sciendo

The Discipline of Historical Liturgics in Russia: From «Unhappy Step-daughter» to Full-fledged Scholarly Discipline

Zoya Dashevskaya*

The birth of liturgical research in Russia is a phenomenon that deserves careful study. The development of liturgical studies took place mainly in the Theological (Spiritual) Academies of St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kyiv and Kazan. The publication of liturgical source materials was the first step towards the establishment of an independent scientific school of liturgical studies in Russia. Thanks to Nikolai Krasnoseltsev, Ivan Mansvetov, Alexei Dmitrievskij, Ivan Karabinov and other prominent liturgists, we have a number of outstanding treatises on the liturgy of the East and West, the Typicon, both of Greek and Russian liturgical traditions, the Sacramental rites and other orders grown out of use. At present, the considerable range of matters addressed in these studies is poorly recognized, although the hypotheses of Russian scholars and their gains in methodology anticipated some of the achievements of the liturgists in the second half of the 20th century.

Keywords: *Liturgical Studies, Typikon, Theological Academies, Historical Liturgics, Comparative Liturgics.*

1. Why do we need to study not only church services themselves, but the history of liturgical service in the church? Why is Historical Liturgics taught?

The scholarly discipline of Liturgics, or the history of church liturgical service, is a relatively young field amongst historical disciplines. In Russia, the discipline took form significantly later than in Germany or France, for instance. There are a number of reasons for this.

Within the system of religious education in Russia's synodal period, the study of Liturgics presupposed the preparation of educated clergy which meant, first and foremost, the practical study of church liturgy and the acquisition of the skills necessary to serve the liturgy, i.e. the study of knowledge recorded in the tradition's liturgical books. The question of what, in fact, the object of research in Liturgics is, arose within the

* Zoya Dashevskaya, historian, specialist in liturgics and in the history of liturgical studies, St Philaret's Institute, Moscow, 2nd street of Maryina Rostsha, 14, 14 Russia, dean@sfi.ru.

context of the development of the field of historical, including liturgical, source studies – first and foremost in the West. There, in the Modern Era, Liturgics developed as a field of knowledge addressed to the sources of the church's liturgical tradition and took on new relevance in light of the Reformation, and then Counter-reformation processes. In Russia, historical-liturgical studies in its various forms, has basically been involved in a game of "catch-up development" – such as is common in the field of Economics – when an "outsider" vis-à-vis the original process has for a period of time been artificially frozen and then suddenly experiences freedom and sharp quantitative and qualitative growth over a very short time, during which it overtakes "neighbours", amongst whom the process first arose.

The formation of Liturgics as an academic discipline which assumes an historical approach to the study of liturgical rites can be divided into several stages, with key markers between these stages being the establishment of faculties of Liturgics and changes in the By-laws of the spiritual schools. Leading Russian scholar Alexey Afanasyevich Dmitrievskij has described the trajectory of the development of Liturgics, noting the introduction of the academic By-laws of 1814 and 1869 as landmarks which determined the contents of the discipline. Boris Sove developed the idea of Liturgics as a weak and slowly developing discipline, pointing to the establishment of corresponding academic faculties only from the end of the 1830s and beginning of the 1840s:

> A faculty of Liturgics was established at the St. Petersburg Academy in 1839. At the Moscow spiritual academy, Church Archaeology was introduced in 1844. Ecclesiastics was taught from the beginning of the 1830s at the Kiev Academy, and in Kazan, from 1845. With the exception of the St. Petersburg Academy, the teaching of Liturgics was entrusted to scholars of other disciplines - first one, and then another, without any particular constancy. Things were not any better in the seminaries, especially when one takes into consideration the lack of textbooks and study guides.[1]

Faculties were called Church-archaeological Antiquities, which included the study of a subject called "Common Worship"; in 1842, academic programmes relating to "theological studies" introduced a discipline called

---

[1] Boris Ivanovich Sove, *Istorija russkoj liturgicheskoj nauki* [*History of Russian Liturgics as a Discipline*], (Moscow, 1996), 89.

"The Study of Orthodox Worship."[2] The study of ecclesial antiquity took priority with this discipline:

> In the first year of study this field of Orthodox Theology was taught more generally, and afterwards rolled into other academic disciplines, dovetailing with Church History and Dogmatic Theology – it was introduced as a subject with a particular instructor and academic hours in 1842.[3]

Hilarion Alexeevich Chistovich calls this discipline ("The Study of Orthodox Worship") Liturgics, pointing to its subject – "the study of the rites of the Church became a discipline – Liturgics"[4]. And it took a long time to move from a dogmatic to an historical understanding of the character of this discipline. Alexey Dmitrievskij also believed that the dependent position of Liturgics could be explained by the absence of researchers who might have developed Liturgics as a stand-alone scholarly discipline. According to the 1884 By-laws, lectures in Church Archaeology and Liturgics became mandatory for all students. This changed the status of Liturgics, making it a necessary and integral part of the academic process, and strengthening prospects for new scholarly research. After the reforms of 1884, even despite the generally conservative character of the By-laws in relation to academic freedoms, the scholarly development of Liturgics took on a systematic character. This was related to the need for professors who had doctoral qualifications, which necessarily also stimulated academic research. Scholarly travel and new access to scholarly literature – both domestic and international – also played a significant role in the formation of the new discipline of Liturgics. The gradual determination of the borders of the discipline in terms of content, as well as competition between scholars and open scholarly polemic, were all catalysts for the development of historical-liturgical research as a field of History.

---

[2] "… as time moves forward, the circle of theological disciplines is broadened and deepened by fields which are here as of yet unnamed. At present we may include the following disciplines: 1) General Introduction to Orthodox Theology; 2) Scripture reading and Hermeneutics; 3) Dogmatic Theology; 4) Moral Theology; 5) Polemical Theology; 6) Patristics; 7) The Study of Orthodox Worship; 8) Pastoral Theology; 9) Rhetorical Theology, and 10) Governmental Theology and Canon Law." Hilarion Alexeevich Chistovich, *Istorija St. Peterburgskoj dukhovnoj akademii* [*History of the St. Petersburg Spiritual Academy*] (St. Petersburg, 1857), 276.

[3] *Ibidem*, 288–289.

[4] *Ibidem*, 279.

How did Liturgics develop in Russia? In 1886, Professor Alexey Petrovich Lebedev commented that Liturgics was the "most ignored field amongst the step-daughters" of theological disciplines; Alexey Dmitrievskij called Liturgics "poor", impoverished in 1898, Alexander Almazov called the fields of Church Archaeology and Liturgics "the least developed disciplines," and in 1907-1908, Professor Nikolay Vassilievich Pokrovskij called them "new and still developing."

There was a clear need to determine the subject matter of the new discipline. Alexander Petrovich Golubtsov perceived the new discipline of the "study of church liturgy" as the study of historical knowledge, and thus defined the limits of its remit: "When we speak of Liturgics, … we have in mind not the interpretation of ecclesial doctrine, nor the study of the status quo of our liturgical texts, which our scholastic liturgical studies have long understood as the limit of their curiosity." It is obvious that Alexander Golubtsov thinks that Liturgics is neither the interpretation of ecclesial doctrine, i.e. the clarification of the meaning of the liturgy, including the liturgical sacraments, nor the study of the orders of service. Rather, he designates the study of liturgy as, "the determination of historical sources for liturgical services," and "the historical clarification of liturgical forms and geneses."[5]

It was Nikolay Nikanorovich Glubokovskij who first presented Liturgics as a self-contained scholarly discipline, in his work "The Historical Aspect and Development of Russian Scholarly Theology." This work was penned in 1917 for the Academy of Sciences's planned publication of the study "Russkaja Nauka," and was first published in Petrograd, in 1919.[6] Basically, Glubokovskij sums up Russia's pre-revolutionary theological school and all its offshoots, dedicating chapter 15 of his work to Liturgics. Glubokovskij associates the appearance and development of Liturgics as a systematic study of church liturgy with the study of Christian Archaeology, as was fairly common at the time, as departments/faculties of Christian Archaeology and Liturgics were separated from each other only in 1911. Nikolay Glubokovskij presumed that the development of Liturgics was artificially controlled by an interpretive

---

[5] Alexander Petrovich Golubtsov, *Iz chtenij po cerkovnoj arheologii i liturgike* [*Lectures on the Church Archaeology and Liturgics*] (St. Petersburg, SPb., 1917), 31.

