Patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos: A Comparison of the Textual Versions of his Canon to St. Nicholas
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This work is dedicated to the comparison of the versions of the canon to St. Nicholas authored by the patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos. It is based on two manuscripts, and historiographic analysis and a codicological and palaeographic inspection carried out on one of the two are central to the project.

It should be emphasized how important it was to study the original manuscript, which was written by the patriarch himself: it represents his autograph. Thus the object of this paper is the author’s edition of the canon. The collation results in an edition of Philotheus’ own text, which is a unique window into the creative method of the patriarch-liturgist.

Kokkinos’ canon to St. Nicholas was chosen as the object of study chiefly because of a relative lack of research on this text, as well as in the light of the absence of a critical edition. In Russian scholarship a lot of work has been devoted to St. Nicholas. That work, however, has not addressed patriarch

1 A. A. Dmitrievsky, Описание литургических рукописей, хранящихся в библиотеках православного Востока II (Kiev 1901); N. F. Krasnoseltsev, Материалы для истории чинопоследования литургии святого Иоанна Златоустого (Kazan 1889) 34; I. D. Mansvetov, Церковный устав (Типик), его образование и судьба в греческой и русской Церкви (Moscow 1885) 195; T. I. Afanasieva, “К вопросу о редакциях славянского перевода Диатаксиса Божественной литургии патриарха Филофея Коккина,” “Слова и золота взь…”. Сборник статей памяти В. М. Зографина (Moscow 2012) 67–85; Filaret Gumilevsky, Исторический обзор песнопевцев и песнопений греческой церкви 3-е изд (St. Petersburg 1902) 370; G. M. Prokhorov, “К истории
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Philotheus’ canon.

A large portion of the patriarch’s hymns are in the form of a canon. This strongly suggests that in Philotheus’ oeuvre the canon of St. Nicholas would hold a prominent place, for in this particular case he had an opportunity to draw parallels between the confrontation between St. Nicholas and Arius and his own conflict with Nikephoros Gregoras and the anti-Palamites.

The major researchers of Philotheus’ liturgical works, such as J. Goar, G. M. Prokhorov, H. G. Beck, and P. Trembela, make only passing mention of the canon to St. Nicholas, so a critical analysis of it is not offered in their discussions. Apparently, this is because authorial manuscripts uniquely from the patriarch’s pen are in depositories in Russia and so are unknown to most researchers.

A word should be said about the important role and contributions of Ecumenical patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos. In his life (1300–1377/8), he authored more than a hundred works—

2 Prokhorov, ТОДРЛ 27 (1972) 126.
4 J. Goar, Εὐχολόγιον, sive rituale Graecorum (Venice 1730).
7 П. Тремпелас, Αἱ τρεῖς λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Αθήναις κώδικας (Athens 1982) 1–16.
liturgics, homiletics, dogmatics, and hagiography. In addition he codified the rules of Eucharistic and Vesper services that determined the spiritual trajectory of the Orthodox world for more than two hundred years.

The patriarch’s writings survive in manuscripts of the third quarter of the fourteenth century and later. The greater part of his work reflects the strife between the Hesychasts and the supporters of the humanistic thinking that took place across the years 1330 to 1360. Not all of Philotheus’ manuscripts have a firm attribution. Some however are identified, preserved in collections mainly in Italy (the Vatican Library, for example), as well as in Austria, the UK, and other countries.

In her dissertation of 1992 on the poetic works of Philotheus Kokkinos, Petrula Kourtesidou published the canon to St. Nicholas. Her text was based on the paper codex Val.gr. 1531, held in the Vatican Library; Ciro Gianelli had produced a description of this manuscript in 1950. This description however gave only the first line and the canon’s location on folios 47v–60v. He proposed the sixteenth century as his estimate of the date. Kourtesidou (13) judged that the larger part of the manuscript was copied in the fifteenth century, and only a few sheets date later in the sixteenth.

Gianelli did not take note of two other codices that contain the canon to St. Nicholas of Philotheus Kokkinos: one in the Patriarchal Library in Constantinople Hagia Trias 107 and one in the State Historical Museum in Moscow (GIM) Vlad. 431.

With regard to Hagia Trias 107, thanks to the new catalogue

9 Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit no. 11917
10 B. L. Fonkich, “Автографы константинопольского патриарха Филофея Коккина,” Российский Православный университет св. Иоанна Богослова. Ученые записки. Вып. 5 Исследования по византинистике и неогрэйскому языкознанию (Moscow 2000) 59–86.
of the manuscripts of the monastery of the Holy Trinity on the island of Halki, it is now known that it was written on paper in the third quarter of fourteenth century and that some folios were added in the fourteenth (ff. 210v–214v) and the fifteenth centuries (ff. 89v–92v). In 1956 a short description of this codex was published by Archimandrite Emilian Tsakopoulos. It was impossible to perform a close study of this manuscript, hence its exclusion from the present paper; a comparison of the three versions is planned for the future by the author of the present study.

