Neža Zajc

Institute of Cultural History
Scientific-Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts

St Maxim the Greek
(Преп. Максим Грек, 1470–1556):
Some Notes on His Understanding of the Sacred Time

The Introduction

In the year 1518 Great Prince Vasili the Third sent an invitation letter to the Holy Mount Athos with a request for the monk who was experienced in handling holy books. The Russian emperor was looking for somebody who could translate and check some translations of sacred texts in Russian liturgical books. After his arrival to Muscovite Russia, Maxim Trivolis, who soon earned the nickname 'the Greek', translated the Gospels (1519) and the Psalter with extended commentaries (1520). In the year 1525 at Moscow Church court, St Maxim the Greek was accused for the first time of supposed heretical mistakes in the translation of Russian liturgical books. He was suspected of insufficient knowledge of the Russian church language. It is quite well known

among scholars (cf. Б. А. Успенский, 2002, pp. 213, 234–235)[1] that a minor mis-understanding between the political body of the Russian church and St Maxim the Greek, as a translator, was the cause for further accusations against him. He was translating with the mediation of Russian translators, Dmitri Gerasimov,[2] as well as Vlas and Mihail Medovartsev. The process of translation involved the following: St Maxim the Greek submitted words to them in Latin, translated from Greek, and the Russian translators translated the Latin expressions into the Russian redaction of the Old Church Slavonic language. St Maxim the Greek spoke about the accusations against him in the following paragraph of the text, entitled *The Confessional Creed of the Orthodox Faith*:

К симь же вѣдомо да е̂ вамъ бг҃олюбивѣйшимъ ег҃помъ, и пресвѣтлымъ кн҃земъ, и боля́ро̂. Яко не егда бываше мною грѣшнымъ исправление трио̂дное. Латійскою бесѣдою сказа̂ е̂ тлъмачемъ вашимъ, Мите да Власоу за еже не усъвершенѣ изучившу ми вашей бесѣде. Аще убо ху̂͡но нѣ̇что мнитса ва̂ в речени́и тѣхъ, сѣдѣлъ еси и сѣдѣвъ, имъ праведно есть вмѣнити сицево нелѣпотное презрѣние, а не мнѣ.// Понеже а̂ тогда не вѣдахъ ра̂личие сицевы̂ речени́и. Аще бо вѣдалъ бы, никако̂ бы̂ замо̂чалъ, но всако исправилъ бы̂ такову нелѣпотну опись. Которая бо ползА мнѣ ѿ сих черны̂ рубицъ и молитвъ иноческаго житества, и многолѣтны̂ си̂ скоби́и мой. Аще ѡ̂рящуся хуля на Га̂ Бг҃а и Сп҃са моего Іс҃а Х҃а. Нань же упова̂ о̂ млады̂ ногтеи.[3]

St Maxim the Greek, indeed, used the -л form of the verb plus copula -еси for the purpose of distinguishing 2psg from 3psg.[4] But from the following quotation it could be clear that his goal was not narrow-minded grammatical revision. In his writings St Maxim the Greek was not accidentally constantly explaining to the Russians the theologically decisive understanding of the non-lasting or eternal (a-historical) time of the Holy Scripture. However, in the text,

---

[1] See more in the monograph Zajc (2011, pp. 215–222).

[2] See more in recent studies: Verner (Вернер, 2011, pp. 197–222). About D. Gerasimov and his circle of translators, see more: Isačenko (1977, p. 112); Казакова (1972, p. 254). For the historical causes of the Russian omission of the form of the verb in present tense, see also Isačenko (1941, pp. 25–31).

[3] Paris Bibliothèque Nationale, coll. Mss. Slave 123, p. 16 r. (further on: Slave 123).

[4] We argue with the opinion that Maxim was correcting the Russian liturgical books following the principle of the only narrow-minded grammatical tendency, cf. Kravetz (Кравец, 1991, pp. 249, 252, 265). Our opinion is that he was only deeply aware of the biblical time and the theologically proper content of his translation. (See the appropriate description of St Maxim the Greek' linguistic and grammatical contributions to the Russian language of the sixteenth century, V. Jagić (Ягич, 1896, pp. 295–332); M. Barrachi (Barrachi, 1971, Fasc. II, p. 275).

entitled "Тогѡ̈ инока Маѯіма тѡ̈кованїе строкѣ псал҃ма п҃ѳ. Ги прїбѣжище бы̂ на̑" he explained the similar use of the perfect verb (-л form plus copula –еси) on the case of the psalm LXXXIX:

А сия пословица, былъ еси, не ѡлꙋчаѐ насъ Бж҃иаго промысла и прибѣгства якѡ̈ вл҃ка тѡ̈кꙋѐ но наипаче исповѣдꙋетъ и твердо являетъ Бж҃їи же о на̑ промыслъ явѣ гл҃а яко не точию нн҃ѣ прибѣжище еси намъ Ги, но искони ѡлꙋческого рода бы̂ или былъ еси прибѣжище намъ сїе бо да сказꙋетъ намъ, еже врꙵ и рѡ е̑ же е̑ вынꙋ, сирѣ изначала и нн҃е еси прибѣжище намъ, и до сконꙔаниа вѣка боудеши оу на̑ и мы ꙋ тебе по г҃юцемꙋ неложномꙋ ѡбещанїю. И се а̑ с вами есмь по вса дн҃и живота вш҃его иꙗ по си̑, безлѣпь оубо смꙋщаеса о мнѣ добрыи гн҃ъ нашь пословицею сею, А различие пословицамъ симъ таково е̑. Егда пословица сиа соꙔетаеса к первомꙋ лицоу рекше егда бл҃годараше содѣтела гл҃емъ к немꙋ самомꙋ о егꙵ к намъ мл҃рдїи тогда соидетса гл҃ати съставнѣ, Ги прибѣжище былъ еси в рꙵ и рꙵ еже е̑ вынꙋ, а егда которомꙋ лицоу сꙔетеса рекше хвалашеса, инымъ сказываемъ бывше е еже его к намъ бл҃готворенїе, тогда составнѣ гл҃емъ Гь̑ приѣжище бы̂ намъ яко же и инде гл҃ть. Крѣпость моа и пенїе мое Гь̑ і бы̂ мнѣ во сп҃сение (Slave 123, pp. 85 v., 86 r.).

St Maxim the Greek was obviously trying to explain the misunderstanding of the abovementioned circumstances of 'the Creed' with an argumentation[5] by which the analogy in-between two theologically distinguished persons of the Holy Trinity was stressed. He wanted to differ between 2psg and 3psg (that he named as 'first person' and 'second person') especially with the aim of the addressing the Son of God in 2psg. That was the obligatory form for Maxim's praying practice. The 'other/second' expression, according to him, was theologically reserved for addressing God the Father, because the distinction between 2psg and 3psg in the perfect form of the verb (-л+ еси) in Russian Old Church Slavonic did not exist. From that point of view, St Maxim the Greek in 'the Creed' used the Slavic perfect tense as a form, corresponded not only to Greek aorist and imperfect tense, but to Latin perfect as well, which possessed a certain ability to express the significant absoluteness of grammatical tenses (Clackson & Horrocks, 2011, pp. 192–194, 214, 221). Through such a synthetic use of the three Christian church languages, St Maxim the Greek provided the Slavonic assimilation of the non-temporal quality of biblical time. Accord-

---

[5] Our research was not connected with the interpretation of Dr N. V. Sinitsyna (only after our submission of the paper we observed the similar in, Sinitsyna, 2014, Prepodobnyj Maksim Grek, 2014 (Синицына, 2014))

ing to his words, during the process of the translation he was carefully paying attention to the specific timeless dimension of the biblical language, related especially to the presence of Jesus Christ. It could be said, that for Maxim there was no doubt about the duration of being the Son of God on the right side of the Father. It was of utmost importance to express the living of the Orthodox believer in Christ's protective shadow. Indeed, St Maxim the Greek used the present tense to express the voice of Jesus Christ as a citation of His speech from the Holy Bible. But it is true also that Maxim involved the words of the Son of God to use them in a personal prayer.

"The liturgy of the time" was shaped already in the pre-Constantin period (its source was probably synagogal) (Шмеман, 1961, p. 102), but pronouncing the expression 'the Son of God' in the present tense was common in personal prayers from the early ages of Christianity. However, a personal monastic discipline of St Maxim the Greek reflected as his own liturgical prayer practice, enclosed with addressing the Holy Trinity.[6] His prologue to the paragraph from his abovementioned *Confessional Creed* was the following (Slave 123, p. 16 r.):

И нося всяческая гломъ силы своея. Собою очищение сотворь согрешенїй нашй. Сѣде одесную пртла величествиа ввышнй, и прочее, и по вся дни, и ноши пою и глю съ всѣми вами блговѣрными. И взшѣша на нбса. И сѣдааша одесную Оца, и яже по сих. Такѡ и во вседневомъ славословїю, блгаю, славословлю и глю: Гй Бже Ягнец Бжїи

In the theological writings of St Maxim the Greek, which were identified as polemic by twentieth century Russian scholars, he precisely exposed the danger of the literal similarity to the heretical teachings from the early Christian periods to his period. Before his arrival to Russia and before his monastic period at the Holy Monastery of Vatopaidi St Maxim the Greek had received some special education in northern Italy in the field of copying and translating the manuscripts of ancient Greek authors as well as Greek Patristic literature. Handling manuscripts and first printings in the printing house of Aldus Manuzio in Venice qualified him to select among the so called 'Sacred texts' between those which were written under the control of divine inspiration (he called them as 'internal wisdom') and those which

---

[6] However, St Maxim the Greek referred his formulas of the prayers to the apostolic tradition. His theology explicitly excluded the teachings about the onomatodoxy. This topic he clarified in the text 'About the Tale of Aphroditian' (Slave 123, pp. 248–251).

were written as the result of human knowledge. St Maxim the Greek managed to recognize the texts that were regarded as sacred in the levels that led from the higher rung of the Holy Scripture, the language of which his knowledge was very thorough (cf. Каптерев, 1903, p. 129). Consequently, those writings that could not be find in the Scripture, he considered as opposite to the human nature, and called them heretical (as the consequence of 'external knowledge'). On the basis of his critical principles, St Maxim the Greek offered a successful critique of several apocrypha which were among the most difficult (cf. Tschiževskij, 1960, p. 298). However, his education within the Italian experience was well-appreciated at the Holy Mount Athos, where he was ordained as a monk in 1506 in the Holy Monastery of Vatopaidi. The same knowledge of St Maxim the Greek was found doubtful in Muscovite Russia. In Moscow he had to also deal with the superstitions and false beliefs of the Russian people as well as the popular influence of the German Protestant theological writings, which spread astrological thinking. When he was faced with the mistakes in the Russian liturgical books, caused by the previous translations into Russian Old Church Slavonic, St Maxim the Greek recognized the basic theological misunderstandings due to the mistranslation of the ancient Greek philosophical writings, as well as the classical rhetoric. Also, consequently, both the Eastern and Western writings of the early Church Fathers occurred as quite poorly interpreted in the Russian sacred manuscripts books.

In the year 1531 St Maxim the Greek at Moscow Church court was accused for the second time. Among several accusations he was suspected of supposed heretical expressions in addressing the Mother of God. After the condemnation, which was slightly milder than before, he received permission to write. He wrote many texts, properly attributed as the theological ones. Instead of simplifying his own monastic principles as well as writing experiences, he even more firmly continued clarifying the theologically doubtless basis of the Orthodox faith. He wrote down what he considered to be the importance of grammar. The linguistic grammatical terminology he understood in a theological dimension. Precisely, for St Maxim the Greek the grammar was sacred ('грамотикїи стъи') (cf. Ягич, 1896, pp. 301, 306). Therefore, his use of old forms of the verbs in the Old Church Slavonic language was fully intentional. The latter he clearly stated in the text, entitled *About Correcting the Russian Books; and Also Against Those Who Are Speaking That After Resurrection the Lord's Body Became Indescribable*:

А ꙗко не порꙋю сщённыꙗ книгы ꙗкꙋ клевецꙋ́ мꙗ вражꙋюще ими всꙋе. Но прилѣжнъ и со всꙗкꙑ́ вниманїемъ и бж҃їй страхѡмъ и правꙑ́ разꙋмꙋ̀ испра-вливаю ихъ в нꙙ же растлѣвашꙗ ѡбо ꙋ҄бо ѡ҆ преписꙋющїй ненаꙋ́ченны сꙋщїй и неискꙋсных в разꙋмѣ и хꙑтрости грамотикїи стѣи. Ꙗво же ѡ́ самѣ испрьва сътворшꙗ книжны перевꙋ̀ прн҃о памꙗтны́ мꙋжеи. Речет бо сꙗ истинна. Єсть нѣгдѣ неплꙑно разꙋмѣвше силоу еллинскꙑхъ рѣченї и сего ради далече истины ѡпа-доша. Еллинска бо бесѣда мнѡго и не ꙋдов рꙗ̀сꙋжаемо имꙗ̀ разлоу́нїе тѡ̀ка речѐнїи (Slave 123, pp. 259 v., 260 r.).

