

# ST VLADIMIR'S THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

A Continuation of St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly

*Published by*

THE FACULTY OF ST VLADIMIR'S ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Paul Meyendorff, *Editor*

Volume 51, Number 2-3

2007

**Liturgy**

Editorial and Subscription Offices

575 Scarsdale Road, Crestwood, NY 10707

Tel.: +1.914.961.8313

Email: [svtq@svots.edu](mailto:svtq@svots.edu) & [svtq-subscriptions@svots.edu](mailto:svtq-subscriptions@svots.edu)

Website: [www.svots.edu/SVTQ](http://www.svots.edu/SVTQ)

Copyright © 2007 by St Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary

*Back issues are available on microfilm from University Microfilm*

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$40.00

CANADIAN \$40.00 US Funds

FOREIGN \$50.00 US Funds

SINGLE ISSUES \$15.00

---

The views of the authors whose articles appear in  
*St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* do not necessarily  
reflect those of the Seminary faculty.

This periodical is indexed in the *ATLA Religion Database*® and included in *ATLASerials*® (*ATLAS*®), an online collection of major religion and theology journals, published by the American Theological Library Association, 300 S Wacker Dr, Suite 2100, Chicago, IL 60606, email: [atla@atla.com](mailto:atla@atla.com), website: <http://www.atla.com>.

Typeset by Glen R.J. Mules, New Rochelle, NY

Printed by  
ATHENS PRINTING COMPANY  
337 West 36th Street  
New York, NY 10018-6401

## CONTENTS

THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF THE LITURGICAL EIGHT-MODE SYSTEM IN JERUSALEM Stig Simeon R. Frøyshov . . . . .	139
PRAYING THE ANAPHORA: ALOUD OR IN SILENCE? Gregory Woolfenden . . . . .	179
CONFESSION AND SPIRITUAL DIRECTION IN THE ORTHODOX CHURCH: SOME MODERN QUESTIONS TO A VERY ANCIENT PRACTICE Job Getcha . . . . .	203
THE REVISION OF THE VIGIL SERVICE Nicholas Denysenko . . . . .	221
THE PARTICIPATION OF THE DEACONS IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUNION IN THE EARLY CHURCH Paul L. Gavrilyuk. . . . .	253
LITURGICAL ETHICS Benedict M. Guevin . . . . .	277
THE 19TH CANONICAL ANSWER OF TIMOTHY OF ALEXANDRIA: ON THE HISTORY OF SACRAMENTAL OIKONOMIA Andrei V. Psarev. . . . .	297
PRIESTESSES OR PRIESTS' WIVES: PRESBYTERA IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY Valerie A. Karras . . . . .	321
BOOK REVIEWS: Colt C. Anderson, <i>Christian Eloquence: Contemporary Doctrinal Preaching</i> . . . . .	347
NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS . . . . .	351



## THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF THE LITURGICAL EIGHT-MODE SYSTEM IN JERUSALEM

Stig Simeon R. Frøyshov<sup>1</sup>

### *Introduction*

The Oktoechos (from Greek *ὀκτώ ἡχοῦς*, “eight(fold) sound”), liturgical and musical system of eight modes, is or has been a prominent part of most liturgical traditions from the first millennium onwards. During the 20th century, there took place some debate about its time and place of origin within a Christian context which in its main elements may be rapidly reviewed. In 1910, Anton Baumstark lanced the opinion that Severus (ca. 465–ca. 538), the Patriarch of Antioch, wrote a hymnal in eight modes, labeled by Baumstark the “Oktoechos of Severus” and dating from the early 6th century.<sup>2</sup> This view of this hymnal was maintained by Jeannin and Puyade in an article from 1913,<sup>3</sup> which thus affirmed that a musical eight-mode system existed in the Antioch patriarchate already in the 6th century. Their work gained widespread recognition until Cody, in an excellent work published in 1982, definitively discarded the Severus hypothesis, pointing rather to a Palestinian origin for the hymnographic Oktoechos. In recent years Peter Jeffery, supporting Cody, has argued for its Hagiopolite origin;<sup>4</sup> that is, that within a Christian context it first appeared in the Holy City of Jerusalem.<sup>5</sup> At the same time, Cody and Jeffery have proposed a more conservative dating of the origin of the eight-

1 Revised version of a paper given at the 2004 Music Symposium, devoted to the topic “The Octoechos,” St Vladimir’s Seminary, December 10–12, 2004.

2 Baumstark 1910, 45–48 et passim; he again speaks of this hymnal in his influential *Liturgie comparée* (Baumstark 1953, 106).

3 Jeannin & Puyade 1913; see also Jeannin 1936.

4 See Jeffery 2001a and 2001b.

5 This location of its origin seems correct, even though I hope to show in this paper that the Oktoechos is considerably older than what Jeffery concludes.

mode liturgical system than was generally accepted in most of the 20th century. According to Cody, “there is really no evidence for the existence of an octoechos in any sense before the eighth century.”<sup>6</sup> Jeffery, after suggesting in 1991 that the early hymnal (*Ancient Iadgari*, see below) with its Oktoechos section dates prior to the 8th century,<sup>7</sup> in his 2001 article refrained from dating the eight-mode system beyond the dates of the earliest evidence, that is the 8th–9th centuries.<sup>8</sup>

What calls for a new study of the early eight-mode system is first of all a major development in Hagiopolite liturgiology over the last few decades: the ongoing uncovering of Georgian sources that have in the main preserved the most ancient liturgical books of the cathedral of Jerusalem. These permit an actual study of early Hagiopolite liturgy. On the basis of mainly Georgian sources, we shall here review the questions of the time and place of the origin of the Oktoechos, confirming Jeffery (and Cody in a larger sense—Palestine) that it seems to have originated in Jerusalem, but claiming a much earlier dating than they.

**The liturgical eight-mode system.** Of course, the system of eight modes did not embrace the whole of the Palestinian liturgy during the first millennium. We find elements which *are* part of a modal system and elements which are not. Some of the former are part of *eight-week* structures and must be considered elements of a non-musical liturgical Oktoechos. Others only have a mode assigned to them, apparently without any connection to the eight-week cycle, and these elements belong to a musical Oktoechos only.<sup>9</sup> It seems therefore reasonable at some level to distinguish between a liturgical and a musical Oktoechos.<sup>10</sup> In the final analysis I consider that the complete liturgical Oktoechos does encom-

6 Cody 1982, 102.

7 Jeffery 1991, 60 (see footnote 113 below).

8 Jeffery 2001a, 207–9. In this article he considers the Oktoechos as a supplement to the hymnal.

9 The elements belonging to a musical Oktoechos only are first of all chants of the immovable liturgical year (feasts): responsorial and antiphonal psalmody, hymnography.

10 Strictly speaking, the term *ὀκτώηχος*, “[book/system of] eight modes,” is applicable

pass the eight musical modes,<sup>11</sup> but the latter may also operate independently of strictly liturgical parameters.

The liturgical eight-mode system in its most developed stage may then be said to possess four components:

1. An Oktoechos of the calendar year, that is, the repetitive cycle of eight weeks; it also seems to include the eight-week paschal fast. This is the skeleton of the liturgical Oktoechos. Around this skeleton we find components 2–4.
2. An Oktoechos of the Lectionary, that is, doubled quadruple (4x2) or eightfold series of scriptural readings and responsorial chants:
  - the series of four or eight Resurrection Gospels for Sunday Nocturns or Matins
  - eight-mode Sunday Eucharist
  - eight-mode ferial Eucharist (concerns only [four] dismissal prayers).
3. An Oktoechos of the Hymnal, that is, hymnographical collections organized in eight groups called “modes”:
  - Sunday hymnography in eight modes
  - Ferial hymnography in eight modes
4. An Oktoechos of the liturgical chant, that is, the eight musical modes.

In this article, after a few words about my sources and about a major dating criterion, and after four initial remarks, I shall be speaking about the three non-musical components of the complete liturgical Oktoechos. In a final section, I shall propose an answer to the essential question of dating the apparition and evolution of the liturgical Oktoechos.

only when the musical modes are included in the liturgical system. There might have existed some eightfold liturgical structure, centered on the eight-week cycle and not encompassing musical modes, but I shall here call even this “Oktoechos.”

11 According to the view that liturgical music forms an organic part of Liturgy. But in this article, if nothing else is said, I use the term “liturgical” Oktoechos to signify “non-musical.”

**Sources.** The sources I shall be using are mostly Palestinian liturgical books, preserved either in the Greek original, or in ancient versions, that is, Georgian (which is the richest), as well as Armenian, Syriac, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, and Arabic. As is well known, the content of such manuscripts is mostly older than the date of their copying; this is true especially for the non-Greek ones, since their content presupposes a translation process. The liturgical books of Palestinian (principally Hagiopolite) tradition used in this work are the following:

— The Lectionary in several forms:

1. The Great Lectionary (*GL*) containing all scriptural readings and psalmodic chants, some hymns (*incipit*), and also rubrics<sup>12</sup>
2. Manuscripts composed as containing parts of the Great Lectionary
3. The Gospel Lectionary

— The Euchologion, that is still for the most part unpublished<sup>13</sup>

— The (Ancient) Hymnal (in Georgian *Iadgari*, in Greek *Tropologion*)<sup>14</sup>

— The (Ancient) Horologion<sup>15</sup>

12 Michel Tarnischvili, ed. & transl., *Le grand lectionnaire de l'Eglise de Jérusalem (Ve-VIIIe siècle)*. Hereafter: *GL*.

13 As a complete book the Hagiopolite Euchologion seems to have been preserved only in Georgian. Like the Constantinople Euchologion, the Jerusalem Euchologion according to Georgian witnesses generally starts with eucharistic liturgies (the Liturgy of St James and the Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts of St James; these are already edited); then follows various series of prayers, and usually at the end a supplementary Lectionary section. For articles indicating the content of several Georgian Hagiopolite Euchologia, see for example Outtier 1981 and 1983. See also my paragraph on the Jerusalem Euchologion in Géhin & Frøyshov 2000, 176–77.

14 *AI* (*Ancient Iadgari*). Concerning the distinction between the ancient and the new Jerusalem hymnal, see below. The term “Tropologion” is attested only for the new hymnal. For a translation of the *Ancient Iadgari* hymnody of Christmas and Theophany, with introduction and commentary, see Schneider 2004.

15 Edited for the first time in my doctoral thesis, Frøyshov 2003. This liturgical book, of which I am preparing the publication, has great significance for the study of liturgy in Late Antiquity. See below for a short description of this Horologion. At



- Liturgical Manuals, which present various combinations of parts of other books<sup>16</sup>
- And finally an archaic (probably 6th c.) Sabaitic Rule (წჳბო სბბაწმიგობბა, translit: *c'esi sabac'midisaj*) preserved in Georgian<sup>17</sup>

In addition come literary sources, and I shall in particular make use of some Armenian musicological treatises.

#### *Four Initial Remarks*

##### *A major criterion of dating: the shift between the Ancient and the New Hymnals of Jerusalem*

The hymnal of Jerusalem is known in two stages, one old and one new.<sup>18</sup> The new stage is to a large extent identical to the ancient Palestinian layer of the present Orthodox hymnography. The distinction between the old and new hymnals is explained by the famous 10th century Georgian Palestinian monk Iovane Zosime (John Zosima) in codex *Sinai Georgian 34*,<sup>19</sup> a manuscript to which I shall return below. On fol. 123r, Zosime writes the following note, listing the content of his manuscript:

The [hymns] of Lent in their entirety and of all the feasts in their entirety, the hypakoës of Lent and feasts in their entirety, the Resurrection modes [Sunday Oktoechos] in their entirety

some point after AD 600/650, there was a reform of the Jerusalem Book of Hours, resulting in a New Horologion.