The other manuscript, Vlad. 431, also known as Sinodal gr. 349, is an excellent collection of liturgical and dogmatic essays by various authors. It should be emphasized that most of these essays are liturgical works composed by the patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos. As to the history of this codex, it was presumably composed in the Vatopedi monastery on Mt Athos. The hypothesis of composition in Constantinople and its later transfer to Athos is also possible, but there are no facts to confirm it. The codex was in the Vatopedi library until 1654, when the monk and builder of the Trinity-Sergius Monastery Arseny Sukhanov transferred it. Since 1655, it has been in the Patriarchal (Synodal) Library in Moscow. In 1894, thanks to Archimandrite Vladimir, who was the first to systematically describe the Greek manuscripts in the Synodal Collection, the Sin. Graecus 349 received a new number and became Vlad. 431.

14 A. Tsakopoulos, Περιγραφικός κατάλογος τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς Βιβλιοθήκης τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχείου Π Τμήμα χειρογράφων Ι. Μονῆς Αγ. Τριώδους Χάλκης (İstanbul 1956) 118–119.
16 S. Belokurov, Арсений Суханов. Часть первая (Moscow 1891) 326–335.
After the October Revolution of 1917, the codex was transferred to the department of manuscripts and early printed books of the State Historical Museum founded in 1883 as part of the collection of the Moscow Synodal Library (Synodal Collection).

To return to the codicological analysis of this manuscript: it is on fairly thick cream-colored paper, corroded in many places. A few watermarks of the following types can be found (as per the Briquet catalogue): “Bell” no. 3940 (year 1355), “Lily” no. 6751 (year 1344/62), and “Fruit” no. 7397 (year 1361). The codex has 269 folios and a format of 206 × 147 mm. It is dated to the years 1330 to 1360. All book sections are quarterions. The number of lines varies from 23 to 27. The signatures by the scribe’s hand were made in the lower right corner of the first folio. However, during the replacement of the old leather binding, signatures were cut out, and only one has survived: the signature η on folios 43 and 50v. On some leaves of the manuscript, in the upper central part are signatures by its later owners, for example: ιβ on 12/19v, ιγ on 20 and 27v.

The scribes of the fourteenth century used ink in a palette from dark and light brown to black. Headlines and initials are mostly made with brick-red ink, as on folios 3, 6, 12, 14v, 31, 40, etc. The illustrations are missing. Extensive marginal notes, which occupy the entire area of the margins, are found on folios 123v, 124, 147, and 158.

The late-18th century binding is made of cardboard and is covered with imitation leather, with no embossing.

As Boris Fonkich has shown,17 Vlad. 431 is in fact an autograph of Philotheus Kokkinos and can be included in the list of manuscripts containing the patriarch’s hand: Vind. Theol. gr. 168, Vind. Theol. gr. 201, GIM 257, Marc. gr. 582 (coll. 926), Iviron 4710 (590), and Monac. gr. 508. All these date to the third quarter of the fourteenth century. In these manuscripts, the patriarch

17 Fonkich, in Российский Православный 59–86.
made notes on a range of topics, and did textual editing in his own hand. *Vlad.* 431 contains the largest number of his notes, as he was correcting grammatical and/or lexical mistakes made by other scribes.

Some years ago a handwriting examination was conducted on this material that contains Philotheos’ autograph. This revealed features of his script such as strict verticality of letters, the characters θ and N closely adjoined to the vertical line of writing in their upright elements, and unusual ligatures in λο and ρφ.\(^\text{18}\)

The results of the present study indicate that the codex *Vlad.* 431 should have been the key foundation for an *editio princeps* of the author’s text of the canon to St. Nicholas.

The manuscript is also interesting in that, in addition to the patriarch’s handwritten text, eight scribes took part in its creation. Of these the main scribe was apparently closest to the patriarch. This is indicated by that scribe’s use of the first person plural for one of the prayers when he refers to the patriarch: εἴπομεν, εἰσήλθομεν (“we said,” “we entered”). This confirms the hypothesis that he copied this text from the original, presumably having access to the personal notes of the patriarch, to which other scribes did not. For example, the fifth scribe transcribes the text of the same prayer a few lines below in the third person singular: εἶπεν, εἰσήλθεν (“he said,” “he entered”).

