



University of
Zurich^{UZH}

Zurich Open Repository and
Archive

University of Zurich
Main Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2015

The liturgy and meal in version D of the

Σ

Newman, Nicholas

Abstract: By applying Wolfgang Iser's concept of the "implied reader" to the discussion of the person under attack in the Service of the Unholy, Goat Bearded Spanos (edited by Hans Eideneier), this paper attempts to show how the author uses the Spanos to create a variety of parodies, including a parody of the monastic holy man. This paper then offers a translation and interpretation of two sections of the D version of this text, which illustrates this attack on the monastics.

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-116774>

Journal Article

Published Version



The following work is licensed under a Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License.

Originally published at:

Newman, Nicholas (2015). The liturgy and meal in version D of the

Σ . Parekbolai,

5:1-15.

THE LITURGY AND MEAL IN VERSION D OF THE ΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΑΝΟΣΙΟΥ ΤΡΑΓΟΓΕΝΗ ΣΠΑΝΟΥ

NICHOLAS NEWMAN

Introduction

In his exhaustive treatment of the Ἀκολουθία τοῦ Ἄνοσιου τραγογένη Σπανοῦ (“the Service of the Unholy, Goat Bearded Spanos”),¹ Hans Eideneier² puts to rest one of the debates surrounding this text: who is being parodied here? Two possibilities have been proposed: either the work is directed against the *spanoi* in general, all of the beardless, or the author picks out an unknown individual, whom he identifies as the *Spanos* in order to mock him.³ The first theory, which had been the *communis opinio* before Eideneier’s work,⁴ has been argued by a number of scholars, such as Beck, who interprets the text as the “mockery of the beardless, that is the eunuch-like person,”⁵ and Legrand.⁶ The second theory was argued by, for example, Mitsakis, who claims that, rather than the eunuch-

¹ The text is, otherwise, by no means unknown, and usually receives a short treatment in surveys of Byzantine Literature. So, for example, in H.-G. BECK, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur (Byzantinisches Handbuch, 2.3)*. Munich 1971, 195-196 and É. LEGRAND, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés en grec par des Grecs au dix-septième siècle*. Paris 1894. This is an anonymous text (There are actually three different textual versions: A, B and D. Version D is the *editio Veneta* [1553], Version A is the cod. Vind. theol. gr. 244 and Version B is the cod. Vat gr. 1139; cf. EIDENEIER, *Spanos* [see n. 2], 82), dateable to the late Byzantine period (EIDENEIER, *Spanos*, 26), either shortly before or shortly after the fall of Constantinople. Despite the revulsion with which many of the earlier scholars read this work, the text has proven invaluable for middle Greek linguistics and for research on popular literature and early modern Greek, cf. J. KRIVORUCHKO, *Greek Loanwords in Rabbinic Literature: Reflections on Current Research Methodology*, in: T. M. LAW – A. SALVESEN (eds.), *Greek Scripture and the Rabbis*. Leuven–Paris–Walpole, MA 2012, 193-216: 210.

² H. EIDENEIER, *Spanos: Eine byzantinische Satire in der Form einer Parodie (Supplementa Byzantina, 5)*. Berlin–New York 1977.

³ EIDENEIER, *Spanos* (cited n. 2), 10

⁴ EIDENEIER, *Spanos* (cited n. 2), 11.

⁵ BECK, *Volksliteratur* (cited n. 1), 195: “Verspottung des Bartlosen, also des eunuchoiden Menschen.”

⁶ LEGRAND, *Bibliographie hellénique* (cited n. 1), Introduction XXVI.

like person, it is “against a particular individual who most probably occupied a high ecclesiastical position but whose identity is unknown to us today.”⁷ That this text is directed against a specific person was accepted by Eideneier as well. Although Eideneier inclines to the latter explanation, saying that the general attack on all of the *spanoi* “goes against both the content of the text and the type of satirical attack usual in this genre,”⁸ he explains that the attack on the individual was expanded to include fictional elements that deal with the *spanoi* in general⁹ and not with this specific person, and that it was through this expansion, after which the identity of the original victim was forgotten, that the work gained its popularity.¹⁰

Such an understanding of the person of the Spanos has important implications for further interpretation of the text. If the Spanos is not only one individual, but the whole group of the *spanoi*, then the author can use the Spanos as a catalyst for numerous different parodies and allusions to “Byzantine foundation documents ... healing texts and cursing practices,”¹¹ as well as to the various liturgical services of the Byzantine Church.¹² The text can, then, be interpreted following Wolfgang Iser’s¹³ concept of the ‘*implied reader*.’ The author offers signals to the “... ‘addressee’ it (the work) anticipates ...”¹⁴ that, in this case, open the door to various interpretations for each scene in the text. Zachariadou,¹⁵ for example, looks to the animosity between the Byzantines and the Latins, preva-

⁷ K. MITSAKIS, Byzantine and Modern Greek Parahymnography, in: D. CONOMOS (ed.), *Studies in Eastern Chant*, V. Crestwood 1990, 9-76: 63 (= K. MITSAKIS, Βυζαντινή και νεοελληνική παραϋμνογραφία. *Κληρονομία* 4 (1972) 303-364: 354).

