

Patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos: A Comparison of the Textual Versions of his Canon to St. Nicholas

Kseniia S. Morugina

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.¹ 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 Златоустаго* (Kazan 1889) 34; I. D. Mansvetov, *Церковный устав (Тихий), 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 вязь..." *Сборник статей памяти В. М. Загребина* (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

Philotheus' canon.

A large portion of the patriarch's hymns are in the form of a canon.² 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.³

The major researchers of Philotheus' liturgical works, such as J. Goar,⁴ G. M. Proxorov,⁵ H. G. Beck,⁶ and P. Trembela,⁷ 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),⁸ he authored more than a hundred works—

литургической поэзии. Гимны и молитвы Филофея Коккина,” *Труды отдела древнерусской литературы (ТОДРЛ)* 27 (1972) 120–149; G. M. Prokhorov, “Филофей Коккин о пленении и освобождении гераклиотов,” *ТОДРЛ* 33 (1979) 253–260; E. N. Dobrynina, “Неизданные тропари патриарха Филофея Коккина: К вопросу о составе рукописи сборника ГИМ. Син. гр. 429 (Влад. 303),” *Россия и христианский Восток I* (Moscow 1997) 38–48.

² Prokhorov, *ТОДРЛ* 27 (1972) 126.

³ Gregoras *Hist.* 26.14 (III 80 Bonn).

⁴ J. Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον, sive rituale Graecorum* (Venice 1730).

⁵ G. M. Proxorov, “A Codicological Analysis of the Illuminated *Akathistos* to the Virgin (Moscow, State Historical Museum, *Synodal Gr.* 429),” *DOP* 26 (1972) 237–252.

⁶ H. G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich 1977).

⁷ Π. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ τρεῖς λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Αθήναις κώδικας* (Athens 1982) 1–16.

⁸ A. Papadakis, “Hesychasm,” *ODB* (1991) 923–924.

liturgics, homiletics, dogmatics, and hagiography.⁹ 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.¹⁰ 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,¹¹ Petrula Kourtesidou published the canon to St. Nicholas. Her text was based on the paper codex *Vat.gr.* 1531, held in the Vatican Library; Ciro Gianelli had produced a description of this manuscript in 1950.¹² This description however gave only the first line and the canon's location on folios 47^v–60^v. 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 В. Л. Фонкич, "Автографы константинопольского патриарха Филофея Коккина," *Российский Православный университет св. Иоанна Богослова. Ученые записки. Вып. 5 Исследования по византистике и неоллинистике* (Moscow 2000) 59–86.

¹¹ Π. Κουρτεσίδου, *Φιλοθέου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Κοκκίνου ποιητικὰ ἔργα* (diss. Thessaloniki 1992).

¹² C. Giannelli, *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae. Codices Vaticani Graeci. Codices 1485–1683* (Vatican City 1950).

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. 210^v–214^v) and the fifteenth centuries (ff. 89^v–92^v).¹³ In 1956 a short description of this codex was published by Archimandrite Emilian Tsakopoulos.¹⁴ 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,¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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.

¹³ A. Binggeli, M. Cassin, M. Cronier, and M. Kouroupou, *Catalogue des manuscrits conservés dans la bibliothèque du Patriarcat œcuménique. Les manuscrits du monastère de la Sainte-Trinité de Chalki I* (Turnhout 2019) 358–360.

¹⁴ A. Tsakopoulos, *Περιγραφικός κατάλογος τῶν χειρογράφων τῆς Βιβλιοθήκης τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχείου Π Τμήμα χειρογράφων I. Μονῆς Ἁγ. Τριάδος Χάλκης* (Istanbul 1956) 118–119.

¹⁵ B. L. Fonkich and F. B. Polyakov, *Греческие рукописи Московской Синодальной библиотеки: Палеографические, кодикологические и библиографические дополнения к каталогу архимандрита Владимира (Филантропова)* (Moscow 1993).