From this paragraph the concatenated primary Byzantine method of mental reception could be observed. Moreover, St Maxim the Greek demanded such a complex basis for each text and each translation of the sacred text. That also included the theologically defined iconography (what the full title of the quoted text alluded to). Obviously, Maxim spoke against certain followers of a monophysitism that was contrary to the orthodox interpretation of Christology, which teaches that Jesus Christ has two wills (human and divine) corresponding to his two natures. A living presence of the Lord St Maxim the Greek explained also in the short text *About the Lord's Crown and the Scroll in His Arm and About the Name of the Mother of God* (Slave 123, p. 656 r.),[7] explaining also an iconographic detail on the icon of 'Pantocrator':

Понѐ Ѡнъ едꙙ́ по е̂ствоу е̂ соꙋцꙑ неимꙑи ни начала ни кѡ̂ца, но все еже бꙑти, и процꙋ́ꙋ̂цее и настоꙗцее и градоꙋцее ѡбъемь имꙗ̀, его же рꙗ̀и прн҃осоꙋценъ наречется.

The pious praying for the possibility of seeing God face to face, known already from the story of Moses, could be achieved after the moment of seeing God's face as a result of the most doubtless seeking for the Divine Light that is, according to St Maxim the Greek, a sequence from the Goodness of God the Father. That issue he most often repeated by giving the argumentation with the reference to the Epistle of St James in the New Testament (Jm 1, 17). However, also in the case of the iconographical motif called 'Pantocrator (Jesus Christ as the Ruler of the Universe)' Maxim explained the source of the Divine Power.

Прочаꙗ же Ѥго дѣла всꙗ видимаꙗ и невꙙ́имаꙗ ѡ него по бл҃годати Ѥго ꙙ́моꙋт еже бꙑ̂ и жꙑ̂ и двизати ꙺ пребꙑваю, Ѡн же ни ѡ кого иного ни бꙑ̂ ни еже бꙑ̂ имꙗ̀, но прн҃о в собою,[8] ꙺ е̂ пребоꙋдꙋ̂ꙺ в бесконечныꙗ вѣкы.

---

[8] There is a correction above the text: "но в прп бꙺ а собою".

The main goal of the argumentation of St Maxim the Greek was not only the iconographical approach, but the demand of the theologically proper denoting the liturgical reality of the Orthodox believer. When he noticed in the Russian liturgical books literal formulations of theological thought that closely resembled the early Christian heretical conceptions, especially concerning the image of the Son of God, he identified them as the heretical presentations of Jesus Christ because they were in direct agreement to the teachings of the Arians, Nestorians,[9] and Eutychians. St Maxim the Greek clearly argued: the Son of God was and is in accordance with the Orthodox theology, before and after His resurrection – visible. But He is yet visible only to the disciples of Jesus Christ and consequently also describable (especially to them). From the period of the intensifying of the theological confrontations against the spreading Arianism (from the late third century), the liturgical prayers also started to address Jesus Christ Himself (Jungmann, 1925, pp. 103, 106, 197).

In the second part of the abovementioned text, St Maxim the Greek explained the presence of the Son of God with hymnographical fragments in honor of the Holy Theotokos. By the acknowledgment of the Akythistos hymn (the fifth verse of the seventh song), Maxim made an argument of the truth of the Lord being. The Old Testament's prophetical message had been realized in the first verse of the Gospel of Apostle John by the Apostles preaching. In the conclusion of the quoted text, St Maxim the Greek explained the name of the Mother of God in detail, as this was crucial for his personal theological view, determined by the Chalcedon decree of the Christological nature that confirmed the immaculate nature of the Holy Theotokos.

II. The Hierarchy

The key for the proper attribution and selection of canonical texts from non-canonical was a profound knowledge of the writings of the Fathers of the Early Church, St Maxim the Greek considered from an ontological perspective, based on the ascetical readings and interpretations of the Holy Bible.[10]

---

[9] St Maxim the Greek was warning against Nestorians in the text 'About the Abidance of the Orthodox Creed'. Therefore, the question whether he was writing especially against the thoughts that might be too close to Nestorians as he met in Russia, is obviously confirming exactly the latter (cf. Журова, 2011, p. 439).

[10] For an unique and theologically proper description of his monasticism see Kapterev (Каптерев, 1903, pp. 114–171, especially, pp. 121–123).

His theological-liturgical interpretation of time dimension of the Holy Scripture was the main source for the establishment of the morally-ethical hierarchical system. It could be confirmed that already from his entering Muscovite Russia, St Maxim the Greek was able to adequately express basic arguments of the Orthodox theology. His understanding of the Eastern Church fathers was based on the reasonable canonical reception of the Patristic Orthodox writings. St Maxim the Greek's ethical interpretation could be more clearly seen from the very significant fragment of his *Second Letter to Fiodor Karpov About the Astrology*, written during the years 1525–30 in Moscow (Slave 123, p. 38; Синицына, 2008b, p. 313).

Не Козма се бо токмо и Григорïи Акрагáскïи, но и Васïлеи и Григорïа оба и Златыи языкомъ и совокупивше реци, вси, иже въ мⷣрости и стⷮыни въсияшïи, въ присѡ҆щенïи внѣшны҅ наказанïихъ быша юнѣиши еще суще и горнѣишая премⷣрости, е ю҆ прочее мощно Бгоу совокупитися и Бгоявленïю сподобится, неоудостигше, но такоже реци, пⷣ горой еще Фаворскою съ девями ѡставлени, аки совершенѣиший зрѣнïи неоусоуще вмѣститѣни. Аки еще млека, а не твердѣшия пищи требоующе, якⷪ Павел реѵе Коринфомъ.

Maxim pointed out that Gregory of Akragina,[11] Kosmas of the Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa and John Chrysostom achieved a level, defined only with the position of "nine lost" apostles under the foot (bottom) of the mountain (cf. Lk, 20, 43).[12] According to St Maxim the Greek, the Patristic authors had not yet provided the full ability for the profound understanding of the significant presence of the living Jesus Christ. But since they showed their firmness in the faith in the Lord, their teachings could be considered valid.

The expression "under the feet of God; a footstool for your feet", known already from the Book of Psalms (Ps 109, 1; Ps 17, 40–42), evangelically transformed into the symbol of the Holy Mountain, in fact influenced the second translation of 'Liturgical Psalter' by St Maxim the Greek in the year 1552. Four years before his death, he re-translated all the Psalms within the Old Testament

---

[11] T. m. Gregory of Agrigentum', who wrote 'Commentaries on the Book of Ecclesiast' (Ferguson, 1990, p. 491). About the author of the Old Testament's Book of Ecclesiast also St Gregory Nazianzus once expressed as 'not entirely reliable' (Gregorio di Nazianzo, 2012, pp. 270–271).

[12] However, in the text of the Bible the mountain is not named; its naming (as Mount of Tabor) was found in the writings of Origen, St Hieronym and Cyrill of Jerusalem, as well in the teachings of Gregory Palama.

canticles. In his second translation of 'Liturgical Psalter', St Maxim the Greek refined the Russian liturgical language to such a level that it was very close to comprehensible spoken Russian, which occurred as an inclusion of his literal expressions into all future Sinodical versions of the official Russian liturgical Book of Psalms.[13] In 1552, St Maxim the Greek carefully selected the theologically doubtless lexical expressionsin the Psalter. For example, in the third verse of the Psalm 109, instead of 'the first morning star' ('дєнницы'),[14] he wrote the meaning of "the one, who is carrying the Divine Light ('свѣтоносца'), corresponding to the Greek 'Theodohos' (lat. Luciferos).[15] That expression of 'the morning star' St Maxim the Greek used only once with a positive meaning, that was in his *Prayer to the Mother of God*; (otherwise that expression alluded to the specific meaning of the source of the evil).

Within a minor replacement in a declination from the Genitive ('crushed the heads on the earth of many people'; 'сокрушит главы на земли многих') to Dative form ('crushed the heads of the many people on the earth'; 'сокрушит главы на земли многим')[16] in the seventh verse of the Psalm 109, St Maxim the Greek significantly expressed the meaning which was closer to the Judgement of the Higher Justice of Jesus Christ Himself. Therefore, also in the Psalm 98, 9, St Maxim the Greek kept this form to denote Jesus Christ. In that letter to F. Karpov, he further developed a monastic quality of the extreme piousness. He referred to the chapter from 'The Seventh Homily on the Personal Silence' of St Gregory of Nazianzus (Gregorio di Nazianzo, 2012, pp. 268–269), about the ascetic principle of the contemplation about the closeness to the Son of God. St Maxim the Greek provided a narrative explanation by a parabolic story of a merchant who lost his pearl but instead of the hopelessness he chose

---

[13] The further result was that St Maxim the Greek made not only an important revision of the Russian liturgical language, but his grammatical surveys and linguistic decisions about the Church language were being included into the first printed books of Russian Grammar of M. Smotritskij in the eighteenth century. Consequently, the linguistic types that St Maxim the Greek used in his personal writings and biblical translations occurred in the normative language of the Russian literature of the nineteenth century in the most respectable works like those of A. S. Pushkin, F. I. Tjutchev, F. M. Dostoevski, N. V. Gogol, A. P. Chechkov, L. Leskov (Ковтун, Синицына, & Фонкич, 1973, pp. 99–128).

[14] The expression that St Maxim the Greek used only in the conclusion of *The Prayer to the Mother of God and partly Because of Lord's Sufferings* (Slave 123, p. 158 r.).

[15] The Orthodox Name Day of the ‚Theodohos/Feodohos' falls on the firth day after the Feast of the Meeting of the Lord in the Temple (15/16 February).

[16] The Library of the Moscow Museum of History, coll. Uvar. 85, p. 93 r.

to live the rest of his life in devotion and obedient learning of the words of Jesus Christ, exactly as a child (Slave 123, pp. 38 r.–39 r.; Синицына, 2008b, p. 314).[17] As the main help to live a devoted life, St Maxim the Greek explicitly identified it with the Lord's Decalogue.

Remembering the words of St Gregory of Nazianzus, St Maxim the Greek concretized the meaning of the so called "secret life in the Lord" ("in the hidden rooms") (cf. Mat 24, 26; *Новый завет на греческом и русском языках*, 2002, p. 91), the basic idea of which he expressed by the words of Prophet Isaiah from the Old Testament. It could be proposed that St Maxim the Greek thought of certain sentence from the Old Testament of Prophet Isaiah about which he was making an exegetical interpretation in the text, entitled by the sentence from the speech of the Prophet Isaiah, "Сказанїе сеа рѣчи, Ступайте лю̑ моа и прочаа" (Slave 123, p. 80 r.) ("*Pass through, pass through the gates! Prepare the way for the people*" Is, 62, 10). In this text he precisely defined "the life in Jesus Christ."[18] In the Book of the Prophet Isaiah (cf. Is 55, 12; Is 60, 13; Is 66, 1) there is also the abovementioned expression, being "under the surface of His foot." In opposition, in-between the internal (hidden) prayer to Jesus Christ, and the external reflections of human speculations, appeared a basic argument for the creation of one's own practice of the prayer. St Maxim the Greek's constant expression of the sense of the Divine Light could testify to his theological meditation in liturgical terms.

By providing the part from the Homily of St Gregory of Nazianzus, St Maxim the Greek introduced the stages of ascetic rules in terms analogue to human's life gradation. According to the interpretations of the theological thought of St Gregory of Nazianzus, St Maxim the Greek understood the stages of the monastic spirituality (Каптерев, 1903, p. 124) as an outcome of an ascetic metamorphosis from the ancient answer to the mythological issue of the so called 'Sphinx question'. He divided the related solution of the secret of the human's life into three stages: childhood, youth, and old age. Even more secularized, he regarded an earthly life, segmented in seven stages (младенѣ, г҃. дѣць, ѕ҃. ѡтрочище, ѳ҃. Отрѻ̑, ви҃. Юноша, к҃. мѹж, л҃. Ста́. н҃ лѣ). Additionally, St Maxim the Greek reserved another stage or eighth level for those who

---

[17] Although St Gregory Nazianzus used the word with the meaning of the ring quoted sentence could be referred to his Ninth Homily (Gregorio di Nazianzo, 2012, pp. 272–273).

[18] To provide an example of the firm faith St Maxim the Greek paraphrased the words of following Psalms (Ps 103, 28–35; Ps 125, 5).

are seeking ascetic graduation that is understood as already being placed in the future (or among the immortal). This item Maxim explained after the quoted explanation of the iconographical detail in the short text. Maxim indicated the source of his interpretation as from the Byzantine Lexicon *Suide* (Slave 123, p. 656 r.). His liturgical understanding of the human's life was at the same time pedagogical (cf. Шмеман, 1961, p. 159) he thought the ability of spiritual graduation. Some aspects of the ancient literature Maxim changed, referring to the apostolic theology: the human moral degrees were adequately determined in the letters of St Paul the Apostle as well in the exactly above mentioned "The Seventh Homily on the Personal Silence" of St Gregory Nazianzus (Gregorio di Nazianzo, 2012, pp. 270–273).

