Liturgy as Practice, Space, and Theory in Eastern Christianity

The Reform of the Hirmologion by the Russian Old Ritualists

Aleksandr Andreev

Assistant Professor, Department of Classical Languages, St. Petersburg
Theological Academy of the Russian Orthodox Church, Russia
aleksandr.andreev@gmail.com

Abstract

In this paper, the author presents new evidence for the reform of notated manuscripts undertaken by the Russian Old Ritualists (Old Believers) in the second half of the 17th century. The reform was independent of, though contemporaneous with the reform of notated manuscripts undertaken by those who agreed with the liturgical reforms of Patriarch Nikon. The author shows that the purpose of the Old Ritualist reform was to align the text of the notated Hirmologion with the grammatical rules codified in the *Grammar* of Meletii Smotritskii, as republished in Moscow in 1648, and with the text of the non-notated liturgical books printed at the Moscow Print Yard prior to the tenure of Patriarch Nikon.

Keywords

Church Slavonic – Meletii Smotritskii – Patriarch Nikon – liturgical reform – hirmos – Hirmologion – Znamenny Chant – Old Believers – Old Ritualists

1 Introduction

The liturgical reforms enacted in the Russian Church in the middle and second half of the 17th century took place against the background of what N. Uspenskii has called “a profound crisis in Russian liturgical music”,¹ which culminated by the turn of the 18th century in a sudden transition from ancient styles of monophonic and polyphonic chant to the new part-song style of church music.² The reform of liturgical chantbooks and the liturgical music that they recorded began with a program to eliminate *khomony* – the practice when archaic “yers”, which were vocalized during singing performance, are recorded using the Cyrillic graphemes *o* and *e* – and to introduce the *narechnoye* style of singing, in which archaic “yers” are not vocalized and the graphemes representing them have been removed.³ Since the process of eliminating *khomony* began even before the patriarchate of Nikon, the position of Old Ritualists on the use of *khomony* varied: many of the key Old Ritualist leaders, such as Archpriest Avvakum and the Denisov brothers, rejected *khomony* and supported *narechnoye* singing. On the other hand, the influential monks of the Solovetsky Monastery supported *khomony*. The difference in opinion may be observed up to today, with the Priestled Old Ritualists and some Priestless Old Ritualists using chantbooks corrected for *narechnoye* singing in their liturgy, while most Priestless Old Ritualists continuing to practice liturgical chant with *khomony*.⁴

The orthography of the *narechnoye* chantbooks used by the Priestled Old Ritualists has been studied by scholars,⁵ but the text itself has not been investigated so far. Yet we have reason to suspect that a reform of the chantbooks

1 Н. Д. Успенский, *Древнерусское певческое искусство* [N. Uspenskii, *Medieval Russian Choral Arts*], Moscow, 1971, p. 317.

2 For a general introduction to the Nikonian reforms, see P. Meyendorff, *Russia, Ritual, and Reform: The Liturgical Reforms of Nikon in the 17th Century*, Yonkers, N.Y.: Saint Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991, p. 27–80, and T. Pott, *La réforme liturgique byzantine : étude du phénomène de l'évolution non-spontanée de la liturgie byzantine*, Rome: Centro Liturgico Vincenziano, 2000, p. 214–222.

3 On *khomony* (“*khomonii*”), see J. Harri, *St. Petersburg Court Chant and the Tradition of Eastern Slavic Church Singing*. Turku: University of Turku, 2011, p. 51–55.

4 Б. А. Успенский, *Архаическая система церковнославянского произношения* [B. Uspenskii, *The Archaic System of Church Slavonic Pronunciation*]. Moscow, 1968, p. 39–40, 61–65.

5 The issue of *khomony* was first identified by прот. Д. Разумовский, *Церковное пение в России: (Опыт историко-технического изложения): Из уроков, читанных в Консерватории при Московском музыкальном обществе, профессором консерватории и членом Константинопольского музыкального общества, Дим. Разумовским* [Archpriest D. Razumovskii, *Church Singing in Russia: (A Historical and Technical Essay): Materials from Lectures Read at the Conservatory at Moscow's Musical Society by Conservatory Professor and Member of the Constantinopolitan Musical Society Dim. Razumovskii*]. Moscow, 1867, p. 79–80; for an up-to-date bibliography, see Т. Ф. Владышевская и Б. А. Успенский, “Истинноречие,”

undertaken in the second half of the 17th century was not limited to matters of orthography and orthoepy alone. For example, the mid-17th century polemical treatise “Skazanie o razlichnykh eresakh i khuleniakh na Gospoda Boga i na Prechistuiu Bogoroditsu, sodержimykh ot nevedeniia v znamennykh knigakh” identifies both *khomony* and various textual differences between the text of the notated chant manuscripts and the text of non-notated liturgical books printed at the Moscow Print Yard as defects that need to be corrected.⁶

