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The Byzantine ritual for dedication of churches, as it appears in its earliest complete text, the eighth-century euchologion Barberini gr. 336, as well as in the textus receptus of the rite, represents a unique collection of scriptural and euchological texts, together with the ritual actions, intended to set aside the physical space of a public building for liturgical use. The Byzantine rite, in its shape already largely present in Barberini gr. 336, actually comprises three major liturgical elements: 1) consecration of the altar; 2) consecration of the church building; 3) deposition of relics. Our earliest Byzantine liturgical text clearly conceives of the consecration of the altar and the deposition of the relics/“renovation” (encaenia) as two distinct rites, not merely elements of a single ritual. This feature of the Barberini text raises an important question, namely, which of these major elements did in fact constitute the act of dedicating/consecrating the church, and what role did the deposition of relics have in the ceremonies of dedication in the early period of Byzantine liturgical history, considering that the deposition of relics
became a *mandatory* element of the dedication rite only after the provisions to that effect were made at the Second council of Nicaea in 787 CE.

This dissertation examines in special detail the origins and development of the consecration of the altar and the church with oil or chrism as evoking significant parallels to the ritual action of initiation liturgies (washing, anointing, vesting). Such connection provides a glimpse into the early theology behind the act of consecration of a liturgical space. A thorough study of the Byzantine dedication rite also allowed us to reevaluate a prominent role of the liturgies of major imperial cities and cultural centers (Jerusalem, Constantinople) in the formation of the Byzantine liturgical tradition.
To my grandfather Ivan Vasilyevich Piskun (1919- 2004),
who taught me to love history
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem (early fifth cent.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAN</td>
<td>Библиотека Академии Наук = Library of the Academy of Sciences (St. Petersburg, Russia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS</td>
<td>Byzantine Liturgy of St Basil the Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELS</td>
<td>Bibliotheca <em>Ephemerides Liturgicae</em>, Subsidia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIHBR</td>
<td><em>Bulletin de l’Institut historique belge de Rome</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>The British Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.N.</td>
<td>Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSL</td>
<td>Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCO</td>
<td>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR</td>
<td>Byzantine Liturgy of St John Chrysostom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOP</td>
<td><em>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>English translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>Fathers of the Church (series)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCS</td>
<td>Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL</td>
<td>Georgian Lectionary of Jerusalem (fifth-eighth cent.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAS</td>
<td>Liturgy of St James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JECS</td>
<td>Journal of Early Christian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JÖB</td>
<td>Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCL</td>
<td>The Loeb Classical Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQF</td>
<td>Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td><em>Μηναία τοῦ δὸλου ἐνιαυτοῦ</em> (Rome, 1888-1901).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCA</td>
<td>Orientalia Christiana Analecta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP</td>
<td><em>Orientalia Christiana Periodica</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>Old Testament (Hebrew Bible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Православная Энциклопедия (Moscow, 2000- )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Πεντηκοστάριον χαρισμάτων (Rome, 1884).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNB</td>
<td>Российская Национальная Библиотека, National Library of Russia (St. Petersburg, Russia)</td>
</tr>
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<td>SC</td>
<td>Sources chrétiennes</td>
</tr>
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<td>TR</td>
<td>Τριώδιον κατανυκτικόν (Rome, 1879).</td>
</tr>
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INTRODUCTION

Οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν οίκεῖ;  
1 Cor 3:16

Πραΰτης ἀνδρὸς μνημονεύεται παρὰ Θεῷ, καὶ ἀόργητος ψυχή ναὸς γίνεται τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.  
Evagrius, Eight Thoughts 4.11

When the author of this dissertation on one occasion confided his intention to study the Byzantine rite for the dedication of churches to an elderly Orthodox bishop, he was surprised by hierarch’s open ‘confession’ that no matter how many time he himself celebrated the rite, dedicating new churches throughout the United States, the ceremony never made much sense to him. Given that the ceremony for a dedication of a new church building in most cases can be celebrated only once in a lifetime of a particular ecclesial community, as the initiation rites in the life of a Christian, every celebration of this rite may indeed pose, for both clergy and laity present, a fresh encounter with the exquisite array of scriptural texts, prayers and liturgical actions that together comprise this ritual, “so extraordinarily complicated in its symbolism and sacred ‘materialism’. ”1 One could surmise that it is this extraordinary complexity and rarity of the celebration that often stands in the way of clearly perceiving theological and ecclesiological significance of this elaborate ceremony aimed, ultimately, at the preparation of a church

building and its constituent elements – walls, sanctuary space and its furniture – for liturgical use. How, indeed, could such ritual, the purpose of which hinges upon the delimitation of “sacred space” from the territory non-consecrated and “profane,” not stand in contradiction with the thrust of all-too-familiar evangelical and Pauline passages that locate the true “temple of God” within the body of “man Christ Jesus” and the ecclesial community of Christians (John 2:21; 1 Cor 3:16, 6:19-20)? “The Most High does not dwell in houses made with hands,” as Stephen famously states in his speech in Acts (7:48). For Alexander Schmemann, one of the most important Orthodox liturgical theologians of the twentieth century, Stephen’s phrase represents the Weltanschauung of early Christianity that, as an outcome of the Peace of Constantine, gives way to a new, “mysteriological” piety which emphasized the delimitation of the sacred and profane to the detriment of “eschatological” attitude. The perception of an ecclesiastical building as “a sanctified building or sanctuary” was, for Schmemann, one instance of this change in the Christian church’s self-perception. ² Could one thus see the gradual development of the rites for consecration and dedication of a “liturgical space” as a parasitic development of an aspect of the Christian church’s teaching and practice which is external and non-essential to its eschatological self-understanding?³ Through the study of the sources that trace the origins and initial development of the Byzantine rite for the dedication of churches, I hope to show that it is necessary to take into account certain essential aspects of the church’s self-understanding that necessitated the development of a liturgical, ritual

² Ibid., 114 and generally, 110-131.

³ Schmemann’s allusion to the Byzantine rite for the dedication of a church in ibid., 114, could allow one to surmise that his answer to this question could be in the affirmative.
expression of an inherent ecclesiological concept: the transition and appropriation of the scriptural “holy place,” the Temple, refracted through the economy of Christ.

Since the beginning of the fourth century, historical record attests that, as a consequence of the Peace of Constantine, the inaugurations of buildings for the liturgical needs of Christian communities became significant public events, “dedication feasts and consecrations”, notable for the solemn assembly and ceremony – indeed, a “desirable and longed-for spectacle” for recently persecuted ecclesiastical communities.4 The witness of church historians, from Eusebius to Socrates, Sozomen, John Malalas, and others leave no doubt that, beginning with the fourth century, consecrations and dedications of churches remained a focus of many ecclesiastical celebrations also for subsequent generations of Christians. Likewise, the survival of annual feasts commemorating the encaeniae of specific churches in the liturgical calendar of Constantinople,5 as well as in the current Byzantine rite calendar,6 points to the lasting significance of the liturgical rites of dedication which originated in the urban fabric of religious and social life in Byzantium.7 Such an importance of dedication rites for the early and Byzantine liturgy


5 The 10th century Typicon of the Great Church, i.e. of Hagia Sophia, includes annual commemorations for the dedication of the following churches: Theotokos at Blachernae (July 30), Theotokos at Chalkoprateia (December 18) and Hagia Sophia itself (December 24) – ed. Juan Mateos, Le Typicon de la Grande Eglise: Ms. Sainte-Croix no. 40, Xe siècle. OCA 165 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalum Studiorum, 1962), 1:138, 144, 354.

6 Contemporary Byzantine rite liturgical calendar includes the commemorations of the encaenia of the Church of Holy Anastasis in Jerusalem (September 13) and of the encaenia of the church of St. George in Lydda (November 3).

7 Noting the characteristics of Byzantine urban organization differentiating it from Late Antique polis, Gilbert Dagron points out that “dans le meme temps où la ville est devenue un espace banalisé et indifférencié, elle retrouve une topographie sacrée, celle de ses reliques, et un temps sacré, celui de la liturgie et des commémorations, qui trace dans le tissu urban des itinéraires processionels” (“Le christianisme dans la ville byzantine,” Dumbarton Oaks Papers 31 [1977]: 23-24).
warrants a careful and systematic examination of the surviving evidence shedding light on the liturgical ritual which was at the center of these celebrations.

In order to assist the reader’s journey through a complex history of a liturgical evolution of this ritual, I propose, first of all, to offer in this introduction the overview of the present state of this rite among different churches that adhere to the Byzantine liturgical tradition, the tradition originated in the imperial city of Constantinople but evolved into the “Byzantine liturgical synthesis” over the course of early and middle Byzantine period (6th-13th centuries). In the conclusion of this introduction, I will provide an overview of the most important studies of this rite, as well as of the dedication rites of other Eastern Christian traditions, and will delineate the methodology and specific goals of our study.

The Current State of the Rite: Received Text of ‘Greek’ and ‘Slavic’ Traditions

The textus receptus of Byzantine ritual for the dedication of churches, as it was preserved in Greek and in Russo-Slavic traditions, the two major branches of the Byzantine liturgical tradition today, represents a unique conglomeration of scriptural texts, prayers and ritual acts. The Byzantine rite of dedication, as already seen in its earliest complete text – the eighth century euchologion from Southern Italy preserved in codex Barberini gr. 336 – actually consists of two major structural units, highlighting different aspects of consecrating a liturgical space:

1. consecration of an altar and the church building;

---

8 The term “Byzantine rite,” as used in this dissertation, refers to “the liturgical system that developed in the Orthodox Patriarchate of Constantinople and was gradually adopted, in the Middle Ages, by the other Chalcedonian Orthodox Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem… [t]he Byzantine synthesis [is] by far the most widespread Eastern Christian liturgical heritage…” (Robert F. Taft, The Byzantine Rite: A Short History [American Essays in Liturgy; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992], 16).
2. opening of doors and deposition of relics.

It is essential for the purpose of our study that this underlying structure is kept in mind. In addition to these rites, contemporary liturgical books also feature the order – rubrics and hymnography – for the divine office (ἀγρυπνία/vigil) to be celebrated on the eve of the dedication of a church, which will not be studied in detail in this work.9

The Greek and Slavic archieratika, in their contemporary form, diverge with respect to the precise order in which these structural elements are arranged. The recension of the Byzantine rite of dedication, employed today by the churches dependent on the usage of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the Greek Patriarchates of the Eastern Mediterranean, first appears in the 1703 Bucharest publication,10 and continues to be further reprinted in the editions of the dedication rites, either in the ritual anthologies such as the “Great Euchologion,”11 or as a separate volume.12 The rubrics for this particular version of the dedication rites was also included into the so-called “Typicon of the Great Church,” a 19th century Constantinopolitan redaction of the Typicon of St Sabas, edited by Constantine the Protopsaltes (1838) and Georgios Violakis (1888).13 As

9 Specifically, the hymns and Old Testament readings for vespers (Ps 140, aposticha, apolytikion) and matins (poetic kathismata, eight-ode canon and hymns for Pss 148-150). The comparison shows that the hymnography for the dedication of a church in the Byzantine rite has been taken from the Menaion, specifically – from the hymnography for the feast of the Dedication of Holy Anastasis in Jerusalem on September 13; see Μηναία τοῦ ὅλου ἐνιαυτοῦ (Rome, 1888), 1.134-152, where, however, this hymnography is intermingled with the proper hymns for the forefeast of the Exaltation of the Cross.

10 [ed.] hierom. Anthimos, Ἐρμηνεία καὶ ἀκολουθία εἰς ἐγκαίνια ναοῦ (Bucharest, 1703), 10r-25v.

11 Εὐχολόγιον τὸ μέγα (Constantinople, 1803), 200-203 (specifically referencing the Bucharest edition on p. 200); ed. Spyridonos Zerbos, Εὐχολόγιον τὸ μέγα (Venice: Foinix, 1891), 305ff.

12 See, most recently, Ἀκολουθία καὶ τάξις εἰς ἐγκαίνια ναοῦ (Athens: Apostolike Diakonia, 2007).

13 Τύπικον τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας ἡμῶν καθ’ ὅλα (Athens: Bas.D. Saliberos, [1900]), 409-418; see also A. Lukashevich, “Βιολάκις Τύπικο,” PE 8.527-528.
featured in contemporary liturgical books, the Greek recension of the ritual celebrated for the dedication and consecration of a church includes the following structural elements:\(^{14}\): 

1. **Vespers** on the eve of the dedication, prior to which the bishop transfers the relics of a saint (in the form of three particles on a paten) into one of the neighbouring churches.

2. **Matins/orthros** on the day of dedication, at the end of which (during the Praises psalms), the bishop recites, kneeling, the two prayers of dedication by patriarch Kallistos I of Constantinople (d. 1363).\(^{15}\)

3. **Procession and deposition of relics:**
   a. the bishop arrives in the church where the relics are deposited;
   b. Ps 142\(^{16}\), small synapte and two prayers: Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ πιστὸς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου, and Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, πρεσβείαις τῆς ἁγίας δεσποίνης.
   c. the bishop orders the eucharist to be celebrated in the church where the relics were deposited, while himself with clergy and people proceed to the church to be dedicated, carrying the relics; the procession is accompanied with hymnody;
   d. after the procession reaches the outer doors of the new church, it goes around the church and after it arrives before the doors, the readings are performed (Heb 2:11-18; Matt 16:13-19);
   e. the procession goes around the church, while the hymns (3\(^{rd}\) ode of the matins canon for the dedication) are sung; when the procession arrives again before the doors of the church, another canon of readings is performed (Heb 9:1-7; Lk 10:38-42, 11:27-28);
   f. during the third circumambulation, the 6\(^{th}\) ode of the matins canon is sung; when the procession reaches again the main doors of the church,

\(^{14}\) Cited after Ἀκολουθία καὶ τάξις εἰς ἐγκαίνια ναοῦ, 13-64, see also the summary on p. 8-12.

\(^{15}\) ODB 2.1095.

\(^{16}\) Here and further in this dissertation, the Psalms will be cited in accordance with the Septuagint (LXX) numbering, unless specified otherwise.
the bishop gives an exclamation, a troparion is sung, and the prayer Ὅ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν is said, followed by the entrance prayer from the order of CHR and BAS;

g. Ps 23:7 (“Lift up your gates, princes”) is chanted three times, antiphonally, after which the procession enters; the relics are placed into a depository and the chrism is poured over these. The reliquary is sealed and inserted into the “crown of the hole in the pillar of the holy altar, called φυτόν.”

h. Two prayers follow: for the deposition of relics (Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ καὶ ταύτην τὴν δόξαν) and another one, for the installation of the altar (Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ σωτήρ ἡμῶν ὁ πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος).

4. Installation of the altar:
   a. While the psaltists chant Pss 144 and 22, the clerics pour the wax mastic (κηρομαστίχην) upon the enclosure, and deposit the table of the altar upon the pillars; at the end, the bishop exclaims: “Blessed is our God…”.

5. Consecration of the altar and the church:
   a. The bishop is vested into a white linen sheet (σάβανον), to prevent his garments from dirt.
   b. The deacon begins the synapte, and the bishop, kneeling toward the east, recites the prayer Ὅ θεὸς ὁ ἀναρχος καὶ ἀϊδίος.
   c. The bishop applies the nitre (τὰ νῖτρα) to the altar table in a cruciform fashion; the vessels with warm water are brought, and the prayer of consecration is said (Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ ἀγιάς τα ῥεῖθρα τοῦ Ἰορδάνου).
   d. The bishop pours the water upon the altar three times, saying “In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”

17 Ἀκολουθία καὶ τάξις εἰς ἐγκαίνια ναοῦ, 44.
e. The altar desk is rubbed with the nitre and wiped with the sponge, while Ps 83 is said. Here and further each recitation of a psalm concludes with the bishop’s exclamation.

f. The bishop pours the warm wine, rose water or white wine upon the altar three times chanting Ps 50:9.

g. The chrism/myron is poured upon the altar three times in a cruciform fashion, chanting “Alleluia,” and subsequently, Ps 132 while the entire altar is anointed.

h. The altar table is wiped with the antimensia (portable altar cloths), and the cloth icons of four Evangelists are placed under the garment of the altar on the four corners.

i. The undergarment (κατασάρκιον) is put on the altar with the strings tied underneath. Ps 131 is chanted. Thereafter, after the bishop washed his hands, the outer garment is put on the altar, while Ps 92 is said.

j. The bishop censes the entire sanctuary and the church, while saying Ps 25.

k. After the censing, the bishop chrismates the church building, drawing the monogram of Christ on the pillars and walls of the nave.

l. Small synapte by the deacon, two prayers by the bishop: 1) Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς ποιητής; 2) prayer of inclination Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν.

m. Deacon proclaims, “Let us depart in peace.”

6. Liturgy of the Word and final rites:


   b. The bishop lights the new candle.

   c. The hymns to the patron saint and to the dedication are chanted, followed by the ektene and dismissal.

7. Eucharist:

   a. Special antiphons are taken from Pss 83, 64, and (again) 83.
b. The epistle and gospel readings are chosen appropriate to the day or feast.\textsuperscript{18}


d. Liturgy should be celebrated upon the new altar for seven subsequent days.\textsuperscript{19}

This quite complicated ceremony evidently incorporates within the texture of a single rite several overlapping rituals: the deposition of relics, installation of an altar, consecration of an altar and the church by washing with water/wine and by anointing with chrism, consecration of the church by the chrismation of the walls, and the eucharistic liturgy. The sequence of ritual actions which constitute the ceremonial (deposition of relics, followed by the consecration of an altar) appears to derive from practical concerns: since the relics are deposited into the top of the central pillar supporting the altar, the rite of depositio must precede the assembly of the altar itself, followed by its purification and chrismation. However, the current structure of the “received” rite is not free from inconsistencies, one of which concerns the presence of two “liturgies of the Word” at the end of the rite: one at the conclusion of the rite for the consecration of the altar, and another – in the course of the regular ordo of the divine liturgy. An odd choice of “antiphons” for the enarxis rites of the liturgy (first and third antiphons being taken from the same psalm), clearly identifies the enarxis as a later addition to the rite. Second, would it not seem that the deposition of relics be sufficient for the sanctification of this central liturgical object? In this scheme, the elaborate ceremony of consecrating the altar (as if unconsecrated) appears to be redundant, as the relics, a holy object \textit{par excellence}, were by that point already chrismated and sealed

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 64.

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
inside the table. Further comparison with the rite of church dedication as it is practiced by the Byzantine-rite churches of the Slavic tradition shows that such redundancy in the “Greek” recension of this rite is nothing but a result of post-17th century reworking of the ceremony.

The “Slavic” recension of the dedication rites is usually found in various editions of a Chinovnik, a Slavic version of archieratikon, containing the rubrics for the hierarchal celebration of the liturgy, as well as various blessings, ordination rites, and the rites of church dedication.20 In contrast to the “Greek” recension of the Byzantine dedication rite, the order of the divine office (služba) with the special hymnography for the occasion of the dedication of a church is not incorporated into the structure of the dedication ceremonial, but is still included in the editions of Great Trebnik (Ritual).21 The two later prayers attributed to patriarch Kallistos I, placed at the end of orthros in the “Greek” redaction of the rite, are also printed separately, as prayers of preparation for the bishop before the celebration of the rite.22 The “Slavic” redaction of the rite features largely the same elements as in the “Greek” redaction, but arranged in a markedly different order23:

20 See Чиновник архиерейского совершения (Moscow: Moscow Patriarchate, 1983), 2.134-174; also a more recent edition in Освящение храма: Сборник (Moscow: Publications Committee of the Russian Orthodox Church, 2006); on Russian cathedral ěnovniks, see A. Golubtsov, Соборные чиновники и особенности службы по ним (Moscow, 1907), and on the historical origins of the Russian hierarchal ceremonial, most recently, Vassa Larin, The Byzantine Hierarchal Divine Liturgy in Arsenij Suxanov’s Proskinitarij, OCA 286 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2010).

21 Zheltov, “Kommentarii,” in Освящение храма, 384; see the edition of the hymnography on the basis of two 17th century mss., Kieф Sofia 648 (68) and Kieф Sofia 647 in Vasily Prilutsky, Частное богослужение в Русской Церкви в XVI и первой половине XVII в. (Kiev: Petr Barsky, 1912; reprint Moscow: Krutitsy Patriarchal Metochion, 2000), appendix I.

22 See Освящение храма, 54-57, although the first of these prayers is also found after the deposition of relics in the “Slavic” redaction of the rite (Činovnik, 168-172).

23 Činovnik, 134-174; Освящение храма, 58-103 and the commentary, 358-380.
1. Installation of the altar:
   a. Arrival and vesting of the bishop in usual liturgical garments, with the addition of a special robe/apron to prevent the vestments from soiling.
   b. The bishop sprinkles with holy water the pillars of the altar, the boiling wax mastic, and pours the latter upon the pillars. The prayer is read (“Lord God our Saviour, who makes and provides all”).
   c. The bishop sprinkles the tablet of the altar with holy water, and the latter is deposited upon the pillars, while Ps 144 and 22 is chanted. Here and further each recitation of a psalm concludes with the bishop’s exclamation.
   d. A senior presbyter (cathedral dean) brings four nails which are sprinkled with holy water and then driven with four stones into the altar table.

2. Consecration of the altar and the church:
   a. The holy doors (of the iconostasis) are open, and the bishop exits the altar and reads the prayer “God without beginning and eternal,” kneeling.
   b. The bishop enters the altar, the holy doors are closed and the protodeacon says the rest of the great synapte inside.
   c. The vessel with warm water, red wine and the rose water is brought, and the bishop recites the prayer of blessing of waters “Lord our God who sanctified the streams of Jordan” over these.
   d. The bishop pours the water upon the altar three times with the formula “In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Amen.” The wine and rose water are mixed in one vessel.
   e. The altar is wiped with linen cloths, while Ps 83 is chanted.
   f. The bishop pours the wine/rose water mixture upon the altar three times and sprinkes the antimensia with the same, while Ps 50:9 (and the rest) is said. The altar table is wiped with sponges.
   g. The bishop anoints the altar with chrism three times, using the brush, while “Alleluia” is chanted. The same sign is made upon the antimensia and the pillars of the table, while Ps 132 is said.
h. The altar is vested into the undergarment (sprinkled with holy water beforehand), which is tied with a rope around the altar, and Ps 131 is said.

i. The upper garment is sprinked with water, the altar is clothed, and the *antimension*, Gospel book and the cross are placed on top. Ps 92 is chanted.

j. The senior presbyter blesses with holy water the žertvennik (the table where the rite of *prothesis* is performed), vests it, and places the liturgical vessels upon it.

k. The doors of the iconostasis are opened, and the bishop incenses the altar table, the table of *prothesis*, the sanctuary, and the entire church from inside, while Ps 25 is chanted.

l. While the bishop censes, two archimandrites or presbyters follow him: one sprinkes the walls of the nave with the holy water, while another anoints the walls with chrism. The censing and anointing ends with the bishop’s doxology.

m. Small synapte from the deacon, and two prayers: “Lord of heaven and earth” and the prayer of inclination “We thank you, Lord God of powers”.

n. The bishop lights the new candle or lamp.

o. The clergy prepares for the procession, and when the bishop proclaims “Let us depart in peace” all exit the altar.

3. Procession and deposition of relics:

a. The procession goes to another church where the relics of the martyrs were placed beforehand or to the place where the relics are placed, if these are already in the dedicated church. The hymns to the martyrs are sung.

b. Having arrived in another church, the small synapte is said and the Trisagion is sung. The bishop says the prayer “Lord our God who are faithful in your words” and the prayer of inclination. The relics on a paten are incensed, and the bishop carries these, with procession to the dedicated church – or, if there is no such option, outside and around the dedicated church. Meanwhile the hymns of dedication are sung.
c. When the procession reaches the temple, it goes around it, and one of the presbyters sprinkles the walls with holy water.

d. When the procession arrives before the outer doors of the temple, the bishop says an exclamation, and Ps 23:7 is chanted twice, antiphonally between the bishop and the choir inside the church. The relics are incensed.

e. The bishop recites the prayer “God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ who are blessed forever” and, as a prayer of inclination, the entrance prayer of CHR and BAS. The bishop and the chanters sing antiphonally Ps 23:7 for the third time, and the procession enters.

f. The bishop enters the sanctuary, incenses the relics, places three particles of relics into the reliquary, anoints these with chrism and seals the box with wax and mastic. The senior presbyter deposits the relics under the altar inside the middle pillar. Thereafter, the bishop inserts the particles of relics into the antimensia.

g. The prayer of deposition “Lord our God who granted even this glory”, and as a kneeling prayer, that of patriarch Kallistos I “Lord our God who fashioned your creation with one word.”

h. Ektene by the deacon; the bishop ascends the “bishop’s ambo” in the middle of the church, blesses the people with the cross. Dismissal follows and Many years to the bishop.

4. Eucharist:

a. The offices of the third and sixth hours precede the liturgy.24

b. Two epistle and gospel readings: for the dedication (Heb 9:1-7; John 10:22-28) and for the saint or feast of the temple.

Evidently, the “Slavic” redaction offers a different arrangement of the structural units composing the ceremonial for the consecration of a church which, as we shall see in this

24 “After the singing of Many years [to the bishop], they begin the hours” (Činovnik, 174), although, as Zheltov notes, the current practice foresees the reading of the hours prior to the beginning of the entire rite of dedication (Освящение храма, 365). This is consistent with the rearrangement of the rite in the received text of the “Slavic” redaction, when the rite begins with the ceremonial of bishop’s entrance and greeting, as before any hierarchal liturgy.
dissertation, is more consistent with the recensions known from the Byzantine liturgical sources from the eighth century onward (specifically, Barberini gr. 336 and Coislin 213). The study of the latter will constitute a significant part of this dissertation – meanwhile, a few characteristic features of the current redaction of the “Slavic” rite need to be noted. In the Russo-Slavic redaction, the rite also begins by the bishop’s entrance into the altar, but instead of depositing the relics, the clergy install the altar in its place for the rite of the consecration that follows. A significant difference between two redactions of the dedication rite concerns the placement of relics into the altar: while the “Greek” redaction prescribes to deposit the saints’ remains into the top of the central column (which is subsequently covered with the altar tablet), the “Russian” redaction provides for the deposition into the reliquary under the central column/pillar of the altar.\(^\text{25}\) Practical considerations may explain such a digression, since by the time the deposition of relics take place, the altar tablet should already be fixed upon the pillars. Another peculiarity of the “Russian” recension involves the use of nails at the affixing the top of the altar to the base, which presupposes the use of an altar made of wood, rather than stone – indeed, the current custom of the Russian Church.\(^\text{26}\) The copious use of holy water throughout the ritual, where it is applied to practically every material object before its use in the

\(^{25}\) “[A]nd that the altar table should be on four pillars, with the fifth pillar in the middle, with the box, and the box should be in the middle underneath the altar, with the height to be 0,5 arshin’s [= 14’’]” (Činovnik, 134).

\(^{26}\) Освящение храма, 357; Prilutsky observes that in the case that the top of the altar is attached to the pillar(s) with nails, the pouring of the wax-mastic upon the pillars can have only “some symbolic meaning” (Častnoe bogosluženie, 23 n. 2). Notably, the 17th century Ukrainian redaction of the dedication rites makes a clear distinction between the construction of wooden and stone altars – in the latter case, the wax mastic was not used, but just the nails (ibid., 48); thus it is apparent that the use of the gluing substance (wax mastic) was a detail borrowed from the rite of the installation of stone altars, without any practical significance whatsoever.
ceremony (wax mastic, altar table, altar vestments, church walls etc.), constitutes yet another characteristic feature of the “Russian” usage.\textsuperscript{27}

The rite for the dedication of churches, as attested in the received liturgical books of the Ruthenian tradition (Eastern Catholic and Orthodox),\textsuperscript{28} can be considered an offshoot of the “Russian” redaction of the rite or an independent Slavic redaction of the dedication rites which had experienced some influence of the Western ritual of church dedication.\textsuperscript{29} While the structure of the dedication ceremonial is consistent with the Slavic (and ancient Byzantine) recension that placed the deposition of relics after the consecration of the altar, the “Ruthenian” redaction contains several highly idiosyncratic features which deserve to be noted here:

1. the altar table is put together prior to the beginning of the ceremony – so, instead of the installation of an altar, the initial rites consist of depositing the \textit{antimension}, signed by the bishop, on the top of the altar table, with the same prayer, and with the censing the altar around\textsuperscript{30};

2. the water, wine, and rose water are blessed together, and the altar is washed by each of these substances and rubbed with soap; the application of \textit{each} element (water, wine, rose water) is accompanied with the baptismal formula, Ps 83 and Ps 50:11 – thus, these formulae are repeated three times;

\textsuperscript{27} Significantly, the holy water is first applied to liturgical objects well before the blessing of the holy water for the purification of the altar – hence, in all the cases excluding the washing of the altar before its anointing, the bishop uses the water sanctified beforehand, probably in the course of the blessing of waters on the day of Theophany.

\textsuperscript{28} Specifically I refer to the archieratikon edited by Aleksandr Bachin’skiy, Служебник святителский содержащ в себе по чину Святых Восточныя Церкве Литургию святительскую и прочия обряды святителем прислушающия (L’viv, 1886; online publication at the website of the “Ukrainian Liturgical Center”, \url{http://www.liturgia.org.ua/}, accessed March 2011), 55-78.

\textsuperscript{29} For the overview of two redactions of the rite of church dedication in use in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century Ukraine, see Prilutsky, Častnoe bogosluženie, 45-63 and appendix I. The second redaction published by Prilutsky on the basis of two 17\textsuperscript{th} cent. archieratika, exhibits marks of significant influence of the Latin rite.

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 57.
3. After the altar is washed, the bishop sprinkles with holy water the walls of the church inside and outside, with Ps 50:9-10 being read; the aspersion is followed by the anointing of the altar and of the entire church, which concludes with bishop washing his hands;31

4. The prayer “Lord of heaven and earth” is read as a kneeling prayer;

5. No procession to another church is prescribed – the relics are presumed to be located already within the dedicated church; the procession exits the nave and goes around the church three times: twice counterclockwise, and once clockwise; every time the procession reaches the doors of the church, the dialogue with Ps 23:7 takes place;32

6. The prayers “God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ” and the liturgical prayer of the entrance are said after the bishop enters the church and deposits the relics upon the altar;

7. The relics are inserted into an enclosure in the altar tablet itself, sealed with wax mastic, a wooden cork and a metal lid; at this time the icons of Evangelists are also sealed on four corners of the altar table;

8. Only then the altar is clothed and the antimension is placed on the top of the upper cover, but under the eileton (akin to Latin corporal);33

9. The service ends with three prayers for the deposition of martyrs’ relics, and with the dismissal. The divine liturgy follows immediately, with the readings from Heb 3:1-4 and Matthew 16:13-18.34

The comparison with the “Greek” and “Russian” redactions of the Byzantine dedication rite shows that the “Ruthenian” version of the same ritual preserves all the structural components present in first two recensions, but with the addition of certain elements,31

---

31 Ibid., 63-64.

32 Ibid., 69-70.

33 Ibid., 74; one of the earlier, 17th century redactions of the Byzantine rite, preserved in two Slavic mss. from Ukraine, allows for the deposition of the antimension on the top of eileton, just as in the received Russian ritual, but in this case, the antimension was attached to the altar covering (Prilutsky, 52).

34 Ibid., 77.
probably acquired from the Latin rite (e.g. the aspersion of the outside walls), and some
reshuffling of ritual actions for practical considerations. The variations between the
redactions of the rite currently in use among the traditions of the Byzantine rite amount to
the divergence of local usages which became codified and crystallized in the process of
their transition into the printed liturgical books.\textsuperscript{35} These differences aside, the Byzantine
rite for the consecration of a church in its received form invariably consists of several
major units or “rituals” in their own right: 1) installation and consecration of an altar; 2)
procession and deposition of relics, and 3) divine liturgy. In the following discussion of
the origins of the Byzantine rite for church dedication in Late Antique and early to
middle Byzantine period, the knowledge of this structure and the differentiation among
its components will be presumed.\textsuperscript{36}

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{35} Attempts to appropriate this complex rite, through some rearrangement of structural units
comprising it, extend even into the contemporary period, as evidenced by a version of the rite currently in
use in the churches of the Orthodox Church in America (a successor of the pre-1917 North American
diocese of the Orthodox Russian Church): here, the unit including the procession and deposition of relics is
inserted into the middle of the rite for the consecration of the altar, following the washing of the table, but
preceding the chrismation thereof. The relics are then brought in with usual procession, and inserted into
the top of the central column of the altar table, being first anointed with chrism and sealed with wax. The
anointing of the altar and the rest of the \textit{kathierôsis} rite follow. The logistics of the rite – the need to have
the table unclothed for the insertion of the relics – make this redaction similar to Greek and Ruthenian
recensions (each offering a different solution to this liturgical logistics issue), but the solution offered in the
OCA usage completely subverts the structure, inner logic, and historical order of the rite in the interests of
practical convenience. Notably, the OCA redaction of the \textit{Trebnik} (Ritual) includes both the traditional
order and the order reflecting the actual usage in America (which was “changed in significant ways” as the
note reads), leaving to a bishop’s discretion which order to use. See \textit{The Great Book of Needs Expanded
and Supplemented. Vol. 2: The Sanctification of the Temple and other Ecclesiastical and Liturgical
Blessings} (South Canaan, PA: St Tikhon’s Seminary Press, 2000), 55-88 (traditional Russian order), 89-
118 (“[another] order”), also note on p. 55. The author himself was present at the consecration of a church
where the second order was used, as seen from the booklet used for that ceremony: \textit{The Order of the
Consecration of the Cathedral of Saint Seraphim of Sarov, Dallas, Texas, April 21, 2001} (n.p., n.d.), 12-17.
(I am also grateful to Subdn. Vladimir Grigorenko and Rev. John Parker who clarified to me the
peculiarities of the current OCA usage.)

\textsuperscript{36} For the sake of brevity, throughout this dissertation I will refer to the first “ritual” as \textit{kathierôsis}
and to the latter as \textit{encaenia}, consistently with the designation of these rites in the manuscript sources.
Previous Studies: Status Quaestionis

In the course of the last century, liturgical scholarship has made some significant contributions in the study of the Western rites of church dedication. This contribution can be attested to through the works of such scholars as Dionys Stiefenhofer, Pierre de Puniet, Antoine Chavasse, Michel Andrieu, Brian Repsher, Torsten-Christian Forneck, and others. In 1924, Joseph Braun produced a monumental, and still unsurpassed, study of the historical development of the Christian altar, which included the survey of the sources pertaining to the consecration of an altar in Late Antiquity and


True to its scope, the study also referenced various medieval and contemporary sources for the rite of altar consecration in the Christian East, but merely, it seems, for comparative purposes. Despite significant progress in the study of Western rites of church dedication (including the dedication of an altar), a similarly thorough and systematic study of the corresponding rites in the Eastern liturgical traditions so far has not been produced. Some studies of the scholars of Western liturgy indeed feature occasional recourses to the Byzantine evidence for comparison with Western sources, but, taken out of their own historical and liturgical context and the process of evolution, such works can hardly elucidate proper origins and evolution of the Byzantine rite of dedication. At the same time, there have emerged important studies in related fields, dealing with the evolution of ecclesiastical architecture in the East in Late Antiquity, the emergence of a basilica as the architectural framework of Christian liturgy, and the development of the Byzantine architecture per se. However, the

46 Ibid., 1:746-750.
development of the liturgical rite that would serve to transform such a building into liturgical space was not addressed in much detail in these studies.

Some important contributions to the study of the urban setting of early dedication liturgies originated among the studies concerned with the early liturgy of Jerusalem, the hagios polis, the sites of pilgrimage and devotion in the Holy Land and also with the festival of encaenia in the Palestinian liturgical calendar. The discussion regarding the calendrical aspects of the encaenia festival was initiated in the 1954 essay by Matthew Black who indicated a possible connection between the encaenia festival in Jerusalem, attested by Egeria, and the liturgical season of Consecration of the Church in the East Syriac calendars. A more extensive and detailed study of the encaenia celebration in Palestine, as attested by Egeria, Armenian and Georgian lectionaries and the orations of Eusebius of Caesarea was undertaken by Michael A. Fraser in his dissertation completed in 1995. Another contribution of Fraser, relevant to the subject of this study, proposed a possible connection between the hagiopolite festival of encaenia and the later rites of consecration and dedication of churches, thus offering a new perspective upon a possible genesis of these rites.


One of the first attempts at comparative liturgical analysis of Eastern rites of dedication was provided in the essay by René Coquin, which undertook a liturgio-historical comparison of the Coptic, West Syriac and Byzantine rites for consecration of the church and the altar.\textsuperscript{55} On the basis of his comparative analysis, Coquin argued for the Syriac origin of the Coptic dedication rite, with some elements taken over from the respective Byzantine ritual at a later stage.\textsuperscript{56} The author also noted a change in the order of anointing from earlier to later sources, and argued for the late provenance of the anointing of the altar table, as opposed to the anointing of the church building.\textsuperscript{57} Another contribution to the comparative liturgical analysis of the dedication rites came from the study of the Armenian rite of church dedication by Michael Daniel Findikyan.\textsuperscript{58} Making note of significant parallels between the Armenian dedication ritual and the corresponding Byzantine rite, Findikyan suggests the existence of a “simple ancestor of the Greek church ceremony of Καθήρωσις in Barberini 336,” translated in the fifth century, as the earliest layer of the Armenian rite, later embellished with the elaborate ceremonies surrounding the altar table in the eighth-tenth centuries.\textsuperscript{59} The significance of Findikyan’s work lies in his proposition of a common source for the earliest shape of the Armenian dedication ritual and for the Byzantine rite of Καθήρωσις. The tantalizing absence of the ceremony corresponding to the Byzantine rite of encaenia (specifically, 

\textsuperscript{55} “La consécration des églises dans le rite copte: ses relations avec les rites syrien et byzantin,” \textit{L’Orient Syrien} 9 (1964): 149- 187.

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 171-172.

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 169- 172.

\textsuperscript{58} “The Armenian Ritual of the Dedication of a Church: A Textual and Comparative Analysis of Three Early Sources,” \textit{OCP} 64 (1998): 75- 121.

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 118-119.
the deposition of relics) in the Armenian dedication rite, also noted by the author,\textsuperscript{60} could open the discussion regarding the origin and the dating of the deposition of relics as a fixed part of the Byzantine dedication ritual. In addition to Fidikyan’s work, the rites of the consecration of altar and deposition of relics in Syriac, Armenian and Coptic traditions were compared and analyzed by Lizette Larson-Miller, who employed the fifth-tenth century sources from these traditions to illuminate the question regarding the “spatial relationship between the altar and the placement of martyr relics.”\textsuperscript{61} Finally, the study of the sources for the liturgical rites of Nubian churches, produced by Heinzgerd Brakmann, includes a survey of the sources for the dedication rites in this remote land, and suggests possible connections with the Christian rites of dedication elsewhere in the Eastern Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{62}

In the beginning of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, the study of the Byzantine rite of church dedication was limited by a necessity to make available, through publication, the basic original sources (\textit{euchologia}) which was brilliantly (for that period) achieved by Aleksey Dmitrievsky.\textsuperscript{63} The initial task that stood before the liturgical scholars in the East and West consisted in providing, describing accurately, and analysing the existing practice of

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., 113-114.


\textsuperscript{63} Описание литургических рукописей хранящихся в библиотеках Православного Востока, vol. 2: Εὐχολόγια (Kiev, 1910).
the Byzantine rite churches as far as the consecration of the altar and the church building was concerned – the task accomplished by Vasily Prilutsky with respect to the late medieval and modern Russian practice\textsuperscript{64} and by Placide de Meester in the larger historical context.\textsuperscript{65} The actual comparative liturgical work, however, began with an article by Chrysostomos Konstantinidis who attempted to bring together the evidence provided in our earliest Byzantine liturgical text for the rite of dedication (ms. Barberini gr. 336) with the data of Syriac canonical sources, the liturgical commentary of Germanus, archbishop of Constantinople in 715-730, and the famous canon 7 of the Second council of Nicaea stipulating the use of relics in the ceremony of church dedication.\textsuperscript{66} The author argued for the deposition of the saints’ relics as the principal element of the dedication liturgy in all of these sources and proposed the crucial role of patriarch Germanus himself as a possible redactor of the Byzantine ritual.\textsuperscript{67} Needless to say, Konstantinides’ bold and intriguing suggestions were based on a limited selection of sources and need to be reviewed and reexamined as we proceed to bring into foreground of our research the available evidence for these rites from the other Eastern traditions.

The invaluable contribution of many scholars of later generations brought to the scholarly attention the texts of many other sources pertaining to the history of Byzantine dedication rites. Thus, the work of Panagiotis Trempelas provided a critical edition of the Byzantine rite of dedication, based on a number of twelfth- sixteenth century Greek

\textsuperscript{64} Častnoe bogoslужение, 1-123.

\textsuperscript{65} Rituale-Benedizionale bizantino, Liturgia bizantina 2.6 (Rome: Tip. Leonina, 1930), 149-244.


\textsuperscript{67} Ibid., 210, 215.
manuscripts from the National Library in Athens. Likewise, Kosmas Georgiou made available the text of the Byzantine rite of dedication according to two Grottaferrata manuscripts which were at this time attributed to the eleventh century, while in his recent work, Gregorios Ioannides studied the Byzantine rites of church dedication and related rites (foundation of a church, consecration of an antimension) as it appeared in the medieval Greek manuscripts from Cyprus, thus shedding light upon idiosyncratic features of the Cypriote liturgical practice. The importance of Ioannides’ work consists in his study of the ms. Barberini gr. 390, a 16th century euchologion from Cyprus, which served as a source for some rites published in the renowned euchological compilation of Jacques Goar.

A definite step forward from publication of the sources to the interpretation thereof was accomplished by Vincenzo Ruggieri in his commentary on the earliest euchologion text of the Byzantine rites of dedication in ms. Barberini gr. 336. Ruggieri gives special attention to the use and meaning of specific terms used in the liturgical text.

---


καθιέρωσις, ἐγκαίνια, τράπεζα, θυσιαστήριον et al.) and puts the rite into a broader liturgical, historical and art historical context, also pointing out the similarities between certain liturgical actions performed at the dedication of a church (washings, anointing) and corresponding actions of the initiation liturgy – a feature also noted by Trempelas, Ioannides and Mikhail Zheltov. A major breakthrough in the interpretation of the Byzantine dedication rite, especially of the rite of consecration of the altar and church building, came through the essay of Marie-France Auzépy who addressed the question of the genesis of the rite, situating it in the theological and liturgical context of the iconoclast controversy of 8th-9th centuries. The author suggests that it is precisely this connection between the iconoclast theology concerning the liturgical space that would allow setting the dating for the ceremony of καθιέρωσις at the middle, rather than at the beginning, of the 8th century. The recent work of the scholars mentioned above, with an addition of a an up-to-date dossier, begun by Bernard Botte and completed by Heinzgerd Brakmann, remains, to the best of my knowledge, the only attempts at a

73 Ibid., 99-106.

74 “Комментарии” in Освящение храма, 352; see also idem, “Православное чинопоследование освящения храма в истории,” Сборник материалов Богословской конференции Православного Свято-Тихоновского Богословского Института за 2001 год (Moscow, 2001), 88-97.


76 Ibid., 17.

77 See now also my own contribution, “Чин освящения храма в восточных традициях” [The Rite for the Consecration of a Church in Eastern Christian Traditions], in ed. Mikhail Zheltov, Православное учение о церковных Таинствах: 5-я Международная богословская конференция Русской Православной Церкви, Москва, 13-16 ноября 2007 г. (Moscow: Synodal Biblical and Theological Committee, 2009), 3.346-367. The English translation of this essay is currently being prepared for publication.
contextual study and comparative liturgio-historical analysis of the origins and development of the Byzantine dedication rites.

Despite some significant progress made in recent years, it appears evident from the overview above that a systematic study of this rite from the perspective of comparative liturgiology has not yet been accomplished. As a large number of primary sources, such as euchological texts, have become available through critical and diplomatic editions, the immediate task of liturgical scholarship would be to further the interpretative endeavor already initiated with the work of Ruggieri, Ioannides and Auzepy. The task would be to attempt a systematic analysis of the origins, structure and evolution of this fascinating exemplar of the living Byzantine liturgical tradition, which, far from being an intriguing relic of the past, remains, in our view, a crystallization and liturgical expression of continuing ecclesiological self-understanding of the Byzantine church. In reconstructing the origins of this rite, a wide use of the sources from the traditions which had been in dialogue with the Byzantine – especially Georgian, Armenian and Syriac (Melkite) – will enrich our understanding of the evolution and relationship amongst the historical ‘families’ of Eastern liturgical traditions.

Methodology

The methodological approach used in this study is usually identified with the term “comparative liturgiology.” Its theoretical foundations were laid and popularized by Anton Baumstark in his seminal works and further refined in the work of such scholars

---

as Hieronymus Engberding, Juan Mateos, Robert Taft, Gabriele Winkler, Paul Bradshaw and others. One of the fundamental principles of this approach maintains that historical evolution of the liturgy does not consist in the “progressive unilinear growth of entire rituals as homogenous single units,” but rather in a “distinct developments of their individual components.”80 As Taft notes poignantly, the sources unfortunately fail to relate to us their origins and development and therefore, “the only way these problems [of liturgical history] can be solved, if only hypothetically, is by sifting and analyzing, classifying and comparing, liturgical texts and units within and across the traditions.”81 This approach presupposes that the evolution of liturgical rites proceeds from diversity of local usages to the uniformity and homogeneity of a specific “rite” or liturgical “family,”82 which still remains local in its core. The importance of regional variety as one of the major factors for understanding the evolution of Byzantine liturgy is underscored by another methodological observation made by Taft, which he called the “paradox of the periphery.” This ‘law’ of liturgical development observes the ability of the “local churches of the periphery” to “hold onto older liturgical practices long after


81 “Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years,” 523.

82 Ibid., 525; idem, “Baumstark’s... Liturgy Revisited,” 198, 201.
they have been abandoned by the Mother Church." For this reason, the study of such liturgical rite as the consecration and dedication of a church cannot properly proceed without assessment of the reception of this Constantinopolitan ritual by the peripheral churches found within the span of the liturgical use of the imperial city (such as Slavic churches and those of Caucasus). A careful examination of the Armenian and Georgian sources may witness to the preservation of the practices of the church in Jerusalem, no longer extant in its original text or language.

This dissertation is a thorough examination of the origins and evolution of the Byzantine ritual for consecration and dedication of churches, from its presumed origins in the fourth-fifth century until the fixation of the rite in the Byzantine rite euchologia, primarily in the euchologion Barberini gr. 336. In assessing the text of the rite, I will be primarily concerned with the structural evolution of the rite, as reflected in the extant euchological texts, but with a special attention given to the origins of the rite in the urban liturgy of Late Antiquity. The first chapter will examine the background to the emergence of the practice of consecration/dedication of sacred, liturgical space in the Scriptures (Old and New Testament), early Christian writers, and in Greco-Roman law. The second chapter will focus on the early evidence for the rite of dedication of a church in Jerusalem and Palestine and Syria, particularly on the most consequential dedication festival – the dedication of the Holy Sepulchre complex in Jerusalem in September of 335. The third chapter deals with the dedication rites in other major urban centers of

83 Taft, “Baumstark’s... Liturgy Revisited,” 214-215.
84 See for the assessment of this problem, Charles Renoux, “Jérusalem dans le Caucase: Anton Baumstark vérifié,” in Taft and Winkler, eds. Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark, 305-321 and overviews by Brakmann and Verhelst in n. 19 above.
Eastern Mediterranean – Constantinople, Alexandria, Gaza – of which we have surviving and sufficient literary evidence. The fourth chapter, opening the second part of the dissertation, contains the analysis of the issues with text and interpretation, connected with the appearance of the first complete ritual of dedication in the euchologion Barberini gr. 336. The fifth chapter relocates the reader to the Holy City of Jerusalem and strives to present the most complete dossier concerning the rites and feasts of church dedication there, trying to use to the full extent the evidence of the hagiopolite sources in Georgian translation. The sixth and final chapter collects and analyses the evidence for the evolution of the rites for the dedication of a church and an altar in Syria and Egypt after the sixth century, concluding with a hypothesis regarding the origins of the kathierôsis in the liturgy of Constantinople. This dissertation will also incorporate two “study vignettes,” the appendices, which hopefully can trace the possibility of further expansion and continuation of this study: one excursus deals with the peculiar form of the katherôsis rite found in the twelfth century euchologion Ottoboni gr. 434 and touches upon the problem of relation between the origins of the Byzantine dedication rite and Byzantine iconoclasm. The second excursus looks into the further development of the same rite in the eleventh century Constantinopolitan euchologion Coislin 213 by looking closely at the expanded rubrics and ritual actions accompanying the installation of a new altar before the consecration of a church. The third appendix examines the local variation of the Byzantine rite for the consecration of a church in the earliest Slavic manuscript, containing this rite, the fourteenth century ms. Sofia RNB 1056.

Thus, our task of first importance, however, is to examine the evidence pertaining to the practices of church dedication in the Eastern Roman (Byzantine) empire in the
fourth to eighth centuries in order to isolate the earliest shape or structure of the rite and, thus, to shed light upon the genesis of this ritual as it appears in the liturgical manuals of the post-iconoclastic period. In approaching this task, we will consider a manifold array of sources, belonging to different genres: homiletics, hymnography, hagiography, historiographies, as the Byzantine liturgical texts of the dedication rite do not survive for this period. In dealing with texts purporting to contain liturgical information, it will be imperative for us to apply caution by not always assuming the factuality of the source’s “testimony” to an actual liturgical practice. Despite our intention to provide an insight into the history of the dedication rites in early liturgy, the constraints of space will not allow us to write a comprehensive history of the church dedication in the Eastern Christian traditions other than the Byzantine, and the evidence deriving from the Oriental liturgical traditions will be used in this dissertation only as far as it will be relevant and illuminating for the history of the Byzantine rites of church dedication. Nevertheless, the early history of the rites of church dedication, as I hope to show, must be studied contextually, with the presumption of the communication, cross-pollination, and influence between the local traditions of the major urban centers in the late antique and early medieval period.

---

85 For the methodology of reading early liturgical sources, see Bradshaw, Search for the Origins, 1-20.
In one of the earliest studies of Christian rites of church dedication in late antiquity, Dionys Stiefenhofer concluded that the solemn celebration of the eucharist constituted the major, if not the only rite pertaining to the consecration of a church in the beginning of the fourth century CE.\(^1\) Stiefenhofer bases this assumption on the extant accounts of church dedications in Tyre (315) and Jerusalem (335), as well as biblical and pagan practice of concluding the dedication of a temple with sacrifices.\(^2\) A relative dearth of the fourth century evidence pertaining to the dedication of churches, particularly in the Christian East, ensures the reiteration of this assumption in the subsequent liturgical scholarship. Thus also Panagiotis Trempelas in 1955 affirmed that for the fourth century period neither the deposition of relics, nor anointing with chrism, but rather the celebration of the eucharist was considered sufficient for the consecration of a newly-built altar.\(^3\) It remains a question, however, whether such conclusion, perhaps valid for a some localities in the Roman East, is applicable to every major Christian community, or
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1 \(\text{Die Geschichte der Kirchweihe vom 1.-7.Jahrhundert} \) (Munich: Lentner, 1909), 132.

2 Ibid., 2-11, 132.

3 “Τάξις καὶ ἀκολουθία τῶν ἐγκαινίων. Προλεγόμενα,” in idem, ed., \(\text{Μικρὸν Ἐὐχολόγιον. Ἀκολουθίαι καὶ τάξεις ἀγιασμοῦ ὑδάτων, ὄρθρου καὶ ἐσπερινοῦ κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Αθήναις ἱδία κώδικας} \) (Athens, 1955), 2.82-83.
whether one needs to consider presenting a more diverse picture of practices pertaining to the setting apart of a sacred space.

It is the purpose of this section of my dissertation to examine the wide array of textual evidence pertaining to the dedication of churches in the East of the Roman Empire from the beginning of the fourth to the beginning of the fifth centuries. In particular, I will analyze the narratives pertaining to dedications in Jerusalem and Constantinople, with special attention to the role and presence of relics in the dedication ceremonies, as far as we can reconstruct those. In the beginning, however, it seems necessary to divert our attention to the historical and literary background to the dedication rites, giving a brief overview of the dedication of temples in the Old Testament scriptures, patristic sources from the first to the third centuries and, particularly, the Graeco-Roman legal and literary sources depicting pagan practices of temple dedication in the Late Antique period.
1.1 Dedications of the Temple and Tabernacle in the Old Testament

1.1.1 Consecration of Moses’ Tabernacle.

Among the ritual regulations which fill the pages of the Pentateuch, the regulations concerning the construction and consecration of the tabernacle occupy a prominent place. The text makes clear that the building of the tabernacle, a ‘proto-Temple’, has been performed after a celestial model, revealed unto Moses on Mount Sinai, “in accordance with all that [God has shown Moses] concerning the pattern of the tabernacle (המשכן; הַבְּלֵדָה; תְּרוּםָה; תְּרוּפָה; לֵוִי; כָּבֵד; כִּנּוֹן) and of all its furniture (LXX σκευῶν)” (Ex 25:9, cf. 25:40, 26:30, 27:8). Not surprisingly, according to some modern interpreters, the narrative pertaining to the construction of the tabernacle was filled with deeper significance, as a cosmological model related to the creation narrative in Genesis.¹ In Exodus 29-30 and 40 the Lord commands Moses to consecrate the tabernacle, its furniture and the altar of burnt offering by anointing them with oil,² a command which

¹ This is the opinion of Crispin Fletcher-Louis in All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42 (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 2002), 76-77.

² “Then you shall take the anointing oil, and anoint the tabernacle and all that is in it, and consecrate it and all its furniture, so that it shall become holy. You shall also anoint the altar of burnt offering and all its utensils, and consecrate the altar, so that the altar shall be most holy” (Ex 40:9-10; cf. Ex
then is followed by the ordination of the priests of Aaronic lineage in the same manner – i.e., by anointing (Ex 29:7-9, 40:12-15). In Exodus 40, the effect of the consecratory anointing is clearly manifested through a divine epiphany: “the cloud covered the tent, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle” (40:34), which therefore becomes a unique abode of divine presence, a characteristic subsequently applied to the Temple in Jerusalem. Not only did the inner sanctum of the tabernacle become the locus of divine presence – likewise, the altar of burnt offerings upon its consecration by anointing and sacrifices becomes “most holy” and capable to effect holiness through physical contact.

The consecration of the tabernacle and its altar is further expanded with additional details in the eighth chapter of Leviticus: there, Moses sprinkles oil upon the altar seven times (8:10-11), ordains Aaron by means of the same oil (8:12) and thereafter sprinkles the altar with the sacrificial blood, using the blood to anoint the horns of the altar and pouring the remainder of the blood “at the base of the altar” (8:14-15).

1.1.2 Purification of the Tabernacle on the Day of Atonement.

The sanctuary of the tabernacle and temple occupies a central position in the rites surrounding one of the most significant days in the Jewish calendar – the autumn feast of
the Day of Atonement (יָמֵי הָעֵטְפָּה). The rituals prescribed in the Scriptures for Tishri involved fasting (“shall deny yourselves/fast” – Lev 16:29), assembly, sacrifices of two goats (for YHWH and for the Azazel) and the purification of the holy of holies by the incensation and the sprinkling of the sacrificial blood upon the central element of the sanctuary, the kapporet (הכפרת, propitiatorium, the cover of the ark), a place specifically designated for the appearance of YHWH (Lev 16:14; cf. Ex 25:22, 30:6). If we follow Jacob Milgrom’s observations regarding the sense of this ceremony, we can see a living connection between the temple/tabernacle and the community of God’s people, expressed in terms of purity. According to Milgrom, for the mind of the Priestly writer, the sins of the people affect the purity of the temple and therefore require radical cleansing lest the deity will abandon its temple as “God of Israel will not abide in a polluted sanctuary.” On the other hand, one cannot escape observing certain parallels between the rites of original consecration of the tabernacle with its altar and the holy of holies in Exodus 29, 40 and Leviticus 8, on one hand, and the purification of the center of Israel’s cult in Leviticus 16, on the other: in both instances, the main celebrant (Moses or Aaron) uses blood of a sacrificial animal to sprinkle seven times upon the kapporet in the

---


6 Hence came the most common designation of this festival in Greek parlance, νηστεία, first attested in LXX Isa 1:13-14 (Stökl Ben Ezra, 34 n.92).


8 Ibid., 81, cf. 81-84.
holy of holies (16:14) to “make atonement in the sanctuary” (16:17) and anoints the horns of the altar the altar in the holy place, repeating the sevenfold sprinkling (16:19).

1.1.3 **Dedication of the First and Second Temples.**

The construction and dedication of the First Temple in Jerusalem by the third king of Israel, Solomon, is described in detail in 1 Kings 5-8 and 2 Chronicles 2-7. The most remarkable difference between this account and the narratives pertaining to the consecration of the tabernacle in the Pentateuch lies in the central role ascribed to the king in dedicating the newly built temple: it is the king who commands the leaders of the tribes to bring the ark into the new place of worship (8:1). The procession with the ark is followed by the king’s blessing (8:14-21) and his prayer before the altar of YHWH (8:22-53) which he recited kneeling with hands outstretched (8:22, 54), followed by multiple animal sacrifices (8:62-63). The religio-political character of the ceremony is perhaps expressed in a statement that “the king and all the people of Israel dedicated (ויחנכו; LXX ἐνεκαίνισεν) the house of the Lord” (8:63). At the same time, one can notice some similarities with the narrative of the tabernacle consecration in Ex 40 – as at the end of Mosaic consecration rite, here too was “a cloud…[and] the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord” (8:11, cf. 2 Chr 7:2). Also notable is the indication in the biblical narrative that the dedication of Solomon’s temple took place in the “seventh month” (1 Kings 8:2): the chronology of 2 Chr would put the completion of the seven-day festival on the 23rd of 7th month, making its beginning coincide with the fall festival of
tabernacles, five days after the purificatory day of Atonement (10. VII). The specific verb for the ceremony – “dedicated/renewed the house of the Lord” (1 Kings 8:63 = 2 Chr 7:5), as well as its substantive form “dedication/renovation of the altar (המזבח חנכת; ἐγκαινισμὸν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου)” (2 Chr 7:9) is encountered several more times in the Hebrew Bible and appears to have a lasting effect on the formation of the vocabulary connecting the dedication of temples with the concept of renovation or initiation, which will become crucial in the later Jewish and Christian usage. The narrative describing the rebuilding of the temple after the Babylonian exile appears to imitate the Solomonic dedication of the I Temple (Ezra 6:16-19). At the same time the Maccabean restoration of the Second Temple after its pollution in the second century BCE establishes a new feast of the temple, the festival of “Renovation/Dedication (Hanukkah)” which, however, appears to be deliberately juxtaposed to the earlier Temple feast, the feast of tabernacles, by the application of the same name in 2 Maccabees (1:9). Indeed, it has been suggested that Judah Maccabee used an alternative calendar date for the feast of tabernacles to rededicate the polluted temple. The festival on the 10 of the seventh month, the day of Levitical purgation of the temple and the day preceding Solomonic dedication of the First

---


10 With the exception of those already mentioned: Deut 20:5; Prov 22:6; Num 7:10, 84, 88; Ps 29:1; Neh 12:27 (of a wall), and in the Aramaic OT – Dan 3:2 (of the idol), Ezra 6:16. For the uses of ἐγκαίνιζειν/ἐγκαίνια/ἐγκαινισμός in the Septuagint, see Edwin Hatch, Henry A. Redpath, eds. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1998), 364.


Temple, could have constituted the celebration of the “New Year” day for ancient Israelites, hence bringing many connotations of “renewal” (temple, year, community) into focus for the generations before the emergence of Christianity.

1.1.4 Heavenly Temple Traditions.

The narratives describing the consecration of Moses’ tabernacle and the dedication of Solomon’s temple evidently try to make clear that Israel’s God has definitely chosen the newly-built structure as his exclusive dwelling-place (Ex 40:34, 1 Kgs 8:11). However, already the scriptural texts of the Deuteronomic tradition feature attempts to disassociate the one God from more anthropomorphic concepts of divinity, including him being circumscribed by a definite place of earthly cultic worship. The eventual destruction of the earthly temple in 587-586 BCE could not have but provided an external stimulus to the development of the idea of God’s heavenly dwelling, incorruptible and indestructible. If one compares a pre-exilic account of the vision of God in the temple in Isaiah 6 and a post-exilic narrative of the vision of celestial temple in Ezekiel (chs. 1, 40-44), the difference is striking: for Isaiah, it was the Jerusalem temple that was “full of [God’s] glory” (Isa 6:1) and the unique locus of theophany of YHWH on his throne as the object of angelic liturgy (Isa 6:1-3). The vision of Ezekiel, however,
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13 van Goudoever, Biblical Calendars, 36-42.


15 According to the Septuagint, εἶδον τὸν κύριον καθήμενον ἐπὶ θρόνου υψηλοῦ καὶ ἐπηρμένου, καὶ πλήρης ὁ οἶκος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ; the Masoretic text uses the expression פְּלִחתָׁו “skirts of his robe/his train” (Brown-Driver-Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon, 1002).
is specifically set in exile, outside of the temple and of the holy city (1:1) and the divine chariot/merkabah which the prophet envisions is endowed with the characteristics emphasizing God's omnipresence (cf. 1:17). At the same time, as Martha Himmelfarb observed, the particular entourage of Ezekiel's chariot appear to correspond to the furniture of the First Temple – thus Ezekiel's vision not only tries “to disassociate God’s heavenly abode from the temple in Jerusalem,” but also to postulate a celestial counterpart to the destroyed earthly temple.16 Thus, the appurtenances of the Temple in Ezekiel's vision of the merkabah and in his subsequent vision of the ideal temple in chs 40-44 receive their celestial doubles and the central object of the cult, the ark in the holy of holies surrounded by the cherubim, metamorphoses into the divine chariot supported by the “living creatures.”17

If Ezekiel’s revelation postulated the visionary, ideal temple as a substitute and heavenly “projection” of the earthly temple that has been destroyed, the pseudoepigraphic 1st Book of Enoch (also named Ethiopic Enoch as its full text has survived only in this language), the most ancient layer of which is dated to the third century BCE, appears to set the divine heavenly abode in direct opposition to the existing and restored temple in

---


Jerusalem. The Book of Watchers, comprising chs. 1-36 of the Ethiopic Enoch describes the antediluvian patriarch being taken up to heaven and experiencing a vision of the celestial temple composed of “a wall built of hailstones” (14:9), “great house built of hailstones” (14:10-12), and finally reaching the “greater” house, “built of tongues of fire” where he receives a vision of “a lofty throne” with the “Great Glory” upon it (14:15-20). Enoch’s vision is likely to replicate the three-fold structure of the tabernacle and temple, with its sancta sanctis containing God’s “throne”/ark/chariot where God himself appears as the anthropomorphized kavod/Glory. Visionary ascent and transformation of a chosen prophet to God’s heavenly mansions/sanctuary and his participation in the angelic liturgy become one of the central motifs of Jewish apocalyptic literature of the Second Temple period, just as such features as the critique of the existing Jerusalem temple and priesthood, which are often contrasted with the angelic priesthood and sacred calendar viewed as an exclusive privilege of the sectarians. One example of such sectarian Judaism(s) is certainly associated with the communities of the Dead Sea Scrolls.


19 For the recent translation of the Ethiopic text of 1 Enoch, see George W. E. Nickelsburg, James C. VanderKam, 1 Enoch: A New Translation (Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2004), 34-35.


21 For the introduction to the intertestamental – apocalyptic and pseudoepigraphic literature, see George W. E. Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005).

22 Elior, Three Temples, 29-62.
The analysis of such texts as the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q400-407, 11Q17)\(^{23}\) brings some scholars to speculate that the Qumranites did not only view themselves in possession of the correct, unpolluted priesthood and calendar, but also may have regarded their own community as an “*Ersatz* temple,”\(^{24}\) a place where transformed humans minister together with the angels.\(^{25}\) Aside from the Qumran documents, the vast literary tradition of *Himmelfahrt*, together with the vision of multi-tiered heaven, reflects itself in the narrative of Enoch’s ascent and transformation in 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch* (first-second century CE)\(^{26}\) and, likewise, in similar heavenly visions reflected in such texts as *Ascension of Isaiah, Apocalypse of Abraham*, and *Testament of Levi*. The works describing prophetic visionary raptures and visions of celestial temple sometimes show traces of certain Christian doctrines (e.g. *Ascension of Isaiah*), thus attesting to an enduring popularity of such accounts in Christian circles. It has been speculated by a number of scholars that the worldview of the sectarian Judaic movements in the Second Temple period influenced, albeit indirectly, the worldview of Christian communities in its formation period, in particular helping to provide a theological basis for the worship of

---


\(^{24}\) The term used by Crispin Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 132, 161, 166-167, 255, 297, 379.

\(^{25}\) Fletcher-Louis attempts to critique Newsom’s understanding of the community worship in *Songs* as simply analogical to the celestial liturgy (humans who function as angels) – rather, for him the community of the *Songs* viewed their “cultic space in terms of the heavenly world” because they believed that “the true temple is a microcosm of the universe” and “the place where all this liturgy and a communion between angels and men takes place will them be the human community’s own, concrete, earthly cultic space” (*All the Glory of Adam*, 274, cf. 252-279).

Jesus as an exceptional divine figure. The “heavenly temple” traditions with an exalted human figure as a high priest affect the language in which the nascent Christian community (as well as some Gnostic circles) begins to envision the relationship of Jesus to God, and the relationship of the community of Jesus’ disciples to him as the crucified and risen Messiah.

1.2 New Testament.

In comparison with the books of Hebrew Bible, the Scriptures of the New Testament do not abound with allusions to the dedication, consecration, or purification of either the Mosaic tabernacle or Solomon’s temple. However, the language pertaining to the temple does have its own place in the New Testament worldview: most famously, Jesus himself is recorded as contrasting his body with the Temple edifice, foreseeing the destruction of the latter and the restoration/resurrection of the former, according to Evangelist’s gloss (John 2:19-22). Moreover, in the narratives of healing (e.g. regarding

---


29 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν. ἕλεγαν δὲ ἔλεγεν περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὅτε οὐν ἐγερθῆ ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τοῦτο ἔλεγεν, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ὃν εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς (John 19, 21-22).
the woman with the flow of blood\textsuperscript{30}) the holiness that Jesus communicates is expressed, according to some interpreters, in terms of “contagious holiness” of temple and priesthood – however, with a twist: in the New Testament story this holiness is centered now in its new vehicle – Jesus’ body communicating sanctification.\textsuperscript{31}

The identification of the temple with the body of Jesus can be detected already in the letters of Paul where the analogy is taken further, toward the identification of Christ’s body with the church. In several well-known passages Paul establishes the identity of the one body with its “many members” with Christ (Rom 1:25, 1 Cor 12:12-30, Eph 5:30). Elsewhere he parallels the “temple of the holy Spirit” or the “temple of the living God” with the people he addresses (ὑμεῖς – 1 Cor 3:17, 2 Cor 6:16; τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν – 1 Cor 6:19), i.e. the ecclesial community.\textsuperscript{32} Recent attempts to bring into focus Paul’s self-identification as a visionary prophet (based on his enigmatic allusion to his own rapture to the “third heaven” in 2 Cor 12:2-3)\textsuperscript{33} point out similarities between Paul’s description of “spiritual-bodily transformation,” in which “the members of the church participate,” and mystical traditions in the Second Temple Judaism involving ascent to the heavenly temple.\textsuperscript{34} It follows that the interiorization of the structures of a ‘spiritual temple’ leads

\textsuperscript{30} Matt 9:20-22, Mk 5:25-34, Lk 8:43-48.


\textsuperscript{32} It should also be noted that Paul also applies to Christ a term “the place of propitiation (ἵλαστήριον)” (Rom 3:25), specifically derived from the temple setting, as the Septuagint word to translate the Hebrew kapporet, the cover of the ark of the covenant and a place of God’s revelation (Ex 25:22, 30:6; Lev 16:2). The indication that Jesus has become ὑλαστήριον “through faith, in his own blood” may allude to the specifics of the Day of Atonement ritual, which another NT author expands upon in Hebrews.

to transcending and relativization of the boundaries between sacred and profane, implied in the temple laws. The Pauline equation “temple/body of Christ/church” may well have been building upon a long-standing Biblical and extra-biblical tradition of perceiving the earthly temple as an embodiment or projection of the heavenly archetype – with the exception that here the locus of this embodiment lies in the ecclesial community conceived as Jesus’ body.

The Letter to the Hebrews approaches the same theological question from a different angle, depicting Christ as an eternal high priest (3:1, 4:14, 6:20, 9:11) celebrating the celestial and cosmic *Yom Kippur* ceremony at “the greater and more perfect” tabernacle, “not made with hands that is, not of this creation” (9:11). In a radical reshaping of the Levitical regulations pertaining to the day of Atonement, Christ enters into the adytum as a high priest, not once a year, but “once for all (ἐφάπαξ),”35 carrying the sacrificial blood, as required by law (Lev 16:14-15), which in this case is his own (Heb 9:12).36 The new high priest thus has inaugurated (or “dedicated,” ἐνεκαίνισεν) “the new and living way… through the veil, that is, through his flesh” into the heavenly

---


35 However, as noted by Stökl Ben Ezra, Lev 16 records no less than three or four entrances into the holy of holies in the course of the *Yom Kippur* ceremony – the author supposes that the insistence on entering the sanctuary one time a year in Philo (De spec. leg. 1.13.72) and Heb 9:7 was done for “intensification of their polemical and typological arguments.” – *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 30-31, 30 n. 55.

36 Harold Attridge observes in relation to the use of the verb ἐνεκαίνισεν: “as the old covenant had been sacrally and solemnly inaugurated by the blood of animals, so Christ inaugurated the new way of more intimate and interior relationship to God with his own blood” (*The Epistle to the Hebrews: a Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, ed. Helmut Koester [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989], 285).
sanctuary for all the faithful (10:20), not only for the cleansing of “hearts from evil conscience” (10:22), but in order to enable the entire church to enter the heavenly sanctuary.\(^{37}\) It is notable – and relevant to our study – that this passage (Heb 10:20) represents one of very few uses of the term ἐγκαίνια and its derivatives in the New Testament,\(^{38}\) another major one being John 10:22 where it is conceivably stands as a reference to the anniversary of the Maccabean restoration of the Temple, *Hanukkah*,\(^{39}\) taking place on the 25 Kislev. In Hebrews, however, *encaenia* clearly appears to denote the ceremony connected with the sealing of the covenant (9:18) or the purification rite on the Day of Atonement (10:20), projected onto the reality of celestial temple with Jesus as new Melchisedec, the divine-human celestial priest.\(^{40}\)


\(^{38}\) The verb ἐγκαινίζειν is used in Heb 9:18, in the context of inauguration of the first covenant “without blood” in Ex 24:3-8.


\(^{40}\) Anders Aschim has argued that the depiction of Jesus in Hebrews and of Melchisedec in the Qumranic text 11QMelch offer enough parallels to belong to the same tradition, even though any possibility that the author of Hebrews knew the Qumranic text is unlikely and would be “reductionist.” – “Melchisedec and Jesus: 11QMelchisedec and the Epistle to the Hebrews,” in Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila and Gladys S. Lewis, *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 63 (Leiden, Boston, Koln: Brill, 1999), 129-147.
1.3 Philo of Alexandria and Josephus.

As I have tried to point out above, the idea of a connection between the liturgical space of the earthly community of the God of Israel and the celestial temple with the ongoing angelic liturgy was quite common in the literature of the Second Temple period and in the world of nascent Christianity. The significance of the earthly temple as a projection and copy of God’s celestial and cosmic temple stands out clearly in the works of Philo of Alexandria (20 BCE- 50 CE). For Philo, the cosmos itself is divine temple in a proper sense of the word:

the highest and in the truest sense the holy temple of God (ἱερὸν θεοῦ) is… the whole universe, having for its sanctuary (ναό) the most sacred part of all existence, the heaven, for its votive offerings (ἀναθήματα) the stars, for its priests his servants (ἱερέας δὲ τοὺς ὑποδιακόνους) the angels of powers, the bodiless souls... 41

Philo does not elaborate whether he envisions the cosmic temple to possess the same tripartite structure as the Jerusalem temple; however, his description of heaven as τὸ ἁγιώτατον... μέρος, i.e. the equivalent of the holy of holies, may lead to such supposition. Philo’s cosmic temple does not rule out the existence of the earthly sanctuary “made by hands (τὸ χειρόκμητον),” designed for the purpose of earthly liturgical cult – moreover, the uniqueness of the one Temple in Jerusalem reflects the oneness of Israel’s God, while the obligation of pilgrimage entails specific preparation for sacrifice “in a pure manner (εὐαγώς).” 42 The close connection between the earthly temple and its perfect, cosmic model becomes evident in Philo’s interpretation of the Pentateuchal regulations pertaining to the garment of the Jewish high priest (Ex 28:40-43). For Philo, the high


42 *De spec. leg.* 1.12.67-68; Colson, 138-139.
priestly dress “would seem to be a likeness and copy of the universe (ἀπεικόνισμα καὶ μίμημα τοῦ κόσμου)”\(^{43}\): the blue tunic symbolized air, the breastplate – heaven, the twelve stones on the breastplate – the stars of the zodiac, while the ephod (λογεῖον) – the rational organizing principle, etc.\(^{44}\) The high priest, vested for sacrificial service, was thus interpreted as a symbol of created universe, “having upon himself an express image of all (εἰκόνα τοῦ παντός ἡμών ἐμφανῆ περὶ ἑαυτόν),” of God’s “son, all [of creation] (τὸν υἱόν, τὸ πᾶν).”\(^{45}\) The priest thus becomes a divine-human figure by virtue of his endowment with a mediating liturgical function.\(^{46}\) This perception of the high priest as an angelic mediator comes together with the perception of a temple (or community as an \textit{Ersatz}-temple\(^{47}\)) as a microcosm and a middle ground between earthly and heavenly realms.

This worldview was likewise not foreign to Philo’s younger contemporary, Flavius Josephus (37/38- after 100 CE): Josephus demonstrates a similar perception of Moses’ tabernacle as the “temple,”\(^{48}\) whose tripartite structure reflected the cosmic order (“the imitation of the universal nature”) with the holy of holies (adytum) “reserved, like

\(^{43}\) \textit{De spec. leg.} 1.16.84; Colson, 148-149.

\(^{44}\) \textit{De spec. leg.} 1.16.85-17.94; see also Philo’s \textit{De vita Mos.} 2.6, 12.

\(^{45}\) \textit{De spec. leg.} 1.17.96.

\(^{46}\) “For the law desires him to be endued with a nature higher than the merely human and to approximate to the divine, on the borderline (μεθόριον), we may truly say, between the two, that men may through his mediation propitiate God (ινα διὰ μέσου τινὸς ἄνθρωποι μὲν ἱλάσκωνται θεόν) and God a underservant (ὑποδιακόνῳ) to employ in extending the abundance of his graces to men.”\textit{ De spec. leg.} 1.23.116; Colson, 166-167 (amended).

\(^{47}\) For the recurrence of this paradigm in the Qumranic texts, see Fletcher-Louis, \textit{All the Glory of Adam}, 132, 166-167, 255, 297, 379 and \textit{passim}.

Josephus is similarly inclined to allegorical interpretation of the garments of priests and of the high priest, as it was described in Exodus. The liturgical exegesis of Josephus, like that of Philo, appears to be rooted in the cosmological significance of the temple symbols, each of which is capable of embracing a plurality of meanings, but may, in every particular case, be suited for “imitating and representing of the [whole] universe (εἰς ἀπομίμησιν καὶ διατύπωσιν τῶν ὀλὸν).”

1.4 Clement and Origen of Alexandria.

Within the Christian theological discourse, a direct genetic line from the cosmological and mystical exegesis of the temple in the Hebrew Bible connects Philo and Josephus with the work of two great Alexandrian theologians of Christian tradition, Clement and Origen. In the fifth book of Stromeiteis, Clement shows dependence on the Philonian tradition of interpreting the interior of the Mosaic tabernacle as possessing cosmological significance: the altar of incense indicated the position of the earth in the middle of the universe, the veil and the holy of holies symbolized the “world of thought (ὁ νοητὸς κόσμος)” while the robe of the high priest was “the symbol of the perceptible

49 τὴν μέντοι διαμέτρησιν τὴν τοιαύτην τῆς σκηνῆς πρὸς μίμησιν τῆς τῶν ὀλὸν φύσεως συνέβαινεν εἶναι, τὸ μὲν γὰρ τρίτον αὐτῆς μέρος τὸ ἐντὸς τῶν τεσσάρων κιόνων, ὃ τοῖς ἐφεδρίσαν ἦν ἄβατον, ὡς ὀὐρανὸς ἀνεῖτο τῷ θεῷ. – Ant. jud. 3.123; Nodet, 167.

50 Ant. jud. 3.151-178.

51 Ant. jud. 3.180; Nodet, 179; see more generally Ant. jud. 3.179-187. In Josephus’ interpretation, the high priest’s headdress, again, represents “heaven” due to its blue color and the crown which demonstrates the “splendor, in which the divine/Deity most rejoices” (Ant. jud. 3.186-187; Nodet, 180).

However, the vision of the temple/tabernacle as a microcosm was united in Clement’s work with the christological interpretation of scriptural symbols: priestly vestments designated Christ’s economy in the flesh (τὴν κατὰ σάρκα οἰκονομίαν), while the progress of the high priest into the holy of holies indicated the striving of a gnostic Christian towards divine contemplation and hearing the “Word himself.”

Furthermore, in the context of Christian message it is the church which represents the perfect temple:

And if sacred has a twofold application, designating both God himself and the structure raised in his honor (εἰς τίμιν αὐτοῦ κατασκεύασμα), how shall we not with propriety call the church holy, through knowledge, made for the honor of God, of great value, and not constructed by mechanical art, nor embellished by the hand of an impostor, but by the will of God fashioned into a temple (εἰς νέων πεποιημένον)? For it is not now the place, but the assembly of the elect that I call the church (τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκκλησίαν καλῶ). This temple is better for the reception of the greatness of the dignity of God.

This is a change of tone from Stromata 5: no longer a mere prolepsis of incarnation and of a gnostic’s contemplation of God, the image of the temple applies to the “assembly of the chosen ones” in the present. Clement unambiguously identifies the church with the ideal “temple,” the spiritual building that serves as God’s abode. Remarkably, however, he proceeds to extend the metaphor further, identifying the true temple with an individual Gnostic Christian, describing him through the sacerdotal, temple language: the γνωστικός is “greatly honored,” “in whom God is established, that is, the knowledge regarding God.” Finally, using the term pertaining to the dedication of temples in the Graeco-

53 τοῦ δὲ ἀρχιερέως ὁ ποδήρης κόσμου ἐστὶν αἰσθητοῦ σύμβολον. – *Stromata* 5.6.37.1; Stählin, 351.

54 *Stromata* 5.6.40.1-3; Stählin, 353.

Roman society, Clement declares a Gnostic to be “consecrated.” It is the “righteous soul” of a perfect Christian which enshrines, for Clement, “the divine likeness and the holy image/statue (ἅγιον ἅγαλμα),” the pertinent appurtenance of a temple.

Such ‘spiritualized’ interpretation of the image of a consecrated temple can be also detected in the work of Origen. Origen definitely continues the tradition of symbolic interpretation of Levitical regulations with regards to priestly garments – for him, these represent scriptural symbols for Christians’ desire “not only to know and to hear the depths of the divine mysteries but both to fulfill and to do them,” as well as of the immanent priesthood of every perfected Christian – “you too can function as a high priest before God within the temple of your spirit, if you prepare your garments with zeal and vigilance.” Using the allusion to 1 Cor 6:19, Origen ascribes the qualities of priesthood and the temple to the interior life of a consecrated human being, thus reiterating the paradigm already expressed by Clement. Similarly, Origen is quite keen to interpret the allusions to the temple in an ecclesial sense through the mediation of John 2:21 – the temple is Jesus’ body, but so is the church; hence, all three are paradoxically the same. Origen admits the difficulty of distinguishing between the physical body of Christ and his
ecclesial body when the Scriptures speak of the “temple” - however, he makes clear that
the analogy is rooted in the identity of Jesus as “the first born of all creation” (Col. 1:15),
the “image and glory of God” who thus himself “is properly said to be the temple.”60

While the allusions to the temple, particularly as interpreted in the light of John
2:21, 1 Cor 3:17, 6:19 seem quite well-attested in Origen’s work, the allusions to the
consecration/dedication of a temple/church and its altar in a Christian context are much
harder to find. And, what at the first glance appears to constitute a reference to a
Christian rite of church consecration, may prove not to contain allusions to a specific
liturgical practice. One such example derives from Origen’s Second homily on Joshua
where he exegetes the passage from Jos 1:2 (“my servant Moses is dead”) as an
indication of the cessation of the Mosaic law with the coming of Christ, contrasting the
Hebrew ritual practices with the practices of Christianity:

When, however, you will see Gentiles entering into the faith, churches built up,
altars not sprinkled with the blood of sheep, but consecrated with the precious
blood of Christ (1 Pet 1:19), when you will see the priests and levites not
ministering the blood of bulls and goats (Heb 9:13), but rather the word of God
through the grace of the holy Spirit, then say that after Moses, Jesus/Joshua
received and maintained his dominion – not that Jesus/Joshua, son of Nun, but
Jesus, the son of God.61

The reference to the consecration of the altars “with the precious blood of Christ” is
ambiguous enough to motivate some interpreters to connect this reference with the
presumed practice of the early church where the celebration of the eucharist was the rite

60 Com. Jn. 10.264; Heine, 314.

61 Cum vero videris introire gentes ad fidem, ecclesias exstrui, altaria non cruore pecudum
respergi, sed pretioso Christi sanguine consecrari, cum videris sacerdotes et Levitas non sanguinem
taurorum et hircorum, sed verbum Dei per sancti Spiritus gratiam ministrantes, tunc dicit quia Iesus post
Moyse suscepit et obtinuit principatum, non ille Iesus filius Nave, sed Iesus filius Dei - Hom. in Iesu Nave
which effected the dedication of an altar or the church building. It appears more likely, however, that this text attempts to produce a christological interpretation of the Levitical ceremony on the day of Atonement, involving the purification of the sanctuary with the animal blood (Lev 16:13-14) which Origen has also dealt with elsewhere. Origen’s use of the ‘altar’ and ‘blood’ language does not appear to evoke an allusion to a material altar, but more frequently it points to the altar “built of living stones” and applies to the community of the faithful or to the heart/soul of an individual Christian. The use of sacrificial terminology here constitutes a part of theological tradition of spiritualization and interiorization of the cultic OT vocabulary, and therefore should not be used as a reference to specific liturgical customs (e.g. consecration of an altar by eucharistic celebration). It appears necessary, therefore, when we are dealing with the patristic evidence coming from the fourth century – when the celebration of church dedications are unambiguously attested – to bear in mind theological context in which certain terms function within a certain writer’s text, lest we find ourselves coming to overly rash conclusions as to liturgical practices of the church with regards to dedication of temples and altars.

---


64 Hom. Jos. 9.1.

65 “If... you want to exercise the priesthood of your soul, let the fire never depart from your altar.”- Hom. Lev. 4.6.2.
1.5 Graeco-Roman Rites of Dedicatio and Consecratio.

No study of the development of a Christian liturgy of dedication in the early period can proceed without considering the context of a Late Antique city as a milieu in which this Christian tradition had taken roots.\(^{66}\) The consideration of the “urban character of the early Christian worship” prompts us to take into account ritual customs connected with the inauguration of new buildings in the civic religion of a Graeco-Roman city, as far as it is possible to reconstruct those rituals. Whatever effect the customs of *dedicatio* and *consecratio* of buildings, especially of temples, might have had upon the development of authentic Christian rites with a similar purpose, the existence of such practices in the world where Christian liturgy was growing definitely deserves to be noted in some detail.

The issue of a supposed genetic link between nascent Christian rites of dedications of the fourth century with the dedication of buildings and temples in the Graeco-Roman period was first addressed in a paper given by the French scholar Pierre Batiffol at the International Historical Congress in Oslo in 1928.\(^{67}\) Comparing the available evidence for the dedication of churches in the first three centuries, Batiffol concluded that the existence of the rite of dedication before the fourth century is out of the question, because, to his view, the liturgical assemblies of early Christians and wooden altars which they used did not require such a rite.\(^{68}\) Moreover, Batiffol asserted


\(^{67}\) The talk was published in 1939 under the title “De la dédicace des églises: Dédicace païenne et dédicace chrétienne,” *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 28 (1939): 58-70.
that the earliest form for a dedication rite of a new church even in the 4th century was the eucharistic rite itself.\footnote{Ibid., 66.} While he acknowledged that the right of asylum and the concept of the ecclesiastical building as divine property find parallels with the temple law of the Roman state,\footnote{Ibid., 68-69.} he insisted that the notion of sanctity that began to be applied to the Christian temples was not a continuation of the “monde disparu, le monde antique,” but a new creation, emerging from a new reality of Christian notion of holiness of a place.\footnote{Ibid., 70.}

Despite a negative conclusion and Batiffol’s choice to rely on selected Western liturgical sources in his analysis, it is striking that this essay remained one of the few attempts to address the question of continuity between the Roman temple law and Christian concept of sanctity applied to a sacred building. While it is essential for the understanding of Christian theology of liturgical space to consider Judaeo-Christian “temple theology,” the cultural and political aspects of temple construction and dedication in the Roman empire cannot be passed without mention.

About 57 BCE one of the greater and most well-known orators of the Roman republic Marcus Tullius Cicero wrote a treatise “On His House (De domo sua)” where he enumerated various grievances against his oppressors who tried to take advantage of his exile to seize or destroy his property. One of the ingenious ways to do so was undertaken by his enemy Clodius who “consecrated” the spot on which Cicero’s razed house stood, thus attempting to seal the expropriation of this land from the previous owner.\footnote{Ibid., 68-69.} In retort,
Cicero proceeds to list some of the procedural irregularities which would enable him to undermine the validity of the entire ritual. As a result, we can glean from his comments a rather clear picture of what was perceived as a regular procedure of *consecratio* of a land as a property of the divinity, a shrine, altar or a temple. Cicero admits that

1. the ceremony was performed in the presence of a pontiff (§ 117);
2. this pontiff laid his hand upon the door-post and pronounced the formula of consecration (§ 119, 120, 121, 123, 134, 135, 138).

Not questioning the legality of the act itself, Cicero tries to propose several grounds for the invalidation of the ritual in question, pointing out that 1) that only one pontiff (and that of questionable character) was present and not the entire collegium (§ 117); 2) the act of consecration was performed without popular mandate required for consecration of “any building, land or altar” (§ 127); 3) proper formulae were not evoked, but since the dedication was not properly authorized (*neque is cui licit, neque id quod fas fuit, dedicavit*), the latter point becomes moot (§ 138). The outline of the ceremony described by Cicero finds correspondence in the historical works of his younger contemporary, Titus Livius (59 BCE- 17 CE) who describes the ceremony of the dedication of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline hill in the first year of the republic: the consul Horatius Pulvillus shows remarkable self control, not interrupting the

---


73 The door-post of the temple is “at the place of access to the temple by the folding doors (*ibi enim postis est ubi templi aditus et valvae*)” (*De domo sua* 121; Watts, 277) that is the regular procedure required a priest to lay his hand upon the door-post of an entrance leading into the *aedes* that housed the statue of a deity or other treasures – see John H. Stambaugh, “The Functions of Roman Temples,” in Wolfgang Haase, ed. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* II: *Principat* (Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1978), 16.568-574 and, more generally, 554-608.
ceremony when some tragic (however false) news were delivered to him while he was “actually holding the doorpost during the dedicatory prayer.”

Although both the terms *consecratio* and *dedicatio* were used in the early Roman sources and temple inscriptions, the scholars of classical and late Antiquity tended to distinguish between the two notions, referring the first to the act of a transfer of a thing, property or building from the realm of the *profanum* to the realm of *sacrum* or divine, while the latter term sometimes was taken to mean strictly the renunciation of a property in giving it over to a deity. At the same time, the meanings of these terms are close enough for them to be used interchangeably, since both designate the transfer of the property from the profane to the sacred, as was also acknowledged by scholars like Georg Wissowa. The difference between the terms consisted perhaps in the application of the notion of *dedicatio* also to the setting apart of the shrines for the needs of private individuals or associations thereof: as Wissowa notes, such dedications would in all resemble the dedication of temples, but would not fall into the category of *consecratio*, as such would not transfer the property into the category of *loca sacra*. However, Wissowa further notes that there existed a possibility of applying both the terms

---

74 *Hist.* 2.8.


76 “Der Eigentumsverzicht in der Übergabe einer Sache an die Gottheit ist ‘dedicatio’”- Koep, 269.


consecrare and dedicare also to these sorts of consecrations.\textsuperscript{79} The consecrations/dedications on private property were outside of the state’s purview and hence did not need the official approval – however, such in the eyes of a state did not constitute a sacred property.\textsuperscript{80} Additional term – constitutio – was applied in the Roman practice to the establishing the place where the temple or altar would be constructed: thus, a foundation ceremony, delineating the boundaries of the new sacred site.\textsuperscript{81}

As distinct from consecration/dedication of a shrine on a private property, the consecratio of an official temple required approval of both state and religious authority: it was the function of the pontiffs to consecrate the site and the temple, but the final authorization to do so, as we have seen from the case of Cicero’s property, came from the highest state authority – the Senate or the people of Rome,\textsuperscript{82} during the time of the empire represented by the chief magistrate of the state – the emperor. Thereafter,\textsuperscript{83} with the lex dedicationis having been issued by the highest state authority, the entire college of pontiffs proceeded to the site\textsuperscript{84} where one of its members (or the pontifex maximus

\textsuperscript{79} Ibid., 477 n. 6.

\textsuperscript{80} Stambaugh, “Functions of Roman Temples,” 559.


\textsuperscript{82} Gaius, Institutiones 2.5: sacrum hoc solum existimatur quod ex auctoritate populi Romani consecratum est.

himself), with his head covered, pronounced the formula of dedication (*solemnia pontificalis carminis verba*,
\[\text{tit saneomisaenov epi tη kathierosei fohnaz}\]), holding with his hands the door-post. The magistrate, who apparently presided at the ceremony, repeated the same formula, also holding onto the door-post. Two officials, representing religious and civil authority, apparently were necessary for the dedication, although quite often only a state official would be described as the officiant of the ceremony.\(^87\) The ceremony would follow by an *epulum*, a banquet feast,\(^88\) and the dedications of important Roman temples would be followed by games. The Roman historian Cassius Dio, writing in the beginning of the third century CE, regularly describes various games and contests for popular entertainment, associated with the triumphs of Caesar and Augustus, which usually followed a dedication of a major shrine or temple.\(^89\) The day when the temple or the altar was dedicated was subsequently celebrated as its anniversary (*natalis*) and was again accompanied by sacrifices and/or games. Some of the anniversaries had a significant role in ritual sanction of the state authority: thus, the anniversary of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Ides of September became the day when the consuls began their term of office.\(^90\)

\(^84\) Cicero, *De domo sua* 45.117.
\(^85\) Seneca, *De consolatione ad Marciam* 13.1.
\(^87\) As in Livy, *Hist.* 2.8, Plutarch, *Poplicola* 14. The technical expression, defining the relationship between the two kinds of authority, was *magistratus per pontificem* (or *pro pontifice*) *dedit*, signifying the complementary character of the authority – Marquardt refuses to understand *pro pontifice* in the sense that the magistrate acted in the place of the pontiff (*Le culte chez les Romains*, 326-327 n. 9).
\(^88\) See Stambaugh, “Functions of Roman Temples,” 567 n. 88.
\(^89\) *Historiae romanae* 43.22-23, 51.22.4-9, 53.27.2-6.
The solidification of imperial authority and office from the de-facto end of the Roman republic through the period of the Empire saw the increase of the emperor’s role in the building and consecration of temples as well. As evidenced by the funerary inscription for Octavian Augustus, he sponsored out of his own funds the construction or restoration of numerous temples in Rome and personally dedicated offerings in them (ἀφιέρωσα, consacravi). The practice of imperial sponsorship of the temples was to continue throughout the imperial period. The changes in Roman legal system which followed from the shifting of power balance within the Empire seem to be evident from an excerpt from book 68 of the work Ad Edictum by the Roman lawyer Ulpianus (d. 228), which later became included into Justinian’s collection Corpus iuris civilis as part of the Digest (Digesta or Pandecta), a compendium of opinions of various Roman jurists which through their imperial sanction, were given the force of the law in Byzantium.

Sacred places are those which are dedicated to the people whether within the civitas or in the countryside. [1] It must be understood that a public place only becomes a sacred one when the emperor has dedicated it or has granted a power of dedicating it. [2] A noteworthy point is that a sacred place is one thing, but a sacrarium is quite another. A sacred place is one which has been consecrated, a sacrarium is a place in which sacred things are laid up, as can be the case even in a private building, and those who wish to free such a place from its religious tie do so customarily by evocation of the sacred things therefrom.  

---


91 Res Gestae 19-21;

92 Stambaugh, “Functions of Roman Temples,” 565.

The rest of this passage, as incorporated into the *Digest*, differentiates between the concepts of *sancta* as distinct from the objects that are *sacra* and *profana*: even though not ceremonially consecrated, the *sancta* require a sanction (*sanctio*) of a magistrate or public in order to be considered holy.\(^4\) For us, it is important to establish that such norm appears to be fixed in legal documents in the first half of the third century, even though the tradition of the emperor as the judge and benefactor with regards to religious matters begins much earlier\(^5\) – as Fergus Millar notes, “it was precisely because the temples with their priesthoods, rights and ceremonials were essential to the fabric of local society, that concerns relating to them had always been placed before the emperors, and before that to Roman generals.”\(^6\) The above passage from *Digesta* affirms the emperor’s ultimate authority in sanctioning the conversion of a spot into a sacred locality and records an apparent contradiction: the consecration/dedication of a *locus* is described as a public affair – *publice,*\(^7\) seemingly presupposing the approval of the populace, but it is the *princeps* who exercises the people’s or Senate’s authority. It is with this notion in practice that we come to examine the ceremonial of dedication with regards to Christian temples in the beginning of the fourth century.

---


\(^6\) Ibid., 453-454.

\(^7\) Watson translates this term as “to the people,” but an adverbial form (“publicly”) is also possible, given the juxtaposition of “public vs. private” in *Dig.* 1.8.9.2.
CHAPTER 2: DEDICATION OF CHURCHES IN THE CHRISTIAN EAST, 4TH – 5TH CENT.: JERUSALEM, PALESTINE, SYRIA.

“Let us inquire whether the temple of God exists.”¹ As has been pointed out in chapter 1, the appropriation of the OT temple-priesthood language and worldview in Christian discourse has been rather ambiguous. While some Christian writers, as Minucius Felix, contended that Christians have “no altars, no temples, no acknowledged images (nullas aras habent, templa nulla, nulla nota simulacra),”² for others, like the author of the Epistle of Barnabas, the temple continues to exist as a “habitation of our hearts,” a interiorized temple of a human being or of an ecclesial community which is now the locus of God’s presence, a temple par excellence.³ In both cases, the existence of a material building as ‘temple’ delineating liturgical space for a community is deemed non-essential, as long as Christian building activity remained mostly illicit in the eyes of the Roman imperial authorities. It cannot be denied, however, that Christian buildings did exist in the Roman realm: the Chronicle of Edessa includes a description of the flood

---


² Octavius 10; PL 3:264A; remarkably, Minucius lists the “dedication of shrines (delubris dedicandis)” among the things which has proven to be useless for the ancestors of his hearers (ibid. 7; PL 3:253A).

³ Πῶς οὖν ἥκιστα ἡμῶν τὸ κατοικητήριον τῆς καρδίας φθαρτὸν καὶ ἀσθενέας... λαβόντες τὴν ἁφέσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ἐλπίζοντες ἐπὶ τὸ νόμιμα ἐγενόμεθα καὶ πάλιν ἐξ ἁρχῆς κτιζόμενοι, διὸ ἐν τῷ κατοικητηρίῳ ἡμῶν ἀληθῶς ὁ θεὸς κατοικεῖ ἐν ἡμῖν. - Ep. Barn. 7-8.
occurring in the year 201 CE which a “temple of the church of the Christians,” using a term which would most likely indicate the existence in Edessa of a large and public Christian building, until its destruction. However, as the story of the continuous and open building activity of Christian churches begins with the cessation of persecution in the beginning of the fourth century, so the beginning of the liturgical traditions concerning the dedication of Christian churches has its roots in the dedication of churches built in the Constantinian era, in particular of the churches in Jerusalem and Palestine.

Flavius Valerius Aurelius Constantinus was elevated as Augustus by his troops in York on July 25, 306, following the death of his father, Constantinus Chlorus. By defeating, one by one, his political rivals Maximian (310), Maxentius (312) and Licinius (324), at the time approaching the vicennalia of his accession, Constantine became the sole ruler of the Roman empire. It was the battle against Maxentius at Milvian Bridge on October 28, 312 and subsequent triumphal entrance into Rome on October 29 which, through associated legend, have become a turning point in the emperor’s religious policy, symbolically marked in later narratives of Constantine’s life by the famous vision of the luminous cross on the eve of the climactic battle. Even though this experience is credited in Eusebius’ Vita Constantini with convincing the emperor of the truth of

6 For a succinct account of Constantine’s reign, including the relevant dates and some further bibliography (which overall is quite massive), see Noel Lenski, “The Reign of Constantine,” in Noel E. Lenski, ed. The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 59-90.
7 Eusebius, Vita Constantini 1.28- 32; Lactantius, De mortibus persecutorum 44.
Christianity, recent scholarship suggests that the conversion of the emperor and, particularly, of the empire was a much more gradual and slower process. Nevertheless, the change of attitude towards Christianity on the part of Roman empire was evident: if we trust Eusebius’ chronology, upon his triumphal entry into Rome, Constantine published the decree, restoring to the churches the property confiscated during persecutions. Eusebius is eager to prove the special care and benefaction directed by Constantine toward the Christian community – as the bishop famously says:

…to the church of God he [the emperor] paid particular attention. When some were at variance with each other in various places, like a universal bishop appointed by God (οἷά τις κοινός ἐπίσκοπος ἐκ θεοῦ καθεσταμένος) he convoked councils of the ministers of God.

This evidently alludes to the emperor’s subsequent role in the dogmatic controversies splitting the Christian churches in 320s, but at the same time provides us with an important conceptualization of the emperor’s role in the church – at least for the mind of Constantine and Eusebius – as a “universal bishop/overseer” or “the bishop/overseer appointed by God over those outside.” If we leave aside the hagiographical characterization of Constantine’s figure as *christianissimus imperator*, specific to

---

8 *Vita Constantini* 1.32.3.


10 *Vita Constantini* 1.41.3.


12 Eusebius ascribes these latter words to Constantine himself: ἀλλ` ὡμεῖς μὲν τῶν εἴσοδο τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἔκτος ὑπὸ θεοῦ καθεσταμένος ἐπίσκοπος ἄν εἴην. – *Vita Constantini* 4.24; Heikel, 126.
Eusebius’ goal, the terms above do not have as much to do with the emperor’s own religious outlook (Judeo-Christian vs. solar monotheism\textsuperscript{13}), as with the attempt of the Roman state and the Christian church to redefine their own boundaries with respect to each other. As Johannes Straub pointed out, “the church was not prepared for a Christian emperor of the kind represented by Constantine.” Previous emperors might have converted individually, but only Constantine has demonstrated through his acts that “the state officially was interested in the cult of the Christian God.”\textsuperscript{14} The church had to cope with the implied divine and priestly status of the emperor in the civil religion of the Roman state, e.g. expressed through his function as pontifex maximus, the rites of adventus and the custom of proskynesis.\textsuperscript{15} But the acknowledgement of the emperor’s authority even within the church was subject of careful balancing of terms that would make the role of Constantine doctrinally and politically acceptable. Dagron notes that while Eusebius accorded Constantine the title of koinos episkopos, he carefully avoided a more dangerous concept of the emperor as episcopus episcoporum. The emperor was thus like a bishop but not a bishop in any ecclesiastically binding sense.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{13} Drake, Constantine and the Bishops, 170, 182-183; Martin Wallraff, Christus verus Sol: Sonnenverehrung und Christentum in der Spätantike, Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum Ergänzungsband 32 (Münster: Aschedorff, 2001), 126-143.


As we have seen, one of the functions customarily accorded to the Roman princeps by the beginning of the fourth century was the dedication of the public cultic buildings. Frequently, the emperors themselves sponsored the construction of the site and by the 3rd century the emperor’s sanction becomes both a custom and a legal requirement for the public inauguration of a sacred building (cf. Digesta 1.8.9). By having been granted imperial privileges, the Christian church becomes included into the system of the Roman legal customs, including those pertaining to the construction and inauguration of public places of worship. As was argued by Ludwig Voelkl, the analysis of the list of Roman basilicae founded and dedicated by Constantine in the 6th century Liber pontificalis shows similarity with the dedicatory laws (leges templorum) customary for the dedications of temples in the Roman republic.17 Leges templorum traditionally included the name of the deity to whom the building is dedicated, the delineation of the boundaries for the dedicated territory, the date of the consecration and the name of the magistrate who consecrated it – accordingly, the list of the Constantinian basilicae inserted into the narrative describing the reign of the pope Sylvester (314-335),18 lists the name and the title of the consecrator,19 the territory where the basilica was set and numerous gifts which the August bestowed upon the church.20 With respect to the


19 E.g. Lib. pont. 1.172: Huius temporibus fecit Constantinus aug[ustus] basilicas istas quas et ornavit: Basilicam Constantinianam, ubi posuit ista dona...(emphasis and emendation mine). The source refers here to the foundation of the Lateran basilica – one of Constantine’s foundations in Rome (see Duchesne’s comments in ibid., 1,191).
dedications of Constantinian basilicae in the East, Voelkl claims that the letters of Constantine to Eusebius and bishop Macarius of Jerusalem, as well as Eusebius’ own narrations describing the dedications of churches in Bethlehem, Eleona in Jerusalem, Mambre and the octagonal church in Antioch possess a distinct juridical character, thus approximating with their style and meaning those *leges templorum* which would accompany the dedication of a public building in the Roman religious practices.\(^{21}\) If Voelkl is right, the testimony of Eusebius would confirm the crucial role of the Roman system of religious laws for the early history of the rites of church dedication, because if no Christian or Judeo-Christian rites existed prior to the age of Constantine, it would seem natural for the dedication of the first public Christian buildings to follow the traditions of Graeco-Roman temple dedications.

### 2.1 Dedication of the Basilica at Tyre.

Thus, the statement that the history of the Christian *rites* of church dedication, as documented in the sources, begins with the so-called ‘Peace of Constantine’ seems to be corroborated by the evidence. Eusebius of Caesarea does not fail to mention in his narrative of Constantine’s life that one of the consequences of the emperor’s victory over his rival Licinius in 324 was his decrees restricting pagan sacrifices and promoting the

---

\(^{20}\) E.g. *Lib. pont.* 1.176: *Eodem tempore Augustus Constantinus fecit basilicam beato Petro apostolo in templum Apollinis, cuius loculum cum corpus sancti Petri ita recandid: ipsum loculum undique ex aere cypro conclusit, quod est inmobile: ad caput, pedes V; as pedes, pedes V; ad latus dextrum, pedes V; ad latus sinistram, pedes V; subter, pedes V; supra, pedes V; sic inclusit corpus beati Petri apostoli et recandid. Et exornavit supra columnis purphyreticis et alias columnas vitineas quas de Grecias perduxit.

erection and expansion of public buildings of churches. Constantine further confirms his attitude towards the construction of Christian churches as public buildings urging the local bishops, in the letter to Eusebius himself, to “attend to the church buildings, whether by restoring or enlarging the existing ones, or where necessary building new.” However, in his earlier work, *Ecclesiastical History*, the bishop of Caesarea tries to demonstrate that Christian building activity was the direct result of the beneficence of both Constantine and Licinius towards Christians. One of the consequences of the change in the imperial disposition was that

> there was brought about that spectacle for which we all prayed and longed: feasts of dedication in the cities and consecrations of the newly-built houses of prayer, assemblies of bishops, comings together of those from distant foreign lands, kindly acts of one people towards another, union between the members of Christ’s body as they joined together into harmony.

This passage represents, probably, the first instance when the term τὰ ἐγκαίνια is used in the context of a dedication feast of a Christian church – one may note that in this passage this distinctly biblical term stands in apposition to the following expression προσευκτηρίων ἀφιερώσεις, a more customary term for dedications in the Roman

---

22 Regarding the second decree: “The other [law] dealt with erecting houses of prayer (τῶν εὐκτηρίων οἴκων τὰς οἰκοδομὰς) and extending in breadth and length the churches of God…” – Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* 2.45.1; Cameron-Hall, 110 (amended).

23 *Vita Constantini* 2.46.3; Cameron-Hall, 111.

24 *Historia ecclesiastica* appears to have been composed in series from c. 311 to 325; see Andrew Louth, “The Date of Eusebius’ *Historia Ecclesiastica,*” *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 41 (1990): 111-123; R. W. Burgess, “The Dates and Editions of Eusebius’ *Chronici canones* and *Historia Ecclesiastica,*” *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. 48.2 (1997): 471-504.


religious practice. Secondly, without yet explicitly employing the metaphor of the
temple, Eusebius immediately unfolds such inferred image in three different but
interconnected aspects: construction and dedication of visible temples effects the
gathering of ecclesiastical assembly which in turn represents the collecting and
reassembling of the true temple of Christ’s body (John 2:21). Ecclesiastical assembly
brings the people together through “one power of the divine Spirit,” “the same zeal for
faith” and liturgical celebration (“one hymn of praise to God came from the lips of all”).
Eusebius makes clear that the celebration of eucharistic liturgy were the central element
of the encaeniae feast:

Indeed, there were the perfect celebrations of [our] chiefs (τῶν ἡγουμένων
ἐντελεῖς θρησκείας), the sacred rites of the priests (ἱερουργίαι τε τῶν ἱερωμένων)
and fitting ordinances (θεσμοί) of the church, here [manifest] through the
psalmody and the hearing of the words handed over to us by God, here with the
divine and mystical services (θείαις καὶ μυστικαῖς ἐπιτελουμέναις διακονίαις) –
these were the ineffable symbols of the saving passion.

These eucharistic liturgies were accompanied by “panegyric orations” which the
bishops delivered “according to the ability of each,” “inspiring the assembly.” In book
10 of his Historia ecclesiastica, Eusebius cites in full one of such orations whose author
was most likely his thinly disguised self. Identified by the writer as the oration delivered
at the dedication of the Christian basilica in Tyre, Phoenicia in the presence of the
bishop of the city, Paulinus, this panegyric represents a first example of the ekphrasis of
the Christian temple in the tradition of Hellenistic Jewish allegorical exegesis already attested in the works of Philo and Josephus. The date of this homily (of which no clues are given in our text) is usually set by scholars in the range from 313 to 316/17 CE, due mainly to the position of the homily in the text, between the policy of toleration of 313, narrated in the beginning of book 10 and Constantine’s victory over Licinius in 324 in book 10.8-9. The homily still mentions the “souls of the supreme emperors (τῶν ἀνωτάτω βασιλεύων ψυχάς),”32 implying that both Constantine and Licinius were rulers at that point (313-324). Harnack originally opted for 314 for this reason,33 but Gustave Bardy argued that the construction of the basilica could not have started prior to the end of persecutions and proposes the years 316-317 as the date for its completion and dedication.34 The date range, however, is a plausible inference rather than the evidence drawn from the source itself.35

As in the passage introducing the concept of encaniae celebrations in the beginning of the fourth century, Eusebius’ panegyric for the dedication of the church in Tyre is built upon the juxtaposition of the earthly temple and its ‘spiritual’ model

---

31 This would most likely be the same Paulinus who would later become the bishop of Antioch and is referred to by Eusebius in Contra Marcellinum 1.4.1-3; to him as to ἵερε τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος Eusebius dedicates his Ὄνομαστικόν – cf. Louth, “Date of Eusebius’ Historia ecclesiastica,” 119.

32 Hist. eccl. 10.4.60.

33 Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897), 2.108.


35 For more discussion on the date for the homily, see Michael A. Fraser, “The Feast of the Encaenia in the Fourth Century and in the Ancient Liturgical Sources of Jerusalem,” Unpublished doctoral dissertation (University of Durham, UK, 1996; online publication 2004), 41-42. Timothy Barnes places the completion of book 10 in 314-316, but argued that the manuscript tradition shows the evidence of post-324 editing in books 8, 9 and 10.5-7 to account for the removal of Licinius – “Editions of Eusebius’ Ecclesiastical History,” Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 21 (1980): 198-199; cf. Louth, “Date of Eusebius’ Historia ecclesiastica.”
identified variably with the celestial temple, the temple of the ecclesial body of Christ or the interiorized temple of the soul. Throughout the panegyric, Eusebius speaks of the restoration of the church building in Tyre following the persecutions (*Hist. eccl.* 10.4.14, 33, 47). According to him, “this place… by the evil designs of our enemies had been covered with all kinds of vile rubbish.” The restoration of the demolished Christian temple, however, prompts Eusebius to speak of the reconstitution of the ideal temple, the “animate temple (ἔμψυχον ναὸν) which you all are… the house formed of living and firmly set stones,” founded upon the apostles and Christ himself. The souls of the faithful become the building-blocks for the ideal temple, centered upon the “venerable, great and unique altar… the spotless sanctuary of the Priest of all (σεμνὸν καὶ μέγα καὶ μονογενὲς θυσιαστήριον… τῆς τοῦ κόσμου πάντων ἱερός τὸ εἰλικρινὲς καὶ ἁγίων ἅγιον),” with Jesus the μονογενὴς τοῦ θεοῦ, performing the high priestly service in front of it as a mediator. It is Christ who stands as the “great high priest of the universe” in the “living temple of the living God, formed out of you,” the souls of faithful Christians.

This idealized temple possesses the characteristic of the earthly and heavenly temples of the Old Testament and the Letter to the Hebrews: its core is the sanctuary, adytum, into which only the messianic high priest (and also his earthly agent, the bishop Paulinus) can gaze. However, it becomes identified not with a material sanctuary of the Pentateuch, nor exactly with God’s abode in the heavens, but rather with the “ineffable

---

36 *Hist. eccl.* 10.4.26; LCL 265, p. 415.
37 *Hist. eccl.* 10.4.21.
38 *Hist. eccl.* 10.4.68.
39 *Hist. eccl.* 10.4.22.
mysteries of every rational soul (πάσης λογικῆς ψυχῆς τὰ ἀπόρρητα).”\textsuperscript{40} However, in the conclusion to his \textit{ekphrasis}, Eusebius again creates the image of the universal, ideal temple, erected by the Logos himself:

Such is the great temple (μέγας νεὼς) which the Word, the great Creator of the universe, has built throughout the whole world beneath the sun, forming again this spiritual image (νοερὰν ταύτην ἐπὶ γῆς εἰκόνα) upon earth of those vaults beyond the vaults of heaven, so that by the whole creation and by the rational living creatures upon earth his Father might be honored and worshipped.\textsuperscript{41}

Evidently, Eusebius’ thought here is consistent with the Hellenistic Jewish tradition of allegorical interpretation of the temple/tabernacle which, as we have seen above, had been already followed by Clement, and later by Origen.\textsuperscript{42} The image of the temple that is spread throughout the world appears to give homage to the tradition that interprets the universe itself as a temple, again consistently with Philonic exegesis of the Second Temple. However, for Eusebius, the images of a cosmic temple and of a human soul as a temple and, implicitly, a microcosm have a crucial ecclesial dimension: it is the church which is the spiritual temple spread throughout the world, and its earthly projection is the new temple built or restored by the bishop Paulinus in Tyre.

In her study of Eusebius’ homily, Christine Smith has argued for the author’s dependence upon Graeco-Roman rhetorical tradition of ekphratic descriptions of cities and buildings, as well as Jewish allegorical exegesis exemplified by Philo.\textsuperscript{43} Continuing the line of reasoning started by Smith, Michael Fraser has drawn more direct parallels

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Hist. eccl.} 10.4.22-23.

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Hist. eccl.} 10.4.69; Oulton, 443.

\textsuperscript{42} Cf. Origen, \textit{Hom. Lev.} 6.5.2.

between metaphors used by Eusebius and the oration of the Greek rhetor Aelius Aristides at the festival of the temple in Cyzicus, particularly the metaphor that parallels the material edifice with the edifice of human soul. More importantly, Fraser makes note of the recurring allusion in the homily to the supreme kingship of Christ who, as a founder of God’s temple on earth, i.e. the ecclesial community, exercises with respect to it the functions similar to those of a Roman emperor, laying down the laws, dedicating temples and basilicae (βασιλικῶν οἴκων) through the “ornaments and offerings.”

Eusebius’ use of the term basilica (‘royal house’) with respect to the church building in Tyre denotes a specific (albeit regionally divergent) type of a public ecclesiastical building, which – as Richard Krautheimer argued – shares parallels with the contemporary “imperial palace architecture” and was meant to evoke such associations.

While it is questionable whether the basilica in Tyre could have been an imperial foundation (indeed, the homilist directs his praise to bishop Paulinus, rather than to one or both of the emperors), Eusebius clearly presumes that the traditional Roman role of the chief imperial magistrate at a temple dedication, as a dedicatory and benefactor,

44 Fraser, “The Feast of the Encaenia,” 52-54. Fraser, however, does acknowledge that the oration of Eusebius “stands within the Judeo-Christian tradition” (ibid., 54).

45 “[W]hat king ever attained to so much virtue, as to fill the ears and tongues of all mankind upon earth with his name? What king, when he had laid down laws so good and wise (νόμους εὐσεβεῖς οὕτω καὶ σώφρονας διαταξάμενος), was powerful enough to cause them to be published (ἀναγινώσκεσθαι) from the ends of the earth and to the bounds of the whole world in the hearing of all mankind?... Which of the kings exercises so great a sway, taketh the field after death, triumpheth over enemies, and filleth every place and district and city, both Greek and barbarian, with dedications of his royal houses and divine temples, such as the fair ornaments and offerings that we see in this temple (βασιλικῶν οἴκων αὐτοῦ πληροῖ καὶ θείων ναῶν ἀφιερώμασιν, οία τάδε τὰ τούτῳ τοῦ νεῶ περικάλλη κοσμήματα τε καὶ ἀναθήματα?)” - *Hist. eccl.* 10.4.17, 20; Oulton, 409.


continues its application in Christian usage – receiving, however, a strong christological dimension.

The bishop of Caesarea describes the newly built basilica in the chapters 37-45 of his homily. It consisted of *propylaeum*, the colonnade that faced east, which opened the way to the forecourt, enclosed with four colonnaded porticos, with the fountain in the middle. Three doorways led from the atrium into the two-aisled nave, while the altar was situated at the western end of the nave, with the *synthonon*, the seats for the clergy further west.48 This architectural arrangement appears to be quite different, as Krautheimer notes, from the contemporary basilicae in Aquilea (319) and Orléansville (El-Asnam) in N. Africa, the divergence explained through the existence of “variant types” of the basilica.49 John Wilkinson, however, suggested in 1983 suggested another organizing principle behind the architectural arrangement of the basilica in Tyre – precisely, the literary dependence of Eusebius’ account on the description of the new Temple in Ezekiel 40-41 and on the symbolic interpretation of the Herodian Temple by Josephus (*Jewish War* 5.184-227).50 Wilkinson proposed that the sequence of the architectonic components of the building in Tyre, as laid out by Eusebius, follows the sequence of building divisions in both authors, a correspondence enhanced by the proximity of the terms used by Eusebius to the language of the Septuagint Ezekiel and Josephus.51 If so, Eusebius’ purpose in this homily (as Wilkinson also seems to

48 *Hist. eccl.* 10.4.37-45; see Krautheimer, 45.

49 Krautheimer, 45.

suggest\(^{52}\)) appears to be literary and ideological, rather than plainly historicizing. That is to say, the connections to the literary sources might have been aimed at the readership of his *History*, rather than at the historical audience, however educated. It may have intended to present the basilica-temple in Tyre as a architectural model for a Christian temple which will be built subsequently, as well as theological framework for Christian conceptualization of their places of worship (not only their community) in terms of the scriptural temple.

If we take this reasoning further, we may propose that Eusebius may have a specific temple in mind when he composed or redacted his homily which the 10\(^{th}\) book of his *History* localized at Tyre. Wilkinson himself points out that Eusebius’ description of the church in Tyre finds parallels with the same author’s description of another church, dedicated 20 years later: the Martyrium basilica in Jerusalem near the spot of the Lord’s tomb.\(^{53}\) If one reads Eusebius’ homily closely, one may not escape noticing the emphasis on the restoration of a ruined city and its temple to the former glory.\(^{54}\) Admittedly, when the author applies psalmic verses which speak of “the city of God,... his holy mountain” (Ps 86:3, 48:1) he refers to the church,\(^{55}\) but would it not be possible that it was the original, demolished and destroyed city of God, Jerusalem, which the author had in

---


\(^{52}\) Ibid., 560-561.

\(^{53}\) Ibid., 557-558.

\(^{54}\) “[T]his desert, this waterless place, this widowed and defenseless one whose gates they cut down with axes as in a thicket of trees” (4.33); “she who hath long been a widow and deserted hath been robed by the grace of God… and having regained (ἀναλαβόσα) the garb of a bride and put on the garland of beauty…” (4.47); “…and awake and raise her up who was desolate, who lay like a corpse, of whom men despaired… and having raised her he restored her to be such as he learned from the record of the sacred oracles” (4.54).

\(^{55}\) *Hist. eccl.* 10.4.7-8.
mind? At certain point, when he describes the peril which God’s temple has suffered in
the past from the persecutors, one is struck by the similarity of his expression to the
words he uses to describe the condition of the site of the Holy Sepulchre before its
discovery in *Vita Constantini*:

_Hist. eccl._ 10.4.26:  
And this place... which by the evil designs of our enemies had been covered with all kinds of unclean rubbish, he did not overlook...57

_Vita Constantini_ 3.26.6:  
Possessed, therefore, by the divine Spirit he did not negligently allow that place which has been described to remain smothered by all sorts of unclean rubbish through the machinations of enemies...58

It is a matter of general knowledge that Eusebius’ *History* concludes with the
defeat and death of Licinius (19 Sept 324) and hence, the final redaction of the work must
have been completed around 324-326.59 If the chronology in *Vita Constantini* is correct,
the excavation of the site of the cave of the Resurrection had begun in the aftermath of
the council of Nicaea in 325, i.e. at about the same time when the final version of the
*History* was complete.60 It is not unlikely, then, that Eusebius’ homily was shaped and
replenished with allusions to the rebuilding of the holy city and temple in anticipation to

---

56 Michael Fraser makes a similar point in “Feast of Encaenia in the Fourth Century,” 117-118. I am also in agreement with Fraser’s point that “if the Tyre oration was taken out of its present context it might be tempting to suppose that this, and not the appendix to _Laus [Constantini]_, was the oration Eusebius really should have delivered in Jerusalem” (ibid., 117).

57 Oulton, 415.

58 Cameron-Hall, 133.


60 _Vita Constantini_ 3.25-28.
the construction of the new temple in Jerusalem, in the course of which, “against all expectation,” the rock-cut tomb – the martyrion – was revealed.\textsuperscript{61}

It is thus difficult to say how much direct historical evidence we can draw from Eusebius’ homily and from his description of the dedication feast at Tyre and, presumably, other places in the aftermath of the Peace of Constantine. It is clear from his description that the dedication ceremony was most likely associated with the assembly of numerous clergy and people which included a celebration of the eucharist (ἱερουργίαι, μυστικαὶ διακονίαι), involving psalmody, reading of Scriptures and homily.\textsuperscript{62} These are the same common elements which the feast of dedication of the Tyre basilica in (presumably) 314-317 shares with another paradigmatic, but much more consequential of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century dedications – the dedication of the Martyrium basilica in Jerusalem in 335.

\section*{2.2 Dedication in Jerusalem, 335}

It is, again, from Eusebius’ account that we learn of the most significant dedication festival in the fourth century – the dedication of the Martyrium basilica in Jerusalem, next to the alleged site of Christ’s burial and resurrection. Eusebius’ account, found in \textit{Vita Constantini}, confirms the exceptional role of the emperor in the construction of the new site which was to become the focal point of Christian pilgrimage and an enduring inspiration for the consciousness of the fledging church. In the aftermath of the council of Nicaea (325), it was Constantine who, according to Eusebius’ narration, “decided that

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{61} \textit{Vita Constantini} 3.28; Cameron-Hall, 133.

\textsuperscript{62} \textit{Hist. eccl.} 10.3.3-4.
\end{flushright}
he ought to make universally famous and revered the most blessed site in Jerusalem of our Saviour’s resurrection” and therefore gives orders “for a place of worship (οἶκον εὐκτήριον) to be constructed.” Eusebius proceeds to recount how in the course of the excavation for the new church,

at last against all expectation the revered and all-holy martyrion of the Saviour’s resurrection was itself revealed and the cave, the holy of holies, took on the appearance of a representation of the Saviour’s return to life.

Remarkably, in describing the newly discovered site on the place of a future Christian temple, Eusebius already uses the terminology pertaining to the temple in the Scriptures: “Testimony/ martyrion,” “holy of holies.” As in his oration supposedly said at the dedication of the basilica at Tyre, Eusebius seeks to emphasize a connection between the future Christian church building and the destroyed Jewish temple, a connection which he expresses here in terms of contrast. After citing in full the letter of Constantine to bishop Macarius of Jerusalem where the princeps extols the discovery of a “proof/token of [the Saviour’s] most sacred passion (τὸ γὰρ γνώρισμα τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου ἐκείνου πάθους)” and orders the construction of the basilica “superior to those in all other places,” Eusebius recounts that “new Jerusalem was built at the very martyrion of the Saviour, facing the famous Jerusalem of old.” The building of the new church

63 Vita Const. 3.25, Cameron-Hall, 132.

64 αὐτὸ δὴ λοιπὸν τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ πανάγιον τῆς σωτηρίου ἄναστάσεως μαρτύριον παρ’ ἑλπίδα πάσαν ἀνεφαίνετο, καὶ τὸ ἄγαν τῶν ἄγων ἄντρον τὴν ὁμοίαν τῆς τοῦ σωτήρος ἀναβιώσεως ἀπελάμβανεν εἰκόνα. - Vita Const. 3.28; Cameron-Hall, 133.

