The Peculiarities of Creating Two Services Honoring One Saint on the Example of Russian Services to St. Nicholas and martyrs SS. Boris and Gleb

Recent research on hymnography is increasingly drawing the attention of philologists. A separate though related subject is Russian Orthodox original services that have been modified even more frequently than translations of services.

In studying the service, one of the most important features for the division of versions seems to be a typikon). In Russia, the main typikons were Studion-Alexis and Jerusalem. The early services, following the Studion-Alexis typikon, were mostly translated from Ancient Greek, but some services dedicated to Russian saints (for example, SS. Boris and St. Gleb), were also created in this period. Replacing Studion-Alexis, the Jerusalem typikon offers a classification of the services.

In the Jerusalem typikon there are four charter types, reflecting the degree of reverence for the sacred:

1) sextic service (no sticheras on "Praises" and the indication for the great doxology)

2) doxological (contains sticheras on "Praises" and the indication for the great doxology)

3) polyeleos service (contains sessional hymn (sedalen) polyeleos)

4) the vigil service (there is a small vespers and / or sticheras on lity)[1].

In the study of hymnography, following Jerusalem (typikon), one of the most important categorizing features is based on the status of the service, be it sextic, doxological, polyeleos, or vigils. Each category reflects the degree of reverence for the service and sometimes, with the increasing status of service, a geographical spread and increasing uptake of the service can be observed.

The Russian service was based on the existing canon. This canon could be shared services, reverend hierarchs or a specific service to saints. The services to saints of the same rank were usually used, for example, in some versions of a service to the St. equal-to-apostles Vladimir used verses, taken from the service to SS. equal-to-apostles Constantine and Helen[2], and hymns to St. Protomartyr Stephen[3] and to SS. martyrs Cyrus and John[4] are used in the service of the SS. martyrs Boris and Gleb as models. The model of a new hymn could also be a singing of hymns from the services to the saint of another rank, for example, as discovered by

---

[1] *Субботин К.*, свящ. Руководство к изучению устава богослужения Русской церкви. СПб., 1994. С. 9-10.

[2] For example.,: *Антонова Е. В.* Службы свв. Борису и Глебу в книжности Древней Руси. Дисс. на соиск. ст. канд. филол. наук. М., 1997. С. 62

[3] Ibid.

[4] *Rothe H.* Kontakien auf russische Heilige im altrussischen Kondakar//Byzantine Studies/Etudes Byzantines, Vols. 8, 11 & 12 (1981, 1984 & 1985). P. 333 – 341.

Keller, the kontakion to SS. Martyrs. Boris and Gleb altered stichera to St. Procopius[5]. Rothe has shown that in this case, the main topic is a theme of healing, the same theme is used in the last phrase of the kontakion, taken from the kontakion to SS. Cyrus and John[6]: "Вы бо Божественныя врача еста" ("You are divine doctors"). Services to the Russian saints could be taken as a model for later services to the Russian saints: for example, a study by Smirnova has shown that lity's sticheras to Nikita of Pereiaslav were constructed on the model of sticheron to Sergius of Radonezh[7], and one of the versions of the service to the finding of the relics of St. Macarius of Kalyazin, can be traced back to the service to St. Varlaam of Hutyn[8]. Sometimes whole "chain models" were formed. Thus, Smirnova has found that an Exapostilarion of the service to finding relics of St. Makarios of Kalyazin was based on a Exapostilarion to Varlaam of Hutyn, which, in turn, was created by Pachomius Logofet from two Exapostilarions – to St. Sava and to Simeon Serbian[9].

In cases where a service to the saint already existed, this service was taken as a model for the new one. The service could serve as a temporary substitute for a not yet created new one. Later, the service was supplemented by new hymns, and borrowed elements were displaced by original or reprocessed ones, but the process of formation of the service sometimes lasted for several centuries. The service could be appended and processed continuously, resulting in almost complete absence of identical services. The typikon's features help in this case to restore the history of the service. The service, based on the example of services of the general menaion, frequently changes its status in relation to the spread of the feast and the expansion of the hymns, gradually moving from the sextic into doxological, polyeleos and finally vigil. But if the service, which is used as a model devoted to the same saint, the status of a new service could from the beginning fit the status of the original service, and vary according to the local traditions and liturgical function required (e.g. sextic or doxilogical services were easily combined with another service which took place on the same day, while the vigil service was often written out separately). Writing a new canon, or, in rare cases, the replacement of the original canon by borrowed ones indicates not only a serious purposeful correction of a service, but can also show the local traditions of liturgical practice. A particular difficulty in studying the composition of the new service created on the basis of an existing one to the same saint lies in its constant mutability, not only at the status of correcting texts, but also at the status of continuous