[6] Tat'yana Bogdanova and Aleksandr Klement'ev, A.K., "N.N. Glubokovskij," *Pravoslavnaja entsiklopedija* [*Orthodox Encyclopaedia*], no. 11 (November 2006): 601–10.

approach to the study of church liturgy, and that attempts at use of the historical-critical method in this field were perceived as an attack on the sacred. The essence of the problem that Nikolay Glubokovskij saw, was that liturgical material was "denied" historical-critical analysis[7], and therefore he identified the principle for the systematic development of Liturgics as a stand-alone science as within the remit of the historical and historical-critical approaches, having determined a particularly difficult area vis-à-vis liturgical research: first and foremost, it is an analysis of the historical development of liturgical rites. Liturgical material needs to be available to the researcher outside the limiting boundaries of any particular dogmatic or confessional approach. Only under these conditions will Liturgics, as a branch of historical knowledge, develop naturally as a field of historical study. In Glubokovskij's opinion, rites

> are received and considered as the completed forms of various unchangeable fossilizations, and in these forms, they are dogmatized, insofar as by their antiquity they are necessarily raised to the level of primary apostolic source in all of their main elements. Historical genesis is either entirely denied or barely recognised as mere illustration of the fact that it has frozen in the form of stereotypical immunity.

As such, the discipline of Liturgics is significantly broader than just the study of existing liturgical practice; the object of its study should include not only the practice of church liturgical services and their associated rites, but also the entire prayer tradition of the Church.

> Without revealing patterns of historical development, there can be no objective comprehension of the authentic nature [of church services], without which the correct understanding or faithful interpretation [of liturgy] is unthinkable …,

– Glubokovskij notes.[8]

2. The appearance of Liturgics as an academic discipline and its flowering at the beginning of the 1880s.

The trajectory by which Liturgics developed as an academic discipline is described by Alexey Dmitrievskij, who notes its earliest appearance in the

---

[7] Nikolay N. Glubokovsky, *Russkaya bogoslovskaja nauka v ejo istoricheskom razvitii i novejshem sostojanii* [*The Historical Development and Current Condition of Russian Scholarly Theology*] (Moscow: Publishing House of St. Vladimir Fraternity, 2002), 106.

[8] *Ibidem*.

Academic Bylaws of 1814 and 1869, which described the contents of the future discipline:

> Amongst the disciplines taught in our academies, the study of liturgy was introduced in 1814 as the study of "Rites", without being granted the status of an independent field, but rather associated with the related discipline of Canon Law. Our field subsisted in this modest state until the publishing of new Academic Bylaws in 1869, which disassociated it from Canon Law, passing it into the hands of a separate professor who was obliged also to acquaint his students with Church Archaeology and Art."[9]

The dependent status of liturgical studies, in the opinion of Alexey Dmitrievskij, can be explained also by the lack of researchers developing the field as an independent academic discipline.

St. Serge graduate and teacher Boris Ivanovich Sove calls the position of Liturgics in the first half of the 19th century critical:

> Liturgics eked out a meagre existence at seminaries and academies in the first half of the 19th c. It didn't really exist as a stand-alone discipline … Its pathetic state would better be described an unestablished ... The subject was given different names at different academic institutions. At the St. Petersburg Spiritual Academy it was called Liturgics, which name it was also eventually given in Kazan, where it had previously been called Church Studies (Ecclesiastics). At the Moscow Spiritual Academy there was Church Archaeology and Art instead of Liturgics. In Kiev Spiritual Academy, the subject was sometimes called Liturgics, and sometimes Archaeology. The delineation of Liturgical Studies as a particular subject wasn't at all immediate.[10]

Approximately two thirds of the 19th century can be related to the period of development of the discipline of Liturgics that might be called preliminary, or as Natalija Sukhova puts it, "covert." [11] In 1839–1840, faculties and departments, the names of which would presume the study of the history of church services as an academic discipline, appear at the spiritual academics/seminaries. The St. Petersburg spiritual academy had the obvious advantage. After the appearance of the Faculty of Ancient

---

[9] Alexey A. Dmitrievskij, *Puteshestvie po Vostoku i ego nauchnije rezuljtaty: Otchet o zagranichnoj komandirovke v 1887/88* [*Journey to the East and Scholarly Conclusions: Report from an Academic Trip in 1887/88*] (Kiev, 1890), 32.

[10] Sove, *Istoriya liturgicheskoj*, 89.

[11] Natalja Y. Sukhova, "Formirovanie liturgiki kak akademicheskoj distsipliny [The Formation of Liturgics as an Academic Discipline]," *Journal* (*VESTNIK*) *of the Yekaterinburg Spiritual Academy 18*, no. 2 (2017): 88–116.

Church Archaeology in 1839, the discipline of "Common Church Worship" was introduced. In 1844, at spiritual academy in Moscow, "as biblical church history was separated from general church history", "a faculty of *church archaeology* was opened."[12] In Kiev, it seems that the tradition of the study of Liturgics begins in the 1830s, with Archbishop Innokentij (Borisov). In Kazan, at the beginning of the 1840s, Liturgics was united with Canon Law; these disciplines remained untaught for a long while due to the "absence of qualified instructors;"[13] the teaching of Liturgics, under the name Church Studies (Ecclesiastics), began in 1845. There, Liturgics intersected with theological rather than historical subject matter. Initially, as at the Spiritual Academy in Kiev, it was related to Canon Law, and afterwards to the field of Moral Theology. Thus, from the inception of its study until the ratification of the new Academic Bylaws of 1869, Liturgics was related either to historical studies (in St. Petersburg and Moscow), or to theological studies (in Kazan and Kiev). The contents of the course, in all cases, were directly related to the personal and scholarly research interests of those teaching.

The historical component assimilated to the field of Liturgics was constantly on the increase, and by the time of the reform of the Academic Bylaws (Ustav) in 1869, was interpreted not as a practical discipline, but as a historical discipline which of course incorporated both theological components (particularly in relation to the church sacraments), and church-canonical components.

The Bylaws of 1869 assigned permanent faculties for the teaching of liturgical subject matter and presumed the permanent presence of an academician whose position and academic degree were to correspond. The new Bylaws also specified mandatory publication and public defence of masters and doctoral dissertations; the master's degree was transformed from an academic training degree into a scholarly degree. The number of scholarly publications coming out of the spiritual academies, as compared

---

[12] Sergey K. Smirnov, *Istorija Moskovskoj Dukhovnoj Akademii do ejo preobrazovanija (1814–1870)* [*History of the Moscow Spiritual Academy before its Reorganization (1814–1870)*] (Moscow, 1879), 43.

[13] Pjotr V. Znamenskij, *Istorija Kazanskoj Dukhovnoj Akademii za pervyj (doreformennyj) period ejo sushchestvovanija (1842-1870 godi)* [*The History of the Kazan Spiritual Academy over its First (Pre-reform) Period (1842-1870)*], no. 2 (Kazan: Imperial University Publishing House, 1892), 592, 313.

to previous decades, increased multi-fold[14]; academic journals regularly published critical bibliographical summaries of new researches and the catalogues of their academic libraries. A student would come to the academy with a good knowledge of Greek and Latin, and would there study German, French, and even English language. In Kazan the program even included study of those languages towards which the church's mission was particularly directed at that time.

With the introduction of the Academic Bylaws (Ustav) of 1884, lectures in Church Archaeology and Liturgics became mandatory for all students. This changed the status of Liturgics, which became a necessary part of an academy education. Liturgics acquired a more foundational position amongst academic subjects, in general. Despite the conservative overall character of the new academic Bylaws in relation to academical freedoms, after the reforms of 1884, the scholarly development of Liturgics took on a systematic character. Professors were required to have a doctoral degree, which also stimulated scholarly development. Scholarly travel and access to specific literature – both Russian and international - played a significant role in the ongoing establishment of the discipline. The gradual definition of the field's contents and outlines, as well as competition between researchers who were gradually disclosing areas of scholarly polemic, became catalysts for the development of historical-liturgical line of enquiry. Despite these changes, in the 1880s there was little stable understanding of the contents of Liturgics as an "academic discipline": at the same time as the analytical approach to the subject matter of Liturgics continued to develop, descriptions in seminary prospectuses and popular literature continued to refer to the "scholarly study of church services" as the study of liturgical practice, and materials were generally systematized in a fairly arbitrary fashion.