65 Vita Const. 30.1; Cameron-Hall, 134.

66 Vita Const. 31.1.

67 καὶ δὴ κατ’ αὐτὸ τὸ σωτήριον μαρτύριον ἢ νέα κατεσκευάζετο Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἀντιπρόσωπος τῇ πάλαι βοωμένῃ, ἢ μετὰ τὴν κυριοκτόνον μιαφονίαν ἐρημίας ἐπ’ ἔσχατα περιτραπεῖσα δίκην ἐτίσε δυσσεβῶν οἰκητῶν. – Vita Const. 3.33.1.
exactly opposite (ἀντιπρόσωπος) the ruins of the old Jerusalem temple (as our author implies) likely intended to produce a powerful ideological statement, stressing the superiority of the new temple over the old. The identification of the basilical complex on the site of Golgotha and the Anastasis cave as “new Jerusalem,” i.e. of a church with a city, would be unsurprising, as it is consistent with Eusebius’ association of a church building with a new city of God in his oration in Tyre.68

Scholars have noted and commented on one significant omission in Eusebius’ narrative pertaining to the building of the church of the Holy Sepulchre: as he focuses his attention on the discovery of the supposed place of the Lord’s tomb (the cave), he fails to note the invention of another crucial relic of Christ’s passion, the True Cross. It is significant that in his description of the relics in the Holy Land around 333, the pilgrim of Bordeaux mentions the site of Golgotha as a place of crucifixion, the stone of the resurrection and the church built by Constantine, but does not mention the Cross.69 The first clear references to the relic of the cross and to its veneration in Jerusalem occur in the Catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem,70 composed probably in 348-350 and from then on the significant place of this relic in the liturgical life of the holy city, as well as the presence of the relics of the cross around the Mediterranean, is fairly well attested.71 Such


69 A sinistra autem parte est monticulus Golgotha, ubi Dominus crucifixus est. Inde quasi ad lapidem missum est cripta ubi corpus eius posuit fuit et tertia die resurrexit; ibidem modo iussu Constantini imperatoris basilica facta est… - Itinerarium Burdigalense 593.4- 594.3, in Itineraria et alia geographicca, CCSL 175 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1975), 17.


71 In one of such instances, Gregory of Nyssa mentions the relic of the true cross in Vita Macrinae 30; ed. Pierre Maraval, Grégoire de Nyssse, Vie de sainte Macrine, SC 178 (Paris: Cerf, 1971). For more
dearth of evidence for the cult of the cross before the middle of the 4th century could have suggested that the discovery and the rise of this relic in prominence post-dates the foundation and dedication of the Martyrium, the basilica near the site of Christ’s tomb.

The attribution of the discovery of the cross to the empress Helena is apparently based on later hagiographical sources and is not supported by contemporary evidence. On the other hand, a number of scholars (Zeev Rubin, P. W. L. Walker, and Stephen Borgehammar) have suggested that Eusebius’ silence concerning the True Cross was the case of deliberate omission (“strategic silence”) for political, ideological or theological reasons. Thus, Peter Walker sees in Eusebius a representative of the Origenist theological tradition that embraced a “spiritualized” approach to physical objects of religious piety. It is the suggested Origenist theological outlook which would prompt Eusebius to avoid mentioning the discovery of the supposed wood of the True Cross and to emphasize the cave of Anastasis instead. This line of argument is in part based upon

---


74 Walker, Holy City, Holy Places, 116-117, 128-130. Walker argues that “as a theologian Eusebius tended… to emphasize the Resurrection more than Christ’s death, unlike Cyril [of Jerusalem]…
the interpretation of some obscure places in Eusebius’ work, including a reference to
γνώρισμα τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου ἐκείνου πάθους (“evidence/proof/token of his most holy
passion”)  
and τὸ σωτήριον σημεῖον (“saving/Saviour’s sign”), both of which could be
construed as alluding to the relic of the cross that has already been found. Such
supposition has led Borgehammar to suggest that, if the discovery of the cross is possible
around 325, the church of the Martyrium would have been consecrated precisely in honor
of the Cross. It seems though that the construed allusions to the cross appear to be too
vague to support an early date for the finding of the cross and, henceforth, the crucial
significance of this relic for the foundation and dedication of the Martyrium.

It is notable that no allusion to the relic of the true cross is likewise found in
Eusebius’ account of the dedication of the church of Martyrium in 335. This event took
place in conjunction with two other important occasions in the life of the empire and the
church: Constantine’s tricennalia and the council at Tyre, one of the acts in the drama of
the Arian controversy. At this council Athanasius of Alexandria had to answer
accusations from his ecclesiastical opponents with regards to violent behavior, in the
course of which he was removed from episcopacy. However, in anticipation of the
unfavorable outcome, the bishop of Alexandria had secretly fled the council and rushed
to Constantinople to present his case before the emperor himself, which he did on

---

Eusebius had continuously emphasized the spiritual nature of Christianity and the need for a progression away from more physical considerations in Christian worship” (ibid., 129). See, however, remarks by Stefan Heid, “Ursprung der Helenalegende,” 41 n.2 who considers the arguments e silentio unconvincing.

75 Vita Const. 3.30.1 (in the letter of Constantine to bishop Macarius).

76 Vita Const. 1.37.1, 1.40.1, 2.16.2, 3.3.1; Laus Constantini 6.21, 9.8, 9.17.

77 Walker, Holy City, Holy Places, 127-130; on the ambiguity of the expression γνώρισμα τοῦ πάθους, see the comments by Averil Cameron and Stuart Hall in their edition of Life of Constantine, 282-283.

October 30 and November 6, resulting in the temporary restoration of the Alexandrian bishop to his office.\(^79\) It is in the course of the synod’s proceedings that, as Eusebius also reports, the bishops received the imperial letter ordering them to “go at once and not defer their journey to Jerusalem,”\(^80\) for the purpose of celebrating the dedication of the newly built basilica of the holy city.

Eusebius describes this occasion as one of extreme solemnity, marked by the presence of bishops from across the eastern empire,\(^81\) as well as government officials, with the noted exception of the emperor himself, who has sent a personal envoy to these celebrations.\(^82\) The proceedings of the dedication, as well as the record of the events leading up to this occasion, have been described in Eusebius, as well as in the work of fifth-century church historians Socrates Scholasticus, Sozomen, Theodoret of Cyrus and anonymous historian from Cyzicus.\(^83\)

It is our earliest source (Eusebius’ *Vita Constantini*), however, that gives a comparatively detailed image of liturgical celebrations at this dedication ceremony,


\(^{80}\) *Vita Const*. 4.43.1.

\(^{81}\) Eusebius mentions the episcopal representatives of Macedonia, Bythinia, Thrace, Persia, Cilicia, Cappadocia, “all Syria and Mesopotamia, Phoenicia and Arabia with Palestine itself, Egypt and Libya, the inhabitants of the Theban area” - *Vita Const*. 4.43.3-4; Cameron-Hall, 170.


\(^{83}\) The work under the title Συντάγμα τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ ἁγίας συνόδου (usually referred to as *Church History*) which was previously attributed to Gelasius of Cyzicus, a presbyter of the last quarter of the 5th century, is now thought to belong to the anonymous author. See Günter Christian Hansen, “Enleitung,” in idem, ed, *Anonymous von Cyzicus: Historia ecclesiastica, Kirchengeschichte*, Fontes Christiani 49.1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), 1.7-53.
characterized by the numerous homilies and multiple eucharistic celebrations. What is significant, though, was that our author describes the ecclesiastical liturgy at this feast as being in perfect balance with the civil ‘liturgy’ of the imperial representative, lavishing gifts of benefaction in the emperor’s name upon the clerical participants of the ceremony, as well as the poor and needy members of the congregation in complete concord with conventions pertaining to the public dedication feasts in Roman practice. In a symphonic response to these actions of the emperor’s ὑπηρεσία (by proxy),

God’s ministers (οἱ δὲ θεοῦ λειτουργοὶ) enriched the feast with both prayers and sermons. Some praised the God-beloved emperor’s devotion to the Saviour of all, and recounted in detail the magnificent work connected with the martyrion; some with festive sermons (θεολογίαις) based on divine doctrines (θείων δογμάτων) provided a variety of intellectual delights for all to hear. Others gave expositions of the divine readings, disclosing ineffable meanings, while others, incapable of this, propitiated God with bloodless sacrifices and mystical ceremonies for the general peace and for the church of God, for the emperor himself, who was responsible for such great things, and for his God-beloved sons, they offered up prayers of supplication to God. This was the occasion when we also, being honored with favors beyond us, graced the feast with various addresses to those assembled, at one time interpreting in a written work the elaborate descriptions of the emperor’s philosophical ideas, at another making prophetic ideas applicable also to the symbolic rites presently in hand (καιρίους καὶ τοῖς προκειμένοις συμβόλοις τὰς προφητικὰς ποιούμενοι ἑρμηνεύοντες θεωρίας). In this way the festival of dedication (ἡ τῆς ἁφιερώσεως ἑορτή) was carried out with joyful celebrations (σὺν εὐφροσύναις) in the thirtieth year of the emperor’s reign.84

Such terms as “bloodless sacrifices and mystical ceremonies (θυσίαις ἀναίμους καὶ μυστικαῖς ἱερουργίαις)” evidently allude to eucharistic celebration in the course of the feast, as well as a specific reference to the celebrants offered the “supplicatory prayers” “for the common peace and for the church of God,” as well as for the emperor himself and his sons (ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς εἰρήνης, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ θεοῦ, αὐτὸν δὲ βασιλέως

84 Vita Const. 4.45.1-3; Cameron-Hall, 170-171 (slightly amended).
There is an almost identical expression in the late 4th century hagiopolite source, namely the post-baptismal catecheses attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem or John II, his successor. In the course of his exposition of the actions of the hagiopolite eucharistic liturgy, the author of the Catecheses refers to the celebrant and congregation “entreating God for the common peace of the churches, for the welfare of the world, for the emperors (ὑπὲρ κοινῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνης, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου εὐσταθείας, ὑπὲρ βασιλέων).” Even though a source reflecting the hagiopolite liturgy in the last quarter of the fourth century, this textual parallel may confirm that in Eusebius’ time the eucharistic liturgy, accompanied by the readings, exegetical homilies and hortatory addresses was at the center of the dedication ceremonies.

---

85 Vita Const. 4.45.2.

86 See on the question of attribution Alexis J. Doval, Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogue: the Authorship of the Mystagogical Catecheses, Patristic Monograph series 17 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2001); however, Victor Saxer in his introduction to Cirillo e Giovanni di Gerusalemme, Catechesi prebattesimali e mistagogiche, Letture cristiane del primo millenio 18 (Milano: Paoline, 1994), 31-44, tries to argue for sustainability of the claim for John’s authorship on literary, as well as liturgical grounds (see pp. 39-44). Charles Renoux has noted on the matter of attributing another homily to John II that the latter’s authorship cannot be established without question, precisely “en raison principalement de l’impossibilité de le comparer à des écrits indiscutablement authentiques” (“Une homélie sur Luc 2,21 attribuée à Jean de Jérusalem,” Le Muséon 101 (1988): 95); it would suffice to exercise such caution in this case as well.


88 Eusebius himself claims to have pronounced several homilies on this occasion (cf. Vita Const. 4.45.3) and promises in Vita Const. 4.46.1 to publish in the future a work “addressed to emperor himself” containing the bishop’s ekphrasis “of the Saviour’s church, of the salvific cave, of the emperor’s works of art and large number of offerings” (Cameron-Hall, 171). The issue of which exactly was the homily or homilies which Eusebius pronounced at the dedication feast and which did he present to the emperor remains a subject of discussion. H. A. Drake has identified sections 11-18 of Eusebius’ encomium for Constantine on his tricennalia as the speech which he pronounced at the dedication celebrations in 335 and then repeated before Constantine in November 335 (as described in Vita Const. 4.33.1-2) (In Praise of Constantine: a Historical Study and New Translation of Eusebius’ Tricennial Orations [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978], 38-45). Timothy Barnes has disagreed with the latter identification, since the content of the speech declared by Eusebius in VC 4.33.1 and 4.46.1 does not correspond to the content of LC 11-18, and contended that the oration which Eusebius pronounced before Constantine was lost and the posthumous edition of Laus Constantini had the wrong speech appended to it. However, he agrees with Drake that chs. 11-18 of LC contain the homily that Eusebius pronounced during the festivities.
The fifth-century historians (Socrates Scholasticus, Sozomen, Theodoret of Cyrus and the anonymous presbyter from Cyzicus) who also mention the dedication in 335 in their works, appear to be more interested in the events of Arian controversy and the council at Tyre and mention the Jerusalem dedication just in passing. Thus, Socrates, whose Church History covered the events from 305 to 439,\(^\text{89}\) mentions the dedication of holy places as a backdrop to the aftermath of the tumultuous synod in Tyre in 335.

Socrates merely mentions that in the course of the council's proceedings with respect to Athanasius, a “letter was brought from the emperor, summoning the council to come speedily to the new Jerusalem (ἐπὶ τὴν νέαν Ἰερουσαλήμ).” That they did and, upon arriving to the city “made a magnificent feast at the dedication of the places (πάνδημον δὲ ποιήσαντες ἐορτὴν ἐπὶ τῇ καθιερώσει τῶν τόπων),” receiving Arius into communion as well.\(^\text{90}\) Sozomen, Theodoret and an anonymous author from Cyzicus (whose account is dependent on that of Theodoret\(^\text{91}\)) also weave the account of dedication in Jerusalem into the narrative describing the synod at Tyre, underlining the exceptional role of the emperor the dedication, summoning the bishops to Jerusalem,\(^\text{92}\) fulfilling his role as a

---


\(^\text{90}\) Socrates, Hist. eccl. 1.33.1; ed. Günther Christian Hansen, Sokrates Kirchengeschichte, GCS n.s. 1 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995), 82.


\(^\text{92}\) “Marianus, a man of noble stature and the royal scribe, came to Tyre and handed to the synod [of bishops gathered there] the letter from the emperor, exhorting/ordering (παρακελευομένη) them to
benefactor through distributions of provisions\textsuperscript{93} and donations to the newly-built temple.\textsuperscript{94}

None of the historians cited above contribute any information with regards to the exact date when the dedication of Martyrium took place: all are consistent, however, that the event took place in the 30\textsuperscript{th} year of Constantine’s reign, i.e. in 335. Regarding a specific date for the feast of dedication, September 13, Anton Baumstark was of the opinion that this particular day was chosen by Constantine since it coincided with the feast of dedication of the ancient Roman temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline Hill. Baumstark found such choice of date quite characteristic for Constantine’s religious policy.\textsuperscript{95} Michael Fraser in his work seems to find such a suggestion plausible, noting the urgency with which Constantine summoned the bishops

\begin{quotation}
\textsuperscript{93} “And he also sent together those of the officials of kind disposition who distinguished with faith and piety, ordering them all to furnish all the provisions, not only to the bishops and priests and their entourage, but also to all needy who flocked from everywhere [to the city]” (Theodoret 1.31.2; cf. Anon. Cyz. 3.17.33).

\textsuperscript{94} “And they went to Jerusalem and dedicated the temple (τὸν ναὸν καθιέρωσαν), as well as the precious objects and offerings sent by the emperor, which still lie in the holy church and amaze those who look upon it due to their richness and great size” (Sozomenus 2.26.2); “And he [=Constantine] adorned the divine altar/sanctuary with the royal veils and golden vessels with precious stones” (Theodoret 1.31.2).

\textsuperscript{95} Anton Baumstark, \textit{Liturgie comparée: Principes et méthodes pour l’étude historique des liturgies chrétiennes}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed., ed. Bernard Botte, Collection Irénikon (Chevetogne, Paris: Éditions de Chevetogne, 1953), 203 (Baumstark attributes the suggestion to Dom Ildefons Herwegen). The dedication of the temple on the lower crest of the Capitoline Hill occurred in the first year of the Republic and is mentioned in Livy 2.8.6-8, 7.3.8; Polybius 3.22.1; Tacitus, \textit{History} 3.72, although none of these sources mention the date of September 13 when this dedication is usually set – see Lawrence Richardson, \textit{A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome} (Baltimore, London: John Hopkins University Press, 1992), 221-224. It is Plutarch who in \textit{Poplicola} 14 definitely identifies the date of dedication with the ides of September.
\end{quotation}
from Tyre to Jerusalem – apparently so that the celebration could fall on a certain day.96 The intention of having the day of dedication of the Holy Sepulchre on the day of Roman festival would signify Constantine’s intention to displace the traditional Roman cult with the symbols of Christian religion, building the Sepulchre complex on the site of the Roman temple and forum in Aelia Capitolina97 and also suppressing the dedication of the major Roman temple with the similar observance with regards to the central shrine of the new Jerusalem.98

At the same time, Fraser has put forward another intriguing suggestion, attempting to link the day when the *encaenia* in Jerusalem took place (13 September) with the day of 10 Tishri, the Day of Atonement on the Jewish rabbinical calendar.99 If, according to Fraser’s argument,100 Yom Kippur fell on 13 September in 335, the feast of *encaenia* of the holy city becomes part of a different symbolic framework with the polemical motif directed to contemporary Judaism, rather than to Graeco-Roman religion. It is questionable, however, whether the observance of Jewish rabbinical calendar would have much relevance for the calendar of the Jerusalem Christian communities. It has been observed that the “steps toward the regulation of the [Jewish] calendar into a fixed system were taken in the third or fourth century,”101 and thus the standardization of

96 Fraser, “The Feast of Encaenia,” 121 and generally, 120-129.


98 Hunt, “Constantine and Jerusalem,” 405-420; Fraser, “The Feast of Encaenia,” 121.


100 Fraser used the online “Hebrew Calendar” program to calculate the Julian date for 10 Tishri in 335 – ibid., 27 n. 14.
observances among Jewish communities was in its formative stage at this time as well.  

Hence, it would not be quite relevant to speak of the calendrical usage in Judaism which the Christians would try to compete with by situating “their” equivalent of Yom Kippur on that day. Additionally, as we know, the Jewish population of Jerusalem was expelled from the city following the Bar Kochba revolt (132-135 CE) and there may be a reason to believe that the prohibition was renewed at the time of Constantine with a new, polemical motivation in mind (with the exception perhaps of the anniversary of the Temple’s destruction).

It is hardly possible, therefore, to determine conclusively the reasons for setting the date of dedication in Jerusalem for September 13. But it is not unreasonable to suppose that Constantine’s motivation might have been to make the dedication of the major temple of the new Christian city coincide with the Ides of September, rather than with the date of Yom Kippur. Jerusalem, despite being the “city of Christ” in


104 The pilgrim of Bordeaux speaks of the “perforated stone (lapis pertusus)” to which Jews come once a year with lamentations, anointing it and then “withdraw (recedunt),” possibly signifying that they were allowed to enter the city just for this purpose – Itin. Burg. 591.4-6; CCSL 175, 16. This is also the interpretation of Günter Stemberger, Jews and Christians in the Holy Land: Palestine in the Fourth Century, trans. Ruth Tusching (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 40-43. The expulsion of the Jews from Jerusalem and even the entire Judea formed a part of the legendary pertaining to the invention of the True Cross – this is precisely the action of Helena in the late 5th-6th century Judas Kyriakos legend, extant in its Syriac translation, see Han J. W. Drijvers, Jan Willem Drijvers, The Finding of the True Cross: the Judas Kyriakos Legend in Syriac, CSCO 565, Subsidia 93 (Louvain: Peeters, 1997), 70-71. If the legend is of hagiopolite origin, as the editors suggest (ibid., 20-27), the appending of the expulsion of Jews at the end of the narrative would provide a mythological explanation for what seemed to be a reality by the end of the 5th century.
Constantine’s program,\textsuperscript{105} was still an imperial foundation, as the historians’ accounts do not fail to point out: it is not surprising, therefore, that Constantine urged the bishops to inaugurate the buildings that he funded on the date that was important to him as a Roman.

The overview of the narratives describing the dedication of the Martyrium in September 335 shows that, whether the relic of the true cross had already been discovered in 335 or not, it played no role in the ceremonies of the consecration of this church. Hence, I would consider Borgehammar’s suggestion that the church of the Martyrium was consecrated “to the Cross”\textsuperscript{106} or, that it was built to house the relic of the cross,\textsuperscript{107} to be somewhat unlikely. It is not until mid-fourth century that we have probable indications to liturgical veneration of the True Cross in the \textit{Catecheses} of Cyril,\textsuperscript{108} as well as to the finding of the object during Constantine’s reign in Cyril’s letter to Constantius around 351-353.\textsuperscript{109} At the same time, the recurring term used throughout

\footnotesize{105} Dagron, \textit{Naissance d’une capitale}, 408.

\footnotesize{106} \textit{How the Holy Cross Was Found}, 108-111.


\footnotesize{108} Particularly see Cat. 10.14: Τὸ ξύλον τὸ ἁγιόν τοῦ σταυροῦ μαρτυρεῖ, μέχρι σήμερον παρ’ ἡμῖν φανόμενον, καὶ διὰ τῶν κατὰ πίστιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ λαμβανόντων, ἐντεῦθεν τὴν οἰκουμένην πάσαν σχεδὸν ἔδη πληρώσαν. Borgehammar’s suggested translation runs: “The holy wood of the Cross gives witness: it is here to be seen in this very day, and through those who take [pieces] from it in faith, it has from here already filled almost the whole world”; to Borgehammar it suggests the recent finding of the cross, as the literal interpretation of the passage would point at the dissemination of the relics of the cross throughout the world through those who take pieces from it – the practice to the extreme form of which Egeria attests about 30 years later (\textit{Itin.} 37.2). It must not be overlooked, however, that Cyril’s phrase can be an allusion to Matthew 10:38 (καὶ ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου) and thus can refer to the taking up of the cross by the faithful Christians.

various narratives refers to the “(holy) temple” and its “consecration/dedication
(ἀφιέρωσις, καθιέρωσις),” evoking linguistic connection with the terminology of Graeco-Roman civil religion.

At the same time, another connection emerges from what we could see of Eusebius’ ideological program in his earlier homily-ekphrasis at Tyre: imperial benefaction brings about the restoration of the scriptural temple of Solomon and the prophets, as the ideal and better temple manifesting the restoration of the true temple – the Christian church. The genre of *Vita Constantini*, as opposed to *Church History*, allowed much less space for such theological insights – however, a clear reference to the restoration of Jerusalem through the construction of the new basilica (which, as the physical manifestation of the true church is the new Jerusalem) in *VC* 3.33 speaks volumes. The reconstitution of the Solomonic temple will continue to be a recurring motif for the subsequent Christian conceptualization of this temple ceremony.

2.2.1 The Feast of Encaenia in Jerusalem in 380s: Egeria.

The state of affairs with regards to the celebration of this feast nearly fifty years later can be gleaned from the travelogue of the Spanish pilgrim and religious virgin Egeria who spent three years in Jerusalem, leaving a record of its liturgical practices at the end of 4th century. Following the internal evidence of the travelogue, Paul Devos has determined the exact range of years when Egeria visited the holy city as

---

approximately from the Easter of 381 to the Easter of 384. Egeria’s account of the liturgical feast of dedication is found at the very end of the extant part of the travelogue: the narrative breaks off in mid-sentence when she proceeds to describe the station on the fourth day of the octave. Remarkably, she still describes the feast of dedication as commemorating the consecration of both the Martyrium and of the Anastasis rotunda, as well as the finding of the True Cross:

They call the day of dedication (\(dies enceniarum\)) when the holy church which is on Golgotha, which they also call the Martyrium, was consecrated to God; and also the holy church which is found at the Anastasis (\(quae est ad Anastase\)), that is in the place where the Lord rose after his passion, was consecrated to God on the same day as well. The dedication of these holy churches is celebrated with great solemnity, for the cross of the Lord was found on the same day. And thus afterwards it was established that when these holy churches above were consecrated for the first time, this was the day when the cross of the Lord was found, so that [both] also may be celebrated with great joy on the same day (\(et ideo propter hoc ita ordinatum est, ut quando primum sanctae ecclesiae suprascriptae consecrabantur, ea dies esset qua crux Domini fuerat inuenta, ut simul omni laetitia eadem die celebrarentur\)). And this is also found in the holy Scriptures that this was the day of dedication when holy Solomon, while the house of God, which they were building, was perfected (\(consummata\)), stood before the altar of God and prayed, as it is written in the book of Paralipomenon.

It is not possible to grasp from this passage, on what specific date the annual memorial of dedication in 335 took place in Egeria’s time. At the same time, the traveler makes it clear that this was the day endowed with special significance by the church in

\[\text{References}\]


112 \textit{Itin. Eg.} 49.3; Maraval, 318.

113 I find the interpretation of Maraval to be more plausible: “On a établi en effet que le jour où les saintes églises susdites avaient été consacrées pour la première fois était celui où l’on avait découvert la croix du Seigneur, de sorte qu’on célèbre les deux choses ensemble, le même jour, avec grande solennité” (Maraval, \textit{Journal du voyage}, 317). Wilkinson’s translation rearranges the phrase, losing some of the meaning – precisely that the celebration on that day would commemorate \textit{both} the dedication of Martyrium and Anastasis, as well as the finding of the Cross (\textit{Egeria’s Travels}, 164).

114 \textit{Itin. Eg.} 48.1-2; Maraval, 316.
Jerusalem: not only did it commemorate the dedication of both Martyrium and the Anastasis, but the author also claims that this original dedication was purposefully assigned to the day when the True Cross was found a decade before the Golgotha complex was completed. In Egeria’s description, the celebration of encaenia in Jerusalem seems to revolve around the relic of the cross, an object which since 340s became a center of popular devotion in Jerusalem, as Egeria herself testifies in her account of the Holy Friday services. In addition, as we have seen, Egeria introduces a scriptural warrant for the celebration, connecting the dedication of the Christian church in Jerusalem with Solomon’s dedication of the First Temple. The allusion to the book of Paralipomenon (Chronicles) refers to the description of this event in 2 Chron 5-7, including the procession with the ark and its deposition in the new temple (5:2-13), Solomon’s prayer in the temple before the altar (6:12-42) and his sanctification of the temple by offering sacrifices and celebrating the feast for seven days (7:5-9). The meaning of this scriptural parallel can extend beyond its role of a mere scriptural warrant: in Chronicles, Solomon dismisses the people on the “twenty third of the seventh month,” the octave of the Sukkot/Feast of the Tabernacles (2 Chron 7:10), indicating that it was on the feast of the Tabernacles that the temple was dedicated (cf. 1 Kings 8:2, 65; 2 Chron 7:8). The place of such allusion in Egeria’s account may signify that connection between Jewish autumn festivals (at least as they appeared in the Scriptures) and

115 Itin. Eg. 37.1-3; Maraval, 284-287.

116 See also 1 Kings 8:1-66; however, Egeria follows more closely the Vetus Latina version of Chronicles, as observed by Fraser, “Feast of Encaenia,” 170, 170 n.534.

Christian celebrations connected with the new, Christian temples have prevailed in the popular mind. On the other hand, specific liturgical acts of the scriptural Solomon that Egeria mentions (standing before the altar, praying) or possibly implies (deposition of the ark, sacrifices) may suggest a connection between the ceremonials of dedication of the new temple of Christ and Solomonic dedications. We have no evidence to corroborate such speculative suggestions, but a supposition that the dedication of churches in Jerusalem could have involved a special prayer before the altar, resembling the prayer of Solomon (1 Kings 8:23-53; 2 Chron 6:14-42), is not improbable.

Egeria’s description in her travelogue reflects the development of this festival into an eight-day celebration, following the scriptural example. It involved a large assembly of laity and monks (monachorum et apuctitum), coming even from distant places (Mesopotamia, Syria, Egypte, Thebaid) and forty to fifty bishops. It appears that the attendance of this feast was perceived as being obligatory, along the lines of biblical injunctions regarding mandatory appearance “before the Lord” on Passover, Shavuot and Sukkot (Deut 16:16). As Egeria states, “they think that whoever is not present at such a great feast, commits a grave sin.”

Thus, the traditions surrounding the dedication of the holy places in Jerusalem, as they have formed by the last quarter of the 4th century associated the building of the Christian temple in Jerusalem with the restoration (to a larger extent) of the Solomonic temple (2 Chr. 6:1-7:11). Egeria does not say whether the ceremonies at the feast of dedication in any way replicated the ceremonies described in 1 Kings and 2 Chronicles (bringing in of the ark, prayer, descent of the glory of God, animal sacrifices) and we

118 Itin. Eg. 49.2; Maraval, 318.
have no hard evidence that the connection between the OT and Christian rites of
dedication was expressed in the 4th century in a ritual form.

2.2.2 The Feast of Encaenia in Jerusalem: Sozomen.

In his account of the dedication ceremonies in Jerusalem in September 335, the
fifth-century historian Sozomen sheds light upon the annual liturgical commemoration of
the dedication of “Great Martyrium” (as he calls it) by the Jerusalem Christian
community in the fifth century:

From that day [=the day of dedication in 335] the church of Jerusalem with great
joy holds this feast every year, when also initiations are performed and the church
celebrates for eight days in a row, when many people come together from every
place under the sun and from everywhere visit these actual holy places at the time
of this feast.119

As the time of Sozomen’s work, which itself was dependent on Socrates, dates to
the period after 443 CE,120 and his coming to Constantinople dates to 425,121 it would be
plausible to suggest that the celebration of the initiation ceremonies on the feast and
during the octave of encaenia was introduced some time after the construction and
dedication of the Anastasis and the Martyrium in September 335. The Letter to
Armenians,122 written by bishop Macarius of Jerusalem probably soon after the original

119 ἐξ ἐκείνου δὲ ἐπήσιν ταύτην τὴν ἐορτήν λαμπρὸς μάλα ἄγει ἡ Ἰεροσολύμων ἐκκλησία, ὡς καὶ
μυήσεις ἐν αὐτῷ τελεῖσθαι, καὶ ὡκτὼ ἡμέρας ἐφεξῆς ἐκκλησιαζεῖν, συνενέα τε πολλοῖς σχεδὸν ἕκτην
τῆς ὑπὸ ἡλίου, οἱ καθ’ ἱστορίαν τῶν ἱερῶν τῶν γενόμενον πάντοθεν συνηγορεύσι κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ταύτης τῆς
πανηγύρεως. Ibid. 2.26.4; Bidez-Hansen, 87-88.

120 Glenn F. Chesnut, The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret and

121 Ibid., 192.
dedication of the holy places (Macarius died in 335-336) still mentions Pascha, Epiphany and Pentecost as the only baptismal feasts.\textsuperscript{123} Egeria, similarly, mentions the octave of \textit{encaenia}, but does not mention baptismal ceremonies taking place, although she definitely describes the feast of \textit{encaenia} as that of great solemnity.

2.2.3 The Feast of Encaenia in Jerusalem: The Armenian Lectionary.

Whatever may be the original date when the dedication of the holy places in Jerusalem was celebrated (13, 14 or 17 September), the evidence of the first liturgical sources is clear – the traditional date of \textit{encaenia} by the end of the fourth-beginning of the fifth century was September 13. Our earliest liturgical source for the liturgy of Jerusalem is the so-called ‘Armenian Lectionary,’ a translation of readings and rubrics for the liturgical year as celebrated by the hagiopolite community. It was first published by Conybeare in 1905,\textsuperscript{124} on the basis of two manuscripts – but it was the work of Charles (Athanase) Renoux which provided us with the third manuscript of the lectionary (ms. \textit{Jerusalem 121})\textsuperscript{125} and the subsequent comparative edition of all three manuscripts

\textsuperscript{122} The text of the Letter has survived only in Armenian translation; see its recent edition by Abraham Terian, ed. trans. \textit{Macarius of Jerusalem: Letter to the Armenians}. AVANT 4 (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2008), for the discussion of the Letter’s Greek Vorlage and dating see the introduction, pp. 13-73.

\textsuperscript{123} “And this (form of mystery) they hasten to carry out with great eagerness in the holy places of Christ, which all Christians, those who fear Christ, must also carry out in the baptismal service on these days: on the holy Epiphany of the Nativity of the Lord, and on the saving Easter of the life-giving Passion of Christ and on Pentecost full of grace – when the divine descent of the life-giving Spirit overflowed among us” (trans. Terian, \textit{Macarius}, 83). This passage from the \textit{Letter} survived in the discourse “On the Epiphany of our Lord and Saviour” by the 7\textsuperscript{th} century author Anania of Shirak. The editor of the recent publication of the Letter of Macarius has restored the excerpt where it belonged, parallel with § 223.1b- 11a of the Letter’s text as found in \textit{Kanonagirk’} - see Terian, \textit{Macarius}, 63-68 and the text of the passage, 82-87.

This new edition allowed Renoux to date the document and liturgical practices reflected therein between 417 (death of John II of Jerusalem, commemorated in *AL*) and 438/439 (transfer of St Stephen’s relics to the church of St Stephen, not yet attested in *AL*).\footnote{Renoux, PO 36.2, p. 360-363.}

Being a liturgical document which contains readings and minimal rubrics, *AL* does not include the euchological texts and hence the search for any trace of a liturgical rite performed at the dedication/consecration of churches or altars would be futile. It does seem useful for us to look at the set of readings used at the liturgy on September 13, as it may give a glimpse into the framework of theological ideas underlying both the rite and the feast of dedication:\footnote{As determined by Charles Renoux who compared the data of the manuscripts with the evidence from the homilies of the hagiopolite presbyter Hesychius – “Un document nouveau sur la liturgie de Jérusalem: les homélies festales d’Hésychius de Jérusalem,” *Maison-Dieu* 139 (1979): 139-164. See the history of the publication and research into *AL* in Fraser, “The Feast of Encaenia,” 185-189.}

\footnote{Athanase Renoux, ed. *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121*, v. 35.1, 36.2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969-1971).}

\footnote{“Un manuscrit du lectionaire arménien de Jérusalem,” *Le Muséon* 74 (1961): 361-385.}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ms. Jerusalem 121</th>
<th>ms. Paris 44</th>
<th>ms. Erevan 985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On September 13, dedication of the holy places of Jerusalem.</td>
<td>On September 23 is the dedication of the holy places.</td>
<td>On September 13, the dedication of the holy places of Jerusalem, which they make during eight days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first day at the Holy Anastasis.</td>
<td>The first day, at the Holy Anastasis and this canon is performed:</td>
<td>The first day, at the Holy Anastasis and this canon is performed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 64, antiphon: <em>To you, O God, belongs praise in Sion and to you will be given the prayer in Jerusalem</em> (Ps 64:2)</td>
<td>Psalm 64: <em>To you, O God, belongs praise</em> (Ps 64:2).</td>
<td>[same as J]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the First Letter of the Apostle Paul to Timothy, 240:</td>
<td>[same]</td>
<td>[same]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… (1 Tim 3: 14-16)</td>
<td>[same]</td>
<td>[same]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleluia, Ps 147: <em>Praise the Lord, O Jerusalem.</em></td>
<td>[same]</td>
<td>[same]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospel according to John: 241: <em>It was therefore the Dedication in Jerusalem and it was winter... and everything that John said about this man was true, and they believed in him</em> (Jn 10:22-42)</td>
<td>[same]</td>
<td>[same]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the second day, they assemble at Holy Martyrium and the same canon is performed. And, on the same day, they raise the precious Cross for the whole assembly.</td>
<td>[…] assemble at Martyrium and the same canon is performed. They raise the precious Cross for the whole assembly.</td>
<td>And the next day, the second day, they assemble at the Holy Martyrium and the same canon is performed. And, on the same day, they raise the precious, life-giving [and] holy Cross for the whole assembly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

129 Ms. Paris 44 gives an erroneous date for the feast (Renoux, PO 36.2, p. 361 n.1).
What is remarkable here is that only a two-day festival is attested in AL (with an exception of the tenth-century ms. Erevan 985), with the repetition on the second day of the kanon of readings from the first (Ps 64, 1 Tim 3:14-16, Ps 147, Jn 10:22-42). This data apparently contradicts the witness of Egeria, Sozomen and of the later Armenian lectionaries, as well as of the Georgian Lectionary which are consistent in reporting that the annual feast of encaenia had an octave. The reason for such discrepancy may lie either in the adjustment of liturgical practices in Jerusalem in the beginning of the fifth century, which seems hardly probable, as we have evidence for the existence of the octave of Dedication from the post-fifth-century sources. In order to consider an alternative, we have to allow the possibility that AL has preserved traces of different stages in the development of the hagiopolite liturgical cursus and some of its features, as recorded in the AL, reflect a stage in the development of Jerusalem calendar which is earlier than the time of Egeria.

In his study regarding one of the Armenian manuscripts that preserves the text of AL, the 9th-10th cent. Paris BN arm. 44, Charles Renoux notes several archaic features of the document pertaining to the celebration of the sixth Saturday of Lent and to the pericopes from the 1 Samuel in the lectionary. These features demonstrate, for him, that liturgical practices preserved in the document (and manuscript Paris 44) do not

---

130 As also noted by Fraser, “The Feast of Encaenia,” 190-192.


132 Itin. Eg. 49.1.

133 This is one of the possibilities suggested by Fraser, “The Feast of Encaenia,” 190-191. In his second suggestion, his conclusions coincide with ours.

merely reflect the state of hagiopolite liturgy between 417 and 438/9, but may also preserve vestiges of earlier usages that can be traced to the fourth or even third century.\textsuperscript{135} With Renoux’s observations in mind, it is conceivable that the manuscripts \textit{Paris 44} and \textit{Jerusalem 121} that record a two-day feast for \textit{encaenia}, rather than an octave, reflect a stage in the celebration of this feast that was earlier than the cursus at the time of Egeria’s visit (381-384). In the two witnesses to \textit{AL} we may see the intermediary stage between the earliest stage in the development of the feast\textsuperscript{136} – one day celebration of the dedication and of the finding of the cross – and the emergence of the dedication octave: a two-day feast with the cross exaltation ceremony shifted onto the second day.\textsuperscript{137} At the same time, the \textit{AL} does give readings and rubrics for the octave celebrations of Epiphany\textsuperscript{138} and Easter.\textsuperscript{139}

It is possible, therefore, that the version of the fifth-century lectionary that was preserved in the \textit{Paris 44} manuscript contained a record of more archaic practices with regards to the autumn feast of dedication. There is, however, another feast which appears only in the Paris ms. of \textit{AL} and may constitute one of the earlier references to the dedication of an altar: it is the occasion marked in the rubrics as “for the dedication of all altars which they build (ամենայն սեղանոց նաւակատեաց որ կանգնեն).” As distinct from other feasts indicated in \textit{AL}, this occasion does not have a specific date assigned to it, but its canon of readings is found between the festivals of apostle Andrew.

\textsuperscript{135} Ibid., 195-6.
\textsuperscript{136} Borgehammar, \textit{How the Holy Cross was Found}.
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid.,
\textsuperscript{138} \textit{AL} 2-9; Renoux, 214-223.
\textsuperscript{139} \textit{AL} 46-51; Renoux, 314-323.
The Paris manuscript of the lectionary provides a full canon of readings for this celebration:

Ps 42:4
Hebrews 13:10-16
Alleluia, Ps 25
Matthew 23:12-22

This canon shares no readings with the feast of Encaenia on September 13, but all the readings for this occasion contain one or another reference or allusion to the altar: the psalmic verse speaks of coming “before the altar of God, to God,” while the alleluia psalm contains reference to the “circling [the Lord’s] altar” (Ps 25:6). The choice of the scripture readings also seems to be motivated by allusions to the altar, specifically, to the Levitical altar reinterpreted through the message of Christ’s parousia. The epistle reading from the last chapter of Hebrews contrasts the Christic altar and priesthood of the New Testament with the altar of the OT tabernacle (13:10, 15), while the Matthew reading concerns the oath by the altar and the sanctuary, emphasizing its sanctifying power rooted in the presence of God that dwells in it (23:18, 20-21).

There is still no consensus among scholars with regards to the origins of this celebration and its function within the fifth-century Jerusalem calendar and, unlike other feasts of the ancient Jerusalem calendar, this particular feast or occasion does not find parallels within the liturgical calendar of the Armenian church. Bernard Botte in 1957 had suggested a connection between this feast and the Jewish feast of Hanukkah, commemorating the Maccabean renovation of the Second Temple – 25 Kislev on the
lunar calendar would fall approximately at the same time when the feast of “dedication of all altars” would occur according to *Paris 44*. Such correspondence would suggest certain anti-Jewish motive behind this commemoration. However, this canon of readings finds an almost exact correspondence in another source – the 6th century Syriac lectionary from ms. *BM Add. 14528*, which features two sets of liturgical readings – for the “dedication of a holy church,” and for the “dedication of an altar,” the latter of which features the readings identical to those of *AL*. It appears that the set of readings in *AL*, situated between November 30 and December 25, has been designed toward an occasional use, rather than for a fixed annual commemoration: the set of readings was to be employed whenever a new altar and church were erected in Jerusalem. At the same time, the fixation of an occasional service at a definite point within a liturgical year would indicate an archaic character of such rubric, which seems to mark the earliest manuscript for *AL, Paris BN 44*. The later liturgical sources, the Georgian Lectionary in particular, no longer feature such a commemoration, which would suggest that a dedication of “all/any altars” was no longer considered a part of Jerusalem liturgical year from the fifth century on. The reading from Matthew 23 can be found on the third day of the octave of dedication in the Georgian lectionary which suggests that some elements of the “dedication of all altars” were incorporated into the octave. Aside from the readings, the “typicon-lectionary” of *Paris BN 44* does not mention any elements

---


145 GL 1250.
which could constitute the rite for the dedication of altars in the fourth-fifth century Jerusalem and the question, whether the rite in question at that period would be limited to the celebration of the eucharist does not find a definite answer here.

By contrast with AL, the Georgian Lectionary, usually dated between fifth and eighth century (although scholars tend to isolate several chronological layers within the document), describes the feast of September 13 as specifically "dedication of the Anastasis which is encaenia (encaenia της αναστασεως)" and prescribes a somewhat different set of readings, with the addition of the Old Testament lesson. The Epistle and Gospel readings, however, remain the same (1 Tim 3, John 10). As the data of the Georgian lectionary and tropologion (iadgari), pertaining to the feast of Dedication, arguably postdate the period under review in this chapter, we will defer a more detailed discussion of it until the next section of this dissertation.

2.2.4 Later Hagiographical Traditions Pertaining To The Encaenia In 335.

A later text associated with the event of the dedication of holy places in Jerusalem appears to reflect a tradition which forged a connection between the event of 335, the ritual of church dedication and the christological controversies of the period – the doctrinal context of the council in Tyre in 335. We encounter this tradition in the Discourse on the Finding of the Venerable and Life-giving Cross (Λόγος εἰς τὴν ἐὑρέσιν

---

146 The term used by Renoux, “Manuscrit arménien Paris 44,” 194.


toī τιμίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ), attributed to a certain Alexander, a 6th century monk/bishop of Cyprus, of whom hardly anything beyond that is known. The treatise, influenced by Josephus, Eusebius and Cyril (particularly, the latter’s Letter to the emperor Constance II), comprises the account of the history of Christianity from Tiberius to the finding of the Cross by Helena, together with an encomium to the Cross. In the aftermath of the Cross’ discovery, Alexander adds a description of the events surrounding the council of Tyre, accusations against Athanasius of Alexandria and his flight from the council. In contrast with the historical record, Athanasius in his departure did not proceed directly to Constantinople to preempt the announcement of the council’s decisions to Constantine, but briefly stationed in Jerusalem:

It was said that when Athanasius was fleeing from there, he went up into the holy city, made a prayer, anointed with the holy chrism and sanctified the houses of prayer before the coming of the other bishops (ἀνῆλθεν εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν, καὶ ποιήσας εὐχὴν, καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ μύρῳ χρίσας καὶ ἁγιάσας τοὺς εὐκτηρίους οἴκους πρὸ τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν ἐπισκόπων παρουσίας)... [after Athanasius visited the emperor,] ...the bishops, having come to Jerusalem, with joy fulfilled the feast of dedication (φαιδρῶς λίαν ἐπετέλεσαν τὴν ἑορτὴν τῶν ἐγκαινίων), with the king sending treasures and gold and silver, adorned with the precious stones, veils adorned and precious, and things suitable for distribution for the poor and honoring those who came to the feast. But when the God-loving emperor heard concerning the

149 Some scholars date the work and activity of Alexander to the 9th century, e.g. J. Straubinger, Die Kreuzaffindungslegende Untersuchungen über ihre altchristlichen Fassungen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der syrischer Texte, Forschungen zur Christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte 11.3 (Paderborn: Schönlingh, 1912), p. 73. Alexander Kazhdan noted that the “traditional date of the mid-6th c[entury] or before 614 lacks any validity” (ODB 1.60). See in support of the dating of the treatise to the time of Justinian Michel van Esbroeck, “L’opuscle ‘Sur la Croix’ d’Alexandre de Chypre et sa version géorgienne,” BK 37 (1979): 102-103. John W. Nesbitt argues for the sixth-century dating based upon the internal evidence: there is no mention of iconoclasm or Arab conquest, the burning issues for a 9th century author (“Alexander the Monk’s Text of Helena’s Discovery of the Cross (BHG 410),” in idem, Byzantine Authors: Literary Activities and Preoccupations: Texts and Translations dedicated to the Memory of Nicolas Oikonomides, The Medieval Mediterranean 49 [Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2003], 23-39, especially 32-33).

150 Athanasius, Apol. contra Ar. 82.1; Apol. ad Const. 1.3; see Timothy D. Barnes, Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire (Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard University Press, 1993), pp. 22-24.
dedication of the holy places he gave many thanks to God and was drawn more to the Christian manner of life.\textsuperscript{151}

Thus, according to a later tradition reported by Alexander, the celebration of \textit{encaenia} was preceded with the service of consecration of the ecclesiastical building by 1) prayer; and 2) anointing with chrism. Significantly, this consecration rite which through its basic structure echoes the later rites of consecration of the church and the altar, is celebrated here by one bishop (i.e. Athanasius), whereas the liturgical rite of \textit{encaenia}, as featured in this passage, seems to presuppose the presence of many bishops, a public and solemn occasion. It also must be noted that while in the surviving Greek version of the legend Athanasius’ actions at consecrating the hagiopolite churches are described as a rumour or some report, the Georgian version of the legend\textsuperscript{152} appears to report this story with the air of a certain fact:

The bishops went up to Jerusalem and found the churches already blessed and sealed with chrism and they recognized that Athanasius, patriarch of Alexandria, had dedicated (\textit{ἐνεκαίνισεν}) and blessed all the holy churches of Jerusalem. And they were first saddened on account of this, but so that not to make public the work which was from God, they also celebrated the feast of the dedication of the holy churches of Jerusalem with great joy.\textsuperscript{153}

For our purposes it suffices to point out important differences between the two accounts. Naturally, the events which unfold in both narratives are situated in the context

\textsuperscript{151} PG 87.3: 4065C- 4068A.

\textsuperscript{152} Ed. Tamila Mgalobišvili, ალექსანდრეს ქვიპრელის ქრონიკა (X–XIV სს. ხელნაწერების ძეგლი) (Tbilisi: “Mecniereba”, 1978); see also van Esbroeck, “L’opuscle ‘Sur la Croix’ d’Alexandre,” 102-121.

\textsuperscript{153} "და თარიღდებს მირონის განხორციელდება თავის მამაკაცი ჰაერი საკრძალებლად, იდვინებ მთავარმა განაახლი და აკურთხებით ყოველას. თითქმის თანამედროვე მამათმა მამათან განეკუთვნება და აღმოჩენები გავლენი წმიდა იერუსალემში და განაახლილი და აკურთხები წმიდათ იერუსალემში დიდი სიხარულით, ადამიანი თავის ინტერესს გამოაჩენს, აერთიანებს თავის აღმოჩენაში და გამოაჩენს წმიდა იერუსალემში დიდი სიხარულით (Mgalobišvili, 72-73)."
of the anti-Arian polemic at the council of Tyre: the bishops who proceed to consecrate the buildings of Jerusalem are Athanasius’ opponents and accusers. There is, at the same time, a difference between the Greek and Georgian versions: the Greek version of the legend treats the respective actions of Athanasius and the bishops as complementary: the Alexandrian bishop proceeds to consecrate the buildings, and afterwards thereafter the bishops arrive and perform the encaenia. On the other hand, the Georgian version that derives, supposedly, from another, non-extant Greek redaction of the legend,\(^\text{154}\) paints the opposition between two parties more starkly. In the second account, it is Athanasius who is effectively purging the churches of the holy city from the supposed “heretical” pollution, thus making the subsequent action of the bishops coming from Tyre quite unnecessary and, indeed, an action of the hagiographic enemies of a saint who try to conceal the information about the saint’s deed (“in order not to make public the work that was from God”). As van Esbroeck also surmises, Alexander’s legend effectively seeks to produce a literary refounding of Jerusalem, postulating its orthodox ‘genealogy’ coming back to the only “orthodox” bishop at the council of Tyre, Athanasius. The Georgian version of the legend, evidently, still contains memory of historical polemic surrounding the council and tries to unravel a contradiction between commemorating the dedication performed by the bishops who received Arius into communion.\(^\text{155}\) The remaining memory of controversy evidently can speak of a hagiopolite origin of the Discourse where the commemoration of the dedication of 335 remained one of the major feasts of the liturgical year.

\(^{154}\) van Esbroeck, Les plus anciens homéliaires, 271-273; idem, “L’opuscule”; Mgaloblišvili, p. 31-32.

\(^{155}\) Barnes, Athanasius and Constantine, 23.
The contention of both Greek and Georgian redactions of the Legend regarding the role of Athanasius at the dedication of churches in Jerusalem has no historical basis: in reality the rival bishop has fled the council in secret in order to secure his audience with Constantine before the latter would know of the council’s decisions. Likewise, we have no contemporary accounts that confirm the details of consecration ceremony as it is given in the *Discourse*. Rather, the development of a tradition regarding the use of prayer and chrism for the consecration of a significant church (or “prayer house”) reflects a later stage in the development of the rite, contemporary with the composition of the *Discourse* (mid-6th cent.). Significantly, the Georgian version of the *Discourse* described the churches consecrated by Athanasius as “blessed and sealed with *myron* (ὢδεκάδαίμον δόσιμον),” pointing at the prayer and anointing with chrism as two structural elements of the rite, as well as establishing a connection with the initiation rites through the use of the term “seal.”

The tradition regarding the use of anointing at the dedication of holy places in Jerusalem is reflected also in another non-Byzantine source, the 13th century *Synaxarion of Ter Israel*, published in Constantinople in 1834. This text also appears to have preserved a tradition that the churches of Jerusalem were anointed at their original consecration in 335, for the synaxarion entry for 4 Hori (September 13) reads:

> [After the buildings were constructed,] there were gathered multitudes of holy fathers, patriarchs and countless saintly bishops which were joined together from all parts of the universe, accompanied by priests and all the multitude of the clergy of the church and of holy ascetics and by all kinds of people coming from all parts of the world, firstly – by saint Macarius, patriarch of Jerusalem… and with the fasting, prayers and songs accompanied by tears, they anointed and

---

156 Ibid, 23.

157 For the uses of the term *σφραγίζω/σφραγίς* in patristic literature, see Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 1354-1357.
blessed, through the magnificent feasts of consecration, the church of the holy Resurrection and the chapel, even more holy, of the tomb of Christ, the fountain of life, and that of the Golgotha, and also other holy places, and they distributed to the poor a very costly meal.

In comparison with the Discourse on the Finding of the Cross, the account from this Armenian synaxarion lacks any polemical features: the assembly gathered on the occasion of dedication is described as “holy fathers, patriarchs and countless saintly bishops,” without any mention of the council of Tyre or of any controversy surrounding it. Bishop Macarius, most likely still living at the time of the original dedication, is described as the true central figure at the festival, with no mention of the imperial representative. At the same time, this late medieval witness attests to a continuing tradition of recasting the events of 335 in terms of liturgical customs of a later period when the anointing of the altar and/or church building was an inalienable part of dedication ceremonies.

2.3 Dedication of Churches/Altars in Syria: Ephrem the Syrian

In contrast to later legendary material, the first solid evidence for the use of oil in a Christian rite of dedication is found in one of the hymns by the greatest church father of the Syriac-speaking world, Ephrem the Syrian. His life span usually is set between

\footnote{G. Bayan, ed., trans. Le synaxaire arménien de Ter Israel. Il. Mois de Hori. PO 6, fasc. 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1971), 214-215 (emphasis mine).}
approximate 306 AD and June 9, 373, and he is usually presented in scholarship as a solitary (ihidôyô) preacher and catechist in the church of Nisibis (modern Nusaybin in SE Turkey) and, for the last decade of his life, in the church of Edessa (Urfâ). The Hymns on Virginity constitute one among Ephrem’s great cycles of poems (madraše), which were arranged after the author’s death at least by the end of the 5th century.

This particular hymn cycle, however, does not represent a unified composition: in particular, hymns 4 to 7 constitute a separate sub-cycle, dealing with “oil, the olive tree and the mysteries of our Lord (ܥܠܡܫܚܐܘܙܝܬܐܘܐܙܝܡܪܢ),” as the rubric at the end of hymn 3 testifies. The link between oil and mysteries/symbols of Christ is manifested through the rich baptismal imagery which Ephrem uses in these poems. Thus, in Virg. 4.14 he compares the flowing river of paradise to the “outpouring of oil… as a glorious symbol for the churches (ܒܪܐܙܐܫܒܝܚܐܠܥܕܬܐ)” which “illumines to the holy church.”

---


161 Brock, Hymns on Paradise, 11; the traditions associated with the 6th century Vita of Ephrem (his travel to Caesarea and Egypt, interaction with Basil and Bishoi, ordination to diaconate) are considered today as a result of later ‘monasticisation’ of Ephrem’s figure to fit later topoi of monastic sanctity – see on this Joseph P. Amar, “Byzantine Ascetic Monachism and Greek Bias in the Vita Tradition of Ephrem the Syrian,” OCP 58 (1992): 123-156.

162 Brock, Hymns on Paradise, 35.


The central image in this couplet is “oil” which “has three names, trumpets of baptism (ܡܫܚܐ),” which, according to Robert Murray, refers to the trinitarian baptismal anointing. This initiation discourse, in which the metaphorical language of “oil” is set, may establish a proper context for the passage directly related to our study, which appears earlier in the same hymn:

Oil is the scepter for old age
and the armor for youth.
It supports sickness and
is the bulwark of health.
It is one, but it is many in its uses:

it gives anointing to altars,
and they bear the offering of reconciliation. Who will be sufficient to it which is extended to the evil as to the good, and soothes the oppressed as the just, which, like its Lord, has opened its treasure-house to carry from it every help?

In this passage, the various uses of the oil (ܡܫܚܐ), particularly those related to protection and healing, are described as a direct extension of the saving economy of “its Lord (ܡܪܗ),” i.e. Christ, the “anointed one (ܡܫܝܚܐ),” a connection rooted in Syriac etymology of the term.

Here, however, the significance of anointing acquires one additional aspect: the oil is also used to anoint the altar to prepare it for the eucharistic celebration. In Ephrem’s symbolic world, the pre-baptismal anointing (a most likely subject matter of

165 Symbols of Church and Kingdom, 128.

166 Virg. 4, 10; ed. Edmund Beck, Hymnen de virginitate, CSCO 223, Scriptores syri 94 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CSCO, 1962), 15. For this passage I followed the translation by Kathleen E. McVey, Ephrem the Syrian: Hymns, CWS (New York, Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1989), 278, with some changes, particularly regarding the translation of the term ܡܫܚܐ.
Virg. 4.14) has a variety of meanings, “pneumatological and christological,” as well as preparatory. While in other passages, like Virg. 4.14 the function of oil is to provide anointing, healing and illumination (the oil “illumines [ܡܢܼܗܪ] to the holy church”), in Virg. 4.4 its function is mainly limited to healing and preparation: the altars are prepared through anointing so that they could be fit for the celebration of the eucharist which, significantly, is described here as the “sacrifice of reconciliation (ܩܘܪܒܢܬܪܥܘܬܐ),” possibly reflecting the covenantal language of the OT sacrifices. Likewise, the term used to describe the function that the oil provides for the altars – anointing, mšikhuthā – is rather loose and does not indicate whether it was oil or myron that were used at the anointing of the altar. It would seem though, as it has been already pointed out, that Ephrem refers here to a well-known and established custom for the Syriac-speaking communities of which he was aware: the initiation of a Christian altar by anointing it with oil before the celebration of the (first) eucharist. The language of “anointing the


169 Hence, the term mšikhuthā should not be translated “chrism,” as McVey does (p. 278), but rather simply “anointing”; see also Payne Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus, 2.2241.

170 Braun, Der christliche Altar, 1.670.

171 The statement of Ephrem in Virg. 4.10 has been a victim of a misunderstanding which sometimes recurs in the scholarly works dealing with the dedication of churches in Eastern Christian churches. It stems from the fact that one of the first to make note of this passage was the Syriac Orthodox patriarch and scholar Ignatius II Ephrem Rahmani who cites Virg. 4.10 in his commentary to the first
“altars” in this passage could be construed as alluding to Ex 40:5-6, 26-29 where Moses erects and, presumably, anoints two altars as part of the arrangement of the tabernacle. At the same time, the context of the “hymns on oil, the olive tree and the mysteries of the Lord” (Virg. 4-7) and the use of the terms meškhā and mšikhuthā alludes to the imagery connected with the initiation rites: just as at the baptismal ceremonies, also in this case the anointing with oil effected healing/restoration and purification of an object or person in preparation for the service to God.

2.3.1 Consecration Of An Altar In Hagiography: The Case Of Julian Saba.

An additional reference alluding to the consecration of an altar, perhaps a portable one, in the Syriac milieu in the later fourth-early fifth century can be found in the narrative of the life of the fourth-century Syriac ascetic Julian Saba (d. 367), one of the earliest known ascetical figures in the Syriac world. The earliest allusion to this edition of the 5th century Syriac church order Testamentum Domini (Testamentum Domini nostri Jesu Christi [Mainz: Kirchheim, 1899], 156 n. 1). This citation has led some scholars, including Gregorios Ioannides, to otherwise exceptional article “Il rito della dedicazione di una chiesa negli eucologi ciprioti,” BBGG III s. 5 (2008): 150, 150 n. 11 to misattribute Ephrem’s quote to the Testamentum Domini itself, also following Rahmani’s slightly amended translation (he translates میکس میشکه as “ut portent sacrificium nostrum” instead of simply “sacrificium”). In fact, Rahmani himself points out in his commentary that “animadvertendum porro est, a Testamento nullum commemorari ritum ad benedicendam ecclesiam, de cujus constitutione partibusque, quibus ipsa constat, distincte agit” and that Ephrem’s allusion to anointing in the “hymno de oleo” is the only such allusion before the Areopagite (Rahmani, TD 156).


episode from his life occurs in the passage from *A History of the Monks in Syria* or *Philotheus* by Theodoret of Cyrrhus (c.393-c. 466), composed probably during the latter’s tenure as the bishop of this city in no earlier than 440, but no later than 448. The passage in question concerns the journey of the saint with a few select disciples to Mount Sinai in order to escape the attention of numerous pilgrims flocking to him. The company of monks was carrying with them necessary provisions of bread and salt and gathered the drinkable water on the way, as Theodoret describes, providing a helpful illustration of the practices of contemporary pilgrims. Upon arriving at their destination, Julian and his companions devoted some time to the practice of silence (τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἡσυχίαν ὑφήγοντο) and, finally, set apart that, apparently deserted place, for liturgical celebration:

> Upon that rock, in the [crack of] which Moses, the chief of prophets, was hiding when he was deemed worthy to see God, as far as he was able, [Julian] has built a church and sanctified the divine altar which survived until today, [after which] he returned to his own place of struggle.179

---


176 See Canivet, *Le monachisme syrien*, 31-35; as Canivet, following Nikolay Glubokovsky, points out, three of the figures discussed in *Philotheus* appear in Theodoret’s *Ecclesiastical History* (1.6.7; 2.26.30; 3.19.24; 4.22.25, 4.24.27) with specific allusions to that earlier work – Canivet, ibid., 28, 28 n. 3; Glubokovsky, *Блаженный Феодорит, епископ Киррский* (Moscow, 1890), 2.417, n. 26.

177 ταύτην [τιμήν] ἀποδιδράσκων – δῆλος γὰρ ἅπασι γεγονός εἶλκε πρὸς αὐτὸν διὰ τῆς φήμης τούς τῶν ἁγιάθων ἑραστάς (Philotheus 2.13; Canivet, Leroy-Molinghen, 222).

178 Canivet, Leroy-Mollinghen, 223, n.1.

179 Ἔν ἐκείνη δὲ τῇ πέτρᾳ, ώρ’ ἢ κρύπτομενος Μωϋσῆς τῶν προφητῶν ὁ κορυφαῖος ἡξεύθη τῶν θεῶν ἰδεῖν, ὡς δυνατόν ἦν ἰδεῖν, ὁ κορυφαῖος ἡξεύθη τῶν θεῶν ἰδεῖν, ὡς δυνατόν ἦν ἰδεῖν, ἀκολύθησαν δευτέρων καὶ τῶν ἁγίασας θυσίαστι οὗ καὶ εἰς δεύτερο διέμεινεν, εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν ἐπανήκε ταλαίπωραν. - *Philotheus* 2.13; Canivet, Leroy-Mollinghen, 222, 224.
Sidney Griffith estimates that Julian’s visit to the Mt. Sinai must have occurred around 362.\(^{180}\) During her journey through holy sites of Palestine in 380s Egeria gave a brief description of a church at the bottom of the mountain, surrounded by monastic cells, and another, small church at the summit of the mountain next to the “cave of holy Moses (spelunca ubi fuit sanctus Moyses).”\(^{181}\) It seems reasonable to suggest that Theodoret intended to attribute the foundation of one of those churches to Julian Saba: there were only two churches during Egeria’s visit to the mountain and Theodoret is clear that Julian’s church was still standing in the first half of 5\(^{th}\) century. However one views the historicity of Theodoret’s attribution of the church, it seems that the building in question could have not been anything more than a small chapel for the needs of the monastics and pilgrims, exactly how Egeria in 380s seems to describe the building on the summit of the mountain.

What is more significant in Theodoret’s narration is the claim that Julian Saba himself “sanctified the divine altar” of the newly-built church (ἐκκλησίαν δειμάμενος καὶ θείον ἁγιασάς θυσιαστήριον).\(^{182}\) As Griffith notes, despite the reservations of some earlier scholars, there is no reason to doubt the hagiographical evidence that Julian Saba was a priest.\(^{183}\) The Syriac hymns attributed to Ephrem provide a parallel to Theodoret’s account in describing Julian’s activity in terms of scriptural typology:

Moses set up the altar of sacrifices,

---

\(^{180}\) Griffith, “Julian Saba,” 191. It is clear from Philotheus 2.14 that Julian Saba’s pilgrimage to Mt. Sinai was contemporaneous with the reign of his namesake Julian the Apostate (361-363) (Canivet, Leroy-Molinghen, 224-225).

\(^{181}\) Itin. 3.1, 3.3-6; CCSL 175, p. 40; Wilkinson, Egeria’s Travels, 109-110.

\(^{182}\) 2.13; Canivet, Leroy-Molinghen, 224.

\(^{183}\) Griffith, “Julian Saba,” 192; Edmund Beck notes, with respect to Jul.Sab. 20.3 and 21.20 that “Julianos Saba war also nach den Hymnen Priester,” Hymnen auf Julianos Saba, CSCO 322, p. 77 n. 2; CSCO 323, p. 81 n.9.
and he sprinkled the blood of animals on it.
Saba set up the altar of holiness
and broke upon it there the living body.\textsuperscript{184}

The use of the verb ܐܬܩܢ ("set up/construct/fix") for both the action of Moses (Ex 24:4) and of Sabas may allude to the rite of consecration of an altar, followed by liturgical celebration, which brings to mind the passage from Ephrem’s \textit{Hymn. Virg.} discussed above where an altar is required to be anointed with oil for the eucharist to be celebrated on it. However, Ephrem’s hymns say nothing of the manner in which the altar was “set up.” This lacuna came to be filled by another source discussed by Sidney Griffith, the \textit{mêmrâ} on Julian Saba attributed to Jacob of Sarug, where the same episode is narrated thus:

\begin{quote}
Saba too
was raised up
to Mt. Sinai…
He \textit{anointed} and designed
a holy church
in that splendid place.\textsuperscript{185}
\end{quote}

The mention of anointing of the altar at its consecration in the 6\textsuperscript{th} century source is not striking, as such practice appears to be quite established by the time it was described in \textit{Corpus Areopagiticum} (end of the fifth-beginning of the sixth century). The earlier sources – Ps.-Ephrem and Theodoret – are less specific in their description of Julian’s actions which leads us to suppose that the \textit{mêmrâ} attributed to Jacob of Sarug reflects liturgical realities contemporary to the time of its author. A paradoxical feature of all these texts regarding Julian’s activity on Sinai is that the liturgical celebrant who consecrated the new altar was Julian Saba himself, who according to our sources was a

\textsuperscript{184} The ET is cited after Griffith, “Julian Saba,” 192.

\textsuperscript{185} Damascus ms. 15/12, C.III-D.I; cited after Griffith “Julian Saba,” 191 (emphasis mine).
priest, not a bishop. It appears that previous scholars of Julian Saba as ascetical figure rarely addressed this aspect of his biography, a quite unusual action of a monastic priest “consecrating” or even “anointing” the altar of the newly built church.\(^\text{186}\) The fact, however, that the hagiographical tradition chooses to narrate this story without vesting Julian Saba retroactively with episcopal authority shows that such action was anything but unusual. In fact, only the later canonical literature of West Syriac tradition contains specific prohibitions against the priests consecrating altars and requires for a bishop to “complete/perfect (ܢܫܡ) the altars consecrated by presbyters.”\(^\text{187}\) Even though it is hard to speculate what were the concrete actions implied by Theodoret’s term ἁγιάζειν τὸ θεῖον θυσιαστήριον or Ps-Ephrem’s “setting up” of an altar, Ephrem’s genuine witness to the use of oil for the consecrating of an altar can suggest that those who consecrated the altars with oil in the 5\(^{\text{th}}\) century Syriac communities might have been presbyters, not just bishops.

Another curious parallel between the hagiographical evidence and the canonical literature of the Syriac tradition occurs also in Theodoret’s Philotheos and this time involved the author himself as witness. He describes the laudable eucharistic piety of another monastic figure – a Syrian monk Maris who had a desire for a long time to be present at the eucharistic liturgy (ποθήσας δὲ διὰ χρόνου μακροῦ τὴν πνευματικὴν καὶ μυστικὴν θυσίαν προσφερομένην ἱδεῖν). Fulfilling his request, Theodoret reports that, in

\(^{186}\) In their works on Julian Saba, Fr. Sidney Griffith and Edmund Beck discuss the consecration of an altar in the context of the Syrian monk’s eucharistic piety and the issue regarding his priestly ordination; see Griffith, 192; Beck, Hymnen auf Julianos Saba, 81.

\(^{187}\) “It is necessary that the bishop shall complete/perfect by the sign of the cross, but without myron, those altars which have been anointed by the presbyter…” (Chapters written from the Orient, ch. 5; ed. Arthur Vööbus, The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition, CSCO 367-368, Scriptores Syri 161-162 [Louvan: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1975], 164/158); “It is not lawful to permit a priest to anoint an altar…” (ibid, ch. 8; Vööbus, Synodicon, 165/158-159).
the absence of a proper altar, he celebrated the eucharist, used instead the hands of several deacons holding (presumably) the sacred vessels (καὶ ταῖς τῶν διακόνων χερσὶν ἀντὶ θυσιαστηρίου χρησάμενος τὴν μυστικὴν καὶ θείαν καὶ σωτήριον θυσίαν προσήνεγκα). The story seems to be unprecedented and, as Canivet has speculated, seemed to be sufficiently unusual for Theodoret to include it into his narrative. However, such liturgical practice makes an appearance, among other later texts, in the later canonical collection of questions and answers attributed to the pen of prominent West Syrian bishop Jacob of Edessa (c.640-708) where the use of the deacon’s hands as a quasi altar is precisely mandated for the cases where no fixed or portable altar is found. A quite different model of behaviour from the one Theodoret describes in the case of Julian Saba perhaps is explained by the fact that, as it seems, the case of Maris was the case of one-time liturgical celebration for which no consecration rite was deemed necessary.

Thus, very few disjointed pieces of evidence from the Syriac-speaking realm provides some witness to the existence of the rudimentary rites for the consecration of a new altar in the second half of the fourth-beginning of the fifth century: we know that altars may have been anointed with oil (Ephrem) or “set up”/“sanctified” in a new church (Julian Saba). It seems that such consecration could have been performed at this time by

---

189 Canivet, Le monachisme syrien, 232.
190 See Canivet, ibid., 232 n. 122.
191 “When a presbyter and the deacon go on a (journey) in a desert land and they have with them a cup and a paten, the deacon holds the cup and the paten (and) becomes a substitute for an altar – holding the paten in his right hand and the cup in his left hand; in this way the priest offers out of necessity” – Vööbus, Synodicon, 259/237.
a presbyter alone, as well as (presumably) by a bishop. It is not until the witness of Pseudo-Dionysius’ writings that we will encounter an affirmation of episcopal authority with respect to the consecration of the altar in the Syriac realm.

2.4 Anointing of the Altar in the 4th Cent. Jerusalem? – Homily on the Church by Bishop John II

In addition to the clear indication to the anointing of the altars in Ephrem and two references to the same in the sixth-century legendary material concerned with the finding of the True Cross above, there exists another tantalizing reference to the anointing in a (presumably) fourth century literary source. This is a homily that survived in Armenian translation under the title “Panegyric on the holy church of the Lord (Երիտասարդ Առաքել Բազիլիկ Սուրբ Եկեղեցի)” (CPG 3626), successfully attributed by Michel van Esbroeck to John II, the bishop of Jerusalem in 387-417. This homily was first published in 1966 by P. Ananian on the basis of the 19th century ms. *Venice 731* and attributed to John the Chorepiscopos whom Ananian had placed at the beginning of the eighth century. The next publication of this homily a few years later by van

---


193 The homily in *Venice 731* has a slightly different title “Panegyric on the holy catholic church (Կաթոլիկ Առաքել)” : see Barsegh Sargisian, Մայրցուցակ հայերի արձանագրական գրականություն. հիշատակային հարուստ Վենեցիա (Venice, 1924), 2:389.
Esbroeck\textsuperscript{194} produced a better edition of the text on a basis of an older manuscript – the 15\textsuperscript{th} century \textit{čarantir} (florilegium) \textit{Erevan 993}.\textsuperscript{195} Likewise, van Esbroeck also has put forward a more intriguing hypothesis regarding the date and provenance of the homily, attributing it to the successor of Cyril\textsuperscript{196} and suggesting September 15, 394 for the date when the homily was spoken. Its \textit{Sitz im Leben}, according to van Esbroeck, was the event of the dedication of the church of Holy Sion in Jerusalem. Van Esbroeck makes this assumption on the basis of several pieces of evidence which we will examine further and, if his conclusions are correct, we will have at our disposal another late-fourth century homily, originating from Jerusalem and complementing, as we will see, the evidence from Ephrem’s \textit{Hymns on Virginity}. The identification of “John” of the homily with the bishop of Jerusalem and of the church in question with the Holy Sion stems from convergence of three pieces of evidence\textsuperscript{197}:

1. A rubric in the Paris manuscript of the Georgian Lectionary (ms. \textit{Paris B.N. iber. 3}, f. 155\textsuperscript{f}), indicating the commemoration for the Friday before the Palm Sunday, cross-referenced from a similar commemoration of March 29, as of “John bishop of Jerusalem who first has built up (\textit{ÀÙÀÛÄÍÀ}) Sion and Modestes who has built it up a second time after the fire.”\textsuperscript{198} In opposition to the opinion of Kekelidze who


\textsuperscript{196} “Homélie sur l’église,” 287.

\textsuperscript{197} van Esbroeck, “Jean II,” 107-109.

\textsuperscript{198} Michel Tarxnišvili, \textit{Le grand lectionnaire}, 1.98/1.80.
considered this “John” of various redactions of the Georgian Lectionary\textsuperscript{199} to be John the Merciful, the 7\textsuperscript{th} century archbishop of Alexandria,\textsuperscript{200} Garitte convincingly identified this hierarch who “built up” the church of Holy Sion with John II, bishop of Jerusalem in 387-417.\textsuperscript{201}

2. The reference to the date of September 15 as the date when the encaenia for the Sion church took place was found in the unpublished Georgian homily on Dedication by John of Bolnisi (Iovane Bolneli), a 9\textsuperscript{th} century bishop of a town in Kvemo Kartli (modern Georgia).\textsuperscript{202} Here the author refers to the feast of September 13 as the dedication of the holy Anastasis, of September 14 as the dedication of the “holy catholic apostolic church,” i.e. the Martyrium, and of September 15 as the “encaenia of the holy and glorious Sion which is the mother

\textsuperscript{199} Two other 10\textsuperscript{th} century manuscripts of the Georgian lectionary contain references to the commemoration of bishops John and Modestes on March 29 and on the 6\textsuperscript{th} Friday of Lent. The Lathal manuscript reads for the Friday before the Palm Sunday: “Synaxis at Sion. Memory of archbishop John and of Modestes who built up (აღაშენა) Jerusalem” (Kekelidzze, Ierusalimskii kanonar’, p. 67). The Kala ms., on the other hand, reads: “The memory is of holy hierarchs John and Modestes who built up (აღაშენეს – plural!) Jerusalem” (ibid., 193). It is precisely the last reference which made Kekelidze to interpret “John” of this paragraph as the contemporary of Modestes, John the Merciful of Alexandria (609-620) (ibid., 193-194). However, the presence of the commemoration for John, “bishop of Jerusalem” on March 29 in the Armenian lectionary (dated to 417-439) (Renoux, Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121, pp. 232-233) confirms that Kekelidze’s interpretation is incorrect.

\textsuperscript{200} Kekelidze, Ierusalimskii kanonar’, 193-194.

\textsuperscript{201} Gérard Garitte, Le calendrier palestino-géorgien du Sinaiticus 34 (X\textsuperscript{e} siècle), Subsidia Hagiographica 30 (Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1958), 187.

\textsuperscript{202} The homily is found in ms. Athos Iviron 11, f. 178v-182, as referenced by Michel van Esbroeck in Les plus anciens homéliaires géorgiens: étude descriptive et historique, Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 10 (Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1975), 99. Van Esbroeck supposed that the familiarity of the author with the liturgical calendar of Jerusalem can be an indication that this John was a (Georgian) monk who preached in Jerusalem in the beginning of the 7\textsuperscript{th} century – after the restoration of churches and before the Arab seizure of the Holy City – and became the bishop of Bolnisi later on (ibid., 312, 315-316). More recent research by Stephane Verhelst dates the works by this author to the ninth century – see “Trois questions relatives à Jean de Bolnisi et la parabole de la brebis perdue (Origènisme, manichéisme, threnos Adam),” ARAM Periodical 18-19 (2006-2007): 165.
of all churches.” The homily attributes the construction of the church to emperor Theodosius I, which narrows down the date for the homily to 387-395 (the emperor’s death).

3. The final point depends on van Esbroeck’s interpretation of a tantalizing term “Paulicians” (պաւղոսեանսն) that appears in the Panegyric in the context of praise directed at a supposed benefactor or (re)builder of the church in question – this person is praised of putting this specific group to order. Van Esbroeck identifies these mysterious “Paulicians” with the supporters of Paulinianus, the younger brother of Jerome, whose ordination in about 394 became a bitter point of controversy between Jerome, Epiphanius of Salamis and bishop John of Jerusalem. This idea allowed the Bollandist scholar to narrow the period for this homily even more and to suggest the date of September 15, 394.

---

203 ms. Athos Iviron 11, f. 178v, cited in Les plus anciens homéliaires, 314. The full text of the passage is as follows: “Today the holy church of the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ rejoices, and with it, all holy churches rejoice, because on this same 13th of September the encaenia of this holy church of Resurrection is celebrated and on the 14th of this same month is celebrated the encaenia of the holy catholic apostolic church which [both] were built up (აღაშენა) by king Constantine. And yet on the same day the vision and adoration of the precious Cross upon which our Lord Jesus Christ hung for our salvation. And on the 15th of the same month is celebrated the encaenia of the holy and glorious Sion which is the mother of all churches which also the holy apostles founded, but Theodosius the great king built up, expanded and made glorious (adorned), in which also the holy Spirit came down on the holy day of Pentecost” (translation mine); the full English translation of the homily by Levan Gigineishvili is forthcoming in ed. Vladimir Baranov, Kazuhiko Demura, Basil Lourié, Patrologia Pacifica Secunda: Selected Papers presented to the Asia-Pacific Early Christian Studies Society Fifth Annual Conference (Sendai, Japan, September 10-12, 2009), and Other Patristic Studies (= Scrinium: Revue de patrologie, d’hagiographie critique et d’histoire ecclésiastique 6; forthcoming, Gorgias Press, 2010), 339-345. For more discussion on this homily in the context of John’s other works, see Tamila Mgaloblišvili, ed. კლარჯული მრავალთავი [Klarjeti Polykephalaion], Monuments of Old Georgian Literature 12.1 (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1991), 40-46.

204 Panegyric 37.

The latter point appears to be connected with another interesting suggestion of van Esbroeck – the identification of a person frequently alluded to and addressed in the homily with Porphyrius, the future bishop of Gaza. According to his *Vita*, prior to his episcopal ordination, Porphyrius has held the office of *stavrophylax* (the guardian of the True Cross) in Jerusalem, a key position with respect to the center of ecclesiastical life in this city, the churches of Anastasis and Martyrium. If, as we know, Porphyrius became the bishop of Gaza in 395, this would support the year 394 as a possible date when the church of Holy Sion was dedicated.

The interpretation of the evidence offered by Michel van Esbroeck has gained some acceptance in recent scholarship, but his solution (September 15, 394; Holy Sion)

206 van Esbroeck, “Jean II,” 110-111.

207 In the text of this homily, this person – evidently a benefactor or builder/commissioner of the church – is called Փոփոր (P’op’or) – see Panegyric 36, 59.

208 The *Life of Porphyrius* written by Mark the Deacon states that “Praylos, bishop of Jerusalem” τὴν παραφυλακὴν τοῦ τιμίου σταυροῦ ἐνεπίστευσεν αὐτῷ (*Vita Porphyrii* 10; ed. Henri Grégoire, M.-A. Kugener, *Marc le Diacre: Vie de Porphyre, évêque de Gaza*, Collection Byzantine [Paris: Belles Lettres, 1930], 10); the review of the edition by F. Nau is found in *Revue de l’Orient chrétien* 27 (1929-30): 422-441. The editor of the Life presupposes an anachronism here, as Praylos did not become the bishop of Jerusalem until 417. – hence it would be the previous occupant of the see, John II, who had ordained Porphyrius and granted him the office of *stavrophylax* (Grégoire-Kugener, “Introduction,” lxix-lxxi, 11 n.1). Zeev Rubin (“Porphyrius of Gaza and the Conflict between Christianity and Paganism in Southern Palestine,” in Arieh Kofsky and Guy G. Stroumsa [eds.], *Sharing the Sacred: Religious Contacts and Conflicts in the Holy Land, First-Fifteenth Centuries CE* [Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi, 1998], 31-65), following Paul Peeters (“La vie géorgienne du Porphyre du Gaza,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 59 [1941], 98) has suggested that the anachronistic *Praylos* of the Greek version replaced the name of Cyril of Jerusalem in the original version due to confusion of the Syriac *Qurilos* as *Borilos* < *Praylos* of the Greek (if one accepts the Peeters-Rubin argument in favor of the original Syriac underlying the Greek). Rubin had found it implausible that Praylos would be considered having a better reputation than John II, given that the former also was involved in the Pelagian controversy (Rubin, 52 n. 52). If Rubin’s argument is accepted, the ordination of Porphyrius to the priesthood must be redated from 392 to shortly before Cyril’s death in 386. However, it must be noted that bishop John was a much more prominent literary opponent of the Origenist and Pelagian debates than his successor and, given the (successful) attempts to purge John’s name from the calendar, I would find it much more convincing, pace Rubin, that the later redaction of *Vita Porphyrii* followed suit.

209 For the use of the term σταυρόφυλαξ, see Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, p. 1255.

cannot be accepted without question. In what follows, we will briefly review possible problems in dating and provenance of this homily and will see whether the date suggested by the Bollandist scholar stands to closer scrutiny.

1. Place. The identification of the church in question with Holy Sion was based entirely on the convergence of external evidence (Georgian lectionary, homily of John of Bolnisi). The only reference in the text of the Panegyric which can be construed as an allusion to the church of Sion occurs in § 89 where the bishop calls the hearers to ascend to the “upper room… ministering by the Holy Spirit.” The association of Sion with the “upper room” and the location of the Spirit’s descent on Pentecost can be safely attested from no later than c. 383 (the time of Egeria’s visit to the holy city): despite usual assumptions, Cyril does not mention Sion as a place of the Spirit’s descent and it is

---


212 “Let us ascend to the upper room (վերնատունն), with the holy assembly ministering by the holy Spirit, because ‘at that hour he will come, the Spirit of truth will lead you in all things’ (Jn 16:13), and ‘your good Spirit will lead me’ (Ps 142:10), and ‘those who labour by the Spirit of God,’ and ‘the Spirit is interceding’ (Rom 8:26), and ‘Spirit does [not] move backwards’ (Ezek 1:9-17), and ‘stand in the Holy Spirit’ (2 Cor 2:4-6), and ‘walk by the Spirit’ (Gal 5:16), and ‘be aglow with the Spirit’ (Rom 12:11), (you) ‘to whom through the Spirit is given the word of wisdom’ (1 Cor 12:8). For strength adorns a lion, and beauty – a peacock, but the Holy Spirit adorns a human being, by fashioning us, namely, the ‘temple of the Holy Spirit’ (1 Cor 6:19), by making us sweet-smelling, like incense that burns its smoke upwards” – Panegyric 89-91; not in the allusion to Ezek 1:9-17 was supplied by van Esbroeck, “Homélie,” 303.

213 Itinerarium Egeriae 43.3; CCSL 175, p. 85; Sion is mentioned multiple times as a station in Egeria’s description of liturgical rites of Jerusalem (25.6, 11; 27.5, 6, 7; 29.1, 2; 37.1; 39.2, 4, 5; 40.2; 41.1; 43.3 (!), 8, 9; 44.3). See also Baldwin, Urban Character of Christian Worship, 49-50.

214 Cyril of Jerusalem mentions the descent of the Spirit “upon the apostles in the form of fiery tongues here in Jerusalem in the upper church of the apostles (ἐν τῇ Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐν τῇ ἀνωτέρᾳ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐκκλησίᾳ)” (Catechesis 16.4, ed. G. Reischl, J. Rupp, S. Patris nostri Cyrrilli Hierosolymorum archiepiscopi opera quae supersunt omnia [Munich, 1848-50], 2.208-210). However, Cyril does not explicitly identify this “upper church of the apostles” with the church in Sion, but only as a place (station) where the descent of the Spirit took place (ibid., 210). The assumption that Cyril meant Sion as the location of the church became widespread in the scholarship (Walker, Holy City, 295-6, see though 286; Taylor, Christian and the Holy Places, 212), but the term “Sion” is not found in Cyril’s text of Cat. 16.4 (cf. 16.18).
Epiphanius who c. 392 amalgamates the “seven synagogues” tradition\(^{215}\) with the location of the “upper church” on Sion. Such interpretation would strengthen the argument for attributing the building of the basilica of Holy Sion to John II.\(^{216}\)

2. Date. Stéphane Verhelst has pointed out that the date of September 15 in the Georgian sources cited by van Esbroeck might not reflect the actual date of the church’s dedication, since a practice of celebrating *particular* dedications has not yet been established in the fourth- fifth century.\(^{217}\) He suggests the season or feast of Pentecost as just as good a conjecture,\(^{218}\) but it likewise is speculative, as the presence of the Spirit motif in the homily may reflect the character of Sion as the locus of the Spirit’s descent on Pentecost. It will suffice to note that there is no solid basis for establishing a definite

\(^{215}\) The tradition of “seven synagogues” on mount Sion, of which only one was left standing is mentioned by the pilgrim of Bordeaux (*Itin. Burgdigalense* 592.4-7; CCSL 175, p. 16; cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* 16.18). Epiphanius reports a similar tradition, but associates the site with the location of the apostolic “upper church” (*De mensuris et ponderibus* 14; PG 43:260-261). Recent scholarship has been engaged with the idea that the single remaining synagogue on Mt Sion was the same site as the “upper church,” later reconstructed as a basilica. The “synagogue-church” theory has been championed by scholars who maintained Jewish Christian traditions behind the origins of holy places in Jerusalem; see Bellarmino Bagatti, *The Church from the Circumcision: History and Archaeology of the Judaeo-Christians*, trans. Eugene Hoade (Jerusalem: Franciscan Print Press, 1971), 117-118; Bargil Pixner, “Church of the Apostles Found on Mt Zion?” *Biblical Archaeology Review* 16.3 (1990): 23-28; Simon C. Mimouni, “La synagogue ‘judéo-chrétienne’ de Jérusalem au Mont Sion: texte et contexte,” *POC* 40 (1990): 215-234; Walker, *Holy City*, 286-289; for the criticism of this supposition, see Taylor, 207-220. Verhelst emphasizes the presence of the relic of the “throne of James” in Jerusalem, attested by Eusebius (*HE* 7.19), to justify the suggestion of “l’intégration de la synagogue primitive dans l’église byzantine de la Sainte-Sion” (*Traditions judéo-chrétiennes*, 191-2).

\(^{216}\) Joan Taylor argues against the existence of any pre-Constantinian structure at the location of Sion and dates the construction of Sion basilica to the time of bishop Maximus, Cyril’s predecessor - *Christians and the Holy Places*, 212-220. Taylor dismisses the evidence which van Esbroeck collects as “late and doubtful,” while stressing that the Letter of presbyter Lucianus (PL 41:807-15) describing the translation of St Stephen’s relics into the church of Holy Sion (in sanctam ecclesiam Sion ubi et archidiaconus fuerat ordinatus – PL 41:815) is silent on the issue of John II’s role in the construction of the basilica (Taylor, 213). The argument *e silentio* in the document entirely devoted to a different issue (the relics of Stephen) can hardly be taken as fully convincing.

\(^{217}\) Verhelst cites the dedication feasts of the church at Bethlehem and of the Nea church on September 18 and 16 respectively – within the octave of Encaenia – whose actual dedication dates were May 31 and November 20 – *Traditions judéo-chrétiennes*, 201-202, 202 n. 207.

\(^{218}\) Ibid., 202-203.
terminus ad quem except within the limits of John II’s tenure as the bishop of the holy city (387-417) and the end of Theodosius’ reign (395).

Another potential problem with the homily’s attribution lies in the fact that this text may be the first recorded instance of endowing Gregory of Nazianzus with the title of “Theologian (Աստուածաբան).” Unless we explain this appellation to the transmission in the late manuscript tradition (our earliest ms. of the homily belongs to the 15th century), we need another corroboration of the use of this title in the 390s in order to explain its appearance here, fifty years before our first unambiguous witness to this title – the Acta of the Council of Chalcedon (451).

Therefore, while the setting of this text in the late fourth century Jerusalem is quite probable, and its association with the church of Holy Sion possible, even though still undetermined, its precise dating to September 15, 394 appears to be based on assumptions which are too broad to be conclusive. Leaving aside for now the critical assessment of van Esbroeck’s analysis, we will turn to the text of the Panegyric itself in order to see what evidence it provides for the early history of church dedication in Jerusalem. The homily consists of eight self-contained structural units, each one being devoted to an exposition of one or several scriptural types which is then applied to the temple and the sanctuary. On several occasions, the author proceeds to exalt the

---

219 Panegyric 15.

220 The title “theologian” appears in the inscription preceding an excerpt from Gregory’s Letter to Cledonius: τοῦ μακάριου Γρηγορίου τοῦ θεολόγου ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Κληδόνιον – Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum, ed. E. Schwarz, vol. 2.1.3 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1933), 114; cf. ODB 2:880; Bernard Wyß, “Gregor II (Gregor von Nazianz),” RAC 12 (1983), col. 796. The use of the term in the inscription of the letter suggests, however, that the application of this term to Gregory was common enough before its appearance in the acts of this council. Another documented use of this moniker is found in Gregory’s 7th century biography written by the presbyter Gregory (PG 35:288C).
apparent benefactor of the church – identified by van Esbroeck with Porphyrius – and, almost always, concludes with exhortation to his audience to imitate scriptural models presented above. The homily contains more than 200 scriptural quotations (direct and not) and heavily borrows from the Old Testament temple language, apocalyptic literature (e.g. Fourth Book of Ezra\textsuperscript{222}) and Evagrian ascetical theology.\textsuperscript{223}

Regardless of the correctness of van Esbroeck’s dating of the homily, careful study of its text clearly shows that the dedication of a newly-built church was indeed its original \textit{Sitz im Leben}, for at the outset of his exegetical exposition, the author says:

\begin{quote}
Now, watered from the streams of the Holy Spirit, let us dance like David before the ark of the Lord, crying out the power of miracles which took place in our days. Glorifying him\textsuperscript{224} with resplendent words let us offer gifts to the newly-built propitiatory\textsuperscript{225} and the divinely-indwelled bridal chamber which summons us from earth.\textsuperscript{226}
\end{quote}

The bishop likens the ecclesial celebration at hand to David’s rejoicing before the ark of the covenant (2 Sam 6:4), but most importantly he calls the people to honor the newly-

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item The types explored in each section of the homily are: seven-tiered heaven (27-33), the “Jerusalem above” (34-40), Paradise in Eden (41-55), the ark of “Shem and Noah” (56-61), the mount of Abraham, the Golgotha and the ladder of Jacob (62-65), Mount Sinai, the burning bush and tabernacle (66-72), the holy place, the “room of veil,” i.e. the adytum (73-84), the temple of Solomon, Zerubbabel and Ezekiel, the marriage of Christ and the church (85-91). See also \textit{Panegyric} 24-26.
\item \textit{Panegyric} 21.
\item See e.g. \textit{Panegyric} 32-33, 45, 84.
\item It is not exactly clear whether the proper antecedent of զուանիահարազալու (‘him glorifying’) is the Lord or the Spirit.
\item Unfortunately, neither Latin nor French translation of նորակերտ քավարանիս done by the great Bollandist (“dona ferentes simus renovati” - “Homélie,” 291; “en apportant les dons, soyons renouvelés” - “Jean II,” 116) appear to be satisfactory: the lexica of Classical Armenian clearly point to “newly-built” or “newly constructed” as the most fitting in this context – Gabriel Awetik’ean et al. Նորակերտ քավարանիս (Venice, 1837), 2.443; Matthias Bedrossian, \textit{New Dictionary Armenian-English} (Venice, 1875-1879, reprint Beirut: Librarie du Liban, 1985), 535. As evident from my translation, I take norakert as modifying k’awaran.
\item …ազատագրելու զայական տերմինում նորակերտ հայերենի կերպարագրիչը, զայական տերմինում - \textit{Panegyric} 17-18.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
built “place of propitiation” which at the same time is likened to the “bridal chamber” of
God and the Church (Eph 5:22-32) and, apparently, to the chariot, drawing the people
from earth.\textsuperscript{227} John will proceed further to study several “clusters” of scriptural symbols,
all of which will possess an epiphanic characteristic and all reflect the symbolism of the
temple and liturgical synaxis. Thus, at certain point he juxtaposes the images of mount
Sinai, the burning bush and the tabernacle, interweaving all three scriptural narratives: he
depicts Moses approaching barefoot the “true bush where the divine voices are heard”
and immediately speaks of his ascent to Mt Sinai where he finds “Aaron wearing an
ephod” and Besalel from the narrative of the building of the tabernacle.\textsuperscript{228} The
significance of such complex intertextual exegesis lies in the central theme of the homily
– the newly-built church as the locus of liturgical synaxis and of divine epiphany.\textsuperscript{229}

It is with this in mind that we can examine the preferred image that John employs
to speak about the church – the metaphor of “propitiatory” or “place of propitiation.”
The term քաւարան recurs eight times throughout the homily\textsuperscript{230} and shows strong
dependence of John upon the liturgical language of Old Testament. In the vocabulary of
Armenian patristic literature, the term կավարան is used to translate the Septuagint term
իլաստիրուն,\textsuperscript{231} which in turn translates the Hebrew ֲkappōret, signifying the “propitiatory”

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{footnote}{227} A possible allusion to the chariot of fire from the story of Elijah in 2 Kings 2:11. \end{footnote}
\begin{footnote}{228} Panegyric 66-68; cf. Ex 31:1, 35:30, 39:2-26. \end{footnote}
\begin{footnote}{229} Since the use of the term իլաստիրուն for the altar is quite unusual, we must assume that it is the
church building as a whole which is meant by this term; For the survey of Greek and Latin terms applied
for the altar in biblical, Graeco-Roman and Christian patristic literature (such as θυσιαστήριον, τράπεζα,
βωμός, ara, mensa et al.), see Joseph Braun, Der christliche Altar in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung
(Munich: Karl Widmann, 1924), 21-42. \end{footnote}
\begin{footnote}{230} Panegyric 18, 23, 33, 40, 55, 61, 84, 96. \end{footnote}
\end{footnotesize}
or “place of propitiation” – a constituent part of the scriptural depiction of the tabernacle or Temple, specifically of the holy of holies. In five instances throughout the text, the exposition of a certain scriptural type (seven-tiered heaven, the Jerusalem above, the Paradise of Eden, Noah’s ark, the interior of the tabernacle) concludes with an invocation that specific benefit may come or be accomplished through the intercession of the (or this) holy propitiatory.

The meaning of this specific phrase is not easy to grasp. Michel van Esbroeck in his analysis suggested a strong connection between k’awaran of this homily and kappōret as a central element of the annual celebration of Yom Kippur in the Scriptures, even going as far as to propose that the prominence of propitiation theme in this homily makes it possible that the day of dedication of Holy Sion in that year could have coincided with Yom Kippur according to the Jewish calendar. If it is correct, the emphasis on the theme of propitiation and direct allusions to the ritual vocabulary of the Hebrew Scriptures may point to a motif of Judeo-Christian polemic in this work. However, it appears more reasonable for us to concur with the opinion of Verhelst that the allusions

---

231 A fundamental 19th century reference work on the vocabulary of classical Armenian renders the meaning of the term k’avaran as “a place and instrument of propitiation, like temple, church, cross and any holy place.” It appears to be a native Armenian word, derivative of the adjective քավար ‘propitius’ and the verb քավամ ‘propitius sum,’ along with the term քավարանյութ ‘propitiatio, expiatio’ – Awetik’ean, Նոր բարգիրք, 2.1000.

232 Ex 25:16-21, 31:7, 35:12, 38:5-8; Lev 16:2, 13-15; Num 7:89; Amos 9:1; Ezek 43:14, 17, 20. Specifically, the term kappōret refers to a “solid golden lid surmounted by two golden Griffins,” i.e. the Cherubim, covering the “gold-plated wooden box” of the covenant ark/chest – see William H. C. Propp, Exodus 19-40: a New Translation with Introduction and Commentary. Anchor Bible v. 2A (New York: Doubleday, 2006), pp. 515-516. In LXX Num 7:89 the hilastērion is referenced as analogous with the ark of the covenant, perhaps by way of pars pro toto: ἄνωθεν τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου, δ ἐστιν ἐπὶ τῆς κιβωτοῦ.

233 Panegyric 33, 40, 55, 61, 84.

234 “Jean II,” 109, 111.
to the theme of propitiation are “too vague” to help us determine the exact date,\textsuperscript{235} especially as both Christian and Jewish liturgical calendars at that time still appeared to be in the formation stage.\textsuperscript{236} If, however, van Esbroeck’s argumentation hinges on the extensive use of the term \textit{k’awaran} (\textit{ἱλαστήριον}) in this homily, we must keep in mind that the tradition of christological interpretation of this term, prevalent among Christian writers of the third-fourth century interpreted this term christologically, following Paul’s use in Rom 3:25.\textsuperscript{237} Following Origen who listed the term \textit{ἱλαστήριον} as one of Christ’s titles in his \textit{Commentary on John},\textsuperscript{238} such authors as Eusebius of Caesarea and Gregory of Nyssa use this term precisely in the mode set by the Pauline interpretation and often in conjunction with the passage from Romans.\textsuperscript{239} In this context, John’s emphasis on the church as place of propitiation can be seen as following a christological \textit{topos}, rather than being dependent on supposed ‘Judeo-Christian’ context.

There is, however, another tantalizing passage in this homily which makes this text significant for our study. About half-way through his text, John devotes a paragraph to the exposition of yet another set of scriptural types: “the mount of Abraham on which


\textsuperscript{236} The diversity among the calendars of various Jewish communities would make it highly improbable that Christian community of Jerusalem would have used any of contemporaneous Jewish calendars as a point of reference. On the formation of Jewish calendar in late Antiquity, see Sacha Stern, \textit{Calendar and Community: A History of the Jewish Calendar, Second Century BCE- Tenth Century CE} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

\textsuperscript{237} δικαιούμενοι δωρεάν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ... (Rom 3:24-25).

\textsuperscript{238} \textit{Comm. Jn.} 1.119, 139, 240, 255, 267, 268.

\textsuperscript{239} Eusebius, \textit{Comm. Ps.} (PG 23:593, 629, 908, 956); Gregory of Nyssa, \textit{De perfectione Christiana} (GNO 8/1.175, 187), \textit{In cant. cantorum} (GNO 6.44); \textit{De vita Moysis} 2.182.
the Sheep was suspended on the tree, and the ladder of Jacob, and the stone which he
anointed.”240 The bishop then proceeds to the exhortation directed at his hearers:

O divine mystery, on it (the mountain) only a figure, but the reality among us!
Behold – the true ladder from earth to heaven, behold – the encampments of
angelic host! Let us, through Abrahamic willingness and holy faith approach the
sacrifice of Isaac, of our own souls. O priests of Christ, let us become the
imitators of the Son of God through the priestly service of Melchisedec! Let us
ascend by the divine ladder from earth to heaven through its three stages – faith,
hope and love; let us not waver away from Christ. “May” our “fruit rise higher
than Lebanon and “may we flourish”241 in this paradise of God like the tree
sabek,242 blessing the name of the Lord through this holy anointed stone.243

We have seen above that John uses the formula “through the intercession of this holy
place of propitiation” to conclude almost every exposition of a scriptural type presented
before his hearers, to direct their attention to the liturgical function of the newly
dedicated building as a “place of propitiation.” In this passage, however, liturgical
function of the sacred space is made even more specific: the “priests of the Lord” are
called to imitate the ministry of Christ as a high priest “according to the order of
Melchizedec”244 through liturgical service (“blessing the name of the Lord” – Ps
112:2;245) “through the holy anointed stone (στή ιερήν ἀπεστειλατος Ἑσαύ)
λειψάνων αὐτῷ),” a newly consecrated altar. Some 4th century textual evidence


241 Ps 71:16 (LXX).

242 The expression ὑπερβαίνω ἀπεστειλατος likewise is directly derived from the scriptural account of
Isaac’s sacrifice; cf. Gen 22:13 (καὶ ἰδοὺ κριός ἐξ κυντρομομενος ἐν φυτῳ σαβεκ τῶν κερατων). In Origen’s
Homilies in Genesis this passage is interpreted christologically: the ram symbolises Christ as a “victim and
priest” who “according to the flesh… is offered on the altar of the cross” (Hom. Gen. 8.9; ET Ronald E.


244 Ps 110:7; Heb 5:6, 10, 6:20, 7:10-17.

245 εἰπὶ τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου εὐλογημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος (LXX).
(Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom) points to the use of stone altars in the latter half of
the fourth century246 and for this reason the use of a stone altar at the church of Holy
Sion, one of the major centers of liturgical life in the holy city, is not unlikely. Naturally,
the passage should be read with an eye to John’s exegesis of scriptural narrative: Jacob’s
vision of the ladder (Gen 28:10-17) and the subsequent raising and anointing of a stone in
Bethel (Gen 28:18-22), the scriptural types to be interpreted as allusions to Christ
himself, an “anointed one” and “propitiatory” par excellence.247 More specifically,
however, this passage refers to the “stone [altar]” as having been anointed, presumably in
the course of dedication ceremonies – a practice which so far has been unambiguously
attested only by Ephrem for the Syriac communities. The expression “anointed stone,”
again exploiting the scriptural model of Jacob’s anointing of the stone in Bethel (Gen 28)
is found in the later Georgian euchology sources which most likely reflect Jerusalem
liturgical traditions. In one of the special renditions of kvereksi (litany) on the occasion
of the feast of Encaenia (September 13), the 11th century euchologion Sinai iber. 12
contains a petition:

You [Christ] who through Jacob has revealed the anointed stone as a ladder raised
to heaven[, we pray to you: hear and have mercy!]
You who through the patriarch (revealed) this anointed stone (as) the image of
your glory[, we pray to you: hear and have mercy!]248

246 The references in Gregory of Nyssa and John Chrysostom were already discussed above; see
also Braun, Der christliche Altar, 1.115-117; Klaus Wessel, “Altar,” Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst,
vol. 1 (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1966), col. 112; see also J. P. Kirsch, Th. Klauser, “Altar (christlich),”
Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, ed. Theodor Klauser, vol. 1 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann Verlag, 1950),
col. 341-342.

247 Indeed, the adjective անծին�� applied to the “holy… stone” in § 65 of John’s homily, can be
rendered as χριστός (see ref. below), making the christological allusion of John even more poignant, if we
suppose that this might have been the Greek term underlying the Armenian translation; see G. Avetikean,
Kh. Siwrmelean, M. Awgerean, ՀՀ Պատմության տարածք, 2: 1015.
The presence of the expression “anointed stone” in the liturgical vocabulary of a source reflecting Jerusalem traditions, particularly in the context of the feast of encaenia/dedication, may confirm hagiopolite prominence of the homily ascribed to “John of Jerusalem.” While I do not think it likely that the date of this festival (September 15), as calculated by van Esbroeck, is accurate, I do find the late fourth century dating and the hagiopolite location (Holy Sion) to be plausible. Such considerations may allow us to set an earlier, fourth-century date for the introduction of anointing into the rite of church dedication within the Greek-speaking realm. It is notable that, as in the case of Ephrem’s *Hymn on Virginity* 4, we cannot yet say which substance (myron or oil) could have been used for the consecration of an altar or church: we will not have definitive evidence in this respect until Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite.

2.5 Dedication of the Basilica in Gaza, 406

If the date on which the dedication of the church of Holy Sion was celebrated is not possible to determine with certainty, and whether the allusion to anointing reflects an actual practice remains a problem, one common feature unites the account discussed above with the descriptions of other church dedications in Palestine: the assembly of clergy and people and the celebration of the eucharist. This seems to be precisely the sequence of events at the dedication of another major church in Palestine, but outside of Jerusalem – the basilica in the city of Gaza. Here again we come across the figure of

248 Sinai Georgian O. 12, f. 23v; see for the full discussion of these litanies further, ch. 5.3.1 of this dissertation.
bishop Porphyrius of Gaza who has been identified by Michel van Esbroeck with
P’op’or, the only person mentioned by name in the homily of bishop John II of
Jerusalem. The Life of Porphyrius establishes that he was ordained presbyter in
Jerusalem and subsequently appointed to the office of stavrophylax in the church of the
Holy Anastasis. Upon his ordination as a bishop for the Palestinian city of Gaza on
March 18, 395, Porphyrius embarked on an energetic campaign to eradicate the traces
of paganism in the city and to bolster the influence of the Christian community which
until then has been a minority. Porphyrius’ activity reached its climax in the
destruction of the Marneion, a major pagan temple of the city and the construction of the
new Christian basilica in its place. The Life of Porphyrius written by the bishop’s
associate Mark the Deacon remains our major source for the chronology of these events.
It has survived in Greek and Georgian versions which differ amongst themselves and
both may reflect the lost Syriac Urtext, as was argued by Paul Peeters and, more recently,

249 See Panegyric 36, 59.

250 See footnote 199 above.

251 The date is established through the internal chronology of the Greek version of Porphyrius’ life – see Vita Porphyrii 11-16; see also Alexander Kazhdan, “Porphyrius of Gaza,” ODB 3.1700.


253 Vita Porphyrii 65-94; Grégoire-Kugener, 51ff.
by Zeev Rubin. Both recensions of the Life describe the commission of deacon Mark to Constantinople to obtain support of the imperial administration for the closure of the pagan temples of Gaza which was accomplished with the support of the military.

While all eight temples were closed in 398, the Μαρνεῖον, a major shrine of Marnas, the patron deity of Gaza, survived the destruction, allegedly due to a bribe of the government official responsible for enforcing the imperial decree. The temples were closed with the help of Roman army in 402, while the Marneion was burned to the ground and deliberately desacralized, its marble furnishing being used for the pavement before the new Christian cathedral. The new basilica was built with the express permission of the spouse of the emperor Arcadius Eudoxia (400-404) who, however, was already dead by the time the basilica was finished five years later (407). The account of the dedication festival celebrated upon the basilica’s completion is featured in both Greek and Georgian

254 The Georgian recension of the VP survives in the 17th century ms. Gelati 1, published by Paul Peeters in “La vie géorgienne de Porphyre de Gaza,” Analecta Bollandiana 59 (1941): 65-216; for Peeters’ argument in favor of the Syriac Vorlage of the Georgian, as well as the Greek Vita, see his introduction to the publication, pp. 65-100. Peeters’ interpretation was subject to severe criticism by Frank Trombley in Hellenic Religion and Christianization, 246-282: for Trombley, both Georgian vita and the lost Syriac Vorlage of the Georgian translation were dependent on the Greek Urtext of Mark the Deacon. Zeev Rubin, however, has tried to reinforce Peeters’ thesis for the Syriac original of both versions, setting them within a revised chronology of Porphyrius’ life; he also argued that Trombley has misinterpreted some of Peeters’ arguments – see Rubin, “Porphyrius of Gaza,” esp. 36-47.

255 Vita Porphyrii 65; on the participation of the Roman army in the closure and destruction of the pagan temples in Gaza, see Rubin, “Porphyrius of Gaza,” 59-65. VP 77 contains also another allusion to the protection of the Christian population by the military forces: during a stational procession described in this passage, εξ εκατέρων δὲ τῶν μερῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἦσαν οἱ στρατιῶται οἱ υπολειφθέντες χάριν τῆς εὐταξίας τῆς πόλεως (Grégoire-Kugener, 61-62).


257 Vita Porphyrii 66-69.

258 Vita Porphyrii 76; Grégoire-Kugener, 60-61.

259 For a short biography of Eudoxia, see ODB 2.740. VP indicates that the letter from Eudoxia authorizing the construction contained a plan of a cruciform church which was then followed in the construction (ὁ σκάριφος τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας σταυροειδῆς - VP 75).
versions of the *Life* and, due to the understanding that both recensions may equally be representing the lost original Greek or original Syriac, I cite both versions of the account below:
1. After the five years have passed, the construction of the great holy church (called *Eudoxiana* by the name of the most pious empress Eudoxia) was completed. And the most holy Porphyrius celebrated the dedication (τὰ ἐγκαίνια) on Easter, the day of resurrection with lavishness, not sparing the cost. 2. And, gathering all the monks from the surrounding country, thousands in number, with other pious clerics, laity and bishops, he joyously celebrated all the days of the holy Easter. 4. And they saw the angelic choirs – not only during the church service, but also in the hours when they had a meal, for it was not only a perceptible meal, but a spiritual one too. After the food they said the psalm and after the drink – a hymn. 5. The idolaters, however, watched what was happening and their heart melted. For indeed the foreigners arrived from everywhere to see the beauty and grandeur of the said holy church and said that it was greater than all the churches of that time.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek <em>Vita</em> 92</th>
<th>Georgian <em>Vita</em> 92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. After the five years have passed, the construction of the great holy church (called <em>Eudoxiana</em> by the name of the most pious empress Eudoxia) was completed.</td>
<td>1. And after the five years the construction of the temple was finished, since it was adorned with every adornment without measure; and it was named after Eudoxia the queen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And the most holy Porphyrius celebrated the dedication (τὰ ἐγκαίνια) on Easter, the day of resurrection with lavishness, not sparing the cost.</td>
<td>2. Then St. Porphyrius celebrated the dedication of the holy church (γ... ἀκροτρίτικον ἡγημόνιον ἕλκοντα) and blessed it on the day of the Lord’s resurrection, which is Pascha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. And, gathering all the monks from the surrounding country, thousands in number, with other pious clerics, laity and bishops, he joyously celebrated all the days of the holy Easter.</td>
<td>3. And he gathered countless Christian population from the city and from the surrounding country; and he set up for them a large meal with abundance, since there was in that place a gathering of monks, about a thousand men, and the bishops, and countless people; and there was a great rejoicing on the day of dedication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. And they saw the angelic choirs – not only during the church service, but also in the hours when they had a meal, for it was not only a perceptible meal, but a spiritual one too. After the food they said the psalm and after the drink – a hymn.</td>
<td>4. And the saint was gladdened on their account, and the assembly was like (the assembly) of holy angels and it was full of spiritual delight (ἀγαθή δοξή), for with loud voice they sung the praise of God and the hymn of the holy church (ἀνάγεται ἡγημόνιον ἔστιν ἡ ἱερὰ πόλις ἐπὶ τύχης ἔργον ἡγημόνιον).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The idolaters, however, watched what was happening and their heart melted. For indeed the foreigners arrived from everywhere to see the beauty and grandeur of the said holy church and said that it was greater than all the churches of that time.</td>
<td>5. Then the souls of the idolaters who were in the city were melted with sadness, not because of the rejoicing of the assembly (of Christians), but because they saw the beauty of the holy church that was built and greatly adorned and filled with faithful people – the temple of God, which was formerly (a temple) of Nonos, their god and (was) in their hands, but now was handed over and given to Christians. Because of this, their weeping and sadness greatly increased and they gnashed their teeth against Christians, and they could not do great harm (to them), because they were afraid of the people and of the emperors; and thus they were tortured with jealousy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

260 Grégoire and Kugener, 71.

The analysis of these two versions of ch. 92 of the *Life of Porphyrius* shows that both certainly rely on a common source, but have adapted the narrative of the hypothetical *Urtext* differently. If we accept, with Frank Trombley, that the extant redaction of the Greek life is a later revision produced on the eve of the council of Chalcedon in 444-451, we can observe that the account of the events in the Georgian life is free of many complexities that may be explained by an intervention of a later editorial hand. The two texts do not differ with regards to the time it took to complete the construction of the basilica Eudoxiana (1), nor do they differ with regards to the main celebrant of the ceremony, the bishop Porphyrius (2). At the same time, the explanation for the displeasure of the pagan population that the Georgian text seems to offer may be a more historically plausible one: resentment over the handing over of the pagan temple area to the Christians and over the imperial support to this action (5). What is significant for our study of the festival of the dedication of the basilica in Gaza is the indication of both versions of the *Life* that the celebration occurred on Easter Sunday and the contention of the Greek *Life* that the bishop “performed the joyful celebration all the days of holy Easter (ἐποίησεν εὐφροσύνην τὰς πάσας ἡμέρας τοῦ ἁγίου Πάσχα).” It is possible that this phrase points to a eucharistic celebration in all of the days of paschal octave, following the feast of dedication on the day of Easter: if we follow the witness of the Armenian Lectionary, the liturgy of early 5th century Jerusalem would know of the octave of Easter, while Egeria can bear witness to the octave of the annual feast of

---

262 The terminus *ante quem* is derived from the titulature of the bishop of Jerusalem as mere ἐπίσκοπος, while the terminus *ad quem* is determined from the close adaptation of Theodoret’s *Philotheos* in the proemion to *VP* (Trombley, *Hellenic Religion and Christianization*, 279). In fact, the Georgian life consistently uses the title “patriarch” for the bishop of Jerusalem, which however does not discount the value of this recension as an earlier witness to the text of *VP*. 
Encaenia. The Georgian Life fails to mention the continuation of the dedication festivities for all of the “days of holy Easter.” Another difference between the Greek and Georgian recensions concerns the curious appearance of “angelic hosts” during the ecclesiastical service (ἐν τῇ ἀκολουθίᾳ τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ), as well as during the time of the communal meal (ἐν ταῖς ὥραις, ἣνίκα ἐγεύοντο). The Georgian version presents this element of the narrative regarding the angelic vision much more conventionally: it is the congregation which is likened here to the assembly of the angels, gathered for the spiritual feast (sulieri gancxromaj = *πνευματικὴ εὐφροσύνη). Also, the narrative elements in the Life of Porphyrius present certain similarities with the celebration of the encaenia in Jerusalem in 335, as described by Eusebius, as well as with the description of annual hagiopolite feast of dedication by Egeria in 380s. All these occasions would involve the assembly of a congregation, including monks, bishops, clergy and laity which presumably would be involved in a solemn eucharistic celebration: but this would be a common feature for ecclesiastical events of such scale. Significantly, in providing lavish provisions for the congregation, “not sparing the cost,” bishop Porphyrius exercises here the role comparable to the one of emperor Constantine at the dedication in Jerusalem in 335: the role of benefactor, exercising his function on the occasion of a dedication festival by distributing the provisions to those in need. If we keep in mind the likely

---

263 AL 46-52ter; Renoux, Codex Jérusalem 121, 312-329.

264 Itin. Egeriae 49.1.


266 Vita Constantini 4.45.1-3.

267 Cf. Theodoret, Hist. eccl. 1.31.2; Anon. Cyz. 3.17.11.
presence of the military entourage for the protection of the Christian community,
Porphyrius’ function would provide an early example of the fusion of ecclesiastical and
civil/socio-political roles in the context of a ritual inauguration of a new Christian
“temple.”

2.6 Conclusion
The genesis of the rites pertaining to the dedication of churches/altars in Palestine,
Syria and, especially, in the city of Jerusalem, as far as anything certain can be said about
them, took place in the context of the fundamental change in the position of the Christian
churches in the Graeco-Roman world. As we have seen on the occasion of several
dedications – the basilica in Jerusalem in 335, possibly the basilica in Tyre in 317-319,
the church in Gaza in 406 – these ceremonies had not only enjoyed the support of the
state authority in the form of donations or monetary subsidy, but also presented a
profound political and ideological message for the church itself, establishing its identity
as a possessor of a true temple, in contrast to the destroyed temple of God in Jerusalem
and to the temples of pagan deities. The ritual form of this celebration would involve a
solemn festival with, however, a strongly Christianized content, as the focus of the
festival would be a celebration of a eucharist. At the same time, in the Syriac realm and,
by the late 4th century, possibly also in Jerusalem (the dedication of Holy Sion), we find
evidence for the developing of original Christian rites for consecration of altars/churches,
centered on the anointing with sacred oil. On the occasions when the existence of such
specific rites cannot be attested (e.g. Armenian lectionary for Jerusalem), we find
evidence for the development of a Liturgy of the Word, specific for the occasion of
dedication/consecration of liturgical space and, not unlikely, in conjunction with the
eucharistic liturgy, sufficing for the sacralization of a liturgical space.
CHAPTER 3:

DEDICATION OF CHURCHES IN THE CHRISTIAN EAST, 4TH CENT.: CONSTANTINOPLE, EGYPT, ASIA MINOR.

3.1 Dedication of Churches in Constantinople, 4th Century

Emperor Constantine had celebrated the dedication of his new imperial capital, named after himself, on May 11, 330.\(^1\) Despite Eusebius’ attempt to demonstrate, in his account of Constantine’s life, that the emperor intended for the capital to be founded as a distinctly Christian city, by establishing churches instead of pagan shrines and by consecrating “the city to the God of the martyrs (τὴν αὐτοῦ πόλιν τῷ τῶν μαρτύρων καθιέρου θεῷ),”\(^2\) parallel accounts from later historians (Zosimus, Malalas, Chronicon paschale) show that the foundation of Constantinople kept in line with the traditions of the Roman civil religion. Indeed, Constantine still possessed the title of pontifex maximus and was reported to have built two pagan sanctuaries in his newly-built city: the one of Rhea, the mother of gods, and of Tyche, the protectress of the city.\(^3\) The foundation of

---

\(^1\) Ioannes Malalas, Chronographia, Dindorf 321; Chronicon Paschale, Dindorf 529; see Cameron-Hall, 18 n. 56.

\(^2\) Vita Constantini 3.48.1-2.

\(^3\) Zosimus, Hist. 2.31.2-3; Dagron, Naissance d’une capitale, 373-377; see also Stavros Gouloules, “Τὰ ἐγκαίνια τῆς Κονσταντινουπόλεως: ἡ χρονολογία (11 Μαΐου 330) καὶ ἡ σημασία τῆς γιὰ τὴν ἀνανέωση τοῦ ρωμαϊκοῦ κράτους,” Βυζαντινός Δόμος 8-9 (1995-1997): 151-182, esp. 170ff.; idem, “Οἱ
the city was celebrated with the erection of the statue of Constantine on a porphyry
column in the Forum and the dedication was marked with the chariot racing, the erection
of another statue and the decree to celebrate the anniversary of the city (τὸ γενέθλιον τῆς
πόλεως) on this day. It appears that while Constantine did disconnect the public funding
from the three old pagan temples of Byzantium, the temples remained standing until the
rule of Theodosius I.

Despite the evident agenda of the Christian hagiographers of Constantine’s life,
the increase of the Christian church’s prominence in the life of the empire would, it
seems, have prompted the establishment of the respective places of worship in the new
imperial city as well. But the task of determining which exactly were the churches which
Constantine might have founded and dedicated in his city presents some difficulties. If
earlier historians attribute to Constantine the foundation of just several churches (Hagia
Eirene, Holy Apostles), by the eighth century the list of Constantinian foundations
extends to 4, 6 or even 10 churches. Careful scrutiny of the available evidence has led
Gilbert Dagron to conclude that with the exception of the church of Holy Apostles,
hardly any of the churches usually included in the lists of Constantinian foundations (not
excepting Hagia Sophia and Hagia Eirene) can be safely attributed to the time of the

---

4 Chronicon paschale, Dindorf 528-529.
5 Malalas, Chronographia, Dindorf 324, 345.
6 Socrates, Hist. eccl. 1.16.2; Sozomen, Hist. eccl. 2.3.7-8.
7 Theophanes mentions Hagia Eirene, Holy Apostles, St Mokios and Archangel Michael at
Anaplous (de Boor, 23). For other references see Dagron, Naissance d’une capitale, 392 n. 5-6.
city’s founder. Moreover, Dagron tends to question the very intention of Constantine to (re)invent the new imperial city as a Christian one, since “what was true for Jerusalem, would be false for Constantinople.” That is, while Jerusalem was effectively refounded by Constantine as a Christian city \textit{par excellence}, Constantinople was an imperial city, centered around the figure of its founder whose statues were set up in its Forum.

The church of the Apostles appears to be the only ecclesiastical structure, consistently attributed to Constantine from the fourth-fifth century. Nevertheless, even this attribution has been a subject of increasing scrutiny by scholars in the recent decades. In the concluding chapters of his narrative of Constantine’s life, Eusebius attributes to the emperor the construction of a “shrine (νεών)” which he also embellished, and “dedicated (ἀφιεροῦ)” it to “perpetuate for all mankind the memory of our Saviour’s apostles.” Further he explicitly states that Constantine “dedicated the shrine/temple to the apostles (ἀφιέρου τοῖς ἀποστόλοις τὸν νεών),” using the language that strongly suggests the context of a temple dedication (ἀφιέρωσις). At the same time, the architectural arrangement for the building that Constantine had dedicated and Eusebius described was by no means traditional: the emperor evidently designed the church to be his own mausoleum. In Eusebius’ words,

---


9 Ibid., 400.

10 Ibid., 400-401.

11 \textit{Vita Constantini} 4.58, 60.1; Heikel, 141.

12 \textit{Vita Constantini} 4.60.4; Heikel, 142.
He erected twelve repositories like sacred monuments in honour and memory of the company of the apostles, and put his own coffin in the middle with those of the apostles ranged six on either side.\textsuperscript{13}

The mausoleum, where the imperial deceased would have been lying in the midst of the apostolic cenotaphs (or reliquaries), was designed to be a liturgical space: the emperor set the altar in the middle (\textit{μέσον θυσιαστήριων πηξάμενος}) so that “even after his decease he might benefit from the worship which would be conducted there.”\textsuperscript{14} Despite this rather ambiguous language, scholars did not doubt that this passage from Eusebius speaks of the construction of the Holy Apostles by Constantine himself. Thus, André Grabar considered the church of the Apostles, with its mausoleum, an example of Christian adaptation of the Hellenistic \textit{herōon}, a monument to the city’s founder situated in its midst.\textsuperscript{15} Richard Krautheimer, in response to challenges to scholarly consensus,\textsuperscript{16} considered Constantine to be the founder of the church, thereafter restructured by Constantius II who built the mausoleum to house the dynastic remains.\textsuperscript{17} But it was Dagron who argued that Constantine has built the mausoleum for himself as the city’s

\textsuperscript{13} δώδεκα δ’ οὖν αὐτὸθε θήκας ὡσανεὶ στήλας ἱερὰς ἐπὶ τιμῇ καὶ μνήμῃ τοῦ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγείρας χοροῦ, μέσην ἔτιθε τὴν αὐτοῦ λάρνακα, ἣς ἐκατέρωθεν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀνά νεκρον - \textit{Vita Constantini} 4.60.3; Heikel, 142; Cameron- Hall, 176.

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Vita Constantini} 4.60.2.


\textsuperscript{16} Such as G. Downey, “The Builder of the Original Church of the Apostles at Constantinople: a Contribution to the Criticism of the \textit{Vita Constantini} Attributed to Eusebius,” \textit{DOP} 6 (1951): 51-80 who, following the non-Eusebian sources, argued that the church was built by Constantius II, not by Constantine – however, in order to secure this argument, the author had to challenge the authenticity of \textit{Vita Constantini}.

founder which thereafter was transformed into the Church of the Apostles with the founder’s remains “exiled” to the mausoleum. The intention to situate his tomb in the center of the church, surrounded by the apostolic cenotaphs, may have corresponded to Constantine’s vision of himself as the church’s “outer bishop,” or even alter Christus or the “thirteenth god.” Not surprisingly, as Dagron speculates, such intentions could have caused some alarm from the contemporaries.18

It was Cyril Mango, however, who further developed Dagron’s insight with regard to the original purpose of the “Church of the Apostles” mausoleum-temple complex. According to Mango, the evidence, especially Eusebius’ testimony, points to the conclusion that Constantine built the mausoleum, but not the cruciform basilica,19 the existence of which is attested in 380s by Gregory Nazianzen.20 In Mango’s opinion, a more plausible explanation for Eusebius’ words καὶ ἐκκλησιάζειν ἐνταυθοῖ παρεκελεύετο (“he also commanded for the services to be held there,” VC 4.60.2), could be produced if we suppose that the building where the services were to be conducted was not a church, where the liturgical celebration would have been natural. Rather, Eusebius was attempting to present in a more acceptable fashion Constantine’s original design to display his own body in the midst of the assembly of the apostolic θήκαι (cenotaphs or remains).21 The building activity of Constantius II intended perhaps to rectify,

---


20 PG 37:1258; cf. Dagron, Naissance d’une capitale, 403.
retrospectively, Constantine’s daring original plan, by constructing the church dedicated
to the apostles themselves.22

In any case, whether Constantine considered his own body to represent a relic in
the mausoleum-church which he built is not exactly clear. But it is in connection with
this church that we hear first of the translation and deposition of relics in Constantinople,
as well as the dedication of this church. The 7th century Chronicon Paschale provides
some important detail with regards to the translation of the apostolic remains in the
church that bore that name, taking place in the time of the consulship of the emperor
Constantius and the future emperor Julian:

In the time of these consuls, on the 1st day of the month Panemos [July], the relics
of Timothy, the holy disciple of the apostle Paul and the first bishop elected in
Ephesus of Asia, were brought into Constantinople with all honour, and deposited
at the [church of] Holy Apostles beneath the holy altar.23

The next year, 357, according to the Chronicle, the deposition of the relics of Luke the
Evangelist and of Andrew, one of the Twelve, takes place in the same church:

Under these consuls [Constantius Augustus and Julian Caesar], on the 3rd day of
the month of Dystros [March], the relics of the holy apostles Luke and Andrew
were brought into Constantinople, through the zeal of Constantius the August,

21 “Constantine’s Mausoleum,” 57-59.
22 Dagron appears to accept Mango’s correction of his own interpretation in Naissance d’une
capitale – see Empereur et prêtre: étude sur le “césaropapisme” byzantin (Paris: Gallimard, 1995), 148-
154, 372 n. 43. For the criticism of Mango’s reconstruction, see Leeb, Konstantin und Christus, 97-103;
Lamberigts and P. van Deun, eds. Martyrium in Multidisciplinary Perspective: Memorial Louis Reekmans,
Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 117 (Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press,
1995), 71-98.