Nevertheless, St Maxim the Greek did not adopt the ascetic degrees either from the Apostles or from the Patristic authors.[19] Despite the mortal human time, he was affiliated in notifying the living time only by Jesus Christ. According to the theology of St Maxim the Greek, a baptized believer who wished to obtain the ability to experience the vision of God's face (an icon with an ontological value) (cf. Golitzin, 1994, p. 121), had to experience personally the being with the Christ from His very Birth.[20] This is why St Maxim the Greek was trying to describe the possibility of seeing the Son of God as a result of the devotional co-existence with Jesus Christ. While in the text of the Bible only three selected apostles saw the Jesus Christ's face (the Apostles: James, the brother of the Lord; Peter; John), and others had only the roles of witnessing the acts of the living Son of God (the preaching from being very close to Jesus Christ), the latter could also be related to the conception of the godlikeness of the radiant human's mind.[21] After the Lord's Ascension, the Apostles unanimously elected James the Just as first bishop of Jerusalem.[22]

In the relation of the non-approachable Divine source of the Holy Light, coming from God the Father, St Maxim the Greek very often referred to

---

[19] For an inadequate definition of St Maxim the Greek's theology as a copy of the Patristic authors with inappropriate terminology of the contemporary antropological theology see Konovalov (Коновалов, 2014, pp. 133–134).

[20] The latter could be referred also to the theological battle against the Appolinarism.

[21] Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus (Флоровский, 2006, p. 121).

[22] He presided over the Apostolic Synod which discussed the question of whether Gentiles who adopted the Christian faith should be circumcised. He suggested that they should not be burdened with the ordinances of the old Law, but should be told to refrain from fornication and the consumption of food sacrificed to idols (Acts 15, 20).

the Epistle of James from the New Testament (Jam 1, 17), the first bishop and the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the author of the Epistle in New Testament.[23] Maxim thus purposely indicated James's authorship of James's authorship of the first redactions of the Divine Liturgy especially related to Anaphora (in the text *About the Tale of Aphroditian*) that Saint Basil the Great adopted (Slave 123, p. 253 v.). To the first bishop of Rome, St Peter, St Maxim the Greek referred quite continuously, also in the prayer, entitled 'How Peter was crying', the source of which could be found among the canticles of St Ambrose of Milan.[24] It is worth mentioning that a in *The Prayer on Dormition of Mother of God*, attributed to St Symeon (Logophet) Metaphrast, translated into the Old Church Slavonic version by St Maxim the Greek,[25] Apostle Peter also appeared as a very unique reference to Gospel's readings. An important use of the words by Apostle Peter St Maxim the Greek included in the text, entitled *Against a Sinful Manuscript*,[26] dealing with the uncritical reception of the Apocrypha writings. Referring to the title of the mentioned text St Maxim the Greek utilized an experience gained during the printing process with Aldus Manuzio, and a printing process[27] as a unique opportunity to express the sacred form of Jesus Christ's Word in fixed terms, but especially, to separate it from mere human speculation. He used the meaning of the 'manu-script' ('hand-writing') as an example of doubtful and mistakable writings written by human hand and mind on the contrary to the sacred texts, created directly by an inspiration from the Highest Instance. He clarified that an insufficient study of the Holy Scripture amongst ecclesiastical staff could be dangerous for the self-awareness of Christians. Indeed, St Maxim the Greek warned against heretical teachings that were at that time contemporary in Central Europe, but as well in Muscovite Russia.

---

[23] There the expression 'under surface of the feet' (Jm 2, 3: 'And ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool') is also mentioned, but here St James indicates rather an opposite meaning (a lack of individual humbleness), concerning the Holy preachers (Apostles).

[24] St Ambrose of Milan, 'Super Luc. de poenit., distinct' (Trubar, 1562, p. 143).

[25] Russian Government Library, RGB: f. 113, coll. Volokolamskoe № 488, fol. p. 65 v., p. 66 r.

[26] The last chapter, 24th of Chludov collection (Журова, 2011, pp. 286–287).

[27] About the possible contribution of St Maxim the Greek to the first Russian printing proceedings see Francis J. Thomson (Thomson, 1998, pp. 789–792; Taube & Olmsted, 1987, pp. 105, 108–112).

The first impression is that the text *Against a Sinful Manuscript* of St Maxim the Greek was written only against the Apocrypha as the body of knowledge. But he opposed to the hopeless and enclosed position of an irreducibly sinful nature for Christian believer.[28] St Maxim the Greek concluded the text with a distinguished reference to the first ecumenical Church Councilat Nicaea (325 A. D.),[29] quoting a sentence from Proverbs (26, 11), repeated in 2 Peter (2, 22),[30] which was prescribed by the twelfth canon, the last canon on the apostasy.[31] Concerning the problem of original sin, and referring to Deuteronomy and Epistles of St Paul and St Peter (cf. Eph 2, 14–16; Col 2, 13–15; Act 15, 10–11), St Maxim the Greek expressed his belief that every believer could be redeemed. However, he did not consider the moment of baptism closely connected to the moment of the resurrection (like Theodore of Mopsuestia, Cyril of Alexandria and Cosmas Indycopleistes) (cf. Mejendorff, 1964, p. 374) but he regarded the baptism as the first step on the road to the salvation.

About the unique approach of St John the Apostle, St Maxim the Greek spoke in the text *About the Holy Gospel of John*,[32] based on the sentence from the Gospel of John (Jn 21, 25). For our study it is important to stress that in this text St Maxim the Greek also described his consideration of the rightfulness of Old Testament's prophets. They represented the stage of transition from the old law to the evangelical Creed. Maxim regarded them as being at the same level within the Church Fathers, which was however not simultaneous to the real time of the life of Jesus Christ that only apostles and early saints could have contributed. St Maxim the Greek described the being of the Lord in the present time as the intimacy to the Son of God, defined by the conception of the eternal and completely timeless devoted fidelity to the love of living God. 'The friends of God ('Дрȣзи Бжїи')' that St Maxim the Greek mentioned several times in his writings alluded the Holy Family within which the understand-

---

[28] St Maxim the Greek was speaking in terms of God's love and a completely doubtless faith in Jesus Christ, by reference to Whom all previous mistakes or minor beliefs are vanquished from the moment of the baptism, regardless of time or place on Earth.

[29] Corpus Christianorum. I. (325–787). Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta (*The Oecumenical Councils*, 2006, p. 26).

[30] St Maxim the Greek used this sentence also in the text 'Слово о покаянии' (Ševčenko, 2001, p. 295).

[31] G. Alberigo, Concilium Nicaenum I – 325 (Alberigo, 2006, p. 11).

[32] 'Тогѡ̀ Максима сказанїе ѿ еѵⷢ҇їа еже ѿ' Іѡанна' (Slave 123, p. 580 v.).

ing of the family members itself[33] was intentionally re-valuated in monastic perspective of the secondary home.

Не ꙗко излиⷩни соушⷶ по всеи вселеⷩⷷй песка боудⷮⷷ, но ꙗко премнози ꙇ ѕѣло преизлиⷩни боудут сирѣⷱ иже ѿ вѣка ꙇ даже до сконⷱанїа ⷷго оугодиⷲшеи ⷷмоу (Slave 123, p. 582 r.).

For the Apostles, St Maxim the Greek reserved a position that their apostolic role was to bring the living Son of God to reality by preaching. Also, the importance and glory of the prophets was dependent on apostolic action. The principle of the mentioned transition of the canonical message of the Holy Bible entirely threw the body of the sacred text that could be alluded to implicitly by the Apostles, and continued by preaching in the writings of the Church fathers. The survival of the devoted speech of the Old Testament Prophets[34] threw the historical time St Maxim the Greek illustrated with the moment of their transition from earthly life. In the following quotation that introduces the liturgical aspect of the theology of St Maxim the Greek, he expressed the inter(scriptual) textual interaction between the Old Testament and the Gospels. The echoes of the past/old are determined in the evangelic speech by the confirmation of the previous prophetical message.[35]

Л ꙗко то по превосхⷪономоу оⷡрзоу глⷶнїа реⷱено быⷭ, ꙗвлено ⷷ. Зане ꙇ при сем блговѣрныⷯ цⷬⷨ двⷣ, премнози были блгоⷱтивⷷ оугⷶжаюⷲⷣи бгоу въ ꙗзыцѣ ꙇоудѣистѣ и свѣдѣтеліⷷ томоу їже ѿ бжⷭтвеⷩ Самоуиле ликъ прⷬⷪⷱескїи. Такоже ꙇ по

---

[33] This kind of perception of the "spiritual family" became popular in contemporary Russian Theological thought.

[34] About St Maxim the Greek's translations from the experts from the Old Testament see more: Olmsted 1987, pp. 18–27. It has to be said that he was already at the very beginning of his being in Moscow, Russia working on the corrections of the canticles and odes from the psalms (cf. Thomson, 1998, pp. 826, 827; Горский & Невоструев, 1855–1869, pp. 99–100), the types of liturgical chanting after the regular church readings of the Book of Psalms (exactly as was an Athonite liturgical rule). St Maxim the Greek made corrections, for example, in the odes as "The canticle of Isaiah" and the "The canticle of St John the Forerunner.

[35] In the conclusion of Maxim's article there were being approved the leading theological paradoxes (Rom 3,12; Ps 13, 4) of the Wisdom of the Highest. Maxim is quite evidently revealing the principle of God's selection by Whom external poverty, often due to profound service to Jesus Christ, is balanced with a gift of a spiritual fertility, and consequently, a posthumous immortality. The opposition between quantity and quality is evidently solved already in the Psalms (Ps 138, 17–19) as the uniqueness of the faithful ones, and the power of their extreme humbleness.

Дѣдѣ Илїа ι Єлисѣи, ι иже ѿ нй прꙋческии лй немал. /…/ їже не преклониша колѣна прⷣѣ валом. Iсаïа же Iеремïа Амⷭ ι же и Авдïа. I Малахιа ι Аввакоӱ, ι вь преселенïи вавилоⷩско Данй ї трїе ѿроци, ι Иезекïй ι ини мнози (Slave 123, pp. 582 r., 582 v.).

It seems obvious that, when talking about the event of the Transfiguration of Jesus Christ in *The Second letter to F. Karpov*, St Maxim the Greek used the liturgical expression ("Богоявлению") for the event, traditionally related to the last feast of the Orthodox Christmas Theophany that is the Epiphany. In the text *About the Blessing of Water on the Matin of the Epiphany* (Сказание ѿ ѡсⷳщенïи водѣ на заутриа стыⷯ Богоявлении) (Slave 123, p. 553; cf. Журова, 2011, pp. 93–97), Maxim defined the difference between the blessing of the water on the last Sunday in January, that is on the matins of the Epiphany (already previously known as Christian custom as was the blessing the water at midnight, related to the Feast 'Adoration of the Magi'),[36] and the custom of the blessing of water on each Sunday in regular month. Moreover Maxim witnessed that the blessing of water, carried out at the Monasteries of the Holy Mountain Athos every first Sunday in the month except in January, fully eliminated the traces of the pagan's beliefs. The practice of blessing the water was established in the tenth century by Patriarch Photius (according to St Maxim the Greek by translation of 'the Scholia' of Theodore Balsamon on the *Nomocanon* of Photius), especially with the purpose of gaining the Christian awareness of the evangelical message which could be achieved by a transition from the Old to New Testament. Only that could finally determine the Christian faith.

The terms being "internal purification", "the Fear of God", "Suffering", "The Lord's Ten Commandments or the Decalogue" were the topics of the ascetic practice of the Orthodox believer in order to help one's soul not to be crushed by external influences, by other people and by evil spirits. But the mentioned terms are as well a part of the liturgical readings at the feast of the Meeting the Lord in the Temple (the last before the great fasting period of Lent), which was celebrated in Jerusalem in fourth century forty days after the Epiphany. However, St Maxim the Greek also pointed out that during that 'short passing suffering present' only the prayers to the Mother of God might consolidate Christian souls. The latter he expressed in several of his writings.

All the above mentioned reflected St Maxim the Greek's own practice of a deep prayer that was continuously focusing on the literal denoting the pres-

---

[36] S. Joann. Chrysostom., Hom. De bapt. 2 (Migne, PG 49, 36; *Euchologion*, 1873, pp. 215–225).

ence of Jesus Christ. By that the specific reception of the times could finally be urged. St Maxim the Greek experienced the tense of the Holy Bible as a way of achieving the permission to think about the eternity of time. The involvement into the present, and at the same time, eternal time of Jesus Christ during the personal prayer St Maxim the Greek recognized as revealing in a soteriological sense, opened by the Personification and the Holy Birth of Jesus Christ, determined by the Feast of the Meeting of the Lord that symbolizes the invitation to the humble believers to enter into the Holy time of Jesus Christ. The Feast of the Meeting of the Lord in the Temple, by which the Son of God was invited into the Church as a form of His highest self-gift, no more in a sacrificed form of an Old Testament, signified the end of His childhood and the beginning of Jesus Christ's public life and His service to the people.