In this paper, I consider the text of the Hirmologion, a liturgical chantbook containing, chiefly, the texts (accompanied in all of the sources studied here by the neumatic Znamenny musical notation) of hirmoi – hymns based on the nine Biblical Odes and used as poetic and musical models for other texts of the Canon sung at Matins according to the Byzantine Rite.⁷ In a previous paper, I provided a typology of the Znamenny notated Hirmologia of the 17th century.⁸ Among the manuscripts reviewed, I identified a group of notated Hirmologia containing the text of hirmoi without *khomony* but in the pre-Nikonian redaction, that is, not influenced by the Nikonian *editio princeps* of the Slavonic Hirmologion printed in Moscow in 1657.⁹ I termed these manuscripts “non-Nikonian reformed Hirmologia”. Presently five such copies are known to me; they are presented in Table 1. All of these manuscripts may be dated, on the basis of watermarks or inscriptions, to the second half of the 17th century, and all contain Znamenny Notation bearing cinnabar marks (Type B notation according to the classification of Gardner) or cinnabar marks and *priznaki* (Type A notation).¹⁰ While the text of these manuscripts generally agrees with the text of the “archaic” Slavonic Hirmologion as given in the 16th century manuscripts

in: *Православная энциклопедия*, Т. 27. [T. Vladyshevskaja and B. Uspenskii, “Istinno-rechiie,” in: *Orthodox Encyclopedia*, vol. 27]. Moscow, 2011, pp. 716–719.

6 As given by Н. А. Никольская, «Сказание» инока Евфросина и певческая книжная справа XVII века [N. A. Nikol'skaia, *The “Skazanie” of Monk Evfrosin and the Reform of Musical Chantbooks in the 17th Century*]. Unpublished baccalaureate thesis at St. Petersburg State Conservatory, 2008, p. 84. Available online at: <http://znameni.ru/PEECTP/09a_Nikolskaja.pdf>.

7 For an introduction to the history of this liturgical book, see M. Velimirović, “The Byzantine Heirmos and Heirmologion,” in: *Gattungen der Musik in Einzeldarstellungen*, Bern, München: Francke Verlag, 1973, pp. 192–244, and S. Harris, “The ‘Kanon’ and the Heirmologion,” *Music and Letters*, 85.2 (2004), pp. 175–197.

8 A. Andreev, “Toward a Typology of the 17th Century Slavonic Notated Hirmologia,” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 85 (2019), pp. 481–503.

9 A. A. Андреев, “Венецианские печатные Ирмологии XVI–XVII вв. и книжная справа в Москве,” *Христианское чтение* [*Idem.*, “The Venetian Printed Hirmologia of the 16th–17th Centuries and the Reform of Liturgical Books in Moscow,” *Christian Reading*], 2017 (5), pp. 98–109 (DOI 10.24411/1814-5574-2017-00097).

10 J. Gardner, *Russian Church Singing*. Volume 1. *Orthodox Worship and Hymnography*. Trans. by V. Morosan. Yonkers, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980, pp. 114–115.

TABLE 1 “Reformed non-Nikonian” Hirmologia studied

Shelf code	No. of Hirmoi	Dating
NLR O.I.508	671	After 1660
RSL coll. 379 #36	675	1660s or ‘70s
RSL coll. 379 #55	677	1660s or ‘70s
NLR O.I.38	630	Before 1668
NLR O.I.217	670	Before 1691

NLR = National Library of Russia, St. Petersburg
RSL = Russian State Library, Moscow

edited by Hannick,¹¹ one also finds certain changes that agree in part with the text of hirmoi in the pre-Nikonian liturgical books printed in Moscow under patriarchs Joasaph I (1634-1640) and Joseph (1642-1652). The same redaction of the text of the hirmoi is also found in 18th and 19th century manuscript Hirmologia produced at the Old Rite literary center at Guslitsa and in the two printed editions of the notated Hirmologion undertaken by the Russian Old Ritualists: volume 6 of the *Krug tserkovnogo drevnego znamennogo penia* published in 1884-1885 in St. Petersburg through the patronage of Arsenii Morozov and the *Irmosy tserkovnogo znamennogo penia* published in 1908 at the press of Lazar Kalashnikov in Kiev.¹² The textual changes in this “reformed non-Nikonian” redaction of the Hirmologion vis-à-vis the “archaic” redaction reveal the extent to which the Old Ritualists themselves were willing to “correct” liturgical books and also provide a better context for understanding the liturgical reform undertaken by Patriarch Nikon and the “correctors” of the Moscow Print Yard.

11 C. Hannick, *Das Altslavische Hirmologion: Edition und Kommentar*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Weiher Verlag, 2006.