23 Ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπάτων, μὴν πανέμω α’, Τιμοθέου τοῦ ἁγίου μαθητοῦ γενομένου Παυλοῦ τοῦ
ἀποστόλου, ἐπισκόπου τε πρώτου χειροτονηθέντος ἐν Ἔφεσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας, τὰ λείψανα ἐπέθη ἐν
Κωνσταντινούπολει σὺν πᾶσῃ τιμῇ, καὶ ἀπετέθη εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους Ἀποστόλους ὑπόκατῳ τῆς ἁγίας τραπέζης.
– Ludovicus Dindorf, ed. Chronicon Paschale. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae (Bonn: Ed. Weber,
1832), 559; for ET see Michael Whitby and Mary Whitby, trans. Chronicon Paschale 284- 628 AD.
Translated Texts for Historians 7 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989), 33.
with zeal and piety, with psalmody and hymnody, and were deposited at the Holy Apostles.  

These dates are confirmed in the chronograph *Consularia Constantinopolitana* (which gives for these translations the dates June 1, 356 and March 3, 357 respectively)\(^{25}\) and in the Chronicle of Jerome, the continuation of Eusebius.\(^{26}\) Philostorgius, whose Arian-leaning history survived in the epitome made by Photius, was meaning to exalt Constantius’ piety, reporting of these translations, adding further details pertaining to the origin of relics: the remains of Andrew and Luke came from Achaia, while those of Timothy – from Ephesus. This historian also clearly attributes the foundation and erection of the temple of the Apostles to Constantius, who, as he reports, next to the church also “established the ancestral tomb (καὶ τὸν πατρῷον τάφον ἱδρύσασθαι),”\(^{27}\) where he was also subsequently buried.\(^{28}\)

It is only nine years after the death of Constantius, on April 9, 370, under the consulship of the emperors Valentinianus and Valent, that the church of the Holy Apostles was dedicated in Constantinople (καθιερώθη ἡ ἐκκλησία τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων)

\(^{24}\) Ἐπὶ τούτων τῶν ύπάτων μηνι δύστρῳ γ’ ἠνέχθη ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει τὰ λείψανα τῶν ἁγίων Λουκᾶ καὶ Ἀνδρέου τῶν ἁποστόλων σπουδῇ Κωνσταντίου τοῦ Αὐγούστου μετὰ σπουδῆς καὶ θεοσεβείας ψαλμῳδίας τε καὶ ύμνολογίας, καὶ ἀπετέθη εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους Ἀποστόλους; Dindorf, 542, Whitby and Whitby, 33.


\(^{27}\) Philostorgius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.2; ed. Joseph Bidez, Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte, mit dem Leben des Lucian von Antiochien und den Fragmenten eines arianischen Historiographen, GCS 21 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972), 31-32. This author, however, mentions the translations, as well as the building the Great church and the church of the Apostles out of the chronological sequence.

\(^{28}\) Philostorgius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.6; cf. Socrates 1.40, Sozomen 2.34.5; the attribution of the tomb’s ἱδρύσις to Constantius II probably indicates that it was repaired before or at the time of his burial, see Mango, “Constantine’s Mausoleum,” 60.
ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει μηνὶ ξανθικῷ πρὸ πέντε ἰδῶν ἀπρίλιων). The sources do not reveal any liturgical detail pertaining to this celebration – neither do these indicate the degree to which this ritual has remained a part of the imperial religious responsibility or has transferred to the responsibility of the Christian ecclesiastical authority. What we find important is that while both acts – deposition of the sacred remains and dedicatio – pertained to the actions that would sacralize the place and extract it from the realm of profane in the Roman legal sense, these were quite distinct actions in fourth-century Constantinople. Consequently, the deposition of the apostolic remains in the church of the apostles and its public dedication (καθιέρωσις) were clearly conceived as two distinct rituals, not only distinct in time, but also bearing different functions.

The issue of apostolic remains in the church of the Holy Apostles emerges again in the sixth century in conjunction with the building work of Justinian, as reported by Procopius in his extremely laudatory account concerning the imperial rebuilding of Constantinople. Here Procopius credits Justinian with establishing the custom of burying emperors and their consorts in this church, even though this church (or the mausoleum in it) was definitely used for such purpose earlier, perhaps even before the church itself was constructed. Moreover, Procopius’ report presents the finding of the apostles’ relics

29 Dindorf, 559. Xanthikos was the fifth, intercalary month in the Syro-Macedonian calendar system, in use in the Roman East until approximately late second century CE; see Alan E. Samuel, Greek and Roman Chronology: Calendars and Years in Classical Antiquity, HbA 1.7 (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1972), 139-145.

30 “A sacred place is one which has been consecrated, a sacrarium is a place in which sacred things are laid up…” Digesta 1.8.9.2; Watson, 26.

in the church as a both surprise and accidental discovery, which is quite astonishing if
these relics were deposited in the church in the fourth century, as the chronicles suggest:

[W]hen the emperor Justinian was rebuilding this shrine, the workmen dug up the
whole soil so that nothing unseemly should be left there; and they saw three
wooden coffins lying there neglected (θήκας δὲ ξυλίνας ἐνταῦθα πη
ἀπημελημένας τεθεὰντα τρεῖς), which revealed by inscriptions upon them that
they contained the bodies of the apostles Andrew, Luke and Timothy. 32

Justinian, reportedly, proceeded to deposit the coffins again into the ground, this time
marking the spot of burial appropriately. 33 It is not clear whether Procopius’ narrative can
be taken as entirely trustworthy, given his evident bias to extol the works of Justinian,
and hence the latter’s role in rediscovering the “forgotten” remains of the apostles and in
reestablishing their cult is likely to have been exaggerated by the sixth-century court
writer. However, Procopius’ witness seems to confirm the evidence of Chronicon
paschale: the apostles’ relics were buried into the ground beneath the altar – not in the
repositories prepared by Constantine 34 – and were not the object of open veneration, at
least until the time of Justinian. 35

The dedication of the Great Church in Constantinople, later to be known as Hagia
Sophia, has also been recorded in Chronicon paschale with the precise date of the 15th of
the month Peritios (February), 360. 36 While the year of 360 is confirmed by the

32 De aedif. 1.4.21; Dewing, 52-53.
33 ἀπερ ἁσμενέστατα βασιλεὺς τε αὐτὸς καὶ Χριστιανοὶ ξύμπαντες εἶδον, πομπὴν τε αὐτούς καὶ
πανήγυριν ἐπιτετελέσας τῇ τε περὶ αὐτούς τῇ ἐξοσιωσάμενοι τὰ εἰωθότα καὶ περιστείλαντες τὰς θήκας
αὖθις τῇ γῇ ἔκρυψαν, οὐκ ἁσίμων οἴοδὲ ἄγειτον λιπόντες τὸν χώρον, ἀλλὰ σώμασιν ἀποστόλων ἀνειμένον
καταστησάμενοι ζῆν εἰσεβεία (De aedif. 1.4.22; Dewing, 52).
35 I am indebted to Dr Andrei Vinogradov (Institute of World History, Russian Academy of
Sciences) for bringing Procopius’ testimony to my attention.
Chronicon of Jerome,

which might have served as a source for later historiographies, the date recorded in the Chronicon paschale differs by one day with the date indicated in the same text which gives the date for its encaenia as “day 16 before calends of March which is day 14 of the month Peritius.”

The date of February 15, however, is confirmed in Fasti Hydatiani (also known as Consularia Constantinopolitana) and by Socrates, who puts the event of this church’s consecration at the same time with the installation of the new bishop Eudoxius.

The Chronicon gives precise dates for both consecrations, putting the enthronement of Eudoxius on January 27 and τὰ ἐγκαίνια τῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας “not many days” later. The 72 bishops who were recorded as present at Eudoxius’ consecration had presumably remained in the city for the consecration of the Great Church on February 15. Chronicon proceeds to describe the generosity of emperor Constantius, expressed through his many offerings (ἀναθέματα) to the church at the dedication, including “great gold and silver treasures,” “many gemmed and gold-threaded

---

36 Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει μηνὶ περιτίῳ ἡ ἐκκλησία Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (Dindorf, 543).


38 Dindorf, 544; Whitby and Whitby, 35.

39 “Constantio X et Iuliano III. His conss. dedicatum est Constantinopoli dominicum die XV kl. Mar.” - Burgess, 238.

40 Εὐδοξίου δὲ ἀναδειχθέντος ἐπισκόπου τῆς μεγαλοπόλεως τηνικαῦτα καὶ ἡ μεγάλη ἐκκλησία ἡ ὀνομαζομένη Σοφία ἑνεκαίνισθη ἐν ὑπατείᾳ Κωνσταντίου τὸ δέκατον καὶ Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ Καίσαρος τὸ τρίτον τῇ πεντεκαιδεκάτῃ τοῦ Φεβρουαρίου μηνός. –Socrates, Hist. eccl. 2.43.11; ed. Günther Christian Hansen, Sokrates Kirchengeschichte, GCS n.s. 1 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995), 181.

41 Chronicon Paschale, Dindorf, 543-544.
cloths for the altar,” the curtains for the doors, various gifts to the clergy and a “corn allocation (σιτομέτριον) of great size” for the poor population of the city.

This emphasis on the role of the imperial benefaction at the encaenia appears also to reflect the tendency to incorporate public Christian rites pertaining to the buildings into the system of Roman legal and social customs. The emperor serves as a founder, chief builder of a cult edifice and, consequently, is bound to express his lavish generosity as part of his public leitourgia. Notably, according to the Chronicon, the “dedication of the Great Church” took place 34 years after Constantine has “laid the foundations,” which most probably is referring to the foundation of the city itself, rather than that of the Great Church. In such case, Constantius’ act of dedicating the cathedral church of the imperial city would attempt to establish continuity between his work and the stature of his father, the city’s founder.

The first building of the Great Church was destroyed in the fire of 404, during the riots that followed the expulsion of John Chrysostom out of the capital. On Sunday, October 10, 415 the dedication of the rebuilt Hagia Sophia was celebrated, for the second

---

42 Ibid., 544-545; Whitby and Whitby, 35.

43 The reference in the Chronicon paschale is ambiguous - ἔτελέσθη δὲ ἐτῶν λαοῦ μικρῷ πρόσω ἡ ἡ τοῦ θεμελίους καταβάλετο Κωνσταντῖνος (Dindorf, 544) can be understood as referring to the foundation of the city or of the Great Church. Later sources attribute the foundation of the church to Constantine – e.g. the anonymous Discourse on the foundation of the temple of Hagia Sophia; ed. Evangelia Vitti, Bochumer Studien zur neugriechischen und byzantinischen Philologie 8 (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1986), 435, 469, 491, 509, 541, 563, 583; as well as Georgios Cedrenos, Historiae compendium 1.498.3 – however, Socrates clearly attributes the construction of the church to Constantius around the time of Macedonius’ installation as the bishop of Constantinople in 341: κατὰ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὴν μεγάλην ἐκκλησίαν ἔκτιζεν (2.16.16; Hansen, 109). Dagron plausibly suggests that the indication in Chronicon paschale refers to Constantine’s founding of the city, rather than of the Great Church (Naissance d’une capitale, 398).

44 Chronicon Paschale; Dindorf, 568; also Socrates, Hist. eccl. 6.18.17-18.
time in the history of this church.\textsuperscript{45} Several days earlier, on October 2,\textsuperscript{46} the relics of the biblical patriarch Joseph and of Zacharias, father of John the Baptist, were transferred into Constantinople and deposited in the Great Church, which suggests that the building may have been already used before its rededication. The same conclusion is suggested by the reference in \textit{Chronicon paschale} to the similar transfer of the relics of the prophet Samuel on May 19, 406 and their deposition in the Great Church. The chronicle reports the participation of the emperor Arcadius and other government officials, including the whole Senate, in the procession with the relics, with the emperor leading the procession (\textgreek{προηγουμένου}).\textsuperscript{47} It is possible, though, that the relics could have been deposited in the \textit{skeuophylakion} – a small rotunda to the NE of the church, where the sacred vessels were kept, since this building is known to have survived the fire of 404, according to Palladius’ account.\textsuperscript{48} The details of the transfer of relics in 415 deserve to be cited, since the setting of this ritual within the framework of Constantinopolitan urban liturgy will prove to be significant for the development of the Byzantine liturgy of dedication:

These same relics were borne in two caskets (\textgreek{γλωσσοκόμοις δύσιν}) by Atticus, patriarch of Constantinople and Moses, bishop of Antaradus in Phoenicia, both

\textsuperscript{45} τῷ αὐτῷ ἔτει ἐπετελέσθη τὰ ἐγκαίνια τῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας Κωνσταντινουπόλεως μηνι γορπιαίῳ πρὸς ἑξάοδον ὁκτωβρίων ἡμέρα κυριακή. – \textit{Chronicon Paschale}; Dindorf, 572.

\textsuperscript{46} The date which the \textit{Chronicon paschale} actually provides is the “sixth day before Nones of September,” i.e. August 31 – however, I follow here the suggestion of Michael and Mary Whitby who consider the Roman date to be faulty, since there are only four days before \textit{nones} in September. The editors suggest that the correct date for the transfer of relics would be October 2, which was Saturday, just as the chronicle relates. – Whitby and Whitby, \textit{Chronicon Paschale}, 284- 628 AD, 64 n. 218.

\textsuperscript{47} Dindorf, 569.

sitting in the carriages (ἐν βουριχαλίοις); these [relics] were deposited in the Great Church with Ursus the city prefect, in attendance, as well as the entire senate. 49

The chronicle does not report the presence of the emperor Theodosius II at this procession, although does attest to the participation of other imperial magistrates and senators, apparently with the emperor’s sanction. What is distinctive about this ceremony, especially as we regard it in parallel with the transfer of relics in 406, is the prominent role that the bishops occupy in this procession, as they appear sitting on the *bourichallion*, a senator’s carriage. 50 If we consider the witness of the seventh-century chronicle to be reliable for the early fifth century events, we can observe here that the ecclesiastical officials begin to occupy the position earlier ascribed to the imperial magistrates. Given the religious function that magistrates exercised in the context of the dedication rites in the Roman civil religion, it will not be surprising that the high officials of the new state religion begin to exercise a similar function. At the same time, as in the case of the depositions of relics in 356, 357 and 406, this ceremony does not yet constitute a rite of church dedication *per se*. Even though the two events on October 2 and 10, 415 may have been celebrated in conjunction with another, and the presence of sacred relics may have added to the solemnity of the feast, the act of the relics’ transfer was completely distinct ceremony from the social and religious ritual that inaugurated the church upon its construction or re-construction. It seems that only with the passage of time, in the sixth century, the presence of the relics at the dedications in Constantinople becomes a constituent part of this ceremony.

49 Dindorf, 572; Whitby and Whitby, 64.

50 The lexicon of Liddell and Scott define βουριχάλλιον as a “senator’s ox-cart.” – *LSJ* 326.
3.2 Athanasius and His Apologia to Constantius

The practice of gathering large assembly with many bishops and the emperor present at the feast of dedication becomes a recurring feature in the description of dedication feasts from now on. Quite often the dedication itself takes place in conjunction with another important feast in the church calendar: thus, the so-called synod in encaeniis – the synod of Antioch assembled on the occasion of the dedication of the “Great Church” of Antioch – took place on January 6, 341, apparently on the day of the feast of Epiphany. The surviving proceedings of the synod record the presence of ninety-seven bishops and the emperor Constantius at the celebration.51

It is another dedication at the time of Constantius’ reign that will concern us in this section of our chapter. Athanasius’ legendary role in the dedication of the holy places in Jerusalem in 335, which we touched on before, should not overshadow his genuine contribution to our knowledge regarding the dedications of churches in the fourth century. In his Apology to Constantius which he wrote in two stages – in 353 (ch. 1-12, 14-18) and 357 (chs. 13, 19-35),52 Athanasius intends to answer accusations from his ecclesiastical opponents charging him with treasonable offenses, including the celebration of a liturgy in a church which has not yet been dedicated. The church in


52 Barnes, Athanasius and Constantius, 12, 196-197; see also Jan M. Szymusiak considers the two redactions of the Apology to consist of chs. 1-21 and 22-35 respectively – “Introduction” in Athanase d’Alexandrie, Deux Apologies, à l’empereur Constance, Pour sa fuite, SC 56bis (Paris: Cerf, 1987), 59-61.
question was the newly built church in the Caesareum (Sebasteion) complex on the waterfront in the Great Harbor of Alexandria. As Michael Fraser notes, Caesareum was the structure with historic ties to the imperial cult in Alexandria and the building of a church in this location, funded by emperor Constantius, was in sync with that tradition. Additionally, if we remember that the authority to dedicate cultic building publice lay with the emperor as the highest government official, the attempt to use the church for liturgical purposes before the solemn dedication could be considered as an illegal usurpation of authority. In his defense, Athanasius freely admits the charge, stating “we held no day of dedication (οὐκ ἐγκαίνιων ἡμέραν ἐπετελέσαμεν), O God-fearing August, for to do so without your command (πρὸ τῆς σῆς προστάξεως) was unlawful (ἀθέμιτον).” Athanasius thus shows his familiarity with the existing law and uses his legal competence to subvert the charges put against him, showing that no transgression has occurred. The celebration of the liturgy in the Great Church was a response to the pressing need for space, “for the feast was Easter and the people were numerous” and, as the bishop does not fail to note, eager to pray for the emperor’s salvation. Further, Athanasius insists that by celebrating in an unfinished church he did not act on his own judgment, but followed an “example of the fathers (τύπον... τῶν πατέρων)”: his predecessor Alexander likewise celebrated liturgy in a church of Theonas while it was

53 Fraser, “Feast of the Encaenia,” 144.

54 Epiphanius, Haer. 69.2; PG 42.204-205.

55 Digesta 1.8.9.


57 Apol ad Const. 14; Szymusiak, 116.
being built. The Alexandrian bishop refers also to similar practices in the West, in Trier and Aquileia, presumably during his first exile to Trier in 335-337\(^{58}\): he alleges that, due to the multitude of people, they had to celebrate in an unfinished building.

All the while, Athanasius insists that the congregation in Alexandria did not hold the ceremony of dedication proper: “there was no dedication, but synaxis of prayer (γέγονεν οὐκ ἐγκαίνια, ἀλλὰ σύναξις εὐχῆς).”\(^{59}\) As the bishop asks rhetorically:

where would it be lawful for the people to pray – in the desert, or in a built-up place of prayer? Where would it be proper and honorable for the people to say “Amen” – in the desert, or in the place already called Kyriakon?\(^{60}\)

It is clear that in the bishop’s understanding, the celebration of encaenia presupposed a sanction of the emperor, in person or through an emissary, exactly as the Roman law stated. This is precisely what he calls upon the emperor to do, addressing Constantius directly: “may you, O God-loving August, live many cycles of years, and celebrate/perform (ἐπιτελέσεις) the feast of dedication!”\(^{61}\) As Barnes suggested, this section of the Apology was intended to be presented to Constantius in person in May 353 and hence, chapter 18 of the treatise formed the original conclusion of the work, with the prayer for Constantius’ well-being and with the invitation for him to visit Alexandria.\(^{62}\)

At the same time, this conventional peroration confirmed a crucial role of the chief magistrate of the empire, still possessing some essential religious duties with respect to public worship, such as the dedication of the public religious buildings.


\(^{59}\) Apol. ad Const. 15, Szymusiak, 118.

\(^{60}\) Apol. ad Const. 16; Szymusiak, 118.

\(^{61}\) Ibid., 18; Szymusiak, 126.

\(^{62}\) Barnes, Athanasius and Constantius, 197, 302 n. 6.
This rhetorical propriety notwithstanding, Athanasius does not miss the opportunity to subvert slightly the legal conventions of the time, which he knew quite well. In the conclusion to the first redaction of his treatise (ch. 18), he appears to differentiate between the encaenia (the solemn inauguration of a building) and the preparation of an altar for liturgical celebration. The words of Athanasius, “the prayers of all for your (i.e. Constantius’) salvation do not impede the feast of encaenia”\textsuperscript{63} indicate that, even though the building was already prepared through prayers that took place in it, the emperor would still be welcome to celebrate the proper dedication of the Great Church. Athanasius, however, carefully points out that all that was necessary for the preparation of the liturgical space has already been accomplished: “the place is ready, having been purified in advance by the prayers that took place before (ἐτοιμὸς γὰρ ὁ τόπος προαγνισθείς ταῖς προγενομέναις εὐχαῖς).”\textsuperscript{64} In support of his subtle point, Athanasius cites the scriptural authority, referring to the actions of the post-exilic priests of the Second Temple:

May the unlearned not be deceived; may they learn from the fathers and read also the Scriptures. But rather may they learn from you [Constantius] for you are a lover of words, that while the temple was being constructed after the captivity and the feast of Tabernacles was at hand (and it was a feast, celebration and great service of prayer in Israel), Jesus of Josedeq the priest, and his brothers, and Zerubabel, son of Salathiel, the wise, and Ezra the priest and scribe of the law have gathered the people “of one accord into the wide space of the first gate which was to the east” (I Ezra 5:46), prepared the altar of God and offered there and there celebrated the feast (καὶ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἠτοίμασαν, κἀκεῖ προσήνεγκαν, κἀκεῖ τὴν ἑορτὴν ἐπετέλεσαν).\textsuperscript{65}

\textsuperscript{63} Apol. ad Const. 18; Szymusiak, 126.

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., 18; Szymusiak, 128.

\textsuperscript{65} Ibid., 18; Szymusiak, 126.
It is likely that the sequence of events in Athanasius’ rendering of the account from Ezra 3:2, 8-11 exactly replicates the sequence of the bishop’s own actions on the feast in question: he gathered the people, set up an altar and celebrated the eucharist. These scriptural warrants allow Athanasius to differentiate between a solemn dedication of a building upon its completion and the preparation of a building for liturgical use. For the former, the consent and participation of the state was necessary, while for the latter – the ecclesial assembly which sanctified the place through their prayer and, as follows from the scriptural model, a prepared altar. Athanasius does not tell us, as it is irrelevant to his purpose, what form did the preparation of the altar took or whether the altar was already sanctified and merely brought into the unfinished church, thus sanctifying the building. It is not also clear, although probable, that Athanasius refers here to the consecratory function of the eucharist itself, since he used the phrase σύναξις εὐχῆς to refer to the eucharistic celebration.66

3.3 Gregory of Nyssa on Preparation of the Altar

Another patristic text where the preparation of an altar for the liturgical celebration appears to be mentioned takes us further from great cities of the empire to Cappadocia in Asia Minor. It comes from Gregory of Nyssa who in his homily on the Feast of Lights (in diem luminum), most likely delivered in Cappadocia around 383,67 specifically refers, as it seems, to a certain ceremony of preparation of the altar for the

---


67 For the short biographical sketch of Nyssene’s life and works, see Anthony Meredith, Gregory of Nyssa. The Early Church Fathers (London, New York: Routledge, 1999), 1-26.
purpose of liturgical celebration. Gregory clearly sets the discussion of the altar consecration in the sacramental context. The rest of this passage in question deals with the work of the Spirit in the sacrament of baptism and the eucharist. Gregory warns his audience against shunning the common symbols of the sacraments such as e.g. the baptismal water, because “he who operates” (i.e. the Spirit, τὸ ἐνεργοῦν) is “great and what is being wrought by him is marvelous,” and adds:

For also this holy altar, before which we have stood, is by nature a common stone, not different from other slabs, which adorn our walls and embellish the pavements. But when it is consecrated for the divine service and has received the blessing, it is a holy table, an immaculate altar, no longer touched by everyone but by the priests only and by the pious among them.68

The key phrase in this passage – καθιερώθη τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ θεραπείᾳ καὶ τὴν εὐλογίαν ἐδέξατο – is quite ambiguous: it is clear that the idiom “to receive the eulogia” could refer to eucharistic celebration, and indeed such a position was assumed by Trempelas, among others, to strengthen a general assumption that at that time “the celebration of the eucharist upon the newly constructed altar was seen as sufficient for its consecration and dedication.”69 Indeed, if we take the phrase καθιερώθη τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ θεραπείᾳ as a parallel construction to τὴν εὐλογίαν ἐδέξατο, with the meaning of θεραπεία as “service, worship,”70 the reference to the eucharistic service is conceivable here. It should be reminded though that the meaning of θεραπεία includes “healing, remedy”71 and it is in


70 Lampe, Patristic Greek Lexicon, 644.
this sense that this term in regards to baptism a few lines above our passage. The construction ἑραπεία τοῦ θεοῦ is ambiguous enough for us to say whether this phrase indicates our service to God (e.g. a eucharistic feast) or God’s service/favour/remedy given to us in dedicating an altar to be a locus of his presence. Additionally, the analysis of the loci in the works of the Nyssene where the term eulogia appears, suggests that that it would be quite uncharacteristic for Gregory to use this term in the sense of a material object (relic, eucharistic species), in contrast to other patristic works of this period. It seems, rather, that Gregory prefers to employ this term in a more direct meaning: a ‘blessing’ in a general sense (“God’s blessing”) or a verbal benediction or prayer. It is in this latter sense that this term seems to be used in Nyssa’s homily Against those who delay baptism:

…every place belongs to the Master of all and all water is suitable for the purpose of baptism – only if you find the faith in the one who receives and the blessing of the priest who sanctifies.

---

71 Ibid., 644.c; Liddell-Scott, 9th ed. 792.

72 σύνθετος ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ οὐχ ἀπλοῦς, ὡς ἀκριβῶς ἐπιστάμεθα, καὶ διὰ τούτο τὸ διπλό καὶ συνεζευγμένο τὰ συγγενῆ καὶ ὄμων φάρμακα πρὸς θεραπείαν ἀπεκληρώθη, σώματι μὲν τῷ φαινομένῳ ὕδωρ τὸ αἰσθητόν, ὡς ἐν τῇ ἁοράτῳ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀφανὲς πίστει καλοῦμεν, ἀρρήτως παραγινόμενο (GNO 9.1, 225 (emphasis mine)).

73 Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon, 570.

74 As in his Homily on the holy and saving Pascha: Ἡ μὲν ἄλλην τοῦ σαββάτου κατάπαυσις ἢ τὴν εὐλογίαν τοῦ θεοῦ δεξαμένη, ἐν ἥ κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἔργων ὁ κύριος (GNO 9.309).

75 Out of 83 instances of Gregory’s use of the noun εὐλογία (reviewed with the use of the online database Thesaurus Linguae Graecae), only three can be classified as referring unambiguously to an ecclesiastical blessing – blessing of one’s mouth – presumably with a sign of the cross (Funeral Oration for Meletius; GNO 9.446), the blessing/dismissal at the end of the service (Vita Macrinae 16) and the blessing/prayer of the priest at baptism (see further). See also De instituto Christano (GNO 8 [1].77) where the noun εὐλογία also appears to designate a verbal blessing/prayer, but in this case – in the context of the story of Melchizedec (Gen 14:18-20).

76 PG 46:416C-432A.

77 πᾶν ὕδωρ ἐπιτήδειον εἰς τὴν τοῦ βαπτίσματος χρείαν, μόνον ἐὰν εὑρή πίστιν τοῦ λαμβάνοντος, καὶ εὐλογίαν τοῦ ἁγιάζοντος ἱερέως (PG 46:421).
If the “blessing” in the context of the initiation liturgy (εὐλογία τοῦ ἁγιάζοντος ιερέως) means a verbal blessing, i.e. a prayer, it would not be improbable that eulogia in the passage from In diem lum. above also refers to a prayer spoken over the altar. When a simple slab of stone is dedicated for the liturgical purpose and has received a blessing from a priest, it has become set apart from a profane realm and conceived in the terms reminiscent of the OT prohibition of the approach to the holy place for the impure priests (cf. Ex 19:22, 24; 30:19-20, 40:30-31). The altar is clearly set apart for the purpose of the eucharistic celebration, but it does not follow from this passage that it was set apart by means of a eucharistic service. In the homily this passage appears in conjunction with the discussion of the transformative role of the Spirit in the change of the non-sanctified matter, so the allusion to the eucharistic epiclesis here is possible, but the text does not provide a strong enough language to indicate by what means the altar was consecrated.

3.4 Allusions to the Dedication of Church and Altar in the Works of John Chrysostom

The dating and provenance of the homilies of John Chrysostom has been subject to reconsideration in the recent scholarship. Nevertheless, the details of his biography,

as we know it,\textsuperscript{79} would leave the last quarter of the fourth century and two prominent cities (Antioch and Constantinople) as the outline of the spatio-temporal framework where the preaching of Antiochene presbyter and, later, the Constantinopolitan archbishop took place. It seems to be difficult and speculative to derive from his texts the information beyond these boundaries. As the work of Pauline Allen and Wendy Mayer has shown, the criteria which the preceding scholarship has used to establish a \textit{Sitz im Leben} for his works, especially for the sermons on Pauline epistles, are ambiguous and do not always elucidate the provenance of the homilies. For instance, with regards to the use of the adverb ἐκεῖ or ἐνταῦθα in the \textit{Homily on 2 Corinthians 26}, Mayer notes that, despite appearances, such indications are not convincing enough to pinpoint a “present location” (Constantinople) and “does not refer to the present situation of audience and homilist.”\textsuperscript{80} Thus, even obvious markers of time/place within the text of Chrysostom’s homily do not stand up as historical evidence under closer examination.

Such consideration requires to examine critically an often-cited passage from another homily in the same collection, \textit{In II Cor. hom. 20}, that, as some think, confirms the existence of a practice of consecrating a new altar by the first celebration of a eucharistic liturgy.\textsuperscript{81} In this homily, Chrysostom offers an exegesis of 2 Cor 9:10-15, exploring the passage verse-by-verse and then proceeding to a paraenesis where he exhorts his audience “to exhibit a virtue of life worthy [of so great grace],” attending to

\textsuperscript{79} A classic study is by Chrysostomus Baur, \textit{Der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit}, 2 vols. (Munich: M. Hueber, 1929-30); ET by M. Gonzaga, 2nd ed. (London: Sands, 1959-1960); however, a complete revision of the traditional account of this Father’s life is in preparation by Wendy Mayer.

\textsuperscript{80} Mayer, \textit{Homilies of St John Chrysostom}, 391-392.

the giving of alms instead of “excess and drunkenness and gluttony.”” 82 After referring to
the injunction in the Sermon on the Mount to be “like your Father who is in heaven”
(Matt 5:45), John introduces the image of a “[God’s] altar,” built not by Besalel (Ex
35:30-36:1) but by God himself from “the matter more luminous than the heaven, from
rational souls.” 83 Chrysostom certainly draws on the image of the heavenly temple
composed of souls as building-blocks, which we have already seen in Eusebius, 84 but
adds another contrast, more directly related to his theme: he juxtaposes the material altar
and the altar/sanctuary 85 “composed of the very members of Christ… the body of the
Lord.” This other sanctuary, where one can sacrifice “in secret” (Matt 6:4), is none other
than the body of a fellow human being in need of charity and almsgiving. This, for
Chrysostom, is an “altar” more holy than the altar of both ancient Jewish and
contemporary Christian cult. 86 The need for the physical expression of cultic worship
expresses itself in the almsgiving to a true spiritual temple, another human being.

This [material] altar is revered because of the sacrifice that is laid upon it, but
that, of the merciful human being, not only on this account, but also because it is
even composed of the very sacrifice which makes the other to be revered. Again,
this is but a stone by nature, but it becomes holy because/when it receives Christ’s
body: but that one is holy because it itself is Christ’s body. So the latter one,
beside which you, layman, are standing, is more awesome than the former. …You
honor this altar, because it receives the body of Christ, but him who is himself
Christ’s body you treat with contempt and, when it perishes, you neglect it. This
altar you may see lying everywhere, both in the streets and market places, and you

82 The homily is found in PG 59:535-540; English translation is adapted from NPNF, 12.372-374.
83 Βούλει καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον αὐτοῦ ἱδεῖν: οὐ Βεσελεὴλ αὐτὸ ἐκοδόμησεν, οὔτε τις, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς ὁ
θεὸς, οὐ διὰ λίθων, ἀλλὰ δι’ ὑλῆς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λαμπρότερας, διὰ ψυχῶν λογικῶν (PG 59:539).
84 Hist. eccl. 10.4.55ff.
85 The meaning of θυσιαστήριον often encompasses both the altar and the altar-presincts, i.e.
sanctuary and, by extension, the temple (Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon, 660).
86 Αἰδέσθητι τοῦτο αὐτῷ: ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ θύεις τοῦ Δεσπότου τὸ ἱερέαν. Τοῦτο τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ
tοῦτον τοῦ νῦν φρικωδέστερον, οὐχὶ τοῦ παλαιοῦ μόνον (PG 59:540).
may sacrifice upon it every hour, for on this too is sacrifice performed, and as the priest stands calling the Spirit, so you also call the Spirit, not with the voice, but with works.87

This passage is very illustrative of John Chrysostom’s characteristic theology of poverty which, for him, was not a part of moral, but rather of his eucharistic theology with the eucharist serving as foundation of diaconia to the poor, while the spiritual temple of Christ’s body is composed from the bodies of its suffering members.88 At the same time, through the contact with the eucharistic body and blood of Christ, the altar of the Christian temple (τοῦ νῦν), a simple “stone by nature,” is transformed. An allusion to the eucharistic celebration is evident, particularly considering John’s reference to the “invocation of the Spirit (ὁ ιερεὺς ἔστηκε τὸ πνεῦμα καλὸν)” in the sentence that follows. The question remains, though, whether the reference to the altar as a “stone by nature” sanctified with the reception of Christ’s body (i.e. the eucharist) can be construed as alluding to actual practice of consecrating a stone altar through its contact with the sanctified eucharistic species, presumably by celebrating a eucharistic liturgy upon it. It appears to us that this passage provides too little reliable evidence, since Chrysostom is not concerned in this passage with the way in which the churches or altars are consecrated. His concerns are theological and ethical rather than descriptive of current liturgical practice. Even though the reference to stone altars in both John and the Nyssene above suggests that such use was common, the idea that the altar was

87 [Τ]ούτῳ μὲν γὰρ θαυμαστόν διὰ τὴν ἐπιτιθεμένην ἐν αὐτῷ θυσίαν, ἐκείνῳ δὲ τοῦ ἐλεήμονος οὐ διὰ τοῦτο μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτι καὶ ἐς αὐτὴς σύγκειται τῆς θυσίας τῆς τοῦτο ποιώσης. Ἐκατονταῖον τοῦτο πάλιν, ὅτι λίθος μὲν ἐστὶ τὴν φύσιν, άγιον δὲ γίνεται, ἐπειδὴ σῶμα δέχεται Χριστοῦ, ἐκείνῳ δὲ, ἐπειδή αὐτὸ σῶμα ἔστη Χριστοῦ. Ὡστε τοῦτο φρικωδέστερον ἔκεινον, ὃ σὺ παρέστηκας ὁ λαϊκός. . . Σὺ δὲ τὸ μὲν θυσιαστήριον τοῦτο τιμᾷς, ὅτι δέχεται τοῦ Χριστοῦ σῶμα, τὸν δὲ αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ οὔτα καθυβρίζεις, καὶ περιορᾷς ἀπολλύμενον (PG 59:540).

consecrated through the celebration of the eucharist does not seem to follow from this
text. Additionally, this evidence, if counted as such, cannot be securely tied to a concrete
time and place, for as we know from recent research into John’s Pauline homilies, even
the elements of a single chain of sermons can be attributed to different locations of
Chrysostom’s career.89

At the same time, this passage should remain within the span of our attention,
since – as the excerpt from Gregory of Nyssa previously – it reflects an important
component of liturgical piety surfacing at the second half of the fourth century, namely,
the notion that a physical contact with the sanctified matter (eucharist or relic) necessarily
effects change in the non-consecrated realm. In this passage, the “stone” is holy because
it becomes a place for physical presence of the holy things: eucharistic species and
eucharistic liturgy itself. We can see in this notion a possibility of liturgical projection of
what Robert Wilken calls “tactile piety, worship with the lips and the fingertips” that, to
him, was a major driving force behind popular pilgrimage movement to the holy places in
Palestine.90 It will follow, therefore, that the notion of “tactile piety” was by any means
not limited to Palestine or to issues in popular devotion.

There is, however, another spurious text attributed to Chrysostom which appears
to be related to the annual feast of dedication-encaenia. This is a homily preserved in ms.
Paris gr. 751 (f. 179r-181v), entitled Εἰς τὰ ἐγκαίνια (CPG 4927).91 The attribution to

89 With regards to the series of homilies on Philippians, where the homogeneity of the cycle is
called into question, see Allen and Mayer, “Chrysostom and the Preaching of Homilies in Series,” 284.

90 Robert L. Wilken, The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought (Yale
Chrysostom is put in question by the compilers of the *editio princeps*, and the analysis of the text provides further clues that this homily was most likely not said by Chrysostom, but by an anonymous preacher on the feast of Encaenia.\textsuperscript{92} The location of the homily, however, is not Jerusalem, as the homilist emphasizes that he also “wished today to be present in the holy places and to take part in the angelic feast with those assembled,… and to see the cross more honorable that the heavens and to embrace the Master’s tomb,”\textsuperscript{93} but his health has prevented him from doing so.\textsuperscript{94} After making such apology, the preacher proceeds to offer an exegesis of John 10:22-30 which, as follows from his comments, was the reading for the day.\textsuperscript{95} This reading corresponds to the Gospel lesson for the feast of Encaenia on September 13 in the Jerusalem lectionary, featured both in its Armenian\textsuperscript{96} and Georgian versions.\textsuperscript{97} It seems likely, therefore, that the homilist addressed the congregation which was not in Jerusalem, but within a range of influence of the Holy City, as it is seen from that this location used Jerusalem liturgical rite.

Remarkably, the allusion of the preacher in this homily to his inability to attend the gathering of people for this festival and his need to make a public apology for his absence...
corresponds to the witness of Egeria and Sozomen regarding a public and solemn assembly associated with the feast of Encaenia, the attendance at which was considered nearly obligatory. The allusion to the πανήγυρις on the day of Encaenia would give this homily a temporary frame around the fifth-sixth centuries, in any case before the significant disruptions of the hagiopolite liturgical life since the seventh century. At the same time, this text provides no clues with respect to the rites concerning the altar or the church in this period.

3.5 Synesius of Cyrene: Dedication of a Church as a Means of Property Seizure

The life and works of Synesius appears to represent a notable case of shifting boundaries in the religious attitudes in the period of the empire’s embrace of Christianity. A Neoplatonic philosopher and a local politician (curialis), Synesius was popularly elected in 409-10 to be the bishop of Ptolemais in the Libyan Pentapolis (Egypt), which he accepted upon the condition of retaining his wife, while avowing not to proclaim the doctrines which he did not believe. The passage in question comes from the time of his tenure as a bishop and, consequently, a judge of ecclesiastical affairs. In Letter 67,

---

98 See chapter 2, pp. 62-66.


written supposedly in 411, Synesius relates to the first bishop of the Egyptian region, Theophilus of Alexandria (385-412) several cases which he had to resolve and which included a dispute between two other bishops, Paul of Erythron and Dioscorus of Darnis. First, Synesius describes his visit to Erythron and his failure to unseat Paul from the bishopric, due to popular protests. Then the bishop of Ptolemais proceeds to describe the dispute regarding a place in the village Hydrax – an apparently disputed territory between the jurisdictions of Paul and Dioscorus. This place was an abandoned fort, situated in the “loftiest part of the village,” which made it a strategically expedient location for military purposes. In the course of the dispute, Dioscorus accused Paul that the latter “consecrated to God the property of another under the pretext of piety (καθοσιώσαντα ...τῷ θεῷ τόπον ἄλλοτριον, ἀρπάσαντα δὲ οὔτω τὴν τῆς εὐσέβειας ὑπόθεσιν).” Paul claimed that this place has been occupied as a church long before the other bishop acquired the rights of ownership, thus claiming the right of possession through the fact of occupancy. Synesius dismisses this argument, maintaining that the prayer “by necessity” in a place under the pressure from the enemy “does not consecrate a spot (τὸν τόπον οὐ καθιεροῖ),” since that would deem “all mountains and all the valleys” to be churches, for in those places too, under certain circumstances, “prayers and mysteries take place.” It

---

101 The judicial power was one of the privileges granted to Christian bishops by Constantine; see Peter Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992), particularly 96-103; also see Straub, “Constantine as κοινὸς ἐπίσκοπος,” 47-48.


103 *Letter* 66.152-153; Garzya, 179.

104 τὸ γὰρ ἐν ἐπιθρομῇ ποτὲ πολέμιων ἐκεῖσε συμφυγόντας ἀνθρώπους εὐξασθαι τάναγκαία, τούτο τὸν τόπον ὁ καθιεροῖ· ἢ πάντα μὲν ὅρη πᾶσαι δὲ φάραγγες ἐκκλησίαι, καὶ οὐδὲν ὁ τι φρούριον ἐκφεύγειν
is ironic that Synesius’ argument in this respect echoes the response of Cicero five centuries earlier in similar circumstances: an attempt to seize certain property by ‘consecrating’ it as a place for a temple.\textsuperscript{105} However, while Cicero advances a legal argument, basing his claim upon the lack of proper procedure and ritual, Synesius argues from the common sense – the fact that someone has prayed in a spot, does not consecrate it as a church. This argument, however, does find basis in the Roman law which, as we saw, prohibited non-public consecrations – a place consecrated \textit{private, non publice} does not possess a binding force.\textsuperscript{106}

Further inquiry, as related by Synesius, elucidated the manner in which the spot was consecrated to serve as a church:

But I asked of the time of the consecration (\textit{καθιδρύσεως}) and whether it was done through donation or agreement of the owners. It became clear that the opposite was the case. One of the bishops asked it; the other, who was the owner [at the time], refused it. Finally, one went with the keys, but the other burst in, and bringing with him a table, consecrated a small room on a broad plateau.\textsuperscript{107}

Synesius thereafter dismisses this consecration by Paul of Erythron as the one without legal force and, clearly, an illegal confiscation of a property of the other. Further, Synesius notes his disgust at the fact that the “prayer, [holy] table and the mystical veil become the instruments of violent attack (\textit{εὐχὴ καὶ τράπεζα καὶ καταπέτασμα μυστικόν, τὸ δημόσιον εἶναι, ἐν οἷς ἄπασιν, ὅταν οἱ πολέμιοι προνομεύσωσιν, εὐχαὶ καὶ μυστήρια γίνονται} (\textit{Letter 66.161-166}; Garzya, 179)).

\textsuperscript{105} \textit{De domo sua} 55.140-141.

\textsuperscript{106} Sacrae autem res sunt hae, quae publice consecratae sunt, non private: si quis ergo privatim sibi constituerit sacrum "sacrum constituerit", sacrum non est, sed profanum. Semel autem aede sacra facta etiam diruto aedificio locus sacer manet (Marcian, \textit{Institutiones} 3; \textit{Digesta} 1.8.6).

\textsuperscript{107} ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ τὸν καιρὸν ἔζητον ἡς καθιδρύσεως, εἰ παρὰ διδόντων, εἰ παρὰ συγχωροῦντων τῶν κυρίων ἐγένετο. ἀπεδείχθη λαμπρῶς ἡ πράξεις ἁπάντας τάναντα. τῶν ἑπισκόπων δὲ μὲν ἦτε λαβεῖν, δὲ δὲ οὐκ εἴδοι διὸ τοῦ κύριου ὅν. τέλος δὲ μὲν ὄχετο τὰς κλεῖς ἔχον, δὲ δὲ ἄνοιγναι καὶ τράπεζαν εἰσφορήσαις καθευροῖ σιμικρόν οἰκίσκον ἐν λόφῳ πλατεῖ (\textit{Letter 66.170-176}; Garzya, 179-180).
ἐφόδου βιαίας ὀργανα),” and expresses doubt that the holy Spirit can descend into the place divided by strife. Bernhard Botte and Heinzgerd Brakmann have noted that, to the mind of Synesius, the presence of the Spirit is not expressed in material terms (*nicht quasi physikalisch*), as being ‘bound’ up with the ritual element of the liturgy. These scholars find it remarkable that it was considered (at least for Synesius) possible for the bishop to declare the dedication that has already taken place as invalid. It seems evident though that, despite Synesius’ conviction that the unlawful and spiteful action does not effect the divine presence and transformation of a place into the temple of God, this was the most likely expectation in the mind of bishop Paul and his followers.

Moreover, since Synesius (unlike Cicero many years before) does not question the details of the ritual procedure, it follows that the liturgy of dedication was performed correctly and the customary rite of consecration of a church in this Egyptian province did indeed include 1) bringing in of the altar; 2) prayer with the invocation of the Spirit; 3) velatio – i.e. the establishment of the sanctuary separated by the “veil of the mysteries.” An alternative hypothesis would be that “prayer, table and mystical veil” refer to the celebration of the eucharist upon the altar that was already consecrated and the small room in this ruined fortress was dedicated by the fixing of the altar – exactly the term (καθίδρυσις) that Synesius himself uses as a synonym of καθιέρωσις in his discussion of the matter. Our author himself indicates that it is possible to celebrate the eucharist (εὐχαὶ καὶ μυστήρια) in time and place of need where there is no church building – hence

---


111 This is the opinion of Botte and Brakmann in ibid., 1148.
he may imply that the case discussed here represents an analogous situation\textsuperscript{112}: an altar brought into a building, a eucharist celebrated and the building consecrated in this manner through the ‘contact’ with the already consecrated ritual object (altar). However, Synesius’ argument represents an attempt to control and monitor the inordinate expressions of ‘consecrations through contact,’ by asserting the power of the first bishop of the province (or his emissary) to annul such dedication which violated a proper legal conscience and common sense.

3.6 Conclusions

The discussion of the Letter 67 of Synesius again brings the subject of church dedications into contact with the principles of Roman law regarding property and the boundaries of the \textit{sacra}. This makes us return to the point where we began our discussion in these chapters and to address the changes in the legal system of the Roman empire consequential to the state’s acceptance of Christianity as one of recognized religions (313), and then as the only licit system of belief (380). In the beginning of the fifth century, the new codification of the legal system through the \textit{Codex Theodosianus} takes place under the Eastern emperor Theodosius II (408-450), which, in particular, introduced two important regulations regarding buildings of religions that rivaled Christianity, particularly of Judaism and of pagan cults. With regards to the first issue, the law of 423 prohibited construction of new synagogues, even though the existing ones

\textsuperscript{112} See also Ioannides, \textquotedblleft Τάξις γινομένη περὶ ἀντιμινσίων,	extquotedblright 305-307.
were not to be destroyed.  

The remaining edifices of Graeco-Roman religion, however, were the subject of even stricter regulation, as the decree from November 14, 435 has put a final touch upon the gradual legal disintegration of the status of pagan cults in the empire: not only did it prohibit the pagan sacrifices, already banned by the imperial law, but also commanded to demolish the shrines and temples still standing (si quam etiam restant integra) and to purify them by placing the sign of the “venerable Christian religion.” The latter detail is ambiguous: on the one hand, it could signify for the buildings of the pagan cult to be demolished completely and for the “sign of Christian religion,” i.e. the cross, to be erected on that spot. On the other hand, this law could prescribe the purification of a building with the placement of a sign of the cross upon its walls, which was the manner in which in the sixth century the Egyptian temple in Philae in Nubia was converted to Christian usage, as we shall see in one of the chapters that follow.

What significance, if any, could this change in the legal standing of pagan and Jewish places of worship vis-à-vis Christian ones have for the development of the liturgical rite for the dedication of churches by the beginning of the fifth century CE? Let us revisit

---

113 CTh 16.8.25, ed. Theodore Mommsen, Paulus M. Meyer (Berlin, 1905).
114 CTh 16.10.7, 16.10.8.
115 Omnibus sceleratae mentis paganae exsecranda hostiarum immolationibus damnandisque sacrificiis ceterisque antiquiorum sanctionum auctoritate prohibitis interdicitus cunctaque eorum fana templa delubra, si qua etiam nunc restant integra, praecipto magistratum destrui collocattioneque venerandae christianae religionis signi expiari praecipimus, scientibus universis, si quem huic legi aput competentem iudicem idoneis probationibus illusisse constiterit, eum morte esse multandum (CTh 16.10.25, emphasis mine).
some points regarding the evidence from the fourth and fifth centuries that we have surveyed above:

1) As we have seen in the first chapter, by the time Christianity emerges as a legal and public form of religious observance throughout the Roman empire, one can observe two phenomena that apparently influence the way in which the church has formulated its attitude towards the setting apart of the liturgical space – one would be peculiar to the cultural setting of the Graeco-Roman world, another, it seems – to the mindset of Christianity itself:

a. a more or less established customs regarding separation of religious space and dedications of temples in the legal and religious system of Roman empire. These included certain ritual acts (gestures, formulae, processions) and, with the changes in Roman political system, were characterized with an increasing presence and participation of the emperor as a “benefactor” and “dedicator” of a public temple;

b. a theological conviction, shared with Hellenistic authors of the Second Temple period and sectarian Jewish communities regarding the exegesis of OT temple language and terminology – a concept which postulates the existence of the heavenly temple with angelic liturgy, in which the earthly cult and community shares through imitation or direct participation. In Christian discourse, this concept becomes interwoven with the idea that identifies the (true) temple with the body of the Messiah and, consequently also, with the body of the disciples, the ecclesial community.
2) With the establishment of the public character of Christianity, it was essential for the new congregations to appropriate the practices that would ensure not only proper ritual, but also a proper legal status of their buildings. This necessitated the involvement of both the emperor and numerous bishops in the consecration of the cathedrals in the major cities of the empire (Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople). However, Christian conceptualization of the sanctity of a building had to make use of scriptural precedents, together with the implied ideological framework of a “true/heavenly temple” embodied as Jesus and/or the church. One trace of such influence is the biblical name τὰ ἐγκαίνια which becomes associated with the rite of dedication of a Christian temple.

3) The concept of immanent sanctity of the temple/church in Christian context, with the diversity still highly characteristic for the various local Christian churches, was resolved in different manner:

   a. public dedication ceremony with the eucharistic celebration (Jerusalem);
   b. eucharistic celebration with a public dedication desirable but not essential, as the thrust of Athanasius’ argument seems to imply (Alexandria);
   c. physical contact with a holy object that would communicate sanctity to the church or altar by contact with the eucharistic species (John Chrysostom), consecrated altar brought into an unconsecrated building (Synesius);
   d. finally, two sources may attest that in the second half of the 4th century in Syria (on the border with Persian empire), as well as probably in the late 4th century Jerusalem, the altars may have been consecrated by oil or
chrism through anointing or pouring (the evidence is inconclusive as to what substance was used or how it was applied).

With respect to the last two points, I would like to stress the importance of the contact as means of effecting consecration, as it finds correspondence with the characteristic attitude toward holy objects in this period which Robert Wilken called “tactile piety” – a belief in holiness being communicated by touch, evident throughout the Mediterranean world.117 There is no reason to doubt that, being so much present in popular piety, even to an extreme degree,118 such attitude would escape influencing liturgical practices of the Christian churches.

4) If Taft’s observation with regards to the argumentum e silentio with respect to the Eastern liturgical practices can be accepted as valid even for this period,119 one may conclude that there might have been no textual liturgical rites or prayers associated with the rite of dedication or consecration of Christian churches or altars, since no extant church orders of this or earlier period (Apostolic Tradition, Apostolic Constitutions, Canons of Hippolytus, Testamentum Domini) preserve any of such texts. The only exception applies to the set of readings in the early fifth century Jerusalem lectionary pertaining to the feast of Encaenia on September 13 and to the obscure feast of “dedication of all altars.” There is no evidence to suggest that even in the latter case anything but eucharistic liturgy was in place.

117 “A new tactile piety that attached itself to things, to bones and relics, to places and shrines, to sacred books, even to liturgical implements like chalices and veils, was evident all over the Christian world” (The Land Called Holy, 115-116).

118 See Egeria, Itin. 37.2.

119 “Anton Baumstark’s Comparative Liturgy Revisited,” 211.
5) It will be observed that we have avoided discussing the role and significance of relics of saints’ bodies in the dedication of Christian churches in the East – which can be explained by the fact that in none of the sources discussed above we can note that the relics play any role in the dedication of a church per se. Certainly, various depositions of relics were reported throughout the Mediterranean, particularly in Constantinople (Timothy – 356, Luke and Andrew – 357, Samuel – 406, Joseph and Zacharias – 415), but also in Jerusalem and Antioch, and certainly those have contributed to the holiness of the place and its increase in authority, but we have no evidence that such transfers of the saints’ relics effected consecration/dedication of a given church in this period. What was likely true for the churches in the West of the empire (Ambrose of Milan), might not have the same significance in its Eastern provinces.

Thus, the response of Christian church and its liturgy to the need to set apart, ritually, the sacred, liturgical space for the ecclesial community was the one of appropriation and change. At this stage, especially in major imperial cities, the public rite of dedication of an ecclesiastical building still was likely to constitute one of Roman Staatspräsentationen, not yet defined as integral part of specifically Christian liturgical practice. However, 


However, the imperial ceremonial practices was also much in flux in the early period – see Michael McCormick, “Analyzing Imperial Ceremonies,” JÖB 35 (1985): 1-20.
as the Christian communities grasp their own, scripturally-based interpretation of the new realities, the integrated liturgical ceremonial was bound to emerge, in particular integrating the deposition of relics into the rite of dedication, as we will see in the following chapter.
PART II

THE FORMATION OF THE BYZANTINE RITE FOR THE CONSECRATION OF AN ALTAR AND A CHURCH
CHAPTER 4:
THE BYZANTINE (CONSTANTINOPOLITAN) RITE FOR THE DEDICATION OF A CHURCH.

In the previous discussion, I have attempted to delineate the main strategies in which the rites for the dedication of the church in the Christian East have emerged and have been developing from the early fourth to mid-fifth century. The goal of our study of these sources was to demonstrate the versatility of the approach of Christian churches toward the consecration of liturgical space and, at the same time, the rootedness of this approach in the Christian scriptural exegesis and in the appropriation by the Christians in the empire of legal norms pertaining to differentiation between “sacred” and “profane.” This section of the dissertation will directly address the origins and evolution of the liturgical rite of consecration/dedication of a church and an altar, in the shape which it took in the Byzantine liturgical tradition. As it was indicated in the Introduction, the Byzantine rite of dedication is perceived in this dissertation to be a composite rite consisting of the rite of καθιέρωσις, i.e. the rite of the consecration of the altar and the church building through anointing, and the rite of encaenia, i.e. the rite of the solemn entrance of the bishop into the church and of the deposition of relics. Since at least the eleventh century – and the formation of the “new” Constantinopolitan recension of the

1 This rough subdivision does not address, for the time being, a finer distinctions and more intricate interweaving of structures within each of these two “rites,” which will be evident in the process of our discussion.
Byzantine euchologion – these two distinct rites have began to morph in the practice of the Patriarchate of Constantinople into one continuous ritual – a recension that, with some significant variations – has entered the received tradition of both Greek and Slavic churches. It is important, however, to regard the two constituent rites or structures – the rites of *kathierôsis* and of the *encaenia* – as two separate rites with their own distinctive history and their own integrity, which only in the middle Byzantine period begins to form a structural unity.² It appears, therefore, reasonable for the purpose of structural clarity to restrict our efforts in this segment of the study to the liturgio-historical analysis of the rite of consecration of an altar in the Byzantine tradition, and specifically, to the origins of anointing of the altar as the focal point of the consecration rite. In order to be able to see the end of our journey in this dissertation project, it may be useful to contextualize the anointing of the altar within the Byzantine rite of church dedication in the form in which it emerges in the post-iconoclast Byzantine history. The overview and preliminary analysis of the text of the Byzantine rite of church dedication, according to the “older” recension of the ritual, will be instrumental for such an endeavour.

### 4.1 The Byzantine Rite of Dedication of a Church According to the “Old” Recension (*Barberini Gr. 336 et alia*)

In order to understand better our goal and destination in this section of the study, it may prove useful to lay out in the *beginning* of my work the content and structure of

---

² As Taft described the process of development of liturgical structures, “[l]iturgies do not grow evenly like a healthy living organism. Rather, their individual structures possess a life of their own. More like cancer than native cells, they can appear like aggressors, showing riotous growth at a time when all else lies dormant” ("How Liturgies Grow: The Evolution of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy,” in *Beyond East and West*, 207).
the Byzantine rite for the consecration of a church and an altar (*kathierôsis*), together with the rite for *encaenia*, as it appears in the earliest witness to the text, the late eighth-century euchologion *Barberini gr. 336*. This uncial manuscript remains also the most important and earliest witness reflecting the liturgy of Constantinople. The commemoration of the “most faithful emperors, the Christ-loving empress (ὑπὲρ τῶν πιστοτάτων βασιλέων, τῆς φιλοχρίστου βασιλίσσης)” in the diptychs of CHR allowed Brightman to suggest the dating of this manuscript between 788 and 797, to coincide with the reign of Constantine VI (780-797) who was married to Mary of Amnia in 788, with his mother Irene as co-ruler. However, Constantine deposed his mother in 790, only to restore her in 792, and instigated the Moechian controversy by divorce and remarriage in 795: thus the plural of the “emperors” could refer either to Constantine and Mary or Constantine and Theodote. The presence of the ὀπισθάμβονας prayer attributed to

---


6 *ODB* 1.502.
patriarch Germanus I (715-730), while at the same time the discovery of the Latin prayer for the blessing of milk and honey on one of the folios of the Barberini euchologion, dated to c. 800 or 795-815, establish a wider time frame for the genesis of the liturgical book transcribed in this codex. Brightman’s attempt to narrow down the ‘window’ for the dating of the ms. has been challenged by Jacob who pointed out that the plural of the imperial/royal title βασιλέως, just introduced into the Byzantine official usage by Heraclius in 629, was not used to refer to the emperor and his spouse, but rather to the emperor and his co-ruler. The practice of ruling emperors bestowing the imperial title upon theirs sons was an accepted (albeit not always successful) legal device to ensure the passing of the throne to one’s descendants, while the existence of multiple emperors proved to be so common that it became a “normal pattern” to depict two emperors on the 8th-10th century Byzantine coinage. While a part of Jacob’s objection to Brightman’s

---

7 Incipit: Δόξα σοι Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ (f. 254r-v = Parenti- Velkovska, 240); first noted by Chrisostomos Constantinidis in “L’Ordo de la dédicace des Églises selon le rite byzantin vers la moitié du VIIIe siècle,” in ed. S. Kyriakides, A. Xyngopoulos, and P. Zepos, Πεπραγμένα τοῦ Ἑλληνικού Ἰστορικού Συνεδρίου (Θεσσαλονίκη 12-19 Απριλίου 1953) (Athens, 1956), 2.214. For the list of other mss. containing the prayer attributed to Germanus (with a slightly different incipit), see Jacob, Histoire du formulaire, 110-111.


10 Histoire du formulaire, 65-66; Jacob points out that in its first use in the novella of March 21, 629 the title πιστοὶ ἐν Χριστῷ βασιλεῖς applied to Heraclius and his son and co-emperor Heraclius New Constantine a.k.a. Constantine III (Chrysos, 30).

11 See on the problem of imperial succession in Byzantium, Dagron, Emperor and Priest, 13-53.

narrow dating of the ms. has been proven to be incorrect,\(^{13}\) the main point that he raised still stands: if the reference to τῶν πιστοτάτων βασιλέων points to co-emperors, it opens a broader window of possible dates for the manuscript, due to numerous instances of joint imperial rulers in the 8\(^{\text{th}}\) century.\(^{14}\) Thus, the euchologion may have been copied between 730 and the beginning of the 9\(^{\text{th}}\) century, with the second half of the 8\(^{\text{th}}\) century as a more likely period.\(^{15}\)

While the manuscript definitely shows signs of its origins in the rite of the Great Church of Constantinople (mentioning the “patriarch” ten times, and “emperor” four times\(^{16}\)), the presence of the Latin prayer on the verso of one of the folios situates this manuscript in Southern Italy c.800 CE and thus confirms its Italo-Greek provenance.\(^{17}\) Additionally, Jacob had managed to isolate within the Barberini euchologion several prayers also found in the Egyptian, West Syriac, and hagiopolite liturgical ordines (prayer of the entrance and Trisagion in CHR and several ὀπισθάμβοι prayers),\(^{18}\) suggesting to

\(^{13}\) Jacob refers to the commemoration of εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ πιστοτάτου ἡμῶν βασιλέως, cited by Brightman in the diptychs of BAS (Liturgies, 333; Jacob, Histoire du formulaire, 65-66; idem, “Tradition manuscrite,” 115), but as the authors of the recent edition of the Barberini euchologion have pointed out (“Introduzione,” in L’euologio Barberini, 20 n. 6), this citation derives from the diptychs of the 10\(^{\text{th}}\) century ms. Grottaferrata Γ.β. VII, and not from the Barberini gr. 336 which features a lacuna in the anaphora of BAS (f. 16v-17r = Parenti-Velkovska, 66-67). The contention of Jacob, however, regarding the application of βασιλεῖς, does not appear to have been refuted.

\(^{14}\) E.g. Leo III and Constantine V ruled together in 720-741, Constantine V and Leo IV in 751-775, Leo IV and Constantine VI in 776-790, Constantine VI with his mother Irene as regent in 780-790, Nicephorus I and Stauracius in 802-811. Indeed, the allusion to τῶν πιστοτάτων βασιλέων may as well not be connected to a specific ruler, but rather may be reflecting a common custom of joint emperorship. In this case, τῆς φιλοχρίστου βασιλίσσης may then refer to an emperor’s spouse, even though Irene of Athens still remains a strong possibility.

\(^{15}\) Jacob, Histoire du formulaire, 67; Parenti-Velkovka, 20.

\(^{16}\) Jacob, Histoire du formulaire, 68.

\(^{17}\) Ibid., 68-70; Parenti-Velkovska, 20-21.

\(^{18}\) Histoire du formulaire, 74-118.
him that, in addition to the rites of the Constantinopolitan origin, the redactor of the
*Barberini gr. 336* made use of a Palestinian source, most likely coming from Jerusalem.\(^{19}\)
The accumulation of the Oriental material in our earliest witness for the Byzantine
liturgical rites may point out to the origin of this source on the periphery of the Empire
where such cross-pollination of traditions may have been very likely.\(^{20}\) At the same time,
it cannot be stated with certainty that the integration of certain Palestinian elements into
the framework of a Byzantine euchologion could not have occurred in Constantinople
itself, since we do not possess any comparable liturgical source from the period between
first and second onsets of iconoclasm.

The uniqueness of the *Barberini* euchologion as a source for the 8\(^{th}\) century
liturgical rite of Constantinople has a direct connection with our study of the formation of
the Byzantine rite for the dedication of the church, since it contains the first witness to
this rite, as also to many other rites (baptism, marriage, ordinations, monastic tonsure,
daily office etc.). A comparative study of the manuscript witnesses to the rite of church
dedication in the Byzantine tradition allows to isolate at least two redactions of the rite,
which we could tentatively designate as “older”/“shorter” and “new”/“long.” The
former, the more ancient shape of the rite appears to be represented in the earliest
Byzantine euchologion, *Barberini gr. 336*, as well as in several other witnesses: the 11\(^{th}\)
century *Sinai gr. 959* (f. 128r- 136v),\(^{21}\) the 12\(^{th}\) century euchologion from the monastery

---

\(^{19}\) Ibid., 119.

\(^{20}\) See Taft on the “law of the periphery” in “Anton Baumstark’s Comparative Liturgy Revisited,”
in ed. Taft, Gabriele Winkler, *Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (1872- 1948)*, OCA
265 (Rome, Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2001), 214.

\(^{21}\) Dmitrievskij 2.42- 64; Jacob, *Histoire du formulaire*, 217-223; Donato Diamante, “L’eucologio
of the Saviour “in Lingua Phari (τοῦ ἄκρωτηριοῦ)” (Messina) in ms. Bodleian Auct. E. 5.13 (f. 133v-142v), the euchologion Ottoboni gr. 434 (f. 88r-93v), dated to 1174/75 CE, and the 12th/13th cent. Palestinian Melkite euchologion BM Or. 4951, preserving a multilingual (Palestinian Syriac, Edessan Syriac, Arabic and Greek) transcription of several pontifical rites. All these sources preserve a strict distinction between the rites of καθιέρωσις and encaenia, and share a number of common characteristics, evident in the collated text which I present below. The “new” redaction of the dedication rite, represented for the first time in the Constantinopolitan euchologion of presbyter Strategios Paris B.N. Coislin 213 (1027 CE), as well as in the so-called “euchologion of Bessarion” Grottaferrata Γ.β. I (13th cent.), ms. Vatican gr. 1872 (12th cent.), the

---


23 Ed. in the dissertation of Abraham-Andreas Thiermeyer, “Das Euchologion Ottoboni Gr. 434 (12. Jahrhundert),” Thesis ad Lauream (Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, Roma, 1992); partially published as Das Euchologion Ottoboni Gr. 434 (Palästina 1174/75), Excepta ex Dissertazione ad Doctoratum (Romae: PIO, 1992); also see Jacob, Histoire du formulaire, 247-249.


euchologion Athens Ethnike Bibliothekhe 662 (late 13th cent.) and by other later manuscripts, can be clearly distinguished from the former redaction by the inclusion of the elaborate rubrics for the preparation of the elements for the consecration, as well as the brief ‘rite’ for the installation of an altar. A few manuscripts represent the variation on the “new” redaction, e.g. the 12th century euchologion Napoli Biblioteca Nazionale II.C.21, or the Georgian recension of the rite in Tbilisi S 143 (11th century) and Sinai Georgian O.73 (12th/13th cent.) which may represent the redaction antecedent to that of Coislin 213 and subsequent euchologia of this tradition. Additionally, ms. Sinai gr. 973 (1153 CE) includes what appears to be the first folio of the rite of καθιέρωσις, reflecting the “older” redaction, but the rest of the text appears to have been lost.

In what follows, I provide the text of the Byzantine rite for the consecration of the church and the deposition of relics according to the euchologion Barberini gr. 336 (BAR further) collating it with other manuscripts representing the shorter or “older” redaction of the rite: Sinai gr. 959 (SIN), Bodleian Auct. E.5.13 (BODL), and Ottoboni gr. 434 (OTT). I will not be indicating such textual variations as found in the Palestinian Syriac/Arabic translation of the rite in BM Or. 4951 (MELK), as such often abound in translated texts – rather, I will indicate only the significant divergences in the rubrics. An earlier attempt to provide the text of the dedication rite has been undertaken by Vincenzo

27 Panagiotis L. Kalaitzidis, Τὸ ὄψ’ ἀριθμ. 662 χειρόγραφο- εὐχολόγιον τῆς Ἐθνικῆς Βιβλιοθήκης τῆς Ελλάδος, Excerpta ex Dissertatone ad Doctoratum (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientale, Facultas Scientarum Ecclesiasticarum Orientalium, 2004); the rite of dedication is also reproduced, in collation with other mss. of the National Library of Greece in Athens, in Panagiotis N. Trempelas, Μικρὸν εὐχολόγιον: Ακολουθία καὶ τάξεις ἁγιασμοῦ ὕδατων, ἐγκαινίων, ὀρθροῦ καὶ ἐσπερινοῦ κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις ἰδία κώδικας (Athens, 1955), 2.103-146.

28 This euchologion includes an amalgamated rite which fuses the longer redaction of the Byzantine ritual with the elements of the equivalent Roman rite for the dedication of a church (f.40v ff.).

29 f. 155v; Dmitrievskij 2.126-27.
Ruggieri who, however, did not include OTT and MELK into consideration.\(^{30}\) Likewise, Panagiotis Trempelas cited BAR and SIN in his edition of the Byzantine ritual of dedication in accordance with the 13\(^{th}\)-17\(^{th}\) manuscripts of the National Library of Greece, but he does not appear to treat these two sources as representing a different recension of the rite from the one that entered the later manuscripts and, eventually, the received text of the ritual in both Greek and Slavic traditions. Overall I have chosen to prefer the reading of Barberini euchologion, as the earliest witness, even if it is contradicted by other three witnesses from the later period. This is also the reason I have chosen to reproduce the title of the καθιέρωσις rite exactly as it appears in the ms., as a lectio difficilior, normally ignored by the editors of the rite of dedication in Barberini.\(^{31}\)

4.1.1 The Rite of Consecration of the Altar and the Church (Text and Translation).

The Rite of Kathierôsis (Consecration of an Altar and a Church).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and Preface</th>
<th>The Order (to be celebrated) at the consecration of the holy temple and the holy table in it, one day before the encaenia. Before the patriarch arrives into the church which is to be dedicated, the (official) in charge of ordinations is sent forth, and instructs the marble-masons to set up the</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Τὰξις γινομένη ἐπὶ καθιερώσεως ἁγίου ναοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ ἁγίας τραπέζης πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας τῶν ἐγκαινίων.</td>
<td>The Order (to be celebrated) at the consecration of the holy temple and the holy table in it, one day before the encaenia. Before the patriarch arrives into the church which is to be dedicated, the (official) in charge of ordinations is sent forth, and instructs the marble-masons to set up the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Πρὸ τοῦ παραγενέσθαι τὸν πατριάρχην ἐπὶ τῶν χειροτονιῶν, καὶ παρασκευάζει τοὺς μαρμαράριους στῆσαι τὴν τράπεζαν καὶ πληρούντων</td>
<td>The Order (to be celebrated) at the consecration of the holy temple and the holy table in it, one day before the encaenia. Before the patriarch arrives into the church which is to be dedicated, the (official) in charge of ordinations is sent forth, and instructs the marble-masons to set up the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{30}\) “Consacrazione e dedicazione,” 82-93 (text), 94-98 (Italian trans.), see ibid., 81 for the list of mss. used. The French translation of the Byzantine rite of dedication in BAR was published by André K. Fyrillas, “Le rite byzantin de la consécration et dédicace d’une église,” La Maison-Dieu 131-140, but as Coquin has noted (“La consécration des églises dans le rite copte,” 162 n. 27), Fyrillas’ translation was not accomplished on the basis of the manuscript itself, but on the basis of frequently misleading notes in Goar’s Euchologion.

\(^{31}\) Ruggieri, “Consacrazione,” 82; Parenti-Velkovska, 156.
αὐτῶν τὸ ἔργον καὶ ἀναχωροῦντων, εἰσέρχεται ὁ πατριάρχης ἐν τῷ ναῷ.
3. Καὶ πάντων τῶν λαϊκῶν ἐξερχομένων, καὶ μηδενὸς ἔσω μένοντος σὺν αὐτῶ πλῆν κληρικῶν μόνων, καὶ πανταχόθεν ἀσφαλισμένης τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ποιεῖ εἷς τῶν διακόνων εὐχὴ.
4. Καὶ λέγοντος Ἐν εἰρήνῃ τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν, κλίνει γόνυ ὁ πατριάρχης παρὰ τὰς θύρας τοῦ ιερατείου διὰ τὸ μήπω τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποτεθεῖσαν τράπεζαν ἁγιασθῆναι.

1. ἐγκαινισμὸς ἐκκλησίας

2. πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας τῶν ἐγκαινίων

3. τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ὁ ἱερομνήμων ἁγίαν τρ.”

4. ἀναφέρεται ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ὁ πατριάρχης εἰσέρχεται ἐν τῷ ναῷ. Καὶ πάντων τῶν λαϊκῶν ἐξερχομένων, καὶ μηδενὸς ἔσω μένοντος σὺν αὐτῶ πλῆν κληρικῶν μόνων, καὶ πανταχόθεν ἀσφαλισμένης τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ποιεῖ εἷς τῶν διακόνων εὐχὴ.

3-4. λέγει εἰς τῶν διακόνων Ἔτι καὶ ἐτι κλίνοντες τὰ γόνατα τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν ὁ πατριάρχης ὁ μὲν διάκονος λέγει Ἀντιλαβοῦ, σῶσον, ἐλέησον, ἀνάστησον καὶ διαφύλαξον ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς τῇ σῇ χάριτι.

2. Ὕπερ τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας τῶν πάντων εὐσταθείας τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγίων τοῦ θεοῦ ἁγιασμένων εὐσταθείας τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἁγιασμένων, καὶ τῆς τῶν πάντων ἐνώσεως.
τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.

4. Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν, τοῦ δὲ ἱερωσύνης, διαμονῆς, εἰρήνης, ὕγειας καὶ σωτηρίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῶν συμπαρῶντος αὐτοῦ ἱερέων, τῆς Ἑρμοῦ διακονίας, παντὸς τοῦ κλήρου καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.

5. Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀγιασθῆναι τῶν οἰκον τούτων καὶ τῶν ἱερέων καὶ τῶν συμπαλαιῶν, τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ διακονίας, παντὸς τοῦ κλήρου καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.

6. Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ θεοφυλάκων βασιλέων, παντὸς τοῦ παλατίου, καὶ τοῦ στρατοπέδου αὐτῶν, τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.

7. Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἱερέων, τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ διακονίας, παντὸς τοῦ κλήρου καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.

8. Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ θεοφυλάκων βασιλέων, παντὸς τοῦ παλατίου, καὶ τοῦ στρατοπέδου αὐτῶν, τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.

9. Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ θεοφυλάκων βασιλέων, παντὸς τοῦ παλατίου, καὶ τοῦ στρατοπέδου αὐτῶν, τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.

10. Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ θεοφυλάκων βασιλέων, παντὸς τοῦ παλατίου, καὶ τοῦ στρατοπέδου αὐτῶν, τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.

11. Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ἱερέων, τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ διακονίας, παντὸς τοῦ κλήρου καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.

12. Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ θεοφυλάκων βασιλέων, παντὸς τοῦ παλατίου, καὶ τοῦ στρατοπέδου αὐτῶν, τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.

13. Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ θεοφυλάκων βασιλέων, παντὸς τοῦ παλατίου, καὶ τοῦ στρατοπέδου αὐτῶν, τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.

1. ὁ ἐπίσκοπος OTT ὁμιτ μὲν SIN ἀνάστησον SIN οὖς SIN χάριτι οὖς OTT
4. ὁ ἐπίσκοπος OTT from here read: ἱερωσύνης, διαμονῆς, εἰρήνης, ύγειας καὶ σωτηρίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῶν ἑργῶν τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν SIN ὁμιτ καὶ... λαοῦ BODL | omit παντὸς... λαοῦ

his hands, and for the priests who are present with him, the diaconate in Christ, all the clergy and the people, let us pray to the Lord.

That this house and the altar which is in it may be sanctified by the presence and power and action of the Holy Spirit, let us pray.

For the most pious and God-loving emperors, all their palace and army, let us pray to the Lord.

So that Lord our God may assist them in battle and subject to them every enemy, let us pray to the Lord.

For this city, and every city and land, and for them that in faith dwell therein, let us pray to the Lord.

For the good weather, for the good produce of the fruits of the the earth, and for peaceful times, let us pray to the Lord.

For those who sail and travel by land, those who are sick, suffering, in bonds and for their salvation, let us pray to the Lord.

For our deliverance from every affliction, wrath, danger and necessity, let us pray to the Lord.

And for all who require from the Lord the assistance and support, let us pray to the Lord.

(Commemorating) our all-holy, pure, most glorious, blessed Lady Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary and holy and most praised apostles, the saint, whose temple is dedicated.
Opening Prayer

1. Ο θεός ὁ άναρχος καὶ ἀΐδιος, ὁ ἐκ μὴ ὄντων ἐκτενέστερον ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν συμπαρόντων αὐτῷ ἱερέων τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν

2. Ο θεός ὁ άναρχος καὶ ἀΐδιος, ὁ ἐκ μὴ ὄντων ἐκτενέστερον ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν συμπαρόντων αὐτῷ ἱερέων τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν

And as he is kneeling and then stands up, and while the deacon’s litany takes place, the patriarch prays, saying thus:

[K1]

God without beginning and eternal, who brought all from non-being into being, who dwells in the unapproachable light, and has the heaven as the throne and the earth as footstool, who gave Moses command and the outline/model, and put into Besalel the spirit of wisdom, and enabled them for the completion of the tabernacle of testimony, in which the statutes of worship were the images and patterns of the truth; who granted to Solomon the breadth and largeness of heart, and through him raised up the temple of old, but dedicated for the holy and all-praised apostles the worship in the Spirit and the grace of the true tabernacle, and through them had planted your holy churches and your altars, Lord of powers, upon all the earth, that noetic and bloodless sacrifices may be offered to you; who was well-pleased also for this temple to be built in the name of your saint N., for the glory of you, and your only-begotten Son, and of your Holy Spirit. Yourself, immortal and most bountiful King, remember your compassions and your mercies for they are from the ages, and do not reject us, polluted by many sins, nor violate your covenant on account of our impurity, but overlook even now our transgressions, and empower us, and
4. Nai, δέσποτα κύριε ὁ θεὸς, ὁ σωτήρ ἡμῶν, ἐποιφοιτήσει τοῦ θείου καὶ ἀναξίω θεοῦ σου, καὶ ἐνισχύσω τὸν ἅγιον τούτον καὶ καθιέρωσιν σου καὶ παντὸς τὸν αὐτῷ ἑνίσχυσον ἐγκαινισμὸν σου ἐνίσχυσον τὸν ἅγιον τούτον λειτουργίας, καὶ τὴν σὴν εὐσπλαγχνίαν διὰ παντὸς μεγαλύνωμεν.

5. πλήρωσον αὐτὸν φωτὸς αἰώνιον, αἱρέσεως αὐτῶν εἰς κατοικίαν σὴν, ποίησον αὐτὸν τὸν πολλὸν τοιχόμονας δόξης σου, κατακόσμησον αὐτὸν τὸν τοῖς θείοις σου καὶ υπερκοσμίοις χαρίσματι ἐπάκουσον.

6. κατάστησον αὐτὸν λαμένα χειμαζομένων, ἁπάτειον παθῶν, καταφύγιον ἁσεβῶν, δαιμόνων φυγαδευτήριον, ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῷ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ἀνεωγμένους ἐπ’ αὐτῶν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς, καὶ τὰ ὅσα σου προσέχοντα, εἰς τὴν δέησιν τῶν ἐν φόβῳ σου’ καὶ εὐλαβεία ἐν αὐτῷ εἰσόντων’ καὶ ἐπικαλουμένων τὸ πάντιμον καὶ προσκυνητὸν ὅνομα σου’ ὥσα ἐν αὐτῷ αἰτήσωματε, καὶ σὺ εἰσακούσῃ ὅσα θυσιάσωμεν’ ὧν ἡμεῖς ποίησον τὸν ἅγιον τοῦτον καταντᾷν πάντων, καὶ ἐπικαλοῦμεν τὸν ἅγιον τοῦτον ἐν καταφύγιον καταντᾷν, καὶ τὴν χάριν ἡμῶν τοῦ ἅγιον τοῦτον ἔναντος κατακομίζειν ἐπισκίασεως, θαρροῦμεν γὰρ οὕτω εἰς τὴν τῶν ἡμέρων ανάζων’ χειρῶν ὑπογιαίναν, ἀλλ’ εἰς τὴν σὴν ἀφάτον ἀγαθότητα. Ἐκφώνησις.

7. Ὁτι ἠγιοι τὸν Ἡσυχίας ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐπαναπαύῃ, καὶ πρέπει σοὶ ἡ δόξα τοῦ ἅγιον εὐλογῶμεν ἐπὶ τῷ ἀγαθῷ τῆς ἐννοιας. Εἰς τὴν ἁγιασμον τοῦ ἅγιον καταντᾷν, καὶ τὴν χάριν ἡμῶν τοῦ ἅγιον κατακομίζειν ἐπισκίασεως, ἢ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐν ἀγάμῳ ἐπαναπαύῃ, καὶ πρέπει σοὶ ἡ δόξα τοῦ ἅγιον εὐλογῆσαι. Ἐκφώνησις.
Blessing of Water and Washing of the Altar

| 1. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ Ἀμήν’, ἐπιδίδονται τῷ πατριάρχῃ νίτρα λευκὰ καὶ ταῦτα ῥίπτει εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν τράπεζαν σταυρειδῶς, καὶ φέρεται σίτλα τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος πεπληρωμένη ὑδάτως, καὶ ἐπικλίνων αὐτῇ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὁ πατριάρχης ἐπεύχεται οὕτως: | And after “Amen,” the white nitre is given to the patriarch and he throws these upon the holy table in the form of a cross, and the vessels of holy baptism are brought full of warm water, and, bowing his head to it, the patriarch prays thus: [K2] Lord our God who sanctified the streams of Jordan through your salvific epiphany; yourself also now send down the grace of your Holy Spirit, and bless this water for the consecration and perfection of this your altar. Exclamation: For you are blessed to the ages of ages. Amen. And after this he pours three times onto the
| 2. Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ ἁγιάζας τὰ βάθη τοῦ Ἰορδάνου διὰ τῆς σωτηριώδους σου ἐπιφανείας, αὐτός καὶ νῦν κατάπεμψτε νῦν τῷ ἁγίῳ του πνεύματος, καὶ εὐλόγηστε τὸ ὑδάτος τούτου πρὸς ἁγιασμὸν καὶ τελείωσιν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου σου τούτου. Εἰκὼν/νήσις: Ὑπαρτείς οὖν τὰ αἰώνια ἡμῶν ἤδη τῶν αἰώνων τὰς ἁγίας ναοὺς καὶ τὸ ἔργον ὁμοίως εἰς τὰς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν. | Lord our God who sanctified the streams of Jordan through your salvific epiphany; yourself also now send down the grace of your Holy Spirit, and bless this water for the consecration and perfection of this your altar. Exclamation: For you are blessed to the ages of ages. Amen. And after this he pours three times onto the

---

1. ὁ ἐπίσκοπος OTT ὑγιεὶς ΟΤΤ add “Amen.” MELK
2. ὁ πατριάρχης OTT omit SIN Yes...Saviour: “O Lord, our Lord, and our God and our Saviour” MELK

---

And after “Amen,” the white nitre is given to the patriarch and he throws these upon the holy table in the form of a cross, and the vessels of holy baptism are brought full of warm water, and, bowing his head to it, the patriarch prays thus: [K2] Lord our God who sanctified the streams of Jordan through your salvific epiphany; yourself also now send down the grace of your Holy Spirit, and bless this water for the consecration and perfection of this your altar. Exclamation: For you are blessed to the ages of ages. Amen. And after this he pours three times onto the
3. Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπιχέει τρίτον τῇ τραπέζῃ ἐκ τοῦ χλιαροῦ λέγων· Εἰς (τὸ) ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.
4. Καὶ μετὰ τὸν ἐπιθέντων νίτρων ἀποσμήχει τὴν τράπεζαν καὶ τοὺς κίονας αὐτῆς τὰς χερσίν, εἶτα μετὰ σπόγγου καινοῦ καθαροῦ ἐκ τοῦ υπολοίπου χλιαροῦ ἐκμάσσει αὐτὴν.
5. Ἐν δὲ τῷ ταῦτῃ γίνεσθαι, λέγει τὸν πσαλμὸν ἅπαξ ἢ καὶ πολλάκις, πάντων αὐτῷ συμψαλλόντων μέχρι οὗ τελέω τὴν ἀποσμήξιν καὶ ἀποπλύνῃ, καὶ τότε δοξάζει καὶ ἐπεύχεται λέγων· Δόξα τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

Anointing of the Altar

1. Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο λαμβάνει καννί[ον] κολλάθου καὶ ἐπιχέει αὐτὸ τρίτον σταυρειδῶς λέγων· Ῥαντιεῖς με ὑσσώπῳ καὶ καθαρισθήσομαι, πλυνεῖς με καὶ ὑπὲρ χίονα λευκαθήσομαι· ἀκουτιεῖς με ἀγαλλίασιν καὶ εὐφροσύνην, ἀγαλλιάσονται ὀστέα τεταπεινωμένα.
2. Καὶ τοῦτο γʹ λέγει καὶ εἰδ’ οὕτως συνάπτει καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ψαλμοῦ μέχρι τοῦ τέλους, καὶ οὕτως δοξάζει τῇ ἐπεύχεσθαι· Ἐνλογητὸς ὁ θεός εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων.
3. Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο λαμβάνει σάβανον

And after this he takes the vessel of the measure [of wine] and pours it three times in the form of the cross, saying: “Cleanse me with hyssop, and I shall be clean, wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow; you will heard me with joy and gladness, the bones which were humbled shall rejoice” (Ps 50: 9-10).

And this he says three times, and at once he adds also the rest of the same psalm until the end, and thus he says the Glory, and prays: “Blessed is God unto the ages of ages.”

---

32 I correct here ἐπιχέει αὐτῷ to αὐτὸ, as suggested by Parenti-Velkovska in Evxologij, 482, pace Coquin, “La consécration des églises,” and Auzepy, “Isauriens et l’espace sacré,” 16 n.22.
καινουργίων καὶ ἐπιτίθεσιν ἐπάνω τῆς τραπέζης καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἀποσπασμένης αὐτῆς λέγων τὸν ρλα’ ψαλμὸν’ ἄπαξ ἢ καὶ β’ μέχρι αὐτοῦ τῆς τραπέζης καὶ ἐπιλέγει πάλιν’. Δόξα Χριστῷ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

4. Καὶ λαμβάνει τὸ ἀγγείον τοῦ μύρου, καὶ λέγοντος τοῦ διακόνου· Πρόσχωμεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ τραπέζῃ γ’ σταυροειδῶς, ποιῶν γ’ σταυρούς’, ἕνας μέσον καὶ δύο ἐκατέρωθεν, λέγων γ’ τῷ Αλληλούια ἡς ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, καὶ ἀποδιδόσαν τὸ ἀγγείον τοῦ μύρου, ἐκ τῶν γενομένων γ’ σταυρῶν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ τραπέζῃ ἁγία τριὰς, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.
Vesting and Incensation

1. "Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο νιπτόμενος τὰς χεῖρας, λαμβάνει τὸ ἁπλώμα καὶ περιβάλλει τῇ ἁγίᾳ τραπέζῃ, λέγων' τὸν θυ καὶ πολλάκις ἢ καὶ τὸ τράπεζαν ἄμα γὰρ τὸ τὸ ἁπλώμα καὶ περιβάλλει τῇ ἁγίᾳ τραπέζῃ, λέγων ὅτι τὸν ψαλμόν ἅπαξ ἢ καὶ πολλάκις ἢ καὶ τὸ τράπεζαν ἄμα γὰρ τὸν ψαλμόν ἅπαξ ἢ καὶ πολλάκις μέχρις ὧν ἀποθυμιάσῃ. Καὶ μετὰ τὸν Ἀμὴν, ἐπιδίδοται τῷ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ θυμιατήριον, καὶ θυμιᾷ τὴν ἁγίαν τράπεζαν καὶ τὸ ἱερατεῖον καὶ ὅλον τὸν ναὸν, λέγων τὸν κε’ ψαλμόν ἅπαξ ἢ καὶ πολλάκις μέχρις ὧν ἀποθυμιάσῃ.

2. Εἰς τὸν θυμιὰν τὸν πατριάρχην, εἷς τῶν συμπαρόντων αὐτῷ ἐπισκόπων, βαστάζων τὸ ἁγγεῖον τοῦ μύρου, ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσθεν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ποιεῖ σταυροὺς ἐκ τοῦ μύρου εἰς ἕκαστον κίονα καὶ πισσὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ ναοῦ.

Litany and Dismissal Prayer

1. Εἶτα μετὰ τὸ πληρῶσαι, ὡς εἴρηται, τὴν θυμίσαιν καὶ τὸν τοιούτον γαλμόν, καὶ δοξάσαι, ποιοῦντος διακόνου εὐχήν συναπτὴν συνηθῶς. Καὶ μετὰ τὸν Αντιλαβοῦντος εὐχὴν τῆς παναγίας, ἀκολουθεῖ διακόνου ἡμῶν τῆς παναγίας εὐχήν συναπτὴν συνηθῶς. Καὶ μετὰ τὸν Αντιλαβοῦντος ἡμῶν τῆς παναγίας εὐχὴν συναπτὴν συνηθῶς, ἀκολουθεῖ διακόνου ἡμῶν τῆς παναγίας εὐχήν συναπτὴν συνηθῶς. Καὶ μετὰ τὸν Αντιλαβοῦντος ἡμῶν τῆς παναγίας εὐχήν συναπτὴν συνηθῶς, ἀκολουθεῖ διακόνου ἡμῶν τῆς παναγίας εὐχήν συναπτὴν συνηθῶς.

2. Κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὁ τὴν ἁγίαν σου ἐκκλησίαν ἀρρήτω σοφία

And after this, having washed the hands, he takes the vestment and puts it upon the holy table, saying Ps 92, once or many times until the table is finally clothed, and then he says the Glory. And after “Amen,” the archbishop is given the censer, and he censes the holy table and the sanctuary and the whole temple, saying Ps 25 once or many times, until he will incense it. While the patriarch incenses, one of the bishops present with him, carrying the vessel of the chrism, follows him and makes the crosses with chrism upon every pillar and corner of the same temple.

Lord of heaven and earth, who established your church in ineffable wisdom, and had put together the order of priestly ministry...
Δέσποτα τηλικούντων δεομένου τάξιν ἐν ἐπαύσω δειχθῇ θεμελιώσας εὐεργετῶν ἀκατακρίτως ὡς γῆς ἀκουσίων προσφέροντα σὴν ἀναστάσεως κυβέρνησιν καὶ ἡμῶν τῆς Θεϊ̄παράδοσιν μαθητὰς οἱ λατρεύειν ὥστε ἔργῳ ἐκπορευθομένου, καθὼς ἐπηγγείλατο εἰς δυνατοὶ ἱερωσύνης παρέδωκαν ὅπως ἐνεστῆσαν τὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ τῷ θείῳ υἱοθεσίας, καὶ ἡμᾶς τῇ ἀναίμακτον τὸ ψαλμόν καὶ οἱ θαυμάτωσιν αἰωνίῳ, ὃς γὰρ ἐνεστῆσαν τὸν καιρὸν περὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν παρεστῶτας δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἀναστάσεως ποιησάμενος, καὶ ἀναλήφθης εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, ἐνεδώκεν τὸν καιρὸν ἀνατολός καὶ ἀποστόλους καὶ συστησάμενος βασιλείας κανόνας ἐκ ἐν εὐσπλαγχνε ἐνέδυσεν ἄγιον γέγονεν, ὡς τῷ θεῷ καὶ φρικτῷ. Ἰδρύσαν ἅμαρτολοὶ προσπίπτομεν υἱοθεσίας ἐδωρήσω ἀνήνεγκεν ἁγίον, ἔργῳ κοινωνοὺς· ἐνεργεσιῶν μονογενοῦς εὐεργεσιῶν ἑαυτὸν ἔδωραν ἀνθρώπινον λειτουργίας ἐκκλησίας, καὶ δὲ πρόσδεξαι τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῖν παντὸς τοῦ πάντιμον ἐνδespèreς ἀγαθότητος ἔδωραν ἀνθρώπινον λειτουργίας ἐκκλησίας, καὶ δὲ πρόσδεξαι τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῖν παντὸς τοῦ πάντιμον ἐνδ招商引�
Prayer of Inclination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Kai meta to Aymh, legei· Eirhni pasin. Kai to diakonou legontos Taz kefalas 'humon to Kyriw klinoimen, 'epexechetai ouutos·</th>
<th>And after “Amen,” he says: “Peace to all.” And after the deacon says, “Let us bow our heads to the Lord,” he prays thus:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Euxharistoidemn sou, kuriw o theos ton dunamw, oti an eixechari chariin epi toous agious sou apostholous, kai toous osious 'humon patera hziosas dia polellon sou filanvropian mecris 'humon ton amartolon kai arheious doulon sou ekteinai.</td>
<td>[K4] We give thanks to you, Lord the God of powers [Ps 83:9], for you vouchsafed to extend to us, your sinful and unfit servants, the grace which you had poured out upon your holy apostles and our venerable fathers. Therefore, we pray you, Master of many mercies, fill this altar with glory [1 Kgs 8:11], sanctification and grace, so that the bloodless sacrifices offered in it, may be changed into the pure body and precious blood of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ [Tit 2:13], your only-begotten Son, for the salvation of all your people and of our unworthiness. Exclamation: For you are our God, the God of mercy…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dio deometha sou, despota polileee, plirososon doxeis kai 'agiasmoi kai charitos to thiasasthiron touto eis to metapeieisitha·</td>
<td>'add “the end” (ܡܠܟ) MELK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The image contains a table with text in Greek and English. The table includes the text of the Prayer of Inclination, with corresponding translations and annotations. The text is divided into sections, each with numbered captions. The table also includes side notes and footnotes for clarification. The Greek text is aligned to the left, and the English translation is to the right of each Greek section. The table is formatted to show the alignment of the Greek and English content, making it easier to compare and understand the text.
Dismissal

"Καὶ οὕτως ἐν εἰρήνῃ προέλθωμεν."

And thus the deacon says: “Let us go forth in peace.”

"εἴθα οὕτως BODL ʿadd καὶ ἀπολύει BODL ʿΚαὶ...προέλθωμεν omit SIN | εὐθὺς· Δόξα σοι Χριστέ ὁ θεός ή ἐλπίς ἡμ[ῶν], καὶ ἀπόλυ[σ]ς. Εἰ δὲ ἐστὶν προσφορά, λειτουργεῖται αὐτικά ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος, ἀντί τοῦ χερουβικοῦ, ψάλλεται ὑπὲρ ψάλλεται εἰς τὰ ἐγκαίνια τῆς μεγ[άλης] ἐκκλη[σίας] OTT

instead of “And…peace”: “This is the dedication of the temple only, apart from the church, i.e. (of) the holy table, and the laying of bones of the martyr beneath it.” MELK³³

The Rite of Encaenia.

Title

Τάξις γινομένη ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐγκαινίοις τοῦ ἡδη καθιερωθέντος ἁγίου ναού.

The Order (celebrated) at the encaenia of the holy temple (which was) already consecrated.’

Τὸν ἐγκαινίων SIN

"The…consecrated: Order is for the consecration of the hallowed temple preceding the dedication (?) MELK³⁴

Preface

Τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν ἡ καθιεροῦται ὁ εὐκτήριος οἶκος, γινομένου λυχνικοῦ καὶ πανυχίδος ἐν μία τῶν σύνεγγυς τοῦ καθιερωθέντος εὐκτήριου ἐκκλησιῶν, τῇ καὶ δηλωθησομένη διὰ τοῦ κηρυκτικοῦ τῶν

On the same day in which the house of prayer is consecrated, the vespers and the pannychis ʿtake place in one of the churches close to the oratory to be consecrated, which is announced by the

³³ I have repositioned the rubric which Black places at the beginning of the “second service,” i.e. of the encaenia (Rituale Melchitarum, 80)

³⁴ See the footnote above. I have changed Black’s translation (p. 80), presuming the Arabic (Karshuni) rubric to be the garbled rendering of the Greek as in BAR, SIN, BODL et alia.
herald of the assemblies, where clearly also the holy relics remain. Early in the morning, the patriarch arrives there, and as the deacon does the litany of the Trisagion, he prays this:

`\textit{καταμένουσι BODL `omit ἐκεῖσε SIN `omit τρισαγίου SIN `omit αὐτὸς BODL}`

\[\textit{\`ο πατριάρχης, λέγων οὕτως SIN}\]

\textit{add \textit{I mean, the agrypnia” MELK “appropriate synapte with Trisagios” MELK}}

\section*{Opening Prayer}

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ πιστὸς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου καὶ ἀψευδὴς ἐν ταῖς ἐπαγγελίαις, ὁ χαρισάμενος τοῖς ἁγίοις σου μάρτυσιν τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν καλὸν ἀγωνίσασθαι, καὶ τὸν δρόμον τῆς ἐυσεβείας τελέσαι, καὶ τὴν πίστιν τῆς ἀληθοῦς ὁμολογίας φυλάξαι· αὐτὸς, δέσποτα πανάγιε, ταῖς αὐτῶν ἱκεσίαις παρακλήθητι, καὶ χαρίσαι ἡμῖν τοῖς ἀναξίων σου δούλοις μέρος καὶ κλῆρον ἐχεῖν μετ’ αὐτῶν, ἵνα μιμηταὶ αὐτῶν γινόμενοι, καταξιωθῶμεν τῶν ἐναποκειμένων αὐτῶς ἁγαθῶν. Ἐκφώ(νησις)· Ἐλέει καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ.} \end{quote}

\[\textit{add ἐν ταῖς cod. BAR}\]

\section*{Prayer of Inclination}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Καὶ μετὰ τὸ Ἀμὴν, λέγει· Εἰρήνη πᾶσιν.
\item Καὶ τοῦ διακόνου λέγοντος· Τὰς κεφαλὰς ἡμῶν τῷ κυρίῳ κλίνωμεν(ν), ἐπευχέται αὐτῶς.
\item Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, πρεσβείαις τῆς ἁγίας δεσποίνης ἡμῶν Θεοτόκου, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων σου, τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν τῶν ἀναξίων σου δούλων κατεύθυνον, καὶ ἐν πάσιν εὐφρεστεῖν ἡμᾶς τῇ σῇ ἁγαθότητι καταξίωσον. {Ἐκφώ(νησις)}· Εἰπ τὸ πανάγιον ὅνομά σου εὐλογημένον τοῦ πατρος καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ.}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{quote}
\textbf{[E1]} Lord our God, faithful in your words and unlying in the promises, who granted to your holy martyrs to fight the good fight, to complete the course of piety, and to preserve the faith of true confession. Yourself, all-holy Master, be entreated by their intercessions, and grant us, your unworthy servants, to have a part and inheritance with them, so that as we become their imitators, we may be made worthy of the good things that lie in store for them. \textit{Exclamation: By the mercy and love for mankind.}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textbf{[E2]} Lord our God, through the intercessions of our holy Lady Theotokos, and of all your saints, set right the works of our hands of your unworthy servants, and vouchsafe us in all things to please your goodness. \textit{[Exclamation: May your all-holy name be blessed, of the Father and of the Son.]}\end{quote}
**Procession and Entrance**

1. After “Amen,” the patriarch himself begins: “Glory to you, Christ God, the apostles’ boast, the martyrs’ joy.” And bearing the holy relics with those present with him, the bishop arrives with the procession to the temple to be dedicated. And when he enters the narthex and stands opposite the middle door of the temple/nave, and says: “Blessed are you, Christ God, unto ages of ages.” And the singers begin the troparion: “Lift up your gates, princes, and be lifted up, ancient doors,” and the rest. And at once the doors are opened, and he enters with all the people.

**Deposition of Relics**

1. While the indicated troparion is being chanted, the patriarch deposits the holy relics in the place prepared for them, and does this prayer:

2. While the indicated troparion is being chanted, the patriarch deposits the holy relics in the place prepared for them, and does this prayer:
Our God who had granted even this glory to the saints who fought on your behalf—
that their relics may be sown in all the earth in your holy churches and the fruit of healings may be received. Yourself, Master who are the Giver of all good things, by the intercessions of the saints, whose relics you were well-pleased to have (made to be) deposited in this revered church, make us worthy without condemnation to offer you in it the bloodless sacrifice, grant us all the petitions unto salvation, providing in it also in return to those fought for the sake of your name, to perform miracles through them for our salvation. For yours is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, now and…

| Our God who had granted even this glory to the saints who fought on your behalf—
| that their relics may be sown in all the earth in your holy churches and the fruit of healings may be received. Yourself, Master who are the Giver of all good things, by the intercessions of the saints, whose relics you were well-pleased to have (made to be) deposited in this revered church, make us worthy without condemnation to offer you in it the bloodless sacrifice, grant us all the petitions unto salvation, providing in it also in return to those fought for the sake of your name, to perform miracles through them for our salvation. For yours is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, now and… |

| Liturgy |
| - Εἴτε δοξάζουσιν οἱ ψάλται καὶ εἰσανάπτουσιν τὸ τρισάγιον, καὶ γίνεται ἀκολούθως πᾶσα ἡ λειτουργία. |
| - καὶ ΒΟΔΛ ἡ θεία λειτουργία ΣΙΝ |

| Then the singers chant the Glory, and they add the Trisagion, and the entire (order of the) liturgy follows. |
| - Εἴτε δοξάζουσιν οἱ ψάλται καὶ εἰσανάπτουσιν τὸ τρισάγιον, καὶ γίνεται ἀκολούθως πᾶσα ἡ λειτουργία. |

| 4.1.2 The Structure of the Rite in Barberini Gr. 336. |

To summarize the evidence presented in the collation of the five manuscripts above, I will provide the structure of the two rites for the dedication of a church, as these appear in the “old” redaction of the Byzantine ritual. The first of these rites, the
“consecration of the holy church and the holy table/altar which is in it” consists of the following elements:

1. preparation of the altar by marble-workers;
2. entrance of the patriarch and exit of the lay people;
3. diaconal synapte;
4. meanwhile, the patriarch, kneeling, reads the first prayer: Ὅ Θεὸς ὁ ἄναρχος καὶ ἀνάμνησα ταῦτα ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱερόν (K1);
5. cleansing of the altar with the nitre36;
6. blessing of the warm water, brought in the baptismal vessels – the prayer Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ ἁγιάσας τὰ ἱερά τοῦ ἱερόν (K2);
7. washing of the altar with the formula “In the name of the Father etc.”. The table is wiped/cleansed with the chant of Ps 83;
8. pouring of the measure of the fragrant wine over the altar with Ps 50:9-10;
9. the altar is wiped with the new cloth, while Ps 131 is chanted;
10. anointing of the altar by the pouring of myron with the chant of “Alleluia” “as at the time of the holy baptism (ὁς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱερόν βαπτισματος). The anointing is accompanied by Ps 132;
11. vesting of the altar with Ps 92;
12. incensation of the altar, the sanctuary, and of the entire church while Ps 25 is chanted. Simultaneously, the anointing of the pillars of the church with oil takes place.
13. synapte and prayer Κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὁ τὴν ἁγιάζαν σου ἐκκλησίαν ἀρρήτῳ σοφίᾳ θεμελιώσας (K3);
14. prayer of inclination: Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων (K4);
15. a diaconal acclamation “Let us depart in peace,” presupposing a dismissal and the conclusion of the service.

The second rite, the “encaenia of the temple already dedicated,” includes the following structural components:

1. vespers and pannychis on the preceding night in one of the nearby churches, where the relics are also placed;
2. procession of the patriarch “at dawn” into this church;

---

35 Further, I will use these sigla to refer to the prayers constituting the Byzantine rite.

36 The term πιπτρ or νιτρίν was used for the soap or some equivalent cleansing substance in the Byzantine period. In Greek antiquity the term nitron was applied to “a form of sodium carbonate, which formed a cleansing compound when mixed with oil,” and while “the chemical composition of Byzantine nitron is unknown,” the term continued to be used in the Byzantine period (A[lexander] K[azhdan], A[lice]-M[ary] T[albot], “Soap,” OBD 3.1920-1921); see also LBG 5.1082.

37 The word καννίιν appears to be a syncopated form of καννίον, κάννιον ‘vessel’, as suggested by Parenti-Velkovska in Exxologij, 482 on the basis of the entry in LBG 759. The
3. diaconal litany “of the Trisagion” and the patriarch’s prayer Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ πιστός ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου (E1);
4. prayer of inclination: Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν πρεσβείαις τῆς ἁγίας Δεσποίνης (E2);
5. procession with the relics into the church to be dedicated with the chant of the troparion “Glory to you, Christ God”;
6. station before the central door into the nave;
7. patriarch’s blessing and the chant of the “troparion” Ἀρατε πύλας οἱ ἄρχοντες ἡμῶν (Ps 23:7);
8. entrance with the same verse as an introit;
9. deposition of relics “in a prepared place” with the prayer of deposition Ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ καὶ ταύτην τὴν δόξαν (E3);
10. doxology from the chanters, followed by the Trisagion and the rest of the eucharistic liturgy.

The comparison of the text of the dedication rite in accordance with BAR, SIN, BODL, OTT, and MELK shows that these have preserved the same redaction of the rite, which can be attributed to the cadre of the “ancient” euchologion of Constantinople, formed (possibly) before, during, or in the immediate aftermath of the first Iconoclasm (c. 730-787). While the text of the rites for kathierôsis and encaenia in four later witnesses are close to the version of Barberini, it is by no means homogenous and contains a number of unique characteristics, e.g.:

1. BODL does not mention the vesting of the altar after the anointing with myron (f. 138r-v), but instructs to proceed directly to the incensation.38
2. MELK is the only manuscript which divides the opening prayer of the patriarch in the καθιέρωσις rite (K1) into two prayers, with the first separated by simple “Amen,” without doxology.
3. While MELK does not contain a diaconal acclamation, indicating a dismissal, the rubric which Black places at the beginning of the rite of encaenia, clearly refers (if we correct Black’s positioning of the rubric) to the first service as the rite of

---

38 Jacob, “Une euchologe,” 333-34.
the consecration of the “temple”/هִיכָל only,\(^{39}\) thus maintaining a clear distinction between two rites. At the same time, only BODL and OTT among those mss. preserving the “older” redaction of the rite clearly indicate a dismissal at the end of the first rite.\(^{40}\)

4. OTT contains a number of unique features, not attested in other mss: it substitutes ἐπίσκοπος for πατριάρχης throughout the rubrics of the rite, consistently with the suggested characterization of this ms. as a “Palestinian (likely Melkite) copy of the old Constantinopolitan euchologion”\(^{41}\) later used in a peripheral Palestinian diocese of either Bethlehem or Mt Sinaï\(^{42}\): for a smaller diocese, the presence of only one bishop would have been more relevant. In conjunction with this one must also read the substitution of πρεσβυτέρων for ἐπισκόπων as the generic title for bishop’s concelebrants in 1.6.3 above.

5. The most distinctive feature of OTT is certainly the inclusion of the rite of καθιέρωσις only, without the rite of encaenia with the deposition of relics. Instead, the rite concludes with the rubric regarding the use of proper Great Entrance chant during the celebration of BAS.\(^{43}\)

\(^{39}\) “This is the consecration of the temple only, apart from the church, I mean, the holy table, and the laying of the bones of the martyr beneath it” (trans. Black, with emendations, *Rituale Melchitarum*, 44/80). Given the content of the “first” rite of dedication (consecration of church and the altar), this rubric contextually could only refer to the rite of consecration *without* the deposition of relics, i.e. the first rite, not the second. Thus, the additional title for the second service as “Second Service: Consecration of the Chancel only,” inserted by Black (p. 80), may be erroneous.

\(^{40}\) καὶ ἀπολύει (f. 140v = Jacob, “Une euchologe du Saint-Saveur,” 334).

\(^{41}\) Thiermeyer, *Das Euchologion Ottoboni*, 118.

\(^{42}\) Ibid., 77.

\(^{43}\) f. 93v; ibid., 116-17; also Stefano Parenti, “Nota sull’impiego e l’origine dell’inno Σιγησάτω πᾶσα σάρξ βροτεία,” *Κυπριακαὶ Σπουδαί* 64-65 (2000-01): 191-199.
6. Likewise, uniquely, OTT does not include the rubric instructing the bishop not to kneel during the recitation of the first prayer concluding the καθιέρωσις rite (K3, I.7.1).

For the three of the manuscript witnesses to the earlier form of the Byzantine dedication rite – SIN, OTT and MELK – the origin in the Oriental provinces of the empire, namely Palestine, seems to be certain: SIN mixes up the Constantinopolitan material with the prayers for which parallels can be found in JAS, suggesting Jerusalem or Sinaitic origin for the euchologion,44 while the Palestinian origin for OTT and MELK has also been discussed.45 As it was stated before, BAR, an Italo-Greek source for the rite of Constantinople, incorporates the Oriental material into the texture of the Constantinopolitan rite. On the other hand, BODL, also a South Italian euchologion, has shown affinity with the euchologia Grottaferrata Γ.β. II and Vatican gr. 1811 (both -12th cent.),46 neither of which include the καθιέρωσις rite, but just the rite of encaenia,47 showing a still lingering perception of a clear separation between the two rites. The presence of these unique features in Palestinian and Italo-Greek euchologia exemplifies the survival of earlier elements and structures of the rite in the liturgical traditions of imperial periphery, which we shall observe consistently throughout this dissertation. By contrast, the euchologia representing the “longer” redaction of the dedication rite, first

44 Jacob, Histoire du formulaire, 217-221.

45 Brakmann, “Altkirchlichen Ordinationsgebete Jerusalems,” 111; Thiermeyer, Das Euchologion Ottoboni.

46 Jacob, “Un euchologe,” 295.

47 Grottaferrata Γ.β. II, f. 123v-125v; Vatican gr. 1811, f. 62r-64v.
attested in the eleventh-century Constantinopolitan euchologion *Paris B.N. Coislin 213*,
show the evidence of significant evolution and expansion of the liturgical rubrics and
ritual movements. The most distinctive characteristic of this redaction concerns very
detailed instructions for the patriarch and the clergy for the installing of the altar, with an
additional prayer Κύριε ὁ Θεός καὶ Σωτήρ ἡμῶν ὁ πάντα πραγματευόμενος (H), and the
chant of Ps 144 as the table is being set upon the pillars. The *Coislin* euchologion also
introduced two additional prayers into the rite of *encaenia*, preceding the entrance of the
clergy into the church: Ὅ θεός καὶ πατήρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (E-III) and
Δέσποτα Κύριε ὁ θεός ἡμῶν ὁ καταστήσας ἐν οὐρανοῖς (E-IV), the prayer of the
entrance from the ordo of BAS and CHR. This is the recension of the Byzantine rite of
dedication which will remain largely unchanged throughout the middle and late
Byzantine period, and will continue to constitute the basis for the received text of the rite
in the Slavic tradition.

4.2 “Encaenia” in *Barberini Gr. 336* and the Dedications of Churches in
Constantinople in the 6th-10th Centuries.

---

48 f. 8v-10v; ed. J. Duncan. *Coislin 213. Euchologe de la Grande Église.* Dissertatio ad Lauream,
Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum (Rome: PIO, 1983), 10-12. I also refer here to the paper
“The Rite of Installation of an Altar in the Byzantine Euchologion *Coislin 213,*” I presented at the annual
meeting of the North American Academy of Liturgy in January 2011.

49 f. 10v-11r = Duncan, 12-13. I also refer here to the paper “The Rite of Installation of an Altar in
the Byzantine Euchologion *Coislin 213,*” I presented at the annual meeting of the North American
Academy of Liturgy in January 2011.

50 f. 17v-18v = Duncan, 22-24.
From our earlier exposition of the structure of the rite of *encaenia*, its distinguishing features may be observed: it is a public, stational liturgy involving a procession of the congregation led by the patriarch, the clergy and the people from one location within the city to a newly consecrated church. The rite reaches its culmination in the opening of the church doors, entrance, and the deposition of relics in a “prepared place.” Our earlier discussion of the dedication rites in Late Antique Eastern Mediterranean (see Part I, chapters 2-3) pointed out the connection between the fledging rites for the dedication of Christian public cultic buildings and the Roman ceremonies for the inauguration of temples and public buildings. Through our review of the available evidence for the *encaeniae* in the early Byzantine Constantinople, I hope to demonstrate that the rite of *encaenia* in the Barberini euchologion fits well into the context of Late Antique public, processional ceremonial in general, and of the processional liturgy of the Great City in particular.

The importance of the imperial presence and sanction for the dedication of the building is evident also in the later celebrations of church dedications in Constantinople in the time of Justinian the Great. The evidence regarding these festivals has survived for us in the accounts of historians, such as John Malalas, Theophanes the Confessor and the anonymous authors of *Chronicon Paschale*, and of another anonymous seventh or eighth century historiographic excerpt preserved under the title “Ἐκλόγαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας.” For example, in John Malalas’ description of the


dedication of the Church of Holy Apostles, which emperor Justinian pulled down entirely and rebuilt, according to the witness of Procopius, we observe a public stational liturgy involving a procession with the relics led by the patriarch:

Μηνὶ ιουνίῳ κηʹ, ἵνα δικτιῶνι τῇ αὐτῇ, ἐγένετο τὰ ἐγκαίνια τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ η ἐκκλησίας τῶν τιμίων λειψάνων Ἀνδρέου, Λουκᾶ, καὶ Τιμοθέου ἐν Ἰουνίῳ τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεις καὶ διήλθεν ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Μηνᾶς μετὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἁγίων λειψάνων καθήμενος ἐν όχήματι βασιλικῳ.

On June 28, the same indiction, there was in Constantinople the dedication of the Holy Apostles, and the deposition of the precious relics of Andrew, Luke, and Timothy. And the bishop Menas came in procession with their holy relics, seated upon the royal chariot.

A remarkable feature of this description is the position of the patriarch, who leads the procession, “sitting in the royal chariot.” Apart from this indication of the patriarch’s sharing in imperial authority, Malalas’ account does not say anything more specific concerning the participation of the emperor in the dedication liturgy. An account of historian Theophanes clarifies this point in his description of the dedication of the church of St Eirene in Sykae (Galata), “just about at the opening of the bay,” in September 551/552:

In the month of September of the same year, the 15th indiction, there was the encaenia of the Hagia Eirene in Sykae; and the holy relics proceeded out of the great church, also with two patriarchs: Menas of Constantinople and Apolinarius of Alexandria. Both sat in the royal chariot, holding on their knees the holy relics.

53 Buildings 1.4.10.
54 Malalae Chronographia, ed. Dindorf, 484.
55 The anonymous author of Eclogae adds another detail: “with another reserve golden chariot proceeding in front (ἄλλου χρυσοῦ όχήματος προηγουμένου ἀδεστράτου ἐμπροσθεν)” (Cramer, 113).
56 Procopius, Buildings 1.7.1 and generally, 1.7.1-16.
And they went until the Ferry and they crossed over, and the emperor greeted them there. They opened the same church of the holy martyr Eirene.\textsuperscript{57}

Thus, the emperor would participate in the stational procession, but would join the congregation at a certain point during the way. It is notable, however, that here the role of a main figure of authority at the dedication ceremony has shifted to a hierarch: we see that the emperor chooses to walk on foot while the patriarchs rides in the imperial chariot.\textsuperscript{58} The tension with regards to the question, on whose authority the building is dedicated, is still present in the legendary narrative relating the building and the second dedication of Hagia Sophia on December 24, 562. In this account, when emperor Justinian and patriarch Eutychius enter the newly constructed church, the emperor “escaped from the hand of the patriarch,” and was the \textit{first} to enter the church in his role as a new Solomon.\textsuperscript{59} The historical reliability of this narrative may be rather slim, and the role of an emperor in this dedication, according to the traditional historical accounts is more reserved:

And on December 24, there was the \textit{encaenia} of the Great Church, the second time. The \textit{pannychis} of the same \textit{encaenia} took place in the [church of] St Plato, and the patriarch of Constantinople Eutychius came out thence with the procession, with the emperor also present. The patriarch was sitting in the chariot and bore the apostolic form (\textit{ἀποστολικὸν σχῆμα}) and holding the holy Gospel, while all were singing: “Lift up your gates, O princes” (Ps 23:7).\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{57} Theophanes, \textit{Chronographia} 551/552; de Boor 1: 228; see also John Malalas, \textit{Chronographia}, ed. Dindorf, p. 486.

\textsuperscript{58} Averil Cameron, “Images of Authority: Elites and Icons in Late Sixth-Century Byzantium,” \textit{Past and Present} 84 (1979): 3-35.


\textsuperscript{60} Theophanes, \textit{Chronographia} 562/3; ed. de Boor, 1:238.
The service described by Theophanes has specific features of Constantinopolitan liturgy: it began in the martyr’s shrine dedicated to St Plato where the pannychis, a distinctly Constantinopolitan office, was celebrated. The patriarch is again assuming the principal position in the ritual which is indicated by his sitting in the royal chariot, with the emperor simply “present (συμπαρόντος).” Quite remarkably, the bishop performs the procession with a sacred object, but this object is not the relics of a saint in whose honor the church is dedicated, but the Gospel book, evidently functioning here as a symbolic representation of the Patron of the new church – Christ himself. The pannychis on the eve of the dedication, stational procession from another location to the new church, and the singing of Ps 23:7 as the introit – these elements find clear parallels in our eighth-century rite of encaenia in Barberini gr. 336 and confirm its Constantinopolitan origin.

The Constantinopolitan practices at the annual festivals of church dedication found in the tenth-century Typicon of the Great Church, i.e. Hagia Sophia, edited by Juan Mateos, present interesting parallels with the rite of encaenia in the euchologion Barberini gr. 336. The Typicon records three of such annual festivals for the different churches in the imperial city: the dedication of the church of the Theotokos at Blachernae on July 30, the dedication of the church of the Theotokos at Chalkoprateia on December 18, and the dedication of Hagia Sophia itself on Christmas Eve, December 24. For the

---

61 Procopius, Buildings 1.4.27.


63 Malalas provides a similar information, also citing Ps 23:7 for the text of the troparion, but calling the Gospel book “τὸ ἁγιον μεγαλεῖον.” (Malalae Chronographia, p. 495).

first of these occasions, the typicon gives no interesting details, except for using Ps 23:7 at the third antiphon of the liturgy.\(^{65}\) The Typicon provides more information regarding the annual commemoration of encaenia of the Chalkoprateia church, describing of a rogational procession (λιτή) from Hagia Sophia to the church of the Theotokos:

The orthros is celebrated on the ambo, and at Ps 50, they say the troparion *Lift up the gates, O princes* (Ps 23:7). And the litê comes out of the Great Church and the singers at the ambo begin the troparion written above on the eve, *Rejoice, O blessed*. And the lite goes through the Lead-workers [district] (Μολυβδουργοῦ) to the Milion (εἰς τὸ Μίλιον) into the Chalkoprateia, and they enter into the narthex. And after the troparion which was sung is finished, the orphans begin *Lift up the gates* and the church is opened, and the singers begin the *Glory*.\(^{66}\)

The entrance is immediately followed by Trisagion and the liturgy of the Word, without the antiphons.\(^{67}\) A similar order appears to be followed in a more solemn celebration a few days later – the commemoration of encaenia of Hagia Sophia. On this day, coinciding with the Nativity Eve,

the patriarch comes [into the Great Church] and enters from the side door into the holy altar, and the prayer (litany) of Trisagion is recited (καὶ γίνεται εὐχὴ τρισάγιου).\(^{68}\) And the singers begin the troparion on the ambo: *Your city, O Theotokos,* [...] And when the litê comes out, the church is immediately closed. The litê goes up to the Forum and the singers sing the *Gloria* with the same troparion, tone middle 4: *Your city, O Theotokos,* and the deacon says the great litany, and again they begin the troparion, tone plagal 4: *Our city, Lord.* [...]. And when the litê arrives to the narthex, before the great doors, after the troparion is finished, the patriarch blesses and the orphans begin: *Lift up the gates*. And the singers open the gates and after the entrance, immediately the Trisagion, and the prokeimenon, 3rd tone: *Great is our Lord* (Ps 146: 5, 1). The Epistle to the Hebrews, 7:26-8:2. Alleluia, tone 1, verse Ps 73:2. The Gospel

---

\(^{65}\) Mateos, OCA 165, 1.354.

\(^{66}\) Ibid., 1.138.

\(^{67}\) Αντίφωνα δὲ οὐ γίνονται, ἀλλ’ εὐθέως τὸ τρισάγιον... Ibid., l.21.

\(^{68}\) Mateos translates this term as “la prière du trisagion” (1.145). This term, however, should be read in conjunction with the phrase used in Barberini 336 for a similar occasion – καὶ ποιοῦντος διακόνου εὐχὴν συναπτὴν τρισαγίου (Parenti-Velkovska, 171); it seems that what is meant here is the litany before trisagion, chanted by the deacon.
according to John, 10:22-30. Koinonikon: *Rejoice in the Lord O you righteous* (Ps 32:1). Instead of *Depart in peace*, the deacon says *Wisdom!* and they celebrate the vigil (*pannychis*) according to order.\(^{69}\)

The order described for the *encaenia* celebration on December 24 has significant parallels to the rite of *encaenia* in our oldest Byzantine euchologion, and is significantly more detailed than the description of the original dedication in 562, but it also contains some variations. Thus, the church of Hagia Sophia serves apparently as both the starting point and, obviously, the end of the procession: however, its doors are closed and then solemnly opened for the procession to enter which indicates the intention to replicate the original ceremony. The text of the troparia seem to be suited for the status of Hagia Sophia as the main cathedral of the imperial city, for it contains prayer for the deliverance of this city, adorned by the “sceptres of kingship.”\(^{70}\) As compared to the rite in *Barberini gr. 336*, the only principal variation is the inclusion of relics and of the ritual elements connected to the relics (prayers, carrying them in procession, deposition). As has been noted above, no use of relics is mentioned in the description of the dedication of Hagia Sophia in 562 – however, the deposition of relics was apparently a part of the dedication ritual of such churches as the Holy Apostles and Hagia Eirene in Sykae. The use of relics in the crypts under the altars\(^{71}\) or the altar with *confessio* where the relics could be touched (as in Hagia Euphemia)\(^{72}\) is attested by the archeological evidence – hence, it is reasonable to believe that what was a Constantinopolitan practice with respect to some of

\(^{69}\) Mateos, 1.144, 146.

\(^{70}\) Ibid., 1.144.


\(^{72}\) Ibid., 66-67.
the churches of the city came to be the standard practice at the dedication of every church
after the binding decree of Second council of Nicæa (787). 73 The shape of the
dedication liturgy as it appears in Barberini gr. 336 corresponds to the stage in the
development of the Constantinopolitan stational liturgy which John Baldovin attributes to
the seventh century: at this point the Trisagion is no longer a processional chant of the
antiphonal psalmody, but serves as the introit, and another antiphonal psalm is added
before the Trisagion.74

4.3 The Western Rites for the Consecration of a New Altar: Washing, Anointing,
Deposition of Relics (8th -9th Cent.).

The sequence of lustrations and anointings, followed by the deposition of relics,
may lead one to consider a connection between the similar sequence of ritual acts in the
Western (Roman) rites of church dedication and the Byzantine rites for the dedication of
a church. The history of the Roman rites for church dedication is certainly better studied
than the genesis of the equivalent Byzantine and Oriental rites, and gives evidence of
complex interweaving of local Western traditions – specifically, Roman and Gallican.75

73 “…We decree that in those sacred temples which were consecrated without the relics of the holy
martyrs, the deposition of relics is to take place, after the customary prayers…” (can. 7).