From the age of early Christianity (from the seventh century in the West) the Purification (of the Virgin) had also been regarded (Badurina, 1979, pp. 486–487) as the preparation for the Lent. Both feasts, the Meeting of the Lord as well as the Purification, were established to form the permission to enter the living time of the Son of God. In that shape an introduction of the Lord into the Temple was opening the further temporal duration of human time, characterized with the expressions of suffering life-time and 'the short passing suffering present' (according to St Maxim the Greek, "in short times"). That is why during the Feast of the Meeting the Lord in the Temple, also the Mother of Jesus, Mary, had to be purified, in the terms of devotional love and the ecclesiastic consecration in accordance with the real time of the believer's life (as opposed to the pagan's accordance of the myth).[37] According to the Holy unity that involves the two, Mary and Jesus Christ,[38] St Maxim the Greek dedicated his *The Prayer to the Mother of God and partly Because of Lord's Sufferings* to both. It seems that he was trying to reveal the atmosphere of the peaceful dying which could be felt at the chanting of the Vespers, taking place each February, by the Byzantine liturgical reading of the Triodion firstly on the subject of the Last Judgment (Mt 25, 31–46), and on Adam's fall, on the Sunday before the Cheesefare Week.

---

[37] Almost the entire feast of the Holy Mother of God was established in order to consecrate and to bless the church in the life of the Mother of God (Шмеман, 1961, p. 162).

[38] Further on, the two liturgical circles, being divided, consequently they shaped the removable feasts, related to living time of the Son of God, placed in the Triodion, or, Pentekostarion, and the constant non-removable feasts, placed in the Menaia (Wellesz, 1998, pp. 140–141), included all Feasts in the glory of the Mother of God.

Concerning his corrections of Russian liturgical Triodion (cf. ᾿исправленїе трїѡ̈ное᾿), St Maxim the Greek intentionally used terms, taken from the liturgical Orthodox calendar of the Triodion for the metaphorical expression of the forerunning steps to the mystery of the shadow emerging from Jesus Christ. However, if we agree that by mentioning the expression "the epiphany vision" St Maxim the Greek had in mind the Feast of the Lord's Transfiguration (non-removable Orthodox Feast on August 6th) (Lk 9, 28–36), but he was at the same time alluding to his speech to the period just before the Feast of the Meeting the Lord in the Temple. Maxim used the expression of "the seeing God/Lord" in the meaning, known from the recognition of the Elder Symeon in the Temple. Indeed, St Maxim the Greek did not mix the terms of "Transfiguration" and "Epiphany" ("the seeing God/Lord")" as a part of Christmas "Theophany",[39] but was referring exactly to the lifetime of Jesus Christ (after His baptism and His spiritual engagement) (Mt 3, 13–17). The entering into the possibility of understanding the image of the Son of God derived from the moment of the Personification or, directly from the Holy Birth of Jesus. In his other writings and his corrections of Muscovite redactions of the Athonite Typikons (from previous Russian scribes), he in fact traced from the death of Jesus Christ (and following events of the Resurrection, the Pentecost, the Ascension and the Transfiguration) the concept of disability to achieve the highest understanding of the Divine's light. For St Maxim the Greek the most important liturgical and translational moment was to indicate the presentation of the Son of God already in the Psalms. He considered the personal progress only connected with the graduation of the Christian spiritual life.

We observed the following topic: St Maxim the Greek considered most strictly the apostolic duty to preach and to witness. To the contrary, he showed a certain very mild rule regarding Old Testaments Prophets and the Church fathers. Additionally, he expressed a merciful attitude to all sincerely humble and faithful in loving devoted believers. However, with the principle of the Holy Grace, St Maxim the Greek understood it was like realizing in the present perspective, where the feeling of equality of time or Eternity is emerging. Precisely, the survival of the Old Testament Prophets as well of the Patristic authors in the form of co-existence appeared in the human's memory in the explicit non-temporal vision. The graduation in the ascetic practice which

---

[39] The earliest Eastern Homily on the Epiphany or Christmas is known as '38th Homily' of St Gregory of Nazianzus (Флоровский, 2006, p. 119).

was also related to the eschatological eternity was rebalanced in the present tense of an everyday personal prayer of the St Maxim the Greek. The latter, permitted by the Holy Spirit, could serve for the argumentation of the ability of St Maxim the Greek to create the author's manuscript archive, written in Old Church Slavonic.

III. The Holy Trinity

It could be proposed that St Maxim the Greek understood the degrees of participating in God's presence as the graduated relation between the catechumens and the baptized faithful believers with which the entrance of the Divine Liturgy in the church was opened. This could be observed in his interpretation of the benefits of spiritual gifts for the believer's consciousness in the text *About the Right of Everyone to be Present at the Divine Liturgy*. In this text, St Maxim the Greek stated that the prohibition from attending the Divine Liturgy 'for those who were late for the Gospel's reading' was contrary to the basic theological conception of the Holy Grace of the Jesus Christ. Maxim stressed that after the translation of the biblical text by Apostle Matthew from Hebrew to Greek also the Divine Liturgy had been divided into three stages (he considered the Hebrew text of the Bible as not enlightened enough and preferred that of the Septuagint which he considered as directly divinely inspired). Exactly the same principle was observed in his theological interpretation of classifying the Christian authors. It is necessary to also take into account St Maxim the Greek's argumentation about the authenticity of the Gospel of St John in the abovementioned text *About the Holy Gospel of John*. He marked the Old Testament's prophets within the Church fathers (and the metaphoric images and figures from their speeches) as suitable for denoting the passing events and sorrows of the present time. At this point one has to have in mind also his consideration of Old Prophets that did not have the complete ability to see the face of the Lord in the present, similar to catechumens who must stay outside the church and they are not allowed to visit the Divine liturgy (thus, Maxim never indicated the latter issue). According to St Maxim the Greek only with faithfulness could they achieve the permission to enter the Church (with the purpose of participating in the Liturgy of the faithfuls).

According to the quoted text of St Maxim the Greek, at the first part of the Divine Liturgy, during which the prophets of the Old Testament were read, their prophetical words were proposed to describe the physical part of the human's

consciousness. Their prophecies directly "narratively" ('сказательно')[40] sub-
mitted the preparation of the body and the soul to the mystery of the Holy
Communion which was a proper introductory moment to the Divine Liturgy
in the form (Introitus: Psalm, Antiphona, Gloria at Matins, Kyrie Eleison from
thesixth century in the Eastern churches), which could be mainly attributed
to St Basil the Great (cf. Swainson, 1884, pp. 76–78). By liturgically addressing
God in the Holy Trinity, St Maxim the Greek referred to the earliest Christian
tradition, when Jesus Christ, according to the Gospel (cf. Mt 18, 5–20), was
represented as a mediator (Ušeničnik, 1933, p. 212). The first part of the Divine
Liturgy denoted the degree of the not yet enlightened enough Apostles and
the Church fathers.

In the second part of the Divine Liturgy, according to St Maxim the Greek,
the confessional prayers for the forgiveness were read (the Creed as the confes-
sional short prayer, the prayers for the emperors and the prayers for all Ortho-
dox believers) in order to reveal the principle of the profound humbleness and
the pre-reminiscence of the possible 'likening to God.'[41]

Втора а҃ часть начїнающи ѿ сего. Блгословено цр҃тво ѡц҃а и сн҃а и ст҃го дх҃а
и проч҃аа. Даже до херѫвимскїа пѣн҃. Єгда приносатса ѿ жрьтвеника принесеныа
ут҃ныа дары во ѡлтарѣ (Slave 123, p. 405 v.).

The description of the liturgical act by St Maxim the Greek reflected
the Byzantine period, when the altar was combined with the Repast (Table) of
the Lord what was in the accordance with the synthesis in the development of
the Typikon. Beside canticles, hymns, liturgical chants ('Cherubin'), the inserts
from the apostolic letters were pronounced during the second part of Liturgy
with the aim of showing the reality of the personification of the Son of God
in Jesus Christ, but as well as the announcement of His sufferings. The words
of Apostles could (like at the foot of the mountain) become a document of
testimony only after the experience of the Word of Jesus Christ as the Highest
Truth. After the 'spiritual' death of the Apostles (that is identified by listening
to the Lord's Word), the Church Fathers could merely follow their words.

According to St Maxim the Greek all believers could equally enter and
liturgically participate in the living and revealing presence (cf. Golitzin, 1994,

---

[40] Although this word could be translated also as 'parabolic', St Maxim the Greek meant
exactly 'in the explanatory manner'.

[41] Cf. Gregory of Nazianzus (Флоровский, 2006, p. 123).

p. 127) of the life of the Lord. St Maxim the Greek clearly expressed the pre-
condition for the humble request of equality as the ethical value. That was
the principle 'of the total purity of the heart and the sincere piety of the soul'.
Thus, St Maxim the Greek named the second part of the Divine Liturgy
as the prayer-devotional stage ('молитвенная'), by which the 'taste of the sacred
teachings is acting as purifying and inspirational' (Slave 123, p. 406 r.).
As the result of the latter, during the church Communion prayers (as the bap-
tizes believers after the attendance of the Divine Liturgy) in the believer's
consciousness with facing Jesus Christ the achievement of the spiritual insight
in the present time occurred.

The third part of the Divine Liturgy, according to St Maxim the Greek,
was entirely related to the co-interactivity of the Holy Spirit, called ('epiclesis')
from the higher priest to complete the final stage of the liturgical participa-
tion. The Angelic odes (the Cherubic Hymn) were repeated but this time
without the liturgical act of the offering.[42] The believers had to be at this stage
completely free of any secondary thoughts: their souls had to be pure in order
that they could be able to receive the Communion and to experience the Holy
transformational process ('прелагает') of bread and wine into Jesus Christ's
Holy Word/Body and into His Holy blood. The mysterious part was realized
in the conclusion of the Divine Liturgy. At that moment the purification as
the final forgiveness of sins was prior to any kind of further glory, understood
as seeing a reflection of the Lord's face. St Maxim the Greek slightly differ-
ently interpreted the three parts of the Divine Liturgy, because he provided
his ontological view of synthetizing the liturgical and theological aspects to
prove the priority of the 'sacred action/process' to the New Testament's text.
The mentioned prohibition he regarded as the problem of the merciless heart and
unwise egocentric mind without ability to sense the Divine Reason (Slave 123,
p. 407 r.), understood as 'Logos' in the Word of Jesus Christ.

St Maxim the Greek experienced the Divine Liturgy especially on purpose to
be able to theologically-liturgically properly celebrate the Holy Trinity. Accord-
ing to Maxim, the three parts of the Divine Liturgy corresponded to the three
chapters of the Anaphora that allowed the final doxology of the Holy Trinity.
Thus, "The righteous faith in the Holy Trinity" ('сїа же суть вѣра права') followed

---

[42] The problem of word order in the pronunciation during the liturgy St Maxim the Greek
additionally defined in the crucial text 'A Homily To Those Who Three Times Sing Alleluia
according to the tradition of the Church, but the four time 'The Glory to the God''.

by the ancient Christian liturgical rule (cf. Шмеман, 1961, p. 102), pre-Arian (cf. Jungmann, 1925, p. 42) or pre-Niceanian (cf. Н. Д. Успенский, 2006, pp. 321–350), partly identified with the Antiochian or Syrian liturgy of the latefourth century (Ušeničnik, 1933, pp. 200–202), was finally defined in the version of the Divine Liturgy by St John Chrysostom. The assimilation of the rule of the monastic prayer with the order of the theological time had been started to shape previously to Byzantine decisive synthesis of the liturgical time (Шмеман, 1961, p. 164). St John Chrysostom stressed the non-compulsory engagement of the Holy Spirit and at the same time the acting role of Jesus Christ (Шмеман, 1961, pp. 341, 344). But St Maxim the Greek in the conclusion of the quoted text described the parabolic content of the Divine's marriage, in which everyone is invited and welcomed, if only they are able to wear a pure (that means, light full) wedding costume (that means, a dress) as the analogue to His Joy. The believer who comes last could provide himself a wedding costume by performing pious works ('сткаша себѣ от преподобныхъ дел'). This principle St Maxim the Greek used as an argumentation for the equality of all faithful believers, especially minors (cf. Mt 18, 14), but faithful Christians, to be redeemed. The scene of the Divine's marriage that appeared both in the conclusion of Divine liturgy as well as in the conclusions of many St Maxim the Greek's personal prayers, especially in *The Prayer to the Mother of God and partly Because of Lord's Sufferings*, ('достоины́ внутрь чрьтога да причастатса вѣчныа радости. Радо– сти е҆ѣ сподобляютса и҆ исткаша себѣ ѿ прпныⷯ дѣл свѣтлую ѡдежоу и свѣщами неугасающими вполу ноци срѣтаю жениха') symbolizes the rightness of every believer to feel the redemption and to enjoy the celebration as one part of the Holy Communion. That Maxim the Greek concretized in both texts by exactly the same verb ('причастатса').