12 The literary culture of the Russian Old Ritualists still lacks an adequate study in English. For information on the Old Ritualist literary center in Guslitsa, see E. A. Ageeva, “Гуслиця,” in: *Православная энциклопедия*, Т. 13 [E. Ageeva, “Guslitsa,” in: *Orthodox Encyclopedia*, vol. 13]. Moscow, 2006, pp. 503-509; on the printing of chantbooks by Old Ritualists, see Е.Ю. Шевчук и И.В.С., “Издательства и издания духовно-музыкальные (Старообрядческие церковнопевческие издания),” in: *Православная энциклопедия*, Т. 21 [E. Shevchiuk and I.V.S., “Publishers and Publications of Church Music (Old Ritualist Musical Publications),” in: *Orthodox Encyclopedia*, vol. 21]. Moscow, 2009, pp. 579-580; Е.Ю. Шевчук и Е.А. Агеева, “Калашников Лазарь Филиппович,” in: *Православная энциклопедия*, Т. 29 [E. Shevchiuk and E. Ageeva, “Kalashnikov Lazar’ Filippovich,” in: *Orthodox Encyclopedia*, vol. 29]. Moscow, 2012, pp. 432-434.

2 Grammatical Changes in the Text of the Hirmoi

I now proceed to describe the changes introduced by scribes into the “non-Nikonian reformed” redaction of the Hirmologion, for simplicity taking examples only from the text of the authentic tones.¹³ The following grammatical changes may be observed.

In the realm of morphology, the reformed text regularly uses the case endings -и, -ы instead of the case endings -ѧ, -ѧ for the *gen. sg.*, *nom. pl.*, and *acc. pl.* forms of nouns that decline according to the soft and mixed varieties of the second declension.¹⁴ This norm was codified in the *Grammar* of 1648 (f. 99r–101r), but not yet in the *Grammar* of Meletii Smotritskii,¹⁵ and was being introduced into the printed liturgical books at the Moscow Print Yard already in the 1640s for the purpose of resolving homonymy between the nominative and oblique cases.¹⁶

13 In the tables that follow, the hirmoi are numbered according to the system employed by Hannick, *op. cit.*; for ease of reference, I also provide the number of the corresponding Greek hirmos according to the system first proposed by J. Raasted, “Observations on the Manuscript Tradition of Byzantine Music, 1: A List of Heirmos Call-Numbers, based on Eustratiades’s Edition of the Heirmologion,” *Cahiers de l’Institut du Moyen-Âge Grec et Latin*, 1969 (1), pp. 1–12. The “archaic” redaction is quoted as given by Hannick, *op. cit.* The “reformed non-Nikonian” redaction is quoted as recorded in the manuscripts listed in Table 1 and in the printed editions *Krug* and *Irmosy*; where discrepancies exist between these sources, they are indicated in footnotes. The following sigla are used for the printed liturgical books (the number in parentheses indicates the number of this edition in the catalog of A. С. Зернова, *Книги кирилловской печати, изданные в Москве в XVI–XVII веках. Сводный каталог* [A. Zernova, *Cyrillic Books Printed in Moscow in the 16th–17th Centuries. A Consolidated Catalog*], Moscow, 1958): MSept1644 – *Минея, сентябрь*. Moscow, 1644 (#173); MDec1636 – *Минея, декабрь*. Moscow, 1636 (#128); MDec1645 – *Минея, декабрь*. Moscow, 1645 (#177); MJam1622 – *Минея, январь*. Moscow, 1622 (#43); MJam1644 – *Минея, январь*. Moscow, 1644 (#171); MFeb1646 – *Минея, февраль*. Moscow, 1646 (#183); MAug1630 – *Минея, август*. Moscow, 1630 (#76); MAug1646 – *Минея, август*. Moscow, 1646 (#187); TL1640 – *Триодь постная*. Moscow, 1640 (#153); TL1642 – *Триодь постная*. Moscow, 1642 (#162); TL1650 – *Триодь постная*. Moscow, 1650 (#224); TF1635 – *Триодь цветная*. Moscow, 1635 (#125); TF1648 – *Триодь цветная*. Moscow, 1648 (#208); Oct1631 – *Октоих*. Moscow, 1631 (#86); Oct1638 – *Октоих*. Moscow, 1638 (#142); Oct1649 – *Октоих*. Moscow, 1649 (#214).

14 I call this the second declension, as in modern grammars of Church Slavonic (*cf.* Archbishop Alypy (Gamanovich), *Grammar of the Church Slavonic Language*, Trans. by Archpriest J. Shaw, Jordanville, N.Y.: Holy Trinity Monastery, 2001, pp. 76–78), even though Meletii Smotritskii calls it the first declension (*cf.* E. А. Кузьминова, *Грамматики Лаврентия Зизания и Мелетия Смотрицкого*. [E. Kuz’minova, *The Grammars of Lavrentii Zizanii and Meletii Smotritskii*], Moscow, 2000, pp. 170–184).

15 *Ibid.*, pp. 176–177.

