

THE BYZANTINE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE LITURGY OF MARK IN THE SINAI NEW FINDS

Michael ZHELTOV
Moscow, Russia

1. Introduction

In 1981, Dr. Heinzgerd Brakmann published an article describing a manuscript of the Liturgy of Mark.¹ This manuscript, Sinaiticus graecus 2148, had already been mentioned in the famous edition by F. E. BRIGHTMAN, *The Liturgies Eastern and Western*, yet without indication of its exact shelfmark,² and was therefore considered lost till its re-discovery by H. Brakmann. The present article presents a description of manuscripts of the Liturgy of Mark from the Sinai New Finds collection – a large set of manuscript fragments in various languages lost in the eighteenth century and re-discovered in 1975.³

According to the catalogue of the Greek part of this collection,⁴ there are four new manuscripts of the Liturgy of Mark (X stands for a manuscript = Χειρόγραφον, codex in the minuscule script written on paper; E stands for a roll = Εἰλητάριον): X214, E25, E42, and E66.⁵ However, the monastery librarian, Father Justin, who helped me a lot with the manuscripts,⁶ also pointed out two more fragmented rolls of the same Liturgy: SE1 and SE2 (SE standing for a roll fragment – Σπάραγμα εἰληταρίου). All these manuscripts are written in the minuscule script, and are relatively late.

According to the catalogue, X214 and E66 should be dated by the 12th–13th centuries, E25 and E42 – by the 14th; a mark on an envelope containing SE1 and

¹ H. BRAKMAN, *Zur Bedeutung des Sinaiticus Graecus 2148 für die Geschichte der melchitischen Markos-Liturgie*, in: JÖB 30 (1981), 239–248.

² BRIGHTMAN lxiv (here “Manuscript D”).

³ The first reports of this discovery were presented in the following publications: L. POLITIS, *Nouveaux manuscrits grecs découverts au Mont Sinai: rapport préliminaire*, in: Scriptorium 34 (1980), 5–17; ΑΡΧΙΕΠ. ΔΑΜΙΑΝΟΣ, *Εἰσήγησις ἐπὶ τῶν νεωστὶ εὑρεθέντων παλαιῶν χειρογράφων ἐν τῇ Ἱερᾷ Μονῇ Σινᾶ*, in: JÖB 32,4 (1982), 105–116.

⁴ The English version: *Holy Monastery and Archdiocese of Sinai. The New Finds*. Athens 1999. The original Greek edition: ΑΡΧΙΕΠ. ΔΑΜΙΑΝΟΣ, ΑΡΧΙΜ. ΣΩΦΡΟΝΙΟΣ, Β. ΠΕΛΤΙΚΟΓΛΟΥ, Π. ΝΙΚΟΛΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, *Τὰ νέα εὑρήματα τοῦ Σινᾶ*. Athens 1998. See also an important review of this catalogue: P. GÉHIN, S. FRØYSHOV, *Nouvelles découvertes sinaïtiques: à propos de la parution de l’inventaire des manuscrits grecs*, in: REByz 58 (2000), 167–184.

⁵ *The New Finds* (see fn. 4), 221, 256, 258, 261; Cf. H. BRAKMAN, *Neue Funde und Forschungen zur Liturgie der Kopten* (1996–2000), in: ICCoptS 7 (2004), 575–606, here 586.

⁶ I express my deepest gratitude to Fr. Justin.

SE2 assigns them to the 13th–14th centuries. I agree with these indications save the ones for X214, which I would date by the 13th–14th centuries instead of 12th–13th, and for SE2, which should be of the 14th century.

A comparison of each of the six items with the other ones shows that SE2 and E42 are parts of the same roll. P. Géhin and S. Frøyshov have supposed in their article that E25 and E42 may also come from a single manuscript,⁷ but this proved to be wrong. This leaves us with the five manuscripts of the Liturgy of Mark: one of the 12th–13th centuries (E66), two of the 13th–14th centuries (X214 and SE1), and two of the 14th century (E25 and E42+SE2). The exact contents of these remained completely unknown to the scholars of the Egyptian liturgical tradition until now.