16 E.g., *Sinai Georgian 47*, AD 977 (mostly elements of Sunday Matins; see description in Gvaramia et al. 1987, 52–55) and *Sinai Georgian 53*, 9th–10th c. (Lit. of St James [edited], lectionary for weekday Liturgies, the common office of martyrs, and for Sunday Liturgies, elements of Sunday Matins, weekday eight-mode hymnal); see description in Gvaramia et al. (1987), 55–58).

17 Edited in Xevsuriani 1978, 112–15. I am preparing for publication a French translation with commentary of this important document, preserved in a fragment (*St Petersburg Greek VII*, fol. 3rv) restored to the *Sinai Georgian 34* by L. Xevsuriani.

18 One of the very rare mentions of this shift in non-Georgian publications is Met'reveli 1978, 47–48. At least 5% of the hymns of the ancient hymnal are retained in the new.

19 The correct interpretation of this explication is the merit of Met'reveli 1966, 167–68.

and the ferial [hymns, i.e., ferial Oktoechos] in their entirety. You will find all the ancient [hymns] below [= in the following] and all the new above. Pray!<sup>20</sup>

The old stage is preserved only in a Georgian translation called *Ancient Iadgari*, while redactions of the new stage subsist in the Greek original, as well as in Georgian and Syriac versions. An element for dating the shift of the two stages is provided by the attribution of hymns in some new stage manuscripts. Even though manuscript hymn ascription is often unstable and dubious, in the case of the hymnographers Sophronius of Jerusalem, John of Damascus, and Cosmas the Hagiopolite manuscript attribution is actually quite stable. Sophronios, whose possibly authentic hymnody does not figure in the *Ancient Iadgari*, but does so in the New Tropologion, therefore seems to constitute the first hymnographer of the new stage.<sup>21</sup> John and Cosmas, the principal hymnographers of the new stage, flourish in the decades before and after 700. We may consequently assume that process of composing a New Hymnal, replacing the Ancient Hymnal, was begun in the 7th century, presumably in its first half.

*The Oktoechos is a phenomenon of the public ("cathedral") liturgy*

The 10th-century codex *Sinai Georgian 34* comprises a Book of Hours (see above, footnote 16) which appears as the Horologion companion to the Jerusalem Lectionary and Hymnal. The presence in it of hymnody from the *Ancient Iadgari* constitutes the main evidence for dating its present redaction to no later than the first half of the 7th century.<sup>22</sup> Much of its content is older. The archetype of its Greek *Vorlage* must have been composed for the

20 Met'reveli et al. 1978, 117.

21 See my entry on Sophronius of Jerusalem in *Canterbury Dictionary of Hymnology* (in preparation).

22 As we have already seen this redaction belongs to the Ancient Horologion of Jerusalem; the Georgians of the 10th century called it "Georgian," a technical term denoting the Georgian translation of the old Hagiopolite liturgy.

Jerusalem cathedral.<sup>23</sup> In spite of its breathtaking cursus of 24 daily offices, the Horologion of *Sinai 34* is also the evident ancestor of the ancient Horologion of St Sabas (*Sin. Gr.* 863, 9th c.) and of the present Orthodox Horologion.

This new document of Hagiopolite liturgy does give us an important insight into the liturgical Oktoechos. It distinguishes between two types of offices. The document itself attaches to the first type the label *σαερόκο*, *saeroj*, “public,” comprising the Hours which were meant for public worship; in the present fragmentary state (first quaternion lacking) of the Horologion, these include: Vespers, Communion (Presanctified), Nocturns, Matins, and the partially monastic office of Compline. The other offices have no designation, but they are intended for an ascetic or monastic community, which cannot be anything else than the tagma of Spoudaites (*τῶν Σπουδαίων*) attached to the Jerusalem cathedral. The short and simple ascetic offices are centered on the daily chanting of the entire Psalter.

Now it is evident from the Ancient Horologion of *Sinai 34* that the eight-mode liturgical system is a phenomenon pertaining to the public offices and not to the ascetic ones. All the ascetic offices possess one particular element with modal assignment: the *tsardgomaj* (kathisma) section, comprising the *tsardgomaj* refrain with its psalm verses and its concluding hypakoë. Only one modal assignment is given, always figuring in the rubric which opens the *tsardgomaj* section. Presumably the whole section, including the hypakoë, was sung in the same mode. As for the hymns and psalm verses themselves, the mode is fixed. It is not affected by the eight-week cycle and is therefore only part of the musical Oktoechos.

On the contrary, all the public Hours have liturgical eight-mode elements, first of all Vespers and Matins, to which are applied complete eight-mode hymnals, both a resurrectional one and a ferial one, and further also the Communion office, which has a dismissal

<sup>23</sup> Indications: It contains prayers taken from the Jerusalem Euchologion and hymns taken from the Jerusalem Hymnal (*Ancient Iadgari*).

prayer in eight modes, and Nocturns, which has an eight-mode alleluia psalm (Ps 133).

*The terminology of authentic and plagal modes*

The traditional Greek term denoting the first four modes is *κύριος*. However, the existence in Latin tradition of the terms *authentus* and *authenticus* raises the question whether these had not been transliterated from the Greek terms *αὐθέντης*, *authentēs*, and *αὐθεντικός*, *authentikos*. In the supposed absence of Greek evidence for such terms, hypotheses have been put forward that in the 9th century the Carolingians created a Hellenizing term not in use in the Greek Church itself.<sup>24</sup> However, early Greek sources containing the term in question actually do exist.

In at least two Greek manuscripts one finds the term *authentēs* and *authentikos*; in both cases the term is abbreviated *αυθ*, *auth*, so we do not know which of the two words was meant. The first manuscript is the uncial Palestinian Gospel Lectionary *Sinai Greek 212* (l 846)<sup>25</sup> whose dating is disputed, ranging from the 7th to the 9th century.<sup>26</sup> This Lectionary starts with the eight Resurrection Gospels for Matins and, as was already pointed out in 1976 by Heinrich Husmann,<sup>27</sup> the first Gospel is assigned to mode 1: *HX[OΣ] A' AYΘ[ENTHΣ/ENTIKOΣ]* (fol. 1r). The second source is *Sinai Greek N.E. M 167*, a minuscule hymnal fragment of the

24 See Huglo 1973: "aucun de ces deux termes [*authenticus*, *authentus*] n'a été emprunté au grec" (p. 141); Huglo (1975); Huglo is followed by Jeffery 2001a, 155–71. P. 169: "Aurelian's chauvinism, doubtless widespread in his time, renders it easy for us to understand why Latin musicians of his period would have created Greek musical terms such as 'authentus' and 'parapter,' which the Greeks themselves did not use." Concerning the term 'parapter,' it must be akin to the Georgian term 'paraptoni' (see E. Meřreveli & B. Outtier 1979, p. 68–85), which suggests that both the Latin and the Georgian term are transliterating a Greek term in actual use.

25 Lectionary numbering according to Aland 1994.

26 Aland et al, 1994: 9th c.; Amphoux 1996: 8th c. (p. 42); Kamil 1970: ca. 7th cent. (p. 70); Gardthausen 1886: no date.

27 "Der Sinai gr. 212 zeigt mit seiner Angabe *ēch a' auth* im Titel des ersten Evangeliums, dass im 'Unzialzeitalter' die ersten vier Kirchentöne im Griechischen *authentikos* hiessen und dass der gregorianische Choral auch seine Bezeichnung *authenticus* aus dem Griechischen bezog" (Husmann 1976, 174).

New Finds of Sinai, dated by Nikolopoulos to the 9th–10th c., which assigns some stanzas of “Lord, I have cried” to the 4th authentic mode: *HX[OΣ] Δ' AΥΘ[ΕΝΤΗΣ/ΕΝΤΙΚΟΣ]*.<sup>28</sup>

These Greek manuscripts therefore prove that the Latin musical terms *authentus* and *authenticus* were received from the Greek liturgical vocabulary, no doubt from that of the Jerusalem Church since the manuscripts concerned are of Hagiopolite tradition.

### *The sequence of eight modes*

There has been some discussion also concerning the status of another aspect of the early Latin Oktoechos: the mode sequence in which each authentic mode is followed by its plagal mode,<sup>29</sup> instead of dividing the eight modes in two groups, one with the four authentic modes, the other with the four plagal ones, which is usual in most Hagiopolite Lectionaries<sup>30</sup> and in later Greek tradition.<sup>31</sup> What has not been sufficiently pointed out in earlier studies<sup>32</sup> is that the Latin sequence is by no means an isolated phenomenon. We find it also in the following Georgian, Syrian, Syro-Palestinian, and Armenian liturgical documents:

- The witness *Paris Georgian 3* (10th–11th c.) of the Georgian Lectionary: two series of resurrectional responsoria, one of the prokeimenon-psalm, the other of the alleluia-psalm<sup>33</sup>
- The witness *Sinai Georgian 40* (10th c.) of the Ancient Hymnal of Jerusalem: two series (processions [*litaniisaj*] and

28 See my remark about this in Géhin & Frøyshov 2000, p. 179. The mode indication is visible on photo 144 of the catalogue (*Holy Monastery and Archbishop of Sinai* 1998).

29 In 1–8 mode numbering corresponding to: 1, 5; 2, 6; 3, 7; and 4, 8.

30 See Janeras 1986, 61–64 (table, p. 62: *Sinai Georgian 38*, *Tsagareli 81* (today: *Schoyen MS 035*), *Sinai Arabic 116*, *Sinai Greek 212* and *210*).

31 In 1–8 mode numbering corresponding to: 1–4, 5–8).

32 But see Husmann 1971, who mentions Jacobite sources.

33 *GL* n° 1679–1686, 1687–1692.

the office “Of the Children”) of *tsardgomaj* (kathisma) / *hypakoë*<sup>34</sup>

- The archaic *Sabaite Rule* from *Sinai Georgian 34*: a Sunday Vespers *prokeimenon* series<sup>35</sup>
- Syrian<sup>36</sup>
- The Gospel Lectionaries *Sinai Syro-Palestinian 1* (AD 1104) and 2 (AD 1118): a series of resurrectional pericopes at Easter<sup>37</sup>
- The earliest Armenian treatise on the Divine Office, attributed to a 7th-century author<sup>38</sup>
- The present Armenian eight-week cycle of four Sunday resurrectional Gospels<sup>39</sup>

The dates of the manuscripts in question do not permit straightforward conclusions concerning the age of this kind of modal enumeration. In my view it is probable however that we have here the original order of the modes in the Jerusalem *Oktoechos*, even though there is some evidence that the two enumerations could have coexisted.<sup>40</sup>

### *The Oktoechos of the Jerusalem Church Year: The Eight-Week Cycle*

The eight-week cycle is the starting point and the **skeleton** of the liturgical *Oktoechos*. All other liturgical eight mode elements

34 *AI*, 364–66. The ms. does not specify whether the hymns are *tsardgomaj* or *hypakoë*.  
35 Xevsuriani 1978, p. 114.