16 See the discussion in *Грамматика 1648 г.* под ред. Е. А. Кузьминовой [Grammar of 1648, ed. by E. Kuz’minova], Moscow, 2007, pp. 561–562.

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
Aα'7 = 42	ОТЪ ЗЕМЛА НА НЕБО	Ѡ ЗЕМЛИ НА НЕБО	Ѡ ЗЕМЛѦ НА НѢѠ (TF1635, f. 237r) → Ѡ ЗЕМЛНѦ НА НѢѠ (TF1648, f. 204r)
A5'7 = 46	СНИДЕ ВЪ ПРЕИСПОДНАА СТРАНЫ ЗЕМЛА	СНИДЕ В ПРЕИСПОДНАА СТРАНЫ ЗЕМЛИ	СНІДЕ ВЪ ПРЕИПОДНАА СТРАНЫ ЗЕМЛѦ (TF1635, f. 238v) → СНІДЕ Б ПРЕИПОДНІА СТРАНЫ ЗЕМЛНѦ (TF1648, f. 205v)
Aγ'4 = 80	ПАЛИМЫА ЮНОША	ПАЛИМЫА ЮНОШИ	ПАЛНІМЫА ЮНОША (MDec1636, f. 374v) → ПАЛНІМЫА ЮНОШЫ (MDec1645, f. 398v)

Another common change is the introduction of possessive pronouns instead of enclitic pronouns in the dative case. The *Grammar* of Meletii Smotritskii indicates that the enclitic pronouns **МИ**, **ТИ**, **СИ** and the possessive pronouns **МОЙ**, **ТВОЙ**, **СВОЙ** are equivalent.¹⁷ In some instances, the full form of the possessive pronouns was used already in the liturgical books printed under Patriarch Filaret (1619-1633), or was introduced into the liturgical books printed under Patriarch Joasaph I:

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
Aγ'5 = 27	ЦРКОВЬ СИ	ЦЕРКОВЬ СВОЮ	ЦРКОВЬ СВОЮ (MAug1630, f. 256v)
Aγ'4 = 75	РАБЪ СИ	РАБЪ СВОИХЪ	РАБЪ СВОИХЪ (MDec1636, f. 370r)
Aζ'1 = 6	ВЪ УРЕВЪ ТИ	ВО УРЕВЪ ТВОЕМЪ	БО УРЕВѢ ТН (Oct1631, p. 1, f. 25v) → БО УРЕВѢ ТВОЕМЪ (Oct1638, p. 1, f. 14r)

In a number of instances where the text in the notated Hirmologion was changed in favor of the text in the printed liturgical books, equivalent syntactical constructions were used. Thus, the genitive of possession was changed to a

17 E.A. Кузьмина, *Грамматики Лаврентия Зизания и Мелетия Смотрицкого*, p. 402.

possessive adjective or vice-versa, a possessive adjective was changed to a genitive of possession:

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
Aη'1 = 7	дѣти израиля	дѣти израилевы	дѣти ізраїлєвы (Oci631, p. 1, f. 27r; Oci649, p. 1, f. 38r)
Aη'6 = 32	тлю смертною	тлю смерти	тлю смѣрти (MAugi630, f. 261r) → тлю смѣрти (MAugi646, f. 261v)

Other syntactical changes include changes in word order, the usage of adverbs rather than adjectives, and differing attempts to translate the Greek article into Church Slavonic:

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
Aα'4 = 74	равна же отъцѹ	равна ѿцѣ же	равна ѿцѹ же (MDec1636, f. 269v; MDec1645, f. 394r)
Aς'5 = 30	некредно вопиаше Cf.: ἀσινῆς ἐβόα. ¹⁸	некрежденъ вопиаше	некрежденъ вопиаше (MAugi630, f. 259r; MAugi646, f. 259v)
Aε'5 = 29	темнѣимъ и въ сѣни Cf.: τοῖς ἐν σκοτει καὶ σκιᾷ. ¹⁹	свѣимъ во тмѣ и сѣни	свѣимъ во тмѣ и сѣни (MAugi630, f. 258v)

In a number of instances, the “archaic” text of the notated Hirmologion contained a translation error. The error was either absent from the text of the printed liturgical books, or had been corrected in the liturgical books during the patriarchates of Joasaph I or Joseph:

18 *Εἰρμολόγιον*, ἐκδιδόμενον ὑπὸ μητροπ. Σωφρονίου Εὐστρατιάδου [*Hirmologion*, published by Metrop. Sophronius Eustratiades]. Chennevières-sur-Marne, 1932, p. 3.

19 *Αὐτόθι*.