From the very first era of Christianity in Eastern Churches the Eucharistic celebration of the Holy Communion was supported by Gospel readings by a deacon or a higher priest (Funk, 1905, pp. 57, 161) (with lighting candles in praise of God; Badurina, 1979, p. 495). Admitting the power of the Holy Spirit, St Maxim the Greek understood the texts of the Holy Bible as the highest range of the sacred scriptures. According to the Gospel's condemnation of those who had not carefully used their talents (cf. Matthew (Mt 25, 29), Maxim most strictly treated those, who were supposed to be called for witnessing the Christian faith (the Prophets, the Apostles, the Church Fathers, Patristic authors). That was the reason why he also confirmed that the text of the Holy Bible could inspire the soul, but only "the blood and the body of Jesus

Christ" gave the blessing and complete redemption of the previous sins and initiate the future life of the believer into the service to the Lord (Slave 123, pp. 406–407) – as an analogue of the subsequent effect of the blessed water at the custom of blessing the water at the Epiphany, forty days after Christmas. The simultaneous and analogous purification of the Holy Theotokos and Jesus Christ, presented at the Feast of Meeting of the Lord in the Temple (noticed on the icon) prepared the completion of the Orthodox Trinity. However, the text of St Maxim the Greek was not the indirect transformation of the Liturgy of the Presanctified gifts,[43] but the argumentation that everyone could participate in the Divine Liturgy, and at the same time also celebrate the Holy Eucharist. A special hierarchy of the Holy personalities, as described in Maxim's texts, was not an exact copy of Dyonisius Areopagyte "Ecclesiastical Hierarchy" (cf. Golitzin, 1994, pp. 128–134) to which the text reasonably related. But Maxim's the most personal interpretation of the early Christian Communion originated from the Areopagyte's apostrophic addressing the "beautiful children who were stepping to the pre-symbols" (*Dionizij Areopagit*, 2008, pp. 425–431).

The Feast of the Meeting the Lord in the Temple (two Old Testament's Prophets, St Symeon and St Anna, gathering with Maria and Jesus, the child, cf. Lk 2, 22–35) was the early Christian Feast of the Purification or the Meeting the Lord in the Church (in Byzantine Empire from Justinian's decree in 542) (Ušeničnik, 1933, p. 140) that empowered the Eucharistic prayers. When the believers obtained the possibility of enjoying the Communion, they were free from their sins and could enter into the Lord's time. Maxim's ethical conception of denoting the human's time posted the Divine's point of view, precisely, the perspective of Jesus Christ (cf. Golitzin, 1994, p. 129) that purposely affected the ontological classification with the value of eschatological (apocalyptic) sense. Reasonably, the latter is always beginning with the long fasting period (as an analogue to Christ's fasting after His baptism, cf. Mt, 4, 2), for the Great Lent time, during which devoted believer all the time searched the forcing limit of the prohibition and God's Grace of seeing the Son of God's face.

St Maxim the Greek obviously did not accidentally use the word 'Epiphany' ('Богоѧвленїю') to denote the 'Theophanical' ascetic discipline of 'apostles' (as those, who are chosen and send by God). He synthesized the theological and liturgical aspects as well as the Old Testament evidences of Jesus Christ

---

[43] A liturgy of St Gregory of Nazianzus was officially declared only later on 5th Ecumenical Council of Trulle (692) by LIIth canon (*The Oecumenical Councils*, 2006, p. 265).

with the Gospel's witnessing by the method of the so called juxstaposition, the result of which cannot be predictable because it is entirely depended on the action of the Holy Spirit. The latter importantly reflected Maxim's personal prayer practice that encouraged him to write down his own version of the Old Church Slavonic language.

IV. The Missing Aspect of His Work: The Holy Theotokos

The most unambiguous presentation of Jesus Christ's nature St Maxim the Greek found in the poetical prayers, especially those, dedicated to the Mother of God, which he mentioned in several of his writings. However, the main ideas about the holiness of the Mother of God he indicated already in his translation of the text *The Hagiography of the Mother of God* from "The collection of the hagiographic writings of St Symeon Metaphrast", for which Maxim was at Moscow local church court in May 1531 secondly accused of supposed heretical expressions, used for the addressing the Mother of God.

In the beginning of the text *The Hagiography of the Mother of God*,[44] he referred to the writings of St Dyonisius Areopagyte, St Gregory of Nyssa, and St Athanasius of Alexandria. But the unique text, entitled *About This Unfortunate Century*, reflects the mentioned topics, notably, about the hierarchical selection of the eternal preachers. In the beginning of this text a narrator (an author) meets the widow in black who tells him about the miseries of the world in the significant lament, in the manner of the Byzantine court writings of the eleventh century (Buckler, 1929, pp. 241–243). However, the woman in black, named Basileusa,[45] lonely by steep road-way,[46] significantly self-identified in the prayer in the conclusion of the text:

Како оубо неправѣнъ ли прикладуетса пути поустоу треѻкаанный съ вѣкъ, а сама вдовѣ женѣ и вдовьствами ризами ѡдѣана сѣжу ѿ дивїихъ звѣреи обьемлема и лютѣ ѿ нй растѣзаема якѿ прѣ малыми сказа̑ тебѣ. И еже паче иный

---

[44] National Library of Sankt Petersburg, RNB, Mss. coll. Sof. 1498, p. 119 v. (121 v.)

[45] Among Russian scholars exist a belief that in this text St Maxim the Greek portrayed the Russian state. (See the authoritative scholar of the Old Russian literature D. S. Lihachov, Лихачев, 2007, p. 81). Cf. The female Emperor was named as Basileusa in the writings of Constantinople Court and Imperial Writings (Constantin Porphyrogenete, 1939).

[46] The latter could not be identified with the Russian landscape. The Italian scholar proposed a northern Italian landscape (Пиккио, 2002, p. 218).

в печаль послѣднюю въвержетъ мене ꙗко не имꙗ побарающй по мнѣ по ревности Бжїе исправлающй ѿручники моа бесчтⷮующй ꙗцⷤ же имѣ древле. Не имамъ Самуила великаго Їереа вышнаго противопльчившагоса съ дерзновенїемъ Саоулу преслⷮушникоу, не имꙗ Нафана исцѣлившагоа блгⷮокозненою прїчею Двда црⷮа и ѿ падениа оного лютаго избавивша. Не имꙗ подобны̋ рѣнителеи Илїи и Елисею нестыдывшйса бѣзаконⷮѣшиа насйники пⷭⷮа а не црⷮта самарїискй. Не имꙗ Амвросиа чⷮѹⷩного архиереа бжиа не оубоавшагоса высоты црⷮтва Феодосиа великаго, не имꙗ Василлїа великаго въ стⷮыни и всꙗкои премⷮудⷮусти восиашаго, и премⷮрⷮѣишими оучⷮенїи оужасивша моеа сестры гонитела Оуалёта. Не имꙗ Їѡанна великаго и златаго азыкⷮо сребролюбивоу и лихоимⷮѣицоу црⷮцу Евдоксию изⷮѡбличившаго не стерпⷮѣвша прⷮѣрⷮѣти теплыа слезы бѣдныа оны вдовы. Како оубо неправенⷮѣ ли вдовѣщеи женѣ подⷮѡна сѣжу при пути пустѣ окаяннаго глⷮю вѣка нⷩⷮѣшнꙗго таковы̋ побⷮѡникⷮо и ревнителеи лишена (Slave 123, p. 75 v.; cf. Журова, 2011, pp. 39–40).

The incorporation of the lamentation (lachrymose deification) of Basileusa within the Old Testament Prophets (Samuel, Nathan, David, Elijah, Elisha) and the Church fathers (from the fourth to sixth century), not only the Eastern ones (since the first place belongs to St Ambrose of Milan, St Basil the Great, St John Chrysostom), presents them as the representative individuals who faithfully served Jesus Christ. But their co-existence is placed in the simultaneous time, where past, present, and future tenses all exist in the present moment. St Maxim the Greek located Basileusa among the personalities of the sacred history. A similar principle could be noticed in the St Ambrose' *De obitu Theodosii* (cf. St Ambrosius, 1955, fasc. 18). The parallel existence of the Old Testament Prophets within the Patristic authors that were already confirmed as immortal one might also find in the early Christian imperial (Constantine and post-Constantine) monuments[47] that were built in the difficult period of rising Christianity. It could be partly confirmed that such a unique interpretation of the sacred female being from the Bible was adopted from writings of St Ambrose about the virginity ('De virginibus'; 'De virginitate') and in the discourse on the death of Theodosius, ('De obitu Theodosii'), in which among the patriarchs of the Genesis was also included Constantine the Great to the heavenly company. That concept was rare in the Patristic writings, but it was accepted into

---

[47] For example, at the Arch of Constantine, the base of the Column of Arcadius, the base of the Obelisk of Theodosius, but also in the Byzantine chronicles (for example, 'The Chronicle of J. Skillitzes', see Velmans, 1972, p. 153).

the liturgical poetry of Byzantine hymnographer Roman Melodos (Moorhead, 1999, pp. 52–54, 67, n. 44), from whom St Maxim the Greek might have had an acknowledgment of such schema of the genealogy of irreproachable female personalities of the Bible (what St Ambrose notably developed, concerning especially the past life of the Mother of God). Maxim's Basileusa listed the pious male personalities from the Old Testament and from the fourth century Patristic and imperial circles (from her lifetime and afterwards).[48] That kind of strictly biblical interpretation of an eternal meaning of the heritage of the Mother of God could be found in the Patristic works. Particularly in "The meditation on 'Song of Songs'" St Gregory of Nyssa reached the place of the Church of Christ as Christ's bride, which allowed him the perception of certain timeless theological doctrine.[49] The specific contribution of the Byzantine hymnography, especially reserved for 'the expression of an inexpressible' (mystical context of the presence of Christ's Mother in the Holy Scripture), could be understood as the unique pattern of the so called 'Theology of the Mother of God' (similar only to the doubtless structure of St Ambrose' theological-liturgical thought (see Zajc, 2014, pp. 157–169): in his interpretation of the Church as a woman). It was Mary Who realized such prophetic preachings (Moorhead, 1999, pp. 99, 108), that St Maxim the Greek had expanded in his confessional writings (concerning his firm *Creed of the Orthodox Faith*, written after April 1538) (Синицына, 2008a, p. 190).

Although the exact word order (for example: 'црⷭ҇цу не преⷣрѣти сирѡтьст–ва')[50] survived in *'The Prayer on Dormition of Mother of God'*, the prayer, that Basileusa pronounced ('Не имⷶ́…') was, in fact attributed to the icon of the Theotokos of the Holy Monastery of Vatopaidi (Алексеев, 2012, p. 40).[51]

---

[48] Additionally, Basileusa is not a rhetoric allegory but a literary realization (Ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία) of the Gospel form of the Heavenly Celestial City or the Kingdom of Heaven (cf. Mt 13, 24, 44–47 etc).

[49] See more Louth (2013).

[50] Russian Government Library, RGB: f. 113, coll. Volokolamskoe № 488, fol. p. 65 v., p. 66 r.

[51] In Russia, where such a beginning of the prayer was known only a century later this text of St Maxim the Greek was written (in the seventeenth century), it was assimilated into certain prayer to the icon called 'Всех скорбящих радость' (*Молитвослов*, 1998, pp. 192–193) which in some aspects replaced late-Byzantine (thirteenth century) forms and Western presentations of the iconographical motif named 'Pieta'. About the latter St Maxim the Greek, however, also gave a reflection (while he noticed that among the Russians the iconographical motif 'Pieta' was wrongly represented and understood as depression and dejection, which is one of the deepest sins, according to the Bible, he wrote down the text 'About the Icon Called

St Maxim the Greek considered that his duty was to create such language that could enchant the specific presence of the Holy Trinity within the Mother of God, within the appeal of that speech of Basileusa is closing the text. This theological issue could be observed in the iconography of the scenes of 'Annunciation' (from the middle of eleventh century) and 'Deisis' (the end of eleventh–the beginning of the twelfth century) in the mosaics of the Monastery of Vatopaidi, ordered by Andronikus II – (a copy of) (Каштанов, 2001, p. 214), whose chrysobull (*Le Mont Athos et l'Empire byzantine*, 2009, p. 136, no. 45), dated 1301, St Maxim the Greek carried to Moscow in 1518.

The inseparability of the Mother and Her Son was iconographically established in early Christian ideality (ideology). That was the reason why St Maxim the Greek marked Basileusa with the suffering image (of Mother without Her Son) as only through that iconological gesture, She could be invited into the consciousness of the Christian believer in a difficult time. The principal non-separativity of the Mother of God and Her Son could be theologically and anthropologically properly expressed as a conclusion to the glory of the Holy Trinity (because Mary was responsible for the incarnation-birth of Christ as Word).

As we observed, many of the important issues ('the morning star'; 'the pearl'; 'the love and devotion'; 'the moment of the mortal/biblical transition'; The Divine marriage) were expressed in St Maxim the Greek's *The Prayer to the Mother of God and partly Because of Lord's Sufferings*. Precisely, with a metaphor of the pearl Maxim indicated the secret amount of internal ability to understand the Divine mysteries. The morning star symbolizes the quintessence of the emphasized action of the Holy Spirit.

Аще и бⷭ҇твенъ нѣкыи втебѣ оумъ съкровен е҇ ꙗко бисерь в раковинѣ. И тогⷣа оуразумѣеши неразумїа мглу бжⷭ҇твенны̑ свѣтом ѿ тебѣ изгандемy. свѣ же Парак–литовъ вселшиса в тебе, все та ѡзарй ꙗко денницу /…/ Но блжⷩ҇ъ оубо йже вѣрою несоуменною прїемь се въ срⷣци своемь, изыде ѿ житїа сего, въистинну таковы поживе акы бг҃ъ ввесконечныа вѣкы (Slave 123, p. 158 r.).