⁸ EIDENEIER, Spanos (cited n. 2), 11: “widerspricht sowohl dem Inhalt des Texts als auch der in diesem Genus üblichen Art des satirischen Angriffs.”

⁹ For an overview of the political parodies in this text, see VANA NICOLAΪΔΟΥ-KYRIANIDΟΥ, *Ο απόβλητος και ο θεοπρόβλητος. Πολιτική ανάγνωση της Ακολουθίας του Σπανού*. Athens 1999.

¹⁰ EIDENEIER, Spanos (cited n. 2), 11-13.

¹¹ EIDENEIER, Spanos (cited n. 2), 13: “byzantinische Urkundenformulare ... Heilbüchern und Verwünschungspraktiken.”

¹² This text is a collection of services, an Ακολουθία, for the feast day of the fictitious Spanos in the fictitious month of Συκώβριος. This collection of services follows the format of the *Menaion*, giving both the common services, Vespers, Orthros as well as the Divine Liturgy and *Enkomia*, a stylized service of mourning, and the *Synaxarion* reading for the feast day. There is also a longer prose section that deals with the marriage and healing of the Spanos.

¹³ T. EAGLETON, *Literary Theory: an Introduction*. Oxford 1983.

¹⁴ EAGLETON, *Literary Theory* (cited n. 13), 84.

¹⁵ E.A. ZACHARIADOU, Η Ακολουθία του Σπανού: σάτιρα κατά του λατινικού κλήρου, in: S. ΚΑΚΛΑΜΑΝΙΣ – Α. ΜΑΡΚΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ – Γ. ΜΑΥΡΟΜΑΤΙΣ (eds.), *Ἐνθύμησις Νικολάου Μ. Παναγιωτάκη*. Herakleio 2000, 257-268.

lent at the time when the work was written as inspiration for the person of the Spanos.¹⁶ Playing on this animosity of the audience, the beardless Spanos is, in the interpretation of Zachariadou, meant to evoke the very image which would first come to mind to the Byzantines when a beardless man is mentioned, a satirized, beardless Roman cleric.¹⁷ In another recent study, Karanastasis, who postulates a slightly later date, the 16th century, for the text than Eideneier does,¹⁸ uses the influx of Spanish Jews into the Ottoman Empire to create (Hi)spanos from Spanos, so that the Spanos is supposed to satirize these new immigrants.¹⁹ Since the satire is built on the expectation of the reader, it is possible for the author to create multiple layers of parody, the initial impression of the beardless man evokes the image of the Roman cleric, as the name Spanos evokes the Hispanic Jew, but both of these interpretations remain out of place in the thoroughly Byzantine Ἀκολουθία; this allows for other, Byzantine, social groups to come into question for sources of parody as well.

In the D version (16th century),²⁰ following the *Enkomion* of the Spanos is a parodized Divine Liturgy and a meal closely tied to it. This paper will explore one interpretive layer of those two sections: how the author uses intertextuality to create an anti-monastic parody.

Spanos as the anti-Monastic

One of these groups, that provide a target of the parody in these liturgical services seem to be the monks, who were so powerful in Byzantine society.²¹ “How important he was in his rural district, how much deference he enjoyed from the local population ...”²² is already seen in the saints Vitae of late antiquity, such as the “Life of St. Theodore of Sykeon and many other texts.”²³ From being im-

¹⁶ ZACHARIADOU (cited n. 15), 264-267.

¹⁷ ZACHARIADOU (cited n. 15), *passim*.

¹⁸ T. A. KARANASTASIS, Ἀκολουθία του ανοσίου τραγογένη Σπανοῦ. Χαρακτήρας και χρονολόγηση. Μία ερμηνευτική προσέγγιση (*Μεταβυζαντινά Κείμενα και Μελέτες*, 2). Thessaloniki 2010.

¹⁹ KARANASTASIS, Ἀκολουθία (cited n. 18), 100.

²⁰ This paper will focus solely on the D version of the Spanos text, as the A version has a completely different Liturgy text here, and the B version has no Liturgy section at all.

²¹ For more on monasticism in Byzantine society see also: D. CANER, *Wandering, Begging Monks: Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity* (*The Transformation of the Classical Heritage*, 33). Berkeley 2002. See also D. SAVRAMIS, *Zur Soziologie des byzantinischen Mönchtums*. Leiden–Cologne 1962.

²² C. MANGO, *Byzantium: The Empire of New Rome*. New York 1980, 112.