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
Αδ'1 = 3	ИС ТЕБЕ ИЗЫДЕТЬ ИЗРАИЛЕКА ПРОВЪЗГЛАШАШЕ СВѦТААГО Cf.: ἐκ σοῦ ἐξελεύσεσθαι τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ προανεφώνει τὸν Ἄγιον. ²⁰	ИС ТЕБЕ ИЗЫТИ ИЗРАИЛЕВИ ИЗЪ ПРОВОЗГЛАШАШЕ СВѦТАГО	ИЗЪ ПРѢВЪЗГЛАШАШЕ СѦТѦГО (Oct1631, p. 1, f. 13r) → ИЗЪ ПРѢВЪЗГЛАШАШЕ СѦТѦГО (Oct1638, p. 1, f. 12v)
Αζ'9 = 39	ТѦЛОУ СЛОУЖИТИ МОУСИКИНСКИМЪ СЪГЛАСИЕМЪ Cf.: εἰκόνη λατρεῦειν μουσικῆς συμφωνίας συγκαλουμένης λαοῦς. ²¹	ТѦЛО СЛѦЖИТИ МѦСИКИНСКОМЪ СОГЛАСИЮ	ПѦЛО СЛѦЖИТИ МѦСИКИНСКОМЪ СОГЛАСИЮ (TC1635, f. 28or; TC1648, f. 256v)

Sometimes a syntactical difference between the “archaic” notated Hirmologion and the printed liturgical books reflected different versions of the underlying Greek text, which may also be reflected in the Slavonic manuscript tradition. While it is tempting to see a reliance on Greek sources behind such changes, we have little evidence that “correctors” at the Print Yard had access to Greek sources prior to the patriarchate of Nikon.

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
Αα'12 = 50	БОЖЕСТВЕННЫ ПРОУВРАЗИ ... КРЕСТОМЪ ТВОИМЪ Cf.: Ὁ θεϊότατος προετύπωσε ... τὸν Σταυρόν σου. ²³ But: H, G, Sp, and Venetian Hirmologia have τῷ Σταυρῷ. ²⁴	БОЖЕСТВЕННЫ ПРОУВРАЗИ ... КРЕСТЬ ТВОИ	БЖЕТВЕННЫ ПРОУВРАЗИ ... КРѦТОМЪ ПВОИМЪ (TL1642, f. 371r) → БЖЕТВЕННЫ ПРѦУВРАЗИ ... КРѦТОМЪ ПВОИ (TL1650, f. 339r) ²²

²⁰ *Αὐτόθι*, p. 1.

²¹ *Αὐτόθι*, p. 4.

²² However, TL1640 (on f. 261r) has the reading *κρѦтъ пвѡѡ*.

²³ *Αὐτόθι*, p. 5.

²⁴ The sigla for Greek manuscripts of the Hirmologion are those adopted by the MMB series and Velimirović, op. cit.: O – BNF Coislin 220 (end of the 11th or beginning of the 12th

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
Aγ'7 = 43	из гроба одѣждена Христа Cf.: ἐκ τάφου ὁμβρήσαντος Χριστοῦ. ²⁵ But: O, H, G, Ku, Sp, and Si have ὁμβρήσαντα Χριστόν.	Христа	ἡζ' гроба одѣждѣнша Х л (TC1635, f. 237v) → ἡζ' гроба одѣждѣнша Х ртл (TC1648, f. 204v)

The introduction of such changes into the text of the reformed Hirmologion, however, was not consistent. For example, in a number of instances the use of enclitic pronouns remained, or the word order continued to differ from the printed text. Quite possibly such differences may be explained by discrepancies within the printed books themselves – in cases when an hirmos occurred in more than one printed liturgical book, the scribes had to choose one version of the text:

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
Aγ'9 = 35	ЗАПОВѢДИ ТИ	ЗАПОВѢДИ ТИ	ЗѦПОВѢДѢЙ ТѦВѦХЪ (TC1648, f. 253v); ЗѦПОВѢДѢЙ ТѦ (MSep1644, f. 10r)
Aζ'3 = 68	ОТЦЕМЪ БОГЪ БЛАГОСЛОВЕНЪ ЕСИ	ΩΤЦЕМЪ БОГЪ БЛАГОСЛОВЕНЪ ЕСИ	ΩΤЦѦΜΙ БѢЖЕ БΛΓΓΕΝЪ ΕΣΗ (MDec1645, f. 397v); ΩΤЦѦΜЪ БГЪ БΛΓΓΕΛΟΒΕΝЪ ΕΣΗ (Oct1649, p. 1, f. 22r)
Aη'3 = 70	ДѢЮУ ЮЖЕ ПРОИДЕ УИСТОУ	ДѢВЪ ЮЖЕ ПРОИДЕ УИСТВ	ДѢДЪ ѦЖЕ ѦТѢДЪ ПРОѦДѢ (MDec1645, f. 398r); ДѢДЪ ѦЖЕ ПРОѦДѢ ѦНѢТѢДЪ (Oct1649, p. 1, f. 27v)