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 quaternions. 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 50^v. On some leaves of the manuscript, in the upper central part are signatures by its later owners, for example: ιβ´ on 12/19^v, ιγ´ on 20 and 27^v.

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, 14^v, 31, 40, etc. The illustrations are missing. Extensive marginal notes, which occupy the entire area of the margins, are found on folios 123^v, 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), *Ivion* 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 Ν closely adjoined to the vertical line of writing in their upright elements, and unusual ligatures in λο and ρφ.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: εἶπομεν, 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 κανόνας εἰς τὸν ἐν ἁγίον πατέρα ἡμῶν Νικόλαον οὗ ἡ ἀκροστιχὶς ἢ τε τὸν θερμὸν ἡμῶν προστάτην καὶ πατέρα. Ἐν δὲ τοῖς θεοτοκίαις 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."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, "Ἐγνώ σε ἐκ μήτρας, θεοφόρε, ὁ πάντα γινώσκων θεὸς πρὸ τοῦ πλασθῆναι ἐν κοιλίᾳ ἀγιάζει, "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, ἠτοιμάσαν βέλη εἰς φαρέτραν τοῦ κατατοξεύσαι ἐνσκοτομήνῃ τοὺς εὐθεῖς 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 (*hairetismos*) which is traditionally included in the Akathistos as part of the *oikos*: Χαῖρε τοῦ κόσμου χαρὰ παρθένε χαῖρε, "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 Μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχὴ μου τὸν Κύριον, "My soul doth magnify the Lord," along with the refrain Τὴν τιμιωτέραν τῶν Χερουβίμ, "More honored than the Cherubim."²⁰ In the canon to St. Nicholas, Philotheus replaces the Theotokos Song with the following: "Ὅλον με καταπεσόντα θεοτόκε καὶ συντρίψαντα τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα ὁ θεὸς δι' ἔλεον ὅλον σώζει ἀναλαβὼν ἐκ γαστροῦ σου ὅλον, δέσποινα, τὸν ἄνθρωπον διὸ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς μεγίστης σε σωτηρίας ἡ κτίσης πόθω δοξάζουσα εὐλογεῖ τὸν τόκον τὸν σὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, "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, *Богослужбный устав православной церкви. Опыт изъяснительного изложения порядка богослужения Православной Церкви* (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, γλυκὴ περιλάλημα, λαμπρὰ γενέθλια), epithets (θεῖος, ὑψιστος, μέτριος, ταπεινός, ἀήττητος, πᾶος) and, to a lesser extent, hyperboles (τὴν γῆν πᾶσαν διαβαίνοντα, ἡ γῆ πᾶσα συμφώνως καὶ ἡ θάλασσα τὰ θαύματα ἀνακηρύττει σου), as well as figurative comparisons (ὡς μέγα στοιχεῖον, ὡς ποιμὴν φιλόανθρωπος, 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 perspective 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 prepositional-nominal constructions. For example, Τὴν δόξαν σου ὑμνεῖν ἀξίως τίς δύναται ὡς Μωσῆς ἐφάνης γὰρ ὅλος δεδοξασμένος has three subjects and one of them has two verbals: 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 presented 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. Ωιδὴ δεύτερη. Ἀπόρῳ γλωττῆ καὶ χεῖλεσιν ἐγκώμιον βραχὺ καὶ παράκλησιν προσοίσων τῇ σῆ, 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 versions 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 τυφλοὶ τὸν ὁδηγόν, πάντες τὸν πρόμαχον, “The

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 ὅλην τοῦ πνεύματος, “All the grace of the spirit.” But in *Vlad.* 431 this part is called ὠδή α’ ἤχος α’ (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 λελύται κατάρα, “the curse be destroyed,” and end with σώσαι τοὺς ὑμνοῦντάς σε, “save those who pray to you.” After this, a theotokion was read. After the theotokion 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 ἄνδρας εἰκῆ φθόνῳ διεβλήθησαν, “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 “Ἐγὼ 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 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 μαθηταῖς συνέλθωμεν). By contrast, in the Vatican manuscript published by Kourtesidou 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 ὕμνους ἐν θεοῖς οἱ γράφοντες ἐπιστήμην