36 H. Husmann / P. Jeffery: “Syrian Church Music” (4.i), *Grove Music Online*, ed. L. Macy. Accessed on 5 October 2007 from <http://www.grovemusic.com>. “The modes may be listed from 1 to 8 in order (i.e., first the four authentic modes, then the four plagal), in a manner similar to that of Byzantine chant. Alternatively, in some early manuscripts such as the *ma’niāthā* (sometimes wrongly termed *Oktoëchos*) of Severus of Antioch, they appear in the order 1–5–2–6–3–7–4–8, in a manner similar to that of Gregorian chant, with each pair of modes (authentic and plagal) sharing a common final grouped together.”

37 Smith Lewis 1899; see below.

38 T’ahmizyan 1972, 91–93; see below.

39 *Breviarium Armenium*, 102–3; *Armenian Book of Hours*, 53. In both these editions the order of modes follows that of the Gospels (Mt first); the result is that the mode order is reverse (4–8, 3–7 etc.), but that, however, does not affect the point I make.

40 They do coexist in the treatise of Movsēs Siwnec’i.

presuppose it. In itself it is very simple and does not need any clarification: it is just a succession of eight weeks. But why eight? And when does it appear? The answer to these questions will necessarily affect our idea of the ideological and chronological origins of the whole Oktoechos system.<sup>41</sup>

The questions that will occupy us here are then, first, the *raison d'être* of the eight-week cycle, that is, its theological motivation; and second, the date of its origin.

### *Why eight: The theology of Sunday as the 8th day*

The early Church, already from the late first century, in its theology of Sunday makes widespread use of the ancient<sup>42</sup> symbol of the *ogdoad* or *octave*, that is, the number eight.<sup>43</sup> The Lord's Day is seen as both the 1st and the 8th day of the week. In some penetrating studies Jean Daniélou has argued that in the Christian context, the *ogdoad* first appears in Judeo-Christian apocalyptic literature,<sup>44</sup> and that Gnostic speculations on the *ogdoad*,<sup>45</sup> by some held to be the primary source, in reality depend on this literature.<sup>46</sup>

The earliest literary documentation of this notion is found in the

41 An important aspect of the problem of the eight-week cycle is to determine the day of the year on which it starts in the early period. There is some evidence that it began after Pentecost, but there is also evidence favoring the antiquity of the present Orthodox practice, which makes the eight-week cycle start on New Sunday (Sunday after Easter). Since Lent already had eight weeks in the late 4th century according to Egeria, if the eight-week cycle started on New Sunday the whole year might then be covered by the eight-week cycle, except Easter week, which is a kind of eschatological moment transcending the calendar year.

42 The *ogdoad* was a creation myth of Hermopolitan cosmogony in Ancient Egypt.

43 See: H. Dumaine, art. "Dimanche," *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, vol. 4, 1920, col. 858–994 (esp. 879–84); F. J. Dölger, "Zur Symbolik des altchristlichen Taufhauses. I. Das Oktagon und die Symbolik der Achtzahl," 153–82, in: id., *Antike und Christentum*, vol. 4, Münster, 1934; K. Schneider, art. "Achtzahl", col. 79–81, in: *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 1, 1950; J. Gaillard, "Dimanche," col. 948–82 (esp. 958–61, 976–81), in: *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, vol. 3, 1957; S. Lilla, art. "Ogdoas — Ogdoad (ὀγδόαζ)", p. 610–11, in: Berardino, A. Di (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, tr. from Italian by A. Walford, New York, 1992.

44 Daniélou 1951, 346–48; Daniélou 1965, 68f.

45 See S. Lilla, art. cit. (footnote 43), 610.

46 Daniélou 1951, 348; Daniélou 1965, 67.

Judeo-Christian *Letter of Barnabas* (1st half of 2nd c.).<sup>47</sup> Later it is frequently found in patristic literature, such as St Justin Martyr, St Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, the Cappadocian Fathers, and St John Chrysostom.<sup>48</sup>

According to Daniélou, the notion of Sunday as the 8th day appears, in Judeo-Christianity, as the justification of a cultic creation, that is, of that of Sunday, as replacement of the Sabbath.<sup>49</sup> The rationale is clear: only in a community where the 7th day was of great importance could the idea of a following 8th day have meaning. Bacchiocchi puts it cogently: “As the eighth day, Sunday could claim to be the alleged continuation, fulfillment and supplantation of the Sabbath, both temporally and eschatologically.”<sup>50</sup> The idea of *Sunday as the eighth day* expresses the fundamental *opposition* between the *Jewish* cultic day and the *Christian* cultic day, probably within an anti-Jewish polemic.

*From eight days to eight weeks: A Judeo-Christian origin to the eight-week liturgical system?*

Since the eighth day is the addition of one day to a series of seven days, could it be that the eight weeks represent the addition of one week to a series of seven weeks?<sup>51</sup> For this to have been the case, a cycle of seven weeks would have to have existed in early Jerusalem to which an eighth week could naturally be added. Was there any such cycle? Yes, there actually was one and the addition of an eighth week to it might have had the same logic as the eighth day addition. There even exists, as shown by Cody (1982, 94–97), a later example of a liturgical rite (West-Syrian) in which the same shift took place (see below).

47 Διὸ καὶ ἀγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ἧ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανοῦς (*Ep. Barn.*, 15,9—*Sources chrétiennes* 172, 188).

48 For citations, see Daniélou 1951 and 1965, as well as the articles mentioned in n.43.

49 Daniélou 1965, 71

50 Bacchiocchi 1977, 301.

51 This idea was suggested by Cody (1982, 96–97), who is cited by Jeffery 2001a, 180–81, but neither provides any evidence to substantiate it.



An article by H. and J. Lewy from 1942–1943 on the ancient West-Asiatic calendar explains how several peoples in the Ancient Near East, including the Israelites, followed an ancient Amorite calendar consisting of several units of fifty days, called “pentecontads.” According to the Lewys, however, in the last centuries before Christ, in order to permit the succession of several pentecontads, in Israelite usage one day was removed and there remained only 49 days (7 x 7).<sup>52</sup> The series of pentecontads was applied also to the sectarian calendar of Qumran literature, each pentecontad being connected with a harvest feast.<sup>53</sup> Further, what is of great interest to us, the Amorite pentecontad calendar supposedly lies behind the liturgical seven-week cycles in Syrian Christianity, both East and West Syrian. As noted by the Lewys, a series of *šabu’a* (from Syriac for “seven”), a seven-week period, figures in the calendar of the East Syrian liturgical rite.<sup>54</sup> An essential seven week cycle is that leading to the Jewish Festival of Weeks and the Christian Pentecost.

Even more significantly, because of the closeness between the Antiochian and Jerusalemite spheres, Cody brings to light a similar seven-week cycle in 9th–11th century sources of the West-Syrian liturgical tradition. Referring to two 11th c. *ma’niāthā* manuscripts (*Vatican Syriac 94* and *London British Library Add. 17140*), containing Resurrection (Sunday) hymnody of Severus of Antioch and

52 Lewy 1942–43, 105: “... the Jews decided to establish the uninterrupted succession of the weeks by suppressing the fiftieth day of each pentecontad”; 109: “Hence it becomes apparent that in the second century BC when the author of the Book of Jubilees proposed his calendaric scheme, the uninterrupted succession of the weeks and sabbath-days, even though already in use, was still a matter of discussion and controversy.”

53 11 *QT* (the Temple Scroll), 18–22; 4 *QMMTA*. It is also found in the usage of the Jewish Therapeutae (*De Vita Contemplativa*, 64–89). See Baumgarten 1976 and 1987. Baumgarten (1987, 73ff.) assumes that the Book of Jubilees was familiar with the pentecontad calendar.

54 Lewy 1942–1943, 100–2. Cf. Cody, n. 56 on the sevenfold ordering of Sundays in the East Syrian Lectionaries. See also the calendar overview in Maclean 1894, p. 264. After the seven weeks of Pentecost follow those of the Apostles etc.

others, "given in consecutive numerical order of the modes, from 1 to 7," Cody writes:

One infers from the contents of these two codices that in Jacobite churches around the beginning of the eleventh century a cyclic arrangement of texts in all eight modes was operative for ferial days, while a series in the first seven modes alone was operative for Easter Week and the Sundays of Eastertide, and for any other Sundays on which the Resurrection was primarily commemorated.<sup>55</sup>

This **hymnodic sevenfold modal structure** is paralleled by Jacobite Lectionary witnesses from the same three centuries (9th–11th), even from Antioch itself.<sup>56</sup> Only **from the latter half of the 12th century** onwards were Jacobite *ma'niāthā* and Lectionary manuscripts structured according to the **eight-week cycle**. One witnesses here a late transition from a seven-week cycle to an eight-week cycle in the Syrian Orthodox (Jacobite) Church.

Eric Werner, although not always displaying sober argumentation, nevertheless offers many creative thoughts and synthetic perspectives.<sup>57</sup> I believe he is right when he argues, with support in Baumstark, for a calendar origin of the Oktoechos.<sup>58</sup> His actual argument, however, cannot be correct. The calendar element to which he attaches the origin of the Oktoechos is the pentecontad, pointing to the fact that there are eight Sundays in such a period of fifty days. This theory is untenable for the reason that although there are eight Sundays in a pentecontad, there are not eight weeks. Contrary to what Werner suggested, the eight-week cycle would thus have appeared in reaction to the pentecontad.

In his doctoral thesis, Walter Ray has suggested that the 4th-century Church of Jerusalem had emerged from a community using the calendar of the Jewish *Book of Jubilees* (2nd century before

<sup>55</sup> Cody 1982, 93.

<sup>56</sup> Cody 1982, 94–95.

<sup>57</sup> And the many oriental sources speaking of or alluding to eight musical modes, evoked by Werner in his chapter on the Oktoechos (1959, 373–409), deserve a thorough investigation.

<sup>58</sup> Werner 1948, 6–8; Werner 1959, 381ff.

Christ): “We have observed that the Jerusalem church took over not only the structure of the Jubilees calendar, but also its narrative elements and central themes.”<sup>59</sup> Ray recovers indications that even the pentecontad harvest feasts are reflected in the earlier layer of the Armenian translation of the Jerusalem Lectionary (pp. 140ff.). On the basis of Ray’s findings, we may assume that the Church of Jerusalem, like the communities following the sectarian calendar, and like East- and West-Syrian Churches, at some early stage knew cycles of seven weeks.

I therefore propose the following hypothesis: as Judeo-Christians christianize the week by adding the 8th day to the Sabbath, the Church of Jerusalem later christianizes the 49-day pentecontad by adding an eighth week to the seven Jewish weeks. The eight-week cycle then appears, through a Judeo-Christian logic, as the extension of the Sunday *ogdoad* from the weekly cycle to the annual cycle. In this way there would be an analogy between the Sabbath-Sunday relationship and the seven weeks-eight weeks relationship. As Sunday continues and fulfills the Sabbath, the eighth week continues and fulfills the seven weeks.

#### *When eight? The eight week fast and a 4th-century homily*

The question of the duration of the Jerusalem Lent and fast constitutes a complicated matter, and we can here only suggest a hypothesis according to which the addition of an eighth week of fasting is connected with the creation of a liturgical eight-week cycle. Let us emphasize at once that, as Verhelst has pointed out,<sup>60</sup> it is necessary to distinguish between Lent as a liturgical period and Lent as a fast, since the latter may begin (one week) before liturgical Lent actually starts and include Great Week.

It is historically certain that in Palestine at a certain time there took place an extension of the duration of the pre-paschal fast from seven to eight weeks. St Dorotheus of Gaza, a Palestinian elder of the mid-6th-century, in his 15th *didaskalia* explains the difference

<sup>59</sup> Ray 2000, 160. See also Ray 2004.