²³ *Ibid.*

portant in rural districts, the monks moved into the cities, where they became “popular heroes and members of the establishment.”²⁴ Such power and influence in society earned the monks enmity and envy from other groups in society, and other late Byzantine texts satirize and polemicize the monastics and clergy as well, such as the poems of Theodoros Ptochoprodromos.²⁵

The very name Spanos, the beardless, can be interpreted as an ironic parody of a monastic. The Byzantine monks, and clergy in general, were famous for their beards, and are, in fact, forbidden from cutting them; the bearded Byzantine clergy were even listed among the reasons for the anathema pronounced against the Patriarch of Constantinople by Cardinal Humbert in 1054.²⁶ By using the name ἀνόσιος Σπανός (“the Unholy Spanos”), a man whose only wish is to receive the beard he cannot grow himself, the author ironically replaces the *topos* of the bearded holy man with the beardless wicked man. Another ironic connection between the Spanos and the monks is that the beardless man is not even eligible for admittance in a monastery. In the late ninth century *Athonite Typikon* used in the Megisti Lavra, Athanasios of Athos writes: “I order the superior and the brothers who have positions of leadership after him never to receive a eunuch into our Lavra, even if he be an old man, nor (should they receive) a young boy, even though he should be the son of the man who holds in his hands the imperial scepter.”²⁷ The prohibition of eunuchs and young boys, those who cannot grow beards, is underscored by a dire warning: “If anyone transgresses this command of mine by receiving such forbidden persons, let him be separated from the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, from the holy, consubstantial, and life-giving Trinity; let him also receive the curse of

²⁴ MANGO, *The Empire of New Rome* (cited n. 22), 113.

²⁵ The ‘ptochoprodromic issue’, the question whether Theodoros Ptochoprodromos is an author or typifies a genre of literature, is an interesting question, but beyond the scope of this paper. Two names have been very important in the debate surrounding this issue: Eideneier and Hörandner. For more on this debate see: H. EIDENEIER, *Ptochoprodromos: Einführung, kritische Ausgabe, deutsche Übersetzung, Glossar (Neograeca Mediae Aevi, 5)*. Cologne 1991; W. HÖRANDNER, *Autor oder Genus? Diskussionsbeiträge zur “Prodromischen Frage” aus gegebenem Anlaß. BSl 54 (1993) 314-324*; H. EIDENEIER, *Tou Ptochoprodromou*, in: M. HINTERBERGER – E. SCHIFFER (eds.), *Byzantinische Sprachkunst. Studien zur byzantinischen Literatur gewidmet Wolfram Hörandner zum 65. Geburtstag (Byzantinisches Archiv, 20)*. Berlin–New York 2007, 56-76; and H. EIDENEIER, *Πτωχοπρόδρομος. Κριτική έκδοση*. Herakleio 2012, 93-112.

²⁶ N.N. VOEIKOV, *Tserkov, Rus’ i Rim: v dvukh Chastiakh. Sviato-Trötskii Monastyr 1983*; translation in: *Orthodox Life* Vol. 45, No. 5 (Sept–Oct 1995) 41-43.

²⁷ G. DENNIS, *The Athonite Typikon*, in: J. THOMAS – A. CONSTANTINIDES HERO (eds.), *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents, 1 (Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 35)*. Washington D.C. 2000, 263 (§ 48).

our holy fathers and be anathematized from the inheritance of the just.”²⁸ The Spanos, then, functions as the anti-monk, an ironic reversal of the normal monastic *topoi*.

The Divine Liturgy

Following the services of Vespers, *Orthros* and the *Enkomion* (the *Epitaphion*), the fictitious *Menaion* entry also calls for a Divine Liturgy in honor of the ‘un-holy Spanos.’

Greek text of the Liturgy in the *Spanos* text (D 1594-1662)

Γίνεται Κακολογία μεγάλη εἰς τὸν σπανὸν καὶ Ἀπόλυσις.

Εἰς δὲ τὴν Λιμουργίαν οἱ μαγαρισμοί.

Ἰστῶμεν στίχους ἡ΄. Ἦχος α΄. Πρὸς τὸ Διὰ βρώσεως.

Ἐν τῇ ἀτυχίᾳ σου μνήσθητι ἡμῶν, σπανέ.

στίχ. Μαγάριοι οἱ σπανοί, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν γερανῶν.

στίχ. Μαγάριοι οἱ σπανοί, ὅτι πενθοῦντες οὐ παρακληθήσονται.

στίχ. Μαγάριοι οἱ σπανοί, ὅτι πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες οὐ χορτασθήσονται.

στίχ. Μαγάριοι οἱ σπανοὶ οἱ ἀνελεήμονες, ὅτι οὐκ ἐλεηθήσονται.

Ἐνεκρώθης, πονηρότατε,

καὶ ἐν μνημείῳ κατεχώθης, σπανέ,

ἀλλὰ σ΄ ἐδέχθηκεν κακῶς

φεῦ, ὁ Χάρος μὲ τὸ δρέπανον

κ΄ εἰς τὸν Ἄϊδην σ΄ ἔρριψεν,

κ΄ ἐκρημνίσθης ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ του.

στίχ. Μαγάριοι οἱ κακοποιοὶ σπανοί, ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ τράγων κληθήσονται.

Ἐστραβώθης ἀγριώτατε,

καὶ ἐστρεβλώθης παντελῶς, πονηρέ,

ἀλλὰ καὶ δίκην τὴν πικρὰν

ἐπερίλαβες τῶν ἔργων σου,

καὶ εἰς Χάρον ἀπελθε

καὶ ἀγάλλου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ του.