74 John F. Baldovin, The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development and

75 For the status questionis the relevant pages of Bernard Botte and Heinzgerd Brakmann,
“Kirchweihe,” RAC 20 (2004), 1139- 1169, should be consulted, but also Joseph Braun, Der christliche
Altar in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung (Munich: Alte Meister Guenther Koch, 1924), 1.525-730; J.
Torsten-Christian Forneck, Die Feier der Dedicatio ecclesiae im Römischen Ritus : die Feier
der Dedikation einer Kirche nach dem deutschen Pontifikale und dem Messbuch vor dem Hintergrund
ihrer Geschichte und im Vergleich zum Ordo dedicationis ecclesiae und zu einigen ausgewählten
The letter of Pope Vigilius to Profuturus of Braga (538 CE) confirms that in sixth-century Rome the celebration of the mass alone sufficed for the dedication of the church, if no deposition of relics took place at the same time.\footnote{quia consecrationem cuiuslibet ecclesiae in qua sanctuaria non ponuntur celebritatem tantum scimus esse missarum (PL 69:18-19).} If the deposition of relics did take place, the Roman rite of dedication also included the aspersion with the \textit{aqua exorcizata}\footnote{See Bernard Capelle, \textit{``L’\textit{aqua exorcizata} dans les rites Romaines de la d\textit{édicace au \textit{VI}e siècle,''}\textit{ Re"{u}ve B\textit{\^e}n\textit{édictine} 50 (1938): 306-308.}} – but, as Antoine Chavasse noted, “la célébration de la messe demeure le rite consécrationnaire \textit{essentiel}’ of this period.\footnote{In \textit{Le Sacramentaire Gélasien (Vatican Reginensis 316): sacramentaire presbytéral en usage dans les titres Romain au \textit{VII}e siècle}, Bibliothèque de Théologie: Histoire de Théologie 1 (Tournai: Desclée, 1958), 37. See also John A. Eidenschink, “Dedication of Sacred Places in the Early Sources and in the Letters of Gregory the Great,” \textit{Jurist 5} (1945): 181-215, 523-558.} For Gallia, on the other hand, the sixth century evidence suggests the use of anointing by chrism at the consecration of an altar, as follows from the canon 14 of the council in Agde under Caesarius of Arles (506), which prescribes that the altars be dedicated not only by chrismation, but also by a sacerdotal blessing.\footnote{Altaria placuit non solum unctione chrismatis, sed etiam sacerdotali benedictione sacrari (ed. C. Munier, \textit{Concilia Galliae}, CCSL 148 [Turnhout: Brepols, 1963], 200). Benz notes that there is no indication that the resolutions of this council, as well as the one of Epao (517), together with the witness of Caesarius, had but “nur lokale Bedeutung” and that these “bald und allgemein angenommen worden seien” (“Zur Geschichte,” 107 n. 214).} The Gallican dedication rites of the sixth century might have included the chrismation of the altar, as well as the deposition of relics\footnote{de Graviers, “Dédicace,” 109-17.} – although, while Gregory of
Tours (c.538-594) refers to the consecration of a new altar in conjunction with the deposition of relics, he does not specify exactly what this rite entailed.\footnote{Liber in gloria confessorum 20; Liber vitae patrum 8.8, 15.1 (in Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum 1.2: Miracula et opera minora [Hanover, 1969]); see also Benz, “Zur Geschichte,” 80; Botte-Brakmann, “Kirchweiche,” 1155-1156.}

powerful use of the Old Testament imagery certainly is found in the rubric dealing with the celebrant’s actions at the consecration of an altar, common for *Gelasianum vetus* and *Missale Francorum*. It instructs the celebrant to apply the mixture of wine and water to four corners of the altar “with his finger,” afterwards sprinkling the altar “seven times” with the same mixture, and finishing by pouring the remainder of the mixture at the base of the altar and incensing the altar. As was noted in previous scholarship, the rubric describing these actions represents a pastiche of scriptural quotations from Exodus 29 and Leviticus 8, containing the divinely revealed procedure for the installation of Aaronic priesthood, but also quite reminiscent of the annual feast of purgation of the temple on *Yom Kippur*: in both instances the ritual described in the Hebrew Bible involves the slaughter of an animal (Lev 16:6) and the sprinkling of its blood upon either the altar (Ex 29, Lev 16:17-19) or the ark and the *kapporet* of the holy of holies (Lev 16:12-14). The comparison below shows the exegetical intent of the compilers of the Gallican dedication rites, as in their adaptation of scriptural passages the mixture of wine and water seems to occupy the place of sacrificial blood in the OT ritual:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulgate</th>
<th>Gelasianum vetus</th>
<th>Missale francorum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ex 29:12a:</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. sumptusque <em>de sanguine vituli</em> ponentes super cornua altaris digito tuo</td>
<td>1. Primitus enim ponis super cornu altaris digito tuo <em>vinum</em> cum <em>aqua mixtum</em>;</td>
<td>1. Ponis super cornua altaris digito tuo <em>vinum</em> cum <em>aqua mixtum</em>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lev. 8:11:</strong>&lt;br&gt;2. cumque sanctificans <em>asperisset</em> altare septem vicibus</td>
<td>2. <em>et asperges altare septem vicibus,</em></td>
<td>2. <em>et aspergis altare septem vicibus;</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ex. 29:12b:</strong>&lt;br&gt;3. reliquum autem sanguinem <em>fundes iuxta basim eius</em> [i.e. altaris]</td>
<td>3. reliquum autem fundes ad <em>basem,</em></td>
<td>3. relicum autem fundes ad basem;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ex. 29:13</strong>&lt;br&gt;4a. <em>et offeres incensum super altare</em></td>
<td>4a. <em>et offeris incensum super altare</em></td>
<td>4a. <em>et offeres incensum super altare</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, both sources that represented the Gallican use of the Roman rite, constitute the consecration of the altar by “anointing” and aspersion with the mixture of blessed water and wine. A similar procedure is attested in another eighth century source, Sacramentary of Gellone, which prescribes to consecrate the altar by the same prayers and ceremony as in *Gelasianum vetus*, but with the addition of a more elaborate rite of preparation of salt, water, and wine, with several exorcisms and blessings over these elements.88 The Sacramentary of Angoulême, “un sacramentaire épiscopal” attributed to 768-781 and traced to a different Frankish archetype of *Gelasianum* than the Sacramentary of Gellone,89 is the first source to include the anointing of the altar with chrism in the sequence of rites for the consecration of a new basilica (*Ordo consecrationis basilicae*

88 ed. A. Dumas, *Liber Sacramentorum Gellonensis*, CCSL 159 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1981), 360-71; see also Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 71. The sequence of exorcisms and blessings has parallels with the exorcisms and aspersions at the blessing of a private home in *Gelasianum vetus* 3.75-76.

novae), together with the deposition of relics.\textsuperscript{90} The rite opens with the procession and entrance of the clergy into the new temple, the blessing of the water/wine mixture, the aspersion of the church, the consecration of the altar by the same mixture. Then the bishop applies the chrism “in the middle of the altar, on its corners and in the place where relics will be put,” thereafter anointing the walls of the church, and consecrating the church furnishings. The final part of the rite involves the procession of the clergy to the place \textit{ubi sunt illae reliquae}, entrance and the deposition thereof into the altar. The appearance of the anointing of the altar with chrism together with the deposition of relics led Suitbert Benz to suggest that neither aspersion, nor anointing with chrism had anything to do with the consecration of a building, but rather accompanied the rite of the deposition of relics.\textsuperscript{91} The connection of chrismation with the deposition of relics appears to be clear in the Sacramentary of Angoulême (as the \textit{loculus/confessio} for the relics was anointed), but it appears that the comparison of Romano-Gallican sacramentaries shows that the anointing with water/wine mixture may have been perceived as the altar consecration rite, making chrismation redundant.

Such view should be examined against the evidence of the rites pertaining to the dedication of a new church among the \textit{Ordines Romani}. \textit{Ordo XLI} devoted to the dedication of a church (\textit{ordo quomodo ecclesia debeat dedicari})\textsuperscript{92} belongs to the “Gallicanized” collection of \textit{ordines} (Collection B) and dates slightly earlier than the Sacramentaries of Gellone and Angoulême, namely to c.750-775.\textsuperscript{93} Consistent with the

\textsuperscript{90} \textit{SacrEng} II.32.2020, II.32.2021-33.2026 = ibid., 301-304.


\textsuperscript{92} Andrieu, \textit{Ordines Romani} 4.339-347
genre of the *ordines*, containing liturgical “stage directions,” rather than text of the prayers, *Ordo XLI* describes a much expanded and elaborate ritual, including [1] entrance of the bishop and clergy with Ps 23; [2] inscription of the alphabet on the floor of the nave; [3] blessing of salt, water, and ashes; [4] prayer and [5] exorcism of salt and water; [6] blessing of wine; [7] anointing and aspersion of the altar, interior and exterior of the church walls, and of the floor; [8] incensation and *five* anointings of the altar: four with *oleum*, and the last [9] with the chrism, followed by the chrismation of church walls and incensation; [10] blessing of the church furnishings; [11] procession, transfer, and deposition of relics; [12] mass. The actions are interspersed with incipits of the antiphons and the core of the celebrant’s prayers which remain unchanged from *Gelasianum vetus*. In addition to the prayer texts, the *Ordo XLI* preserves the ritual acts that characterized the dedication rites in the Gallican tradition, as seen in the sacramentaries: the blessing of wine/water and the anointing of the altar with this mixture.\footnote{Ibid. 4.336.} The *ordo* in question is notable for the addition of the series of new elements to this core structure, particularly of the triple anointing of the altar, twice with holy oil and once with the chrism. The aspersions and anointings also constitute integral elements of the *Ordo XLII*, specifically describing the transfer and deposition of relics into the altar. This *ordo* “is clearly Roman in origin and contains no Gallican elements,” being dated to c. 720-750.\footnote{Ibid. 4.334.} According to this *ordo*, bishop exorcizes the water, putting (*mittit*) the chrism into it, preparing a “malt” (*maltam*) for the enclosure of the relics. Thereafter, he “baptizes (*baptizat*)” the altar with the sponge, prepares the *confessio*/enclosure, also

\footnote{Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 181.}
anointing it with chrism, deposits the relics with three particles of the eucharist and three grains of incense, and chrismates the four corners of the altar. The rite concludes with the vesting of the altar, the aspersion of the entire church, and the dedication mass.

Around 790s the compiler of the “Saint Amand Collection” of Gallicanized *ordines*, reflecting the use of Northern Frankia, produced *Ordo XLIII*, another rite for the deposition of relics, essentially an amalgamation of *Ordo XLI* and *Ordo XLII* with the omission of many Gallican elements, such as the entire sequence of anointing and aspersion with water-wine mixture, but the chrismation of the altar before the enclosure of the relics remains intact. Thus, the suggestion of Benz of ultimate genetic link between the chrismation of the altar in the Western rites and the preparation of the *loculus* for the insertion of relics may be qualified: clearly, while the anointing in the *Ordines XLII* and *XLIII* constitutes a ritual delineation of the place for relics, the five-

---


98 Ibid. 4.405-413; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 152, 181; Benz (“Zur Geschichte,” *passim*) appears to construe *Ordo XLIII* as the antecedent to both *XLI* and *XLII*, but this conclusion does not appear to hold with respect to the textual history of the *ordines* reconstructed by Andrieu (e.g. idem, 406).

99 Additionally, by contrast with *Ordo XLII*, the ordo from St Amand Collection appears to avoid some baptismal associations present in the former ordo: thus, it specifically requires the bishop not to put the chrism into the water used for the washing of the altar (§5: *lavit altare cum spungia et non mittunt chrisma*; Andrieu, 413). It is notable that in the latter passage the compiler avoids to use the verb *baptizare* present in *Ordo XLII*.

100 § 13-14 = Andrieu, 412.

101 ponit chrisma intus in confessione per angulos quattuor in cruci... (*Ordo XLII* §10), et facit crucem similiter cum chrisma et per quattuor angulos altaris desuper (ibid. § 15).
fold anointing with oil and chrism in Ordo XLI has a deeper symbolism which can hardly be connected with the deposition of relics.

The elements that appears to comprise the Gallican rite of consecration of the altar and the Roman rite for the deposition of relics come together in the Romano-Germanic Pontifical of the tenth century, identified as the episcopal service book that was “to become the point of departure for all later episcopal books.” The interlocking of the structures of two ordines with a different placement and meaning of the anointing of the altar results in the double chrismation of the holy table and the church in PRG: first, during their consecration (§ 52-57) and second, in conjunction with the deposition of relics (§ 135, 142), also accompanied by the deposition of the eucharist and incense together with the relics – a feature inherited from the Roman Ordo XLII. At the same time, the perception of the ablution and aspersion of the altar as “baptism,” clearly present in the Roman ordines (Ordo XLII.6 – et baptizat ipsum altare de ipsa aqua cum spongia) also becomes incorporated, together with the structural elements of the said ordines, into the complex new framework of the dedication rite in PRG, where it combines with the elements of the Gallican rites, inspired by the Levitical priestly ceremonial in the Scriptures. Together with the rite of dedication itself, PRG provides a lengthy exposition and exegetical commentary on the dedication rite (Quid significent duodecim candelae) which appears to stress the analogy between the ceremonies of the

102 Vogel, Medieval Liturgy, 230 and also 230-47.
104 § 136; ibid., 170.
105 Ibid., 90-121; for the English translation and study of this commentary, as well as of the dedication rite in RGP, see Repsher, Rite of Church Dedication, 67-106, 171-196 (ET).
dedication rite and the rites of initiation, even thought the significance of the rite is not reduced to “baptismal” meaning. The analogy with the baptismal rite is evident in the commentator’s exegesis of the anointing of the altar with oil: the author notes that

fittingly enough the order is kept so that after the cleansing through water... oil is poured on the altar, because the holy church is first cleansed with water in the font of baptism and then is anointed by the hand of the bishop, so that it merits to receive the Holy Spirit.106

For the modern scholar of the rite in PRG and in this commentary, “there is little doubt that as the rite of church dedication developed, it drew inspiration from the baptismal ceremony,” and “by the ninth century the rite of church dedication has taken on more and more features of the rite of baptism.”107 Even though our sources demonstrate a complicated textual history of the early medieval Western rite for church dedication, with diverse interpretative models underlying liturgical actions in various strands of tradition, it is compelling to regard the ceremony of dedication in its tenth century form as construed or redacted to suggest the analogy with the rites of initiation. In this scheme, the sequence of ‘washing-anointing-vesting-dedication mass’ constituting the core of the rite in PRG may correspond with the sequence of ‘immersion-anointing-vesting-mass’ in the initiation rites of the Roman tradition, e.g. in Ordo XI.108 The significance of the dedication ceremony as a quasi-‘initiation rite’ should not obscure the polyvalent character of liturgical symbols, as is evident even in the commentary Quod significant

106 Quid significant 40 = Pontifical Romano-Germanique, 110; ET is taken from Repsher, Rite of Church Dedication, 94.

107 Repsher, Rite of Church Dedication, 120-121.

108 Ibid., 120; see the translation of the ordo XI in E.C. Whitaker, Maxwell E. Johnson, Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2003), 244-51, also the discussion in Maxwell E. Johnson, The Rites of Christian Initiation: Their Evolution and Interpretation, rev. ed. (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2007), 222-29.
duodecim candelae, but the baptismal symbolism for the rites of Western tradition most likely can be regarded as one of the most important interpretative models, emerging in the West at the period of formation of equivalent rites of church dedication in Byzantium.

4.4 Ὡς Ἐπὶ Τοῦ Ἁγίου Βαπτισματος: The “Baptism” of the Altar in the Byzantine Rite? A Problem of Interpretation

As I have stated above, in the form in which it appears in the euchologion Barberini gr. 336, the rite for the dedication of a church is a composite rite, consisting of at least two major structural components: the rite of καθιέρωσις (consecration of an altar and a church building) and the rite of encaenia, including the solemn entrance into the church and the deposition of relics. It is the first of these ‘rites’ which includes the washing of the altar with water and wine, and anointing it by outpouring of chrism upon the altar by the hand of the bishop:

And [the bishop] takes the vessel of myron, and while the deacon says Πρόσχωμεν, he pours (ἐπιχέει) from it three times upon the altar in the form of the cross, making three crosses, one in the middle and two on the sides, saying three times “Alleluia” as at the holy baptism (ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἅγίου βαπτισματος).

It were these specific manual acts of the bishop in the course of the rite of dedication which led several scholars studying the Byzantine rite of dedication to suggest a connection between the washing, anointing, and vesting of the altar on the one hand, and the immersion and anointing of a person in the course of the Christian rites of initiation on the other. A clear allusion in the rubrics of the rite itself, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἅγίου

\[\text{109}\] ed. Parenti-Velkovska, 156-164.

\[\text{110}\] f. 152r = Parenti-Velkovksa, 160.
βαπτίσματος, appears to support such an assumption, and in this respect, some scholars made an attempt to compare the rites for the dedication of an altar in the Eastern and Western traditions. Thus, describing the ceremony of the consecration of an altar in the Byzantine rite, Ioannis Fountoulis indicates as one of its sources, the traditions of the Old Testament, but on the other, the “idea, strongly cultivated in the East and in the Gallican liturgical use, regarding the parallelism between the purification of the altar and the baptism of a Christian.”

Panagiotis Trempelas offers a similar observation with regards to the affinity between the Byzantine and the Gallican use of the Latin rite: noting that the Medieval Western authors reflect upon the “parallelism between the rite of the encaenia and the rite of baptism,” Trempelas finds this parallelism in the Byzantine rite as well, especially in the ritual actions surrounding the consecration of the water for the ablution of the altar. The Greek liturgist correctly observes though, that unlike its Western counterpart, the Byzantine rite did not include the aspersion of the church walls. Nevertheless, Trempelas is inclined to attribute the washing of the altar with water and wine in the Western rites to the Byzantine influence. A seemingly apparent affinity of the Byzantine dedication rite with the liturgy of initiation was noted also by Placido de Meester, as also by Chrisostomos Konstantinidis and Vincenzo Ruggieri.

111 η ἐντόνως ἐν τῇ Ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῷ γαλλικανικῷ λειτουργικῷ τύπῳ καλλιεργηθείσα ιδέα τοῦ παραλλελομένου τοῦ καθαγιασμοῦ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου πρὸς τὸ βάπτισμα τοῦ χριστιανοῦ (“Εγκαίνια,” ΘΚΗΕ 5.322).

112 “Τάξις καὶ Ακολουθία τῶν Ἐγκαίνιων,” in idem, Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον, 2.91-94.

113 Ibid., 94. As noted before, while the received text of the Greek usage of the Byzantine rite of dedication indeed does not include the aspersion of the walls, consistently with both “older” and “new” redactions of the middle Byzantine rite (see Ακολουθία καὶ τάξις εἰς Ἐγκαίνια ναοῦ, 56-57), the received text of the dedication rite in the Russian tradition demonstrates the addition of this procedure to the ceremonial, in conjunction with the chrismation of the church walls during the bishop’s incensation (Οσвящение храма: сборник [Moscow: Committee on Publications of the Russian Orthodox Church, 2006], 91).
in their respective studies on the rite of church dedication in *Barberini gr. 336*,¹¹⁶ and by Mikhail Zheltov in one of the rare scholarly commentaries on the Byzantine rite of dedication.¹¹⁷

The two extant commentaries on the rite of church dedication, produced in late Byzantine period, also appear to engage, to some extent, the analogy between the baptismal ceremony and the rite for the consecration of an altar. In his exegesis of the rites of καθιέρωσις, Nicholas Cabasilas (c.1322/23- c.1391) alludes to baptismal purification in connection with the use of Ps 23 during the installation of the altar,¹¹⁸ and uses the analogy with the use of the consecrated baptismal water for the cleansing of a person:

just as also having cleansed the water in which one should baptize the perfected one from all the wickedness of demons through [his] prayers, the priest thus adds the final saying, according to the same reason, he first washes off the (altar) table with the waters that protect from evil, and at the same time shows the way how one must flee to what is good, which is first to incline from evil <…>.¹¹⁹

Thus he perceives the significance of watery ablution of the altar in the purification akin to the cleansing through baptismal waters. However, it is the anointing with “divine......
myron” which grants to the altar “the grace from God”\textsuperscript{120} and, “possessing all the power for perfecting (τῇ τελετῇ), points straight to the sacrifice itself,”\textsuperscript{121} i.e. the eucharistic sacrifice. The anointing with myron, for Cabasilas, is the “power of the altar,” but as such needs material vehicle to communicate itself, “as fire and light through appropriate bodies,” the bishop perfects (ἀπαρτίζει) the altar by anointing and depositing the bones of martyrs.\textsuperscript{122} For Cabasilas, the consecration of the altar is clearly accomplished through the pouring of chrisμ which communicates the divine power to the material object – however, the analogy between the anointing of the altar and chrismation of a person is not used by this author.

An allusion to baptismal rites in connection with the dedication of the altar appears in another commentary, produced a few decades after Cabasilas by Symeon, archbishop of Thessalonike from 1416/17 until his death in 1429.\textsuperscript{123} Thus, describing the opening rites of the ceremony of καθιέρωσις, Symeon describes how after reciting the opening (kneeling) prayer, the hierarch rises “and approaches the sacred table and imitates what pertains to the baptism (καὶ τὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἐκτυποῖ).”\textsuperscript{124} Further, Symeon explains the meaning of this allusion:

For since the table represents (εἰκονίζει) of Jesus who is called the “rock of life” and “corner-stone”, it also receives [the symbols] of his baptism (τὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος αὐτοῦ δέχεται), and this in a double manner: perceptible and noetic,

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{120} Vita in Christo 5.21: ὃ τῷ θυσιαστήῳ τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ χάριν οἶδε κομίζειν.
\item \textsuperscript{121} Ibid. 5.22.
\item \textsuperscript{122} Ibid. 5.24.
\item \textsuperscript{123} The English translation of the commentaries has been accomplished as part of still unpublished dissertation by Steven Hawkes-Teeples, The Praise of God in the Twilight of the Empire: the Divine Liturgy in the Commentaries of Symeon of Thessalonika (+ 1429) (Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome, 1997).
\item \textsuperscript{124} De sacro templo 106 = PG 155:313B.
\end{enumerate}
so that being washed, it may become clean, and may be purified with water, while receiving the purification with the Spirit, for it stands as the instrument of the Spirit.125

Symeon’s passage clarifies the context of allusion to “baptism” here: for him, the washing of the altar does not symbolize the baptism of a ‘person,’ but the baptism of Christ – the analogy stemming from christic symbolism applied to the altar. The baptismal motif is not used by Symeon, however, when he comments on the application of chrism to the altar. Symeon describes the “holy myron” as that which “brings perfection of the altar”:

since the name of Christ our God is the poured out myrrh (Song of Sol 1:3), also the table, which manifests the one who was buried in it, is anointed with myron, and it all becomes myrrh, for it also receives the grace of the Spirit.126

The anointing of the altar with chrism thus possesses pneumatological significance, where the role of Spirit is taken as that which enables the table to become τῶν δωρημάτων τοῦ πνεύματος... ἐργαστήριον where “awe-inspiring and mystical things are performed.”127 As Symeon’s interpretation of the washing-purification of the altar, his exegesis of the altar’s chrismation likewise appears to be based on “Christ-altar” symbolism – however, this is quite a different interpretation than analogy with baptismal rites, suggested in later scholarship.

The use of baptismal analogy in the interpretation of the rite of καθιέρωσις would assign the anointing of the altar the significance of the post-baptismal chrismation as the ritual bestowal upon a person/object of the gifts of the Spirit. The problem complicates

125 Ibid. 107 = PG 155:313C.
126 Ibid. 111 = PG 155:316C.
127 Ibid.
when one tries to apply the comparative methodology to the same structural unit – washing-anointing-vesting – within the rites of church/altar dedication in other traditions. Indeed, the Armenian rite of dedication, like the Byzantine, contains the washing of the altar with water and wine, followed by anointing with chrism and vesting. At the same time, the West Syriac rites of consecration of a church and an altar, as well as the rite for the consecration of a portable altar (tāblīthō), includes the chrismation, but not the washing with water/wine. The lustrations are not found in the Coptic rite for the consecration of an altar, or in the equivalent East Syriac rite. The absence of lustrations in the Oriental rites for the altar breaks down the supposed ‘baptismal’ analogy that would also equate the anointing of the altar with the pneumatological post-baptismal anointing of a person.

Furthermore, the indication ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος in the rubric describing the pouring of chrism upon the altar, while chanting “Alleluia,” cannot be construed as a reference to post-baptismal chrismation at all. If the allusion in BAR and subsequent manuscripts and redactions of the rite is to the Byzantine initiation rite, this action and the chant of “Alleluia” do not accompany chrismation of a person, but rather the consecration

---

128 F.C. Conybeare, Rituale Armenorum, being the Administration of the Sacraments and the Breviary Rites of the Armenian Church (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905), 6; notably, the washing (as opposed to anointing) is performed in the Armenian rite by the deacons, not the bishop.

129 The Latin translation is published as I.-M. Vosté, Pontificale iuxta ritum Ecclesiae syrorum occidentalium id est Antiochiae (Vatican, 1941), 79-82, 107-108.


of baptismal water. Thus, in the same BAR euchologion, after the anamnetic and
epicletic prayer over the water and the prayer for the consecration of the holy oil, the
following actions ensue, which we present in comparison with the relevant section of the
dedication rite:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rite of καθιέρωσις in BAR, f. 152r-v</th>
<th>Rite of initiation in BAR, f. 103v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Καὶ λαμβάνει τὸ ἄγγελον τοῦ μύρου, καὶ λέγοντος τοῦ διακόνου: Πρόσχωμεν,</td>
<td>1. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ Ἄμην, ὁ διάκονος λέγει: Πρόσχωμεν. καὶ λαμβάνει ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸ τρυβλίον τοῦ ἁγίου ἑλαίου,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ἐπιχέει εξ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ τραπέζῃ γ΄ σταυροειδῶς, ποιῶν γ´ σταυροὺς, ἕνα μέσον καὶ δύο ἐκατέρωθεν,</td>
<td>2. καὶ ποιεῖ εξ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὑδώρ σταυροὺς γ΄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. λέγων γ´ τὸ Ἀλληλούια, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος,</td>
<td>3. ψάλλων τὸ Ἀλληλούια σῦν τῷ ὀχλῷ γ´,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. καὶ ἀποδίδοις τὸ ἄγγελον τοῦ μύρου, ἐκ τῶν γενομένων γ´ σταυρῶν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ τραπέζῃ ὀλείφει ὅλην αὐτὴν τῇ χειρί ἐπάνω πάσαν</td>
<td>4. καὶ μετὰ τούτῳ ἀποτίθεται τὸ τρυβλίον…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The affinity between two actions is self-evident: the sequence of the diaconal acclamation
“Let us attend,” followed by the triple chant of “Alleluia” with the triple cruciform
infusion of oil into the font, appears to be exactly the pattern followed at the consecration
of an altar in the course of the καθιέρωσις ceremony. One point of divergence between
the two ritual actions is, certainly, the absence of the people at the consecration of the
altar in the sanctuary, since the laity has been expelled from the church at the beginning
of the consecration rite – hence, the ὀχλος is not involved in the chant of “Alleluia.” The
crucial divergence, however, between the two rites lies in the substance used for the

132 Parenti-Velkovska, 160.
133 Ibid., 129.
consecration of either the font or the altar: while the rite for the consecration of the altar
prescribes to use myron, the baptismal rite in BAR (and subsequent Byzantine
euchologies) uses “holy oil,” which was consecrated through the special prayer Δέσποτα
κύριε ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν inserted between the prayer for the consecration of the
water Μέγας εἰ κύριε and the infusion of oil. The expression ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος in
the rite for the consecration of an altar does not appear to refer only to the triple chant of
“Alleluia,” but to the entire sequence of actions, since these show close correspondence
in both rites: 1) diaconal acclamation- 2) infusion in the form of three crosses- 3)
“Alleluia.” It appears thus that the rite for the dedication of the altar contains a reference
to the practice of using myron for the consecration of the baptismal water – a practice
manifestly absent in the Byzantine rite, but well attested in the non-Byzantine rites,
particularly those reflecting Syro-Antiochene traditions: West Syriac rite of initiation, as
well as in the Syro-Maronite rite. Further discrepancy which could indicate the
origin of at least some elements of the Byzantine rite of καθιέρωσις in the non-Byzantine
traditions lies in the absence of the anamnetic-epiclectic prayer preceding the consecration
of the altar, similar to the prayer for the consecration of a font, present in the Eastern rites
of initiation, including the Byzantine one.

Thus, the attempt to ‘make sense’ of the difficult and complex ceremonial of the
Byzantine rite for the consecration of churches through suggesting an analogy between
this rite and the initiation of a Christian may be the case of a liturgical faux ami where the
superficial similarity between two rites is employed to explain the origins of the rite or

---

134 See the translation of the received text in Whitaker-Johnson, Documents, 82-98.

135 Ibid., 99-108; also see Augustin Mouhanna, Les rites de l’initiation dans l’église maronite,
OCA 212 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1980).
the dependence between two rituals. I have tried to demonstrate already that, if there is an affinity between the anointing of the altar and the rite of initiation, the ritual element imitated at the pouring of chrism upon the altar is not the chrismation of a person, but rather the infusion of oil for the consecration of baptismal water. While this may assist in clearing the misconception recurrent in the scholarly and popular literature, it still does not entirely address the issues of possible origins for the structural units constituting the Byzantine rite of the consecration of the altar and the encaenia of the church. If the effusion of the chrism upon the altar imitates the consecration of the baptismal font, why is it not preceded immediately by the anamnetic-epicletic prayer, as in the rite of baptism? If the consecration of an altar imitates the consecration of baptismal water, why is chrism/myron used, and not “holy oil”? Specifically in the light of the latter problem, we have to consider seriously the possibility of the influence of non-Byzantine rites upon the development of the Byzantine rite of the dedication of a church and the altar. Precisely in order to explore this possibility, I will devote the rest of this Part II of my dissertation to the exploration of the evidence from the Jerusalem (ch. 5) and Syriac/Egyptian (ch. 6) ecclesiastical traditions pertaining to the dedication of an altar and, in particular, to the rite of the anointing of the altar with oil or myron. It will be necessary for us to be aware of these witnesses to the practice of anointing of the altar, to analyze the hagiopolite evidence in order to figure out the composition of the rite of dedication of a church and an altar in the Holy City between the fifth century and the Persian/Arab invasions of the seventh century and subsequent Byzantinization of the Jerusalem rite. Seeking to illuminate through comparative study the aspects of the origins of the Byzantine rite for the dedication of churches, I will use the liturgical
evidence pertaining to the equivalent rites in the Armenian, West Syriac, and Coptic traditions, even though I do not aim to produce a comprehensive study of each of the rites in the context of their respective traditions in this dissertation.

4.5 Conclusions

Even a superficial analysis would show that the two constituent parts of the Byzantine rite are quite different in their liturgical setting, their focus and their theology. The rite of “consecration” presents itself as exclusively clerical: e.g. at the entrance of the patriarch, everyone but the clergy are required to leave the church building. The attention in the first rite is drawn exclusively to the altar, it contains several lengthy prayers, epicletic in mode, with the exegetical amplification of scriptural types as these relate to the “work of the hands” of the clergy present. By contrast, the rite of encaenia possesses a radically different character: it is a example of a public, stational liturgy, involving a procession of the congregation led by the patriarch and the clergy from one location within the city to a newly consecrated church, reaching its culmination in the opening of the church doors, the entrance and deposition of the relics in a “prepared place.” If the emergence of the latter rite in the Constantinopolitan urban setting can be connected to the development of stational liturgy in the major urban centers of Late Antique world (Rome, Constantinople, Jerusalem, Antioch),\textsuperscript{136} the origins of the first, ‘hierarchic’ ritual of consecration appear to be more obscure, as this ‘rite’ appears as a functional double to a stational encaenia/dedicatio rite. Thus, even before we venture into the study of the

\textsuperscript{136} See Baldovin, \textit{Urban Character of Christian Worship}.
“anointing of the altar” in the next two chapters, I open the possibility that two distinct structural components of the Byzantine rite of dedication do not only attest to different functions (consecration of an altar vs. *dedicatio* of a building), but also to different origins of specific constituent ‘rites.’ I propose that the amalgamation of these rites within the framework of one ritual could have come as a result of the influence of liturgies originating in other urban centers (e.g. Jerusalem) on the local liturgical tradition of Constantinople. The comparative study of the church dedication rites, as these can be reconstructed for the first millenium Jerusalem, Syria, and Egypt, is therefore necessary in order to acquire a full picture of the mutual influence and interdependence of traditions leading to the formation of this one unique rite.
CHAPTER 5:
THE ORIGINS OF THE BYZANTINE RITE FOR THE CONSECRATION
OF AN ALTAR I: BYZANTINE JERUSALEM (5TH-7TH CENT.).

The study of the rites for the dedication of churches in Jerusalem prior to the upheavals of Persian and Arabic invasion and subsequent Byzantinisation of the Jerusalem liturgy represents a lacuna in liturgical scholarship. To the best of our knowledge, no attempt has been made to provide a broad study of the liturgical sources pertaining to the rites of church dedication in Jerusalem and a tentative reconstruction of such rite has not yet been endeavored. However, in our previous discussion in Part I, one could discern the unique role which the dedication of the Holy Anastasis and Martyrium in 335 played in the formation of the sacred topography of the Holy City, which subsequently could not but influence the place which the festival of Encaenia has to occupy in the liturgical life of the city’s Christian community. Even the establishment of smaller, monastic foundations could not have proceeded with some form of dedication rite, the establishment/consecration of an altar as a minimal requirement for claiming the space of a building for liturgical use. Thus, the Life of Melania the Younger (c.383-439) describes the initiative of the female ascetic “to build the chapel in the monastery and to establish the altar in it, so that they (the monastics) would be made worthy to receive

regularly the holy mysteries (ἐσπούδασεν ἐὐκτήριον ἐν τῷ μοναστηρίῳ οἰκοδομῆσαι καὶ στῆσαι θυσιαστήριον ἐν αὐτῷ, ἵνα συνεχῶς ἄξιονται τῆς μεταλήψεως τῶν ἁγίων μυστηρίων).”² The affixing of the altar is described here a condition sine qua non for the proper functioning of a building as the place for the eucharistic assembly. Similarly, the foundation of a church may have involved deposition of relics: the same source relates that upon the completion of the chapel in the women’s monastery on the Mount of Olives, Melania has deposited there (κατέθετο...ἐκεῖσε) a number of the saints’ relics: of the prophet Zachariah, the first martyr Stephen, of the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste and others.³ The Life says nothing, however, with regards to the exact place where the relics were deposited: under the altar, in proximity to the altar or elsewhere in the church, but the sense that physical proximity to a holy object (consecrated altar, relics) thereby makes the place sanctified and fit for liturgical use is evident here.

One of the major complexities for a comprehensive study of the rites of dedication in Jerusalem in the period after the fourth century but before the seventh century turmoils consists in the fragmentary character of the sources for the fifth/seventh-century Jerusalem liturgy. The considerable selection of hagiopolite sources has survived in the Old Georgian translation through their reception in the liturgical tradition of the

---

² Vita Melaniae iunioris 48; ed. Denys Gorge, Vie de sainte Mélanie, SC 90 (Paris: Cerf, 1962), 218. The Life establishes the frequency of eucharistic celebration as twice a week, Friday and Sunday, in addition to festal celebrations (ἐκτὸς τῶν ἑορτῶν) (ibid.). The Life of Peter the Iberian, referring to the same monastic establishment and mentioning the presbyter Gerontius, the supposed author of the Life (see ibid., 54-62), notes that the latter celebrated eucharist three times each Sunday, including once in the women’s monastery, and additionally served the eucharist daily for Melania herself “according to the custom of the church of Rome (ܕܪܘܡܝܕܥܕܬܐܥܝܕܐܐܝܟ)” (Vita 46; ed. Cornelia B. Horn, Robert R. Phenix Jr., John Rufus: The Lives of Peter the Iberian, Theodosius of Jerusalem and the Monk Romanus, SBL Writings from the Greco-Roman World 24 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008], 62-63)

³ Vita Melaniae iunioris 48; ed. Gorge, 218.
Georgian church that followed the Jerusalem rite until the eleventh-twelfth century,\textsuperscript{4} but the Byzantine, Armenian, Syro-Antiochene, and Egyptian sources also preserve traces of the defunct hagiopolite ritual.\textsuperscript{5} Given the possibility that the hagiopolite ritual of church dedication could have exercised particular influence upon the emergence of the post-iconoclast Byzantine rite for the consecration/dedication of churches, it befits the scope of this dissertation to examine the available evidence of the rites of dedication as these were practiced in Jerusalem and its environs before the seventh-eighth century, as far as such can be ascertained from the available sources. Since no direct evidence of the hagiopolite rite of church dedication (equivalent to \textit{Barberini gr. 336} for the Byzantine rite) has survived, all three groups of available liturgical sources will be studied: 1) lectionary/calendar; 2) hymnography; 3) euchologion. In what follows, I will examine the evidence pertaining to dedications of churches in and around Jerusalem from the fifth century on, including the feasts of dedication, especially the annual commemoration of the dedication of the Holy Anastasis and Martyrium in 335. It is my argument in this thesis that for the church of Jerusalem, as well as probably the churches under the liturgical influence of the “holy city,” the dedication of the Holy Sepulchre complex provided a ‘model’, both theological and liturgical, for both the celebration of the dedication rite and for the annual commemoration of such dedication of a specific church.


\textsuperscript{5} Ute Wagner-Lux, Heinzgerd Brakmann, “Jerusalem I: Liturgie,” \textit{RAC} 17.706-12.
5.1 Encaenia in the Georgian Lectionary

Alongside the Armenian Lectionary which we have discussed earlier, the recension of the hagiopolite lectionary which has survived in Georgian translation (further – Georgian Lectionary/GL) remains one of the most important sources for the liturgical use of the church of Jerusalem. Initially published on the basis of just two tenth-century Svanetian manuscripts, Lathal ms. and Kala/Lakurga ms. by Korneli Kekelidze in 1912, the most complete edition to day has been accomplished by Mikheil Tarchnišvili in 1959-60 on the basis of four manuscripts – the tenth-eleventh century Paris B.N. géorgien 3, Sinai Georgian O.37 (dated to 982 CE), the Lathal and Kala mss. – in addition to two fragments, a seventh-century xanmeti lectionary fragment from Graz and an eighth-century haemeti palimpsest fragment (H). Other sources, such as the euchologia mss. Sinai iber. 12 and 54, have been studied since the publication of Tarchnišvili’s edition and have to be considered for the comprehensive examination of the evidence GL provides for the feasts of dedication in the hagiopolite calendar.

---

6 Korneli Kekelidze, Иерусалимский канонарь VII века (Грузинская версия) (Tiflis, 1912).


8 Tarchnišvili, 1.v-xv; also see Helmut Leeb, Die Gesänge im Gemeingottesdienst von Jerusalem (vom 5. bis 8. Jahrhundert), Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie 28 (Wien: Herder, 1970), 25-26; H. Goussen, Über georgische Drucke und Handschriften, die Festordnung und den Heiligenkalender des altchristlichen Jerusalems betreffend (Munich: Gladbach, 1923), 4 and the reviews of the latter by F.-M. Abel in Revue biblique 33 (1924): 611-623 and Paul Peeters in Analecta Bollandiana 42 (1924): 137-140. In citing the Tarchnišvili’s edition of the Georgian lectionary (further – T), I am using the following format – volume: page nr. for the Georgian text/page nr. of the Latin translation. With regards to the distinction between the khanmeti (4th-7th cent.) and haemeti (7th-8th cent.) texts, distinguished by the consonant indicator for 2nd person and 3rd person verb object, see Heinz Fähnrich, Grammatik der altgeorgischen Sprache (Hamburg: Buske, 1994), 1, 11, 79-82.

If the date for the oldest recension of the Armenian Lectionary can be determined between 417 and 438 CE,\textsuperscript{10} the dating for the extant Georgian recension of the Jerusalem lectionary is usually set more broadly, between the fifth and the eighth centuries.\textsuperscript{11} A mere glance at the contents of the GL would convince one that we are presented in GL with a later stage in the development of the hagiopolite lectionary that the Armenian Lectionary: GL includes a much more extensive list of feasts and sanctoral memories, fuller canon of readings with the addition of some composed hymnography. At the initial publication of GL, just on the basis of Lathal and Kala mss., Kekelidze suggested early seventh century, specifically the reign of patriarch Sophronius of Jerusalem (634-644), as the definitive date when this redaction of the Jerusalem lectionary emerged, moreover, the publisher did not hesitate to attribute this recension to Sophronius himself.\textsuperscript{12} The opinion regarding the “authorship” of Sophronius was rejected by Dmitrievskij, Abel, Baumstark and others who reviewed the 1912 publication, however, most scholars still attributed this redaction of the lectionary to the seventh century.\textsuperscript{13} Further studies which not only used the extant manuscripts of the lectionary, used in Tarchnišvili’s edition, but also relied on further analysis of the hagiopolite hymnographic corpus extant in Georgian

\textsuperscript{10} See part I, chapter 3.

\textsuperscript{11} As indicated in the title of Tarchnišvili’s edition.

\textsuperscript{12} Kekelidze, \textit{Ierusalimskii kanonar’}, 24-25. Kekelidze based this assumption on the lack of reference to any patriarch of Jerusalem past Zachariah (609-32) and Modestes (632-34), especially Sophronius (ibid., 24).

manuscripts. In his own analysis, Tarchnišvili suggested the existence of two redactions of GL: the earlier, reflecting the Jerusalem use of the early fifth century and attested to by the seventh and eighth century lectionary fragments, and the later redaction, translated at the end of the seventh century, which remained in use of the Georgian church until the tenth century.  Helmut Leeb offered a more nuanced interpretation of Tarchnišvili’s position, suggesting that the time frame of the fifth-eighth centuries (set by the publisher of GL) does not signify that the compilation of GL can be attributed to a specific “Zeitpunkt” between these boundaries, but rather that the extant text of the lectionary is a product of several centuries of formation, achieving its final form no later than the eighth century. This concept became further elaborated in the works of Georgian scholars Elene Metreveli and Lili Khevsouriani. Metreveli questioned Tarchnišvili’s view regarding the existence of two successive redactions of GL and had shown that the Georgian version of the Jerusalem lectionary, which was initially translated in the end of 5th or the beginning of 6th century, had evolved at the same time with the development of its Greek prototype, reflecting the changes and developments that were taking place in the latter. The earliest stage in the development of GL is reflected in the seventh-century xanmenti fragment, however, the lectionary continued to evolve even after the seventh century, throughout the entire period when it was in liturgical use. As distinct from the


Armenian Lectionary which may be interpreted to reflect a specific stage in the growth of Jerusalem liturgical rite, GL spans the development of the living liturgical document over the course of several centuries, encompassing changes both in its Greek Vorlage, the lectionary and calendar of Jerusalem, as well as in the practice of Georgian church that continued to use the Jerusalem rite until the tenth and eleventh century.  

This complex and composite nature of the Georgian Lectionary has also to be taken into consideration as we examine the evidence the lectionary provides for the celebration of the feast of Encaenia in Jerusalem on September 13, as well as other feasts of dedication mentioned in the Jerusalem calendar, as reflected in GL. Moreover, the examination of the evidence contained in GL must not be conducted without reference to the Georgian sources that attest to the liturgical calendar of the Jerusalem church, such as the calendar of Sinai Georgian O.34 (tenth cent.), as well as the hymnography of the

---


17 Some of the latest developments, reflecting most likely the local Georgian tradition, were the propers for the memorials of Georgian saints (GL 1434 = T 2.74/60), as well as the commemoration of the Georgian martyr Abo on January 7 (GL 118 = T 1.23/25).

18 Of the recent studies that offered important insights into the place of Encaenia in the Georgian recension of the Jerusalem lectionary, particularly in comparison with the Armenian sources, one must note Michael Fraser’s contribution in “The Feast of Encaenia in the Fourth Century,” 202-216, and M. Daniel Findikyan, “Armenian Hymns of the Holy Cross and the Jerusalem Encaenia,” forthcoming in Revue des études arméniennes. I am very grateful to Fr Daniel Findikyan for allowing me to refer to his article prior to its appearance in print, and for his willingness to discuss the subject matter with me.

19 f. 25r-33r, ed. Gérard Garitte, Le calendrier palestino-géorgien du Sinaiticus 34 (Xe siècle), SH 30 (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1958). The manuscript in question, written for the most part by the Georgian scribe Iovane Zosime, contains, in addition to the calendar, the ancient Palestinian horologion (f. 1-24v) and two recensions of the Jerusalem tropologion (iadgari) (f. 34r-123r; f. 123v-143r). The horologion has been studied by Stig Ragnvald Froshov in his yet unpublished dissertation, “L’ horologe ‘géorgien’ du Sinaiticus ibericus 34,” vols. 1-2 (Université de Paris-Sorbonne/Paris IV, Institut catholique de Paris, Institut de théologie orthodoxe Saint-Serge, Paris, 2003, rev. 2004), who also gives a detailed description of the entire codex, including the folia discovered in other manuscript depositories (51 folia
“Ancient Tropologion” or *iadgari* of Jerusalem.\(^{20}\) Thus, the calendar in Sinai Georgian O.34 does not naturally provide the scriptural readings for the octave of Encaenia, but does contain information regarding the stations for daily liturgy during the eight-day celebration.\(^{21}\) Likewise, the corpus of hagiopolite hymnography contained in the Ancient Tropologion includes the repertory of poetic and scriptural texts used in the liturgy for a specific feast, which could be paralleled with the data of GL. The information pertaining to the Encaenia of September 13 contained in these sources must be compared and collated with the evidence provided in the Georgian lectionary in order to get a more complete picture of the celebration of Encaenia in Jerusalem after the 5th century.

5.1.1 **September 13 and the Octave of Encaenia In the Georgian Lectionary.**

Reflecting a further stage in the development of Jerusalem lectionary after the Armenian Lectionary of the early fifth century, GL contains a significantly expanded cursus of readings that also includes liturgical hymnography. Likewise, while the Armenian Lectionary provided readings and rubrics just for the first and second days of the feast, GL gives the full canon of readings for the entire octave of Encaenia, even though the course of readings survives in its fullness only in the tenth-century “Lathal” ms.\(^{22}\) The testimony of GL, with the addition of the Armenian lectionary, as well as *iadgari* is presented below in parallel columns for the purposes of comparison:

\(^{20}\) ed. Metreveli et al., *Udzelesi iadgari*.

\(^{21}\) f. 31r = Garitte, *Calendrier*, 90-91.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Armenian Lectionary (ms. Jerusalem 121)(^{23})</th>
<th>Georgian Lectionary(^{24})</th>
<th>Iadgari(^{25})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On September 13, dedication of the holy places of Jerusalem. The first day at the Holy Anastasis.</td>
<td>September 13. In the Anastasis, Dedication which is Encaenia (ოსური თანამედროვე მამა წოდება).</td>
<td>Encaenia (ơơơơơơ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 64, antiphon: <em>To you, O God, belongs praise in Sion</em> (Ps 64:2)</td>
<td>VESPERS: Troparion (oxitaj): <em>How innumerable is your [longsuffering]</em>.(^{26})</td>
<td>VESPERS(^{28}) [Troparia for <em>Lord I have cried</em>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleluia, Ps 147: <em>Praise the Lord, O Jerusalem.</em></td>
<td>Verse (<em>dasdebeli</em>): <em>Shout with jubilation to God, all the earth</em> (Ps 65:1).</td>
<td>MATINS(^{29}) [Troparia for the Biblical odes]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{22}\) Tarchnišvili, *Grande lectionnaire* 1240 n. a, 1253-1254 n. a, pp. 37, 39; Kekelidze, *Ierusalimskii kanonar*’, 130-134.

\(^{23}\) Renoux, PO 36.2, 360-363.

\(^{24}\) GL 1234-1240 = T 2.42-44/36-37. I did not include the *incipit*’s and *desinit*’s for each of the scriptural readings, as provided in the lectionary, merely giving the citation.


\(^{26}\) The *incipit* for the *oxitaj* შენი სულგრძელობა სუ ება... (T 2.43) is incomplete (while the entire reference to the troparion is absent from the Paris and Lathal mss.); I followed the interpretation reflected in Tarchnišvili’s own translation which seems to interpret the missing word as *სულგრძელობა* ‘magnanimity, longsuffering’ (Davit Čubinašvili, *K’art’ul-rusuli lek’ikoni* [St Petersburg, 1887; reprint Tbilisi: Sabčot’a Sak’art’velo, 1984], col. 1196), ‘Ertragen, Ausdauer’ (*ADW* 1118-9), so also Leeb, *Gesänge*, 162.

\(^{28}\) *Udzvelesi iadgari*, 287-288.

\(^{29}\) Ibid., 288-297.

\(^{30}\) Ibid., 297-298.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Armenian Lectionary (ms. Jerusalem 121)</th>
<th>Georgian Lectionary</th>
<th>Iadgari</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psalm, tone 5: <em>All the nations whom you have made</em> (Ps 85:9). Verse: <em>For you, O Lord, have helped me</em> (Ps 85:17).</td>
<td>Psalm, tone 5 (85:9) Verse (85:5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First reading, of the Wisdom of Solomon (Wisd. Sol. 9:1-19), to be found in [the service of] the church dedication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second reading, of the prophet Zachariah (Zach 1:16-2:5).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alleluia, tone 5 (64:5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third reading, Paul to Timothy (3:14-16), to be found in Lent, on the Thursday of Palms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleluia, tone 5: <em>We shall be filled with good things [of your house]</em> (Ps 64:5).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the washing of hands (<em>xelt’abanisaj</em>), tone 6: <em>The sound of your prophets.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the holy things (<em>sic’midisaj</em>): Alleluia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears clear that while there is a striking difference between the repertory of readings in the Armenian and Georgian lectionaries, showing a remarkable growth from the fifth century on, the comparison between GL and “ancient Iadgari” demonstrates consistency in the sequence and order of texts and hymns, with the exception of the

---

27 The “Lathal” ms. is the only ms. that provides the *desinit* at v. 42, as well as rubrics for the *xelt’abanisaj* and *sic’midisaj* hymns (T 2.37 a; Kekelidze, *Ierusalimskii kanonar’,* 130).
entrance troparion (*oxitaj*) at Vespers, for which no equivalent has been found in the known texts of the *iadgari*.31 By comparison with the Armenian lectionary, the repertory for the feast has retained the same NT readings (1 Tim 3:14-16; Jn 10:22-42), while adding two OT readings (Wisd. 9:1-8; Zach 1:6-2:5),32 as well as the hymnography accompanying the entrance of the bishop (*oxitaj*), and two hymns covering the actions between the reading of the gospel and the transfer of the gifts for the eucharist. Ps 64 used before the epistle at the liturgy in the Armenian lectionary was replaced with Ps 85, but Ps 64:5 was used to substitute for the Alleluia Ps 147 which was relocated to the third day of the octave of Encaenia.33 The reorganization of the scriptural material, particularly of psalmody, show tendency to reduce the emphasis on a local character of the celebration with references to Jerusalem (Ps 147) and Sion (Ps 64).

The “Lathal” ms. of GL also provides the full lectionary for the eighth day celebration of Encaenia, including some rubrics regarding the stational churches in Jerusalem where the synaxis for that particular day was to take place. The Armenian lectionary, while mentioning the eighth-day celebration in one of the manuscripts (ms. *Erevan 985*), does not provide rubrics or readings but for the first and second day.34 I will compare the evidence provided in the Georgian lectionary with the tenth-century calendar in Sinai Georgian O.34 which gives the stations for every day of the octave:

---

31 In the ancient *iadgari*, the *psalmuni* (psalm) and *das(a)debeli* (psalmic verse) of vespers are usually preceded by a collection of hymns for Ps 140 (*Lord I have cried*), and not by a single troparion, as in GL.

32 For the analysis of the theological contents of the GL scriptural readings for Encaenia, see Fraser, “Encaenia in the Fourth Century Jerusalem,” 204-206.

33 GL 1247 = T 2.45/38.

34 Renoux, PO 36.2, p. 360-363.
1) On the first day, “Dedication or Encaenia,” the synaxis is set in the Anastasis church. *Sinai Georgian O.34* describes the feast day as the “Dedication of holy churches, which is called the Encaenia.”

2) September 14 in the Armenian Lectionary was the day when the cross was “shown” (գուշա) to the assembly. In GL this day was designated as the “day of the exaltation of the cross” with the synaxis in the Martyrium. GL provided the rubrics for the ceremony of the elevation and washing of the cross prior to the liturgy, “at the third hour.” The repertory of hymns and readings for the liturgy of the feast included:

1. Troparion (oxitaj): *The seal of Christ* ((stripo, ointment) – GL and iadgari or another oxitaj, *The manifold host of the angels*.
2. *Psalmuni + dasadebeli*: Ps. 27:9, 8
3. OT readings: Prov 3:19-23; Isaiah 65:22-24; Wisd. 14:1-7; Ezekiel 9:2-6
4. Epistle – 1 Cor 1:18-25
5. Alleluia Ps 45:11
7. Hymns at the washing of hands and for the holy things (Lathal ms. and iadgari).

---

35 სატფური წმიდათა ეკლესიათა რომელსა ჰრქ ან ენკენია (Garitte, Calendrier, 90).
36 Renoux, PO 36.2, p. 361.
37 ღვთის ხანგრძლოვან აღმოჩენის შემდეგ; GL 1240 = T 37 n. a.
38 The station is not specified in GL, but is indicated in *Sinai Georgian O.34* (Calendrier, 90); for the stations of the octave of Encaenia in the Armenian and Georgian sources, see also Findikyan, “Cross and Encaenia.”
39 “The seal of Christ has saved us all, the Life and Resurrection of our souls” (*Udzvelesi iadgari*, 313). This troparion is listed as second (or “other”/sxuaj) in two mss. of ancient iadgari, but its brevity and its presence in GL suggests that it was the original entrance troparion for September 14.
40 *Udzvelesi iadgari*, 312.
41 *Udzvelesi iadgari*, 313; GL 1245 n.2 = T 2.38; the second day of Encaenia is the only day of this octave which has special troparia for the entrance, washing of hands, and for the “holy gifts.”
3) For September 15, GL provides a rubric “Synaxis in Sion,” with the canon of readings including Ps 147:1-2, Isaiah 33:17-22, Hebrews 8:7-9:10, and the Gospel lesson from Matthew 23:1-22. As we see, the psalm and Alleluia psalm may have been relocated from their original places on the first day of Encaenia in the Armenian Lectionary (having switched positions), while the gospel reading partially corresponds with the sixth century Syriac lectionary from British Museum Add. 14528, also thought to have been dependent on the hagiopolite tradition, which provides the reading of Matt 23:12-22 for the reading for the “dedication of an altar.”42 In Gérard Garitte’s edition of the calendar of Sinai Georgian O.34, the rubric “synaxis in Sion, dedicatio (ζητήσεως ὁμολογίας, λαξαθετούσιν)” is attributed to September 14, but the manuscript itself is rather ambiguous and quite possibly allows the reading that attributes this rubric (and hence – the synaxis in Sion) to the third day of dedication.43

4) On the fourth day of Encaenia, September 16, the lectionary sets the synaxis in the Nea church of the Theotokos, built by Justinian and dedicated on November 20, 543 and destroyed by the tenth century.44 The set of readings for this day in GL includes Ps 146:2, 1; prophecy lesson from Zachariah 8:3-8; and Romans 11:25-27.


43 ed. Garritte, Calendrier, 90. The examination of ms. Sinai Georgian O.34 (f. 31r) shows that the line which begins ζητήσεως ὁμολογίας... etc. is written in a different hand into the space in between the lines pertinent to September 14 and 15 respectively and thus could be attributed to either of these dates. Since the text indicating the station for September 14 (“synaxis at Martyrium”/ζητήσεως ὁμολογίας ὑπερώνος) also seems to be written in the same hand above the line, we may surely attribute the reference to the station at the church of Sion to September 15, correcting Garitte’s reading of the ms.; likewise, the interpretation of Garitte’s information in the table in Findikyan, “Cross and Encaenia” (esp. n. 92), also should be amended. A Georgian menaion-iadgari from the Sinai collection, ms. Sinai Georgian O.65 (tenth cent.), also indicates the commemoration of September 15 as λαξαθετούσιν ὁμολογίας/dedicatio Sionis (see Nikolay Marr, Opisanie grazinskikh rukopisej Sinajskogo monastyria [Moscow-Leningrad: Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1940], 143). Another menaion, ms. Sinai Georgian O.59, designates September 15 as dedicatio crucis (Marr, 101). Garitte makes note of these manuscripts (Calendrier, 330), but it curiously does not seek another interpretation of the reading in the Sinai O.34 calendar.

Alleluia Ps 83:2 and the gospel lesson from Mark 11:15-18.\textsuperscript{45} By contrast, the calendar of \textit{Sinai Georgian O.34} designates again the church of Holy Sion as the station for the fourth day, and it seems likely that the station on the fourth day was relocated from Sion to the Nea Church following the latter’s construction and dedication in 543.\textsuperscript{46}

5) For September 17, GL prescribed again the station at Sion, with the lectionary consisting of Ps. 124:1, 2; Hebrews 12:18-28; the Alleluia psalm 86:1 and the gospel lesson from Matthew, as the lectionary specified, “to be found on the seventh Thursday of Pascha (\textit{zatikt’ a 7 xučabat ’sa}),”\textsuperscript{47} which appears to indicate the Thursday \textit{after} Pentecost, as in GL the seventh Thursday of Pascha has the gospel lesson from John (7:37-42), not Matthew.\textsuperscript{48} The readings for Thursday after Pentecost likewise are not included in the extant mss. of GL, but the reference to it appears in the eighth century \textit{hæmeti} fragment (H) where the \textit{incipit} of the reading in question can be identified as Matthew 16:13.\textsuperscript{49} The calendar in \textit{Sinai Georgian O.34} is inconsistent with the data of GL, giving “the place of Ascension” as the station for the day.\textsuperscript{50}

6) On September 18, GL does not give any indication of the station for the day, but \textit{Sinai Georgian O.34} locates the synaxis to Bethlehem.\textsuperscript{51} The lectionary indicated

\textsuperscript{45} GL 1251-1253 = T 2.46/39.

\textsuperscript{46} ms. \textit{Paris Georgian 3} is the only ms. that includes the station at Nea, while the later medieval Armenian manuscripts designate either Anastasis or Martyrium as the station for the fourth day. It may be that the Sion was the original station also for the fourth day, and the presence of the station at Nea is a result of post-sixth-century “manipulation of the stations” (Findikyan, “Cross and Encaenia,” n. 94). It was possible for GL to have two stations at Sion in a row, as is seen on December 26-27, the second and third day of the Christmas octave (GL 32, 42 = T 1.14-15).

\textsuperscript{47} The reading of the fifth to eighth days of the Encaenia octave mostly derive from the Lathal ms., see GL 1253 a = T 2.39; Kekelidze, \textit{Ierusalimskii kanonar’}, 132-134.

\textsuperscript{48} GL 871 = T 1.134.

\textsuperscript{49} GL 1392 n. c, m = T 2.54; cf.GL 1693-1696.

\textsuperscript{50} Garitte, \textit{Calendrier}, 90.

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 91.
in GL includes Ps 131:8, 1, Hebrews 9:24-10:7, the Alleluia psalm 44:12 and the gospel lesson from Mark 12:28-44.\(^{52}\)

7) For September 19, GL and Sinai Georgian O.34 again are in disagreement, the latter locating the synaxis to “Golgotha,”\(^{53}\) while the extant witnesses to the lectionary do not provide any station. The readings for this day are Ps. 86:2, 7, Romans 9:1-5, Alleluia Ps. 95:1 and the gospel reading from John 2:23-3:6.\(^{54}\)

8) The eighth and final day of the Encaenia octave is provided with a station in Anastasis in Sinai Georgian O.34, but no station is indicated in GL. The canon of readings for this day included Ps 64:2, 3; Galatians 4:18-26, the Alleluia psalm 147:12 and the gospel reading from Luke 20:1-19.\(^{55}\)

The psalmody for the third to eighth days of the Encaenia octave is also attested in the Georgian Iadgari, which provides exactly the same psalms for the eucharistic liturgies of these days, as in the lectionary.\(^{56}\) Except for the readings of the second day of the octave which revolve around the exposition of the motif of the Cross through OT and NT, most of the scriptural readings in one way or another allude to the theme of the church, particularly as prefigured through the scriptural Temple. A few readings contain allusions to the “holy places of Jerusalem,” the dedication of which the octave celebrated: Jerusalem itself (Gal 4, Heb 12) and Sion (Rom 11, Heb 12). The majority of the scriptural texts, however, appear to have an ecclesiological focus, presenting various metaphors for the church: temple (Matt 23, Mark 11, Heb 9-10, Mark 12), vineyard

---

\(^{52}\) GL 1253 e-g = T 2.39.

\(^{53}\) The location of the crucifixion featured a chapel “behind the Cross” which is probably the intended location of this station. The church was destroyed by the Persian invasion in 614; it may have been restored by patriarch Modestus who is credited with the restoration of Anastasis and Sion in GL (1414 = T 2.56-57; Kekelidze, 146); Adamnanus, *De locis sanctis* 1.5.1 (CCSL 175, 190), Maraval, *Lieux saints*, 256-57.

\(^{54}\) GL 1253 h-k.

\(^{55}\) GL 1254 a- b = T 2.47/39-40.

\(^{56}\) Udzvelesi iadgari, 314.
(Luke 20), rock (Matt 16). Even those texts which do contain references to Jerusalem and Sion can be taken themselves as allegories signifying the church of true believers, rather than a specific church building in Jerusalem. Thus, even though the inspiration for the liturgical feast of September 13 was tied to a specific historic event of 325-335 (finding of the cross and dedication of Martyrium), the incorporation of this feast into the liturgical memory of the Jerusalem church led to its transformation into a symbolic celebration of the church and the cross.

5.1.2 Dedications of Other Jerusalem Churches in Georgian Lectionary.

In the preceding section, I have looked at the data presented in the Georgian Lectionary with respect to the feast and octave of the annual commemoration of the dedication of Holy Sepulchre complex on September 13, named in this source simply “dedication which is encaenia,” i.e. the dedication feast par excellence. However, the surviving manuscripts of the Lectionary present a number of other feasts of dedication scattered throughout the liturgical calendar of Jerusalem church, connected with various stations and churches which can be localized, where possible, within the city itself or in the vicinity thereof. In what follows, we shall briefly discuss the dedication feasts of the Jerusalem churches (other than Holy Anastasis and Martyrium), comparing the data of the Georgian Lectionary (through Kala, Lathal and Paris mss.) with the Jerusalem calendar of Sinai Georgian O.34, published by Garitte. In our discussion, specific

57 ἄλλα προσελυλήθατε Σιὼν ὄρει καὶ πόλει θεοῦ ζώντος, Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐπουρανίῳ, καὶ μυρίασιν ἄγγέλων (Heb 12:22); ἢ δέ ἂνο Ἰερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ἡς ἐστίν μήτηρ ἡμῶν (Gal 4:26).

58 The most recent and thorough examination of the stational churches in and around Jerusalem, mentioned in the Jerusalem Georgian Lectionary, has been undertaken by Stéphane Verhelst, “Les lieux de station du Lectionnaire de Jérusalem,” Proche-Orient Chrétien 54 (2004): 13-70, 247-289.
attention will be drawn to the multifaceted terminology used to refer to a feast of inauguration of a church in the lectionary, as well as to the Scriptural readings prescribed for these occasions. As will be seen, all hagiopolite feasts of dedication have fixed calendar dates, except the dedication on the 7th Saturday after Easter, and thus it will be reasonable to review these feasts in the order of their appearance in the calendar.

1. On January 21, the Lathal ms. puts the “dedication (ბაღალმესტო)” at the church of St Paul (Paris ms.) or St Peter (Lathal, Garitte), with the readings corresponding to those of either Encaenia or the liturgy of dedication (ეკანენიო, totum dedicationis).

2. On the seventh Saturday after Easter (i.e. the Saturday before Pentecost), the “deposition of the altar” (ნავგალავება, collocatio altaris) at “Golgotha” or the “holy Place of the Skull” (Lathal, Garitte), i.e. the location within the Holy Sepulchre complex. The readings include Ps. 83: 4, 2; Acts 28:15-31, Jude 1-25, Hebrews, Alleluia Psalm 25:1-2, 34:24, and the gospel reading from Matthew 5:17-24 (offering of the gift before the altar).

3. On May 31, GL sets the “dedication” (ბაღალმესტო) at Bethlehem, presumably at the basilica of the Nativity, founded by Helena, destroyed in the Samaritan revolt in

---

59 Kekelidze, *Ierusalimskij kanonar*, 51; the church in question is not, most likely, the church of St Peter at the site of House of Caiaphas, as Kekelidze suggests (ibid., 175-77), but this is not possible, since the dedication of this church is commemorated in GL on August 17 or 18 (see below). Garitte, following Goussen (“Über georg. Drucke,” 9) identifies the church as the one of Sts Peter and Paul in Bisanteo near Mount of Olives, mentioned in the treatise *Commemoratorium de casis Dei* (dated to 808 CE), see *Calendrier palestino-géorgien*, 137; Vincent and Abel, *Jérusalem nouvelle*, 938; Verhelst suggests that there may be an eventual confusion between the names of the martyrs attributed to the original foundation in the early fifth cent. (“Lieux de station,” 41-43).

60 GL 162 = Tarchnisvili, 1.31/31. I have altered Tarchnišvili’s translation from *totum encaeniorum*, to preserve the ambiguity of the original.

61 GL 876 = Tarchnisvili, 1.168/135. The term *dadgmaj* (depositio, collocatio) is absent in the Lathal ms. (Kekelidze, 107).

62 წმიდისა საკურთხეველისა სატფური (Garitte, 118).

63 Verhelst, 252.
529, and built anew in Justinian’s time.\textsuperscript{64} Lathal ms. and the calendar of \textit{Sinai Georgian O.34} designate the feast as “synaxis” (σύναξις),\textsuperscript{65} but the assemblage of the readings suggests, that this is the dedication of the basilica of the Nativity which is celebrated here\textsuperscript{66}: the Psalm designated is the one “of the dedication,” i.e. Ps 25:8, 7; the epistle to the Hebrews 1:1-12 is taken from the Christmas day lectionary in GL,\textsuperscript{67} the Alleluia psalm is Ps 109:1, and the gospel reading is taken from John 7:37-42, the same as on the seventh Thursday after Easter.\textsuperscript{68}

4. On June 4,\textsuperscript{69} the Kala ms. features the “dedication of the church” (δωρεάν τοῦ ἐγκαθιστήριον) at Bethany, presumably at the Lazarium basilica, founded in 330-390 and rebuilt in the fifth century,\textsuperscript{70} which was the station of the procession on the Saturday before Palm Sunday at the time of Egeria’s visit.\textsuperscript{71} This commemoration is absent from both Paris and Lathal ms.,\textsuperscript{72} as well as from the calendar of \textit{Sinai Georgian O.34}, but the selection of readings in both versions of the lectionary reflect a connection to the dedication feast (GL specifies that both the Psalm before the readings, the lesson from Paul’s letters and the Alleluia psalm to be “of the dedication”), while other readings have a likely connection to the location of the station (Acts 1 and Luke 10:38-42).\textsuperscript{73}


\textsuperscript{65} Kekelidze, \textit{Ierusalimskij kanonar’}, 115; Garitte, \textit{Caledrier}, 69.

\textsuperscript{66} Garitte, \textit{Calendrier}, 238.

\textsuperscript{67} The reading from Hebrews matches the epistle reading of the Christmas vigil (Tarchnišvili 2.12; cf. 1.2/12).

\textsuperscript{68} GL 868-871; Tarchnišvili 1.134.

\textsuperscript{69} GL 1010 = Tarchnišvili 2.13/14.

\textsuperscript{70} Ovadiah, \textit{Corpus of the Byzantine Churches}, 29-31.

\textsuperscript{71} \textit{Itin}. 29.2-6.

\textsuperscript{72} Kekelidze, 116; Tarchnišvili, 2.13 n. 1010.1. The feast in these sources is “Commemoration of Mary and Martha,” quite consistently with the gospel reading choice (Luke 10:38-42).
5. On June 9, GL appoints the “dedication” at Probatica, with the readings corresponding to those of the dedication (*totum dedicationis*). The Lathal ms. diverges from the rest, directing to seek for the lectionary of that day under the September 20 date, i.e. at the octave of Encaenia, but it may be more reasonable to consider the reading *totum dedicationis* as earlier. The church in question, as is clear from the calendar of John Zosime (*Sinai Georgian O.34*), is the church of the Theotokos at Probatica/Sheep’s Pool, associated with the healing of the paralytic (John 5:1-9), was built as a basilica at the beginning of the fifth century and survived beyond the Persian capture of Jerusalem in 614.

6. On June 22, GL celebrates the “dedication” of the church of the Archangel Michael, which was most likely situated near another church, the “building of the presbyter Jordan” (GL 1275) – the latter, whose dedication feast was on October 5 (see below), may have been associated with the monastery of Spoudaion, a late fifth-sixth century foundation. For both GL and the calendar of John Zosime, this feast coincides with the commemoration of the prophet Elias and the deposition (ÃÀÃÂÌÀÎ) (of relics) of the prophets Elissaeus and Obadiah. The readings reflect both angelic (Ps 102:20-21, Heb 1:1-12) and prophetic themes (1 Kings 19:9-18, 2 Kings 2:1-14), with an addition of the gospel reading of the fifth day of the octave of Encaenia (Matt 16:13-18), jointly confirming the

---

73 While GL designates the former three readings as “of the dedication,” the Lathal ms. specifies that the readings in question are Ps. 25:8-7, 1 Tim 3:14-16 (as at the feast of Encaenia) and the Alleluia ps. 92 (Kekelidze, 116).

74 GL 1017 = Tarchnišvili 2.14/14.

75 Kekelidze, 116; cf. GL 1254 n. a- b. The readings for the octave of Encaenia were preserved fully only in the Lathal ms. and include Ps 64:2-3, Gal 4:18-26; alleluia ps. 147:12 and the gospel reading (attested in other mss.) Luke 20:1-19 (Tarchnišvili 2.39-40).

76 Garitte, *Calendrier*, 71.


78 GL 1048-1052 = Tarchnišvili 2.17/17.

79 Verhelst, “Lieux de station,” 52-54; cf. with regards to the foundation of the monastery by patriarch Elias of Jerusalem, *Vita Sabbæ 31*. 
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multilayered character of this feast as both dedication of the church of the Archangel, and of the deposition of the prophets’ relics.  

7. On July 12, there is a feast designated in the Paris ms. as 

\[ \text{altaris collocatio/depositio} \]

at the “building of Anathon” (anat’onis šejnebulsa), deemed by Verhelst to be identical with the “building of Aphronius (ap’ronis)” located close to Gethsemane, which is given as a station for November 14. The Lathal ms. designates this feast as nothing but “of the altar” (sakurt’xevelis), with no station indicated, while directing to look for the lectionary on October 24, the altaris depositio at the Tomb of the Theotokos in Gethsemane. Other mss. direct to use the readings for October 23, a dedication of the church built by Maurice/Marcian, but it seems likely that the Lathal rubrics preserve a more authentic reading, particularly if we accept Verhelst’s identification of the “building of Anathon” with the church close to Gethsemane, and the dating of the construction after 430.

8. On August 11, there is a celebration of the “dedication [of the church] of the Theotokos (satp’uri ǧmr’t’ismšobilisaj)” in the monastery of Spoudaeon (τῶν σπουδαίων) near the Holy Sepulchre complex, constructed during the tenure of patriarch Elias. It could be that the proximity of this location, central for

---

80 The presence of the prophetic relics, as well as of the church dedicated to angels in proximity to the Anastasis, suggests for Verhelst an early dating (“Lieux de station,” 54), which seems to be a rather speculative suggestion.

81 GL 1086 = Tarchnišvili 2.22/21.


83 GL 1359 = Tarchnišvili 2.62/51.

84 Kekelidze, 119.

85 Tarchnišvili 2.62/51, cf. ibid., 2.56/46-47.

86 Verhelst, 23.

87 GL 1140 = Tarchnišvili 2.29/26.

88 Verhelst, 25, 52-53.
Jerusalem, explains that the readings for this feast, as GL indicates, are the same as the readings for the Encaenia on September 13.

9. On August 13, the Paris ms. of GL (as well as the calendar of Zosime) features the “dedication” (satp’uri) at the church situated at the “third mile” from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, which was the station for the feast of Mary on August 15 in the Armenian lectionary, and by the fifth century came to be associated with the tradition of Mary’s dormition. The Kathisma (‘Seat’) of Mary became a place for a new church built through the assistance of a female benefactor Ikelia in the reign of emperor Marcian (450-457), and which became associated with two archaeological discoveries, of a basilical church in 1950s and of an octagonal church in 1992-1997. The Paris ms. locates the station of August 13 at an unidentified village of Bet’ebre, which to Verhelst suggest a polemical stance toward the traditional Kathisma spot. On the other hand, not only two other manuscripts of GL locate the station in a different village (Petop’ori), but neither Lathal nor Kali mss. designate this feast as “dedication,” describing it rather as

89 GL 1143 = Tarchnišvili 2.29-30/26.

90 Garitte, Calendrier, 73; however, in this ms. the word “dedicatio” has been added above the line in small letters, as the editor observed (73, 13 n. 2).

91 Renoux, PO 36.2, 354-357.


93 Cyril of Scythopolis, Vita Theodosii = Schwarz, Kyrillos, 236.

94 On the latter discovery, see Rina Avner, “Jerusalem, Mar Elias,” Excavations and Surveys in Israel 13 (1993): 89-92; also Shoemaker, Ancient Traditions, 81-98, and Verhelst, “Lieux de station,” 262-263, esp. n. 64 where he disagrees with Shoemaker’s identification of the 1992 discovery as the “new Kathisma,” and of the basilical church as the “old” one. Verhelst suggests the octagon to be the “old” station on the spot of Mary’s dormition, while the church at Ramat Rachel (basilical one) he associates with the church of the ‘Betebre’ village, the station for August 13 in GL.

95 Verhelst, 262-263.
“synaxis (krebaj).” The set of readings selected for this feast partially supports its character as “dedication,” consisting of Ps 71:6-2, Isa 7:10-17, Heb 8:7-9:10, Alleluia ps. “of the dedication” (i.e. Ps 64), and the gospel reading Lk 11:27-32. GL features, however, another dedication feast in this station on December 3 (see below).

10. On August 17 or 18, a feast of dedication (satp’uri) is celebrated at the church of St Peter at the location of the house of Caiaphas. The church, commemorating the betrayal of Peter, most likely did not appear at this location (north of Holy Sion) before 439, since the Armenian lectionary does not mention it. The proximity of the church to the Anastasis-Martyrium complex, again, explains the use of the lectionary for this dedication feast, identical with the one used on the Encaenia feast. The Lathal ms., however, prescribes to use the lectionary for October 22 (presumably meaning October 23, another important hagiopolite dedication festival).

11. On August 30, GL features both the commemoration (xsenebaj) of Phocas and Babylas, and a feast of the dedication of a church at the foundation of Ephrem. This church, presumably of Sts Phocas and Babylas, is featured as a station also for September 9, the commemoration of these saints. Presumably, August 30 would be the dedication feast of this church, which, due to its occurrence in the Life of Melania the Younger (d. 439), must have existed prior to 439, although

---

96 Kekelidze, 123; Tarchnišvili 2.29/26, GL 1143 n.1.
97 The set of reading slightly differs in two other mss., see Kekelidze, 123.
98 In the Lathal and Kali mss. (Kekelidze, 124), as well as in the calendar of John Zosime (Garitte, 84-85).
99 GL 1157 = Tarchnišvili 2.32/28.
100 Maraval, 258-259; Verhelst, “Lieux de station,” 264-265.
101 Kekelidze, 124.
102 GL 1194 = Tarchnišvili 2.37/32.
103 GL 1227 = Tarchnišvili 2.35-36.
104 Vita Melaniae junioris 58.
the exact time when the relics of these saints may have been transferred there, as well as the precise identity of “Ephrem” who founded the church, remains undetermined. The readings for the dedication feast include Ps 92:5-1, Ephesians 3:14-21, Alleluia “of the saints,” i.e. of the general commemoration, and the gospel reading taken from the “fifth day of Encaenia” octave, that is, Matt 16:13-18.

12. On September 6, the feast of “deposition”/dedication of an altar (sakurt’xevelisa dadgmaj, sakurt’xevelisa satp’uri) was celebrated at the church near the Siloam Pool most likely founded by empress Eudocia in the mid-fifth century. The readings for this day, according to the Paris ms., correspond to sixth Tuesday after Easter (zatikt’a), with the Pauline lesson derived from the liturgy of dedication, while the Lathal ms. directs to use the lectionary for the sixth Saturday after Easter, indicating a possible scribal confusion. If the latter reading is correct, it may be possible to see a connection between the readings for September 6 and the lectionary for the seventh Saturday after Easter, another feast of “deposition of an altar” (see above).

13. The next day after the completion of the octave of Encaenia, September 21, a feast of dedication is celebrated at the church of New Sophia in the location known as the “house of Pilate.” Only the Lathal ms. preserved the lectionary for this day, but the feast is also attested in the calendar of John Zosime which

105 Verhelst, 43-44.
106 GL 1218 = Tarchnišvili 2.40/34.
107 Sakurt’xevelisa satp’uri is used in the Lathal ms. (Kekelidze, 128) and in the calendar of John Zosime (Garitte, Calendrier, 89).
108 Avi-Yonah, 772-773; Verhelst, 271 who notes that the church might not yet have existed in 438-439, but was already present at the time of Peter the Iberian’s ‘travel’ to Jerusalem in the vision to his disciple circa 475 (Vita Petri Iberi 134; ed. Cornelia B. Horn and Robert R. Phenix, John Rufus: The Lives of Peter the Iberian, Theodosius of Jerusalem, and the Monk Romanus, SBL Writings from the Greco-Roman World 14 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008], 196-7).
109 Kekelidze, 128.
110 GL 1256 a = Tarchnišvili 2.47-48/40.
111 Kekelidze, 134.
demonstrates its unquestionable presence in the hagiopolite calendar.\textsuperscript{112} The church in question was not yet in place at the time of the Armenian lectionary, but is attested around 475 in the Life of Peter the Iberian, which would place its construction around mid-fifth century.\textsuperscript{113} Of the readings for the feast, the \textit{p’salmuni} definitely reflects the theme of dedication (Ps 25:8, 12), while the rest has been derived from the fourth Friday after Easter.\textsuperscript{114}

14. The feast on September 28 does not bear the title of “dedication” of a church or an altar, but rather celebrates the deposition (\textit{dadgma}) of the relics of the saints George, Pamphilius, Alexander, Tarachus, Probus, and Andronicus at the chapel of St Alexander in the village of Enbigon (Engiglon, Enbiglon),\textsuperscript{115} the location of which is unknown.\textsuperscript{116} The lectionary for this day, however, are directed to be taken either from the lectionary for Encaenia (Lathal\textsuperscript{117}) or from the set of readings for October 23, the dedication of the Gethsemane church, suggesting a connection between the feast of “deposition of relics” and dedication of the church in question.

15. On October 3, GL also features a feast of dedication of a church (\textit{satp’uri eklesiisaj}) well outside of the vicinity of the Holy City, the church on Mt Sinai.\textsuperscript{118} The church in question may be identical with the one built by Justinian.\textsuperscript{119} The use of the readings for the Encaenia on this occasion reflects an evident liturgical connection between Sinai and Jerusalem, but the presence of this feast in GL speaks more of the transmission of hagiopolite liturgical tradition, rather than of the urban liturgy of the City.

\textsuperscript{112} Garitte, \textit{Calendrier}, 91, cf. 335.
\textsuperscript{113} \textit{Vita Petri Iberi} 134; Horn-Phenix, 196-197.
\textsuperscript{114} Kekelidze, 134; Verhelst, 265-66.
\textsuperscript{115} GL 1259 = Tarchnišvili 2.48/40-41.
\textsuperscript{116} Verhelst, “Lieux de station,” 30.
\textsuperscript{117} Kekelidze, 135.
\textsuperscript{118} GL 1273 = Tarchnišvili 2.50/42.
16. On October 5, GL celebrates the dedication (*satp’uri*) at the church of Virgin Mary, the building of the presbyter Jordan, a foundation most likely connected to the church of the archangel Michael near the monastery of Spoudaeon, the dedication of which GL celebrated on June 22.\(^{120}\) The readings for the feast included Ps 25:5-8, Hebrews 7:26-8:2, Alleluia ps. 44:11, and the gospel reading of John 7:28-31.

17. Another feast of dedication (*satp’uri*) falls on October 7,\(^{121}\) which Lathal ms. and the John Zosime calendar locate at the “place of Ascension” (*ağsamağlebelisaj*),\(^{122}\) most likely referring to the building constructed with the aid of Poemenia around 378, not the “Eleona church” founded by Helena.\(^{123}\) The readings for this festival of dedication correspond with those of the 5\(^{th}\) day of the Encaenia octave.

18. On October 23, GL features the celebration of a “great dedication/consecration” (*satp’uri didi*) in Gethsemane, at the building of “emperor Maurice” (*Mavrik mep’isa*).\(^{124}\) This designation refers to another important Jerusalem landmark, the church built around the traditional location for the “tomb of the Theotokos” in Gethsemane or valley of Josaphat.\(^{125}\) The proper dating for this building, and therefore also for the date of its original dedication feast, may present a problem: the calendar of John Zosime features another “dedication at Gethsemane” on June 13,\(^{126}\) while

\(^{120}\) GL 1275 = Tarchnišvili 2.50/42; Verhelst, 53; Garitte, *Calendrier*, 95.

\(^{121}\) GL 1279 = Tarchnišvili 2.51/42.

\(^{122}\) Kekelidze, 137; Garitte, *Calendrier*, 95.


\(^{124}\) GL 1320 = Tarchnišvili 2.56/46-47; October 22 in Lathal ms. (Kekelidze, 139).

the rubric in GL puts the construction of the Gethsemane church into the late sixth-early seventh century, during the reign of Maurice (582-602). The station of Mary’s tomb in Gethsemane is unknown in the Armenian lectionary, but appears to be in place by circa 451, as attested in the sixth century Coptic text, *Panegyric on Macarius of Tk ôw*, attributed to Dioscorus of Alexandria.127 Several sixth century pilgrimage accounts also attest to the existence of a church at the location of Mary’s tomb,128 which may signifies that the church was already in place by that time.129 In his edition of the Lathal ms. of GL, Kekelidze proposed that the rubric for October 22/23 should read *Markiane* (Marcian) instead of *Mavrik* (Maurice), thus placing the construction of the building to the reign of the former (450-457), quite consistent with literary testimony and the time of expansion of the Theotokos cult in the aftermath of Ephesus (431).130 The construction of the new church on the site could be conceivable after the Persian takeover of the city in 614 (and the subsequent Byzantine recovery), but Maurice’s reign would be an unlikely period for such enterprise. Therefore, it is likely that the “great dedication” commemorated on October 23 celebrated the dedication of the original fifth century cruciform church on the site of Mary’s tomb. The readings for this feast included Ps 92:1, 5; Ephesians 5:20-32 (church

126 Garitte, *Calendrier*, 72; this feast is not reflected in the manuscripts of GL.


128 Theodosius, *De situ terrae sanctae* 10 (CCSL 175, 119); *Breviarii Hierosolyma* 7 (ibid., 112); and a later travelogue of Arculf in *De locis sanctis* 1.12.1-5 (ibid., 195-96); see Shoemaker, *Ancient Traditions*, 101-105.

129 Shoemaker also suggests that the construction of the Nea church during the time of Justinian presupposes the existence of an “old” church dedicated to the Theotokos, which could have been the church in the valley of Josaphat (*Ancient Traditions*, 101-2).

130 Kekelidze, 209-10, cf. 139 for his emendation of the ms. text. One could accept his solution *pace* Garitte who proposed for the 23 October date to be the second dedication of the Gethsemane building, with the first set on June 13, as in the John Zosime calendar (GARITTE, *Calendrier*, 250; cf. the acceptance of the same proposal by Verhelst, “Lieux de station,” 270). In fact, *Sin. iber. 34* never indicates that the building which dedication was celebrated on June 13 was the tomb of the Theotokos (*satp’<u>ri gesmanias*; Garitte, *Calendrier*, 72).
as bride), Alleluia ps. 147:1 ("Praise the Lord, O Jerusalem"), and the gospel reading from Matthew, taken from the lectionary of the fifth day of the Encaenia octave (16:13-18).

19. The celebration of a “great dedication” at the site of Mary’s tomb in Gethsemane appears to continue in GL to October 24 with the “deposition of the altar” (sakurt’ xevlisa dadgmaj) in Gethsemane, at the “tomb of the Theotokos.”\(^{131}\) Arculf’s seventh-century travelogue mentions the existence of two structures on the site, arranged on two levels (dupliciter fabricatae), the lower of which was a rotundal building containing an altar in... orientali parte and the relic of the tomb on the right side thereof.\(^{132}\) If we presume that the “great dedication” on October 23 celebrated the inauguration of the ‘upper,’ larger building on the site, then the deposition of an altar on October 24 can be connected to an actual site, the rotundal chapel on the site of Mary’s tomb, presumably modeled on the earlier building of the Lord’s Tomb.\(^{133}\) The lectionary for this day include the readings which may be considered typical for a dedication feast: Ps 83:4, 2 (“Your altar, Lord of hosts”), Hebrews 13:10-16,\(^{134}\) Alleluia ps. 25:12, and the gospel reading from the Encaenia itself (John 10:22-37).

20. The feast of the “dedication of the church” (satp’ uri eklesiisaj) on October 25 is localized at the village of Ida-Qutha (ida qut’as dabasa),\(^{135}\) a place which identity is uncertain. The toponym of the village betrays a Syriac or Aramaic origin (ida = \(ܝܕܬܐ\) ‘church’), but the lectionary seems to be firmly integrated into the liturgical cycle of the Hagios Polis, since GL prescribes to take the readings either from the

\(^{131}\) GL 1323 = Tarchnišvili 2.57/47.

\(^{132}\) De locis sanctis 1.12.1-2 = CCSL 175, 195.


\(^{134}\) The reading corresponds to the epistle reading for January 1 (Heb 13:7-16; GL 70), however, GL for October 24 notes the incipit of the reading to be v. 10 (“We have an altar,” etc.).

\(^{135}\) GL 1325 = Tarchnišvili 2.57/47. The mention of this place is omitted in the Lathal ms. (Kekelidze, 140).
preceding feast on October 23 (Paris ms.) or from the sixth day of Encaenia octave (Lathal ms. 136).

21. Similarly, on November 4, GL features the “dedication of an altar (satp’uri sakurt’xevelisaj)” in the village of Gelbane/Gebane or Gebal. 137 The dedication of the church at this site, supposedly identified with the site of ancient Gibeon (modern al-Jib), 138 where a fifth-sixth century church has also been discovered, 139 coincides with the memory of Isidore 140 which may suggest that either the church was named after the saint, or his relics were deposited there, neither of which is acknowledged by GL. The readings for the feast correspond to one of the days of the preceding “double feast” of the church in Gethsemane: October 23 (Paris ms.) or 24 (Lathal/Kala ms.); the correspondence of the readings to the latter date may be more likely, if we suppose that the set of readings for October 24 consisted of those used at the dedication/consecration/deposition of any altar.

22. November 10 in GL represents one of the November festivals associated with the memory of St George and with the churches dedicated to him. While the calendar of John Zosime posits on November 3 the dedication of the church of St George in a Palestinian town of Lydda (mod. Lod) 141 and the same date appears also in the Georgian Iadgari, 142 none of the surviving mss. of GL seem to acknowledge this date. Instead, there is a feast of “dedication of the church” in conjunction

136 Kekelidze, 140.

137 GL 1341 = Tarchnišvili 2.60/49; the identification of the day as “dedication of the church” is absent from the Lathal ms. (Kekelidze, 141).

138 As proposed by Milik in Revue biblique 60 (1953): 579.


140 Kekelidze acknowledges his inability to identify which Isidore is celebrated on this occasion (Kekelidze, 281).

141 Garitte, Calendrier, 102, see also 374-75 for Garitte’s comments where he cites other Georgian menaia referencing the date of dedication in Lydda on November 3 (Sinai iber. 1, Sinai iber. 65, Tbilisi S 145); cf. Delehaye, Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae, 191-92; also Michel van Esbroeck, “L’histoire de l’église de Lydda dans deux textes géorgiens,” Bedi kartlisa 35 (1977): 109-131.

142 Metreveli et al., Udzelesi iadgari, 318-321.
with the “commemoration of St George,” which the Paris ms. situates at the
village of Enbigon (Engiglon, Enbiglon), a site of another celebration on
September 28 (see [14] above). Kekelidze has made a plausible suggestion that
the date recorded in GL represents the *apodosis*, i.e. the octave of the dedication
of the church of St George in Lydda, however this supposition does not explain
the disappearance of the November 3 date from GL, nor does it justify the
connection with the “village of Enbigone,” presumably a locality near
Jerusalem. The readings for this day also partly reflect this festival’s
integration into liturgical life of Jerusalem: troparion (*oxitaj*), Ps 144:10, 20;
Proverbs 29:2-6, 2 Thess 1:1-12; Alleluia ps. 88:8, and the gospel reading from
John 15:20-16:4. The final rubric in GL says “all the rest [is] of the
Dedication” indicating that the remaining hymnography (hymns for the washing
of hands and for the holy gifts) were to correspond to those of the Encaenia on
September 13.

23. The date of November 20 in GL and the calendar of John Zosime marks the feast
of dedication “in the building of the God-loving emperor Justinian, in the church
of the Theotokos.” This description certainly refers to the Nea (New) church of
Virgin Mary, constructed by the orders of Justinian and dedicated on November
20, 543. Archaeological excavations on the site of the Nea confirmed the

143 Kekelidze, 282-286, esp. 285-86.
144 The Enbigon station is not mentioned in the Lathal/Kala mss. which were Kekelidze’s only
sources available when his edition was published.
145 As the rubric specifies, the reading is taken from the service for all martyrs celebrated at the
church of St Stephen on January 22 (GL 164). The connection to the commemoration of St George is
evident.
146 The Lathal/Kala lectionary gives the reading from Mark 13:3ff (Kekelidze, 142).
147 იწაფი ყოველი სატფურებისა  GL 1355.
148 GL 1373 = Tarchnišvili 2.64/52; the Lathal/Kala lectionary simply has “dedication of the
[building of] God-loving emperor Justinian” (Kekelidze, 143).
149 The John Zosime calendar has *satp’uri nea c’midisaj* (dedication of the holy Nea [church]) –
Garitte, *Calendrier*, 105.
description of a large basilical structure in Procopius’ *De aedificiis*, unearthing also a large vaulted subsidiary building, a water cistern, dedicated in 549-550, judging by its inscription. The church was likely to have been damaged in the invasion of 614 and completely destroyed by the ninth century. It recurs in GL again during the octave of Encaenia where it is featured as a station on September 16, which prompts Verhelst to suggest that this day celebrated the restoration of the basilica after 614. It is more likely, however, that the construction of the church of the size and prominence of Nea, given the imperial sponsorship, provided its incorporation into the array of Jerusalem’s “holy places” celebrated during the octave of Encaenia. The November 20 date thus stands as the date for the annual commemoration for the *encaenia* of the Nea church, probably corresponding to the date of the original dedication. Manuscripts of GL show discrepancy with regards to the lectionary for this day: while the Lathal/Kala lectionary prescribes to take the readings from the “seventh Thursday of the Pentecost,” the Paris ms. provides a complete set of readings, consisting of Ps. 131:8, 1; Hebrews 3:1-6; Alleluia ps. 34:18 and the gospel lesson from the fifth day of Encaenia (Matthew 16:13ff.).

24. On November 23, GL features yet another festival connected with the commemoration of St George: the “dedication” at the building of presbyter Euplius, also identified as the church of St George “outside of David’s Tower.”

150 Procopius, *Buildings*, 5.6.1-26; the date of dedication is established in the *Life of John the Hesychast* (Schwarz, *Kyrillos*, 216) as November of the 6th indiction, i.e. 543, see Verhelst, “Lieux de station,” 57; regarding the connection between this dedication feast and the establishment of the feast of the Presentation (Entry) of the Theotokos into the Temple in the Byzantine calendar, see Henri Chirat, “Ψόμια διαφορά,” in *Mélanges E. Podechard: études de sciences religieuses offertes pour son éméritat au Doyen honoraire de la faculté de théologie de Lyon* (Lyon: Facultés catholiques, 1945), 121-134, esp. 132-33.


153 Verhelst, 57.

154 Kekelidze, 143. This canon of readings would include the psalm “of the Dedication” (i.e. of the Encaenia), the readings from Acts (26:1-7) and 1 Letter of John (5:16-21), the Alleluia psalm 109:1, and the gospel reading from John 7:37-42 (GL 868-873).
The identity of Euplius is unclear, but appears to be of hagiopolite provenance. The church in question, also a basilica, was most likely connected with the hospice for the elderly which was built outside of Jerusalem walls by Eudocia in the fifth century, and thus preceded the construction of the basilica, which dates to the beginning of the sixth century. The readings in GL, again, demonstrate some parallels with the readings for other feasts of dedication, consisting of Ps 92:5, 1; the reading from 1st Letter to Timothy (3:14-16), Alleluia ps. 149:1, and the gospel reading from John (7:28-31).

25. The date of December 2 (Lathal ms. and John Zosime) or 3 (Paris ms.) marks a second feast of dedication associated with the church of the Kathisma “on the road to Bethlehem, at the third mile,” the site associated with the Dormition and Assumption of the Virgin Mary. The 1992 excavations of the Byzantine church, most likely corresponding to the “Old Kathisma” built in the fifth century, revealed an octagonal structure with the relic of a rock (‘seat’) in the middle and four chapels on the sides. The problem arises with connection to the identification of August 13 feast as dedicatio in Paris ms. and in John Zosime’s calendar (see [9] above). The December 2/3 date, however, is represented as dedicatio ecclesiae in all the sources for GL and in the calendar of Sinai Georgian O.34, and may reflect the date of original dedication in the mid-fifth century.

---

155 GL 1379 = Tarchnišvili 2.65/53; also Garitte, Calendrier, 105.

156 Verhelst, “Lieux de station,” 48-49; as Verhelst also notes, Εὔπλου appears in the list of “bishops and presbyters, the priest-martyrs, who rightly divided the word of your truth” in one of the mss. of Greek JAS (ms. Vatican Borg. 24, 1880 CE; Mercier, PO 26.2, 216 l. 17).

157 Life of John the Hesychast (Schwarz, Kyrillos, 204).

158 Ovadiah, Corpus, 81. The basilica of St George, now in the neighbourhood of Giv’at Ram/Sheikh Badr in Jerusalem, was excavated by M. Avi-Yonah in 1949.

159 GL 1395 = Tarchnišvili 2.67/55; Kekelidze, 145; Garitte, Calendrier, 108.

when the church was constructed.\textsuperscript{161} If the church of the Kathisma was built in the mid-fifth century, it would be roughly contemporary with the church on the site of the Tomb of Mary in Gethsemane, the dedication of which was celebrated on October 23-24. Appropriately, GL does not include a separate canon of readings for the dedication of the Kathisma, but refers back to the lectionary for October 23.\textsuperscript{162}

26. The church of John the Baptist or the “building of the patriarch John,” the dedication of which is celebrated in GL on December 15,\textsuperscript{163} occurs as a station in the lectionary on three more occasions: the festivals of the Nativity of John (June 24),\textsuperscript{164} John’s beheading (August 29),\textsuperscript{165} and the invention (and deposition) of his head on October 26.\textsuperscript{166} The patriarch in question, as Garitte has suggested, is John III (in 516-524) which would make the early sixth century the period when the church “on the city’s border (k’alak’isa kedesa)” was constructed.\textsuperscript{167} The readings for the feast of dedication of this church correspond to the common lectionary for the “blessed ones,”\textsuperscript{168} with the exception of the \textit{p’almuni} (Ps 25:8, 7:9) which may reflect the theme of temple dedication. The gospel reading is specific to the saint celebrated at this station (Luke 9:7-11).

27. On December 23,\textsuperscript{169} the Paris ms. of GL, as well as the calendar of John Zosime,\textsuperscript{170} celebrate the dedication of a major architectural and liturgical

\textsuperscript{161} \textit{Vita Theodosii} = Schwarz, \textit{Kyrillos}, 236.

\textsuperscript{162} The Lathal lectionary refers to October 25 instead, but this may be discounted as a scribal error (Kekelidze, 141).

\textsuperscript{163} GL 1412 = Tarchnišvili 2.69/56.

\textsuperscript{164} GL 1055 = Tarchnišvili 2.18/17-18; Garitte, \textit{Calendrier}, 74, 258-59.

\textsuperscript{165} GL 1186 = Tarchnišvili 2.35-36/31; Garitte, \textit{Calendrier}, 87, 315-16.

\textsuperscript{166} GL 1326 = Tarchnišvili 2.57/47; Garitte, \textit{Calendrier}, 100, 368.

\textsuperscript{167} Garitte, 258-259; Verhelst, 55-6.

\textsuperscript{168} See GL 1508-1522.

\textsuperscript{169} GL 1429 = Tarchnišvili 2.72/59.
landmark which, however, was situated in Constantinople, rather than Jerusalem –
the second dedication of the Great Church of Constantinople, the Hagia Sophia on
December 24, 562.\textsuperscript{171} Just as in GL, the dedication of Hagia Sophia was
celebrated in Constantinople on December 23.\textsuperscript{172} The set of reading chosen for
this celebration shows, beyond the evident signs of ‘Byzantinization’, signs of
integration of a dedication feast of the church of Constantinople into the
hagiopolite liturgical system, since it includes the psalm “of the
dedication/Encaenia,” i.e. of September 13, the reading from Hebrews derived
from the lectionary of November 20 (the dedication of Nea), and, again, the
gospel reading of the “fifth day of Encaenia” octave (Matthew 16:13ff). The
contents of the lectionary makes it unlikely that the dedication of Hagia Sophia
entered GL during the transmission of the text into Georgian realm, but rather
shows that at certain point this feast was celebrated in Jerusalem.
Thus, the lectionary and calendar of the church of Jerusalem, as it is known
through its recension in the Georgian tradition, presents a complex picture of the
development of annual feasts of dedication in the context of sacred topography of the
holy city. Excluding the feast of Encaenia of the Holy Sepulchre and its octave
(September 14-20), the Jerusalem calendar features 27 feasts the appellation of which in
the liturgical sources explicitly refers to the dedication of a church or an altar
(“dedication,” “dedication of the church,” “dedication/deposition of the altar”). With a
very few exceptions (church on Mt Sinai, Hagia Sophia in Constantinople), these feasts
celebrate dedications at the churches in and in the vicinity of Jerusalem. While the
precise location of some “villages” (Ida-Qutha, Enbigon) is not possible to determine, it

\textsuperscript{170} Garitte, \textit{Calendrier}, 111-112.

\textsuperscript{171} Theophanes, \textit{Chronographia} = de Boor 1.238, ET Mango and Scott, 350.

\textsuperscript{172} Mateos, \textit{Typicon}, OCA 165, 146; also Delehaye, \textit{Synaxarium ecclesiae Const.}, 340 (τὰ ἐγκαίνια τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας).
is plausible that these may be connected to monastic foundations, demonstrating close connection between the organization of hagiopolite liturgical life in GL and urban monasticism.\textsuperscript{173} The overview of the lectionary for dedication feasts of different churches in the Jerusalem area can demonstrate how construction and inauguration of a new ecclesiastical building signified its incorporation into the already existing structure of urban liturgical life by modeling the lectionary for a new dedication feast upon the canon of readings for the dedication feasts of the most prominent Jerusalem churches. Thus, on six occasions (21.01., 09.02., 11.08., 18.08., 28.09. [Lathal/Kala], 03.10.) the entire canon of readings used at the annual feast of dedication refers back to the appropriate lectionary for the feast of Encaenia of the Holy Sepulchre on September 13. Another such ‘model’ is found in the dedication of the basilica on the site of the tomb of Virgin Mary on October 23 – the readings for this occasion are used again on five other dedication feasts (12.07., 28.09. [Paris], 25.10., 04.11., 03.12.). In addition to (re)using the entire set of readings, Georgian lectionary features the repeated use of separate scriptural readings on the occasion of church dedications: thus, if the gospel reading for September 13 (John 10:22-37) used by itself only once (24.10.), the gospel reading for the “fifth day of the Encaenia,” i.e. of the Encaenia octave (Matthew 16:13ff) is used on its own much more frequently, being featured on seven other occasions (22.06., 30.08., 07.10., 23.10., 10.11., 20.11., 23.12). Similarly, three feasts of dedication (31.05., 04.06., 23.12.) feature the use of the psalm before the readings, characterized as “psalm of dedication (p 'salmuni satp 'urisaj),” apparently again referring to the lectionary for the

\textsuperscript{173} Verhelst, 59-60, who also points out to the Aramaic background for the toponyms of some yet undetermined “villages.”
Encaenia (Ps. 65:9, 17)\textsuperscript{174} or to the lectionary for a common rite of dedication, which we will review further (Ps. 83:4, 2).\textsuperscript{175} The lectionary likewise shows a repeated use of the same psalms for the feasts of dedication: Ps 83 (seventh Saturday of Pentecost, 24.10.), Ps 25 (31.05., 21.09., 05.10., 15.12.), Ps 92 (30.08., 23.10., 03.11.), all connected to the occasion in question by the allusions in these texts to altar and temple. The repeated use of the same psalms in the liturgical readings for dedication feasts seems to indicate a formation in this period (fifth-sixth centuries) of the range of texts associated with the celebration of church dedication which subsequently emerged as part of the rite of church dedication, both in Jerusalem and later in Constantinople.

On several occasions, instead of a more commonly used terminology for the feast of dedication (\textit{satp'uri, satp'uri eklesiaj}), GL employs the term which emphasized the altar as a central liturgical element in the celebration of a dedication: \textit{sakurt'xe\textit{v}(e)lisa dadgmaj}. The term \textit{dadgmaj}, translated by Tarchnišvili as \textit{collocatio}, could be more accurately rendered as “deposition,”\textsuperscript{176} since this is the same term which the Lectionary used for the deposition of the saints’ relics.\textsuperscript{177} This term is used in relation with the dedication at five locations: Golgotha (GL 876, seventh Saturday after Easter), building of Anathon/Aphronius (GL 1086; July 12), Pool of Siloam (GL 1218; September 6), Tomb of Mary in Gethsemane (GL 1323; October 24), and the village of Gelbane/Gebal.

\textsuperscript{174} GL 1236 = Tarchnišvili 2.37.
\textsuperscript{175} GL 1549 = Tarchnišvili 2.73.
\textsuperscript{176} Cf. Čubinašvili, \textit{Kart'ul-rusuli lek'sikoni}, 357; the Sardshweladse- Fähnrich lexicon translates the term as “Stellen, Hinstellen, Aufstellen, Setzen” (\textit{ADW} 308), consistent with our interpretation thereof as deposition or setting in place.
\textsuperscript{177} See e.g. on September 22 “in the building of Hesychius the presbyter, his commemoration, [and] the deposition (\textit{dadgmaj}) of Peter and Paul” (Kekelidze, 134; Tarchnivšili 2.40/47).
(GL 1341; November 4). The use of such term reflects the growing prominence of the act of a deposition/dedication of an altar as an integral part of a church dedication rite, or possibly as another synonym for the rite of the inauguration of a church. The study of this term in its own lectionary context, however, gives us an opportunity to narrow down the period when the rite of “deposition of an altar” as one of the dedication rites became established in the liturgy of Jerusalem. If one compares the canon of readings for these several feasts of *altaris depositio*, it is clear that on the occasion of *depositio* in GL 1086 (building of Anathon/Aphronius) and GL 1341 (village of Gebal), the readings used correspond (if we follow the Lathal ms. reading) to the deposition of the altar at the tomb of the Theotokos in Gethsemane on October 24.178 The lectionary for the deposition of the altar at the Pool of Siloam is supposed to follow the lectionary for sixth Tuesday (Paris ms.) or Saturday (Lathal ms.) after Easter,179 but perhaps one could presume an error in transmission and thus assume that it was the *seventh* Saturday after Easter that was meant, and the canon of readings to follow would be the same as for the deposition of the altar on Golgotha.180

While the presence and significance of an altar at other three locations (Siloam, Aphronius, Gebal) is not recorded in the sixth/seventh-century accounts of Western pilgrims to Jerusalem, the altars at Golgotha and at the tomb of Mary receive such a mention. Thus, Arculf’s travelogue mentions the presence of an altar in the cave on the site where the relic of the Cross was preserved (*in eadem vero ecclesia quaedam in petra*...)

---

178 Kekelidze, 119, 141.
179 GL 1218 = Tarchnišvili 2.34; cf. ibid., 1.164-166/132-133; the lectionary for the 6th Saturday has not been preserved in the manuscripts.
180 See [2] in the list above.
habetur excisa spelunca infra locum Dominicae crucis), and where the regular liturgies for the departed were offered (ubi super altare pro quorundam honoratorum animabus sacrificium offertur). At the same time, the Piacenza pilgrim reports the presence at Golgotha of the relic of the “altar of Abraham” and Melchizedec (in latere est altarium Abrahae ubi ibat Isaac offerre, obtulit et Melchisedech sacrificium), the presence of which derives evidently from the identification of Golgotha with the Mt Moriah, the place of Isaac’s sacrifice (Gen 22). While this relic of the altar of Abraham and Melchizedec in these sixth-century accounts may not be the same altar as in Arculf’s narrative above, but rather a relic preserved at that place, it is not impossible that the latter altar was placed at Golgotha in the earlier period, and that it is exactly the establishment of this altar that GL celebrates on the Saturday before the feast of Pentecost. Similarly, in describing the rotundal church on the site of the Tomb of Virgin Mary in Gethsemane, Arculf attests the presence of an altar in its eastern part, “on the right hand side of which there is Mary’s empty sepulchre made of stone” (in cuius orientali parte altarium habetur, ad dexteram vero eius partem Mariae saxeum inest vacuum sepulcrum). It appears that the feast on October 24 in the Georgian lectionary refers precisely to the “deposition” of this altar at the traditional burial site of Mary, specifically to the side of the relic of her empty sepulchre. The descriptions of the altars deposited at Golgotha and in Gethsemane single out one common characteristic

\[\text{181 De locis sanctis 1.5.2; CCSL 175, 190.}\]
\[\text{182 Antonini Placentini itinerarium 19 = CCSL 175, 138-39.}\]
\[\text{183 Cf. Breviarium de Hierosolyma A 2.55-58 = CCSL 175, 110; Theodosius, De situ Terrae Sanctae 7 = CCSL 175, 117-18.}\]
\[\text{184 De locis sanctis 1.12.2 = CCSL 175, 195.}\]
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trait, which may underlie such practice of consecration, a deposition of an altar only, without a dedication of a building or a deposition of relics. These altars have been deposited at an enclosure/building already sanctified by virtue of its unique connection with Jesus or Mary and hence in no need of additional sanctification, with the exception of the altar which is placed/deposited at that place to enable the regular eucharistic celebration.

The analysis of the festivals of church dedication in Jerusalem, as these appear in the Georgian lectionary and the calendar of Sinai Georgian O.34, reveal certain unifying characteristics which, it seems, may help us to determine the shape of the rite of dedication in the stage of its formation in the Holy City. On the one hand, the array of dedicated buildings/churches presents a rather peculiar picture, marked by the absence of the dedication feasts for such landmarks as the Apostles’ church at Eleona and the basilica of Holy Sion, both fourth century constructions.185 Likewise, as Verhelst notes, the list of monastic foundations featured as stations in the Georgian lectionary – and which, consequently, occasionally appear as the stations on the feasts of dedication – does not include any foundations associated with Euthymius the Great (376-473) or Sabas (439-532) – however, it features a number of monasteries which had a period of association with the monophysite movement.186 This stands in contrast with the data of the John Zosime calendar which does include the feasts associated with Mar Saba and its θεόκτιστος ἐκκλησία on May 10 and December 12.187 At the same time, the presence of

185 While the exact date of foundation, construction, and dedication is unclear, the basilica of Holy Sion (the first stage, destroyed in 614) cannot be dated later than the tenure of John II of Jerusalem (387-417), see Avi-Yonah, “Jerusalem,” 778; Ovadiah, Corpus, 89-90.

the feasts associated with the emperor Justinian in the lectionary (03.08., 12.09., 16.11., 23.12.) puts the formative phase of the calendar of GL in the time frame from middle of the fifth to the early seventh century, contemporaneous with the growth of the Sabaite foundations near Jerusalem.188 The majority of the buildings, the dedication of which was celebrated in the Georgian lectionary, was founded and constructed either in the early/middle fifth century or in the early sixth century (Bethlehem, Spoudaion, Nea, St George, St John the Baptist), and it appears that it was this massive construction activity associated with such names as the empress Aelia Eudocia in the fifth century, and the emperor Justinian in the sixth, that may have inspired the development of the liturgy of church dedication as well. The feast of dedication already present in the Jerusalem calendar by 380s, the dedication of the Holy Anastasis, has been reinterpreted as the Encaenia (Geo. enkeniaj) and provided a model for the dedication feasts of the newly constructed buildings. The growth of the Marian veneration ensured that the dedication of the basilica and altar on the site of Mary’s tomb, itself an apparent imitation of the Lord’s sepulchre, provided a model for the dedication festivals for the churches built after c. 450. Moreover, the analysis of the feasts of dedication in the Jerusalem calendar in the fifth-sixth centuries captures the development of the rite of church dedication in its formative stage, still closely linked with the social liturgy of Roman dedicatio and the authority of a sponsor as the “dedicator,” but also necessarily included as the celebration of the eucharistic liturgy with the use of recurring scriptural passages, especially psalms and gospels, and such ceremonial elements as deposition of relics and deposition of an altar. The formation of the developed liturgy of church dedication is particularly evident

187 Garitte, Calendrier, 65, 110, cf. 221.

188 See further, 1.3.2.
in the canon of readings for the foundation and dedication of a church, which I will discuss in the following section of this chapter.

5.1.3 “Depositions of Relics” in the Jerusalem Lectionary and Dedication.

We may encounter a similar conception of sanctity of a place if we subject to our analysis the correlation between various feasts of “deposition of relics” and the locations/stations in and around Jerusalem, as these appear in the Georgian lectionary and in the calendar of John Zosime. The connection between the dedication of a church and the deposition of relics in the fourth to sixth century is tenuous at best and the direct link between two ritual events must not be readily assumed. What may be more safely presumed is a conception of sanctity, apparently prevalent in this period, as we indicated before, that stems from the communication of holiness through direct contact with a holy place, object, or person – in this case, a consecrated altar or a relic of a saint. However, would the deposition of a saint’s relic inside the church effect the consecration of a liturgical space, making it suitable for subsequent worship? The deposition of the relics of Stephen at the church of St Stephen represents exactly such a case: the latter feast is featured in GL on June 15,189 on the same date designated in the calendar of John Zosime as the “invention of the bones” of the saint,190 clearly demonstrating the conflation of the event of finding the relics of the saint under bishop John II in 415 and the event of their subsequent deposition.191 However, the study of other contemporary sources shows that

189 დადგმა წმიდა სტეფანესი; GL 1031 = Tarchnişvili 2.15/16.
190 სტეფანეს ძუალთა პოვნა; Garitte, Calendrier, 72; see the commentary on 252-53.
the June 15 date presents another case of such hagiographic téléscopage of several related events: as *Vita Petri Iberi* attests, the deposition of the bones of St. Stephen at the church of his name took place in the presence of empress Eudocia,\(^{192}\) Cyril of Alexandria and other Egyptian bishops on May 15, 439.\(^{193}\) The description of this event in the *Life of Peter the Iberian* evidently perceives the dedication and deposition of relics to be coterminous concepts and events:

> For when [Cyril] was persuaded by the believing and orthodox empress Eudocia to come for the deposition of the precious bones of the glorious and all-praised Stephen, … and to conduct the consecration of the beautiful temple (ܢܥܒܕܘܐܩܢܝܐܕܗܝܟܠܐ) the she had built outside the northern gates of the Holy City, he gladly accepted the invitation. He came with the multitude of bishops from all Egypt and magnificently conducted the deposition of the holy bones (ܡܐ̈ܕܓܖܘܣܝܡܐܥܒܕܫܒܝܚܐܝܬ ...ܝܫܐ̈ܩܕ) of the first of the martyrs on the fifteenth of the month of Iyor.\(^{194}\)

The event described in the life of Peter corresponds to the general outlines of *dedicatio* of a public religious building as perceived in the Late Roman legal system, as it evolved in the situation of the transfer of religious authority to Christian ecclesiastical leadership: the *encaenia* (not coincidentally the Syriac translator transliterates the term\(^ {195}\)) in the presence of an imperial sponsor officiated by ecclesiastical authority. The use of parallel

---


\(^{195}\) ܐܩܢܝܐ = ἐγκαίνια, as the editors of the ET themselves note (Horn and Phenix, 67 n. 3).
construction ("conduct the encaenia" vs. "conducted the deposition of the holy bones") within a few lines from each other suggests the clear perception that these two terms describe the same liturgical rite, the encaenia of the church with the deposition of relics.

The absence of reference to encaenia in the section describing the actions of the bishops on May 15, 439, may be explained by the use of the term "deposition" as pars pro toto of the entire dedication rite, especially because the deposition of the saints’ bones into the church built in his name would be seen as the ultimate act of consecration. Remarkably, when the same church was rebuilt by Eudocia shortly before her death, on June 15, 460, the reference to its (re)dedication (encaenia) in Vita Euthymii no longer includes any allusion to any deposition of relics:

And having arrived in haste to the holy city and sent for the archbishop, she narrated the words of the great Euthymius [regarding her impending death]. She prepared for dedication the temple of the holy First Martyr Stephen, while it was yet unfinished, on the fifteenth of the month of June (ἀπλήρωτον ὄντα τὸν ναὸν τοῦ ἁγίου πρωτομάρτυρος Στεφάνου ἐγκαινισθῆναι παρεσκέυασεν), and bestowed upon it a large income… And she visited all the churches that she has built, dedicating them (ἐγκαινίζουσα) and to each bestowing the sufficient income.196

Thus, the date of June 15 recorded in the Georgian lectionary and in the John Zosime calendar does not refer either to the deposition of Stephen’s relics, or to the original finding of his bones, but to the second dedication of the church, apparently following a reconstruction, in 460. As at the first dedication of St Stephen’s, the liturgical rite celebrated on this occasion appears to be heavily influenced by the notion of imperial sponsorship of the construction, expressed through Eudocia’s role as such a sponsor and, in that sense, a dedicatory. Cyril also makes clear that Eudocia did not fund the construction of just the church of St Stephen, but many other churches in Jerusalem

196 Cyril of Scythopolis, Vita Euthymii 51 = Schwarz, Kyrillos, 54.
which she also dedicated, prematurely it seems, in anticipation of her impending death. At the same time, the presence of relics at the first dedication and the need for the presence of Christian ecclesiastical authority (one or many bishops) provided, it seems, an ecclesial corrective to the Late Antique concept of *dedicatio*, thus transforming a Roman civil custom into a Christian liturgical ritual.

At the same time, while the deposition of relics of St Stephen appears to present a clear-cut case when the term *depositio* stands as one of the synonyms for the rite of dedication of that church (probably not in least because of the historical coincidence of two events), other *depositiones* in the lectionary and calendar may not always be interpreted in this way. For example, GL features three instances of depositions of relics at the church of the Apostles (Apostoleion, Matheteion) on the Mount of Olives\(^{197}\): the deposition of Peter, Paul, Thomas, John the Evangelist, John the Baptist, Isaiah, Theodore, Claudian and Tryphon on May 5,\(^{198}\) the deposition of Ephraemia and the presbyter Sabini on September 11,\(^{199}\) and the deposition of the relics of Marianus and Valens (or Marina, Valentiana, and bishop Martyrius) on October 27.\(^{200}\) Another *depositio*, of the apostle Andrew, at the same location, is featured in the John Zosime calendar on April 29.\(^{201}\) The deposition of the relics of the apostles (as well as other saints) at the Eleona corresponds with the purpose and designation of the church,

\(^{197}\) See Ovadiah, *Corpus*, 82-83.

\(^{198}\) GL 968 = Tarchnišvili 2.8/10; the calendar of John Zosime features this *depositio* on May 9 and adds the apostle Philip and Onesiphor to the list of saints (Garitte, *Calendrier*, 65).

\(^{199}\) GL 1229 = Tarchnišvili 2.42/36; Garitte, *Calendrier*, 89.

\(^{200}\) GL 1327 = Tarchnišvili 2.58/47; “Marianus and Valens” are the saints found in the John Zosime calendar (Garitte, 100).

\(^{201}\) Garitte, 63.
however, these dates cannot be associated with the dedication of that church, since the latter is confidently attributed by Eusebius to the sponsorship of empress Helena during her visit to the Holy Land in 324-25.\textsuperscript{202} Additionally, several calendar dates marked as \textit{depositiones} celebrate the deposition of relics of \textit{same} saints in several different locations: thus, the deposition of Tarachus, Probus and Andronicus is celebrated on June 27 at the Stoa of St Stephen (a term signifying a portico\textsuperscript{203}),\textsuperscript{204} on July 18 at the tomb of Rachel,\textsuperscript{205} and on September 28 at the church of St Alexander in the village of Enbigon.\textsuperscript{206} The relics of Peter and Paul make another appearance at the building of presbyter Hesychius on September 22,\textsuperscript{207} and the \textit{depositio} of John the Baptist is again featured on July 25,\textsuperscript{208} October 15 (building of Flavian),\textsuperscript{209} October 20 (village

\textsuperscript{202} Eusebius, \textit{Vita Constantini} 3.43.3.

\textsuperscript{203} Verhelst, “Lieux de station,” 51-52; cf. the description of the deposition of relics of “holy Persian martyrs” and of the “forty martyrs” in the church on Mt of Olives on May 16, 439 in \textit{Vita Petri Iberi} 49 (Horn and Phenix, 66-69). Note, however, that Verhelst’s identification of the temple in \textit{Vita Petri} as the Stoa of St Stephen’s is based on the translation of the passage by Devos in “L’année de la dédicace,” 266-67, where Devos opts to understand the adjective in the construction \textit{ܟܢܝܟܐ} \textit{ܒܗܝܟܠܐ}, literally, “in a venerable temple” (referring to the foundation of Melania on Mt of Olives) in the sense of \textit{μικρός}, thus rendering the term “le petite temple,” implying a martyrium church; cf. idem, “ΣΕΜΝΟΣ = ΜΙΚΡΟΣ chez Jean Rufus et Gérontios,” \textit{Analecta Bollandiana} 86 (1968): 258, and “L’année de la dédicace,” 279. Horn and Phenix in the recent translation of the life of Peter the Iberian do not opt for this inference and translate the term according to its literal Syriac meaning, “venerable temple” (Horn and Phenix, 67). Additionally, one must note the deposition of the “forty martyrs” at the “monastery of Peter the presbyter” featured in GL on October 13 (GL 1294 = Tarchnišvili 2.53/44). One wonders whether this “monastery of Peter the presbyter” may be connected with Peter the Iberian himself, and the entire foundation – with the “Melanian” church whose dedication was originally celebrated on May 16, 439. Similarly, could this deposition date on October 13 be connected with the “dedications” of churches which Eudocia participated in (as a sponsor) shortly before her demise on October 20, 460?

\textsuperscript{204} GL 1064 = Tarchnišvili 2.19/18.

\textsuperscript{205} GL 1096 = Tarchnišvili 2.24/22.

\textsuperscript{206} GL 1259 = Tarchnišvili 2.48/40-41.

\textsuperscript{207} GL 1256b = Tarchnišvili 2.47/40; Kekelidze, 134.

\textsuperscript{208} GL 1109 = Tarchnišvili 2.25/23.

\textsuperscript{209} GL 1299 = Tarchnišvili 2.53-54/44.
Enbiteba),\textsuperscript{210} and on November 14 (building of Aphthonius) in the calendar of John Zosime.\textsuperscript{211} This multiplication of dates connected to the depositiones of the same saints certainly attests to dissemination of the cult of certain saints throughout the Holy City, but none of these dates can be firmly connected, through other sources, to the dates for the dedication of these churches, and the terminology of the calendar and lectionary suggests that the depositions of relics took place in the churches that were already built and dedicated by the time the new set of relics has been deposited at that edifice.

5.1.4 Dedication of Churches and Palestinian Monasticism.

The vitae of the founding figures for the Palestinian monasticism, Euthymius the Great (d. 473) and Sabas the Sanctified (d. 532), both written by Cyril of Skythopolis (d. 558),\textsuperscript{212} provide evidence to some variations in the rites as were practiced in the monastic communities of Palestine in the end of the fifth-beginning of the sixth century. On May 7, 428, archbishop Juvenal of Jerusalem, with two other presbyters, including the renowned Hesychius, consecrated the church of the Lavra of Euthymius (ἐγκαινίζει τὴν τῆς λαύρας ἐκκλησίαν) and on the same occasion, ordained two monks as deacons.\textsuperscript{213} The vita gives no other details of such consecration, except for the bishop’s role as the main celebrant. The Life of Sabas, in turn, provides four episodes related to the consecrations of churches in the later half of the fifth century, corresponding to several stages that marked the expansion of Sabas’ own monastery began as a group of ascetics

\textsuperscript{210} GL 1315 = Tarchnišvili 2.56/46.

\textsuperscript{211} Garitte, 103-104.

\textsuperscript{212} ed. E. Schwartz, Kyrillos von Skythopolis, TU 49.2 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1939), 3-200.

\textsuperscript{213} Vita Euthymii 27; Schwartz, 26.
that congregated around his dwelling place in a cave on the east bank of the Kidron valley.\textsuperscript{214} The Life of Sabas describes that, as the monastic community around Sabas grew, in response to his prayer, he had a vision of a fiery column (στῦλον πυρός), which is described in the \textit{vita} with reference to Gen 28:12, the vision of Jacob’s ladder.\textsuperscript{215} The \textit{vita} makes a clear connection between the divine intervention that marks the spot chosen as “the house of God” (Gen 28:17) and the cult of relics, since it makes the earthly end of the fiery column be grounded in the place known to the readers of the \textit{vita} as the tomb of Sabas.\textsuperscript{216} The first church in this place was established in a natural cave where a space could be found for the altar enclosure and \textit{diakonikon}.\textsuperscript{217} The life describes, however, that Sabas had “adorned (κοσμήσας)” the church and ordered for the service (κανόνα) to take place there on Saturdays and Sundays, but was postponing its dedication (τὴν θεόκτιστον ἐκκλησίαν ἐγκαινίσαι ὑπερέθετο), as it would have entailed his own ordination to presbyterate.\textsuperscript{218} In the end, archbishop Sallustius of Jerusalem (in 486-494) responded to the complaints of rebellious monks and ordains Sabas to the presbyterate, apparently in Jerusalem, then proceeding to dedicate the Theoktistos church on December 12, 490. According to the report of the \textit{vita},


\textsuperscript{215} \textit{Vita Sabb.} 17; Schwartz 102.

\textsuperscript{216} Ibid.: ἐν τῷ δυτικῷ τοῦ χειμάρρου κρημνῷ, ἐνθα νῦν κατάκειται τὸ τίμιον αὐτοῦ λείψανον ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν νυνὶ ὅντων δύο ἐκκλησιῶν.