As stated above, the teaching of Liturgics was highly dependent upon the scholarly preferences of the professor, and his historical, theological, culturological and linguistic training. References to European studies found in preserved academic course materials from the time, indicate these primarily German-language materials as the primary historiological and methodological bases for what was being taught by Liturgics

---

[14] "… if in 1872 the library had on access 9 Russian journal titles and 17 international titles, then by 1877 it subscribed to 23 Russian titles and 10 international titles." See: Dionisij Shljonov, "Biblioteki i bibliofily," *Almanac bibliofila*, XXXVII (Moscow, 2014): 48.

professors at Russian Spiritual Academies during the second half of the 19th century. One of the stimuli for the development of historical-liturgical research was scholarly work into the pre-Nikonian worship tradition, both by Old Believers and by Orthodox scholars representing the prevailing, "Nikonian" tradition.

Representatives of the academic community Nikolay Pokrovskij (in St. Petersburg Spiritual Academy), and future bishop Cristophor (Smirnov) (in Kiev Spiritual Academy), demonstrate quality acquaintance with the scholarly materials of their western counterparts, though basically without moving beyond these boundaries. The same could not be said of their colleagues Nikolay Fomich Krasnoseljtsev (Kazan Spiritual Academy), Ivan Danilovich Mansvetov (in Moscow Spiritual Academy), or Alexey Dmitrievskij (Kazan and Kiev Spiritual Academies). It is difficult to determine the degree to which Krasnoseltsev and Mansvetov incorporated their own research into what they taught at the Spiritual Academies, due to a lack of complete course texts amongst the materials which have come down to us. Preserved course materials from Alexey Dmitrievskij show that he made broad use both of other published materials and of his own research. (The most eloquent example of this is the final course Dmitrievskij taught at the Petrograd Theological Institute in the second half of the 1920s.) The unique academic course materials of Alexey Dmitrievskij (in Kazan), Alexander Golubtsov (in Moscow), Nikolay Pokrovskij and Ivan Karabinov (in St. Petersburg) speak of the establishment of a specific methodology. The historical-genetic method, which Ivan Mansvetov, Alexander Almazov and Alexey Dmitrievskij strongly advocated, was still a pioneering innovation in historical-liturgical scholarship in the 1880s. At the very beginning of his scholarly career, Dmitrievskij wrote:

> It follows that the single dependable and fully academic approach, and the most effective in terms of productive yield under current conditions for the study of theological source material, remains that which has been called… genetic.[15]

Dmitrievskij also insisted upon historical-critical consideration of church services and rites:

> …when studying the rites and church orders of the Orthodox Church it is necessary not only to look at their gradual formation from a

[15] Dmitrievskij, "Bogosluzhenije Russkoj tserkvi za pervye pjatj vekov [Church Services in the Russian Church over its First Five Centuries]" *Pravoslavnij sobebsednik*: 150.

> historical perspective, but also from a critical perspective, with the goal of delineating random elements introduced by people … Perhaps by means of historical-critical study of the order of our church services we will be successful in recovering our rites and orders in that state of initial purity which they had when they were passed down from the hands of their initial artists and creators.[16]

Dmitrievskij believed that in order to explain liturgical diversity, it is necessary to dig deeply into the genetic study not only of Slavonic manuscripts, but also of Greek language liturgical source materials. In the times just subsequent, Comparative Liturgics played a leading role in the development of the field as a whole. Ivan Karabinov became the primary specialist in Comparative Liturgics, despite the drama surrounding the development of his research on the Eucharistic prayers.

What, precisely, was unique about the scholarly knowledge of the specialists named above? The contemporary requirement for ownership of the historical-cultural context, against the backdrop of which the order of church services was developing, helps us determine what was unique about these academician's teaching and research. All Russian liturgists, and in particular those who also wore day jackets and not just cassocks, or who were perhaps even primarily teachers of Church Archaeology rather than clerics, were very well-grounded in Church History and Palaeography, theological disciplines and Canon Law, knew ancient and modern European languages well, participated in historical-archaeological congresses in Russian and abroad, and boasted scholarly distinctions and publications in the field of Church Archaeology and Classics. In the second half of the 19th century, the broad circle of interests and professional competencies pulled into the field provided a space in which each Russian liturgist could distinguish himself by manifesting his unique interests in the field of liturgical studies.

Gradually, an understanding of "liturgical studies", or Liturgics, began to find its limits, despite the fact that the phrase "scholarly study of church services," in the seminary setting, continued to be understood as

---

[16] Idem, Lekcii po liturgike. CH. 1: *Kursy lekcij, prochitannye studentam Kazanskoj duhovnoj akademii v 1882–1884 gg.* (Ekaterinburg: Ekaterinburgskaya Duhovnaya Seminariya, 2017). [*Lectures on the Liturgics. Part 1. Series of Lectures delivered for the students of Kazan Spiritual Academy during the academical period 1882–1884*] (Ekaterinburg: Ekaterinburg Spiritual Seminary, 2017). Taft: nuzhno vosstanovitj element tak, kak oni byli zadumany (Taft: we need to restore elements to the way in which they were originally meant).

referring to the existing practice of church liturgical forms and the skills needed to serve these orders of worship.

3. Vectors of Development in Russian Liturgics

From the beginning of the 19th c., we can see a general European tendency for the establishment of national scholarly schools for the study of the history of liturgy, as well as a significant increase in the quality of works being published on liturgy; Russia and Russian-language works are no exception to this rule. In Russia, between the final decades of the 19th c. and the end of the 1920s, the scholarly discipline of Liturgics developed in a number of different directions.

In addition to descriptions and publications of source materials, the study of the Euchologion, various typikons, and orders for service of the sacraments continued to develop. Just as in the West, the study of church liturgy in Russia began primarily with consideration of the native liturgical tradition, meaning that the field of research was the common worship of the Russian Orthodox Church.

The first task undertaken was publication of liturgical source material – not just descriptions of the manuscripts with short comments on one or another peculiarity as publishers saw fit, but full versions of the liturgical source materials. From the 1860s to the 1880s and onward: a description of liturgical manuscripts from the Synodal library was published by Fr. Alexander Gorskij and Capiton Nevostrujev; a description of liturgical books from the library of the Solovetskij Monastery was published by Nikolay Krasnoseltsev, Alexander Vadkovskij and Ivan Porfirjev; books from Novoierysalimskij Monastery library were prepared by Archimandrite Amfilokhij (Sergievskij-Kazantsev); a description of liturgical manuscripts from the Vatican library was prepared by Nikolay Krasnoseljtsev; and finally, the works of Alexey Dmitrievskij describe liturgical manuscripts from the libraries of Athos, Greece, and Sinai. It wasn't descriptions of manuscripts, however, that answered the research demands of the time, but their full publication, as Alexey Pavlov and Fr. Michail Gorchakov had done in relation to ecclesial law. Ivan Mansvetov, working with sources to which he had the proper access, considered the full and complete publication of church liturgical manuscripts an urgent task, without the completion of which Liturgics would not be able to progress as a scholarly discipline. It's worth citing the entire quotation here:

> We feel the weight of more and more necessity in this impenetrable, pain-staking and dry work, and certain fields of ecclesial scholarship are directly dependent upon our degree of familiarity with and understanding of the development of liturgical manuscript materials. The description of manuscripts only serves this goal in part. Even the best descriptions only point to the materials and give us an idea of what we might search for in a known work; the direct use of source materials themselves remains necessary and, as ever, cumbersome. The bringing of source materials to light and the publication of the more important among them would unquestionably raise the level of our liturgical scholarship, presenting us directly with an entire genre of literature in which the answers to many salient, ecclesial questions might be found.[17]

3.1 Researching the Typikon

One of the first objects of study in the newly born Russian discipline of Liturgics from about the mid-1860s was the typikon as an integral system of church worship determining the connections between daily, weekly and yearly (the movable, i.e. the Triodion, and immovable, i.e. the Menaion) cycles, including the calendar of feast dates and the lectionary. Scholars proposed bases for the systematization of historical-liturgical sources - both the periodization of the typicon's development, and also the classification of various types of liturgical typica, while trying to analyse the ways in which these types had influenced each other. In the works of Nikolay Odintsov[18], Ivan Mansvetov[19], Alexey Dmitrievskij[20],

---

[17] Ivan D. Mansvetov, "K stat'e o grecheskom kondakare XII-XIII v. (Otvet Arhimandritu Amfilohiyu)," *Pribavleniya k tvoreniyam svyatych otsov*, no. 4 (1880), 483. ["To the Essay on the Greek Kondakar XII-XIII c. (Answer to Arhimandrit Amfilohiy)]," in *Pribavleniya k tvoreniyam svyatych otsov*. (1880. Part 26. Issue 4, 482–503): 483.