2. The parchment roll E66

According to the catalogue of the Sinai New Finds, E66 is a parchment roll, sized 2200 × 245 and, as mentioned above, dated by the 12th–13th centuries.⁸ The roll has lost its beginning, and opens with the last lines of the “First Prayer of the Morning”.⁹ The prayer is immediately followed by the acclamations Εἰρήνη πᾶσιν and Ἀγαπήσωμεν..., and the prayer of the kiss of peace – i. e., by that part of the liturgy that follows the Great Entrance.¹⁰

At first sight, this suggests that the scribe of E66 has used the “First Prayer of the Morning” instead of the prayer of the Cherubic hymn, or added it after that one. Another manuscript of the Liturgy of Mark, Vaticanus graecus 1970, lends support to this hypothesis: the “standard” prayer of the cherubic hymn is replaced here with another one, and an additional prayer is also added (fol. 45v–46r). But on the opposite side of E66 the last lines of the “First Prayer of the Morning” with the following kiss of peace rubrics correspond to the very last prayers of the Liturgy of Mark (see below). This leaves little space to anything else before the “First Prayer of the Morning”. Perhaps the roll contained some other service, written after the Liturgy of Mark? The length of the roll should have thus been expanded, providing additional space for the introductory rites of the Liturgy of Mark on the opposite side. This, however, seems unlikely.

It is far more likely that the written text of the Liturgy of Mark in E66 simply lacks the Liturgy of the Word, being opened by the “First Prayer of the Morning”, immediately followed by post-Great Entrance rites: the kiss of peace, etc. How could that be? Undoubtedly, in the 12th or 13th century no Greek priest could celebrate the Eucharist omitting the prothesis, entrances, Scripture read-

⁷ GÉHIN, FRØYSHOV, *Nouvelles découvertes sinaïtiques* (see fn. 4), 178, fn. 48.

⁸ *The New Finds* (see fn. 4), 261.

⁹ See G. CUMING (posthumously), *The Liturgy of St. Mark, edited from the manuscripts with a commentary* (OCA 234). Roma 1990, 5–6, 89–90.

¹⁰ See *ibid.* 17.

ings, litanies. But an absence of the initial part of the Eucharistic rite is not uncommon to the Byzantine liturgical formularies. It is well known that in Constantinople there was no real difference in the text of the Liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom up until the prayer for the catechumens, and it was therefore common to write down only one of the two formularies in full, while starting the other with the prayer for the catechumens, providing a reference – at best! – to the complete one.¹¹ This is evidently the case with E66, which indicates that in the 12th–13th centuries the Greek Orthodox clergy on Sinai or in Egypt celebrated the Liturgy of Mark in more or less the same way they celebrate the Liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom today: the Liturgy of the Word follows the common Byzantine formulary, and the differences begin only somewhere near the Great Entrance.

Hence in the 12th–13th centuries the Liturgy of Mark was apparently still in use, and its text was still copied for liturgical purposes, and not merely for the benefit of scholars or collectors. This brings to mind an incident that occurred in Constantinople in 1194 A. D.: In that year the visiting Greek patriarch of Alexandria scandalized the residents of the capital city by his attempt to celebrate the Liturgy of Mark, causing the famous canonist Theodore Balsamon to issue a response prohibiting the use of this Liturgy.¹²

The rubrics for the kiss of peace in E66 are combined with the according prayer in a customary way,¹³ but the prayer of incense that is given after the prayer of the kiss of peace in the other manuscripts of the Liturgy of Mark¹⁴ is omitted. In E66 the prayer of the kiss of peace is immediately followed by the rubrics concerning the Creed and the initial dialogue of the anaphora (a deficiency of the *accessus ad altare* dialogue¹⁵ from the main text is made up in two marginal notes). This side of the roll continues with the anaphora, up to the intercessions for the dead.¹⁶

The opposite side of the roll opens with the institution narrative and the rest of the anaphora.¹⁷ Thus, a relatively small part of the roll, which included the ending of the intercessions, and the Sanctus with the petitions surrounding it, is lost. The variant readings of E66 are closer to Vatican. gr. 1970 than to the other known manuscripts of the Liturgy of Mark, but the two manuscripts, E66 and Vatican gr. 1970, are by no means identical.

The anaphora in E66 is concluded with the Constantinopolitan doxology Καὶ δὸς ἡμῖν... instead of the Egyptian Ὡσπερ ἦν καὶ ἐστὶν καὶ ἔσται..., but the latter

¹¹ See A. JACOB, *Histoire du formulaire grec de la liturgie de Saint Jean Chrysostome* (Thèse présentée pour l'obtention du grade de docteur en philosophie). Louvain 1968 (mscr.).

¹² PG 138, 953.