στίχ. Μαγάριοι οἱ σπανοὶ δεδιωγμένοι ἔνεκεν τρίχας, ὅτι κακῶς ἀκούσωσιν.

Τὸν σπανὸν πάντες γελάσωμεν

καὶ τὸ μουστάκιν του ἐκβάλωμεν,

συνελθόντες καταχέσωμεν

καὶ ἐν Ἄϊδι πέμψωμεν,

²⁸ Ibid.

ὅπως μένη ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ του.

στίχ. Μαγάριοι ἐστε, σπανοί, ὅταν ὑμᾶς ἐκδιώξωσιν καὶ ἐκβάλωσιν ἔξω.

Τοῦ σπανοῦ τὴν μνήμην σήμερον
ἐλθόντες πάντες καθυβρίσωμεν
καὶ τὴν παγκάκιστον αὐτοῦ
θέαν πάντες ἐκγελάσωμεν·
καὶ βοῶμεν πάντοτε,
ὦ σπανέα, χέζομεν τὰ γένια σου.

στίχ. Μαγάριοι οἱ μαχοποιοὶ σπανοί, ὅτι αὐτοὶ φουρκισθήσονται.

Δεῦτε πάντες τὸν παμμίᾳρον
σπανόν, τὸν ψεύτην καὶ κατάδικον,
τὸν ἀγριώτατον δεινῶς
ὁμοῦ πάντες καθυβρίσωμεν
καὶ αὐτοῦ μαδήσωμεν
τὴν μουστάκαν ὁμοῦ καὶ τὸ γένειον.

στίχ. Κλαίετε καὶ θρηνεῖτε, σπανοί, ὅτι ὁ γέλωσ ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

Φεῦγε πάλιν, ἄγωμε στ' ἀνάθεμα,
κακὲ τριγένη, πονηρότατε,
εἰς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μὴ φανῆς,
ἕως οὗ ξεφυτρώσης γένειον,
μήπως πάλιν κλάσωμεν
καὶ τὸ στόμα σου σκατὰ γεμίσωμεν.

Δόξα.

Τὸν σπανέα καθυβρίσωμεν
τὸν μιᾶρον καὶ τὸν ἀπάνθρωπον,
καὶ τὸν πατράδελφον αὐτοῦ
δεῦτε πάντες ὀνειδίσωμεν
κράζοντες καὶ λέγοντες,
ὦ σπανέα, σφάκελα στὰ μάτια σου.

Καὶ νῦν.

Τὴν πατσάδα σου τὴν ἄσχημον
καὶ τὴν μουστάκαν τὴν πανάγριον
καὶ τὴν πιγούναν τὴν μακρὰν
καὶ τὴν θέαν σου τὴν ἄτσαλον
καθορώντες λέγομεν,
ὁ θεός μου, ἐκ τοὺς σπανοὺς ἡμᾶς λύτρωσαι.

Καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς Λιμουργίας ὡς ἔθος ἐστίν.

English translation

The Great Kakology to the Spanos begins, as does the Dismissal.

The Defilements for the Limurgy.

We sing six verses in the first tone, following the Διὰ βρώσεως.

In your misfortune remember us, Spanos.

Verse: Defiled are the Spanoi, for theirs is the kingdom of the cranes.

Verse: Defiled are the Spanoi, for the poor shall not be comforted.

Verse: Defiled are the Spanoi, for those who hunger and thirst shall not be filled.

Verse: Defiled are the merciless Spanoi, for they shall not receive mercy.

You died, most wicked one,
and are held in the grave, Spanos,
but it received you wickedly,
Alas, Charon with the scythe,
he casts you down to Hades,
and you are hurled down into your kingdom.

Verse: Defiled are the Spanoi who do wicked deeds, for they shall be called the sons of goats.

You were blinded, wild billy goat,
and were entirely distorted, wicked one,
but you received the bitter justice
of your deeds,
get hence to Charon
and rejoice in your kingdom.

Verse: Defiled are the Spanoi who are persecuted for the sake of hair, for they shall be heard wickedly.

Let us all deride the Spanoi
and let us cast off his moustache,
let us all, coming together, shit upon your beard
and let us send him into Hades,
so that he may stay in his kingdom.

Verse: Defiled are you, Spanoi, whenever they banish you and cast you out.

Let us all, coming together today,
mock the memory of Spanos
and let us all laugh out loud
at his entirely wicked visage;
and always cry aloud
O Spanos, shit to your beard.

Verse: Defiled are the Spanoi who do ill, for they shall be hanged.

Come everyone and together
 let us all mock terribly the entirely unclean Spanos
 the liar and the unjust and condemned
 and the most wild one
 and let us pluck bare
 both his mustache and his beard.

Verse: Cry out and wail, Spanoi, for great is your mockery upon the earth.
 Flee back, wicked one with three beard hairs,
 most wicked one,
 let us lead him to anathema,
 you should not be revealed to men
 before you grow a beard,
 lest we cry again
 and fill your mouth with shit.

Glory.

Let us mock the Spanos
 the polluted and inhuman,
 and his uncle, come let us all reproach him
 crying out and saying:
 O Spanos, shit to your eyes.

Now and.