[5] *Keller F.* Das Kontakion aus der erste służba für Boris und Gleb// Schweizerische Beiträge zum VII Internationalen Slavistenkongreß in Warschau, August 1973, Slavica Helvetica 7. Bern, 1973. S. 65 – 74.

[6] *Rothe H.* Kontakien auf russische Heilige… P. 335 – 336.
[7] *Смирнова А. Е.* Творчество гимнографа XVI в. Маркелла Безбородого. Дисс. на соиск. ст. канд. филол. наук. СПб.. 2005. C. 39.
[8] Ibid. P. 79.
[9] ibid. P. 80.

modification of hymns. In this case we need to distinguish the new version and the old "augmented" version. Copyists could enter a service in other sticheras, known to them through the Stichirarium, while the version of the service was not modified in general.

The service in the Transfer of the Relics of St. Nicholas from Myra to Bari and the service in the Transfer of the Relics of St. Boris and Gleb are taken as examples.

In Russia the feast of the Transfer of the Relics of St. Nicholas from Myra to Bari (May, 9) was set in one of the years 1087-1090. Traditionally, the Feast of the Relics of St. Nicholas is considered as a Russian holy day. Scholarly attention to this feast was attracted in the 18th century, when it became one of the key arguments in the debate about the Latin influence on the Russian church[10]. However, since the mid-nineteenth century all Russian scholars agree that the introduction of the feast is not related to the Latin tradition. Duychev suggests that the establishment of the feast could have occurred through southern Italian, Sicilian and Greek influence[11], but most scholars have come to the conclusion that it was an independent decision by the Russian Church. "While Nicholas was not a Russian saint, and the celebration of May 9 was of Western origin, this day belongs to the Russian tradition due to the fact that it was independently instituted by the Russian Church, which was established on the initiative of Kiev in contradiction of the Byzantine tradition. Introduced by Pope Urban II, the celebration of St. Nicholas on the 9th May took the form of a local, Apulian feast, which subsequently was not taken up in the Catholic world as widely as the day of the Repose of the Saint on the 6th of December.[12]

The feast of the Transfer of the Relics of St. Nicholas is older than the service. In Russia, it was widely known as the service of the Repose of St. Nicholas (December, 6). Since this service was translated from the Greek, correction and modification were rare. The most common were Studion-Aleksis version and Jerusalem version, which replaced the previous ones – unified text corrected in accordance with the new typikon[13]. It is very likely that the service in the Transfer of the Relics of St. Nicholas was written after the feast was established, and already known service in the Repose of St. Nicholas were used until the new service was created. The service in the Repose of St. Nicholas was afterwards taken as a model for a new service. Such an assumption is confirmed by the copy of services contained in Menaion of the 14th century

[10] *Крассовский А.* Установление в русской церкви праздника 9 мая в честь перенесения мощей святителя Николая из Мир Ликийских в г. Бар //Труды Киевской духовной академии. 1874, декабрь. С. 571; *Макарий, митр.* История русской церкви. Харьков, 1857. Т. 2. С. 230–231.

[11] *Duicev I.* Riflessi della religiosit`a italo-greca nel mondo slavo ortodosso // Atti del Convengo Storico Interecclesiale. Padua, 1973. Vol. 1. P. 181–222.

[12] *Лосева О. В.* Русские месяцесловы XI–XIV в. М., 2001. С. 102.

[13] *Легких В. И.* Службы на Преставление и Перенесение мощей свт. Николая Мирликийского в славянской рукописной традиции XII – нач. XVII в.: текстология гимнографии. М., Спб., 2011. С. 30 and further.