The title of the canon is given as Τοῦ αὐτοῦ κανώνας εἰς τὸν ἐν ἀγίον πατέρα ἡμῶν Νικόλαου οὗ ἢ ἀκροστίχος ἢ τοῦ θερμόν ἡμῶν προστάτην καὶ πατέρα. Ἐν δὲ τοῖς θεοτοκίοις Φιλόθεος: “His canon to our Holy Father Nicholas with acrostic ‘our fervent defender and father’: in the hymns in praise of the Virgin Mary, Philotheus.”\(^\text{19}\)

In composing the canon the patriarch relied on the tradition

\(^{18}\) Fonkich, *Российский Православный* 59–86.

\(^{19}\) In quoting from the manuscript for the purpose of this paper, I give its actual readings and accents, without emendation.
and models of authorities for liturgical poetry such as St. Andrew of Crete, St. John of Damascus, St. Cosmas of Maiuma, St. Theodore the Studite, and others.

In the troparia of the canon to St. Nicholas, Philotheus makes profuse references to Old Testament and New Testament narratives. For example, "Εγώ σε ἐκ μήτρας, θεοφόρε, ὁ πάντα γινώσκων θεός πρὸ τοῦ πλασθήναι ἐν κοιλίᾳ ἁγιάζει, "He had knowledge of you from the womb, God-bearer, the all-knowing God before form was taken in the body made you holy” (Jeremiah 1:5). Furthermore, βέλος ὄξυ εἰς καρδίας πεμπόμενον may be evocative of Ps 10:3, ὅτι ἰδοὺ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐνέτειναν τόξον, ἠτοίμασαν βέλη εἰς φαρέτραν τοῦ κατατοξέυσαι ἐνσκοτόμην τοὺς εὐθείς τῇ καρδίᾳ, “For, lo, the wicked have bent their bow; they have prepared their arrows in the quiver, to shoot in the dark the upright of heart.”

At the end of the seventh song, Philotheus inserts an Introduction (hairétismos) which is traditionally included in the Akathistos as part of the oikos: Χαίρε τοῦ κόσμου χαρᾷ παρθένε χαίρε, “Hail, joy of the world, Virgin, hail.”

As a rule, if the canon is read at Matins, burning of incense on the altar takes place after the eighth song, as well as the performance of the Theotokos Song Μεγαλόνει ἡ ψυχή μου τῶν Κύριον, “My soul doth magnify the Lord,” along with the refrain Τὴν τιμωτέραν τῶν Χερουβίμ, “More honored than the Cherubim.” In the canon to St. Nicholas, Philotheus replaces the Theotokos Song with the following: "Όλον με καταπέσοντα θεοτόκε καὶ συντρίπτοντα τὸ κατ’ εἰκόνα ὁ θεὸς δι’ ἐλέουν ὅλον σώζει ἀναλαβόν ἐκ γαστρός σου ὅλον, δέσποινα, τὸν ἀνθρωπον διὸ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς μεγίστης σε σωτηρίας ἢ κτίσης πάσω δοξάζουσα εὐλογεῖ τὸν τόκον τὸν σὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας, “O Theotokos, God saves me who was in my entirety fallen and had shattered my likeness (to God), by taking up from your womb, o Lady, the entire man;

20 V. Rozanov, Βογολογισμικός άλλος τοιοοκλεινής. Επίπτωμα ζητομετοχιστικού άνθρωπού τοιοοκλεινής Θεολογικής Τεχνίτης (Moscow 1902) 79–80.
so the creation glorifies you with love as the cause of the
greatest deliverance and blesses your child for eternity.” From
this deviation we can conclude that the canon to St. Nicholas
was not intended to be read at Matins.

Regarding the use of tropes, we can notice a most extensive
use of metaphors (σκότος τοῦ θανάτου, γλυκὸ περιλάλημα,
λαμπρὰ γενέθλια), epithets (θείος, ύψιστος, μέτριος, ταπεινός,
ἄβτητος, πράος) and, to a lesser extent, hyperboles (Ἕν γὴν
πᾶσαν διαβαίνοντα, ἡ γῆ πᾶσα συμφώνως καὶ ἡ θάλασσα τὰ
θαύματα ἄνακηρύττει σοῦ), as well as figurative comparisons (ὡς
μέγα στοιχεῖον, ὡς ποιμήν φιλάνθρωπος, ὡς Μωσῆς).

The grammatical component of the canon to St. Nicholas is
not more complex than its lexicality, but at the same time it has
several interesting features. The construction of temporal per-
spective is fundamental: the author makes extensive use of
modifiers of time, of various morphological types, such as verbs
in personal form, verbal participles, participles, and preposi-
tional-nominal constructions. For example, Τὴν δόξαν σοῦ
ἥμειν ἄξιος τὸς δύναται ὡς Μωσῆς ἐφάνης γὰρ ὅλος δεδοξασμένος
has three subjects and one of them has two verbs: continuous
time is succeeded by specific and vivid time.

