iaroslavl’ princes service lacks several folia, not noticed or corrected by the paginator: from Canon troparion C1:5-1 to C1:6-2, from Canon troparion C1:8-5 to C1:9-2, and from the first Praises Sticheron on. To correct the lacuna in the first instance, one folio was removed from the first service to SS. Feodor, David, and Konstantin, and inserted here (presently indicated as f. 433). The second lacuna still remains.

In its structure and content – aside from the missing folia – this service follows almost verbatim Chud. 75 (V2a), the main differences mostly being the copying errors: a) In the first Kontakion after Ode 6 (#85) the final words “Slava prepodobnym” is mistaken for the ‘Glory’ verse and written out in red; b) Canon troparion C1:7-3 “Postom i molitvoiu” (#91) is attached to “Ploti vasha povinuvshe” (#92); c) Canon troparion C1:9-3 (#111) renders the initial “Se otverzesia” as “*Ne* otverzesia.” Additionally, this service doesn’t publish the Parimia “Pravednik ashche postignet” (#12ii), but instead sends the reader to the 25th of September for it.

One later correction involves Canon troparion C2:4-1 “Na zemli stepen” (#63) which has the words “bozhestvenyi khram vash” crossed out with red ink, most probably reflecting the non-Iaroslavl’ usage.

RGB, f.344 (Sobr. Shibanova) №154 [V2b]

This end of the sixteenth century September Menaion contains a service to the “Novoiavlennym chiudotvortsem...” (f.342–358) very similar to the above-described Luk.-Mark. 75. Both texts send the reader to find the Parimia to St. Sergius’s September 25 service, and the two are unique in mistaking the Ode 6 Kontakion’s ending “Slava prepodobnym” (#85) with the ‘Glory’ verse, written in red. Although the missing folia in Luk-Mark. 75 make it impossible to compare the last part of the Matins, at least two slight differences between these two services can be detected: Shib. 154 does not contain a clarification “Vkhod, prokimen dniu” at Vespers (#11), and does separate the Canon troparia C1:7-3 “Postom i molitvoiu” (#91) and “Ploti vasha povinvshe” (#92).

Apart from the absence of the Litya stichera and the two traits mentioned above (the Parimia and the Kontakion), Shib. 154 follows Chud. 75 (V2a) almost verbatim up until the Praises. Here it leaves out the additional end-of-Matins stichera (similar to its predecessors, Und. 383 and Uvar. 1134), and adds the directives for “Velikoe slavoslovie i otpust” and the Liturgy (#131-132).²⁵⁰

The positioning of the Iaroslavl’ princes’ service in this particular Menaion differs from other fifteenth–sixteenth century September Menaia previously analyzed. Here it is moved to the back of the book, while the ending of the regular daily September 19 service contains only a reference to the three princes’ service saying “ishchi ot dosky” (find next to the [back] cover). The same scenario is observed at the end of September 20, with a reference to the back of the book for the *Polyeleos* service to SS. Mikhail and Feodor of Chernigov. The higher-ranked *Vigil* service to St. Sergius, however, appears in the main body of the anthology under September 25

²⁵⁰ “Na liturgii apostol chiudotvortsem k Galatom: Bratie plod dukhovnyi. Evang[elie] ot Maf [Matfeia]: Reche Gospod’ Svoim uchenikom vy este svet. Prichastno: Raduitesia pravednii.”

rather than at the back. This may be due to the fact that the Iaroslavl' princes and SS. Mikhail and Feodor services were added to this Menaion later, while St. Serguis's service was already part of it at the time of its writing.

RGB f.310 (sobranie Undol'skogo), №101 [V2b]

This sixteenth century Trefoloi to the Russian saints²⁵¹ contains a *Polyeleos* service to the Iaroslavl' princes (f.12–28) which continues treating them as “*novoiavlennye*.” With the Litya stichera exception, this service bears more resemblance to Chud. 152 (V2a) rather than Chud. 75, specifically seen in the Aposticha Theotokion “Bogoroditse Devo” in place of “Bogoroditse, Ty esi loza” (#23). With no new texts added and no vita present, this service would be unremarkable had it not been for the fact that it is the youngest V2 service known to us that still mentions no Cross-Elevation rubrics, although the first services containing those rubrics had appeared as early as late fifteenth century (see Chapter 3 and variant V3).

* * *

The comparison of eight V2a and five V2b of the above earliest available services reveals a number of notable patterns and allows us to partially trace the development of certain services:

1. None of the V2 texts copy or borrow from any part of the V1 Shchuk. 331 service.
2. At least four V2a (*Vigil* ranked) services belong to late fifteenth / early sixteenth century and predate the earliest known V2b (*Polyelei* ranked) texts.

²⁵¹ Undol'skii, *Slaviano-russkie rukopisi*, 113. Among the 25 services to Russian saints, there are 9 *Vigil*, 10 *Polyeleos*, and 6 of the *Six-stichera* rank. The September services include that of Mikhail and Feodor of Chernigov (Sept. 20, *Polyeleos* with the Cross-Elevation rubrics), Sergius (Sept. 25, *Vigil*), and Grigorii Pel'shemskii (Sept. 30, *Polyeleos*).

3. The earliest known V2 service is Kaz. 4635, despite its notable liturgical impeccability and minimal textual/copying error, is not directly reproduced in any of the observed later V2 services and remains on the periphery of the V2 variant scheme. No other services of this type call for either the kathisma sedalia congruent with the Jerusalem Typicon's rubrics for *Vigil* ranked services, or the Theotokos Canon preceding the two canons to the princes, or the Katavasia at the end of each ode. The Polyeleos Sedalion "Tverdostiiu razuma" and the Psalm 50 Sticheron "Prepodobne otche, vo vsiu zemliu," although present in the other fourteen analyzed V2 services, are found in different locations and serve different functions. The Troparion "Iako apostolom sprichastnii" is seen only in one other text – Uvar.1037 (V2b), although direct copying is highly improbable. What cannot be liturgically explained is the use of three troparia at the end of Vespers, which can reflect a local tradition. Additionally, Kaz. 4635 translocates to the Litya the extra end-of-Matins stichera inherent in most V2 services – as a possible Matins Aposticha remnant of a simpler *Six-stichera* rank service, that will later be edited out in several V2b and most V3 services. This unique relocation does suggest that at least one of the sources for Kaz. 4635 or its protograph was an earlier service that contained Matins Aposticha. Finally, the placement of the vita after Canon's Ode 3 is a unique trait among all other services to the Iaroslavl' princes of any variant, which may reflect an older or a local tradition of reading it during the Canon rather than at the end of the service.
4. Chud. 75, being one of the earliest known services to the Iaroslavl' princes, is also the first one to appear in the Menaion, attesting that by the end of fifteenth century their memory has entered the broader standardized codices. Not surprisingly, Chud. 75 contains the largest number of features that appeared in the subsequent services, the closest of them being Luk-

Mark. 57 and Shib. 154. The discrepancies with the earlier Kaz. 4635 service that demonstrated better liturgical precision attest that the latter version was not known to the writer of Chud. 75, and it will take at least another half-century to make all the necessary adjustments, such as adding the *kathisma sedalia*, the Theotokos Canon, and eliminating the Matins Aposticha. While the new texts in Chud. 75 eliminate any possibility of its being copied from Kaz. 4635, the two versions undoubtedly have a common origin, which could be either a more primitive *Six-stichera* ranked September 19 service, or a Lenten March 5 service, neither of which have been found.

5. TSL 643, previously thought to form the basis of other V2 and V3 texts,²⁵² in fact contains multiple unique or rare features that were not included in the later versions. It is most similar to Chud. 79 and Und. 101. Its omission of the Canon troparion C2:9-2 may suggest a conscious avoidance of the topos of venerating the saints' relics at the local Iaroslavl' church.
6. The services in Chud. 152, IaMZ 15483 present two very similar versions of the V2 variant, only marginally different from Chud. 75, both including the vita at the end of the service, similar to TSL 643. Along with TSL 643, Chud. 79, and Und. 101 they contain a special Theotokion "Borogoditse Devo," which may be a remnant of the Lenten origins of the September 19 service, completely edited out in the remaining V2 services.
7. A definite common source or an inter-copying pattern exists between Chud. 79 (V2a), Uvar. 752 (V2a), and Uvar. 1037 (V2b). These three, although distinguished by several minor differences, present a unique version of V2 in their introducing the Third Kathisma Sedalion, the Psalm 50 Sticheron, the different Matins Prokimenon "Chestna pred

²⁵² Lenhoff, *Early Russian Hagiography*, 140.

Gospodem,” and the special theotokia supplementing all their kathisma sedalia. Chud. 79 and Uvar. 752 have more in common and both appear in the September Menaia. Uvar. 1037, however, not being limited by the Menaion, retain a vita at the end. This latter service (Uvar.) also retains the unique Troparion to all three princes “Iako apostolom” found elsewhere only in Kaz. 4635, but the evidence suggests that it may copy a version that predates the 1480 Kazan manuscript.

8. Among the most extraordinary V2a services is the Uvar. 707, which bears the signs of distinct liturgical editing and clarification (the more specific title of the service, the directives for the entrance at Vespers, the Great Doxology, and the order at the Liturgy). Several abbreviations are introduced, such as the notes at Parimia, Litya, and Psalm 50 that send the reader elsewhere to find the texts. Some corrections are made compared to the earlier V2 services, although the superfluous end-of-Matins stichera still remain. An absolutely unique feature is the addition of the third troparion to the princes “Izhe ot iunosti...” not observed in any of the analyzed V2 texts. Several new podobn melodies are added to the already existing stichera, which had no earlier precedents.
9. All V2a services, with an exception of Kaz. 4635, contain the additional end-of-Matins stichera and an extra ‘Glory’ verse attached to the Praises with no apparent designation. These constitute a likely remnant of the Matins Aposticha from either an earlier *Six-stichera* ranked service to the three princes, or the Lenten March 5 one. Not called for by the Jerusalem Typicon at the *Polyeleos* or *Vigil* ranked services, this liturgical error finally caught the attention of scribes at some point during the sixteenth century and the seemingly superfluous texts were eliminated, as seen in Uvar. 1134, Und. 383, and Shib. 154 (all V2b).

The fact that all remaining V2a services included those texts contrary to the earliest of them – Kaz. 4635, adds more weight to the argument for Kaz. 4635’s scarcity.

10. The inherent feature of all V2b versions is the absence of Litya. The earliest of them are predated by at least four V2a services, which attests that the fuller Litya version was developed earlier and then underwent scaling down to the *Polyeleos* level. Copying from sources such as Chud. 75 (V2a) is also evident in many V2b texts, although new liturgical developments are sometimes observed.
11. Uvar. 1134, while following Chud. 75, demonstrates some major hymnographic and liturgical editing. It is among the first services to finally notice and truncate the Matins Aposticha remnant sticheras. Additionally, it makes an attempt to merge the previous two existing canons to Feodor and all three princes into one.
12. Und. 383 is the only V2 manuscript in our possession where an entire booklet is dedicated solely to the Iaroslavl’ princes that could have been written for a more private cell or chapel use. While not introducing any new hymns, it bears elements of different versions, including Kaz. 4635, and is one that appears to be compiled from multiple sources. It also shows a vast number of small liturgical novelties and irregularities. Additionally, it is one of the rare V2 texts that omits the additional end-of-Matins stichera.
13. Uvar. 1037 written quite likely after the Council of 1549, introduces two novelties in the September 19 service title as it stops naming the three princes “*novoiavlennye*” and begins the inscription with “*prestavlenie*.” This focus on St. Feodor’s repose is also attested by eliminating the Kontakion and Ikos to all three princes at the Canon, while those to Feodor alone remain. While Uvar. 1037 stays within the general parameters of Chud. 75, it also demonstrates rare traits occurring in various other V2 sources, such as three kathisma

sedalia and a Prolog Vita, and a rare Troparion “Iako apostolom.” Additionally, this service uses few previously unseen liturgical elements such as new podobens to the old hymns and a new Matins Prokimenon “Vozveselitsia pravednik,” thus attributing SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin to the righteous rather than venerable fathers. The comparison of this service’s rare Troparion “Iako apostolom” against the same one in Kaz. 4635 allows an assumption that Uvar. 1037 follows a text more primitive than the earliest known Kazan service.

14. In the pool of V2b *Polyeleos* versions, evident similarity exists between Luk-Mark.57 and Shib. 154, which bear minimal deviations from the “standard” Chud. 75. Both were integrated into the September Menaion, while the latter reveals a more particular liturgical approach, removing the additional end-of-Matins stichera and appending the rubrics for the Liturgy.
15. Late-sixteenth–early-seventeenth century service, Und.101 follows Chud. 152 more closely than Chud. 75. Most ordinary in its content, it is primarily noteworthy for its late appearance while still bearing no mention of Cross-Elevation, even though V3 services containing those rubrics had already existed for over a century.
16. Among the 14 anthologies consulted above, ten also include the September 20 service to SS. Mikhail and Feodor. Out of those ten, nine services include the Cross-Elevation (Chud. 152 being an exception), while no Iaroslavl’ princes’ services do. Three of the 14 books – Chud. 75, Uvar. 752, and Luk-Mark. 57 – also include a separately-written service to the ordinary September 19 saint (Trophimus), and all three are also supplied with full festal rubrics – the explanation for which will be presented below.

The above analysis and the search for patterns allows us to make several preliminary conclusions about the appearance and the development of the V2 type service to the Iaroslavl' princes. First and foremost, this version, remarkably, has absolutely no common hymns with the earliest known service in Shchuk. 331 of the V1 type. Originating around 1480s, V2 versions span throughout the sixteenth century and contain no rubrics for Cross-Veneration. Although no primary version has been located, most V2 texts resemble each other, their pattern and order revolving around the first Menaion service in Chud. 75, while the earliest Kaz. 4635 manuscript remains unknown to the later copiers. Some deviations between the versions can be attributed to copying error or diverse primary sources, while others owe it to various liturgical alterations and adaptations that may have depended on local cult and practices. The *Vigil* ranked versions predate the *Polyeleos* ones, which reflects the more solemn initial celebration and the intentional scaling down of the princes' rank. This may have occurred naturally due to the cult's spread to the areas farther from Iaroslavl' where these saints were less known, or in light of the new local Russian saints canonized by Metropolitan Makarii's Moscow Councils of 1547 and 1549.

Placed under September 19, V2 services essentially celebrate two events: the repose of St. Feodor, and the Relics Translatio of the three princes. Following Chud. 75, most texts include two sets of stichera on "Lord I call," Lytia stichera (for V2a type), the Aposticha, two troparia, two canons, two sets of kontakia and ikoi, Svetilen, stichera at Praises, and the additional end-of-Matins stichera. Some manuscripts adjoin occasional new hymns or transfer the existing ones to another location in the service, filling in the gaps. Above we discovered that a large number of hymns are based on the General Menaion's services to either one or multiple venerable fathers (GMV1 and GMV2), while other texts share sources between various Byzantine saints and the earlier Russian ones, namely Metropolitan Peter, Leontii of Rostov, and Sergii of Radonezh. No

convincing sources have been located for approximately one third of the hymns, some of which betray obvious signs of new composition or borrowing.

As has been stated in the beginning of this chapter, the main feature that distinguishes the V2 services – as well as Shchuk. 331 (V1) – from the later and modern V3 type is the absence of the Cross-Elevation afterfeast rubrics. According to the Jerusalem Typicon, this feast starts on September 14 and lasts until September 21. Each of the festal days has its daily saint’s service supplemented with some of the hymns to the Cross, particularly the Troparion, Kontakion, Canon and the theotokia.²⁵³ Naturally, the same is expected of the September 19 service to the Iaroslavl’ princes as well. However, not only do the V2 services omit any mention or reference to the Feast, some of them contain exactly the opposite directives, such as the call for the Theotokion ‘Tsariu Nebesnyi’ at the “Lord I call” and the Theotokion “Bogoroditse, Ty esi loza” at the Aposticha, in place of the festal hymns to the Cross.²⁵⁴ In addition to the canons omitting the Kontakion and Ikos of the Feast, Kaz. 4635 prescribes the first Canon to Theotokos and the Katavasia “Otverz usta moia,” which directly contradicts the Canon and Katavasia to the Cross, prescribed by the Ustav.

To explain such phenomena, an argument may be made that at the time of V1 and V2 services’ writing, an older Studite Typicon practice was still in place, where the afterfeast of Cross-Elevation was not extended beyond September 15.²⁵⁵ Such an interpretation has several drawbacks. Firstly, the earliest service available (Shchuk. 331, V1) dates to 1468/9, which is

²⁵³ TSL 239 (Ustav, first half of fifteenth cent.), f.67v.–73v.; TSL 465 (September Menaion, beginning of fifteenth cent.), f.170v.–222v. See also: Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 520-23, 528.

²⁵⁴ These two theotokia would not cause any liturgical conflict had the given service been placed outside of the afterfeast season or during Great Lent.

²⁵⁵ GIM Sin. 330 (f.77v.–f.78) states that “poprazd’n’stviia ch’st’nago krsta ne byvaet,” although does mention the hymns to the Cross on September 15 along with hymns to St. Nicetas (cited from Pentkovskii. *Tipikon Studita*, 283.

well beyond the timespan of Rus' transition from the Studite Ustav to the Jerusalem one,²⁵⁶ and production of the Studite-type Menaia.²⁵⁷ Secondly, all known services to all three princes are written in accordance with the Jerusalem Typicon and include at least several of the elements not present in the Studite services: Litya, Aposticha, kathisma sedalia, and Praises. Lastly, the same anthologies that contain V1 and V2 services to the Iaroslavl' princes devoid of hymns to the Cross, do contain these very hymns in the adjacent services, such as September 19 to St. Trophimus²⁵⁸ and September 20 to SS. Mikhail and Feodor.²⁵⁹ What can be true, however, is that the scribes simply copied the original services into these volumes without any liturgical analysis or editing. The question, then, must be extended to the protographs of V1 and V2: why did they not include any Cross-Elevation rubrics in the first place?

The evidence from the adjacent services to St. Trophimus and to SS. Mikhail and Feodor, most of which do contain the hymns to the Cross, makes it highly implausible that the liturgists and hymnographers of the service to the Iaroslavl' princes at the turn of fifteenth century were not aware of the Cross-Elevation afterfeast and the Jerusalem Typicon's regulations. Instead, we are more inclined to posit that the original protograph for the V2 services – similarly to our conclusion at the end of Chapter 1 dealing with V1 variant – was either written for the feast of the three princes' Relics Translatio on March 5, or was created as a “generic” service to suit any calendar date, since neither March 5 nor September 19 feasts were yet fully consolidated in the period between the relics' finding in 1463 and the first known service in 1468/9. Both of these

²⁵⁶ Pentkovskii. *Tipikon Studita*, 227-28; Pentkovskii, “Ierusalimskii ustav,” 504–05. While the author does mention several examples of the Studite rubrics being used as late as seventeenth century (227-88), they pertain to the regulatory monastic articles of the Ustav (“O trapezakh” and “O lechebnitse”), and not the liturgical rubrics.

²⁵⁷ Sergii (Spasskii). *Polnyi Mesyatseslov Vostoka*, I:209–10.

²⁵⁸ Five September Menaion services to St. Trophimus which contain Cross-Elevation rubrics: Chud. 75 and 79, Uvar. 752, Luk.-Mark. 57, Shib. 154.

²⁵⁹ Eight anthologies containing the September 20 services to SS. Mikhail and Feodor with the Cross-Elevation rubrics: TSL 643, Chud. 75, Uvar. 707, 752, 1037, Luk.-Mark. 57, Shib. 154, Und. 101. This list includes Shchuk. 331 (V1). The only exception where the SS. Mikhail and Feodor service lacks the afterfeast references is Chud. 152.

hypotheses will be developed and tested in Chapter 4 dealing with March 5 Translatio service to the three princes.

As Chapter 3 will show, further liturgical evolution will manifest itself in a V3 variant that will gradually eliminate the previous inconsistencies, add the Cross-Elevation rubrics, and finalize the integration of the service to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin into the September Menaion cycle for the centuries to come.

CHAPTER 3

VARIANT 3: SEPTEMBER 19 SERVICES WITH CROSS-ELEVATION RUBRICS

The most adapted and widespread group of services to Saints Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin will be designated hereby as the third variant, or V3. The context and order of these services are very similar to those in V2, with one significant difference: V3 adds the mentions and hymns of the Cross-Elevation afterfeast. Most likely this was the single most important reason for this variant to survive in the later anthologies more than any other, and to serve as the blueprint for the modern service. With very few exceptions, all texts within this variant are dedicated to all three Iaroslavl' princes and the vast majority of these services are found under September 19.²⁶⁰ Its earliest manuscripts are attributed to the late fifteenth–early sixteenth centuries (TSL 617, IaMZ 14898, TSL 466). While the spread of V2 texts wanes toward the turn of the sixteenth century, V3 services continue to be copied to this day. The key to this permanence lies in their better concordance with the Jerusalem Typicon's rubrics for the afterfeast of Cross-Elevation, which was absent in their V1 and V2 counterparts.

Despite being akin among themselves in content and sequence, many early V3 services vary in their smaller details to an extent that neither of them can be with certainty declared as a common base text (as Chud. 75 was for Variant 2). Such diversity leads us to postulate that their common prototype was not a V3 text, but each one developed from an earlier version of V2. For this reason, Chud. 75 and the table in the beginning of Chapter 2 will continue to serve as a reference for this chapter, against which all V3 services will be compared. While there is no need

²⁶⁰ With the exception of the services under March 5, which have been categorized as V4 and will be analyzed in Chapter 4.

to describe the provenance of hymns already covered in Chapter 2, we will concentrate only on the elements and texts that have not appeared previously.

Similar to the preceding chapter, Chapter 3 divides the services into two groups: V3a containing the *Vigil* (Litya) and V3b of the lower *Polyeleos* rank.

IaMZ №14898 (837) [V3a]

This Miscellany of select services for September (4^o) dates to the last quarter of the fifteenth century,²⁶¹ lists the service to the Iaroslavl' princes under September 19 (176v.–199v.) titled “Pamiat' sviatykh novoivavlenykh chiudotvoretz, kniazia Feodora Iaroslavskago i detei ego Davyda i Konstantina” after a brief mention of the daily saints, Trophimus, Sabbatius, and Dorimedon.

The service begins with “Ashche proizvolit eklesiarkh, poem Blazhen muzh – a trait that has not been seen in any previous V2 or V3 texts. This suggestion that the service can either be kept simple (*Six-stichera*) or elevated to a festal (*Polyeleos* or *Vigil*) rank may indicate that the service was intended for a diocese outside of Iaroslavl', where the three princes may or may not have been solemnly venerated.

Another new trait is the appearance of the three “Lord I call” stichera to the Cross: “Krest presviatyi neoborimaa pobeda...,” “Drevle ubo opolchenie...,” and “Derzhava nepobedimaa nam krest...”

²⁶¹ V.V. Luk'ianov, “Kratkoe opisanie kollektzii rukopisei Iaroslavskogo oblastnogo kraevedcheskogo muzeiia,” *Kraevedcheskie zapiski*, vyp. 3 (Iaroslavl': Iaroslavskii oblastnoi kraevedcheskii muzei, 1958): 207.

These are followed by the usual four stichera of tone 8, podoben “Chto vy narechem” (#1-4)²⁶² and another three of the same tone, podoben “O preslavnoe chiudo” (#5-7). While the ‘Glory’ verse is the same (#9), the ‘Now and ever’ directives revert to the festal Theotokion: “praz. glas 2: Vospleshchem dnes’ pesnoe torzhestvo...,” which is unique among V2 and V3 texts.

The “Vykhod, prokimen dniu” instructions are present (#11), followed by the usual Parimia readings (#12), all written out. These are followed by the four Litya stichera already seen previously (#13-16), their ‘Glory’ verse (#17) and the Theotokion “Vospoite luidie” (#18).

The Aposticha section constitutes another novelty: all three stichera and their two verses are dedicated to the Cross-Elevation afterfeast (“praz gl. 1, pod. Nebesnym chinom”): “Krest vozvysitsia i besi progonimi...,” “Voznosite Gospoda,” “Priide bogoliubi vsi...,” “Bog zhe tsar’ nash,” “Goresto drevle oslazhdaa Moisei...” While the ‘Glory’ verse coincides with Chud. 75 (#22), the Theotokion is again to the Feast: “praz gl. 5: Glas prorok Tvoikh...”

The only Troparion given hereby is the one to all three princes, “Iako zvezdy” (#24), while the Feodor’s Troparion (#25) is omitted. Instead, one finds here an incipit to the festal Troparion “slav i nyn praz. Spasi Gospodi liudi Svoa:”

As the Vespers end, the instructions call for a Compline with a Canon and three stichera to St. Trophimus (f.183v.–188), not seen in any V2 service and only one V3 (Uvar. 710): “Poem sviatym muchenikom na pavechernitse,” “Kanon glas 8, irmos Vooruzhna: Tresvetnymi sianmi dukha...” This Canon lists Sedalion to the martyrs with a Theotokion to the Cross after the third ode, and an entry “конд и икос праз” after the sixth.

²⁶² As above, the # sign is referring to the hymns from Chud. 75, represented by the chart in the beginning of Chapter 2.

The Matins resume at f.188 with “Zri na utr: trop praz, tazhe chiudotvortsem trop, slava i nyn praz.,” not repeating any of these texts. Again, the Troparion to Feodor alone (#25) is not mentioned.