¹³ BRIGHTMAN 123; CUMING, *The Liturgy of St Mark* (see fn. 9), 17.

¹⁴ Cf. CUMING, *The Liturgy of St Mark* (see fn. 9), 17–18.

¹⁵ On this part of the Eucharist in the Byzantine tradition see: TAFT, *History II*, 285–306.

¹⁶ BRIGHTMAN 125 11–129 18; CUMING, *The Liturgy of St Mark* (see fn. 9), 20 4–30 33.

¹⁷ BRIGHTMAN 132 22–134 29; CUMING, *The Liturgy of St Mark* (see fn. 9), 40 9–48 11.

is also given in a marginal note, written by a different hand and preceded by a rubric in Arabic: “The deacons say:”¹⁸

The doxology is followed by a customary blessing, a rubric (written by a different hand), introducing the litany Πάντων τῶν ἁγίων,¹⁹ a substantially shortened version of the prayer before “Our Father”, and the acclamations which surround “Our Father” itself.²⁰

After the doxology of “Our Father” comes the inclination prayer,²¹ and then a prayer of elevation, which is different from those given in the other manuscripts of the Liturgy of Mark. I give it here in full:

Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ μόνος ἅγιος· ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαύομενος· ὁ διδοὺς πᾶσι τοῖς αἰτουῦσιν ἀγαθὰ διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος· ἁγίασον πάντα τὸν λαὸν σου· τῇ παντοδυνάμῳ σου βουλήσει· ὅπως ἀκατακρίτως μετασχῶμεν τῶν μυστηρίων σου ÷

The wording of this prayer has some parallels with the καρποφορία petition, which is recited after the elevation according to the other manuscripts of the Liturgy of Mark²² (in E66 the καρποφορία is omitted completely), and with the elevation prayer of the Liturgy of James.²³ The prayer clearly alludes to the ekphonesis Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, which in E66 is given explicitly, and to the communion, which is passed over in silence.

The manuscript ends with three prayers: the prayer of thanksgiving after communion,²⁴ the prayer behind the ambo,²⁵ and the “other prayer”. The latter is in fact one of the prayers of skeuophylakion from the Liturgy of James, the famous Ἐκ δυνάμεως εἰς δύναμιν..., which was widely circulated in the Byzantine liturgical periphery.²⁶ On the opposite side of the roll it corresponds to the “First Prayer of the Morning” (see above).

The institution narrative in E66 is enriched by three acclamations to be pronounced by the people (or rather by the deacons, as an Arabic remark above the third of them prescribes), written out in the margins. These acclamations are mentioned in a number of other manuscripts of the Liturgy of Mark, but in E66

¹⁸ I am grateful to Dr. Gregory Kessel who helped me with reading the Arabic notes in this and the other manuscripts.

¹⁹ On this litany, the presence of which is just one of many signs of “Constantinopolization” of the Liturgy of Mark in mediaeval times, see TAFT, *History* V, 74–103.

²⁰ BRIGHTMAN 135 11–135 24, 135 31–136 2, 136 19–136 20; CUMING, *The Liturgy of St Mark* (see fn. 9), 50 3–50 20, 51 30.

²¹ BRIGHTMAN 137 1–20; CUMING, *The Liturgy of St Mark* (see fn. 9), 52 4–18.

²² BRIGHTMAN 137 31–138 8; CUMING, *The Liturgy of St Mark* (see fn. 9), 54.

²³ B.-CH. MERCIER, *La liturgie de Saint Jacques : édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine* (PO 26,2). Paris 1946, 226 [112]; A. ΚΑΖΑΜΙΑΣ, *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἰακώβου τοῦ Ἀδελφοθέου καὶ τὰ νέα σιναϊτικὰ χειρόγραφα*. Thessaloniki 2006, 214.

²⁴ BRIGHTMAN 141 9–29; CUMING, *The Liturgy of St Mark* (see fn. 9), 58 5–15, 59 21–23.

²⁵ CUMING, *The Liturgy of St Mark* (see fn. 9), 59 1–60 21.