ἅπασαν ἅπαντας λογικὴν συγκροτοῦντες τὴν μόνην τῶν ὕμνων ἀρχὴν καὶ αἰτίαν ἀνυμνήσωμεν λαμπρῶς· τῇ παρθένῳ πᾶν ἐγκώμιον συνάγοντες, “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 *prosimion* (σαλπίσσωμεν ἐν).

As to significant compositional differences, the vocabulary of the two texts is generally identical. An exception is the substitution of the word πνεῦμα 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:

ὠδὴ ἀ΄ ἦχος ἀ΄ Χριστὸς γεννάται
 Τὴν χάριν ὅλην τοῦ πνεύματος
 πυρίνην ὥσπερ γλῶσσαν δεξάμενος
 Χριστὸν ἱεράρχα κάθαρν
 γλῶσσάν τε καὶ καρδίαν σῶν ὑμνωδῶν
 ὅπως σου τὴν μνήμην
 ἀνυμνήσωμεν φαιδρῶς πάτερ Νικόλαε.

Ὁ μέγας ἄρτι Νικόλαος,
 ποιμὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὁ κράτιστος,
 ποιμένας ὁμοῦ καὶ ποίμνια
 πᾶσαν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν λαμπρῶς καλεῖ.

Δεῦτε συνελθόντες,
 ὡς κοινῶ πατρί λαμπρῶς πανηγυρίσωμεν.

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

Τὸ γὰρ πρὸς ἀξίαν
 ὑμνοὺς πλέκειν σοὶ σοφὲ πᾶσιν ἀδύνατον.

Θερμὸς προστάτης Νικόλαε,
 ὠράθης τῶν πιστῶς δεομένων σου,
 θερμὸς δὲ πολλοῖς αὐτόκλητος
 ὄφθης σωτὴρ καὶ ρύστης, ὥσπερ θεὸς
 φθάνων τὰς αἰτήσεις
 τῶν πιστῶν περιουσία ἀγαθότητος.

Θεοτοκίον Φαιδρὸς προέρχεται ἥλιος,
 ἐκ πύλης κεκλεισμένης φαινόμενος,
 ἢ νύξ ἐμφανῶς προέκοψεν,
 ἤγγεκεν ἡ ἡμέρα. Φύσις βροτῶν
 δέχου τὸν δεσπότην
 ἐκ παρθένου διὰ σὲ βροτὸν γενόμενον.

ὠδὴ γ΄ τῶ πρὸ τῶν αἰῶνων
 Ἔγνω σε ἐκ μήτρας,
 θεοφόρε, ὁ πάντα γινώσκων θεὸς·
 πρὸ τοῦ πλασθῆναι ἐν κοιλίᾳ ἀγιάζει σε πλάστην
 ψυχῶν καὶ ποιμένα μέγιστον.
 Ὡσπερ τῶ Πέτρῳ πιστεύων καὶ σοὶ
 τὸ οἰκεῖον ποιμνιον.

Ῥάβδω ἐγκρατείας
 τῶν παθῶν μάκαρ σχίσας τὴν θάλασσαν,
 ὡς Μωυσῆς τῆς ἀπαθείας εἰς τὸ ὄρος ἀνήλθες,
 λαβῶν νοητῶς τὰς πλάκας δὲ
 τὴν ἐκκλησίαν παιδεύεις Χριστοῦ
 νόμον τὸν ἐν πνεύματι.

Μέτριος ἐφάνης,
 ταπεινός τε καὶ πρῶος Νικόλαε.
 Ὅθεν τοῦ πνεύματος ἡ χάρις δαυιλῶς ἐκχυθεῖσα
 ἐν σοὶ · μέγιστον ἀνέδειξε
 ταῖς τῶν θαυμάτων ἀκτίσι τὴν γῆν
 πᾶσαν διαβαίνοντα.