In this paragraph the sense of the fruit of love and a faith in Jesus Christ, which is exactly a direct transition from the lifetime to Eternity, is also

---

as 'Melancholy'). The similar verses in present could be found in the prayer to the icon of the Mother of God, named 'Kazanska' what could be as well related to the Muscovite period of the life of St Maxim the Greek.

expressed. The fruit of the devoted life could be only the reminiscence of the Divine marriage which is in fact the analogue moment to the Eucharistic enjoyment of the Holy Communion. But St Maxim the Greek was also repeating that all theologically-liturgical doing of the believer revealed the contradiction between the God's fear and the demanded joy of praising, expressed already in the Old Testament. He described that such opposition disappeared between a child and his mother. In this relationship the equality of one's soul is admitted as the righteousness of the believer. As the Mother of God related to the words of the Holy Spirit, only the Holy Spirit could provide to the believer the awakening attitude (self-awareness) as well as the fruit of the faith. Finally, the Holy Theotokos is the completion, the fulfillment of the Old Testament pedagogical preparation of humanity for its acceptance of the incarnated Savior God. This is the reason that She is also the "fruit of creation" according to St Nicholas Kavasilas (to whom St Maxim the Greek referred especially about the liturgical discipline), She is the measure that all of creation is to attain. The interaction of the total faith and the awakening mind Maxim regarded as a proper goal of the personal prayer as well as of the one's earthly life. St Maxim the Greek also clearly defined the heretical teachings about the inappropriate veneration of the holiness of the Holy Virgin Mary for example in the texts *About the Tale of Aphroditian* and *Against Those, Diminishing the Holiness of the Mother of God*. Although St Maxim the Greek was constantly testifying that all his literal doing had all the time been dedicated to the action of the Holy Spirit, he was at the same time repeating the principle of deep self-awareness and fully conscious literal work. Subsequently the co-existence of the vivid mind and the Divine Reason led to the 'another' stage in ascetic graduation and consequently provide the level of the preachers. Such were Holy apostles whose role was to witness the living God.

All the abovementioned concretized that St Maxim the Greek used during all his lifetime the selected favorite literal expressions by which his entirely intentional use of the Old Church Slavonic language during his living in Russia was confirmed. Moreover, at the same time, it is speaking about the fact that he certainly possessed certain knowledge of Old Church Slavonic already before his arrival to Moscow, mainly from the South Slavonic sources. The latter seems to be of great importance. That is the reason that despite of the secularization of his works into models or chapters we proposed the consideration of the author's opus as a concluded whole.

V. The Epilogue

In his personal writings of St Maxim the Greek it is far-most evident the author's voice. But in Russia the problem of the addressee very soon arose in the author's mind. St Maxim the Greek concluded his *Letter to the Metropolitan Macarius*[52] with a request of his return to Holy Mount Athos. After 27 years of prohibition from enjoying the Divine Liturgy and receiving the Holy Eucharist,[53] the Metropolitan Macarius in the year 1551–1552 sanctioned the latter to the old Athonite monk.

Прости мо҄а дерзость, и мое сї҄е дерзостное воспоминание прїими с кротот҄їю им же ѡ҄бразомъ ҷадолюбивїи ѡ҄цы свой младенецъ нѣмотования и воз҄ати ми Бл҄го– изволи непотрѣ҄номоу рабоу твоемоу Бж҄твены҄ Сп҄са Х҄а дар҄о приҷастие его҄ лишенъ есмь не вѣм ҷесо ради лѣта оужь З҄І. Свидѣтель ѡ мене твоемоу прп҄бьствоу самъ единъ срц҄евидецъ й҄ таины тмы дѣла и помышленїа ѡ҄крытъ І обличити хоц҄ѣ на страшн҄о своемъ второмъ пришествїи, ак҄о ниҷтоже лукаво ни хоу҄но о православн҄ѣи вѣре вашеи иже и, моеи, н҄й свѣмъ себе н҄й писа҄ ѡн҄у ниже Г҄лӑ якѡ нѣцыи ѡб҄огаша мене, /…/ Но еще пр҄ѣ самыми вѣможа҄ гл҄ѣм л҄ӑ нашоу православную вѣру свѣтлѣ҄и бѣ обиновения въспроповѣд҄ӑ Бл҄гдатию поклоняемаго божественаго Параклита просц҄ѣн бы҄ и оукрѣплен҄ъ. /…/ Идѣже ни послан бы҄ ѡ сц҄енныа ѡбители ватопедския по повелѣнїю прп҄бны҄ ѡц҄ъ мой по милостину, вездѣ Бл҄годатїю е҄го Параклита просца҄– емъ православную вѣроу свѣтло проповѣд҄а. И с ҷестию подо҄ною ѡтпуц҄ѣ паки бы҄ въ су҄ую гору, и нигде же во уз҄а падо҄ ниже в темниц҄а затвор҄ѣ бы҄ н҄й мразы и дымы и глады у҄моренъ бы҄ ѣлика случиша҄ здѣ мнѣ правѣ҄ными су҄бами Бж҄ими гр҄ѣ ради всако мой премноги҄, а не за ересь нѣкую у҄пова҄ на цедроты Г҄а моего Ї҄са Х҄а, яко нива срц҄а моего ҷиста и бѣ и е҄ и до конца пребудетъ Бл҄годатию Сп҄са Х҄а ѡ всякия еретиҷьския хоулы /…/ А҄ же не кесара смр҄на и неҷестиваго власте́ля землены҄, но самого содѣтеля и вл҄ыку҄ все҄ Ис҄а Х҄а единого срц҄евѣдца призываю свѣдетела вамъ Г҄мъ моимъ на дш҄ю мою, яко ҷистъ есмь ѡ всѣхъ й҄ же на мене лгаша суперники мои. Й҄ же соу҄а Б҄ѡ. И яко й҄наҷала и до сего у҄са доброхоте҄ Бг҄омолецъ Бл҄гоҷестивыа державы вашеа, и бы҄ и есмь и боудоу до конца и зде и вездѣ по заповѣди Сп҄совѣ,

---

[52] In the Paris manuscript of St Maxim the Greek (Slave 123) this letter directly follows the text of Basileusa.

[53] The latter confirms our investigations about Maxim's deep suffering, and subsequently, his profound consideration of those who are unjustly lacking of the Holy Mysteries (of Sacred Gifts).

ю̈ презира́яи, сп҃сениа не оулучи́тъ. Бг҃ойволи́те оубо, бл҃гойволи́те Га҃ ра́ди сътвори́ти ми́лость ѡ мнѣ́ бѣ́дномъ. Дади́те ми видѣ́ти ст҃ую го́ру мл҃твеницоу все́и вселе́нѣи (Slave 123, p. 79 v.–80 r.).

As soon as St Maxim the Greek decided not to rely on human rules (of the people who imprisoned him), he addressed his speech to the highest Christian authority of Jesus Christ. Such an appeal was used already at the Church Council at Ephesus in the year 431 (which was important for fixing the canonical part of Holy Scripture) in the speech, accusing the heretical teachings of Nestorius, who therefore enlisted the help of Jesus Christ Himself as judge (Abramowski, 2006, p. 75).

In Maxim's personal supplicatory prayers the naming and calling the Son of God was very important (cf. Gregorio di Nazianzo, 2012, p. 274) as the witness of believer's rightness, which allowed him to also solve the question of the addressee (for St Maxim the Greek, in fact, irresolvable).

That letter of Maxim to the Metropolitan Macarius (after which followed the author's papers about the monasticism, regarded as the ethical teachings) (Синицына, 1977, p. 168) reflected Maxim's hypersensitivity for a sublime forms of the Old Church Slavonic features (ср҃цеви́децъ – ср҃цевѣ́дца (cf. Acts 15, 8); просщ҃е́н – просщ҃да́емъ). The theological-liturgical interpretation of the biblical time that gave certain ontologically-eschatological value on the human's spiritual deed, St Maxim the Greek named explicitly »the Theology of Jesus Christ« (Синицына, 2008b, p. 194). Finally, in the prayer *About the Birth of Jesus Christ and also Against the Judes* (Slave 123, p. 160 v.) St Maxim the Greek defined the Lord's being with the time perspective as Jesus Christ appeared in the time ('Акы прѣ̀оуста́вленому вре́мени явле́нїа Єго').

Ни тѣ́ про́чее сщ҃е́ны пр҃ркѡ̀ да повину́ютса акы такова́ съ́лгавшй на Хв҃а. Ни же да ча́ю̈ ино́го прїи́ти. Акы прѣ̀оуста́вленому вре́мени явле́нїа Єго

The implicit message of St Maxim the Greek was his observation that the Russian liturgical practice was not sufficiently performed.[54] Nevertheless, St Maxim the Greek also in Russia managed to experience the presence of the Son of God, to see the Divine's Light and to create his own forms of the liturgy and his personal Eucharistic (Communion) prayers (Белокуров,

---

[54] The problematic issue of the Greek liturgy in the relation to the Roman liturgical rite was depicted already in the one of the first review of the biography of St Maxim the Greek by work of I. Denissoff (Grumel, 1944, p. 259).

1899, add. LXXX–LXXXII). That was the reason why the source of his prayer practice could be traced through the process of the detailed study of Maxim's individual Old Church Slavonic language.

It is clear enough that St Maxim the Greek combined the words, terms and expressions from theological, grammatical, liturgical and hymnographical fields that shaped the author's individual vocabulary. With such a complex basis of the knowledge he operated simultaneously in each of his texts in order to express the firm and complex theologically-liturgical, but in fact, canonical issues. Indeed, in special formation of the Old Church Slavonic St Maxim the Greek created his personal language ('idiolect'). Within his own version of complexed Slavonic language, based on the synthetic vision of three possible approaches of the sacred language, that were Greek, Old Church Slavonic and Latin, he formed a unique theologically non-approachable language. Although his commentaries and translations were carefully selected writings from byzantine hagiographic, theological, liturgical texts as well as the excerpts from the early and late byzantine hymnography, his linguistic sources could be regarded as entirely biblical. The basic source for the language of St Maxim the Greek also in Russia was mainly from the South Slavonic manuscripts. With them he might had a quite sufficient acknowledgment, gained during his monasticism in the Holy Vatopaidi monastery where he had an access to them at the Athonite monastic libraries. He certainly had encountered the South Slavonic manuscript also during his staying at North Italy where the circulation of the copies of the manuscripts threw the Balkan peninsula was vivid, but especially in Venice, where the Slavonic liturgical first-printing in the beginning of the 16th century was only started to begin.

VI. Conclusion

It is quite well known that St Maxim the Greek suffered in Muscovite Russia because of his devoted translational work that resulted in his final departure, in the Monastery of the Holy Trinity and St. Sergius Lavra. In 1556, on 21th January he was finally consecrated as the memorial day of St Maxim the Confessor, and consequently the feast day of Saint Maxim the Greek. Already at the beginning of his arrival he became famous among the ecclesiastical as well as among royal circles as a great translator but also a skilled Athonite monk in the theological discussions. Consequently, his words about the biblical themes and iconographical subjects as well as about the monastic duties received

a highly authoritative reputation. He forwarded to the Russian clergymen the detailed commentaries on the fragments from the Holy Scripture. All this enabled the survival of Maxim's linguistic species as the literally models of the Old Church Slavonic languages in the Russian liturgical consciousness until the modern times.

On the philological level the personal writings of St Maxim the Greek reflected the period of the transition from the Old Testament images to the soteriologically-revealing forms of the New Testament readings. The specific ascetic interpretation of the biblical time enriched his personal ethics. His vital reception of the biblical time dimension made it possible for him to produce his own monastic rule of the individual praying discipline, characterized mostly by directly addressing the Son of God that he recognized through the canonical theological stresses in the fragments of the byzantine – early and late – hymnography, especially those, dedicated to the Holy Theotokos. The latter significantly confirmed his personal prayer practice, known to him from the Holy Mount Athos, particularly from the Vatopaidi Monastery. However, St Maxim the Greek did not reform the liturgical rule[55] as a result of prayer practice, but he adopted certain liturgical elements into his personal prayers that permitted him to also spiritually survive in Russia in the prison. His Old Church Slavonic idiolect reflected the level of the transition from liturgical to personal prayer.

With this study it is proposed that in Old Church Slavonic writings of St Maxim the Greek, especially in his individual Slavonic literally forms, were preserved the echoes of the earliest forms of the Christian theological thought from the age of the establishment of Christianity, signified in the East by the profound Trinitarian theology of St Gregory of Nazianzus (who firstly created the Greek Christian liturgically-poetical homilies), and in the West by contemplational-liturgical works of St Ambrose of Milan (who firstly introduced the Vespers chants in Milan's Office), finally theologically determined in the Christological definition of the Chalchedonian decree (cf. Golitzin, 1994, p. 130).

---

[55] That issue from a certain perspective differed from the Byzantine tradition (cf. Шмеман, 1961, p. 160).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abramowski, L. (2006). Concilium Ephesenum 431. In *The Oecumenical Councils from Nicaea I (325) to Nicaea II (787)* (pp. 71–118). Turnhout: Brepols.(Corpus Christianorum Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta, 1)

Alberigo, G. (2006). Concilium Nicaenum I 325. In *The Oecumenical Councils from Nicaea I (325) to Nicaea II (787)* (pp. 1–34). Turnhout: Brepols.(Corpus Christianorum Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta, 1)

Badurina, A. (Ed.). (1979). *Leksikon ikonografije, liturgike i simbolike zapadnog kršćanstva.* Zagreb: Sveučilišna naklada liber.