Through comparison of these two manuscripts of the canon,
Vat.gr. 1531 and Vlad. 431, clear differences begin to reveal
themselves. In the patriarch’s autograph, the second ode of the
canon is absent. The completed acrostichis of the canon pre-
sented in Vlad. 431 is sure evidence that the canon never had a
second ode. By contrast, in Vat.gr. 1531 the canon begins as
follows: Καταβασία. Ωἰδῆ δεύτερη. Ἄπορῳ γλᾷττη καὶ κεῖλεσιν
ἐγκώμιον βραχὺ καὶ παράκλησιν προσοισων τῇ σῇ. Νικόλαε,
“Katabasis. Second song. Let us offer you a short panegyric
and prayer with our poor tongue and lips, Nicholas.” Thus it is
possible to deduce that we are dealing with two or more ver-
sions of the same canon, or two completely different canons to
St. Nicholas, with alternate odes, which is a regular occurrence
in the liturgical manuscripts.

A passage of Vat.gr. 1531 missing in Vlad. 431 ends as follows:
Χῆρες τὸν τρόφεα, οἱ τυφλοί τὸν ὀδηγόν, πάντες τὸν πρόμαχον, “The
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widows <magnify> the nurturer, the blind the guide, and all men the champion." After that, a passage shared by both manuscripts immediately begins: Τὴν χάριν ὀλην τοῦ πνεύματος, “All the grace of the spirit.” But in Vlad. 431 this part is called ὡδὴ ἀ’ ἤχος ἀ’ (first song, first tune), while the Vatican manuscript continues after πάντες τὸν πρόμαχον without any title.

The third song in the Vatican codex is significant for its length. It begins with the hirmos τῷ πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, “before all ages,” followed by a set of three troparia that begin with λελύτας κατάρα, “the curse be destroyed,” and end with σῶσαι τοὺς ὑμοῦντάς σε, “save those who pray to you.” After this, a theotokion was read. After the theotikion comes another set of three troparia, which is absent in author’s manuscript. The first verse of the first troparion is Δέλτον ἐν καρδίᾳ κεκτημένος, “One who has acquired a writing-tablet in his heart.” The last troparion of the group ends μὴ ἀδικῆσαι τοὺς ἀνδρας εἰκῆ φθόνοι διεβλῆθησον, “do not injure the men who were slandered by vain envy.” Immediately after this, a passage common to both manuscripts is composed of four troparia, beginning Ἐγνω σε ἐκ μήτρας, θεοφόρε. “He had knowledge of you from the womb, o God-bearing.” Then in the Moscow manuscript begins the fourth song, while in the Vatican it is followed by other troparia, a sessional hymn, and a theotokion.

In general, it should be emphasized that Vlad. 431 presents a shorter version of the canon, compared with that in the Vatican manuscript. Most of of the hirmoi, troparia, and sessional hymns are absent from the Moscow codex, and after the sixth song there are no kontakia with oikos and no life history with miracles. After the ninth song, only the word συνέλθωμεν is written instead of an exapostilarion (which is probably a reference to the eighth exapostilarion Τοῖς μοθητοῖς συνέλθωμεν). By contrast, in the Vatican manuscript published by Kourtessidou there is a full exapostilarion Ὁ οὐρανὸν τοῖς ἄστροις.

Another point of interest is the note inscribed by the fourth (main) scribe of the Moscow codex at the very end of the canon: συνέλθωμεν ὑμνοὺς ἐν θεοῖς οἱ γράφοντες ἑπιστήμην
"Let us come together, those who compose hymns to the Divine, and conjointly adhering to all logic and knowledge let us hymn radiantly the only beginning and cause of hymns, those who compose every kind of laud for the Virgin.”

In the Vatican codex this text is absent and at the end of the canon is a sticheron of the first mode (τῶν οὐρανίων) and gloria with prosoimion (σαλπίσωμεν ἐν).

As to significant compositional differences, the vocabulary of the two texts is generally identical. An exception is the substitution of the word πνεύμα in the gloria of the third song of the canon in Vlad. 431 for πάτηρ (accent as in the manuscript) in the Vatican codex. And the word order in the seventh song has been changed: Vlad. 431 reads Ἡ γῆ πᾶσα συμφώνως καὶ ἡ θάλασσα, “the whole land in unison and the sea,” while the Vatican version has Ἡ γῆ πᾶσα καὶ ἡ θάλασσα συμφώνως, “the whole land and the sea in unison.”