Ὅλον τῷ δεσπότη
 σεαυτὸν ἐκ παιδὸς ἀφιέρωσας
 καὶ πνεῦμα ὅλος ἐτελέσθης, ἀποστὰς ὅλος κόσμου,
 διὸ τῶν τοῦ κόσμου ῥύσαι με
 σκανδάλων ὅλον σοφὲ καὶ Θεῷ
 ὅλον καθιέρωσον.

Θεοτοκίον Ἰσχυρὸς δυνάστης
 σαρκωθεὶς ὁ Θεὸς νῦν ἐφίσταται.
 Οἱ ἐν τῷ σκότει τοῦ θανάτου φῶς θεάσασθε μέγα
 Χριστὸν ἐν σπηλαίῳ μέλλοντα
 ἐκ τῆς παρθένου γεννάσθαι φρικτῶς
 ἦν πιστῶς ὑμνήσωμεν.

ὠδὴ δ' Ῥάβδος ἐκ τῆς ρί[ζας]
 Νόμοις ἐκ μαζῶν τῶν μητρικῶν
 ὑπέκυψας τοῦ πνεύματος,
 νόμους σαρκὸς ὑπερβὰς, ὅσιε.
 Ὁ νόμος ὅθεν ἐν σοὶ
 καὶ πρὸ ὥρας τέθνηκεν,
 ὄντως ὁ δεινὸς τῆς ἀμαρτίας
 διὸ ἐδόθης πιστοῖς
 θεῖος νομοθέτης Νικόλαε.

Ὑπνον ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νυσταγμὸν
 βλεφάροις σοῖς οὐκ ἔδωκας,
 ἕως οὗ εὐρες τόπον ἄξιον.
 Τῷ πάντων δημιουργῷ
 πάτερ τὴν καρδίαν σου
 ἦν καὶ καθαρθεῖσαν ἐπαξίως

ἀνέδειξεν ἑαυτοῦ
σκήνωμα τῆς δόξης ὁ ὕψιστος.

Μέγιστα βραβεῖα πρὸς Θεοῦ
καὶ δόξαν κομισάμενος
ὑπὲρ τῶν πόνων τῶν μεγάλων σου.
Μεγάλων πάντας παθῶν
καὶ κινδύνων λύτρωσαι
τοὺς προβαλλομένους σὲ μεσίτην
καὶ πρεσβευτὴν πρὸς Χριστὸν,
μάκαρ συμπαθῆ καὶ ὀξύτατον.

Νέκρωσον τὸ φρόνημα, σοφέ,
σαρκός μου τὸ δυσήνιον
τὴν πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἔχθραν δέομαι,
ὡς δυνατὸς ἀνελῶν
καὶ τοῖς νόμοις ὅλον με
καθυποβαλὼν καλῶς ἐκείνου
καὶ δοῦλον δείξας Χριστοῦ
τὸν δεδουλωμένον τοῖς πάθεσιν.

Θεοτοκίον Λύτρωσιν ἀπέσταλεν ἰδοῦ
ὁ κύριος ὡς γέγραπται
λαοῖς φυλαῖς καὶ γλώσσαις σήμερον·
λαὸν καὶ γὰρ ἑαυτοῦ
πάντας ἀπεργάζεται
ἓνα τοὺς ἐν πίστει προσκυνοῦντας,
τὴν σάρκωσιν τοῦ υἱοῦ
καὶ σὲ θεοτόκον κηρύττοντας.

ὦδὴ εἴ θεὸς ὢν εἰρήνης
Ὡς μέγας ὁ πλοῦτος τῶν σῶν οἰκτιρμῶν
ἀνεφάνη τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἄμετρος.
Ἦ χύσις τοῦ ἐλέους σου
θεράπον τοῦ Χριστοῦ
σὺ γὰρ τοῖς δεομένοις
τὰ ὄντα διανέμων
καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐσπούδαζες,
μάκαρ λανθάνειν τοὺς λαμβάνοντας.