Seeing your deformed visage, your
 wild moustache, the long chin
 and your disgusting beard let us cry aloud:
 O my God, save us from the Spanoi.

And the remainder of the Limurgy as is customary.

Two abnormalities in the structure of the text are evident: 1. The Liturgy is not complete; the only hymn present is the third antiphon. 2. This is not the antiphon that is expected, the parody is of the text of the Beatitudes (*Matthew* 5: 3-12). The Beatitudes are part of the monastic Typika, whereas the antiphons used in the parish are the remnants of the Cathedral rite. Although they are not used in Greek usage very often (although there are times when they should be used) they are used in the Slavic churches under monastic influence.²⁹

It is in this reversal of the expected liturgical text, as well as in the wordplay that the parody is found. This parody of the Beatitudes, replacing Μακάριοι with

²⁹ See below, p. 10. See also P. TREMPERAS, Αί τρεῖς λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας. Athens 1982, 31, 34 and 36.

Μαγάριοι, focuses the entirety of this liturgy on one of the few textual differences between the Cathedral rite, the complex liturgical form found in the large churches of Constantinople, and the Monastic rite, the simpler liturgical rite developed in the monasteries; the Antiphons.

The Byzantine Antiphons³⁰ were responsorially sung psalms which served to “occupy the people while they themselves were waiting for the bishop-celebrant’s formal entrance.”³¹ This type of hymn was developed very early; it was introduced in the fourth century in Antioch, according to legend, by two monks, Flavian and Diodore.³² From there the use of the Antiphons quickly spread to Cappadocia already in the fourth century,³³ and to Constantinople between 630 and 730.³⁴ Before the tenth century the Antiphons were “not a necessary part of every liturgy,”³⁵ but in the tenth century the Antiphons had reached their final form, though Kucharek’s claim that their form remains in use, unchanged, to the present day³⁶ is not entirely correct, as the Antiphons “have been reduced to a few scraps of their original form, and the troparia after the third antiphon have been so multiplied as to take on an independent existence detached from the psalmody which they were originally destined to serve as refrains.”³⁷

The Antiphons were developed in the Cathedral rite of the large churches of Constantinople, especially the church of the Hagia Sophia,³⁸ marked by complex ritual and large numbers of clergy.³⁹ The complexity of the Cathedral rite is

³⁰ Studies on the Byzantine Antiphons are relatively rare, and are usually part of a longer study of the Byzantine liturgy in general. Some studies include: R. TAFT, *The Evolution of the Byzantine “Divine Liturgy.”* *OCP* 43 (1977) 8-30; J. MATEOS, *La célébration de la Parole dans la liturgie byzantine: Étude historique* (OCA, 191). Rome 1971; C. KUCHAREK, *The Byzantine-Slav Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Its Origin and Evolution.* Allendale, NJ 1971; and M.M. SOLOVEV, *The Byzantine Divine Liturgy: History and Commentary.* Washington, D.C. 1970.

³¹ KUCHAREK, *Byzantine Slav Liturgy* (cited n. 30), 369.

³² KUCHAREK, *Byzantine Slav Liturgy* (cited n. 30), 367-368.

³³ Cf. the Barberini Codex; cf. also KUCHAREK, *Byzantine Slav Liturgy* (cited n. 30), 368 and 369.

³⁴ TAFT, *Evolution of the Byzantine “Divine Liturgy”* (cited n. 30), 11.

³⁵ TAFT, *Evolution of the Byzantine “Divine Liturgy”* (cited n. 30), 27.

³⁶ KUCHAREK, *Byzantine Slav Liturgy* (cited n. 30), 370.

³⁷ TAFT, *Evolution of the Byzantine “Divine Liturgy”* (cited n. 30), 28.

³⁸ S. PARENTI, *The Cathedral Rite of Constantinople: Evolution of a Local Tradition.* *OCP* 77 (2011) 449-469.

³⁹ The impressive ceremony is seen in Byzantine art as well, the depiction of this ceremony in the Menologion of Basil II is described by TH. MATHEWS, *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy.* University Park 1971, 146: “The miniature represents the celebration of the 26th of October, the feast commemorating the deliverance of the city from the earthquake of 740. The bishop leads the procession, carrying

reflected in the Antiphons of the Byzantine rite,⁴⁰ which were sung by the laity in their processions to the main church of Constantinople as well as in their wait for the celebrant. The Antiphons consist of a series of three Psalms with set hymn verses.⁴¹ The third antiphon, which we would expect in this parody, functions as an *Eisodikon*, an entrance hymn, which consists of *Psalms* 94 and the *Apolytikion* of the feast day.