While Chud. 75 had no sedalia at either Kathisma (#28-29) or Polyeleos (#30), this service lists all three. The first Kathisma Sedalion to the Cross was not present in V2, and is rare among V3:²⁶³ “po 1 kaf. sed. glas 7: Tserkvi vopiet Ti Khriste Bozhe... dvazh.” Similar case is with the second Kathisma Sedalion, “po 2 kaf sed glas 4: Krest Tvoi Gospodi iako... dvazh.”²⁶⁴

Conversely, the Polyeleos Sedalion, tone 1 “Zhiteiskoe more vozderzhaniem... dvazh” was already seen on multiple occasions in V2 (as a Sedalion at the second Kathisma or the Canon’s third ode), as well as some V3b versions. The Theotokion “Nebesniu dver’ i kovcheg...,” however, is found only seen in V2 Kaz. 4635 (also as the Theotokion at the Polyeleos Sedalion) and is nowhere to be found in V3.

Matins continue with the regular festal Antiphons (#31) and Prokimenon “Vozveselitsia” (#32), followed by the same Gospel “Vy este svet” (#33), yet the Psalm 50 Sticheron, tone 6 “Prepodobnii otsi, v vsiu zemliu...” (#34) has only one single parallel in Kaz. 4635 (occurring at the same location in service), dedicated to Feodor alone, while this service introduces plural tense to reflect all three saints.

One of the previously unseen elements that appears in virtually all V3 services, is the first Canon to the Cross-Elevation feast “on 6” in accordance with the Jerusalem Typicon,²⁶⁵ yet is content with simply mentioning it as “Kanon prazd na 6.” It is followed by the two familiar canons to the saints (#35, 40) “on 8”: “glas 8, irmos Vodu preshed” and “glas 4 Otverzu usta.”

²⁶³ Occurs only in TSL 466 and Uvar. 59.

²⁶⁴ TSL 466 is the only other service that contains it.

²⁶⁵ TSL 239 (Ustav, first half of fifteenth cent.), f.71–73; TSL 465 (September Menaion, beginning of fifteenth cent.), f.174v. or 207. See also: Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 522.

While the order and most texts are the same as in Chud. 75, there are certain variations worth mentioning:

a) The only hymn appearing after the Canon's third Ode is "glas 8, Iavistesia svetil'nitsi vsesvetlii..." which is labeled here as "sed[alen]," even though it is widely known as Kontakion to all three princes (#86). This is followed by "sl. i nyn praz." to the Feast.

b) Ode 6 is followed by one Kontakion of the 4th tone – "Iavisia velie solntse..." concluding with "...slava prepodobnym" (#85) and one Ikos "Na vysote..." concluded with "slava prepodobnym" (#88) – both dedicated to Feodor alone with their endings matching.

c) The Svetilen is the same as in Chud. 75 (#119), but adds a festal reference of "slav inn praz."

As one might expect from decades of copying and dozens of redactions, several Canon troparia contain slightly different wording. Thus, Canon 1 troparion 6-3 (#77) instead of "Blagimi navy ukrasivsia, Khristovi prilepilsia esi on iunosti..." in Chud. 75, reads "Urkasilsia esi blagonravie i Khristovi ot iunosti prisvoisia." Canon 1 troparion 6-4 (#78) renders "Glagolom Bozhiim zakonnym ispolnitel bys, ispoln'sia o Davyde" as "Glagolom I zakonom ispolnitel' Bozhiim byl esi ispolnisia, itche mudre Davyde." Lastly, Canon 2 troparion 7-3 (#96) changes the previously known "Khoteniem ot mir'skykh sladosti otluchaiushchesia" to "Zhelaniem ot mir'skikh sladostei otluchaiushches..." While relatively miniscule, such differences occur throughout the manuscripts, and may one day serve as cues for locating exact prototexts and their copies, once the entire codex of services is located and transcribed. This undertaking, however, reaches far beyond the scope and magnitude of the present study.

The first four stichera at Praises (#121-124) and their ‘Glory’ verse “Prepodobnii ottsi svechestnii...” (#125) match Chud. 75, yet this service does not contain the additional three stichera found in most V2 services (#126-130), but goes directly into the festal “Inne prazdni.”

The end of Matins adds a directive for the Great Doxology and Dismissal (“Slavoslovie velikoe, i otpust”) (#131), and concludes with “Sluzhba vsia prepodobnicheskaa +,” referring to the GMV2 rubrics for the venerable fathers.

A *Polyeleos* service to SS. Mikhail and Feodor follows immediately on f.199v.–212v. under September 20, and reflects similar Cross-Elevation rubrics.

RGB f.304 (TSL), №617 [V3a]

This Miscellany of services for Russian Saints, aka Trefologion (4°), is dated to the late fifteenth – early sixteenth centuries²⁶⁶ and begins with the service to the Iaroslavl’ saints.²⁶⁷ It is missing an unknown number of initial folia, while folio 1 on the current pagination begins with the “Lord I call” Sticheron “Prepodobnii ottsi Feodore, Davyde s Konstantinom slavnym...” – a slight variation of the fifth Sticheron from Chud. 75 (#5). The next three stichera (#6-8) are followed by a short standalone entry “i muchenikom 3.” This reference, absent from any V2 or V3 texts, may be an extension of a satellite service to holy martyr Trophimus and his companions celebrated that same day, as it follows the trend of other references to these saints

²⁶⁶ Updated in Kloss, “Arkheograficheskii obzor,” 166.

²⁶⁷ This service was previously described in Lenhoff, *Early Russian Hagiography*, 142–44, where the author makes the following valuable observations about TSL 617: a) It represents an intermediate stage between the initial local and the broader national veneration of the three princes; b) It combines the hymns found in Shchuk. 331 and in TSL 643; c) Its writer often – although inconsistently – adds the names of SS. Davyd and Konstantine to the hymns previously dedicated to St. Feodor; d) The Kontakion “Iavistesia svetilnitsy” to the princes adds a line to the previous version known from KB-6/1083, expressing the extended patronage of the princes over the entire land of Rus’; e) The editorial tendencies in TSL 617 reflect “the church’s increasing separation from the affairs and fortunes of the appendage princes, and its widening horizons.”

later in the Canon.²⁶⁸ The ‘Glory’ verse (#9) coincides with Chud. 75, but the Theotokion to the Cross “I nyne togozh glas: Proobrazuia kresta Tvoego Khriste...” is unique among V3 services as it copies the third Litya Sticheron from the September 14 Cross-Elevation Great Vespers service.²⁶⁹

The mentions of “Vykhod, prok. dniu” (#11) and the full Parimia readings in the usual order (#12) are present. Litya is designated here as “Na iskhozhenii,” listing three stichera out of four already seen in Chud. 75 (#13, 15, 16), save “Izhe na zemli angela...” (#14). The ‘Glory’ verse and Theotokion are identical as well (#17-18).

The Aposticha hymns (#19-22) differ only in their Theotokion to the Cross “I nyn togozh: Dnes’ drevo iavisia, dnes’ rod evreiskii pogibe...,” not found in any V3 other texts; it copies the Aposticha ‘Now and ever’ verse of the September 14 Small Vespers.²⁷⁰

The two usual troparia, “Iako zvezdy mnogosvetlyia...” (#24) and “Iako tselitelia preizriadna...” (#25), follow in the same order with identical inscriptions.

The beginning of Matins reflects the Jerusalem Typicon norms for the Cross-Elevation afterfeast: “trop. *praz.*, sviatym dva, slava i nyne, *praz.*” The first and second kathisma sedalia (#28-29) are in honor of the Cross and mimic the ones mentioned above in IaMZ 14898, and are prescribed to be repeated twice each. It is the Polyeleos Sedalion to Feodor alone (tone 4, *podobn* “Skoro va”: “Plot’skoe mudrovanie porabotil esi...” (#30) that is unique among V2 and V3, yet is a successfully pluralized version of the Shchuk. 331 Sedalion:

Shchuk. 311, Kathisma 1 Sedalion to Feodor:	TSL 617, Polyeleos Sedalion to the princes:
---	---

²⁶⁸ TSL 617 is not unique in this aspect, as allusions to SS. Trophimus, Sabbatius, and Dorimedon occur in IaMZ 14898 and others.

²⁶⁹ TSL 465 (September Menaion, early fifteenth cent.), f.159v.

²⁷⁰ TSL 465, f.156.

Плотское мудрование поработилъ еси, блажене княже Федоре, и горшее покорилъ еси, лучшее восприялъ еси, преславны отче, и скрушилъ еси бѣсомъ выа, и нынѣ восия си чудесе, яко солнечны лучь, в добродѣтель сияя божию благодатью; того ради велегласно славим тя. (f.63)	Плотьское мудрование поработилъ еси, блажене Феодоре княже с Двѣмъ и Костянтином, горшее покорили есте лучшему и въсприяли есте почсть преславную <i>оци</i> , искрушите бѣсомъ выа; и нынѣ сияете чудесы, яко солнечныя лоуча в добродѣтели сияете бжею блгодтъю. Того ради велегласно славим вас. (f.5v.–6)
--	---

The choice of the V1 text as a source over the V2 Sedalion “Tverdostiiu razuma,” that sometimes appears here in other V2 and V3 services, may be attributed to the author’s decision to use a smaller number of monastic topoi and the presence of the miracles theme in the former.

This Sedalion is followed by the festal “slav inyn: Krest Tvoi Gospodi iako svet.” incipit, which is seen in only one other V3 service, Uvar. 59, where it will be analyzed due to being written out in full.

The regular Antiphon (#31) is followed by a new type of Prokimenon – “Chestna pred Bogom smert” and its verse “Chto vozdam,” typical mostly for the younger V2 and V3 texts.²⁷¹ The Gospel pericope is the same (#33).

Psalms 50 Sticheron is unique among V2 or V3, and instead once again reverts to the V1 text seen in Shchuk. 311, while making a pluralization attempt:

<u>Shchuk. 311, ‘Glory’ verse at Aposticha to Feodor, tone 8:</u> Нынѣ ты вернии молять: Христова угодника, богомудраго князя, божественаго свѣтилника, ярославскаго чудотворца, русьскимъ княземъ велика помощника, воздержанию наставникъ, терпѣнию, яко твердый столпъ, простотѣ скровище, смиренію благопотребитель, нищимъ утѣха, страннымъ неоскудно	<u>TSL 617, Psalm 50 Sticheron to the princes, tone 8:</u> Ннѣ ты вѣрнии молять Хсва оугодника <i>бгоблжнаго</i> Феодора, бжственаго свѣтилник ярославскаго чудотвоца, русскимъ кнземъ велика помощника, вздержанію наставник, терпѣнію яко твердый столпъ, простотѣ скровище, смиренію блгопотребитель, нищимъ утѣха, страннымъ неоскудно податель,
---	---

²⁷¹ V2: Chud. 79 (mid-1500s), Uvar. 1037 (mid-1500s), and Uvar. 752 (seventeenth cent.). V3: IaMZ 14927 (first half of 1600s), RGB Or. 209 (1660s–1670s), IaMZ 15173 (1670s–1680s), and Und. 111 (eighteenth cent.).

<p>податель, наполнился еси, <i>княже</i>, Христовы любви, явился еси воистину врачъ всѣм скорбящимъ людемъ, и велможамъ наказатель, и мнихомъ наставникъ. Нынѣ ты вѣрою блажимъ, божественую твою память достойно почтемъ. (f.62v.)</p>	<p>наполнился еси Хсвы любви, явились есте <i>врачеве (sic!)</i> воистину <i>велици</i> и всѣмъ скобящимъ людемъ и велможамъ наказатель, и мнихомъ наставникъ. Ннѣ ты вѣрою блжимъ и бжственую память <i>вашу (sic!)</i> достойно почитаем. (f.6)</p>
--	---

While the *topoi* of Iaroslavl’ and the intercession for all Russian princedoms are retained, the pluralization attempt is problematic. Similar to the tactic used in the Polyeleos Sedalion above, the scribe may have chosen to use the more personalized V1 text here instead of the more generic V2 “Prevodobne otche” which already existed since Kaz. 4635.

A distinctive trait of all V3 texts, the “Kanony praz. s ermos na 6” directive is followed by another instruction: “i sviatym na 8, chidotvortsem na 4,” whereby “sviatym” signifies the regular calendar saints – St. Trophimus, and the “chidotvortsem” – the Iaroslavl’ miracle-workers.²⁷² The total count of the troparia prescribed hereby for each Ode (18) exceeds that allowed by the Jerusalem Typicon (a maximum of 14).²⁷³ One explanation for this error may be that the scribe intended to integrate the service to the new Iaroslavl’ saints into the regular September 19 service that coincided with the Cross-Elevation afterfeast, but forgot to correct “sviatym na 8” to “sviatym na 4.” In that case, however, we would see indications for at least the Troparion and Kontakion to St. Trophimus, and perhaps a Sticheron at the Aposticha and Praises. Yet, apart from one short inscription at “Lord I call,” TSL 617 contains no other mentions of the daily saints. This allows us to explain the two references to St. Trophimus and his companions as casual copying errors from the source that contained their service.

²⁷² Likewise, SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin were referred to as “чудотворцы” earlier in the Vespers Troparion.

²⁷³ Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 295. Other V3 services known to us avoid this error by omitting the Canon to St Trophimus and requiring six troparia to the Cross, and eight to the princes.

The first two canons (Cross and St. Trophimus) are not written out as they could be readily found in a regular September Menaion. Hence, the only Canon present is that to “chidotvortsem” – Tone 8 “Vodu proshed.” It is not, however, to be confused with the Canon to the three princes from V2 services with the same initial Irmos (#35) for the reasons described below.

Although the troparia of the first two odes seem to mention all three holy princes, this Canon is essentially a close – partially-pluralized – resemblance of the earliest known Canon to St. Feodor alone – that of Shchuk. 311. Following are the two more basic examples (pluralizations italicized):

<p><u>Shchuk. 311, Canon 1-1 to Feodor:</u> Благимъ нравы украсилъ еси, преподобне княже, от уности Христа възлюбивъ, и мирьскыя вещи посрамивыи, божественаго въздержания наполнився, досточюдныи княже Федоре. (f.63)</p>	<p><u>TSL 617, Canon 1-1 to the princes:</u> Благыми нравы <i>украсистеся</i>, преподобнии, от юности Христа <i>възлюблеше</i> и мирьскыя вещи <i>посрамисте</i>, божественаго въздержания <i>наполнены</i>, <i>досточюднии</i> Феодоре, Давиде и Костянтине. (f.6)</p>
<p><u>Shchuk. 311, Canon 1-3 to Feodor:</u> Въсприялъ еси, мудры княже, заповѣди блугу взирая к Богу сердечною любовию, и тѣмъ внятъ заповѣди Господни, и ыныѣ с преподобнымъ сочталъ та Господь. (f.63v.)</p>	<p><u>TSL 617, Canon 1-3 to the princes:</u> <i>Въсприясте</i> заповѣди блугы, <i>премудрии</i>, взирающе к Богу сердечною любовию, и тѣмъ <i>внясте</i> заповѣди Господня. И нынѣ с преподобными сочта <i>вас</i> Господь. (f.6v.)</p>

Having pluralized troparia 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 3-1, and 3-2, the editor did not continue in the same manner and left the rest of the Canon as in the original. The following examples of this liturgical adaption are more complex as they attempt to alter some of the important topoi (underlined):

<p><u>Shchuk. 311, Canon 1-2 to Feodor:</u></p>	<p><u>TSL 617, Canon 1-2 to the princes:</u></p>
---	--

<p>Божимъ закономъ исполненъ еси, премудры княже, и вся заповѣди Христовы сохранилъ еси, и нынѣ наполнилъ еси <u>градъ свои</u> божественныхъ чудесъ и всѣмъ вѣрнымъ благодатно лучъ испустилъ еси. (f.63v.)</p> <p><u>Shchuk. 311, Canon 3-1 to Feodor:</u> Нынѣ тя молять, богумудрыи, <u>гражане</u>, преподобныи княже, спаси град нашъ и всѣхъ вѣрныхъ съхрани. (f.63v.)</p> <p><u>Shchuk. 311, Canon 3-2 to Feodor:</u> Изъмлада предлежавъ вседержателевы, богоблажены княже, сохрани насъ от бѣсовскыя злобы, и <u>градъ свои</u> сохрани невредимъ. (f.63v.)</p>	<p>Божимъ закономъ <i>исполнитесь премудрии</i> и вся заповѣди Христовы <i>сохраните</i>, и нынѣ <i>наполните <u>отечество свое</u></i> божественныхъ чудесъ, и всѣмъ вѣрнымъ богатно луча <i>испустисте</i>. (f.6v.)</p> <p><u>TSL 617, Canon 3-1 to Feodor, adding D/K:</u> Нынѣ тя молять <i>бголюбивии <u>народи</u></i>, <i>Феодоре с доблимъ твоимъ плодомъ:</i> спи град нашъ и вся вѣрныя <i>схраните</i>. (f.6v.)</p> <p><u>TSL 617, Canon 3-2 to the princes:</u> Изъмлада предлежавъ вседержителеви, богоблажене <i>Феодоре, Двде с Костянтином</i>, <i>схраните</i> нас от бѣсовскыя злобы, и <u>землю русьскую</u> <i>схраните</i> невредиму. (f.6v.)</p>
---	--

These three examples demonstrate that in addition to adjusting the Canon to extol all three princes, the scribe/editor had elevated the three Iaroslavl' princes from the level of patrons of their principality to those over the entire Rus'.²⁷⁴ For reasons yet to be determined, however, both the pluralization and the changes of topoi were interrupted at troparion 3-2.²⁷⁵

Although a number of Canon troparia remain completely unchanged in comparison to Shchuk. 331,²⁷⁶ while others add only Feodor's name,²⁷⁷ the minor divergences observed in troparia 6-1, 6-2, 6-3, 8-1, 8-2, 8-3, and especially the theotokia 5-4, 6-4, 7-8, are enough to

²⁷⁴ G. Lenhoff reaches a similar conclusion: "The recasting of Fedor, David, and Konstanin from local sovereign saints to intercessors for the land of Rus' clearly anticipates Metropolitan Makarij's nationwide search for new wonder-workers, whose powers are extended to all faithful subjects of the Muscovite grand prince." (Lenhoff, *Early Russian Hagiography*, 144).

²⁷⁵ Further troparia such as 4-1 ("grad nash"), 5-3 ("siaeet grad tvoi rustei strane"), 6-1 ("gradu svoiemu"), 6-3 ("grad svoi") bear no changes.

²⁷⁶ Canon troparia 3-3, 4-1, 4-3, and especially the more stable theotokia 1-4, 3-4, 4-4.

²⁷⁷ In addition to 3-1 and 3-2 seen above, the following troparia add "Feodor" to a simple "kniazhe" as compared to Shchuk. 331: 4-2, 5-1, 5-2, 6-2, 8-2.

conclude that the exact source for TSL 617's Canon could not have been the Shchuk. 331 text, but rather one of its variants.

Odes 7 and 9 of this Canon follow an entirely different source – the first Canon to the three princes seen in Chud. 75 and the rest of V2 services (#35), although a close comparison does not reveal any evident V2 protographs. Additionally, the composer of TSL 617 omits troparia “Ploti vasha povinuvshe” (#92), “Na zemli zhiv” (#110), and “Iskrushenym serdtsem” (#112) – seemingly avoiding the epithets that extol Feodor's alleged monastic exploits and/or ascetic battle with demons.

Such an atypical selective copying tactic raises a question as to why the composer of TSL 617 attempted to pluralize the V1 Canon while already having at his disposal the Canon(s) to the three princes from V2. The answer may lay in the context of the V2 Canon(s), which – as seen in Chapter 2 – might have seemed too generalized and for the most part detached from the saints' vita content. Conversely, the V1 Canon, though originating from the general Canon “prepodobnomy edinomu” (as seen in Chapter 1), seems to be more personalized and developing the theme of the miracle-working relics' importance for the Iaroslavl' citizens. To demonstrate this contrast, a context analysis was undertaken of each V1 Canon troparion that the scribe chose to include in TSL 617 in place of each V2 troparion not included (“–” means there were no personalized topoi in that troparion).²⁷⁸

<u>V2 troparia (per Chud. 75) not in TSL 617</u>	<u>V1 troparia (per Shchuk. 331) included in TSL 617</u>
1-2: –	отечество свое; чудесь (<i>градъ свои</i> in V1)
3-1: за вес мир; всю вселеную	молять... народи (<i>молять... гражане</i> in V1)
3-2: –	спаси град нашъ
	землю русьскую сохраните (<i>градъ свои сохрани</i> in V1)
3-3: всяки... чудесы	–

²⁷⁸ These parallels reflect only the troparia that contained the personalized topoi of relics, miracles, the city of Iaroslavl', intercessions, as well as princely and universal patronage.

4-1: –	градъ нашъ; исцѣляеши... страсти; уврачюеши; твоим честным мощемъ
4-2: –	град свои чудесными благоюханми
5-1: всю вселеную	–
5-3: многи чудесы	сияеть градъ твои въ рустѣи странѣ / чудесь твоихъ
5-5: воспоите вся земля	–
6-1: тя явѣ... мирови	точииши граду своему многа исцѣления от твоих честныхъ мощей
6-2: за весь мир помолися; князю нашему градъ и люди своя	
6-3: –	много явилъ еси чудесь
6-4: даровъ чудес	–
8-2: за всю вселеную... моляся	–
8-3: раку же чудес покасазсте всѣм	–
Светилен: чудес твоих память	русьтѣй странѣ

As seen, the V1 Canon contains significantly more personalized topoi, while V2 contains only five mentions of the miracles (3-3, 5-3, 6-4, 8-4, Svetilen), and only one mention of relics (8-3). It is important to note that the scribe chose to edit out all phrases to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin as universal intercessors (3-1, 5-1, 5-5, 6-1, 6-2, 8-2) in favor of various V1 topoi, including relics, the city of Iaroslavl' (or simply "grad nash") and the land of Rus' in general.

The Canon analysis is somewhat complicated by the scribe's choice to omit the V1 Canon odes 7 and 9 in favor of their V2 versions. This decision not only fails to follow the pattern described above, but contradicts it altogether:

<u>V1 (Shchuk. 331) troparia not in TSL 617</u>	<u>V2 troparia included in TSL 617</u>
7-3: русьстии князи; ярославьскийи гражане	–
9-1: исцѣление твои честныи мощи	–
9-2: солнце русьстѣи странѣ; свои градъ	–
9-3: страсти исцѣляешъ; весь мир прославляюще чудесными дѣлы	–

Although the exact reasons driving such selectivity are not evident, the scribe’s randomness in this process is highly improbable. One reasonable explanation may be that the V1 protograph manuscript had missing or damaged folia which rendered copying from it impossible and led the scribe to revert to the V2 text he so diligently tried to avoid earlier in the Canon.

Post-third Ode hymns include a single Sedalion to all three princes “Molim vas prepodobnii,” which is a pluralized variation of Shchuk. 331 second Kathisma Sedalion. The ‘Now and ever’ verse to the Cross “Izhe prevyshe iako Bog” follows – it will be seen in other V3 texts, although most of them will suffice by mentioning “Slav. inyn praz.” This text is not copied directly from the festal Cross-Elevation September 14 service, as seen above in similar instances, but rather from the base service under September 19 to St. Trophimus, where it also serves as the ‘Now and ever’ verse at Canon Ode 3 Sedalion.²⁷⁹

The Sixth Ode is followed by a Kontakion that for the most part follows the Chud. 75 type, yet is worthy of special mention:

<p><u>Chud. 75, Kontakion o the princes</u> Явистеся свѣтилници всесвѣтлыи, въ плоти ангели, яко живота древо райское пощением и бдѣнием явистеся вѣрою възвращаеми, и процвѣли есте молитвами своими небесныа благодати приимыи, врачеве крѣпкы явистеся, исцѣляете недужных душа с вѣрою приходящих к рацѣ мощей ваших, чудотворци показастеся, Феодоре и Давиде и Костентине, молитвѣ Христа Бога грѣховъ оставленіе подати вѣрою и любовію чтущим память вашу. (f.140v.)</p>	<p><u>TSL 617 Kontakion to the princes:</u> <i>Новоизбрании</i> явистеся свѣтилници всесвѣтлыи, во плоти <i>яко</i> ангели, живота древеса райская пощениемъ и бдѣнием явистеся вѣрою возрастаеми, процвели есте молитвами своими, небѣсныа благодати приемше, врачеве крѣпци явистеся, исцѣляете недужных душа, с вѣрою приходящих к рацѣ мощей вашихъ, чудотворци показастеся, Феодоре, Давиде и Костянтине, молитвѣ Христа Бога, <i>да зовемъ вы: радуитесь, стражие земли руської и утвержение.</i> (f.14)</p>
--	--

Two important discrepancies are the addition of “Novoizbrannii,” which is not seen in any other V1, V2, or V3 services, and the custom-made ending that seems to resemble the sixth

²⁷⁹ TSL 465 (September Menaion, early fifteenth cent.), f.208.

Ode Ikos in Shchuk. 331 containing “Raduisia, bozhestbenyi novyi chiudotvoret’s, rus’skym kniazem pomoshchnik i krepky strazh gradu nashemu.” This new ending has been edited to resonate with the Ikos, which comes from one of the unidentified V1 services, similar to Shchuk.