(Sofia's collection of Russian National library (RNB, Soph. 382). The beginning of the service is not preserved; the service starts with a stichera on "Praises" and consists entirely of hymns borrowed from the services for the Repose St. Nicholas on the 6th December. This manuscript was studied by Smyka. She concludes that originally a service for the Transfer of the Relics of St. Nicholas did not have its own hymnography[14]. The complete microtextological research has shown that all the hymns belong to the Studion-Aleksis version of the December service[15]. This fact indicates the age of the feast: It was established even before the Jerusalem typikon and the associated Jerusalem version of the service on the 6th December.

Numerous statutory notes in 15th century refer also to the "December" service: if the "May" service to St. Nicholas was mentioned, it was usually limited by following Troparion "Правило вѣрѣ и образъ кротости, воздержанию учителя яви тя стаду Своему…" ("Rule of faith and image of meekness, temperance teacher waking thee His flock ..." (hereinafter - the "Rule of faith ...") and sending "аще хощеши Николе, смотри декабря 6" ("If you want St. Nicholas, see Dec. 6.")

Sometimes it is possible to find an extended succession, though all the hymns were taken from the "December" service. For example, the typikons from the beginning of the 15th century, except the troparion "Rule of faith ...", mention sticherons and a canon to St. Nicholas (neither ton nor incipit were specified), after the 6th Ode of canon "Kontakion December 6" and "service on Lity - December 6" are mentioned[16]. The typikon of mid-fifteenth century mentions a stichera to St. Nicholas after "Glory" - "Человѣче Божии верныи рабе, служителю Господень, мужу желании…" ("The man of God and faithful servant, the servant of the Lord, man of wish ..." and "Святителем удобрение и отцем красоту, источника чюдесем и верным заступника велика, сшедшеся, празднолюбци, песньными хвалами воспоим... " ("All the lovers of the feast, who came, let us pray with our songs of enchantment for hierarchs and beauty for the clergy, the source of miracles and the power of the intercessor for faithful people...")[17]. –

Since the created Transfer of the Relics of St. Nicholas service was based on the vigil service to the same saint, it is difficult to talk about it as a single-stage writing: it was modified repeatedly; new hymns were added and replaced borrowed ones. Borrowed hymns were created to replace for the missing ones. See, for example, the kontakion of the third tone "Взыде звѣзда от востока до запада..." ("The star comes from east to west ...") did not have an ikos till the

---

[14] *Смыка Е. А.* Праздник перенесения мощей св. Николая: ранняя русская гимнографическая традиция//Церковное пение в историко-литургическом контексте: Восток-Русь-Запад (Международная конференция 15-19 мая 2000). Гимнология. М., 2003. С. 162.

[15] *Легких В. И.* Службы на Преставление…

[16] РНБ, Погодинское собрание, ;№ 32. Л. 64. (Russian National Library, The Pogodin's fond, № 32. F. 64).

[17] РНБ, Основное собрание, Q.I.975. Л. 225 (Russian National Library, The main fond, Q. I. 975. F. 225).

middle of the XVII century, so the ikos "Воспоим нынѣ святителя пѣсньми..." ("Let us pray hierarch be songs..."), taken from the "December" service was very often used. Also sticheras and sedalens, and especially sticheras after "Glory", were often borrowed.