[18] Nikanor F. Odintsov, N.F., *Porjadok obshchestvennogo i chastnogo bogosluzhenija v drevnej Rossii do XVI veka* [*Orders of Common and Private Worship in Ancient Russian before the 16th c.*] (St. Petersburg: An I.L. Tuzov Booksales Publication. Publishing House of the Charity for the Young and Poor, located at Ligovka, 1881).

[19] Ivan D. Mansvetov, *Tserkovnyj ustav (tipik), ego obrazovanije i sudjba v grecheskoj i russkoj tserkvi* [*The Church Typikon, its Formation and Fate in the Greek and Russian Church*], (Moscow: Tip. Lissnera i Romana 1885).

[20] Alexey A. Dmitrievskij, "Part 1. Sluzhby kruga sedmichnogo i godichnogo i chinposledovanija tainstv: Istoriko-arkheologicheskoe issledovanie" ["Services of the Weekly and Annual cycles and the Sacramental Orders of Service: a Historical-Archeological Study,"] in *Bogosluzhenie v russkoj tserkvi v XVI veke*. [*Church Services in the Russian Church in the 16th c.*], ed. idem (Kazan: Imperial University Publishing House, 1884), 614 (pag. var.); idem, *Drevnejshie patriarshie Typikony – Svjatogrobskij ierusalimskij i*

Ivan Karabinov[21], Fr. Michail Lisitsyn[22], and Michail Skaballanovich[23], the typikon is no longer presented as a single, over-arching rule or constitutional document, but looks like a system which over its various stages of development – both in Byzantium and in Rus – came together over many centuries. These scholars' hypotheses on the origins and development of various versions of the typikon and the interdependence of the Palestinian and Constantinopolitan traditions of prayer, inside which the

---

Velikoj konstantinopoljskoj tserkvi: Kritiko-bibliograficheskoe issledovanie [*The Most Ancient Patriarchal Typika – Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem and the Great Church of Constantinople*] (Kiev, 1907); [Separate Editions from the Journal "Trudy Kievskoj Dukhovnoj Akademii" from 1900 (no. 9–10) and 1901 (no. 1, 9, 12)]; idem, *Bogosluzhenije Strastnoj i Paskhaljnoj sedmits vo sv. Ierusalime IX-X v.* [*Church Services of Holy Week and Bright Week in Holy Jerusalem in the 9th and 10th Centuries*], text without introductions, postlogues, archeological and liturgical notes, as published in 1804, furnished by the Jerusalem Patriarchal Library, ed. Dmitrievskij (Kazan: Imperial University Publishing House, 1894), XVI, 426, XVI – Supplement to the Journal "Pravoslavnij Sobesednik" from 1888-1894; idem, *Puteshestvie po Vostoku i ego nauchnije rezuljtaty: Otchet o zagranichnoj komandirovke v 1887/88* [Journey to the East and Scholarly Conclusions: Report from an Academic Trip in 1887/88] (Kiev, 1890), 32; idem, *Opisanie liturgicheskikh rukopisej, khranjashchikhsja v bibliotekakh Pravoslavnogo Vostoka, vol. 1, tipika. part 1. Pamjatniki patriarshikh ustavov i kritorskie monastyrskie typikony* [*Descriptions of Liturgical Manuscripts from the Libraries of the Christian East, vol.1, typika, part 1. Records of Patriarchal Typika and Authorial Typika from Monasteries*] (Kiev, 1895), XX+CXLVII+912+XXV; *Ibidem, vol. 2. Evkhologii* (Kiev, 1901), XII+1058+XXVII+32; *Ibidem, vol. 3 (first half), tipika, part 2*, (Petrograd, 1917), VIII+768+IV; idem, *Puteshestvie po Vostoku i ego nauchnije rezuljtaty* [*Journey to the East and Scholarly Conclusions*] (Kiev: G.T. Korchak-Novitskij Publishing House, 1890); idem, *Bogosluzhenie v Russkoj Tserkvoj za pervye pjatj vekov* [*Church Services in the Russian Church over its First Five Centuries*] (Kazan: Imperial University Publishing House, 1882), 227.

[21] Ivan A. Karabinov, I.A., *Postnaja Triodj: Istoricheskij obzor ejo plana, sostava, redaktsij i slav. perevodov* [*The Lenten Triodion: A Historical Overview of its Plan, Contents, Editions, and Slavonic Translations*] (St. Petersburg: 1910, Moscow, 2004); idem, "K istorii ispravlenija Postnoj Triodi pri patriarkhe Nikone" [Toward a History of the Correction of the Lenten Triodion in the times of Patriarch Nikon], *Christian Reading*, no. 5/6 (1911): 627–43; idem, "K istorii Ierusalimskogo ustava (Towards a History of the Jerusalem Typikon)," *Christian Reading*, no. 3 (1912): 360–382; no. 4 (1912): 483–494; idem, "Studijskij tipik v svjazi s voprosom o reforme nashego bogosluzhebnogo ustava [The Studite Typikon and the Question of Reforming our Typikon for Church Worship]: (speech made at annual assembly day in St. Petersburg on 8 March, 1915)," *Christian Reading*, no. 9 (1915): 1051–62.

[22] Michail Lisitsyn Fr, *Pervonachaljnyj slavjano-russkij typikon: Istoriko-Arkheologicheskoe issledovanie* [*The First Slavonic-Russian Typikon: A Historical-Archeological Study*]: with attachments, 45 illustrations (St. Petersburg, 1911), [4], XVI, 387.

[23] Michail N. Skaballanovich, *Tolkovyj typikon: Objasniteljnoe islozhenie Typikona s istoricheskim vvedeniem* [*Interpretive Typikon: A Descriptive Setting of the Typikon with Historical Introductions*], no. 1, 2, 3 (Kiev, 1910). Reprint: (Moscow: Palomnik, 1995).

necessity to distinguish monastic from cathedral practice sometimes issued in stringent polemic expressed in the pages of scholarly publications.

The first examples of source studies of the Slavic-Russian typikon were carried out by Fr. Alexander Gorskij and Capiton Nevostrujev, who classified manuscripts of Russian typika as relating to two different redactions, or traditions – Studite and Jerusalem. This "Studite Typikon" was based on the order of services and life at the Stoudios Monastery in Constantinople in the years following the victory of the Iconodoules, with its characteristic services according to a daily cycle.[24] The Jerusalem Typikon followed the typikon of the Monastery of St. Savva in the Judean desert, with its systematic grouping of church services, typified by vigils on the Eve of Sundays and Feast Days, the Canon incorporated into morning prayers, and various others.[25] It was precisely this division of materials that determined all ensuing discussion and attempts at classification, including efforts to move away from the existing stratification of church liturgical materials into two groups and bring to light different sources of the liturgical tradition.

Archbishop Sergij (Spasskij), in his two-volume publication "The Complete Menologion of the East," further developed this classification in consideration of the earliest Slavonic-Russian Studite-Alexian Typikon, hypothesizing the existence of another "ktitorite" (i.e. authorial) typicon used in Russian practice, and based upon usages at the little-known Monastery of St. George of Mangana, in Constantinople. In Bishop Sergij's opinion, this typikon influenced the formation of the typical church liturgical practice in Rus, and the particular nature of the Studite-Alexian Typikon can be explained by the fact that it reflects this "ktitorite" typikon.[26]

Nikolay Odintsov further developed thinking about this hypothesized "ktitorite" typikon in his work, entitled "The Order of Common and Private Worship in Ancient Rus before the 14th Century". Professor Dmitrievskij disputes Odintsov's conclusions in his work, entitled

---

[24] Alexey M. Pentkovskij, "Studijskij ustav i ustavy studijskoj traditsii" [The Studite Typikon and Typika from the Studite Tradition], *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*, no. 5 (2001): 69–80.

[25] Idem, "Ierusalimskij typikon v Konstantinopole v Paleologovskij period" [The Jerusalem Typikon in Constantinople in the Palaelogan Period], *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*, no. 5 (2003): 77–87.