The Antiphons of the Cathedral rite, as laid out above, is what one would expect in a liturgical parody of the late Byzantine period, especially as the abbreviated form of the Antiphons discussed by Taft⁴² become standard in the Greek parish churches, and are still in use today,⁴³ and are one of the few remnants of the Cathedral rite which survive the increasing importance of the Monastic rite toward the end of the Byzantine Empire. This expectation is not fulfilled, however, as the parody is of the third antiphon of the liturgy in the Monastic rite. These Antiphons are 1. *Psalms* 102; 2. *Psalms* 145 and 3. the Beatitudes (*Matthew* 5: 3-12) which are seen, for example, in the *Typikon* of St. Savvas,⁴⁴ these were adopted by the Slavic churches.⁴⁵

in his left hand the Gospel book, bound in gold with precious stones, and in his right a censer; artistic economy has thus assigned to the bishop tasks that would ordinarily fall to his accompanying deacons. At the bishop's right stands the cross-bearer, who wears a strap around his neck from which to support the heavy cross he carries ... At the cross bearer's right walks a layman, evidently a senior citizen of high rank, who carries a candle. In the second row of figures appears a young deacon in his white *linea*, likewise carrying a candle, and at his right another cleric, who carries in his right hand a parchment scroll which, from the position of his fingers between the rolls, he seems to be reading."

⁴⁰ For more on the Cathedral rite itself see MATHEWS, *The Early Churches of Constantinople* (cited n. 39), 138-173; PARENTI, *Cathedral Rite* (cited n. 38), 449-466; G. M. HANKE, *Vesper und Orthros des Kathedralritus der Hagia Sophia zu Konstantinopel. Eine strukturanalytische und entwicklungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Psalmodie und der Formulare in den Euchologien. Inauguraldissertation zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades eines Doktors der Theologie, Philosophisch-Theologische Hochschule Sankt-Georgen. Frankfurt a. M. 2002*; S. PARENTI – E. VELKOVSKA, *L'Eucologio Barberini gr. 33. Seconda edizione riveduta con traduzione italiana (Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae. Subsidia, 80)*. Rome 2000.

⁴¹ The first Antiphon consists of *Psalms* 65: 1-4 with the hymn: Ταῖς πρεσβείαις τῆς Θεοτόκου, Σῶτερ, σῶσον ἡμᾶς. The second Antiphon consists of *Psalms* 66 with the hymn: Σῶσον ἡμᾶς, Υἱὲ Θεοῦ, ὁ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν, ψάλλοντάς σοι Ἀλληλούια. This is followed by the singing of the *Monogenes* hymn of Justinian.

⁴² See above p. 9.

⁴³ Cf. Ἱερατικόν. Athens 1962, 107-110.

⁴⁴ BISHOP DEMETRI KHOURY, *The Book of the Typikon*. Miami 2011, 51

⁴⁵ The Greek rubrics, in which these Antiphons are laid out, are also generally not in use, for example, on Mt. Athos. That the monastic tradition is ultimately adopted by the

The author creates a parody of only one hymn out of the entire liturgy, and picks out one of the few parts of the text, the Beatitudes, in the monastic liturgical rite⁴⁶ that differs from the Cathedral rite. This can, then, only be a parody aimed at the monastics, but what is its purpose? This parody seems to be a statement against the power monks have in Byzantine society, using the takeover of the Byzantine liturgical world by the monastic rite as an example. This replacement had been gradual, beginning already in the ninth century after the fall of Iconoclasm and the increase in the power of the monks, with the so-called Studite reforms,⁴⁷ and continuing gradually over the next few hundred years.⁴⁸ Even around the time of the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, the Cathedral rite is still in use, though on its last leg and its “swan song”⁴⁹ is described by St. Symeon of Thessaloniki in the 15th century in *The Liturgical Commentaries*.⁵⁰ The author even seems to play on Thessaloniki as the last bastion of the Cathedral rite. In the introduction to the text, the month in which the feast day is celebrated is identified as *Sykobrios*, fig month, and the *Kekragaria*⁵¹ of Vespers are in plagal of the first tone, following the *Prosomion*:⁵² Ὡ τοῦ παραδόξου θαύματος. This connects the feast day of the Spanos with the feast day of St. Demetrios, the patron saint of Thessaloniki, which is celebrated in October (*Oktobrios*), the only month which could have served as a model for the month name *Sykobrios*, and the *Kekragaria* of the feast day of St. Demetrios are also in plagal of the first tone following the *Prosomion*: Ὡ τοῦ παραδόξου θαύματος.⁵³

Church as a whole is seen in TREMPERAS, *Αἱ τρεῖς λειτουργίαι* (cited n. 29), 162-163.

⁴⁶ It is the complexity of the processions etc. that marks the differences between the Monastic and Cathedral rites.

⁴⁷ T. POTT, *Byzantine Liturgical Reform: A Study of Liturgical Change in the Byzantine Tradition*. Crestwood, NY 2010, 115-151.

⁴⁸ POTT, *Byzantine Liturgical Reform* (cited n. 47), 116. The exact progression of this replacement is rather complicated, and the specifics need not be discussed here. The progression is described by POTT, *Byzantine Liturgical Reform* (cited n. 47), 229-230: “... the cathedral rite was unable to maintain itself. The reigning monastic rite is the ‘neo-Sabaite synthesis’ which, originating in Palestine on the basis of the Studite ‘typikon’ and developed on Mt. Athos, has gained ascendancy in all the Byzantine ‘liturgical peripheries’ [i.e. the Slavic churches] beyond Constantinople and Greece, as a result of the codifications of Patriarch Kokkinos (1353-1355,-1364-1376).” Cf. also R. TAFT, *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History*. Collegeville, MN 1992, 79-80; 82-83).