Πραότης καὶ ζῆλος ὁμοῦ ἀκραιφνῆς
τὴν καρδίαν τὴν σὴν ἀπειργάσαντο
οἰκεῖον ἐνδιαίτημα
σοφὲ ὑπερφυῶς.

Σὺ γὰρ τῶν ἐναντίων
τὴν ἔνωσιν ἐδέξω
μαχητῆς ἀήττητος
ὑπὲρ τοῦ πνεύματος γενόμενος.

Ῥομφαία ὠράθης καὶ βέλος ὄξυ
εἰς καρδίας πεμπόμενον · ἔνδοξε
ἐχθρῶν τοῦ τῶν ἀπάντων
βασιλέως καὶ Θεοῦ εἰδώλων καὶ δαιμόνων
αἰρέσεων ἀτόπων
τὰς ψυχὰς εὐφραίνων δὲ
τῶν ἐκζητούντων σου τὸν κύριον.

Ὁ μέγας ποιμὴν τῶν ἀπάντων Χριστός,
τῶν προβάτων σε μάκαρ ἀνέδειξε
ποιμένα καὶ διδάσκαλον
αὐτοῦ τῶν λογικῶν,
διὸ πλανώμενόν με
εἰς ὄρη ἀπωλείας
ὡς ποιμὴν φιλόανθρωπος
τὸ σὸν ἐκ ζήτησον νῦν πρόβατον.

Θεοτοκίον Ὁ μέγας ἀνθρώπων ποιμὴν καὶ σωτὴρ
ἐκ παρθένου ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἔρχεται,
τεχθῆναι διὰ πέλαγος
ἀφάτων οἰκτιρῶν
σπῆλαιον ἐτοιμάζου,
ποιμένες ἀγραυλοῦντες
τὴν κοινὴν ἀνάκλησιν
εὐαγγελίζεσθε τοῖς πέρασιν.

ὠδὴ στ' σπλάγχνων ἰωνῶν
Σὺ τῶν ὀρφανῶν ὄντως ἐχρημάτισας
πατῆρ καὶ χηρῶν προστάτης ἔνδοξε
τῶν νοσοῦντων τὲ καὶ ἐν λύπαις ἠδίστη ἀνάψυξις.
Ἰατρὸς παθῶν ψυχῆς ὁμοῦ καὶ σώματος.
Ὅθεν καὶ κοινῇ προσφθέγγονται
καὶ καλοῦσι σου πάντες τὸ ὄνομα.

Τύπος καὶ κανὼν σοφὲ κυβερνήσεως
ψυχῶν ἀγαθοῖς ποιμέσι γέγονας.
Πρεσβυτέρων δὲ εὐταξία καὶ κόσμος ἐξαιρέτος
μελωδῶν ἢ συνεχῆς ὄντως πανήγυρις
πάσης ἐκκλησίας κάλλιστον

καὶ φαιδρὸν καὶ γλυκὸν περιλάλημα.

Ἄνδρες μονασταὶ συγχαίρουσι σήμερον
 ἡμῖν τῷ πατρὶ συνεορτάζοντες
 συμφωνοῦσι γὰρ καὶ συνάδουσιν ἅματα πρόσφορα
 ἀκριβείας ἀσκηταὶ καὶ τῆς ἀπλότητος
 πάντες τὸν κοινὸν ὕμνοῦσι σε
 καὶ προστάτην ὁμοῦ καὶ διδάσκαλον.