\textsuperscript{217} Joseph Patrich connects the Theoktistos church of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century with today’s church of St Nicholas of Myra in Mar Saba monastery (\textit{Sabas}, 71-72).

\textsuperscript{218} Ibid., 102. On the ascetic reticence toward the sacred orders, see
λαβὼν τὸν τε μακαρίτην Σάβαν καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους κατῆλθεν εἰς τὴν λαύραν... καὶ τὴν θεόκτιστον ἐκκλησίαν ἐγκαινίσας, θυσιαστήριον ἡγιασμένον ἐν τῇ θεοκτίστῳ κόγχῃ κατέπηξεν, πλεῖστα λείψανα ἁγίων καὶ καλλινίκων μαρτýρων ὑπὸ τὸ θυσιαστήριον καταθέμενος...

having taken the blessed Sabas and others, he [i.e. Sallustius] came down to the lavra... and having dedicated the Theoktistos church, he established in the divinely made apse the consecrated altar, depositing under the altar many relics of the holy and victorious martyrs...219

The bishop’s actions at the consecration of a church, described here as *encaenia*, include the establishment/affixing220 of the “consecrated altar” and the deposition of relics – the same actions attested for the 6th century Antiochene liturgical tradition with the Syriac canon attributed to Severus. At the same time, the use of past participle ἡγιασμένος with respect to the altar used at this ceremony may suggest that at this consecration a previously consecrated altar may have been used which was thereafter deposited (together with the relics) in the church-to-be, thereby making this space consecrated. The passage, again, does not specify which relics were deposited under the altar at the lavra of St Sabas, but merely describes the actions (deposition of the altar, deposition of relics) considered to be an episcopal prerogative at the dedication rite.

The second church, the Great or Theotokos church (μεγάλη ἐκκλησία) of the Mar Saba monastery was built in the course of the second stage of the construction on the site, when many other large buildings were added, making Mar Saba “the foremost (τὴν ὑπερέχουσαν) of all lavrae of Palestine.”221 The new church was dedicated by

219 Vita Sab. 19, Schwartz, 104.

220 Literally κατατήγνυμι means ‘stick fast’ or ‘plant firmly’ something into the ground (Liddell et al. Greek-English Lexicon, 905).

221 Vita Sab. 7, Schwartz, 91; ibid., 19, Schwartz, see Patrich, Sabas, 63.
archbishop Elias of Jerusalem (in 494-516) on July 1, 501. The description of the dedication rite is again extremely succinct, merely stating that

τῆς οὖν μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας οἰκοδομηθείσης καὶ κόσμῳ παντί διακοσμηθείσης κατελθὼν ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις Ἡλίας ἀρχιεπίσκοπος εἰς τὴν λαύραν ταύτην ἐνεκαίνισεν καὶ ἡγιασμένον κατέπηξεν ἐν αὐτῇ...

when the great church was constructed and adorned with every ornament, the archbishop among the saints Elias went down to the lavra, dedicated it and established in it the consecrated altar...222

The description corresponds to the account of the dedication of the Theoktistos church, including the mention of the “consecrated altar,” but excluding the deposition of relics under the altar which was the feature of the dedication in 490. Two other dedications are mentioned in the Life of Sabas, but these two were conducted by Sabas himself, the ordained priest and the archimandrite of his monastery. In 503-506 the conflict within the Lavra led to Sabas’ voluntary exile from which he returned only at the urgings of the patriarch Elias in 506.223 By that time the sixty monks have left the Sabas’ main compound and settled in a ravine south of Thekoa/Tuqu’ and named their compound the “New Lavra.”224 At the request of Sabas, patriarch Elias allowed him to organize the new dwelling as a “lavra” and to build a church there, for which Sabas received from the patriarch “one litre of gold.” Together with the monetary sponsorship, the patriarch gave to Sabas “authority over that place and over those who dwelled there.”225 With such authority over the New Lavra, Sabas had built (ἀκοδόμησεν) there a bakery and a church

222 Vita Sab. 32, Schwartz, 117.
224 Vita Sab. 36; Patrich, 107-109.
225 πατριάρχης δοὺς αὐτῷ ἀπὸ χειρὸς χρυσίου λίτραν μίαν παρέσχεν αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ οἰκούντων (Vita Sab. 36 = Schwartz 123).
which he himself adorned and dedicated in 507 (ἡντινα διακοσμήσας ἐνεκαίνισεν).\textsuperscript{226} We can assume that the authority to dedicate a church building was given to Sabas, a priest and archimandrite, from the patriarch who thus acted as dedicator (through monetary donation) through Sabas as if “by proxy.” However, we see further that Sabas himself acts as dedicator for the monastery of Zannos, established by two brothers, Zannos and Benjamin, before 511.\textsuperscript{227} These two monks asked for Sabas’ own cell which he built southwest of Lavra and, granting their request, Sabas sponsored the construction of a church at that site and dedicated it (τὴν ἐκκλησίαν φροντίσας ἐνεκαίνισεν).\textsuperscript{228} The vita of Sabas provides no detail with regards to the difference between the rites of dedication celebrated by the bishop of Jerusalem or by a priest. The right to dedicate a church or the altar was not wholly a prerogative of a bishop, but could have been delegated to a presbyter with sufficient authority, such as the archimandrite of a large monastery, who, in the case of the Monastery of Zannos, may not have needed such authorization at all.

The \textit{Pratum spirituale} by John Moschos (d. 619), a collection of monastic hagiographical anecdotes and a major source for the Palestinian monastic practices c. 600 CE, including liturgical customs,\textsuperscript{229} does not provide us with many details regarding the dedications of churches, but serves as a clear witness to the perception of the consecrated liturgical space as the locus of divine presence. On two occasions John relates a story which reports a vision of an angelic presence at the consecrated altar. In the first story, in

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{226} \textit{Vita Sab.} 36 = Schwartz 123.
\textsuperscript{227} Patrich, \textit{Sabas}, 158-161.
\textsuperscript{228} \textit{Vita Sab.} 42 = Schwartz 133.
\end{flushright}
the words of some abba Leontius from the lavra of St Theodosius the Great, tells of such vision as the monk comes to receive the eucharist at the church on Sunday:

Coming down one Sunday, I went to the church to receive communion, and coming in I saw an angel standing on the right side of the altar (ἄγγελον παρεστῶτα ἐν τῷ δεξιῷ μέρει τοῦ θυσιαστήριον). Having received, I departed to my cell. And the voice came to me, saying, “Because this altar is sanctified, it was entrusted to me to remain by it (Ἐξότου ἡγιάσθη τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦτο, ἐγὼ ἐπιστεύθην παραμένειν ἐν αὐτῷ).”

This passage refers to a well-attested practice of Palestinian and Egyptian ascetics to spend the weekdays in seclusion of their cells, and to attend the eucharist on Sundays and feasts, although there were occasions of ascetics abstaining from communal eucharistic celebration on Sunday as well. The “lavra” mentioned in this passage appears to be the New Lavra, originally established by the monks of Mar Saba monastery who separated themselves due to a conflict, and the altar in question was the altar of the church of the New Lavra, built and consecrated by Sabbas himself in the 507. In another passage, a

---

230 Pratum spirituale 4; PG 87/3:2856.

231 See also Historia monachorum in Aegypto 20.7, ed. André Jean Festugière, SH 34 (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1961), 120-21; Pratum spirituale 122, 127. It was the practice of Palestinian monastic communities to hold eucharistic assembly on Sunday, as it was in the koinobia of Theoctistus, the lavrae of Euthymius and Pharan; later, the days of communal eucharist came to include Saturday, as in lavra of Mar Saba; see the overview in Patrich, Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism, 244-253.

232 For a theological justification of such practice see Anastasius of Sinai, Quaestiones et responsiones, ed. Marcel Richard, Joseph A. Munitiz, CCSG 59 (Turnhout: Brepols/Leuven: University Press, 2006), 12-14; and more broadly on the eremitic eucharistic practices, Taft, Communion, Thanksgiving, and Concluding Rites, 349-361.

233 A. Kazhdan, “Sabas,” ODB 3.1823; Patrich, Sabas, 107-110. In 555, the lavra was repopulated with 120 orthodox monks due to the second Origenist controversy and, hence, by the 7th century it was quite a large establishment (Patrich, Sabas, 109).

234 ὁμοδόμησεν αὐτοῖς ἁρτοκοπεῖον καὶ ἑκκλησίαν, ἣν τνα διακοσμήσας ἐνεκαίνισεν τῷ ἐξηκοστῷ ἐνάτῳ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἡλικίας χρόνῳ; Vita Sabbæ 36, ed. E. Schwartz, Kyriillos von Skythopolis, TU 49.2 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1939), 123. It is notable that it is Sabas himself who performs the dedication of the altar here, as opposed to the dedication of the Theoctistos church and of the Theotokos church of Great Lavra in December 490 and on July 1, 501, which was performed by patriarch Elias (V. Sabb. 19, 104; 32, 117).
similar vision is described, this time in relation to another Sabbaite ascetic, abba Barnabas who due to an injury was forced to abandon his cell and move to the lavra of the Towers by the Jordan. When another hermit comes to take Barnabas’ place in his cell, he recounts a vision which he experienced:

After abba Barnabas the hermit came up from his cave to the (lavra of the) Towers, and spent some time there, another hermit came into his cave, and when he came in, he saw an angel of God standing at the altar, which the elder had made in his cave and consecrated (καὶ εἰσελθὼν θεωρεῖ ἄγγελον Θεοῦ ἑστῶτα ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, ὅπερ ἦν ποιήσας ὁ γέρων ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ σπηλαίου, καὶ ἁγιάσας). And the hermit said to the angel: “What are you doing here?” The angel said, “I am the angel of the Lord, and what was consecrated by him, was entrusted to me by God (Ἄγγελός εἰμι τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ἀφ’ οὗ ἡγιάσθη, ἐμοὶ ἐπιστεύθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ).”

Evidently, the altar in question here refers to the altar built and consecrated in the ascetic’s own cell where presumably it was used for a regular celebration or reception of the eucharist in his solitude, although the passage does not specify how the altar was used or the frequency of eucharistic celebration upon it. These two stories, put in parallel, show that no distinction is made between the altar in the cathedral church, consecrated through solemn ceremony and the altar at the cell of an ascetic: by virtue of being sanctified both are equally holy, as is evidenced by the presence of an angel at the altar, even when this altar is abandoned out of necessity (as in Pratum spirituale 10).

235 On this lavra, see Patrich, Sabas, 118, 121; also mentioned in Pratum spirituale 5-9, 40, 100.

236 Pratum 10, PG 87/3:2860.

237 On devotional eucharistic celebration in solitude, see Taft, Communion, 356-58, 366-70.

238 It is not clear whether the presence of an angel at the altar table was to ensure the uninterrupted eucharistic ministry: there is no hard evidence that Palestinian monks did practice devotional eucharistic celebration in their cells as early as the seventh century (see references to Taft’s Communion above). The trope of an angel as liturgical minister, however, is not unknown in the ascetic literature: thus, in Palladius’ account, an angel gives communion to a younger monk when a priest neglects to do so (Lausiac History 18.25). Note, however, the position of an angel to the right side of the altar which is similar to the position of abba Dometianos as the minister with a λειτουργικὸν ῥπαστήριον (liturgical fan) in one of the early
seems clear from these stories, as well as from the reference to the dedication of the church of the New Lavra that in the sixth/seventh century it was still possible for the ordained priests to consecrate an altar in a private chapel or in a community church without the presence of a bishop – however, with the sanction of the latter.\textsuperscript{239}

5.1.5 The Rites of Foundation and Dedication of a Church in the Georgian Lectionary.

In addition to the canon of scriptural readings for the calendrical dates of the Jerusalem liturgical year, the manuscripts of the Georgian lectionary include an appendix containing the lectionary entries for the feasts of common categories of saints: Virgin Mary (GL 1437-1445), the Cross (§1446-1454), apostles (§1455-1468), prophets (§1469-1474), martyrs (§1475-1492), holy bishops (§1493-1507), righteous, blessed ones, and confessors (§1508-1522), and finally, holy kings (§1523-1527).\textsuperscript{240} Following the readings and hymnography of a divine liturgy for the feasts of these categories of saints, the lectionary includes the canons of scriptural readings for two other occasions, [1] “when you will lay the foundation of the church (აღწევების უფლება),” i.e. the foundation of the church (§1528-1534),\textsuperscript{241} and [2] the dedication of a church (დახვრეწავების უფლება; §1535-1559).\textsuperscript{242} These lectionary entries do not contain an explicit description of the rites for foundation and dedication of a church, being rather instances of the “miraculous assurance of a Saracene” story in \textit{Vita Euthymii} by Cyril of Skythopolis (Schwartz, 45).

\textsuperscript{239} \textit{Vita Sabb.} 32; Schwartz, 117.

\textsuperscript{240} Tarchnišvili 2.75-87/61-70.

\textsuperscript{241} Tarchnišvili 2.88-89/71.

\textsuperscript{242} Tarchnišvili 2.89-91/71-74.
confined to a list of scriptural passages to be used on these occasions, but still it appears that the analysis of this evidence of the Georgian lectionaries was unfortunately missing from the attempts to sketch early history of the rites for church dedication.\textsuperscript{243}

**Foundation of a Church.**

The lectionary for the laying of foundation of a church contains no other rubric that would allow to situate it in a liturgical context, except for the title of the rite, indicating when the set of readings in question was supposed to be used. As a regular canon of readings, common in the Georgian lectionary, the scriptural passages for the foundation of a church include the initial psalm 89:17, 16 (“Make straight the work of our hands… Look upon your servants and your works”), the readings from Genesis (28:5-29:35), Proverbs (3:19-23), Isaiah (65:21-66:2), Haggai 1:1-15, and 1 Corinthians (3:9-16). The Alleluia ps. 86:1 (“His foundation is upon the holy mountains” is followed by the gospel passage containing the confession of Peter and Christ’s promise to the church, which we have already seen employed on several occasions at the commemorations of dedications in Jerusalem (Matthew 16:13ff). The recurring theme in these scriptural passages naturally pertains to the laying of foundation at a divine chosen spot, be it a physical location (Bethel in Gen 28:18) or the apostolic work as the grounding for the church (1 Cor 3:10, ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον ἐθηκα). The lectionary for the foundation of the church does not make clear, however, whether this were the readings

\textsuperscript{243} With the exception of occasional references, such as Leeb, *Die Gesänge im Gemeindegottesdienst von Jerusalem*, 76-78, who refers to the use of common psalmic text in the lectionaries for dedication festivals, including the one under discussion here, but does not reflect on the service itself; also see a similar allusion in Findikyan, “Armenian Hymns on the Church and the Cross,” 76 n. 43.
used at the celebration of a eucharistic liturgy or as a scriptural component of a non-
eucharistic ritual with scriptural passages specifically selected to suit the occasion of
church foundation.244

The comparison of the evidence of the Georgian lectionary with the heritage of
another liturgical tradition heavily influenced by Jerusalem rite, the liturgy of the
Armenian church, may provide some assistance in contextualizing the rite of church
foundation as specifically a non-eucharistic ritual of a ‘proclamation-service’ type. The
Armenian rite for the foundation of the church (հիմնարկութիւն սրբոյ եկեղեցւոյ), as
featured in the earliest extant Maštoc’, the ninth-century ms. Venice 457,245 consists of
the following elements:

- psalmody (Pss 48, 84, 87)
- laying of a single rock for the foundation of a church, with other 11 stones on
  the four corners of the site
- intercessory prayer by the bishop
- anointing of the stones with the formula “May this stone be blessed…”
- scriptural readings
- prayer “Lord our God who have been pleased to build your church…”
- diaconal proclamation
- bishop delineates the ground of the site of the sanctuary with a “pickaxe”
- II canon of readings
- prayer = Daniel 9:4-19

The ritual, as it appears in the late ninth-century Maštoc’,246 is shown in a developed
form, including two episcopal prayers, diaconal intercessions, and ritual actions. Due to

244 On the Verkündigungsgottesdienst, a ‘proclamation service,’ marked by such selection of
readings and characteristic for Jerusalem rite, see Rolf Zerfass, Schriftdnung im Kathedraloffizium
Jerusalems, 37-38.

245 The English translation of the ms. text, collated with mss. San Lazaro I.5.199 (13th c.) and BM
cod. Orient. 2682 (14th c.), is found in Conybeare, Rituale Armenorum, 1-3; the Armenian text is consulted
after its partial publication in the catalogue by B. Sargisean and G. Sargsean, Մայր ցուցակ
ձեռագրաց Մատենադարանի Մխիթարեանց ի Վենետիկ (Venice: S. Lazar, 1966), 3.5-7.
its genre, the Georgian lectionary cannot contain any elements which would indicate whether any of the ceremonies that are extant in the Armenian recension of the rite, were ever present in the practice of the church of Jerusalem. The comparison of the lectionary readings for the rite of foundation of a church shows, however, a definite connection:

\[246\] See on the question of dating *Venice 457*, Findikyan, “Armenian Ritual of the Dedication of a Church,” 76 n. 3.
The comparison shows that the lectionary in the Armenian ritual of foundation of a church represents an expanded version of the hagiopolite Georgian lectionary for the same occasion, extending the number of readings from the original five (Gen, Prov, Isaiah, Haggai, 1 Corinthians) to eight (with the exclusion of the Genesis passage) and appending the second, shorter canon of readings, to be recited at the site where the altar was to be constructed.\textsuperscript{249} Due to an apparent close connection between the readings for the foundation of a church in GL and the first canon of readings in \textit{Maštoc’}, it can be assumed that the first canon of readings belongs to an earlier layer of the rite, directly

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Foundation of the church, GL} & \textbf{Foundation of the church in \textit{Maštoc’}\textsuperscript{247}} \\
\hline
Ps 89:17 \textit{The work of our hands.} & [I canon] \\
V. 16 \textit{Look upon your servants and your works}.\textsuperscript{248} & Ps 89:17b \textit{Make straight for us, O Lord, the works of our hands.} \\
5. 1 Cor 3:9-16 & 5. Zachariah 2:1-5 \\
Alleluia Ps 86:1 & 6. Zachariah 4:1-9 \\
Matthew 16:13ff. & 7. Haggai 2:4-9 \\
& 8. 1 Cor 3:9-15 \\
& Alleluia Ps 21:1 \\
& \textbf{Matthew 16:13-19} \\
& \textbf{Prayer of the foundation} \\
& [II canon] \\
& Ps 86:1 \\
& 1. Isaiah 60:1-7 \\
& 2. 1 Peter 2:1-10 \\
& Alleluia, Ps 84 \\
& Matthew 7:21-29 \\
& \textbf{Prayer of Daniel (9:4-19)} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{247} \textit{Rituale Armenorum} 2-3; cf. Ղիրք մեծ մաշտոց կոչեցեալ, 159-166 (further cited as \textit{Great Maštoc’}).

\textsuperscript{248} The Lathal ms. has for \textit{p’salmuni} and \textit{dasdebeli} Ps 89:17, 1 instead (Kekelidze, 155).

\textsuperscript{249} “And they enter for the office into the place where the altar is being set up, and the following canon is performed” (Conybeare, 3).
deriving from the liturgical rite of Jerusalem. If so, one should consider the possibility that the prayer recited by a bishop, that concludes the first canon of readings, may also derive from the liturgical use of the Holy City. None of the extant Georgian recensions of the hagiopolite euchologion (Sinai Georgian O.12, 54, 66, Tbilisi A 86) contain a prayer for the foundation of a church – however, as noted by Conybeare, this same prayer is widely represented in the early Byzantine euchologia that originate from Constantinople and Southern Italy. The earliest instance of this prayer is certainly found in the late 8th century euchologion Barberini gr. 336 (f. 144v-145r), but a number of important 10th-13th century witnesses to Byzantine euchologion contain the text of this prayer as well: the 10th century St Peters burg gr. 226 (Euchologion of Porphyry Uspensky; f. 98r-v), RGB gr. 27/Sebastianov 474 (f. 131v), Grottaferrata Γβ. VII (f. 105v), Grottaferrata Γβ. IV (f. 107r-v), Sinai gr. 959 (f. 71r), the 11th century “euchologion of Strategios” Paris NB Coislin 213 (f. 8r), the 12th century Bodleianus Auct. 5.13 (f. 122v-123r), Ottoboni gr. 434 (f. 59v-60r), Vatican gr. 1554 (f. 104v),

250 Conybeare, 18, citing Goar, Euchologion, 606.
254 ed. Passarelli, 145.
256 ed. Duncan, 9.
Sinai gr. 973 (f. 94),\textsuperscript{258} the 13th century Grottaferrata Γ.β. I (f. 73v-74r), and others.\textsuperscript{259} It should be noted for the sake of comparative analysis that many of the Byzantine euchologia that contain the prayer for the foundation of a church belong to the type of presbyteral euchologion, e.g. not containing the rite for dedication of a church, ordination etc.. The corollary from such place of this prayer can be that in the Byzantine rite this prayer (and hence the performance of the ritual for the founding of a church) could be used by presbyters, while in the Armenian tradition it appears still to be an episcopal privilege. The Greek text of the prayer shows relative stability in the number of Byzantine euchologies and thus can reasonably be proven to be the text underlying the Armenian Maštoc’ recension, as seen from many parallels between to text, which I tried to demonstrate in the table here, marking some (not all) variants in the Greek:

\textit{Lord our God who upon the/this rock was pleased to build your holy church – you, Lord, [for] we offer you your own, to build for your praise and glory, this house, which is about to be built, replenish with your exceeding heavenly beneficence, and be the one who repays our debts, strengthen them who minister. Keep them free from sickness and hurt, and keep its foundations untouched and unshakable and sure. Complete and fulfill this house, to the end that in it we may with all songs of praise and glory magnify and bless the honorable and gracious name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, now and eve.}\textsuperscript{260}

\textsuperscript{257} ed. Jacob, 329.

\textsuperscript{258} Dmitrievskij, 2.114.

\textsuperscript{259} See also Goar, \textit{Euchologion}, 485.

\textsuperscript{260} The English translation is adapted from Conybeare, 2, with reference to Sargisean and Sargsean, 6, and \textit{Mec Maštoc’}, 163, which contains some important divergencies from the \textit{Venice 457} text.
The Armenian prayer for the foundation of a church thus appears to be a rather faithful, if somewhat creative, adaptation of the early version of the Greek text preserved in the Byzantine euchologia, as seen from the absence in the former of some variants and additions to the Greek that appear in some later eleventh to thirteenth-century euchologies (COI, Grottaferrata Γ.β. 1, EBE 662). The prayer, both in Greek and Armenian, speaks of the church/house “which is being built” (κτιζομένου), and refers to its foundations (θεμέλια), quite consistently with the recurring theme of the scriptural readings we find in the Georgian Lectionary and the Maštoc’. The expression in the Byzantine prayer τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέρομεν οἱ δοῦλοί σου, Χριστέ, Ἰουστινιανός καὶ Θεοδώρα κτλ. has been most famously associated with the oblation petition in the anaphora of John Chrysostom, as well as with the inscription on the altar in Hagia Sophia, as reported by Cedrenus. While it is thus most readily associated with Constantinople, Taft has shown this formula to be widely used in the anaphoras and inscriptions associated with “Antiochene sphere of liturgical
influence,” but also with Palestine, albeit not in the anaphora of James. The extant inscriptions from Northern Syria and Palestine where the formula τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν is used and which Taft has analysed (e.g. the Riha Chalice, baptismal font on Mt Nebo et al.) usually accompany the dedication of a material object or building for the ecclesiastical, sacred use and, therefore, the use of such formula in the prayer for the founding of a church, which construction would likewise require sponsorship and donation, would be quite appropriate. Thus, even though it is difficult with certainty to assign this prayer to the hagiopolite ecclesiastical milieu, such assumption would not be inconceivable. The use of this prayer in the Armenian rite for the foundation of a church, alongside the hagiopolite canon of readings, remains the strongest argument in favor of such assumption.

**The Dedication of a Church.**

The common lectionary for the “dedication of a church” (ობჰორჯჰორი ღიალო ჭქმა) in the Georgian Lectionary of Jerusalem represents another characteristic case, common for this source, when the abundance of lectionary data is contrasted with scarcity of ritual context for the listed readings. The set of readings as it appears in the Paris ms. of GL, which Tarchnišvili mostly follows, consists of five canons of readings, the first four of which consist of a psalm, one OT reading, one Epistle and the gospel lesson (§1535-1548). The fifth set of readings, designated “for the liturgy (ღორმალი)

---


263 Ibid., 325-26.
"includes the introit troparion (oxitaj), a psalm, two OT readings, one epistle, and the gospel reading (§1549-1553). GL also includes the readings for the second day of dedication, again repeating the pattern “psalm-OT-epistle-gospel,” and instructs to use the readings for the octave of Encaenia on September 13 for the days 3 to 7 after the dedication of a church.\textsuperscript{264} The divergence from the lectionary of the Encaenia octave for the second day after the dedication of a church is understandable, given the growth in prominence of the festival of the Exaltation of the Cross in Jerusalem practice by the sixth/seventh centuries.

The presence of five canons of readings for the occasion of the dedication of a church, with only one of these designated for the use at the divine liturgy, presents a puzzle which, however, can be partly unraveled if we pay close attention to the rubrics which accompany these readings in the Lathal ms. of the GL, published by Kekelidze in 1912.\textsuperscript{265} The manuscript in question breaks off partly through the list of readings for the dedication of a church, following the reading from Haggai 1:14 from the third canon of readings,\textsuperscript{266} and this may be the reason the important rubrics were relegated to footnote in the critical edition of GL. However, in this manuscript, each of the first three canons of readings for the dedication is preceded by the following notes:

- before the 1\textsuperscript{st} set of readings θαυμάζοντες ἔνθαλς (from the southern side)
- before the 2\textsuperscript{nd} “ “ “ ἄγιοι Κανοναρίδες (from the eastern)
- before the 3\textsuperscript{rd} “ “ “ ἄγιοι Κανοναρίδες (from the northern side)

\textsuperscript{264} “as in the festival of Encaenia (vit’arc’a enkeniisa zatikisaj ars)” – GL 1558 = Tarchnišvili 2.91/73.

\textsuperscript{265} Kekelidze, \textit{Ierusalimskij kanonar’}, 155-56.

\textsuperscript{266} Ibid., 156.
Considering the ablative form of these one-line instructions (if we trust Kekelidze’s transcription of the ms.)\(^\text{267}\) as indicating direction \textit{whence} these readings need to be proclaimed,\(^\text{268}\) we find here a sequence of stations which, as we can assume, were designed to interrupt an circumambulatory procession inside or outside the church. The sequence of “sides”/“parts” – south-east-north – suggests a counterclockwise direction of a procession with three stops along the way. If we remember, however, that the exposition of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} ‘station’ is precisely where the Lathal ms. breaks off, then we can situate the 4\textsuperscript{th} set of readings as designed to be proclaimed from the \textit{western} side (of the church), i.e. supposedly at the very doors. The canon of readings for the eucharistic liturgy that follows in the lectionary thus presumably comes after the solemn first entrance of the clergy and people into the church. The arrangement of the readings, together with the rubrics will look, therefore, as follows:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{at the southern side [of the church]}\(^\text{269}\) & Ps 149:1, 2 \\
& Exodus 40:15-32 \\
& Hebrews 3:1-6 \\
& John 7:37-42 \\
\textbf{at the eastern side}\(^\text{270}\) & Ps 92:5, 1 \\
& 4 Kings (LXX) 13:14-21 \\
& Hebrews 8:7-9:10 \\
& Matthew 16:13-18(?) \\
\textbf{at the northern side}\(^\text{271}\) & Ps 67:27, 66:2 \\
& Haggai 1:13-2:9 \\
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\(^{267}\) Tarchnišvili in his edition consistently takes these rubrics to be in the nominative, rather than ablative form, thus making an important divergence from Kekelidze’s reading (see GL 1535 n. 3, 1539 n. 1, 1542 n. 5 = Tarchnišvili 2.89-90).

\(^{268}\) "Der Ablativ bezeichnet den örtlichen Ausgangspunkt einer Bewegung” (Franz Zorell, \textit{Grammatik zur altgeorgischen Bibelübersetzung} [Rome, 1930], 105).

\(^{269}\) GL 1535-1538 = Tarchnišvili 2.89/71-72.

\(^{270}\) GL 1539-1542 = Tarchnišvili 2.89-90/72.

\(^{271}\) GL 1543-1545 = Tarchnišvili 2.90/72-73.
As it has been noted, the sequence of readings for the liturgy of dedication of a church and for the octave of this dedication partially depends on the readings for the Encaenia on September 13. More precisely, however, we can speak of interconnection between the liturgical readings of Encaenia and the readings for the dedication of a church: on September 13, the first OT reading, from the Wisdom of Solomon, is directed to be found in the service “for the dedication of a church” (§1237) where it is cited in full (9:1-19; §1550). On the other hand, it has been noted that the days 3 to 7 of the octave of the dedication of a church derive their lectionary from the corresponding days of the Encaenia octave (§1558), while the lectionary for the four stations and the liturgy on the occasion of a church dedication contains the readings also found in the menologion of the

---

272 GL 1545-1548 = Tarchnišvili 2.90/73.
273 GL 1549-1553 = Tarchnišvili 2.91/73.
274 GL 1554-1557.
275 GL 1558.
Georgian Lectionary for such feasts of dedication as September 13, October 23, and others. As Leeb has noted, the verses of the psalms used in the rite of dedication are also used for the feasts of dedication of specific churches around Jerusalem, e.g.

Ps 92:5, 1 – also used for the dedication of the building of Ephremia (Aug. 30), and for the dedication of the church of St George;  
Ps 83:4, 2 – also used on the seventh Saturday of Easter, and on October 20;  
Ps 25 – for the dedication of the church at Bethany, the dedication of Sophia Nea (Sept. 21), and of “Golgotha near Bethlehem”/commemoration of Abraham on October 9.  

The gospel reading for the second ‘station’ of the dedication rite, Matthew 16:13ff., appears several times throughout the Georgian lectionary: in addition to its position on the fifth day of the Encaenia octave, it is set as the reading on the total of seven other dedication feasts in the calendar (22.06., 30.08., 07.10., 23.10., 10.11., 20.11., 23.12.).

The epistle and the gospel reading used at the fourth ‘station,’ which, as we have suggested, may have preceded the entrance into the church for the celebration of the liturgy, has been taken from the liturgy for the day of Encaenia on September 13 (GL 1239-1240). Finally, the entrance troparion (oxitaj) for the liturgy on the day of dedication is identical with the oxitaj for the Encaenia (“Adorned more than the sun”).

Significantly, this hymn, the full text of which is found in the corpus of Georgian hagiopolite hymnography in the Iadgari, makes clear allusions to the Sepulchre of Christ as the focal point of the dedication liturgy. However, the epistle and gospel readings for the liturgy of church dedication (Heb 13:7-16; Matthew 23:1ff) do not correspond

276 Leeb, *Die Gesänge*, 76-78; Leeb’s analysis includes his “summaries” for the significance or theological idea behind the use of each psalms, Fraser unfortunately had mistaken one of these summaries for an example of an actual liturgical chant (Fraser, “Feast of Encaenia in the Fourth Century,” 204).

277 See the discussion of this hymn further.
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to those of the Encaenia, but rather find parallel in a feast present in the Armenian lectionary of Jerusalem, “The Dedication of All Altars that they Erect,” which as it has been suggested, was an occasional feast for the dedication of an altar in a newly built church. 279  It is plausible, therefore, that it was that very feast for the dedication of altars, attested in only one ms. of the Armenian lectionary (ms. Paris 44), which constituted a core around which the lectionary for the rite of dedication was formed, with the further addition of the elements from the feast of Encaenia (readings before the doors of the church, hymnography for the liturgy) and from other feasts of dedication scattered throughout the Jerusalem liturgical year.

The arrangement of readings in the Georgian hagiopolite dedication rite into five stational units with the four units corresponding to four processional stations around the four corners/walls of a newly built church, and the fifth – to the readings for the divine liturgy finds evident structural parallels in the Armenian rite for the dedication of a church, available to scholarship through Conybeare’s translation and through the study thereof by M. Daniel Findikyan. 280  The structure of the Armenian rite for church dedication, as it appears in the earliest Maštoc’, ms. Venice 457 (ninth-tenth cent.), and

278 There is some confusion in the Georgian lectionary regarding the liturgical gospel reading for the dedication of a church: the rubric in GL 1553 calls to seek the appointed gospel reading from Matthew on the fifth day of the Encaenia octave (invenies ab Encaeniis die V). The extant rubric for that day in GL 1253 4d (preserved in the Lathal lectionary only, cf. Kekelidze, 133) again refers to the reading from Matthew, providing the incipit of Matt 16:13 (ut veniebat Iesus in locos), but requiring to seek the whole reading on the seventh Thursday after Easter. That day of the Pentecost period, however, has the reading from John 7:37-42 (GL 871 = Tarchnišvili 1.168/134), which incidentally is also featured in the rite of dedication in GL (§ 1538). Most crucially, the incipit that the rubric in GL 1553 provides, extant in the Paris ms. only (tunc dicebat Iesus populo illo), corresponds exactly to Matt 23:1, not to Matt 16:13 or John 7:37. For this reason, I have assumed that the liturgical gospel reading of the rite of dedication has preserved the ancient canon of readings for the “Dedication of All Altars” (Heb 13- Matt 23), slightly changing the arrangement of verses.

279 Renoux, PO 36.2, 366-67; see Findikyan, “Armenian Ritual of the Dedication,” 108-09, and also above ch. 3.

280 Conybeare, Rituale Armenorum, 3-10; Findikyan, “Armenian Ritual of the Dedication.”
the liturgical commentaries by Yovhannes Ojnec’i and Step’anos Siwnec’i, studied by Findikyan, similarly incorporates several canons of readings, but with the inclusion of the rites for the entry to the church, the installation of the altar, and its consecration. I cite the structure of the rite here, with the reference to the scriptural readings (including the psalms) used in the course of the ritual281:

- rites of entry into the church [Ps 119-121, 117, 83]
- installation of the altar [Ps 83, 83:4, 22, 25]
- anointing of the altar [Ps 22]
- consecration of the outside of the building [Ps 99]
- vesting of the altar [Ps 92]
- eucharist

The Armenian ritual of dedication thus also incorporates five canons of scriptural readings, with the first canon preceding the service for the installation and consecration of the altar, and four canons appended at the end of the dedication rite, including the canon for the liturgy of the word. Just as the corpus of the scriptural readings in GL, these five canons of the Armenian rite of dedication are characterized by the reiteration of the same scriptural texts centered on the theme of altar and temple, providing exegetical connections between the sacred space of the OT Scriptures and the liturgical space of the Christian cult. At the same time, while providing a significant structural parallel to the

organization of the dedication readings in GL, the Armenian rite incorporates different readings and in a different order, as the comparison of the readings would reveal, suggesting a possible further development of the original Jerusalem model. The relation between the Georgian hagiopolite rite of dedication and the Armenian ritual, however, is not limited to structural similarity. Thus, the reading for the liturgy of the Word (canon IV) in the Armenian rite also contains the reading on Isaiah’s vision in the Temple (Isa 6:1-10), as the second OT liturgical reading in the Georgian rite.\textsuperscript{282} The introductory canon of the Armenian rite maintains the same gospel reading as in one of the processional stations of the rite in GL, which is identical with the one used in GL for the hagiopolite feast of Encaenia (here: John 10:22-31).\textsuperscript{283} Additionally, the Armenian rite partially preserves the canon of readings (epistle+gospel) for the feast of the “Dedication of All Altars” (Armenian Lectionary) which by the time of the Georgian Lectionary had become the lectionary for the liturgy on the occasion of the dedication of a church (GL 1553). In the Armenian rite this set of readings (Heb 13:10-16, Matt 23:1-22) does not appear as the readings for the liturgy of the Word, but as the epistle and gospel readings for the canon II in the conclusion of the dedication rite,\textsuperscript{284} but the presence of this canon in both the Armenian and Georgian lectionary suggest a clear continuity between the arrangement of scriptural readings in the Armenian rite of dedication and the hagiopolite tradition.

\textsuperscript{282} Conybeare, 10; GL 1551.

\textsuperscript{283} Conybeare, 3.

\textsuperscript{284} Conybeare, 9; Findikyan, “Armenian Ritual,” 108-09, 112; as noted by Renoux (PO 36.2, 367 n.1) and Findikyan (109), this canon of readings also appears in the 6th century Syriac lectionary in the ms. \textit{BM Add. 14528} (Burkitt, “Early Syriac Lectionary System,” 13), although this set of readings “for the dedication of an altar” is closer to the canon in the Armenian Lectionary, than to obviously later documents such as GL and \textit{Venice 457}. 298
Regarding the origin of the four canons at the end of the Armenian dedication rite, Findikyan offers two possible scenarios based on the interpretation of the scant information in the Armenian sources: 1) the Armenian rite of dedication had the canon of readings in the beginning and at the conclusion of the rite of dedication, the canon at the conclusion of the rite perhaps “was borrowed from the old feast of the Dedication of all the Altars” and was followed by the canon for the liturgy of the Word; or 2) the four canons “were added to further solemnize the blessing of the four exterior sides of the church at the end of the Dedication service.”

Findikyan suggests that in this case this solemnization was a later addition, and such scenario does present some problems: the arrangement of three canons + the canon for the Liturgy of the Word is insufficient for the blessing of four exterior walls, and, secondly, the Armenian rite for church dedication does already contain the exterior blessing/consecration of the walls of the church which follows the consecration of the altar and precedes its vesting, but does not include any scriptural readings. At the same time, it may be possible to see the origin of the four (five) canon arrangement in the Armenian rite in the hagiopolite rite of church dedication which, as it seems, presupposed the circumambulation of the church with four canons of readings recited at the four sides thereof. The Armenian tradition may have acquired this arrangement of scriptural readings into five sets, but redacted and rearranged the scriptural readings, further complicating the structure of the rite by the insertion of the rites for the installation and consecration of the altar, of which there is no evident trace in

286 Ibid., 109-110.
287 Conybeare, 7; Findikyan, 103.
the GL ritual. Thus, I partly concur with Findikyan’s second scenario that the multiple canons of readings were originally connected with the blessing of the external walls of the church, but I suggest that these canons have lost this original function when the five-canon structure was adapted in the practice of the Armenian church.

One important illuminating characteristic of the Armenian rite of dedication which may help to add more context to the rite of dedication in GL is the presence of diaconal proclamations with the prayer of the celebrant at the conclusion of every unit of scriptural readings, with the exception of the canon of readings for the liturgy of the Word:

- after the introductory canon prayer of Daniel (9:4-19)
- after the canon I prayers “We beseech you…”
  “You who are feared…”
- after the canon II prayers “Lord of Lords and God of Gods…”
  “We pray you, O Lord, benevolent…”
- after the canon III prayer of Solomon (1 Kgs 8:15-54)

Two of these prayers are scriptural texts, while the prayers for canons I and II consist from the units of two prayers interspersed with the pax. As it was mentioned, GL has no reference to any such prayer or “double-prayer” units at the end of the scriptural readings, but the reference to a “prayer” (loc’vaj) in the rite for the consecration of a portable altar in Tbilisi A 86, which I will discuss further, suggests that the presence of such unit in the Georgian hagiopolite rite of dedication cannot be excluded.

At the conclusion of the list of readings for the processional circumambulation of a church and the octave of dedication, GL places three units of psalmody (p’salmuni), with the intriguing rubric “Psalms of dedication when they are needed to you”
apparently providing additional psalmic texts for the use in the ritual of church dedication. The psalm verses listed in GL are as follows:

- tone 4, *Enter into his gates, Shout with jubilation* (Ps 99:4, 2)
- tone 3, *I will enter before the altar, I will confess to you* (Ps 42:4, 4c)
- tone 3, *I am like a fruitful olive [in the house of the Lord], I will confess to you, for you have made* (Ps 51:10, 11)

The lectionary provides no context for these passages and hence it is not possible definitively to determine whether these psalm verses were to be used as introit chant or processional psalmody, but this can be speculated based on the content of the verses, especially Ps 99 and 42. Ps 99 appears in the Armenian rite of dedication, where it accompanies the reentry of the bishop and the clergy after the procession with the consecration of the exterior of the building:

> Thereafter [the bishop] makes a circuit of the north and west sides [variant: the whole], and proceeds to enter the church, saying [Ps 99:1]: *Raise a joyful shout to the Lord, all the earth.*

Admittedly, the lectionary in GL for the dedication of a church shows a different arrangement of the scriptural passages that probably does not allow for the use of this ‘extra’ psalmody in the context of the four scriptural units that were most likely read in the course of the procession around the building. The psalmody placed at the end of the lectionary for the dedication is apparently a collection of additional propers to be used in the case of necessity – however, the possibility of the use thereof in the course of a procession is strongly suggested.

---

288 GL 1559 = Tarchnişvili 2.91/73-74. The editor translates this rubric, rather obscurely, *psalmi dedicationis, quando opus erunt* (ibid., 73).

289 Conybeare, 7; Findikyan comments that Ps 99 “is of course entirely appropriate accompanying the procession reentering the church” (“Armenian Ritual,” 103).
5.2 The Feast of Dedication in the Georgian Iadgari

5.2.1 The Hagiopolite Tropologion/Iadgari: Status Quaestionis

Compared to the Georgian lectionary, the collection of liturgical hymnography of Jerusalem origin that had survived in Georgian translation has been less accessible to many scholars, but its crucial significance for the early history of liturgical chant in the East and West is now broadly recognized.\(^{290}\) The *iadgari* (იადგარი) is a title for a Georgian translation of a liturgical source that was written originally in Greek and

probably bore the title τροπολόγιον,\textsuperscript{291} which included the proper troparia for the public evening office (vespers), morning office (matins), and the divine liturgy for all of the seasons of the liturgical year: fixed feasts, Lent-Easter-Pentecost, Sunday and weekday Octoechos, thus incorporating monthly, daily, and annual liturgical cycles into one liturgical book.\textsuperscript{292} Initially thought to have survived in only one manuscript, the so-called “Papyrus-parchment tropologion” H 2123,\textsuperscript{293} the ancient redaction of the tropologion is now known to be represented in the total of seven manuscripts, the majority of which comes from the “old” collection of St Catherine’s Monastery on Mt Sinai: in addition to the above mentioned H 2123,\textsuperscript{294} these are Sinai Georgian O.18 (tenth cent.),\textsuperscript{295} Sinai

\textsuperscript{291} Davit Čubinašvili’s lexicon identifies the word iadgari to be of Persian origin with the meaning of ‘gift, letter for the sake of memorial’ (\textit{K’art ul-rusuli lek’sikoni}, 575); the reason for application of such term to the collection of liturgical hymns was found to be either the expansion of an earlier collection of saints’ memorial hymns (N. Marr) or the use of hymnography for memorization (L. Xevsuriani). Gérard Garitte, at the same time, pointed out the rubric in ms. Sinai Georgian O.11 which identified the collection of hymnography as “iadgari- tropolojin,” suggesting that \textit{tropologion} may have been the original designation of the source. The use of the title \textit{tropologion} is known among the Greek collections of hymnography where it was found to be applied to collections of various contents, such as mss. Sinai gr. 759 (eleventh cent.), Sinai gr. 789 (twelfth cent.). The more recent Sardshweladse-Fähnrich lexicon renders the meaning of the term iadgari consistently with its liturgical function as “Hymnensammlung” (\textit{ADW} 536).

\textsuperscript{292} The development of the Byzantine liturgical books in the post-iconoclastic period featured the separation of previously unified hymnographic collection into several books: \textit{Menaion} (fixed feasts and saints’ memorials), \textit{Triodion} (Lent, Holy Week), \textit{Pentecostarion} (Easter-Pentecost), \textit{Octoechos} or \textit{Paraklitike} (daily cycle of eight tones); see R.F. Taft, \textit{The Byzantine Rite: A Short History}, 54ff.; “Liturgical Books,” \textit{ODB} 2.1239.

\textsuperscript{293} The manuscript was initially described by Aleksandr Tsagareli in \textit{Памятники грузинской старинь в Святой Земле и на Синае}, Pravoslavnyi Palestinskiy Sbornik 4.1 (St Petersburg: Pravoslavnoe Palestinskoe občestvo, 1888), 159-163, as a “festal menaion” and dated to the seventh-eighth century. The dating was disputed by Kekelidze who dated it to the second half of the 9\textsuperscript{th} century (in “Axali sagolobeli Abo T’bilebris,” in idem, \textit{Etiudebi dzeveli k’artuli literaturis istoridan} [Tbilisi, 1960], 6.414-417, see Xevruriani, “Struktura,” 25). Akaki Šanidze, in the modern scholarly edition of this tropologion, dates the time of its copying to early 11\textsuperscript{th} century, on the basis of some linguistic peculiarities (e.g. use of the letter â); see ed. Šanidze, A. Martirosov, A. Džišiašvili, \textit{Čil-etratis iadgari} (ksampanu-pergamenttina Miesi), Dzeveli k’art’uli enis dzeglebi 15 (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1977), 218. The linguistic argumentation was questioned by Lili Xevsuriani who claimed that such peculiarities are well attested in the tenth-century manuscripts and thus, the ms. may be attributed to the tenth century at the latest (“Struktura,” 26-28).

\textsuperscript{294} Xevsuriani, 23-28; Renoux, \textit{L’hymnaire de Saint-Sabas}, 9-10.
Additional hymns, appropriate for the divine liturgy, are found in the Georgian hagiopolite euchologia Sinai Georgian O.12 and Sinai Georgian O.54, largely corresponding to the *incipit*’s of hymns in the Georgian Lectionary. The close connection between GL and GT is not accidental: according to the opinion of Metreveli and Xevsuriani, the hagiopolite tropologion as a liturgical book originated as a hymnographic “compendium” to the Lectionary which may have originally contained the full texts of the troparia. This process of separation of the tropologion from the lectionary did not occur, according to Georgian scholars, until the end of sixth-early seventh centuries, and is assumed to have been caused in part by the great expansion of the corpus of Greek liturgical poetry in Palestine.

---

295 Probably copied at the Lavra of St Sabas with some participation of Iovane Zosime who copied Sin. iber. 34 – Xevsuriani, 28-30.


298 The codex is dated within the range of 940-965, according to the dates in different parts of the ms., but Stig Frøyshov concluded that it is most likely that Iovane Zosime copied the codex between 960 and 965, continuing to inscribe notes up to 990; see the most comprehensive assessment in Frøyshov, “L’horologe géorgien,” 210-217, esp. 216-217; cf. the summary of the earlier scholarship in Xevsuriani, 32-37.

299 *Udzvelesi iadgari*, 557; the codex is copied with five hands, including that of Iovane Zosime; the date containing the ancient Iadgari is dated to 954, while the rest of the codex was completed after Sinai Georgian O.34; see Frøyshov, “L’horologe géorgien,” 215-216.

300 Xevsuriani, 49.

301 Ibid., 49-52; Metreveli, “Udzvelesi iadgaris calke krebudad gamoqop’is dro da pirobebi,” in eadem et al., *Udzvelesi iadgari*, 684-691, 808-817. Renoux observes that the Armenian title for the Jerusalem Lectionary is երաշտակարան ‘memorial, տարազն, մնացուց’ (cf. Նոր բարգիրք, 2.359) and supposes that this may be an indirect indication that Lectionary and Tropologion used to be a unified liturgical collection at an early stage; see Renoux, “Introduction,” in *Les hymnes de la résurrection*, 31 n. 4,
hymnography of the “Ancient Iadgari” falls out of use and becomes gradually replaced with the new set of hymnography, the “New Iadgari,” represented in such tropologia as *Sinai Georgian O.20, 26, and 34*\(^{302}\): the process of gradual substitution of the “Ancient Iadgari” with the “New” is clearly noticeable in the ms. *Sinai Georgian O.34* which contains the sets of hymns both for the Ancient and New Iadgari.\(^{303}\)

The repertory of hymns that form the Ancient Iadgari constitutes an integral part of the liturgical tradition of the Jerusalem church and undoubtedly reflects the hymnography that was used in the central church complex of the holy city – the church of the Holy Anastasis and Martyrium. At the same time, it should be stressed (as it was done by Renoux) that the repertory of *iadgari* hymns came to us not only through the medium of Old Georgian language, but also through the milieu of the Lavra of St Sabas where most, if not all, extant copies of the tropologion were created.\(^{304}\) Moreover, while the 1980 edition of the Ancient Iadgari accomplished by Metreveli, Xevsuriani, and Čankieva was indeed a breakthrough in the scholarly assessment of this liturgical source,\(^{305}\) it is more than appropriate to emphasize that, just as Georgian Lectionary, the


\(^{303}\) f. 34r-123r, f. 123v-143r; see Froyshov, “L’horologue géorgien,” 196, 199, 250-255.

\(^{304}\) Renoux makes note on the example of the “Papyrus-parchment tropologion” (H 2123) of several particularities in the offices of Palm Sunday, Holy Thursday, Holy Friday, Easter, Easter Octave etc. that reflect the origin of this tropologion in the Sabbaite monastic circles (*L’hymnaire de Saint-Sabas*, 12-18).

\(^{305}\) *Udzvelesi iadgari*, see esp. the French and Russian summaries of the extensive and detailed commentary (resp. 922-929 and 930-939); the French abstract was republished as “Le plus ancien tropologion géorgien,” *Bedi kartlisa* 39 (1981): 54-62, and the table of contents was translated in the review by Andrew Wade, “The Oldest *iadgari*: the Jerusalem Tropologion, V- VIII c.,” *OCP* 50 (1984): 451-56.
“Ancient Tropologion,” or *iadgari*, known to scholars, is a composite source, an amalgamation of several manuscript tropologia which never existed as a single document. Nevertheless, the repertories for the fixed feasts of Jerusalem calendar, one of which (September 13) will concern us below, mostly conform to a similar structure, determined by the structure of the services of the daily office and eucharistic liturgy in the Palestinian tradition of the fifth-eighth centuries. In some way akin to the structure found in contemporary Byzantine Octoechos, Menaion, or Triodion, or in Armenian Šarakan, a repertory for a certain liturgical feast in the *iadgari* consists of a series of short hymns of one or several strophes appended to one of the scriptural texts constituting a base structural skeleton of an evening or morning office. In *iadgari*, such structural dependence is reflected in the titles for the hymns themselves:

**Evening Office**

[Hymns] εἰς τὸ Κύριε ἐκέκραξα – **KyrEk** (Ps 140)

Psalm (*p’salmuni*) and refrain (*dasadebeli*)

---

306 Charles Renoux notes, “soulignons… qu’aucun des sept manuscrits hymnographiques géorgiens… les plus anciens représentatifs de la psalmodie et de l’hymnographie hagiopolites et sabaites amalgamés dans l’édition de l’udzelesi *iadgari*, ne se ressemble; tous présentent en effet des différences notables, expressives de situations liturgiques qui n’ont pas reçu l’attention qu’elles méritent” (*L’hymnaire de Saint-Sabas*, 9). Renoux further notes that for such liturgical texts the genre of critical edition “n’est pas souhaitable” (ibid., 9 n. 17).


308 E.g. the designation of the first set of troparia, *up’alo gaqatqasva*, combines the first words of the Ps 140 (κύριε ἐκέκραξα) with the ending of Dat. Acc. sing. noun –*sa*, thus making the term a substantive, meaning “[hymns/troparia] at/for ‘Lord I have cried’.” The remaining structural elements of the service are designated using the same pattern.
MORNING OFFICE

1. Ὀännerοδοσλοσ - [Hymns] εἰς τὸ ἄσωμεν - As (= 1st ode; Ex 15:1-19)
2. Ὀännerοδοσλοσ - [Hymns] εἰς τὸ πρόσεχε Pros (= 2nd ode; Deut 32:1-43)
3. Ὀännerοδοσλοσ - [Hymns] εἰς τὸ ἐστερεώθη - Este (= 3rd ode, I Regn 2:1-10)
4. Ὀännerοδοσλοσ - [Hymns] εἰς τὸ Κύριε εἰσακήκοα - KyrEis (= 4th ode; Habac 3:2-19)
5. Ὀännerοδοσλοσ - [Hymns] εἰς τὸ ἐκ νυκτός - EkNy (= 5th ode; Isa 26:9-20)
6. Ὀännerοδοσλοσ - [Hymns] εἰς τὸ ἰβόησα - Ebo (= 6th ode; Jonas 2:3-10)
7. Ὀännerοδοσλοσ - [Hymns] εἰς τὸ εὐλογητὸς εἶ - Ben (= 7th ode, Dan 3:26-56)
8. Ὀännerοδοσλοσ - [Hymns] εἰς τὸ εὐλογεῖτε Eul (= 8th ode, Dan 3:57-88)
10. Ὀännerοδοσλοσ - [Hymns] εἰς τὸ αἰνεῖτε Ainoi (= Praises, Ps 148-150)

LITURGY

σὸν αὐτὸν – [Hymn] “of the intercessions”
πΡΩ῎῎῎῎῎῎῎῎῎῎῎῎῎῎῎῎῎῎牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝牝itemName
evolving up to the tenth century. In the text of the iadgari, as it appears both in the manuscripts and in the critical edition, these ‘layers’ of hymnography are marked with the term ჸხუანი/sxuani ‘others’ (Gk. ἄλλα). These particular characteristics demonstrate the nature of the tropologion as a liturgical source in the process of evolution and expansion, which was interrupted by the deliberate change in liturgical practices, the abandonment of the Jerusalem tradition in favor of the Byzantine by the Georgian church in 10th–11th centuries.

In addition to the hymns particular to the divine office, the repertory for a fixed feast from the iadgari also includes a set of hymns for the eucharistic liturgy, accompanying its major ritual actions: the entrance of a bishop (ოხითა/oxitaj), the reading of scripture: psalm (p’salmuni), its refrain (dasadebeli), and Alleluia psalm. The hymns following the gospel reading accompany the washing of hands (ჸელთაბანისა/xelt’abanisay), the transfer of the eucharistic gifts

---

311 As e.g. in the texts associated with the feast of Encaenia in Sinai iber. 18 (ms. B in the Udzelesi iadgari edition), f. 160r, 160v, 161v etc. Xevsuriani notes that the presence of multiple ‘layers’ of troparia within one tropologion is characteristic for ms. H 2123 and Sinai iber. 18 (AB), but is absent in Sinai iber. 40; however, this signifies, according to her, that the compiler of this copy of the tropologion merely “selected one of the layers [of the troparia] from the multilayered hymnography of the Ancient Iadgari, which layer corresponded to the first layer of AB which in many a case was a later addition to the Tropologion.” The brevity of Sinai iber. 40 does not entail its greater antiquity (“Struktura,” 94 fn.; translation mine).

312 Leeb, Gesänge, 37-144.

313 The term, the substantivized form of the Instr. > ღოხა/oxay ‘prayer, intercession, petition,’ is used in GL for both liturgy and vespers; in GT it is more often used in the context of the liturgy; see Leeb, Die Gesänge, 38-49; Schneider, Lobpreis, 43-44.

314 The troparion “for the washing of hands” (xelt’a-bani-sa-j) follows the gospel reading and as follows from its title is suited to accompany the lavabo rites as part of the celebrant’s preparation for the eucharistic offering (see Taft, Great Entrance, pt. 1, ch. 7); the position of handwashing after the gospel reading finds parallel in the sixth-cent. Syriac rite for the stational procession and entrance of the bishop (S. G. Khoury-Sarkis, “Réception d’un évêque syrien au VIe siècle,” Orient Syrien 2 [1957], 139ff.; first
(βοσθοςβολά/sic’midisay),\textsuperscript{315} and communion (ganicadey or ḡavse).\textsuperscript{316} The evidence of the Georgian tropologion for the repertory of hymns for the divine liturgy often and mostly corresponds with the psalmody and readings indicated in the Georgian lectionary, as we shall see below.\textsuperscript{317}

5.2.2 Hymnography of the Georgian Tropologion for September 13.

The extent to which the corpus of hymns contained in the Georgian Tropologion-Iadgari for the feast of Encaenia on September 13 could elucidate the exact rites celebrated at the dedication, as well as theological framework that would assign exceeding importance to this feast, remains open to interpretation. Hans-Michael Schneider in his work that examines the Iadgari hymns for the Nativity-Epiphany cycle expresses no doubt that terms and expressions in these hymns show strong dependence on the publication of the Syriac text in ed. Ignatius Ephraem II Rahmani, \textit{Studia syriaca}, fasc. 3, \textit{Vetusta documenta liturgica} [Sharfeh, 1908], 16-22): “et aussitôt les šahôré [clerics] disent les ma’nyoṭô. Et on apporte l’eau de l’ablution à l’évêque et à tous les prêtres.” According to Leeb, the hymn, equivalent to ṣônî ṭā ewangeliôn of the West Syriac liturgy, accompanied the handwashing of the celebrant and the entrance of the clergy into the altar space (\textit{Die gesänge}, 106); cf. Schneider, \textit{Lobpreis}, 46-48.

\textsuperscript{315} The troparion “for the holy” (sic’mid-isa-) is derived from the term ṣinchid, substantive of cmiday “holy,” meaning “holy thing/holiness” and is assumed to have accompanied the transfer of the gifts to the altar for the eucharistic liturgy (Leeb, \textit{Die gesänge}, 113-124; Schneider, \textit{Lobpreis}, 48-49). There are three types which can be distinguished among sic’midisay hymns in the festal repertories of the iadgari: those concluding with the chant of thrice-holy (common also in the Armenian, East and West Syriac traditions: see Taft, \textit{Great Entrance}, 90-97), those concluding with the Alleluia chant (on six occasions: December 28 [James and David], January 1, Cheesefare Sunday, first Wednesday of Lent, Palm Sunday and the sixth Saturday of Pentecost - Udzvelesi iadgari, 30, 37, 100, 105, 176, 244), and finally the chant of “alleluia” itself which is used only on Palm Sunday (GL), Holy Saturday, Easter, Pentecost, and Encaenia.

\textsuperscript{316} The hymns ganicadey/ganicadey derives from Geo. of Ps 33:9 ṣενοσασθε = γεύσασθε, which is considered a proper communion chant in Jerusalem, as already indicated by Cyril/John II of Jerusalem in the Mystagogical Catecheses 5.20; see Leeb, \textit{Die gesänge}, 124-127; Taft, \textit{Precommunion Rites}. The hymn ḡavse is designated after the verb ḡvsebay ‘fulfill, accomplish,’ which is the first word of the post-communion chant, as shown in the extant manuscripts of JAS (πλήρωσον το στόμα μου αἰνέσως; Mércrier, PO 26.2, 120); Leeb, \textit{Die gesänge}, 127-128, 128-132. These communion chants do not constitute part of every festal repertory (these are present on Holy Thursday, Holy Saturday, Easter – Udzvelesi iadgari, 189, 216, 217-18 etc.), and are not included among the hymns for the feast of Encaenia.

\textsuperscript{317} See also Xevsuriani, “Struktura,” 87ff.
on the Chalcedonian christological formulations with regards to the relation of divinity and humanity in Christ, but also betray connections with the christology of Cyril of Alexandria, as well as of Severus of Antioch. At the same time, Schneider points out that the presence of such dogmatic hymns as Ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός may speak of the reflection in the hymnography of the christological development that took place after Chalcedon, culminating at the Fifth Ecumenical council at Constantinople in 553.

While noting these theological influences, Schneider cautions that with texts containing liturgical poetry, one deals “with texts pertaining to liturgy, hymnodic praise, and poetic proclamation, rather than with systematically thought-out treatises.” Gabriele Winkler, on the other hand, rejected Schneider’s reticence and asserted the theological value of Iadgari as accurately reflecting the “historical development of christology,” which “can be gleaned from its Georgian vocabulary.” Without striving to deal extensively with the theological content and doctrinal issues as featured in the texts of the Iadgari for September 13, the reflection of certain doctrinal issues in the hymnographic texts may

319 It is used as the oxitaj of Easter Sunday and, most likely, of other Sundays as well (Udzelesi iadgari, 216); see Schneider, Lobpreis, 331.
320 Schneider, Lobpreis, 331-339.
321 “nicht um systematisch reflektierte Traktate” (Schneider, Lobpreis, 323). Elsewhere Schneider compares negatively the expression in Iadgari of the concept of incarnation as “clothing in the body/flesh” with the reflection of the same idea in the hymns of Ephrem, considering the latter as containing more consistent (reiche und überaus plastische) symbolic world (ibid., 350).
help to set an approximate date (or terminus ante quem) for those texts, and consequently for liturgical reality that may show itself in these hymns.

Similarly, the connection between the content of Iadgari hymns and of the Armenian hymnographic corpus contained in Šarakan/Šaraknoc’ remains an issue closely related to the problem of the dating and possible antiquity of the texts attributed to the hagiopolite liturgical tradition. Having observed thematic congruity and even textual parallels between Šarakan and Iadgari, Charles Renoux proposed that the original layer of these collections of hymns stems from the hagiopolite liturgical poetry, akin to Egeria’s ymni,323 which was probably already in place in the beginning of the fifth century, and has developed further into two different liturgical collections used by the Armenian and Georgian churches (the latter up to the ninth-tenth cent.).324 Despite that the manuscript sources of Šarakan do not date earlier than the twelfth-thirteenth centuries,325 the recent study by Michael Daniel Findikyan attempted to bolster the reliability of the texts of Šarakan as not only reflective of the hymnographic cadre of early Jerusalem, but also elucidating historical circumstances of the event celebrated: the dedication of the church of Martyrium on September 13, 335.326 Looking at the hymns for the days surrounding the September celebration of the Holy Cross in the Armenian Church – the ‘prefestal’ “Encaenia of the Holy Cross,” Exaltation of the Cross, and the

323 Itin. Eg. 24.1,4,12; 35.3, 37.6.


325 Ibid., 91.

Findikyan finds that the Armenian hymnographic corpus has preserved the débris of the hagiopolite octave of the Encaenia of the Anastasis and Martyrium on September 13, one of the major festivals of the Jerusalem church. Findikyan suggests further that the texts of the liturgical poetry for the feast of the Encaenia may be successfully construed to supplement the evidence regarding the fourth-century dedication, which we possess from the written sources: e.g. the use of the relic of the True Cross at the dedication in 335 (thus supporting the theory regarding Eusebius’ ‘deliberate silence’ regarding the cult of the cross), the presence of the empress Helena at the dedication feast itself, not attested in other sources. If accepted, such reading of these texts would provide a proof of greater antiquity for the ancient layer of the Armenian hymnographic corpus, despite the medieval dating for the manuscripts and apparent lack of established textual history for these hymns. The analysis of the Šarakan hymns in comparison with the Iadgari hymns shows an obvious difference in the

---

327 For the references to the hymns, I am using the 1853 Constantinopolitan edition Հայոց եկեղեցու երգեր (Constantinople, 1853; reprint New York: St Vartan Press, 1986), 636-670. For the English translation of the hymns of the Šarakan was published in “Armenian Hymns of the Church and the Cross,” 73-105. For the partial French translation, see Charles Renoux, “La croix dans le rite arménien: histoire et symbolisme,” Méltho 5 (1969): 123-175. I rely primarily on M.D. Findikyan’s translation in my study, having also consulted an earlier Russian translation by N. Emin in Շարական: բոսական, կեղծական երգեր (Moscow, 1914), 286-303.


329 Findikyan accepts the conclusions of Steven Borgehammer, regarding the presence of the relic of the True Cross already at the original dedication of the Martyrium in 335 CE (How the Holy Cross was Found, 101), and juxtaposes it with the reference to the Cross in the hymn in the Šarakan for the “Dedication of the Holy Cross” ([4], for the Ode of Daniel; Šarakan, 637 = ET Findikyan, “Armenian Hymns,” 74). As I indicated above, Borgehammer argues for the construction of Martyrium basilica to have been undertaken with the intention to house the (already found) relic of the Cross (How the Holy Cross was Found, ), which in my view undervalues the ‘rebuilding of the Temple’ motif behind the original construction of the Anastasis-Martyrium complex (see above, part I, ch. 3).

330 Ibid. 36-37; the reference is to the same hymn [4] for the Ode of Daniel: “the queen stood on the right, the holy church,” an allusion to Ps 44:9, as also noted by Findikyan.
distribution of the hymnographic material within the structure of the rite of daily office, specific to Armenian or Palestinian rite: the Iadgari contains hymns for Ps 140, nine biblical odes, Pss 148-150, while the Šarakan – for the ode of Moses (Exodus 15), ode of Daniel 3, Magnificat, Ps 50, Pss 148-150, and Ps 112. Similarly, while the Armenian corpus contains the full set of hymnody for all eight days of the octave, including the day of the feast, in the Iadgari the complete hymnography is provided only for the first two days, September 13 and 14, while the hymnography for the days 3-8 of the octave merely is limited to the p’salmuni (psalm refrain for the liturgy).331 For the majority of the hymns of the Šarakan for the church and the cross, each of the hymns is limited to three strophes (excepting the alphabetical and some other hymns332), while the repertory of the Iadgari is remarkable for its uneven number of troparia and all but obvious “multi-layered” structure, reflecting the layout of the text in the manuscripts.333 This suggests a process of redaction and manipulation with the texts in the Armenian tradition in an effort to appropriate the originally hagiopolite poetry to the developing structure of the Armenian office.334 Nevertheless, both the Šarakan and Iadgari texts remain unique,

331 See Udzevelsi iadgari, 314. The Georgian menaion Sinai iber. 65 also is reported to incorporate the hymnody for September 15 (“Dedication of Sion”) and September 16 (“Dedication of the Cross and the memory of Eustochius, patriarch of Jerusalem”), but these texts were unavailable to me at this point (see Marr, Opisanie gruzinskix rukopisej, 143).

332 See hymns [34], [57], [60] in Findikyan, “Armenian Hymns,” 85-86, 96-97, as well as non-alphabetic [49] and [66] (ibid., 91-92, 99-100).

333 E.g. Sinai Georgian O.18, f. 160v-171r.

albeit “mediated” witnesses to the hagiopolite liturgical hymnography and, hence, should be used, whenever possible, in conjunction with each other for elucidating theological mindset and specific practices of the liturgy in the Holy City.

The set of hymns for the feast of Dedication in the iadgari consists of 101 “troparion,” excepting the responsorial psalmody and “alleluia” verses, but counting the hymns of which only incipits are extant. Of this number, the repertory of hymns for the evening office consists of seven troparia appended to the “lamp-lighting” psalm 140 (Κύριε ἐκεκραξα), and three hymns which constitute the repertory for the eucharistic liturgy (oxitaj, xelt’abanisaj, sic’midisaj). The remaining hymns are distributed among the nine biblical odes and the “praises” psalms (148-150) of the Palestinian morning office, with the average of 7-8 hymns assigned to each scriptural ode. The texts for the feast of Encaenia in Metreveli’s critical edition of the iadgari, as well as in some manuscripts (such as Sinai Georgian O.18), clearly demonstrate the multi-layered and composite character of this genre of liturgical texts: every set of hymnography appended to a particular biblical text in the divine office possesses two (and sometimes three) layers of hymns, separated with the rubric ὄαΩΗΙΕ, i.e. “other [hymns].” Such multi-layered character of the texts makes it hardly possible to suggest anything but a very

---

335 Such as Ainoi 16-18 (Udzvelesi iadgari, 297).

336 With notable exceptions, such as 10 hymns for the seventh ode (εἰς τὸ εὐλογητὸς εἶ), and 18 hymns for the Praises.

337 Such as the sets of hymns for the 7th Ode and for the Ainoi.
approximate date for the composition of these liturgical hymns which in turn complicates the dating of allusions to liturgical rites that may be found in these hymns.

Despite their ostensibly common origin, the *cadre* of the Iadgari and Șarakan hymns for the feast of Encaenia does not provide many hymnographic texts that prove to be identical enough to reveal a common, and early, source.\(^{338}\) One of such rare textual parallels comes from the hymn that opens the set of hymnography in Iadgari and Șarakan, even though in each respective liturgical book it is found in a different position – as the first troparion for Κύριε ἐκέκραξα (vespers) in the Iadgari, and as the first strophe for the biblical ode Exodus 15 (nocturns) in Șarakan. This strophe in the latter tradition perhaps preserves the hymn in its more primitive form:

\[\text{Իվերայվինիհավատոյըզքոսուրբզեկեղեցի}
\text{ըզսապահեաի}
\]

Upon the rock of faith you have built your holy church; keep her in peace.\(^{339}\)

The first hymn of the Iadgari repertory begins with a very similar expression, albeit significantly expanding the theme with the allusion to the parable of the vineyard (Isa 5:1-12; Matt 21:33-46; Mk 12:1-12; Lk 20:9-19), as well as to Matthew 16:18:

\[ÊËÃÄÓÀ ÆÄÃÀ ÓÀáÀÒÄÁÉÓÀÓÀ ÃÀÀÌÔÊÉÝÄ ÄÊËÄÓÉÀÎ ÛÄÍÉ, ØÒÉÓÔÄ, ÛÄÆÙÖÃÄ ÉÂÉ ÃÀÓÈØÖ: ÁàÄÍÉ ãÏãÏáÄÈÉÓÀÍÉ ÀÒÀ ÄÒÄÏÃÉÀÍ ÌÀÓ ÃÀ ÖÊÖÍÉÓÀÌÃÄ ÌÔÊÉÝÄà ÃÀ ÛÄÖÒÚÄÅÄËÀÃ, ÒÀÌÄÈÖ ÀØÖÍÃÉ ÛÄÍ ÌÀÓ ÛÉÍÀ áÏÒÝÉÄË-ØÌÍÖËÉ. ÌÀÝáÏÅÀÒÏ ÜÖÄÍÏ, ÛÄÂÖÉßÚÀËÄÍ ÜÖÄÍ.\]

Upon the rock of the gospel you established your church, O Christ, you surrounded her with a hedge and said: “The gates of Hades will not overpower her,” and she will remain unshaken and unmoved to the ages, for she has you in her as the Incarnate one. Our Saviour, have mercy on us.\(^{340}\)

\(^{338}\) For the instances of such texts, see Renoux, “Iadgari,” 96-107.

\(^{339}\) Șarakan, 636 = Findikyan, 73.

\(^{340}\) Udzvelesi iadgari, 287. All translations of Georgian texts are mine unless otherwise specified.
Significantly, the above troparion is one of the four Iadgari hymns for which the underlying Greek original has survived in the corpus of Byzantine hymnography, specifically among the Menaion stichera for September 13, which in later tradition are used also for the vigil on the eve of the dedication of any new church. The sticheron in question is appointed for the Ps 140 (Κύριε ἐκέκραξα) at vespers of September 13 and its text, while not entirely identical with the Iadgari troparion, has apparently preserved the core of the original strophe:

```
Ἔθου πύργον ἰσχύος, τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν σου Χριστέ, προαιώνιε Λόγε· ἐθεμελίωσας γιὰρ αὐτήν, ἐπὶ πέτραν τῆς πίστεως· διὸ ἀσάλευτος διαμένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἔχουσα σὲ τὸν διʼ αὐτὴν ἐπὶ σχάτων, ἀτρέπτως γενόμενον ἁγίον, εὐχαριστοῦντες ὅσιο, ἀνυμνοῦμεν σὲ λέγοντες· Σὺ εἰ ὁ πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, καὶ ἐπʼ ἀιῶνα, καὶ ἐτί βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν· δόξα σοι.343
```

You have set the mighty tower, your Church, O Christ the eternal Word, for you have established her upon the rock of faith, therefore it remains unshaken forever, for she has you who in the last times became man without change. In thanksgiving we hymn you, saying: you are before the ages, and forever, and is yet our king, glory to you.

While the core the sticheron remains the same as in the Georgian text, not only thematically, but also lexically, the recension of the Greek original that survived in the sticheraria, as well as in the textus receptus of the Menaion, shows signs of further thematic development: the connection between Matt 16 and Isa 5 remained, but came to

---

341 KyrEk 1, 2, 6 and xelt’abanisaj of the liturgy; the first three have been preserved as stichera for Ps 140 and Aposticha on September 13 (see MR 1.134-135), while the xelt’abanisaj for the liturgy of dedication (as well as that of the 2nd day of dedication, the Elevation of the Cross), is found among the stichera to be sung during the veneration of the Cross on September 14 (MR 167).

342 For the edition of the hymnography for the dedication of a church on the basis of 14th-17th cent. Athenian mss., see Trempelas, Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον, 2.103-119, here 104.

343 MR 1.134-135; I have underlined the textual parallels between the Greek and Georgian versions.

344 E.g. Sinai gr. 1214 (11th-12th c.), Sinai gr. 1217 (11th-12th c.), Jerusalem Hagios Sabas 610 (11th c.), Sinai gr. 1218 (1177 CE), Sinai gr. 1227 (12th c.).
be expressed differently, via an allusion to the “mighty tower,” 
rather than to the vineyard. This sticheron, uniquely attested both in Armenian, Georgian, and later Greek recensions, serves as an example of complex interplay of scriptural allusions, seeking to provide theological and exegetical foundation for the ceremony that this hymnography would accompany or commemorate: the characterization of the church as the ‘new Israel’- vineyard, whose foundation lies in Christ’s parousia and rational bloodless sacrifice (Rom 12:1). The presence of this hymn, in differing recensions, in all three major traditions reflecting the Jerusalem rite would allow with certainty to attribute this hymn to one of the early layers of the hagiopolite hymnography for the feast of the Encaenia on September 13.

“Church as Temple”: Recurring Themes in the Iadgari for September 13.

Aside from the hymn just discussed, however, the connection between the extant Armenian and Georgian hymnography for the Encaenia seems to be limited to common theological points, without explicit textual parallels that would reveal a common source. It may be reasonable to suggest that the Armenian church received the early substrate of the hagiopolite hymns for the Encaenia early enough for them not to reflect its

345 The direct reference in the sticheron is to LXX Ps 60:4 (πύργος ἵσχυς ἀπὸ προσώπου ἐχθροῦ), but see also Isa 5:2, Matt 21:33 and parallels.

346 It should be noted that term “unshaken” that appears in the Georgian and Greek texts may also be attributed to the earliest substrate of this hymn, the traces of which survived in the Armenian (hymn [1] of the Šarakan for the Dedication of the Holy Cross). However, this term is not found in the first strophe of the hymn which we discussed above, but in the second strophe: “You granted mercy in the dwelling of the angels and the place of mankind’s expiation. Grant her your unshaken peace (զանշարժ քո զխաղաղութիւն)” (Šarakan 636 = Findikyan, 73); on the other examples of the use of this term, likely derived from Heb 12:28, in the Armenian liturgical tradition, see Findikyan, “Armenian Hymns of the Church,” 73 n. 35.
subsequent development after the fifth or sixth centuries.\textsuperscript{347} At the same time, the presence of several recurring themes in the hymns reflects a connection on a theological level, especially with respect to the interpretation of the church and its material building in terms of the priestly language of the OT. The contrast between “old” and “new” temple and cult is brought forth many times in the repertory of hymns for the Encaenia, just as in the following example:

Of old Solomon made the dedication of the Temple [and] sacrificed beasts, animals for the sacrifice of whole-burnt offering. But when you were pleased (εὐδόκησας), O Saviour, [that we] reject the type and have knowledge of the truth, this bloodless sacrifice all the ends of the earth offer to you in it (δόλη βοσκείς), crying: You rule over all things, you sanctify all things by your holy Spirit, have mercy on us.\textsuperscript{348}

The contrast in the Georgian text, somewhat lost in the later Greek recension, is clearly drawn between the many sacrifices at the dedication of the Solomonic temple with the one sacrifice of the Christian dedication, the “bloodless” sacrifice of the eucharist (cf. Heb 9:11-12). The text of the Iadgari hymn appears also to retain some local character, absent in the later Greek recension, specifying that “all the ends of the earth offer” this sacrifice to God “in it/upon it” (δόλη βοσκείς), the antecedent to which is apparently the Temple of Solomon. This identification makes sense only if we presume that the dedication of the Martyrium-Anastasis complex was conceived as some form of

\textsuperscript{347} For example, while the theme of a “rock” upon which the church is established recurs at least three times in the Iadgari hymns for September 13 (KyrEk 1, 5; Est 2 = Udzvelesi iadgari, 288, 290), in the Sarakan this theme is found only in the very first hymn for the day before Elevation of the Cross, as discussed above.

\textsuperscript{348} KyrEk 6 = Udzvelesi iadgari, 288. The Greek original for this hymn has also survived among the texts of the Menaiia for September 13, being included among the idiomela stichera at Praises of orthros: Πάλαι μὲν ἐγκαινίζων τὸν ναὸν ὁ Σολομών, ἀλόγων ζώων θυσίας, καὶ ἀλοκαυτώματα προσέφερε Κύριε, ὅτε δὲ ηὐδόκησας Σωτήρ τοὺς τύπους μὲν ἀργῆσαι, γνωσθῆναι δὲ τὴν ἁλλήλων, ἀναιμάκτους θυσίας, τὰ πέρατα τοῦ κόσμου προσφέρει τῇ δόξῃ σου πάντων γὰρ διεσπόσχων, τὰ πάντα ἁγιάζεις τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι. (MR 1.151).
reconstitution of the Solomonic Temple, on the site where the unique (ἐφάπαξ) sacrifice of Christ was offered and the eucharistic “bloodless sacrifice” continued to be celebrated. Throughout the Iadgari hymns for September 13, the term “temple” is one of the most often represented, occurring totally 29 times.\(^{349}\) The church is called the “all-holy temple,”\(^{350}\) the “most glorious” temple,\(^{351}\) the “all-holy temple of angels,”\(^{352}\) while the worshippers are described as “standing today in [Christ’s] temple.”\(^{353}\) The most illustrative example occurs in the course of the morning office where, following the seventh biblical ode (Dan 3:26-56) that begins with blessing the “Lord God of our fathers” (εὐλογητὸς εἶ Κύριε ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν), a theme carried on in the hymnographic composition:

In the temple (δωμάτιον θεοῦ) we bless you, Lord God of our fathers!
In the church (καθολικόν θεοῦ) we bless you, Lord God of our fathers!
We, the faithful who celebrate the dedication (οἰκοδομία τοῦ σπιτιού) glorify you, Lord God of our fathers!\(^{354}\)

---

\(^{349}\) KyrEk 3, 6, 7; As 3, 6; Est 5, 6; KyrEis 1, 2, 4, 8; EkNy 2, 3, 7, 9, 10; Ebo 2, 8; Ben 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10; Eul 1, 2, 6; Magn 3.

\(^{350}\) “Let us joyfully celebrate in this all-holy temple, with praise let us exalt the Creator, the Giver of life to all, who adorned the church with glory” (Ben 9 = Udzvelesi iadgari, 293-4).

\(^{351}\) “Your temple appeared as most glorious, O Lord, in which we glorify you, we praise you, the compassionate (φιλάνθρωπος) God” (Ebo 2 = Udzvelesi iadgari, 292).

\(^{352}\) “We offer you a hymn in the all-holy temple of angels, we lift up (our voices) and say: all the works of the Lord, bless the Lord” (Eul 1 = Udzvelesi iadgari, 294).

\(^{353}\) “Standing today in your temple, we praise you, Christ our God…” (As 3 = Udzvelesi iadgari, 288), “Standing today in your temple, we praise you, who have established [it] for protection of [our] souls and bodies” (Ben 5 = Udzvelesi iadgari, 293). The common strophe in both troparia, ὡς ὁ ἅγιος ἑορτῶν ἡμῶν, ὃς ἀπεδείχθης σήμερον, ἄνωθεν ἐκ τῆς θυράς τοῦ θαλάσσων σου, finds correspondence with a fixed theotokion at the end the Lenten Orthros in the current Byzantine Horologion:

Ἐν τῷ ναῷ ἁγίῳ τῆς δόξης σου, ἐν οὖραν πρὸς σέ ἐστάναι νομίζομεν, Θεοτόκε, πύλη ἐκποράνε, ἀνοίζων ἡμῖν τὴν θύραν τοῦ ἐλέους σου.

\(^{354}\) Udzvelesi iadgari, 293.
Through parallelism, these hymns express the understanding of its community with regards to the identity between the church and the temple, the structure where the believers are present physically and the community which stretches beyond material boundaries. The function of the temple as the place of healing, the place of refuge, a place of assembly or liturgical hymnody, i.e. the properties of a specific place come to be identified with the church at large as a liturgical space of a community, thus identified with a true, spiritual temple, as we have been already expressed by Eusebius in the beginning of the fourth century. A specific church, tied to a specific location – here, the church of the Holy Anastasis – becomes a synecdoche of the larger body of the faithful.

“Church as Sion” in the Hymns for September 13.

Another recurring theme in the corpus of hymnography for the Encaenia pertains to the characterization of the church as the “bride,” with Christ as its bridegroom, elaborating on the scriptural metaphor in Eph 5:32. One of the hymns compares the “barren” woman, the church, with the one with “many children: the assembly of the Jews” – the latter thereby have been exhausted, while the former, the “barren one” “had seven children and was made to prosper.”355 While the passage is textually dependent upon the Canticle of Anna in 1 Sam 2:5, the biblical ode to which the hymn in question is attached,356 the allusion to “seven children” that the στεῖρα/church had borne may not only point to the seven churches of the Book of Revelation,357 but may also reflect an

355 Est 4 = Udzvelesi iadgari, 290.
356 The allusion is of course to 1 Sam 2:5 (ὅτι στεῖρα ἔτεκεν ἐπτά, καὶ ἡ πολλὴ ἐν τέκνοις ἠθένησεν).
inversion of a local hagiopolite lore regarding the “seven synagogues” that were associated with Mount Sion\textsuperscript{358}: with the Christian church displacing the “synagogue,” it is now the former that is in possession of such ecclesiastical ‘progeny.’ On a theological level, this metaphor of the ‘church as a mother’ directly relates to another closely connected metaphor – the church as a ‘virgin.’\textsuperscript{359} Both the Iadgari and Šarakan hymnography contain allusions to this theme, but, it is in the Georgian set of hymns that we find the most illustrative example:

\begin{quote}
We offer to you the angelic voice, O holy church of God, which the holy apostles founded: “Rejoice, the Lord (is) with you.” Christ has established you in peace, [he who is] the only-begotten King of the ages.\textsuperscript{360}
\end{quote}

The expression “[the church] which the holy apostles founded,” which appears once again among the Iadgari texts for September 13,\textsuperscript{361} appears to be an epithet attached to one specific hagiopolite location, the church of Holy Sion, situated at the presumed place of the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost.\textsuperscript{362} The “church of God” of this passage is

\textsuperscript{357} Rev 1:20, 2:1-3:22.

\textsuperscript{358} “Et septem synagogae, quae illuc fuerunt, una tantum remansit, reliquae autem arantur et seminantur, sicut Isaia propheta dixit,” according to the account of the Pilgrim of Bordeaux (\textit{Itineraria et alia geographic}, CCSL 175, 16).


\textsuperscript{360} Ainoi 7 = \textit{Udzelesi iadgari}, 296; the troparion in the critical ed. is cited after the mss. Sinai iber. 18 and Sinai iber. 40, while the iadgari ms. Tbilisi H 2123 features a shorter redaction: “We offer to you the angelic voice, O holy church of God, which the holy apostles founded” (f. 244r = ed. Šanidze, \textit{Cil-etratis iadgari}, 168).

\textsuperscript{361} “As you granted peace and stability to the church, so also (make) those who give glory in your temple, which the apostles founded” – EkNy 7 = \textit{Udzelesi iadgari}, 292; this troparion is, however, attested only in the ms. Sinai iber. 40 (B), cf. H 2123, f. 240r = ed. Šanidze, 166.

\textsuperscript{362} The identifier “which the holy apostles founded” appears in the homily of bishop John of Bolnisi, specifically in the excerpt published by Michel van Esbroeck from ms. \textit{Aths Iviron 11} (Les plus
addressed with the same angelic greeting as is Mary in the annunciation narrative (Luke 1:28), making the church coterminal with the figure of virgin/mother, a customary attribute of Christ’s mother. As the comparison with the Armenian corpus of hymnography would show, the depiction of the church as “mother” has baptismal connotations, alluding to the role of the church as “mother” to the newly baptized Christians. At the same time, the semantic link between church/virgin/mother has a connection, again, with the site of Holy Sion, understood, as it seems, both as a specific location in the sacred topography of Jerusalem and as a synechdoche for the entire church of Jerusalem or the Christian ecclesial body in general. The presence of this theme in the corpus of the Iadgari hymns for September 13 opens up a possibility that at least some of the troparia listed under this date in the Iadgari manuscripts, may not have originally been composed for the feast of the dedication of the Anastasis and Martyrium, but for one of the days of the Encaenia octave, perhaps specifically the days when the station was appointed at the church of Holy Sion. The appellation “Sion” appears in only four of the troparia, but two of these seem to contain direct reference to the site in Jerusalem:

anciens homéliaires, 314). As I have indicated before (pt. 1, ch. 2, n. 214), while Cyril of Jerusalem never explicitly identifies ἡ ἀνωτέρα τῶν ἄποστόλων ἐκκλησία with the church of Holy Sion (Catechesis 16.4), it has been the accepted scholarly view. Likewise, the 6th cent. travelogue of Theodosius describes the church of Sion as “mater omnium ecclesiæ, quam Sion domnus noster Christus cum apostolis fundauit” (De situ terræ sanctæ 7, in Itineraria et alia geographicæ, CCSL 175, 118), while Venerable Bede in the beginning of the 8th century uses the precise expression “ab apostolis fundata” to describe the “magna ecclesia” of Sion (De locis sanctis 2.5; CCSL 175, 258).

363 See the hymn 56 for the fifth day after the Elevation of the Cross: “In this very place a font of baptism was renovated for us, a mother’s womb, in which, conceived by the Spirit, second birth is given to us who believe in Christ…” (Šarakan, 659-660 = F 95), cf. hymn 4; trans. Findikyan, 75. Findikyan connects the allusion to baptism in hymn 56 with the dedication of a baptismal font in a newly-built church (ibid., 95 n. 104). While the allusion to baptismal themes here may be generic, the existence of the rite for the installation of a baptismal font is attested in the Jerusalem euchologion, as we shall see further.

364 Cf. the adjacent theme in the context of a hagiopolite baptismal rite in Mystagogical Catecheses of Cyril/John II of Jerusalem: καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἀπεθνήσκετε καὶ ἐγεννᾶσθε, καὶ τὸ σωτήριον ἐκεῖνο ὄδωρ καὶ τάφος ὑμῖν ἐγίνετο καὶ μήτηρ (Myst. Cat.2.4).
Surround Sion, O people, and encompass her and give glory to God in her, for she is the mother of all the churches, in whom the holy Spirit came to dwell.\textsuperscript{366}

May the holy church and the assembly of great multitudes rejoice, in which the holy Spirit was revealed and said to the apostles: Raise up the voice of your praise in Sion and give glory to God in it!\textsuperscript{367}

The latter troparion makes clear that the “holy church” in question is the place of the descent of the Spirit which since Egeria had been identified with Sion.\textsuperscript{368} Multiple allusions found in the hymnography for the day of Encaenia to the church as an “abode/inheritance of the Holy Spirit,”\textsuperscript{369} the “dwelling” of the apostles,\textsuperscript{370} or the same being “founded by the apostles” may all together be connected with the special place of

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{366}] The Georgian Lectionary (mss. Paris georg. 3 and Lathal ms.), and (as we have determined) also the Georgian Calendar in Sinai Georgian O.34 are in agreement in setting Sion as the station for the third day of the octave, September 15; see a helpful table, comparing Armenian and Georgian sources in Findikyan, “Cross and Encaenia.”
\item[\textsuperscript{367}] Ainoi 4 = \textit{Udzelesi iadgari}, 295. The allusion here is of course to LXX Ps 47:13 (κυκλώσατε Σιὼν καὶ περιλάβετε αὐτὴν, διηγήσασθε ἐν τοῖς πύργοις αὐτῆς), but the identification with Sion church is strengthened with the use of the moniker “mother of the churches.” A strikingly similar textual link between Ps 47 and the church, has survived in one of the stichera of the Byzantine Sunday Octoechos: Κυκλώσατε λαοί Σιών, καὶ περιλάβετε αὐτήν, καὶ δότε δόξαν ἐν αὐτῇ, τῷ ἀναστάντι ἐκ νεκρῶν… (KyrEk 2, Saturday vesp., tone 1); cf. another sticheron with a similar expression: Χάιρε Σιὼν ἁγία, μήτηρ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν· σὺ γὰρ ἐδέξω πρώτη, ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως (KyrEk 3, Saturday vesp., tone 8).
\item[\textsuperscript{368}] Itin. Egeriae 43.3, CCSL 175, 85.
\item[\textsuperscript{369}] “[Christ] who as firm and unshaken has established the holy and all-glorious abode (სამკვდარებლი) of the holy Spirit” (EkNy 6), “The heavens rejoice and the faithful people are glad, with them the holy church rejoices, which you founded as an abode (სამკვდარებლი) of the holy Spirit…” (EkNy 8); “Today all the faithful rejoice and the holy church is crowned, for in it the holy Spirit has made his dwelling (დაიმკუიდრა)…” (Ebo 5); “Him who granted to us the all-holy temple as a house of prayer, in which the Holy Spirit has made his dwelling (დაიმკუიდრა)” (Eul 6). The term samkwdrebeli is defined in the lexicon as “legacy/inheritance, heritage, place of residence/dwelling, settlement” (Čubinashvili, 	extit{K’art ul-rusuli lek’ikoni}, 1092), “Erbe, Erbteil, Erbschaft, Besitz” (ADW 1007).
\item[\textsuperscript{370}] “Your church has shone like light, Christ, unto the dwelling of your holy apostles (sagopelad c’midat’a şent’a mocik’ult’a), in which the holy Spirit was glorified and the multitude of angels was made glad” (Ainoi 2); “You have gloriously adorned your church, Christ Saviour, and revealed (it) as a place of healing, set in order as a dwelling of your holy apostles (sagopelad c’midat’a şent’a mocik’ult’a), who proclaimed your resurrection” (Ainoi 8); it should be noted that the term ḳaτακυπτήριον, which is most likely the term translated by \textit{sagop’eli} in the passages above, is also used to describe the abode of God, whether earthly or heavenly, in Ex 15:17, Ps 75:3, 3 Macc 2:15.
\end{itemize}
the church of Holy Sion as a liturgical station and a place of pilgrimage. In particular, one notes the term “mother of all the churches (μήτηρ Σιων, ἐρεῖ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐγενήθη ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐθεμελίωσεν αὐτὴν ὁ ὕψιστος)" used in the passage cited above, which, despite being of a clearly scriptural origin, was an epithet associated with the “apostolic” church of Holy Sion, the presumed location of the descent of the Spirit, of the Last Supper, and (since the early seventh century) also of Mary’s dormition. Significantly, a similar expression (“mother church” մայր եկեղեցի) is found also among the Armenian hymns for the Encaenia octave, which may suggest that a set of hymns pertaining to the church of Holy Sion in Jerusalem was also found among the original source underlying the Encaenia hymns in this tradition. The presence of this expression elsewhere in the Iadgari (among the ibakoni for the New

371 The concept of Sion as “mother” has its clear origins in LXX Ps 86:5 (μήτηρ Σιων, ἐρεῖ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐγενήθη ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐθεμελίωσεν αὐτὴν ὁ ὕψιστος). The connection is notable in the early 5th century works of Hesychius of Jerusalem, e.g. in his commentary on Ps 47:12 where the “daughters [of Judea]” are interpreted as “the churches” which “are gladdened upon their mother, Sion (ἐὰν τῇ μητρὶ ἀγαλλιάσθωσαν τῇ Σιών)" (Commentarius brevis, in Ps 47:12; ed. in V. Jagic, Supplementum Psalterii Bononiensis: incerti auctoris explanatio graeca [Vienna: Holzhausen, 1917]); also in Hesychius’ commentary on Ps 86:5, “mother Sion” is the one which “nourishes the man, for in it first the bread of life was leavened, which is the body of Christ,” apparently also alluding to the church and the eucharist.

372 Theodosius, De situ terrae sanctae 7 = CCSL 175, 118; the expression “mother of all the churches” is also found in the homily of John of Bolnisi, perhaps dated to the seventh or ninth century, see Michel van Esbroeck, Les plus anciens homéliaires, 314-315; see also idem, “Jean II de Jérusalem,” 108.

373 The characterisation of the church of Holy Sion as the locus of all three events is attested for the first time in the iambic poem by Sophronius of Jerusalem (560-638), Anacreontica 20, 1-55-68; PG 87:3821A; briefly on the development of this topology, see Maraval, Lieux saints et pélerinages, 257, 257 n. 42. The identification of Sion as the site of the Dormition of Mary cannot be dated earlier than late 6th-early 7th century, see Simon C. Mimouni, Dormition et assomption de Marie: Histoire des traditions anciennes, Théologie historique 98 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1995), 533-547; Stephen J. Shoemaker, Ancient Traditions of the Virgin Mary’s Dormition and Assumption, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 67, 125-129, even though Shoemaker leaves open the possibility of an earlier date for the localization of the Dormition at Sion, based on his reading of the early transitus Mariæ narratives (ibid., 128).

374 “Rejoice, Sion, mother church, for upon you the divine ray from the Father of light has shone…” (3rd day after Elevation, ode of Daniel; Sarakan, = Findikyan [35], 87); “Rejoice today, holy Sion, mother church…” (5th day after Elevation, Ps 148; Sarakan, = Findikyan [39], 88); “The One who enlightened the holy, universal, mother church with the divine light…” (5th day after Elevation, ode of Daniel; Sarakan, = Findikyan [51], 93).
and, more importantly, in the intercessions section of the anaphora of St James. Arguably, the allusions to Sion in the hymnography can be viewed as too generic, referring (by synecdoche) to the entire local Jerusalem church in general and aiming to bolster ideologically the status of the city as the “mother of all churches” after the ‘promotion’ of the see to an independent patriarchate after 450. It also seems possible that the very origin of the term “mother of all churches” lies in the original role ascribed to Sion as the supposed place of the descent of the Spirit, and therefore the

375 “[W]e praise you, God risen from the dead, for because of you the mother of the churches rejoices (οὐδὲν σοι ἱστόρεσις θεοφανείας), which you entered with the doors closed…” (H 2123, f. 290v = Šanidze, 202/Udzelesi iadgari, 346; French tr. Renoux, Hymnaire, 432), the reference is certainly to John 20:19 with the place where the disciples were gathered being interpreted as the place where the church of Sion stood. For the historical development of the Antipascha (Thomas Sunday) celebration in Jerusalem and Constantinople (without, however, any consideration of the Iadgari hymnography), see Vitaly Permiakov, “The Historical Origins of the Feast of Antipascha,” St Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly 47 (2003): 155-182.

376 Προσφέρομεν σοι δέσποτα καὶ ύπέρ τῶν ἁγίων σου τόπων, οὓς ἐδόξασας τῇ θεοφανείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου καὶ τῇ ἐπιφοιτήσει τοῦ παναγίου σου πνεύματος, προηγουμένως ύπέρ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ἐνδόξου Σιὼν τῆς μητρὸς πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν… (ed. Mercier, Liturgie de Saint Jacques, 206), similarly in the Georgian recensions “et offerimus tibi Domine… imprimis pro sancta et gloria Sion, mater omnium ecclesiareum” (ed. Tarchnišvili, Liturgiae ibericae antiquores, 16/12, 51-52/38), compare the same text in the 10th century ms. Tbilisi A 86, p. 49, ed. Kekelidze, Drevnegruzinskiy Arxieratikon, 44. The petition regarding the “Sion mater omnium ecclesiareum” is also found in the intercessions of the Syriac JAS (ed. O. Heiming, Anaphora syriaca sancti Jacobi fratris Domini, Anaphorae Syriaceae 2.2 [Rome: Edizioni Orientalia Christiana, Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1953], 152-3); the petition regarding the “holy places” constitutes a hagiopolite addition to the set of intercessions derived from the ancient form of Basil’s anaphora (Ur-BAS), see John R. K. Fenwick, The Anaphoras of St Basil and St James: An Investigation into Their Common Origin, OCA 240 (Rome: Pontificio Institutum Orientale, 1992), 271-283, esp. 241, 275. By contrast, the Armenian JAS does not contain the reference to Sion among its intercessions, as noted by Findikyan, “Armenian Hymns of the Church,” 87 n. 74; also cf. Anton Baumstark, “Denkmäler altarmenischer Messliturgie 3: Die armenische Rezension der Jakobusliturgie,” Oriens Christianus n.s. 7-8 (1918): 1-8.

377 On the struggle of bishop Juvenal of Jerusalem to bolster the independent status of his see, cf. Ernest Honigmann, “Juvenal of Jerusalem,” Dumbarton Oaks Papers 5 (1950): 211-279; Honigmann supposes that it was at the session of σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα in Constantinople between April and July 450 that Juvenal of Jerusalem was awarded the ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the provinces of Phoenicia I, Phoenicia II, and Arabia (ibid., 238, 238 n. 7; also on the creation of the Jerusalem patriarchate, ibid., 271-275).

378 Hesychius, 368.
reference to this term in the hymnography may also indicate this specific place in the topography of the city.

In his analysis of the Armenian Šaraknoc’ hymnography for the octave of Encaenia, Findikyan has proposed that the references to the “Cross,” “Sion,” and “Resurrection” in one of the hymns, specifically in the “doxological acclamations” appended to the Armenian equivalent to Adoramus crucem tuam hymn\(^\text{379}\) were meant to refer specifically to the three major ecclesiastical sites in Jerusalem: the Martyrium (“Cross”), the rotunda of the Anastasis (“Resurrection”), and the church of Holy Sion.\(^\text{380}\)

As we have seen above, it is possible that the references in the Iadgari hymns to “Sion,” “mother of the churches,” and the church “founded by the apostles” also need to be placed in the early liturgical context of the city of Jerusalem, as the references to the site of the church of Holy Sion, the location of the Pentecost. Similarly, a few allusions in the Iadgari hymns suggest a similar reference to another site, the place of Christ’s burial and resurrection, the Anastasis rotunda:

The evening sacrifice we offer to you, O Christ God, who have sent down to the apostles from heaven the holy Spirit and with [your] grace filled the catholic church, in which we are granted the forgiveness of sins by your resurrection.\(^\text{381}\)

The evening sacrifice we offer to you, O Christ God, who illumined the Apostles by [your] divinity and through them has magnified the church upon the rock,\(^\text{382}\) in which [we are granted the forgiveness of sins by your resurrection].\(^\text{383}\)

---


\(^{380}\) Findikyan, “Cross and Encaenia”; cf. also idem, “Armenian Hymns of the Church,” 80-81 n. 55. For the translation of the acclamations, see ibid., 80-81.

\(^{381}\) KyrEk 4 = *Udzvelesi iadgari*, 287.

\(^{382}\) ἐν πέτρᾳ ὑψώσεν με – LXX Ps 26:5.

\(^{383}\) KyrEk 5 = *Udzvelesi iadgari*, 288.
The phraseology of these two hymns contains similarities with the Resurrectional hymnody of the Iadgari, as well as with later Palestinian Octoechos for regular Sundays. For this reason, one may rightly interpret the hymn as alluding to the resurrection of Christ itself, rather than to the relic of the empty tomb. If we, however, reflect on the first hymn as emerging in the context of the Jerusalem stational liturgy, with Anastasis, Martyrium, and Sion as major geographical points of the liturgical life of the city, we may be able to discern such specific allusions in this troparion, similar to what one finds in the Armenian tradition:

“have sent to the apostles from heaven the Holy Spirit”  
“catholic church”  
“by your resurrection”  

Such analysis would seem to be too speculative, were we not able to encounter a similar expression in another hymn, the *oxitaj* (introit), accompanying the first entrance of the

384 E.g. “Nous t’offrons le sacrifice du soir, Christ-Dieu…” (tone 1, KyrEk 13, 17-19; tone 2, KyrEk 2; tone 4, KyrEk 6 = Renoux, *Hymnes de la résurrection*, 103, 105, 141, 214); “L’hymne du soir et le sacrifice spirituel, Christ, nous te les presentons, car tu t’es plu à nous accueillir, par ta résurrection” (tone 4, KyrEk 1, cf. KyrEk 2 = Renoux, 213-214), “aie pitié de nous par ta sainte résurrection” (tone 4, KyrEk 7-8 = Renoux 214-215).

385 Ἑσπερινὸν ὕμνον, καὶ λογικὴν λατρείαν, σοὶ Χριστὲ προσφέρομεν, ὅτι ηὐδόκησας, τοῦ ἐλεῆσαι ἡμᾶς, διὰ τῆς Ἀναστάσεως; Κύριε, Κύριε, μὴ ἀπορρίψῃς ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου, ἀλλὰ εὐδόκησον, τοῦ ἐλεῆσαι ἡμᾶς, διὰ τῆς Ἀναστάσεως (Par, tone pl.4 Sunday, KyrEk 1-2).

386 See references to Findikyan’s study in fn. 62.

387 It is not uncommon in the Georgian sources to refer to the Martyrium as the “catholic church”; the Kala/Lakurga ms. of the Georgian lectionary mentions in *Catholicca* (ქათოლიკე ღვთისმშობლი) as the place of synaxis for the third, fifth, and sixth Sundays of Lent, Holy Thursday, and Easter morning (GL 395, 470, 520, 632, 744 = T 57 n.2, 67 n.2, 74 n. 3, 90 n. 1, 114); likewise in the account of the sack of Jerusalem by Persians in 614 by Antioch Strategos, the author describes what one of the characters sees in a vision: that “all the people went up to the Catholic church, which is [the church of] St Constantine where the wood of the precious Cross was found (ქათოლიკე ღვთისმშობლი სადა იგი იპოვე ძელი პატიოსანას ჯუარისა),” ed. Nikolay Marr in vol. 9 of *Teksty i razyskanija po armiano-gruzinskoj filologii* (St Petersburg, 1909), 14, cited in Kekelidze, *Ierusalimskij kanonar’,* 201; for partial ET, see Frederick C. Conybeare, “Antiochus Strategos, The Capture of Jerusalem by the Persians in 614 AD,” *English Historical Review* 25 (1910): 502-517.
eucharistic liturgy on September 13 which seems to contain several specific allusions to the material building which dedication was celebrated:

Adorned more than the sun, your glorious tomb became life for all the world as well, O Christ God, for earlier, when your all-holy body was placed in it, it destroyed corruption and shattered the sting of death, but on this day of dedication holy churches are made to rejoice, for through it joy was granted to us and the sinners found the remission of sins and great mercy – through which deliver us, O blessed and compassionate (φιλάνθρωπος) Lord, glory to your life-giving Resurrection!

Being attested in the Georgian lectionary for September 13, this hymn may belong to the earliest layer of the hymnography for this day, alongside the vesperal hymn which did not survive to be represented in the Iadgari. This hymn contains the language similar to that in the troparion for Κύριε ἐκέκραξα discussed above (the “remission of sins” and deliverance granted by means of a certain salvific act), but the locus of the salvific action which grants “joy,” “remission of sins,” and by which the deliverance is expected,

388 Hosea 13:14, 1 Cor 15:55.

389 Udzelesi iadgari, 297.

390 GL 1236 = Tarchnišvili, 43/36; it needs to be noted though that GL preserves merely an incipit of the hymn.

391 See GL 1235.

392 Curiously, the expression in the hymn “through it joy has been granted to us” (διότι δοθηκε τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἁγίαν ἀνάστασιν διὰ τοῦ Σταυροῦ, χαρὰ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ) appears to be similar to a line in the hymn Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι, which is a fixed post-Gospel chant of the present Byzantine resurrectional orthros, but is in reality a composite hymn which was a later development in the hagiopolite resurrectional office, as attested in the Anastasis Typicon (= Hagioi Stavrou 43; ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus in vol. 2 of Ἀναλέκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας [St Petersburg, 1894], 11, 194). Stig Frøyshov has determined recently that this chant is a composite text, probably originally of processional origin. Frøyshov was able to trace four of five constituent elements of this chant to various texts in the ancient Iadgari, with the exception of one element: Δεῦτε πάντες οἱ πιστοὶ, προσκυνήσωμεν τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἁγίαν ἀνάστασιν, ἵνα γὰρ ἥλθε διὰ τοῦ Σταυροῦ, χαρὰ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ, which in its latter part is quite similar to “through it the joy was granted to us”; see Frøyshov, “The Resurrection Office of the First Millenium Palestinian Tradition,” forthcoming (presented at the III Congress of the Society for Oriental Liturgies, May 2010). I am grateful to Prof. Frøyshov for letting me refer to his article before its publication.
seems to be the “glorious tomb” of Christ, i.e. the Anastasis rotunda. It is likely that the concluding doxology: “Glory to your life-giving resurrection!” may also have originally been referring to the church of Anastasis whose dedication was celebrated on September 13, rather than to the foundational event in the history of salvation. Such ambiguity is featured, as it seems, in a hagiopolite homily attributed to Ephrem the Syrian, which in its coda employs the expression ἐγκαίνια τῆς ἀναστάσεως, apparently using ἀνάστασις to mean precisely the relic of Christ’s tomb. At the same time, another phrase in the Iadgari hymn – “on this day of dedication holy churches are made to rejoice” – indicates that at the time of the composition of this hymn, the feast of Encaenia have acquired a broader scope, as the feast pertaining not to one, but to many churches in Jerusalem, including the Anastasis, the Martyrium basilica and Holy Sion.

5.2.3 Possible Traces of the Rite of Dedication?

Given that the hymnography for the feast of Encaenia, which has been preserved through the Armenian tradition and Georgian translation, was deeply rooted in the local ecclesiastical topography and local Jerusalem liturgical use, the question arises whether any of the Iadgari texts for this feast can contain evidence regarding the liturgical rite of dedication of a church in Jerusalem. The examination of several hymnographic texts

393 I choose to treat the “glorious tomb” (დიდებული შენი საფლავი) as the antecedent of ამის მიერ and რომელსა მიერ in the oxitaj above.

394 Thus, the doxology at the end of the hymn may be seen as parallel to similarly “topographical” acclamations in the Armenian hymns for the Elevation of the Cross, studied by Findikyan, “Cross and Encaenia”; idem, “Armenian Hymns,” 80-81.

reveal several recurring expressions which may allow us to suggest a connection between
the hymnography for the feast and liturgical practices at the dedication of a church in
Jerusalem and surrounding areas after the fifth/sixth centuries.

Firstly, the emphasis is given in these texts on the public and solemn character of
the celebration, as in the hymn for the washing of hands (*xelt ’abanisaj*) of the eucharistic
liturgy:

The voice of your prophets, of Isaiah and David, has been fulfilled, O God, in
which they said: all nations shall come and bow down before you, for behold! by
your grace, O Benefactor, the people fill your courts. They entreat you, who
suffered crucifixion and by your life-giving resurrection preserve us and have
mercy on us.\(^396\)

Certainly, the genre of the texts does not allow to determine whether the solemn and
festive gathering in question refers to the celebration of a specific historical dedication of
a church (e.g. of the Holy Sepulchre) or to the annual commemoration of this dedication.
Remarkably, when such expressions are used, it is not specified, the dedication of which
church is commemorated in these texts, even though other hymns for Encaenia allow to
build some connections to the topography of Jerusalem:

Let us, the faithful, praise the feast of the day of dedication! Let us extol the
Saviour of all and let us say: praise the Lord, for greatly he is glorified!
Having fulfilled the gathering of the dedication, faithfully let us celebrate, let us
extol the Saviour of all and say: praise the Lord, for greatly he is glorified!\(^397\)

See, see, see: the Lord our God, who adorned the church with glory and in it the
faithful gather to celebrate the feast.\(^398\)

\(^{396}\) *Udzvelesi iadgari*, 297-98. The same *xelt ’abanisaj* was used for the Elevation of the Cross on
September 14 (*Udzvelesi iadgari*, 313); also, a recension of the Greek text of this hymn has survived in the
Byzantine Menaion (MR 1.167, see fn. 24 above).

\(^{397}\) As 1-2 = *Udzvelesi iadgari*, 288.

\(^{398}\) Pros 8 = *Udzvelesi iadgari*, 289.
On this day the holy churches rejoice and the multitude of the faithful rejoice and glorify you alone, O Christ.399

The assembly of the faithful, in the interpretation of these hymns, transcends the boundaries of earthly church and incorporates the incorporeal angelic assembly as well – a recurrent idea in the liturgical texts connected with the dedication rites:

The army of the invisible ones rejoices today, for the angels that drew near and communed with men became the holy church, by which the deception was cast out and the new faith was established…400

At the same time, some hymnographic texts, both in Georgian and Armenian traditions, make apparent allusions to a rite which most likely characterized the hagiopolite rites of church dedication at the stage of their formation in late fifth and early sixth centuries: the rite of the installation/establishment of an altar. Earlier we have seen the ‘deposition’ or ‘dedication’ of the altar (sakurt’xevelisa dadgmaj/satp’uri) as one of the recurring feasts connected to the dedication of churches in and around Jerusalem in the Georgian Lectionary and in the hagiopolite calendar of John Zosime (Sinai Georgian O.34), as well as in the monastic vitae describing the dedication of churches in the foundations of Euthymius and Sabas. The Ancient Iadgari, in turn, contains two troparia which appear to make allusion to a similar practice of the installation of an altar. The first of these follows the Canticle of Three Youths in the course of the morning office:

We celebrate the dedication of your mystical altar (სატფურებასა ვდღესასწაულობთ საიდუმლო შენისა საკურთხეველისას). We lift up and say: all the works of the Lord, bless the Lord!401

399 Ebo 7 = Udzvelesi iadgari, 293.

400 Ainoi 12 = Udzvelesi iadgari, 296.

401 Eul 3 = Udzvelesi iadgari, 294.
The expression “mystical altar” (lit. “altar of your mystery”) contains a clear allusion to the eucharistic celebration as the ultimate goal and purpose of the liturgical object to be dedicated. More interestingly, the dedication of an altar here is seen as an act totally equivalent to the dedication of the entire church, which may be regarded as an allusion to an actual liturgical development in the dedication rites in Jerusalem. As has been noted in section I, the term “dedication of an altar” appears in the Lathal ms. of GL for the feast of September 6 (dedication of the altar at Siloam’s pool), and in the Paris ms. for the feast of November 4, located in an unidentified village Gelbane (Gebal?). The term seems to be equivalent to “deposition of the altar,” encountered on total of eight occasions in the Georgian Lectionary. The use of this expression in hymnography, particularly among the earlier layer of hymns in this set, suggests that the ritual action involving the altar was considered to be part and parcel of the dedication rites – which may have superceded in significance other ritual acts, such as the dedication of the church building and the deposition of relics. Further development of the same theme can be seen in another Iadgari troparion:

Today the holy altar is established in the holy church, upon which the life-giving body and blood of Christ is offered for the forgiveness of sins and for the eternal life. With praises we glorify the Father of mercies.

In the structure of the service, the troparion follows and thematically alludes to the ninth biblical ode (Lk 1:46-55, 68-79), which is reflected in the verb “glorify” used in the
refrain at the end of the hymn. The theme of this troparion seems to allude more explicitly to the rite of dedication, specifically to the “establishing” (daemtkic’a > damtkic’ebaj) of a new altar in a new church, precisely for the purpose of eucharistic celebration, expressed through sacrificial terms – “the life-giving body and blood of Christ is offered,” most likely alluding to the anaphora. The Armenian hymnography for the “Encaenia of the Cross,” which precedes the hymnography for the feast of the Elevation of the Cross in the Šarakan contains a hymn similarly connecting the affixing of the new altar with the offering of the eucharistic sacrifice:

Your altar, O Lord of hosts (Ps 83:4), was erected/raised up (կանգնեցաւ) in faith in your sanctuary. Come people, let us venerate it. Today a precious stone was set up (հիմնեցաւ) in your sanctuary. Come people: In her was offered the true sacrifice and the incorrupt oblation. Come people:406

As Findikyan noted, the allusion to Ps 83 in the first strophe connects this hymn with the rites for the installation of the altar in the Armenian euchologies, and also with the rite of dedication in GL.407 Additionally, one could also see some parallels between the Armenian and Georgian hymns, indicating perhaps a common hagiopolite origin: both refer to the altar being established (Iadgari) or raised up (Šarakan, first strophe), set up/founded (second strophe) for the offering of the eucharistic oblation (Šarakan, third strophe). The two hymns deriving from two traditions heavily influenced by Jerusalem certainly bear the features of liturgical structures into which these were integrated, resulting in different refrains at the end of hymns, particularly in the Armenian where it is subdivided into three strophes. The difficulty of reconstructing the development of Armenian hymnography from the time of the Armenian lectionary to the earliest extant


407 Findikyan, “Armenian Hymns,” 76 n. 43.
šarakan manuscripts in the thirteenth century \(^{408}\) would complicate any final resolution with regards to the ultimate origin of these troparia and their connection with the Georgian hymnography. However, it will suffice to indicate that both Georgian hagiopolite and Armenian hymns at this instance clearly refer to the establishment of an altar as the central focus of the dedication feast in the fifth-sixth century Jerusalem. Even though, as we saw above, the deposition of relics has been connected with the feasts of church dedication in the Holy City and around (Mar Saba), at least in the fifth-sixth century, the allusions in the hymnography show the growth of the rites surrounding the installation and consecration of the altar at this particular period.

5.2.4 The Chant for the Procession with Gifts for the liturgy of Encaenia.

Another distinctive characteristic of the hymnography for the Encaenia in the Iadgari is the use of “Alleluia” as the sic ‘midisaj, i.e. chant designated, literally, ‘of the holy [things].’ \(^{409}\) Aside from the feast of Encaenia, only three other festal liturgies are noted for having a plain “alleluia” as such a chant in the Georgian hagiopolite sources: the lituriges of Easter vigil, Easter, and Pentecost. \(^{410}\) The Georgian lectionary also records the plain “alleluia” as an optional chant for Palm Sunday, \(^{411}\) corroborated by one

---

\(^{408}\) See the discussion in Findikyan, *Commentary on the Armenian Daily Office*, 344-353.

\(^{409}\) სიწმიდისა [ჰს] (H 2123, f. 245v = Šanidze, 170; Sin. iber. 18, Sin. iber. 41 = Udzelesi iadgari, 298).

\(^{410}\) Udzelesi iadgari, 215, 217, 250. In the Iadgari, the chant of “alleluia” serves as a coda for the poetic processional chants- sic ‘midisani on six other occasions: December 28 (James and David), January 1, Cheesefare Sunday, first Wednesday of Lent, Palm Sunday and 6th Saturday of Pentecost (ibid., 30, 37, 100, 105, 176, 244).

\(^{411}\) GL 596 = Tarchnišvili 1.105/85 n. 2. While the Lathal and Kala mss. are deficient at this point (Kekelidze, *Ierusalimskij kanonar’,* 71), the Paris ms. of GL provides the incipit of the poetic sic ‘midisaj
witness to the Iadgari, with other manuscripts including the poetic troparion only. This feature of the eucharistic ordo separates the feast of Encaenia into a distinct category of festivals, all united, as it seems, by their association with the Easter-Pentecost season or with the traditional site of the Resurrection. While the Iadgari texts do not usually go into details with respect to the execution of the Alleluia at the procession with τὰ ἁγία, ms. Sinai Georgian O.37, one of the witnesses to the Georgian lectionary, provides such information for the liturgies of Easter vigil (Holy Saturday), and of Easter morning. Thus, for the liturgy of Easter morning, Sinai Georgian O.37 contains the following rubric:

They bring in (ἡγίασμα) [the gifts] with Alleluia.
Alleluia, tone 1: Alleluia
Verse: Open the gates (Ps. 23:7)
Alleluia.
Glory. Alleluia.

Thus, for both the Easter vigil and the Easter morning liturgy the Alleluia served as a refrain intercalated with at least one verse of Ps 23. Such arrangement is also found in another hagiopolite source, ms. St Petersburg gr. 44 (ninth cent.) which contains 16

---

412 Tbilisi H 2123, f. 139v (Šanidze, 98) includes aleluj’t’a for sic’midisaj as a marginal note (ibid., 98 n. 258; cf. Udzelesi iadgari, 176 n.1), while mss. Sinai iber. 18 (B) and Sinai iber. 41 (D) have only the poetic troparion “Today the King of glory,” which however ends with the triple chant of Alleluia (Udzelesi iadgari, 176). For the note regarding Šanidze’s misreading of H 2123 with regards to the hymn of the holy gifts for the Palm Sunday, see Renoux, Hymnaire, 318 n. 6.

413 GL 739 = Tarchnišvili 1.142/113, n. 3.

414 GL 751 = Tarchnišvili 1.144/115, n. 1.

415 I here reproduce the Sinai iber. 37 rubrics with the consideration of Leeb’s corrections of Tarchnišvili’s serious misreading of GL 739 and GL 751 (Leeb, Gesänge, 115-116 n. 157).
proppers for eucharistic liturgies,\textsuperscript{416} eight of which pertain to the repertories for regular Sundays, corresponding to the eight-tone cycle of Palestinian Octoechos with each Sunday proper apparently assigned to a respective tone.\textsuperscript{417} Just as in the known ordo of hagiopolite JAS, the Gospel reading in this liturgical codex is followed by two hymns, with the interposing diaconal exclamation Μὴ τῶν κατηχουμένων (i.e. the dismissal of the catechumens).\textsuperscript{418} These two hymns must correspond to the xelt’abanisaj and sic’midisaj of the Georgian Lectionary and Iadgari, and in the eight propers for Sunday liturgy,\textsuperscript{419} the second chant, the chant “for the holy gifts” consists of the chant of Alleluia, with the intercalated verse Ps 23:7:

\begin{quote}
 Αλληλούϊα, άλληλούϊα.
 Ἄρατε πύλας οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν, καὶ ἔπαρθητε πύλαι αἰωνίοι, καὶ εἰσελεύσεται ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης.
 Αλληλούϊα.
 Δόξα Πατρι. Αλληλούϊα.\textsuperscript{420}
\end{quote}

Thus, again, the chant “for the holy gifts” here takes the form of the antiphonal psalm 23 with Alleluia as a refrain.\textsuperscript{421}

\textsuperscript{416} Ed. Jean-Baptiste Thibaut, Monuments de la Notation Ekphonétique et Hagiopolite de l’Église Grecque: exposé documentaire des manuscrits de Jérusalem, du Sinaï et de l’Athos conservés à la Bibliothèque Impériale de Saint-Pétersbourg (St Peterburg, 1913), 17-30, publication of the text 4*-11*. The formularies that the codex contains, include those for the common feasts of 1) martyrs, 2) prophets, 3) monastic saints, 4) hierarchs, 5) apostles, 6) consecration of a church (εἰς τὰ ἐγκαίνια), 7) holy women (εἰς γυναικάς), 8)- 15) Sunday propers in 8 tones; 16) archangels (Archangel Michael).

\textsuperscript{417} Ibid., 7*-10*.

\textsuperscript{418} See Mercier, PO 26.2, 176.

\textsuperscript{419} The text of the chant is written in full only for the first, second, third and eighth Sunday propers, but it is reasonable to assume that this chant is prescribed for the use on other Sundays as well, as no processional chant is found for other Sundays in this manuscript.

\textsuperscript{420} Thibaut, Monuments, 7*.

\textsuperscript{421} For the description of antiphonal psalmody in the Byzantine liturgy, see Juan Mateos, La célébration de la Parole dans la liturgie byzantine: Étude historique, OCA 191 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1971), 13-26; Taft, “The Structural Analysis of Liturgical Units: An Essay in
According to Leeb’s interpretation of the evidence, the responsorial or antiphonal chant of Ps 23 with Alleluia formed the earliest layer in the development of the troparion “for the holy gifts” in the Jerusalem rite, subsequently supplemented by the addition of the Gloria and a poetic composition, so widely represented throughout the Iadgari and the Georgian lectionary. Such view was also developed in the subsequent studies of Taft, Renoux, and Winkler, who concluded that the antiphonal psalm (23) with the Alleluia as a refrain represented the earliest form of the sic’midisaj in Jerusalem, specifically used with Ps 23 on Easter. In his study on the rites of “great entrance,” Robert Taft had questioned the possibility that the antiphonal Ps 23 at the transfer of the gifts had originated in Jerusalem, rather than in Constantinople. He based this hypothesis on the homily of patriarch Eutychius of Constantinople (552-565, 577-582), On the Holy Eucharist, which explicitly mentions the chanting during the procession with the gifts of a ὑμνὸς ψαλμικός, i.e. of an antiphonal or responsorial psalm, that contained the words “the King of glory,” a likely reference to Ps 23:7-10. Taft suggests, tentatively, that while Leeb might be correct in assuming that Ps 23 with alleluia may have been the

422 Leeb, Gesänge, 115-119.

423 Taft, Great Entrance, 98-118; Renoux, Hymnes de la Résurrection, 1.84-85; idem, “L’hymne des saints dons dans l’Octoechos géorgien ancien,” in ed. Job Getcha, André Lossky, Thysia aineseos: Mélanges liturgiques offerts à la mémoire de l’archevêque Georges Wagner (1930-1993), Analecta Sergiana 2 (Paris, 2005), 293-313; see also Gabriele Winkler, Das Sanctus, 206-248. It must be added that the use of Ps 23 at the transfer of gifts is a feature of the current rite of the divine liturgy of the Armenian Church – I refer to the recent edition in Very Rev. Fr. Daniel Findikyan, general ed. The Divine Liturgy of the Armenian Church, With Modern Armenian and English Translations, Transliteration, Musical Notation, Introduction, and Notes (New York: St Vartan Press, 1999), 25; see discussion in Taft, Great Entrance, 102-105. Also on the use of Ps 23:7 at the great entrance in the Byzantine (Greek and Slavic) euchologia, see ibid., 234-236.

424 Sermo de sacrosancta eucharistia 8 = PG 86/2:2401; see the discussion in Taft, Great Entrance, 84-86 and idem, Precommunion Rites, 311-312.
“original Jerusalem Great-Entrance antiphon,” his assumption does not exclude a Constantinopolitan origin for the whole structural unit, since it seems to be already in place in the mid-sixth century, and only one source for the Georgian lectionary transcribes the antiphon of Ps 23 in its fullness.\footnote{In the later Georgian lectionary of Jerusalem, Ps. 23 with alleluia appears only in codex Sinai Georg. 37, and hence is only a variant reading in the codices of the lectionary, indicating that it may be of foreign, perhaps Byzantine origin.” - Ibid., 102.} However, while only ms. Sinai Georgian O.37 contains the full transcription of the sic ‘midisaj chant for the Easter vigil and Easter morning liturgy, all mss. of Georgian lectionary and Iadgari consistently mention the use of Alleluia on Easter vigil, Easter morning, Pentecost, and Encaenia. Such consistency makes it more likely that ms. Sinai Georgian O.37 merely provides a full record of what was the implied usage in other sources, and that Ps 23 + Alleluia was indeed used on all these feasts, including the Encaenia, the paschal character of which is without question.\footnote{Ibid., 99-100; cf. idem, “Psalm 24 at the Transfer of Gifts in the Byzantine Liturgy: a Study in the Origins of a Liturgical Practice,” in ed. Richard J. Clifford and George W. MacRae, \textit{The Word in the World: Essays in honor of Frederick L. Moriarty, S.J.} (Cambridge, MA: Weston College Press, 1973), 159-177. Taft also notes (\textit{Great Entrance}, 100, 109ff.) that the use of Ps 23 with alleluia on the feast of Encaenia is explained as well by “the prominent place of this psalm in the rites of the consecration of a church in the Byzantine tradition,” which may be anachronistic, as the development proceeded, in my opinion in the reverse direction, from the “great entrance” rites to the use of Ps 23 at the \textit{encaenia} rite.} If this unit was indeed the original hagiopolite sic ‘midisaj for Easter and Sundays, its preservation during the feasts of paschal season or theme would be consistent with Baumstark’s “law” regarding the subsistence of more ancient liturgical structures in the more solemn seasons.\footnote{\textit{Liturgie comparée}, 30ff.; idem, “Das Gesetz der Erhaltung des Alten in liturgisch hochwertiger Zeit,” \textit{Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft} 7 (1927): 1-23; Taft, “Anton Baumstark’s Comparative Liturgy Revisited,” 200.} At the same time, given our limited knowledge of the development of the pre-iconoclastic Constantinopolitan liturgy, it would not be
unreasonable to suggest that a hagiopolite processional chant could have been adopted in Constantinople sometime in the sixth century.