The service did not have its own troparion for a long time, so the troparion "Rule of faith ..." from the Repose of St. Nicholas service was always indicated, which had become by this time the general troparion to the saint prelate (hierarch). Typikons and menaions very often include a reference sending to the "December" service, such as in the typikon of Jerusalem in the middle of the XV.: "аще хоще и Николѣ, "Правило вѣрѣ…", писан декабря 6" ("If you want St. Nicholas, troparion "Rule of faith ...", wrote Dec. 6")[18]. The note on the 9th May in typikons normally dedicated to the memory of St. Nicholas on the 6th December, where the full text of troparion was written out, or it was a note indicating that troparion "Rule of faith" was a general troparion to a prelate, referring to the feast of the 2nd of September. An indication for the general troparion does not occur in menaions at all, and it is very rare in the typikons, for example, in the Typikon of 1543: "аще хощеши Николе, тропарь, глас 4 "Правило вѣрѣ…" сентября 2" ("If you want St. Nicholas, see troparion, Tone 4 " Rule of faith... " Sept. 2.") [19]. Original "May" troparions start to appear not before the mid. XVI century. However, the troparion "Rule of faith…" was still present, sometimes side by side with one, two or even three original troparions such as in the typikon of the first half of the 17th century.: "тропарь "Правило вѣре…", другии тропарь, глас 4, …"Приспѣ день свѣтлаго торжества, град Барски радуется, и с нимъ Вселеная ликоствуетъ пѣсньми и пѣнми духовными. Днесь бо священое торжество и принесение честных и многоцѣнных мощеи святителя и многочюдотворца Николы, яко солнце незаходимое восиа свѣтозарными лучами, разгоняя тму искушения же и бѣд, о вопиющих вѣрно спасаи нас, яко предстатель наши, велики Николае". Инъ тропарь Николе же, глас 4: "Отьчество свое град Мирскии духом не оставль и в премирныи град Барски тѣлом пришелъ еси, архиерѣю велики Николае, от нюжду множество своимъ пришествиемъ возвеселил еси и болѣзни исцелил еси. Тѣм молим тя, святителю, моли Христа Бога спастися душамъ нашимъ". Инъ тропарь Николе же, глас 4: "Отче Николае, аще во гроб вселися тѣло твое, но высоко содѣвают изрядная чюдеса. Рака же твоя честная точит исцеления приходящимъ ти с вѣрою и творящихъ празникъ честных твоих мощеи, отче Николае, моли Христа Бога спастися душам нашимъ""[20].

[18] РНБ, Основное собрание, F. n. I. 25. Л. 65 (Russian National Library, The main fond, F. n. I. 25. F. 65).

[19] РНБ, Погодинское собрание, № 279. Л. 217 об. (Russian National Library, The Pogodin's fond, № 279. F. 217 rev.).

[20] РНБ, Софийское собрание, № 1145. Лл. 456 об. – 457. (Russian National Library, The Sofia's fond, № 1145. F. 456 rev. - 457).

The original Transfer of the Relics of St. Nicholas service was created in accordance with the requirement of Jerusalem typikon. In my study of the services of St. Nicholas, I divide the Transfer of the Relics of St. Nicholas service into 3 macro version: doxological, polyeleos, vigil[21].

In this case, a sextic service to a hierarch from the general menaion was not required because the model already existed: The compliers knew a vigil service the Repose of St. Nicholas. Principally, St. Nicholas has always been extremely honored. Probably, therefore, a sextic in the Transfer of the Relics service, did not exist. The status of the service depended very much on the liturgical requirement: On the 9th May, when the relics of St. Nicholas took place, the memory of the prophet Isaiah and martyr Christopher were also celebrated. In most of the manuscripts of every day menaions, these services were placed together, while in the Festal menaion only the service to St. Nicholas was written. The main difference between the service in festal menaions and in every day menaions corresponded to the different status of this service. In cases where the Transfer of the Relics of St. Nicholas service was placed with the service to the prophet Isaiah and martyr Christopher (often in every-day Menaions of 15th century), we can see a doxological or polyeleos service, because they are easier to combine with other services. In cases where the Transfer of the Relics of St. Nicholas service was written out separately (in festal menaions, which were normally only contained in the Transfer of the Relics service, as well as some every-day menaions from 15th to early 17th centuries, where the service was already issued separately after the services to the prophet Isaiah and to the martyr Christopher) it represented only a vigil service. In this case, the missing hymns were borrowed to make the service a higher status (for example, the addition of lity with a cycle of "lity's" sticheras, taken from the "December" service, very often transformed the status of the service from polyeleos into vigil).

A status of a service, as has been said, depended mostly on the liturgical requirement. Consequently, it is impossible to trace the development of the service as a gradual increase of the status of the service from doxological to a vigil: We can find a doxological service even in manuscripts of 16th to 17th centuries, when the vigil service was not only known, but widespread.

One of the most stable elements of the service in the Transfer of the Relics of St. Nicholas is a cycle of sticheras on "Lord, I cry...". Variability characterizes sticheras on lity, sticheras on "Praises" and sticherons after "Glory…". Tracing the composition of functionally important elements, as well as sticheras on "Lord, I cry…", one can divide the services into micro-versions and trace their relationship to each other. One of the most important features of the modification of the Transfer of the Relics of St. Nicholas service is a canon (especially for

---

[21] Подробнее см.: *Легких В. И.* Службы на Преставление… С. 114 и далее.

the "vigil" service): the service can contain one or two canons, and the canon can be both original and borrowed[22].