331:

<p><u>Shchuk. 331, Ikos to Feodor:</u> Уясни, отче, блажены княже, <i>многогрѣшныи</i> языкъ, и отверзи ми <i>скверная</i> уста пословити твое честное житѣе и всебожественое чудотворение и явление неоскудныя твояе благодати, преславному <u>твоему граду</u> подая и <u>прочимъ странамъ</u>, мѣногая исцѣления от твоихъ многоцѣлебныхъ мощей, исцѣляющи многоразличныя страсти, и дѣмоньскыя полкы прогоняешь, и славныи <u>град свои</u> спасаешь, и нынѣ ты вси вѣрнии благодарьствено блажим и велегласно взопьемъ: радуися, пресвѣтлыи свѣтилникъ славнаго <u>града</u> <u>Ярославля</u>, просвѣтивы его чудесы своими. Радуися, божественныи новыи чудотворецъ, <u>Русьскымъ княземъ</u> помощникъ и крѣпкы стражъ <i>граду</i> <i>нашему</i>. Радуися, <i>преподобныи княже</i>, <i>божественныя ревности наполнився</i>. Радуися, богоблаженыи княже, благодатныя дары примыше, и <i>блаженыя</i> <i>славы чудесе наполнився</i>. Радуися, всѣхъ купно спасаешь. <i>Но и азъ многогрѣшныи и</i> <i>недостойны рабъ надѣюся милость</i> <i>приятти в день судныи твоими молитвами</i>. <i>Всѣхъ ны здѣяныхъ золь избави, верою</i> <i>зовем ти (людие):</i> Радуися, <i>всемирныи</i> <i>свѣтилниче, княже Федоре богомудре</i>. (f.65-65v.)</p>	<p><u>TSL 617, Ikos to Feodor + D/K:</u> Уясни <i>ми, отче</i>, языкъ и отверзи ми устнѣ прославити твое честное житие и всебожественое чудотворение, и явление неоскудныя твояе благодати преславному <u>твоему граду подая и прочимъ странамъ</u> многая исцѣления от твоихъ многоцѣлебныхъ мощей, исцѣляющимъ многоразличныя страсти и дѣмоньскыя полкы прогоняеши, и славныи <u>град свои</u> спасаеши; и нынѣ ты вси вѣрнии благодарьствено блажимъ и велегласно взопиемъ: радуися, свѣтныи свѣтилникъ славнаго <u>града Ярославля</u>, просвѣтивыи его чудесы своими; радуися, божественныи новыи чудотворецъ <u>русьскымъ княземъ</u> помощникъ и крѣпкыи стражъ; радуися, благодатныя дары приемъ; радуися, купно спасаея всѣхъ; радуися, <i>отче</i> Феодоре, <i>стражъ</i> <i>граду нашему и утвержение</i>. (f.14-14v.)</p>
--	--

Apart from the abbreviation and de-personalization of the original, the editor/scribe, while retaining the acknowledgements of St. Feodor’s importance for Iaroslavl’ and patronage over the Russian princes, avoids calling him “vsemirnyi svetilniche.” He not only replaces the

Ikos refrain, but also alters the Kontakion’s matching ending, as seen above. Additionally, it should be noted that this Ikos was not pluralized to match the Kontakion to all three princes, which may reflect the scribe’s incompetency with grammatical alterations of this sort.²⁸⁰

The Svetilen duly acknowledges the presence of the Cross afterfeast (“Svetilen praz.”), while the following text to the saints, podoben “Dukhom”: “Velmi tia proslavi Gospod’...” copies the Shchuk. 331 version and retains “rus’stei strane,” while omitting “krepkago pomoshchnika *gradu nashemu*.” The ‘Now and ever’ verse (“Izhe ot Boga mirovi...”) does not follow the Cross-Elevation rubric, but retains the equivalent text from Shchuk. 331, editing out the “s prepodobnym kniazem.”

Apart from the Svetilen’s ‘Now and ever’ deviation, the Canon observes all the proper Jerusalem Typicon traits of the Cross-Elevation afterfeast: the Katavasia “Krest nacherta” mention (which is omitted in most V3 services), the ‘Now and ever’ verse at Canon’s third Ode Sedalion, and the initial Svetilen verse.

The first four Praises stichera (tone “podoben Nebesnym chinom na 4”) follow, with small variations, the similar ones in Chud. 75 (#121-124). Although all four are dedicated to St. Feodor, the fourth one in TSL 617 inserts “otsi preblazhenii” in place of the previous “preblazhene Feodore,” despite leaving the singular in “veriou pamiat’ *tvoiu*” and “*spodobi tvoimi* molitvami” earlier in this same Sticheron:

<p><u>Chud. 75, Praises Sticheron 4 to Feodor:</u> Вся чтущая вѣрою память твою свѣтло, сподоби твоими молитвами лютых напасти и страстных бурь всѣх гонзуги присно, и грѣховъ прощение прияти, и дойти милости и радости вѣчныя, преблажене Феодоре. (f.22)</p>	<p><u>TSL 617, Praises Sticheron 4:</u> Вся чтущая вѣрою память <u>твою</u> свѣтло <u>сподоби твоими</u> молитвами от лютыхъ напасти и страстныхъ бурь; и всѣхъ гонзуги присно и грѣховъ прощение прияти, и дойти милости и радости вѣчныя, <i>отци преблаженни</i>. (f.9)</p>
---	---

²⁸⁰ This supposition can be further strengthened by the editor’s abandonment of the pluralization after the first two odes of the Canon.

This type of editing was probably instigated by a hasty or superficial approach, where a more obvious ending phrase was changed, while others were left intact.

The Praises ‘Glory’ verse, tone 8 (“Prepodobnii ottsi...”) undergoes no changes from Chud. 75 (#125), while the ‘Now and ever’ verse calls for “praz. Glas proroka Tvoego” with a curious addendum: “pisan na Khval.” Since there is no other Praises stichera in the service, this entry must be referring to the September 14 service of Cross-Elevation, where the named text was indeed written at the end of the Praises (the last Cross-veneration Sticheron).²⁸¹

The service ends with two short directives: “Slavoslovie vel. i otpust.” for the end of the Matins, and “Sluzhba prepodobnich’skaia” for the Liturgy. These two generalizing mentions are among the earliest of their kind among any Iarsoslavl’ princes services, V2 or V3 (along with IaMZ 14898, which is also dated as fifteenth century).

Based on the above observations of TSL 617, we may posit with a certain level of confidence that:

- a) The scribe had a definite goal to synchronize this service with the Jerusalem Typicon rubrics of the Cross-Elevation afterfeast absent from the V2 services.
- b) The TSL 617 service is the earliest and only known “missing link” between V1 and V2/3, which was first suggested by G. Lenhoff (see footnote 266). While a significant part of the service follows the V2 variant, certain hymns (Polyeleos Sedalion, Psalm 50 Sticheron, Canon, Kontakion, Ikos) follow those seen in Shchuk. 331 beyond the simple Troparion and Kontakion.²⁸²

²⁸¹ TSL 465 (September Menaion, early fifteenth cent.), f.170v.

²⁸² Shchuk. 331 Troparion to St. Feodor “Izmlada iavilsia esi” is seen only one other service: Uvar. 707 (V2a).

- c) The textual evidence from the Canon troparia allows us to rule out direct copying from Shchuk. 331, which leads to the logical assumption that other V1 services must have existed apart from that in the Shchukin Menaion.
- d) The scribe's apparent effort to pluralize Feodor's texts to reflect the new celebration of all three princes in Canon odes 1 and 3 was not always successful and was abandoned in the subsequent odes, which were left as unedited texts to Feodor alone.
- e) The changes in Canon odes 1 and 3, as well as in Psalm 50 Sticheron, reveal an attempt to raise the importance of SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin to a pan-Russian level. This tendency, along with the multiple references of "grad nash" may be explained that TSL 617 originated in Iaroslavl' or its diocese and was intended for a broader usage.
- f) The composer's overall choice of following the more personalized V1 Canon over the more generic V2 one, despite the need to pluralize the former to include all three saints, reflects the push to make this service suitable for larger audience outside Iaroslavl' or its diocese.
- g) While raising the importance of the three princes and adding/retaining the phrases that attest to their importance for Iaroslavl' and "russtei strane," the scribe avoids the previous highly exalted epithets such as "vsemirnii" (as seen in the Ikos and the excluded V2 Canon troparia) and edits out the texts that praise Feodor as an example to monastics (Canon odes 7 and 9).
- h) The presence of the two St. Trophimus references ("i muchenikom" at the 'Lord I call" and "i sviatym na 8" at Canon), not found in any other V2 or V3 services, may be explained as an oversight of the scribe copying the sources which contained them.

- i) The presumed copying errors (out of place mentions of St. Trophimus references), the grammatical pluralizing errors, and especially the abrupt abandonment of Canon editing at troparion 3-2 suggest that the service may have been copied in haste, or by several scribes of diverse abilities.

IaMZ №14927 (889)

Attributed to the first half of sixteenth century,²⁸³ this Festal Menaion (1^o) contains services to numerous Russian saints from the entire calendar year. September 19, after a mere mention of St. Trophimus, continues with “V toizh den’ prestavlenie sviatago blagovernago kniazia Feodora Smolenskago i Iaroslavskago Chiud.,” omitting SS. David and Constantine from the title (f.17-24).

A brief mention of “Vechr. Poem Blazhen muzh” is followed by regular eight “Lord I call” stichera seen in Chud. 75 (#1-8) with the exception of a self-corrected error of re-copying the fourth Sticheron “Grekhovnyi mrak,” which was later crossed out. An identical ‘Glory’ verse (#9) is followed by a feast-oriented entry: “Inyn praz. glas tozh: Glas proroka Tvoego Moiseia” written out in its entirety, which originates from the end of the Praises to Cross-Elevation and has been already seen as the Praises ‘Now and ever’ verse in TSL 617.

A brief entry refers to the Parimia written out elsewhere: “pisany v 28 sego mesiatsa prepodobnomy Kharitonu.” This is followed by the four usual tone 2 Litya stichera (#13-16), the tone of which coincides with IaMZ 14898, but not TSL 617. The ‘Glory’ verse (#17) retains tone

²⁸³ Luk’ianov, “Kratkoe opisanie,” 217.

2 for consistency, while the widespread ‘Now and ever’ verse “Vospoite liudie Materi” (#18) reverts to tone 5 instead.

The Aposticha are similar to Chud. 75 in content and number (#19-22), keeping the same inconsistency of singular vs. plural in the first Sticheron and retaining an archaic “ж” from its source: “Raduisia postnykh <...> vsviatuii vashiu obstupaiushche vsekhvalnii raku.” However, the festal ‘Now and ever’ verse “glas tozh: Dnes’ iako voistinu stoveshchannoe slovo Davyda...” is unique among V2 and V3 services, and is taken from the Litya of the Cross-Elevation service.²⁸⁴

The presence of the Troparion “Iako apostolom soprichastnitsi” makes this service unique among all V3 and most V2 texts, apart from Kaz. 4635 and Uvar. 1037. Considering that both of these services also listed other troparia (“Iako tselitelia” to Feodor alone among them), while IaMZ 14927 omits them, this could be a sign of liturgical editing as the scribe was adapting this service for the Cross-Elevation afterfeast. The only remaining text at the Vespers is “Slav inyn praz. ili bog[orodichen]: Izhe ot veka utaenoe.” While prescribing the festal troparion here is in congruence with the Jerusalem Typicon rubrics, the option of a regular Theotokion is quite unusual and may reflect the local or the contemporary practice of substituting one for another.

Opening the Matins, the three following kathisma sedalia, the Polyeleos Sedalion and three of their theotokia do not follow Chud. 75 or Kaz. 4635, but rather correspond to the Chud. 79 (V2a), Uvar. 752 (V2a) and Uvar. 1037 (V2b) services.

²⁸⁴ TSL 465 (September Menaion, early fifteenth cent.), f.159

The next special trait is the Prokimenon “Chestna,” seen in TSL 617 and more recent V2 and V3 services. Unique among V3 is the repetition of the Psalm 50 Sticheron “Prepodobne otche, ne dal esi...” from its earlier appearance as the Aposticha ‘Glory’ verse (#17) in this very service.²⁸⁵

A major part of the two ensuing canons follows the order seen in Chud. 75 and other V2/V3 texts, although there is a significant number of hymns omitted: Canon Ode 3 sedalia “Zlatyi zaria” and “Tverdostiiu razuma” (#55-56), Canon Ode 4 troparion 1-4 “Kadilo blogoukhaniia” (#61), Canon Ode 6 troparion 1-4 “Blagom zakonom ispolnitel” (#78), Canon Ode 6 troparion 2-3 “Luk sil’nykh skrushil” (#82), Kontakion “Iavistesia svetilnitsi” (#86), Ikos “Svyshe svoe zvanie” (#87), Canon Ode 7 troparion 2-3 “Khoteniem ot mir’skykh” (#96), Canon Ode 8 troparion 1-3 “Slez vashikh kaplia” (#101), Canon Ode 8 troparion 1-5 “Podvizastesia dobre” (#103), Canon Ode 9 troparion 1-4 “Skrushenym serdtsem” (#112), and Canon Ode 9 troparion 1-5 “Vyspre k Bogu mysl” (#113). Similar omissions are seen only in one other service – the already mentioned Uvar. 1037 (V2b), while both services also share the same Canon Ode 3 Sedalion sequence (apart from the festal ‘Now and ever’ addendum in IaMZ 14927),²⁸⁶ and list only one and the same Kontakion and Ikos: “Iavistesia svetilnitsi” (#86) and “Svyshe svoe zvanie” (#87) respectively.

Despite being closer to Uvar. 1037 than to any other V2/V3 service, IaMZ 14927 diverges from it in not including the following: Canon Ode 7 troparion 1-4 “Ploti vasha povinuvshe” (#92), adding “slava prepodobnym *i pokhvala*” endings in both, Kontakion and Ikos

²⁸⁵ Only Und. 383 (V2b) positions this hymn at the exactly same location in the service.

²⁸⁶ Uvar.1037 is the only other service that contains only one Sedalion and Canon’s Ode 3 “Zhitiiskoe more” of the same unique Podoben “Znamenasia” not mentioned anywhere else.

at the 6th Ode (#86-87), and adding the phrase “prilezhno *s prechistoiu Materiui za ves mir molitesia*” in Canon Ode 9 troparion 2-4 (#118).

The Svetilen “Gospod’ tia proslavi” (#119) follows the general trend, yet the prescription “dvashch” is a new element not encountered previously. The ‘Now and ever’ verse follows the pattern already seen at the troparia, by giving a choice to sing the Theotokion or the festal verse: “Bog[orodichen] ili praz.”

The first four Praises stichera and the ‘Glory’ verse “Prepodobnii ottsi vsi” follow Chud. 75 (#121-125). This is followed by a short note “inyn bog.” and directly by “Na stikh. stikhiry gl. 2, podoben Dom Efran,” mimicking the three stichera and their refrains, as well as the ‘Glory/Now and ever’ verse – all seen in Chud. 75 (#126-130). Although the earlier two V3a services seen in this chapter also omit these additional stichera, not called for during the Cross afterfeast, there is nothing unusual in this scribe’s placing them here, especially considering that he might have been copying from a text similar to Uvar. 1037, which did contain them. The peculiarity, however, is in the new clarification label “Na stikh.” which essentially admits that these are the Matins Aposticha stichera, but previously were only seen as simple “iny stikh.” If the scribe chose to treat these hymns as Aposticha, it is unclear why he did not consider the conflict which their presence poses for the *Vigil* rank of this service. Moreover, there is no obvious explanation as to why he did not substitute the Theotokion (#130) with the festal ‘Now and ever’ verse, as he has done in other places of this service.

As has been shown, IaMZ 14927 does not have exact counterparts among the V2/V3 services. While it most closely resembles Uvar. 1037 (V2b), the possibility of direct copying from the latter can be ruled out based on the differences in the Litya and the festal rubrics addenda. The reverse inter-copying could not have taken place as well, since it would be

irrational for the Uvar. 1037 scribe to deliberately omit the Cross-Elevation rubrics found in IaMZ 14927, especially in light of the service to SS. Mikhail and Feodor of September 20 in Uvar. 1037 that includes them. A conclusion can be made therefore that these two services come from the same protograph that contained the Litya, but not the Cross-Elevation rubrics, but different editing approaches were undertaken: Uvar. 1037 eliminated the Litya stichera to simplify the service, thus catering to the wider Russian audience outside of Iaroslavl' or its diocese, while IaMZ 14927 retained the Litya, catering to the local faithful, while perfecting the liturgical side by standardizing it with the Jerusalem Typicon.

Because at this time we know no immediate V3 analogs of this service, it may be surmised that IaMZ 14927 derives from a V2 version, which means the Cross-Elevation rubrics had to be added. The text reveals that the author/scribe achieved this with various levels of success. Some festal propers are indeed added ('Now and ever' verses on "Lord I call," Aposticha, Svetilen), while others are prescribed as optional ('Now and ever' Troparion at Matins and the concluding Svetilen verse), while yet others are not mentioned or ignored (Canon Katavasia, festal Kontakion at the 3rd ode). Finally, some prescribed a 'Now and ever' verse, contradicting Jerusalem Typicon directives by giving the non-festal texts (Sedalion 1, 2, and 3, Polyeleos Sedalion, Praises). This variety of choices disposes us to surmise that the scribe (or the author of the primary protograph redaction) was only partially aware of the requirements of the Jerusalem Typicon regarding the Cross-Elevation rubrics.²⁸⁷ The array of inconsistencies seen in this service might also attest to the transitional period between the Studite and Jerusalem Ustavs that was not yet finalized in the scribe's (or author's) diocese or monastery.

²⁸⁷ Similar sporadic patterns are observed in the service to SS. Mikhail and Feodor immediately following on f.24-28, which prescribes the festal texts in some instances (kathisma sedalia, Canon, Svetilen, Praises), while omits their mention in others ("Lord I call," Aposticha, Troparion, Katavasia, Kontakion).

GIM, Uvar. №59 (806)

While the previous services came from the supplementary Festal Menaia or the Trefologia to mostly Russian saints, this Miscellany is a regular September Menaion (4^o) that includes the main services for that month. Dated to the sixteenth century,²⁸⁸ it is the only regular September Menaion known to me of the V3a type that contains a service to the Iaroslavl' princes. Following the daily September 19 service to St. Trophimus, it is labeled “V toizh den' sviatykh novoivlenykh chiudotvoret's', kniazia Feodora smolenskag i Iaroslavskag i syna ego Davyda i vnuka ego Konstantina” (f.244-263). This is only service that calls Konstantin Feodor's grandson.²⁸⁹

This *Vigil* ranked service follows the basic patterns of V2, adding festal references. Below is the list of traits that may distinguish this service from Chud.75 and Kaz. 4635, and attest that it cannot be a direct copy of either one, while also comparing it to Uvar. 707, which seems to have the closest resemblance to it:

<u>Uvar. 59 (16th cent.)</u>	<u>Kaz. 4635 (1480s)</u>	<u>Chud.75 (late 1400s)</u>	<u>Uvar. 707 (16th cent.)</u>
«Вечер. Блажен муж»	–	–	+
LC “Что вы наречем”	+	+	“Прехвалнии”
LT: 4 stichera, GL, NE	7 stichera, GL, NE	+	+
–	TROP: “Яко апостолом”	–	–
TROP: “Яко звѣзды”	+	+	+
TROP: “Яко цѣлителя”	+	+	+
–	–	–	TROP: “Иже от юности”
“На утрени на Бгъ Гь тропари теж”	–	“На Утрени БГ и мнгомилств»	“На утр. На Бго Гь тропари теж”
SED-1: “Златыи заря”	+	– (at 3 rd ode)	– (at 3 rd ode)
SED-POL: “Твердостию”	+	– (at 3 rd ode)	– (at 3 rd ode)
SED-50: “Преподобне отче Ф., глас евлскый...”	– («Преподобне отче, во всю землю...)	–	“Преподобне отче, глас евангельскый”
<u>CANON</u>			
3-1-3: “Напоивше душа”	–	+	+
KONT: “Явися велие”	– (at 6 th ode)	– (at 6 th ode)	– (at 6 th ode)
–	KONT: “Явистеся свѣт.”	– (at 6 th ode)	– (at 6 th ode)
–	ИК: “На высотѣ”	– (at 6 th ode)	– (at 6 th ode)
ИК: “Свыше свое звание”	– (at 6 th ode)	– (at 6 th ode)	– (at 6 th ode)

²⁸⁸ Leonid, *Sistematischeskoe opisanie*, II:128.

²⁸⁹ The Sofiiskaia II letopis' identifies David as Feodor's grandson and Konstantin as his son (*PSRL*, vol. 6, vyp. 2, (2001), 162).

–	– (as SED-1)	SED: “Златыи заря”	SED: “Златыи заря”
–	– (as SED-2)	SED: “Тврдостю рзума”	SED: “Тврдостю рзума”
SED: “Житеиское море”	–	+	+
–	Житие	–	–
6-1-4 “Глаголомъ...”	–	+ “ <i>Благом</i> законом...”	+
– (at 3 rd ode)	KONT: “Явися веліе”	KONT: “Явися веліе”	KONT: “Явися веліе”
KONT: “Явистеся”	– (at 3 rd ode)	+	+
– (at 3 rd ode)	ИК: “Свыше свое зван.”	ИК: “Свыше свое зван.”	ИК: “Свыше свое зван.”
ИК: “На высотъ”	– (at 3 rd ode)	+	+
PR: 4 stichera, GL, NE	+	4 stichera, GL	4 stichera, GL
AP: 3 stichera, GL, NE	–	+	+
“Славосл. вел. и отпуст.”	–	–	+
–	–	–	“На литургии...”

The differences we have pointed out lead to the conclusion that Uvar. 59 could not have been copied directly from any of these services: Kaz. 4635 does not contain the Matins Aposticha and Canon troparia 3-1-3 and 6-1-4, while Chud. 75 contains an orthographical deviation in Canon troparion 5-1-1, but has no Psalm 50 Sedalion present in Uvar. 59. A different podoben at “Lord I call” in Uvar. 707 may be enough to rule out the possibility of mutual inter-copying with it as well. Nevertheless, it could be surmised with some degree of certainty that Uvar. 59 and Uvar. 707 come from the same protograph.

Special attention should be drawn to the fact the scribe of Uvar. 59, contrary to any V2 and V3 services known to us, except Kaz. 4635, chose to place the Kontakion to Feodor after the third Canon ode. While Kaz. 4635 inserts here the Kontakion to all three princes, Uvar. 59 transfers here the one to Feodor alone. The fact that the Jerusalem Typicon places more importance on the Ode 6 Kontakion and dedicates it to the greater of the two commemorations,²⁹⁰ may tell us about the scribe’s higher prioritizing of the memory of SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin and the

²⁹⁰ Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 301. Among the numerous contemporary fifteenth or early-sixteenth century Typica examples one may point to the services of September 4, where the Kontakion to St. Babylas prevails over that of Prophet Moses (TSL 239, f.60), September 20, where SS. Mikhail and Feodor of Chernigov Kontakion takes precedence over that of Cross-Elevation afterfeast (TSL 46, f.229v.–230), or October 1, where the Protection of the Virgin Kontakion takes precedence over that of Apostle Ananias (TSL 239, f.78v.–79).

translation of their relics rather than those of Feodor alone, which may reflect local veneration tendencies.

One oversight on the scribe's/author's part is that the Kontakion and Ikos he placed under odes 3 and 6 do not match. Kontakion "na predstavlenie Feodoru" beginning with "Iavisia velie..." (#85) is incorrectly followed by the Ikos to all three princes "Svyshe svoe zvanie" (#87), which is also attested by their contradicting ending phrases ("slava prepodobnym" and "velikoe utverzhenie" respectively). The severed counterparts of both of these pairs are found after the sixth Ode as the three princes Kontakion "Iavistesia svetilnitsi" ending in "...pamiat' vashu" (#86) is paired with Feodor's Ikos "Na vysote" ending in "...slava prepodobnym" (#88). The most reasonable explanation of this is that the compiler/scribe of Uvar. 59 had access two sets of kontakia/ikoi from different sources, but was not aware of the Byzantine matching tradition, and hence arbitrarily intermixed them. A similar error was seen in Kaz. 4635, where these two pairs mismatched in a reverse order (see Chapter 2).

Of all known V3 services, Uvar. 59 is the closest to IaMZ 14927 as they are the only two services of this type to retain the additional Aposticha stichera at the end of Matins. The scribe of the given manuscript does a significantly more diligent job of adding the Cross-Elevation references: at "Lord I call," Vespers/Matins troparia, Kathisma and Polyeleos sedalia, Canon Ode 3 sedalia. He only fails to change the 'Now and ever' verses to the festal ones at the Aposticha and the Svetilen. Additionally, the scribe avoids using the Sedalion at the third Kathisma that was not called for, and might have been a remnant of the March 5 Lenten service. At the same time, he fails to delete the extra Aposticha hymns at the end of Matins – a remnant of the *Six-Sticheron* service rank, which will be corrected in all following V3 texts.

RGB, Or. (f.218, Otdela rukopisei) №209; IaMZ №15173; Menaion (Kiev, 1893 / Moscow, 1997/2017

The last two V3a services to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin, despite belonging to the late seventeenth century, are included here as the earliest variants closest to the modern-day Menaion services (also V3a), demonstrating the gradual completion of liturgical editing. Among themselves, they are for the most part identical and therefore can be discussed in the same section.