However, this scholarly consensus regarding the original form of the transfer of gifts in the liturgy of the Holy City, their influence on the Constantinopolitan liturgy, and most of all the proper function of so-called “processional chants,” including Ps 23:7 + Alleluia came to be reassessed due to recent studies of the cadre of hagiopolite sic’midisaj troparia in the Octoechos section of the Iadgari by Charles Renoux,428 and the study of the enarxis prayers of Greek and Georgian JAS by Stéphane Verhelst.429 Through his study of the prayers in the beginning of the ordo of the Greek JAS, and especially through the comparison of Greek and Georgian texts of those prayers, Verhelst was able to determine the original function of those texts as belonging to an earlier shape of the prothesis rite the purpose of which was the preparation of eucharistic gifts after the first entrance of the bishop and the clergy into the church. Through the analysis of the contemporary sources, e.g. the letter of Severus of Antioch to Caesarius,430 Syriac canonical sources431 and liturgical commentaries,432 Verhelst estimated that in the West Syriac rite, the eucharistic gifts were deposited upon the altar before the beginning of the


430 ed. Brooks, PO 14, 194-259, esp. 256.


432 Ibid., 196-97.
liturgy of the Word already in the early sixth century. This rite, functionally equivalent to later Byzantine prothesis, was thereafter adopted in Jerusalem in the sixth century, but – as Verhelst reasons – was probably discarded during the seventh century (perhaps under the Byzantine influence), since the Greek manuscripts of JAS displace two of the prayers featured as part of the prothesis rite in the Georgian mss. (Δέσποτα ζωοποιεῖ, 433 Θεὸς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ τὸν οὐράνιον ἄρτον 434) toward the beginning of the liturgy of the eucharist. 435 While on the first glance this development in the early history of the hagiopolite liturgy appears unrelated to the evolution of hymnography, these elements of the liturgical system of Jerusalem are closely connected, for indeed, the most direct corollary of the displacement of the oblation ritual toward the beginning of the divine liturgy in the sixth-seventh century would be that in this, the most likely period when the hymnography of Iadgari were in the active stages of formation, the hagiopolite eucharistic liturgy did not have a processional rite, functionally equivalent to the Byzantine “great entrance.” 436 We shall return to the prayers of JAS in our further study of the prayers of the Jerusalem euchology, related to the rite and feast of dedication, but it is important to emphasize Verhelst’s conclusion regarding a strong influence of the liturgical tradition of Syriac churches, specifically of the Severian monophysite movement, on the evolution of hagiopolite rites. 437

433 Mercier, PO 26.2, 176.

434 Ibid., 180; this is also the prayer of the Byzantine prothesis rite, already featured in the ordo of BAS in Barberini gr. 336 (f. 1r; Parenti-Velkovska, 57).


This conclusion based on the examination of Greek and Georgian euchological material found support in the study of the *sic’midisaj* troparia in the Octoechos section of the Iadgari undertaken recently by Charles Renoux. It is clear that by contrast to the responsorial chant of Ps 23 with alleluia as a refrain, which possibly was used also on the feast of Encaenia, the *sic’midisaj* troparia prevalent in the Iadgari manifest a different style of composition, consisting usually of self-contained poetic strophes, ending with the chant of *alleluia* or Trisagion. In the light of previous discussion, one would not be surprised to note Renoux’s observation regarding those hymns that these “ne font jamais la moindre allusion à un rite processional qui aurait entouré l’arrivée des oblats avant qu’ils ne soient déposés sur l’autel” — understandably, if at the time the composition of this hymnography was flourishing, these could not have been used to accompany the procession with the gifts to the sanctuary, as at that time in Jerusalem the gifts were deposited during or soon after the time of the first entrance. The hymns in question, particularly those used in the Sunday Octoechos section, indeed hardly can be interpreted as processional chants, since there is no sign of any psalmody, to which the hymn would function as a refrain. The hymns themselves concentrate on the angelic liturgy, the unity of the assembly of the faithful and of angelic choirs, and on the offering of a “sacrifice of praise”/ sacrifice of Christ, i.e. of the anaphora. In conjunction with this content of the

---

437 “Nous pensons qu[e le rite de la déposition des oblats] a une origine syrienne monophysite,” Verhelst, “Messe de Jérusalem,” 251, and further 251-54; also “Déposition des oblats,” 186-192.


439 Ibid., 308-09; such interpretation of the *sicmidisaj* hymns by Renoux is quite consistent with Robert Taft’s exegesis of the meaning of the Byzantine Cherubic hymn as an anticipation of the offering of the anaphora and of the reception of communion: “properly understood…[the Cherubikon] assumes a broader, more balanced liturgical role, tempering the exaggerated importance that has been assigned to the Great-Entrance procession in itself. For at the entrance we welcome the gifts, symbol of Christ, only with a view to their oblation and reception in communion…” (Great Entrance, 67-68).
sic’midisaj troparia and the currently disputed connection of these hymns to the ‘great entrance’ procession, Renoux also proposed to re-evaluate the role the “Ps 23:7 and alleluia” unit could occupy in the context of the hagiopolite liturgy. One characteristic of both ms. Sinai Georgian O.37 and St Petersburg gr. 44, which both feature alleluia with Ps 23:7, is that the verse 7 of that psalm is the only verse that is ever mentioned in this context. Thus, Renoux suggests that, since the hagiopolite sicmidisaj that we know were never accompanied by a psalm, the words “Open your gates, O princes” “désignent seulement une exclamation à l’arrivée des saints dons.” The scholar does not specify the precise liturgical function of this exclamation, but one could surmise that it could be a diaconal (?) invitation interrupting the continuous chanting of alleluia, and marking the moment when the eucharistic gifts are brought to the altar.440

However, certain factors seem to undermine Renoux’s suggestion: firstly, the manuscripts of Georgian lectionary do not appear to include the material which does not pertain to scriptural or hymnographic elements of the service, and if Ps 23:7 was an “exclamation,” it would surely be a prerogative of the clergy. Secondly, if we accept the hypothesis of the absence of a ‘great entrance’ ceremony in the 6th century Jerusalem (a corollary from the deposition of the gifts during the first entrance), the verse 23:7 will not have any connection to any practical use, such as a transfer of the gifts. It can be suggested, therefore, as I surmised above, that the use of Ps 23:7+ alleluia represents a more ancient usage, dating prior to the displacement of the transfer/deposition of the gifts from the beginning of the liturgy of the eucharist to the beginning of the liturgy of the Word in the sixth century.

If we return to the discussion regarding the origin of the use of Ps 23 at the ‘great entrance’ ceremony, the hypothesis of Ps 23+alleluia as a liturgical unit originating in Jerusalem, is quite significant for the history of the Byzantine church dedication rite, since the use of Ps 23 at this ritual was first attested in Constantinople exactly in the sixth century. While the position of Ps 23 in the liturgy of the imperial city is markedly different from its setting in Jerusalem, there seems definitely to be a connection, suggesting that the placement of Ps 23 as a processional chant at the dedication rite may have had its origins in the Jerusalem and (later) Constantinople use of this chant as a processional antiphon. At the same time, patriarch Eutychius’ objection to the use of this chant in Constantinople had a clear theological reason: the use of the psalmic verse with the words “King of glory” seemed to the patriarch inappropriate, since the gifts were not yet consecrated. Given the already existent symbolic association of the “great entrance” with Christ’s burial procession, the use of the “King of glory,” i.e. the messianic term, implied the theological teaching that the body of Christ while dead, remained ‘divine’ and incorrupt, expressed in its radical form by Julian of Halicarnassus (d. ca. 527). Hence, Eutychius’ disapproval of the use of specific psalmic texts was rooted in divergent christological perspectives, as he was a known opponent of

441 At the dedication of Hagia Sophia on December 24, 562; Joannis Malalas Chronographia, ed. Dindorf, 495.

442 Sermo de sacrosancta eucharistia 8.

443 See the overview of the burial cortège symbolism in Theodore of Mopsuestia and Narsai in Taft, Great Entrance, 15-39.

444 See “Aphthartodocetism,” ODB 1.129; with more detail and with references to Julian’s surviving work, see René Draguet, Julien d’Halicarnasse et sa controverse avec Sévère d’Antioche sur l’incorruptibilité du corps du Christ: Etude d’histoire littéraire et doctrinale (Louvain: Smeesters, 1924), 213-216.
Aphthartodocetism.\textsuperscript{445} On the other hand, the liturgical texts of hagiopolite provenance are quite prone to imply the incorruptibility of the body of Christ at his burial in the tomb, e.g. in the \textit{oxitaj} (introit) of the liturgy for the Encaenia on September 13, cited above:

\begin{quote}
...when your all-holy body was placed in it [i.e. the tomb], it destroyed corruption and shattered the sting of death...\textsuperscript{446}
\end{quote}

The presence of such concept in the hymns for the feast of Encaenia would also suggest that these (at least in their earlier layer) cannot be dated later than the sixth century when the issue of the properties of Christ’s body in the tomb became problematized, as one can see from Eutychius’ homily.

\textit{An “Alternative” Sic’midisaj Chant for September 13.}

The only alternative text to be used as the troparion “for the holy [gifts]” for the feast of Encaenia on September 13 comes from the lectionary included in the tenth-century euchology \textit{Sinai Georgian O.54}\textsuperscript{447} that provides an additional important witness to the hagiopolite lectionary at the second third of the tenth century.\textsuperscript{448} For September 13, this euchology provides a different, poetic composition as the \textit{sicmidisaj} of the liturgy:

\textsuperscript{445} Alexander Kazhdan, “Eutychios,” ODB 2.750.

\textsuperscript{446} \textit{Udzvelesi iadgari}, 297.

\textsuperscript{447} The manuscript was first described by Nikolai Marr in \textit{Описание грузинских рукописей Синайского монастыря} (Moscow-Leningrad: USSR Academy of Sciences, 1940), 83-90 and, more comprehensively by Bernard Outtier, “Un témoin partiel du lectionnaire géorgien ancien (Sinai géorgien 54),” \textit{Bedi Kartlisa} 39 (1981): 76-88. The Liturgy of St James and the Liturgy of the Presanctified from this codex were edited by Michel Tarchnišvili in \textit{Liturgiae ibericae antiquiores}, 23, 93-100.

\textsuperscript{448} Bernard Outtier, “Un témoin partiel du lectionnaire,” 88.
Your temple is full of glory, O Lord, in which God Sabaoth is seated upon (his) lofty and majestic throne, and around him the many-eyed Cherubim and six-winged Seraphim with unceasing voices cry out and say: Holy, holy, holy is Lord, the King of glory.449

The coda of the hymn in this euchologion shows some similarities with the sicmidisaj for the second day of the Encaenia octave – the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross on September 14,450 as well as with most of the sic’midisaj hymns in the hagiopolite Octoechos.451 Just as in these troparia, this sic’midisaj centers on the vision of the heavenly temple, inspired by Isaiah 6, quite properly concluding with the chant of the Trisagion (6:3). The focus of this troparion on the angelic praise, anticipating the anaphoral Sanctus, and thus foreshadowing the upcoming offering of the sacrifice of praise/Christ’s sacrifice in the anaphora, appears to be consistent with the theology of the hymns “for the holy [gifts]” in the hagiopolite Octoechos and thus it can be roughly dated to the same period where the chant at the beginning of the liturgy of the eucharist has temporarily lost its function as a processional hymn. It seems thus likely that it was indeed the “alleluia” chant which served as the ancient sicmidisay hymn for September 13 in the Jerusalem rite, while the Isaiah-inspired hymn of Sinai Georgian O.54 was a

449 f. 156v; for the French translation of this hymn, see Outtier, “Un témoin,” 86.

450 “Praising the fearful and invisible festival of the Creator of the invisible beings, who sits on his invisible throne, the Lord of all, we offer gifts to you who are invisible with the divinity and incomprehensible with the eyes. [You,] the invisible one, are served by the many-eyed Cherubim and six-winged Seraphim with the unceasing voice breathlessly cry out and say: Holy, holy, holy is the Lord, the King of glory” (Udzvelesi iadgari, 313). This text survives only in Tbilisi H 2123, while ms. Sinai Georgian O.41 (C) preserves a different text: “The body and blood of the Lord...” (ibid., 313 n. 3).

later, 6th century development, reflecting changes in the ordo of the liturgy of James as it was used in the Holy City at the time.

Hymnography for the Dedication Liturgy in the ms. St Petersburg. RNB 44 (9th cent.)

The ninth-century uncial codex St Petersburg RNB gr. 44, brought from Mt Sinai by Constantine Tischendorff and published by Jean-Baptiste Thibaut in 1913, contains a number of propers for a celebration of a eucharistic liturgy of the hagiopolite tradition, quite consistent with the extant sources for the Greek and Georgian text of JAS. In addition to providing several propers for eight Sundays, corresponding to eight-tone structure of the Octoechos, the codex gives also common propers for the celebration of eucharistic liturgy on the common feasts of saints and on the occasion of the dedication of a church (εἰς τὰ ἐγκαίνια) or, more likely, on the occasion of an annual feast of dedication. The comparison of the common proper for the encaenia of a church with the lectionary for the dedication of a church found in the Georgian Lectionary shows a number of dissimilarities and a lack of direct textual connection between two sets of propers. While the canon of readings in the Georgian lectionary consists of the troparion for the first entrance (oxitaj), same as the one used for the feast of Encaenia on September 13, and the lectionary including Ps 83:4, 2; Wisdom of Solomon 9:1-19; Isaiah 6:1-10, Hebrews 13:7-16, the alleluia psalm 64:2, and the gospel reading from

452 Monuments de la Notation ekphonétique et hagiopolite, 4*-11*; concerning the origin of the ms., see ibid., 17. The photographs of f. 5v and 19r which Thibaut provided in his edition, reveal a number of Arabic marginalia, also often encountered among the liturgical mss. of the Sinaitic collection (e.g. Sinai gr. 973, 959 et al.).

453 Ibid., 6*; here and further I supply the diacritics absent in the majuscule Greek text.
Matthew 23, the codex St Petersburg gr. RNB 44, while conforming to the structure of the hagiopolite JAS, provides the readings with a very few parallels to the Georgian lectionary:

1. Troparion, tone 1: Τούτον τὸν ναὸν πατήρ ἐκτησε, ὁ υἱὸς ἐτελέωσεν, πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγον ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτὸν.
Δόξα πατρί. Τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος τὸ πλήρωμα. Εὐθυμοῦσα.

2. Ps 64:5-6
3. 1 Corinthians 3:8-17
4. Alleluia ps. 25:8
5. Gospel reading from Matthew (16:13-19)
6. Following the diaconal exclamation (Σχολάσωμεν), the hymn:

Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Κυρίου μεγάλως κεκόσμηται, ἐνδυσαμένη τὴν πορφύραν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ στέφανον ἔχουσα τὸν σταυρὸν, ἑορτάζει μετʼ ἀγγέλων τὸν νυμφίον ἔχουσα.

7. After the dismissal of the catechumens (Μή τις τῶν κατηχούμενων), another hymn is sung:

Ἀνάπαυσον Δέσποτα ἐν εἰρήνῃ τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν δούλων σου καὶ ἀξίωσον τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς ὑπὸ καταλάμπει τὸ φῶς τοῦ προσώπου σου, Κύριε. 
Δόξα πατρί. Τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος τὸ πλήρωμα.

8. The lectionary concludes with the indication of deacon’s call Ἐν σοφίᾳ Θεοῦ πρόσχωμεν, and the incipit of the creed.

If we compare this ordo with the data of the Georgian Lectionary, the Georgian Iadgari, as well as with the extant sources for the Greek text of JAS, we will note apparent similarities in the structure of the Liturgy of the Word. Thus, the sequence of hymns troparion (1)- στίχος (2)- hymn (3) corresponds to the sequence of hymns at the Liturgy of the Word in the Georgian lectionary and the Iadgari: rogational hymn (oxitaj)- hand-washing hymn (xelt’abanisaj)- hymn of the “holy gifts” (sic’midisaj).

Moreover, the

454 GL 1549-1553 = Tarchnišvili 2.91/73.

455 The reading is unclear and breaks off at this point.

456 Cf. Greek JAS: Ὅ οἱ ἱερεὺς ἐκφωνεῖ· Πιστεύω εἰς ἕνα θεόν (Mercier, PO 26.2, 182).
comparison with the diaconal rogations of JAS as preserved in the ninth century and later Greek mss. shows without doubt that the content of *St Petersburg gr. 44* reflect the Liturgy of the Word of this hagiopolite liturgy.\textsuperscript{458} However, as it has been pointed out, the hymnography included in this proper is completely distinct from the *cadre* of the hagiopolite troparia from the Georgian Lectionary and the Iadgari, and does not find parallels among the known liturgical hymnography, with the exception of the initial troparion, equivalent to the *oxitaj* (rogational entrance hymn) of the Georgian JAS. This hymn quite closely corresponds to one of paschal stichera found in the *Anastasis Typicon* (ms. *Hagiou Stavrou 43*, 1122 CE) sung during the procession from the Holy Anastasis to the basilica of Holy Martyrium at the vigil service on the Easter eve:

**Anastasis Typicon**\textsuperscript{459} 

Φωτίζου φωτίζου ἡ νέα Ἱερουσαλήμ,  
ἡκε γὰρ σου τὸ φῶς  
kai ἡ δόξα Κυρίου ἐπὶ σὲ ἀνατέταλκεν,  
toῦτον τὸν οἶκον ὁ πατὴρ ὕψος ὑμῶν,  
toῦτον τὸν οἶκον τὸ ὕψος ἑστερέωσεν,  
toῦτον τὸν οἶκον τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιον ἀνεκαίνισεν,  
tὸ φωτίζον καὶ στηρίξον  
kαὶ ἑγιάζον τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν.

**St Petersburg RNB gr. 44**

Toῦτον τὸν ναὸν πατὴρ ἐκτησε,  
ὁ υἱὸς ἐτελέωσεν,  
πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιον ἐπεσκίασεν  
αὐτὸν.


\textsuperscript{458} Καὶ ὅτε πληροῦται τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, λέγει ὁ διάκονος: Σχολάσωμεν ἐκτενῶς, ἐν εἰρήνῃ τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν (Mercier, 172); ὁ διάκονος: Μη τις τῶν κατηχουμένων, μη τις τῶν ἀμύητων, μη τις τῶν μὴ δυναμένων ἡμῖν συνδεηθῆναι (Mercier, 176); ὁ ἀρχιδιάκονος: Ἐν σοφίᾳ θεοῦ πρόσχωμεν (ibid., 182). Curiously, the hand-washing hymn is absent from the manuscripts Mercier used for his edition of JAS; cf. Tarchnichvili, *Liturgiae ibericae antiquiores*, CSCO 122-123, pp. 4-5 (g)/3-4 (l), where the diaconal invocation “In the peace of Christ, chant!” introduces the hand-washing hymn, while the invocation “Let none of the catechumens…” is followed by the transfer of eucharistic gifts (or the chant of “Alleluia” in another version of JAS from cod. *Borgianus ib. 7 - Liturgiae ibericae antiquiores*, 40-41 (g)/30 (l)).

\textsuperscript{459} ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Ἀναλέκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς σταχυολογίας* (St Petersburg, 1894; reprint Bruxelles: Culture et Civilisation, 1963), 2.185.
Since the codex quite often provides the incipits of the liturgical hymns, it cannot be determined whether the troparion for the entrance was cited in full, or whether it concluded in the same way as the paschal processional sticheron found in the Anastasis Typicon. It is clear, however, that the introit for the liturgy on the day of dedication in St Petersburg RNB gr. 44 was dependent on the text from the hagiopolite office of Resurrection, thus demonstrating in liturgical terms a perception of the central of the “holy places” of Jerusalem, i.e. the Holy Anastasis and Martyrium, as a ‘paradigm’ temple for the newly dedicated churches, at least within the realm where the hagiopolite rite was used. The use of the Matthew 16 reading, likewise frequently found as a gospel reading for the dedication feasts in the Holy City, confirms direct connection of the lectionary in St Petersburg RNB gr. 44 to the liturgy of Jerusalem, but the differences in the selection of hymnography does not allow one to place the origin of this lectionary in Jerusalem itself.

5.3 The Jerusalem Euchologion and the Church Dedication.

One of the essential components of the liturgical life in the Holy City between the fifth and tenth centuries, which might have included ceremonies connected with the inauguration of churches, encapsulates itself in a liturgical book which, in its complete form, is known today only in the Old Georgian translation.\textsuperscript{460} The Georgian euchologia,\textsuperscript{460} The only exception to this is the 92-folio uncial euchologion Sinai N. MГ 53 (eighth-ninth cent.), discovered in 1975 among the New Finds in St Catherine’s Monastery, but which had not been yet fully available for the wide study by liturgical scholars; see the description in the catalogue of the new finds: Hiera Mone tou Sina, Τὰ νέα εὐρήματα τοῦ Σινᾶ (Athens: Hypourgéo Politismou/Hidryma Orous Sina, 1998; English ed., Holy Monastery and Archdiocese of Sinai, The New Finds of Sinai (Athens: Ministry of Culture/Mount Sinai Foundation, 1999)); also see Paul Gehin and Stig Frøyshov, “Nouvelles
which may accurately reflect the content of the euchologion that took its shape in the
liturgical use of Jerusalem, contain very limited amount of material which pertains to
church dedications, which to our knowledge includes a) euchological propers – litanies
and prayers for the feast of Encaenia and for the “consecration of an altar”; b) a brief
service for the consecration of the baptistery in Sinai iber. 12; and c) a likewise succinct
rite for the consecration of a portable altar/odiki in ms. Tbilisi A 86.

5.3.1 Kverek’i (litany) and Dismissal Prayers for the Feast of Dedication (September
13).

Alongside the hymnographic pieces of the Jerusalem eucharistic liturgy,
changeable according to a feast or season, the surviving witnesses to the Jerusalem
euchologion contain two other sets of propers specific for the major festivals of the
hagiopolite calendar, including the feast of Encaenia on September 13: the series of
intercessions, i.e. a litany for the liturgy of the feast, and the dismissal prayer at the end
of the liturgy. These series of propers are found in two Georgian witnesses to the
Jerusalem euchologion, mss. Sinai Georgian O.12⁴⁶¹ and Sinai Georgian O.54⁴⁶², both
dated to the tenth century.

découvertes sinaïtiques: à propos de la parution de l’inventaire des manuscrits grecs,” Revue des études
byzantines 58 (2000): 167-184, 177; Stéphane Verhelst, “La messe de Jérusalem.” It is to be understood
that any conclusion reached in this study with regards to the content of the Jerusalem euchologion may be
subject to serious correction by further studies which will take into account the evidence of the Sinai New
Finds.

⁴⁶¹ The euchologion ms. Sinai Georgian O.12, written on 301 folia in the miniscule nussuri script,
and dated to the tenth or the end of the tenth-beginning of the eleventh cent., contains the liturgies of
James, Presanctified, the series of k’vereksi (litanies) and dismissal prayers for the people appropriate for
feasts, seasons, and sanctoral commemorations; as well as a series of prayers for various needs, and a
lectionary. First described by A. Tsagareli, it was more thoroughly described in the catalogue of the
Georgian mss. of the Sinai collection in ed. R. Gmaramia, E. Metreveli et al., K’art’il xelnacert’a
ağceriloba: Sinuri kolek’cia, pt. 3 (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1987), 33-47, as well as in Bernard Outtier, “Un
nouveau témoin partiel du lectionnaire géorgien ancien (Sinai géorgien 12),” Bedi Kartlisa 41 (1983): 162-
“Litany”/kverek’si.

First attested in the late fourth century Antiochene document known as Apostolic Constitutions,463 but perhaps harking back to a hypothetical Judeo-Christian tradition,464 the series of diaconal petitions at the eucharistic service or daily office became one of the crucial structural elements of the Eastern liturgical traditions, including Jerusalem and Constantinople.465 In the eucharistic rite of the Apostolic Constitutions, the diaconal petitions are positioned after the liturgy of the Word and the dismissal of the catechumens, energoumenoi, phôtizomenoi, and the penitents,466 and is preceded by the injunction of the deacon to the faithful to kneel.467 Within the context of the Jerusalem rite, as it is known from the extant witnesses to the Greek JAS, the term “catholic litany” (καθολικὴν συναπτήν) applies to the petitions pronounced by the deacon following the

174 (contains a full French table of contents); see also Gérard Garitte, “Les feuillets géorgiens de la collection Mingana à Selly Oak (Birmingham),” Le Muséon 73 (1960): 251-53.

462 The euchologion ms. Sinai Georgian O.54, written in the majuscule asomtavruli script, contains only 184 folios, and may be dated to the second third of the tenth century. It also contains the liturgies of James and Presanctified, the series of proper litanies and dismissals for the feasts of the year, a set of occasional prayers and blessings, and a lectionary. See R. Gmaramia et al. K’art’ul xelnacert’a… sinuri kolek’c’ia, 58-67, and Bernard Outtier, “Un témoin partiel du lectionnaire géorgien ancien (Sinai géorgien 54),” Bedi Kartlisa 39 (1981): 76-88, who gives a more precise dating for the codex.

463 8.10 = Funk, 488-492 (eucharist), 8.36 = Funk, 544 (vespers).

464 See specifically on the possible connection between the diaconal ‘catholic litany’ of the Jerusalem rite and Jewish shemoné ‘esrê intercessions the work of Stéphane Verhelst, Les traditions judéo-chrétiennes dans la liturgie de Jérusalem, spécialement la Liturgie de saint Jacques frère de Dieu, Textes et Études Liturgiques 18 (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 105-154; idem, “La ‘keryxie catholique’ de la liturgie de Jérusalem et le Shemoneh ‘Esreh,” Questions liturgiques 81 (2000), 5-47.


466 ApConst 8.6.14, 7.9, 8.6, 9.11 = Funk 480-488.

467 ApConst 8.10.2 = Funk 488.
transfer and deposition of the gifts upon the altar. However, from one of the early mss. of the Georgian JAS, Tbilisi A 86 (tenth/eleventh c.), we know of this term (καθολική συναπτή / kverek’i si kat’olikej) to have been applied to both the litany following the gospel reading (i.e. concluding the liturgy of the Word), and the litany following the transfer of the gifts. The Greek redaction of the catholic litany following the “great entrance” consists of 19 petitions, including the petition for the “honorable…, divine gifts set forth,” which, as the comparison with the Georgian JAS in Tbilisi A 86 seems to imply, is an addition to the standard text of the καθολική, used both at the divine liturgy and at the conclusion of vespers in the Palestinian horologion (as evidenced in

468 The term καθολική συναπτή appears in one ms. of JAS, used by Mercier for the critical edition of the Greek JAS, the 15th cent. Paris gr. 2509 (ὁ διάκονος ποιεῖ καθολικήν συναπτήν), while the majority reading gives the text of the rubric: ὁ διάκονος ἄρχεται τῆς καθολικῆς (Mercier, Liturgie de Saint Jacques, PO 26.2, 186 l. 6 and fn.).

469 The Georgian text of the ms., formerly in the collection of the Tbilisi Ecclesiastical Museum, was edited by Korneli Kekelidze in Древнегрузинский архиератикон: грузинский текст (Tiflis: Losaberidze, 1912). The Russian translation of the whole ms. text was published several years prior by Kekelidze in Литургические грузинские памятники в отечественных книгохранилищах и их научное значение (Tiflis: Bratstvo, 1908), 6-32, while the useful English translation of the entire ms. by Fred Conybeare and Oliver Wardrop appeared as “The Georgian Version of the Liturgy of St James,” Revue de l’Orient Chrétien 18 (1913): 396-410 and 19 (1914): 155-173; for another description of the ms., see the catalogue of the former collection of the ecclesiastical museum (A) in ed. T. Bregadze et al., K’art’ul xelnacert’a agceriloba qop ’ili saeklesio museumis (A) kolek’ciisa, vol. 1.1 (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1973), 297-300.

470 The term κυριεύς/κυριεύς appears as a term used to translate “litany” in any of its forms (συναπτή, έκτενή) even in the current use of liturgical Georgian. Etymologically, it derives from κηρούς-κηρούς, designating to the proclamation/preaching [of the gospel], and hence applicable to the clergy (see Lampe, PGL, 752). Verhelst (Traditions judéo-chrétiennes, 114) suggests a possible Semitic origin to the concept of associating “proclamation” with the intercessory prayer, while rejecting a direct connection between Georgian kverek’i si and Syriac karīzūthô ‘heralding, proclamation, preaching, message,’ which may have similar etymology (Payne Smith, Thesaurus syriacus 1.1817-1818); cf. Čubinašvili, K’art’ul-rusuli lek’sikomi, 608; ADW 582.

471 “After the reading of the gospel, the deacon pronounces the catholic litany” (f. 19 = Kekelidze, 17/Conybeare-Wardrop, 401), “the deacon pronounces the catholic litany, but he adds this” [petition for the gifts to be offered] (f. 25 = Kekelidze, 23/Conybeare-Wardrop, 403).

472 See n. 125 above.
The more ancient redaction of the litany, consisting of 25 petitions, has been studied so far on the basis of the Georgian euchologia mss. Sinai Georgian O.34 and 54, even though the study of the new finds on Mt. Sinai is bound to produce new evidence for this important component of the Jerusalem eucharistic rite.

Alongside with the so-called “catholic litany,” the Georgian mss. of JAS uses, rather indiscriminately, the term *kverek'si* to apply to other litanies used in the course of the eucharistic rite:

a) the litany before the gospel, corresponding to τὴν ἔκτενην in the Greek JAS, and present in the Graz ms., but absent in the Tbilisi A 86 ms. of JAS, placed either before (Graz ms.) or after the alleluia chant (Gk JAS, ms. Vatican borg. 24);

b) the litany after the gospel, largely correspondent to the catholic litany after the great entrance, including the *aitêseis*, and appropriately named *kverek'si kat'olikej* in Tbilisi A 86;

c) the “catholic synaptê” before the anaphora;

---

473 The Palestinian horologion in Sinai Georgian O.34 includes the *kverek'si kat'olikej* with 25 petitions in the ordo of vespers (Frøyshov, “L’horologe ‘géorgien’,” 1.26 [edition], 2.461-462); this horologion also includes a prayer specific to this litany (“after the catholic litany [of] 25, prayer”), but included in the beginning of the text (ibid., 1.19). See also Verhelst, *Traditions judéo-chrétiennes*, 144-146.

474 The edition of the “catholic litany” on the basis of these two mss.: Bernard Outtier, Stéphane Verhelst, “La kéryxie catholique de la liturgie de Jérusalem (Sin. 12 et 54),” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 42 (2000): 41-64.


476 I do not intend to ascribe much significance to this feature of the Georgian liturgical books, which is not uncommon among the ‘translated’ liturgical vocabulary – compare e.g. the similar Slavic use of the term *ektënis* (from ἔκτενη) to apply to *any* litany/series of petitions in the formulary of CHR, BAS, PRES or divine office.

477 Mercier, PO 26.2, 170.


479 f. 16-18 = Kekelidze, *Drevnegruzinskij arxieratikon*, 14-17; Conybeare-Wardrop 400-401.

480 Ibid., 401.
d) the litany following the anaphora and preceding “Our Father”\textsuperscript{481}.

While the extant formulary of the Greek JAS includes the catholic litany after the gospel reading and before the anaphora into the formulary of the eucharistic liturgy, its text is lacking from the presbyteral formulary of the Georgian JAS in both Tbilisi A 86 and Graz 5.\textsuperscript{482} Other two tenth-century witnesses to hagiopolite euchologion, Sinai Georgian O.12 and 54 also do not incorporate the full text of the litany into the liturgical formulary, but are unique in presenting its full text in another section of the euchologion which follows the formulary of the hagiopolite PRES.\textsuperscript{483} In addition to the catholic litany which does not appear to vary according to the feast or season, these two euchologia include a series of proper litanies and prayers appropriate for specific festivals and Sunday celebrations of the hagiopolite liturgical year.\textsuperscript{484} In Sinai Georgian O.12, this section of the euchologion is entitled “Litanies for/of the liturgy (კუერექსნი ოქარის წირვისა),” thus indicating JAS (or perhaps also PRES) as the context where these litanies were used. Two of the litanies from these euchologia, one of which is attested in Sinai Georgian O.12 only – are proper to the feast of Encaenia on September 13.

\textsuperscript{481} Called kverek'si in A 86 (Kekelidze, 61; Conybeare-Wardrop 156), and apparently, a synaptê in Greek JAS, as follows from the rubric in ὁ διάκονος συνάπτει οὕτω λέγων μεγάλως, according to ms. Paris Suppl. gr. 476 (15th cent.) – Mercier, PO 26.2, 222.

\textsuperscript{482} Tarxnišvili, Liturgiae ibericae, 3-4.


\textsuperscript{484} Sinai Georgian O.12, ff. 11r-34v; Sinai Georgian O.54, ff. 15v-28v; in Sin. iber. 12 the text of the catholic litany is given following the proper litanies for the feasts, which would correspond to the sequence of the litanies in JAS. For the discussion of the dismissal prayers, see section 3.1.2.
Aside from the term žamis-cirvaj which provides a clear indication that the
litanies in question were proper to the eucharistic liturgy, there is no indication in these
Georgian euchologies as to the exact place within the liturgy where these litanies would
be used. This information can be discerned from the comparison of the text of the
litanies in question with the litanies of the Greek JAS. It should be noted that while both
the majuscule Sinai Georgian O.54 and the miniscule Sinai Georgian O.12 provide a
litany for the day of Encaenia on September 13,\textsuperscript{485} it is only the latter euchologion that
also includes another litany, a kverek’si “for the blessing/consecration of an altar,”\textsuperscript{486}
which in turn is followed by the kverek’si “of the cross (ჯუარისა),” i.e. for the
celebration of the Cross on the second day of the Encaenia octave. It is however the two
litanies falling on and after the date of Encaenia that are the focus of my attention here,
for which reason the citation of the full text may be suitable.

I. Kverek’si of the Encaenia.\textsuperscript{487}
1. Let us all say: Lord have mercy.
2. O Christ who have set your own foundation upon earth and your church upon
the rock of faith, we pray you: hear and have mercy.
3. You who revealed the stone anointed by Jacob as a ladder raised to heaven\textsuperscript{488}:
4. You who through the patriarch this anointed stone (to be) the image of your
glory:
5. You who filled the temple made by hands through Solomon with the glory
which is from you\textsuperscript{489}:
6. You who established the blossomed church of the Gentiles:

\textsuperscript{485} Sinai Georgian O.12, f. 23v: კუერექსი ენკენისა; Sinai Georgian O.54, f. 26v: კუერექსი ენკენიის.

\textsuperscript{486} Sinai Georgian O.12, f. 24v: კუერექსი საკურთხევლისა; Sinai Georgian O.54, f. 27v: კუერექსი უკურთხევის.
as the later
Georgian euchologies, Sinai Georgian O.12 also uses the term kurt’xevaj (lit. benedictio) as the term
equivalent to the consecration or dedication.

\textsuperscript{487} Sinai Georgian O.12, f. 23v-24v; Sinai Georgian O.54, f. 26v-27v.

\textsuperscript{488} Gen. 28:17-18.

\textsuperscript{489} 1 Kgs 8:10-11.
7. You who have granted us a house upon which your grace luminously has rested:
8. You who bestowed upon us the house in which your life-giving body is being offered:
9. You who bestowed upon us the house like heaven by the coming of your holy Spirit:
10. You who (made) the corrupted Sion of old to be called Sion again by the power of the new daughter of Sion:
11. You who lamented Jerusalem which went astray and illumined the church which was called:
12. You who has eradicated from the Jerusalemite branch that which produces thorns and planted the church on a rock as your new olive branch:
13. You who mercifully has shown your church which you planted in the image of the mount of Olives:
14. You who granted us the house above heavens in which your ineffable Father makes his dwelling:
15. O Lord save your people and bless [your inheritance].

II. Kverek'si for the blessing of the altar:
1. Let us all say [Lord, have mercy].
2. You who are the priest forever according to the order of Melchisedec:
3. You who offers and is offered, and who receives the sacrifice:
4. You who by the manger has prefigured for us the spiritual table upon which is offered your life-giving body and blood:
5. You who were put in a manger of the animals, were placed as food on the table of rational beings:
6. You who through fire revealed the table of Elias and have set up for us the table of grace:
7. You who appeared through voice at the sacrifice of Abraham, but have given the Davidic altar for the ineffable (gamout'k'umelad) offering: we entreat you, O Lord, hear [and have mercy]:

490 Isa 62:11, Matt 21:5.
492 Sinai Georgian O.12, f. 24v-25r.
493 Heb 5:6, 10.
495 1 Kgs 18:38.
496 Gen 22:11.
The comparison of these series of petitions with the litanies constituting part of the formulary of the Greek JAS shows that these two *kverek’sni* shows identical characteristics with the litany found between the *alleluia* chant and the gospel reading, i.e. the ἐκτενή,\(^ {498}\) which has also become a regular feature of the Byzantine liturgical formularies.\(^ {499}\) The ἐκτενή in JAS, just as the *kverek’sni* above, begins with the diaconal exhortation Εἴπωμεν πάντες, κύριε ἐλέησον,\(^ {500}\) and has as its final petition Σῶσον, ὁ θεός, τὸν λαόν σου καὶ εὐλόγησον τὴν κληρονομίαν σου, albeit in a much more expanded redaction.\(^ {501}\) In Greek JAS, these two petitions of the ἐκτενή act as a ‘frame’ incorporating in between a number of additional petitions which, in the case of the received text of the Greek JAS, were apparently derived from the “catholic synaptê,” for which the form of the intercessions, beginning with Ὑπέρ would be a sure indicator.\(^ {502}\) Such form of the ἐκτενή can be also encountered among a number of the Byzantine liturgical formularies, e.g. *St Petersburg gr. 226* (tenth cent.), the Latin translation of BAS formerly preserved in the monastery of Johannisberg in Rheingau-Gebirge,\(^ {503}\)

\(^{498}\) Mercier, PO 26.2, 170, 172.


\(^{500}\) Ibid., 170.

\(^{501}\) Ibid., 172.

\(^{502}\) E.g., Ὑπέρ τῆς εἰρήνης τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου καὶ ἐνώσεως πασῶν τῶν ἁγίων ἐκκλησιῶν, δεόμεθα ἐπάκουσον, etc. – Mercier, PO 26.2, 170.

\(^{503}\) Parenti, “L’ektene...n’ell’eucologio *St. Petersburg gr. 226*,” 304-07. Parenti observes that the Greek Italian euchologies, such as Messina gr. 160, Grottaferrata Γ, β, IV, attest to the subsequent reduction in the number of petitions ‘borrowed’ from the great synaptê – ibid., 316-17.
As noted by Mateos, Taft, and Parenti, the ἐκτενή, similarly to a small synaptê in the Byzantine rite, may also follow the type of the classic “expanded Oremus” unit, with the distinction that the deacon already in the beginning petition suggests to the people the response to be given (κύριε ἔλέησον), thereafter proceeding to elaborate on the subject matter of the common prayer. Speaking of this litany within the context of the Byzantine liturgy of the Word, Juan Mateos, and later John Baldovin, suggested that its position after the gospel reading (and before the dismissal of catechumens) cannot be the original one and proposed to seek the origins of the ἐκτενή in the rogational processions (λιταί) characteristic of the stational liturgy of the imperial capital, as evidenced in the tenth-century Typicon of the Great Church. The positioning of the ektenē-type litany within the Greek JAS before, rather than after, the gospel reading may confirm the hypothesis with regards to the processional origins of this liturgical unit. The hagiopolite sources (not used by Mateos) for JAS, e.g. the Georgian euchologia Tbilisi A 86, Graz 5, and N. Sinai 58, do not give enough evidence to date the existence of the ektenê in JAS before to the seventh-eighth century, roughly contemporary with the first

---

504 Mateos, Célébration de la Parole, 152-153.

505 Dmitrievskij 2.133; Mateos, Célébration de la Parole, 153.


508 Verhelst, Traditions judéo-chrétiennes, 156-57.
Byzantine witness, *Barberini gr. 336*, which may support the attribution of this element to a Byzantine influence. The prominence of stational procession in the liturgy of the Holy City, however, had prompted Verhelst to suggest tentatively that while the Byzantine influence upon the insertion of the *ektênê* into JAS is not excluded, it could the that the form of the processional petitions in question had its origins in Jerusalem.

While the original place of the *ektênê* in the euchologies *Sinai Georgian O.12* and 54 is not clear from the sources themselves, the witness of the Georgian hagiopolite euchologia may bring further ramifications to our understanding of the function of this unit.

As Mateos had pointed out, the major characteristic difference between the *synaptê* and the *ektênê* was that in the former the deacon provided for the people the intentions for which to pray, while in the latter he addressed God directly, while the people merely continued this prayer. Two examples of the litanies for the feast of Encaenia from the hagiopolite Georgian euchologia *Sinai Georgian O.12* and 54 provide a direct example of such characteristic trait, an example which is not attested in the extant Greek and Byzantine sources. The series of petitions following the diaconal injunction “Let us all say: Lord have mercy,” and preceding the final intercession “Save, O Lord, your people” (derived from Ps 28:9) address Christ directly: “Christ” (I.2) or “you who (romelman)…” and concluding every petition with, “we pray you, Lord, hear and have mercy (gevedrebit’ šen up’alo ismine da šeguic’qalen).” The content of the petitions is anamnetic in nature, drawing upon the plethora of biblical allusions, united by the theme

509 Ibid., 156-59.


512 *Célébration de la Parole*, 149.
of divine presence in a holy place: the vision of Jacob’s ladder in Gen 28:10-17 (I.3), his anointing of the stone in Bethel (I.4), the building of Solomon’s temple (I.5), the fiery descent of the Lord upon the sacrifice of Elias and the altar of David (II.6-7). Just as the hagiopolite hymnography for the Encaenia, discussed above, these diaconal petitions draw upon the contrast between the “old” Jerusalem/Sion which “went astray” (I.10-12) and the “church of the Gentiles” which “blossomed forth” (I.6), while the allusions to specific holy places in these litanies – Sion (I.10), Jerusalem (I.11, 12), Eleona (I.13), Bethlehem (“manger,” II.4, 5) – support the Sitz im Leben for these liturgical elements in the practice of the church of the Holy City. A connection with other liturgical (e.g. hymnographic) texts for the feast of Encaenia may be apparent in the very first petition which, just as the Iadgari hymn from the vespers of September 13, refers to Christ as the one who “placed… [his] church on the rock of faith” (I.2)513 which in this case is paralleled with the creation account, the setting of the foundation for the earth (Gen 1:6-10, Ps 103:5). Another aspect clearly prominent in the diakonika for the Encaenia, but especially in the diakonika for the “blessing of an altar,” lies in the emphasis on liturgical functionality of the temple and/or altar which dedication is commemorated in this instance: the temple/“house” is where “[Christ’s] life-giving body is being offered” (I.8), while both the altars of Elias and David, but particularly the Nativity manger prefigured “spiritual table upon which is offered your life-giving body and blood” (II.4) and the eucharistic self-offering of Christ “as food on the table of rational beings” (II.5).

Thus, the ἐκτενή/kverek ′sì petitions for the feast of Encaenia and for the “blessing of an altar” are specifically crafted to unfold thematic allusions relevant to the theme of

513 See above, part 2.1.
the celebration: the consecration of a new temple or an altar as a locus of divine indwelling on earth (I.7, 9, 14), a Christian church building as a material embodiment of the “blossomed church of the Gentiles” and a “house like heaven,” an earthward projection of a heavenly temple and also a fulfilment of specific scriptural types. Such theological focus of these *diakonika* leads one to suppose that, just as it may be apparent in the study of the Georgian hagiopolite hymnography for the Encaenia, the composition and introduction of these petitions into liturgical practice of the Holy City came at the time when the connection of the feast of Encaenia with the historical event of September 13, 335 became more loose, and the focus of the celebration became shifted to theological and ecclesiological reflection. As have been noted by Verhelst, the manuscript evidence does not allow us to set the *terminus post quem* for the introduction of ἐκτενή into JAS earlier than the seventh-eighth century. The fact, however, that this liturgical unit is not found in the sources at this exact place (between the Alleluia chant and the gospel reading), does not mean it did not exist as part of a processional celebration. Even more, given the tendency of hagiopolite stational services to use the lectionary that “is always appropriate to the time and place of the celebration,” it is not unfathomable to see the diaconal litany, processional in origin, which content is relevant to the occasion and place of the celebration. Subsequent disintegration of the stational liturgy in the aftermath of Persian and Arabic invasions in the 7th century may have prompted the incorporation of the processional ἐκτενή into the formulary of JAS, while

---


515 As also pointed out by Verhelst, ibid., 158.

the further dissemination of JAS in the Byzantine rite manuscripts allowed the tradition of the ‘festal inserts’ into this litany to be lost.\textsuperscript{517}

The processional origin of the diaconal petitions for the feast of Encaenia still does not fully explain the function of the kvverekʼsi (and a special dismissal prayer) for the “blessing of an/the altar,” which however is extant only in one witness – the euchologion Sinai Georgian O.12. Just as the first litany focused on the theme of the foundation of the “church of the Gentiles” and of the “house like heaven” on earth, the diakonika for the dedication/blessing of an altar unfolds a set of allusions pertaining to the altar as locus of high priestly ministry (\textbf{II.2, 3}), of divine manifestation (\textbf{II.6-7}), and eucharistic celebration (\textbf{II.4-5}). Even though these petitions are placed in the euchologion alongside those pertaining to the hagiopolite feast of Encaenia, and before those pertaining to the feast of the Cross, i.e. between September 13 and 14 of the liturgical year, the thematic scope of this litany is general enough to consider a possibility that these were designated for an occasional rite of consecration of an altar, perhaps to be used in the course of the divine liturgy.\textsuperscript{518} Remarkably, in the historical development of the dedication rites, displaced from the context of JAS and Jerusalem rite, these two litanies had apparently become part of the cadre of texts associated with the dedication of a church and an altar in the Georgian tradition. This explains the incorporation of these two litanies into the

\textsuperscript{517} The reason that the ἐκτενῆ did not find its place after the gospel, as in the formularies of CHR and BAS, may be that another litany – the “catholic synaptê” concluding the liturgy of the Word was already present at that place, as seen in the tenth-cent. euchologion Tbilisi A 86 (f. 19 = Kekelidze, 17/Conybeare-Wardrop, 401). Such ‘crystallization’ of the fossil of the stational procession within the texture of the liturgy of the Word may have caused changes to its text, losing the changeable proper ‘festal inserts’, the place of which was filled with the doublets of the petitions from the “catholic synaptê”; for another explanation, see Verhelst, \textit{Traditions judéo-chrétiennes}, 166-67.

\textsuperscript{518} Dom Bernard Outtier has expressed this possibility (Personal communication, May 2009).
Georgian recension of the Byzantine rite of church dedication in the eleventh-cent. ms. 
Tbilisi S 143, which I will discuss in more detail in one of the following chapters.

Prayers of the “Dismissal of the People.”

In addition to the series of proper litanies for the festivals of the liturgical year, the euchologia Sinai Georgian O.12 and Sinai Georgian O.54 contain a similar series of presbyteral prayers, likewise specific to the feasts of the Jerusalem church. The proper title of this liturgical unit, “prayer of the dismissal of the people (ლოცვა ერის განტევებისა),”519 suggests its place in the context of a eucharistic liturgy (JAS) as the prayer for the dismissal at the end of the service. The formulary of Greek JAS contains several prayers designated as ἡ εὐχὴ ὀπισθάμβονος (‘prayer behind the ambo’),520 a title also appearing in the formularies of CHR and BAS in Barberini gr. 336, and in the later Byzantine manuscripts, including the received text of the Byzantine liturgies.521 While

519 Sinai Georgian O.12, f. 35r; cf. Sinai Georgian O.54, f. 29r.

520 Mercier, PO 26.2, 244-248; additionally, a set of three prayers under the title εἰςχαὶ ὑπολογικαὶ τῆς συνάξεως appears in ms. Vatican gr. 2282 (9th cent.), one of the earliest witness to Greek JAS. These were not included in Mercier’s critical edition of Greek JAS, but were previously published in ed. A. Iosephus Cozza-Luzi, Novae patrum bibliothecae, vol. 10.2: Liturgica (Rome: Typis sacri Consili propaganda christiano nomini, 1905), 105-110; appropriately noted by Taft, Communion, Thanksgiving, and Concluding Rites, 623 n. 165.

the contemporary recension of the Byzantine rite knows only two *opisthambonoi* prayers – the common prayer for BAS and CHR, and the prayer for the Presanctified liturgy\(^{522}\) – a number of Greek manuscripts of Byzantine liturgies, particularly of South Italian provenance, as well as some Slavonic and Georgian sources, preserve a much broader selection of such prayers, suited to feasts and seasons of liturgical year.\(^{523}\) A structural analysis of the place of the *opisthambonos* in the concluding rites of the Byzantine liturgy, as well as a number of parallels between variant Byzantine and hagiopolite prayers, led Robert Taft to suggest, tentatively, Holy Land as the place of origin for the prayers that accumulated at the end of BAS, CHR, and PRES in the Byzantine usage by the end of the eighth century.\(^{524}\) In relation to the development of the final rites of the Jerusalem eucharistic liturgy, Taft suggested that the original ending of JAS consisted of diaconal exclamation/dismissal and the thanksgiving prayer "Εδωκας ἡμῖν δέσποτα τὸν ἁγιασμόν,"\(^{525}\) followed by “the recession to the diaconicon,” and “other dismissal prayers were later appended to this pristine ordo.”\(^{526}\) The appearance of one such prayer, "Εκ

---

\(^{522}\) Zerbos, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 73, 96-97, 118; cf. Taft, *Communion*, 593.

\(^{523}\) See the complete list of variable *opisthambonoi* prayers, with the comparison of Greek, Slavonic, and Georgian recensions in Taft, *Communion*, chapter 10, 645-698.

\(^{524}\) Taft, *Communion*, 634, and also 630-643.

\(^{525}\) Mercier, PO 26.2, 240.

\(^{526}\) Taft, *Communion*, 634.
δυνάμεως εἰς δύναμιν πορευόμενοι,527 was dated to the eighth century by Jacob, primarily due to its absence from such Georgian sources as Tbilisi A 86, representing an earlier recension of JAS.528 The dating, however, of the assemblage of “dismissal prayers” found in the Georgian euchologies Sinai Georgian O.12 and 54 represents a more challenging task which only recently began to be explored in two studies by Stéphane Verhelst.529

Compared to thirty one dismissal prayers in the majuscule Sinai Georgian O.54, the fifty five prayers contained in the miniscule euchologion Sinai Georgian O.12 seem to represent a later expansion and redaction of the earlier corpus of the variable dismissals.530 The analysis of the Georgian texts of the prayers, for which the Greek recension has survived among the variable opisthambonoi in the Italo-Greek euchologies, made Verhelst to note the general faithfulness of the Georgian translation to the original Greek,531 which could make possible the restoration of the original text for the prayers where such has been lost.532 Through the study of the content of “dismissal prayers,” Verhelst was able to propose the early sixth century as the time period when the Greek

527 Mercier, PO 26.2, 240.

528 Jacob, “Prière du skeuophylakion,” 75-80.


532 Verhelst himself attempted to do so with respect to three prayers from the initial rites of JAS, see “L’introduction et disparition,” 9, 14, 19-20.
Vorlagen for these Georgian texts could come into the liturgical use in Jerusalem. If accepted, such hypothesis could provide an important corrective to Taft’s more general dating of the multiplication of dismissals in JAS to the time frame “before the end of the eighth century,” alongside the similar changes in BAS and CHR in Constantinople. Verhelst’s choice for the sixth-century dating was determined by what he interpreted as “Origenist” motifs in the texts of some of the dismissal prayers, e.g. the dismissal prayers for the feast of the apostle John and for the liturgy of Epiphany, which reference the doctrinal statements specifically condemned by the Fifth ecumenical council of 553 and hence, may originate from the period when such statements were not yet considered problematic. Additionally, the reference to the rite of foot-washing in the dismissal of Holy Thursday, and a possible allusion to the eight-week Lent also, for the scholar, speak in favor of the sixth-century dating of the prayers, despite that he himself acknowledges that the presence of the Meatfare (τῆς ἀπόκρεω) Sunday among the cycle of prayers would place the time frame for the prayers closer to the early seventh century. However, Verhelst’s hypothesis regarding possible “Origenist” doctrinal background for the theological content of these prayers may partly explain the survival of some of hagiopolite dismissals only in Georgian. Among those prayers which are not extant among the opisthambonoi found in the Greek euchologies are the two dismissal prayers for the feast of Encaenia that survived only in Georgian: the dismissal “for the Encaenia” (enkentiisa, Sinai Georgian O.12, f. 76r-v) and the prayer, entitled “for the Encaenia” in

534 Taft, Communion, 634.
535 “Prières géorgiennes de renvoi,” 296-97.
536 Ibid., 298-99.
the euchologion *Sinai Georgian O.54* (f. 52r-53r) and “for the dedication of an altar and for the raising of the crosses” (*satp’urebasa sakurt’xevelisasa da dźvart’a apqrubasa*) in *Sinai Georgian O.12* (f. 77v-78v).\(^{537}\) Generally, there are no known variable *opisthambonoi* prayers in the Byzantine tradition, specifically designated either for an annual feast of church dedication, or for the liturgy celebrated on an occasion of such dedication, with the only exception of the Italo-Greek euchologion *Grottaferrata* Γ.β. VII which contains an *opisthambonos* prayer for *encaenia* (*Ὀ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*) that, however, appears to have no relation with any of the hagiopolite prayers we study here.\(^{538}\) The presence of such prayers in the hagiopolite sources, and their absence (with one exception) even in the peripheral Byzantine mss. shows enduring prominence of the September 13 feast in the tradition of Jerusalem, and its peculiar reception by the liturgical uses of other churches.

I give below my translation of the two prayers, which should be treated with all necessary reservations regarding obscurity and possible partial corruption of the text:

**Prayer A:**

For the Encaenia:

To you, holy Lord, who sanctify your holy churches, which you acquired by your precious blood,\(^{539}\) all the faithful assembled in it offer glory and worship – to you, our God, who by your coming upon earth gave us a spiritual house like heaven, the dwelling of the Holy Spirit and the assembly of your holy apostles, in which you raised your life-giving Cross, by planting your flesh upon it. And now, O Lord, at this glorious feast of dedication, have mercy on us sinners, who are celebrating it, and show us worthy of the heavenly, eternal dwelling not made by

---

\(^{537}\) Apparently an arrangement of prayers similar to *Sinai Georgian O.12* (Encaenia-Cross-Dedication of an altar) is also found in the euchologion *Sinai Georgian O.66*, ff. 128v-130r, which we did not compare for this section of the dissertation; see the catalogue description in R. Gmaramia et al. *K’art’ul xelnacert’a aqceriloba, Sinuri kolek’c’ia*, 75.

\(^{538}\) f. 130v-131r = Passarelli, 166-67.

\(^{539}\) Acts 20:28.
hands (≡ ἄχειροποιήτος), through the intercession of your holy apostles, unto your unceasing praise and hymnody, with the Father and the all-holy Spirit, now and ever and unto the ages. Amen.

As mentioned before, this prayer appears in only one of the manuscripts, *Sinai Georgian O.12* (f. 76r-v), and thus may be a later addition to the ordo, especially as the crucifixion and the “life-giving Cross” appear to be the central images in the first half of the text. At the same time, the temple imagery is not supplanted by the theme of the veneration of the Cross, but in this the prayer uses the vocabulary quite similar to the *kverek’si/ektene* for the Encaenia that appears in both *Sinai Georgian O.12* and 54, such as “house like heaven,” “dwelling of the Holy Spirit” (cf. petitions 9 and 14 of the litany cited above). The description of the church as “dwelling of the Holy Spirit” also finds parallels within the hymnography of Iadgari for the Encaenia feast of September 13: God had “established the holy and all-glorious dwelling of the Holy Spirit for the refuge of the faithful,” or “founded” the church “as a dwelling of the Holy Spirit,” etc.\(^{540}\) While the latter terms – “spiritual house like heaven,” “dwelling of the Holy Spirit,” “assembly of holy apostles” – are clearly used to describe the temple/church which was the object of the dedication rites, this earthly locus of divine presence is contrasted with the “heavenly, eternal, acheiropoiètos dwelling,” the heavenly temple as a model for the earthly one.

In comparison with the prayer A from *Sinai Georgian O.12*, the second prayer pertaining to the feast of Encaenia presents a more complex picture. It appears in both of the euchologies, but in a different position in the liturgical calendar: if the majuscule euchologion *Sinai Georgian O.54* designates it as the dismissal prayer for the feast of Encaenia, the *Sinai Georgian O.12* ms. places it after the dismissal prayer for the

\(^{540}\) EkNy 6, 8 = *Udzvelesi iadgari*, 292; see also the troparia Ebo 5, Eulog 6, Ainoi 2.
Exaltation of the Cross (f. 76v-77v), with a different title, “for the dedication/consecration of an altar and raising of crosses.” Moreover, as has been noted by Verhelst, the text of the prayer in Sinai Georgian O.12 shows significant expansions and additions in comparison with the text of the same prayer in Sinai 54, suggesting a subsequent redaction of an earlier text, possibly ‘weeding out’ doctrinally controversial and problematic expressions, to the point of replacing this prayer as the prayer for the Encaenia feast altogether. Due to significant variations between the two redactions of the text, I cite it in separate columns, using italics where the text of Sin.12 diverges from Sin.54.

Prayer B:

Sinai Georgian O.54 (f. 52r-53r)
Dismissal of the people for the Encaenia

[1] O beginningless God who bore your beginningless Word, the divine Counselor (lit. = σύμβουλος θεος, Is 9:7), [2] through whom all was created, that is above the heavens and all that is in it, the Thrones, Principalities, Authorities, and ordered ranks of the angels, invisible ones, whose beginning, by the nature of divinity, you did not show (= ἐφανέρωσας, cf. Jn 17:6) unto men, [3] and these too (esenica) with the luminary and the beginning and the end of eternal earth you made known, and by all providence you preordained this your true coming: [4] first, from the waters you have manifested the earth as an image of the incarnation from the Virgin and in the paradise, the tree of life, the elevation of the victorious Cross was foreshadowed, [5]

Sinai Georgian O.12 (f. 77v-78v)
For the dedication of the/an altar and raising of crosses

[1] O beginningless God who bore your beginningless Word, the divine Counselor, from whom all was created; [2] what is above the heavens and all what is upon it, the Thrones, Principalities, Authorities, Dominions, Mights and orders, the host of angels, innumerable and luminous, without end, eternal and invisible, whose beginning, the nature of divinity, you did not show unto men as image and likeness. [3] But these heavens (ese cani) with the luminary and the beginning and end of eternal earth you made known, and (with) all providence you preordained this your present true Son: [4] first, from the waters you have manifested the earth as an image of the incarnation from the Virgin and in the paradise the tree of life – of the


542 Again, as Verhelst himself have noted, the text is “manifestement corrompu” (ibid., 216), and thus any translation choices made by the current author as well may be open to challenge.
but through the patriarch’s pillar, the headrest and elevation of the ladder to heaven, the descent of angels – you revealed the life-giving catholic church founded by the apostles. [6] Cover us by the power of your precious Cross and preserve your holy church by orthodoxy (lit. righteous faith). By the offering of your incorruptible body and blood cleanse us from sins. [7] For you are our God, and yours is the glory, of the Father and of the Holy [Spirit].

elevation of the Cross, [5] but through the patriarch’s pillar, the headrest and the elevation of the ladder to heaven, the descent of angels – the life-giving tomb you foreshadowed as the house of God, and the incorruptible Resurrection, by the anointing of the stone, you revealed as the glorious catholic church, founded by the apostles, (where) you do great mercy among us through the Only-begotten (and) by the Holy Spirit. [6] Cover us by the power of the precious Cross and preserve your holy church by the right faith, and by the offering of the incorruptible body and blood of your Son cleanse us from sins. [7] For you are our God and we all entreat mercy from you and to you we offer glory, of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, now and ever and unto ages of ages. Amen.

The complexity of these two redactions of the prayer suggests a certain degree of corruption which needs to be accounted for, as we are attempting to unravel the meaning of these texts in the context of the feast of Encaenia on September 13.543 It certainly has to be noted that the Sin.12 text does not merely supply the (perhaps) more pristine Sin.54 text with more material, but also presents some cases where the original text was misunderstood or reinterpreted by the copyist. Thus, through an interchange of syllables in [5], eseni-ca (‘these too’) of Sin.54 becomes ese cani (‘these heavens’), possibly in the desire to ‘correct’ the original by interposing a clear subject to the sentence. For the same purpose apparently the correction of “coming (moslvisa)” to “Son” (dzisa) in [3] was used, making the prayer to be addressed clearly to the Father, and not to Christ. At the same time, it seems that in [2], the multiplication of the names of angelic ranks with

543 In this, I certainly acknowledge my indebtedness to Verhelst’s comments in ibid, 217-18 and 221-22, even though I have certain reservations as to his interpretations of the ms. text.
the addition of epithets, characterizing those, serves rather to confuse the meaning of the
original passage more, rather than to amplify it, while the change from genitive to
nominative for “earth” (quek’anisa → quek’anaj) does nothing for the clarification either.

The prayer, at least in its introduction [1] is clearly directed to God the Father,
“without beginning” (= ἄναρχος), who gave birth to the Son “without beginning,” who is
his λόγος and σύμβουλος θεός (Isa 9:7), from/through whom all was created. The
specification “you preordained your true coming” in the Sin.54 redaction, as a lectio
difficilior, may be preferable and thus Christ could be regarded as the original addressee
of the prayer, or at least of a part thereof. The divine creation of “these too with the
luminary”/“these heavens with the luminary,” i.e. the sun,544 and of the “eternal earth” (?)
is not clearly expressed, but it seems evident that the entire first half of the prayer [1]- [3]
is based on juxtaposition of the creation of heaven and its inhabiting angels on the one
hand ([1]- [2]) and of the material universe (heaven with the “luminary” and the earth) on
the other ([3]). The original address of the prayer to Christ, rather than to the Father, in
Sin.54 may not be considered unusual, since the first prayer for the Encaenia from Sin.12
was addressed to Christ as well, as we saw above. It is the apparent intention of the
redactors of both Sin.54 and Sin.12 to change the address to the Father, which seems
peculiar. This feature, however, becomes clearer once we consider the possible
theological background to these prayers deriving from the second Origenist controversy
in the early to mid-6th century. Indeed, one of the charges raised against the Origenists

544 Pace Verhelst (p. 217-18), I do not find the reason to translate mnai’obi as “corps céleste” as he
does, suggesting that it also may apply “aux anges dans le sin. 54” (ibid., 218). The singular of the
“luminary” may suggest that this is a reference to the sun as an attribute of the created universe, rather than
to any angelic beings.
amounted to their lack of belief that the entire Trinity created the world,\textsuperscript{545} which had no basis in the Alexandrian’s own writings,\textsuperscript{546} but apparently had some foundation in the Evagrian tradition concerning Christ as δημιουργός (who has) τοὺς λόγους τῶν αἰώνων, having an active role in the creation of the material world.\textsuperscript{547} It would seem that the text in question may have emerged under the influence of such tradition of thought, due to a clear demarcation in the text of the prayer of the two levels of creation by the criterion of their accessibility to human perception, where the supra-heavenly realm and the angelic, ideal world, whose ἀρχή was not “revealed to men,”\textsuperscript{548} is contrasted with the material heavens and earth τοῦ αἰῶνος,\textsuperscript{549} for which the “beginning and end” are open for human knowledge and contemplation. One could tentatively suggest a lingering connection here with the two levels of “natural contemplation” discussed in Evagrius’ \textit{Kephalaia}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[545] E.g. λέγουσιν ὅτι ἢ ἄγια τριὰς οὐκ ἐδημιούργησε τὸν κόσμον – Cyril of Scythopolis, \textit{Vita Cyriaci} 13 = Schwarz, \textit{Kyrillos}, 230.
\item[546] See Daniël Hombergen, \textit{The Second Origenist Controversy: A New Perspective on Cyril of Scythopolis’ Monastic Biographies as Historical Sources for Sixth-Century Origenism}, Studia Anselmiana 132 (Rome: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 2001), 278 n. 121; however, as Hombergen notes, the distinction between the “first” and “second” creations, that of intelligible and that of the sensible world, is present in Origen’s works.
\item[549] I tentatively suggest this, meaning “of [this] age” as a possible rendering for sauconomic $>$ sauconomic\;\;lit. ‘eternal’, since “eternal/everlasting earth” does not appear to make sense in the context; our interpretation would also contrast with Verhelst’s who in passing attributes both the “heavens with the luminary” and the “eternal earth” to the angelic realm, which seems to contradict the terms of our liturgical text which is explicit that the “beginning” of the angelic, heavenly reality was not revealed to humans (Verhelst, “Prières de l’ambon,” 218).
\end{footnotes}
gnostica⁵⁵⁰: the “second,” the contemplation of external, material reality in order to perceive the inner spiritual meaning, and the “first,” the contemplation of the bodiless and intelligible reality.⁵⁵¹ The discussion whether the text of our prayer has emerged as a result of interjecting Evagrian thought into the liturgical literature or in the process of polemical opposition to this tradition, e.g. in the Sabbaite circles, is beyond the scope of this work – but the link to Evagrian tradition of ascetical theology may be one of the few keys to clarifying the obscure meaning of this text, and also a reasonable explanation to the eventual relegation of this prayer to a secondary position in the euchologion, as seen in Sin.12, and to its disappearance from the Greek corpus of liturgical prayers.

The imagery of this dismissal prayer from the hagiopolite tradition is construed on the distinction between the heavenly and earthly created realms, the second of which is accessible to human contemplation, thus reflecting a juxtaposition of heavenly and earthly temples in the Judeo-Christian apocalyptic tradition. The second half of the prayer ([5]-[7]), not studied by Verhelst,⁵⁵² illustrates the revelatory function of the earthly realm by enumerating scriptural images through which the παρουσία (moslavj) of Christ was “foreshadowed/preordained”: the creation of the earth from the waters as the image of incarnation from the virgin, the tree of paradise as the tree of the Cross, and – finally – Jacob’s vision in Bethel and his action of anointing of the stone (Gen 28:18) as the foreshadowing of “life-giving catholic church founded by the apostles” ([5]). The ms. of Sin.12 appears to amplify and expand this image, forging a direct link between the

⁵⁵⁰ See e.g. Konstantinovsky, Evagrius, 48-51.

⁵⁵¹ I rely here on the summary in Konstantinovsky, op.cit., 50.

⁵⁵² For unstated reasons, the author had limited himself to transcribing and translating only sections [1] to [4] of the prayer above in both ms. redactions (ibid., 217, 222).
Gen 28 passage and a specific church building – “the life-giving tomb … and the incorruptible Resurrection,” which, “by the anointing of the stone, you revealed as the glorious catholic church.” The absence of the latter clause could suggest a connection to Christ’s death and resurrection, but the specific indication that it was the “tomb” and “resurrection” which were to become the “catholic church” through “anointing of the stone” suggest an attempt on the part of the redactors of the text to tie the text to the location of the church of Holy Anastasis in Jerusalem. The allusion to the “anointing of the stone,” derived from the scriptural source (Gen 28), certainly can be only an anachronism, since there is no evidence to anointing or any signing of altars/churches in the early fourth-century Jerusalem, but it can be plausibly taken as a reflection of the developing rites of church dedication in the Holy City which gradually may began to be including a signing or anointing of the altar table. In what follows my discussion will concern two rites derived from Georgian euchologia – the same Sinai Georgian O.12 and Tbilisi A 86 – which bear direct witness to the existence of a liturgical custom of signing and/or anointing of a consecrated object for the purpose of its consecration in the rite of Jerusalem, before the period of overwhelming Byzantine influence in the period following the Arab invasion of the seventh century.

5.3.2 Consecration of a New Baptismal Font in Sinai Georgian O.12.

While none of the extant witnesses to the Jerusalem euchologion, found among the manuscripts of the “old” Sinai collection (Sinai Georgian O.12, 54, and 66), do not contain the rites for the dedication of a church or an altar, one manuscript, Sinai Georgian O.12 (tenth century), has preserved another related rite, a short service for the
consecration (ganc’ midaj) of a new baptismal font (embazi).\textsuperscript{553} This rite is found in the section of the euchologion containing the rite for the blessing of Theophany waters (ff. 90v-95v), blessing of the palms (95v-99r), marriage (123v-130r), animal sacrifice (ff. 148r-v), etc. The rite in question is positioned right before the baptismal rite (ff. 101r-120r) which itself deserves a special study. The consecration of a font in 

\textit{Sinai Georgian O.12} is quite brief, consisting of an introductory rubric and a short prayer:

\textbf{[f. 101r]}

For the consecration of a new font by the bishop or a priest.

First he will inscribe a cross on the four sides/corners and in the middle, and says this prayer:

\textit{O God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who by your holy Spirit has sanctified the river Jordan and has ordered it to be a divine well; be pleased now also and make this font spiritual, so that it be given unto us from it power of redemption and holiness,\textsuperscript{555} so that those who with a right faith will be washed in it may be cleansed/sanctified from every sin (and) renewed through the regeneration, through the mercy and love for mankind of your only-begotten Son, with whom you are blessed, together with your all holy consubstantial Spirit, now and ever and unto the ages. Amen.}

\textbf{[f. 101v]}

\textsuperscript{553} Outtier translates the term \textit{embazi/enbazi} as “baptistère” (“Un nouveau témoin partiel,” 165) while the Čubinašvili lexicon translates it as “font, tub/tank” (\textit{Kart’ul-rusuli leksik’oni}, 490; cf. also \textit{ADW} 424: “Becken, Taufbecken, Täufer(in)”). The context of the rite itself appears to establish that the object to be consecrated here is a baptismal vessel, rather than a baptistery.

\textsuperscript{554} ვენარიანი cod..

\textsuperscript{555} “Reinheit, Heiligkeit, Heiligtum, Tempelschatz,” \textit{ADW} 1103.
Aside from Sinai Georgian O.12, where it constitutes an integral part of the Jerusalem euchologion, the prayer for the consecration of a baptismal font is also attested in a number of peripheral Byzantine euchologia, thus preserving a Greek recension of this prayer. One of these witnesses has been preserved among the mss. of the “old” Sinai collection, Sinai gr. 982 (13th cent.), another two – from the South Italian euchologia, the tenth-century Grottaferrata Γ.β. IV (f. 95v-96r), and the twelfth-century Grottaferrata Γ.β. VI (f. 99r-v). Unlike the parallel prayer in the hagiopolite euchologion, the prayer in the Greek South Italian recension does not include any rubrics, nor any indication to the rank of the celebrant, but the text of the prayer is nearly identical with the one found in Sinai Georgian O.12:

:Eυχὴ εἰς ἐγκαινισμὸν κολυμβήθρας.:558
Ο Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ διὰ τῆς ἐπιφοιτήσεως τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος καὶ τὸν Ἴορδάνην ποταμὸν ἁγιάσας καὶ θείον ἀποτέλεσας αὐτὸν, εὐδόκησον γενέσθαι καὶ τὴν κολυμβήθραν ταύτην ἁγίαν τε καὶ πνευματικὴν, διόδος ἐν αὐτῇ τὴν σωτηρίαν δύναμιν καὶ εὐλογίαν ἀπολυτρώσεως, ὁπως οἱ μετὰ τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως ἐν αὐτῇ λουούμενοι,

556 f. 60v = Dmitrievskij 2.237, under the title “a similar prayer (εὐχὴ ὁμοία).” The prayer follows a several-page lacuna in the ms., so it is unclear what the ὁμοία is referring to, but it is quite possible that it follows another prayer with a similar purpose.


559 Sinai gr. 982 reads here δοχεῖον (Dmitrievskij 2.237), i.e. “holder” (LSJ 447). The word sabanelaj/ ‘well, bathtub’ in the Georgian may correspond to κολυμβήθρα in a lost Greek variant, and not to the variant in Sinai gr. 982.
Having been tested, they may have mercy of the laver of regeneration. Through the mercy and compassion:

While Parenti indicated that the ninth and tenth centuries would be a period when a number of Palestinian euchological material finds its way into the euchologies of the Constantinopolitan tradition, especially the peripheral ones,\textsuperscript{561} he did not at the time determine the origin of this prayer, just noting its correspondence with the Maronite prayer for the opening of the baptistery during the first days of the Holy Week.\textsuperscript{562} With our knowledge of the material from \textit{Sinai Georgian O.12}, the hagiopolite or at least Palestinian origin for this prayer may be definitively established. Moreover, the position of this prayer \textit{before} the baptismal rite in \textit{Sinai Georgian O.12} may speak of the integral connection of the dedication of the font with the baptismal rite that followed, just as the pneumatological allusions to the baptism in Jordan and to the regeneration of the newly initiated stand out in the very brief text of our prayer. In the Byzantine euchologia, the prayer is found outside of the context of the initiation liturgy, which again may indirectly show its origin in another liturgical tradition.

Of particular interest, especially in relation to other non-extant dedication rites, is the rubric which is prefaced to the prayer of dedication, since it does not only indicate that the dedication of such liturgical object as baptismal font was not an exclusive

\textsuperscript{560} Χάριτι καὶ οἰκτιρμοῖς καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ τοῦ μονογενοῦ σου υἱοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μεθ' οὗ πρέπει σοι δόξα, τιμὴ καὶ προσκύνησις, τῷ π[ατρί] Gb VI 99v.

\textsuperscript{561} “Tra il IX e l’XI sec. la tradizione di Costantinopoli accoglie nei propri libri eucologia e pratiche hagiopolite e più genericamente palestinesi” (Parenti, “L’eucologion Gb IV,” 39).

\textsuperscript{562} Ibid., 155; for the Maronite tradition, see A. Mouhanna, “Un ensemble de textes pour l’ouverture du baptistère les premiers jours de la Semaine Sainte,” \textit{Parole de l’Orient} 9 (1979-80): 113-134.
episcopal privilege (“by bishop of priest”), but also describes a definite liturgical action accompanying the consecration, from which as it seems one could make a connection to the shape of a font presumed here. According to archeological data, which reflects the architectural ecclesiastical setting in the first-millenium Palestine, a baptismal font was usually installed in the apse of a baptistery building which in Palestine was not isolated or of octagonal form. The font itself took a variety of shapes, from rectangular and hexagonal to cruciform, four-lobed one, and egg-shaped. To Bagatti’s estimation, it was the rectangular form which corresponded to the earlier shape of baptismal fonts in Palestine, represented by the fifth-century baptistery in Evron. A four-leaved and cruciform shapes of a font appears to reflect a later development connected with the paschal theology of baptism (death and resurrection of Jesus). The rubric describing the dedication of a font clearly describes the making of the sign of the cross on the four corners/edges of the font “and in the middle,” implying a rectangular shape. Considering that normally the baptismal font would be found in the apse of a baptistery, i.e. in a position where the altar would be normally situated, it is possible to draw parallels between the consecration of a font and the consecration of an altar using a sign of the cross as delimiting the sacred space where the liturgy of initiation would be taking


564 Ibid., 305-06.

565 Ibid., 311-312.

566 As in the baptistery of Mt Nebo, Subeita, ‘Amwas/Emmaus (ibid., 304 fig. 73, 305, 311 fig. 176a).
place.\textsuperscript{567} The touching of the edges of the font at its consecration also is attested in the equivalent Armenian ritual which, however, has come down in a more developed form, much unlike the more primitive rite found in \textit{Sinai Georgian O.12}.\textsuperscript{568} The prayers of the Armenian ritual do not appear to be related to the hagiopolite prayer survived in Greek and Georgian recensions,\textsuperscript{569} and the ritual involves the washing of the font with water and wine, its anointing with the “oil of anointing,” and vesting, much in the manner of the consecration of the altar in the Armenian and Byzantine traditions. At the same time, the actions of a bishop at the consecration of the font in the Armenian rite are very similar to those of a bishop/presbyter in the rite of \textit{Sinai Georgian O.12}: making the sign of the cross (with the chrism) on the four corners of the font.\textsuperscript{570} This peculiarity may point to an early connection between the hagiopolite rite for a dedication/consecration of a baptismal font, the non-extant rite for the dedication of an altar, and the later, more developed Armenian ritual of the baptismal font, itself apparently construed on the analogy to the dedication of an altar.

\textsuperscript{567} One may see a similar concept of delimitation of a sacred ‘territory’ in the rubric preceding the prayer for the foundation of the church (ἐπὶ θεμελίου τιθεμένης ἐκκλησίας) in the 12\textsuperscript{th} century euchologion \textit{Sinai gr. 973}: θυμιᾷ ὁ ἱερεὺς τὰς δ΄ γωνίας τοῦ κτίσματος λέγει· Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ ἐρασθεὶς κτλ. (f. 94r; Dmitrievskij 2.114); similarly, the consecration of a new icon in the sixteenth-century Athonite euchologion \textit{Dionysiou 489} involves the anointing with chrism upon the four corners of the (panel) icon, followed by a prayer (f. 22r = Dmitrievskij, 2.639).

\textsuperscript{568} “And then the bishop stands together with the priests round him. And they lay their right hands on the lips of the font, and they say in unison psalm 29… And they make the sign of the cross, and repeat the same psalm in order…” – ed. trans. F. C. Conybeare, \textit{Rituale armenorum}, 27.

\textsuperscript{569} For the Armenian prayers, see ibid., 27-28, 29.

\textsuperscript{570} “[A]nd the bishop takes the oil of anointing, and sets it in the middle of the font, and with his finger he makes the sign of the cross on the four corners.” – Ibid., 28.
5.3.3 The Consecration of a Portable Altar, ms. Tbilisi A 86 (10th/11th cent.)

The use of a portable altar, i.e. of a consecrated tablet or cloth, serving in place of or alongside with a stationary consecrated altar, has been attested in the liturgical traditions of both Eastern and Western churches.\footnote{See primarily Joseph Braun, Der christliche Altar, 1.42-100, 419-523; for the Byzantine rite use, see Januarius M. Izzo, The Antimension in the Liturgical and Canonical Tradition of the Byzantine and Latin Churches: an Inter-ritual Interconfessional Study (Rome: Pontificium Athenaeum Antonianum, 1975); K. Nikolsky, Об амтиминсах Православной Русской Церкви (St. Petersburg, 1872); I. Petrides, “L’antimension,” DACL 1.2319-2326; Placido de Meester, Rituale-Benedizionale Bizantino, 2.6, 159-164, 233-39; [nnn] G[onesová], “Antimension,” ODB 1.112; M.S. Zheltov, I.O. Popov, “Антиминс,” PE 2.489-493; Gregorios A. Ioannides, “Τάξις γινομένη περὶ ἀντιμινσίων” στὸ κυπριακὸ εὐχολόγιο Barberini greco 390,” Κυπριακὰ Σπουδαί 64-65 (2000-01): 303-350.} The Western canonical prohibitions to celebrate eucharist anywhere but at a place or a stone mensa consecrated by a bishop date to the late eighth- early ninth centuries,\footnote{Braun, Der christliche Altar, 72-73.} but the use of a portable altar, particularly by missionaries, can be traced back to as early as the seventh century.\footnote{Ibid., 73-4.} In the Christian East, the use of a travelling/portable altar can be attested in the Byzantine and Coptic rite, the tradition of Ethiopian (tabot) and West Syriac churches (ܐܬܒܠܝܬܐ).\footnote{Braun, Der christliche Altar, 517-519; Alfonso Raes, “Antimension, Tablit, Tabot,” Proche-Orient Chrétien 1 (1951): 59-70; A.T. da Hebo, “Il Tabot: la sua importanza religiosa e giuridico-cultuale nella Chiesa etiopica,” OCP 60 (1994): 131-57; Ignatius Ephraem II (Rahmani), Les liturgies orientales et occidentales: étudiées séparément et comparées entre elles (Beyrut, Lebanon: Impr. Patriarchale Syrienne, 1929), 47-50.}

The precise history of the use of a portable altar in Byzantium can be traced to c. 700 CE, with the first known occurrence of the practice coming from the encomium to the third century martyr Marcian of Syracuse, where the transfer and establishment of a portable altar is connected to a stational procession to the cave near the saint’s tomb.\footnote{Braun, Der christliche Altar, 72-73.}
If the bishop Theodosius of Syracuse, a central figure in the narrative, can be identified with the participant in the anti-Monothelite synod in Rome on Easter 680, the event described can be safely dated to the end of the seventh century. The liturgical celebration, presided by Theodosius, included a rogational procession in the early morning to the site of the cave. After the chanting of Κύριε ἐλέησον and (apparently) the prayer (πάντων ἐπειπόντων τὸ Ἁμήν), the bishop “established the mystical table which is called antiminsion before the ascent to the cave, and celebrated liturgy (ἐπῆξεν τὴν μυστικὴν τράπεζαν, ἣτις καλεῖται Αντιμίνσιον κατ’ ὁμιλίαν τοῦ αὐτοῦ σπηλαίου τῆς ἀναβάθρας, καὶ ἐποίει λειτουργίαν).” The ritual cleansing of the place through the affixing of an altar and the celebration of eucharist on the site, according to the encomium, effects the transformation of the place from previously demon-infested location into ἐκκλησίας τύπων and ναὸν ἅγιον ἁγγελικόν, i.e. the ritual change of possession of the place through claiming it for liturgical use. This passage, however, represents the first known instance of applying the term ἀντιμίνσιον (also known with the variants ἀντιμήνσσιον, ἀντιμίσσιον, ἀντιμίσσιον) to a portable altar transferred and established at the designated location. The term itself may be of Latin origin (> mensa) and have been applied to a movable table in general. This is precisely the sense in


576 Not Theodore, pace Izzo, 28.

577 Among the signatories of the synodal acts we find Θεοδόσιος ἐλάχιστος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας Συρακούσης τῆς ἐν Σικελίᾳ (Mansi, Sacrorum conciliorum nova amplissima collectio, vol. 11, 304D; ACO 2.2.1); see also PdMZ 7802.

578 AASS Iun. 2, 793B.
which the term is used in the ninth-century chronicle of Theophanes, where it is applied to a table used in the context of the coronation of Constantine VI by his father Leo IV in 775 at the Hippodrome in Constantinople, apparently for the deposition of imperial insignia.\footnote{580} In a similar sense the term \textit{antimension/antimision} is used in the manual of the Byzantine court ceremonial, \textit{De ceremoniis aulae Byzantinae} of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (913-959): here, in the context of the ceremonial of Easter Monday, Wednesday, Ascension and Pentecost, it designates a portable table (τὸ βασιλικὸν ἀντιμίσιον) set outside of the sanctuary of Hagia Sophia for the communion of the emperor.\footnote{581} Aside from imperial communion, such portable table was used at the coronations and marriage of the emperor and \textit{augusta}, the installation (χειροτονία) of a caesar, and of other court titles: \textit{patrikios}, \textit{zoste patrikia}, \textit{nobellissimus} – in such cases, the table was used for the deposition of imperial insignia or of the imperial codicil (κωδίκελλον) signifying the appointment.\footnote{582} By the twelfth-thirteenth century, the term here applied to the altar transferred and established at the site, has become appropriated as the term for a movable altar in the form of a cloth or, originally, a wooden tablet.\footnote{583}

As is evident in the canonical commentaries of Theodore Balsamon (12\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Manuel I

\footnote{579} Izzo, \textit{Antimension}, 23-24; the Sudas Lexicon defines ἀντιμίσιον as “among Romans, a table set before the court of judgment (παρὰ Ρωμαίοις τράπεζα πρὸ τοῦ δικαστηρίου κειμένη)” (ed. A. Adler, \textit{Suidae lexicon}, Lexicographi Graeci 1.1-1.4 [Leipzig: Teubner, 1928-1971]).

\footnote{580} “[T]he emperor went to the Hippodrome with the patriarch. A portable altar having been brought (ἀνεχθέντος ἀντιμίσιον), the patriarch recited the prayer in the presence of all the people, and the emperor crowned his son.” Theophanes, \textit{Chronographia} = de Boor, 1.450; ET by Cyril Mango and Roger Scott, \textit{The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284-813} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 621.


\footnote{582} \textit{De ceremoniis} 47/38, 49/40, 50/41, 52/43, 53/44, 56/47, 57/48, 59/50 = Vogt, 2.3, 11, 16, 27, 34, 47, 59, 65.

\footnote{583} Izzo, \textit{Antimension}, 28-30.
Charitopoulos (d. 1222) and others, as well as from the liturgical commentary of Symeon of Thessalonike (d. 1429), the *antimension* functioned as a substitute portable altar where the fixed consecrated altar was absent or the consecration thereof could be doubted. In the contemporary Byzantine rite usage, *antimension* is present at any stationary altar, consecrated or not, and the presence of an *antimension* signed by the local bishop is a condition *sine qua non* for a valid eucharistic celebration. However, in the context of the stational procession in Syracuse at the turn of the eighth century, it is plausible that the term *antimension*, a common term for any portable table, was used to designate a liturgical peculiarity, the use of a portable altar.

---

584 Theodore Balsamon, in his commentary on canon 31 of Trullo, notes, however that the purpose of placing *antimensia* “onto the holy tables of the oratories (εἰς τὰς ἁγίας τραπέζας τῶν εὐκτηρίων)” was not only to substitute “what furnishes the holy altar and is counted as the tablet of the holy table (μίνσων τῆς ἁγίας τραπέζης), the celebration of the opening [of the church] and of the encaenia, but also to make clear that the liturgy in the oratory is performed according to the bishop’s decision (κατ’ ἐπιτροπὴν ἐπισκοπικὴν)” (Ralles-Potles, *Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων*, 2.372), thus limiting the use of *antimensia* to the oratories where the full rite of consecration was not celebrated. Similarly, patriarch Manuel I Charitopoulos of Constantinople affirmed that the *antimensia* “were not by necessity put upon all holy altars, but upon those of which is not known whether they were consecrated or not, for the *antimensia* occupy the place of the consecrated holy tables (τὰ γὰρ ἄντιμινσία καθηερομένων ἁγίων τραπέζων τόπον ἐπέχουσι)” (ibid., 5.116). In his liturgical commentary on the rite of the consecration of a church, archbishop Symeon of Thessalonike likewise states that the *antimensia* “are instead of a sacred altar (ἀντὶ τραπέζης ιερᾶς γίνονται) and, being consecrated by the hierarch, are “sent to the places where there is no altar (ἐνθα οὐκ ἐστι θυσιαστήριον)” (On the Holy Temple 108; PG 155:313). The only relatively early reference to the indispensability of the *antimensia* derives from the set of 227 ecclesiastical canons attributed to patriarch Nicephorus I of Constantinople (in 806-15; d. 828) published by J.-B. Pitra (*Iuris ecclesiastici graecorum Historia et monumenta*, [Rome: Typis S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1868], 2.327-348). Canon 98 imposes penance of one year interdict and one hundred prostrations to a priest who celebrated without the substitute altar (ἐάν ἱερεὺς λειτουργήσῃ δίχα ἄντιμινσίου, ἐξει ἐπιτίμιου χρόνου ἕνα, μετανοίας ρ’; Pitra 2.337), but canon 97 clearly establishes the context as the use of such ‘altars’ to be the conditions of private celebration or travel. Overall the practice of using the *antimension* seems to be well established in these canons (cf. can. 16, 95, 96, 97, 98), but their evident monastic setting (cf. can. 14, 15, 20, 23 et passim) would allow to doubt their authenticity and the 9th cent. attribution. While Izzo apparently perceives these canons as close to authentic, or at least authoritative (85-86, cf. 85 n.113), their attribution to the renowned iconophile author has been doubted by P. J. Alexander, *Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople*, 156 n.1, Petrides (*DACL*, col. 2320), and Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*, 490. Petrides tried to propose Nicephorus II (1260-61) as these canons’ author, but this seems to be little more than an arbitrary guess. See also Izzo, 86 n. 115.

Further, I will return to the growth of the Byzantine practice of using a portable wooden tablet or a cloth to celebrate the liturgy in an unconsecrated place, while at this point I will consider the evidence to hagiopolite customs which may reflect the beginnings of such practice. For the hagiopolite liturgy, the presence of the feasts of the “deposition of the altar (dadgmaj sakurt'xev(e)lisaj)” in the Jerusalem calendar/lectionary on five occasions may imply that the dedication of this church involved the transfer and establishment of an altar.586 The use of a portable altar at one of sacred sites, specifically in the church on the site of Christ’s Nativity in Bethlehem, is reported in the account of the pilgrimage made to Palestine in the early eighth century by Wilibald, future bishop of Eichstätt.587 This narrative describes the site architectural complex as consisting of the “cave” (spelunca) “where our Lord was born” and the church that “was built above it,” i.e. the church of the Nativity.588 The narrative proceeds to describe that while one “altar now stands [in the church] above (supra stat nunc altare),” a clear reference to an altar in the church of the Nativity, another small altar is made, so that when they wish to celebrate mass inside the cave, they lift up this small altar and bring it inside for the time when they celebrate the liturgy, and afterwards they pick it up and carry it out.589

586 See above 1.3.0.


588 The description of the cave on the site of Christ’s birth seems to be consistent with the description in the early 8th century travelogue of Beda the Venerable, De locis sanctis 7.1 = CCSL 175, 264-65.

589 Ibi supra stat nunc altare, et alius altarius minor factus est, adeo quod ut illi, quando volunt ibi intus missam celebrare in spelunca, tollentes illum altarem minorem portant ibi intus illum tempus, quando missam celebrant, et iterum levant illum foras (Vitae Wilibaldi = Holder-Egger, 98).
While some accounts of Western pilgrims report an altar being “deposited”/“placed” at a
certain sacred site, the practice of using a portable altar at a sacred site with its
subsequent removal does not seem to have been attested before this early eighth-century
account. While the description of this custom by Wilibald may suggest that for this
Western pilgrim such practice was unusual, the use of a portable altar at one of the most
significant sacred sites of Jerusalem hints at a custom well-established by the beginning
of the eighth century. The analysis of the extant Georgian sources for the hagiopolite
euchologion may corroborate the witness of the pilgrim. The presence in three of these
Georgian euchologies of a dismissal prayer (eris gantebebisaj) for the “blessing/
/consecration of an altar”\(^{590}\) may itself propose the celebration of a rite for the
consecration of an altar in conjunction with the feast of Encaenia. More significantly,
however, one of the Georgian witnesses to the hagiopolite euchologion, the tenth-century
codex Tbilisi A 86, contains the rite for the “blessing/consecration of an odiki which is a
traveling altar,” a unique testimony to the use of a portable altar in Jerusalem, as well as
to its ritual consecration which, as I could suggest, gives us an opportunity for a tentative
reconstruction of a non-extant hagiopolite rite of church dedication and to speculate on
the influence of this hagiopolite rite upon the fledging Byzantine rite of dedication.

Published in full by Korneli Kekelidze in 1912,\(^{591}\) ms. Tbilisi A 86, originally
from the collection of the Georgian Ecclesiastical Museum, is an episcopal euchology

\(^{590}\) Sinai Georgian O.12, f. 77v-78v; Sinai Georgian O.54, f. 52r-53r; Sinai Georgian O.66, f.
130r.

\(^{591}\) Древнегрузинский архиератикон: грузинский текст [The Old Georgian Archieratikon: The
Georgian Text] (Tbilisi: Losaberdze, 1912); the first description of the manuscript was featured in M.G.
Dżanašvili, Описание рукописей и старопечатных книг Церковного музея духовенства Грузинской
епархии, Publications of the Ecclesiastical Museum 13 (Tbilisi, 1908), 85-87, but the Russian translation of
the entire ms. was provided by Kekelidze even prior to the publication of the Georgian original in
that includes the ordo of JAS, the ordination of a reader, subdeacon, female and male
deacons, presbyter, chorepiscopos, bishop, and the consecration of a portable altar.

Except for the postscript to the codex, written in the miniscule (xucuri), the manuscript is
penned in a majuscule script (asomt’avruli), prevalent in the Georgian manuscript writing
and epigraphy from the fifth to the eighth century, with several important manuscripts
dating to late tenth century. The basis for the dating of the transcription this codex is
found in its internal data, specifically, in the mention among the living of two Georgian
hierarchs in the liturgical commemorations of JAS and in the colophon at the end of the
manuscript, the catholicos of Kartli Symeon (Svimion) and John/Iovane bishop of
Acquiri, of which the first was the person that apparently commissioned the codex, and
the second was the intended addressee of that commission. Since the second hierarch,
the bishop of Tbet’i and Acquiri and a renowned hymnographer, is known to be
occupying his see in 995 CE, the catholicos roughly contemporary to him can be only

592 V. Silogava, “Асомтаврули,” PE 3.613-614; also see D.Z. Bakradze, “Грузинская
па.leография,” in Труды V археологического съезда в Тифлисе 1881 г. (Moscow, 1887), 208;
Тархнишвили, Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur, 20-21. The Georgian manuscripts executed
in asomt’avruli include the Sinai mravalt’avi/polykephalaion (864 CE), Adishi Tetraevangelion (897 CE),
Opizi Gospel (913 CE), Džruči Gospel (ms. Tbilisi H 660; 936 CE), Parxali Gospel (ms. Tbilisi A 1453; 937
CE).

593 f. 166-167 = Kekelidze, Arxieratikon, 141-42.

594 In the diptychs of JAS: “have mercy, O Lord, and glorify him who acquired these liturgies
(მომგებელი ამათ ჟამის - წირვათსა) – Simon, the catholicos of Kartli, have mercy and glorify John,
bishop of Acquiri and Ephrem bishop of Cilkani” (A 86, f. 57 = Kekelidze 50-51), while the post-script to
the codex is written in the form of address and injunction from Simon to John of Tbet’i and Acquiri who is
not mentioned by name, but rather by the substantive formed from the title of his see (Macquereli > Acquiri)
(f. 166 = Kekelidze 141).
Symeon III (1001-1012) which puts the transcription of the liturgical manuscript at the first years of the eleventh century, if the post-script and liturgical commemorations are contemporaneous with the rest of the manuscript. While it is safe to assume the date of the manuscript to be tenth century, the Georgian text of this euchologion and, moreover, the Greek Urtext appears to be much older. The Georgian martyr Abo of Tbilisi (d. 786) sets the latest *terminus ante quem* for the original of the text – however, the name may be a later addition. A more consistent date range can be acquired through the examination of the diptychs for the departed in the anaphora of JAS, specifically the commemorations of the departed bishops of Jerusalem, fathers of the ecumenical councils, and of the “pious, faithful kings.” Among the last in the list of “our holy fathers the teachers (*modzguarni*)” are the bishops who can be identified with Sophronius of Jerusalem (d. 638), Agatho of Rome (*Agapi*; d. 681), Eulogius of Alexandria (d. 607), Martin of Rome

595 According to the colophon in Tbet’i Tetraevangelion (currently in the Russian National Library), which apparently was commissioned by John; for the translation of the colophon see Tarxnišvili, *Geschichte*, 117 (and ibid., 117-18 for the account of the literary activity of John of Tbet’i/Acquri), also about the manuscript, see O. Vasilieva, “Christian Manuscripts of the East in the National Library of Russia,” *Manuscripta Orientalia* 13.2 (2007): 32.


597 It should be noted that, aside from the post-script being written in *xucuri*, the diptychs for the living which contain the names of Simon, John and Ephrem show some signs of tampering – specifically, some words originally written in red were erased and replaced with the words დიდი შეიწყალენ და ადიდენ (Kekelidze 50 n. 14-15).

598 It is written in red ink in the ms. which may suggest addition (Kekelidze, 53); Verhelst holds the same opinion, see “La messe de Jérusalem,” 241.
(d. 655), and Modestus of Jerusalem (d. 630). The last of the ecumenical councils mentioned is the “sixth holy council of 289,” referring to the third council of Constantinople of 680/681, while the last emperor commemorated seems to be Justinian the Great (d. 565). Verhelst notes that among the names of ascetic saints featured in the diptychs, none of the saint appears to be later than the late sixth century, with abbot Gelasius of Great Lavra (d. 546) being one of the latest in A 86. Thus, judging from the commemorations which could have been plausibly present in the Greek Urtext of this codex, one could set the earliest date for this redaction of the hagiopolite liturgy as the late sixth century and the latest terminus a quo – the end of seventh or the beginning of the eighth century. According to a hypothesis proposed by Verhelst (to which we have previously alluded), the period between early sixth and seventh century was marked by the significant changes in the ordo of JAS, namely, by the introduction (under the Syro-Antiochene influence) and subsequent suppresion of the primitive offertory (prothesis) rite in the beginning of the liturgy of the Word. This stage of development is reflected in the opening rites of JAS in this early, Georgian redaction of hagiopolite archieraticon

599 The list adds “Peter the martyr” (whom we were unable to identify with certainty) and Nicholas, perhaps of Myra or the sixth-century abbot of Sion in Lycia (Kekelidze 54).

600 Kekelidze, 55.

601 Ibid., 56-57.

602 Verhelst leans toward dating this Georgian redaction to the time after the death of Justinian (d. 565), counting the commemoration of the sixth ecumenical council as also a later addition to the diptychs – “Messe de Jérusalem,” 241-242.

603 See Verhelst, “Messe de Jérusalem,” 250-54, 262-67; also “L’introduction et la disparition du rite de Prothèse,” 5-34; as featured in A 86, the “rite of prothesis” as identified of Verhelst, consists of an opening prayer, three prayers of oblation, a vesting prayer, three prayers of incense, followed by a diaconal kverek’i, oxitaj (introit) and the entrance (f. 1-13 = Kekelidze, Arxieratikon, 1-11; idem, LGP 6-9; Conybeare-Wardrop, 397-400).
preserved in A 86, as well as in ms. Graz 5.\textsuperscript{604} The “prothesis rite” of JAS seems to have been partly suppressed in the extant redaction of the Greek JAS,\textsuperscript{605} but nevertheless it exerted a considerable influence on the historio-liturgical development of its ordo.

Moreover, closer to our purpose in this section of the thesis, the conclusions regarding the approximate date for the redaction of JAS in this euchologion may facilitate the dating of other rites contained therein: e.g. of the ordination rites and, more importantly for us, of the rite for the consecration of a portable altar.

The ritual for the “consecration of the odiki” is found at the very end of the manuscript, following the series of ordination rites – a juxtaposition also found in the Greek Byzantine euchologia. The same rite, apparently with some variations, is also found in a number of later Georgian euchologia,\textsuperscript{606} two of which, from the same collection of the Ecclesiastical Museum, were described by Kekelidze in 1908 and will be referred further for the comparison: a) Tbilisi A 450 (16\textsuperscript{th}/17\textsuperscript{th} cent.) under the inscription

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{604} The ms. Graz 5 was written in Sinai c. 985 and published by Tarxnišvili in Liturgiae Iberiae antiquiores, CSCO 122/123, 1.1-34, 2.1-25, but the opening rites of JAS were not included in the latter publication, having been preserved in another collection, as ms. D I VI 1 of the Museum of Czech Literature in Prague, see Jaromir Jedlička, “Das Prager Fragment der altgeorgischen Jakobusliturgie,” Archiv Orientalíni 29 (1961), 183-196. It contains the same series of prayers ‘of oblation’ in the beginning of JAS as A 86, only with the second and fourth prayer in a reverse order (cf. Conybeare-Wardrop, 398; Jedlička, 191-92, 194).
\item \textsuperscript{605} Compare the opening rites of JAS in the critical edition of Mercier, PO 26.2, 160-66; essentially only three incense prayers have survived from the original ordo – more on the analysis of these prayers in comparison with the Georgian counterparts, see Verhelst, “L’introduction et la disparition du rite de Prothèse,” 8-29.
\item \textsuperscript{606} The manuscripts of the later Georgian euchologia that include the rite for the consecration of an odiki are listed in Ekvtime Kochlamazashvili, დიდი სინური კურთხევანის რედაქციული თავისებურებანი: კოდიკოლოგიურ-ლიტურგიკული ნარკვევი (Tbilisi, 2002), 75, and include: Tbilisi A 450, f. 243r-246v; Tbilisi A 294 (16\textsuperscript{th} cent.), f. 60v-63v; Tbilisi H 1742 (1664 CE), f. 113r-114v; Tbilisi H 1719 (1667 CE), f. 101v-102v; Tbilisi A 1505 (17\textsuperscript{th} cent.), 49v-51v; Tbilisi A 186 (17-18\textsuperscript{th} cent.), 2184-2185; Tbilisi H 1352 (17-18\textsuperscript{th} cent.), f. 137v-139r.; Tbilisi A 48 (18\textsuperscript{th} cent.), f. 159v-160r, 160r-165r; Tbilisi A 895 (18\textsuperscript{th} cent.), 52v-54v; Tbilisi H 2383 (18\textsuperscript{th} cent.), f. 131v-132v; Tbilisi Q 106 (18\textsuperscript{th} cent.), f. 236v-238v. I am grateful to Shota Gugushvili for this reference.
\end{itemize}
“Consecration of the odiki, which is the table (tablaj) of God”\(^{607}\), b) Tbilisi A 420 (18\(^{\text{th}}\) cent.) where this rite, significantly expanded, is named “The Georgian consecration of the odiki, [for] with the Greeks it is consecrated together with the church.”\(^{608}\) The allusion in A 420 is apparently to the Byzantine practice of consecrating the antimensia\(^{609}\) at the same time when the complete rite for the church dedication is celebrated, usually by contact with the chrism with which the altar has been anointed (e.g. in Coislin 213, f.14r, 19r-v). The use of the moniker “Georgian (k’art’uli)” in the title of the rite connects it, however, with the traces of hagiopolite liturgical rite remaining in use by the Georgian ecclesiastical tradition: indeed, as Kekelidze has observed,

the Georgians of a later period used to apply the name “Georgian” to those remnants of the ancient Jerusalem liturgical practice which did not agree with the contemporary Athonite-Constantinopolitan usage, not suspecting their Jerusalem origins.\(^{610}\)

This seems to be corroborated by several instances of the use of the term “Georgian” in application to the usages contrasted with the liturgical customs of the “Greeks” which Kekelidze cites elsewhere.\(^{611}\) Even though this designation of the rite in question derives

---

\(^{607}\) Bregadze et al., K’art’ul xelnacert’a aģceriloba… (A) kolek’ ciisa, vol. 2.1 (Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1986), 139, but for a more detailed description, see Kekelidze, LGP 127-128.

\(^{608}\) Bregadze et al., K’art’ul xelnacert’a aģceriloba… (A) kolek’ ciisa, vol. 2.1, 46; Kekelidze, LGP 213-14. For Kekelidze’s commentary on this rite in A 450 and A 420, see ibid., 461-62.

\(^{609}\) It should be noted that Kekelidze consistently uses the anachronistic term antimension in his translation of the Georgian term odiki in his Russian translations.

\(^{610}\) Kekelidze, Arxieratikon, xiv n. 1.

\(^{611}\) With application to the Jerusalem kanonarion that he has published (i.e. the Georgian lectionary from the Lathal and Kala mss.), Kekelidze notes the rubric in a tetraevangelion from Gethsemane dated to 1048 CE that uses the moniker “Georgian” to apply to the kanonarion as distinguished from the typicon of “the Greek church” or St. Sabas’; the author states that “by 11\(^{\text{th}}\) century, Georgians have forgotten about the origins of this kanonarion from the Holy Sepulchre and called its reminscences, contrasted with the Typicon of St Saba, to be Georgian” (Ierusalimskii kanonar’, 37, 37 n.1; see ibid. for
from a very late source, it confirms the presence in the native Georgian tradition of a memory regarding the hagiopolite origins of this ritual.

In what follows, I will provide the text of the rite on the basis of Kekelidze’s edition\(^6\) together with the new English translation of the text.\(^7\) The text will be followed by the commentary and analysis of each of structural elements of this rite, where I will point out parallels with the Armenian rite of dedication, as well as with the rites for the consecration of a portable altar (ἀντιμίνσιον) in the Byzantine tradition. The fuller comparison with the Syro-Antiochene rite of the consecration of tablithô will be undertaken in the following section of this dissertation.

1. **The Title.**

The blessing of an odiki, which is the altar that is carried away when traveling.

2. **Procession and Psalmody.**

The new altar must be put on the top of the old holy altar and they will say the psalm which they pronounce at the dedication of a church: “How beloved.” The ending: “Blessed is the man who hopes in him/it” [Ps 83:1-13].

And four priests will lift up the altar and will send forth incense and candles, and will go once around the altar and place (it) also upon the holy altar and they will do the litany (kverek’si) and a prayer. And they raise up the second psalm: “Remember, O Lord, David and all”; the ending: “But upon it my holiness will shine” [Ps 131:1-18].

---

\(^6\) A 86, f. 156-166 = Kekelidze, 135-141.

\(^7\) For earlier English translation, see Conybeare-Wardrop, 172-173. I have also consulted the Russian translation by Kekelidze in LGP 30-31.
And they lift up the altar and go around for the second time and again place (it) upon the (old) altar. And they do the litany and a prayer and raise up the “Judge me” psalm: “Judge me, O Lord, for I without evil,” the ending: “in the church”614 I will bless you, O Lord” [Ps 25:1-12].

And they lift up the altar and go around for the third time and place (it) upon the (old) altar: and they do the litany and a prayer, and the bishop will bless with this blessing:

3. The Prayer of Consecration.

1. Lord God of powers, who are the creator of all the creatures, who alone has spread out the heavens and established the earth upon its foundation; 2. you, Lord, in the cities and villages have founded the churches, you have raised in it altars and commanded the sacrifices and bloodless offerings to be offered for the sake of your holy name for the redemption of the race of men.

3. Now you, Lord of all, look down upon this odiki and sanctify it by your Holy Spirit, so that on the mountains and in caves, holes and in sea and in every place of your dominion be celebrated upon it the bloodless sacrifice of your only-begotten Son unto communion and remission of sins of all who with the knowledge of holiness offer before you, for the union of the people and for the communion of the divine mystery which is celebrated upon it.

4. For you are God, long-suffering, greatly compassionate and true, the Giver of all holiness and to you we offer glory and thanksgiving, with your only-begotten Son and all-holy, good, life-giving and consubstantial Spirit, now and ever and unto ages of ages.

614 Singular in this text; cf. LXX Ps 25:12: ἐν ἐκκλησίαις εὐλογήσω σε, Κύριε.
4. Anointing of the Altar.

And he pours the chrism three times in the form of the cross. The priests will anoint and say just as at another consecration of the altar. And when they clothe (it) and place it also upon the holy altar.

5. Dismissal.

The deacon says:
Let us bow our heads unto the Lord.

The bishop pronounces this prayer:
1. King of glory and Lord of mercies, our God, the Master of all, who vouchsafed to sanctify this table/tablet (tablaj) by the power of the coming of your all-holy Spirit. 2. Grant to all who will partake from it a pure conscience, the blameless heart and holiness and righteousness of soul and of body and of spirit, and forgiveness of all sins, joy and gladness of eternal life. 3. Through your only-begotten Son, our Lord, God and Saviour Jesus Christ, with whom to you always is due glory and power, with your all-holy and consubstantial Spirit, now and ever and unto ages of ages. Amen.

Thus, the rite for the consecration of a portable altar in this euchologion is a fairly short ritual, involving the initial psalmody (Pss. 83, 131, 25), accompanied by the triple circumambulation of the stationary altar of the church, a presidential prayer, followed by the effusion of myron upon the new portable altar, anointing, vesting, and dismissal consisting of the deacon’s call for the bowing of heads, and a prayer of inclination. From the instructions accompanying the ritual, it appears that the dramatis personae of this brief service include the bishop, multiple presbyters (at least four) who assist the latter, and a deacon who participates in the processions and pronounces the acclamations. The
laity, on the other hand, is not mentioned, and from the content of the rubrics the presence of the people cannot be inferred at all. The liturgical movement and manual acts seem to involve just the space surrounding the main, stationary altar of a church (perhaps, episcopal cathedral) and could have been likely confined to the sanctuary of that church – which explains the absence of the laity. The rite, however, includes the elements – rudimentary processions, litanies, diaconal calls – which by itself may have been remnants of a rite which at one time was public, such as e.g. the celebration of a public dedication of a church. In order to understand better the structural composition of this ritual, I will further make my comments relevant to each of the structural parts of this rite, with some summarizing conclusions in the end.

Title

The object of the consecration ceremony in this euchologion, a portable altar, is named in this text ὀδίκιον/odiki with the gloss stating, literally, “which is taken to and fro for travel (ἀπὸ τὸ ἀναστάσιν ὀδίκιον).” In the later Georgian euchologies, and literature in general, the term odiki came to be understood as an equivalent to the Byzantine antimension, but the presence of a gloss in the title of this rite may indicate that at the time when this euchologion was transcribed, the term may not have been readily understood by the Georgian Christians. One might consider the possibility that the term in question may have come into Georgian from the Greek use, possibly as a derivative of

---

615 Aside from A 420 discussed further, where the term is not translated, it is used in this sense in the translation of the Byzantine dedication rite in Sinai iber. 73 (12th-13th cent.): ὀδίκιον ἐπαραγόμενον ὀδίκιον ἐπαραγόμενον (f. 257v); it is translated as antimins in Čubinašvili, K’art’ul-rusuli lek’sikoni, 992; cf. also the lexicon of the 17th-18th century Georgian language by the 18th century scholar Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani, Sitqvis kona kartuli, romel ars lek’sikoni (Tbilisi: Georgian SSR State Publishers, 1949), 263.
ὁδός, but the scarcity of the information pertaining to the use of portable altars in Palestine or Jerusalem leaves us with no corroborating evidence regards a possible use of such term. It seems clear from the description of the manual acts of the clergy that the object in question could have hardly been similar to a Byzantine antimension, a portable altar on a cloth (at least already in the eleventh-century Constantinople), but was more likely a tablet/board made of a hard material, such as wood or stone. This assumption corroborates with the first appearance of antimensia in the Byzantine use at the time of iconoclasm, which, as we know from Letter 40 to Naukratus by Theodore the Studite, were extant in the form of a cloth or a wooden plank (θυσιαστήριον καθηγιασμένον ἐν σινδόνι ἢ ἐν σανίσι). 616

Finally, the use of the term “blessing” (kurtʾxevaj) in the title of the rite to convey the meaning of ‘consecration’ is also found in the inscriptions of Byzantine dedication rites translated into Georgian from the Greek: e.g. in Tbilisi S 143: “The order and acolouthis of dedication, which is the blessing of the holy church” (f. 149r; emphasis mine), 617 and in Sinai Georgian O.73: “The prayer for the blessing of the church, which is the dedication” (f. 257r). 618 The same term with a literal meaning ‘blessing’ is used in the titles of the ordination rites in Tbilisi S 143, here evidently corresponding to the terms χειροτονία in the original Greek. 619


617 ობჟო ო ოჟოჟოჟო ოჟოჟოჟოჟოჟო ოჟオ (Bregadze et al., K’art’ul xelnacert’a, 1.153; Kekelidze, LGP 37).

618 ოიოჟოჟოჟოჟოჟოჟოჟოჟოჟოჟოჟოჟოჟოჟოჟオ (f. 257r); the use of “prayer” in this ms. evokes comparison with the inscription of the same rite in Sinai gr. 959 (11th c.): εὐχὴ ἐπὶ καθερώσεως ναοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ ἀγίας τραπέζης (f. 128r).
Psalmody and Procession

In our discussion of the lectionary for the dedication rite contained in the Georgian Lectionary of Jerusalem, we have surmised that the quadruple set of readings preceding the lectionary for the eucharistic liturgy were designed to accompany a procession around the church building with four stations, followed by the entrance into the nave of the church. The rite for the consecration of an *odiki* in this tenth-century euchologion has also preserved a processional movement as an integral element of the rite, but with important differences: the movement consists of triple circumambulation of a new altar around the main stationary altar of the church, accompanied by psalms 83, 131 and 25, together with subsequent liturgical acts constituting a single structural unit repeated three times:

- psalm
- procession around the main altar
- deposition of the new altar upon the main altar
- *kverek'si* (litany) and ‘prayer’

The presence of the Pss 83 and 25 in the Georgian Jerusalem lectionary has been noted before – specifically, the first of these psalms serves as a psalm before the readings for the liturgy of church dedication, while Ps 25 bears the same function for the liturgy of the second day of the octave of dedication. It is Ps 83 which is identified in the text of this rite as “the psalm which they pronounce at the dedication of a church,” which could

---

619 ორნა ორნა ორნა ორ (ordination of a reader and psaltist, f. 164r), ორნა ორ (ordination of the archdeacon, f. 166r), ორ (ordination of a presbyter, f. 170r), ორ (ordination of a bishop, f. 173r) – Bregadze et al., *K’art’ul xelnacert’a*, 1.153.

620 GL 1549-1553 = Tarchnişvili 2.91/73.

621 GL 1554-1557.
have been a reference to the use of Ps 83:4 during the liturgy, as recorded in the Georgian
Lectionary, except that here the reference is made to the execution of the entire psalm,
othe responsory of the lectionary. If taken to refer to the use of the whole psalm at the
dedication service, this allusion is one of the two references in A 86 to the hagiopolite rite
of dedication distinct from this ritual for the consecration of a portable altar and
otherwise unknown to us in the corpus of surviving euchologia reflecting the Jerusalem
tradition. The use of the triplet of psalms during the opening rites of the dedication is not
known in Byzantine tradition, but it has been preserved in the Armenian rite of
dedication, the West Syriac rite for the consecration of a portable altar (ܢܘܐܠܐ) (Pss 22-
23, 25-26, 131-132)622 and in the Coptic rite for the consecration of an altar (Ps 22-23,
25-26-92).623

However, it is only the Armenian rite of church dedication that uses Ps 83 in
conjunction with the opening ceremonies pertaining to the installation and consecration
of a new altar in a new church. In the context of this liturgical tradition Ps 83 is but one
of the elements of a larger sequence of psalmody that ‘covers’ the transfer of the new
altar into the church and its installation in the sanctuary. As seen in our earliest witness
to the text of the Armenian ritual in the late ninth-century Armenian maštoc’ ms. Venice
457,624 the rite of dedication opens with the deposition of the altar (“the stone [pup] of

622 See Voste, Pontificale iuxta ritum Ecclesiae Syrorum Occidentalium, 90-103.


624 The Armenian text of this maštoc’ has not yet been published, but it has been partially reproduced in the manuscript catalogue for the Mechitarist Library in Venice, ed. Barsegh Sargsian and Grigor Sargsian, Մայրցուցակ Հայերէն ձեռագրաց Մատենադարանին Մխիթեանց իՎենետիկ, vol. 3 (Venice: S. Lazar, 1966), 5-48. The full English translation of the dedication ritual is
the holy altar”) outside of the church doors, followed by the recitation of Pss 119, 120, 121. Each of the psalm concludes with the doxology and is followed by the diaconal acclamation and a doxological formula by the bishop:

And first the bishop begins to intone and one by one for each psalm they give glory with the same refrain (kc ‘urd’). And one by one at each psalm the deacon proclaims, “Let us ask in faith and accord.” The bishop and the priests say “Blessing and glory,” and sign with the cross the table and coverings.626

The latter action, which Findikyan translates, very literally, as “they trace the Lord” (տեարնագրեն),627 finds correspondence with the similar actions of a presiding bishop in the West Syriac rite for the consecration of a tâblîthô, but here the plural form of the verb suggests that both the main celebrant and the accompanying clergy participate in the marking of the new altar with a cross. The Armenian rite proceeds with the triple chant of Ps 117, followed by the bishop’s signing of the doors of the church, solemn entrance with the altar table carried by the clergy, and the deposition thereof in the midst of the church. The triple chanting of Ps 117 is repeated, and again, as earlier, it is intercalated with the diaconal acclamation and the formulaic blessing by the bishop.628 At this point, the clergy proceeds to chant Ps 83 three times, with the same intercalation, which

---

625 The meaning of this versatile Armenian term which, depending on the context could mean ‘refrain,’ ‘invocation,’ or ‘hymn’, was examined in Findikyan, Commentary on the Armenian Daily Office, 525-531.

626 Majr e ‘uc’ak, 8; ET Conybeare, 4, however I am mostly following Findikyan’s translation in “Armenian Ritual,” 87.

627 Findikyan, “Armenian Ritual,” 87; for the meaning of the verb as “to sign with the cross,” see Bedrossian, New Dictionary Armenian-English, 697.

628 “[A]t the close of the psalm, the same proclaiming [kuɾŋ], and ‘Blessing and glory’.” (Conybeare, 4).
accompanies the transfer of the altar by the hands of the clergy into the sanctuary. Further, with the accompanying chant of Ps 83:4 (“Your altar, O Lord of hosts”), the table is elevated by the clerics, and subsequently installed (հաստատեն) in the sanctuary, after which Ps 22 is sung.

In his study of the Armenian dedication rite, Findikyan compares the ritual of dedication, as known from Venice 457 and early commentaries, with the roughly contemporary late eighth-century Byzantine ritual from Barberini gr. 336 and notes the different functionality attributed to the psalmody in these two traditions. He concludes that the rites for the installation of the altar in the Armenian rite of dedication, together with the accompanying psalmody, has been a result of the liturgical activities of catholicos Yovhannēs Ōjnc’i who around the time of the council of Dvin (719 CE) “compose[d] and insert[ed] the ritual of processing into the church with the altar table,” with the intention “to combat certain local abuses in the construction and disposition of the altars.”

One is compelled, however, to note similarities between the execution of the psalmody in the opening ceremonies to the Armenian rite of dedication and the Georgian consecration of a portable altar in A 86. Certainly, the latter rite does not involve the procession with the altar into the church, but rather a deposition of the tablet

---

629 Conybeare, 4-5; the full description of the installation of the altar following Ps 83 is lacking in Venice 457 due to a lacuna in the ms., which is supplied by Conybeare from the 13th century ms. Venice 323 (see Findikyan, 96 n. 96).

630 “After this, the bishop elevates the table with the priests. And the bishop says three times: ‘Your altar, O Lord of hosts, my king and my God’ (Ps 83:4). The people say ‘Alleluia.’… And repeating (it) three times, they install the altar. Then they recite Ps 22…” (Conybeare, 5; Findikyan, 97). Findikyan noted the absence of the ceremony of ‘elevation’ of the altar tablet in the liturgical commentaries, concluding that the latter has developed into the separate liturgical action by the time of Venice 457 (Findikyan, 97, 119).

631 See e.g. “Armenian Ritual,” 96.

632 Ibid., 119.
upon the altar already installed, with the subsequent circular processional movement around the latter. However, the object of consecration in the case of *A 86* is a smaller, portable altar, the mere size of which could justify the reduction in ‘scale’ of the surrounding liturgical movements: since the circumambulation of the altar does not appear to have any functional significance, it may be safe to assume that these movements represent in a ‘reduced form’ the movements associated with the consecration of a stationary altar at the dedication of a church. The Armenian rite of dedication provides an example of a similar rite where the movements of the altar table, carried by the hands of clerics, do serve a functional purpose (transfer of the altar to the nave – elevation to the bema – installation) and one is compelled to assume a close genetic link between the Armenian and Georgian rites. Furthermore, even though Ps 83 constitutes the only text which is the same between the two rites, the structural similarity constitutes a stronger link: while *A 86* contains a triplet of psalms, each of which concluded with a diaconal litany and a “prayer”/\(\text{καρωζ}\), the Armenian rite of dedication contains *four* such triplets (119-121; 117 x3; 119-121; 83 x3) punctuated with the diaconal *karoz* and priestly exclamation “Blessing and glory” after every psalm.

The presence of the structural unit “psalm-litany-prayer” in both the Georgian hagiopolite euchologion *A 86* and in the Armenian euchologion *Venice 457* suggests the connection of such execution of psalmody to the liturgical use of Jerusalem. The use of a three-psalm unit during a Sunday Resurrectional office has already been noted by Egeria in the late fourth century, who described that after the entrance of the bishop,  

\[633\text{ With the exception of chanting Ps 25 during the washing of the altar table (Conybeare, 6).}\]

\[634\text{ See the detailed structure of the Armenian rite for church dedication in Findikyan, “Armenian Ritual,” 109-113.}\]
a psalm is said by one of the presbyters, with everyone responding, and it is followed by a prayer; then a psalm is said by one of the deacons, and another prayer; then a third psalm is said by one of the clerics, a third prayer, and the commemoration of all.635

The study of Georgian sources reflecting the history of the hagiopolite divine office, particularly of the “Old” Iadgari and ms. Sinai Georgian O.47, shows the presence of this tripsalmonic structure in the Jerusalem office of resurrection also after the fifth up until the tenth century.636 The Georgian sources for the office of the Resurrection do not seem to contain clear indications at the “prayers” after each psalm as seen in Egeria, but Frøyshov proposed that the extant structure (Palestinian in origin) of the Byzantine matins has preserved these “prayers” in the form of priestly ekphônesis, a possible endings to one or several pre-Gospel prayers.637 Bearing in mind this structure, we may be able to identify properly the meaning of the terms kverek’si and loc’vaj in the ordo of the consecration of a portable altar in A 86, the texts of which are not provided in the manuscript. A comparison with the structure of the Armenian rite of altar installation and with what we know of the Palestinian use of a three-psalmic structure may allow us to deduce that the “litany+prayer” in A 86 could have been reduced to mere diaconal acclamation and a priestly ekphônesis, sufficiently formulaic to make the inclusion of a full text unnecessary. A possibility remains that the hagiopolite rite of dedication, which may served as a model for both the initial rites of the Armenian ritual and for the brief

635 Itin. Egeriae 24.9 = CCSL 175, 69; ET Wilkinson 144.

636 See, most recently, the analysis of the sources in Stig R. Frøyshov, “The Resurrection Office of First Millenium Palestinian Tradition,” forthcoming in Acta of the Third International Congress of the Society for Oriental Liturgies (Brill). I am grateful to Prof. Frøyshov for allowing me to use and to cite his article before its publication. In his article, Frøyshov proposes that the Resurrectional prokeimena and Πᾶσα πνοή of the pre-gospel ordo of the current Byzantine resurrectional matins represent the traces of the original first millenium Resurrectional office of the Holy Anastasis in Jerusalem.

637 Frøyshov, “Resurrection Office.”
rite in *A 86*, could have at some point incorporated complete texts of prayers, but with the absence of the corroborating contemporary evidence we are left with mere speculation.