[26] For more on the ktitorite question, see: Vladislav Tsypin, "Ktitor," *Pravoslavnaja entsiklopedija* [*Orthodox Encyclopaedia*], no. 39 (2010): 23–231.

"Church Services in the Russian Church over its First Five Centuries."[27] The topic was further developed by Mansvetov in his doctoral dissertation, entitled "The Church Typikon, its Formation and Fate in the Greek and Russian Churches" (Moscow, 1885). In this work, Mansvetov strove to prove the existence of the Studite and Jerusalem redactions (typika) in Rus, but doesn't pose the question of what church services in Rus were based upon during the time between the baptism of Rus and before the appearance of the monastic typikon brought to the Kiev-Pechorsky Lavra by St. Theodosius. Later, Fr. Michail Lisitsyn proposed that Mansvetov didn't have any copy of the Typikon of the Great Church of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople at his disposal, and therefore determined the geography of its usage based only upon the practice of Byzantine rite churches, while saying nothing of the specific significance of its usage in Rus "… he says not a word, although he is pushed to this conclusion by earlier research in Liturgics, and in particular the monumental work of Professor Golubinskij of the Spiritual Academy of Moscow, entitled «The History of the Russian Church'.»

The periodization of the Russian typicon was first, it seems, proposed by Mansvetov: he classified church liturgical materials into daily, weekly and annual liturgical cycles and associated stages of the typikon's development with the associated liturgical books: the hours (daily cycle), the Octoechos (weekly cycle), and the Menaion and Triodion and Pentecostarion (annual cycle).[28] Fr. Alexander Schmemann proposes his own system based upon this classification[29], as does Hieromonk Michail (Arrants), with various additions and clarifications, particularly as regards the portion on cathedral liturgy.[30]

In a commentary on Mansvetov's dissertation, Dmitrievskij again hypothesizes a particular, "ktitorite" church liturgical usage available to historians of the Studite Typikon. Lisitsyn, who was a student of Dmitrievskij, argues that it is Dmitrievskij, himself, who

---

[27] Dmitrievskij, *Bogosluzhenie v Russkoj Tserkvoj*, 227.

[28] Mansvetov, *Tserkovnyj ustav* (tipik), 1–2.

[29] Thus, in any case, supposes Hieromonk Michail Arrants, who points to the significance of Mansvetov's periodization in the works of Fr. Alexander Schmemann. See: Michail Arrants, *Oko tserkovnoe* [*The Eye of the Church*] (Pererabotka opyta LDA 1978 g. Istoriya Tipikona. Moskva 1999), 15–16.

[30] *Ibidem*, 13–14.

> first seriously calls into question to the traditional division of Slavonic-Russian typika into Studite and Jerusalem groupings, striving to prove that the so-called Slavonic-Russian typikon preserved in the many catalogues of the Moscow Synodal and Typographical libraries in Moscow are not Studite, but "ktitorite" (i.e. authorial)…[31]

Ivan Karabinov spoke out against the hypothesis that the Studite-Alexian typikon has authorial character on more than one occasion, insisting that the monastic typikon in Rus was, first and foremost, based upon the Studite tradition. Despite the fact that their conclusion is hypothetical, the approach taken by Dmitrievskij and Lisitsyn points to an accurate intuition regarding a multiplicity of local traditions and practices[32], though they don't address the question regarding the degree of cross-fertilization between these traditions. In the 2nd half of the 20th c., Hieromonk Mikhail Arrants hypothesized that cross-fertilization between the traditions of worship at the Great (Cathedral) Church of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople and various Palestinian *monasteries* of a hermetic or skete nature (not the Jerusalem Cathedral tradition), lies at the base of the so-called "Studite" synthesis.[33] At present, this hypothesis is subject to a significant amount of reconsideration.

Another important line of research into the typikon relates to the question of practice at the largest cathedrals which determined liturgical worship in the liturgical "capitols" of Constantinople and Jerusalem. In 1892, Dmitrievskij described and published a full catalogue of 9th century Typikon of the Great Church in Constantinople, which is kept at the Patmos library. Dmitrievskij demonstrated the particular significance of the Typikon of the Great Church not only within the ancient Byzantine church, but also for the ancient Russian church. At the same time, he noted stages in the development of the cathedral typikon at Jerusalem and interdependences with the Constantinopolitan cathedral rite, and defined the time at which one of the strongest cathedral traditions – that of Jerusalem – fell into decline. Dmitrievskij demonstrated that the liturgical practice of the Cathedral of the Ascension was

---

[31] Michail Lissitsyn, *Pervonachaljnyj slavjano-russkij typikon: Istoriko-Arkheologicheskoe issledovanie* [*The First Slavonic-Russian Typikon: a Historical-Archeological Study*] (St. Petersburg: V.D. Smirnov Publishing House, 1911), 207.

[32] Stefano Parenti, "The Cathedral Rite of Constantinople: Evolution of the Local Tradition," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 77 (2011).

[33] Robert F. Taft, SJ, *Vizantijskij tserkovnyj obrjad* [*The Byzantine Rite*] (Aletheia: St. Petersburg, 2000), 74.

replaced with monastic liturgical practices, though not of the traditional Palestinian lavra-hermitic type, but with the urban monastic practices of the Spoudayon, as was confirmed by the well-reasoned typology of Catholic scholar Fr. Juan Mateos, decades later. He holds that it was specifically the Jerusalem version of the typikon which would then be adapted by other large cathedral churches and influence the process of synthesis between cathedral and monastic typika in the empire's capital, Constantinople. Similar opinions are held by today's leading liturgists, who note the significance of the cathedral rite of these patriarchates.[34] In essence, Dmitrievskij came to the conclusion which would be voiced at the end of the 20th c. by Archimandrite Robert Taft, who notes the reciprocal influence of cathedral rites in Jerusalem and Constantinople, calling it "a tale of two cities."[35]

An intermediate position between Mansvetov, Krasnoseljtstev and Dmitrievskij on the one hand and Karabinov on the other, was taken by Michail Skaballanovich, who put forward a thesis which held that there were two different types of church service – cathedral/parish and monastic – each of which initially had its own form and sustained synthesis with the other over time, in stages. From the time of Anton Baumstark onwards, in the 20th c. this became the definitive understanding of the development of all church liturgical worship, primarily in relation to the history of the Byzantine rite.

Analysis of the various particularities of typika and their many combinations brought researchers around to thoughts about a multiplicity of varied traditions, which in each case were established under particular and unique circumstances, the inconsistencies in which should hardly be explained by a formal scheme, dividing typika into two different redactions – Studite and Jerusalem. With this approach, the typikon of every large monastery becomes a source of influence upon the liturgical practice of its surrounding region – for the specific monastery or cathedral church, as well as for other monasteries falling within the sphere of its "liturgical" influence. In fact, Russian liturgists set the foundation for the stage-by-stage development of the typikon as a system or organizing liturgical materials based on information found in source materials. Today, their findings lie at the foundation of scholarly knowledge on the

---

[34] Parenti, "The Cathedral Rite."

[35] Taft, *Vizantijskij tserkovnyj obrjad*, 70–77.

development of the typikon as a regulating factor for church liturgical worship in the Christian East.

3.2 Researching the Liturgical Aspect of the Church's Sacraments

Russian liturgists strove to maximally collect and cultivate liturgical source materials relating to both the Greek and Russian practices and traditions of the church's sacramental rites; the next step was definition of the rites' structures and key elements (prayers, liturgical actions and rubrics). At the final stage, scholars endeavoured to reveal any changes to the structures of the rites, explain the movements of various specific elements within the rites, and reconstruct their development over the course of history, taking into account regional particularities and differences. It turned out to be most rewarding not only to compile all source materials and describe them, but to attempt to structure each rite, having considered the historical development of each element within it.

In 1884, Alexander Almazov defended his master's dissertation on "The History of the Rites of Baptism and Chrismation", which gave rise to serious criticism from Dmitrievskij. We should also mention Almazov's next (doctoral) dissertation (in Canon Law), entitled "The Sacrament of Confession in the Eastern Orthodox Church: An Experience in External History, with Primary Use of Manuscripts as Source Material" (defended in 1895), as well as the masters dissertation of Archbishop Venedikt (Alentov) on "The Rite of Extreme Unction: A Historical-Critical Sketch", written under the guidance of Professor Ivan Karabinov and defended in 1917. These works all represent attempts to present an integral picture of specific sacramental rites from the earliest Christian times up until the final formation of the rites as we know them. The Eucharist, as a standalone rite, was included in the group of so-called "common" liturgical rites, and was therefore considered separately.