<sup>60</sup> Verhelst 2003, 23, 48.

between two ways of reckoning the τεσσαρακοστή, *tessarakostē*, “the forty [days Lent]”: first, that of “the holy Apostles,” which lasts seven weeks (six-week Lent plus Great Week);<sup>61</sup> second, that of “the Fathers,” which lasts eight weeks (XV,159). Dorotheus says that the additional element of the latter is a first, “preparatory”<sup>62</sup> week and that it is otherwise characterized by the extraction of Saturdays and Sundays from the counting of Lenten days as well as by its more exact rendering of forty days.<sup>63</sup> Such a chronological development, moving from an earlier seven-week fast (apostles’) to a later eight-week one (fathers’), supports our hypothesis. We then go on asking *when* this change might have taken place in Jerusalem.

The Hagiopolite liturgical books *AL*, *GL*, and *AI* all provide for a liturgical arrangement of a six-week Lent followed by Great Week. The six-week Lent (*tessarakostē*), independent of Great Week, is attested already in St Cyril, in a text pronounced on the last day of Lent (Friday of Palms)<sup>64</sup> and dated to 350 AD or slightly before: ἐν ταῖς διελοῦσαις τῆς τεσσαρακοστῆς ἡμέρας, “in these past days of Lent.”<sup>65</sup> It does not seem that St Cyril counts

61 This constitutes the “classical” Lent in Christian Late Antiquity. See Talley 1991, 174.

62 Dorotheos says this week is added in order that one may προγυμνάζεσθαι, “exercise beforehand” (ed. SC 92: XV, 159, l. 14), as pointed out by Verhelst 2003, p. 41.

63 St John of Damascus (1st half of 8th c.) also discusses the difference between the two durations of fast – seven or eight weeks (De sacris jejuniis, PG 95, col. 63–72), specifying that the latter is the rule of the Anastasis Church: ὁ κοινὸς ὅρος καὶ νόμος τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ὃν καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀγίᾳ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν Ἀναστάσει ἐπιτελοῦμενοι (col. 72A). French annotated translation is provided by Conticello 2005, 89–94, who proposes to date it to the period 735–45 (the article reached me too late to be incorporated into my work). The study by Vassa Conticello of the Jerusalem Lent, accompanying her translation, presents thoroughly the state of research on the question. Conticello emphasizes, like the present author, the correspondance between the Lenten duration of Egeria, Dorotheus, and John of Damascus. The disaccord she finds in the Lectionaries and Sozomen I judge not decisive: the Lenten arrangement of the AL is explained below; Sozomen could be referring to the actual six week Lent of liturgical books.

64 As pointed out by Janeras 2000, 60.

65 In his 18th catechesis (XVIII, 32; ed. Reischl & Rupp, 334).

with a preparatory week preceding the six; the fast period around 350 therefore would have been seven weeks.

Contrary to this, Egeria without any doubt speaks of a paschal fast of *eight* weeks in Jerusalem (*Itin.*, 27,1): “hic octo septimanae attenduntur ante pascha.” Egeria explains the difference between the duration of Lent in her home church and that in Jerusalem by using the same argument as the one given by Dorotheus: the exclusion of Saturday and Sunday from the counting of Lenten days. There can be no doubt that Egeria witnessed the same eight-week fast as the “patristic” one known by Dorotheus and practiced in the later Palestinian and Byzantine rites. Admittedly, Egeria says that liturgically one did the same things all the eight weeks,<sup>66</sup> the only difference from non-Lenten weeks being the addition of the Third Hour (27,4), a difference which would not be reflected in the Lectionary.

It is commonly held that Egeria’s witness to the eight-week fast stands alone and that the more recent *AL* prescribes a seven week Lent.<sup>67</sup> In fact, however, the *AL* also witnesses, indirectly, to the existence of an eight-week fast in Jerusalem: as Renoux has noted, in the Jerusalem fast as represented in *AL* “il faut soustraire les dimanches et vraisemblablement les samedis.”<sup>68</sup> If Sunday is exempted from the counting of the forty days one has already passed to the eight-week system, since the seven-week fast system (40 days plus Great Week) counts Sunday among the forty days; further, the indications pointed out by Renoux (*ibidem*, n.3) that Saturday too is exempted are practically decisive.

The extension of the Jerusalem fast from seven to eight weeks seems then to have occurred at some point between 350 (Cyril) and the beginning of the 380s (Egeria).

It is obvious that the eight-week fast has been superposed on the seven-week arrangement; in fact, **the two organizational principles continue to coexist to some degree in later Palestinian liturgy.** A

66 “Sic ergo singulae septimanae celebrantur quadagesimarum” (27,8).

67 Cf. most recently Day 2005, 130f.

68 *LA*, II, 183.

preparatory eighth (i.e., first) week of fasting is reflected in liturgical readings in the *GL*, but not in the *AL*. Palestinian, as well as later Byzantine,<sup>69</sup> liturgical books limit, strictly speaking, the *tessarakostē* to the six weeks between Meatfare and Lazarus Saturday;<sup>70</sup> at the same time they treat Saturday and Sunday as non-Lenten days and operate a corresponding fast of an eight-week duration.

However, before we may confidently use the extension of the Jerusalem fast from seven to eight weeks as an indication for dating the apparition of the liturgical eight-week cycle, we must evaluate whether it results from the Judeo-Christian logic of Sunday as the eighth day. In fact, it would only seem natural that the exclusion of Saturdays, and not only Sundays, from Lent is motivated by a reverence for the Sabbath, and subsequently linked with the eighth-day symbolism. In an alternative solution, seven weeks of six days (= 42 days), excluding only Sundays, could conveniently have been interpreted as forty days, so that in Jerusalem one would not have had to add an eighth week. Instead, the Jerusalem Church chose an eight-week fast, resulting in a somewhat complicated liturgical rearrangement, juxtaposing two mutually exclusive counting systems.

In the same way as in the East and West Syrian rites, where a seven-week *šabu'a* "of the Fast" precedes Pascha, in Jerusalem, then, a fast period (but here eight weeks) constituted the first of the annual series of such a cycle.<sup>71</sup>

69 Here I have in mind the Byzantine rite, the liturgical synthesis between Constantinople and Jerusalem, not the Constantinopolitan rite.

70 *GL*, for ex., gives these six weeks numbers 1–6, while Great Week is not called the 7th week. This system is continued in the Byzantine Triodion. The first stikheron of "Lord I have cried" at present Orthodox Vespers on Friday evening of the week of Palms (6th week) begins: "Having completed the forty days ..."

71 And likewise, in the present Armenian rite, whatever is the preceding mode, the first Sunday of Lent takes the last mode (4th "side," that is plagal), thus in the Armenian way restarting the annual eight-mode cycle (see Serkoyan 1978, 53). One may also note the interesting fact that the Armenian Psalter is organized in a way that combines the numbers eight and seven: It is divided in eight *kanons* consisting each of

That the theology of the *ogdoad*, as well as the seven+one structure, were vital in Jerusalem in the later 4th century is confirmed by a homily attributed to John II, bishop of the Holy City for thirty years, from 387 to 417. This homily, preserved in Armenian,<sup>72</sup> was given at the dedication of the Holy Sion Church, probably in 394,<sup>73</sup> in any case before 415.<sup>74</sup> John II, who knew Syriac (probably Christian Palestinian Aramaic) and had a good knowledge of the Judeo-Christian tradition of Palestine,<sup>75</sup> gave his sermon an eightfold structure. He first presents an Old Testament typology in seven “circles,” and then adds an eighth circle, which is the habitation of the Holy Spirit in the heart as the divine spouse. We see that the eightfold structure of this homily, consisting of seven + one, resembles that of the eight-week fast: seven weeks of fasting + Great Week.

These two examples of eightfold structure in 4th- or early-5th-century Jerusalem suggest the existence of a milieu congruent with the creation of the eight-week cycle. We shall see that other liturgical evidence of an eight-week cycle does go back to approximately the same period.

seven *gublay*; T'ahmizyan 1978, 197 (who links the eight parts with the eight modes); Kerovpyan 2003, p. 89–96 (excellent overview of the Armenian Psalter).

72 Edition with Latin translation in Van Esbroeck 1973; French translation in Van Esbroeck 1984, 115–25.

73 Van Esbroeck 1984, 112.

74 Verhelst 2003b, who discusses the homily on 200–3, questions Van Esbroeck's *terminus ad quem* AD 395.

75 Van Esbroeck 1984, 106–7.

### *The Oktoechos of the Jerusalem Lectionary*

#### *The four or eight Sunday Matins Gospels*

An important part of the eight-mode Hagiopolite liturgical system was constituted by various eightfold structures of the Lectionary. These concern both the Divine Office and the Divine Liturgy. In contrast to the present Byzantine series of Resurrection Gospels read at Sunday Matins, consisting of eleven pericopes, there was in the Jerusalem rite first a series of four pericopes, then one of eight.<sup>76</sup> They were originally read at the so-called "Resurrection Office," recorded by Egeria, which was a kind of Nocturns office.<sup>77</sup> Later this Sunday Nocturns ceased to exist as an independent office; most of its various parts were spread to other offices, the Gospel pericopes being placed in Matins, as is already the case in the *Ancient Iadgari*.<sup>78</sup>

Sebastian Janeras has gathered much of the manuscript data related to this series, correctly identifying its Hagiopolite provenance.<sup>79</sup> Most of the witnesses display the (presumably) "new" modal sequence (1–4, 5–8), but one finds the old sequence in the Syro-Palestinian Gospel Lectionary.<sup>80</sup>

76 For a study of these three stages, see Janeras 1986. At some point in the historical course of Hagiopolite liturgy the four Gospels have been doubled and thus extended to eight. This extension never reached the Armenian rite, which still has only (the same) four Gospels. In the four authentic modes we find readings from the four Gospels in the order of the Bible, beginning with Matthew. The readings of the four plagal modes usually represent, with the exception of Matthew which is the same, the pericopes directly following the texts of the authentic mode readings. The authentic mode pericopes concern directly the resurrection, while the plagal mode ones are in reality *post-resurrectional* readings (Mk: the "longer ending," post-resurrection appearance and Ascension; Lk: the walk to Emmaus, post-resurrection appearance; Jn: post-resurrection appearance to seven disciples).

77 See Mateos 1961; Winkler 1987. The Armenian "Office of the Myrrh-bearing Women" is a close heir to the 4th century Sunday Nocturns.

78 See Renoux 2000, 129 (mode 1), etc.

79 Janeras 1986.

80 Smith-Lewis 1899, 215–25.



Pericopes	Mode indication
Mt 28:1–20	mode 1 and 1 pl
Mk 16:2–8	mode 2
Mk 16:9–20	mode 2 pl
Lk 24:1–12	mode 3
Lk 24:36–53	mode 3 pl
Jn 20:1–10	mode 4
Jn 20:11–18	mode 4 pl

The well-known existence in the present Armenian rite of only four Resurrection Gospels, called the “Gospels of the Myrrh-bearing Women,”<sup>81</sup> easily makes one suspect that the eightfold Gospel series is not the original one. In search of other witnesses to the four Gospel series, a review of the Georgian material is rewarding, as it usually is. Two 9th–10th c. liturgical manuals have only four Gospels, identical to the Armenian ones except that the pericopes are shorter:<sup>82</sup> *Sinai Georgian 53* (see n.17 above), where the four Gospels are preceded by the *ganiyvidzeni*<sup>83</sup> in eight modes;<sup>84</sup> *Sinai Georgian N.58* (new finds of 1975).<sup>85</sup>

A four-Gospel series almost identical<sup>86</sup> to that of *Sinai Georgian 53* and *Sinai Georgian N.58* exists further in the Easter section of the oldest manuscript of the Georgian Lectionary, the *xanmet'i* fragment<sup>87</sup> dated palaeographically to no later than the beginning of the 7th century, and whose translation for linguistic reasons

81 See for ex. *Armenian Book of Hours*, 53.

82 Their length is however equal to that of the same pericopes of almost all eight Gospel series: Mt 18:1–20; Mk 16:1–8; Lk 24:1–12; Jn 20:1–18 (Gvaramia 1987, 58).