⁴⁹ POTT, *Byzantine Liturgical Reform* (cited n. 47), 229.

⁵⁰ PARENTI, *The Cathedral Rite of Constantinople* (cited n. 38), 451.

⁵¹ The *Kekragaria* are the hymns chanted between the chanting of *Psalms* 141 and the Entrance with the Incense during Vespers.

⁵² A *Prosomion* is a sample hymn, following the melody of which other hymns can be modeled.

⁵³ Μηναῖον τοῦ Ὀκτωβρίου. Athens 1970, 252.

The author, then, seems to take up St. Symeon's lament over the death of the Cathedral rite, but comes at it from the another angle, by satirizing the monastic rite rather than by discussing the merits of the Cathedral rite.

The 'Monastic' Meal

Following the close of the liturgy proper are instructions for a meal. This "meal" consists of a short introduction, followed by the hymn sung while the meal is taking place:

Ἐν δὲ τῇ τραπέζῃ ψάλλει ὁ πρωτοψάλτης τὸ παρὸν κακοφωνικὸν τοῦ σπανοῦ, ποίημα κυροῦ Μαγκλαβᾶ τοῦ Μπορδηλέτου εἰς ἦχον πλαΐου βαρῦ, μετὰ μέλους εὐφώνως.⁵⁴

Α ν ανε τρα γε αν ανε τρ α γε αν α νε τρ α γε ρ ου τε
 ρου τε ρου τε ρε ρε ρε ρε ρε ψεις ψεις ρι ρι ρουτε ρι
 ρι ρου τε α γρε α γρε αγρε κα κα κο κο τρα γε και
 α γριο τρ α γε ο θε ε ε ος μου μου πα πα πα τα
 ξη ξη ξη σε τε τε τε τε τε το το το το τι
 τι τι τι ξης αμην η η ν αμην αμην.⁵⁵

The hymn contains only a few words of intelligible text, as Eideneier points out: Ἄνανὲ τράγε κακότραγε καὶ ἀγριότραγε ὁ θεός μου πατάξῃ σε, ἀμήν.⁵⁶ The syllables that do not belong in the text itself are explained by C. Floros: "the text underlying the song shows an orientation toward the so-called kalophonic style of the 15th century."⁵⁷ Kalophonic chanting flourished following the Latin occupation of Constantinople in 1204, and became progressively more important.⁵⁸ This not only helps to narrow down the date of authorship, but helps in the understanding of the parody in this part of the text.

⁵⁴ "During the meal the head chanter sings the following cacophony of Spanos, a poem by Mr. Torturer son of Farter in the plagial Varys tone, with a sweet sound."

⁵⁵ Spanos D 1666-1674 and EIDENEIER, Spanos (cited n. 2), 220.

⁵⁶ EIDENEIER, Spanos (cited n. 2), 221 ("Anane, billy goat, wicked and wild billy goat, my God should smite you, Amen.")

⁵⁷ EIDENEIER, Spanos (cited n. 2), 221: "Textunterlegung des Gesanges, die eine Orientierung an dem sogenannten kalophonischen Stil des 15. Jahrhunderts verrät."

⁵⁸ A. IOANNIDOU, The Kalophonic settings of the Second Psalm in the Byzantine Tradition (Fourteenth-Fifteenth centuries): A Dissertation In-Progress, in: *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference of the American Society of Byzantine Music and Hymnology (ASBMH)*, 2007, 210-223: 210 (published online: <http://www.asbmh.pitt.edu/page12/Ioannidou.pdf>)

Although the Kalophonic chant was not directly a product of the monasteries, the difficult melodies needed to be “... performed by expert *maistores* ...,”⁵⁹ and this compounded the changes that were occurring in the liturgical rite of Constantinople. The complex rituals of the Cathedral rite were replaced by the simpler rites of the Monastic rite; this meant that the large choirs were no longer necessary, allowing these “*maistores*,” the πρωτοψάλται, to develop a much more complicated chanting style. The name of the author of the hymn in the *Spanos* text: Μαγκλαβᾶ τοῦ Μπορδηλέτου shows that the author recognized the origin of this type of music in lay composers and singers, as “Torturer son of Farter”⁶⁰ is not a monastic name. The author does, however, show that in his mind, this style of chanting is linked with monasticism. This is shown in the way that the author presents the hymn. The hymn is to be chanted while a meal is being eaten, which equates the hymn to the readings of Scripture or other spiritual literature during meals, a tradition still in practice at orthodox monasteries today. The final rubrics in the Liturgy: Εἰς δὲ τὴν τράπεζαν ἐσθίετε ἀντίδια χεσμένα καὶ σκαταφάτα διάφορα καὶ ἀνήθιν, κλανήθιν κακολογοῦντες τὸν σπανόν⁶¹ are especially important in this parody, because the language, which creates a parody of the Eucharist seen in which ἴδιος, personal, is changed to ἀντίδια (as a substitute for the ἀντίδωρον distributed to the faithful) and the homophony between διάφορα and ἀναφορά, the part of the Liturgy in which the Eucharist is consecrated, is used to tie this section with the “meal” section following it, in which a feast is eaten in honor of the Spanos: Εἰς δὲ τὴν τράπεζαν corresponding to: Ἐν δὲ τῇ τραπέζῃ.⁶² By creating this connection between the Liturgy and the “meal” in this way, the author is able to continue the parody of the monks begun in the Liturgy in this new section by connecting Kalophonic chanting and the Monastic rite of the Divine Liturgy and equates the πρωτοψάλτης with the monastic. This focuses and underscores the parody from the previous section and allows the author to continue his attack on the monks as well as widen the parody to include the new chanting style and the “*maistores*” who developed it.