Barrachi, M. (1971). La lingua di St Maxim the Greek. *Instituto Lombardo: Rendiconti: Classe di lettere e Scienze morali e storiche*, (105), 253–280.

Buckler, G. (1929). *Anna Comnena.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Clackson, J. & Horrocks, G. (2011). *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Constantin Porphyrogenete. (1939). *Le livre des ceremonies* (Vol. 2). (A. Vogt, Ed.). Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles lettres".

Čumičeva, O. (2010). Massimo il Greco sull› iconografia. *Studi slavistici*, *7*, 385–394.

Denissoff, E. (1943). *Maxime le Grec et l'Occident: Contribution à l'histoire de la pensée religieuse et philosophique de Michel Trivolis.* Louvain-Paris: Desclée et de Brouwer. (Université de Louvain: Recueil de travaux d'histoire et de philologie, 3* série, 14e fascicule)

Dionizij Areopagit. (2008). (G. Kocijančič, Trans. & Introduction). Ljubljana: Slovenka matica.

Euchologium. (1873). Romae.

Ferguson, E. (1990). *The encyclopedia of early Christianity.* New York: Garland Publishing.

Funk, F. X. (Ed.). (1905). *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Vol. 1). Paderbornae: In Libraria Ferdinandi Schoeningh.

Golitzin, A. (1994). *Et introibo ad altare dei.* Thessaloniki: Patriarchikon Idruma Paterikon Meleton. (Analecta Vlatadon, 59)

Gregorio di Nazianzo. (2012). *Tutte le orazioni.* (C. Moreschini, Ed.). Milano: Bompiani. (Il pensiero occidentale)

Grumel, V. (1944). La personnalité de Maxime le Grec. *Études byzantines*, *2*(1), 255–260. http://dx.doi.org/10.3406/rebyz. 1944.919

Isačenko, A. V. (1941). *Древне-русские этюды: К фонетике древнейшего периода русского языка и к морфологии древнейшего периода русского языка*. Ljubljana: Pri akademski založbi.

Isačenko, A. V. (1977). Vpliv slovenskega jezika na obdelavo zgodovine ruskega jezika 16. in 17. stoletja. In *Nahtigalov zbornik: Ob stoletnici rojstva* (pp. 109–119). Ljubljana: Izobraževalna, Kulturna in Raziskovalna skupnost SR Slovenije.

Jungmann, J. A. (1925). *Die Stellung Christi im liturgischen Gebet.* Münster: Aschendorff. (Liturgiegeschichtliche Forschungen, 7/8)

Le Mont Athos et l'Empire byzantine - Tresors de la Sainte Montagne. (2009). Paris: PetitPalais.

Louth, A. (2013). 'From beginning to beginning': Endless spiritual progress in St Gregory of Nyssa: Lecture at the XXI Conference on the Orthodox Spirituality, Bose 2013. In E. Bianchi (Ed.), *The Proceedings of the XXI International Ecumenical Conference on Orthodox spirituality "The Ages of the Spiritual Life"*. Bose.

Mejendorff, J. (1964). Review of E. Wolska, La Topographie chrétienne de Cosmas Indicopleustès: Théologie et Science au siècle. *Speculum*, *39*(2), 373–375. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2852762

Moorhead, J. (1999). *Ambrose: Church and society in the late Roman world*. Michigan: Longman.

Olmsted, O. H. (1987). Learned Greek Monk in Muscovite exile: Maksim Grek and the Old Testament prophets. *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook*, *3*, 1–39.

St Ambrosius. (1955). De obitu Theodosii. In St Ambrosius, *Sancti Ambrosii Episcopi Mediolanensis opera* (Pt. 7, pp. 369–401). (O. Faller, Ed.).Vindobonae: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky. (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, 73).

Swainson, C. A. (1884). *The Greek liturgies chiefly from original authorities, with an appendix containig the Coptic odinary canon of the mass from two manuscripts in the British Museum.* Cambridge: University Press.

Ševčenko, I. (2001). Gleanings 5 (Conclusion). *Paleoslavica*, *9*, 288–300.

Taube, M., & Olmsted, H. (1987). ПовестьоЕсфири: TheOstroh Bible and Maksim Grek's Translation of the Book of Esther. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, *11*, 100–117.

The Oecumenical Councils from Nicaea I (325) to Nicaea II (787). (2006). Turnhout: Brepols. (Corpus Christianorum Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta, 1)

Trubar, P. (1562). *Articuli oli deili te prave stare vere kersanske.* Tuebingen: Zavod za staroslovensko tipografii.

Tschižewskij, D. (1960). *History of Russian literature*. S-Gravenhage: Mouton&Co.

Ušeničnik, A. (1933). *Katoliška liturgika*. Ljubljana: Jugoslovanska knjigarna.

Velmans, T. (1972). Une illustration inedite de l'acathiste et l'iconographie des hymnes liturgiques a Byzance. *Cahiers Archeologiques (fin de l'antinquite et moyen age)*, *22*, 131–165.

Wellesz, E. (1998). *A history of Byzantine music and hymnography* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Zajc, N. (2011). *Krogozor slovanske besede: Preizkušnja renesančnega humanizma skozi prerez opusov besedil Primoža Trubarja in Maksima Greka*. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.

Zajc, N. (2014). Saint Ambrose of Milan and the establishment of Christianity within the conventions of the new language for the Christians. *Vox Patrum*, *34*, 157–169.

Алексеев, С. (2012). *Чудотворные иконы Пресвятой Богородицы.* Санкт-Петербург: Bibliopolis.

Белокуров, С. (1899). *О библиотеке московских государей в XVI столетии*. Москва: Тип. Г. Лисснера и А. Гешеля.

Вернер, И. В. (2011). "Нестандардная грамматика" библейских переводов Максима Грека: Влияние "Доната" Дмитрия Герасимована церковнославянский язык IV Маккавейской книги и книги Есфирь. In *Священное Писание как фактор языкового и литературного развития* (pp. 197–222). Санкт-Петербург: "Дмитрий Буланин".

Горский, А., & Невоструев, К. (1855–1869). *Описание славянских рукописей Московской-Синодальной библиотеки: В 6 томах* (Vol. 2). Москва: Синодальная типография.

Григорий Палама. (2006). *Об исхождении Святого Духа.* Краснодар: Текст. (Патристика: Тексты и исследования)

Журова, Л. И. (2011). *Авторский текст Максима Грека: Рукописная и литературная традиции:Сочинения* (Vol. 2). Новосибирск: Изд. Сибирского отделения Российской академии наук.

Казакова, Н. А. (1972). Дмитрий Герасимов и русско-европейские культурные связи в первой трети XVI в.In *Проблемы истории международных отношений: Сб. статей памяти Е. В. Тарле* (pp. 248–266). Ленинград.

Каптерев,Н. Ф. (1903). В чем состоит истинное монашество по воззрениям преподобного Максима Грека? *Богословский вестник*, *1*(1), 114–171.

Каштанов, С. М. (2001). К истории русско-греческих культурных связей в XVI в. In *Mocxobia: Проблемы византийской и новогреческой филологии: К 60-летию Б. Л. Фонкича* (pp. 209–218). Москва: Индрик.

Ковтун, Л. С., Синицына, Н. В., & Фонкич, Б. Л. (1973). Максим Грек и славянская Псалтырь: Сложение норм литературного языка в переводческой практике XVI в. In *Восточнославянские языки – источники для их изучения* (pp. 99–128). Москва: Наука.

Коновалов, К. В. (2014). *Влияние исихазма на антропологические и гносеологические воззрения Максима Грека (Михаила Триволиса).* Барнаул: Издательство Алтайского государственного университета.

Кравец, Е. В. (1991). Книжная справа и переводы Максима Грека как опыт нормализации церковнославянского языка XVI века. *Russian Linguistics*, *15*(3), 247–279.

Леонид, архим. (1873). Поездка в Назарет, на Тивериадское озеро и Фавор. *Душеполезное чтение*, (1), 31–72.

Лихачев, Д. С. (2007). *Русская культура.* Санкт-Петербург: Искусство-СПБ.

Молитвослов. (1998). Москва: Изд. Сретенского монастыря ХПП «Софрино».

Новый завет на греческом и русском языках. (2002). Москва: Российское библейское общество.

Пиккио, Р. (2002). *История древнерусской литературы.* Москва: Кругъ.

Синицына, Н. В. (1977). *Максим Грекв России.* Москва: Наука.

Синицына, Н. В. (2006). Новые данные о российском периоде жизни преподобного Максима Грека: Материалы для научной биографии. *Вестник церковной истории*, (4), 221–236.

Синицына, Н. В. (2008a). *Максим Грек.* Москва: Молодая гвардия. (Жизнь замечательных людей. Серия биографий, 1362 (1162))

Синицына, Н. В. (2008b). *Преподобный Максим Грек: Сочинения* (Vol. 1). Москва: Индрик.

Синицына, Н. В. (2014). *Преподобный Максим Грек: Сочинения* (Vol. 2). Москва: РАН.

Успенский, Б. А. (2002). *История русского литературного языка (XI–XVII вв.)* (3rd ed.). Москва: Аспект Пресс.

Успенский, Н. Д. (2006). *Византийская литургия: Историко-литургическое исследование. Анафора: Опыт историко-литургического анализа* (Vol. 2). Москва: издательский совет русской православной церкви: Литургическая библиотека.

Флоровский, Г. (2006). *Восточные отцы IV века*. Минск: Издательство Белорусского экзархата.

Шмеман, А. прот. (1961). *Введение в литургическое богословие*. Париж: Ymca-Press.

Ягич, В. (1896). *Рассуждения южнославянской и русской старины о церковно-славянском языке*. Санкт-Петербург: Императорская типография.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(TRANSLITERATION)

Abramowski, L. (2006). Concilium Ephesenum 431. In *The Oecumenical Councils from Nicaea I (325) to Nicaea II (787)* (pp. 71–118). Turnhout: Brepols.(Corpus Christianorum Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta, 1)

Alberigo, G. (2006). Concilium Nicaenum I 325. In *The Oecumenical Councils from Nicaea I (325) to Nicaea II (787)* (pp. 1–34). Turnhout: Brepols.(Corpus Christianorum Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta, 1)

Alekseev, S. (2012). *Chudotvornye ikony PresviatoĭBogoroditsy.*Sankt-Peterburg: Bibliopolis.

Badurina, A. (Ed.). (1979). *Leksikon ikonografije, liturgike i simbolike zapadnog kršćanstva.* Zagreb: Sveučilišna naklada liber.

Barrachi, M. (1971). La lingua di St Maxim the Greek. *Instituto Lombardo:Rendiconti: Classe di lettere e Scienze morali e storiche*, (105), 253–280.

Belokurov, S. (1899). *O biblioteke moskovskikh gosudareĭ v XVI stoletii*. Moskva: Tip. G. Lissnera iA. Geshelia.

Buckler, G. (1929). *Anna Comnena*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Constantin Porphyrogenete. (1939). *Le livre des ceremonies* (Vol. 2). (A. Vogt, Ed.). Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles lettres".

Denissoff, E. (1943). *Maxime le Grec et l'Occident: Contribution à l'histoire de la pensée religieuse et philosophique de Michel Trivolis*. Louvain-Paris: Desclée et de Brouwer. (Université de Louvain: Recueil de travaux d'histoire et de philologie, 3* série, 14e fascicule)

Dionizij Areopagit. (2008). (G. Kocijančič, Trans. & Introduction). Ljubljana: Slovenka matica.

Euchologium. (1873). Romae.

Ferguson, E. (1990). *The encyclopedia of early Christianity*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Florovskiĭ, G. (2006). *Vostochnye ottsy IV veka*. Minsk: Izdatel'stvo Belorusskogo ėkzarkhata.

Funk, F. X. (Ed.). (1905). *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*(Vol. 1). Paderbornae: In Libraria Ferdinandi Schoeningh.

Golitzin, A. (1994). *Et introibo ad altare dei*. Thessaloniki: Patriarchikon Idruma Paterikon Meleton. (Analecta Vlatadon, 59)

Gorskiĭ, A., & Nevostruev, K. (1855–1869). *Opisanie slavianskikh rukopiseĭ Moskovskoĭ Sinodal'noĭ biblioteki: V 6 tomakh* (Vol. 2). Moskva: Sinodal'naia tipografiia.

Gregorio di Nazianzo. (2012). *Tutte le orazioni.*(C. Moreschini, Ed.). Milano: Bompiani. (Il pensiero occidentale)

Grigoriĭ Palama. (2006). *Ob iskhozhdenii Sviatogo Dukha*. Krasnodar: Tekst. (Patristika: Teksty i issledovaniia)

Grumel, V. (1944). La personnalité de Maxime le Grec. *Études byzantines*, *2*(1), 255–260. http://dx.doi.org/10.3406/rebyz. 1944.919

IAgich, V. (1896). *Rassuzhdeniiaiuzhnoslavianskoĭ i russkoĭ stariny o tserkovno-slavianskom iazyke*. Sankt-Peterburg: Imperatorskaiatipografiia.

Isačenko, A. V. (1941). *Drevne-russkieétiudy: K fonetike drevneĭshego perioda russkogo iazyka i k morfologii drevneĭshego perioda russkogo iazyka*. Ljubljana: Pri akademski založbi.