Alexey Dmitrievskij, in his courses at the Kiev academy between 1884 and 1907 and at his Higher Theological courses in Petrograd between 1923 and 1928, considered the orders of the sacramental rites while paying particular attention to their dogmatic aspect. Sections in his works and course materials are dedicated to the rite of ordination to church orders (Ordination), and his student, Alexey Neselovskij goes on to write his dissertation on "The Rites of Laying on of Hands and Ordination: An Experiment in Historical-Archaeological Research" (1906). There are thematic intersections here with works on rites which had at some point

been considered sacramental (such as monastic tonsure, burial and the blessing of the waters at Theophany) and had since lost that status, and with the research of Konstantin Nikoljskij and Nicolay Krasnoseljtev on rites and prayers from various usages, including healing prayers, the rite of the Play of Daniel, the rite of adelphpoiesis, and others. Scholars have already considered these liturgical rites and their development, allowing that said development had both its positive and negative aspects.

3.3 Researching Eucharistic Prayers

The *Collection of Ancient Liturgies*, a collection of Christian liturgical texts from East and West translated into Russian, marked a significant development in the academic study of the development of liturgical worship, as well as in terms of the popularization of liturgical diversity. This publication was prepared by a professor from the St. Petersburg Spiritual Academy, and appeared in the journal "Christian Lecture" ("Khristianskoje chtenije") between 1874 and 1878.

Next, it is necessary to note publications from the manuscript tradition of euchological material from libraries East and West: a work by Krasnotseltstev, entitled "Description of the Liturgical Manuscripts from the Vatican Library," and descriptions of various liturgical manuscripts from libraries of the Orthodox East – an incomplete project of Dmitrievskij, and works by representatives of the academy in St. Petersburg, Alexander Petrovskij and Fr. Michail Orlov.

The most significant contribution to the study of the Eucharistic Liturgy was made by Ivan Karabinov in his pilot research project, entitled "The Eucharistic Prayer (Anaphora). An Experiment in Historical Liturgical Analysis." As a starting point, Karabinov cites the thesis of Ferdinand Probst, which maintains the existence of "something like a specific traditional, general Christian format for the Eucharistic prayer". In endeavouring to delineate an integral system for the development of the anaphora prayers in both the East and the West, Karabinov, in his proposals, antedates Baumstark, who will later develop a theory on liturgy as a "nature" with its own laws. In doing this, by the beginning of the 20th c. Karabinov has discerned and successfully tested the methodology to which Baumstark himself and his followers will later turn.

The main conclusion to which Karabinov comes demonstrates thanksgiving as the most ancient layer of the Eucharist prayer. By postulating a non-homogenous structure for the texts of the anaphora

prayers on the basis of comparative analysis of the anaphoras in different liturgical "families" and other prayers which are structurally similar to these anaphoras, Ivan Alekseevich, in his 1908 dissertation, put forward the hypothesis that the anaphora did not originally contain the words of institution or the epiclesis, but that these were added at a later date, and demonstrates their absence in ancient Eucharistic texts. Before Baumstark (and Archimandrite Robert Taft, Gabriele Winkler, and others) did so, Karabinov proposes that the anaphora text be considered not as a monolith, but as a fungible structure made up of movable elements. In Karabinov's opinion, the presence or absence of these elements depends upon local particularities in the development of the anaphora and is determined by which texts are available in a given region at a given time, by theological particularities, and by local church practices. This attempt to delineate an integral development plan for the development of the Eucharistic prayer contains within it a key change in methodology: Karabinov attempts to discern the development of the Eucharistic prayer without basing his attempt upon the dogmatic interpretation of the sacrament, but by revealing equilibriums within the text itself – organizing a unified line "from the ancient structure of the anaphora to its finished form". As proof for his hypothesis, together with his address to the text of the anaphora itself, he uses examples of non-Eucharistic prayers, including those from the blessing of baptismal waters, oil for holy unction, and myrrh.

Alexander Golubtsov also spoke out on a number of points pertaining to the contents of the ancient Eucharistic prayer, including the prayers for thanksgiving and the glorification of God[36] in an attempt to solve the problem of continuity in the development of the liturgical rite.[37] In essence, Archimandrite Robert Taft repeats this order of liturgical development in his text "How Liturgies Grow."[38]

We could add further detail to this analytical summary, however the examples above are absolutely sufficient to illustrate that the level and quality of research being undertaken in Russia had no counterparts in Western European scholarship at the time.

---

[36] Golubtsov, *Lectures*, 39.

[37] *Ibidem*, 59.

[38] Taft, "How Liturgies Grow: The Evolution of the Byzantine «Divine Liturgy»," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica XLIII* (1977): 8–30.

Thus, we may easily say that historical-liturgical scholarship in Russia before the catastrophe of 1917 had moved right up and beyond the leading edge in the fields of study of the typikon, the research of eucholog-ical materials and daily worship rites, the church year, and the church sacraments. In Kiev, Dmitrievsky prepared a whole range of specialists, including Fr. Kornelij Kekelidze, Fr. M. Litsitsyn, A.Z. Neselovskij, and others, though perhaps fate smiled only upon Kekelidze, in terms of an academic career.[39] Though Liturgics may have been an "Unhappy Step-Daughter" among Russian academic disciplines at the beginning of the 19th century, as the century drew to a close, the field could full-well have claimed a leading position in historical research *in the world at large.* This was thanks to the many, well-qualified experts who helped forge the path forward. That being said, despite their formidable achievements in the field of liturgical source studies, the daily and annual liturgical cycles, and the liturgies of the sacraments, the heritage of Russian scholars of Liturgics to this day remains insufficiently appreciated in terms of reception, both at home and abroad. Russian Liturgics was, by that point, an absolutely particular, self-sufficient phenomenon, which would determine the developmental path of scholarly knowledge in the field decades in advance, and bearing fruit for the discipline, which state of play continues to this day[40].

4. The Development of Liturgics as a Scholarly Discipline after the Closure of the Spiritual Academies during the Soviet Period

The destruction of the system of education at the time of the Revolution and thereafter, also decimated the system for preparing academic liturgists and ruined the scholarly school which had been based around the St. Petersburg, Moscow and Kiev Spiritual Academies. The tragic break with tradition which occurred after the catastrophe of 1917, in the aftermath

[39] Korneli S. Kekelidze, *Liturgicheskie gruzinskie pamjatniki v otechestvennikh knigikhranilishchakh i ikh nauch znachenie* [*Georgian Liturgical Sources amongst our National Treasures and their Scholarly Significance*] (Tblisi, 1908); idem, *Ierusalimskij kanonarj VII v.* [*Jerusalem Canonaria of the 7th c.*] (Tblisi, 1912); idem, *Drevnegruzinskij arkhieratikon* [*Ancient Georgian Patriarchal Services*] (Tbilisi, 1912) and others.

[40] Archimandrite Robert Taft has repeatedly drawn attention to the significance of the research had been done by Russian liturgical scholars, see: Taft and A. Yu. Nikiforova, "V temnye dlja Rossii gody sovetskogo plenenija ja ezhednevno povtorjal molitvu: «Spasitel' mira, spasi Rossiju!»": Interv'ju s professorom Papskogo Vostochnogo instituta svjashhennikom Robertom Taftom, http://www.bogoslov.ru/text/1743074.html, accessed February 23, 2023.

of which the spiritual schools were closed (first the academies, which were the epicentre of knowledge on Liturgics), brought irreversible harm and loss: physical copies of works were lost, scholarly endeavours were halted in their footsteps, scholars' unique personal collections of liturgical manuscripts and books were robbed and pillaged, and dissertations which had been started were cut off at their prime and lost – we can only imagine what scholarly projects were in the pipeline and what impending discoveries were lost. We know that a doctoral dissertation Karabinov had begun to write on the Liturgy of Basil the Great and his unique library were irreversibly lost, and he himself was executed in 1937. Professors Alexander Katanskij, Alexey Dmitrievskij, priest Vassilij Prilutskij, Vassilij Narbekov and Michail Skaballanovich suffered and died in poverty and hunger. Russian Liturgics lost its leading position in terms of scholarly knowledge as a result of the catastrophic disruption; scholarly schools and societies, the system for training specialists, standards for academic research, scholarly works themselves and the hard-won scholarly vision and methodology by which they were created – all these things were casualties of the Revolution.