²⁶ See A. JACOB, *Une prière du skeuophylakion de la Liturgie de saint Jacques et ses parallèles byzantins*, in: BIHBR 37 (1966), 53–80; A. JACOB, *Une prière du skeuophylakion de la Liturgie de saint Jacques et ses parallèles byzantins: Addenda*, in: BIHBR 39 (1968), 327–331.

they are given in full, as they are in the much later codex of Meletios Pegas.²⁷ The first one appears right before the ekphonesis “Drink of it all of you...” in the main text, and consists of two phrases: Εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. Πιστεύομεν καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν καὶ δοξάζομεν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος. The second one follows the “Drink ye all of it...” and says: Τὸν θάνατόν σου Κύριε καταγγέλλομεν. The third one accompanies the anamnesis: Πιστεύομεν· καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν· καὶ δοξάζομεν· τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πλήρωσον· It is worth noting where, precisely, this expression of faith in the real presence of Christ in the Eucharistic species is placed: near the institution narrative, and not the other parts of the anaphora.²⁸

The second epiclesis, however, is also accompanied by a marginal note, consisting of a rubric in Arabic: “The deacons reply saying”, which introduces the acclamation: Ὡς Θεὸς ἀληθινὸς πιστός. The concluding doxology is accompanied by another marginal note: “The deacons say” (again, in Arabic) – Ὡσπερ ἦν καὶ ἔστιν καὶ ἔσται εἰς γενεάν καὶ γενεάν· καὶ εἰς τοῦ σύμπαντος τῶν αἰῶνων ἀμήν.²⁹ Elsewhere in E66 there are other marginal notes, most of them being short rubrical prescriptions in Arabic. This indicates that the clergy for whom E66 was written must have been Arabic-speaking. And the usage of vernacular for ritual prescriptions proves, once again, that in the 12th–13th centuries, when E66 was composed, the Liturgy of Mark was at times still actually celebrated.

3. The codex X214

The next manuscript, X214, is the only codex among the newly-found witnesses of the Liturgy of Mark. In the catalogue of the Sinai New Finds it is described as follows: “200 × 140, II. 10, quater. 2 (1 + 2 II.), XIIth–XIIIth c. Mass of St. Mark. Decorations: Initials”.³⁰ In my view, the handwriting is actually of a later date; I would suggest the 13th–14th centuries. This manuscript on paper is poorly preserved: only ten pages, the first two of them missing their top third. The remaining part of the Liturgy includes: the prayer of the third antiphon (the beginning is lost), the prayer of the Little Entrance, the prayer after the entrance, the incense prayer, the priestly petitions during the *ektene* of a deacon (the text of latter is not given, but only briefly mentioned in a rubric) after the

²⁷ ΤΙΤΟΣ ΜΑΤΘΑΙΑΚΗΣ, ΑΡΧΙΜ. *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Ἀποστόλου καὶ Εὐαγγελιστοῦ Μάρκου ὑπὸ Νεκταρίου Κεφαλᾶ Μητροπολίτου Πενταπόλεως*, in: *Θεολογία* 26 (1955), 14–36, here 29–30.

²⁸ Cf. M. ZHELTOV, *The Moment of Eucharistic Consecration in Byzantine Thought*, in: M. E. JOHNSON (ed.), *Issues in Eucharistic Praying*. Collegeville MN 2010, 263–306.

²⁹ This is actually the pristine doxology of the anaphora of Mark, while the doxology in the main text of the manuscript is borrowed from the Eucharistic rite of Constantinople.

³⁰ *The New Finds* (see fn. 4), 221.

Gospel reading, the so-called Three prayers, and the prayer of the Cherubic hymn, incomplete.³¹

The text is close to that of the other manuscripts and presents no surprises. The rubrics are laconic and contain in most cases just the names of the prayers. On the other hand, it is mentioned that after the Little Entrance the troparia and kontakia of the day should be sung (fol. 4) – this small sign of byzantinization of the Egyptian liturgy is unparalleled in the other witnesses of the Liturgy of Mark.

4. The paper fragment SE1

The next manuscript, SE1, is not included in the catalogue of the Sinai New Finds. It is a fragment of a paper scroll of the 13th–14th centuries. The scroll is poorly preserved and consists of a sheet of paper measured 220 x 190. One side of it contains most of the prayer of the second antiphon and the initial two lines of the prayer of the third antiphon,³² another one – the short formulae during clergy communion (the same as in the manuscript of Meletios Pegas,³³ but without an invitation for the people to partake) and the first half of the thanksgiving prayer.³⁴ The fragment is obviously just an initial part of a much longer scroll.