The choice of Pss 83, 131, 25 to accompany the rite of consecration of a portable altar stems from the allusions to the scriptural Temple and its altar (Ps 83, 25), as well as to the Davidic tabernacle (Ps 131), the scriptural models of a Christian sacred space built for divine indwelling. The presence of Ps 83 in both the Armenian and Georgian traditions suggests that this psalm perhaps constituted an element of the original core structure of the rite which could have seen further expansion in the Armenian use, as well as in the use of Jerusalem, reflected in *A 86*. The sequence of psalms present in *A 86* (83-131-25) does not seem to be in place in the Armenian ritual, but it has survived in exactly this sequence in the Byzantine rite of καθιέρωσις, albeit (as Findikyan correctly notes) in a different context within the consecration ritual. In cod. *Barberini gr. 336* and subsequent euchologia, the psalms 83, 50:9-10, 131, 132, 92, and 25 accompany the manual acts of the bishop and the clergy, respectively the washing of the altar with water (83) and with wine (50), drying of the altar (131), anointing with myron (132), vesting (92), and incensation of the altar and the church (25). The collection of psalms at this point of the ritual seems to be haphazard enough for any underlying structure to be well-hidden – however, the presence in *A 86* of the three of the same psalms and *in the same order*, may suggest the existence of the original triplet of psalms originating in the hagiopolite rite for the consecration of an altar of which structure the Byzantine rite of καθιέρωσις has preserved but a débris.
**Prayer of Consecration**

The first of the two prayers included in this manuscript follows the third circumambulation of the altar by the four priests carrying the new portable altar, the deposition thereof upon the “old” altar, concluded with the diaconal litany and a priestly “prayer.” While the roles for the litany and prayer are not indicated explicitly, the prayer that follows is specifically noted to be read by the bishop. More specifically, the denotation used for this text is different from loc’vaj above: it is designated as “blessing/consecration” (“the bishop shall bless with this blessing” – akurt’xos ebiskoposman amit’ kurt’xevit’a), and the notable correspondence between the term used for the prayer and the title of the entire ritual in A 86 (kurt’xevaj odikisaj) suggests this text as the preeminent consecratory prayer of this rite. Considering the hagiopolite origins of the euchologion where this prayer is located, it is possible to compare its text with the other liturgical texts of Jerusalem origins, in order to see whether this text can be situated within this liturgical context, and thus whether its dating can be more closely established.

The opening address of the prayer in [1] “Lord God of hosts/powers” appears to be a direct allusion to Ps 83:4 (tà θυσιαστήριά σου, Κύριε τῶν δυνάμεων) and confirms our contention that Ps 83 could have belonged to the earlier layer of the hagiopolite dedication liturgy. The opening clause of the prayer, by citing Ps 103:2b (ἐκτείνων τὸν οὐρανόν ὡς ἀόρατον) and 5a (ἐθεμελίωσεν τὴν γῆν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀσφάλειαν αὐτῆς), defines God as creator, building a link between the creation of cosmos and the foundation of an earthly church, the theme which appears to be also present in the hagiopolite “dismissal prayers” (loc’vaj eris gantevebisaj) for the “dedication of the altar”/Encaenia (ms. Sinai...
Another expression – “creator of all creation(s)” – is also found in one of the ‘incense prayers’ of the initial rites of JAS (τῆς κτίσεως ἁπάσης δημιουργή), and the closeness of the phrasing in the two Georgian uses of this expression (A 86, JAS, f. 9 vs. A 86, f. 159) points as it seems to an intentional use of a phrase pertaining to the Formelgut of the Jerusalem euchological tradition. The appearance of this stock expression in two prayers within the same euchologion (as well as the expression “Giver of holiness” in the doxology to our prayer [5]) suggest a roughly cotemporaneous origin for those prayers; if we accept the hypothesis regarding the development of the prothesis rite in JAS in the sixth-seventh centuries, one could suggest that the prayer in the rite for the consecration of the odiki cannot be dated later than the sixth century. The prayer proceeds in [2] to connect the theme of creation/“establishing” the earth to the act of God laying foundation to churches throughout the world. The curiously specific reference to “cities and villages” apparently alludes to the preaching of the kingdom by Jesus and his disciples in Luke

---

638 See above 3.2.

639 This prayer Εὐεργέται καὶ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων does not have a title in the critical edition of the Greek JAS (Mercier, PO 26.2, 162), but in the Georgian JAS this is one of the three prayers of entrance/incense read by the priest during his ascent to the altar (Kekelidze, 8; Conybeare-Wardrop, 399); for the Greek retroversion and analysis of the prayer, see Verhelst, “L’introduction et la disparition du rite de Prothèse,” 8-12.

640 Kekelidze, Arxieratikon, 8, 137.

641 See also the anaphora of JAS (preface): σοὶ εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ πάσης κτίσεως ὁρατῆς τε καὶ ἀοράτου δημιουργῷ (Mercier, PO 26.2, 198).

642 The expression “Giver of holiness” appears in the post-Sanctus of JAS: πάσης ἁγιωσύνης κύριος καὶ δοτήρ (Mercier, PO 26.2, 200).
only in this instance the proclamation is shaped through liturgical ritual: foundation of a church and establishment of the altar for the purpose of celebrating the “bloodless” eucharistic offering (cf. Rom 12:1, Eph 5:2, 1 Pet 2:5). The pivotal section of this short prayer contains an epiclesis, expressed through the petition to “look down” upon the new portable altar and to “sanctify it” through the coming of the Spirit. The epiclesis in this prayer [3] is not expressed in the form common for the formulary of JAS, since the verb ἐπίβλεψον is used in JAS in the context of a celebrant’s prayer pro seipso. At the same time the Georgian prayer appears to cite the diptychs of the anaphora of JAS (which here, just as BAS, itself quotes Heb 11:38) when it enumerates the places where the “bloodless sacrifice” of Christ is to be celebrated – “on the mountains and in caves, holes and in sea and in every place of your dominion” (cf. τῶν ἐν ὄρεσι καὶ σπηλαίοις καὶ ταῖς ὁπαῖς τῆς γῆς). The purpose of the consecration of the altar is to enable eucharistic celebration in all those various places, quite consistently with the function of a portable altar – however, one also notes that the scope of the sanctifying power of this altar appears to be limited specifically to “(those who)...[will] offer...the divine mystery,” i.e. a cleric who will be celebrating the eucharist:

for the communion and remission of sins of all who, with the knowledge of holiness, offer together before you, for the union of the people and the communion of the divine mystery which is celebrated upon it. 646

643 [Ἰησοῦς] διώδευεν κατὰ πόλιν καὶ κώμην κηρύσσων καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. 

644 Ὁ ἐπισκεψάμενος ἡμᾶς ἐν ἐλέει καὶ οἰκτιρμοῖς... ἐπίβλεψον ἐπ´ ἐμὲ τὸν ἡμεῖς δοῦλον σου... καὶ ἱκάνωσόν με τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ ἅγιου πνεύματος εἰς τὴν λειτουργίαν ταύτην... (Mercier, PO 26.2, 190).

645 Mercier PO 26.2, 210; with the addition of Ps 102:22. The expression ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ καὶ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ τῆς δεσποτείας σου is also found in the fourth presbyteral prayer of the Byzantine matins (Ἱερατικόν, 50).

646 This section presents some difficulty for translation, since the mention of “communion” (= κοινωνία?) twice (ὡς κοινωνία...ὡς κοινωνία) appears to be redundant. Conybeare and Wardrop
The difficulty in proper interpretation of the passage stems from its possible corruption either in Kekelidze’s edition or in the transmission of the text into Georgian, which I tried to correct in this translation, e.g. reading ერთა of the people’ instead of ერთად ‘together’ in the section of the prayer dealing with the effects of the descent of the Spirit upon the altar. The apparent sacerdotal focus of the prayer, evident even despite the syntactic problems in the transmission of the text into Georgian, is not inconsistent with the previously noted clerical character of this entire service pertaining to a portable altar, quite possibly celebrated within the sanctuary, in the presence of the clerics only. Indeed, the phrasing of this passage suggests that the “communion and remission of sins” stemming from this sacred altar concern the celebrating clergy whose precedence is couched here in priestly language related to spiritual γνῶσις – “the knowledge of holy things/holiness.” But, despite the explicitly stated purpose of this consecrated object, namely, to enable liturgical celebration for scattered Christian communities (“in every place of your dominion”), the prayer stresses the “union and communion” as the direct effect of the liturgical celebration which concerns not only the clergy officiating at the new altar, but also the ecclesial community (“the peoples”). The emphasis on unity would fit well with the ecclesiastical context in Palestine in late fifth -sixth centuries,

render this phrase as “for the communion and remission of sins in behalf of all, by the knowledge of holiness of them that sacrifice before thee together for the sake of unity and the divine sacrament of communion which shall be performed upon it” (“Georgian Version,” 172). Kekelidze’s Russian translation gives “for the remission of sins to all, for the oneness of all who offer holiness before you, and for the communion of the mysteries performed upon it” (LGP 31), thus somewhat glossing over the difficulties of the original.

647 I am indebted to Shota Gugushvili for this and other suggestions in this translation.
marked by the involvement of monastic circles and church hierarchy in the ecclesial divisions in the aftermath of Chalcedon, as well as in the second Origenist controversy.648

The close genetic link between this Georgian rite for the consecration of an odiki and the rite for dedication of a church in the Armenian tradition has been noted earlier, and the comparison of the central consecratory and epicletic prayer of the Georgian ritual with the first prayer of the Armenian rite only supports this impression. In the Armenian rite, the prayer follows the transfer and installation of a new altar into the sanctuary, an action which may be see as parallel to the triple procession of the clergy with a new portable altar and the deposition of the latter upon the “old” altar. In order to see a remarkable textual connection between the prayers, I will place the Armenian prayer in parallel with the translation of the prayer from A 86, highlighting the common places where the texts show dependence upon a common Vorlage.649

648 See Lorenzo Perrone, “‘Rejoice Sion, Mother of all Churches’: Christianity in the Holy Land during the Byzantine Era,” in ed. Ora Limor, Guy G. Stroumsa, Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land: From the Origins to the Latin Kingdoms, Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages 5 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), 141-173; idem, La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche: dal concilio di Efeso (431) al secondo concilio di Costantinopoli (553), Teste e ricerche di Scienze religiose 18 (Brescia: Paideia, 1980).

649 The English translation (used with some emendations below) is found in Conybeare, Rituale Armenorum, 5. For the Armenian text cited I referred to Sargsean, Majr c’uč’ak, 9 (where, as in Conybeare, the lacuna of Venice 457 is restored on the basis of Venice 323); the prayer in Sargsean’s catalogue was cited only partially – hence for the remainder of the text I referred to the euchologion ms. Erevan 1001, f. 4-5. The latter ms. is dated to 9th-10th century in Charles Renoux, “Le Christ dans quelques textes du rite arménien,” in Le Christ dans la liturgie: Conférences Saint-Serge, XXVIIe Semaine d’Etudes Liturgiques 1980, Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae Subsidia 20 (Rome: CLV-Edizioni liturgiche, 1981; online publication Paris, 2004), n.2, 55, 107; also see a brief description in ed. V.O. Kazaryan, S.S. Manukyan, Матенадаран, vol. 1: Армянская рукописная книга веков (Сокровища книжного искусства в собраниях СССР) (Moscow: Kniga, 1991), 234. I am very grateful to Prof. Daniel Findikyan who had graciously allowed me to use copies of the relevant folios of Erevan 1001.
Lord God almighty who established the earth upon its foundation, and alone have created many powers. You Lord of all the earth <for all generations V> have strengthened your holy church and commanded to establish the altar therein and to offer sacrifices and rational offerings which are presented without blood to your holy name for the salvation of the human race. Likewise also now, Lord, send your holy sanctifying Spirit and sanctify this altar for the hope of the faithful, for the salvation of all men and those who stand before the great glory of your name, for the renovation of souls, and for the good pleasure of your will, who alone are the merciful God, long-suffering and of many mercies, for blessed is your name, of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, now and ever and unto the ages.

The recension of the prayer which is similar to the Armenian version, is also found in a Syriac recension in the rite for the consecration of tablıthô, in the Coptic rite for the consecration of an altar, as well as in several Greek manuscripts originating in the Byzantine periphery – the twelfth-century Sinai gr. 973, and two sixteenth-century mss. Sinai gr. 993 and Barberini gr. 390. The comparison of the Armenian and the Georgian texts shows a great similarity in the opening section of the prayer, particularly in
theological progression from the creation of the cosmos to the establishment of the
churches on earth. The epicletic section of the prayer in the Georgian text, however,
diverges from the Armenian equivalent, while keeping intact the general thrust of the
prayer, underscoring the eucharistic celebration as the ultimate purpose for which the
altar is consecrated. While, as we noted earlier, the Georgian text may be somewhat
dependent on the dyptichs of JAS (or merely upon Heb 11:38) in this section, the
Armenian prayer following the installation of an altar shows more direct connections to
the Jerusalem Formelgut than the Georgian text: specifically, the petition “for the
renovation of souls,” included into the intercessory section of the Armenian prayer harks
back to several other prayers of explicitly hagiopolite origin:

τὸν κύριον ἣμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν εξαπέστειλας εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα αὐτὸς ἔλθὼν
τὴν σὴν ἀνανεώση καὶ ἀνεγείρῃ εἰκόνα... (JAS, anaphora, post-Sanctus)\(^651\);

This recurrence of this phrase suggests that the term “unto the renovation of soul(s)” (as
well as “unto the good pleasure” \(= \varepsilonἰς \varepsilonὐαρέστησιν\)) may have belonged to the euchologic
formulae common for the corpus of liturgical texts originating in Jerusalem. This in turn

\(^{650}\) Mercier, PO 26.2, 192.

\(^{651}\) Ibid., 200.

can testify to the hagiopolite origin of the Armenian prayer as well, “epicletic in mode” but characterized by “brevity and simplicity.”

At the same time, the connection between the Armenian prayer and the Georgian prayer from *A 86* cannot be doubted, despite the textual divergence in its epicletic formula: both prayers follow the installation of the altar (in the case of *A 86* purely symbolic) and both prayers precede the act of anointing of the altar with *myron* (in the case of the Armenian rite preceded by washing of the altar with water and wine). With this structural similarity, one may more convincingly argue that, as in the Georgian rite, so also in the Armenian ritual, this is a consecratory epicletic prayer, petitioning for the descent of the Spirit upon the new altar to enable it for eucharistic celebration, and the act of the anointing of the altar with chrism that follows serves as a natural ritual counterpart of the prayer that preceded it.

The structural similarity between the two rites (epicletic prayer + anointing) may suggest the Jerusalem liturgical tradition as underlying both rites, with the Armenian prayer possibly reflecting an earlier recension of the text. Earlier we have surmised that if the hypothesis regarding the sixth/seventh-century dating for the redaction of *JAS* witnessed to by *A 86* can be accepted, one could, therefore, date the emergence of an “altar consecration rite” in Jerusalem toward the earlier margin of that time frame, because the rite for the consecration of the *odiki* appears to be dependent on a complete rite for the consecration of an altar and a church already in existence. Since the Armenian version of the prayer does not contain redactional characteristics peculiar to the Georgian rite, it

---


655 Findikyan seems to suggest that the prayer in question in the context of the Armenian ritual seems to *conclude* the rite of installation, rather than to precede the chrismation of the altar, although he never denies that this prayer functions as consecratory (ibid., 98-99).
should be dated to the period before the changes in the Georgian version were introduced, i.e. around the early sixth century.

**Anointing of the Altar**

The consecratory epicletic prayer “Lord God of powers” is immediately followed by the anointing of the altar with chrism/myron. Both the main celebrant, the bishop, and the accompanying clergy (presbyters) take different roles in the rite of anointing:

[The bishop] will pour/apply the chrism (ἡγεμονικός ἑυδέκατος χρισμοῦ) three times in the form of the cross. The priests [then] will anoint and say just as at another consecration of the altar.656

The bishop thus pours the chrism in the form of three crosses upon the surface of the altar, with the anointing substance then rubbed over the body of the object by the accompanying clergy. The verb used here – *dasxmaj* – can signify either pouring,657 or more generic ‘application’ of the oil to the altar658 which, considering that the action takes the form of the “cross,” may signify the bishop’s act of ‘drawing’ three crosses upon the surface of a new altar with his finger. This action of “applying” the oil to the altar finds its correspondence in the Armenian rite of dedication, where the anointing is preceded by the deacons’ washing of the altar with water and with wine, similar to the Byzantine rite for the consecration of an altar.659 However, the climactic manual action in the Armenian rite – the anointing of the altar – is performed by the bishop who

656 Kekelidze, *Arxieratikon*, 139.

657 See *ADW* 364: “gießen, schütten.”

658 Joseph Molitor’s lexicon gives as Greek equivalents to *dasxmaj* τίθημι/τίθεμαι, βάλλω, ἐπιτίθημι, ἐπιβάλλω, but also καταχέω ἐπί and βάλλω ἐπί (Altegeorgisches Glossar zu ausgewählten Bibeltexten, Monumenta Biblica et Ecclesiastica 6 [Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1952], 51).
taking the holy myron of anointing, applies it to the holy table, saying Ps 22 in a lamenting tone. Refrain: “You anointed my head with oil” (Ps 22:5). And they shall anoint first the top of the table, then the four corners, and the southern face of the table, and the western and the northern, then the pillars, saying: “Blessed, anointed, and sanctified be this table in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.” And the people say: “Amen.”

One may notice similarities between this description and the actions of the bishop and the clergy at the consecration of odiki in A 86: the bishop’s application of the oil thereafter spread out by the presbyters (presumably the subject of the plural in the Armenian rite) through multiple anointings in different parts of the altar. The recourse to the Armenian rite would most likely help to explain the cryptic reference in the odiki rite in A 86 that what the priests were prescribed to say during the anointing of a portable altar was the same “as at another consecration of the altar (երեկոյան վերարձույլ սրբով սեղանոյն),” This evident allusion to the existence of a complete rite for the dedication of an altar in Jerusalem remains obscure with regards to the actual psalmic or euchological formulae that were prescribed here, because the complete hagiopolite rite of church/altar dedication did not survive in the Georgian recension. However, the possible Jerusalem ancestry to the Armenian rite, noted above, may allow us to suggest that Ps 22

659 Findikyan, “Armenian Ritual,” 99; it is notable that while in the Byzantine rite of church dedication, it is the bishop presiding at the ceremony who performs the washing of the altar with water and wine (see e.g. Barberini gr. 336, f. 150v- 151v = Parenti-Velkovska, 159-60), while in the Armenian rite this action is delegated to the deacons (սարկաւագունք), indicating perhaps the lesser significance ascribed to these actions in comparison with the consecratory anointing of the altar with chrism.

660 եւ ապա առեալ եպիսկոպոսն զսուրբ միռոնն աւծութեան դնէ ի վերայ սուրբ սեղանոյն (Venice 457 = Sargsean, Majr c’uc’ak, 9). The Armenian euchologion ms. Erevan 1001 (9th/10th cent.) uses a somewhat different reading: եւ ապա առեալ եպիսկոպոսն զեւղ ավծութեան, դիցէ ի վերայ սուրբ սեղանոյն (f. 5; “and then the bishop will apply/put [Aor. subj.] the oil of anointing to the holy table”).

661 Sargsean, Majr c’uc’ak, 9; ET is taken from Findikyan, “Armenian Ritual,” 100.

662 The Armenian commentary on the dedication of a church by catholicos Yovhannēs Ŭjnec’i

663 This line was translated by Conybeare and Wardrop as “what is usually said at the consecration of another altar” (“Georgian Version,” 172), an evident misreading of the Georgian.
and the acclamation “Blessed, anointed, and sanctified…” could have been also the formulae recited at the dedication of a portable altar, and perhaps of a stationary altar as well, in the rite of Jerusalem. Another possibility can be derived from another peculiar characteristic of the Armenian rite – the consecratory prayer “Lord God almighty” + anointing with Ps 22 is preceded by the triple act of elevation-and-deposition of the altar accompanied by the triple chant of Ps 83:4 (“Your altars, Lord of hosts”) with “Alleluia” as a refrain. This elevation of the altar is followed by Ps 22 with the same refrain.664 The use of the same psalmody in these two places suggests that these liturgical loci are connected and perhaps ‘mirror’ each other: thus, “Alleluia” could have also accompanied the anointing of the altar in the Jerusalem rite underlying the rite for the odiki. If “Alleluia” was indeed used at the chrismation of the altar in Jerusalem, we may see in such practice a parallel with the use of “Alleluia” at the anointing of the altar in the Byzantine rite, as well as with the use of the same chant at the consecration of baptismal waters in Armenian, West Syriac, Maronite, and Byzantine rite.665

Dismissal

The anointing and vesting of the altar is followed by a prayer of inclination, apparently functioning here as a dismissal prayer of the rite, since no other dismissal is indicated.666 Because the manuscript colophon with the names of the donor and the

664 Conybeare, Rituale Armenorum, 5-6.

665 For the Armenian rite of baptism, see ibid., 95; also see Winkler, Armenische Initiationsrituale, 430. I tackle the use of “Alleluia” at the consecration of waters in the churches of Syriac tradition in ch. 3.3.1 further.

666 For the significance of the prayer of inclination as blessing/dismissal, both in the Eastern divine office and eucharistic liturgy, esp. on the example of the pre-communion prayer of inclination in CHR, see
receiver of the codex directly follows this prayer, it is not possible to determine whether this rite was celebrated in any conjunction with the eucharistic liturgy – a connection made more explicit in the later Georgian euchologia (e.g. A 420), but not necessarily true for the witness as early as A 86. The prayer is even more succinct than the preceding one and contains the allusion to the descent of the Spirit upon the *tablaj*, i.e. the altar table, and the petition for the spiritual benefits for those who “will partake from it,” i.e. through the reception of communion. As has been noted above, the fact that the term “tablet,” etymologically similar to Syr. ܐܠܟܠܐ, and derivative of *tabula*, was used with respect to this new (portable) altar, seems to point to the shape and texture of the object in question, possibly made of stone or wood.

**Conclusion**

The rite for the consecration of *odiki* (portable altar) in the euchologion *Tbilisi A 86* appears to be the only witness we possess to the structure and content of the rite for the dedication of an altar as it was possibly practiced in the rite of Jerusalem. It is difficult to speculate why the compilers of *A 86*, a pontifical euchologion of a hagiopolite tradition, chose to include a shorter rite for a consecration of a portable altar instead of a complete rite for the dedication of a church, which would have been the bishop’s prerogative. One possibility would find the reason for the survival of a “shorter” rite in a Taft, *Precommunion Rites*, 193-97; however see the criticism of his hypothesis in Heinzgerd Brakmann, “Der Gottesdienst in den östlichen Kirchen,” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 30 (1988), 341, and Alexopoulos, *Presanctified Liturgy*, 238-241. Alexopoulos questions Taft’s identification of the prayer in CHR as the prayer for the dismissal of non-communicants – however, he does not contend its characterisation as a “dismissal prayer.”


668 See further 5.3.2.
better suitability of such rite to the situation in a church on the periphery of the Byzantine world (e.g. Caucasus) where a bishop’s travel to attend the dedication ceremony in person would not always be feasible. On the other hand, one could reasonably assume that a similar situation would not be impossible for the fifth-seventh century Palestine. Recent scholarship has shown that the conversion of the rural Palestine, most starkly evinced in the construction of Christian churches in rural areas, was by no means accomplished by the end of the fourth century, but became a slow and gradual process,669 just initiated in the late fifth-early sixth century.670 Moreover, in many cases it appears that it was the local communities, not the imperial or ecclesiastical sponsors/dedicators, who initiated and funded the construction of a local church building.671 In such situation, the installation of an altar consecrated by a local bishop would be a form of a certain homage to episcopal authority and a visual sign of this community’s incorporation into the structure of the local orthodox ecclesiastical establishment. If we accept this as a working hypothesis, we could see the rationale for the emergence of a rite for the consecration of a portable altar (more literally, the altar to be taken along while travelling), important enough to be included into an euchology and to be preserved in transmission/translation into the tradition of another church.

669 See Doron Bar, “The Christianisation of Rural Palestine during Late Antiquity,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 54.3 (2003), 401-421.

670 “Only during the second half of the fifth century and the sixth century, in the wake of the submission of pagan opposition in the towns, did the bishops and priests begin to turn their attention to the more remote villages too” (ibid., 409). For the discussion of the survival of paganism in Palestine into the Late Antique period, see also Joseph Geiger, “Aspects of Palestinian Paganism in Late Antiquity,” in ed. Arieh Kofsky, Guy G. Stroumsa, *Sharing the Sacred: Religious Contacts and Conflicts in the Holy Land: First-Fifteenth Centuries CE* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi, 1998), 3-17.

At the same time, our examination has shown that the Georgian rite for the consecration of odiki probably belongs to the tradition that also may underlie the Armenian rite for the dedication of churches, particularly its ritual elements and prayers that are concerned with the transfer, installation, and consecration of the altar table. If we attempt to ‘collate’ the evidence deriving from two rites, it may be possible to suggest that the Georgian rite for the dedication of odiki represents an abbreviated service forged out of the elements of a full rite for the consecration of an altar and the church building, which itself has underlied the Armenian ritual of dedication as we know it in its ninth/tenth-century form. The common feature of these two rites is the lack of any mention of deposition or insertion of relics into a new altar: instead, the consecratory acts center on the anointing of the altar with chrism.\footnote{Findikyan notes that “[l]acking the Greek fascination for saints’ relics, the Armenians neglected the ceremony of encaenia. The procession outside and the blessing of the church exterior is analogously situated in the Armenian ordo, and may reflect a conscious substitution of this ritual for the Greek encaenia ceremony” (“Armenian Ritual,” 114). While the author is certainly correct that, compared to the Byzantine ritual, the rite of encaenia with the deposition of relics constitutes the glaring ‘omission’ in the Armenian rite, I may suggest, as I hope to show here, that the reason for this lies not in the Armenians’ attempt to subtract the encaenia from the dedication rite, but in both the Armenian rite of dedication and the Byzantine rite of καθιέρωσις having as their common ‘ancestor’ the hagiopolite rite for the installation/consecration of an altar which did not involve the deposition of relics to begin with.} In addition, the Georgian rite clearly involves the physical contact of a new altar with the stationary one, already consecrated, thus supplying the pneumatological consecration via myron by the manual act suggesting a consecration ‘by contact.’ While the Armenian rite evidently does not involve such ‘contact’ with a consecrated altar, the procession of the altar into the church is punctuated by the bishop’s tracing the sign of the cross upon the altar table, following the repeated unit of ‘psalmody-diaconal proclamation- celebrant’s ekphônesis’,\footnote{Illustrating the noted Late Antique inclination for ‘tactile’ sanctification.} illustrating the
Thus, the psalmody (especially Ps 83) and the prayer “Lord God of powers” were most likely to belong to the early ‘core’ of the rite for the consecration of an altar in the hagiopolite liturgical tradition. While we will be better equipped to discuss the hagiopolite ancestry of the Byzantine rite of church dedication when we reach the end of this part, the discussion will be incomplete without the addressing several issues which I will treat in the following excurses: 1) a possible relation between the rite for the consecration of an altar in Tbilisi A 86 and the Jerusalem baptismal ordo; 2) the reception of the elements of the Jerusalem ritual of altar consecration in some peripheral Byzantine euchologia; 3) further evolvement of the Jerusalem rite for the consecration of portable altars in the Georgian tradition.

*The Hagiopolite Baptismal Rite according to Sinai Georgian O.12: The Consecration of Water with myron.*

Further we have discussed the rite for the consecration of the baptismal font found in one of the extant witnesses to the “Jerusalem euchologion” – ms. Sinai Georgian O.12 (10th/11th cent.). Also, in the beginning of Part II of this dissertation, I attempted to point out the problem inherent in the ritual of the consecration of the altar in the Byzantine dedication rite: the ritual actions in the rite of καθιέρωσις appear to be modeled on the actions of the clergy at the consecration of baptismal water in the Byzantine initiation rite, with one exception – the rite for the consecration of the altar uses myron instead of “holy oil” as in the course of the baptismal ceremony. I have speculated earlier that the presence of such inconsistency in the rite of dedication may point to non-Byzantine

---


674 See Conclusion to Part I.
origin behind some of the elements of the Byzantine rite for the consecration of the altar – specifically, to the origin of those elements among the Eastern Christian traditions which did practice the consecration of baptismal waters with chrism/myron, rather than with the “holy oil.” The comparison of baptismal rites among the living liturgical traditions of the Christian East shows the use of chrism for the consecration of waters attested in the practice of Coptic, Ethiopian, West Syriac, and Maronite churches.675

Thus, the consecration of waters in the West Syriac ordo, attributed to Severus of Antioch, includes the epicletic prayer, accompanied by the priest blowing upon water, the triple signing of the water in a cruciform fashion, the signing of the water with the vessel of chrism with “Alleluia” and Ps. 28:3 + 76:17, and the pouring of the chrism into the water with the formula “In the name of the Father etc..” 676 By contrast with this ordo, another baptismal rite, attributed to Timothy (Aelurus) of Alexandria, mentions the infusion into the water of the “oil of the horn.”677 Despite this divergence of practice even within the West Syriac tradition, one could conceivably suggest a possible connection between the Byzantine rite for the consecration of an altar and the initiation liturgy of the Syro-Antiochene churches. At the same time, as we have established that

675 See for the convenient comparative presentation Johnson, Rites of Christian Initiation, 283 (table), 287-294.


the myron was probably used for the consecration of altars in Jerusalem itself, it may be sensible to examine the evidence to the ritual consecration of baptismal waters also originating from Jerusalem, establishing the Holy City as the liturgical center where the mutual influence between two rites could have taken place.

While it is possible to regard the allusions in the *Catecheses ad illuminandos* (3.3) and *Mystagogical Catecheses* (2.4, 3.1) by Cyril of Jerusalem as indications at the sanctification of baptismal waters through the prayer which may have included “anamnesis and petition,” the indication for the infusion of the oil or chrism into the font in conjunction with the consecration of the waters does not seem to be attested in the fourth- and fifth century sources reflecting Jerusalem practice – moreover, the first testimony for the use of oil/chrism at the consecration of waters for the region of Syria-Palestine derives from Dionysius (*Eccl. Hier.* 2.7). Previous studies on the development of the baptismal ritual in Jerusalem after Cyril, Egeria, and the Armenian Lectionary were limited to the analysis of the evidence of the Georgian Lectionary which is believed to reflect the hagiopolite liturgy of the period between the fifth and the eighth centuries. Our understanding of baptismal rites in Jerusalem and of their possible relation to the fledging rites for the consecration of altars could be significantly improved.

---

678 Μη ὡς ὕδατι λιτῷ πρόσεχε τῷ λουτρῷ. ἄλλα τῇ μετὰ τοῦ ὕδατος δεδομένῃ πνευματικῇ χάριτι (*Cat.* 3.3); σωτήριον ἐκεῖνο ὕδωρ (*Myst. Cat.* 2.4); ἀπὸ τῆς κολυμβήθρας τῶν ἱερῶν ναμάτων (ibid. 3.1).


680 See e.g. Johnson, *Rites of Christian Initiation*, 207, 277.
if we consider a Jerusalem source which so far (to the best of our knowledge) has not
fully entered the scholarly purview, the rite of baptism from the tenth-eleventh century
Georgian euchologion Sinai Georgian O.12.

The baptismal rite in Sinai Georgian O.12 (f. 101v-120r) immediately follows
the brief rite for the consecration of a baptismal font on f. 101r-v, and consists of the
prayers and rituals of the catechumenate, the rite of baptism itself, and the rites of the
eighth day after baptism. In order to perceive the context of the rite, in what follows I
give a preliminary structure of the rite, as it appears in the euchologion:

1. “Prayer of making a Christian” (მხარის ბრძანება), f. 101v-102r
2. “Also a prayer of making a Christian,” f. 102r-103r
3. Prayer “over the baptizands,” f. 103r-v
4. Prayer “over the catechumens,” f. 103v-104r.
5. Provisions if the baptizand is 1) a son of a Christian (f. 104r), 2) “from the
   pagans” (f. 104r-106r; 3) if there is one or two [baptizands], f. 106r
6. Kverek’si for the baptism, f. 110v-111v
7. Prayer by the priest, f. 111v-112r
8. “4th prayer of the catechumens,” f. 112r-v
9. Diaconal kverek’si and prayer, f. 112v-113r
10. Diaconal kverek’si and prayer, f. 113r-114r
11. Kverek’si “over the water” (ზღუბა გამზირვა), f. 114r
12. Prayer by the priest, f. 114r-115r
13. Prayer “over the waters,” f. 115r-117r
14. Consecration of the water, pre-baptismal anointing, immersion, chrismation, f.
   117r-118r

The major obstacle to the study of the post-5th century initiation ritual of Jerusalem is certainly
the lack of editions and translations of the sources pertaining to the Jerusalem euchologion, which is extant
in its more pristine form in the Old Georgian translation only. Additionally, any assessment of the
elements of Jerusalem euchologion, including the baptismal rite will be incomplete without consideration
of the sources for it among the New Finds of Sinai, e.g. Sinai Georgian N.53.

See the short description in R. Gmaramia, K’art’ul xelnacert’a... sinuri kolek’cia, 3.39.
“Rituel du baptême” is listed by Bernard Outtier in his description of the contents of Sinai Georgian O.12
(“Un nouveau témoin partiel,” 165), but no detail is given. In the course of preparation for this dissertation,
I have been informed that the edition of this rite on the basis of Sinai Georgian O.12, with a commentary, is
currently in preparation (in Georgian) by Ektime Kochlamazashvili (Stig R. Frøyshov, personal
communication, February 2011) and (in French) by Bernard Outtier (Bernard Outtier, personal
communication, May 2009), but no edition has been produced so far. To the best of my knowledge, it is in
this dissertation that a partial translation of the hagiopolite baptismal rite in Sinai Georgian O.12 is
appearing for the first time.
15. Dismissal prayer, f. 118r-v
16. Prayer of inclination, f. 118v
17. Entrance of the newly baptized into the church with Gal 3:27.
18. The 8th day rites: presentation of the baptized before the altar, prayer, and prayer of inclination, f. 118v-120r.

The Jerusalem progeny of the rite is best exemplified by the affinity between the rubric [17] above, describing the entrance of the newly baptized into the church after their initiation, and one of the focal points of paschal vigil in the Armenian and Georgian Lectionary, the entrance of the bishop with the newly baptized:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Armenian Lectionary (J)(^{683})</th>
<th>Georgian Lectionary(^{684})</th>
<th>Baptismal rite, Sinai Geo.O.12 (f. 118v)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And at this hour, they ascend to the Holy Martyrium and the bishop lights a lamp. [paschal vigil with 12 readings]</td>
<td>And the bishop blesses the new candle and they light the candles and open the doors. (&lt;\ldots&gt;) After this, the bishop or a priest baptizes the illumined. (&lt;\ldots&gt;) [paschal vigil with 12 readings]</td>
<td>They light the torches and they enter the church, and they say this: <em>You who were baptized into Christ</em> [Gal 3:27], and they come across the altar(^{685})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And while they say the hymn [Dan 3], a great number of the newly baptized enter with the bishop.</td>
<td>And after this the baptized are led into the church with this hypakoe <em>You who were baptized into Christ</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ritual of baptism itself appears to begin with the diaconal litany and prayer “over the waters,” “Lord, God of all, Master of all creatures…,” interrupted by the celebrant’s exorcistic breathing upon the water (once, then three times) and triple signing of the water with the cross. The section of the prayer following the breathing and signing quite


\(^{685}\) აღნთნენ კერიონი და შევიდენ ეკლესია და იტყოდიან ამას: რომელთა ეგე ქრისტ ს მიერ ნათელგიღებიეს და საკურთხეველს შეამთხვევა: დღეს მერვა.
closely follows the equivalent section of the Byzantine prayer for the consecration of baptismal waters, as it appears for the first time in the euchologion Barberini gr. 336686 (incipit: Φυγέτωσαν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ οἱ ἐπιβουλεύοντες τῷ πλάσματι σου). But the first, anamnetic section of the prayer in Sinai Georgian O.12 does not correspond to the first section of the prayer in Byzantine euchologies. This anamnetic section, however, does correspond to the “second prayer” (more likely, the first section of the consecratory prayer) of the West Syriac baptismal ordo of Severus and the Melkite ordo, attributed to St Basil.687 Also, as has been already shown by Engberding, the “second prayer” appearing in the baptismal rites of the Syriac Orthodox and Melkite Syriac traditions finds its Greek equivalent/original in the prayer Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ listed as an alternative prayer for the consecration of waters.688 In the later manuscripts and ritual books, this prayer was affixed to the rite for baptism in the danger of death,689 but the middle Byzantine euchologies list this prayer as a “short” version of the baptismal prayer (εὐχὴ ἢτέρα τῶν ἁγίων βαπτισμάτων ἐχουσα τὸ προοίμιον σύντομον): as such it appears in the euchologies St. Petersburg gr. 226 (f. 88r-v), Grottaferrata Γ.β.Ι (f. 59r-v), Athens Ethnike Biblotheke 662 (f. 92v-93).690 Unlike the received text of Byzantine ritual books,

686 f.100r-102v = Parenti-Velkovska, 127-128; Arranz, L’eucologio costantinopolitano, 186-87.
689 Goar, Euchologion, 303.
which disassociate this prayer from the regular celebration of baptism, both Greek and
Slavonic euchologia apparently use this text as optional preface of the quasi-anaphoral
anamnetic-epicletic prayer over the font, commemorating the divine work of creation and
petitioning the Lord to “look down” and “bless” the water. Following this petition, the
Greek euchologies prescribe the celebrant to revert to the “longer” text of the
consecratory prayer, continuing with the insufflations over the water until the baptism
and the anointings. On the basis of the correspondence between the West Syriac and
“alternative” Byzantine versions of the prayer, it has been suggested that the model Κύριε
ὁ θεός ὁ παντοκράτωρ + Φυγέτωσαν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ reflected early, sixth century
Constantinopolitan usage. The evidence of Sinai Georgian O.12 confirms the use of
exactly the same prayer model for the consecration of waters in the church of Jerusalem
and thus shows a close connection and mutual influence between the liturgical traditions
of the Syriac churches and the rite of Jerusalem. Regardless of whether we consider the
baptismal rite in question as originating in Jerusalem and appropriated by the Syro-
Antiochene rite, or vice versa, it is conceivable that the rite of Jerusalem may have served
as a necessary link by which the elements of the Syro-Palestinian baptismal rite crossed
over into the baptismal rite of Constantinople, to appear in its first post-iconoclastic
euchologion Barberini gr. 336.

nuit de Pâques,” OCP 51 (1985): 85-86; idem, L’eucologio costantinopolitano, 192-93; Trempelas, Μικρὸν
εὐχολόγιον, 1.369; Zheltov also lists the Slavonic euchologia RNB Gif. 21 (13th-14th cent.) and BAN 13.6.3
(16th cent.) which include the same prayer – “Водосвящение,” 140-141.

691 E.g. in ms. Athens Ethnike Bibliothekhe 662: καὶ τὰ λουπὰ ὅσα ἔχει ἡ πρώτῃ εὐχῇ μέχρι τῆς
χρίσεως τοῦ ἁγίου μύρου (Trempelas, 369).

692 Zheltov, “Водосвящение,” 140-141.
A possible connection between the rites for the consecration of an altar in Syria-Palestine and the baptismal rite can be found in the description of the consecration of waters in *Sinai Georgian O.12*, which I cite below, together with the description of the anointings and baptism itself, in order to contextualize the pouring of oil into the waters.

Thus, after the conclusion of the prayer “over the waters,” the following actions ensue:

1. The priest puts/pours the oil of the chrism three times upon the palm of the right hand and he will collect (his) fingers and will put the hand into the font. He will draw the cross (with) right hand and will say thus: “In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,” and will lift up the oil from the rim of the font.

2. And the priest will say: “Alleluia” and the people will respond. And he will put the verse: “The voice of the Lord upon the waters,” and the second time the priest will say: “Glory.”

3. And then the priest will lift up the vessel inside which he will put the oil and puts it into the water in the form of the cross, saying thus: “In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”

4. After this, the deacons shall undress the catechumens, shall anoint (with) the oil and say thus, thus anointing: they will call on the name, so that it shall be: “In the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.” And they will descend into the font and baptize, putting the hand upon the head, three times, and they say thus: “He is baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,” and he will draw the cross on the forehead and shall bring him up from the font and shall rub off with a new cloth the newly baptized.

5. And the priest will anoint (him) with the holy chrism, and shall say thus: “Chrismated, renewed is,” your name – (and) he names the catechumen (who) is anointed – “in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.” He shall anoint in this manner: forehead, eyes, ears, nostrils, throat, both thumbs of the feet and both palms of the hands, the heart, both calves of the legs.

Thus, the baptismal ritual in *Sinai Georgian O.12* comprises the double anointing of the waters – once with the hand of a priest and another, with the effusion of oil from the

---

693 I have added the flexion –sa in square brackets, as it would appear to make more sense grammatically. With this exception, I have tried to be quite literal in this translation which may have resulted in a (perhaps excusable) awkwardness of English phrasing and vocabulary. I also subdivided this excerpt into numbered sections for convenience.

694 *Sinai Georgian O.12*, f. 117r-118r.
vessel—followed by a pre-baptismal anointing, immersion in the font, and chrismation.

The invocation of the Trinity accompanies the major points of the rite: pouring of oil into the waters, both anointings and the immersion. The anointing of the waters by the hand of the priest with the chant of Alleluia + Ps 28:3 is reflected in several redactions of the West Syriac baptismal rite, including the received text, where the “Alleluia” chant accompanies the blessing of the font with the vessel of chrism, and the trinitarian formula— the pouring of chrism into the water. The comparison with O.12 shows the closeness of the baptismal practice of the West Syriac tradition to the indigenous hagiopolite tradition, showing that not only the churches of the Syro-Antiochene tradition, but also the church of Jerusalem maintained the custom of using holy myron for the consecration of baptismal waters, also accompanied with Alleluia.

We have established that the myron was indeed used in Jerusalem at the consecration of baptismal waters, and thus may consider a possibility of a connection between prebaptismal rites and the rites for the consecration of a new altar, as the latter can be ascertained through the medium of the rite for the blessing of the odiki in Tbilisi A 86. The rite for the consecration of the odiki in A 86 contains a celebrant’s prayer incorporating the anamnesis of God’s creation and the epiclesis, the pouring of the chrism upon the altar and its anointing accompanied by the unspecified chant derived from the complete rite of dedication (“[priests] will say just as at another consecration of the

695 Assemani, *Codex liturgicus*, 2.223 (Alleluia + Ps. 28:3) 232 (Alleluia + trinitarian formula), 295 (ordo of Severus – Alleluia + Ps 28:3+ trinitarian formula), 303 (short ordo of Severus; simple Alleluia), 308 (short ordo of Philoxenus of Mabbug; simple Alleluia); cf. *Documents of Baptismal Liturgy*, 92. The ordo of Timothy, not currently in use by the Syriac Orthodox Church, features the triple pouring of the oil from the “horn” into the font with “Alleluia,” followed by the formula which includes the trinitarian invocation (Brock, “Timothy,” 387). In the Armenian rite, “Alleluia” is not accompanied by psalmic verses, but the same Ps 28:3 follows the pouring of water into the baptismal font, i.e. in a similar context, but in a different location—see Winkler, *Armenische Initiationsrituale*, 423-24.
Earlier, on the basis of the textual connection between the elevation of the altar and its anointing in the Armenian rite, I have suggested that “Alleluia” might have been used at the consecration of the altar in the dedication rite underlying the dedication of the odiki in A 86. If such suggestion can be sustained, one may discern in the development of the rites for the consecration of the altar an ecclesiological idea expressed through the medium of liturgical structures: through the transformative power of the Spirit, material creation is converted for a salvific use – to be the “waters of rest, waters of purification…, illumination of souls” (waters, O.12) or to be used for the “communion and remission of sins of those who… offer before you” (altar, A 86), for “renovation of souls, good pleasure of [divine] will” (altar, Armenian ritual). If the ceremony of the consecration of an altar was influenced by or modified upon the consecration of baptismal waters, primarily through the use of myron, it may be reasonable to propose that the above mentioned allusion to the consecration of waters in the Byzantine rite of καθιέρωσις (ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἁγίου βαπτίσματος) preserves a ritual reminiscence of Syro-Palestinian or hagiopolite origins of this rite, adapted and modified for the liturgical use of the imperial capital in the eighth century.

The Traces of the Hagiopolite Rite of Dedication in Byzantine Euchologia.

In accordance with the ‘law of the periphery,’ noted by Taft, the churches situated on the fringes of the Byzantine world had a tendency to “hold onto older liturgical practices long after they have been abandoned by the Mother Church.”697 While this is

696 See above ch. 3.3.[4].

697 Taft, “Anton Baumstark’s Comparative Liturgy Revisited,” 214.
demonstrably true for the surviving elements of the Jerusalem rite in the traditions of the churches of Caucasus, the Byzantine euchologia of the imperial periphery – e.g. Sinai, Cyprus, South Italy – show examples of integration of the non-Byzantine material into the ritual framework determined by the rite of Constantinople. With the fading away of the Jerusalem rite from actual liturgical use in the Holy City itself and on the fringes of the Byzantine world (e.g. Georgia), the fossils of non-Byzantine usages may be precious witnesses to the liturgical rites of Jerusalem which has not survived in their full form – one of which is the rite for the consecration of the altar and the church. In what follows I will review several examples of the recurrence of the prayer texts which bear striking resemblance to the liturgical texts of the Georgian and Armenian tradition discussed above. In the Byzantine-rite euchologia which I am going to discuss, these prayers stand as integral components of the rites for the consecration of antimension (a Byzantine portable altar) – with one important exception which I am going to turn to in the first place.

The euchologion ms. Sinai gr. 973, dated to 1153 CE (as follows from the colophon), contains the sequence of three rites concerned with the church and the altar, two of which would make a customary appearance in those Byzantine euchologia which include the rite of church dedication, being the prayer for the foundation of a church (f. 95r-v) and the prayer for the reconstitution of the shaken altar table (εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ σαλευθῆναι ἁγίαν τράπεζαν ύπὸ τινων; f. 96r-v) – however the rite for the dedication of

---

698 “Gli eucologi che dipendono da modelli pre-iconoclasti ci sono tutti giunti in antologie miste della periferia bizantina (Sinai ed Italia Meridionale) in cui per duplicazione o per sostituzione sono state integrate formule e materiale eucologico dei patriarcati non bizantini di lingua greca” (Parenti, “L’eucologio manoscritto Γ.β. IV,” 46).

699 The colophon is transcribed in Dmitrievskij, 2.83.
the church is not found in this place. The euchologion contains what appears to be the beginning of the rite of καθιέρωσις (f. 155v) and the hymnography for the divine office celebrated on the eve of dedication (Ακολουθία τοῦ παμμεγάλου ἐγκαινίσμου τοῦ ναοῦ; f. 156r-159v), but the manuscript appears to be incomplete or corrupted at this point. 700 However, between the two rites for the church and the altar mentioned above, the euchologion contains a short rite under the title “The Order at the establishment of an altar performed by two or three presbyters (Ακολουθία ἐπὶ ἑδράσεως θυσιαστηρίου ἐπὶ δύον πρεσβυτέρων ἢ τριῶν γινομένη; f. 95v-96r). 701 The significance of the term ἑδράσις/ἑδραίωσις used in the title of this service can be more precisely established, if we compare the title of the καθιέρωσις rite found elsewhere in this euchologion with the title of the same rite in other Byzantine euchologia, e.g. Barberini gr. 336:

BAR.336: Τάξις γινομένη ἐπὶ καθιερώσεως ἁγίου ναοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ ἁγίας τραπέζης 702

Sin. gr. 973, f. 155v: Ακολουθία εἰς ἐγκαινία ναοῦ καὶ εἰς ἑδράσεις ἁγίας τραπέζης, ἦγουν ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς θεμελίου αὐτοῦ,

Sin. gr. 973, f. 95v: Ακολουθία ἐπὶ ἑδράσεως θυσιαστηρίου ἐπὶ δύον πρεσβυτέρων ἢ τριῶν γινομένη.

Even though the phrasing in the titles of these rites is not exactly parallel, it is possible to see the term ἑδράσις/ἑδραίωσις ‘establishing’ (derivative of ἑδραῖος ‘make stable’) 703 as equivalent, to a degree, to καθιέρωσις in the context of this liturgical document, as it

700 The beginning of the rite of καθιέρωσις contains just one leaf which breaks off after the fourth petition of the diakonika (f. 155v), while the texts for the divine office for the dedication contain a possibly deliberate lacuna (f. 156v).


702 f. 145r-v = Parenti-Velkovska, 156.

703 LSJ 478.
certainly occupies the place in the document where one would expect the rite of καθιέρωσις to be found. However, the rite itself has a much simpler and succinct structure and does not mention explicitly the anointing of the altar with chrism – moreover, it follows from the title that the rite is to be celebrated by two or three presbyters. The constituent elements of the ritual are as follows:

1. *diakonika*: “In peace…” etc. (καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς);
2. *prayer* recited by a priest Sin1 ὁ πάσης φύσεως δεσπότης καὶ πάσης κτίσεως δημιουργός;
3. *greeting of peace + prayer of inclination*: Sin2 Κύριε, κύριε, ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί σου τῷ κορυφαίῳ;
4. *manual acts and deposition of the altar table*, accompanied by Ps 144:1 (thrice), ending with the *Glory*;
5. *greeting of peace*, litany and dismissal.704

The first person singular in which the actions following the two prayers are described, imply that the manual actions (applying to the altar the fastening and sweet-smelling substances: γομφωτήρ, chrism, frankincense, incense, ladanium gum) and the deposition of the altar tablet upon the base was performed by the senior member of the clergy present.706 His role appears to be equivalent to the role of the bishop in A 86 who anointed the altar, but here it is limited to the act of the altar’s ‘deposition’, which in the Armenian ritual and in A 86 was done by the presbyters. This link with the hagiopolite rite for the deposition and consecration of a new altar is intensified when we compare the

---

704 Καὶ βάλλει γομφωτήρ καὶ λάδανον, καὶ μύρον, καὶ θυμίαμα, καὶ λίβανον, πρὶν ἐπιθείς τὴν ἁγίαν τράπεζαν καὶ λέγει: Ὕψώσω σε, ὁ θεός μου, λέγει γ’. καὶ δοξάζει καὶ διδωσι εἰρήνην, καὶ ποιεῖ τὴν ἐκτενή, καὶ ἀπολύει (f. 96r).

705 For γομφωτήρ, the lexica either give “ship-builder, surgical instrument for excising bone” (LSJ 356) and “surgical instrument for cutting out” (= ἐκκοπεύς, Sophocles, 336, 437; cf. LBG 325), none of which fits the context here – it is more likely that this rare term is derivative of γομφόω ‘fasten with bolts, metaph. curdle’ (LSJ 356) indicating the fastening agent to attach the altar table to its base.

706 While it is still possible that the ambiguity of the term ἱερεύς, as applicable for both bishops and presbyters in Late Antique period (see Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 670), allowed for the participation of the bishop here, the title of the rite implying the presence of presbyters only may exclude this possibility.
texts of the prayers in Sinai gr. 973 and the consecratory prayer of the Armenian and Georgian rites. Before reviewing the text of the prayer from this euchologion, it is necessary to indicate for the purposes of comparison another unique rite featuring similar prayer.

The Cypriote euchologion Barberini gr. 390, copied on the commission of bishop Germanos Kouskonarios of Amathounta in 1575/76, was used in the renowned 1667 edition of the Greek euchologion by Jacques Goar and it is in Goar’s work that the first publication of the “alternative” rite for the consecration of the antimensia appears (Τάξις γνωμένη περὶ ἀντιμινσίων). The recent new edition by Gregorios Ioannides places this rite firmly in the context of other euchologia of the Cypriote origin, featuring the same rite – the 16th century Athos Dionysiou 489 (f. 93-99) and Larnaka Kitio 18 (f. 43r-50v) – and other euchologia containing comparable rite for the antimensia: Milan Brera AD XI 47 (1573 CE), Patriarchate of Alexandria 46 (14th cent.), Patriarchate of


708 Goar, Euchologion, 518-21 (with commentary on 521-22).

709 “Τάξις γνωμένη περὶ ἀντιμινσίων,” 313-319; the Italian version of the article is forthcoming in the Acta of the Il Congress of the Society for Oriental Liturgies (Rome, September 2008).

710 Dmitrievskij 2.642 who references the Goar edition; Ioannides notes that there are a few differences between the rite as in Dionysiou 489 and Barberini gr. 390 but the text is essentially the same (Τάξις γνωμένη περὶ ἀντιμινσίων, 331).

711 ed. Ch. I. Papaioannou, Τακτικὸν ἢτοι Αρχιερετικῶν εὐχολόγων τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς Καρπασίων καὶ Ἀμμοχώστου (ἐκ χειρογράφῳ τῆς ἱερᾶς μητροπόλεως Κίτιον) (Larnaka, 1915), see for the antimension rite, 28-32.
The role of Cyprus as an “important way station between East and West,” both economically and culturally, situated in close proximity to both Palestine, Egypt and Asia Minor, explains the appropriation of certain elements of liturgical rite of Jerusalem in this territory. The presence of the rite for the consecration of the *antimensia* outside of the Byzantine rite for the dedication of a church in a Byzantine euchologion evinces the “duplication” that may have come as a result of the appropriation into the fabric of a local liturgical tradition of the elements of non-Byzantine, here – Palestinian, liturgical rite. If we compare the rite for the *antimensia* in *Barberini gr. 390*, *Kitiou 18*, and *Dionysiou 489* with the rite of *hedrasis* in *Sinai gr. 973*, not only shall we note the use of the same liturgical text as one of the principal prayers of the rite, but also we will not fail to notice the amalgamation of the elements of hagiopolite origin with the structure and texts derived from the Byzantine rite of church dedication, the primary ritual form for the consecration of the church and altar established by this period. The structure of the “Cypriote” rite for the *antimensia* is as follows:

1. *opening blessing* Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία:
2. *diakonika*
3. *peace and prayer Cy1* Ο πάσης φύσεως δεσπότης καὶ κτίσεως ἀπάσης δημιουργός.
4. *peace and prayer Cy2* Κύριε παντοκράτορ, ὁ μέγας καὶ ἰσχυρός καὶ δυνατός.

---

712 Dmitrievskij 2.344-53.
713 Ibid., 2.376-83.
714 Ibid., 2.668-705.
715 Ibid., 2.898-902.
716 Ibid., 2.616-24.
5. anointing of the antimemorium with chrism σταυροειδῶς with the triple chant of Alleluia and verse 83:4a, 83:4b

6. peace and prayer Cy3 Κύριε ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων· εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι διὰ παντός [= K4]
bishop signs (σφραγίζει) the antimemorium with his own hand with the formula:
“Behold, it is sanctified and perfected, and the altar has become the holy of holies, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, now:” (Ἰδοὺ ἡγίασται καὶ τετελεῖωται καὶ γέγονε θυσιαστήριον ἁγίον· ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, νῦν) Ps 92 follows.

7. litany, Ps 117, and prayer Cy4 Κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς [= K3]

8. peace and prayer of inclination Cy5 Δέσποτα κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ διὰ τῶν ἁγίων σου ἀποστόλων.


10. Litany and dismissal.

It is evident that certain elements of this rite have been extracted from the full Byzantine rite for the dedication of a church or, more likely, from the rite for the consecration of the antimemorium, similar to the one in the Cypriote euchologion Milano Brera AD XI 47, which consisted of the sequence of prayers derived from the Byzantine kathierôsis and encaenia rites: K3, K4, E3. The presence of the typical Byzantine opening blessing Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία with the synaptê to follow, as well as the ektenê before the dismissal, speak of the integration of this service into the framework of Constantinopolitan tradition. At the same time, a number of elements in this ritual connect it with the witness to the hagiopolite rite of dedication of altars, as evinced by Armenian and Georgian sources: 1) prayer Cy1 which we shall review shortly; 2) use of Ps 83:4 at the manual acts regarding the altar (here- anointing, compare with elevation in the Armenian rite); 3) signing of the altar with bishop’s hand, comparable with his imprinting of the cross upon the altar during the Armenian installation ceremony, together with the formulaic acclamation of the consecration of the altar. However, the

719 Ioannides, “Τάξις γινομένη περὶ ἀντιμινσίων,” 331-333.
most direct link with Jerusalem practices is found in the text of the first prayer of the rite 
Cy1, the same as the first prayer S1 in the rite of *hedrasis* in *Sinai gr. 973*, and quite 
similar to the prayer before the anointing of the altar in the Armenian ritual, and the 
prayer in the same position in *A 86*, as also have been noted by Ioannides. Further, I 
cite the text of this prayer after the Sinai euchologion (S), noting the variants in 
*Barberini gr. 390* (B) and *Kitiou 18* (K), although the two Cypriote euchologia give 
a nearly identical reading. The doxology of the prayer in the respective witnesses are 
completely different, hence I chose to include these both into the main text of the prayer. In the parallel column I will indicate the places where this prayer corresponds with the 
first prayer from the Armenian (Arm) and Georgian (Geo) rites of altar consecration:

| 1. Ὅ πάσης φύσεως δεσπότης, καὶ κτίσεως ἀπάσης δημιουργώς, ὁ πάντα πάντοτε ποιών' καὶ πραγματευόμενος ἐπ’ εὐεργεσίᾳ καὶ σωτηρίᾳ τοῦ γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων, | who are the creator of all the creatures Geo who established the earth upon its foundation Arm established the earth upon its foundation Geo |
| 2. ὁ θεμελιώσας τὴν γῆν ἐπὶ τὴν ἁσφαλείαν αὐτῆς, καὶ ποιώνθαναμάσια. | You Lord of all the earth <for all generations V> have strengthened your holy church and commanded to establish the altar therein ˹and to offer sacrifices and rational offerings which are presented without blood to your holy name for the salvation of the human race. Arm you, Lord, in the cities and villages have founded the churches, you have raised in it altars and commanded the sacrifices and |
| 3. σὺ μόνος’ πανταχοῦ’ κατὰ πόλιν καὶ χώραν ἱδρύσας τὰς ἐκκλησίας’, ἔπηξας’ ἐν αὐτάς ἡκεσιαστηρίων’ καὶ ἐκέλευσας ἐν αὐτάς ἡπήσιας καὶ προσφορὰς λογικὰς καὶ ἀναιμακτοὺς προσφέρειν τῷ ὅνοματι σου’ εἰς σωτηρίαν τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων’, | |

---

720 Ibid., 349.
721 Dmitrievskij 2.114.
καὶ νῦν ἐξαπόστειλον τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ἅγιασον τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦτον εἰς ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας, τῶν προσιόντων τῇ ἁγιότητι, ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος καὶ πνεύματος, καὶ ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

S 5. Ὅτι σὺ μόνος εὐσπλαγχνος, μακρόθυμος καὶ πολυέλεος καὶ σοὶ τὴν δόξαν:

B 5. Ὅτι ηὐλογημένον καὶ δεδοξασμένον ὑπάρχει τὸ πανύμνητον ὄνομά σου τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἅγιου πνεύματος, νῦν καὶ ἀεί:

1. ἰδέατα ποιῶν πάντοτε ἐπὶ σωτηρία καὶ ἐπὶ εὐεργεσία; 3. δέσποτα ὀμιτ πανταχοῦ κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ χώραν ἀπὸ τὸν πανάγιον θυσιαστήριον καὶ προσφερεῖ θυσιαστήρια τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μεγαλειότητι εἰς ἀνανέωσιν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος.

Likewise also now, Lord, send your holy sanctifying Spirit and sanctify this altar for the hope of the faithful, for the salvation of all men and those who stand before the great glory of your name, for the renovation of souls, and for the good pleasure of your will. 

who alone are the merciful God, long-suffering and of many mercies, for blessed is your name, of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, now and ever and unto the ages. 

For you are God, long-suffering, greatly compassionate and true.

This prayer, as the first prayer of the rite for the consecration of antimensia, appears in several other Byzantine euchologia, which Ioannides divides into three groups. The first, exemplified by the euchologia originating in the Patriarchate of Alexandria: the Patriarchate of Alexandria Library 46 (f. 54v-60r) and Sinai gr. 974 (1510 CE), the

724 I rely upon the discussion of these sources in Ioannides, “Τὰξις γινομένη περὶ ἀντιμινσίων,” 334-37.

725 Dmitrievskij 344-53.

726 The rite for the consecration of the antimensia is found on f. 178r-185r (Dmitrievskij 702-703).
prayer Sin1/Cy1 appears under a title Εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ ἁγιάσαι θυσιαστήριον,727 while the litany preceding this prayer includes some petitions which could have originated in the ordo of JAS.728 In the second category of the manuscripts, the euchologia Patriarchate of Alexandria Library 392 (1407 CE) and Sinai gr. 1006, the first doublet of prayers Sin1/Cy1 and Cy2 is immediately followed by the chant of Alleluia with Ps 83, and the acclamation Ἰδοὺ ἡγίασται καὶ τετελείωται.729 Finally, the third group represented uniquely by the euchologion Sinai gr. 993 (16th cent.), integrates the prayer Sin1/Cy1 into the rite for the consecration of antimensia,730 expressly different from the rite found in the Cypriote euchologia: not only does the rite include the insertion of relics into the portable altar,731 but the sequence of prayers and ritual actions closely follows the Byzantine rite of dedication, with the consecration of an altar and encaenia with the deposition of relics. This apparently Byzantine sequence is complicated by the insertion of the prayer Sin1/Cy1 following the opening prayer of the Byzantine rite Κ1 Ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἄναρχος καὶ ἀΐδιος, indicating some degree of influence of the traces of the hagiopolite tradition, perhaps through the mediation of either Alexandria or Cyprus. According to Ioannides’ suggestion, it is the second group of the manuscripts which may have preserved the original sequence, completing the consecration of a portable altar with the chrismation and the pronouncing the consecration ‘formula’: the mss. of the first group,

727 Dmitrievskij 703.
728 Ioannides, 335.
729 For Sinai gr. 1006, see Dmitrievskij 616.
730 Ibid., 898-900.
731 It follows from the title of the rite for the antimensia in this euchologion: Ἀκολουθία εἰς τὸ καθιερώσαι ἀντιμίνσια μετὰ ἁγίων λειψάνων, εἰς τὸ ἱεροπραγματεύειν ὁ ἱερεύς εἰς ἑκκλησίας χαλασμένας καὶ ἁγίας τραπέζας, λείψανα μὴ ἑχούσας, καὶ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ (f. 57r; ibid., 898).
as well as the Cypriote euchologia Barberini gr. 390 et al. have preserved this rite in a form amalgamated with the elements of the Byzantine rite of dedication.\textsuperscript{732}

The comparison of the text of the prayer Ὅ πάσης φύσεως δεσπότης with the consecratory prayers of the Armenian rite and the Georgian rite of odiki demonstrates the correspondence in certain unique expressions and theological concepts which suggests a common source underlying the Greek, Armenian, and Georgian versions. Certain key expressions in 2, 3, and 5 are common to all three versions, while the phrasing of the Greek text in 4 (the epicletic segment) closely corresponds to the Armenian. At the same time, while the recension of the prayer in Byzantine sources may have preserved the text of the prayer in the original, the comparison with the Georgian and Armenian shows clear signs of subsequent evolution of the text in the Greek-language liturgical tradition: the opening address 1 in the Greek contains several expressions, for which there is no correspondence in either Armenian or Georgian versions. In the next section of this dissertation, I will compare these three versions of the prayer for the consecration of an altar with the Syriac and Coptic recensions of this text, in order to determine whether this evolution of the text has occurred while the prayer still constituted part and parcel of the hagiopolite rite, or after it was appropriated as additional material in Byzantine euchologia.

While the prayer \textbf{Sin1/Cy1} Ὅ πάσης φύσεως δεσπότης has drawn our considerable interest in this section due to its appearance in both Greek and several Oriental versions of the rites pertaining to the consecration of altars, the second prayer \textbf{Sy2} of the rite for the presbyteral ‘establishment’ of an altar in \textit{Sinai gr. 973} deserves

\textsuperscript{732} Ioannides, 336-37.
some attention as well, since it is possible to suggest here a hagiopolite connection as well. Such assumption comes from the appearance of an equivalent text in the Armenian rite for the dedication of a church where this prayer follows the anointing of the altar, anointing of the walls of the nave, the circumambulation of the church exterior, and the reentry of the clergy into the sanctuary.733 For the purpose of comparison, I will cite here the text of the prayer according to Venice 457 and Erevan 1001,734 in parallel columns with the Greek text of the prayer cited after Sinai gr. 973 and another euchologion Vatican gr. 1970735 of South Italian (Rossano) provenance, dated to early 12th century.736

Armenian (Venice 457+Erevan 1001), ET
Lord our God who in the name of our chief apostle Peter being called the Rock, in like manner called your church. You, Lord,

Sinai gr. 973 (1152/53)+ Vatican gr. 1970 (12th c.)
Κύριε, Κύριε, ἐν τῷ ὄνομα σου τῷ κορυφαίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων σου Πέτρῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας σου πέτραν προσαγορεύσας ἐκεῖνον καθὼς αὐτὸν ἐκ τῆς σοῦ προσώπου τοῦ Κυρίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρακάτωσαν καὶ τῷ συμφωνοντικῷ τοῖς ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἀμφιβολίᾳ τῶν ἀδικίων πρὸς τῷ ἀπειθοῦντι τῆς σοῦ ἐκκλησίας ἐνομίσαντι·

733 Conybeare, 6-7.

734 The translation of the prayer appears in Conybeare, 7; the Armenian text of Venice 457 was partially reproduced in Sargsean, Majr c’uc’ak, 10. I am citing the section of the text not cited by Sargsean after ms. Erevan 1001, and I am again indebted to Prof. Findikyan for letting me study the photographs of a few folios from this euchologion.


736 Jacob, “L’euchologe,” 85-86.
also bless by your infinite power this temple which we built/we erected in your name, and that which was established in it make it the altar of holiness, so that the spotless (offerings) which they offer upon it may be changed into the preciousness and incorruptibility of the body and blood of your Christ. Grant those that enter into it (that) they confess their sin, to be the propitiation of our souls and health of bodies, through the intercession of the holy Theotokos and of all your saints. For blessed is your holy name, and glorified (is) your kingdom, of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, now.

Thus, the content of this “simple and concise” prayer appears to be quite identical both in the Armenian and Byzantine rites, which indicates the reliance of a common source. The introductory address makes use of Matt 16:13, which we saw as one of the liturgical readings for the feasts of dedication of churches in and around Jerusalem, while the text of the prayer contains an allusion to the Mosaic consecration of the altar in the tabernacle in Ex 40:10 (καὶ ἔσται τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων). The eucharistic celebration, for which purpose the altar is explicitly consecrated, is also couched in the terms reminiscent of the scriptural Temple and sacrifice (προσκομιζομένας...θυσίας/spotless [offering]). While by itself such allusion may not reliably indicate a specific locality whence this prayer may have originated, in the context of other allusions, the connection to the Holy City cannot be excluded.

One of the Byzantine sources for this recension of the prayer, *Vatican gr. 1970*, represents one of the extant manuscript sources for the Greek JAS,\textsuperscript{738} which can attest to some access the compiler of this euchologion had to the sources of Jerusalem origin: in Jacob’s opinion, its principal source was an eleventh-century Palestinian euchologion containing an early redaction of the euchologion of Constantinople.\textsuperscript{739} Thus, the more interesting becomes the selection of prayers in connection with the dedication of a church, found in this euchologion: aside from two fragments corresponding with the Byzantine rite of *encaenia* (f. 11r-v) and *kathierōsis* (f. 14r), the manuscript contains a prayer for the foundation of a church (f. 212r-v), two prayers for the deposition of relics (f. 212v-213v), a prayer for the opening of a polluted church (f. 213v-214r), and a rite (f. 11v, 212r) and a prayer (f. 214v) connected with the installation of an altar.\textsuperscript{740} The title and rubrics of the latter rite in *Vatican gr. 1970*, as well as in another 13th century ms. *Vatican gr. 1552*,\textsuperscript{741} (τάξις γινομένη ἐπὶ ἑδράσεως ἁγίας τραπέζης), closely correspond with the rite for the ‘establishment’ of the altar in *Sinai gr. 973*, however the prayer before the installation of an altar is equivalent to the prayer Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, ὁ πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος of the “longer” redaction of the Byzantine rite for the church dedication, rather than to *Sin1/Cy1*, as cited above. However, the prayer *Sin2* is not found within the same rite in this ms., but rather is copied elsewhere in the euchologion under a separate title εὐχὴ ἄλλη ἐπὶ τραπέζης πηγνυμένης ἐν ἁγίῳ θυσιαστηρίῳ, marking it as a doublet of the rite for the installation of an altar in this

\textsuperscript{738} Mercier, PO 26.2, 137.

\textsuperscript{739} Jacob, “L’eucologe,” 115-116.

\textsuperscript{740} The incipits and some texts are transcribed in ibid., 107-108.

\textsuperscript{741} f. 35r-36r.
manuscript. The redaction of the prayer closely corresponds with the version in Sinai gr. 973, and is found in two other euchologia, Athos Great Lavra 189 (13th cent.) and 
Sinai gr. 988 (15th cent.). In another South Italian euchologion, Vatican gr. 1552, this 
prayer is incorporated within the rite of hedrasis, but in a redaction which is considerably longer and bears less resemblance to the second prayer of the Armenian dedication ritual. While Vatican gr. 1970 most likely predates Sinai gr. 973 by about fifty years, it is evident that the latter ms. has preserved the older recension of the rite for the installation of an altar. The presence of these prayers in the Armenian rite of dedication, precisely in the same sequence, as in Sinai gr. 973 (Sin1-Sin2), suggests that these may have been the two prayers from the hagiopolite ordo for the consecration of an altar and church which traversed from the lost Greek-language source to the liturgical rites of the Armenian church where the sequence of actions and redaction of prayer texts may have

742 Dmitrievskij 181; Jacob suggests that this ms. probably corresponds to ms. Γ 7 described by S. Lauriotes and S. Eustratiades in Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts in the Library of the Lavra on Mount Athos, Harvard Theological Studies 12 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925), 32; Jacob, “L’eucologe,” 110 n. 207.

743 Dmitrievskij, 600; Jacob, “L’eucologe,” 110.

744 Δέσποτα Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν· ὁ τῷ κορυφαίῳ συν τῶν ἀποστόλων Πέτρῳ φήσας, τὸ ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτη τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν· καὶ πύλας ἄδου ὑπὸ κατεσχύσωσιν αὐτοῖς· ἵνα ὁ ἴστερον τῷ ιδίῳ σου άματι· περιεποιήσετο καὶ ἱγίαςας· αὐτὸς φιλάνθρωπος δὲ ἐπίβλεψον εἰς οὐρανόν ἀγίου σου ἔπι τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, τὸν οἰκοδομηθέντα εἰς δοξολογίαν σὴν ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι σου τοῦ ἄγιου τοῦτο· καὶ ἰδίῳ τῷ ἱερουργίας τῶν ἀναξίων ῥαντισμῷ τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς λύτρον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἕρρησον ἱεροπροσκύνημα. ἀνοικοδομηθέντα· ἀποστόλων· ἱερομάρτυρας· ἀναξίων· ἱεροσολυμίων· ἀνάμμητων· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνάμμητων· ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀνανάστων· ἁγιασάς ἱερατικῶν· ἀ
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been closer to the original source. Similarly, the traces of the same rite for the dedication
of altar and church can be detected in the rite for the consecration of a portable altar,
which, similarly to the medieval Byzantine tradition, adapted the complete rite of church
dedication for the purpose of consecrating “traveling” altars. Apparently, this sequence
of two prayers Sin1- Sin2, as part of the service for the dedication of an altar, was by the
end of the first millenium received by the Byzantine-rite churches in the regions formerly
belonging to the periphery of the Empire. However, the existence of the Byzantine rite
for the dedication of churches practiced throughout the Byzantine world pushed this
‘alternative’ rite to the fringes of the Byzantine rite. While still incorporating these
prayers into manuscript euchologia, such as Sinai gr. 973, Vatican gr. 1970, Vatican gr.
1552, the compilers showed some versatility in coming up with a liturgical rationale for
their use, designating the purpose of these rites as “installation” (ἑδράσις/ἑδραίωσις),
rather than consecration/dedication of a new altar. Remarkably, as we shall see shortly, it
appears likely that one of the recensions of this hagiopolite rite of altar consecration,
transformed into an installation rite, was incorporated into a “longer” redaction of the
Byzantine rite of dedication, which makes its first appearance in the Constantinopolitan
euchologion Coislin 213 in 1027 CE.

The “Consecration of Odiki” in other Georgian euchologia.

Earlier I have indicated that, aside from A 86, the ‘hagiopolite’ rite for the
consecration of a portable altar is found in a number of other later Georgian euchologia,
two of which were described by Kekelidze in the beginning of the last century.\textsuperscript{745} A brief glance at two later witnesses of the sixth/seventh-century rite demonstrates further evolution of this ritual within the indigenous Georgian liturgical tradition, in the course of which a Jerusalem ritual becomes intertwined with the elements of the Byzantine rite of church dedication and the Byzantine rite for the consecration of \textit{antimensia}. At the same time, the presence of this rite even in very late Georgian euchologia speaks of the survival of the non-extant rites and liturgical customs on the periphery of the former Byzantine realm.\textsuperscript{746} Thus, in the sixteenth/seventeenth-century euchologion \textit{Tbilisi A 450} the rite in question bears the title “Consecration of an \textit{odiki} or the tablet/table (tablaj) of God,” indicating that at least in the understanding of this source the portable altar could have, at this late date, had the form of a wooden plank or board, rather than of a cloth as in the usage of Greek and Slavic churches of the period. The rite of consecration of the said “tablet” largely follows the shape of the ritual in \textit{A 86}, with some variations:

The \textit{odiki} to be consecrated is placed upon the altar, while the psalms are being read: “His foundations are upon the holy mountains; the Lord loves the walls of Sion more than all the dwellings of Jacob” [Ps 86]. Four priests carry the \textit{odiki} around the altar, and then place it upon this same altar. Litany and the psalm: “The Lord is my illumination and my Saviour, whom shall I fear” [Ps 26]. They lift up the \textit{odiki} for the second time, carry it around the altar, upon which they place it thereafter. Litany, prayer, and “Lord have mercy” 3 times. [The psalm] “Sing to the Lord a new song, His praise is in the midst of the church” [Ps 96]. They take the \textit{odiki} for the third time and, having brought it around the altar, put it upon the altar. The prayer: “Lord God of powers…” After this prayer, they anoint it three times in the form of the cross with holy chrism, and place [the \textit{odiki}] upon the altar. Deacon: “[Bow] your heads.” The priest [reads] the prayer: “God of peace and the Lord of mercy…”\textsuperscript{747}

\textsuperscript{745} Kekelidze, \textit{LGP} 106-157, 209-214. For the list of other manuscripts containing the same rite, see n. 602 above.

\textsuperscript{746} See regarding the “law of the periphery”: Taft, “Anton Baumstark’s Comparative Liturgy Revisited,” 214.
Here the rite has largely preserved the structure, liturgical movements, and the prayer texts of the original hagiopolite rite, with the exception of substituting the psalmody sung during the triple procession around the fixed altar with another triplet, Pss. 86, 26, 96.

Likewise, while the original rite distinguished between a “prayer” (most likely a formula) that concluded the litany and the “blessing,” i.e. the prayer of consecration which was recited prior to the anointing of an altar, the current rite seemingly conflates the two “prayer” texts. The indication for the effusion of the chrism by a bishop with subsequent anointing by the assistant priests has also evolved into a more simplistic “anointing.”

Finally, the text is marked by a glaring omission of any mention of a bishop, indicating that this rite could have been celebrated only by several presbyters, which brings this text in connection with another liturgical ‘descendant’ of this hagiopolite rite, the rite for the establishment of the altar in *Sinai gr. 973* (12th cent.).

Even though another Georgian witness to the rite of a portable altar, *Tbilisi A 420*, has been separated from *Tbilisi A 450* only by one or two centuries, it shows remarkable development resulting, it seems, from a conflation of the Georgian (originally hagiopolite) rite with the equivalent rite that has evolved in the Byzantine tradition:

Having prepared the *odiki*, they bring it to the catholicos who is going to celebrate the liturgy; before the beginning of the liturgy it is spread out upon the altar. After the Gospel [reading], four priests take it and bring it around the altar three times, with the deacon preceding with the censer and the lighted tapers, meanwhile they sing special psalms at each circle: at the first, “I will confess you, O Lord, with all my heart and will sing you before the angels” [Ps 137], at the second – “Praise the Lord for he is good” [Ps 146], at the third – “Praise the Lord, O Jerusalem, praise your God, Sion” [Ps 147]. Then they place *odiki* upon the altar. The catholicos prays: “Lord and God of powers, the creator of all creation…” After this prayer, the bishop sprinkles the *odiki* with the rose water.

---

747 LGP 127-128; here and further my translation of the euchology text is based on Kekelidze’s Russian translation of the same, for the reason that the original manuscripts preserved in the collection of the National Center for Manuscripts in Tbilisi were not made accessible to me.
saying “You will sprinkle me with hyssop, and I shall be clean, you will wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow” [Ps 50:10], 3 times. He finishes this psalm, [saying] “Blessed is our God, always now and ever;” then he draws upon the odiki three crosses with the holy chrism: in the middle and on two sides, saying: “In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, amen.” Psalm: “Behold, how good and pleasant it is for the brethren to dwell together” [Ps 132] [refrain:] “Glory to you, our God, glory to you”. The bishop: “Glory to you, Holy Trinity, our God, glory to you.” He takes the censer and censes, reciting Ps [25]. Deacon: “Let us pray to the Lord,” the bishop, the prayer: “O Lord of heaven and earth.” “Peace unto all.” Deacons: “[Bow] your heads.” Bishop, the prayer: “King of glory and the Lord of mercy…” and again, “I give thanks to you, O Lord of powers…”. Then taking holy relics, wax and crushed mastic, he pours upon these with chrism, mixes them up, and saws these to the back of the antimension. Deacon: “Let us pray to the Lord.” The bishop, the prayer: “Lord our God who have given this glory…” Immediately afterwards they begin the liturgy.

The recension of this ritual in this eighteenth-century euchologion has several distinct features that show signs of the remarkable resilience of hagiopolite elements in the worship of the Georgian church, since this rite even at this later stage preserves intact the three-psalm processional structure and the rudimentary procession of the clergy around the altar, even though the triplet of psalms is again different from either A 86 or A 450 (Pss. 137, 146, 147). In contrast to A 450, the presence of the bishop (specifically, the patriarch) is clearly indicated, and the time of the celebration (prior to the beginning of the eucharist) is specified. At the same time, the contamination of a hagiopolite ritual with Byzantine elements is such that one could probably refer to this rite as an amalgamation of two rites for the consecration of antimensia. Firstly, in concurrence with the prevalent Byzantine practice, the “altar” to be consecrated is a cloth, not a piece of wood or stone, even though it still requires four clergymen to carry it in procession.

---

748 “Ps 42” in Kekelidze’s translation – I have chosen to correct this to Ps 25, as it is clearly a confusion stemming from the identical incipits of the psalms (κρῖνόν με, κύριε – κρῖνόν με ὁ θεός).

749 Kekelidze, LGP 213-214. The rite concludes by citing the formula to be written on the sides of the odiki-antimension which I did not cite here (ibid., 214).
Secondly, the actions of the catholicos after the conclusion of the psalmody and the recitation of the prayer derive from the Byzantine rite for the consecration of an antimension. Aside from the peripheral Byzantine rites, which we will see in the next section of this chapter, the Byzantine rite of the antimensia was an abbreviation of the church dedication rite, complete with the insertion of the particle of the relics into the cloth. In the variant of the rite reflecting the Constantinopolitan tradition, the consecration of the antimensia outside of the full service of dedication, included washing of the substitute altar, its anointing with chrism, incensation, and the insertion of relics, accompanied with the Pss 50, 132, 25 and three prayers derived from the Byzantine dedication rite: K-3 Κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, K-4 Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, E-3 Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ καὶ ταύτην τὴν δόξαν. It seems evident that the variant of the Georgian consecration of antimensia in A 420 has resulted from the eclectic amalgamation of the indigenous Georgian, originally hagiopolite, rite with the Constantinopolitan rite that became dominant in the practice of the Byzantine-rite churches.

5.4 Conclusions: the Rite of Jerusalem and the Byzantine Ritual for the Consecration of an Altar

Having examined the evidence of the broad array of liturgical sources reflecting hagiopolite and Palestinian usage with regards to the dedication of a church and

---


751 The rite in this form, together with the insertion of relics, has been described in mid-fifteenth-century by Symeon of Thessalonike, *De sacro templo* 127 = PG 155:332-333, and is found in a Cypriote euchologion ms. *Brera AD XI 47* (1573 CE), discussed in Ioannides, “Τάξις γινομένη περὶ ἀντιμινσίων,” 331-333.
consecration of an altar, we may be capable of drawing some tentative conclusions on the basis of sources that have been studied. While the reconstruction of the rite of dedication as practiced in Jerusalem before the end of the first millennium is to be considered incomplete pending the discovery of the new manuscript evidence, one may be able to delineate major strategies along which the rites of dedication in Jerusalem could have been developing in the period after the terminus post quem for the Armenian Lectionary (early fifth cent.), but before the terminus ante quem of the Georgian Lectionary (eighth cent.).

1) Due to the fifth-century dating for the earliest layer of the Georgian Lectionary of Jerusalem, this source may provide testimony for the early stage of the development of dedication rites in/around the city – unfortunately, as a lectionary, a rather limited one. The examination of the lectionary evidence allows us to see that the readings employed for the feasts in/around Jerusalem were either specific to the place which was celebrated or, frequently, patterned upon the readings of Encaenia or its octave, suggesting the dedication of Holy Sepulchre as the implied ‘model’ for other dedication liturgies. The terminology of the hagiopolite lectionary and calendar makes us see the variety of liturgical rites which may have been used for the consecration of liturgical space: dedicatio, depositio reliquarum, and depositio altaris – these distinct terms may be synomymous or may imply the variety of a liturgical rite used on a particular occasion. On the other hand, the study of the lectionary for the occasional feasts of dedication provides us with a early, stational model for the rite of dedication in Jerusalem, involving a procession around the church with four stations, entrance into the
church, and the *eucharist*, followed by the seven-day celebration. The solemn entrance into the church for the beginning of the liturgy may have in the early sixth-early seventh century involved the deposition of eucharistic gifts *upon the altar*, followed by the primitive *prothesis* — it is not inconceivable, therefore, that the first processional entrance into a new church could have involved the deposition/installation of the altar itself, the deposition of saints’ relics, or both (cf. *Vita Sabbæ*; § 1.3.2 above).

2) The perception of the *encaenia* of the Holy Sepulchre as a ‘model’ for at least some of the *encaenia* festivals finds expression in the hymnography for the Encaenia found in the ancient Georgian Iadgari. The dedicated church is perceived as a “temple” and a locus of angelic and ecclesial liturgy, that through the work of Christ’s *parousia* has come to supplant the scriptural temple and sacrifices. The absence of any allusion to the presence of saints’ relics in the hymnography leads to suggest that for this layer of theological reflection that accompanied the growth of dedication rites, the relics of the saints did not constitute a prominent aspect. Instead, an allusion to the dedication/’establishment’ of the altar (Eul 3, Magn 5; see § 2.3 above) supports our hypothesis that the installation of an altar constituted a part of the earlier core of the hagiopolite dedication rite. The Iadgari hymnography expresses a

---


753 It may not be accidental that Ps 83:4 is used in the Armenian rite of dedication for the rite of elevation and installation of an altar – Conybeare, 5.

theological perception of sacred liturgical space, which is rooted in the model of ‘earthly vs. heavenly’ temple and in the view of the earthly temple/church as a microcosm, the foundation of which is correlated with the creation narrative. This is the perspective which informs the liturgical texts (specifically ‘dismissal prayers’) for the Encaenia and for the “dedication of altars” found in the Georgian witnesses to the Jerusalem euchologion (*Sinai Georgian O.12, Sinai Georgian O.54, Sinai Georgian O.66*).

3) The traces of this liturgio-theological perspective are found also in the unique witness to the dedication rites of Jerusalem: the rite for the consecration of a portable altar in *Tbilisi A 86*. Through the comparison of this rite with the corresponding elements of the Armenian ritual of dedication, we have been able to establish certain elements which may have constituted the core of the dedication rite antecedent to both the Armenian and the Georgian witnesses: procession-Ps 83- installation of an altar- prayer “Lord of powers”- anointing of the altar through the pouring of chrism. We still perceive here the remnants of the same ‘core’ as could be discerned in the Georgian Lectionary, but with the addition of the epicletic prayer and the pouring of/anointing by the *myron*. If one accepts Verhelst’s hypothesis with regards to the influence of Syro-Antiochene (non-Chalcedonian) liturgical rites upon the ordo of JAS in the beginning of the sixth century, one may envision the possibility of the adoption of the rite for the anointing of the altar from the use of Syriac churches. The epicletic prayer, asking to “send” the Holy Spirit into the

---

755 See above.
water and to “sanctify” it (\textit{\textit{un\textit{\textit{wptw \textit{-upptw)}} appears in the Armenian baptismal ordo, where it is followed by the cross-wise outpouring of the holy oil into the font,\textsuperscript{756} an action that appears to have strong parallels in the Syriac tradition.\textsuperscript{757} Moreover, the only unquestionable pre-sixth-century evidence for the anointing of/outpouring of oil upon the altar in order to prepare them for eucharistic celebration, derives from Ephrem and, for the West Syriac traditions, from Pseudo-Dionysius.\textsuperscript{758} The attribution of the antecedent of the Armenian and Georgian rites to the sixth century would allow sufficient time for the custom to become established in the church of Jerusalem.

\textsuperscript{756} Conybeare, 95; Winkler, \textit{Das Armenische Initiationsrituale}, 210. 


\textsuperscript{758} Ecclesiastical Hierarchy 4.12; see further, Chapter 6.1.
CHAPTER 6:

THE ORIGINS OF THE BYZANTINE RITE FOR THE CONSECRATION OF AN ALTRAR II: SYRIA, EGYPT, CONSTANTINOPLE.

In the previous chapter I have attempted to reconstruct, on the basis of the evidence of the Old Georgian euchologia and the Armenian rite, the historical evolution of the rite for the consecration of an altar as it was used in the church of Jerusalem between the fifth and eighth-tenth centuries. The pneumatological character of the service and its possible connection with baptismal rites was discussed, and the appearance of its disiecta membra in the euchologies of the Byzantine tradition was noted. Our investigation of the origins of the Byzantine rite for the consecration of an altar will be incomplete, however, without a recourse to the most important witnesses to the consecration of the altar in the West Syriac (Syro-Antiochene) and in the Coptic tradition. In discussion of a possible connection between the rites for the consecration of a new altar and baptismal rites (see above 3.3.1), I have noted close correspondence between the baptismal rite of the church of Jerusalem and the equivalent rites of Syro-Antiochene and Maronite traditions, which can attest to the mutual influence between the liturgies of Jerusalem and Antioch and of the surrounding regions. At the same time, the comparison between the rites for the consecration of the altar of the West Syriac and Coptic traditions shows the close correspondence between these rites which in turn can attest to the exchange of liturgical material across the Eastern Mediterranean. I will
conclude this section by reviewing my earlier conclusions regarding the hagiopolite rite of church dedication, and will discuss the possibility of Syro-Palestinian origin for the Byzantine rite of καθιέρωσις. If such hypothesis will be proven to be correct, I will suggest the approximate time frame when this rite could have appeared in the use of the church of Constantinople.

According to Aidan Kavanaugh, “[l]iturgical worship happens in space, and space is shaped into place by the meaning people discover within it.”1 Our investigation of the formation of the ritual that isolated a liturgical space in the Christian East cannot proceed without a few words pertaining to some distinctive features characterizing the disposition of the liturgical space in Syria and Palestine. One of such characteristic features pertains to the use of the bema, a raised platform in the middle of the nave reserved for the celebration of the liturgy of the Word, in the churches of East and West Syriac liturgical traditions. Several important studies on the development and liturgical use of this element of liturgical space has demonstrated close relationship between the formation of the spatial syntax of a liturgical building and the growth of the rite celebrated therein.2 Another feature pertaining to the organization of liturgical space in the churches of the


Syria and Palestine concerns the disposition of the reliquary, containing the remains of the saints, with respect to the consecrated altar, the focal point of the eucharistic celebration. In our earlier discussion of the consecration of the Theoktistos church at Mar Saba in 490, we have seen the rite which included both the installation of the altar by the bishop, and the deposition of the saints’ relics “under the altar (ὑπὸ τὸ θυσιαστήριον).” In order to see how in the context of the fledging rituals for the consecration of a church these rites or elements thereof relate to each other, it needs to be seen how the foci of these ritual units – an altar and a reliquary – could relate to each other spatially in the Syrian and Palestinian churches.

In his monograph on the evolution of the church buildings in Syria, Jean Lassus has demonstrated that for the Christian basilicas in Northern Syria, at least since the fifth century, it was not the custom to place the relics in or under the main, stationary altar of the church, but rather in one of the pastophoria, i.e. the side chambers to the north or south of the sanctuary. Alternatively, an additional chapel containing multiple relics could have been added to the basilica, as evidenced by the archeological studies of the church in the village of Brad, where in the 5th century a chapel was evidently added to the original building dated to 395-402. The placement of the relics in a separate chapel did not only give access to the relics for the clergy, but also made them directly approachable

---

3 See above Chapter 5.1.4.


for the laity who were also able to receive the *eulogiai* from the relics (specifically the oil, consecrated by the contact with the saintly remains). Thus, Lassus insisted that, for the Northern Syria, the two chambers adjacent to the sanctuary did not have the roles of *diaconicon* and *prothesis*, but that one of these chapels served as a depository for the saints’ relics, which had no direct impact upon the celebration of the eucharistic mystery on a consecrated altar, the shape of which (whether rectangular or *sigma*-shaped) underlines its primary function as the table of the eucharistic meal. Tchalenko has dated the introduction of the ‘chapelle des martyrs’ in the Northern Syrian churches to c. 430, specifically citing the archeological evidence from the church in Qirbîze and Qasr Iblisu, both featuring the installation of the chapel containing reliquaries in the *southern* end of the sanctuary. This position of the relics chapel was characteristic for the churches of the Antiochene region – on the contrary, the churches of the Apamea featured the placing of the reliquaries into the *north* pastophorion, which was connected to the sanctuary by a door, but at the same time was not easily accessible from the corresponding aisle of the nave. Whether the “chapel of the martyrs (*ܕܐ̈ܕܲܣܗܒܝܬ*)” was placed in the pastophorion to the north or south of the sanctuary, and whether the access to the chamber with relics

---

6 Several reliquaries from the region studied by Lassus were equipped with an opening on the top of a box and another opening, for the introduction and evacuation of the oil respectively – see Lassus, *Sanctuaires*, 162-67. Remarkably, the account relating the discovery of the relics of the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste by empress Pulcheria (399-453) describes one of the other ways to contact the relics: in the story, the official inserts a “light rod (ῥᾴδον λεπτὴν)” into the opening which produces the “sweet odor of myrrh” by contact with the relics; see Sozomen, *Eccl. H.* 9.2.13-14, ET in *NPNF* vol.2, 421.

7 Lassus, *Sanctuaires*, 180; “[L’]autel étant une table, τράπεζα, n’est pas n’importe quelle table; c’est la table même de la Cène… Les syriens antiques ont rappelé, par la même forme de l’autel, le sens figuratif de la cérémonie symbolique qu’ils célébraient” (ibid., 201).

8 Tchalenko, *Villages*, 1.334-335, 334 n. 2.

9 Ibid., 334 n.2; Doncéel-Voûte, *Pavements des églises de Syrie*, 493, citing the examples of the churches in Houad, the north church of Haouarte, and Jerada (ibid., 144, 102, 151).
was relatively unimpeded or was regulated by means of doors (Brad, basilica B of Reshafa) or small window openings (north church of Sobata),\(^\text{10}\) it remains clear that the role of the relics within the Syrian basilical churches was subsidiary to the liturgical celebration. As Doncéel-Voûte notes, the martyrium-reliquary was “un lieu occasionnel de visite et de vénération,”\(^\text{11}\) while the altar remained the focal point of the consecrated liturgical space.

It can be also presumed that, while attested for the Northern Syria, the reliquary-martyrium as a separate place of a paraliturgical cult existed also in Palestine and Arabia (e.g. churches of Gerasa and Gadara). Moreover, Noël Duval concluded on the basis of archeological findings that the fixed altar has not appeared in the Arabian region before the sixth century, and the relics were not placed under the altar in these regions until the construction of a solid altar became ubiquitous in the sixth-seventh centuries.\(^\text{12}\) At the same time, as follows from the already cited vita of St Sabas, the relics were placed under the main altar in the Palestinian churches.\(^\text{13}\) The excavations of various Byzantine-period churches in Palestine revealed several examples of the relics contained in a small room or cavity (loculus) under the altar, as in the churches on the Mount of Olives, ‘Ain

\(^{10}\) See in more detail in Doncéel-Voûte, *Pavements*, 532-540.

\(^{11}\) Ibid., 538.


\(^{13}\) Another well-known example comes from the vita of Peter the Iberian, where however the deposition of the bishop’s body “in the house of prayer under the altar (ܡܕܒܚܐ ܡܢ ܠܬܚܬ ܕܨܠܘܬܐ ܒܒܝܬ)” celebrated a year after his death, had no connection with the dedication of that church (*Life* 193 = Horn-Phenix, *Lives of Peter the Iberian*, 278-79).
Hanniyah, Khirbet el-Beiyudat near Jericho, St George church at Khirbet Mekhayyat,¹⁴ although the preservation of reliquaries in sepulchres or grottos is also known.¹⁵ The placement of relics under the altar is quite widely attested through archeological evidence for the churches in Jordan, e.g. in the eastern church of Pellawhere the reliquary is dated to the end of the fifth- beginning of the sixth century,¹⁶ or the northern church of Esbous (Hesban), where the _loculus_ with the reliquary under the altar has been renovated in the second half of the sixth century.¹⁷ The presence in Palestine, Jordan, and Arabia of two ways in which the relics were deposited in a church – mainly _sub altare_ or in a locus physically separate from the sanctuary – speaks of an intermingling of usages aimed at the incorporation of the cult of the saints and their relics within the ritual and liturgical framework of a public church building. Such mixing of several local usages could not, in our opinion, but have a profound effect upon the shaping of liturgical rites which aimed at the consecration of liturgical space. The study of the evidence pertaining to the existence of such rites and their formation in the churches of the Syriac traditions, specifically around the Syro-Antiochene region, is the subject of the first several sections of this chapter.

---

¹⁴ Ibid., 184; Bagatti, _Church from the Gentiles in Palestine_, 250-57; cf. also the illustration of the reliquary under the altar at the church of St George at Khirbet Mekhayyat, ibid. 248.

¹⁵ Bagatti, 252-3.

¹⁶ On the reliquaries in the region of Jordan, see Anne Michel, _Les églises d’époque byzantine et umayyade de Jordanie (provinces d’Arabie et de Palestine, Vᵉ- VIlᵉ siècle: Typologie architecturale et aménagements liturgiques_, Bibliothèque de l’Antiquité tardive 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001), 72-81; on the east church in Pella, ibid., 122 (also illustration on p. 123).

6.1 Anointing of the Altar with Myron: Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite

The author who concealed his identity under the name of Paul’s Athenian convert, Dionysius the Areopagite (Acts 17:34), mentions the consecration of an altar in the context of his discussion of the rite for the consecration of myron in the fourth book of his Ecclesiastical Hierarchy.\(^{18}\) The dating, actual authorship, and provenance of the Corpus Dionysiacum has been the subject of continuous debate ever since the impossibility of its attribution to the apostolic period was brought to the attention of Western scholars by Lorenzo Valla and Erasmus.\(^{19}\) The authenticity of the Corpus was questioned, however, at the first instance when it was used in the christological debate by the Severan party during the colloquy in Constantinople in 532: Hypatius of Ephesus, a representative of the Chalcedonian party, doubted that it could be proven that the treatises of the Corpus were written by Dionysius.\(^{20}\) The first public allusion to the works of Dionysius in 532 appears to represent a firm terminus ante quem for the composition of the Corpus: aside from this appearance, the passages from the Corpus feature in three works of Severus – two anti-Julianist treatises written before 525 (probably a later interpolation), and the Third Letter to “John the Hegoumenos” composed probably around 532-537.\(^{21}\) The scholars were able to determine a tentative terminus post quem


when they noted an extensive use in the Corpus of the works of Neoplatonic philosopher Proclus who died on April 17, 485.\textsuperscript{22} An attempt to narrow down the date hinged on the interpretation of liturgical evidence provided in the Corpus – specifically, upon the supposed allusion to the use of the Creed in the liturgy in \textit{Ecclesiastical Hierarchy}.\textsuperscript{23} The introduction of the Creed into the eucharistic rite was earlier attributed to patriarch Peter the Fuller of Antioch around 489,\textsuperscript{24} but the latter information was judged to be a later interpolation, and patriarch Timothy of Constantinople (511-518) emerged as a more safe candidate to have undertaken such an initiative.\textsuperscript{25} Additionally, it may be questioned that καθολικὴ ὑμνολογία referred in \textit{Ecclesiastical Hierarchy} in actuality refers to the Creed,\textsuperscript{26} even though John of Scythopolis, the sixth century commentator on the Dionysian corpus, appears to have taken that view.\textsuperscript{27} Thus, it may be presumed that the works of the Corpus may have been written between c.485 and c.532, perhaps closer to regarding the citation of \textit{Divine Names} in Severus’ \textit{Contra Additiones Juliani} and \textit{Adversus Apologiam Juliani}, that the supposed interpolation must have been done before the translation of the anti-Julianist works by Paul of Callinicum in 528 CE (ibid., 107). Regarding the lack of evidence for the early dating of the third Severus’ letter which cites Dionysius, see also Rorem and Lamoreaux, \textit{John of Scythopolis}, 11-15.


\textsuperscript{23} \textit{EH} 3: προομολογηθεὶς ὑπὸ παντὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας πληρόματος τῆς καθολικῆς ὑμνολογίας (Heil-Ritter, 80), \textit{EH} 3.7: ὑμνοῦσιν ὑμνολογία καθολικῇ τὴν ἁγαθούργον καὶ ἁγαθοδότιν ἀρχήν; ὥρ' ἢς αἱ σωτηριώδεις ἡμῖν ἀνεδείχθησαν τελεταὶ τὴν ἱερὰν τῶν τελουμένων θέωσιν ἱερουργοῦσαι (ibid., 87).


\textsuperscript{26} As Taft suggests in \textit{Great Entrance}, 48-49, 398.

the sixth-century margin of this time period. While the time span in which the Corpus might have been produced has been a subject of scholarly consensus, attempts to identify the author behind the pseudonym have met with different results, with the various proposed figures including Peter the Iberian, Damascius (Neoplatonic philosopher), Severus of Antioch, or others, including even the first Syriac translator of the Dionysiana, Sergius of Reshaina, and the author of the *scholia*, John of Scythopolis. The authorship hypotheses that have emerged in the search for the ‘historical Pseudo-Dionysius,’ however, have met and, as Golitzin notes, are bound to meet with the same fate: the “failure to convince any save their sponsors.” Moreover, the work of Charles Stang has recently suggested that in the case of Dionysian corpus, its literary device of


33 *Et introibo ad altare*, 25.
pseudonimity was “no mere ploy for sub-apostolic authority…, but [was] in fact itself an ecstatic devotional practice in the service of the apophasis of the self,” neatly connected with the ideology of writing in Late Antiquity.\footnote{34}

While the localisation of Dionysius’ work in Syria-Palestine was already suggested by Josef Stiglmayr in 1895,\footnote{35} recent scholarship has given more attention to the Syriac background of the Corpus Dionysiacum, particularly trying to frame it within a context of Chalcedonian/ non-Chalcedonian controversy of the fifth-sixth centuries. Rosemary Arthur has attempted to connect the appearance of Dionysian writings with the activity of the authors associated with the non-Chalcedonian camp (John of Tella, Stephen bar Sudaili, Zacharias of Mitylene and especially Sergius of Reshaina), but particularly of those writers close to Origenist/Evagrian ascetical theology and spirituality.\footnote{36} The studies by István Perczel, on the other hand, have attempted to redefine the textual history of the Corpus itself, not just the content of the treatises, in view of possible origins of “Dionysius” in the early sixth century Syriac Christianity.\footnote{37}


\footnote{35}Das Aufkommen der Pseudo-Dionysischen Schriften und ihr Eindringen in die christliche Literatur bis zum Lateranconcil 649, in IV. Jahresbericht des öffentlichen Privatgymnasiums an der Stella matutina (Feldkirch, 1895).

\footnote{36}Pseudo-Dionysis as Polemicist, 106-121, 175-183, 187-191; she at some point characterizes Dionysius’ teaching as “typical of sixth century Origenists,” meaning primarily the teachings of Evagrius (ibid., 183). To situate the Corpus further into the network of Syriac Christian Origenist thinkers, Arthur tries to redefine the traditional assessment of another pseudonymous work, Book of Hierotheus, attributed now to Stephen bar Sudhaili, suggesting rather that bar Sudhaili’s work was primary to that of “Dionysius” who wrote in response/refutation to Stephen (e.g. ibid., 61; also eadem, “A Sixth Century Origenist: Stephen bar Sudhaili and his Relationship with Ps.-Dionysius,” Studia Patristica 35 [2001]: 368-373); see the review of Arthur by Robert A. Kitchen in Hugoye 14.1 (2011): 178-181.

Perczel takes a closer look at the first translation of the Corpus into Syriac undertaken by Sergius of Reshaina (d. 536), and instead of presuming it to be a free rendering of the known Greek version, he posits the existence of an earlier Greek redaction upon which Sergius’ translation depended.\textsuperscript{38} Perczel contends that the first Syriac translation offered a clearer reading of certain places of the Corpus and, moreover, it provides a glimpse of the earlier “Dionysius” which “was more openly Origenist” in its theology – features which, as the author argues, were subsequently “softened” in the extant Greek redaction produced in the circle of John of Scythopolis.\textsuperscript{39} These considerations make us take seriously the witness of the Syriac translations of Dionysius – by Sergius of Reshaina (S\textsuperscript{1}), and by Phocas bar Sargis of Edessa (c. 684/86; S\textsuperscript{2})\textsuperscript{40} – when we approach the passage dealing with the consecration of the altar in the fourth chapter of the \textit{Ecclesiastical Hierarchy}.\textsuperscript{41}

---

\textsuperscript{38} “[T]he Greek text \cite{Kühneweg:1999} of the Corpus was still intact when it reached Sergius, so that a careful philological study of Sergius’ Syriac text will permit a critical reconstruction of the original Greek text” (“Earliest Syriac Reception,” 562).

\textsuperscript{39} “…[I]n certain instances, when the logic of the Greek text is broken, even perturbed, the Syriac offers a perfect logic, consistent with other parts of the [Corpus Dionysiacum]” (ibid., 562, 562-3).

\textsuperscript{40} In his edition of Jacob of Edessa’s homily on the consecration of myron, Sebastian Brock noted the direct quotations in this homily from Phocas’ translation and suggested it must have been completed shortly before the homily was pronounced, during Jacob’s episcopate (684-688) and before the death of patriarch Athanasius of Antioch (d. 686), i.e. between 684 and 686; see Brock, “Jacob of Edessa’s Discourse on the Myron,” \textit{Oriens Christianus} 63 (1979): 21.

The placing of the Corpus into the theological context of the sixth century Syria-Palestine appears consistent with the liturgical data provided by the Corpus. The baptismal rite, including the prebaptismal signings and anointing, consecration of the font, immersion and the post-baptismal anointing with *myron*, appears to reflect the fifth-sixth century Syriac baptismal liturgy, as far as we know it. Furthermore, the description of the rite for the consecration of *myron* in *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* contains certain parallels with the West Syriac liturgical practice attested in later sources. Specifically, Dionysius describes the consecration of *myron* to begin with the exclusion of the non-initiated/non-clerics (ἀτελειώτων) and the liturgy of the Word, followed by the deposition of the *myron* upon the altar, accompanied by the chant of “Alleluia” (τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς τῶν θεολήπτων προφητῶν ἐπιπνοίας μελώδημα) and the prayer. A similar sequence of a prayer, resembling structurally the eucharistic anaphora, and the chant of “Alleluia” appears in the West Syriac rite for the consecration of *myron*, e.g. in the thirteenth-century Pontifical of Michael the Syrian (ms. *Vatican syr. 51*). By contrast, the rite of Constantinople, as seen in the euchologion *Barberini gr. 336* incorporates the consecration of *myron* into the rites of the Holy Thursday liturgy, but does not include the

---

42 *EH* 2.2.1-8; Baby Varghese notes that “[l]’ordre des rites baptismaux qui se trouvent dans la *Hiérarchie ecclésiastique* est essentiellement le même que la liturgie baptismale syrienne du Vᵉ et du VIᵉ siècle” (*Les onctions baptismales dans la tradition syrienne*, CSCO 512, Subsidia 82 [Louvain: Peeters, 1989], 150, and further, 150-161).

43 *EH* 4.2 = Heil-Ritter, 97.

chanting of “Alleluia.”\textsuperscript{45} The latter detail, however, connects the Syro-Antiochene rites of baptism with the rite for the consecration of myron and, in later sources, also with the consecration of an altar.

The allusion to the consecration of an altar with myron appears at the end of the same fourth chapter of Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, devoted to the exegesis of the rite of the consecration of myron. Pseudo-Dionysius writes\textsuperscript{46}:

Kαὶ τὸ τοῦ ἱεραρχικῶς ἐννόησον, ὅτι καὶ τοῦ θείου θυσιαστηρίου τὴν ἱερὰν τελείωσιν ἢ τῶν ἁγιώτατον τελετών θεσμοθεσία ταῖς τοῦ ἱερωτάτου μύρου τελετουργεῖ παναγέσιν ἐπιτύπωσαν. Ἐστι δὲ ὑπερουράνιος καὶ ὑπερούσιος ἡ θεουργία τῶν θειών νοῶν ἡθοποιοῦσα τῆς θεολογίας ἱερὰ καὶ θεοσιευγός δύναμις. Εἰ γὰρ ἂν τὸ θείωταρον ἡμῶν θυσιαστήριον Ἰησοῦς, ἡ θεαρχικὴ τῶν θείων νοῶν ἀφιέρωσις, ἐν ὧν κατὰ τὸ λόγιον, ἀφιερώμενοι καὶ μυστικῶς ὀλοκαυτούμενοι τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἔχομεν, ὑπερκοσμίοις ὁφθαλμοῖς ἐποπτεύσωμεν αὐτὸ τὸ θειώτατον τοῦ θειώτατον θυσιαστήριον, ἐν ὧν τὰ τελεύημα τελείται καὶ ἀγιαζότατος, πρὸς αὐτὸ τοῦ θειώτατον μύρου τελούμενον. Ἀναγάζει γὰρ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτὸν ὁ παναγιώτατος Ἰησοῦς καὶ πάσης ἡμῶν ἁγιαστεῖας ἀποπληροῖ τῶν ἐπ’ αὐτὸ τελουμένων οἰκονομίας εἰς ἡμᾶς ὡς θεογεννήτους λοιπὸν ἀγαθοναρικῶς διαβαίνοντον.

And consider this in a hierarchic manner, that also the order of the most holy mysteries perfects the sacred perfection the divine altar by the all-holy effusions of the most sacred myron. And th(is) divine deed is supercelestial and superessential, (being) the beginning and the accomplishing power of our every theourgic sanctification. For if Jesus is our most divine altar, the divinely initiated sanctification of the divine minds, in which – according to the word – sanctified and mystically offered up “we have the entrance” [Eph 2:18; cf. Rom 5:12, Eph 3:12], let us behold with eyes above this world this most divine altar - in which what is perfect is perfected and sanctified – perfected from the most divine myron itself. For the all-holy Jesus sanctifies himself for our sake and fills us with every sanctification of the things that are accomplished upon it through dispensation (and) traverse then beneficially toward us as to those born of God.

The term used to designate the consecration of the altar, τελετουργία, has been equally applied by Dionysius to the consecration of myron in the same chapter of \textit{EH},\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{45} Parenti-Velkovska, 143-145.

where the sacrament of chrism has been explicitly paralleled with the eucharistic celebration (ὁμοταγῆ καὶ ταυτουργὸν τῷ τῆς συνάξεως ἱερῷ τελεστηρίῳ), containing “the same images, many and mystical arrangements and sacred sayings.”48 Another term, applied to the rite of the consecration of an altar in EH 4, θεουργία occurs twice in the same sentence (ἔστι δὲ... ἡ θεουργία, πάσης τῆς θεουργικῆς... ἁγιαστείας ἀρχή), emphasizing, through the pleonastic use of the term the purpose of the consecratory act—a “divine work” aimed to transform a material altar into the locus of “divine work” of the liturgy.49 Such an extraordinary significance attributed to a liturgical object is explained further through the presentation of the altar of a church as the type of Jesus as “our most divine altar (τὸ θειότατον ἠμῶν θυσιαστήριον),” apparently rooted in Rom 3:25 where Jesus is identified with ἱλαστήριον- kapporeth, a pars pro toto of the scriptural Temple. A slightly different phrasing in Sergius of Reshaina’s translation further emphasizes the typology: Jesus, as “our spiritual and divine altar (ܢܘܐܠܪܘܚܢܐܗܝܐܡܕܒܚܢ),”50 is contrasted with “this most divine altar/ this our divine and all-holy altar (ܢܩܕܝܫܐܠܗܝܐܗܢܐܠܡܕܒܚܢ),” the material altar which will be consecrated by effusion of oil. Characteristically also, the collection of epithets used to describe the ceremony of consecration or the object of the ceremony, the altar – πάσης τῆς θεουργικῆς ἡμῶν ἁγιαστείας ἀρχῆ καὶ οὐσία καὶ τελεσιουργὸς δύναμις – appears in almost identical sequence in the opening paragraph of Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, where all these terms are applied to none other but Jesus

47 EH 4.3.3, 4.3.4, 5.1.1 (Heil-Ritter, 97-98, 104).
48 EH 4.3.3 = Heil-Ritter, 97.
50 Strothmann, 26.
himself.\textsuperscript{51} The identification of the altar with “Jesus” underlines the role of the former as a source of “theurgic sanctification” accomplished through ritual of eucharistic offering for which the altar is a focal point. The parallel with the humanity of Christ, indicated through the use of the name “Jesus” here, appears to be grounded in its role as instrument of divine salvific activity, and the altar becomes an “anointed one” through chrismation also in order to serve as a vehicle of sacramental sanctification. The altar as a typological representation of Christ appears to be an accepted topos in the later commentaries on this passage of Dionysius, either by John of Scythopolis in the sixth century\textsuperscript{52} or by Syriac commentators Theodore bar Zarudi (8\textsuperscript{th}-9\textsuperscript{th} cent.), John of Dara (d. 860) and Dionysius bar Salibi (d. 1171).\textsuperscript{53} Thus, Theodore, in apparently the earliest of the Syriac commentaries, builds an analogy of consecration of an altar and consecration of myron, also understood christologically: as myron, “which is Christ (ܡܫܝܚܐܕܐܝܬܘܗܝ),” is sanctified “by him, the Father and the Spirit according to humanity (ܐܢܫܐܝܬ), and sanctifies us,” so also the altar, “which is Christ, first is sanctified by myron, i.e. it sanctifies him and it sanctifies us.”\textsuperscript{54} Further, Theodore comments that

the altar, which is sanctified, and the myron which sanctifies, is Christ, who is sanctified and sanctifies. Because he is sanctified by economy (ܚܣܘܢܐ), and as long as he remains in his divinity, he sanctifies…”\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{51} αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς, ὁ θεαρχικῶτατος νοῦς καὶ ὑπερούσιος, ἡ πάσης ἱεραρχίας, ἁγιαστείας τε καὶ θεουργίας ἀρχὴ καὶ οὐσία καὶ θεαρχικοτάτη δύναμις (EH 1.1.1 = Heil-Ritter, 63-64).

\textsuperscript{52} Ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, καὶ σημεῖον τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὸ ύψος τοῦ τοιούτου θυσιαστηρίου, ὥπερ ἐστίν ὁ Χριστὸς (PG 4:159).

\textsuperscript{53} These commentaries, which follow the second Syriac translation by Phocas, were published by Strothmann, Das Sakrament der Myron-Weihe.

\textsuperscript{54} Strothmann, 1.52/2.45. Likewise, bar Salibi in his glosses to Dionysius’ text appends a one-word comment “Christ” to the original passage’s reference to “this divine altar,” i.e. the altar of a church (Strothmann, Das Sakrament der Myron-Weihe, 1.111/2.93).

\textsuperscript{55} Strothmann, 1.53/2.46.
While these commentaries are at times too succinct to untangle fully, the connection made by Syriac commentaries two centuries after the writing of the Dionysian corpus appear to capture the gist of the original passage where the altar is not construed as a mere functional liturgical object but a visual commentary on the divine economy, being sanctified through the consecratory acts of the church as serving as a source of those same liturgical consecratory acts, in a manner similar to the function of Christ’s humanity in the history of salvation (Heb 13:12).

If we review the scarce details of the rite for the consecration of an altar that emerge in Dionysius’ text, it appears that the latter amounts to the pouring of chrism, possibly several times (ἐπιχύσεσιν). This practice is referred to as prescribed by the θεσμοθεσία (‘ordinance/law’),\[^{56}\] that is, as an established custom in the churches which liturgical practice was familiar to “Dionysius,” i.e. the churches of the Syriac tradition. This would be unsurprising if we read the allusion to the anointing of the altars in Ephrem’s *Hymns on Virginity* as an indication of an actual fourth century Syriac liturgical custom. Ps.-Dionysius makes clear that the consecration of the altars was to be celebrated by a bishop/bishops – firstly, through the use of the adverb ἱεραρχικῶς in the beginning of the passage in *EH* 4.3.12,\[^{57}\] but also further in the chapter of *EH* dealing with the ordination rites:

> Therefore, the divine ordinance allotted the sanctification of the hierarchic orders, the perfection of the divine myron, and the sacred fulfillment of the altar solely to the perfecting powers of the inspired hierarchs.\[^{58}\]

---

\[^{56}\] Lampe, *PGL* 646; both Syriac translations use ἁγιάζω (Strothmann, 1.26-27).

\[^{57}\] Syr. “in a high priestly manner” (_guardia [Sergius], guardia [Phocas]).
Thus, Dionysius establishes that, alongside the ordination rites and the consecration of chrism, the dedication of an altar constitutes one of the exclusive prerogatives of episcopacy. The statement of the rights of bishops as “dedicators” should be viewed in the context of apparent evolution of the rites of dedication in the churches of the Syriac tradition: as we saw earlier, the sources reflecting the fourth century customs may regard presbyters as equally capable of consecrating an altar (see the vita of Julian Saba). The inclusion of the church/altar dedication among episcopal rites may have intended to emphasize the exclusive authority of a local bishop in establishing new churches, an important concern for the churches already divided through doctrinal controversies.

Several decades after the possible *terminus ante quem* for the Dionysian Corpus, Sergius, the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch in 557-561, saw it necessary to emphasize in his letter to Monophysite bishops in Persia that the consecration of altars and churches pertained to episcopal authority:

> And I say again, there is no such custom in this Roman region that presbyters anoint altars and consecrate churches, except in some corner. We believe thus that this is right that in all places the tradition and custom should be kept which is in it, lest as we renew some, the disturbance works in the church, and dubious opinions will be preserved. And the prayer shall be over their violation who anoint the altars and consecrate churches. And we believe that they are forgiven with your petition on their behalf. And they will be threatened that if they shall do later something in this manner, they will be deprived from their priesthood, but now it is mercifully forgiven to them. The altars, though, shall not be anointed again as they instruct (to do) in the regions of barbarians, in which the presbyters anoint the altars. But to your holiness it is fitting that you keep the traditions that (are) in your region, which holy fathers handed over in it.

---

58 Ὅθεν ἡ θεία θεσμοθεσία τὴν τῶν ἱερατικῶν τάξεων ἁγιαστείαν καὶ τὴν τοῦ θείου μύρου τελείωσιν καὶ τὴν ἱεράν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τελετουργίαν ταῖς τῶν ἐνθέων ἱεραρχῶν τελεσιουργοίς δυνάμεις ἐνιαίους ἀπεκλήρωσεν *(EH 5.1.5 = Heil-Ritter, 107)*.

The content of this passage testifies that even thirty years after the Corpus, the practice of presbyters consecrating altars by anointing and even dedicating church buildings was still found among the churches under the jurisdiction of the Antiochene monophysite patriarch. Sergius affirms that this is the custom of “the barbarians’ regions (ܢܘܬܐ ܥܬܝܐܕܒܪܒܖ),” i.e. Persia, but not the mainstream custom of the empire (“Roman region”/ܐܬܘܡܝܐ ܕܪܗܗܢܐ ܘܒܐܬܪܐ). In case, however, that practice is followed, Sergius appears to mandate that a “prayer (ܦ݂ܠܘܬܐ)” is said which is supposed to correct the fault of the presbyters who follow the erroneous practice, and to establish episcopal authority over the newly consecrated holy place. The ambiguity between a bishop or a presbyter as the main celebant of the altar consecration/anointing rite, still evident in 550s, shows that the description of the dedication rite in Dionysius’ text fits well within the context of liturgical growth of the churches of the Syriac tradition, specifically – of the patriarchate of Antioch in the first half of the sixth century.

The Syro-Antiochene context of Dionysius’ allusion to the dedication of an altar is further confirmed when we note the discrepancy between the Greek and Syriac versions of *EH* 4.3.12 with regards to the substance used for the anointing of the altar. While the Greek version of Dionysius consistently uses the term μύρον, the translation of Sergius of Reshaina is as consistent in using the term “all-holy oil” instead: thus, in this rendering, “the completion of the holy, divine altar” is accomplished “by the pure effusions of the holy anointing of this all-holy oil (ܩܕܝܫܗܢܐ ܕܡܫܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܗ).”

---

60 Ibid., 221-222 (translation mine, see p. 226 for van Roey’s Latin translation).
Further, referring to “our divine and all holy altar,” the liturgical object which the Christians are called to contemplate as a type of Jesus, the “spiritual altar,” is the one “upon which the holy things (ܕܫܐ̈ܩܘ), what is perfected, are sanctified and perfected… through the anointing of the oil of holiness (ܕܫܐ̈ܩܘܕܡܫܚܡܫܝܚܘܬܗ).” The use of the term “holy oil” instead of myron (perfumed oil) may be a reflection of the ambiguity persistent in the works of Syriac ecclesiastical authors of the sixth-seventh centuries (Philoxenos of Mabbug, John of Antioch, Jacob of Edessa) who in their discussion of the rites of initiation often tended to use the terms “holy oil” and myron as synonymous, referring to the same substance prefigured in the use of oil in the Old Testament. The later witnesses to the practice of the West Syriac churches, including the liturgical texts, tended to differentiate between the two terms, reflective of the pneumatological emphasis shifted to the immersion and post-immersion anointing with myron. Thus also, conforming to the change of sacramentological views, Phocas of Edessa in his new rendering of the Corpus at the end of the seventh century chose to use the transliteration of the Greek term μύρον/ܩܕܝܫܐܡܘܪܘܢ throughout his translation, including the passage referring to the consecration of altars. But if we pay attention to Perczel’s hypothesis that Sergius in his Syriac rendering had access to the earlier, non-extant recension of the Corpus, it would not be inconceivable that the earlier version of Dionysius’ treatise had indeed alluded to the use of the “holy oil,” not myron, for the consecration of altars.

61 Strothmann, 26.
62 Ibid., 28.
63 Varghese, Onictions baptismales, 162-169, 181-199.
64 Ibid., 283-309.
65 Strothmann, 27, 29.
Significantly, the Armenian translation of the Dionysius’ works, accomplished by Step’anos Siwnec’i (d. 735) in the early eighth century Constantinople, also does not transliterate the Greek term myron in EH 4.3.12 but describes the consecration of the altar as taking place “by the all-holy pouring of the sacred oil (սրբազանին իւղոյ ամենասուրբ հեղմամբն).” By contrast with the Syriac version of Sergius, Step’anos’ translation uses both the terms myron (միւռոն, մեռոն) and “oil (իւղ, եւղ)” as synonymous throughout his translation. The Armenian translation of Step’anos attempts to be quite close to the original Greek text, so that, as Thomson observes, “literalness of Stephen’s rendering makes the Armenian obscure.” Could it the interchange of the terms “oil”/“myron” throughout Step’anos’ translation reflect a more flexible and synonymous use of these terms (ἔλαιον/μύρον) in the recension of the Greek version of the Corpus which the bishop of Siunik was using? A hypothetical use of ἐλαιον/μύρον interchangeably in the text possibly underlying the Armenian translation connects it, as an early eighth century witness to Dionysius’ text, with the earlier Syriac rendering which also does not show a clear differentiation between myron and consecrated oil.

Regardless of the choice of the term for the substance used for the anointing of the altar, it appears that the use of “holy oil” as synonym to myron becomes well-attested

---


68 Thus, just in the previous paragraph, EH 4.3.11 Step’anos translates ἡ τοῦ μύρου δωρεῖται τελειωτικὴ χάρις as միւռոնին կատարողական ավծումն պարգևէ (ibid., 94.19), but uses իւղ/եւղ on several earlier occasions where the received Greek text has μύρον (ibid., 93.14, 94.1.4.9.10).

among the Syriac writers soon after the appearance of the Dionysian corpus. Patriarch Sergius in his letter, mentioned above, presumably intended to clarify the use by stating clearly that myron is “what the Syrians call the ‘oil of anointing’ (ܕܡܫܝܚܘܬܐ ܡܫܚܐ).”  

At the end of the seventh century, in the homily pronounced on the occasion of the consecration of myron on Holy Thursday by Jacob of Edessa (640-708), the bishop uses both terms interchangeably throughout his treatise, with an apparent preference for “holy oil.” This homily is remarkable by several allusions to specific liturgical use of oil/chrism, in the rite of initiation and in the rite of the consecration of churches. The use of this oil in the rite of initiation is paired with the scriptural type, the use of the anointing to “anoint prophets, designate priests, and proclaim kings,” and the Christian use of oil to anoint people is ascribed this significance of priestly/royal anointing: it “perfects us all as priests and head disciples of the apostles.”  

Similarly, the use of oil by the patriarch Jacob to anoint the stone in Bethel (Gen 28:18-19) to make it the “house of God” prefigures, for Jacob of Edessa, the Christian use of “holy oil” when it “perfects and completes houses of God, namely churches (ܠܐ ܕܢܫܡܐ ܓܡܪܬܐ ܠܥܕ ܕܐܠܗܐ)” by the bishops’ hands.  

Likewise, referring to the consecration of the tabernacle by Moses in Ex 40, Jacob sees the fulfillment of this type in the church of the New covenant, which “has shown us clearly this holy oil which consecrates churches instead of the Tent, the

---

70 van Roey, “Lettre,” 222.


72 Discourse on the Myron 4 = Brock, 30.

73 Ibid. 2 = Brock, 29.
altar instead of the table, and instead of being consecrated by the single Moses, it is
consecrated through the agency of all the apostles.74 The allusion to the rite of the
consecration of the church and altar by anointing with “holy oil” through the hands of
bishops is evident. Jacob’s homily, strongly indebted to the works of Dionysius whom he
cites in Phocas’ translation,75 clearly affirmed that the same substance used to impart the
royal anointing upon a baptizand and consecrated in the course of the Holy Thursday
ceremony,76 is used during the consecration of an altar and church.