The parody here focuses not on the form of the text, as we saw in the liturgy, but on the overly complex nature of the Kalophonic style itself. Along with the

⁵⁹ J.P. SWAIN, *Historical Dictionary of Sacred Music (Historical Dictionaries of Literature and the Arts, 13)*. Lanham, MD 2006. Also available at www.sacred_music.enacademic.com/327Kalophonic_Chant

⁶⁰ τοῦ Μπορδηλέτου could perhaps also be a Hellenization of Bordello, “of the brothel.”

⁶¹ *Spanos* D 1662-1665. “For the Eucharist you will eat your own dung and the excrement of others, breaking wind, while speaking ill of the Spanos.”

⁶² *Spanos* D 1666-1668.

short text that is overly full of the senseless syllables that mark the Kalophonic style, the author begins with a direct attack on the style, by calling the hymn a *κακοφωνικόν*. He then moves to a more subtle parody, one which only a person well versed in the chant style would notice. Every hymn is written in one of eight tones: four regular tones, three “plagal” tones and an eighth.⁶³ This hymn is supposed to be in the *πλαΐου βαρύ*; there is, however, no such tone. The seventh of the eight tones is called *βαρύς*, and is not one of plagal tones.⁶⁴ This could be a mistake on the author’s part, but he uses the tones correctly throughout the rest of the text.⁶⁵ Rather than taking this tone marker at face value, it should be interpreted as an attempt to irritate and parody. The same irritating, mocking parody is found at the beginning of the hymn itself with the meaningless word: “Anane.” These “recurrent syllables ... are the beginning of an Echema, i.e. an intonation formula that is important for the preparation of the Choir.”⁶⁶ This intonation is especially important in letting the rest of the choir know what tone a hymn is in. *Anane* is, however, not the correct intonation for *βαρύς* tone, but of the first tone. This could also be a mistake on the part of the author, but this is unlikely since he has not made any other such mistake in the rest of the text. This, like his use of “plagal Varys,” is another irritation and parody of the “*maistores*.”

Conclusion

An attack on an individual may have inspired the author to begin the Spanos text, but the Spanos quickly becomes a vector of making numerous parodies on various aspects of late Byzantine society. One such aspect is the omnipresent Byzantine monk. The parody of the monastic shows especially in the liturgy and the meal following it.⁶⁷ Here the author uses the form of the Liturgy and the complexities of the hymns to parodize the Monastic rite, which was replacing

⁶³ S.I. SAVAS, *Byzantine Music in Theory and in Practice*. Roslindale, MA 1965, 42-43.

⁶⁴ SAVAS, *Byzantine Music* (cited n. 63), *ibid*.

⁶⁵ Cf. EIDENEIER, *Spanos* (cited n. 2), 83, 85, 87 etc. The only other place in which such a mistake is made is on p. 92 where the author once again parodies these “*maistores*” by using *πλαΐου βαρύ*. Here the parody is even more pronounced because the series of *Anavathmoi* being rewritten here are not supposed to be in *Varys* tone, but in fourth tone.

⁶⁶ C. Floros in EIDENEIER, *Spanos* (cited n. 2), 221: “Die wiederkehrenden Silben Anane bilden den Anfang eines Echemas, d. h. einer für die Vorbereitung des Chores wichtigen Intonationsformel”.

⁶⁷ There are other sections of the text, not discussed in this paper, that may also be monastic parodies, such as in the *Synaxarion* of the Spanos.

the Cathedral rite as well as the Kalophonic style of chanting, which replaced the large choirs of the Cathedrals with small, professionally trained choirs and chanters.

We see here not only the ironic reversal of the monastic *topos*, but that the author distorts those liturgical practices that result from the great influence of monasticism in Byzantine society, especially the growing importance of the monastic rite of the Liturgy, in order to make his attack. Through this parody, the author gives the reader a glimpse into the real life politics of the people of the late Byzantine Empire, in which not all were content with the power had by the monks.

Kearsarge Regional High School
North Sutton, New Hampshire

ABSTRACT

By applying Wolfgang Iser's concept of the "implied reader" to the discussion of the person under attack in the *Service of the Unholy, Goat Bearded Spanos* (edited by Hans Eideneier), this paper attempts to show how the author uses the *Spanos* to create a variety of parodies, including a parody of the monastic holy man. This paper then offers a translation and interpretation of two sections of the D version of this text, which illustrates this attack on the monastics.