83 Responsorial chants immediately preceding the Gospel, probably versions of the three antiphons of Hagiopolite resurrectional Nocturns / Agrypnia.

84 It also contains several eight-mode structures of the Sunday liturgy.

85 Aleksidze et al. 2005, 418

86 The only difference is Lk 24:1–35.

87 Ms. *Graz Univ. Libr.*, 2058/1. Edition: Šaniče 1944. Ms. no. 47 in Outtier's list of witnesses of Old Georgian NT versions (Outtier 1988).

must have taken place during the 5th–6th century.<sup>88</sup> In earlier studies these pericopes have been interpreted as intended for actual services of Easter and Bright Week.<sup>89</sup> This is unlikely, however, since in other lectionary witnesses of this archaic period (most importantly, the Armenian version) the Gospel readings of Easter Day and Monday after Easter follow another order: Mt–Jn–Mk–Lk.<sup>90</sup>

What role do these four paschal Gospel pericopes play in a Lectionary? We find help to understand this in the series of eight Gospel readings of two later Gospel Lectionaries: *Sinai Greek 210*, probably written in 861 or 862,<sup>91</sup> and the 10th-century Greek-Arabic *Sinai Arabic 116* (l 2211).<sup>92</sup> In the latter the Gospel readings are called by the manuscript *εὐαγγέλια ἀναστάσιμα* (nos. 72, 74). In these two Lectionaries only the first Gospel readings (respectively the first and the three first) have calendar rubrics, while the other pericopes have modal assignments only. In their given order most of these eight pericopes are therefore not intended for use in the actual services of Easter Week.

What we witness here, then, is the insertion into a Lectionary's paschal cycle of the eight-mode Matins Gospels of the Resurrection, and the insertion of the series of four such Gospels is to be dated to no later than the 5th–6th century, the period to which is dated the translation of the four *xanmet'i* Gospel pericopes.<sup>93</sup> Placed in the Lectionaries at Easter day, these four or eight Gospels were obviously intended for use in the eight-week cycle, not in the fixed calendar year. This must have been the role played also by the four Gospels at Easter Day in the *xanmet'i* fragment of the Geor-

88 See Outtier 1996, 76.

89 See Tarchnischvili 1942–1943, 5f.; Janeras 1986, 59.

90 *AL* XLIVter, XLV, XLVI; see further Janeras 1986, 58–59 (comparative table).

91 l 844 of Aland e.a. 1994. To the codex 210 have been joined several fragments, of which the most important is *Sin. N.E. MG* 12 (see Harlfinger e.a. 1983, 13–14 with plates). One damaged page of the latter permits with probability to date the manuscript to 861 or 862 and suggests its copying at the Great Lavra of St Sabas.

92 Duly presented by Garitte 1977.

93 This is the probable date of the Greek model of the *xanmet'i* fragment.

gian Lectionary which, as we have seen, differ from the more or less contemporary *AL* and *GL* Easter Gospels.

We also observe here a doubling of the original quadruple series of Sunday Nocturns or Matins Gospels. One note written by Iovane Zosime at Sinai in 977 (*Sinai Georgian* 47) concerning the eight Gospels, probably testifies to this development: “These are the holy Gospels of Matins of the holy Sundays in all eight modes, with the complete ordo,<sup>94</sup> as it is in the Greek manner on Holy Sinai.”<sup>95</sup> The mention of “the Greek manner” may be directed to Georgian monks who were used to only four Gospels, the very ones of *Sinai* 53 and *Sinai* N.58 mentioned above.

#### *Eight modes applied to quadruple text structures*

The identification of quadruple structures used in an eight-mode system is in itself interesting and seems to be not without analogy to the two groups of four modes of the musical Oktoechos.

In fact, Palestinian sources offer numerous cases of quadruple structures presumably used in an eight-mode system. A first Georgian example is found in the 10th-century *Sinai Georgian* 54, a Euchologion comprising a Lectionary supplement. In the Euchologion part, which follows the structure of the Lectionary, there is a section of Divine Liturgy Dismissal prayers.<sup>96</sup> This section ends with four Dismissal prayers, prescribed for Sundays 1 to 4, with no modal assignment.<sup>97</sup> In the corresponding Lectionary section of the manuscript we find however an *eight-mode* series of Sunday Liturgies.<sup>98</sup> It is evident here that the context of the four Dismissal prayers was the provision for eight modes; one must have used the same Dismissal prayers for the pairs of authentic and plagal modes.

Two manuscripts of the *Ancient Iadgari* have four hypakoë labeled “of the souls,” that is, of Saturday, the day devoted to the

94 That is, the prokeimenon-psalm and the alleluia-psalm.

95 Gvaramia et al. 1987, 55.

96 In Georgian: *eris gant'evebaj*, “the dismissal of the people.”

97 Gvaramia et al. 1987, 60 (fol. 54r–56v).

98 Gvaramia et al. 1987, 66–67.

departed; four *tsardgomaj* (kathismas) and hypakoë of the Resurrection (Sunday); four *tsardgomaj* and hypakoë of the angels (Monday).<sup>99</sup> The Euchologion *Sinai Georgian 12* has four Dismissal prayers for the daily Presanctified Liturgy of St James.<sup>100</sup>

An interesting aspect of the doubling of the Resurrection Gospel series is the reading of the second plagal mode, the so-called “long ending” of Mark (16:9–20). As we can see from ancient Armenian and Georgian New Testament versions,<sup>101</sup> this pericope was absent from the Scripture text employed at Jerusalem in the 4th–5th centuries and for some time thereafter. The difficulty of dating the insertion of this pericope into the Jerusalem New Testament prevents us, however, from using this fact as evidence for dating the shift from four to eight gospels.

#### *Divine Liturgies in eight modes*

There existed in the Palestinian tradition an **Oktoechos** not only for the divine **office**, but also for some chants and prayers of the Divine **Liturgy**. The earliest witness to this is probably the pre-7th-century ***Ancient Iadgari, the old hymnal of Jerusalem***. The Sunday eight mode elements found there are the prokeimenon-psalm and the alleluia-psalm, as well as the hymns for the Washing of Hands and for the Entrance of the Gifts. The prokeimenon and the alleluia, which are also found in the Great Lectionary (*GL* n° 1979–1692), are sure signs of the existence of an Apostle and a Gospel in these offices.

99 Mss. *Tbilisi H-2123* and *Sinai Georgian 40. AI*, 352–59.

100 Gvaramia et al 1987, 38, nos. 52–55. The ms. rubric specifies **ერის განტევებაჲ სამარადისონი**, *eris gant'evabaj samaradisoni*, “daily [prayers] at the dismissal of the people.” The word **სამარადისონი**, *samaradisoj*, “perpetual, daily, fixed, ordinary,” signifies in other sources (*Sinai 26*, *Sinai 34*, *Sinai 53*) weekdays, ordinary days, distinguished from Sunday and feast days. On ordinary days was celebrated a Communion service of Presanctified Gifts, as is seen in the Horologion of *Sinai Georgian 34*. The Communion office of this Horologion has two prayers for the Dismissal of the people.

101 See for ex. Metzger 1971, 122–23. The liturgical traditions that used these New Testament versions were either Jerusalemite (Georgian) or deriving from the rite of Jerusalem (Armenian).

Such scriptural readings are present in similar eight-mode Sunday Liturgies found in the Lectionary supplement of the Euchologion *Sinai Georgian 54* (10th c.)<sup>102</sup> and in the partial Lectionary *St Petersburg RNL Greek 44* (9th c.).<sup>103</sup> Here there are eight fixed Gospels to be read in the same cyclical way as the eight-mode hymns. The pericopes are however in most cases not the same in the two manuscripts.

The eight-mode Sunday Liturgies were obviously intended for the same part of the Church year as the rest of the Sunday Oktoechos, that is, all year except for Lent and maybe partly the Easter season. This fact is of interest for us, since the later Hagiopolite liturgical Lectionary has readings for Sundays, in the form of an approximate *lectio continua* of all four Gospels.

Significantly, these are not present in the 5th-century Armenian Lectionary. Neither does the oldest (*xanmet'i*) fragment of the Georgian Lectionary, the content of which dates from the 5th–6th centuries, have a continuous reading for the part of the year concerned, which would have been a reading of John between Easter and Pentecost. A *lectio continua* is present in the 8th-century Georgian Lectionary, but not in all the witnesses.<sup>104</sup> Neither does the Armenian rite, which introduced the *lectio continua* only after the 12th century—at least as far as concerns Matthew and John<sup>105</sup>—point to any great antiquity of the *lectio continua* in Jerusalem.<sup>106</sup>

The question of dating the continuous Sunday readings of the four Gospels is very complex and requires detailed research of a vast source material. *A priori* we cannot exclude that the eight-mode Sunday Lectionary is more ancient than the continuous reading throughout the year.

Even for ferial (*samaradiso*, see n.100) Liturgies (at this early

102 Outtier 1981, no. 42–49.

103 "Enchiridon liturgique du IXe siècle (Codex N° XLIV)", 17–30 (introduction), 3\*–11\* (edition), in: Thibaut 1913.

104 See investigation for each of the four Gospels in Verhelst 1999, with conclusion 165–66.

105 Renoux 1972, 478–79; Renoux 1996, 71–72. See Verhelst 1999, 117, 142.

106 Since the Lectionary of the Armenian rite is adopted from Jerusalem.

stage this means the St James Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts), there was an eight-mode element: the dismissal prayer. As we have already mentioned, there were four of these in *Sinai Georgian 12*. The ms. only numbers them, but the use of Presanctified Liturgy dismissal prayers according to the liturgical eight-mode system is beyond doubt in the Ancient Horologion of *Sinai Georgian 34*, where the second dismissal prayer of the Communion office is given a plagal mode assignment (mode 3 plagal).<sup>107</sup>

We have now come to the third component of the liturgical Oktoechos, that of the Hymnal.

### *The Oktoechos of the Jerusalem Hymnal*

#### *The Sunday Oktoechos of the Ancient Iadgari*

The most impressive product of the eight-mode system of Jerusalem is probably the eight-mode hymnal for Sundays, the “Resurrection Hymns (*Dasadebelni aydgomisani*)” of the *Ancient Iadgari*. Published in the original Georgian more than 25 years ago, it was described for the Western world in an article by Peter Jeffery in 1991. Since then it has become much more accessible thanks to a French translation of one of the manuscripts, the *Sinai Georgian 18* (10th c.).<sup>108</sup> The excellent commentary and footnotes by the author, Dom Charles (Athanasé) Renoux, make this book a point of departure for the study of the earliest Sunday hymnbook of Jerusalem.