Τέκνον μωμητὸν ἐγὼ μόνος γέγονα
 πάθεσιν αἰσχροῖς, ὄντως ἀνάξιος
 τῆς καλλίστης σου καὶ τερπνῆς πανηγύρεως ἔνδοξε.
 Ἀλλὰ σὺ περιελὼν μου τὴν αἰσχύρη
 πάτερ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀνάδειξον
 δαιτυμόνα τοῦ δεῖπνου σου ἄξιον.

Θεοτοκίον Θαῦμα τὸ παρὸν θαυμάτων ἐπέκεινα
 καὶ λόγου καὶ νοῦ παντὸς ἀνώτερον
 καὶ παρθένος γὰρ ἡ αὐτὴ νῦν καὶ μητὴρ γνωρίζεται
 καὶ τὸ γέννημα Θεὸς ὁμοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπος·
 τούτου τὰ λαμπρὰ γενέθλια
 προτελοῦντες κροτοῦμεν χαρμόσυνα.

ὠδὴ ζ' οἱ παῖδες εὐσεβεία
 Ἡ γῆ πᾶσα συμφώνως καὶ ἡ θάλασσα
 πάτερ τὰ θαύματα ἀνακηρῦττει σου.
 Καὶ γὰρ ὁ σὸς φθόγγος ἐξελέλυθεν
 εἰς τὰ πέρατα διδάσκων ψάλλειν ἅπαντας
 ὁ τῶν πατέρων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἶ.

Νυμφίος ὁ ὠραῖος ὑπὲρ πάντας
 ἀνθρώπους ὡς γέγραπται τῆς νύμφης μάκαρ
 τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίας ὠραιότατον
 σέ ἀνέδειξε, νυμφίον τούτου φέροντα
 τοὺς χαρακτῆρας τρανῶς καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα.

Κοσμήσας σου τὸν βίον συμπαθεία
 σοφὴ καὶ πραότητι καὶ τῇ ἀγάπῃ
 τῇ λαμπρᾷ μιμητῆς ἐφάνης ἄριστος
 τοῦ ποιμένου τοῦ καλοῦ ἀναμαζάμενος
 τὰς ἰδικὰς ἀρετὰς καλῶς ἐκείνον.

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

πάθη πάτερ χαλεπὰ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος
καὶ πειρασμοὺς ἀνελὼν τοὺς τῶν δαιμόνων.

Θεοτοκίον Ἔρχεται ὁ δεσπότης ἐν σπηλαίῳ
τεχθῆναι ὡς ἄνθρωπος· προυπαντήσωμεν
πιστοὶ τῇ παρθένῳ προβαλλόμενοι·
τὸν πατέρα τῆς χαρᾶς ἕξαρχον ψάλλοντες.
Χαίρε τοῦ κόσμου χαρὰ παρθένε χαίρε.

ὦδὴ ἡ' θαύματος ὑπερφυῶς
Ἰθυνον τῇ κυβερνήσει σου τὸ σκάφος
σοῦ δεόμεθα τῆς ἐκκλησίας
τὸ ἰστίον κούφισον τοῖς ἀνέμοις τοῖς νοητοῖς
καὶ τῷ κλύδωνι γενναίως ἐπιτίμησον
καὶ ῥύσαι παντοίως κινδυνεύουσαν ὡσπερ πάλαι
πλωτῆρας πάτερ διέσωσας
ἐπὶ τοῦ πελάγους σωτῆρ φανεῖς ἀθρόως.

Πέπτωκε τὰ εἰδῶλα πάτερ τῆς πλάνης
σοῦ τῷ ῥήματι μόνῳ τῆς γλώττης
τοῦ Ἀρείου αἵρεσις, φροῦδος ὄφθη σαῖς διδαχαῖς,
ἀδικίαν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου σὺ πεποίηκας
διὸ καὶ τὴν ποιμνὴν σου διέσωσας εὐλογεῖτω
ἡ κτίσις πᾶσα τὸν κύριον
καὶ ὑπερυψόντω βοῶσαν εἰς αἰῶνας.