RGB, f.218, Otdela rukopisei (hereafter cited as Or.) №209, although labeled as *Sbornik kanonov* (4°) dated 1660-70s,²⁹¹ is essentially a collection of texts in honor of the Iaroslavl' princes, preceded only by several canons to the Holy Trinity, St. Sergius, the Theotokos and St. Nikon of Radonezh. The liturgical service under September 19 titled “Blagovernomu kniazii Feodory i chadom ego blagovernym kniazem Davydu i Konstantinu smolenskim i iaroslavskim chiudotvortsom” (f.39-63v.) is followed by Feodor's vita (f.64-88), the vitae of David and Constantine (f.88-91v.), a reading titled “Mesiatsa marta v 5 den': Prenesenie chestnykh moshchei blal. Vel. Kniazia Feodora i chad ego Davyda i Konstantina Iaroslavskikh chiud., slovo 3” (f.92-98v.), an article on the saints' miracles (f.99-140v.), and finally a “Pouchenie” (f.140v.-144), which ends this book. The service resembles a separate pamphlet not sharing any folia with the previous or the following texts, and written in unique calligraphy, that was most likely bound separately into this anthology.

IaMZ 15173 is dedicated solely to all three princes and dates to late 1670s – early 1680s.²⁹² The service – “Sluzhba blagovernomu velikomu kniazii Feodoru i chadom ego blagovernym kniazem Davydu i Konstantinu Smolenskim i Iarsoslavskim chiudotvortsem” (f.1-29) – is

²⁹¹ Last update: Kloss, “Arkheograficheskii obzor,” 160.

²⁹² Last update in Kloss, “Arkheograficheskii obzor,” 161.

followed by the extended version of their “Zhitie” and a “Pokhval’noe slovo” (f. 32-186) of a different format that concludes with an article “O perelozhenii moshchei” (f.186v.–188v.), carried out in a different handwriting and mentioning the more recent event of the translation of the relics into a new reliquary on June 22, 1704.

Both services follow the basic V2a pattern seen in Chud. 75 and are closest to Chud. 79, although they add the Cross-Elevation rubrics and slightly edit a number of texts. The “Lord I call” texts (#1-10), the Parimia (#12) and Aposticha (#19-23) are the same, with few minor differences.²⁹³ The Litya hymns (#13-18) are also identical, apart from the first Sticheron that was altered (#13).²⁹⁴ Both troparia are present (#24-25). The first Kathisma Sedalion (located at Canon Ode 3 in Chud. 75, #55) has a textual a variation,²⁹⁵ while the second Kathisma and Polyeleos sedalia undergo no changes (located at Canon Ode 3 in Chud. 75, #56-57). The Praises (#121-125) are identical, although both services merge into one hymn the previously separated stichera “Chiuв’stva vsia nastavle” (#122) and “Vyshniago moshchiiu” (#123). As for the canons, while IaMZ 15173 contains both, Or. 209 lists only the first one, although in both cases the sedalia are placed after the Canon’s third ode, and the kontakia and their ikoi – after Ode 6.

The major differences (in cursive) may be rendered as follows:

<u>Or. 209 (1660–70s)</u>	<u>IaMZ 15173 (1670–80s)</u>	<u>Chud. 75 (late 1400s)</u>	<u>Chud. 79 (mid-1500s)</u>
Вечер. Блажен муж	–	–	+
LC: под. Что вы наречем	+	+	–
LC-3: (<i>var.2</i>) <i>Благодатию</i>	(<i>var.2</i>)	(<i>var.1</i>) Грѣховныи	(<i>var.1</i>) Грѣховныи
<i>Всесвятаго Духа...</i>		мракъ...	мракъ...
LC-7: ...ваше творяще	...ваше творяще	...ваше творяще	...ваше творяще
успение.	<i>празднество.</i>	успение.	успение.
LC-NE: <i>И ннѣ Бог.</i>	<i>И ннѣ празднику</i>	Царю Небѣсныи...	Бго: Царю Небѣсныи

²⁹³ Sticheron 3 in both services adds “*Blagodatiu Vsesviatago Dukha*” to the typical “*Grekhovnyi mrak...*”; Sticheron 7 in IaMZ 15173 has “...ваше твориашче *празднество*” in place of “...ваше твориашче *успение*” everywhere else.

²⁹⁴ “*Postnicheskomu zhitiiu porevnoval esi, prepodobne otche...*” vs. “*Postnicheskuiu nagotu vspleskal esi na zemli, prepodobne otche Feodore...*” in V2a.

²⁹⁵ It begins in both services as “*Trisiiatelnago sveta zariu...*” instead of “*Zlatyia zaria...*” typical to V2.

Matins Aposticha, while altering certain hymns (“Lord I call” Sticheron 3, Litya Sticheron 1, Kathisma 1 Sedalion, Canon Ode 3 troparion 1-1, Kontakion, and Praises stichera 2 and 3). Or. 209 completely omits the second Canon to all three princes. The direct contradictions in Prokimenon and Gospel pericope in the first two services make the scenario of direct copying from Chud. 75 or Chud. 79 unlikely.

A comparison of Or. 209 and IaMZ 15173 shows that the latter does better in following the Jerusalem Ustav’s Cross-Elevation rubrics. While both services correctly prescribe the festal ‘Glory, Now’ verses/troparia at the Litya, ‘God is the Lord’, Kathisma 1 and 2 sedalia, Polyeleos Sedalion, Canon Ode 3 Sedalion, Svetilen and Praises, and prescribe the festal Canon, the latter manuscript (IaMZ) rightfully adds the festal “Lord I call,” Aposticha and Katavasia to that list.²⁹⁶ It also makes one important correction of indicating Matthew’s Gospel pericope as 43 (vs. 44 in Or. 209), and includes the Parimia texts, which were only named in Or. 209 without a reference to their location. These features certainly make IaMZ 15175 – written approximately a decade later – a perfected and more complete version of Or. 209, yet this possibility is highly unlikely, since the latter did not contain the second Canon to the Iaroslav’ saints.

More thorough analysis shows that the scribe of IaMZ 15173 used numerous textual alterations (‘Lord I call Sticheron 7, both troparia, Canon Ode 9 troparion 2-4), and added one completely new Canon troparion (2-2b at Ode 8) and Svetilen. Comparing them to the older V2 variants may yield some understanding of the editor’s intentions:

<p><u>Chud. 75 (late 1400s)</u> <u>“Lord I call” Sticheron 3:</u> Грѣховный мракъ от сердцеъ наших отгнавь...</p>	<p><u>IaMZ 15173 (1670–80s)</u> <i>Благодатию всестаго дха, грѣховный мракъ от сердцеъ наших отгнавь...</i></p>
---	--

²⁹⁶ It should be noted, however, that the Cross-Elevation Kontakion is not included or mentioned at the Canon Ode 3, where it normally belongs.

<p><u>“Lord I call” Sticheron 7:</u> ...поминайте вои[сти]ну блажащихъ вас на земли, пресвятое ваше творяще уснение.</p> <p><u>Litya Sticheron 1:</u> Постничьскую наготу въсплескаль еси на земли, преподобне отче Феодоре, и страстныя прѣлоги в быстринах слезъ твоих вся притупил еси, листвица божественая и честная, на Небѣса возводящая, всѣм сказася богоприятно житие твое. Благочестья бо плоды в себѣ показавъ, силою отганяя неможения страстей о вѣрно вопиющих ти: радуися, востока звѣзда златозарная, иночествующии свѣтилнице; радуися, приснопамятне, <i>пустыни доброе совпитѣние</i>, Церкви непозыблемое утверждение; радуися, заблужшим велики вождю; радуися, наше похвало и вселенѣи радование свѣтло.</p> <p><u>Troparion to Feodor:</u> Яко цѣлителя преизрядна и казателя благоприятна... преподобне, молися о душах наших.</p> <p><u>Troparion to the princes:</u> Яко звѣзды многосвѣтлыя... Молите Христа Бога грѣховъ оставление даровати душамъ нашим, миръ и велью милость.</p> <p><u>Kathisma 1 Sedalion:</u> Златыи заря въ душѣ стяжавъ, отче преподобне Феодоре... раздрѣши ны от грѣхъ и от золь бесчисленныхъ молитвами твоими, преблажене отче.</p> <p><u>Canon Ode 3 troparion 1-1:</u> Неизреченныя таины присно вознося, блажене Феодоре и Давиде и Костянтинѣ за весь миръ, <i>святѣ, учителя блажени</i> тресвѣтлою зарею просвѣтите, <i>проиде</i> яко молнѣя всю вселеную.</p> <p><u>Kontakion to the princes:</u> Явистеса свѣтилници всесвѣтлии... Молите Христа Бога грѣховъ оставление подати вѣрою и любовью чущимъ память вашу.</p>	<p>...поминайте <i>любовію</i> блажащихъ васъ на земли, и стое ваше творящихъ <i>празднество</i>.²⁹⁷</p> <p><i>Постничьскому житію поревноваль</i> еси прѣдбне оче Феодоре, и страстныя прилоги въ быстринах слезъ твоихъ <i>потопиль</i> еси, и блгоприятное житіе твое, лѣствица бжествена и чстна возводяща на нбса всѣмъ показася. Блгочестія бо плоды в себѣ показавъ, <i>сілоу дха стаго</i> отгоня неможения страстей от вѣрно поющих ти: радуися востока звѣздо <i>свѣтозарная</i>, <i>радуися</i> иночествующымъ свѣтилнице приснопамятный; радуися цркви <i>доброе воспитѣние</i> и непозыблемое утверждение; радуися, заблуждышимъ великій вождю; радуися, наша похвало и вселеннѣй радование свѣтло.</p> <p>Яко цѣлитель преизряденъ и казалетль блгоприятенъ... прѣдбне <i>Феодоре</i>, <i>моли хрста бга спастися дшямъ нашимъ</i>.²⁹⁸</p> <p>Яко звѣзды многосвѣтлыя... Молите хрста бга <i>спастися</i> дшямъ нашимъ.²⁹⁹</p> <p><i>Трисіятелнаго свѣта</i> зарю въ души стяжав отче преподобне Феодоре... <i>избавляти</i> ны от <i>бѣдъ</i> и золь безчисленныхъ, молитвами твоими, преблаженне отче.</p> <p>Непрестанныя молитвы присно приносяще к <i>Бгу</i>, <i>Блажене Феодоре</i> и двде с костантиномъ за весь міръ, и трисвѣтлою зарею просвѣтите, яко молнѣя вселенную.</p> <p>Явистеса свѣтилници всесвѣтлии... <i>Сего ради вси вѣрою и любовію благодарно</i> вопіемъ</p>
--	---

²⁹⁷ This change does not appear in Or. 209.

²⁹⁸ This change does not appear in Or. 209.

²⁹⁹ This change does not appear in Or. 209.

<p><u>Canon Ode 8 troparion 2-3:</u> Чюдеса, святе, твоими душевныя ми болѣзни исцѣли твоими молитвами, святе Давиде с Костяньтином славным, просяще отпуста от бещесленых ти золь, с бесплотными ти силами Христови предстоиши. С нимиже поеши непрестанно: дѣти, благословите.</p> <p><u>Canon Ode 9 troparion 2-4:</u> Ангели, архангели, пророци и апостоли, и весь ликъ преподобных отецъ и священных мученикъ, преблаженным Феодором к Христу <i>прилѣжно</i> молитесь, да избавит ны от всѣх бѣд, Егоже вси величаем.</p> <p><u>Praises Sticheron 2:</u> Чювства вся наставле наказавъ законном, премудре, божественаго разума источникъ бывъ, славне, и от славы во славу преиде Духа Святаго силою; чюдеса бо дивна дѣя, преподобне отче Феодоре, и от силы в силу дѣянїя славу приим, апостолом равень бывъ.</p> <p><u>Praises Sticheron 3:</u> Вышняго мощью и щитомъ истиннымъ огражесе... и <i>человѣчьскыя умы</i> просвѣщаеши чюдеса многими, <i>удивляя вся дѣянїя твоих подвиги</i>, Феодоре преблажене.</p>	<p><i>вамъ, радуйтесе граду нашему великое утверждение.</i></p> <p>Со бесплотными силами преподобнїи оцы хрстви предстоите молитвами вашими стїи, дшевныя наша болѣзни исцѣляите и от безчисленныхъ золь избавите насъ вопїющихъ: Гсда поспѣвайте дѣла и превозносите его во вѣки.</p> <p><i>Престая Дво Бдце Мріе</i>, со агглы и архагглы и <i>со всѣми нбсными силами</i> и со прроки и апслы, и съ лики прбдныхъ оцъ, и сщенныхъ мчникъ и со блженнымъ <i>Феодоромъ</i> молися сну твоему хрсту <i>бгу нашему</i>, да избавить ны от всѣхъ бѣдъ, <i>тебе величающыя</i>.</p> <p><u>Praises Sticheron 2 (+3):</u> Чювства вся <i>плоти</i> оставль... апостолом равень былъ еси, вышняго помощію и щитомъ истиннымъ ограждесе... и <i>члки ясно научи</i>, просвѣщая чюдеса многими. <i>Феодоре</i> блаженне, моли спасися намъ.</p>
---	--

The following patterns may be derived from these correlations:

- a) Several alterations improve the grammar and eliminate incomprehensible phrases (Litya Sticheron 1, Kathisma 1 Sedalion, Canon Ode 3 troparion 1-1, Canon Ode 8 troparion 2-3, Praises Sticheron 2).
- b) Some hymns edit out the monastic topoi present in the previous versions and the original venerable father(s)' or hierarch(s)' texts that lie at the foundation of the holy princes' service (Litya Sticheron 1, Canon Ode 3 troparion 1-1, Praises Sticheron 3).

- c) A few corrections seem to be geared toward improving the theological concepts in the hymns (“Lord I call” Sticheron 3, Litya Sticheron 1, Canon Ode 9 troparion 2-4).
- d) Other modifications pursue liturgical and tonal purposes of matching (both troparia and Kontakion, the new ending of which perfectly matches the Ikos that remained unmatched in manuscripts since Kaz. 4635).

Replacing “prazdnestvo” with previously customary “uspenie” in “Lord I call” Sticheron 7 may have been used to avoid the calendar discrepancy of Feodor’s repose on September 19 and the three princes’ relics Translatio on March 5. Noteworthy also is the fact that both Or. 209 and IaMZ 15173 reverse the order of troparia seen in all V2 and V3 texts, and place Feodor’s Troparion “Na prestavlenie sviatago: Iako tselitel’ preizriaden...” (#25) before the three princes’ Troparion “Na prenesenie moshchei sviatago: Iako zvezdy mnogosvetlyia...” (#24).

The only new hymn in IaMZ 15173 not seen in any earlier V2 or V3 texts, is the Svetilen “Iakozhe solntse...,” for which we were unable to find exact parallels.³⁰⁰ Curiously, the scribe did not write this Svetilen to reflect the memory of all three princes, to whom both canons are dedicated:

<p><u>Chud. 75 Svetilen:</u> Господь ты прославии в чудесѣх, всеблажене Феодоре, жива преставлешася избавил еси от бесмертия, яко Своего угодника. Сего ради чудес твоих память въсхваляем.</p>	<p><u>IaMZ 15173 “Свѣтилень стымъ”:</u> ІАкоже слнце блистая зарю испущаеши чудесь, просвѣщая всѣхъ срдца, иже твою славную память трорящимъ вѣрно, преблженне Феодоре, и спасаеши от бѣдъ и будущаго гнѣва.</p>
--	---

³⁰⁰ More recent anthologies include two similar hymns that might be interconnected: 1) The modern General service to venerable fathers (Praises Sticheron 1: “Светлейше просиявши, якоже солнце, преподобнии, всепразднственная память ваша, лучами облиставае ваших добродетельных деяний, блаженнии, озаряючи верных чувства светом чудес ваших; сию убо празднующе радостно вас восхваляем, и верно ублажаем всепразднственную память вашу.”); and 2) The July 5 service of St. Sergius’s relics’ Translatio (Praises Sticheron 1: “Яко звезда многосветлая Христа солнца незаходимаго, зарями твоих добродетелей всех просвещаеши, блистанием чудес вся концы озаряеши, богоблаженне и богомудре отче Сергие, верою чтущих святую память твою, и честное обретение мощей твоих в песнех светло почитающих.”).

IaMZ 15173 is so far the earliest known service practically identical to the modern version in its content, order, and textual versions. Here is how it compares to the Kiev 1893 Menaion service widely used by the Russian Church today:

<u>IaMZ 15173 (1670–80s) V3a</u>	<u>Menaion (Kiev, 1893 / Moscow, 1997/2017) V3a</u>
“В вечеръ Блажен муж”	+
LC: “Что вы наречем”	+
LC-3: “Благодатию Всесвятаго Духа...”	LC-3: “Благодатию Всесвятаго Духа...”
“...ваше творяще <i>празднество</i> .”	“...ваше творяще <i>успение</i> .”
И ннѣ празднику	+
Written out entirely	+
LT: 4+GL+NE	+
LT-NE: Иннѣ Воспоите...	LT-NE: И нынѣ праздн.
AP-3: “Лѣствица <i>небомѣрная</i> ...”	“Лѣствица <i>небовосходная</i> ...”
Иннѣ праз. Приидите...	+
–	TR: “Отъ юности <i>вашея</i> ” (to the princes)
TR: “Яко звѣзды” (var2 to the princes)	+
TR: Яко цѣлителя... (var2 to Feodor)	–
Слава и ннѣ, троп. праз.	+
GIL: feast twice, GL – saint, NE – feast.	+
KATH-1: Трисіятелнаго свѣта зарю... (var2)	+
KATH-2: Твердостію разума...	+
SED-POL: Житеиское...	+
PROK: Честна...	+
Mt-43	+
SED-50: Препеодобніи отцы... поучившеся...	+
CANON: праз. на 6 и стым на 8 (2 canons)	+
Катавасія празднику	+
3.1.1: Непрестанныя молитвы (var2)	+
SED-3: Житіиское...	+
– <i>CAN-4.1.(2)</i> “Духовный <i>арган</i> ...”	–
CAN-6.1.1 “Вѣрою и <i>любовію</i> ...”	+
–	CAN-6.1.4: “Глаголомъ и законном <i>исполнитель</i> ”
CAN-6 KONT: “Явися днесь...” (Feodor)	–
CAN-6 IK: “На высотѣ...” (Feodor)	–
CAN-6 KONT: “Явистеся...” (var 1 to the princes)	+ (var 2)
CAN-6 IK: “Свыше званіе...” (var 1 to the princes)	+ (var 2)
– <i>CAN-7.1.(4)</i> : “ <i>Плоти ваша</i> ...”	–
– <i>CAN-7.2.(4)</i> : “ <i>Свершивъ теченіе</i> ...”	–
– <i>CAN-8.1.(1)</i> : “ <i>Къ Богу прилъжно</i> ...”	–
– <i>CAN-8.1.(2)</i> : “ <i>Любовью и вѣрою</i> ...”	–
8.2.3: “Со безплотными силами...” (var 1)	+ (var 2)
– <i>CAN-9.1.(2)</i> : “ <i>На земли живъ</i> ...”	+
– <i>CAN-9.1.(4)</i> : “ <i>Се, отверзесе вамъ</i> ...”	+
9.2.2: Да входятъ въ храм...	+
9.2.4: Престая Дво Бце... (var2)	+ (var 2)
SV: “Якоже солнце...”	+
PR: 3 + GL + NE праз.	PR: 3 + GL + NE праз.
PR-1: “Преподобне отче...”	PR-1&2: “Преподобне отче...” <i>дважды</i>

PR-2&3: “Чувства вся...” & “Вышняго...” combined	PR-3: “Чувства вся...”
PR-4: “Вся чтущыя...”	+
PR-GL: “Приидите вси...”	+
PR-NE: “праз. Егоже древле...”	+
– <i>Dismissal directives</i>	–
LIT: ПРОК “Честна,” ЕР 213, GOS Mt.10, СОМ “В память”	+

Most of the divergences here lay in the slight textual corrections, while the Troparion “Iako tselitelia,” Kontakion “Iavisia dnes’,” and Ikos “Svyshe zvanie” – all to Feodor alone – are abandoned. The only texts present in the 1893 version and not seen in IaMZ 15173 are the newer Troparion “Ot iunosti vasheia...” to all three princes and the Canon troparion 6-1-1 “Veroiu i liuboviiu...”

* * * * *

This section will deal with four sixteenth-century *Polyeleos* ranked services to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin (V3b type).

RGB f.304 (TSL), №466

The earliest known V3b service is found in the September Menaion TSL 466 (4^o),³⁰¹ and was written in Moscow in June 1505, as claimed on folio 354.³⁰² Even though the patron or the

³⁰¹ This service was previously described in Lenhoff, *Early Russian Hagiography*, 144–46, who among other general observations noted that TSL 466 is approximately 25% shorter than TSL 643 and retains only the Kontakion to St. Feodor, omitting the one to the three princes. The scholar also proposes that the changes made by Medovartsov, a Moscow editor, “reflect local religious concerns and observance” and were partially motivated by a “desire to streamline the unwidely Jaroslavl’ office.”

³⁰² F.354 reads: “Милостию Божиею <...> написана сия книга Минеа в преименитом и славнем граде Москве, в монастыри св. и великаго чудотворца Николы Старого, замышлением и рукою многогрешнаго Михаила Иаковля сына Медоварцова новоградца, в лето 7013 (1505) июня 24.” The the princes service (f.355-366v.) is located *after* this dating inscription, and its bulk is attributed to one of the scribes from the same scriptorium, with only the title and the side additions (on ff.357v.–359 and 365) made by Medovartsev himself (N. V. Sinitsyna, “Knizhnyi master Mikhail Medovartsev,” *Drevnerusskaia letopisnaia kniga* (1972): 299. Kloss likewise attributes the folia containing the service to the princes to Medovartsov or one of his associates, and approximates its dating to 1505–1520 (Lenhoff, *Early Russian Hagiography*, 415).

recipient church are not indicated, its provenance from St. Nicholas “the Old” Monastery in Moscow under the metropolitan jurisdiction may tell us about the capital’s reception and veneration of the Iaroslavl’ princes.

The title for the regular September 19 service to St. Trophimus and Great Martyr Eustathius (f.208) does include the reference to the Iaroslavl’ princes’ service (“Sluzhba ikh pisana ot dski nazadu”³⁰³), which was clearly added later in vermilion (*kinovar*’) with a different handwriting, using the vacant top and bottom spaces.³⁰⁴

This service follows the basic patterns of V2 and V3.³⁰⁵ Most of the festal rubrics are present, except for the absence of the festal stichera on “Lord I call” (present in IaMZ 14898 and IaMZ 15173) and the Cross-Elevation Kontakion at either Ode 3 (present only in Uvar.710 – see below), as well as of the Praises ‘Now and ever’ verse retaining the older “Raduisia i veselisia” (#130) in place of the festal one (seen in IaMZ 14898, IaMZ 15173 and Or. 218).

Unlike the above-mentioned V3a services, TSL 466 does not introduce any new hymns or liturgical elements. At the same time, it does not follow verbatim any V2 services discussed in Chapter 2, including Kaz. 4635³⁰⁶ and Chud. 75.³⁰⁷ The simultaneous presence of the Polyeleos Sedalion and Psalm 50 Sticheron (which were added in chunks on the top and bottom margins on

³⁰³ “Ot dski nazadu” refers to the rear board/book cover, next to which the sought service is located.

³⁰⁴ Service to SS. Mikhail and Feodor of Chernigov (f.219, September 20, *Polyeleos*) and St. Sergius (f.270, September 25, *Vigil*) – follow immediately after the services to the ordinary calendar saints for each respective date.

³⁰⁵ The hymns in TSL 466 are as follows: “Lord I call” – 8 stichera with the ‘Glory’ and ‘Now and ever’ verses; 3 Parimia; 4 Aposticha with their ‘Glory’ and ‘Now and ever’ verses; no kathisma sedalia; Polyeleos Sedalion (added on the top/bottom indents); Prokimenon “Vzveselitsia”; Gospel Mt. 11; Psalm 50 Sticheron (added on the top/bottom indents); two canons; 4 Praises stichera with their ‘Glory’ and ‘Now and ever’ verses; no additional Matins Aposticha; Prolog readings.

³⁰⁶ E.g. discrepancies in wording in “Lord I call” stichera 2, 6, 8, Polyeleos Sedalion, Psalm 50 Sticheron, Canon troparia 4-2-4, 9-2-4, as well as the presence of Troparion “Iako tselitelia,” Canon troparion 3-1-3, and Canon Ode 3 sedalia.

³⁰⁷ E.g. discrepancies in the Podoben of “Lord I call,” Canon troparion 9-2-4 wording, the presence of Polyeleos Sedalion, Psalm 50 Sticheron, and Canon troparion 9-2-2.

f.357v.-359), as well as multiple troparia omissions in both canons (as compared to Chud. 75) approximate TSL 466 to the earliest V3a services, although no direct sources can be identified:

- a) IaMZ 14898 (fifteenth century), though containing several common rare features,³⁰⁸ lacks the Aposticha verses to the holy princes and a Troparion to Feodor;
- b) TSL 617 (late 1400s – early 1500s), while containing Feodor’s Troparion, lists different Polyeleos Sedalion and Psalm 50 Sticheron, and completely omits the second Canon;
- c) IaMZ 14927 (first half of sixteenth century), despite matching in other aspects,³⁰⁹ lacks the Troparion to Feodor, Canon Ode 8 troparion 1-5 and Canon Ode 9 troparion 1-5, while listing different Polyeleos Sedalion, Prokimenon, Psalm 50 Sticheron and Ikos ending.