Since the service initially consisted of hymns from the "December" cycle, the modifying process was not in the modification of already existing hymns, but in replacing them with original "May" hymns. These kinds of modifications were dependent on the liturgical traditions of certain areas, but were often made at the discretion of the transcriber. This fact entails the following difficulty: Since the references of typikons often sent us to the "December" hymns without incipits (for example, the most common reference "and sticheras on lity see December 6"), the composition of hymns could vary even within the same version, so there is almost no absolutely identical composition of the service. This is due, firstly, to the original service: Untranslated texts were modified much more often than translated ones; and secondly, the existing model – a Repose of St. Nicholas service. The hymns, borrowed from "December" service were interchangeable, reduced or added, even when the composition of original hymns of the "May" service was not changed. Later manuscripts, which contained early version of the service, include some more new hymns, which were not known at the time of the creation of the earlier version. Thus, the composition of sticheras differed in terms of which version of the "original" service a copyist had.

The principle of "mosaic" service is also very important for the study of services. The study of the service must distinguish a version of a service and a version of a hymn. It was a normal practice, when menaions contained only a reference to the "December" hymns instead of written out text, sometimes even without incipits, and when copying a service, copyists could access different types of books[23]. In this case, one version of a service could contain different versions of hymns. So one should take into account the fact that the corrected service may contain some "old" versions of the stichera, but it was not a result of conscious archaic modification of the service. In such cases, the micro-textology of hymns should be studied separately, since it has no influence on a version of a service in general.

The Transfer of the Relics of SS. Boris and Gleb service is taken as a second example.

The first mention of the memory of SS Martyrs Boris and Gleb (July, 24) was found in manuscripts of the end of the 11th to the beginning of the 12th century in calendars of Mstislav's Gospel (State Historical Museum Sinodalny coll., № 1203), in the service menaion (Russian State Archive of the oldest acts, Sinodalny Typography, № 121. Pp. 28 on. - 31) studion's Kondakar (State Tretyakov Gallery, -5349)[24]. The oldest cycle of liturgical hymns dedicated SS martyrs Boris and Gleb, was created at the end of the 11th to the beginning of the 12th Century.

---

[22] *Легких В. И.* Службы на Преставление… С. 139 и далее.
[23] Perhaps the copyists even log the chant from memory.
[24] См.: *Лосева О. В.* Русские месяцесловы XI – XIV веков. М., 2001. С. 92.

The earliest manuscripts, consisting this service are - the July menaion at the end of the 11th to the beginning of the 12th Century (Novgorod's origin) (Russian State Archive of the oldest acts F. 381. № 121. L. 28 on. - 31) and Kondakar studion of the same time (printing typikon) (State Tretyakov Gallery, № K-5349. L. 78).

The earliest mention of the service for the Transfer of the Relics of SS. Boris and Gleb (May,2) - a few sticheras in non-musical manuscript ofthe 14th Century. (Russian State Library Sofijsky f. 304 № 22), borrowed from the service on the 24th July. The second source from the 14th century – a Stirarios (RSL f. 113 № 3) – also contains a hymn from the service on July 24 [25]. Seregina dates back to the time of the two transfers of the relics (1072 and 1115) and creation of two services in the Transfer of the Relics of SS. martyrs. These services were not known throughout Russia, as in the case with the memory of SS. Martyrs Boris and Gleb (July, 24), but were local in character. Afterwards the two services merged into one – the service of the Transfer of the Relics of SS. Martyrs. Boris and Gleb on the 2nd of May[26].

The service for the Transfer of the Relics of Sts. Martyrs Boris and Gleb was created according to the Jerusalem typikon. It is supposed that the service was once corrected by Pachomius Logofet[27], and for this reason I follow Antonova, who divides versions of the service into "before Pahomius" and "Pahomius's" versions of the service[28]. I would prefer to talk about macro-versions, which are not as widely ditributed. Since "Pahomius's" chants were combined with older ones almost immediately, I also identify the "mixed" macro-version. The fourth macro-version, which I call "Mikhail's", demonstrates serious conscious modification, and the addition of new hymns, including a new canon, signed as "creation of a monk Mikhail"[29]. Thus, I have identified four macro-versions:

1) "before Pahomius"
2) "Pahomius's"
3) "Mixed"
4) "Mikhail's"

The first original hymns in the service was a cycle of sticherons for "Lord I cry…" to Prosomoion (προσόμοιον) "Rejoice ...". Initially the feast was local, gradually gaining more and more importance, such that the service undergoes a transformation from a sextic up to a

---

[25] *Серегина Н. С.* Песнопения русским святым… С. 93.
[26] *Серегина Н. С.* Песнопения русским святым… С. 78 – 80.
[27] This is a controversial point of view. Textual comparison of the services in the Memory of Sts. Martyrs Boris and Gleb and in the Transfer of the relics of Sts. strst. Boris and Gleb, shows that, most likely, they were corrected by one man, which we arbitrarily assume Pachomius Logofet . Since the textual comparison of all the services belonging Pachomius Logothete, is not considered in this article, conventionally I call one of the versions of the service "Pahomius's."
[28] *Антонова Е. В.* Службы Свв. Борису и Глебу...
[29] RNL, Pogodin's fond, № 431, Liturgical Miscellany, beginning of XVII в. P. 110 rev.

vigil. These modifications reflect the status of the service's transformation, so I feel justified in making the segregation on the grounds of the typikon.

One of the manuscripts of the first part of 16th century [30] illustrates the service completely made up of hymns, borrowed from the service to the memory of SS. Martyrs Boris and Gleb (July 24). There is not even an original cycle of sticherons for "Lord, I cry…" and the original Canon, which was present almost in all versions of the service in the Transfer of the Relics of SS. martyrs Boris and Gleb. At the time of writing, I know of only one manuscript that shows this kind of service, but despite the lack of any early manuscript of this version, I attribute it to the first, based on the composition of the service. The establishment of the feast could happen before the creation of the service, in which case the already well-known service would normally be used. Later a new original service was created based on the known one[31]. Such a scenario is possible also for a service for the Transfer of the Relics of SS. martyrs Boris and Gleb, and this manuscript is an indirect confirmation of this assumption. Early manuscripts from the 14th and 15th centuries and also some manuscripts from the 16th century often display a minimal composition of chants - the original cycle of sticherons for "Lord, I cry…" and the canon with a sedalen of 8th ton, borrowed from "July" service, known to me as "doxological before Pahomius" version. One can find also a single addition of original[32] or borrowed troparions and sticheras, taken from the general menaion. The minimal composition of the service, as well as ancient sessional hymn (sedalen), allows me to suggest that this version of the service first appeared after the entirely borrowed one. By the 15th century a mandatory part of the original hymns was formed: The cycle sticheras for "Lord, I cry", troparion, canon, kontakion and ikos. The missing hymns continued to borrow from the "July" service. The borrowed chants were also used to fulfill the requirement of raising the status of the service: a cycle of sticheras (or just one stichera for "Glory") on "Praises", borrowed from the "July" service, tranformed the service into a doxological one; borrowed sessional hymn of the 1st Ton "Измлада Христа възлюблеше купно, брата честна, и жизни нестарѣющиа въжделѣвши, славная…" ("You have loved Christ since your youth, pure brothers, and you have wished for unaging life, glorious ... ") performed by polieleos, transformed the service to the status of polyeleos.

"Pahomius's" macro-version of the service was also based on the "July" service. In the service in the Transfer of relics, the correction cannot be traced so uniformly as in the service to

---

[30] RNL, Kirillo-Belozersk's fond, № 400/657. Festal Menaion. Pp. 349 – 359 rev.

[31] A similar situation occurred with the establishment of the feast of transfer of the relics of St. Nicholas, as it was written above. For details see: *Легких В. И.* Службы на Преставление…

[32] I refer to the original all hymns written specifically for the new service and assigned to this service, regardless of whether they are really original or "up to date" borrowed chants.

the memory of SS. Boris and Gleb: There are many borrowings, and the modified "May" chants were combined with "July" ones.

At the same time it was still possible to have a service, consisting entirely of borrowed "July" hymns, which is confirmed by a 16th century manuscript of the in the Pogodin's archive of the RNL[33]. It is difficult to say what caused the rejection of the existing original "May" service. Perhaps the original service in the Transfer of the Relics was unknown in a particular places and the creator used the service on July 24. In any case, these cases confirm my assumption that in the absence of a new service for a feast, a service to the same saint could be used.