The eight-mode liturgical system of this Sunday hymnal concerns three or four offices: Vespers, perhaps Nocturns, Matins, and the Divine Liturgy. The content of these offices is the following:<sup>109</sup>

At Vespers: Hymns at “Lord I have cried,” Prokeimenon, *Oxitaj* (entrance hymn).

The two hymns “Now bless” (sung at Ps 133) and “[Hymns] at the Cross” were originally sung at Sunday Nocturns, called the “Resurrection Office”; it is possible, as indicated above, that by the

107 Fol. 4v15.

108 Renoux 2000.

109 There are no rubrics telling where each office begins. The division into separate offices causes some problems.

time of this hymnal the Nocturns office had been abolished as a separate Hour and spread to other offices. In that case the two hymns in question would probably have been attached to Vespers, possibly either as Aposticha stichera or procession hymns.

At Matins: Canon of 9 odes, Prokeimenon, Hymn after the Gospel (*gardamotkumaj*), Hymns at Praises (Pss 148–150).

At the Liturgy, as we have seen: Prokeimenon-psalm, Alleluia-psalm, “[Hymn] at the Washing of Hands,” Hymn at the Entrance of the Gifts.

In his article on the Oktoechos, Jeffery argues on the basis of manuscript structures that the Sunday Oktoechos “originated as a kind of appendix or supplement to the tropologion or ‘antiphoner,’ known in Georgian as ‘Iadgari.’”<sup>110</sup> Contrary to this, it seems that the Sunday Oktoechos from an early period formed part of the Iadgari. Jeffery’s evidence, i.e., its varying place in the structure of Iadgari manuscripts hardly constitutes any proof; since the eight-mode material could not be inserted into the annual or paschal cycles, it had to be put either before or after these, and there is no reason why either place was not acceptable. Some Greek Oktoechos manuscripts from the 10th century onwards are even entitled “Tropologion,” which is the Greek equivalent to the Iadgari.<sup>111</sup> These do belong to the *New* stage of the Hymnal, but they nevertheless show that the Oktoechos was considered part of the Tropologion material even at a later time, when this one hymnal was divided in several. We may safely deduce from this that the Oktoechos of the *Ancient Iadgari* belonged to the originally one Jerusalem hymnal.

Jeffery’s tentative dating of the *Ancient Iadgari* Sunday Oktoechos to the eighth century<sup>112</sup> is also hardly defensible. The shift between the Old and the New Jerusalem hymnals, as we have seen, takes place in the 7th century, seemingly its first half. It is extremely improbable

110 Jeffery 2001a, 200; see also 201.

111 See for ex. Husmann 1971, 32–46: *Sin. gr.* 777 (11th c.), *Sin. gr.* 784 (12th c.), *Sin. gr.* 789 (12th c.). Another is *Grottaferrata D.g.* 12, dated to 970.

112 Jeffery 2001a, 201: “Thus if we choose the most conservative dating for the tropologion—the seventh century—we may suppose that the Oktoechos, which began as a supplement to it, belongs perhaps to the eighth century.”

that an *old* Sunday Oktoechos hymnal should have been written after this crucial date, at a time when hymnographers were already writing the new hymnal, which certainly contained a *new* Oktoechos.

How old then is the old Sunday hymnal? We must distinguish between the age of the hymns themselves and the age of the particular redaction of the hymnal that we know from the *Ancient Iadgari*. Let us first consider the age of the hymns themselves.

Comparing the theological style and formulations of these hymns with credal and patristic texts of the 4th and 5th centuries, Dom Renoux finds that they are characterized by the Christology of the 4th century<sup>113</sup> and in particular connected with the works of St Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, active from 345 to 387, and St Hesychius, priest and preacher of the cathedral of Jerusalem, flourishing in the first half of the 5th century.<sup>114</sup> Renoux finds that Cyril probably wrote liturgical hymns, while Hesychius in his homilies probably made use of an existing hymnography.<sup>115</sup> On the whole, Renoux dates what he labels the “ancient common fund” of Hagiopolite resurrectional hymnography to the 4th–5th centuries.

Another indication of the age of this Sunday Oktoechos is the existence in the Armenian hymnography of some of the same hymns.<sup>116</sup> The correspondence between Armenian and Georgian versions of Hagiopolite hymnography points to a common 5th-century origin.<sup>117</sup>

Now let us move on to the redaction of the Sunday Oktoechos preserved in the *Ancient Iadgari*. This redaction cannot possibly date as far back as to the time of Cyril and Hesychius. The indications of this emanate from historical changes of liturgical structures.<sup>118</sup>

First, a comparison with 4th–5th Jerusalem practices recorded

113 Renoux 2000, 45–49.

114 Renoux 2000, 44–45.

115 Ibid.

116 See footnotes in Renoux 2000, passim.

117 Renoux 2000, 52–55.

118 I shall be studying in detail the development of the Jerusalem Agrypnia in a forthcoming publication.



by Egeria, and preserved in the Armenian rite, reveals that the structure of Sunday Matins of the *Ancient Iadgari* is already different and cannot date from the 4th–5th century.<sup>119</sup>

Second, the series of nine odes of Hagiopolite festal Matins clearly appears to be a development of a more ancient festal series of odes containing two (or three) odes only. In fact, some witnesses of the Sunday Oktoechos of the Ancient Iadgari contain, in addition to the nine-ode hymnography, hymn layers<sup>120</sup> limited to odes 8–9 or 7–9 (or even ode 9 only).<sup>121</sup> For example, the *Sinai Georgian 41* (10th cent.) possesses a fifth layer limited to odes 8–9 and to the first four modes only.<sup>122</sup> The dating of the extension from 2–3 to 9 odes is complex and needs further investigation,<sup>123</sup> but the bare fact that the Armenian Sunday office has only odes 7–9 suggests that the 9-ode series originated in the 6th century.<sup>124</sup> These reflections<sup>125</sup> suggest dating the particular *AI* stage of the Sunday Oktoechos to the 6th century.

On the other hand we must ask if the preserved redaction of the Sunday Oktoechos does not yield evidence of eight-mode Sunday hymnody older than the 6th century. We have already seen that some Sunday hymnody seems to date from the 4th and 5th centu-

119 The Sunday Resurrection Gospel, which was originally read at Nocturns (the “Resurrection Office”), like in the present Armenian “Office of the Myrrh-bearing Women,” is in the *AI* placed at the Matins service, between the 9 ode canon and the Praises.

120 In most of these codices each additional layer is announced by the term (ննդօօ, *sxuaj*, “other” (ննդօօ, *sxuani*, “others”), translating the Greek ἄλλος / ἄλλοι.

121 This concerns mostly *Sinai Georgian 18* and *41*.

122 The ms. has lost its beginning and starts in the middle of the 7th ode, mode 2; one may assume that the first mode presented the same picture as modes 2–4.

123 One important aspect is the feast of the Nativity, which in one witness of the *AI* contains an older layer of odes 7–9 only. This hymn layer could constitute a clue to the dating of the 9-ode series, but, as is well known, the dating of the introduction in Jerusalem of this feast is in itself uncertain.

124 The relationship of the Armenian daily office to that of Jerusalem also needs to be examined in depth, but it does seem that the Armenian liturgy starts to depart from the Hagiopolite one in the 5th century.

125 Another fact that must be taken into consideration is that Hesychius, in his early-5th-century *Commentary on the Odes*, glosses a series of 14 biblical odes. Given the apparent antiquity of the use in Jerusalem of the 2–3 odes series it is however difficult to imagine that the 14 odes series was intended for actual liturgical use there.

ries, but are there traces of a pre-6th century octotonal ordering of it? Yes, the data just mentioned concerning the development of the canon odes would constitute such traces. As we have just said, the diodes (odes 8–9) of the fifth layer of *Sinai Georgian 41*, representing an earlier “canon” structure than the 9-ode series of the 6th century, are modally ordered (modes 1-4). The significant fact that only four modes are involved further point to a very early period; the four hymn modes are analogous to the four Sunday Gospel pericopes (5th c.). It seems safe for these reasons to suggest a dating to the 5th century of the Sunday diodes of *Sinai Georgian 41*.<sup>126</sup>

### *The ferial Oktoechos of the Ancient Iadgari*

The Ancient Iadgari comprises eight-mode hymnography for Vespers and Matins, not only for Sundays but also for ferial weekdays. This material has been preserved in three Georgian manuscripts, each of them presenting a different number of sections. *Sinai Georgian 34* even has two slightly diverse redactions (with or without the 9 odes—see below). Only the least developed redaction (that of *Sin. 40*) of this hymnody was published in the 1980 Tbilisi edition (pp. 513–26).

	<i>Sin. Geo. 34</i> (fol. 132r–133v; incipits only)	<i>Sin. Geo. 53</i> (fol. 80v–86v)	<i>Sin. Geo. 40</i> (Al, p. 513–524)
Vespers	Lord I have cried	+	+
	<i>Oxitaj</i> (entrance hymn)	+	+
	Prokeimenon-psalm	+	+
	“Aposticha”	+	-
	<i>Litaniisaj</i> (procession hymn)	-	-
Matins	9 odes = “canon” (in the “Georgian” Horologion only)	-	-
	Praises	+	+
	“Aposticha”	+	- <sup>127</sup>

126 Further examination of the presumably older layers is necessary, including comparison with the Armenian Oktoechos. If there was found an Armenian version of these diodes it would very much strengthen our dating.

127 The Praises that precede, however, include at the end many of the hymns that figure in the “Aposticha” of the two other redactions.

The hymns of the ferial Oktoechos are either newly composed or taken from existing offices, for instance those of Lenten offices, St Stephen the Protomartyr, the Hierarchs, the Fallen-Asleep. It is noteworthy that there was a Vespers prokeimenon in eight modes, presumably replacing the more ancient fixed alleluia-psalm, which is still used in present-day Lenten Vespers of the Byzantine rite.<sup>128</sup> The two Aposticha sections must also be late newcomers. One particular element, the 9 odes (or “Canon”), figures only in the Ancient Horologion (in *Sinai Georian 34*), as sample hymns, and *not* in the hymnal part of the same manuscript. This suggests that the ferial nine-ode “canon” hymnography was the latest element to have been composed, which is confirmed by the maybe 6th-century *Sabaite Rule* of fixed daily chants, found in the same codex, prescribing diodes or triodes for the whole year (and not only for Lent).

The presence of **this eight-mode ferial hymn collection in the Ancient Horologion of Jerusalem**, datable to the first half of the 7th century, confirms its place in the old stage of Hagiopolite hymnography. In view of its late elements which I have just mentioned, I presume that the ferial Oktoechos of the Ancient Iadgari dates from its last creative period, that is, the **first decades of the 7th century at the latest.**

### *Early Armenian Musicological Treatises*

For the last sources providing data to the question of the early liturgical Oktoechos, let us examine briefly two Armenian literary sources of great importance for dating the Oktoechos. Outtier and Jeffery have given credit to the Armenian historian Step’anos Orbelean (1250/60–1304), who attributes the introduction into the Armenian rite of the eight modes to bishop Step’anos Siwneç’i of the 8th century.<sup>129</sup> However, there exist a few small Armenian

128 That is, the genre is the same (psalm with “alleluia” refrain), but the psalms are different.

129 Outtier 1978, 103; Jeffery 2001a, 181.

treatises composed before this century which contain indisputable data about the eight modes.