Uvar. 59 (V3a, sixteenth century) is the closest variant to TSL 466, and may have come from the common protograph, as it contains all the texts present therein, despite the differences in their placement in the service³¹⁰ and multiple deletions in TSL 466³¹¹ as shown below:

<u>Uvar. 59 (V3a)</u>	<u>TSL 466 (V3b)</u>
Title: “...и внука ег Константина.”	“...и Константину.”
LC (под. “Что вы наречем”): 4 (the princes) + 4 (the princes)	+
+ GL + NE (feast)	– (removed due to Polyeleos rank)
Litya stichera	+ (NE = feast)
AP: 4+GL+NE (“Богородице, Ты если лоза”)	–
TROP: “Яко звѣзды...” (the princes)	+
TROP: “Яко цѣлителя...” (Feodor)	–
KATH-SED 1,2: “Златыи заря... слава инын праз.”	– (moved to CAN-3; instead: “Житіиское море...”)
SED-POL: “Твердостию...”	+
PROK: “Въвеселится...”	+
GOSP: Mt.11	“Преподобніи отци святіи Ф и Д с К, поучившесе...”
SED-50: “Преподобне отче Феодоре, глас...”	
CANON:	– (moved to CAN-6)

³⁰⁸ E.g. identical Polyeleos Sedalion, Prokimenon, and the concluding Ikos phrase.

³⁰⁹ The Podoben for “Lord I call,” with the same reference date for Parimia, and Canon troparion 7-1-4 are absent from both.

³¹⁰ These texts are: Polyeleos Sedalion, Psalm 50 Sticheron, Canon Ode 3 Kontakion, Ode 3 Sedalion, Praises ‘Glory’ verse.

³¹¹ The deletions are: Troparion and Ikos to all three princes, kathisma sedalia, multiple Canon troparia, Matins Aposticha.

CAN-3 KONT: “Явися веліе” (Feodor)	–
CAN-3 ІК: “Свыше свое званіе...” (the princes)	CAN-3 SED: “Златы заря...”
– (was at KATH SED-1)	CAN-3 SED: “Твърдостію разума...”
– (was at SED-POL)	– (was at SED-POL)
CAN-3 SED: “Житеиское море...”	–
4.1.2 “Духовный орган...”	– (CAN-5.1.1 and 5.1.2 separated)
5.1.1 and 5.1.2 paired	–
5.1.4 “Незлюбиви и кротцы...”	–
6.1.1 “Върою и любовію...”	“Моля прилѣжно...”
6.2.1 “Глаголи прилѣжно...”	–
6.2.4 “Всеблажене Феодоре...”	CAN-6 KONT: “Явися веліе” (Feodor)
– (was at CAN-3)	–
CAN-6 KONT: “Явистеся...” (the princes)	+
CAN-6 ІК: “На высотѣ...” (Feodor)	–
7.1.4: “Плоти ваша...”	–
7.2.4: “Свершивъ течение...”	–
8.1.1: “Къ Бгу...”	–
8.1.2: “Любовью...”	–
9.1.2: “На земли живь...”	–
9.1.4: “Скрушеным...”	+
PR: 4+GL+NE	– (was at SED-POL); instead: “Приидѣте вси...”
PR-GL: “Преподобніи отци вси...”	–
МАТ-АР: 3+GL+NE	+ (was at PR-GL)
МАТ-АР-GL: “Приидѣте вси...”	+
PR(АР)-NE: “Радуися и веселися...”	–
Ending: “Славословіе великое. И отпуст:”	

If these two services indeed had a common prototype, this comparison suggests that TSL 466 may in fact be its reworked and simplified version. The deletion of multiple Canon troparia by the scribe of TSL 466 may be explained by his desire to adhere to the common count of three troparia and one concluding Theotokion per each Ode of the Canon – the number observed in both canons invariably. The particular reasons for omitting certain troparia and not the others, though unlikely arbitrary, can only be surmised based on the observed tendencies:

CAN troparion deleted from TSL 466
(numbered according to Chud.75):

4-1-2 (#59)

6-1-1 (#75)

7-1-4 (#92)

7-2-4 (#97)

8-1-1 (#99)

9-1-2 (#110)

9-1-4 (#112)

Topoi pertaining to hierarchs or monastics:

весь миръ сладостно научаем правым учением

восіавъ на земли яко солнце, мглу идолскую всю

потребляем.

воздержаніем всяцѣ поживете и во бдѣніи

Совершивъ теченіе богоносных отецъ днесъ

подвиги твоя и труды и слезы твоя

На земли живь яко ангель, с плотію яко бесплотень

сокрушите бѣсом козни

The most evident reasons for omitting the above Canon troparia is the avoidance of the topoi generally associated with the holy hierarchs (4-1-2, 6-1-1, 7-2-4) and venerable monastics (7-1-4, 8-1-1, 9-1-2, 9-1-4). Although it can be argued that these topoi do occur in hymns to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin elsewhere, the findings in Chapters 1 and 2 above have to be taken into consideration – that the bulk of V1 and V2/V3 services originated from the generic services to venerable father(s) or include hymns borrowed from such saints as Leontii of Rostov, Metropolitan Peter (both hierarchs), and Sergius (a monastic), which certainly contained the metaphors and similes pertaining to those two ranks. TSL 466 is a good example of how these were being edited out with time.

Not all deleted troparia, however, included the ascetic or hierarchical topoi.³¹² Three of them, for instance,³¹³ contained mentions of the saintly princes' relics and miracles, although another 19 with such mentions were retained.³¹⁴

Of greater interest is the scribe's exclusion of the Troparion, Kontakion and Ikos to all three saints (while retaining those to Feodor alone), despite the fact that both canons and most other hymns are dedicated to all three princes. Because the Jerusalem Typicon afterfeast rubrics do allow the presence of troparia and kontakia for as many as two additional Menaion saints,³¹⁵ such deletion was unnecessary. Presumably copying from an earlier V2 service (all of which known to me did include Troparion-Kontakion-Ikos sets to both Feodor and the three princes), it becomes evident that the editor must have had another reason to eliminate the second set of hymns.

³¹² The omitted Canon troparia 5-1-4, 6-1-4, 6-2-4, 7-2-4, and 8-1-2 did not include these topoi.

³¹³ Canon troparia 6-1-4, 6-2-4, and 9-1-4.

³¹⁴ Canon troparia 1-2-2, 1-2-3, 3-1-3, 4-2-3, 5-1-3, 5-2-3, 6-1-3, 6-2-1, 6-2-2, 6-2-3, 7-1-2, 7-2-1, 8-1-1, 8-2-1, 8-2-2, 8-2-3, 9-2-1, 9-2-2, 9-2-3 (numbering given according to TSL 466).

³¹⁵ E.g. TSL 242 (Ustav, first half of sixteenth cent.), f.554v. See also: Vasilii Rozanov, *Bogosluzhebnyi ustav: opyt iz'iasnitel'nogo izlozheniia poriadka bogosluzheniia Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi* (Moscow: Pravoslavnyi Sviato-Tikhonovskii Gumanitarnyi Universitet, 2008), 106–108.

He may have deemed them unfit for September 19 feast commemorating Fedor's repose as they were usually labeled "na prenesenie moshchem." Another possible explanation is that there may have already existed a separate feast to the Iaroslavl' princes' relics Translatio (March 5) and the scribe decided not to confuse the two.³¹⁶

The fact that this specific redaction of the service was included in the September Menaion written in a Moscow monastery, while V2a/b and V3a versions were available by 1505, allows us to make several important assumptions about the Muscovite liturgical demands, as well as the place of the three holy princes of Iaroslavl' in the all-Russian pantheon of early native saints:

- a) The Moscow provenance of TSL 466 with high degree of probability reflects the capital's reception and veneration of the Iaroslavl' princes, as well as the local liturgical customs;
- b) The fact that the service to the patron saints of the regional Iaroslavl' principedom is added to the 1505 Moscow Menaion suggests that SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin were promoted and already revered in the capital;³¹⁷
- c) The reduction of the service rank from *Vigil* (V3a) found in earlier manuscripts to *Polyeleos* (V3b) inadvertently points to the fact that despite a certain degree of royal support the Iaroslavl' princes were not as highly revered in Moscow as in their homeland, and had to be downgraded to the level of other regional saints (such as Mikhail and Feodor of Chernigov);

³¹⁶ As will be discussed in Chapter 4, the earliest known March 5 service dates to the early 1500s.

³¹⁷ This conforms with G. Lenhoff's observations – based on number of extant documents and vitae – that the patronage of SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin may have been promoted by Tsar Ivan IV and the Moscow nobility (Lenhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 59-60).

- d) The presence of the Cross-Elevation afterfeast rubrics absent in the Studite Typicon implies that by 1505 Moscow had transferred to the Jerusalem Typicon;
- e) The simplification of the Canon odes' troparia count to the most basic 3+1 form reveals the drive to standardize the service;
- f) St. Feodor is given a focal point in this September 19 service, while his two sons and their hymns take secondary position and are less pronounced, which is especially evident from the omission of the three most important hymns to all three princes (Troparion, Kontakion, and Ikos) in favor of those to Feodor alone.
- g) Another reason for the omission of the Troparion, Kontakion and Ikos to all three princes may have been Medovartsov's acquaintance with the March 5 feast and service celebrating their relics' Translatio (see Chapter 4). The editor may have deemed the said hymns labeled "na prenesenie moshchem" not fit for September 19 feast commemorating Fedor's repose.

GIM, Uvar. №710 (811)

The service in the September-November Menaion Uvar. 710 (1^o) emerges as somewhat unique and dates to the beginning of the sixteenth century (f.104v.–116v.).³¹⁸ Its title "Prestavlenie prepod otets' nashikh kniazei Iiaroslavskikh Feodora i Davyda i Konstantina," contains the earliest instance among any V2 or V3 texts when the word "novoiavlennykh" is excluded.

³¹⁸Leonid, *Sistematicheskoe opisanie*, II:129. The month of September also includes the services to SS. Ivan (Ioann) of Novgorod (September 7), Mikhail and Feodor of Chernigov (September 20, including the Cross rubrics), and Sergius (September 25) – all of *Polyeleos* rank.

This *Polyeleos* service bears only a partial allusion to the Cross-Elevation rubrics. Initially, an inscription is given about the daily saints, St. Trophimus (“Sluzhba muchenikom na pavechernitsy”), which allots their service a secondary place at Compline – the trait observed only in one other service, IaMZ 14898.

The Vespers sequence begins with “Blazhen muzh,” three “Lord I call” stichera to the Cross,³¹⁹ and five to the holy princes (#1, 5, 6, 7, 8)³²⁰ in order to make up the count of eight total stichera in accordance with the Jerusalem Typicon afterfeast rubrics, and thus correcting the error made in TSL 466. Following the regular ‘Glory’ verse (#9), the prescription of “Tsar’ nebesnyi” Theotokion (#10), however, contradicts the Cross-Elevation rubrics, which should have been festal.

Without mentioning the Entrance or the evening Prokimenon, the service prescribes the typical Parimia (#12), followed by the usual Aposticha stichera with their ‘Glory’ verse, seen in V2 and V3 (#19-22). Once more an incongruence is allowed by not including the festal ‘Glory’ verse and retaining the regular “Bogoroditse, Ty esi loza istinaia” (#23). Another irregularity is that only the first phrases are given for the two troparia to the saints (#24, 25), whereby each is accompanied by a previously unseen directive “pisan v ustave.”³²¹ An insertion of “I nyne prazdniku: Spasi Gospodi luid.” is placed between the two troparia in error and should have been after the second one.³²²

³¹⁹ A similar pattern is observed only in IaMZ 14898 and the more recent IaMZ 15173.

³²⁰ Stichera “Svetlosti dukhovnyia,” “Grekhovnyi mrak ot serdets’,” and “Iako zvezdy vsesvetlyia” (#2-4) known from Chud. 75 are omitted.

³²¹ This type of reference is the earliest and unique among all the fifteenth–seventeenth century manuscripts consulted in this research.

³²² Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 220.

Unexpectedly, beyond the last line of folio (f.107) there appears a festal Sticheron “I nyne praz: Glas prorok Tvoi Isaiia” written in smaller font, which pertains to the Praises (see below).

The order is continued by a prescribed Compline service and a “Kanon sviatym muchenikom na pavech.” to St. Trophimus and his companions: (glas 8, “Vooruzhena faraona porguzi”), including a Sedalion, a Kontakion, three stichera with a Theotokion to the Cross, and two kathisma sedalia. The fact that this anthology had appointed these daily saints the lower rank by shortening their service and moving it to Compline, attests to the fact that at least in one diocese, cathedral, or monastery wealthy enough to afford its own full set of size 1° yearly Menaia in the beginning of sixteenth century, the cult of the Iaroslavl’ princes was most commonly assigned to the September 19 date.

The service resumes with Matins and an inscription: “Na utreni po kaf. sed. i Poliel i stepenna i Evang i stikhira, vse sviatym kniazii i prepodobnym.” Such an abbreviation adds to the uniqueness of this service, since one would expect these texts to be written out like in any other V3 service known to us. Their omission here would be justified in case the scribe was copying from a V2 service similar to Chud. 75 which lacked the kathisma sedalia and the Post-Gospel Sticheron (#27-28, 31).

The left margin next to this brief mention (f.108) contains an addendum in red ink reading: “Trop. na utr. praz, slava i nyne sviatym,” which once again makes the error of placing the Troparion to the saints last.³²³

³²³ Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 273-74. This rule has been prescribed by the Jerusalem Typica since the fifteenth century (TSL 239: f.71, 72, 73, etc.). It was generally followed by all V3 services to the princes described in this study as well as many other services (e.g. TSL 466 f.210v. – daily September 19 service to St. Trophimus; f.222v. – service to SS. Mikhail and Feodor of Chernigov, September 20).

The Canon follows with directives similar to those in other V3 services: first the Canon to the Cross on 6, and two canons to the holy princes on 8. The third Ode hymns resemble the standard V2a services in TSL 643, Chud.75 and Chud.152, rather than any V3a or V3b, retaining the three original sedalia (#55-57). However, Uvar.710 is unique among V2 and V3 services analyzed here, in that it calls for a Kontakion and Ikos to the Cross (“Kond. i ikos prazd.”). This element, although congruent with the Jerusalem Typicon rubrics of the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries, was not yet very widespread in the services to new Russian saints during that period. Thus, the Jerusalem Ustavs and Menaia clearly prescribe the afterfeast Kontakion (and often Ikos) of the 12 major feasts to be sung after Ode 3 for various Byzantine *Polyeleos* or *Vigil* saints throughout the year.³²⁴ Yet, many of the services to Russian saints either omitted the mention of the feast after the third Ode altogether (possibly following the older Studite practice), or called for a mere festal Sedalion or Theotokion.³²⁵

The Canon continues with Ode 3 sedalia to the Cross (“Izhe prevyshe iako Bog”), following the Jerusalem Typicon afterfeast rubrics, previously seen only in TSL 617. Both sixth-Ode kontakia (#85-86) and both ikoi (#87-88) are retained from V2, unlike in any other predating V3 service.

³²⁴ E.g. TSL 239 (Ustav, first half of 1400s), ff.73, 128; TSL 46 (Psalter, Gospel, and Ustav, ca.1500), ff.296, 320v., 345v.; TSL 505 (December Menaion, 1513), f.360; TSL 517 (January Menaion, 1513), f.56–56v.

³²⁵ Thus, Trefoloi to Russian saints, TSL 617 (late-fifteenth–early-sixteenth cent.) has four afterfeast services that do not call for any festal hymns after Ode 3 (ff.13, 145v., 166, 177v.), and only one that does (f.5). This number slightly grows by the end of that century, as seen in another Trefoloi to Russian saints, RGB f.98 (sobr. E. Egorova) №38 (last quarter of 1500s), where all three services that fall during a certain afterfeast include the festal Ode 3 Theotokion (ff.249v., 297, 309). The service to the princes in Uvar. 710, however, is not unique in engaging the afterfeast’s Kontakion and Ikos after Ode 3; the September 20 service to SS. Mikhail and Feodor of Chernigov (TSL 466, September Menaion from 1505, f.224v.) and November 22 service to St. Mikhail of Tver’ (TSL 619, Trefoloi, second half of sixteenth cent., f.29) are among the similar, if scarce, examples. Modern use supports this practice, as stated in “Ukaz o sluzhbe sedmichnoi” (*Oktoikh, sirech’ Osmoglasnik*, vol.1 (Moscow: Moskovakaia Patriarkhiia, 1981), 692).

The Canon analysis yields Chud.152 (V2a) as the closest copy to Uvar.710, with Chud.75 and TSL 643 as close second and third. Notwithstanding, Uvar.710 cannot be considered an exact copy of any of the three due to the following discrepancies:

- a) Canon troparion 1-2-1 (#41) is partitioned and presented as two different troparia “Vsi vy...” and “S veroiu pamiat’ vashu...” completely eliminating the troparion “Izmlada Khrista” (#42);
- b) Canon troparion 5-1-1 (#67) integrates “Prosveti tvoe zhitie” and “Tserkvi ty byst” in one text (similar to Kaz. 4635, Chud.152 and Chud.75, but not TSL 643);
- c) Canon troparion 5-1-4 mistakenly follows the Cross-Elevation Canon text “Kroviiu chestnago kresta pokazal esi...” in place of “Nezlobivi i krottsi” (#69);
- d) Canon troparion 7-1-1 unites “Prilezhnyia ti podvigi” (#89) and “Oruzh’em vashikh molitv” (#90) into one troparion, unlike any other V2 or V3 service;
- e) Canon troparion 9-2-2 “Da vkhodiat nyne” (#116) missing from TSL 643, is present in here and most other V2/V3 services;
- f) In addition to the above, the following Canon troparia from Chud.75 are missing in Uvar.710: 6-1-4 (#78),³²⁶ 7-2-5 (#98), 9-1-1 (#109).

Several grammatical errors, not seen in any other V3 services, may have resulted from rapid copying: Canon troparion 1-1-1 “Zrak grekhovnyi”; 3-1-3 “Zapoivshe...”; 3-2-3 “Tsarstva Gospodnia...”; 4-2-4 “Gospoda nam rodila...”; 8-2-4 “Vsia prechistago”; 9-1-5 “Khytry mysl’i k Bogu”; Svetilen “Ves tia proslavi.”

³²⁶ Troparion 6-1-4 is present in Chud.152.

It should be noted that despite multiple references to the festal rubrics (which also include the “Slava i nyne, praz.” verse at Svetilen), there is no mention of a Katavasia to the Cross.

The Praises contain four typical V2/3 stichera (#121-124) followed by a ‘Glory’ verse “Prepodobnii ottsi vsi” (#125) and an inscription at the ‘Now and ever’ that gives a choice to the precentor between the festal hymn or the regular Theotokion: “inne praz ili Bog.: Raduisia i veselisia Mati Bozhi, krasuisia.”

Another unique trait of this service not observed anywhere else is that instead of the additional Matins Aposticha to the holy princes, the Praises are followed by the afterfeast stichera with their Cross-Elevation refrains: “Na stikh glas 6: pod Tretii den’: Idezhe stoiasta noze Khve obrazu poklonimsia...” / “Voznosite Gospoda Boga” / “Umertvivshe strasti pot’skiia...” / “Bog zhe tsar’ nash” / “Zhivotochnyi ot bozhestvenykh rebr...” / “Slava i nyne gglas 5: Glas proroka Isaie: pisan pred kanonom na vecherne.” The placement of these texts here presents a liturgical conflict: no *Polyeleos* service should contain the Matins Aposticha, but rather end with the singing of the Great Doxology.³²⁷ The only instance when this could be possible is during Lent,³²⁸ which may again hint on a connection with the March 5 service (see Chapter 4 for an extended discussion). Finally, no Liturgy proceedings or Prolog readings are present at the end of the service.

The comparison of this text with other V2 and V3 services does not establish any definite protographs or copies. Among the predating or contemporary V3 texts, IaMZ 14898 (V3a) shares the most similarities with Uvar.710 that make both of them unique, yet is divergent in other aspects. Festal rubrics apart, the Canon sequence in Uvar.710 mostly resembles those of

³²⁷ Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 318-19; 323.

³²⁸ E.g. Typicon’s directives for St. John the Baptist’s February 24 *Polyeleos* service: TSL 239 (Ustav, mid-fifteenth cent.), f.164; TSL 46 (Psalter, Gospel, and Ustav, ca.1500), f.188v., 310v.

Chud.152, with Chud.75 and TSL 643 as close follow-ups (all being late-fifteenth century V2a texts).

As the second earliest V3b service on our list, Uvar.710 demonstrates a blend of V2 and V3 elements, integrating many festal rubrics, yet not all. Two abbreviated Vespers troparia with the references “pisan v ustave” present an important factor for our research, which reveals that already in the early sixteenth century the troparia to the Iaroslavl’ princes were included in local Ustavs. Another important factor ensuing from this text is that the service to SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin has already taken a primary place in at least one particular Monthly Menaion and diverted the daily saints’ memory to Compline.³²⁹

GIM, Uvar. №1102 (808); NB MGU (Nauchnaia Biblioteka Moskovskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta) №721

Another attempt of a festal adaptation is presented in the Menaion Miscellany Uvar.1102 (4°) broadly dated as sixteenth century,³³⁰ and is a virtual double from the September Menaion MGU 721 (4°), attributed to the third quarter of 1500s.³³¹ Both services belong to the *Polyeleos* rank and take a slightly different and more primitive approach to the new Jerusalem Typicon rubricizing than the previously described Uvar.710. The “Lord I call” hymns (#1-9) do not prescribe any festal stichera apart from the mention “i nyne praz” for the ‘Now and ever’ verse.

³²⁹ This Miscellany’s size 1° suggests that it was most likely intended for general church kliros – not a mere private cell – usage.

³³⁰ “Sluzhba Iaroslav (*sic.*), v toizh den’ predstavlenie blagovernago kniazia Feodora smolenskago iaroslavskago, i synove ego Davyda i Konstantina” (f.232–249v.). Dating: Leonid, *Sistematicheskoe opisanie* II:129.

³³¹ “Prestavlenie blagovernago knzia Feodora smolenskago i Iaroslavskago i synovkh ego Davyda i Konstantina” (f.164–180). Dating: Natal’ia A. Kobiak; Irina V. Pozdeeva, *Slaviano-russkie rukopisi XV-XVI vekov Nauchnoi biblioteki Moskovskogo Universiteta* (Moscow: Moskovskii Universitet, 1981), 109.

The Aposticha stichera are for the holy princes (#19-22), while the ‘Now and ever’ verse gives a choice of “Bog ili krestu.” Only one Troparion – that of the three prince – is given at Vespers’ end (#24), without mentioning the one to the Cross. This renders the following Matins entry “na Bgo Gospod’ tropari tazh” problematic, most likely resulted in by a copying error, as the troparia to Feodor (“Iako tselitelia”) and the Cross were accidentally left out.³³²

After the festal kathisma sedalia (“Na 1 stikholog; na 2; sed praz. tazh”), the text continues with the sedalia at Polyeleos (“Po polieleos: sed glas 8 Izhe na zemli angela <...>. Slav i nne 2zh, Radisia i veselisia Mati <...>”), which previously never appeared as Polyeleos sedalia in V2 or V3. “Izhe na zemli angela” appears to be the second Litya Sticheron in V2a and V3a types (#14), while the Theotokion “Raduisia i veselisia Mati” serves as the ‘Now and ever’ verse at Praises for most V2 services (#130). This is an important finding for our research, as it proves that the scribe was using a more complete and festal *Litya*-ranked service as his source in order to “scale down” the Iaroslavl’ princes’ service to *Polyeleos* rank.

The typical Prokimenon and Gospel directives are followed by the “Zlaty zaria” hymn, which for the first time among all V2/V3 services appears not as a Kathisma or Ode 3 Sedalion (#55), but as a Psalm 50 Sticheron. The Canon (“praz na 6, sviatym na 8”) avoids any mention of the afterfeast: there are no Kontakion, Sedalion, Katavasia or Svetilen to the Cross. Both kontakia and ikoi (to Feodor and the three princes, #85-88) appear after Ode 6, while their two sedalia (“Tverdostiiu” and “Zhiteiskoe,” #56-57) follow Ode 3.

The sequence of both canons very closely resembles that of Chud.75 (followed by Chud.152, TSL 643 and Uvar.707 as the slightly deviating followers), apart from only two small

³³² Because Feodor’s Kontakion and Ikos are listed later alongside those to all three princes, the omission of the Troparion to Feodor “Iako tselitelia” could have been simply accidental.

details: that Uvar.1102 has moved Canon Ode 3 Sedalion “Zlatyi zaria” (#55) to Psalm 50, and has reversed the order of kontakia and ikoi³³³ after the sixth ode.

The four Praises stichera (#121-124) are assigned a rarely-used Podoben “Raduisia,” seen only in Uvar.707, although the texts remain unchanged. No additional Aposticha stichera are present, and the ‘Glory’ verse (#125) is followed by a mere mention of “inyn praz.” The service ends with the “Slavoslovie velikoe i otpust.”

The marginal variations between Uvar.1102 and MGU 721 are that the latter omits the inscription “Vykhod, Prok. dniu,” while adding the Troparion to Feodor at Vespers (“Iako tselitelia,” #25).³³⁴

As other V3b services, Uvar.1102 and MGU 721 do not have any striking similarities with any other V3 services, but are most likely adaptations of a V2 service close to Chud.75, with which they share virtually the same Canon order. Unsensational in liturgical creativity, these services nevertheless conceal an important discovery that their scribe was using a *Litya* service to the Iaroslavl’ saints to reduce them to the *Polyeleos* rank, which could be the case if these Menaia were intended for the broader Russian hymnographic arena outside of Iaroslavl’ diocese.