In conclusion, the following observations can be made. On the basis of the comparison of the versions of the canon to St. Nicholas in the two manuscripts, two possible scenarios of regarding the amplification of the text can be hypothesized. The first would assume that the Vat.gr. additions to the author’s text might have been made by another, unknown writer. The second would hold that patriarch Philotheus himself authored these additions but the surviving autograph gives us only the original and shorter version. The first scenario seems more plausible, since the codex Vat.gr. 1531, with its enlarged version of the canon, dates to the 15th–16th centuries, made almost two centuries after the patriarch’s death. This scenario seems consistent with the manuscript studied by Kourtesidou, which does not show any trace of authorial corrections or text-editing by Philotheus’ collaborators.

We present here the canon to St. Nicholas by Patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos as it stands in the manuscript Vlad. 431, scribe’s orthography and accents left unedited:
καὶ ἡμι οἱ· ἠχος α· Χριστὸς γεννάται
Τήν χάριν ὀλην τοῦ πνεύματος
πυρίνην ὠςπερ γλώσσαν δεξάμενος
Χριστὸν ἱεράρχα κάθαρον
γλώσσαν τε καὶ καρδίαν σῶν ὑμνώδῶν
ὅπως σου τὴν μνήμην
ἀνυμνήσωμεν φαίδρως πάτερ Νικόλαε.

Ὀ μέγας ὁρτι Νικόλαος,
ποιμήν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὁ κράτιστος,
ποιμένας ὡμοῦ καὶ ποιμνία
πόσαν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν λαμπρῶς καλεῖ.

Δεῦτε συνελθόντες,
ὅς κοινῶ πατρί λαμπρῶς πανηγυρίσωμεν.

Νικᾶ τὰ σὰ κατορθώματα,
καὶ λόγους, καὶ τὰ πράγματα, μέγιστε,
διὸ τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν πρόθεσιν
δέχου μετ᾽ εὐμενείας μόνην ἡμῶν.

Τὸ γὰρ πρὸς ἀξίαν
ὕμνους πλέκειν σοι σοφὲ πάσιν ἀδύνατον.

Θερμὸς προστάτης Νικόλαε,
ὁράθης τῶν πιστῶς δεομένων σου,
θερμὸς δὲ πολλοῖς αὐτόκλητος
ὁρθῆς σωτήρ καὶ ῥύστης, ὠςπερ θεὸς
φθάνων τὰς αἰτήσεις
τῶν πιστῶν περιουσία ἀγαθότητος.

Θεοτοκίον Φαιδρῶς προέρχεται ἥλιος,
ἐκ πύλης κεκλεισμένης φαίνομενος,
ἡ νύξ ἐμφανῶς προέκοψεν,
ἡγιείν ἡ ἡμέρα. Φύσις βροτῶν
δέχου τὸν δεσπότην
ἐκ παρθένου διὰ σὲ βροτὸν γενόμενον.

ὁδὴ γ᾽ τῷ πρὸ τῶν αἰῶνων
"Εγνώ σε ἐκ μήτρας,
θεοφόρε, ὁ πάντα γινώσκων θεός·
πρὸ τοῦ πλασθῆναι ἐν κοιλίᾳ ἀγιάζει σε πλάστην
ψυχῶν καὶ ποιμένα μέγιστον.
"Ωςπερ τῷ Πέτρῳ πιστεύων καὶ σοὶ
tὸ οἰκείων ποιμνιον.
Ῥάβδῳ ἔγκρατείας
tὸν παθὼν μάκαρ σχίσας τὴν θάλασσαν,
ὡς Μουσῆς τῆς ἀπαθείας εἰς τὸ ὄρος ἀνήλθες,
λαβὼν νοητῶς τὰς πλάκας δὲ
tὴν ἐκκλησίαν παιδεύεις Χριστοῦ
νόμον τὸν ἐν πνεύματι.
Μέτριος ἐφάνης,
tαπεινός τε καὶ πρᾶος Νικόλαε.
'Οθεν τοῦ πνεύματος ἡ χάρις δανιλῶς ἐκχυθεῖσα
ἐν σοῖ· μέγιστον ἀνέδειξε
ταῖς τῶν θαυμάτων ἀκτίστι τὴν γην
πᾶσαν διαβαίνοντα.
'Ολον τῷ δεσπότῃ
σεαυτὸν ἐκ παιδὸς ἀφιέρωσας
καὶ πνεύμα ὅλος ἐτελέσθης, ἀποστάς ἔλος κόσμου,
διὸ τῶν τοῦ κόσμου ρύσαι με
σκανδάλων ὅλον σωφὲ καὶ Θεῶ
ὅλον καθερωσον.
Θεοτοκίοιν Ἰσχυρὸς δυνάστης
σαρκωθεῖς ὁ Θεὸς νῦν ἐφισταται.
Οἱ ἐν τῷ σκότει τοῦ θανάτου φῶς θεάσασθε μέγα
Χριστὸν ἐν σημαίῳ μέλλονται
ἐκ τῆς παρθένου γεννάσθαι φρικτῶς
ἡν πιστῶς ὑμνήσωμεν.