The tradition of teaching Liturgics was taken up by scholars from the Russian emigration, particularly at St. Serge Theological Institute in Paris. Notably, we might point to Archimandrite Cyprian Kern's lectures, "Liturgics: Hymnology and Calendar of Feast Days" and "The Eucharist." The Liturgics course wasn't prepared for publication by the author himself, but contains various approaches to the scholarly discipline called "Liturgics." The first step is called the historical-archaeological approach, which searches for "the gradual development and change in liturgical rites, hymnology, use of vestments, church utensils," etc. Archimandrite Cyprian notes, that a systematized course in Liturgics (the course in Liturgics was published in 1945) – along the lines of the lecture courses of Vassilij Bolotov and Nicolay Golubinskij in Church History, or the lecture courses of professors Ilya Berdnikov, Alexey Pavlov and Nicolay Suvorov in Canon Law – never appeared. The Academic courses of Nikolay Pokrovsky, Alexander Golubtsov, and Vassilij Prilutskij are only "attempts at the systematic consideration of Liturgics as an academic discipline."[41] As a result, Archimandrite Cyprian doesn't view his own course as foundational, and therefore designs it as more of a summary

[41] Cyprian Kern, *Liturgika: gimnographia i eortologia* [*Liturgics: Hymnography and Calendar of Feast Days*] (Moscow: Krutitskoe Patriarshee Podvorje, 1998), 14.

overview, though he does endeavour to delineate the development of the liturgical calendar of feasts and the stages of development of the typikon, based on classical works by Ivan Mansvetov, Fr. Michail Lisitsyn, Michail Skaballanovich, and Bishop Sergii (Spasskij).

Fr. Alexander Schmemann is the brightest star amongst those representatives of the emigration's 2nd generation involved in the development of theological thought. He proposed several extremely important liturgical-ecclesiastical concepts, in which he synthesizes the ideas and Eucharistic ecclesiology of Fr. Nikolay Afanasiev, and continues developing the idea of a liturgical movement (moving forward with Fr. Romano Guardini's ideas on the liturgical gathering as a very specific action, in particular), combining these things with the theological question of the eschatological nature of church sacraments – first and foremost the Eucharist. In the opinion of Archimandrite Robert Taft, Fr. Alexander Schmemann's reconstructions aren't without historical error, though it was Schmemann in particular, who

> took up the analytical and defragmented understanding of Liturgics, known by the code name "theology of the liturgy", and transformed them into "liturgical theological" material by considering Christ and the Church which conceals Him – the "Sacrament of Kingship" – within herself for "the life of the world".[42]

Bishop Nikolay (Kozhukharov) of Makariopol, in his 1967 course for the spiritual academy of the Synod of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, entitled "Introduction to Liturgics," says that the course "is more or less a composite of various materials."[43] Nevertheless the author clearly strives to make use of material from leading liturgical scholars of the time, including: Ludwig Eisenhofer, Lazar Mirkovich, Ene Branişte, Christo Dimitrov, and others.

In the period during which an atheistic worldview predominated and the church was persecuted, it was possible to study the history of Christian church worship only in the sense of considering its various forms, as did Nikolay Uspensky of the Leningrad Spiritual Academy.[44]

---

[42] Taft, "Liturgicheskoe delo 25 let spustja posle Aleksandra Shmemana (1921–1983): chelovek i ego nasledie" ["Liturgical Affairs 25 years after Alexander Schmemann (1921–1983): The Man and his Heritage]," in Stat'i [*Articles*], vol. 2, 311–50.

[43] Nikolay Kozhukharov, *Vvedenie v liturgiku* [*Introduction to Liturgics*] (Moscow: St. Philaret of Moscow Higher Orthodox Christian School, 1997), 6.

[44] Nikolay Dmitrievich Uspensky, *Pravoslavnaja vechernja: istoriko-liturgicheskij ocherk; Chin vsenoshchnogo bdenija* (Η ΑΓΡΥΠΝΙΑ) na Pravoslavnom Vostoke i v Russkoj Tserkvi

Uspensky was one of the last students of the great Russian liturgist Alexey Dmitrievskij, and himself also carried out independent research on the history of church liturgy. Given that he had no access to any means of broadly publishing his own work in scholarly journals, he published articles and monographs on the history of Byzantine and Russian church singing.[45] Simultaneously, he published historical-liturgical works in the journal called "Bogoslovskie Trudy" ("Theological Papers"), which was a publication of the Leningrad Spiritual Academy, making use of and often borrowing from scholarly material in the works of his predecessors and contemporaries, thereby familiarizing his students with the achievements of modern Liturgics.[46] He was supported in his work at the Leningrad academy by Hieromonk Mikhail Arrants.[47] Researchers working in the fields of Byzantine, Russian and Western Medieval History, Art History, and Greek and Russian Philology, also made use of liturgical sources. For example, in the Historical-Philology Course of Professor Nikolay Meshcherskij of Leningrad State University, entitled "Christian Liturgical Text History," the professor taught his students about the different types of Christian rites and their structures, gave them access to liturgical books and explained the history of their compilation, spoke of various types of

---

[Orthodox Evening Prayer: A Historical-Liturgical Sketch; The Vigil (Η ΑΓΡΥΠΝΙΑ) in the Orthodox East and in the Russian Church] (Moscow, 2004). For more on N. D. Uspensky see the biography and bibliography of works laid out in: Gennadyj Povnij, "Zhizn' i dejateljnost' N.D. Uspenskogo [The Life and Works of N.D. Uspensky]," *Works of the Minsk Spiritual Academy*, no.2, and P. Dubinov, "Spisok trudov professora Nikolaja Dmitrievich Uspenskogo [A List of Works by Professor Nikolay Dmitrievich Uspensky]," *Theological Works*, 13 (1975): 20–25.

[45] See, for instance, the articles and monographs of Uspensky on musicological topics: Uspensky, "Psalmy" (Psalms), in *Muzykaljnaja entsiklopedija*, ed. Y.V. Keldysh, vol. 4 (Moscow: Sovetskaya entsiklopedija, 1978); idem, *Drevnepusskoe pevcheskoe iskusstvo* [*The Art of Ancient Russian Singing*] (Moscow, 1965); idem, *Obraztsy drevnorusskogo pevcheskogo iskusstva* [*Examples of Ancient Russian Song*] (Leningrad, 1968); idem, *Lady russkogo Severa* [*Musical Modes of the Russian North*] (Moscow, 1973).

[46] Idem, "Anafora (opyt istoriko-liturgicheskogo analiza)" [The Anaphora – An Experiment in Historical-Liturgical Analysis], *Theological Works*, 13 (1975): 40–147. Compare: Ivan Karabinov, *Evkharisticheskaja molitva (anaphora). Opyt istoriko-liturgicheskogo analiza* [*The Eucharistic Prayer (Anaphora). An Experiment in historical-liturgical analysis*] (St. Petersburg, 1908).

[47] See the short biography of the scholar and information about his scholarly works, at: Konstantin Poljsky, "Arrants," *Pravoslavnaja entsiklopedija* [*Orthodox Encyclopaedia*], no. 3 (2003): 382; and information available on the Internet at: http://arranz.canto.ru.

hymnology and the history of Christian hymnography.[48] Maya Momina, who is one of the leading scholars in the field of the study of the Triodion, was one of Meshcherskij's students at that time.[49] Historical liturgical studies, while masked behind the façade of various non-religious course titles, remained a subject of academic enquiry.[50]

At that time, Liturgics as an academic subject was one of the core courses in the programme of the spiritual schools (The Orthodox Theological Institute in Moscow[51], the spiritual academies and seminaries). The most well-known of such courses was the course in Liturgics taught by Georgy Shimanskij at the Kiev academy and the Volyn Theological Seminary

---

[48] Nikita A. Meshcherskij, *Istoria khristianskoj liturgicheskoj pisjmennosti* [*The History of Christian Liturgical Texts*] (St. Petersburg: Dmitrij Bulanin, 2013), 526.