The comparison and contrast of the above-analyzed V3b services may be presented as follows:

<u>Uvar.710 (early 1500s)</u>	<u>TSL 466 (1505)</u>	<u>Uvar.1102 (1500s) / MGU 721 (third quarter of sixteenth cent.)</u>
Вечер. Блажен муж	–	+
LC 1-3: Cross	–	–
LC4: Преподобне отче Ф	+ (1)	+ (1)
–	LC-2-4: Свѣтлости / Грѣховныи мрак / Яко звѣзды	LC-2-4: Свѣтлости / Грѣховныи мрак / Яко звѣзды

³³³ Feodor’s Kontakion “Iavisia velie” (#85) is followed by his Ikos “Na vysote” (#88), and by the princes Kontakion “Iavisia” (#86) with their Ikos “Svyshe” (#87).

³³⁴ It should be also noted that the *Vigil* ranked service to St. Sergius (September 25) in the MGU 721 Miscellany sends the reader to the the princes’ service for the full Parimia texts by an inscription “sm.19 den’ kn. Feodoru,” which attests to the correlation and synchronicity of the services in the manuscript.

Menaion services.³³⁵ This was largely due to its adherence to the Jerusalem Typicon Cross-Elevation afterfeast hymns, which has been for the most part finalized by the 1670-80s as seen in IaMZ 15173. The following two charts will compare the festal rubrics employed in the *Litya* (V3a) and *Polyeleos* (V3b) services, and demonstrate to what extent those were being followed by each scribe:

IaMZ 15173 (late 1670s – early 1680s); Menaion (Kiev 1893, Moscow 1997/2017)	IaMZ 14898 (fifteenth century) (V3a)	RGB TSL 617 (late 1400s - early 1500s) (V3a)	IaMZ 14927 (1 st half of 1500s) (V3a)	GIM Uvar.59 (sixteenth cent.) (V3a)	RGB Or.209 (1660s – 1670s) (V3a)
“Lord I call”: 3 stichera to Feast	+	–	–	–	–
“Lord I call” ‘Now’ verse: Feast	+ “Восплещем”	+ “Прообразуя”	+ “Глс прка”	+	–
Litya ‘Now’ verse: Feast (“Воспоиште”)	+	+	+	+	–
–	Aposticha: Feast	–	–	–	–
Aposticha ‘Now’ verse: Feast («Приидите, людїе»)	+ “Глсь пррокъ”	+ “Дн҃сь древо”	+ “Днсь яко во”	–	–
Troparia (Vespers): saints, Feast	+	–	+/- “праз. или бог”	+	–
Troparia (Matins): Feast twice, saints, Feast	+	+	–	+	+
Kathisma 1 Sedalion: saints, Feast	+ (Feast only)	+ (Feast only)	–	+	+
Kathisma 2 Sedalion: saints, Feast	+ (Feast only)	+ (Feast only)	–	+	+
Polyeleos Sedalion: Saints, Feast	–	+	–	+	+
Canon: Feast on 6	+	+	–	+	+
Canon Katavasia: Feast	–	+	–	–	–
–	–	–	–	–	–
<i>Canon: Kontakion/Ikos to Feast</i> ³³⁶	–	–	–	–	–
Ode 3 Sedalion: saints, Feast	+	+	+	+	+
Svetilen: saints, Feast	+	+ saints, Feast, “Иже от Бога”	+/- “Бог или праз.”	+	+

³³⁵ Minia: Septemvrii (Kiev: Tipografiia Kievo-Pecherskoi Lavry, 1893); reprinted in Moscow: Sretenskii monastyr’, 1997/2017), f.186v.–196; Mineia: Sentiabr’ (Moscow: Izdatel’skii sovet Moskovskoi Patriarkhii, 1988), 518-536 – also known as “Zelenye minei” and reprinted in 2002, 2008, 2011, 2014.

³³⁶ Neither IaMZ 15173, nor Kiev 1893/Moscow 1997/2017 Menaia list the Kontakion and/or Ikos to the Cross at the Canon. Jerusalem Typicon rubrics – in the sixteenth and twentieth centuries alike – clearly prescribe the afterfeast Kontakion after Ode 3 for various *Polyeleos* or *Vigil* saints throughout the year: TSL 46 (Psalter, Gospel, and Ustav, ca.1500), f.320v.; *Tipikon*, 1906, f.316v.; Minia: Avgust (Kiev, 1893 / Moscow, 1996), f.101. Though relatively insignificant, this omission demonstrates that even today church book editors, when lacking liturgical aptitude, may overlook a defect while engaged in automatic copying.

Praises ‘Now’ verse: Feast (“Егоже древле Мойсей”)	+	+ “Глас пророка”	–	–	+
Liturgy Beatitudes: Feast, saints	–	–	–	–	+
<i>Total festal elements listed: 15</i>	<i>12 (+1 extra)</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>6 (2 optional)</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>9</i>

This table reveals that IaMZ 15173 and the modern services contains 15 elements to the Cross-Elevation afterfeast, with the two close followers (IaMZ 14898 and TSL 617) dating to as early as fifteenth or early sixteenth centuries. The textual varieties (such as seen in the ‘Now and ever’ verses at “Lord I call” and Aposticha) and the sequence changes (as in the Matins troparia) in handling of festal rubrics attest to each scribe’s/editor’s independent approach, reflection of local customs, or copying from different sources. In one instance (IaMZ 14898) the writer mistakenly substituted the Aposticha stichera to the saints with the festal ones – a remnant attribute of the *Six-stichera* service,³³⁷ while another scribe (IaMZ 14927) gave the precentor a choice between the festal and the regular theotokia at the Vespers troparia and the Svetilen ‘Now and ever’ verse.

A similar table below compares IaMZ 15173 to the remaining V3b *Polyeleos*-ranked services, which differ from V3a only in their exclusion of Litya hymns, and hence fall short by one from the potential festal element count:

IaMZ 15173 (late 1670s–early 1680s); Menaion (Kiev 1893, Moscow 1997/2017)	RGB TSL 466 (1505) (V3b)	GIM Uvar.710 (early sixteenth cent.) (V3b)	GIM Uvar.1102 (1500s) / MGU 721 (3 rd quarter of sixteenth cent.) (V3b)
“Lord I call”: 3 stichera to Feast	–	+	–
“Lord I call” ‘Now’ verse: Feast	+	–	+
Litya ‘Now’ verse: Feast (“Воспоите”)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Aposticha ‘Now’ verse: Feast («Приидите, люді»)	+	–	+/- Бог іли кресту

³³⁷ E.g. TSL 46 (Psalter, Gospel, and Ustav, ca.1500), f.227v., 228v., 229v.

Troparia (Vespers): saints, Feast	–	+	–
Troparia (Matins): Feast twice, saints, Feast	+	+	–
Kathisma 1 Sedalion: saints, Feast	–	–	+
Kathisma 2 Sedalion: saints, Feast	–	–	+
Polyeleos Sedalion: Saints, Feast	+	–	–
Canon: Feast on 6	+	+	+
Canon Katavasia: Feast	+	–	–
– <i>Canon: Kontakion/Ikos to Feast</i>	–	+(after Ode 3)	–
Ode 3 Sedalion: saints, Feast	–	+	–
Svetilen: saints, Feast	+	+	+
Praises ‘Now’ verse: Feast (“Егоже древле Моисей”)	–	+/- праз или Бог	+
–	–	3 Aposticha stichera to feast	–
Liturgy Beatitudes: Feast, saints	–	–	–
<i>Total festal elements listed: 15³³⁸</i>	7	8 (1 optional) (+1 extra)	7 (1 optional)

Unlike other services which follow the common trend, Uvar.710 adds two exceptional elements: a) the festal Kontakion and Ikos at Ode 3 of the Canon, conforming with the Ustav, but not yet seen in many services to Russian saints (see footnote 313), and b) the three Matins Aposticha to the Cross, which could have been added by error, or as a remnant from a *Six-Sticheron* or Lenten-service prototext.³³⁹

As compared to the previous table, these V3b services reveal considerably fewer Cross-Elevation elements than even the two *Vigil*-ranked V3a services that predate them (IaMZ 14898 and TSL 617). This less careful compliance with the Jerusalem Typicon rubrics adds to our hypothesis that V3b services were copied from the V2 prototypes rather than V3a ones, while

³³⁸ The maximum count, including the afterfeast Kontakion, would be 16.

³³⁹ Matins Aposticha are not typical for services other than during the Lent, or those that are below the *Doxology* rank (i.e. *Simple* or *Six-Sticheron*). See: Rozanov. *Bogoslužebnyi ustav*, 109, 114, 119, 426.

each scribe worked separately to furnish his new variant with the festal elements called for by the Jerusalem rubrics, implementing his personal interpretations or reflecting the local customs.

Summing up the evidence seen in this chapter, we can conclude/surmise the following:

- a) While V3 services began appearing before V2 variant was discontinued, the oldest of them are well predated by the oldest V2s, such as Kaz. 4635, TSL 643, Chud.152 and Chud.75.
- b) The significant fluctuation among the V3 services and their retention of similarities with their V2 counterparts suggests that more often than not the V3 scribes used V2 texts as their base.
- c) Various Cross-Elevation elements along with diverse liturgical adaptations seen in the V3 texts allow us to theorize that their editors worked independently from one another as they altered the preexisting V2 protographs, rather than copying their contemporaries' V3 variants. This may have been the result of an excessively rapid and geographically vast spread of the cult of the Iaroslavl' princes in the mid-sixteenth century throughout the newly-united Moscow State, furnished by the royal patronage, as suggested by earlier scholars.³⁴⁰
- d) While the fifteenth–seventeenth century V3 texts demonstrate a wide variety of liturgical Cross-Elevation adaptations – some barely acknowledging the feast's existence, and others virtually matching the fully-developed versions of the modern

³⁴⁰ G. Lenhoff reaches this conclusion based on her study of vitae and other historical manuscripts (Lenhoff, *Early Russian Hagiography*, 168; Lenkhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor*, 59-60, 261). Gorodilin, "Kul't sv. Fedora," 175-80 maintains a similar point of view, taking into account socio-political considerations. A. Mel'nik's study of the spread of icons to the Iaroslavl' princes supports this theory ("Pochitanie iaroslavskikh sviatykh Feodora, Davida I Konstantina za predelami Iaroslavlia v XVI v.," *Makar'evskie chteniia*, XX (2013): 121-22).

- day – they all attest to the wide range of liturgical creativity and suggest the lack of consensus among the scribes/scriptoria and local interpretations of the Jerusalem Typicon.
- e) The earliest V3 services containing the Cross-Elevation rubrics (TSL 617 and IaMZ 14898) compared to the latest V2 texts lacking such (see Uvar.752, Und.101 from Chapter 2) attest that the Jerusalem Typicon transition spanned over at least a century and a half – from late-fifteenth to mid-seventeenth – depending on the geographical provenance of the texts available to us at the time of this writing.
 - f) At least two V3b manuscripts (Uvar.1102 and MGU 721) demonstrate a rank-lowering tactic. While their prototexts contained the *Litya* hymns, the scribes chose to downgrade them to the *Polyeleos* rank. The most plausible reason is the fact that these *Polyeleos* services were not intended for the Iaroslavl’ diocese (which would most likely require a solemn *Litya* rank), but for broader all-Russian and Moscow-centered congregations.
 - g) Downscaled to *Polyeleos*, the V3b services differently emphasize the importance of the Iaroslavl’ princes’ service for the calendar year. TSL 466, Uvar.1102 and MGU 721 place them after the daily service to St. Trophimus, thus allowing a choice of celebrating either set of saints, while Uvar.710 relocates St. Trophimus’s service to a secondary position at Compline and gives the Iaroslavl’ princes a clear preference.
 - h) TSL 617 is unique and transitional among the V2 and V3 services in its consulting the hymns from V1. Integrating these with the texts from V2, it originates in Iaroslavl’ or its diocese, but pursues a goal of popularizing the memory of SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin on a broader pan-Russian level.

- i) IaMZ 14898 seems to be the only redaction among V2 or V3 services that references hymns found only in Kaz. 4635.

CHAPTER 4

VARIANT 4: MARCH 5 SERVICES TO THE TRANSLATIO OF THE THREE PRINCES' RELICS

Apart from the September 19 service commemorating St. Feodor's repose, a secondary and significantly less widespread service "On the Translation relics..." ("*Preneseniiu moshchem...*") of the three Iaroslavl' princes may be found under March 5. Its scarcity may be conditioned by its placement during the Great Fast (Lent), when its observances are substantially limited due to the Lenten penitential character and prohibition of *Vigil*-ranked celebrations to the saints. Indeed, no *Vigil* versions of March 5 service have been found as of yet – only those containing *Polyeleos*.

At this time only four texts to St. Feodor and his sons predating the seventeenth century may be attributed to the March 5 date. Three belong to the *Polyeleos* rank, while the fourth one is merely a Canon (non-rankable). The three full services belong to no later than the mid-sixteenth century (GIM Chud. №333, GIM Chud. №112, RGB Luk.-Mark. №57).³⁴¹ Although these texts essentially follow the V2 and V3 types in content and structure, we will designate them as a distinct variant – V4, as they must be addressed separately.

Before delving into the texts, the dilemma of the two overlapping liturgical cycles – Triodion and Menaion – must be discussed. According to the Jerusalem Typicon, the yearly calendar's "unmovable" commemorations during the period of the Great Fast (the Lenten Triodion), which fall between February 15 and May 5 (Julian calendar) are to be carried out in a less solemn manner. Similar to their modern versions, the fifteenth century *Ustavs* allotted *Vigil* rank only to the feasts of the Annunciation (March 25) and the Lord's Entry into Jerusalem (Palm

³⁴¹ IaMZ №505 (sixteenth–seventeenth cent.) and RNB Pog. №761 (mid-seventeenth cent.) are not available to us at the time of this writing. Und. 104 (sixteenth–seventeenth cent.) is a partial service that will be discussed below.

Sunday, the Sixth Sunday of Lent).³⁴² The highest among the saintly celebrations – Finding of the Head of St. John the Baptist’s (February 24) and the 40 Martyrs of Sebaste (March 9) – merit only a *Polyeleos* rank. Each of these two commemorations is accompanied with rigorous and highly-detailed “Mark’s chapters” (*Markovy glavy*), supplied in both the Typicon and the Menaion, prescribing how they should be carried out in various coincidences with the Triodion calendar.³⁴³ The rubric scenarios may be summarized as follows: 1) When these feasts fall on Monday of the First Week of Lent, they are moved to the previous Sunday; 2) When they fall on a Saturday or Sunday of the second through fifth weeks, they are served on those days combined with that day’s commemorations; 3) When they occur on any Lenten weekday, they are served on those days combined with the penitential Lenten hymns and prostrations.³⁴⁴

In the first two cases, they receive a more festive celebration of St. John Chrysostom’s or St. Basil the Great’s Liturgy that is standard for all Saturdays and Sundays of Lent. In the vastly more common third scenario, however, they call for only a Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. Following these rubrics, the Iaroslavl’ princes’ March 5 commemoration could only acquire a special festive Liturgy when it occurred on Saturday or Sunday of the first five weeks of Lent, or on Monday of the first week. However, due to Sunday Resurrectional and other Lenten themes,³⁴⁵ only the first four Saturdays³⁴⁶ would yield the most festive conditions.³⁴⁷

³⁴² E.g. TSL 46 (Ustav, 1500), f.314, 383.

³⁴³ Typicon’s directives for February 24: TSL 239 (Ustav, mid-fifteenth cent.), f.164v., 167v.–169; TSL 46 (Psalter, Gospel, and Ustav, ca.1500), f.187v.–189.

³⁴⁴ These rubrics are for the most part the same as the modern ones, with a slight difference in that today, if the saint’s day falls on Tuesday through Friday of the First Week of Lent, it is moved to either the previous Sunday or the following Saturday (*Tipikon*, 1906, f.246v.). See also: Nikol’skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 501–03.

³⁴⁵ First Sunday of Lent – Orthodoxy; Third Sunday – Cross Veneration.

³⁴⁶ Fifth Saturday of Lent is occupied by the Virgin Mary’s “Akathist” commemoration.

³⁴⁷ This would be a reasonable justification for the Spasskii Monastery abbot Khristofor’s scheduling the initial reburial of Feodor’s relics in 1463 on the Second Saturday of Lent (RGB, Or. 209, f.95v.–96 – cited in Lenkhoff, *Kniaz’ Feodor*, 254).

The Orthodox Paschalia for the remainder of the century after the Inventio/Translatio year 1463 shows that March 5 coincided with any Lenten Saturdays only five times.³⁴⁸ This dearth and volatility would constitute a reasonable desire for the church authorities to affix the celebration to the day of Feodor's repose, September 19, as is attested by Shchuk. 331 and a vast number of V2 and V3 manuscripts. While the March 5 commemoration could still be observed on that date or moved to a more suitable Lenten day, it would have been celebrated mostly at the Spasskii Monastery, around greater Iaroslavl', and in places of special veneration, including the churches dedicated to the three princes that began to appear by mid-sixteenth century.³⁴⁹ Yet, as of now, no *Vigil*-ranked V4a texts have been found, which only strengthens our hypothesis that the main feast to the three princes was observed on September 19, while the secondary March 5 feast merited only a *Polyeleos*, congruent with the Typicon rubrics that preclude *Vigil* celebrations for saints during the Triodion cycle.

GIM, Sobranie Chudova Monastyria (Chud.) №333

This is the earliest known March 5 service and originates from the beginning of a sixteenth century Miscellany of services and vitae to the Russian saints.³⁵⁰ Despite it closely following the September 19 texts in structure and content, its title “Mesiatsa marta 5: Preneseniiu moshchem sviatykh novoiavlennykh chiudotvortsev” has not been seen in any of the previous September 19 variants.

³⁴⁸ 1468 – 1st Saturday of Lent; 1474 – 2nd Saturday; 1485 – 3rd Saturday; 1491 – 3rd Saturday; 1496 – 3rd Saturday. Additionally, March 5 coincided with Lenten Sundays five times from 1463 to 1499: 1469 – 3rd Sunday; 1475 – 4th Sunday; 1480 – 3rd Sunday; 1486 – 4th Sunday; 1497 – 4th Sunday (Raschet Pravoslavnoi Paskhalii, URL: <http://grigam.narod.ru/kalend/kalen22.htm>, 06.22.2023).

³⁴⁹ Mel'nik, “Pochitanie Iaroslavskikh sviatykh,” 119–121; Gorodilin, “Kul't sv. Fedora,” 162–63.

³⁵⁰ F. 132-140v. Dating: Protas'eva, *Opisanie rukopisei*, 196; Kloss, *Izbrannye trudy*, 2:22. While the order of other services and vitae in this Miscellany does not follow any distinct chronological order, it is evident that the Iaroslavl' princes' service was not inserted here later, since its beginning and ending parts are written adjacent to the texts for other saints.

This service is followed immediately by the service to SS. Mikhail and Feodor of Chernigov with the September 20 date. The anthology also contains at least two sets of consecutive services that were probably copied from a common Menaion: St. Feodosii (May 3) and St. Antonii (May 9); St. Leontii (May 23) and St. Nikita (May 28). This pattern suggests that the March 5 service to the Iaroslavl' princes and its adjacent September 20 service to SS. Mikhail and Feodor may have been both copied here from the same September Menaion. The Prologue redaction vita at the end of the Matins in Chud. 333 service contributes to this hypothesis, as its title "Marta v 5: Prinesenie moshchem sviatykh novoiavlennykh chiudotvoretts..." excludes any narrative of the relics' finding, but instead is followed immediately by "V toizh den', prestavlenie... kniazia Fedora" and the story of St. Feodor's repose from September 19. One plausible reason for re-designating the September 19 service and placing it under March 5 was that the commissioner of Chud. 333 anthology or its protograph was pursuing a goal of establishing the Inventio/Translatio feast for the princes, which, of course, could not be done without the blessing of local church authorities. Such a practice was not incongruent with other previously glorified Russian saints that enjoyed both the Repose and the Inventio/Translatio services (SS. Boris and Gleb³⁵¹ and Sergius of Radonezh³⁵²), or those that had their Inventio dates set as their main feasts (Leontius of Rostov³⁵³ and Isaiia of Rostov³⁵⁴).

The case of St. Sergius's two services appears to be very similar to those of the Iaroslavl' princes. Sergius's Inventio July 5 service copies the four main stichera on "Lord I call,"³⁵⁵ the first

³⁵¹ Repose on July 24: TSL 568 (June-July Menaion, 1514), f.209; Inventio on May 2: TSL 548 (April-May Menaion, 1514), f.177v.

³⁵² Repose on September 25: TSL 640 (Miscellany, fifteenth cent.), f.1; Inventio on July 5: TSL 568 (June-July Menaion, 1514), f.256.

³⁵³ May 23 (TSL 313: Psalter with addenda, end of fifteenth cent., f.418).

³⁵⁴ May 15 (TSL 617: Trefoloi, late fifteenth–early sixteenth cent., f.163).

³⁵⁵ TSL 640 (Miscellany, fifteenth cent.), f.2v.–4 / TSL 568 (June-July Menaion, 1514), f.257v.–258v.

Canon with Svetilen,³⁵⁶ and one Praises Sticheron from his earlier September 25 Repose service.³⁵⁷

The only new hymn in the Inventio service is the Troparion.³⁵⁸

The structural and textual analysis of the Chud. 333 hymns show that they are most identical to Chud. 152 (late fifteenth century), and then to TSL 643 (1497-98) – both pertaining to the V2a type. With the exception of the Litya hymns absent in Chud. 333, it contains identical stichera on “Lord I call” and Aposticha, the same Parimia readings, troparia, prokimena, and the Gospel pericope; the Praises follow the same pattern of four stichera and their ‘Glory’ verse, followed by the identical additional end-of-Matins texts. The Canon used in Chud. 333 is likewise identical to both of these V2a services, yet several slight deviations make direct copying from these two texts unlikely. For instance, Chud. 333 contains Canon troparion 6:1:4 “Glagolom zakonym” (#78) not present in Chud. 152; it cites Canon troparion 5:1:1 (#67) as one text, while TSL 643 divides it into two different troparia; it also includes Canon troparion 9:2:2 “Da vkhodiat nyne” (#116), not found in TSL 643. The textual and structural deviations lead us to conclude that Chud. 333 cannot be a copy of Kaz. 4635.³⁵⁹

This service does not include the rubrics for the Cross-Elevation, and lacks the Litya stichera, making it a *Polyeleos* rank. Compared to other *Polyeleos* V2b services, Chud. 333 has no close earlier semblances, meaning that it was probably downgraded from a V2a *Litya*-rank service, which again suggests the borrowing from a September 19 source. Another compelling sign is the retention of the end-of-Matins Aposticha stichera (#126-130) that existed in many V2 texts, but

³⁵⁶ TSL 640, f.8v.–18v. / TSL 568, f.265v.–276.

³⁵⁷ TSL 640, f.19 / TSL 568, f.276v.

³⁵⁸ TSL 568, f.263–264v.

³⁵⁹ Different readings are noted in Sticheron 6 and 8 of the “Lord I call” (#6, 8), the Aposticha Theotokion (#23), the Canon troparia 4:1:3 (#60) and 6:2:2 (#81), as well as the absence in Chud. 333 the kathisma sedalia (#28-29), Ode 3 Kontakion (#53), and the Psalm 50 Sticheron (#34). Additionally, Chud. 333 adds three stichera on the Praises (#126-128 which were placed at the Litya in KAZ 4635) and the Prologue vita at the end of Matins (#133).

would be out of place in the March 5 service as it conflicts with the Lenten Typicon calling for the Triodion Aposticha in their stead.³⁶⁰

Noteworthy in this service is the phrase “Da vkhodiat nyne v sviaty khram *sei* k chestnym ti moshchem” in the Canon troparion 9:1:2, contained only in a limited number of its chronological predecessors. This local allusion may suggest that Chud. 333 was copied from a source that was used or originated at the Spasskii Monastery in Iaroslavl’.³⁶¹

GIM, Chud. №112

While the Chud. 333 service was part of a Miscellany of various services, Chud. 112 is a full-fledged Menaion for March–April. This signifies that by the time of its writing in the mid-sixteenth century,³⁶² the March 5 service has become part of the monthly liturgical obikhod – at least in the diocese, monastery, or cathedral for which this tome was written.³⁶³ The liturgical revisions here present make this *Polyeleos*-ranked V4b service more suitable for the Translatio feast than the former Chud. 333 version. Compared to the latter, Chud. 112 truncates large sections that belong solely to St. Feodor (the first four stichera at “Lord I call” /#1/, the Troparion “Iako tselitelia” /#25/, the entire first Canon, the additional four Matins stichera after the Praises /#126-129/, and the vita reading). At the same time, it adds (or keeps) liturgical details such as the first Canon to Theotokos (“Kanon Bogoroditsi na 6”), previously seen only in Kaz. 4635 (V2a). Among other rare features, it contains the Psalm 50 Sticheron “Prepodobne otche Feodore, ne dal esi sna,” that commonly appears as the third Aposticha Sticheron (#22).³⁶⁴

³⁶⁰ TSL 239 (Ustav, mid-fifteenth cent.), f.164–164v.

³⁶¹ Among the services prior to the sixteenth century, “ceи” is present only in KAZ 4635 (V2a) and IaMZ 14898 (V3a), while edited out in Chud. 152 (V2a) and TSL 617 (V3a). TSL 643 (V2a) omits troparion 9:2:2 completely.