Isačenko, A. V. (1977). Vpliv slovenskega jezika na obdelavo zgodovine ruskega jezika 16. in 17. stoletja. In *Nahtigalov zbornik: Ob stoletnici rojstva* (pp. 109–119). Ljubljana: Izobraževalna, Kulturna in Raziskovalna skupnost SR Slovenije.

Jungmann, J. A. (1925). *Die Stellung Christi im liturgischen Gebet*. Münster: Aschendorff. (Liturgiegeschichtliche Forschungen, 7/8)

Kapterev, N. F. (1903). V chem sostoit istinnoe monashestvo po vozzreniiam prepodobnogo Maksima Greka? *Bogoslovskiĭ vestnik*, *1*(1), 114–171.

Kashtanov, S. M. (2001). K istorii russko-grecheskikh kul'turnykh sviazeĭ vXVI v. In *Moskhovia: Problemy vizantiĭskoĭi novogrecheskoĭfilologii: K 60-letiiu B. L. Fonkicha* (pp. 209–218). Moskva: Indrik.

Kazakova, N. A. (1972). Dmitriĭ Gerasimov i russko-evropeĭskie kul'turnye sviazi vpervoĭ treti XVI v. In *Problemy istorii mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniĭ: Sb. stateĭ pamiati E. V. Tarle* (pp. 248–266). Leningrad.

Konovalov, K. V. (2014). *Vliianie isikhazma na antropologicheskie ignoseologicheskie vozzreniia Maksima Greka (Mikhaila Trivolisa).* Barnaul: Izdatel'stvo Altaĭskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta.

Kovtun, L. S., Sinitsyna, N. V., & Fonkich, B. L. (1973). Maksim Grek i slavianskaia Psaltyr': Slozhenie norm literaturnogo iazyka v perevodcheskoĭ praktike XVI v. In *Vostochnoslavianskie iazyki – istochniki dlia ikh izucheniia* (pp. 99–128). Moskva: Nauka.

Kravets, E. V. (1991). Knizhnaia sprava i perevody Maksima Greka kak opyt normalizatsii tserkovnoslavianskogo iazyka XVI veka.*Russian Linguistics*,*15*(3), 247–279.

Le Mont Athos et l'Empire byzantine - Tresors de la Sainte Montagne. (2009). Paris: PetitPalais.

Leonid, arkhim. (1873). Poezdka v Nazaret, naTiveriadskoe ozero i Favor. *Dushepoleznoe chtenie*, (1), 31–72.

Likhachev, D. S. (2007). *Russkaia kul'tura*. Sankt-Peterburg:Iskusstvo-SPB.

Louth, A. (2013). 'From beginning to beginning': Endless spiritual progress in St Gregory of Nyssa: Lecture at the XXI Conference on the Orthodox Spirituality, Bose 2013. In E. Bianchi (Ed.), *The Proceedings of the XXI International Ecumenical Conference on Orthodox spirituality "The Ages of the Spiritual Life"*. Bose.

Mejendorff, J. (1964). Review of E. Wolska, La Topographie chrétienne de Cosmas Indicopleustès: Théologie et Science au siècle. *Speculum*, *39*(2), 373–375. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2852762

Molitvoslov. (1998). Moskva: Izd. Sretenskogo monastyria KhPP «Sofrino».

Moorhead, J. (1999). *Ambrose: Church and society in the late Roman world*. Michigan: Longman.

Novyĭ zavet na grecheskom i russkom iazykakh. (2002). Moskva: Rossiĭskoe bibleĭskoe obshchestvo.

Olmsted, O. H. (1987). Learned Greek Monk in Muscovite exile: Maksim Grek and the Old Testament prophets. *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook*, *3*, 1–39.

Pikkio, R. (2002). *Istoriia drevnerusskoĭ literatury*. Moskva: Krug.

Shmeman, A. prot. (1961). *Vvedenie v liturgicheskoe bogoslovie*. Parizh: Ymca-Press.

Sinitsyna, N. V. (1977). *Maksim Grek v Rossii*. Moskva: Nauka.

Sinitsyna, N. V.(2006). Novye dannye o rossiĭskom periode zhizni prepodobnogo Maksima Greka: Materialy dlia nauchnoĭ biografii. *Vestnik tserkovnoĭ istorii*, (4), 221–236.

Sinitsyna, N. V. (2008a). *Maksim Grek*. Moskva: Molodaia gvardiia. (Zhizn' zamechatel'nykh liudeĭ. Seriia biografiĭ, 1362 (1162))

Sinitsyna, N. V. (2008b). *Prepodobnyĭ Maksim Grek: Sochineniia* (Vol. 1). Moskva: Indrik.

Sinitsyna, N. V. (2014). *Prepodobnyĭ Maksim Grek: Sochineniia* (Vol. 2). Moskva: RAN.

St Ambrosius. (1955). De obitu Theodosii. In St Ambrosius, *Sancti Ambrosii Episcopi Mediolanensis opera* (Pt. 7, pp. 369–401). (O. Faller, Ed.). Vindobonae: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky. (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, 73).

Swainson, C. A. (1884). *The Greek liturgies chiefly from original authorities, with an appendix containig the Coptic odinary canon of the mass from two manuscripts in the British Museum*. Cambridge: University Press.

Ševčenko, I. (2001). Gleanings 5 (Conclusion). *Paleoslavica*, *9*, 288–300.

Taube, M., & Olmsted, H. (1987). Povest' o Esfiri: The Ostroh Bible and Maksim Grek's Translation of the Book of Esther. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, *11*, 100–117.

The Oecumenical Councils from Nicaea I (325) to Nicaea II (787). (2006). Turnhout: Brepols. (Corpus Christianorum Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta, 1)

Thomson, F. J. (1998). The Slavonic Translation of the Old Testament. In *Interpretation of the Bible* (pp. 605–920). Ljubljana–Sheffield: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti – Academic Press.

Trubar, P. (1562). *Articuli oli deili te prave stare vere kersanske*. Tuebingen: Zavod za staroslovensko tipografii.

Tschižewskij, D. (1960). *History of Russian literature*. S-Gravenhage: Mouton&Co.

Uspenskiĭ, B. A. (2002). *Istoriia russkogo literaturnogo iazyka (XI–XVII vv.)* (3rd ed.). Moskva: Aspekt Press.

Uspenskiĭ, N. D. (2006). *Vizantiĭskaia liturgiia: Istoriko-liturgicheskoeissledovanie. Anafora: Opyt istoriko-liturgicheskogo analiza* (Vol. 2). Moskva: izdatel'skiĭ sovetrusskoĭ pravoslavnoĭ tserkvi: Liturgicheskaia biblioteka.

Ušeničnik, A. (1933). *Katoliška liturgika*. Ljubljana: Jugoslovanska knjigarna.

Velmans, T. (1972). Une illustration inedite de l'acathiste et l'iconographie des hymnes liturgiques a Byzance. *Cahiers Archeologiques (fin de l'antinquite et moyen age)*, *22*, 131–165.

Verner, I. V. (2011). "Nestandardnaia grammatika"bibleĭskikh perevodovMaksima Greka: Vliianie "Donata" Dmitriia Gerasimova na tserkovnoslavianskiĭ iazyk IV Makkaveĭskoĭ knigi i knigi Esfir'. In *Sviashchennoe Pisanie kak faktor iazykovogo i literaturnogo razvitiia* (pp. 197–222). Sankt-Peterburg: "Dmitriĭ Bulanin".

Wellesz, E. (1998). *A history of Byzantine music and hymnography* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Zajc, N. (2011). *Krogozor slovanske besede: Preizkušnja renesančnega humanizma skozi prerez opusov besedil Primoža Trubarja in Maksima Greka*. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.

Zajc, N. (2014). Saint Ambrose of Milan and the establishment of Christianity within the conventions of the new language for the Christians. *Vox Patrum*, *34*, 157–169.

Zhurova, L. I. (2011). *Avtorskiĭ tekst Maksima Greka: Rukopisnaia i literaturnaia traditsiia: Sochineniia* (Vol. 2). Novosibirsk: Izd. Sibirskogo otdeleniia Rossiĭskoĭ akademii nauk.

THE MANUSCRIPTS:

Paris Bibliothèque Nationale: Mss. Coll. Slave 123.

National Library of Sankt Petersburg (RNB): Mss. coll. Sofijskoe. №1498.

Russian Government Library (RGB): Mss. Coll. Volokolamskoe № 488.

Historical Museum of Moscow (GIM): Mss. Coll. Uvarov. 85.

Św. Maksym Grek. Kilka uwag o jego rozumieniu czasu świętego

Artykuł poświęcony jest specyficznemu rozumieniu związku języka i tradycji biblijnej w manuskrypcie św. Maksyma Greka. Proponuje odpowiedzi na pytania dotyczącego jego teologii, jakie zostały zawarte w jego liturgicznym doświadczeniu świętego czasu, które nie polega na odtwarzaniu ekscerpcji z autorów patrystycznych, lecz jest przede wszystkim oparte na właściwym odczytaniu i dogłębnym rozumieniu Biblii. Maksym Grek, który w swoich pismach osobistych wykazuje szczegółową wiedzę na temat zarówno Starego Testamentu, jak i słowiańskich tekstów biblijnych, posiada umiejętność oddzielenia nie tylko tekstów kanonicznych od niekanonicznych, ale także z powodzeniem klasyfikuje nauki chrześcijańskie zgodnie z ich wartością etyczną, od proroków Starego Testamentu do apostołów i Ojców Kościoła. Hierarchią tą nadaje także znaczenie wymiarowi ontologiczno-eschatologicznemu (trzy poziomy – właściwe Świętej Trójcy) ich wysiłków duchowym. Wiedza, która ujawnia się również w precyzyjnym rozumieniu decyzji dogmatycznych pierwszych ekumenicznych soborów Kościoła, sytuuje najwyżej bezpośrednią naukę płynącą od Syna Bożego, której Maksym Grek doświadczył dzięki teologiczno-liturgicznej praktyce modlitewnej.

W bizantyńskiej hymnografii odnajduje on jednoznaczne sformułowania teologicznie, poświęcone Matce Boskiej, które najdobitniej określają specyfikę jego osobistej teologii. Wszystkie wspomniane fakty wiodą do dalszych badań jego charakterystycznego języka staro-cerkiewno--słowiańskiego, w którym stara się zachować nie tylko wczesną mentalność chrześcijańską, lecz także teologiczno-liturgiczne cechy ascetycznej, a później monastycznej, dyscypliny, której nauczył się w monastyrze Vatopedi na Świętej Górze Atos. Artykuł stawia tezę, że tylko szczegółowe badania języka św. Maksyma Greka pozwalają na zdefiniowanie jego teologii.

Słowa kluczowe: św. Maksym Grek, Biblia, liturgia, gramatyka, teologia, język staro-cerkiewno--słowiański

St Maxim the Greek: Some Notes on His Understanding of the Sacred Time

Based on a manuscript by St Maxim the Greek, this article explores his specific understanding of the relationship between language and biblical tradition. It gives some answers to questions concerning his theology, which are posed by his liturgical experience of the sacred time, which is based not on repeating the excerptions from the patristic authors, but is primarily founded on his accurate reading and in-depth perception of the Holy Bible. Maxim the Greek, who in his personal writings showed a detailed knowledge of both the Old Testament and Slavonic biblical texts, was thus not only able to separate the canonical from the non-canonical sacred texts, but also successfully classified the Christian teachings according to ethical value, from the Old Testament prophets to the apostles and the Church Fathers. With his hierarchy he also gave meaning to the ontological-eschatological dimension (three levels – appropriate to the Holy Trinity) of their spiritual efforts. His knowledge, which also reflects the precise understanding of dogmatic theological decisions of the first ecumenical church councils, ranks highest the learning that comes directly from the Son of God, which Maxim the Greek experienced through his theological-liturgical prayer practice.

Maxim found theologically unambiguous formulations which most profoundly determined the specific nature of his personal theology in the Byzantine hymnography dedicated to the Mother of God. All the mentioned facts lead the author to the further explore his specific Old Church Slavonic language, in which he managed to preserve not only the early Christian mentality but also the theological-liturgical characteristics of the ascetic and later monastic discipline that he learned in the monastery of Vatopedi at the Holy Mount Athos. The article concludes with the proposition that only through detailed study of the personal language of St Maxim the Greek can we arrive at a definition of his Theology.

Keywords: St Maxim the Greek, Bible, liturgy, grammar, theology, Old Church Slavonic

Nota o autorze

Neža Zajc (nzajc@zrc-sazu.si) – doktor nauk humanistycznych, badaczka w Instytucie Historii Kulturowej w Centrum Naukowo-Badawczym Słoweńskiej Akademii Nauk i Sztuk. Zainteresowania naukowe: bizantyńskie studia teologiczne i liturgiczne, w szczególności badanie starych i nowych poetyk.

Neža Zajc, PhD (nzajc@zrc-sazu.si) – Research Fellow at the Institute of Cultural History of Scientific-Research Centre, Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts. Research interests: history of Russian and Slovenian languages and literatures from the Middle Ages to modern times; Byzantine theological and liturgical studies, including especially old and new poetics.