[49] Maya A. Momina, "Postnaja i Tsvetnaja Triodi [The Lentan and Festal Triodia]," *Metodicheskije rekomendatsii po opisaniju slavjanorusskikh rukopisej dlya svodnogo kataloga rukopisej, khranjashchikhsja v SSSR* [*Methodological Recommendations to the Description of Slavonic-Russian Manuscripts from the Summary Catalogue of Manuscripts Preserved in the USSR*], part II, issue 2 (Moscow, 1976): 389–419; idem, "Tipy slavjanskoj Triodi [Types of Slavonic Triodion]," in *Jazyk i pisjmennostj srednebolgarskogo perioda* [*Language and Literature from the Mid-Bulgarian Period*] (Moscow, 1982), 114–19; idem, "Voprosy klassifikatsii slavjanskoj Triodi [Questions of Classification and the Slavonic Triodion]," *Trudy Otdela Drevnerusskoj Literatury*, vol. 37 (Leningrad, 1983), 25–38; idem, "Problema pravki slavjanskikh bogosluzhebnykh gimnograficheskikh knig na Rusi v XI v.," in *Trudy Otdela Drevnerusskoj Literatury*, vol. 45 (St. Petersburg, 1991), 200–19; idem: "Samopodobnye pesnopenia v tserkovnykh bogosluzhebnykh rukopisjakh [Self-similar Songs in Liturgical Manuscripts]," *Rus i juzhnie slavjane* (St. Petersburg, 1998), 165–84; Momin and E. M. Shvarts, "Rukopisnyj prototip staropechatnykh moskovskikh Triodej XVI veka [A Handwritten Prototype Early Moscow Triodia]," *Drevnerusskaja literature: Istochnikovedenie* (Leningrad,1984), 188–94; Maja Andreevna Momina and Nikolaos H. Trunte, *Triodion und Pentekostarion nach slavischen Handschriften des 11.-14. Jahrhunderts. Teil I: Vorfastenzeit. Mit einer Einführung zur Geschichte des slavischen Triodions von Maya Momina* (Paderborn-München-Wien-Zürich: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2004) = PS, ed. H. Rothe. Bd. 11.

[50] See, for instance: Sergey S. Averentsev, "K ujasneniju smysla nadpisi nad konkhoj tsentraljnoj apsidy Sofii Kievskoj" [Towards a Clarification of the Meaning of the Inscriptions Above the Central Apse Cupola at St. Sophia, Kiev], in Drevnerusskoe iskusstvo i khudozhestvennaja kulhtura domongoljskoj Rusi (Moscow: Nauka, 1972), 25–49.

[51] After ceasing to function in the 1920s, the Moscow Spiritual Academy was reformed in 1944 and reopened in the Lopukhin Building of Novodevichy Monastery as the Orthodox Spiritual Institute, and was later renamed as the Moscow Theological Institute and then the Moscow Spiritual Academy. Since 1947, the Academy has been located at the Lavra in Sergeev Posad (Zagorsk, during Soviet Times).

in the 1950s and 60s.[52] Shimanskij's course didn't presuppose that his students would come away with any sort of an overview of the academic achievements of the discipline of Liturgics, and his course materials don't contain references to academic literature on the subject, or even to the classical works of Dmitrievskij. Rather, Shimanskij presented commentaries on the existing typikon and practical particularities of the church liturgical usage, without making reference to their historical codification in church liturgical texts or to the historical context from which the daily cycle, liturgy or church sacraments had arisen. Liturgics, in the works of various different representatives and the analysis of their works, was occasionally a subject of research at the spiritual academies, though these works were rarely widely distributed in academic circles.

The Post-Soviet period ushered in a new stage in the development of Liturgics in Russia, with its primary representatives being Fr. Mikihail Zheltov and Alexey Pentkovskij, who are both recognized specialists in the academic community of liturgical scholars. It is too early, however, to speak of the full rebirth of the field of historical liturgical studies in Russia.

Conclusions

As in the famous Andrey Rublev's icon of the Saviour of Zvenigorod, only a fragment of the face of the Russian achievements in Liturgics from the first 20 years of the 20th century remains – but that fragment is addressed directly to us. This means that the road ahead, for those who wish to continue work in our historical liturgical tradition, is a road of labour and significant effort. After all, the great Russian liturgists instruct us, first and foremost, in professionalism, with their patient and painstaking endeavors. Ours is a field of meticulous scholarly work, aimed at understanding how revelation of the worship of our Heavenly Father in spirit and truth (John 4:24) is expressed over the course of history in all its forms. As Robert Taft, one of the leading liturgists of the 20th c., puts it:

---

[52] Germogen I. Shimanskij, *Liturgika: tainstva i obrjady* [*Liturgics: Sacraments and Rites*] (St. Petersburg: Obshchestvo pamjati igumenii Taicii, 2019), 303. In relation to Shimanskij's biography, it is a common mistake to believe that during his time teaching in Kiev, i.e. after 1951, he was a student and "used the advice of leading liturgist and professor M.N. Skaballanovich." This is not possible, insofar as Skaballanovich died in August 1931. It seems that Shimanskij was largely self-taught, and in the preparation of his course materials made use of the pre-revolutionary materials on Liturgics and the order of service to which he had access.

> The ultimate goal of any liturgical research is three-fold: understanding, based in knowledge, from the perspective of practical application. The academic scholar of liturgy must, first and foremost, make possible true comprehension …as clearly flows from the premise that service to God manifests objective reality, the meaning of which is not dependent upon our thoughts, attitudes or stances vis-à-vis this reality, but is rather found in the specific contents of the Christian tradition. The only possible path for the acquisition of such knowledge is the study of all manifestations of our tradition over time. This is what we call our history.[53]

The history of Russian Liturgics, with all its achievements, teaches us to understand; its determining value for us today lies in that:
1) the Eastern-Christian church liturgical tradition has, to a significant degree, been systematized;
2) Russian liturgists have developed a productive methodology for the research of the enormous volume of diverse liturgical materials. This methodology remains relevant to this day;
3) we have this knowledge available to us in Russian language, which is principally important for the reception and further development of the discipline of Liturgics in Russia and gives us hope for the future development of liturgical studies in Russia.

[53] Taft, "Anton Baumstark's Comparative Liturgy Revisited," *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 265 (2001): 191–232.

The Doctrine of Original Sin and its Influence on the Theology and Practice of Baptism

Petru-Mihail Pruteanu*

In the 20th century, both in the East, but mostly in the West, a genuine movement of patristic and liturgical renewal took shape, aiming to establish as to what degree the theological discourse and the liturgical life of the Church today corresponds to the spirit and the practice of the Church of the first centuries. In this spirit, the question was often asked if the generalization of infant baptism in the West (5th century), but also in the East (6th century), was influenced by the theory of "original sin" and the Augustinian "bogeyman" concerning the inevitable condemnation to hell of all who die unbaptized. In his book "Of Water and the Spirit", Father Alexander Schmemann briefly touches, but does not fully develop the subject, and fails to reach any clear conclusions. In the current study we tried, as much as was possible, to follow the roots and dogmatical consequences of this theory, and also to discern its ensuing consequences on baptismal rites and texts, as well as other practical and canonical implications, like the importance of baptismal immersion.

Keywords: *Baptism, Immersion, Infants, Liturgy, Original Sin*

Introduction

In the writings of the late Father Alexander Schmemann (1921–1983), I was able to identify three passages addressing "original sin" in the context of Baptism.[1] Each time the matter is discussed briefly, without ample dogmatic or historical background, rather a sad account of its implications on both the theological and the common understanding of Baptism:

For a long time, the theological and spiritual interest in baptism was virtually disconnected from its cosmic significance, from the totality of man´s relation to the world. It was explained as "man´s liberation" from "original sin". Both original sin and the liberation from it were given an

* Petru-Mihail Pruteanu, docent at the Theology Faculty of the Portuguese Catholic University, Bishop of the Russian Orthodox Church in Western Europe, Rua Padre António Farinha Martins 74, Vivenda Santo António 1º andar, Alto dos Gaios, Estoril 2765-078, Portugal, s-mpruteanu@ucp.pt.

[1] One of the texts is cited below, and the others are taken from Alexander Schmemann's book *Of Water and the Spirit. A Liturgical Study of Baptism* (New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974), 54 and 63. There are other places where the author uses the expression "original sin" as a "technical formula" or with an allegoric sense, but these passages do not serve the current study in any meaningful way.