However, versions of the service, combining original and borrowed hymns, were more common. Borrowed chants could keep or change the location of the service (for example, on the great vespers sung sticheras on aposticha of 2nd ton "Домъ себѣ Духу Святому оцистивьше, тому и в нас жилище съдѣлаите, святии, молитвами вашими…" ("Prepare yourself as a home for the Holy Spirit, do the same dwelling in us, Saints, with your prayers ...", "Божественная и чюдная двоице, потребители прельсти и сиятеле благочестию, молитеся спастися душамъ нашимъ…"("The Divine and miraculous Dyad, exterminators of enticement shining of piety, pray for our souls to be saved ... "), "Пресвѣтлыя звѣзды явльшеся, непобѣдимии страдалци, озарите нас вѣрою... ""Most lucent stars come, invincible sufferers, illuminate us with your faith... " and stichera on "Glory" of 6th ton "Побѣждаеми желаниемь будущих, паче от млада възраста любьвѣ Христовы прилѣпишавшися и неправѣдное убииство от братоубиица прътерпѣвше…" ("Defeated of the future wishes, you cleaved in the love to Christ from your youth, endured the unjust murder of fratricide... "), written on a small vespers of "Pahomius's " version of the service on July 24). The cycle of sticheras for "Lord, I cry…" presented in the "before Pachomius" version, and canon with sedalen, kontakion and ikos remained as unchanged original chants.

In summary:

In the study of a service, following the typikon of Jerusalem, one of the most important categorizing features is based on the status of a service, be it sextic, doxological, polyeleos and vigils. Each category reflects the degree of reverence for the service and sometimes, with increasing status of service, a geographical spread and an increasing commitment of the feast can be observed.

Russian services were created by the existing canon. This could be either a shared services or Reverend Hierarchs, Martyr etc., and specific service saints, often Byzantine. Usually

---

[33] RNL, Pogodin's fond, № 571. Pp. 20 – 31. n this version of all the hymngs, except for the first svetilen, are borrowed from the "July" service.

the services of the same rank of the saints were used, but singing hymns from the services of saints of another rank could also be taken as a model. More recent services could be based on the model of services honoring Russian saints. In the case of an already famous saint, the existing service to this saint becomes a model for a new one.

The Transfer of the Relics of St. Nicholas service was written after the introduction of the feast. At the beginning the service in Repose of St. Nicholas, which later became a model for a new service, was used also for a new feast.

Since the service was initially consisted of hymns in the "December" cycle, the modification process was not in the emendation of already existing hymns, but in replacing them with original "May" chants. These kinds of changes were dependent on the liturgical traditions of certain areas, but were often left to the discretion of the transcriber. The service was modified many times, chants were added, replaced each other, and so on. The borrowed hymns made up for the missing ones. Since typicons gave often references to the "December" chants without incipits, the composition of hymns could vary even within the same version.

The Transfer of the Relics of SS. martyrs Boris and Gleb service was created following the Jerusalem typicon, and it is assumed that the originator of one of the versions of the service was Pachomius Logofet. I have identified four macro-versions:

1) "before Pahomius"

2) "Pahomius's"

3) "Mixed"

4) "Mikhail's"

Some versions were still entirely from hymns taken from the "July" service, but in the 14th century original version "May" chants appeared: Stichiras on "Lord, I have cried ..." and a canon.

"Pahomius's" macro-version of the service was based on the "July" service. In the "May" service, a correction can not be traced so uniformly as in the "July" one: There were a lot of borrowings and the modified "May" chants were combined with "July" ones.

Even with the almost universal distribution of original hymns, a version consisting entirely of chants the "July" cycle was still possible. It is difficult to say what caused the rejection of the existing original "May" service. Perhaps, the original service for the Transfer of the Relics was unknown in particular places, and the creator used the service on July 24. In any case, these cases confirm my assumption that in the absence of a new service for a feast, a service to the same saint could be used.

However, versions of the service, combining original and borrowed hymns, were more common. Borrowed chants could keep or change the location of the service. The cycle of

sticheras for "Lord, I cry…" presented in the "before Pachomius" version, and canon with sedalen, kontakion and ikos remained as unchanged original chants.