'όδη δ' ῥάβδος ἐκ τῆς ρίζας
Νόμοις ἐκ μοχῶν τῶν μητρικῶν
ὕπεκυψας τοῦ πνεύματος,
νόμους σαρκὸς ὑπερβάς, ὁσιε.
'Ο νόμος ὅθεν ἐν σοί
καὶ πρὸ ὃρας τέθηκεν,
ὅντως ὁ δεινὸς τῆς ἀμαρτίας
διὸ ἐδόθης πιστοῖς
θείος νομοθέτης Νικόλαε.

"Ὑπνὸν ὕφθαλμοῖς καὶ νυσταγμῶν
βλεφάροις σοῖς οὐκ ἐδοκας,
ἐσος οὐ εὔρες τόπον ἄξιον.
Τῷ πάντων δημιουργῷ
πάτερ τὴν καρδιὰν σου
ἡν καὶ καθαρθείσαν ἐπαξίως
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ἀνέδειξεν ἑαυτοῦ
σκήνωμα τῆς δόξης ὁ υψιστος.
Μέγιστα βραβεία πρὸς Θεοῦ
καὶ δόξαν κομισάμενος
ὕπερ τῶν πόνων τῶν μεγάλων σου.
Μεγάλων πάντας παθῶν
καὶ κινδύνων λύτρωσαι
tους προβαλλομένους σὲ μεσίτην
καὶ πρεσβευτὴν πρὸς Χριστὸν,
μάκαρ συμπαθῆ καὶ ὦξύτατον.
Νέκρωσον τὸ φρόνημα, σοφὲ,
σαρκὸς μου τὸ δυσήνιον
tà τὴν πρὸς τὸ θείον ἐχθραν δέομαι,
ὡς δυνατὸς ἀνελὼν
καὶ τοῖς νόμοις ὄλον με
καθυποβαλὼν καλὸς ἐκείνου
καὶ δούλον δεῖξας Χριστοῦ
tὸν δεδουλωμένον τοῖς πάθεσιν.
Θεοτόκιον Λύτρωσιν ἀπέσταλεν ἱδὼν
ὁ κύριος ὡς γέγραπται
λαοὶς φυλαίς καὶ γλῶσσαις σήμερον·
λαὸν καὶ γὰρ ἐστιν οὐτοῦ
πάντας ἀπεργάζεται
ένα τοὺς ἐν πίστει προσκυνοῦντας,
tὴν σάρκωσιν τοῦ οὐιου
cαὶ σὲ Θεοτόκον κηρύττοντας.

ॐ ἐ ν ἡ ἐ ν Ἑ πίρηνη
Ὡς μέγας ὁ πλούτος τῶν σῶν οἰκτίρμῶν
ἀνεφάνη τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἠμετρός.
Ἡ χύσις τοῦ ἐλέους σου
θεράπων τοῦ Χριστοῦ
σὺ γὰρ τοῖς δεομένοις
tὸ ὄντα διανέμοιν
καὶ αὐτοὺς ἔσποιδαζες,
μάκαρ λανθάνειν τοὺς λαμβάνοντας.
Πραότης καὶ ξέλος ὁμοῦ ἄκραυφνῆς
tὴν καρδίαν τὴν σὴν ἀπειργάσαντο
οἰκεῖον ἑνδιαίτημα
cοφὲ ὑπερφυώς.
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Πάτριάρχης Φιλοθέως Κόκκινος

Σὺ γὰρ τῶν ἐναντίων
τὴν ἐνωσίν ἐδέξω
μαχητὴς ἀήττητος
ὑπὲρ τοῦ πνεύματος γενόμενος.

Ῥομφαία ὀράθης καὶ βέλος ὦ
εἰς καρδίας πεμπόμενον - ἐνδοξε
ἐξ θρόνον τοῦ τῶν ἀπάντων
βεσπλέως καὶ Θεοῦ εἰδώλων καὶ δαμόνων
αιρέσεων ἀτόπων
τὰς ψυχὰς εὐφραίνων δὲ
tῶν ἐκζητοῦντων σου τὸν κύριον.