Ἄρρητος ἡ σὴ φιλοτεκνία πάτερ,
ὑπερβαίνουσα πατρικὸν φίλτρων,
μητρικὴν συμπάθειαν σχέσιν πᾶσαν τὴν φυσικὴν
διὰ τοῦτο καὶ αὐτόκλητος ἐφίστασαι.
Φρουρῶν γρηγορούντας καὶ καθεύδοντας σωτηρίαν
ἡμῖν εὐαγγελιζόμενος
διδούς ἰλαρῶς μετ' εὐχῶν σοφὴ τὴν χεῖρα.

Θεοτοκίον Ὅλον με καταπεσόντα θεοτόκε
καὶ συντρίψαντα τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα
ὁ Θεὸς δι' ἔλεον ὅλον σώζει ἀναλαβὼν
ἐκ γαστροῦ σου ὅλον, δέσποινα, τὸν ἄνθρωπον
διὸ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς μεγίστης σε σωτηρίας
ἡ κτίσις πόθῳ δοξάζουσα
εὐλογεῖ τὸν τόκον τὸν σὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

ὦδὴ θ' μυστήριον
Τὴν δόξαν σου ὑμνεῖν ἀξίως τίς δύναται
ὡς Μωσῆς ἐφάνης γὰρ

ὅλος δεδοξασμένος τὴν ὄψιν
 ἀρρήτως θεόπτα καὶ γὰρ
 ἡ ἐνοῦσα σοι τοῦ πνεύματος λαμπὰς
 ἐκφανεῖσα καὶ τοὺς ἔξω περιέλαμπεν.

Ἐνέθηκε τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ θεμέλιον
 ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ στύλον σὲ
 θείαν ὡσπερ ψυχὴν θεοφόρε
 ὡς μέγα στοιχεῖον αὐτὴν ·
 συγκρατοῦντα καὶ συνέχοντα στερρῶς
 εἰς αἰῶνας ἀπερίτρεπτον ὡς ἔφησεν.

Ἐρυστὴν καὶ σὺ φύσιν λαχὼν ὡσπερ ἄνθρωπος
 τῇ μὲν γῆ κατέλιπες
 νόμοις τοῖς φυσικοῖς τὸ σὸν σῶμα
 ψυχὴ δὲ ἡ θεία Χριστῷ
 παρεστῶσα σὺν ἀγγέλοις τῆς λαμπρῶς
 ἀπολαύει νῦν θεώσεως τρανότερον.

Ἄπας λόγος πάτερ σαφῶς καὶ ἐγκώμιον
 τῆς μεγάλης δόξης σου
 πόρρω καὶ τῆς ἀξίας ἐκπίπτει
 ἐκ πόθου δὲ τοῦτον ἡμεῖς
 σοὶ προσφέρομεν τὸν ὕμνον εὐλαβῶς
 οἱ τοὺς σοὺς ἐπαίνους πνέοντες, Νικόλαε.

Θεοτοκίον Συνδράμωμεν θαῦμα τὸ μέγα ὀνόμενοι
 ἡ παρθένος πάρεστιν
 ἔμβρυον φέρουσα τὸν ἐν μήτρᾳ
 τὰ βρέφη ζωοῦντα Χριστὸν
 οἱ ποιμένες σὺν ἀγγέλοις τὴν κοινήν
 σωτηρίαν ἐν σπηλαίῳ προαγγέλλουσι.

Συνέλθωμεν · ὕμνους ἐν θεοῖς οἱ γράφοντες · ἐπιστήμην ἅπασαν
 ἅπαντας · λογικὴν συγκροτοῦντες τὴν μόνην · τῶν ὕμνων ἀρχὴν καὶ
 αἰτίαν · ἀνυμνήσωμεν λαμπρῶς · τῇ παρθένω πᾶν ἐγκώμιον
 συνάγοντες.

June, 2020

Institute of World History
 Russian Academy of Sciences
 Moscow, Russian Federation
 ksenyamorug@mail.ru