The choice was not always obvious: in the last two cases, the text in the Hirmologion remains unchanged because it agrees with the text in the printed Octoechos, despite the fact that the hirmoi in question belong to the Nativity

century); H – Athos Iveron 470 (middle of the 12th century, see photographic reproduction by C. Høeg, *Hirmologium Athoum* (Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae, 2), Copenhagen, 1938); G – Grottaferrata E.γ.11 (beginning of the 13th century, see the publication by L. Tardo, *Hirmologium Cryptense: Codex Cryptensis E.γ.11* (Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae, 3), Roma, 1951); Sp – NLR Greek 121 (dated 1302); Ku – Sinai Greek 1256 (dated 1308); Si – Sinai Greek 929 (11th century, OdO structure). For the Venetian editions, I use *Εἰρμολόγιον*, Ἐνετίστιν, παρὰ Ἀντωνίῳ τῷ Πινέλλῳ, 1603, here on f. 4v.

25 *Εἰρμολόγιον* ... ὑπὸ μητροπ. Σωφρονίου Εὐστρατιάδου, p. 5.

Canon by St. Cosmas of Maiuma, so we would expect them to agree with the text in the printed Menaion. We also find instances where the text has been changed to agree with the printed Menaion, in this particular case – in spite of the tendency to substitute the second person singular perfect for the aorist, a practice that probably originated on Mt. Athos in the 14th century and spread to Muscovy as early as during the tenure of Metropolitan Cyprian at the end of the 14th century:²⁶

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
ГѢ'3 = 859	въ църкви славы ти явисѧ	въ църкви славы ти явисѧ	бѣ църкви славы ти явѧсѧ (MFeb1646, f. 23); бѣ църкви славы ти явѧнѧ ѿ ѿ ѿ (Oct1649, p. 1, f. 310r)

The process of reforming the text of the printed liturgical books during the patriarchate of Joseph must have been quite chaotic, since the same text may occur in different redactions in different liturgical books or even within one liturgical book. The text of the reformed Hirmologion may reflect one of the redactions found in the printed books:

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
ГѢ'2 = 864	в законнѣи сѣни писании	в законнѣмъ сѣнописании	бѣ законномъ сѣннописаніи (MFeb1646, f. 25v) бѣ законнѣ сѣни писаніи (Oct1638, p. 1, f. 269r) бѣ законнѣй сѣни писаныи (Oct1649, p. 1, f. 314r) бѣ законнѣй сѣни ѿ писаніи (ibid., f. 269v) бѣ законномъ сѣннописаніи (ibid., f. 272v)

26 On this, see: Т. И. Афанасьева и М. Г. Шарихина, “Употребление перфекта 2-го лица ед. числа вместо аориста: к вопросу о времени становления грамматической нормы,” *Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики* [Т. Afanasyeva and M. Sharikhina, “Usage of the Perfect instead of the Aorist in the Second Person Singular: on the Issue of the Establishment of this Grammatical Norm,” *Drevnyaya Rus'. Voprosy Medievistiki*] 67:1 (2017), pp. 102-109.

3 Lexical Changes in the Text of the Hirmoi

In addition to changes in syntax, we can also observe lexical changes in the text of the hirmoi. This usually involves the usage of a different synonym to translate the underlying Greek word, with the “reformed” redaction following the lexical usage of the printed liturgical books:

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
Αα'5 = 26	πρεοῦκραшена БОЖИЕЮ СЛАВОЮ <i>Cf.</i> : πεποικιλμένη τῇ θείᾳ δόξῃ. ²⁷	πρεοῦκραшена БОЖЕСТВЕННОЮ СЛАВОЮ <i>Cf.</i> : πάσχει ὡς θνητός. ²⁸	πρεδ'κραшена божеством СЛАВНО (MAugi646, f. 257r)
Αζ'6 = 47	стражеть ѿко МЪРТВЪ <i>Cf.</i> : πάσχει ὡς θνητός. ²⁸	стражеть ѿко смертенъ <i>Cf.</i> : πάσχει ὡς θνητός. ²⁸	отражеть ѿко мѣртвенъ (TC1648, f. 208r)
Αζ'5 = 31	огнь οὔβο прохлажаше <i>Cf.</i> : τὸ μὲν πῦρ ἐδρόσιζε. ²⁹	огнь οὔβο ωροшаше <i>Cf.</i> : τὸ μὲν πῦρ ἐδρόσιζε. ²⁹	ѡгнь ѡуво ѡрошаше (MAugi646, f. 260v)
Αη'1 = 7	доброотоу БЛАГОВѢРІА <i>Cf.</i> : τῷ κάλλει τῆς εὐσεβείας. ³¹	доброотоу БЛАГОУЕСТИА ³⁰ <i>Cf.</i> : τῷ κάλλει τῆς εὐσεβείας. ³¹	добрѣотѣ бл҃гоуѣстїа (Oct1638, p. 1, f. 26v)

In some instances, the text in the “archaic” Hirmologion contained an erroneous translation, and this error was corrected by introducing the reading from the printed liturgical books. Such errors typically were caused by the confusion of Greek homonyms or paronyms:

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
Ας'3 = 66	морьскыи звѣрь ЕДИНАГО ПРИАТЪ <i>Cf.</i> : ἐνάλιος θῆρ οἶον ἐδέξατο. ³² The “archaic” translator must have read οἶον instead of οἶον	морскии звѣрь ѿκωβα ПРИАТЪ	морьскїй звѣрь ѿκωба прїаѣтъ (MDec1645, f. 396v)

²⁷ *Εἰρμολόγιον* ... ὑπὸ μητροπ. Σωφρονίου Εὐστρατιάδου, p. 5.