Ὁ μέγας ποιμὴν τῶν ἀπάντων Χριστός,
tῶν προβάτων σε μᾶκαρ ἀνέδειξε
ποιμένα καὶ διδάσκαλον
αὐτοῦ τῶν λογικῶν,
διὸ πλανώμενόν με
εἰς ὅρη ἀπωλείας
ὡς ποιμὴν φιλάνθρωπος
τὸ σὸν ἐκ ζήτησιν νῦν πρόβατον.

Θεοτοκίον Ὅ μέγας ἀνθρώπων ποιμὴν καὶ σωτὴρ
ἐκ παρθένου ὡς ἀνθρώπως ἔρχεται,
tεχθὴν διὰ πέλαγος
ἀφάτων οἰκτιρμῶν
σπήλαιον ἑτοιμάζον,
pοιμένης ἀγροκολούντες
τὴν κοινὴν ἀνάκλησιν
εὐαγγελίζεσθε τοῖς πέρασιν.

ὡδὴ στ’ σπλάγχνων ίωνᾶν
Σὺ τῶν ὀρφανῶν ὄντως ἐχρημάτισας
πατήρ καὶ χηρῶν προστάτης ἐνδοξε
τῶν νοσοῦντων τε καὶ ἐν λύπαις ἡδίστη ἀνάψυξις.
Ἱστρός παθὼν ψυχῆς ὁμοῦ καὶ σώματος
Ὅθεν καὶ κοινὴ προσσφέργονται
καὶ καλοῦσι σου πάντες τὸ ὅνομα.

Τύπος καὶ κανὼν σοφὲ κυβερνήσεως
ψυχῶν ἄγαθοῖς ποιμέσι γέγονας.
Πρεσβυτέρον δὲ εὐταξία καὶ κόσμος ἐξαίρετος
μελωδῶν ἡ συνεχὴς ὄντως πανήγυρις
πάσης ἐκκλησίας κάλλιστον
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καὶ φαϊδρόν καὶ γλυκὸν περιλάλημα.

'Ανδρές μονασταὶ συγχαίρουσι σήμερον ἢμίν τῷ πατρὶ συνεορτάζοντες
συμφονοῦσι γὰρ καὶ συνάδουσιν ἄματα πρόσφορα ἀκριβείας ἀσκηταὶ καὶ τῆς ἀπλότητος
πάντες τὸν κοινὸν ὑμνοῦσι σε καὶ προστάτην ὁμοῦ καὶ διδάσκαλον.

Τέκνον μομητὸν ἐγὼ μόνος γέγονα πάθεσιν αἰσχροῖς, ὅντως ἀνάξιος
tῆς καλλίστης σου καὶ τερπνῆς πανηγύρεως ἐνδοξὲ.
Ἀλλὰ σὺ περιελὼν μου τὴν αἰσχρότητα
πάτερ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀνάδειξον δαιτυμόνα τοῦ δείπνου σου ᾗζιον.

Θεοτοκίον Θαῦμα τὸ παρὸν θαυμάτων ἐπέκεινα καὶ λόγου καὶ νοῦ παντὸς ἀνότερον
καὶ παρθένος γὰρ ἡ αὐτὴ νῦν καὶ μητὴρ γνωρίζεται καὶ τὸ γέννημα Θεὸς ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπος.
τοῦτο τὰ λαμπρὰ γενέθλια προτελοῦντες κροτοῦμεν χαρμόσυνα.

ὡδή ζ’ οἱ παιδεῖς εὐσεβεία Ἡ γῆ πᾶσα συμφώνως καὶ ἡ θάλασσα
πάτερ τὰ θαύματα ἀνακηρύττει σου.
Καὶ γὰρ ὃ σὺς φθόγγος ἐξελήλυθὲν εἰς τὰ πέρατα διδάσκον ψάλλειν ἄπαντας
ὁ τῶν πατέρων Θεός εὐλογητὸς εἰ.

Νυμφίος ὁ ὀραῖος ὑπὲρ πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὡς γέγραπται τῆς νύμφης μάκαρ
tῆς αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίας ὧραίωτατον σὲ ἀνέδειξα, νυμφίον τούτο φέροντα
tους χαρακτήρας τρανῶς καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα.

Κοσμήσας σου τὸν βίον συμπαθεία σοφὲ καὶ προάτη καὶ τῇ ἄγαπῃ
tῇ λαμπρά μιμητῆς ἐφανὴς ἀριστος
tοῦ ποιμένος τοῦ καλοῦ ἄναμμαχον
tας ἰδικὰς ἀρετὰς καλῶς ἐκεῖνον.

Ἀδίκου καταδίκης καὶ θανάτου
χαλεποῦ ὡς ἔσωσας τρεῖς ἄνδρας πάλαι καὶ ἡμᾶς τοῦ τριπλοῦ θανάτου λύτρωσαι

KSENIIA S. MORUGINA
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πάθη πάτερ χαλεπά ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος καὶ πειρασμοῦς ἀνελὼν τοὺς τῶν δαιμόνων.