5. The parchment roll E25

This parchment scroll is described in the catalogue of the Sinai New Finds as follows: “Parch., 1320 × 255, umbilicus, XIVth c. Mass of St. Mark (one third is preserved)”.³⁵ It is in fact quite a lengthy ending of a once complete scroll: the remaining text belongs to the middle of the Eucharistic formulary, and uninterruptedly flows from one side to the other. It contains the incomplete anaphora of the Liturgy of Mark: the text opens with the intercessions for the Emperor, and ends up with the anamnesis.³⁶ There are quite a lot of Arabic notes in the margins, mostly rubrics describing the ritual acts of the priest and the deacon, but one of them contains a commemoration of someone called Najib.

³¹ BRIGHTMAN 117 22–122 16; CUMING, *The Liturgy of St Mark* (see fn. 9), 9 6–16 7.

³² BRIGHTMAN 115 12–36; CUMING, *The Liturgy of St Mark* (see fn. 9), 8 12–9 6.

³³ ΤΙΤΟΣ, ΑΡΧΙΜ. *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία* (see fn. 27), 34.

³⁴ BRIGHTMAN 141 9–20; CUMING, *The Liturgy of St Mark* (see fn. 9), 58 5–10.

³⁵ *The New Finds* (see fn. 4), 256.

³⁶ BRIGHTMAN 128 13–133 20; CUMING, *The Liturgy of St Mark* (see fn. 9), 28 7–43 9.

6. The paper fragments E42+SE2

The last of the new witnesses to the Liturgy of Mark, a paper scroll of the 14th century, is preserved in four fragments, one of them being of significant length, while the others are just small pieces. The bigger fragment is described in the catalogue of the Sinai New Finds as follows: “Pap., 2100 × 255, XIVth c. Mass of St. Mark (two thirds is preserved)”.³⁷ The other fragments are not mentioned in the catalogue, and form a storage unit called SE2. This unit consists of three pairs of glasses holding the fragments of a scroll in between them. The pairs of glasses are numbered; numbers 1 and 2 contain a single piece of paper each, number 3 contains two such parts, I will call them 3A and 3B. The sides of these fragments are also labelled as α and β . As I have already pointed out, all these fragments belong to the same scroll, and their correct order is as follows:

The inner side of the scroll: SE2. 2 (α) – SE2. 3B (α) – SE2. 3A (α) – SE2. 1 (α) – E42 (recto).

The outer side of the scroll: E42 (verso) – SE2. 1 (β) – SE2. 3A (β) – SE2. 3B (β) – SE2. 2 (β).

The scroll contains a significant part of the complete text of the Liturgy of Mark, with the most losses in the beginning and in the end. The first remaining prayer in the scroll is the prayer of the Little Entrance, the last – the inclination prayer after “Our Father”.³⁸ Since the most inner part of the scroll is well preserved, the text of the Eucharistic formulary flows uninterruptedly from one side of the scroll to the other. The variant readings are close to that of Vatican. gr. 1970. There are some marginal notes, written simultaneously with the main text of the scroll: this follows from the fact that the scribe sometimes deliberately leaves room for these notes in the main text column. The marginal notes are written in exactly the same hand; most of them are in Greek, though they also include several words in Arabic in a couple of cases. It is clear that the scribe copied the text of the Eucharistic formulary alongside the additional remarks to it from some other manuscript, most possibly an earlier one, without seeing any difference between these two very different layers of the text. In my view, this should mean that in the 14th century the Liturgy of Mark had ceased to be actually celebrated, and was being copied only for collectors’ purposes, merely as a historical and literary monument.

7. Conclusion

The contents of the witnesses to the text of the Liturgy of Mark of the Sinai New Finds Collection, E66 of the 12th–13th centuries, X214 and SE1 of the 13th–14th centuries, and E25 and E42+SE2 of the 14th century, have heretofore

³⁷ *The New Finds* (see fn. 4), 256.

³⁸ BRIGHTMAN 117 17–137 15; CUMING, *The Liturgy of St Mark* (see fn. 9), 10 25–52 16.

remained unknown to scholars of the Egyptian liturgical tradition. Their brief examination above – besides describing the liturgical particularities of these witnesses – helps to establish the timeframe for the practical use of the Liturgy of Mark in the liturgical life of Egypt, which evidently ceased by the 14th century, but had still been vibrant in the 12th–13th centuries. And it is my hope that this study shall offer an impetus for the further study of the worship traditions of the Christian East.³⁹

³⁹ I am very grateful to Sr. Vassa (Larin) for her kind help with reviewing the English text of this article.