³⁶² Protas’eva, *Opisanie rukopisei*, 65.

³⁶³ The service to the Iaroslavl’ princes follows the primary March 5 service to St. Conon. The vita account is not present.

³⁶⁴ It appears as Psalm 50 Sticheron only in Und. 383 (V2b) and IaMZ 14827 (V3a).

Several unprecedented directives make Chud. 112 stand out from among any other previously described services. One of them is the Sticheron “Iako zvezdy vsesvetlyia” – commonly known as the fourth Sticheron at “Lord I call” (#4) in most other V2 and V3 services, – which the composer chose to place after the third Praises Sticheron instead of the “Lord I call” section. Another unique entry – “Na 1 stikholog i na 2 sed kak izvolit nastoiatel” – gives the rector freedom to choose between the hymns to the saints and those from the Lenten Triodion, foreign to any previous variants. The re-designation of the hymn “Zlaty zaria” (commonly known as Sedalion of the first Kathisma or Canon Ode 3, #55) as the Sticheron after Polyeleos, is not seen in any other services available to us at this time.

While Chud. 112 is a more vivid example of adjusting to the Lenten calendar and the Translatio celebration, it does not yet contain any exclusively Lenten Typicon directives, such as the end-of-Matins directives for the Lenten Triodion Aposticha and the three great prostrations,³⁶⁵ or the Presanctified Liturgy rubrics with a separate set of “Lord I call” stichera.³⁶⁶ Originating most likely from a V2 source, it retains at least one element of the September service that does not belong in the Lenten weekday service – the Great Doxology, which it prescribes at the end of Matins.³⁶⁷

Among the contents of the Chud. 112 Menaion, one finds three other services to local Russian saints that received national veneration (*vsetserkovnoe pochitanie*) at the Makaryev Moscow Councils of 1547 and 1549: Metropolitan Iona (March 30), Zosima and Savvatii (April 17), and Stefan of Perm’ (April 26).³⁶⁸ While St. Iona’s service is a *Polyeleos*, similar to that of

³⁶⁵ See February 24 rubrics for St. John the Baptist (*Ustav*, 1500: TSL 46, f.310v.).

³⁶⁶ See the Lenten *Polyeleos* service to the 40 Martyrs of Sebaste, March 9 (TSL 534, March Menaion, late fifteenth cent., f.55v., 60–61).

³⁶⁷ The Great Doxology was previously mentioned in Uvar. 707 (V2a), Uvar. 1134 (V2b), TSL 617 (V3a), IaMZ 14898 (V3a), Uvar. 59 (V3a), Uvar. 1102 (V3b).

³⁶⁸ According to the list of the locally-venerated saints that were accepted as national at the 1547/49 Moscow Councils, presented in: Golubinskii, *Istoriia kanonizatsii*, 100–04.

the Iaroslavl' princes, the other two services are in fact *Vigils*,³⁶⁹ which reflects the new Church decree to celebrate the Inventios/Translatios in addition to the Repose days of each of the newly-glorified saints.³⁷⁰

A peculiarity not be overlooked is that Chud. 112 is one of the earliest services that omits the adjective “*novoiavlennykh*” in its title. Had this been the only case, we may have dismissed it as a copying error, yet this seems to be a growing pattern found in at least four other manuscripts.³⁷¹ Perhaps this phenomenon of deliberate editing out of “*novoiavlennye*” may be explained by the fact that by the mid-sixteenth century the Iaroslavl' princes were already accepted as saints across the Russian Church so that their names were not mentioned in the canonization lists of the 1547/49 Moscow Councils.³⁷² At the same time, the term “*novoiavlennye*” continues to be retained well into the seventeenth century,³⁷³ perhaps due to simple word for word copying from the older originals.

RGB f.152 (Sobranie Lukashevicha-Markevicha), №57

³⁶⁹ Chud. 112 may well be one of the earliest March–April Menaia that contains *Vigil*-ranked services to the newly-canonized Russian saints during the Lenten season. To regulate these new celebrations, special “Temple Chapters” (*Khramovy glavy*) will be later developed and added to the Typicon, which were not yet present in the sixteenth century Ustavs available to us (e.g. TSL 46, TSL 239–247) but seem to appear in the early seventeenth century (e.g. TSL 248, f.207–234v.).

³⁷⁰ Although no acts have been preserved from the 1547/49 Moscow Councils, the summary of their decrees had been given by Tsar Ivan IV and recorded in the 1551 Stoglav Council. The tsar recalls that he assembled the hierarchs on the question of glorifying the new saints, which yielded the following results: “...predaiut tserkvam Bozhiim peti i slaviti i prazdnovati <...> prestavleniia ikh i obreteniia chestnykh moshchei ikh.” (Stoglav. Kazan': Tipografiia Gubernskago pravleniia, 1862, 45) – cited in Golubinskii, *Istoriia kanonizatsii*, 106.

³⁷¹ Other chronologically close services to the Iaroslavl' princes with the same omission are: GIM Uvar. 710 (September–November Menaion, early sixteenth cent., V3b), GIM Chud. 79 (September–November Menaion, mid-sixteenth cent., V2a), GIM Uvar. 1102 (Menaion, sixteenth cent., V3b), and GIM Uvar. 1037 (Sluzhby, sixteenth cent., V2b).

³⁷² Gorodilin, “Kul't sv. Fedora,” 175.

³⁷³ E.g. RGB Shib. 154 (September Menaion, end of sixteenth cent.), GIM Uvar. 752 (September Menaion, 17th cent.), TSL 626 (Trefoloi, seventeenth cent.).

Described in Chapter 2 above, this September Menaion with addenda dating to the 1550s–1560s contains two services to the Iaroslavl’ princes, written in different hands. One of them appears under the September 19 date (V2b, f. 420 v.–440 v.) and was described in Chapter 2. The other (f. 112–134) is presented without a date in its title, yet because it is followed by the April 14th service of SS. Antonii, Ioann, and Evstafii, we assume that it was meant for the March 5 Translatio feast. It could have been copied from a Menaion containing the Spring months, the one similar to Chud. 112 which already contained a March 5 Translatio service. Ranked as *Polyeleos* and avoiding any reference to the Cross-Elevation, the two services are mostly similar in content and structure, and there would be no reason for a compiler to include both of them in the same anthology unless these services came from different sources and were meant for different dates.

As noted in Chapter 2, one folio from the first service (V4) containing parts of the Canon’s Ode 8, was at some later point in time extracted and inserted to fill the unexplained lacuna formed in the second V2b service (presently labeled as f. 433). The fact that the V4 service could be dismantled for parts in such a manner might point to the fact that this service (presumably March 5) was not used very often and was inferior to the September 19 one.

Besides the missing folia, the September 19 text is virtually identical in its structure and hymn count to the first (March 5) service, with a miniscule number of typical copying discrepancies. The most notable difference lies in the Parimia section: while the March 5 service, not listing any readings, sends the reader to St. Sergius’s September 25 service (“Pisan na sergeev den’ sep. 25”), the September 19 service writes out two readings in full, and refers to the same service of St. Sergius (“Pravednik ashche pos. pisan 25 den”) for the third reading. The September’s mention in the first case and the absence of such in the second one attests that the

first service did not belong to the month of September; if it had, it would not need to mention “sep[temvrii].”³⁷⁴

The March 5 service in Luk.-Mark. 57 does not present any striking variations from the Chud. 333 (V4b) service, although the extant ones are sufficient to suspect a different source and void the inter-copying presumption: it lists “Bogoroditse Ty esi loza” (#23) as the Aposticha Theotokion in place of “Bogoroditse Devo” in Chud. 333, completely omits the Ode 3 Sedalion “Zlatyi zaria” (#55), writes out the troparia “Postom i molitvoiu” and “Ploti vasha povinuvshe” (#91-92) as a single Canon troparion 7:1:3, and truncates the additional post-Praises Matins stichera (#126-129). On the other hand, Luk.-Mark. 57 adds the mention of “Slavoslovie velikoe i otpust” (#131), as well as the rubrics for the Liturgy (#132).

The absence of the Beatitudes may be a sign that the scribe had the Presanctified Gifts Liturgy in mind rather than that of St. John or St. Basil.³⁷⁵ The prescribed Epistle is Gal. 5:22–6:2 (pericope 213) from the service to the venerable father(s): “Apostol chiudotvortsem k Galatom: Bratie plod dukhovnyi.”³⁷⁶ The mentioned Gospel “Reche Gospod’ Svoim uchenikom vy este svet miru” (pericope 11, Mt. 5:14–19), however, was not part of any general Menaion services, but rather a repetition of the Matins Gospel earlier in this very service.³⁷⁷ This particular conjunction of the pericopes for the Epistle and the Gospel (213 and 11) has not appeared in any services to the Iaroslavl’ princes prior to the 1550s of any type available to us.

³⁷⁴ C.f. the second service to the princes in this Menaion: “Pravednik ashche pos.: pisan 2 den” (f.422). See also Uvar. 59 (September Menaion): “Parem’i Prichet chtenie: pisany sego mtsa 25 den” (f.246) and “Kanon prazdniku... pisan sego mtsa 14 na Vozdvizhenie” (f.249v.).

³⁷⁵ The Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts does not contain the initial Antiphons (incl. Beatitudes), since it starts with the Vespers (see Nikol’skii. *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 461–62).

³⁷⁶ MDA 77 (Miscellany, first half of fifteenth cent.), f.167, 168v.; TSL 379 (General Menaion, fifteenth-sixteenth cent.), f.147v.

³⁷⁷ This same pericope 11 is found in most V2 and V3 services to the Iaroslavl’ princes, including KAZ 4635, Chud. 75 and TSL 466.

The Communion hymn “Radutesia” is widely used throughout the year, including the services to other princely saints, such as Boris and Gleb (July 24),³⁷⁸ and Vladimir (July 15).³⁷⁹

The above-listed traits make Luk.-Mark. 57 similar to Chud. 75 from the previously seen V2 services – assuming the removal of the Litya and the Matins Aposticha stichera, as well as adding the rubrics for the Liturgy.

RGB, f.310 (Sobranie Undol’skogo) №104

This sixteenth–seventeenth century compilation of the canons to Russian saints³⁸⁰ is similar to Luk.-Mark. 57 in the sense that it presents the hymns to the Iaroslavl’ princes in two different sections – September 19 (f. 10v.–15) and March 5 (f. 557v.–566v.) – despite being for the most part identical. Both texts are not the full Vespers/Matins sets, but mere nine-Ode canons, each preceded by the two troparia – one to Feodor, and one to all three saints. Both sets list Feodor’s Troparion “na prestavlenie” (“Iako tselitel” #25) and “Na prenesenie moshchem” Troparion to the three princes (“Iako zvedzy” #24), albeit in reverse order.³⁸¹ Both are copies of the first Canon “Vodu proshed” (#35) common to V2 and V3 services, and contain an absolutely identical sequence of troparia at all its odes. Both include a sole Sedalion at Ode 3 “Zhitiiskoe more” (#57), and neither contains any references to the Cross-Elevation feast. The only difference between the March 5 and September 19 canons is that the former includes two sets of kontakia (“Iavisia velie solntse” #85 and “Iavistesia svetil’nitsi” #86) and their matching ikoi (“Svyshe svoe zvanie” #87 and “Na vysote” #88), while the latter only lists Kontakion and Ikos to Feodor alone (#85 and #88).

³⁷⁸ E.g. TSL 613 (Trefoloi, fifteenth cent.), f.299.

³⁷⁹ E.g. TSL 577 (July Menaion, fifteenth cent.), f.106v.

³⁸⁰ Undol’skii, *Slaviano-Russkii rukopisi*, 118.

³⁸¹ The Troparion to the Relics Translatio (“Iako zvezdy” #24) prevails for the March 5 Canon.

In their content, both canons in Und. 104 follow the general structure of the first Canon in Chud. 75 (V2a) with the following differences:

- a) Und. 104 reflects a standardization attempt as it retains only four troparia (i.e. three troparia and a Theotokion) per each ode,³⁸² leaving out all the others. The truncated ones are: ##59, 92, 99, 100, 110, 112;³⁸³
- b) Troparion 3:1 begins with a corrected phrase “*Neprestanny molitvy prisno prinosiashche...*” instead of the almost ubiquitous “*Neizrechennya tainy prisno prinosiashche...*” (#45);³⁸⁴
- c) The single troparion 5:1 seen in Chud. 75 (#67) is divided into two separate troparia: “*Prosveti tvoe zhitie...*” and “*Tserkvi ty byl esi...*”;³⁸⁵
- d) Troparion 6:1 alters the original “*Liuboviiu i veroiu*” (#75) to “*Veroiu i liuboviiu.*”³⁸⁶

Although the exact protograph for the canons in Und. 104 remains to be located, the above observations reveal that the newer services seen in RGB Or. 209 (V3a, 1660s–1670s) and IaMZ 15173 (V3a, 1670s–1680s) contain virtually the same redaction of the Canon. Thus, it would be safe to assume that all three manuscripts share a common original variant.

* * *

³⁸² Ode 6 is the only exception and retains five troparia.

³⁸³ A similar standardization/truncation attempt has been undertaken in Uvar. 1037 (V2b), although the truncated troparia are completely different in both cases.

³⁸⁴ This feature seems to be a later correction as it appears only in two other services in our possession: Or. 209 and IaMZ 15173 (both V3a).

³⁸⁵ This trait approximates Und. 104 to such early redactions as TSL 643 (V2a), Uvar. 1037 (V2b), IaMZ 14898 (V3a) and TSL 466 (V3b), but not KAZ 4635 (V2a), Chud. 75 (V2a) and Uvar. 710 (V3b).

³⁸⁶ The earliest service in our possession with this feature is IaMZ 14927 (V3a, 1st half of the sixteen cent.). Only three other manuscripts reflect this change: Or. 209, IaMZ 15173, Und. 111 (all are V3a).

In sum, there are only two firmly identifiable March 5 services known to us at this time, one that could be possibly considered as such, and one Canon – all of which belong to the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries. The earliest known V4 March 5 services appear almost half a century later than their September 19 counterparts, which they essentially copy. Although not consistent, the most important new features include: adding the phrase “Na prenesenie moshchem” to the title, omitting the first Canon or Troparion to St. Feodor, and calling Feodor “*velikii kniaz*’.” The fact that the September 19 text is re-designated as the March 5 service and newly-labeled as “Na prenesenie moshchem” is congruent with the Inventio/Translatio celebrations of other previously glorified Russian saints, such as Boris and Gleb, Leontius of Rostov, Isaiia of Rostov, and especially Sergius of Radonezh, whose Inventio service is essentially a copy of his earlier Repose service. Such a tendency to establish a secondary Inventio/Translatio celebration for local saints on a national scale was consolidated in the 1547/49 Council’s decree to begin commemorating the Translatio dates.

The most notable feature of V4 services is their scarcity, presumably dictated by their overlap with the Lenten Ustav rubrics. The impossibility of holding solemn *Vigils* during the Lenten Triodion cycle seems to be the reason September 19 became the primary feast to the three princes over the March 5 *Polyeleos* service.

We can’t exclude, however, the possibility of the local March 5 veneration in Iaroslavl’ and the Spasskii Monastery prior to the earliest available V4 manuscript (Chud. 333, beginning of sixteenth century), despite the lack of solid documentary proof.³⁸⁷ These early celebrations might

³⁸⁷ It would be natural to assume that the earliest March 5 manuscripts would originate in Iaroslavl’, yet we found none in the Iaroslavskii Muzei-Zapovednik (IaMZ) archives. One possible explanation for this was given to us in a personal conversation (September 12, 2019) with the Archival Director, Tatiana Ivanovna Gulina, who stated that the largest part of the manuscripts kept in the Iaroslavl’ archives and churches was burned during the 1917 Revolution and the subsequent years, which leaves us today with a collection that cannot fully represent the city’s history.

have followed the same liturgical practices observed in Iaroslavl' today, whereby the absence of the March 5 service in most modern Menaia³⁸⁸ does not prevent the clergy from observing the Translatio festivities utilizing the September 19 service.³⁸⁹

The available V4 texts do not demonstrate any remnants of the Cross-Elevation rubrics, which could mean that they developed independently from the V3 type. Inconsistent in their contents, neither could they be copies of each other. Borrowing most likely from the V2a type, the March 5 service scribes downgraded the original from *Vigil* to *Polyeleos* to make it suitable for the Lent. As compared to the *Vigil*-ranked services in the March-April Menaia to other Russian saints promulgated at the Makaryev Councils' of 1547 and 1549, SS. Feodor, David, and Konstantin's March commemoration takes a secondary position,³⁹⁰ although as seen in the two mid/late-sixteenth century Miscellanea (Luk-Mark. 57, Und. 104), both the March 5 and the September 19 feasts were acknowledged. Although by the late nineteenth century, the Translatio

³⁸⁸ The only post-Revolutionary Menaion known to us mentioning the Iaroslavl' princes' March 5 memory is *Minea: Mart*, vol. 1 (Moscow: Izdatel'skii Sovet RPTs, 1984; reprint, Moscow: Izdatel'skii Sovet RPTs, 2002), 165–8). However, even this most voluminous edition in existence today relegates the seeker of the full service to September 19 and retains only the two troparia, one Kontakion, and a brief vita dedicated to the 1463 Translatio event.

³⁸⁹ Priest Dimitrii Pchelkin, cleric of the Dormition (*Uspenskii*) Cathedral where the relics of SS. Feodor, David, and Konstantin are currently preserved, has thus described the March 5/18 celebrations of 2021 – which fell on Thursday of the First Week of Lent – in a personal letter (March 31, 2021): “According to the Typicon, such feasts may be moved over a few days to allow the possibility to celebrate them with Matins and Polyeleos, and to use the saints' troparia and kontakia instead of the Lenten ones during the Hours. However, this year we did not transfer [the March 5 celebration to another day] with the blessing of the Iaroslavl' Metropolitan. The service was therefore carried out in the following manner: Wednesday evening there was a typical [Lenten] service, namely the Great Canon of St. Andrew. In the morning all was according to the Ustav: Matins, the Hours with the troparia to the holy princes, and their Kontakion being added to the Typica. During the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, the Epistle and the Gospel [to the holy princes] were read.” This account attests to two practices coexisting in the primary Iaroslavl' Cathedral: the standard one is to relocate the feast (to the closest Friday or Saturday evening) in order to allow for the more festive *Polyeleos* Matins, and the exclusive one that would keep the feast on March 5, but requires a special blessing of the local bishop or rector overruling the Ustav rubrics.

³⁹⁰ Mel'nik reaches similar conclusions based on the analysis of churches, icons, and the *Obikhodnik* entries dedicated to the three princes. Having divided the saints venerated in Rus' in the sixteenth century into three veneration popularity categories, the author assigns SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin the “medium level of popularity” (Mel'nik, “Pochitanie Iaroslavskikh sviatykh,” 122–123).

service had disappeared from standard Menaia,³⁹¹ there is not enough evidence at this time to determine whether the celebrations continued to take place in Iaroslavl' itself. What is known, however, is that after the return of the three princes' relics in the 2000s,³⁹² their veneration has been reinstated, and the local Inventio/Translatio celebrations are once again solemnly observed.

³⁹¹ No mentions of the Iaroslavl' princes are found in some of the most widespread pre-Revolutionary liturgical sources: *Menaion: March* (Kiev: Tipografiia Kievo-Pecherskoi Lavry, 1893), f.22v.; *Tipikon*, 1906, f.254v.

³⁹² According to Priest Dimitrii Pchelkin, no public services were held at the relics since the Soviet seizure of the old Dormition Cathedral (1918) until their return to Feodorovskii Cathedral in early twenty-first century, and their relocation to the new Dormition Cathedral in 2012.

CONCLUSION

In this dissertation, we have observed the patterns employed in the making of 30 liturgical services. Based on these findings, as well as on the data available to us from the previous scholarship, I would like to propose a reconstructed chronology of the liturgical veneration of SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin and the historical development of their services.

St. Feodor was locally revered by the end-of-fourteenth-century (Prolog, RNB 59) and the sarcophagus with his remains, as well as the separate sarcophagi of his two sons – were preserved in the Iaroslavl' Spasskii Monastery church. Although no documents or hymnography have been found to demonstrate that he was venerated liturgically, local veneration might still have existed in the form of Panikhidas or Molebens using the generic hymns. According to the Vologda-Permskaia chronicle, at some point in 1463, the relics of the princes were discovered to be incorrupt, which led the local Archimandrite Khristofor to move them to the main church and place them in one common tomb. On March 5, 1463, Prince Aleksandr Feodorovich and the local clergy, as mentioned in the vita, intended to perform an honorary burial of the relics, probably due to the absence of the evident manifestations of sainthood (IaMZ 15522). This date was likely chosen because it coincided with the second Saturday of Lent, which in the fifteenth century was not yet occupied by any particular liturgical celebration. When the crowds gathered for these ceremonies, however, several miracles occurred that changed the course of the planned events. The bodies were placed in a *raka*, an open casket, and were presented for popular veneration. The event itself will be later referred to as Translation of the relics (*prenesenie moshchem*). According to the vita, more miracles followed throughout April and May of that year. However, when the word reached the ruling Archbishop Trifon of Rostov, he treated the news with skepticism, apparently unconvinced

by the results of the investigations. He was struck with illness on August 6, 1467 and subsequently retired to Spasskii Monastery. The diocesan vacancy was then filled by Bishop Vassian, sometime around December 13, 1467, and it was this church leader who evidently supported the glorification of the three princes (Tipografskaia Chronicle).

The earliest extant full service to St. Feodor is found in the 1468/69 September Menaion, which was written for the neighboring Vladimir diocese's Aleksandrov Monastery. My research suggests, however, that this manuscript may not have been the earliest collection of hymns in honor of the Iaroslavl' princes. In Chapter Three, it was shown that the late-fifteenth century Canon in TSL 617 follows an unknown V1 service, closely related yet not identical to Shchuk. 331. Additionally, the earliest full service to all three princes in Kaz. 4635, as seen in Chapter 2, may have been predated by an extinct V2 protograph which is somewhat reflected in Uvar. 1037. Finally, a rare short anthology containing the five earliest-known hymns to SS. Feodor, Davyd and Konstantin from 1470's in RNB, KB/1083 may in fact support F. Spaskii's hypothesis that the initial local services could have been carried out as early as 1463 using the General Menaion and a small number of personalized hymns to the saints written out in special leaflets (*tetradki*).

Despite the fact that the Shchuk. 331 service is the oldest dated text and is placed under September 19, the liturgical discoveries made in this study suggest a different chronology. Indeed, I would like to propose that the actual glorification festivities took place in Iaroslavl' on March 5, 1468, and that they used a service other than Shchuk. 33 – one that was similar to those of V2-V3, containing the names of all three princes and the relics Translatio. This prototype service may have been written without a set calendar date since the celebration had not yet been established prior to the canonization. This line of reasoning is based on the following premises:

- a) March 5, 1468 was not only a five-year anniversary of the translation of relics in 1463, but it also conveniently overlapped with the first Saturday of Lent, which commemorates St. Feodor's namesake – St. Theodore the Tyro;
- b) Our study of the V2-type services shows that while appointed to be celebrated on September 19, they bore liturgical and hymnographical remnants of the Translatio service and lacked the September rubrics for the feast of the Elevation of the Cross;
- c) All V2 and V3 services (except for the deliberate omissions in TSL 466, RGB 209 and YaMZ 15173), had the Troparion of the Translatio precede the Troparion in honor of St. Feodor's repose;
- d) 1468 was the first year of rule of the new Bishop of Rostov, Vassian, who replaced the skeptical Archbishop Trifon. It would be logical for the former to begin his rule by initiating a long-awaited glorification in one of the biggest monasteries in his diocese;
- e) The simple six-sticheron service in Shchuk. 331 lacks the Polyeleos and other festive hymns required during the canonization proceedings;
- f) The Shchuk. 331 service is placed under September 19 – the day of St. Feodor's repose. This service commemorates Feodor exclusively, without a single reference to SS Davyd and Constantin, whose incorrupt relics had been laid together with their saintly father in the same tomb since 1463.

Since the March 5 celebration would have conflicted with the Lenten Triodion penitential observances for most of the years following 1468, it would only be natural for the local liturgists and clergy to appoint the future annual feast day on a more suitable date: September 19. This also explains why no services for the three princes are found on March 5 until the beginning of the sixteenth century.

By the 1480s, the cult of the Iaroslavl' princes appears to have enjoyed a rapid rise in prestige. The early *six-sticheron* V1 service in Shchuk. 331 was replaced by major *Vigil*-ranked V2a services such as the one found in Kaz. 4635. Moreover, once the Iaroslavl' principedom became a part of Muscovy, the veneration of its three local patrons began to spread across the new realm,

propelled by the patronage of Tsar Ivan IV and the Moscow nobility. The saints' increasing popularity is confirmed by the growing number of extant sixteenth-century services and vitae manuscripts. The earliest anthology of Moscow provenance with a service to the Iaroslavl' princes, TSL 466 (dated 1505) contains the earliest known *Polyeleos* to these saints. Although less festive than *Vigils*, *Polyeleos* services became widespread, if not more numerous, throughout the sixteenth century (Uvar. 1134 and others). In the Iaroslavl' diocese itself, however, the holy princes were naturally venerated with more solemnity, as reflected by the fact that all four services to the holy princes in the local Iaroslavl' IaMZ archive are *Vigils*. As the veneration of the saints spread, the original hymns to SS. Feodor, Davyd and Konstantin were often edited to invoke them as pan-Russian/universal intercessors, rather than solely the patrons of a local principality. The earliest such example of this kind of service might in fact be Shchuk. 331, since it invokes St. Feodor's spiritual patronage over all Rus' and promotes Iaroslavl' as an important center for the new Moscow tsardom.