The first treatise is entitled “On the orders of the Church,” and is attributed<sup>130</sup> to a certain Movsēs K’ertoł, also from Siwneč’i.<sup>131</sup> In two paragraphs, Movsēs describes typological and symbolic aspects of the eight modes, that is, of the four “voices” and the four “sides.” In each case he also mentions liturgical pieces which are sung in the given mode.<sup>132</sup>

According to a fairly recent study,<sup>133</sup> the author of the treatise is probably identical to Movsēs K’ert’oľahayr, Bishop of Aršarunik from 630 to 648 and to be distinguished from Movsēs K’ert’oľ (end of 7th c.).<sup>134</sup> Now if the eight-mode system appeared in Armenia in the 7th century, we may suppose that it was in use at an earlier period in Jerusalem, since it was without any doubt adopted from there. The mature reflection on the eight modes found in Movsēs’ text suggests that the Armenians had received the eight-mode system some time prior to its composition; this permits us to move back probably to 6th-century Jerusalem.

A number of ancient musicological Armenian treatises concern the eight-mode system. Four of these are presented by T’ahmizyan<sup>135</sup> and two by Arevšatyan (1996–1997).<sup>136</sup> They lack credible attribution to an author, but internal evidence points to an early dating: according to T’ahmizyan (p. 63) his four texts are datable to no later than the 7th century, according to Arevšatyan

130 There does not seem to be any doubt about the authenticity of this work.

131 Edited in T’ahmizyan 1972, 91–93.

132 I am grateful to Dr. Aram Kerovpyan, Paris, for having provided a preliminary French translation of the parts of the treatise that concern the modes.

133 Ananean 1991.

134 In this question see Renoux (1993, 290) and Findikyan (2004, 43), who follow Ananean 1991.

135 T’ahmizyan 1977, 63–65, 86–87, 160–64.

136 From the indications of manuscript sources it seems that only two of these texts are identical: text “B” of T’ahmizyan (see 1977, 63) and the short redaction of the first commentary in Arevšatyan.

(p. 340) her two (or four)<sup>137</sup> probably belong to one of two early periods of the development of the Armenian eight-mode system (the first period relating to the 4th–5th centuries, the second, to the 7th–8th centuries). Awaiting a critical edition and a thorough, global study of all the Armenian musicological treatises of this early period, what we can say at this point is that they seem to confirm the chronological evidence provided by the treatise of Movṣēs.

### *Conclusion: Dating the Apparition and Evolution of the Eight-Mode Liturgical System*

In conclusion we shall gather together the data we have examined about the early development, including the essential question of dating, of the liturgical Oktoechos, keeping in mind that the skeleton of the liturgical Oktoechos was the eight week cycle of the Church year and that some data are concretely dated, some are dated in a conjectured or circumstantial way.

The earliest Oktoechos evidence is possibly the eight-week pre-paschal fast described by Egeria (381–384), which seems to have appeared between ca. 350 (the fast as we may glean from St Cyril’s Lenten catecheses, lasted seven weeks: six weeks *tessarakostê* plus Great Week) and the early 380s. The theological reasoning behind the eight-week fast was certainly reverence for the Sabbath in the case of counting the forty fast days (Saturday and Sunday exempted), but the Judeo-Christian “eighth day” symbolism may very well have been another, larger operative motif behind this creation. In that case the eight-week pre-paschal fast could have been an element of an eight-week cycle traversing the entire year.

The earliest Oktoechos evidence for which we provide a conjectural dating we place in the 5th century; the diodes of the Sunday hymnody of the *Ancient Iadgari* codex *Sinai Georgian 41*. In general, it is beyond doubt that the *Ancient Iadgari* belongs to the Georgian translation of the pre-Islamic (before 638) phase of Hagiopolite liturgy, that is, the Oktoechos liturgical system existed

<sup>137</sup> Aravšatyan identifies three redactions of her first text, the shortest of which is treated also by T’ahmizyan (text “B”).

in Jerusalem by the 6th century. But these diodes, arranged in the four authentic modes, represent an earlier stage (presumably of the 5th c.) of the “canon” than the 9 ode series of the Sunday hymnody of the preserved *Ancient Iadgari*.

Another Oktoechos evidence of the 5th century is possibly the series of four Gospels of Sunday Nocturns, found in the 5th–6th centuries *xanmet'i* fragment of the Georgian Lectionary and in the present Armenian “Office of the Myrrh-bearing Women,” the pericopes of which textually date to the early 5th century. As the Sunday diodes, these pericopes consist of only four units. The question is however how to determine the liturgical use of the four Sunday Resurrection Gospels. Textually they may be dated to an earlier period than the *AI* Sunday Oktoechos: the Georgian *xanmet'i* Lectionary fragment to the 5th–6th centuries; the four Armenian Resurrection pericopes to the early 5th century at the latest, since they have the same length as those of the earliest manuscript of the Armenian Lectionary, the *Jerusalem 121*, whose content is dated to 417–438.<sup>138</sup> But were these four Hagiopolite Gospel pericopes part of an eight-week cycle, or did the number four only result from the existence of four Gospels? As we have seen, a quadruple literary unit could very well be used within an eightfold liturgical system, but this is a negative argument and not positive evidence of any actual such use. However, the strong evidence given by the Sunday diodes for the existence of a 5th-century liturgical Oktoechos makes it not only plausible but probable that the four Gospel readings also belonged to this octotonal system. Further, their strange or even abnormal (unrelated to the calendar readings) location in the 5th–6th c. Georgian *xanmet'i* Lectionary (Easter Day), identical to that of the eight-mode series of later Lectionaries, points to the same Oktoechos function. In other words, there seems to have existed an eight-week Lectionary system for Sunday Nocturns or Matins in the 5th century, consisting of one resurrection pericope from each Gospel. Later this series was

<sup>138</sup> The two other witnesses of the earliest Armenian Lectionary, which are slightly more recent, no longer have the long readings.

extended into eight readings through the addition of post-resurrection accounts for the plagal modes (except for 1st plagal mode).

Chronologically the next evidence is the redaction of the Resurrection hymns preserved in the *Ancient Iadgari*, datable to the 6th century.

The earliest concretely dated certain evidence for the Oktoechos is the Armenian treatise “On the orders of the Church,” from the first half of the 7th century, attributed to Movsēs Siwnec’i.

**Let us also summarize** what has been said about the theological motivation for the Oktoechos. It is grounded in the symbol of Sunday as the 8th day. The Christian adoption of the ancient Egyptian *ogdoad* symbolism probably took place in Judeo-Christian communities of the late first century. This was motivated by reverence for the Sabbath in addition to an even greater reverence for Sunday. Concretely, it was prompted by the need to justify the replacement of the Sabbath by Sunday as the weekly day for worship. The eight-week cycle was created through an application of the eighth-day symbolism to the calendar year: as the eighth day was added to the seven days, an eighth week was added to the seven-week cycles of the early Judeo-Christian calendar of Jerusalem. That the theological symbolism of the *ogdoad* was still vital in early 5th-century Jerusalem is shown by the seven+one structure found in a sermon attributed to archbishop John II of Jerusalem.

The first elements of the eight-mode liturgical system appeared, then, within the public (and not monastic) part of the cathedral liturgy of Jerusalem, possibly in the second half of the 4th century, certainly in the 5th. By the 6th century, most elements of the complete non-musical system had been created, forming an integral part of Hagiopolite liturgy of the Byzantine period.

### Bibliography

- AI = Metʹreveli, Elene, Čʻankʻievi, Caca, & Xevsuriani, Lili. 1980. უძველესი  
იადგარი [*udzvelesi iadgari*] (The Most Ancient Iadgari). Tbilisi.
- AL = Renoux, (Charles) Athanase. *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121: I–II*.  
Turnhout, (PO 35,1 et 36,2), 1969–1971.
- Aland, Kurt et al. 1994. *Kurzgefaste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des*

- Neuen Testaments. Zweite, neubearbeitete und ergänzte Auflage.* Berlin & New York.
- Aleksidze, Zaza (intr.) & Mahé, Jean-Pierre (tr.). 2001. *Le nouveau manuscrit géorgien sinaïtique* N SIN 50. *Edition en fac-similé.* Louvain, (CSCO 586, Subsidia 108).
- Aleksidze, Zaza et al. 2005. *Catalogue of Georgian Manuscripts Discovered in 1975 at St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai.* Athens.
- Amphoux, Christian-Bernard. 1996. "Les lectionnaires grecs," 19–47, in: Amphoux & Bouhot 1996.
- Amphoux, Christian-Bernard, Bouhot, Jean-Paul (dirs.). 1996. *La lecture liturgique des Epîtres catholiques dans l'Eglise ancienne.* Lausanne.
- Ananean, P. 1991. "Movsēs K'ert'olahayr and Movsēs Xorenac'i", *Bazmavep* (1991), 7–25 (in Armenian).
- Arevšatyan, Anna S. 1996–1997. "Deux textes arméniens attribués à Basile de Césarée sur l'interprétation des modes musicaux," *Revue des études arméniennes* 26, 339–55.
- Armenian Book of Hours = The Book of Hours or the Order of Common Prayers of the Armenian Apostolic Orthodox Church.* Evanston, 1964.
- Bacchiocchi, Samuele. 1977. *From Sabbath to Sunday. A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity.* Rome.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. 1976. "4Q Halakah<sup>a</sup>, the law of Hadash, and the Pentecontad Calendar," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 27, 36–46.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. 1987. "The Calendars of the Book of Jubilees and the Temple Scroll," *Vetus Testamentum* 37, 71–78.
- Baumstark, Anton. 1910. *Festbrevier und Kirchenjahr der syrischen Jakobiten.* Paderborn.
- Breviarium Armenium = Breviarium Armenium sive dispositio communium Armeniacae Ecclesiae precum [...].* Venice, 1908.
- Cody, Aelred. 1982. "The Early History of the Octoechos in Syria," 89–113, in: Garsoïan, Nina G., Mathews, Thomas F., & Thomson, Robert W. (eds.). *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period.* Dumbarton Oaks Symposium. Washington, DC.
- Coticello, Vassa. 2000. "Jean Damascène," 989–1012, in: Goulet, Richard (dir.). *Dictionnaire des philosophies antiques*, vol. 3. Paris.
- Coticello, Vassa. 2005. "La Quarantaine hiérosolymitaine dans le *De sacris ieiuniis* de Jean Damascène," pp. 77-94, in: Getcha, Job & Lossky, André (eds.). *Θυσία αὐνέσεως. Mélanges liturgiques offerts à la mémoire de l'archevêque Georges Wagner (1930-1993).* Paris.
- Daniélou, Jean. 1951. *Bible et liturgie. La théologie biblique des sacrements et des fêtes d'après les Pères de l'Eglise.* Paris.