²⁸ *Αὐτόθι*.

²⁹ *Αὐτόθι*, p. 3.

³⁰ *Irmosy* (f. 21v) reads **ДОБРОТОУ БЛАГОУЕСТИА**, but *Krug* (f. 475v) reads **ДОБРОТОУ БЛАГОВѢРІА**.

³¹ *Εἰρμολόγιον* ... ὑπὸ μητροп. Σωφρονίου Εὐστρατιάδου, p. 1.

³² *Αὐτόθι*, p. 6.

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
Aδ'2 = 63	ОТ БЕСМОУЖНЫЯ БЕСПЛАТНЫИ БОГЪ	Ѡ БЕСМѠЖНЫА БЕСПЛОТНЫИ БОГЪ	Ѡ НЕИСКѠМѠЖНЫА НЕВЕЩЕѠВЕННЫИ БГЪ (MDec1645, f. 395r); Ѡ БЕЗМОУЖНЫА БЕЗПЛОТНЫИ БГЪ (Oct1649, p. 1, f. 20r)
Aθ'3 = 72	ХВАЛАЩЕ ВЕЛИУАЕМЪ	ХВАЛАЩЕ ВЕЛИУАЕМЪ	БѠСПЕВѠЮЩЕ ВЕЛИУАЕМЪ (MDec1645, f. 399v) ХБѠЛАЩЕ ВЕЛИУАЕМЪ (Oct1649, p. 1, f. 23r)
Bθ'3 = 432	ХРИСТИАНОМЪ ЗАСТОУПНИЦА	ХРИСТІАНОМЪ ЕСИ ЗАСТОУПНИЦА	ХРІТІАНОМЪ ЕСИ ПРЕСТѠПТЕЛЬНИЦА (MJan1622, f. 135r) ХРІТІАНОМЪ ЗАСТОУПНИЦА (Oct1649, p. 1, f. 141v)

Though in the last case we see a conflation of the readings in the Octoechos and the Menaion.

As with differences in syntax, lexical differences could exist not only between different editions of the printed liturgical books, but also within the same edition. In the following example, the text in the Hirmologion remains unchanged, despite the various readings that come up in the printed liturgical books:³⁸

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
Γε'5 = 860	ОТЪ АНГЕЛЪ СЛАВЫ ДАРЫ ПРИЕМАЮЩА	ѠТ АНГЕЛЪ СЛАВЫ ДАРЫ ПРИЕМАЮЩА	Ѡ АНГѠЛЪ СЛАВЫ ДАРОНОСИМА (MFeb1646, f. 23v) Ѡ АНГѠЛЪ СЛАВЫ ДАРЫ ПРІЕМАЮЩА (Oct1638, p. 1, f. 225r) → Ѡ АНГѠЛЪ СЛАВЫ ДАРОНОСИМА (Oct1649, p. 1, f. 238r)

³⁸ For a discussion of the translation of the Greek verb δορυφορέω (“to attend as a body-guard”) and its derivatives into Church Slavonic, see A. Andreev, *The Reform of the Hirmologion in Moscow in the 17th Century*. Unpublished *kandidat teologii* dissertation, vol. 2, pp. 82–83. Available online at: <<https://go.spbu.ru/19a3001>>.

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
			<p>ѿ ѿг҃лѣ славы дѣры прѣмѣнѣца (ibid., f. 305r) and on f. 311r, where in the margin an alternate reading ѿбѣтѣнѣма was printed as well.</p>

The “correctors” who worked at the Moscow Print Yard knew that the text of the printed liturgical books often disagreed with the text of the notated chant manuscripts. This is evident from one example in the Octoechos of 1649, where the reading *спасѣнію вѣнѣнѣ*, which also occurs in the two previous editions of the Octoechos, remains, but the marginal note *ѿ не повѣнѣнѣ* is introduced (on f. 150r), indicating that the text should not be sung as in the “archaic” notated manuscripts. In the “reformed” manuscripts of the Hirmologion, the reading from the Octoechos was introduced:

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
Вс’5 = 408	спасению покиньникъ	спасенію вѣнѣнѣ	<p>спасѣнію вѣнѣнѣ (Ost1631, p. 1, f. 147v) → <i>спѣсѣнію</i> <i>вѣнѣнѣнѣ</i> (Ost1638, p. 1, f. 137r) → <i>спасѣнію</i> <i>вѣнѣнѣнѣ</i> (Ost1649, p. 1, f. 150r), and a marginal note.</p>