The integration of the September 19 service into the September Menaion cycle appears to have taken place in the following manner. As early as the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the liturgists and scribes have realized the absence of the Cross-Elevation hymns which conflicted with the afterfeast rubrics. Gradually and independently they began to edit the existing V2 services (TSL 617), giving rise to the V3 type (IaMZ 14898 and others) – still the most popular variant of the service in use today.

The liturgical details and remnants detected in some of the services of this type (Uvar.1102 and MGU 721), moreover, clearly attest that the feast was gradually downscaled from a full *Vigil* service to a *Polyeleos*, so as to make the service more accessible to broader Russian congregations. My research shows that the V3 editors worked independently from one another as they altered the

preexisting V2 texts. This may have been the result of the rapid spread of the cult in the mid-sixteenth century throughout Muscovy, thanks to the influence of royal patronage.

The March 5 Translatio commemoration, although originally abandoned due to its conflicts with the Lenten Triodion, was not forgotten completely. Several attempts to revitalize it had been detected starting as early as the beginning of the sixteenth century (Chud. 333). These V4 type services, however, were merely copies of the September 19 V2 texts.

The decision to re-designate the existing Repose services as the Inventio/Translatio ones was not new in Russian hymnography. We can observe a similar process, for example, in the church services for St. Sergius of Radonezh. The 1547/49 Council had prescribed the commemoration of the Translatio dates for a number of local saints at the national level, thereby officially establishing their secondary celebrations. At least two mid- to late-sixteenth century anthologies (Luk-Mark. 57 and Und. 104) contain virtually the same service to the Iaroslavl' princes under both dates, September 19 and March 5. It is worth noting that the September 19 service to the Iaroslavl' saints is also used for March 5 celebrations in the present day, although these celebrations are observed mostly in Iaroslavl' and its diocese.

The evolution of the liturgical services for SS. Feodor, Davyd, and Konstantin was for the most part completed by the second half of the seventeenth century. At least one text, dated to 1670-80s (IaMZ 15173), has not undergone any changes since that time, and is virtually identical to the modern Menaion service. This manuscript therefore serves as a *terminus ad quem* for my dissertation.

The hymnography honoring the three Iaroslavl' princes has earned a worthy place in the Russian Menaion. It has been drawn upon by the composers of later services to saints such as Prince Petr Ordynskii (June 30), Venerable Ioasaf Kamenskii (September 10), Venerable Ioann

and Longin of Iarenga (July 3), the Synaxis to All Saints of Russia (first Sunday of St. Peter's Fast), and an extended service to St. Athanasius the Great (May 2), among others.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE LITURGICAL AND HYMNOGRAPHICAL CREATIVITY OF A MEDIEVAL SCRIBE

As part of a larger picture of literary creativity in medieval Rus', the case of the Iaroslavl' princes sheds light on the development of the liturgical texts and delineates certain correlations between their cult and hymnography. Juxtaposition of the discoveries within each distinct rank of services allows us to observe certain liturgical patterns and textual editing methods that may be shared by a broader range of canonized Russian saints:

1. The extensive usage of the General Menaion in the composition of new services for Russian saints;
2. Copious borrowings from the services of earlier Russian saints, despite the difference in saintly categories;
3. Problematic attempts of altering the existing texts from singular to plural grammatical forms;
4. Infrequent typological confusion between the ranks of the venerable fathers and the holy hierarchs;
5. The association of the saintly princes with the venerable fathers;
6. Focusing on the thaumaturgic qualities and relics of the saints;
7. The local use of *Vigil* services very close to the canonization year;
8. The scaling down of the liturgical rank from *Vigil* to *Polyeleos* outside of the local diocese, as veneration spreads;
9. Creating new Relics Translatio services from older Repose services;
10. Altering the original hymns to elevate the local saints to the level of spiritual patrons of all Rus';

11. Promoting the home towns of local saints as important new centers for the Moscow tsardom;
12. Limited liturgical corrections to eliminate error or update the older liturgical orders to satisfy the new Jerusalem Typicon rubrics;
13. Compilation of several Matins canons into one;
14. Independent work of various hymnographers with older manuscripts, distinct signs of creativity and lack of uniformity;
15. Various methods of assimilation of the new saints' services with the previously existing ones in the Menaion.

The practical significance of this dissertation is in the methodologies employed here which may provide a model for future scholarly research of the unstudied services to early Russian saints, thus contributing to a better understanding of the literature and hymnographic practices in medieval Rus'. It may, furthermore, contribute to the socio-political discussion on the basis of the premise that "the words of the festal church services influenced the mass veneration much more than the Lives of Saints, because the services were heard yearly by all attendees, most of whom never read the vita texts; it was the reception of those very liturgical texts that formed the actual cult..."³⁹³

³⁹³ S. Gorodilin, personal correspondence with Gail Lenhoff, September 2019; translation mine.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPTS³⁹⁴ AND PRINTED LITURGICAL BOOKS

1. Cod. Slav. 37: *Miniia obshchaia*, late twelfth–early thirteenth cent.
2. **GIM, Chud. 75: Mineia na Sentiabr', end of fifteenth cent.**
3. **GIM, Chud. 79: Mineia na Sentiabr' i oktiabr', mid-sixteenth cent.**
4. **GIM, Chud. 112: Mineia na Mart–Aprel', mid-sixteenth cent.**
5. **GIM, Chud. 152: Sbornik, end of fifteenth–beginning of sixteenth cent.**
6. **GIM, Chud. 333: Mineia na Mart, beginning of sixteenth cent.**
7. **GIM, Shchuk. 331: Mineia na Sentiabr', 1468/9**
8. GIM, Sin. 257: *Mineia prazdnichnaia*, fifteenth cent.
9. GIM, Sin. 330: *Tipikon*, fourteenth cent.
10. GIM, Sin. 986: *Stepennaia kniga*, 1555–1563
11. **GIM, Uvar. №59 (806) 4°: Mineia na Sentiabr', sixteenth cent.**
12. **GIM, Uvar. 707 (856) 1°: Trefoloi, sixteenth cent.**
13. **GIM, Uvar. 710 (811) 1°: Miniea na Sentiabr'–Noiabr', beginning of sixteenth cent.**
14. **GIM, Uvar. 752 (844) 1°: Miniea na Sentiabr', seventeenth cent.**
15. **GIM, Uvar. 1037 (868) 4°: Sluzhby novoivlennym chudotvortsam, sixteenth cent.**
16. **GIM, Uvar. 1102 (808) 4°: Mineia prazdnichnaia. sixteenth cent.**
17. **GIM, Uvar. 1134 (858) 4°: Trefoloi, sixteenth cent.**
18. **IaMZ 14927 (889): Mineia prazdnichnaia, first half of sixteenth cent.**
19. **IaMZ 14898 (837): Sbornik na Sentiabr', last quarter of fifteenth cent.**
20. **IaMZ 15173: Sluzhba i zhitie blagovernomu velikomu kniazii Feodoru i chadom ego, late 1670s–early 1680s**
21. **IaMZ 15483: Sbornik, 1530's–1540's**
22. IaMZ 15522: *Sbornik*, beginning of sixteenth cent.
23. **Kaz. (NBLKFU) 4635: Sbornik, 1480's**
24. **MGU 721: Mineia na Sentiabr', third quarter of sixteenth cent.**

³⁹⁴ Manuscripts that contain services to SS Feodor, Davyd and Konstantin which are analyzed in this dissertation are rendered in bold.

25. RGB, Egor. 38: Trefoloi to Russian saints, last quarter of sixteenth cent.
26. RGB, Ios. 336: Ustav, 2nd half of fifteenth cent.
- 27. RGB, Luk.-Mark. 57: Sbornik, 1550's–1560's**
28. RGB, MDA 77: Sbornik, 2nd half of the fifteenth cent.
- 29. RGB, Or. 209: Sbornik kanonov, 1660-70's**
30. RGB, Rum. 305: Paterik, 1470's
- 31. RGB, Shib. 154: Mineia na Sentiabr', end of sixteenth cent.**
32. RGB, TSL 27: Triodion, sixteenth cent.
33. RGB, TSL 46: Sbornik, ca.1500
34. RGB, TSL 239: Ustav, 1st half of fifteenth cent.
35. RGB, TSL 241: Ustav, mid-sixteenth cent.
36. RGB, TSL 242: Ustav, first half of sixteenth cent.
37. RGB, TSL 248: Ustav, early seventeenth cent.
38. RGB, TSL 304: Irmologii, early sixteenth-cent.
39. RGB, TSL 313: Psaltir', late fifteenth cent.
40. RGB, TSL 368: Oktoikh, 1497
41. RGB, TSL 379: Shestodnev i Obshchaia Mineia, late fifteenth–early sixteenth cent.
42. RGB, TSL 385: Triod' postnaia, fifteenth cent.
43. RGB, TSL 465: Mineia na Sentiabr', beginning of fifteenth cent.
- 44. RGB, TSL 466: Mineia na Sentiabr', June 1505**
45. RGB, TSL 480: Mineia na Oktiabr', fifteenth cent.
46. RGB, TSL 492: Mineia na Noiabr', 1469
47. RGB, TSL 504: Mineia na Dekabr', end of fifteenth cent.
48. RGB, TSL 505: Mineia na Dekabr', 1513
49. RGB, TSL 515: Mineia na Ianvar', fifteenth cent.
50. RGB, TSL 517: Mineia na Ianvar', 1513
51. RGB, TSL 518: Mineia na Ianvar', 1513
52. RGB, TSL 523: Mineia na Fevral', fifteenth cent.
53. RGB, TSL 534, Mineia na Mart, late fifteenth cent.
54. RGB, TSL 546, Mineia na Aprel', fifteenth cent.
55. RGB, TSL 548, Mineia na Aprel'–Mai, 1514

56. RGB, TSL 558: Mineia na Mai, fifteenth cent.
57. RGB, TSL 566: Mineia na Iiun', end of fifteenth cent.
58. RGB, TSL 568: Mineia na Iiun'–Iiul', 1514
59. RGB, TSL 569: Mineia na Iiun' i Iiul', first half of sixteenth cent.
60. RGB, TSL 576: Mineia na Iiul', fifteenth cent.
61. RGB, TSL 577: Mineia na Iiul', fifteenth cent.
62. RGB, TSL 586: Mineia na Avgust, fifteenth cent.
63. RGB, TSL 613: Trefoloi na Mai–Avgust, fifteenth cent.
- 64. RGB, TSL 617: Trefoloi, late 1400s–early 1500s**
65. RGB, TSL 619, Trefoloi, second half of sixteenth cent.
66. RGB, TSL 626, Trefoloi, seventeenth cent.
67. RGB, TSL 640: Sbornik, fifteenth cent.
68. RGB, TSL 641: Sbornik, fifteenth cent.
- 69. RGB, TSL 643: Sbornik sluzhb russkim sviatym, 1497–98**
70. RGB, Und. 100: Trefoloi, second half of fifteenth cent.
- 71. RGB, Und. 101: Trefoloi, sixteenth cent.**
- 72. RGB, Und. 104: Sbornik kanonov russkim sviatym, sixteenth–seventeenth cent.**
73. RGB, Und. 111: Sluzhby Iaroslavskim chiudotvortsem, eighteenth cent.
- 74. RGB, Und. 383: Sbornik, end of sixteenth cent.**
75. RNB, KB 6/1083: Sbornik, 1470's–1480's
76. RNB, Pog. 59: Prolog, ca.1400
77. Mineia Obshchaia, Moscow: n.p., 1599–1600
78. Mineia: Mart, Moscow: Izd. Sovet M.P., 2002
79. Mineia: Mart. Chast' 1. Moscow: Izdatel'skii Sovet RPTs. 1984; reprint, Moscow: Izdatel'skii Sovet RPTs, 2002.
80. Mineia: Sentiabr'. Moscow: Izd. Sovet Moskovskoi Patriarkhii, 1988; reprints, 2002, 2008, 2011, 2014.
81. Minia: Avgust. Kiev, 1893; Moscow, 1996.
82. Minia: Septemvrii. Kiev, Tip. Kievo-Pecherskoi Lavry. 1893; reprint, Moscow, Sretenskii monastyr', 1997/2017.
83. Oktoikh, sirech' Osmoglasnik. Vol. 1. Moscow: Moskovakaia Patriarkhiia, 1981.

84. Tipikon, siest' Ustav. Moscow: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1906; reprint, Kiev: Ukrainskaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov', 1997.

SELECT LITERATURE

1. Angelov, Boniu St. "Kliment Ohridski – avtor na obshti sluzhbi." In: *Iz starata b'lgarska ruska i sr'bska literatura. Kn. III*. Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences Publishing House, 1978, 32–33.
2. Arsenii, ieromonakh and Ilarii, ieromonakh. *Opisanie slavianskikh rukopisei biblioteki Sviato-Troitskoi Sergievoi lavry*. Vol. II. Moscow: Moskovskii universitet, 1878–79.
3. Artem'ev, Aleksandr Ivanovich. *Opisanie rukopisei, khraniashchikhsia v biblioteke Imperatorskogo Kazanskogo Universiteta*. St. Petersburg: Arkheograficheskaia Komissia, 1882.
4. Barsukov, Nikolai Platonovich. *Istochniki russkoi agiografii*. St. Petersburg: Tip. M. M. Stasiulevicha, 1882; reprint, Leipzig, 1970.
5. Elesievich, Snezhana. "K issledovaniiu obshchikh sluzhb v slavianskoi kirillicheskoi pis'mennosti." *Drevniaia Rus' . Voprosy medievistiki*, 4 (34) (2008), 5–17.
6. Efimenkov, Vitalii Petrovich. "Sluzhby kniaziiu Feodoru i ego synov'iam." In Geil Lenkhoff. *Kniaz' Feodor Chernyi v russkoi istorii i kul'ture*. Moscow; St. Petersburg: Al'ians-Arkheo, 2019, 111–35.
7. _____. "«Raduisia, svetil'nik Iaroslavlia»: perviaia i zabytaia sluzhba sv. kniaziiu Feodoru Iaroslavskomu." *Vestnik Iaroslavskoi dukhovnoi seminarii*, vypusk 3 (2021), 80–93.
8. _____. "«Iaroslavliu velikoe utverzhenie»: zarozhdenie pochitaniia i perviaia sluzhba sviatym Feodoru, Davidu i Konstantinu Iaroslavskim." *Vestnik Iaroslavskoi dukhovnoi seminarii*, vypusk 4 (2022), 56–75.
9. _____. "«Siiat grad tvoi v rustei strane» – dal'neishee razvitie sluzhb sviatym Feodoru, Davidu i Konstantinu Iaroslavskim." *Vestnik Iaroslavskoi dukhovnoi seminarii*, vypusk 6 (2023), 90-101.
10. Gardner, J. von. *Russian Church Singing*. Vol. 1. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980.
11. Golubinskii, Evgenii Evsignievich. *Istoriia kanonizatsii sviatykh v Russkoi Tserkvi*. 2d ed. Moscow: Universitetskaia tipografiia, 1903; reprint, Moscow: Krutitskoe Patriarshee Podvor'e Obshchesto liubitelei tserkovnoj istorii, 1998.

12. Gorodilin, Sergei Vladimirovich. "Kul't sv. Fedora Iaroslavskogo: sotsial'nyi i politicheskii aspekty vozniknoveniia i razvitiia." *Srednevekovaia Rus' 13* (2018), 125–180.
13. Iatsimirskii, Aleksandr Ivanovich. *Opis' starinnykh slavianskikh i russkikh rukopisei sobraniia P. I. Shchukina*. Vypusk 2. Moscow: Izd. P.I. Shchukina, 1897.
14. *Ierarkhi Rostovsko-Iaroslavskoi pastvy v preemstvennom poriadkie s 992 goda do nastoiashchago vremeni*. Iaroslavl': Tip. Germana Fal'k, 1864.
15. Iur'eva, Tatiana Vladimirovna. *Fedor Chernyi – chelovek i ikona (Kanonizatsiia Iaroslavskikh sviatykh v kul'turno-tipologicheskoy aspekte)*. Ed. 2. Iaroslavl', IaGPU im. K. D. Ushinskogo, 2014.
16. Kagan, M. D., Ponyrko N. V., Rozhdestvenskaia M. V. "Opisanie sbornikov XV v. knigopistsa Efrosina." *TODRL 35* (1980), 3–300.
17. Kloss, Boris Mikhailovich. "Arkheograficheskii obzor ispol'zovannykh rukopisei." In Geil Lenkhoff, *Kniaz' Feodor Chernyi v russkoi istorii i kul'ture*. Moscow; St. Petersburg: Al'ians-Arkheo, 2019.
18. _____. *Izbrannye trydy*. Vol. 2, *Ocherki po istorii russkoi agiografii XIV-XVII vekov*. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 2001.
19. Kobiak, Natal'ia Adol'fovna; Pozdeeva Irina Vasil'evna. *Slaviano-russkie rukopisi XV-XVI vekov Nauchnoi biblioteki Moskovskogo Universiteta*. Moscow: Moskovskii universitet, 1981.
20. Lenhoff, Gail. *Early Russian Hagiography. The Lives of Prince Fedor the Black*. Slavistische Veröffentlichungen. Fachbereich Neuere Fremdsprachliche Philologien der Freien Universität Berlin. Bd 82. Berlin; Weisbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1997.
21. _____. *The Martyred Princes Boris and Gleb: A Socio-Cultural Study of the Cult and the Texts*. UCLA Slavic Studies 19. Columbus: Slavica Publishers, 1989.
22. Lenkhoff, Geil (Lenhoff, Gail) "Kanonizatsiia i kniazheskaia vlast' v Sever-Vostochnoi Rusi: Kul't Leonii Rostovskogo." *Iaroslavskaia starina 3* (1996), 13–22.
23. _____. *Kniaz' Feodor Chernyi v russkoi istorii i kul'ture*. Moscow; St. Petersburg: Al'ians-Arkheo, 2019.

24. Leonid, arkhimandrit. *Sistematicheskoe opisaniie slaviano-rossiiskikh rukopisei sobrania grafa A. S. Uvarova; v chetyrekh chastiakh*. Vol. II. Moscow: tip. Mamontova, 1893.
25. Loseva, Ol'ga Viktorovna. *Russkie mesiatseslovy XI-XIV vekov*. Moscow: Pamiatniki istoricheskoi mysli, 2001.
26. _____ . *Zhitiia russkikh sviatykh v sostave drevnerusskikh prologov XII – pervoi poliviny XV vekov*. Moscow: Rukopisnye pamiatniki drevnei Rusi, 2009.
27. Luk'ianov, V. V. "Kratkoe opisaniie kolleksiie rukopisei Iaroslavskogo oblastnogo kraevedcheskogo muzeiia." Iaroslavskii oblastnoi kraevedcheskii muzei. *Kraevedcheskie zapiski*, 3 (Iaroslavl': Iaroslavskii oblastnoi kraevedcheskii muzei, 1958).
28. Makarii (Bulgakov), mitropolit. *Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvi. V 12 tomakh*. St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Iuliiia Bokrama, 1857–83.
29. Mel'nik, Aleksandr Gavrilovich. "Pochitanie iaroslavskikh sviatykh Feodora, Davida i Konstantina za predelami Iaroslavlia v XVI v." *Makarievskie chteniia. Sviashchennye voiny Rossii*. Vypusk 20 (2013), 118–123.
30. Aleksandra Iurievna Nikiforova. Problema proiskhozhdeniia sluzhebnoi Minei: struktura, sostav, mesiatseslov grech. Minei IX–XII vv. iz monastyria sviatoi Ekateriny na Sinae. Moscow: Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, 2005.
31. _____ . "Rozhdenie Minei: Grecheskie Minei IX–XII vv.," *Vestnik Pravoslavnoho Sviato-Tikhonovskogo gumanitarnogo universiteta*. Vypusk 4 (22) (2010): 103–21.
32. Nikol'skii, (protoierei) Konstantin. *O sluzhbakh Russkoi Tserkvi, byvshikh v prezhnikh pechatnykh bogosluzhebnykh knigakh*. St. Petersburg: Tip. T-va "Obshchestennaia pol'za," 1885.
33. _____ . *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava bogosluzheniia Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi*. St. Petersburg: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1907.
34. Okhotnikova, V. I. *Povest' o Dovmonte*. Leningrad: "Nauka," 1985.
35. Pentkovskii, Aleksei Mstislavovoch. "Ierusalimskii ustav." *Pravoslavnaia entsiklopediia*. Vol. 21. Moscow: Tserkovno-nauchnyi tsentr "Pravoslavnaia entsiklopediia," 2012, 504–05.
36. _____ . *Tipikon patriarkha Aleksiiia Studita v Vizantii i na Rusi*. Moscow: Izd. Moskovkoi Patriarkhii, 2001.

37. Pokrovskii Nikolai Nikolaevich; Lenkhoff Geil D., eds. *Stepennaia Kniga Tsarskogo Rodosloviia po drevneishim spiskam*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2007.
38. Potekhina, Elena; Kravetskii, Aleksandr, ed. *Minei: obrazets gimnograficheskoi literatury i sredstvo formirovaniia mirovozzreniia pravoslavnykh*. Olsztyn: Univ. Warminsko-Mazurski, 2013.
39. Protas'eva, Tatiana N. *Opisanie rukopisei Chudovskogo sobraniia*. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1980.
40. *Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei*, Vol. 6, vyp. 2, *Sofiiskaia II letopis'*. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 2001.
41. _____, Vol. 24, *Tipografaskaia letopis'*. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 1999.
42. _____, Vol. 26, *Vologodsko-Permskaia letopis'*. Moscow: Rukopisnye pamiatniki Drevnei Rusi, 2006.
43. "Raschet Pravoslavnoi Paskhalii." <http://grigam.narod.ru/kalend/kalen22.htm> (accessed January 30, 2023).
44. Rozanov, V. *Bogosluzhebnyi ustav: opyt iz'iasnitel'nogo izlozheniia poriadka bogosluzheniia Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi*. Moscow: Pravoslavnyi Sviato-Tikhonovskii Gumanitarnyi Universitet, 2008.
45. Sedova, Rimma Alekseevna. *Sviatitel' Petr mitropolit moskovskii v literature i iskusstve Drevnei Rusi*. Moscow: Russkii mir, 1993.
46. Serebrianskii, Nikolai Il'ich. *Drevnerusskie kniazheskie zhitiia*. Moscow: Imperatorskoe obshchestvo istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete, 1915.
47. Sergii (Spasskii), arkhiepiskop. *Polnyi mesiatseslov Vostoka*. 2-e izd. isp. i dop. V 3 tomakh. Vol. I. Vladimir: Tipo-Litografiia V. A. Parkova, 1901; reprint, Moscow: Izd. "Pravoslavnaia entsiklopediia," 1997.
48. Shablova, Tatiana. *Kormovoe pominovanie v Uspenskom Kirillo-Belozerskom monastyre v XVI–XVII vv.* St. Petersburg: Renome, 2012.
49. Shalamanov, Blagoi. "Neizvestni khimnografski proizvedeniia ot Kliment Okhridsk." *Spisanie na B'lgarskata akademiia na naukite. Godina XXXIII, kniga 1*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bulgarskata Akademiia na Naukite, 1987, 51–67.

50. Shchapov, Iaroslav Nikolaevich. *Sobranie I. Ia. Lukashevicha i N. A Markevicha: opisanie*. Moscow, 1959.
51. Sinitsyna, N. V. “Knizhnyi master Mikhail Medovartsev.” *Drevnerusskaia letopisnaia kniga. T.1*. Moscow: Nauka, 1972, 286–317.
52. Skaballanovich, M. *Tolkovy Tipikon*. 1910–1915; reprint, Pskovo-Pecherskii monastyr’, 1994, Vyp. II; Vyp. III.
53. Spasskii, Feodosii Georgievich. *Russkoe liturgicheskoe tvorchestvo (po sovremennym mineiam)* (Praris, YMCA-Press, 1951; reprint, Moscow: Izdatel’skii sovet Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi, 2008.
54. Stockij, S. “Ueber den Inhalt des Codex Hankensteinianus.” *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 110 (1886), 607–89.
55. Stroev, Pavel Mikhailovich. *Spiski ierarkhov i nastoiatelei monastyrei Rossiiskoi Tserkvi*. St. Petersburg, Arkheograficheskaiia komissiia, 1877; reprint, Moscow: Rukopisnye pamiatniki Drevnei Rusi, 2007.
56. Turilov, Anatolii Arkad’evich. “Zabytye i maloizvestnye fakty iz istorii drevneishego perevoda Prologa u iuzhnykh slavian.” *Slavianovedenie* 2 (2012), 8–26.
57. Undol’skii, Vukol Mikhailovich. *Slaviano-russkie rukopisi V. M. Undol’skogo*. Moscow: Universitetskaia tip., 1870.
58. Vasil’ev, Vasilii. *Istoria kanonizatsii russkikh sviatykh*. Moscow: Moskovskii Universitet, 1893.
59. Vinogradov, Vasilii Petrovich. *Ustavnye chteniia: ocherki po istorii greko-slavianskoi istoriko-uchitel’noi literatury*. Vol. I. Sergiev Posad: Tip. Troitse-Sergievoi Lavry, 1914.