- Daniélou, Jean. 1965. "Le dimanche comme huitième jour," 61–89, in: Botte, Bernard et al. (eds.). 1965. *Le dimanche*. Paris.
- Day, Juliette. 2005. "Lent and the Catechetical Program in Mid-Fourth-Century Jerusalem," *Studia liturgica* 35, 129–47.
- Findikyan, Michael. 2004. *The Commentary on the Armenian Daily Office by Bishop Step'anos Siwnec'i (†735). Critical Edition and Translation with Textual and Liturgical Analysis*. (OCA 270). Rome.
- Frøyshov, Stig R. 2003. *L'Horologe "géorgien" du Sinaiticus ibericus 34. Edition, traduction, et commentaire*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Paris: Université de Paris-Sorbonne (Paris IV), Institut Catholique de Paris et Institut de théologie orthodoxe Saint-Serge.
- Gardthausen, Victor. 1886. *Catalogus codicum graecorum sinaiticorum*. Leipzig.
- Garitte, Gérard. 1977. "Un évangélaire grec-arabe du Xe siècle (cod. Sin. ar. 116)," 207–25, in: K. Treu (ed.). *Studia codicologica* (TU 124). Berlin.
- Gehin, Paul & Frøyshov, Stig 2000. "Nouvelles découvertes sinaïtiques: à propos de la parution de l'inventaire des manuscrits grecs," *Revue des études byzantines* 58, 167–84.
- GL = Tarnnischvili, Michel (ed. & tr.). 1959–1960. *Le grand lectionnaire de l'Eglise de Jérusalem (Ve–VIIIe siècle)*. CSCO 188–89, 204–5. Louvain.
- Gvaramia, R., et al 1987. ქართულ ხელნაწერთა აღწერილობა. სინური კოლექცია. ნაკვეთი III [kartul xelnač'erta ayč'eriloba. sinuri kolekcia. nakveti III] (*Description of Georgian Manuscripts. Sinai Collection. Part III*). Tbilisi.
- Harlfinger, Dieter, et al 1983. *Specimina sinaitica. Die datierten griechischen Handschriften des Katharinen-Klosters auf dem Berge Sinai. 9. bis 12. Jahrhundert*. Berlin.
- Holy Monastery and Archbishop of Sinai. 1998. *Τὰ νέα εὐρήματα τοῦ Σινᾶ*. Athènes.
- Huglo, Michel. 1973. "Comparaison de la terminologie modale en Orient et en Occident," 758–61, in: Glahn, H. et al. (ed.). *Report of the Eleventh Congress Copenhagen 1972*, vol. II. Copenhagen.
- Huglo, Michel. 1975. "Le développement du vocabulaire de l'Ars Musica à l'époque carolingienne," *Latomus: Revue d'études latines* 34, 131–51.
- Husmann, Heinrich. 1971. "Hymnus und Troparion. Studien zur Geschichte der musikalischen Gattungen von Horologion und Tropologion," *Jahrbuch des staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preussischer Kulturbesitz*, 7–86.
- Husmann, Heinrich. 1976. "Eine alte orientalische christliche Liturgie: altsyrisch-melkitisch," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 42, 156–96.
- Janeras, Sebastia. 1986. "I vangeli domenicali della resurrezione nelle tradizioni liturgiche agiopolita e bizantina," 55–69, in: Farnedi, Giustino (ed.). *Paschale Mysterium. Studi in memoria dell'abate prof. Salvatore Marsili (1910–1983)*. Roma.

- Janeras, Sebastià. 2000. "Le vendredi avant le Dimanche des Palmes dans la tradition liturgique hagiopolite," *Studi sull'Oriente Cristiano*, 59–86.
- Jeannin, Jules. & Puyade, Julien. 1913. "L'Octoëchos syrien," *Oriens Christianus*, n.s. 3, *I Étude historique* 82–104; *II Étude musicale* 277–98.
- Jeannin, Jules. 1936. "Octoëchos syrien," in: *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* 12/2, 1888–99.
- Jeffery, Peter. 1991. "The Sunday Office of Seventh-Century Jerusalem in the Georgian Chantbook (Iadgari): A Preliminary Report," *Studia Liturgica* 21, 52–75.
- Jeffery, Peter. 1994. "The Earliest Christian Chant Repertory Recovered: The Georgian Witnesses to Jerusalem Chant," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 47, 1–38.
- Jeffery, Peter. 2001a. "The Earliest Octoëchoi: The Role of Jerusalem and Palestine in the Beginnings of Modal Ordering," 147–209, in: *id.* (ed.), *The Study of Medieval Chant, Paths and Bridges, East and West. In Honor of Kenneth Levy*. Woodbridge.
- Jeffery, Peter. 2001b. "Octoëchos," *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* 18, 370–73.
- Kamil, Murad. 1970. *Catalogue of all Manuscripts in the Monastery of St Catherine on Mount Sinai*. Wiesbaden.
- Kerovpyan, Aram. 2003. *L'Oktōēchos arménien. Une méthode d'analyse modale adaptée au répertoire des šarakan*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Paris: Ecole pratique des hautes études, Sciences historiques et philologiques.
- Lages, Mario Ferreira. 1969. "Étapes de l'évolution du carême à Jérusalem avant le Ve siècle," *Revue des études arméniennes* 6, 67–102.
- Lewy, Hildegard & Julius. 1942–1943. "The Origin of the Week and the Oldest West Asiatic Calendar," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 17, 1–152c.
- Macleay, Arthur. 1894. *East Syrian Daily Offices*. London.
- Mateos, Juan. 1961. "La vigile cathédrale chez Egérie," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 27, 281–312.
- Met'reveli, Elene. 1966. "‘მესელისა’ და ‘მესურის’ გაგებისათვის" [*"mexelisa" da "mexuris" gagebisatvis*] (*On the order of "mexeli" and "mexuri"*), 160–77, in: შოთა რუსთაველი. ისტორიულ-ფილოლოგიური ძიებანი (Shota Rustaveli. Historico-philological research). Tbilisi.
- Met'reveli, Elene. 1978. "Les manuscrits liturgiques géorgiens des IXe-Xe siècles et leur importance pour l'étude de l'hymnographie byzantine," *Bedi kartlisa* 36, 43–48.
- Met'reveli, Elene, et al. 1978. ქართულ ხელნაწერთა აღწერილობა. სინური კოლექცია. ნაკვეთი I [*kartul xelnac'erta ayč'eriloba. sinuri kolekcia. nakveti I*] (*Description of Georgian Manuscripts. Sinai Collection. Part I*). Tbilisi.

*The Early Development of the Liturgical Eight-Mode System in Jerusalem 177*

- Met'reveli, Elene & Outtier, Bernard. 1979. "La compréhension des termes hymnographique paraptoti et mosartavi," *Bedi kartlisa* 37, 68–85.
- Metzger, Bruce. 1971. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. Stuttgart.
- Nersessian, Vrej (ed.). 1978. *Essays on Armenian Music*. London.
- Outtier, Bernard. 1978. "Etude critique des documents présentés," 102–6, in: *Nersessian* 1978.
- Outtier, Bernard. 1981. "Un témoin partiel du lectionnaire géorgien ancien (Sinai géorgien 54)," *Bedi kartlisa* 39, 76–88.
- Outtier, Bernard. 1983. "Un nouveau témoin partiel du lectionnaire géorgien ancien (Sinai géorgien 12)," *Bedi kartlisa* 41, 162–74.
- Outtier, Bernard. 1988. "Essai de répertoire des manuscrits des vieilles versions géorgiennes du Nouveau Testament," *Langues orientales anciennes, philologie et linguistique* 1, 173–79.
- Outtier, Bernard. 1996. "Les lectionnaires géorgiens," pp. 19–47, in: Amphoux & Bouhot 1996.
- Ray, Walter. 2000. *August 15 and the Development of the Jerusalem Calendar*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame.
- Ray, Walter. 2004. "Toward a Narrative-Critical Approach to the Study of Early Liturgy," pp. 3–30, in: Johnson, Maxwell E. & Phillips, Edward (eds.). *Studia Liturgica Diversa. Essays in Honor of Paul F. Bradshaw*. Portland.
- Renoux, Charles (Athanasie). 1972. "Les lectures bibliques du rite arménien : de la Pentecôte à Vardavar," 477–498, in: *Festschrift B. Botte*. Louvain, 1972.
- Renoux, Charles (Athanasie). 1993. "Les commentaires liturgiques arméniens," 277–308, in: *Conférences Saint-Serge XXXIX*, Rome (B.E.L. Subsidia 70).
- Renoux, Charles (Athanasie). 1996. "Les lectionnaires arméniens," pp. 53–74, in: Amphoux & Bouhot 1996.
- Renoux, Charles (Athanasie). 2000. *Les hymnes de la résurrection. 1. Hymnographie liturgique géorgienne. Introduction, traduction et annotation des textes du Sinai* 18. Paris.
- Šaniče, Ak'ak'i. 1944. ხანმეტი ლექციონარი [*xanmet'i lektionari*] (*The Xanmet'i Lectionary*). Tbilisi.
- Schneider, Hans-Michael. 2004. *Lobpreis im recten Glauben. Die Theologie der Hymnen an den Festen der Menschwerdung der alten Jerusalemer Liturgie im Georischen Udzelesi Iadgari*. Berlin.
- Serkoyan, N. 1978. "Les huit modes de l'hymnaire arménien," 53–82, in: *Nersessian* 1978.
- Smith Lewis, Agnes (ed.). 1899. *The Palestinian Syriac lectionary of the Gospels. Re-edited from two Sinai Mss. & from P. de Lagarde's edition of the Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum*. London.

- T'ahmizyan, Nikolos. 1972. "Moses Siwnec'i and his Composition about the Grades," *Lraber* 12, 84–93 (in Armenian).
- T'ahmizyan, Nikolos. 1977. *Теория музыки в древней Армении (Music Theory in Ancient Armenia)* Erevan.
- T'ahmizyan, Nikolos. 1978. "Monodische Denkmäler Alt-Armeniens. Die Tradition der Armenischen Psalmodie," 191–222, in: *Nersessian* 1978.
- Talley, Thomas J. 1991. *The Origins of the Liturgical Year*. Colledgeville.
- Tarchnischvili, Michael. 1942–1943. "Zwei georgische Lektionarfragmente aus dem 5. und 6. [sic] Jahrhundert," *Kyrios*, 1–28.
- Thibaut, Jean-Baptiste. 1913. *Monuments de la notation ekphonétique et hagiopolite de l'Église grecque*. St. Petersburg.
- Van Esbroeck, Michel. 1973. "Une homélie sur l'Église attribuée à Jean de Jérusalem," *Le Muséon* 73, 283–304.
- Van Esbroeck, Michel. 1984. "Jean II de Jérusalem et les cultes de S. Étienne, de la Sainte-Sion et de la Croix," *Analecta Bollandiana* 102, 99–134.
- Verhelst, Stéphane. 1999. *La liturgie de Jérusalem à l'époque byzantine. Genèse et structures de l'année liturgique*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Jerusalem: Hebrew University.
- Verhelst, Stéphane. 2003a. "Histoire ancienne de la durée du carême à Jérusalem," *Questions liturgiques* 84, 23–50.
- Verhelst, Stéphane. 2003b. *Les traditions judéo-chrétiennes dans la liturgie de Jérusalem spécialement la Liturgie de saint Jacques frère de Dieu*. Leuven.
- Werner, Eric. 1948. "The oldest sources of octave and octoechos," *Acta Musicologica* 20, 1–9.
- Werner, Eric. 1959–1984. *The Sacred Bridge. The Interdependence of Liturgy and Music in Synagogue and Church during the First Millennium*. Vol. I, London & New York, 1959. Vol II, New York, 1984.
- Winkler, Gabriele. 1987. "Ungelöste Fragen im Zusammenhang mit den liturgischen Gebräuchen in Jerusalem," *Handes amsorya* 101, 303–15.
- Xevsuriani, L. "Sin. 34–ის შედგენილობის საკითხისათვის" ["Sin. 34–is šedgenilobis sak'itxisatvis"] (*The problem of the composition of Sin. 34*), *Mvaltavi* 6, 1978, 88–123 (translation and commentary in preparation by S. Frøyshov).