Finally, in two instances we find lexical changes introduced into the text of the “reformed” Hirmologion that do not occur in the liturgical books printed in Moscow before Patriarch Nikon:

No.	Archaic	Reformed non-Nikonian	Printed pre-Nikonian
Аα’8 = 34	люди измѣньшеωμου	люди избавишѣмѣ	<p>лѣди ѿзмѣньшеωмѣ (TC1635, f. 276r; TC1648, f. 253v; MSept1644, f. 8v)</p>
	<p>Cf.: τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἀπαλλάξαντι.³⁹ Note that the reverse change <i>ѿзбѣльшѣмѣ</i> → <i>ѿзмѣньшѣмѣ</i> is</p>		

39 *Εἰρμολόγιον* ... ὑπὸ μητροπ. Σωφρονίου Εὐστρατιάδου, p. 4.

No. Archaic Reformed non-Nikonian Printed pre-Nikonian
 made by the Nikonian scribes in the proof
 copy of the Hirmologion of 1657 (SHM Syn.
 762, f. 2r).

Aδ' 4 = 76	ροδα ζεμλνα οβновлєннє	ροδα γελοβεуа οβновлєннє	ρόδα ζεμλνά ωβηοβλένιτς (MDec1645, f. 395v)
---------------	---	---	---

Cf.: Γένους βροτείου τὴν ἀνάπλασιν.⁴⁰

4 Discussion

Two conclusions follow from the examples presented in this paper, one methodological, the other historical. In terms of the methodology of describing East Slavic notated chant manuscripts from the 17th century and onward, it is evident that noting the presence or absence of *khomony* in a manuscript does not provide sufficient information about it. Furthermore, the use of the terms “razdel'norechie” and “novoe istinnorechie”, which, first introduced by Archpriest D. Razumovskii, have become common, should be avoided. The mere absence of *khomony* (“novoe istinnorechie”) does not tell us if a manuscript was intended for use by those who accepted the Nikonian reform or rejected it. Instead, a chant manuscript lacking *khomony* should be described as “reformed Nikonian” or “reformed non-Nikonian”. For an Hirmologion, this is done by considering the ordering of the hirmoi and checking if the text conforms (fully) with the Nikonian *editio princeps* or (in part) with the liturgical books printed in Moscow before Patriarch Nikon. So far, a typology for the other chantbooks used in the second half of the 17th century has not been developed, but it is quite possible that they reveal a similar dependency on the printed books.

The second conclusion is historical: despite the accepted stereotypes, a closer examination of the liturgical chantbooks demonstrates that at least some Old Ritualists operated fully within the spirit of linguistic reform characteristic of Muscovite Russia in the 17th century. The reform touched upon aspects of Church Slavonic grammar reflected in the influential *Grammar* of Meletii Smotritskii, published in Vievis in 1618-1619, and its later reprint, with some modifications, in Moscow as the *Grammar* of 1648. It also attempted to resolve discrepancies between the text of notated manuscripts and the text of the printed liturgical books. The goals pursued by the Nikonian scribes were

⁴⁰ *Αὐτόθι*, p. 7.

similar. The main difference is that for the Nikonian reformers, it was the Greek books printed in Venice that were viewed as authoritative, while for the Old Ritualists, the authoritative source was found in the Slavonic books printed in Moscow before the Nikonian reform.

The reform undertaken by the Old Ritualist scribes, however, was neither complete, nor comprehensive. In many instances discrepancies between the notated Hirmologion and the non-notated printed liturgical books remained, including in the case of hirmoi that had undergone change in the printed liturgical books edited in the 1630s and '40s. The reform was thus somewhat haphazard and, while treating the pre-Nikonian books as authoritative, the scribes must have been somewhat skeptical of their content. This brings us to the question of the reform of the pre-Nikonian printed books themselves, which, with the exception of some recent studies of their orthography,⁴¹ remains a badly neglected area of research. A thorough comparison of the text of various pre-Nikonian printed editions is needed in order to reveal the extent of a liturgical reform in Russia in the decades prior to the tenure of Patriarch Nikon, as well as the methods used and sources consulted by the “correctors” of the Moscow Print Yard.

Acknowledgement

This paper is based on a report given at the International Conference “Liturgy as Practice, Space, and Theory in Eastern Christianities”, 1-4 October, 2019, Kirillov, Russia.

⁴¹ See, С. М. Кусмауль, “Книжная справа 40-х годов XVII века,” [S. Kusmaul, “Book Correction in the 40s of the 17th Century”] *Slověne* = *Словъне*. *International Journal of Slavic Studies*, 2014 (1), pp. 72-101, and the bibliography therein.