Θεοτοκίον Ἡ ἔσποτης ἐν σπηλαίῳ τεχθῆναι ώς ἄνθρωπος· προσπαντήσωμεν πιστοὶ τῇ παρθένῳ προβαλλόμενοι· τὸν πατέρα τῆς χαράς ἐξαρχὸν ψάλλοντες. Χαίρε τοῦ κόσμου χαρά παρθένε χαίρε.

ὁδὴ ἡ θαῦματος ὑπερφυώς Ἡθυνόν τῇ κυβερνήσει σου τὸ σκάφος σοῦ δεόμεθα τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὸ ἵστον κοῦφισον τοῖς ἀνέμοις τοῖς νοητοῖς καὶ τῷ κλύδωνι γενναίῳ ἐπιτίμησον καὶ ῥύσαι παντοίῳ κινδυνεύουσαι ὁσπερ πάλαι πλοτήρας πάτερ διέσωσας ἐπὶ τοῦ πελάγους σωτὴρ φανεὶς θρώως.

Πέπτωκε τα εἴδωλα πάτερ τῆς πλάνης σοῦ τῷ ρήματι μόνῳ τῆς γλώττης τοῦ Ἀρείου ἀἵρεσις, φρούδος ὄρθη σαίς διδαχαίς, ἀδικίαι ἐκ τοῦ μέσου σὺ πεποίηκας διὸ καὶ τὴν ποίμνην σου διέσωσας εὐλογεῖτο ἡ κτίσις πάσα τὸν κύριον καὶ ὑπερψώντοι βοῶσαν εἰς αἰῶνας.

Ἀρρητὸς ἡ σῇ φιλοτεκνία πάτερ, ὑπερβαίνουσα πατρικὸν φίλτρον, μητρικὴν συμπάθειαν σχέσιν πάσαν τὴν φυσικὴν διὰ τοῦτο καὶ αὐτοκλήτος ἐφίστασαι. Φρουρῶν γρηγοροῦντας καὶ καθεύδοντας σωτηρίαν ἕμιν εὐαγγελιζόμενος διδοὺς ἱλαρῶς μετ᾽ εὐχων σοφὲ τὴν χείρα.

Θεοτοκίον Ἡ ὀλον με καταπεσόντα θεοτόκε καὶ συντρίγαντα τὸ κατ᾽ εἰκόνα ὁ Θεὸς δι’ ἔλεον ὀλον σωζεὶ ἀναλαβόν ἐκ γαστρὸς σου ὀλον, δέσποινα, τὸν ἄνθραπον διὸ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς μεγίστης σε σωτηρίας ἡ κτίσις πόθω δοξάζουσα εὐλογεῖ τὸν τόκον τὸν σὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

ὁδὴ θ’ μυστήριον Τὴν δόξαν σου ὑμεῖν αξίως τίς δύναται ὡς Μωσῆς ἐφάνης γὰρ
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ὅλος δεδοξασμένος τὴν ὑπήν ἀρρήτως θεόπτα καὶ γάρ
ἡ ἐνοῦσα σοι τοῦ πνεύματος λαμπὰς ἐκφανείσα καὶ τοὺς ἕξω περιέλαμπεν.

Ἅπας λόγος πάτερ σαρώς καὶ ἐγκόμιον τῆς μεγάλης δόξης σου πόρρω καὶ τῆς ἀξίας ἐκπίπτει ἐκ πόθου δὲ τούτον ἡμεῖς σοι προσφέρομεν τὸν ὕμνον εὐλαβῶς οἱ τοὺς σοὺς ἐπαίνους πνέοντες, Νικόλαε.

Θεοτοκίον Συνδράμωμεν θαῦμα τὸ μέγα ὅψιμον ή παρθένος πάρεστιν ἐμβρυον φέρουσα τὸν ἐν μήτρα τὰ βρέφη ζωοῦντα Χριστὸν οἱ ποιμένες σὺν ἀγγέλοις τὴν κοινὴν σωτηρίαν ἐν σπηλαίῳ προαγγέλλουσι.

Συνέλθωμεν ὑμνοὺς ἐν θεοίς οἱ γράφοντες· ἐπιστήμην ἀπασαν ἀπαντάς· λογικὴν συγκροτούντες τὴν μόνην· τῶν ὕμνων ἀρχὴν καὶ αἰτίαν· ἀνυμνήσωμεν λαμπρῶς· τῇ παρθένῳ πᾶν ἐγκόμιον συνάγοντες.