We have seen above that, in Dionysius’ treatise, the altar is not a mere liturgical
object, but itself is a type; an earthly altar, “perfected” by anointing, points to the
sacrifice of him who is the altar par excellence (Heb 13:10) and to the ‘mystical’
consecration and sacrifice of Christians through the spiritual altar/Jesus in the eucharistic
celebration. Moreover, the connection to the rites of Christian initiation can be seen
through the specific reference to the “effusions” (ἐπιχύσεις) of myron/“holy oil.” This
term appears in the chapter of Ecclesiastical Hierarchy which describes a moment in the
rites of initiation, following the pre-baptismal anointing, using the terms nearly identical
to EH 4.3.12:

[the hierarch] approaches the mother of adoption [i.e. the font], and having
consecrated the water in it through sacred invocations, and having perfected it by
three cruciform pourings of the most holy myron, and having enunciated, in a
number equal to the number of all-sacred applications of myron, the sacred
inspired song of the God-spoken prophets, he orders for the man to be brought
forth [i.e. for baptism].77

74 Ibid. 3 = Brock, 30.
75 Ibid. 11, 12, 15, 16; see the discussion in Brock, 21.
76 For another, metrical homily also supposedly pronounced on Holy Thursday by a theologian
from Jacob of Edessa’s circle, George, bishop of the Arabs (d. 724), see Baby Varghese, “George, Bishop
The passage describes the consecration of the waters of the baptismal font that immediately follows the anointing of the initiated person with “the holy oil of anointing (τὸ τῆς χρίσεως ἅγιον ἑλαιον).” The ritual consecration of waters is taking place while the presbyters anoint the baptizand on the whole body (πανσώμως). The consecration of baptismal waters consists of multiple (three) effusions of myron, and it is probable that the ritual actions at the consecration of an altar in EH 4.3.12 has taken its inspiration from the baptismal ceremony. It is worth emphasizing the obvious, however: the action described in EH 2 in terms analogous to EH 4 does not refer to the chrismation of a person, but to the consecration of the contents of a baptismal font by epicletic prayer (ἱεραῖς ἐπικλήσεσι) and the outpouring of myron. Thus, the earliest Syro-Palestinian source that describes the consecration of the altar by chrismation makes it clear that, if the use of oil in the rite of dedication implied a conscious attempt to imitate the baptismal ceremony, it construed this action on the model of the consecration of baptismal waters, not of the chrismation of a person. If the pouring of oil/chrism upon the altar was modeled upon the pouring of the same element into the baptismal font before its use for a sanctification of a person, can one also assume that an epicletic prayer was recited before the anointing? The text of EH 4 does not provide any direct evidence to the latter, but it is plausible to assume such a use. The Syriac-influenced rite of dedication celebrated in Lower Egypt (Scetis) around mid-seventh century certainly shows the presence of a prayer prior to the anointing of the altar, indicating that if the latter was not used in the

ecclesiastical practice known to Dionysius, it will have been certainly supplied more than a century later. The presence of the epiclesis in the rite known and used by Dionysius can be inferred from the implied pneumatological character of the consecratory act: the christological typology drawn in this passage (4.3.12) hinges upon the change in the mode of contemplation applied to the material signs, e.g. the altar (“let us behold with eyes above this world this most divine altar”), suggesting a certain role of the Spirit. Additionally, while the Spirit is not directly mentioned in EH 4.3.12, its role in relation to Christ’s economy is discussed in the preceding passage, which refers to the double ‘role’ of Christ as a receiver (as human) and supplier (as divine) of the Spirit, specifically in the context of the initiatory chrismation (ἡ τοῦ μύρου δωρεῖται τελειωτική χρίσις). 

6.2 Severus of Antioch and the Rite of Church Dedication

In one of our preceding chapters concerning the hagiopolite festival commemorating the dedication of Holy Anastasis, it was noted that the influence of Jerusalem liturgy upon the liturgy of other urban centers of Eastern Mediterranean had as its corollary the appropriation, to one degree or another, of some hagiopolite traditions regarding the Encaenia feast. The collection of homilies authored by Severus, the patriarch of Antioch on the Orontes in 512-518, contain some of the earliest examples of patristic homilies for the feast of Dedication with a verifiable date. The fact that this and

78 “But the perfecting anointing of myron is also given to him who perfects this sacred mystery of divine birth, the coming of the divinely originating Spirit, with the imagery of symbols indicating, as it seems, that he [Christ] who for our sake was sanctified by the divinely originate Spirit as befits a human, [also] supplies the most divine Spirit being unchanged in his divine essence (ὡς’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ δι’ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωποπρεπῶς τῇ θεαρχικῷ πνεύματι καθαγιασθέντος ἀναλλοιώτῳ τῆς οὐσιώδους θεότητος ἕξει τὸ θειότατον πνεύμα χορηγοῦμενον)” – EH 4.3.11 = Heil-Ritter, 102.
other homilies originate outside of Jerusalem, only underlines the remarkable influence of this aspect of the hagiopolite liturgy. One of the earliest examples of such homily on the feast of Dedication is the homily on the “Dedication of the Holy Cross and the Earthquake,” pronounced by Severus, the patriarch of Antioch on the Orontes in 512-518, on September 14, 513, presumably (but not certainly) at the Great Church in Antioch which may have served as the cathedral church from its dedication in 341.79 This homily, preserved in the Syriac translation by Jacob of Edessa,80 was given on the occasion celebrating both a feast designated as the “Dedication of the Holy Cross (Կաթողիկոսի սրբապատկեր),”81 and the commemoration of the Antioch earthquake of September 14, 458.82 In accordance with the homily’s inscription, the pervading theme of Severus’ preaching here concerns the salvific power of the Cross which “caused the teaching of the gospel proclamation to shine upon us,”83 but at the same time, the theme of the Cross closely


81 Presumably, hudôthê’/‘renovation’ would be a literal translation of τὰ ἐγκαίνια, see J. Payne Smith, Compendious Syriac Dictionary, 130.

82 The editors of the homily note that the date was the 55th anniversary of the disastrous earthquake (Brière-Graffin, 641 n.1), on which see Glanville Downey, A History of Antioch in Syria: From Seleucus to the Arab Conquest (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 476, 597-604; Mohamed Reda Sbeinati et al., “The Historical Earthquakes of Syria: an Analysis of Large and Moderate Earthquakes from 1365 B.C. to 1900 A.D.,” Annals of Geophysics 48.3 (2005), 386-87.

83 Brière-Graffin, 642-3.
intersects with numerous allusions to the temple and altar. Thus the homily opens with
the contrast of the “first dedication” of the “temple in Jerusalem which the wise Solomon
had built, and the Holy Spirit, speaking through David the prophet, prefigured” with the
present celebration in honor of the “Cross of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ by whom
all/every temple is sanctified and every sacrifice and intellectual mystery is perfected.”
While the phrase “all/every temple is sanctified” may refer to the ritual consecration of
churches with Christ indivisibly present in each one of the Christian ‘temples,’ other
places in the text may betray Severus’ emphasis on spiritual and interior reality of this
consecration. Indeed, through the allusion to 1 Cor 3:16-17 and 6:19, he points out that
through Christ the Christians themselves became “temples of God.” The link between
the temple as God’s unique dwelling and Christ’s mystery, accomplished on the cross, is
taken further, when Severus identifies the “wooden altar (θυσιαστήριου ξυλίνου)” in
Ezekiel (41:21-22) with the Cross as the “altar of propitiation (ܕܚܘܣܝܐܡܕܒܚܐ)” in
the prophet’s vision of the church/spiritual temple (ܪܘܚܢܐܗܝܟܐ). Ezekiel’s “wooden altar”
in the “spiritual temple” signifies Christ offering himself on the Cross as a “rational
victim (ܡܬܗܘܢܢܝܬܐܢܟܣܬܐ)” by whom the Christians “are elevated to the knowledge of
the holy Trinity.” While the association of the prophet’s “wooden altar” with the wood
of the Cross lies on the surface, on a more concrete level, Severus’ use of this scriptural
citation may imply that he knew of the use of wooden altars in the Christian churches.

84 Brière-Graffin, 640.
85 Brière-Graffin, 640-1.
87 See a parallel in Origen: “For this reason he himself is both victim and priest. For truly
according to the spirit he offers the victim to the Father, but according to the flesh he himself is offered on
the altar of the cross…” (Origen, Hom. in Gen. 8.9; ET Heine, FC 71, 145).
At the same time, the allusions to the temple in connection with the feast of the Cross, as well as the recurring references to “renovation/renewal” in the homily\textsuperscript{88} and the very denotation of the feast as the “Encaenia of the Holy Cross,” imply a strong dependence of the church of Antioch in this period on the Jerusalem calendar in the early sixth century that is evident in the apparent adaptation of the hagiopolite “Encaenia-Cross” cycle of feasts. As it is clear from Severus’ homily, however, the integration of these feasts into the Antiochene liturgical calendar resulted in the merging of the two celebrations into one, with September 14 becoming the date for both the “renovation” feast, closely connected with the church/temple, and for the feast of the Cross. Such development is attested in a number of West Syriac (Jacobite) menologies, which also provide an explanation for the merger of the two feasts in the Antiochene practice. Thus, a calendar found in the late seventh-century ms. \textit{British Museum Add. 17134} places for September 13 the memory of the “holy apostles and St John Chrysostom,” while the celebration indicated for the next day is entirely consistent with the inscription and content of Severus’ homily: “Dedication of the Cross and the memory of the ancient earthquake (ܩܐ̈ܥܬܝܥܐ̈ܕܙܘܘܕܘܟܕܢܐ܂ܕܨܠܝܒܐ܂ܚܘܕܬܐ).”\textsuperscript{89} The move of the Encaenia to September 14 can thus be explained by the need to account for the celebration of the memory of John Chrysostom, but also by the growing prominence of the feast of the Cross on that day.\textsuperscript{90} The removal of Encaenia from the September 13 date appears to

\textsuperscript{88} E.g. Brière-Graffin, 640.

\textsuperscript{89} The series of West Syriac menologies was published in ed. trans. François Nau, \textit{Un martyrologe et douze ménologies syriaques}, PO 10.1 (Paris: Brepols, 1913), here 34.

\textsuperscript{90} The traditional death date of Chrysostom is September 14, 407 (Socrates, \textit{Hist. eccl.} 6.21.1); thus, in this West Syrian calendar his memorial has also (like the feast of Encaenia) became displaced from its historical date to account for the celebration of the Cross.
derive from relative unimportance of the local Jerusalem feast for Antioch, but at the same time the presentation of the feast on September 14 as the “Dedication/Encaenia of the Cross” reflects, through liturgical memory, a tacit acknowledgement of the festival’s hagiopolite origin.91 This is seen further in another calendar, discovered by François Nau, ms. British Museum Add. 14504 (9th-10th cent.) which presents the September festivals in a manner similar to the earlier calendar, but puts on the September 12 the feast of the “Encaenia of the holy catholic church (ܩܲܐܬܘܠܝܩܝ ܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܕܥܕܬܐ ܚܘܕܬܐ),” showing another way of appropriating the Jerusalem feast.92

A testimony for some form of adoption of the Jerusalem tradition of Encaenia celebration in Antioch can also be observed in another homily of Severus, this time pronounced on the feast of the dedication of a local church, the Great Church in Antioch.93 The Homily 112, dated to November 3, 517,94 in accordance with its title, was spoken on the occasion of the “ἐγκαίνια or dedication (ܘܕܬܐ ܚܟܝܬܐܘܢܩܢܝܐ)” of the Great

91 Remarkably, the same calendar in BM Add. 17134 places for September 15 “the memory of the confessors and the dedication [of the church] of the Theotokos (ܐܠܗܐ ܝܠܕܬ ܕܩܕܝܫܬܐ ܘܚܘܕܬܐ)” (Nau, PO 10.1, 34), referring apparently to the church of the Theotokos in Antioch where Severus’ Cathedral Homily 83 was pronounced on December 25, 515 (Mayer-Allen, Churches of Syrian Antioch, 106-108; for the homily see ed. Maurice Brière, Les homiliae cathedrales de Sévère d’Antioche, traduction syriaque de Jacques d’Edesse: Homélies LXXVIII à LXXXIII, PO 20.2 [Brepols, 1929]).

92 The festival of September 14 is designated in this calendar as the “encaenia or elevation of the venerable Cross (ܡܝܩܪܐ ܕܨܠܝܒܐ ܡܬܬܪܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܐܘܟܝܬ ܚܘܕܬܐ)” (Nau, PO 10.1, 46). Likewise, another later calendar from the 11th-12th cent. ms. British Museum Add. 14519 presents the celebration of September 14 through preserving the Greek term as “anakania (ܐܢܐܟܐܢܝܐ)” that is, the dedication of the cross and the memory of ancient disasters” (ibid., 52).

93 See above n. 63.

94 ed. Maurice Brière, Les Homiliae Cathedrales de Sévère d’Antioche: Homélies CIV à CXII, PO 25.4 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1943), 795-803; on the date see ibid., 795 n.1; the homily makes clear that the occasion for its pronouncement coincided with the memory of the “318 fathers” of the Council of Nicaea (ibid., 796-7), which falls on November 3 according to the extant West Syrian (Jacobite) calendars, e.g. British Museum Add 17134, BM Add 14504, BM Add 14708 (Nau, Martyrologe et douze ménologes, PO 10.1, p. 35, 47, 98). One of the menologies, the 9th-10th cent. ms. BM Add 14504 adds to the commemoration of the Nicaean fathers on November 3 the memory of emperor Constantine the Great (ibid., 47), which is also reflected in Severus’ homily (Brière, PO 25.4, p. 796).
Church, when the synodal letters of saint Timothy, archbishop of the Alexandrians, were read. In the very beginning of this homily, Severus draws on a scriptural precedent for the festival of dedication, seeking to explain the traditional title of the encaenia with an allusion to John 10:22 (ἐγένετο τότε τὰ ἐγκαίνια ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις), introducing the citation with the phrase “for as somewhere in the holy Gospels we have heard being said.” This allusion may with some probability be construed as a reference to the Gospel read at the liturgy on that day, which then explains why Severus chose this passage as his starting point in the homily. As we have seen before, John 10:22ff. has been used as a Gospel reading for the feast of Encaenia in the Jerusalem lectionary (both Georgian and Armenian), and it is plausible that the same reading, in imitation of Jerusalem practice, would be used at the dedication of the Great Church of Antioch.

Consistent with the development of the ideology of this liturgical feast, Severus makes a point that while the occasion of “this feast of this great church” was to “honor… this divine temple where the mystery of piety is celebrated daily and the entire order of spiritual worship is fulfilled,” its purpose is not attached to a “visible edifice,” to the recognition of “the antiquity or newness of wood and stone, and celebrating its dedication.” Rather, the point of the feast lies in a spiritual regeneration, “with the renovation and non-antiquity of the faith in Christ and the works renewed to

---

95 Ibid., 795. The patriarch in question is Timothy III (IV) of Alexandria, ruling from October 517 to February 7, 535 (on his surviving works, which do not include the letters mentioned in the homily, see Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 2.42-45); he, being miaphysite, welcomed Severus to Alexandria after the latter’s flight from his see in September 518 (Allen-Hayward, *Severus*, 25).

96 Brière, PO 25.4, 795 l.5-6.

97 Ibid., 795 l.11-796 l.2.
perfection,” a point leading directly to an account of the delineation of the orthodox faith through doctrinal controversies. Severus asserts that it is the “dedication” of this church, “whose foundation (is) upon this rational rock of faith” (i.e. the orthodox doctrine) that he celebrates, “not of that (church) which you are seeing with the sensible eyes.” Severus’ homily on the annual feast of dedication of the Great Church shows signs of appropriation of the feast’s ideology to the local ecclesiastical context of Antioch, as well as current state of the doctrinal controversies, but it also demonstrates a tendency notable in the hagiopolite hymnographic and homiletic texts: the spiritualization of a ‘historical’ feast transformed from an annual commemoration connected to a specific local church building to a level of a universal feast of the Church. Despite their importance in reconstructing theological framework underlying the celebration of dedication festivals, these homilies do not provide specific evidence regarding the liturgical celebration of the dedication feast, or of a dedication rite.

A more specific allusion, appearing to connect the sanctification of liturgical space with a concrete ritual act is found in another of Severus’ Cathedral Homilies, pronounced by the patriarch on the occasion of the deposition of relics of martyrs Procopius and Phocas at the church dedicated to the archangel Michael in Antioch. Taking place at a renowned sanctuary devoted to the chief of angelic armies, Severus chastises those who attempt to accord angels with divine honors as being “under

98 Ibid., 796 l. 3-4; see further a reference to 2 Cor 5:17 (“new creation” in Christ) in ibid., 796 l.6-7.

99 Ibid., 797-798.

100 Ibid., 799 l.1-3.

anathema” by the “holy canons” and turns to discuss the place of the martyrs and their relics placed in the church:

[W]e too… sanctify churches/houses (شقا وسکر) which have been built in the name of the angels with the bones and sacred limbs of the holy martyrs, or with their victorious dust/ashes (مدخ) which has all been bravely burned and has become a sacrifice: by this very deed we proclaim that they too, like the angels, are mighty powers.102

In reference to this text, Lizette Larson-Miller notes that this homily “implies that the church was already consecrated and that the deposition of the martyr relics was in addition to the earlier consecration.”103 Certainly, if the church where the homily was spoken was indeed the “great” church of Michael the Archangel in Antioch, built during the reign of Leo I (457-474) and destroyed during the earthquake of 526,104 the deposition of martyrs’ relics in this church during Severus’ patriarchate would not coincide with the event of this church’s dedication. Moreover, the verb which Severus uses in this passage (شقا وسکر) is different from the term used to refer to the consecration of the church and altar (صلاة) in the sixth century Syriac translations of Corpus Dionysiacum, and in the later Syriac canonical literature. This may indicate that the ritual action referred to in the passage from Severus’ homily does not relate to the consecration/dedication of a church building, and therefore, the latter rite did not need to incorporate the deposition of martyr relics as a necessary component, particularly as the

102 Hom. 72, PO 12.1, 84; ET Allen-Hayward, Severus, 132.
homilist refers to the churches dedicated “in the name of the angels.” The placement of the relics in a church would thus contribute to the sanctity of the liturgical space, but would not be considered a sine qua non for the place to carry out a liturgical function.

In the article referred above, Larson-Miller makes a connection between the passage in Severus’ homily, ostensibly referring to the deposition of relics in a church with the instructions for a consecration of a church or martyrium found in the Synodicon of the West Syriac tradition, a canonical collection published by Arthur Vööbus from a single manuscript, *Syrian Orthodox Patriarchate Damascus 8/11*, dated to 1204 CE. The description of the church dedication appears in the canonical work preserved under a lengthy title “Chapters (lit. kephalaia) which were written from the Orient, their questions were presented to the holy fathers and there was for them this answer.” The treatise, belonging to an oldest stratum of the indigenous Monophysite canonical legislation, contains – as follows from the title – the responses to the questions regarding liturgical practice, addressed by the churches in communion with the West Syrian bishops who did not accept Chalcedon. A proper date for these series of canonical responses is facilitated by a discussion in canon 25 of the validity of the baptisms and ordinations performed by the Julianist party in opposition to Severus, particularly those ordained by Zebad and others whose ordination was in question. 

---

105 ed. Arthur Vööbus, *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition*, CSCO 367-368, Scriptores syri 161-162 (Louvain: Secrétariat du CSCO, 1975), for the description of the manuscript, see CSCO 367, ix-xx. The manuscript is dated (according to the colophon) to 5 Iyar 1515 of the Seleucid era (= May 5, 1204).


107 The ms. *BM Add. 12155* where the “oldest stratum,” including Chapters appears, dates to the 8th century (ibid., 13 n. 94).
the text of the canon (“almost twenty years have passed since all that Zebad arrogantly did…” 109) would establish the date for the compilation of these canonical responses at no later than twenty years since the end of Severus’ patriarchate, i.e. circa 538 CE.110 The discovery of a succinct description of the dedication rite among these early sixth century kephalaia makes this one of the earliest sources for the liturgy of church dedication in the Syro-Palestinian region.

The connection of this canon to the work of Severus of Antioch becomes more lucid once we consider that another, later work of canonical legislation, Nomocanon (or Ktôbô d’hudajê, lit. “book of directions”), compiled by a renowned West Syriac bishop and writer Gregory Abû’l-Faraj or Bar Hebraeus (1225/6- 1286) around 1250-1263.111 The chapter dealing with the church building, altar, and its furnishings in this work of canonical codification preserves the text of a canon quite similar to the one extant in the sixth-century Chapters – however, in Bar Hebraeus’ Nomocanon, this canon is directly attributed to “Severus.”112 The comparison of the two text establishes that these two canons are most likely two redactions of the same rule:

---

108 Chapters 25, in Synodicon, CSCO 368, 162. See also the list of sources dealing with the problem of ordinations produced by Zebad and others in Volker L. Menze, Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 180 n. 723; also cf. Ernst Honigmann, Évêques et évêchês monophysites d’Asie antérieure au Vle siècle, CSCO 127, Subsidia 2 (Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1951), 105-107.

109 Synodicon, 162.

110 Volker Menze gives a narrower date: 532-534 CE (Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church, 155).


112 Bedjan, 17.
A church or a martyrium shall be consecrated in the following fashion: The bishop, the day before, goes, fastens the altar and consecrates it. On the following day he goes – if this be a martyrium, and he prays and places the bones of the martyrs or the apostles into their urns, performs a prayer for the deposition of the bones and anoints their urns with the “opobalsamon” or the oil of perfume, i.e. he does not consecrate but anoints because [it is] gladness only. And in like manner shall he anoint, beginning just above the screen (in front of) the altar step. If there is a cross affixed to the wall, the one that gives peace, the fragrance should reach it. After all this, the service of the (sacred) books and the offering of the sacrifice shall be completed. But if the time is such that it is difficult to perform all these things, the altar is to be anointed by the bishop and it is to be commissioned and permission will then be given by the bishop through the priests to do the rest.

In addition to attributing this canon to Severus, Bar Hebraeus’ Nomocanon includes a detailed commentary- “direction” (ܗܘܕܝܐ), providing a liturgical instruction for the rite of the consecration of the church and the altar. However, since I consider this rubric as belonging to a later stage in the development of the dedication ceremony, it seems appropriate to review it in one of the following subsections of this chapter. Regarding the two extant variants of the “canon of Severus,” it may be suggested – following the

---

113 Synodicon, 159. I use Vööbus’ translation with minor adjustments, italicizing the portions of the text where the Synodicon version diverges from the Nomocanon one.


115 בְּלוֹחֲוֹד בּוֹסֶמֶא מָטֶל גַּיֵּר מַטָּמֶשְׁחָיָן מַקְדָּשְׁיָן דֶּלָּא דִּיֵּנָו (Synodicon, f. 67a = Vööbus, CSCO 367, 166).

principle of *lectio brevior* – that the redaction of the canon preserved in the *Nomocanon* and attributed directly to the patriarch, may be slightly earlier, even though it is discovered in a much later, thirteenth-century canonical code. On the other hand, the version of this canon in the *Synodicon* contains many details which appear as supplementary to the original text: an opening phrase-introduction, a more specific description of the anointing of the sanctuary, and a directive regarding the delegation of some of the functions regarding the consecration of the church and altar from the bishop to the presbytery.

Both versions of the same canon, however, reflect the identical ceremony for the dedicating of a church and an altar, structured as a two-day celebration:

**FIRST DAY:**
1. arrival of the bishop
2. installation of the altar
3. consecration of the altar

**SECOND DAY:**
4. arrival of the bishop
5. prayer (?)
6. deposition of the relics (“bones”) into the reliquary/-ies
7. anointing of the reliquary, doors of the altar, walls, cross
8. liturgy of the Word
9. eucharist

The text of the canon supplies no detail regarding the ceremony of the first day: it is merely stated that the bishop “fastens/affixes (ܡܫܡܡܐ)” the new altar and “consecrates it (ܡܬܚܕܫ).” The description of the second-day ceremony might be somewhat more extensive: it begins with the bishop reciting an opening prayer, performing the deposition of relics into a reliquary with a proper prayer, and the anointing of the depository, surrounding walls, and the image of the cross mounted on a wall. The eucharistic liturgy concludes the *encaenia*. The canon explicitly states, however, that the whole latter
ceremony (excluding, presumably, the eucharist) would take place, had the church in question been a “martyrium (ܕܐٍܡܛܝܢܐ),” using a term which (as we have seen) in the practice of Syrian churches described one of the sacristies adjacent to the altar area, designated as a repository for the saints’ reliquary or multiple relics. The term beth sahdê (‘place of martyrs’) thus referred to either such an annex within the basilical church, or to the entire basilica which contained such a depository. This practice of repositing the relics in an adjacent sacristy, rather than under the altar (as in the regions of Palestine, South Syria/North Arabia, and Greece), represents a distinctive characteristic of the churches of North Syria around Antioch, Apamea-on-the-Orontes, Lebanon, Phoenician coast, and the river Euphrates. Liturgical instructions for the dedication of a church represented in the “canon of Severus” reflect this spatial differentiation between the altar table, the focal point of the liturgical rite, and the martyrion, connected to the cult of the saints and popular piety. Both versions of the canon in question feature the anointing of the reliquary and walls by opobalsamon (ܐܦܒܠܣܡܘܢ = ὀποβάλσαμον), “the sap of the balsam-tree,” cultivated in the area close to the Dead Sea, rather than by the consecrated substance such as myron or “holy oil.” The longer redaction of the canon

117 Lassus, Sanctuaires chrétiennes de Syrie, 173-183; Donceel-Voûte, Pavements des églises byzantines, 532-540.

118 Donceel-Voûte, Pavements, 532-33, also n.100.

119 Ibid., 499

120 Donceel-Voûte, Pavements, 492-98, 534.

121 Sophocles, Lexicon, 813; cf. LSJ 1240-1241 (ὁποβάλσαμον, ὀπός).

among the *Chapters* makes an effort to spell out the implication that the anointing of the walls upon the deposition of relics is *not* equivalent to the consecration of the building: it/he “does not consecrate but [merely] anoints” with a fragrant substance. The evident corollary from this distinction in the canon of Severus, and other Syriac evidence, already has been expressed by Larson-Miller: “[the relics] were apparently not necessary for the dedication of a church building”124 – the installation and consecration of the altar on the eve of the eucharistic celebration sufficed for the preparation of liturgical space for its proper use. It may be possible, however, to note in the text of this canon, attributed to one of the most illustrious bishops active in Eastern Mediterranean in the early sixth century, another tendency, parallel to the continuous effort to integrate the cult of saints and their relics, placed in the *martyria*, into the spatial syntax of church buildings from late fourth to sixth centuries.125 This sixth-century canonical legislation attests to the effort to integrate the rite of deposition of relics into the rite for the dedication of a new church, as an additional element intended to communicate sanctity to the newly built place of worship. Our earlier examination of the fourth and fifth century evidence pertaining to the East Mediterranean showed that the dedication of a church building and the deposition of relics constituted two separate rites, the latter of which pertained rather to the cult of the saints, than to the ritual consecration of sacred space. In this canon, it is evident that consecration of an altar by the bishop still constitutes the rite of church consecration/dedication *par excellence*.


The “canon of Severus,” if indeed it can be attributed to the patriarch of Antioch, must certainly be read in the context of the struggle of the non-Chalcedonian clergy in the early sixth century to establish “parallel,” monophysite hierarchy and to regulate the matters of ecclesiastical discipline, including liturgical practices. This was the explicit purpose of the collection known to us as the *Chapters written from the Orient,* and other canons in this document attest to the efforts of monophysite bishops to regularize the ritual customs pertaining to the dedication of churches and altars. It has been already stated in canon 14 that in case of necessity, the altar is to be anointed (ܡܕܒܚܐ ܡܬܡܫܚ) by the bishop and “is sent away (ܡܫܬܕܪ),” while the presbyters are given commission to complete the rite of dedication on the site of a new church. This is one of the earliest allusions to the use of a portable altar in East Mediterranean, preceding the first Byzantine witness, dated to c. 700 CE, by approximately 160-170 years, and thus suggesting the possible origins of the practice in Syria during the turmoil of “overlapping” hierarchies in the aftermath of Chalcedon.


128 Vööbus, *Synodicon,* 166/159.

129 I have suggested a sixth/seventh century date for the hagiopolite rite underlying the consecration of a portable altar in the pontifical *Tbilisi A 86,* but no specific allusion to the date could be found through internal critique of this liturgical source.
Chapters show give further details as to the form which this “altar” that was “sent away” took in the practice of the Syriac monophysites:

If a tablet (ܐܒܠܝܬܐ) that is consecrated is placed on an [altar] table which is not consecrated and [the sacrifice] is offered on it, the table does not become thereby become consecrated. It is proper, however, that also the table shall be consecrated (canon 16).130

A tablet which is painted (ܡܨܝܪܐ) shall not be consecrated (canon 17).131

While the latter canon stipulates against the use of excessively decorated tablets (or perhaps even portable images) as portable altars, the former rule appears to be consistent with the general effort of the document to circumscribe the authority of the presbyters at the dedication of new churches and to reassert the liturgical authority of a bishop:

It is necessary that the bishop shall complete by the sign of the cross, but without myron, those altars which have been anointed by the presbyter, saying: “This altar is consecrated and completed in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.” Only this – another prayer is not necessary (canon 5).132

It is not lawful to permit a priest to anoint an altar. If an altar is to be put in another place, the priest may remove it and fix it elsewhere – where it may be necessary – but this shall [only] take place with the permission of the bishop (canon 8).133

The former canon is to be read in the context of a rule that precedes it, specifying how the Christians “baptized by presbyters,” but who “have not been signed by the holy myron” shall have their initiation completed with the sign of myron and prayer.134 The rule that follows deals with a similar practice of ‘correcting’ an irregular consecration through

130 Synodicon, 167/160.
131 Ibid.
132 Ibid., 164/158.
133 Ibid., 165/158-59.
134 canon 4; ibid., 164/158.
prescribed ritual actions – since here it is presumed that the altar has already been
anointed by a presbyter, no further anointing/chrismation is deemed necessary. A
tumultous ecclesiastical situation in the region of Syria in the early sixth century appears
to be reflected in the canon 10 which uniquely described the rite of a conditional
dedication of an altar: if the altar has been made of marble, not wood, it was to be
“anointed” with a conditional formula of consecration.\textsuperscript{135} The context of the canonical
legislation in the \textit{Chapters} allows us to supply the details of the rite for the consecration
of an altar which the “canon of Severus” (= canon 14) does not itself provide:

1) marble was considered to be a material more suitable for the consecrated altar, but
wooden altars were not uncommon (canon 10);
2) the altar, either portable or stationary, was consecrated by anointing with \textit{myron}
(canon 5, 8, 10) from the hands of a bishop;
3) a formula was said at the consecration, similar to those that appear in other
canons, and remarkable by the invocation of the Trinity over the consecrated
object:
   a. “This altar is consecrated and completed/perfected in the name of the
      Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit” (canon 5), or
   b. “We anoint this altar, if it has not been anointed, in the name of the Father,
      the Son, and the Holy Spirit” (canon 10).
4) a portable altar (tablet, \textit{tablithô}) was employed in the situation where the bishop
could not be physically present to accomplish the rite (canon 14), or it was
necessary to celebrate the liturgy in an unconsecrated place (canon 16).

Another, ostensibly sixth-century reference to the tradition of anointing the
altar(s) at its consecration, provided that the attribution of the text in question is correct,
comes from a letter of Philoxenus (Aksenoyo) of Mabugh (Hierapolis) (d. 523), a
prominent bishop and theologian of the Monophysite movement. A citation from
Philoxenus’ letter “about church affairs (ܢܣܐ̈ܦܘܢܩܡܐ̈ܡܛܠܬܢܝܐ̈)” is found in a Syriac
canonical treatise \textit{A Discourse Concerning Ecclesiastical Leadership}\textsuperscript{136} also included in

\textsuperscript{135} Ibid., 165/159.
the West Syriac Synodicon. The letter under such title does not survive among the extant works of Philoxenus, but this may not be a reason to reject his authorship. In the treatise, the reference to Philoxenus’ letter is used as one of the examples that “divine apostles and skillful shepherds were used in leadership for the peace of the holy church and for the benefit of the believers and the uniting of the separated ones.” Philoxenus’ letter is used as an example of dispensation applied to the churches taken over from the jurisdiction of the heretics:

Again also the holy Philoxenus in that letter about church affairs says: “Because of the honor of peace and the benefit of the believers also the altars and temples which had been anointed and consecrated (ܘܐܬܩܕܫܘܕܐܬܡܫܚܘ) by Eudoxius the Arian were accepted by the orthodox bishops without being anointed and consecrated anew (ܡܢܕܪܝܫܐܬܘܐܬܩܕܫܘܡܫܚܘ).”

Eudoxius, a member of Eusebian party in the course of the fourth century christological debates, served as a bishop of Germanicia and Antioch, but most prominently, as the archbishop of Constantinople (360-370). It may be that it is to this last tenure that Philoxenus refers here and the church/altar in question may refer to the churches of Constantinople which, as we can infer from the sources, were not rededicated upon the

---

136 Vööbus, “Discovery of a Treatise about the Ecclesiastical Administration Ascribed to Michael the Syrian: A Unique Document in the Literary Genre of Canon Law,” Church History 47.1 (1978): 23-26. While the treatise itself is ascribed to patriarch Michael the Syrian (1126-1199), Vööbus doubts such attribution and assigns the terminus ante quem for the canonical work to the year 909 CE (ibid., 25-26).


138 Vööbus, Synodicon, CSCO 376, Scr. syri 164, p. 183 n.73.

139 Ibid., 184.

140 Vööbus, Synodicon, CSCO 375-6, Scr. syri 163-4, p. 178/183-184.

141 F. W. Bautz, BBK 1.1550-51.
departure of the last Arian bishop Demophilus in 380. At the same time, (Ps.) Philoxenus’ allusion to the “anointing and consecrating” as part of the dedication ritual for Constantinople would be is anachronistic and appears to reflect the custom of the churches under the jurisdiction of Antiochian see in the early sixth century. The value of this passage, if judged an authentic sixth-century witness, is in corroborating the testimony of Pseudo-Dionysius and West Syriac Synodicon with regards to the anointing the altars and the church buildings for the purpose of consecration/dedication in the patriarchate of Antioch in the first half of the sixth century. The use of a formulaic expression “anointed and consecrated” twice in a quite short passage attests to this usage having become an accepted and standard practice in the churches of West Syriac tradition. Another interesting aspect of this passage lies in its use as a warrant for the custom of “economy” in converting the churches and altars consecrated by heterodox clergy for such communities: the thrust of the passage appears to be that the action of dedicating a heterodox altar anew would be precisely unnecessary, a stipulation with which contemporary and later Syriac canonical tradition have come to disagree.

6.3 Consecration of the Church of St Macarius in Scetis (Egypt)

Fearing arrest, Severus of Antioch fled from his see to Egypt on 29 September 518 and spent the next twenty years of his life in exile, continuing to care for his diocese from distance, and to further the cause of anti-Chalcedonian movement through his letters.

142 Sozomen, Hist. eccl. 5.7.

143 For the account of the dedication of Hagia Sophia in 360, shortly after the installation of Eudoxius, see above, Part I, chapter 3.
and writings.\textsuperscript{144} It cannot be attested with certainty whether Severus personally influenced or introduced any Syriac liturgical customs among Egyptian non-Chalcedonian Christians, the presence of his name in the Coptic liturgical sources, not only in menologia, but also in the inscriptions of liturgical prayers attests to continued exchange of liturgical material among Syro-Antiochene and Egyptian churches.\textsuperscript{145} In our attempt to reconstruct the early history of the rites of church dedication in the East Mediterranean, the Syro-Egyptian connection is especially significant, since one of the earliest descriptions of the dedication ceremony among the Oriental churches derives from a Coptic, seventh century source, and the ritual described bears significant similarities to the details of the Syriac rites of dedication which we were able to extract from Ps.-Dionysius and Syriac canonical literature.

The rite for the consecration of Christian liturgical space must have had special significance for the churches in Egypt, as the conversion of this province to Christian religion came hand in hand with the destruction and, especially, “conversion” of temples of Graeco-Roman and Egyptian religion for the use in Christian worship.\textsuperscript{146} The inscriptions which are found in the former temple of Isis in Philae on the frontier between Egypt and Nubia and attest to the building’s conversion of into the church of St

\textsuperscript{144} Allen-Hayward, Severus, 24-25; see also W.E. Crum, “Sève’re d’Antioche en Égypte,” \textit{Revue de l’Orient Chrétien} 23 (1923): 92-104.


Stephen\textsuperscript{147} in the sixth century\textsuperscript{148} reflect the idea of transformation of a place (\textit{ἐγένετο ὁ τόπος ὁ τότες}) into a temple/house of a Christian saint (\textit{ὁ κὁ σ τὁ άγίου Στεφάνου}).\textsuperscript{149} At the same time, the signs of the cross inscribed into the walls of the former Egyptian sanctuary convey the concept of exorcism and ritual purification of a previously demon-indwelled location, thus implying the performance of certain cleansing ceremony on the occasion of the place’s dedication as a Christian church.\textsuperscript{150} By contrast with the conversion of pagan sanctuaries, exemplified by such Egyptian locations as Philae, Dendur et al.,\textsuperscript{151} the rite of consecration of a church to be discussed further concerns the newly-built Christian church, rather than a reused building, describing the dedication of a new church at the monastery of St Macarius the Great in Scetis, Nitrian Desert (today – Wādī al-Natrūn) by the monophysite Coptic patriarch Benjamin I (622 or 626-665).\textsuperscript{152}


\textsuperscript{148} Nautin connected the conversion of the temple (which he divided into two phases) to the activity of Narses the cubicularius/ chamberlain at the destruction of the pagan temples in Philae around 535-537 ("Conversion," 3-8), but Grossmann and later Dijkstra question Nautin’s interpretation of archeological evidence and his isolation of two “phases” of conversion; Dijkstra suggests that the dedicatory inscriptions, mentioning bishop Theodore, could have referred to any point during his long tenure in 525-577 ("Religious Encounters," 155-57).

\textsuperscript{149} Nautin, “Conversion,” 12.

\textsuperscript{150} Ibid., 16.

\textsuperscript{151} For further examples, see Peter Grossmann, \textit{Christliche Architektur in Ägypten}, Handbuch der Orientalistik 62 (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 2002), 43-48.

The narrative describing the consecration of the church at the lavra of St Macarius has survived in two major recensions: in the Arabic History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria by Severus ibn al-Mukaffa’ (d. 987), and in the earlier bilingual (Bohairic) Coptic-Arabic account preserved under the Arabic title Book of the Consecration of the temple of Benjamin (كتاب يكريز هيكل بنيامين), first published only in 1975 on the basis of the ms. Abû Maqâr 217, and several other witnesses. Judging from a colophon, the principal manuscript source is dated to 1348 CE, but the internal evidence suggests to the editor of the source that the composition of the original narrative could be traced back to the end of the seventh century, not too long after the events described, but prior to the death of patriarch Agatho (d. 681), to whom the narrative is ascribed.

This account is hagiographic in genre: the visions of angels, St Macarius the Great, and Christ himself constitute the recurring motif in the narrative, thus possibly hinting at the significance of the event in the mind of the author and his audience – nevertheless, the story is set within specific historical circumstances and the writer appears to be quite attentive to liturgical detail. While the year of the event is not given in the text, the time frame for Benjamin’s patriarchate, 622/626- 665 and the mention of the tenure of the Melkite patriarch Cyrus to Alexandria (631- 643) gave Coquin the

---


155 Ibid., 10.

156 Ibid., 46-49.
possibility to fix the time frame of the events described between December 28, 645 or 646 and January 3, 646 or 647.\textsuperscript{157} The position of the feast within liturgical year is quite clear: the text describes that the patriarch was approached by the monks of Scetis with the request to perform the dedication following the celebration of Christ’s Nativity on 28-29 Koiak (= 24-25 December),\textsuperscript{158} and the dedication itself was set on 8 Tobi (= 3 January), with patriarch arriving in a solemn procession to the monastery the day before.\textsuperscript{159} On the morning of January 3, the patriarch commissions one of the presbyters (Agatho, the author of the text), to prepare the liturgical books necessary for “the consecration of the church (ἐνασκελε)”,\textsuperscript{160} thus clearly implying the existence of a fixed, written liturgical text regulating the celebration of the rite in early seventh century Egypt. The “first prayer” recited by the patriarch in the presence of the concelebrating clergy – presumably, the opening prayer of the rite – is accompanied by the first vision of St Macarius present in the church. The preeminence of the ascetical authority over institutionalized hierarchy, represented by the two bishops, is clearly underlined in the interpretation of the vision given by a cherub to Benjamin: Macarius, a monastic saint, is described as “the father of patriarchs and bishops, because he is the Spirit-bearing (τιμίωτοφόρος) father of all the monks of this whole mountain (= monastery).”\textsuperscript{161} The


\textsuperscript{158} Coquin, 88-91.

\textsuperscript{159} Ibid., 105, 109. Aside from Benjamin, the dedication was concelebrated by bishop Basil of Pshate (ibid., 113).

\textsuperscript{160} Ibid., 112-113.

\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., 116-117.
central point of the narrative, however, lies in the description of the rite of dedication of the altar and the church, in the course of which the celebrant experiences the vision of Jesus, the “Anointed One,” anointing the altar of the new church:

1. And, having come into the sanctuary, I said the prayer of the holy myron (𐀩𐀰𐀖ⲉⲭⲏ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲙⲩⲣⲟⲛ ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲃ) and when I took the myron in order to pour it slowly (ⲉⲓⲛⲁⲧⲉⲗⲧⲉⲗ) upon the holy altar (ⲡⲓⲑⲩⲥⲓⲁⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲃ), I heard the voice saying: “Be attentive, O bishop!” 2. As I turned slowly toward the table, I saw the hand of the Saviour anointing the altar, while I was seized by great fear and trembling, in a manner that I said to myself with the patriarch Jacob (Gen 28:17): “Behold, this place is terrible, this is nothing but the house of God and this is the gate of heaven, the place of the rest of the Exalted One.”

3. Then, as we [i.e. the concelebrating clergy] were looking at him, we saw him [i.e. the bishop] all enflamed, his face glistening with light and none of us could dare to say him a word, but we were in a usual state (κατάστασις).

4. He spoke and said: “This is the tabernacle (촎ⲧⲗⲣⲓⲛ) of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit,” and he went around [H the sanctuary three times164], saying three Alleluia’s and adding a verse, saying: “How lovely are your dwelling-places, Lord God of powers, my King and my God, my soul desires and faints to enter into your courts (ⲉⲛⲉⲕⲁⲩⲗⲏⲟⲩ), your sanctuaries, Lord God of powers, my King and my God, unto ages of ages” (Ps 83:1-3).

5. And when he consecrated the tabernacle (ⲧⲁⲣⲓⲛⲓⲛ ⲛⲃⲃⲓⲛⲏ) he went out toward the people [A and consecrated the pillars165] and the walls. Again he returned and sat down in the tabernacle/sanctuary. 6. He spoke to us and said: “I was taken today into paradise of the Lord Sabaoth and I heard the ineffable voice which did not come up to the heart of men, according to the word of wise Paul (1 Cor 2:9). Believe me, brothers, I saw the glory of Christ today filling the tabernacle (ⲧⲁⲣⲓⲛⲓⲛ ⲛⲃⲃⲓⲛⲏ) and I saw with my sinful

---

162 Lit. “to drip, let drop” (Crum, CD 411).

163 Coquin’s preferred reading is “mais nous <n’>étions <pas> dans un état-normal,” supposing that the negation has disappeared in the transmission of the text (Livre de la Consécration, 133 and 133 n. 48). I do not think the context of the story necessitates such a correction: the inability of the patriarch’s retinue to converse with him (waiting for him to speak first) may stem from that they are in “un état-normal” while clearly he is not, being transformed by the vision and thus made capable to speak ‘prophetically’ (cf. Isa 6:6-8).

164 H in Coquin’s edition refers to the first redaction of History of the Patriarchs, ed. Seybold; Coquin interprets this remark as referring to a triple perambulation of the sanctuary (Livre de la Consécration, 61), but it would seem likely that the word referred to the triple chant of Alleluia (as in Bohairic version) that accompanied the procession inside the altar area. See further discussion on the problems with this translation later.

165 A in the 1975 edition refers to the Arabic rendition of the text based on collated mss. Coptic Museum Lit. 12, Abû Maqâr ﯶ18, and Abû Maqâr ﯶ17 (Coquin, 70-71).
eyes the invisible arm and the exalted hand of our Saviour Jesus Christ anointing the table (этомук) of the holy place. … Indeed, it is the throne of God the Father almighty and of his only-begotten Son and of the holy Spirit who is above this place. … 7. Stand up now, my sons, let us perform the holy liturgy (ἡπεβεβιὸν εὐσύχα), let us give communion to our fathers and let us glorify the exalted God.”

The rite of dedication as it appears in this remarkable account contains several pieces of important evidence for the evolution of church dedication rites in the East Mediterranean, but also presents a few details in need of contextual interpretation. The consecration rite in this text, certainly, does not preserve a complete text of the ritual, as later euchologia would, but nevertheless, the shape and structural components of the ceremony can be discerned. The rite begins at dawn with the opening prayer of the patriarch, followed by his entrance into the sanctuary. The rite begins inside the sanctuary, and continues as follows:

- prayer of the “holy myron” (1),
- pouring of the myron upon the altar (1),
- formula of consecration: “This is the tabernacle…”,
- circumambulation of the altar with Alleluia and Ps 83 (4),
- procession around the nave with the anointing of the columns (5),
- patriarch’s return to the sanctuary and ‘rest’ (6),
- celebration of the eucharist (7).

Even though the presence of the patron saint of the church and of the entire monastery complex, Macarius the Great, is emphasized in this narrative, the dedication of this church does not mention the deposition of relics, leading us to presume that the rite known to Benjamin and Agatho did not involve the placement of relics at all, but rather that its main focus was the anointing of the altar, sanctuary, and the temple with the

---

166 ms. Abū Maqâr ٢١٧, f. 23r- 27v; Coquin, 131-141. I generally follow Coquin’s French translation, adding also numbers for the convenience of citation.

167 Coquin, 60-61.

168 Also, cf. Coquin, 138-139.
myron. The use of the oil of anointing for the sanctification of the building evokes numerous scriptural allusions, e.g. the consecration of the Mosaic tabernacle with “oil” in Exodus 40. This connection is visible in the consistent use of the term ἵκων (= σκυνή) for the sanctuary of the church, particularly when the consecrated sanctuary is proclaimed to be the indwelling of the Trinity (4). Most directly, the anointing of the altar with oil parallels the scriptural anointing of the stone with oil by patriarch Jacob in Gen 28:18-22. The writer demonstrates an understanding of this typology by indicating that the myron was ‘let drop’ i.e. poured (τατα/τετελε) upon the altar table, in imitation of the actions of Jacob in Gen 28:18. The author further underlines the typology by putting the words of Jacob in Gen 28:17 (“how awesome is this place” etc.) into the mouth of the story’s protagonist, patriarch Benjamin (2).

The function and content of the prayer preceding the effusion of myron upon the table (ὣρεγκη ἑνὶ χιρων ἐοὺα) is not easy to interpret. René Coquin inclines to understand the prayer as the prayer of “blessing”/consecration of the chrism before using this blessed substance to sanctify the altar and the church itself, a prayer that – to Coquin’s understanding – has disappeared from the rite by the fourteenth century, when the extant manuscript sources for the ritual can be dated.169 Can this contention be sustained? There is no corroborating evidence from either Egyptian or other Oriental traditions that would establish that the myron/oil for the consecration of an altar is not the same substance as used in the course of the initiation rites, but is blessed anew each time the altar dedication has to be celebrated. Most of the later Eastern Christian traditions,

---

169 “Vraisemblablement, le patriarche bénit ici le myron, rite qui n’existe plus au XIVᵉ siècle au cours de la consécration des églises…” (Coquin, Livre de la Consécration, 131 n. 46).
with the notable exception of the Church of the East, do not consecrate the oil/\textit{myron} in the course of the dedication rite, but use the same substance which is used for post-baptismal anointing, often consecrated in a special rite, which existence for Syria was already attested by Dionysius. The existence of a separate rite for the blessing of \textit{myron} would obviate the need for consecrating the oil in the course of the dedication rite. While we do not possess a seventh-century Egyptian witness for the existence of this rite of chrism, later literary and liturgical testimony for the rite should not be discarded. Furthermore, as we have seen in the case of Jerusalem rite, and will see further with respect to West Syriac rites, the outpouring of the chrism upon the altar was customarily preceded by a prayer, petitioning for the descent of the Spirit upon the altar, not upon the oil. The designation in the narrative of Agatho of the prayer in the beginning of the rite as the “prayer of the holy \textit{myron}” may be an indication that this prayer immediately preceded the effusion of the \textit{myron}, visualizing the coming of the Spirit upon the altar.

\begin{thebibliography}{10}

\bibitem{170} The rite of church dedication in use by the Church of the East includes the consecration of the oil for the anointing of the altar; see François Yakan, “La consécration de l’huile pour la sanctification de l’autel,” in Constantin Andronikof, Achille Triacca, Alessandro Pistoia, \textit{Les Bénédictions et les sacramentaux dans la liturgie, Conférences Saint-Serge, Semaine d’études liturgiques 34, June 23-26, 1987}, BELS 44 (Rome: CLV-Edizioni Liturgiche, 1988), 309-323; and Toma, \textit{Mystery of the Church}, 68-69 (the English translation of a relevant prayer of the rite).

\bibitem{171} \textit{Ecclesiastical Hierarchy}, ch. 4.
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In contrast to the Armenian, Georgian/Jerusalem, and Byzantine rites for the consecration of an altar which we reviewed before in this study, the rite of dedication in Agatho’s narrative does not mention the chanting of psalmody prior to the anointing of the altar by the bishop: the latter performs the first pouring of myron (seemingly) at once upon his entrance into the altar. However, the chant of Alleluia with intercalating verse (λέξις) of Ps 83:1-3 appears in this text immediately following the anointing of the altar and the vision which patriarch experiences. The Coptic text describes the bishop to “go around it (ⲛⲁϥⲱϯ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ) – the altar or the sanctuary – saying the Alleluia with the psalmic verse, presumably accompanying procession with anointings.173 Coquin interprets this movement as the “consécration du sanctuaire,” presuming that the patriarch moves around the sanctuary/altar area: however, the Coptic text does not specify what exactly the bishop “goes around,” while the corresponding section of the Arabic History of the Patriarchs uses the term haykal (بالھيكل, ودار بالھيكل), which, being related to Syriac حیكل may designate the sanctuary of a Christian church. However, the version of the story in the History of the Patriarchs features the use of this term in the clear sense of “altar table”175 – hence, bishop’s circumambulatory movement in the sanctuary may pertain to nothing else but the same anointing of the altar, which began with the outpouring of the oil upon the table and continued with the anointing of the structure with oil from all sides. The use of Alleluia + Ps 83 at the consecration in Scetis finds correspondence in the Coptic rite for the dedication of the altar and the church in a

173 Coquin, 132.

174 ‘palace, temple’ (Payne-Smith, Lexicon, 1003-1004).

175 Cf. the description in H of the anointing of the altar (لاقطر علي الهيكل المقدس) which Coquin translates “pour (le) verser-goutte-à-goutte sur l’autel saint” (ibid., 131) – here H unambiguously uses haykal to designate the altar table.
Coptic-Arabic manuscript dated to 1307 CE and presented to the bishop of Salisbury by the Coptic patriarch Kyrillos V in 1898.\(^{176}\) We will closely examine the structure and content of the rite of dedication in this manuscript in the following section of this chapter – but for now it is necessary to note the formulae which accompany the anointing of the altar with chrism in this rite. In this fourteenth-century witness, the bishop “pours [the chrism] upon the table three times in the form of the cross, saying every time ‘Alleluia’,”\(^{177}\) “seals” the table with three signs of the cross, pronounces the formula, and thereafter he anoints the whole table with his hand, saying the Alleluia and these verses (\(\lambda \varepsilon \xi \varepsilon \zeta\)) of the psalm, the clergy responding to him “Alleluia.”

The psalmic verses used during this anointing are Ps 83:1-3 (1), Ps 83:3-4, 6-8, 10 (2), and Ps 83:4 + Ps 25:6-8 (3), followed by a doxology, and intercalated with the chanting of Alleluia.\(^{178}\) Thus, if the witness of the later liturgical source can be taken into consideration, it appears that also in the 7th century the triple chanting of Alleluia with Ps 83 may have accompanied the bishop’s anointing of the altar table, not of the sanctuary walls. It should be remembered that Ps 83 has been used in the context of the consecration of the altar by anointing by the churches of both Armenian, Georgian, and Byzantine tradition, either preceding the anointing (Byzantine), accompanying the procession and installation of the altar (Armenian) or chanted during the procession with a portable altar around the main altar of the church (Georgian). The presence of a


\(^{177}\) Horner, I.20-21.

\(^{178}\) Ibid., I.21; also ms. *Borg. copt 1* (1474 CE), f. 357v-360r (descr. in Arnoldus van Lantschoot, *Codices Coptici Vaticani, Barberiniani, Borgiani Rossiani* 2.1: *Codices Barberiniani orientales 2 et 17, Borgiani coptici 1-108* [Vatican: Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1947], 17).
common scriptural text among several local traditions may speak of possible cross-pollination between the dedication rites of these traditions, with the source of influence originating in Syro-Palestinian or Jerusalem usage.

While we have established that Alleluia + Ps 83 have probably been chanted while the altar was being anointed, no chant is mentioned alongside the initial effusion of oil upon the altar, following the prayer “of the holy myron.” One of possible explanation for such omission would be that at this point the narrator was preoccupied with relating the central episode to the story: the patriarch’s vision of the “hand of the Saviour” anointing the altar. In the context of the religious and political situation in Egypt soon after the Arab invasion, the vision in the narrative may have served several purposes: it emphasized bishop’s privilege as the only proper celebrant for the dedication of a church, and – by revealing Christ as the “true” minister of the liturgical rite – it affirmed the unchanging christological and ecclesial reality underlying the construction and inauguration of this new temple.\(^{179}\) The epiphany leading to the patriarch’s ecstatic and transformation at the vision has also a clear theological message expressed in Benjamin’s proclamation of the consecrated altar and sanctuary as the “the σκηνή” of the Trinity, the “place of rest for the Exalted One,” i.e. the reconstituted earthly temple, an earthly projection of a heavenly model, the place of divine indwelling.

Further down in the narrative, the text offers what can be interpreted as a counterpoint to the first vision, which was firmly rooted in the perception of a liturgical

\(^{179}\) Another local example of an attempt in Late Antique Egypt to bolster the authority of a place by tracing its origins to Jesus of Nazareth can be found in the hagiographic traditions regarding the “mountain of Qosqam” or later the monastery Deir el-Muharraq: the tradition attributes the consecration of the first church on the site to none other than Christ himself; see Leslie MacCoull, “Holy Family Pilgrimage in Late Antique Egypt: the Case of Qosqam,” in *Akten des XII. internationalen Kongressen für christliche Archäologie* (Bonn, 22.-28. September 1991), Studi di antichità cristiana 52 [= JAC Ergänzungsband 20.2] (Münster: Aschendorff, 1995), 2.987-992.
space as the locus of divine presence. This “counterpoint” has also been presented by means of the (same) patriarch’s vision: during the celebration of the liturgy, the bishop observes that when he went to give communion to monks of Scetis, he saw that the whole file (στοίχος) of elders raising such smoke of incense, so that it attained the height of the basilica, and then the roof of the church opened for the smoke, and the incense reached the heavens. And I thought, saying to myself: “Each of our fathers offers incense in that he receives the holy mysteries of the Son of God the Most High with thanksgiving.” And as I was observing the elders in prayer, I perceived the truth: they were saying the prayers and supplications when they were receiving the holy mysteries, the body and the venerable blood of Christ. [Thus] I saw the prayers of the saints that the angels were taking and bringing before the throne of God.\(^{180}\)

The image of an incense ascending heavenwards as a sign of pure sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins has firm biblical roots (Ps 140:2), and due to this connection has found specific ritual expression in the churches of West Syriac tradition.\(^{181}\) At the same time, the metaphor of incense as pure sacrifice has been connected to the ascetic labours and, specifically, to prayer and contemplation, in the works of Evagrius – those of paramount importance for ascetic theology in the East Mediterranean, especially in the sixth century. Evagrius identifies the “spiritual sacrifice” with “pure conscience which puts [itself] upon the state of the nous as on an altar,”\(^{182}\) and uses the image of incense as an offering of prayer upon the altar of the mind,\(^{183}\) specifically linking the “bowls of incense,” identified as the “prayers of the saints” in Rev. 5:8, with “friendship with God

---

\(^{180}\) Coquin, *Livre de la Consécration*, 140-145.

\(^{181}\) See on this, Joseph P. Amar, “Patterns of Prayer: The Ḥûssôyô Incense Rite of Forgiveness,” *OCP* 73 (2007): 379-416, see ibid., 381 n. 8 for an up-to-date bibliography on the rite of forgiveness connected with the burning of incense.


or the perfect and spiritual love.” The monks’ visible (certainly, only to patriarch’s eyes) expulsion of incense fumes can be taken as a metaphor for the achievement of their ascetic labour – interiorization of the temple/divine abode within their own bodies through prayer. It is notable, though, that such effect, in the case of monastic elders in Scetis, is not divorced from the sacramental life of institutional church, as their epiphany as “temples” becomes manifest only upon their reception of the eucharist, thus interiorizing divine presence both spiritually and corporally, through eucharistic communion.

Such possible allusions to the motif of ‘interiorization of the temple’ may place the narrative of the consecration of the church of St Macarius in Scetis by patriarch Benjamin into the sixth century Syro-Palestinian literary context, imbued with the literary influence of the Evagrian tradition. Aside from this literary/theological connection, liturgical realities reflected in this account connect well with the evidence pertaining to the consecration of churches in Jerusalem, preserved in the Armenian and Georgian sources: the pouring of the oil of myron upon the altar, the use of Alleluia and of Ps 83 suggest a possible common tradition-motif linking Egyptian and Palestinian usages. Our study of the later Coptic and West Syriac rites for the dedication of altars may further support our hypothesis regarding such a connection.

---

184 On Prayer 77 (ibid., 201).

185 Cf. Evagrius, Reflections 34: “The mind is the temple of the Holy Trinity” (ibid., 214); “a person not open to blame is a temple of God” (Maxims 2.9; ibid., 230); “soul without anger becomes a temple of the Holy Spirit… an intellect at peace becomes a shelter for the Holy Trinity” (On the Eight Thoughts 4.11-12; ibid., 80). I am grateful to Robin Darling Young to pointing me to these and other similar passages in Evagrius’ oeuvre.
6.4 The Consecration of an Altar in the Coptic Liturgical Tradition.

In order to sketch out further development of the rite of church consecration in the Coptic tradition, for the purpose of further comparison with West Syriac and Byzantine rites, I will utilize the sources which have been made available through scholarly work in publication and edition of medieval Coptic liturgical manuscripts. Primarily I rely upon George Horner’s edition (and translation) of the 1307 Coptic-Arabic ms. containing the entire rite for the consecration of the church, altar, and baptistery, to which I already referred above. I will also refer for variants to two eighteenth-century manuscripts, which detailed description is found in the catalogue of Coptic mss. of the Vatican Apostolic Library: *Vatican copt. 46* (1719 CE), containing the description of the service used in 1411 CE at the consecration of the church of St Mercurius by the Coptic patriarch Gabriel V (1408–27), and *Borg. copt. 1* dated to 1758 CE, but reflecting an original dating to 1344 CE. A marked distinction between these very late sources and the ceremony discussed above, dated to 646-47, is found in the reversal of the actions accompanying the consecration of the altar and of the nave of the church: while the consecration rite used by patriarch Benjamin involved the anointing of the altar itself,

186 Horner, *Service for the Consecration*; the rite has also been published in the Coptic euchologion by Raphael Tuki, *Pijóm eferapantokin ejennieučé ethouah, pimeros nhouit* (Rome, 1761). As René Coquin notes, the ms. published by Horner and preserved in the library of the Selly Oak College is the second oldest known ms. containing the Coptic rite for the dedication of the church: the oldest, unpublished manuscript has been preserved in the library of Deir as-Suryan in Wādī al-Natrūn, and dated to 1180/1181 CE (“La consécration des églises dans le rite copte: ses relations avec les rites syrien et byzantin,” *L’Orient Syrien* 9 [1964]: 150).


188 See the Arabic colophon (with Latin trans.), ibid., 281.

189 van Latschoot, *Codices Coptici Vaticani*... 2.1, 11-19.
followed by the anointing of the nave, the later Coptic rites are marked by a centrifugal
movement – the sanctuary and nave are washed and anointed first, and then the altars.

Aside from the actual liturgical manuscripts, such sequence can be noted in an
important mid-fourteenth-century witness to the Coptic rite for the consecration of a
church, contained in the treatise on ecclesiastic institutions, written in Arabic under the
title *The Precious Pearl* (الجوهرة النفيسة).\(^{190}\) This work, authored by an Egyptian
Monophysite writer Youḥannâ, son of Abu-Zakariyâ (known as Ibn Sabbâ), represents a
theological compendium dealing with the issues of dogmatic theology, ethics, liturgical
and ecclesiastical discipline of the Coptic Church.\(^{191}\) The treatise has proved to be similar
in many ways on an earlier work *Tartîb al-kahanut*, and was probably dependent on the
latter.\(^{192}\) Among the issues pertaining to liturgical discipline, the treatise includes a
chapter on the construction of a church,\(^ {193}\) as well as a relatively detailed exposition of
the service of the consecration of a newly built church and altar, the excerpts from which
I cite below.\(^ {194}\)

The account pertaining to the consecration of the church describes the liturgical
actions that take place, as well as provides a symbolic exegesis of some points of the

\(^{190}\) It was first published in Cairo in 1901, and later in a critical ed. by Jean Pérèr, *La perle précieuse, traitant des sciences ecclésiastiques (chapitres I-LVI)*, PO 16.4 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1922). The publication is made on the basis of three mss.: *Paris B.N. copt. 207* (end of 14th cent.), *Paris B.N. copt. 208* (1638 CE), and *Vatican copt. 130* (1697 CE) (Pérèr, “Avant-propos,” 595). *Precious Pearl* had also some
influence on the later Coptic ecclesiastical tradition: a 19th century Coptic theologian Filuthawus Ibrahim (1837-1904) used *Precious Pearl* as a basis for his *Cathecism of the Coptic Church* (Otto F.A. Meinardus, *Two Thousand Years of Coptic Christianity* [Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 1999], 62).


\(^{193}\) § 27; Pérèr, 658-660.

\(^{194}\) § 54; Pérèr, 749-753. I rely on Pérèr’s French translation of the Arabic text.
ritual. The exposition begins with the establishing the scriptural authority behind the entire consecration rite, precisely the dedication of the first tabernacle by Moses (Ex 30:25-26, 40:9), together with affirming the privilege of a bishop to be an ordinary celebrant of the liturgy of dedication:

They do not celebrate the holy offering in the church before it is consecrated by the patriarch or by a bishop. Since the first tabernacle in which Aaron, the high priest, offered sacrifices for the sins of the people was anointed, in accordance with the word of God, with the oil of the horn of anointing, just as the prophets were anointed. Therefore, it befits for the church to be anointed with the holy chrism, just as the tabernacle of the ancient law was anointed.\footnote{Ibid., 749-750.}

The author further describes the placing of “seven new lampstands bearing seven new lamps, kindled with the oil of Palestine (i.e. olive oil)” before the sanctuary, for which he finds a scriptural warrant in Rev 1:12, 4:5.\footnote{Ibid., 750.} Likewise, before the beginning of the ceremony, seven vessels of water are placed on tripods before the sanctuary and upon each of these – a “packet of green plant/leaves (السلق الأخضر),” to be used for sprinkling water upon the walls. The use of this plant leaves\footnote{R.W. Lane’s \textit{Arabic-English Lexicon} (London: Williams and Norgate, 1863) defines سلق as ‘bete, and particularly red garden-bete.. a plant having long leaves’ (p. 1410).} is interpreted through connection with the burial of Christ in the garden tomb –

But since the altar is the image of the tomb that contained the living body, it was necessary to select chards for the consecration of churches, in order to mark the walls with the sign of the cross by the bishops’ hands.\footnote{Périer, 751.}

Further, the ceremony of the consecration is described, which as it seems, consists of three circumambulations within the nave and sanctuary, with subsequent consecration of the altar:

\footnote{195 Ibid., 749-750.}

\footnote{196 Ibid., 750.}

\footnote{197 R.W. Lane’s \textit{Arabic-English Lexicon} (London: Williams and Norgate, 1863) defines سلق as ‘bete, and particularly red garden-bete.. a plant having long leaves’ (p. 1410).}

\footnote{198 Périer, 751.}
1. Then the patriarch anoints with the holy chrism the walls of the said church, by his own hand, without the help of the bishops. He comes to the altars with the vessels filled with water, sanctifies them and consecrates them at a marked boundary, before which the sacrifice (eucharist) is offered there. If there are then upon the altar some tablets which make them similar to altars portable in every place, he consecrates them, sprinkles them with water and anoints them. 2. This anointing of the church with the holy chrism is made during the third circle of procession, for during the first (circle), all the bishops carry the vessels for the patriarch and, if there are no other bishops, the priests (do this). The patriarch takes the water from the vessels with the cup made with marrow and sprinkles the walls of the church from the roof until the foundations.

3. For the second circle [around the church], the anointing of the walls is made, especially with the help of the leaves of chard, with a sign of a cross. 4. On the third circle, the holy chrism is poured first upon the altars, then the forearm of the archpriest applies unction to the altar table, then, always on the third circle, they mark with the holy chrism in the form of a cross, the walls, corners, and pillars.

5. When this is accomplished, the gifts are brought upon all the consecrated altars and the liturgy is celebrated at once. People communicate according to custom, and he [the bishop] divides the marrow and the shards of the vessels, to each a part. 6. The lamps must not cease to be lit day and night in the church, so that there would not ever be any alien fire. The vessels of the altar, made of gold or silver, crystal, or other material, must be guarded, as it is fitting, with the greatest care. One must not bring into the sanctuary neither milk nor honey. One must not conduct in churches neither banquets, nor symposia. 7. It will be known that the earthly church is the image of the heavenly Jerusalem and that its priests are earthly angels and celestial men.199

The ritual of dedication of a church, as laid out in this treatise, does not contain any hint to the text of the prayers, scriptural readings, hymns, or psalms that were used – Ibn Sabbâ limits himself to the description of external ceremony. From the description, one can see that the rite for the consecration of a church consists of three successive processions of the bishop and clergy around the nave of the church. Every ‘circle’ of the procession is accompanied by a certain ritual action:

1) aspersion of the walls with water (2);

2) anointing of the walls (3); and

3) chrismation of the altar, altar tablets, and the walls and pillars (4, 1, 2).

199 Périer, 751-753.
It appears somewhat inconsequential that the rite mentions anointing of the walls of the nave twice, before and after the chrismation of the altar – the solution which can be offered here may lie in the supposition, which we shall further in what follows, that the Coptic rite of dedication represents a combination of two, originally separate rites: the rite for the consecration of the altar, and the rite for the dedication of a church. Such conjunction of two (and more) rites becomes a common feature of church dedication rituals across the Eastern liturgical tradition, but it is in the Coptic (and, to a degree, in the West Syriac) tradition that the composite nature of the service of dedication seems clearly visible.

At the consecration of the church in Scetis around 645-47 CE, which we reviewed above, the focus of the entire rite was upon the consecration of the altar: it is during the chrismation of the altar that the patriarch’s epiphany takes place. The notes on the manner in which the consecration of the church should be conducted, published and translated by Horner from much later manuscripts, ms. *Berlin Dq. 111* (14th cent.)200 and ms. *BM Or. 1331* (1355 CE),201 also are preoccupied with the consecration of the altar table (or multiple altars) only:

> From the holy canons: let the bishop sanctify the *haikal’s* and let there be with him seven presbyters, and he shall sign them (یرشمھا) with the myron which is the oil of gladness, even the seal of the Lord.202

---

200 For the description of this manuscript, see W. Ahlwardt, *Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, vol. 21: *Verzeichniss der arabischen Handschriften* (Berlin: Asher, 1897), 9.547-552 (No. 10184).

201 For the description of this manuscript, see Charles Rieu, *Supplement to the Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London, 1894), 18 (No. 23).

202 *Berlin Dq. 111*, f. 247; not having had access to the original Arabic mss., I am relying on Horner’s ET in *Service for the Consecration of a Church*, vii.
Let the bishop consecrate the haikal’s and let there be with him at the time of the consecration seven presbyters, and let him sign with the myron, which is the oil of gladness. Since it is the seal of the Lord, let it be worthy that he should celebrate at it [i.e. the altar], and let him read over the altar the gospel of John the Theologian, and let him not celebrate at it the first time unless with the assembly of presbyters and their chief, and all the deacons.203

Similarly to the description in “Precious Pearl,” the preparation for the consecration of the church in the Coptic-Arabic pontifical of 1307 CE, edited by Horner, also features the furnishing of elements united by the symbolic number “seven”: “seven new pitchers are filled with water, and seven kinds of fragrant herbs are put into each; seven lamps are lit on seven stands and also candles.”204 The main structural elements of the double service of the consecration of church and altar are as follows:

I. Consecration of the church
1. The clergy assembles in the middle of the church and the bishop sits on his throne.
2. Prayer for the new foundation: “O Master, Lord God the almighty, the King, the holy Saviour, Framer and Creator of all things:”205
3. Liturgy of the Word:
   a. Psalmody: Pss 121- 150.
   c. Ps 121
   d. Antiphon with the verses of Pss 92:5, 95:10
   e. Epistle readings: (1) Heb 7:26- 9:1; (2) James 2:14-23; (3) Acts 7:44- 55
   f. Antiphon with the verses of Pss 68:26, 68:11-12

203 BM Or. 1331, f. 36v-37r; cited after Horner, vii.

204 Horner, Service for the Consecration, 1. Henceforth I will follow Horner’s translation, referring to the Coptic original only when it is needed for the complete understanding of the text.

205 Ibid., 1-2.
g. Gospel readings: (1) Matthew 17:1-5; (2) Mark 9:2-7; (3) Luke 9:28-36; (4) John 10:22-42
h. Litany and the Creed

4. Rite of consecration:
   a. Prayer and offering of incense
   b. Prayer pro seipso: “Lord God of hosts who brought us into the lot of this ministry:”
   c. Prayer II: “Master, Almighty, and Lord of the universe:”
   d. Litany of seven petitions, ending with “Lord have mercy” (x100)
   e. Bishop – prayer “O consubstantial and coeternal, equally without beginning with God the Father, God the Word:”
   f. Litany “Save your people, bless your inheritance” etc., of four petitions
   g. Bishop – prayer “O Master, Lord God the Almighty, who art in heaven, God of all natures visible… deign now to overshadow this place…” twice interrupted by the deacon’s exclamation προσεύξασθε;
   h. Deacon’s call and Peace (in Greek); bishop’s prayer “Master, Lord God almighty, King, Saviour, Framer, the Creator of all things…”
   i. Bishop kneels and, after multiple Kyrie eleison, rises and proclaims: “The holy grace of God which heals the infirmity and fills up deficiences… have also now chosen and prepared for us this place for a holy church of God most high…”
   j. after multiple Kyrie eleison, the bishop prays pro seipso “Give us also, our Master, grace for this ministry…”
   k. Deacon’s call (in Greek): “Let us stand well…”; the bishop calls and the people respond “Have mercy on us, O God the Father, the almighty” (in Greek);
   l. Bishop reads the epiclesis, and at every “Amen” signs with his thumb: “Have mercy upon us, O Lord, and have mercy upon us… send from your own height… the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit…” etc.
   m. “Our Father” with embolism by the bishop; prayer of inclination

---

206 As noted by Horner (ibid., 4), the prayer is derived from Ps.-Clementine Homilies (Hom. Clem. 3.72; ed. J. Irmscher, F. Paschke, B. Rehm, Die Pseudoklementinen I. Homilien, GCS 42 [Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1969]); see also Heinzgerd Brakmann, “Pseudo-Clemens Romanus, homilia 3,72 als petrinisches Konsektationsgebet der Koputen und der egyptischen Melchiten,” Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum 10 (2007): 233-251. Coquin notes that this and preceding prayer pro seipso have been effectively adapted from the ordination rites (“La consécration des églises dans le rite copte,” 154).

207 ET Horner, 6.

208 The formula likewise have been adapted from the rites of holy orders; see Bernard Botte, “La formule d’ordination ‘La grace divine’ dans les rites orientaux,” L’Orient Syrien 2 (1957): 285-296.
n. Bishop consecrates the waters, saying Εἰς πατὴρ ἅγιος, ἐις υἱὸς ἅγιος, πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἀμὴν. Ps 150 is said.

o. The procession of the clergy with crosses, candles, incense and Gospel book, while the bishop sprinkles the walls of the church, beginning with the wall behind the altar table, etc.

p. After the blessing with waters, the bishop consecrates the walls of the church by anointing these with chrism, using his thumb, with the formula: “We consecrate this place (ⲉⲛⲣⲁⲅⲓⲁⲛ ⲙ̅ⲡⲁⲧⲟⲩⲱⲧⲫⲁⲓ) as [name of the church patron] in the name of the Father,” etc. and at every anointing.209

II. Consecration of the altar210

1. Psalmody, petitions, and prayers:
   a. Bishop stands before the altar table, surrounded by the clergy.
   b. offering of incense, prayer of incense
   c. Ps 22 + 23
   d. archdeacon recites litany of four petitions
   e. bishop offers incense, and signs the altar with his thumb, crosswise, without chrism
   f. Ps 25 + 26 + 92
   g. archdeacon: Στῶμεν καλῶς, etc., followed by the litany of 18 petitions
   h. bishop offers incense, signs the altar cross-wise without chrism, and says the prayer: “Master Lord God almighty, the true God and Framer of all created things...”; after the deacon interrupts with Προσεύξασθε, the epiclesis of the prayer is said: “at this time, send upon us the grace of your holy Spirit, upon this table set before your holy glory, and let it become a spiritual altar...”
   i. the manuscript includes an additional litany of four petitions, and an additional prayer “O our Master, Lord Jesus Christ, who sent from on high your Spirit, the Paraclete from the Father...” with a different prayer for the consecration of an oratory.
   j. prayer: “Lord God receive this fervent supplication” (= Byz.BAS/CHR Κύριε... τὴν ἐκτενὴν ταύτην ἱκεσίαν...211);
   k. “And the bishop [reads] the prayer [C1] (κε εὐχὴ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος)”212: “Lord God of our salvation,” and, after the deacon’s Προσεύξασθε,

209 Horner, 12/390. The manuscript includes a hymn ( hãng) of the Virgin Mary (ibid., 12-13/391-396), but it is not clear whether this hymn is designed to accompany the procession.

210 Horner, 13-25/397-500.

211 See the euchologion Barberini gr. 336, f. 5r-v (Parenti-Velkovska, 60).

212 Horner 19-20/440-448; the editor of the ms. reads the rubric as “another prayer,” interpreting κε as meaning “other, different” (Crum, CD 90-91), but there is a possibility that the rubric simply reads, as corrupted Greek, καὶ εὐχὴ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος = καὶ [τὴν] εὐχὴν [λέγει] ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, signifying that the prayer in question is not an additional prayer, but in fact the central prayer of the rite.
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the epiclesis: “We beseech and pray to you, Lover of mankind, complete the consecration of this altar by the oil of the grace (ϧⲧⲉⲛ ⲡⲓⲛⲉϩ ⲛ̅ⲧⲉ ⲡⲓϩⲙⲟⲧ)…” and “send down on us the grace of your holy Spirit to complete this liturgy and this table…” with multiple Amen’s by the people, as the bishop signs the altar with the sign of the cross.

1. After the deacon’s, another prayer [C2] by the bishop: “Lord of every nature and Framer of all your creation (ⲧⲛⲏⲃ ⲙ̅ⲫⲩⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲓⲃⲉⲛ)” with the petition to “send the Holy Spirit and complete this mystery.”213

2. Anointing of the altar
   a. “The bishop takes the pot of chrism and pours upon the table three times in the form of the cross, saying every time ‘Alleluia,’ and he makes with his thumb three crosses on it with chrism, sealing.”214
   b. formula: “We consecrate this altar which has been already placed… with this holy chrism, in the name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit.”215
   c. Anointing of the whole table by the bishop (“with his hand”) with ‘Alleluia’ and verses of Pss 83:1-3, 3-4, 6-8, 10 + Ps 44:4, 26:6-8; interspersed with Alleluia and Gloria Patri.
   d. Peace + thanksgiving prayer [C3] “We thank you in all things, Lord God of powers…”.
   e. Bishop and clergy venerate the altar while the deacon pronounces the petition (φωνή).
   f. Vesting of the altar and deposition of the Gospel and the cross, followed by the prayer “We thank you, good Master, and praise your holy name which is above every exalted name…”.
   g. Petition by the deacon for the builders and sponsors + prayer by the bishop “Remember, Lord God, all who laboured…”.
   h. Prayer of inclination: “Master, King the almighty, you of the great throne…”.

3. Final rites and the eucharist.
   a. Incense, prayer of incense, “[bishop] places the eucharistia upon the altar,” and begins the canon of psalmody, doxology and the Gospel of the morning:
      1. Ps. 25:8, verse Ps. 25:7 + Ps 83:3-4; Luke 19:1-10.
   c. Consecration of the baptismal font with chrism, followed by the psalm 25 and the same gospel reading.216

---

213 Horner 20/448-450.
214 Ibid., 20-21.
215 Ibid., 21.
216 Ibid., 24-25.

The rite for the consecration of a new church in the Coptic tradition attested at the beginning of the fourteenth century represents an extraordinarily complex ceremony where, however, two major structural units are discernible: the consecration of the church building, and the consecration of the altar table. While the first rite, pertaining to the building, includes a lengthy list of scriptural readings (twenty-eight total, including three epistle and four gospel passages), and culminates in the rite of aspersion of the church walls with the consecrated water, followed by chrismation. The chief characteristic trait of this rite lies in its evident similarity of the order of eucharistic liturgy, beginning with the liturgy of the Word (I.3.a-h). The similarity appears to be even more striking in the epiclesis of the prayer for the new building, which the Spirit is called to transform into the place of divine indwelling (I.4.k). Following the archdeacon’s invocation for the people to “stand well,” the bishop proceeds to pray:

Yea we beseech you, Lord God, look upon us your unworthy servants beseeching you, hear us and have mercy on us. (People: Have mercy upon us, God the Father almighty.218) Have mercy on us, Lord, and have mercy on us, and let your tender mercies come speedily before us. Send from your holy height, from your heaven, your dwelling-place, from your ineffable bosom, the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit. He who is hypostatic, the mighty Giver of life, who spoke in the Law and the Prophets, who is everywhere and fills all places, who works of his own authority… [Send him] upon us also your servants, and upon this place which has been built for you to the glory and honor of your holy name, that he may purify it and consecrate it. Amen. And transform it into a holy temple. Amen. A pure church. Amen. A house of salvation. Amen. A house of pardon of sin. Amen. A propitiatory of the faithful. Amen. An altar of heavenly things. Amen. An assembling place of the angels. Amen. A harbor of safety. Amen. A tabernacle

---

217 Στῶμεν καλῶς, στῶμεν εὐλαβῶς, στῶμεν μετὰ φόβου, θεοῦ τρόμου, ἱσυχία[ν] πάντες ἐξόμεθα, εἶπομεν πάντες Κύριε ἔλεησον (Horner, 377). I have transliterated the acclamation from the Coptic uncial alphabet, correcting the misspellings (e.g. itacisms).

218 Also cited in Greek in the text of the rite: ἔλεησον ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ὁ πατήρ ὁ παντοκράτωρ (ibid., 378).

This, epicletic section of the prayer is comparable with the corresponding prayer in the rite for the consecration of the altar that follows the consecration of the church. Here, in the 1307 CE Selly Oak manuscript, following the deacon’s call to prayer, the celebrant pronounces the invocation, drawing the sign of the cross upon the altar, with people likewise responding with repeated “Amen’s”:


The latter epiclesis is significantly shorter than the one used for the consecration of the church, but, aside from the principle of lectio brevior, certain awkwardness of the construction of the phrase in this excerpt (“send…your holy Spirit…to make it worthy of the communion…, a holy altar, a harbour…” etc.) may not only suggest that this prayer is earlier than its counterpart in the church consecration rite, but also may point out that it is a translation which has obscured the clear meaning of the original. I shall return to this in the next section of this chapter.

---

219 Horner, 9-10/378-382. Cf. the multiple “Amen’s” in the Coptic prayer for the consecration of the baptismal waters, as cited in Johnson, Rites, 288.


221 οὕς ταὐτάτης ὑπὲρ ἤτερας ἥμερας ἡμέρας ἡμείς οὐκ ἠμενὼς ὑπερβηκεῖρον οὕτως (Horner, 446).
The further section of the rite for the consecration of the church in the Selly Oak manuscript continues to imitate the eucharistic rite even more closely, citing the Lord’s Prayer, and accompanying the consecration of waters (in a manner akin to the commixture rite) with the Εἰς πατὴρ ἅγιος acclamation. The redaction of the latter acclamation is very similar to the one used in the Coptic liturgy until today, while, at the same time, the epiclesis (designated as such in the rubrics) closely resembles the pre-epicletic invocation of the Spirit in the Syriac and Greek versions of the anaphora of James, as well as the one in the Coptic anaphora of Cyril:

**Syr JAS:** …for your people and your inheritance implore you, and through you and with you saying to the Father – People: Have mercy on us, Father almighty.

**Greek JAS:** Καὶ ἐκφωνεῖ· Ὁ γὰρ λαὸς σου καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία σου ἱκετεύει σε. Ὁ λαὸς· Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε, ὁ θεὸς, ὁ πατὴρ, ὁ παντοκράτωρ.

**Cyril:** Sacerdos involvit manus suas velo, et signum crucis facit versus populum, mox dicit alta voce: Populus enim tuus, et Ecclesia tua obsecerant te dicentes. *P:* Miserere nostri, Deus Pater omnipotens.

The people’s acclamation in the consecration rite was more plausibly derived from the Coptic liturgy of Cyril, but its similarity with the similar acclamation in JAS, and its survival in Greek within the Bohairic text of the consecration service, certainly points to the Syro-Palestinian ancestry of this part of the rite. The modeling of the consecratory

---

222 See this acclamation before the commixture rite in the Coptic liturgy of St Basil – see pi-Euchologion nte ti-Ekklesia n-Alexandrine (Rome, 1971), 406; on this acclamation as a response to Sancta sanctis in the Byzantine and other Eastern rites, see Taft, Precommunion Rites, 240-248.

223 Horner, 378.


225 Mercier, PO 26.2, 204.

226 Translation is cited after Hänggi-Pahl, Prex eucharistica, 138.

prayers of the rite upon the eucharistic anaphora and precommunion rites also has been attested for the Coptic baptismal ritual,\textsuperscript{228} and may have constituted a peculiar characteristic of the Coptic tradition. However, the reference in our text to the \textit{ordo} of James, rather than to that of Mark or Basil, may be a sufficient indication that the ritual of consecration has been developed under the influence of the West Syriac tradition, specifically – of the West Syriac eucharistic liturgy.\textsuperscript{229}

The second rite, the rite for the consecration of the altar, has a markedly different structure. It consists of two units of psalmody, punctuated by the offering of incense, diaconal litanies and the prayers by the celebrant, followed by the sequence of another four prayers, the anointing of the altar with Ps 83, 44, and 26, and concluding with the thanksgiving prayer and rubrics for the consecration of a baptismal font. If one can consider the two units of psalmody a part of a basic underlying structure of this ritual, one could not avoid noting its similarities with the structure of the rite for the “consecration of an \textit{odiki}” in the Georgian euchologion \textit{Tbilisi A 86}, featuring a three-fold repetition of a unit of psalmody-litany-procession. In this Coptic rite dated to 1307 CE, we can see but the débris of the supposed original structure: three psalmic units compressed into two, with additional prayer texts added. By the fourteenth century – as this service book and the rite described in a contemporary treatise \textit{The Precious Pearl}

\textsuperscript{228} See Whitaker-Johnson, \textit{Documents}, 137; Spinks, \textit{Early and Medieval Rituals and Theologies of Baptism}, 105-107.

shows – the rites of for the consecration of the building and the rite for the consecration of the altar were conjoined to form a single serial sequence of ritual consecratory actions which the author of the *Precious Pearl* interprets as a sequence of three circumambulatory processions inside the newly dedicated building.\(^{230}\)

Thus the positioning of the two rites in this document leads one to suppose that the dedication of the church in the Coptic tradition was a result of a conjunction of two, originally independent rituals. It must be noted that the rite of consecration as it appears in two much later manuscripts contain some variations to the rite as it appears in the Coptic-Arabic ms. of 1307 CE. The variations concern the addition of some ritual actions, as well as repositioning of some of the prayer texts within the structure of the rite:

1) in the manuscript *Borg. copt. 1*, reflecting a late fourteenth-century original, the consecration of the church and the altar are placed side-by-side, as two separate rites and thus appear largely as in the manuscript edited by Horner,\(^ {231}\) with few modifications, such as circumambulation of the church at the conclusion of the rite for the consecration of an altar.\(^ {232}\) Here the prayers of the second rite, marked in our outline as \textbf{C1} and \textbf{C2} are found just preceding the action of anointing of the

\[^{230}\text{In the book of consecration dated to 1307 CE the two of these three processions (with water and with chrism) are found at the culmination of the rite of the church building (Horner, 11-12), while the third (with chrism applied to the walls and pillars – essentially, a repetition of the second ‘circle’) is unmentioned (ibid., 21-23), but may have been awaiting its development at this point.}\]

\[^{231}\text{van Lantschoot, *Codices Coptici* 2.1, 15.}\]

\[^{232}\text{Ibid., 17.}\]
altar with chrism. In contrast to the rite in Vatican copt. 46, there is no washing of the altar before its chrismation;\textsuperscript{233}

2) the euchologion ms. \textit{Vatican copt. 46}, describing the dedication of the church of St Mercurius by patriarch Gabriel V in 1411 CE,\textsuperscript{234} i.e. a little more than a hundred years later than the date of the Selly Oak College ms., effectively merges the two rites: after the two prayers from the rite for the consecration of a church – “Lord God of powers” (see above, I.4b) and “Lord, Lord almighty and the Lord of all” (I.4c) – follows a prayer extracted from the rite for the consecration of an altar (II.1h), to which is appended the epicletic invocation which in the Selly Oak College ms. is found at the end of the prayer in the rite of altar consecration (II.1k/C1). The latter is interrupted with the already mentioned invocation “Have mercy” akin to the pre-epicletic dialogue in the West Syriac anaphorae (cf. I.4k), which is followed by the continuation of the epiclesis of the Spirit upon the “holy altar (\(ⲧⲁⲛⲑⲩⲥⲓⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲉⲑⲟⲩⲃ\))” (II.1k). The rite continues with another prayer, “Lord of every nature” derived also from the rite for the consecration of an altar (II.1l/C2), the Lord’s Prayer, \(\varepsilon\iota\varsigma \upsilon\gamma\iota\varsigma\) by which the water is consecrated, the washing of the altar table with the blessed water, its anointing with chrism and vesting.\textsuperscript{235} The consecration of the church is apparently missing in this redaction of the rite. The agglutination of two originally separate services into one rite is

\textsuperscript{233} Ibid., 16-17.

\textsuperscript{234} Hebbelynck, van Lantschoot, 281.

\textsuperscript{235} Ibid., 286-289.
quite consistent with the efforts for liturgical reform undertaken by Gabriel V, the 88th Coptic patriarch, in the early fifteenth century.\footnote{Khalil Samir, “Gabriel V,” \textit{Coptic Encyclopedia} 4.1130-33; Coquin, “La consécration des églises dans le rite copte,” 151.}

Our purpose in this section of our study was not to provide an exhaustive discussion of the rites for the consecration of the altar and the church in the Coptic Christian tradition. It was an attempt to demonstrate the recurrence in the Coptic tradition of similar ritual forms and prayer texts as in other Eastern Christian rites, which will become evident from our further discussion. One common feature uniting both hagiographic, theological, and liturgical descriptions of the rite of church dedication must be the absence of any mention of the saints’ relics, or any actions pertaining to their deposition or procession inside the newly built church. The ‘spiritual presence’ of the saint – the patron of the church and the monastery – is clearly indicated in the narrative of the consecration of the “sanctuary of Benjamin” in mid-seventh century Wādī al-Natrūn, but any ritual action connected with the relics is conspicuously absent.\footnote{Noted also by Coquin, “La consécration des églises dans le rite copte,” 157-160, particularly with respect to the rite for the consecration of the altar.} While in the case of the monastery of St Macarius the absence of his remains (and of any ritual connected with them) has an historical explanation,\footnote{Macarius the Egyptian’s relics were returned to Scetis only in the late 8th century, during the reign of the patriarch John IV (775-799) – see Antoine Guillaumont, “Macarius the Egyptian, Saint,” \textit{Coptic Encyclopedia} 5.1491.} the absence of any such ritual in the fully developed rites of dedication may indicate a deeper liturgio-historical and theological reason, the roots of which may lie in the Syriac liturgical heritage of the Coptic Christianity. This tradition presumably singles out the anointing of the altar, not the deposition of relics or the opening of the church, as a preeminent form of the
consecration of a church in the Syro-Palestinian traditions. As we showed in the introduction to this chapter, the subsidiary role of relics in the North Syrian churches was expressed through their spatial disposition within a building, i.e. their placement in a side chapel, rather than underneath the altar.  

Before we proceed to examine the extant witnesses to the rites for the consecration of the church and altar in the West Syriac tradition, I wish to bring the reader’s attention to three prayers found in the Coptic rite for the consecration of the altar, indicated in the outline above as C1, C2, and C3. The first two of these prayers normally (in the Selly Oaks ms., Vatican copt. 46, and Borg. copt. 1) precede the anointing of the altar with chrism/myron, while the latter prayer, the prayer of thanksgiving, follows the rite of anointing. It is only after we have examined the West Syriac rite for the consecration of the church and the altar, that it will be worthwhile to present a textual comparison of these prayers in these two traditions, as well as in the liturgical tradition of the late-eighth century Byzantine church.

6.5 From Syria to Egypt? The Trajectory of Liturgical Evolution in the Oriental Rites of Church Dedication.

If the studies of the church dedication rites in the Christian East indeed, as was noted already, comprise a rather short bibliography, the studies which attempt to consolidate the liturgical evidence from several Eastern liturgical traditions, and to analyze them from the perspective of comparative liturgiology, are in even higher

239 Coquin tentatively proposed that such disposition may also have been characteristic for the Coptic churches (“La consécration des églises dans le rite copte,” 160 n. 21).
demand. The only systematic study which endeavoured such analysis before the attempt
undertaken in the present dissertation was authored in the 1964 article by René Coquin,
already cited many times above.240 Aside from examining the Coptic rite of dedication
per se, the study was unique in attempting to compare the Coptic rite with other medieval
Oriental rites and thus to deduce the origin and evolution of the Egyptian rite in
question.241 It was Coquin who noted that the structure and a number of prayers in the
Coptic rite where it pertains to the consecration of the church building are very close to
the structure and prayers of the rite of church dedication in the Syro-Antiochene (or West
Syriac) tradition.242 The rites in both traditions begin with the extensive lectionary of
readings, concluded with the chanting of the Creed, which may suggest an attempt to
construe the rite of church consecration on the pattern of the ‘liturgy of the Word’. A
number of prayers, particularly in the beginning of the rite of church consecration closely
correspond in West Syriac and Coptic rites – the divergences, however, are explained by
Coquin by the appropriation of some prayers and formulae from the Byzantine rite.243 In
order to test the validity of Coquin’s hypothesis regarding the relation of the Byzantine,
West Syriac, and Coptic rites, it is suitable to review the structure of the Syro-Antiochene
rite of church dedication, as it appears in the medieval West Syriac archieratika, such as

240 “La consécration des églises dans le rite copte.”

241 See e.g. the comparative table in ibid., 179-187.

242 Coquin relied on the Latin translation of the “Pontifical of Michael the Syrian” (= ms. Vatican
syr. 51, 1172 CE), accomplished in 1773 by Giuseppe Luigi Assemani (1710-1782), and published, with
additions of ms. Borg. syr. 57, by Jacques-Marie Vosté as Pontificale iuxta ritum Ecclesiae Syrorum
occidentalium id est Antiochiae: Versio latina, vol. 1 (Vatican: S. Congregazione ‘Pro Ecclesia Orientali’,
selon l’ancienne tradition de l’église maronite,” L’Orient syrien 4.3 (1959): 322. Coquin also claims to rely
on another witness to the West Syriac dedication rite, ms. Paris B.N. syr. 112 (1239 CE), to which we did
not have access for this study.

the “Pontifical of Michael the Syrian.” The latter represents the redaction of the Syriac Orthodox archieratikon attributed to the patriarch of Antioch Michael the Great (1166-99), the author of the eponymous Chronicle. This redaction of the archieratikon is known through its oldest exemplar in ms. *Vatican syr. 51*, copied at the monastery Môr Barsaumô at the end of the twelfth century. Our close study of the West Syriac rites of dedication will enable us to revisit and review Coquin’s hypothesis, to indicate the reasons for my disagreement with his thesis, and to provide a more plausible working hypothesis regarding the origins of the Byzantine rite for the dedication of a church, as it appears at the end of the eighth century.

6.5.1 The West Syriac Rite for the Dedication of the Church: Assessing Coquin’s Proposal.

The rite for the dedication of a church in the West Syriac (Syro-Antiochene) tradition appears in its complete form at the end of the twelfth century, and represented through the liturgical manuscripts of the Syriac Orthodox tradition, e.g. *Vatican syr. 51* (1188/89 CE), *Paris B.N. syr. 112* (1239 CE), *Jerusalem Mark 110* (1279 CE),

---


245 The description is in ed. Stephanus Evodius and Joseph Simonius Assemani, *Bibliothecae apostolicae Vaticanae codicum manuscriptorum catalogus in tres partes distributus*, vol. 1,2, *Codices Chaldaeos sive Syriacos* (Rome, 1758), 314-328. On the date of the ms., see Hubert Kaufhold, “Über Datum und Schreiber der Handschrift *Vaticanus Syriacus 51*,” *ARAM* 5 (1993): 267-75. According to Kaufhold, ms. *Vatican syr. 51* “ist… die älteste bekannte Abschrift von Michaels Exemplar,” i.e. the copy of the West Syriac pontifical which is the closest to the copy produced by the patriarch himself. On the basis of the colophon in another copy of the same pontifical, ms. *Dair az-Za’faran 220* (16th cent.), Kaufhold was able to date the ms. *Vatican syr. 51* to the year 1500 of the Greeks or 1188/89 CE (ibid., 273). I was able to view the manuscripts through the electronic copy procured by the staff of the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library, to whom I owe my immense gratitude – but I also closely consulted the Latin translation of the same text in Vosté, *Pontificale*, 63-91.

246 Referenced in Coquin, 162.
Jerusalem Mark 109 (1300 CE), Jerusalem Mark 113 (15th cent.),\textsuperscript{247} as well as in the liturgical books, representing the received tradition of the churches celebrating in the West Syriac rite.\textsuperscript{248} The rite, as it appears in these sources, consists of the following structural elements:

1. **Preparatory rites:**
   a. All-night vigil in the same church which is consecrated;
   b. Morning office and vesting of the clergy.

2. **Opening rites:**
   a. Clergy gathers in the sanctuary around the altar.
   b. The bishop says the prayer of the beginning “Make us worthy, Lord God, that we may renovate your holy church...”
   c. Hymnody, proper for the dedication of the church:
      i. Responsory (חסְמָה) “Have mercy on me” (Ps 50), for the consecration of the church,
      ii. the psalms of the third hour, followed by the qanônô (poetic refrains) for the consecration of the church.
      iii. the chant of Ps 50 is followed by another prayer of the bishop,
      iv. the verses of the psalms and qanônô are intercalated by 7 short prayers.
   d. Offering of incense, deacon’s exclamation Στῶμεν καλῶς, and the bishop says prooimion “Glory to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, who renews the ages,” and sedrô “To you glory, to you thanksgiving, Jesus Christ”.
   e. Hymnody II: chant (qôlô) “from the ordo for the dedication of the church.”
   f. Prayer “Receive, Lord God, this fragrance”.
   g. Hymnody III: chant “You established your church for your dwelling, Lord.”

3. **Liturgy of the Word:**

\textsuperscript{247} The mss. from the Syriac Orthodox Monastery of St Mark in Jerusalem were accessed online at the website of the Center for the Preservation of Ancient Religious Texts, supported by the Brigham Young University, http://cpart.byu.edu/?page=126&sidebar (accessed Spring 2010). The description of the manuscripts is found in the inventory by William F. Macomber, “Final Inventory of the Microfilmed Manuscripts of the St. Mark’s Convent, Jerusalem, Manuscripts in Syriac, Garshuni, Arabic, April 16, 1990” (Provo, UT: Brigham Young University, Harold B. Lee Library, 1995).

\textsuperscript{248} E.g. see the edition of the Syriac Catholic pontifical: [Liber ordinum pontificalium quae administrantur in Ecclesia sancto Antiochena Syrorum] (Sharfeh, Lebanon: Seminary of Our Lady, 1950), 127- 203 (further cited as Syriac Catholic Pontifical).
d. Prayer by the bishop: prooimion “Praise to the heavenly Bridegroom,” and sedrô “Christ our God, who from the streams of fire and spirit” (extremely lengthy).

4. Consecration of the Altar and the Church:
a. Responsory
b. Prayer of the incense
c. The Creed
d. Bishop says the prayer for himself during the Creed, bowing: “Lord God of the holy powers (ܡܪܝܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܚܝ ܠܘܬܐ ܩܕܝ ܫܐ)”
e. Archdeacon proclaims the litany of 12 petitions
f. Bishop recites the prayer, bowing: “Lord God of all creation intelligible and perceptible… (ܡܪܝܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܟܠܗ ܒܪܝܬܐ ܡܬܝܕܥܢܝܬܐ ܘܡܬܪܓܫܢܝܬܐ)” with the exclamation: “Thus we pray and beseech you: fulfill the word of our mouth…”
g. Peace, and prayer II: “King, Saviour, and Holy One, Provider and Creator of all things… (ܡܠܟܐ ܦܪܘܩܐ ܘܩܕܝܫܐ ܘܥܒܘܕܐ ܘܒܪܘܝܐ ܕܟܠ)” with the exclamation: “So that, delighting in your sacred law, and in divine songs…”
h. The myron is brought upon a paten (πίναξ) by the bishop, and the cross by the chorepisopos.
i. Procession with fans and lights, while a hymn for the consecration of myron is sung.
j. Bishop makes a sign of the cross on the eastern wall of the sanctuary (ܡܕܒܚܐ), followed by three signs of the cross with a thumb dipped in myron.
   i. Formula: “Christ our God through the prayers of your holy apostles… bless and sanctify this altar and us (ܒܪܟ ܘܩܕܫ ܠܡܕܒܚܐ ܗܢܐ ܘܠܢ).…”
k. The same anointing and formula + chant is repeated at each of the walls of the altar area.
l. Consecration of the altar table (“table of life”/ܦܬܘܪ ܚܝ):
   i. Prayer for the installation of the altar: “Lord who in your ineffable goodness filled all the earth by your wisdom…”
   ii. Bishop signs the table with his thumb dipped in chrism, three times, chanting Alleluia + verse Ps 44:7 + doxology.
   iii. thereafter he signs it three times without chrism, saying: “Signed, anointed, sanctified, and sealed and imprinted is this table, so that upon it may be offered divine offerings and mystical sacrifices, in the name of the Father (+ Amen), in the name of the Son (+
Amen), in the name of the Holy Spirit (+) for eternal life.

Amen.”

iv. Vesting of the altar, and place the tabliðô (portable altar) upon it.

v. At the same time, the deacon pronounces the litany of 11 petitions.

m. Consecration of the church:

i. clergy proceed out of the altar into the nave;

ii. the bishop anoints with his finger on the four walls of the church, “in any place he desires.”

1. Formula = see 4.j.i (instead of “this altar and us” – “this church and us”);

iii. the clergy sing hymns, proceeding from one side to another;

iv. the bishop also signs columns, doors, beth-gazô, etc.

v. they arrive to the western gates of the church; the bishop stands before the gates, facing the church, and recites the “prayer of Solomon” for the dedication of the Temple (3 Kings 8:10-11, 22-23, 28-30, 31-53, 57-60).

vi. responsory – Ps 83:3


viii. the bishop signs above the door with his finger without chrism three times; if there are multiple doors, each one is signed.

ix. If possible, they proceed outside the church and around the building, with the bishop signing four walls outside;

1. when they return and reenter the altar, the responsory follows and the gospel reading – John 10:22-38.

n. Concluding rites:

i. they turn to the altar table, and the bishop recites the prayer, bowing: “We give thanks to you, good Lord, and we glorify your holy name…”

ii. Archdeacon proclaims a petition for the sponsors and builders of the church, and the bishop recites the prayer of commemoration.

iii. Peace, and the prayer of inclination: “We give thanks to you, Lord, that you made us worthy to stand in this place before you…”

5. Deposition of Relics:

a. “if there are bones of the saints, the bishop lifts them up and puts them into their place,” in procession with incense and light;

b. an “appropriate hymn” is sung, a κύκλιον for the saints; the bishop says the proper sedrô, a qôlô and the prayer of incense;

c. bishop says the prayer (bowing): “Lord, Lord Jesus Christ, the high priest of our souls…”

d. Peace, and another prayer: “Holy Lord who rest in the holies, who is the praise of prophets…”

6. Dismissal: bishop may read the exposition of the “mysteries,” various prayers, and dismisses the people.

---

249 Cf. ms. St Mark 110, f. 71f.
A careful analysis of the preceding rite in comparison with the Coptic rite of dedication reveals a number of parallels between the two, supporting the hypothesis of their direct relation. Certainly, the West Syriac rite includes a number of distinct characteristics proper to the context of the Syro-Antiochene liturgical tradition, such as the use of the hymnody proper to the occasion. Another characteristic trait, specific to the Syro-Antiochene tradition, is the presence in the rite of a distinctive liturgical unit, consisting of the offering of incense and a two-part prayer by the celebrant, an introduction-frûmâyûn (= προοίμιον) and a prayer- sedrô (2d, 3d). This unit, essentially a rite of forgiveness (hûssôyo), “constitutes the core element of the introductory rites of the canonical hours and sacraments” of the Syriac Church of Antioch, and thus can represent a uniquely West Syriac addition to this ritual.

At the same time, a number of features unite the West Syriac rite for the consecration of the church and the equivalent Coptic rite. The cursus of prayer and liturgical action commences in both rites by the celebration of an all-night vigil. Both rites also include the ‘liturgy of the Word’, even though the lectionary provided by the Coptic ritual is incomparably much more extensive: the West Syriac rite includes just three OT and three NT readings, including the Gospel reading from Matthew 16, which also appears as a liturgical reading for the feasts of dedication in the Jerusalem lectionary. As noted by Coquin, the three prayers which precede the anointing of the

250 Amar, “Patterns of Prayer,” 382.

251 “The bishop and clergy with all the people are assembled during the night of [preceding] a Sunday in the new church” (Borg. copt 1, f. 1-2v = van Lantschoot, 11), cf. Vatican copt. 46, f. 136r-v = Hebbelynck- van Lantschoot, 281-82); “It is fitting that in the night they keep vigil of prayer at the same church which shall be consecrated” (Pontificale, 63).
walls of the sanctuary and of the altar in the Syriac rite, i.e. the prayer pro seipso “Lord God of powers” (4e), “Lord God of all creation intelligible” (4f), and “King, Saviour, and Holy” (4g), all find their parallels in the Coptic rite (14b, 14g, 14h). The latter, however, apparently alters and expands a more primitive Syriac ordo by the addition of other prayers: 1) the prayer 14c that, as the preceding one, also finds its parallel in the Coptic ordination rites, being derived from the prayer in Homilia Clementina 3.72; 2) the secret prayer during the litany (14e); 3) the formula “Holy grace,” with the subsequent prayer and epiclesis (14i-l), patterned after the similar formula in the rites of holy orders and the epiclesis of the liturgy of Cyril. The use of the Lord’s Prayer and εἰς ἅγιος formula (14m-n) further confirms the suggestion of Coquin that the Coptic rite of dedication was formed on the basis of the more primitive West Syriac ordo which was subsequently expanded with the intention to imitate the rites of ordination and of the eucharistic liturgy. The following table offers a comparison of the rites for the dedication of the church in the Syro-Antiochene and Coptic traditions, indicating both common elements and the elements unique to each rite.

Sigla: + present, – absent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coptic Rite</th>
<th>West Syriac Rite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIGIL</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITURGY OF THE WORD to the Creed</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prayer “Lord God of powers”</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prayer (Ps.-Clementine)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>litany</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

252 See Chapter 5.2.

253 See note 189 above.


255 Ibid., 171.
secret prayer “Consubstantial and coeternal”
prayer “Lord God of all creation”
Peace
prayer “Master Lord God almighty, King”
“Holy grace”
pre-epiclesis
“Have mercy” + epiclesis
Our Father
“One is holy” + consecration of waters
lustrations – walls of the sanctuary and nave
anointing of the walls of the sanctuary
–
–
–
anointing of the walls of the nave
[Rite for the consecration of the altar]
Prayer of thanksgiving I
Prayer of thanksgiving II
Consecration of the baptistery
–
EUCHARIST

EUCHARIST

installation of the altar
anointing of the altar
readings (prayer of Solomon, Gospel)
– (cf. the rite of the tablíthô)\textsuperscript{256}
–

deposition of relics (optional)

One of the most notable differences between the Coptic and West Syriac rites concerns the presence in the latter tradition of the rite for the deposition of the relics (“bones”) of the saints,\textsuperscript{257} which is passed without mention in the usage of the Coptic Church.\textsuperscript{258} It should be noted that even in the West Syriac usage the deposition of relics in the new church is contingent upon the availability of the saints’ remains, and in no way appears to be an indispensable element of the rites of dedication.

\textsuperscript{256} See further, Chapter 6.5.2.
\textsuperscript{257} See Vosté, Pontificale, 90-91.
\textsuperscript{258} Coquin, 157-60.
A more significant divergence among these traditions concerns the place of the installation and chrismation of the altar within the two rituals. Significantly, the Syro-Antiochene and Coptic rite show commonality in prescribing for the anointing of the church to begin with the anointing of the walls of the sanctuary,\textsuperscript{259} which in the Coptic tradition is also preceded by the aspersion of the walls of the altar area and of the church with the blessed water.\textsuperscript{260} In the Syriac version, this action is followed by the prayer for the installation of the altar table, and the chrismation of the altar, after which comes a litany and the chrismation of the walls of the church, the “prayer of Solomon” from 1 Kings and two Gospel readings.\textsuperscript{261} The Coptic ritual, as was shown above, presupposes the consecration of the altar as a self-sufficient, independent rite, including psalmody, litanies, prayers, and the chrismation of the table. The absence of such rite within the order of the service in the Syro-Antiochene ritual\textsuperscript{262} led Coquin to suggest that the ‘second’ rite of the altar has been an innovation, introduced into the Coptic service of dedication at quite a late date, no earlier than the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{263} Furthermore, using the Byzantine euchologion Barberini gr. 336 as his source, Coquin proposed that the prayers in the Coptic rite for the consecration of an altar contain a number of parallels

\textsuperscript{259} As Coquin notes (ibid., 167 n. 41), the translation of Assemani, published by Vosté, invariably translates ܡܕܒܚܐ as ‘altar’, particularly in the rubrics describing the first anointing prior to the affixing of the ‘table of life’. The term ‘table of life’ (ܝܬܘܪ ܐܚܝ) and ܡܕܒܚܐ ‘altar’ are synonymous in designating the eucharistic altar of a Christian church (Payne Smith, Thesaurus Syriacus, 2.3347), the latter term can also signify the ‘sanctuary’ i.e. the segregated altar area (ibid., 807); it is in this latter sense the term appears to be used in the service of the consecration of a church.

\textsuperscript{260} Horner, Service for the Consecration, 11.

\textsuperscript{261} Vosté, Pontificale, 80-84.

\textsuperscript{262} “[L]’oraison secrète dite pendant cette litanie, et les trois formules sacerdotales (la seconde de type anaphorique) qui suivent n’ont pas d’équivalentes dans le rituel d’Antioche” (Coquin, 169).

\textsuperscript{263} Coquin, “La consécration des églises dans le rite copte,” 169, 171-72.
with the Barberini rite and hence the ‘second rite’ of the Coptic service for the dedication of a church was at least partly influenced or inspired by the equivalent Byzantine ritual.  

Judging from a purely chronological arrangement of the manuscript sources, the Byzantine rite attested first by the late eighth-century Barberini euchologion is the earliest witness to the complete text of the rite for the consecration of a church among the Eastern Christian traditions. However, the scarcity of liturgical sources attesting to the liturgy of church dedication in the early medieval period should require a more nuanced approach, based on the critical assessment of the internal evidence, i.e. the texts of the prayers and the persistence of the structure of the rites. It is on the basis of this analysis that we consider Coquin’s proposal of a late dating and of Byzantine origin for the Coptic rite for the consecration of an altar to be incorrect. The author rightly notes that the aspersion of the walls of the sanctuary and church with the blessed water must be a later, post-eleventh-century interpolation into the Coptic rite, since none of the prayers which accompany that action refer to the blessing of waters. He also notes that both the Alexandrine and the Antiochene rites began the anointing of the church by the anointing of the eastern wall of the sanctuary behind the altar table, i.e. the easternmost point of the church. In the Coptic rite, the consecration of the walls of the sanctuary continues with the anointing of the walls of the nave – in the Antiochene rite, the anointing of the altar

---

264 “[I]ci c’est au rituel byzantin que l’Eglise copte a emprunté la prière centrale, traitée en anaphore et augmentée d’une épîcîlese” (ibid, 169); “Beaucoup plus tard, vraisemblment pas avant le 14 siècle, la consécration de l’autel estimée trop succinte fut amplifiée avec quelques prises au rituel byzantin” (ibid., 172).

265 Ibid., 166.

266 Ibid., 167- 68.
intervenes, creating an odd sequence of anointings where the altar is consecrated after the walls of the sanctuary. It may appear more plausible to propose that the sequence of prayer for the affixing of the altar, with the subsequent anointing of the latter, was a later addition to the Syriac rite of the consecration of the church, which originally, as in the Coptic rite, was intended just for the consecration of the church building. It is notable that the litanies and prayers of the West Syriac ritual rarely refer to the consecration of an altar at all, but contain copious allusions to the sanctification of a “house” or “place”:

Let us all pray at this hour for this house which is consecrated, so that God may in his goodness establish it in every grace, and erect his altar therein…

So that God which dwells in the highest and looks down upon the humble, resting in it and choosing it for the dwelling-place for himself, may with divine grace and heavenly gift fill it, which is prepared for the indwelling of his divinity…

[And now vouchsafe to overshadow this place, and to sanctify it for the praise to your all-honored name… and fulfill the promise of your all-holy Spirit, so that it may dwell and work, and move the word of the Gospel, and complete every deed and word which comes to pass in this place…]

[You] who implanted to Besalel the spirit of wisdom, so that he may build the tabernacle to your holy name, when your people from Israel was walking its way in the desert. Sanctify, establish, confirm, watch over, and preserve by your exalted and strong hand this holy and sacred house, which is for your sake and for the uttering of praise to you.

You who established the temples made-by-hand for the place of your dwelling, and affixed in it the mystical altar which is the likeness of your manger, we entreat [you].

Significantly, it were the texts of diaconal litanies in this rite which contained references to the establishment of the “mystical altar.” On the other hand, the prayers, which are

267 Litany before the anointing; Vosté, Pontificale, 76-77.
268 Prayer before the anointing (4f); ibid., 78.
269 Prayer before the anointing II (4g); ibid., 79.
270 Litany after the consecration of the altar; Vosté, Pontificale, 82.
found in both traditions and thus can be presumed as pertaining to the original “core” of the service, contain no such allusions. It can be tentatively concluded, therefore, that the rite for the consecration of the church in the Syro-Antiochene tradition did not contain the consecration of an altar but was primarily the rite for the consecration of a church building. It is this, earlier redaction of the rite which was assumed into the Coptic liturgical tradition which further expanded the rite to enhance the analogy with the ordination rites and with the eucharist.

If the rite for the dedication of a church in the Coptic tradition has its source in the Syro-Antiochene ritual of the same purpose and function, albeit in a somewhat earlier recension, can the West Syriac tradition likewise be the source for the ‘second rite’ of the Coptic two-part service, the rite for the consecration of an altar? Coquin rejects such possibility: the prayers of this rite of the Coptic church “n’ont pas d’équivalentes dans le rituel d’Antioche.”

The suggested alternative – the acquisition of prayers from the Byzantine tradition – does not appear convincing. If the Copts had appropriated the elements of the Byzantine rite to form the rite for the consecration of the altar, it appears unreasonable not to have incorporated other Byzantine elements such as the lustrations with the water and wine.

The solution to the problem, however, lies in Coquin’s failure to consider another liturgical rite found both in the manuscripts and in the editions of the West Syriac archieratika – namely, the rite for the consecration of portable altar


272 If the appropriation of the Byzantine elements occurred at a later date, as Coquin suggested (ibid., 172), the Coptic rite of the church dedication already contained the aspersion of the walls with water, and it would have been natural to appropriate the analogous aspersion of the altar from the Byzantine rite.
tablets or *tablithê*, which presents the structure and content startlingly close to the latter part of the Coptic service for the dedication of a church.

6.5.2 The Rite for the Consecration of *Tablithô* in the Syriac Church of Antioch.

The rite for the consecration of an altar tablet or *tablithô* (伝えلت; derivative of *tabula* or *τάβλα* 273) is contained in the number of manuscripts reflecting the Syriac Orthodox (Jacobite) tradition, where it is found alongside the full rite for the consecration of a church,274 as well as in the manuscripts of the Maronite tradition, e.g. the Maronite archieratikon *Vatican syr. 49* (1559 CE),275 where it is the sole service pertaining to the rites of dedication. The title of the rite reflects the understanding reflected even in contemporary Syriac Orthodox practice that the rite for the consecration of a *tablithô* “est le même que pour les autels”276:

The *akolouthia* i.e. the sequence and order of the consecration of altar(s) i.e. of the tablet(s) that is upon the [altar] table (伝えلت 伝えلت 伝えلت 伝えلت 伝えلت 伝えلت). 277

The description of this *Ersatz*-altar in the inscription of the ritual implies the function of the *tablithô* as not only a portable altar used in necessity, but effectively as an appurtenance belonging to any consecrated altar, similar in function to a Byzantine *antimension*. In the received tradition of the Syriac Church of Antioch, the tablet, made

---


275 f. 110v- 128; Assemani, *Catalogus* 1.2, 311-314 (the colophon is reproduced on 313-314).


277 The earliest ms., *Vatican syr. 51*, has the terms *mâdbhô* and *tablithô* in the singular, while the next ms. we studied, *Jerusalem Mark 110* (1279 CE), has them already in the plural.
of precious wood or stone, is placed upon the stationary altar, and its only distinction from the latter is that the tablet is portable. As the rite itself specifies, the tablets are consecrated at a certain time in the liturgical year, “on Thursday of the Week of Mysteries [i.e. of the Holy Week], and on all Thursdays from the [feast of the] Resurrection until the feast of Ascension.”

Our interest here concerns primarily the text of the rite for the consecration of the portable altar. Further, we provide the outline of the rite, as it appears in both the medieval West Syriac archieratika, and in the contemporary editions.

1. Preparatory Rites:
   a. Bishop places the tablets upon the consecrated altar.
   b. Vesting of the bishop and the clergy.
2. Opening rites:
   a. Clergy stand in the sanctuary around the altar table.
   b. Bishop says the opening prayer, followed by the responsory, as in the rite of church consecration.
   c. Three hymns (ܬܐ̈ܬܫܒܚ) from the qanônô for the dedication of the church, intercalated with bishop’s prayers.
   d. Bishop says prooimion “Glory to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the King...” and sedrô “God who grants great gifts...,” both from the rite of the consecration of chrism.
   e. Hymnody: “Holy One who established your habitation/temple (ܫܟܝܢܬܟ),” ending with “Send your habitation over these altars and they shall be sanctified.”
3. Liturgy of the Word:
   a. Prayer of incense.
   b. Readings as in the rite for the consecration of a church (see above).
   c. The Creed.
4. Consecration of the Altar Tablet:

---

278 “The tablets are made from selected wood or precious tablets or out of likewise precious stone, marble or other” (Vosté, Pontificale, 97); see also Rahmani, 47; and the illustration in Izzo, Antimension, ill. 13.

279 Rahmani, 47.

280 Vosté, Pontificale, 97.

281 Ibid., 30.
a. Bishop says the prayer for himself during the Creed, bowing: “Lord God of powers (ܡܪܝܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܕܚܝ ܠܘܬܐ);”
b. Bishop and clergy chant Pss 22-23 in the 3rd tone, and the bishop blesses the tablet with his thumb without chrism:
   i. “He takes the tablet not yet consecrated, and places it before himself upon the old tablet, already consecrated [i.e. the one permanently positioned upon the altar], and signs with his thumb without myron the part of the cross from east to west on the northern side [of the tablet], and then another part [of the cross] from north to south on the eastern side [of the tablet]… This is the first cross.”
c. Clergy complete the psalms and, after doxology, sing the verse: “You who upon Mount Sion.”
d. Archdeacon – Στῶμεν καλῶς, and the bishop says the prooimion “Praise, honor, and worship (ܫܘܒܚܐ ܘܐܝܩܪܐ ܘܣܓ大酒店) to one Divinity, worshipped in the trinity of Persons,” and sedrô “Lord God who knows what is in the heart of all”
e. Two hymns for the church in the 7th tone with the refrain (ܬܟܫܦܬܐ): “Holy Church was confirmed in faith…”
f. Prayer of incense
g. Bishop and clergy chant Ps 25-26 in the 7th tone, with “Alleluia” as refrain, ending with doxology and verse.
h. During the chanting, the bishop takes the tablet(s) and makes the second sign of the cross, without chrism, as above in 4.c.i.
i. Archdeacon – Στῶμεν καλῶς, and the bishop says the prooimion “Glory, thanksgiving, and worship (ܒܚܬܐܬܫ ܘܬܘܕܝܬܐ ܘܣܓ大酒店) to one true God,” and sedrô “God Most High who are glorified by immaterial essences”;
j. Hymn for the myron in the 7th tone, or for the Church, in the 8th tone.
k. Prayer of incense
l. Bishop and clergy chant Ps 131-132 in the 8th tone, ending with the doxology and a hymn verse.
m. During the chanting, the bishop makes the third sign of the cross upon the tablet, as in 4.c.i.
n. Archdeacon says the litany (ܟܪܘܙܘܬܐ) of 9 petitions “Let us all stand upright, etc.”
o. Bishop prays, bowing [S1]: “Lord God of our salvation:” with the exclamation: “Yea, we entreat [you], our most merciful God, send the grace of your Holy Spirit:”
p. Peace, and another prayer [S2], which the bishop prays standing upright (ܟܕ ܦܫܝܛ “): “Lord of all nature, and Creator of every creature:”
q. Bishop and clergy chant the hymn from the rite of consecration of chrism; he places the tablet upon the “old (i.e. already consecrated) tablet,” puts

282 Ibid., 99.
chrism on his thumb and makes with it three signs of the cross upon the tablet:

- **first anointing** with the hymn of the consecration of chrism
- **second anointing** with the antiphon:
  
  Therefore God, your God anointed you [Ps 44:7a]. Alleluia.  
  With the oil of gladness and sweetness more than your kinsmen [Ps 44:7b]. Alleluia.  
  **third anointing** with “Glory”+Alleluia, and “Ever and unto ages” + Alleluia.

r. Then the bishop takes the consecrated tablet, signs it (x3) with his thumb without chrism, and says the formula:
  
  i. “Signed, anointed, and sealed is this altar which is put forth, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, for the fulfillment of the consecrations of the holy things, forever.
  Amen.”

s. **Ps 83** is chanted in the 4th tone.

t. Archdeacon proclaims the “catholic” litany (καθολική) of 11 petitions “Again and again, and for these altars which are sanctified:” while the bishop anoints the entire tablet with holy myron.

u. Bishop says the prayer of thanksgiving [S3] (εὐχαριστίας): “We give thanks to you, Lord of powers:”

5. **Dismissal**:
  
  a. Bishop begins to chant the hymn in the 3rd tone, of the Church: “The queen stood on your right hand, holy Church:”
  b. the clergy venerate (“give peace”) the consecrated tablet, and the dismissal by the bishop follows.

The examination of the rite above reveals a few similarities with the rite for the consecration of a church in the Syro-Antiochene tradition, but at the same time the overall structure and content of the rite is significantly different. Indeed, the rite for the consecration of a tablithô uses a number of elements extracted from the church dedication rite, such as the hymnography (2c, 4e, 5a), the opening rites (2a-e), the scriptural readings which form an imitation of the ‘liturgy of the Word,’ concluding with the Creed (3a-c), and the prayer at the beginning of the rite (4a). However, by contrast to the rite of church dedication, the initial part of this rite is organized as a triple repetition

---

283 ܐܡܝܢ ܠܥܠܡܝܢ ܫܐ ̈ ܩܕ ܕܫܐ ̈ ܕܩܘ ܠܫܘܡܠܝܐ (Jerusalem Mark 110, f. 96r).
of a structural unit, which involves a chanting of a psalm (or multiple psalms), the signing of a new altar, and also a litany, the celebrant’s prayer, offering of incense, and hymnody. Two prayers (marked in the outline as S1 and S2) precede the chrismation of the altar, also accompanied by the psalmody, and the rite concludes by another, longer litany, the prayer of thanks (S3) and the veneration of an altar by the bishop and the clergy present. The comparison between this, more succinct rite, and the Coptic rite for the dedication of an altar, thought by Coquin to have been a late medieval, indigenous interpolation, shows a number of striking parallels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West Syriac rite of <em>tablithô</em></th>
<th>Coptic rite for the consecration of an altar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening rites (&gt; WS rite of church consecration)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITURGY OF THE WORD (&gt; “ ”)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer “Lord God of powers” (&gt; “ ”)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 22-23</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signing of the altar, litany, incense hymnody</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 25-26</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signing of the altar, litany, incense</td>
<td>Ps 25, 26, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 131-132</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signing of the altar, litany</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer S1</td>
<td>Prayer “Master Lord God”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer S2</td>
<td>Prayer “Lord God accept our fervent supplication”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anointing of the altar with Ps 44 + Ps 83</td>
<td>Prayer C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>Prayer C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catholic litany</td>
<td>anointing of the altar with Pss 83, 44, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanksgiving prayer S3</td>
<td>vesting of the altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– (but see WS rite for the cons. of a church)</td>
<td>kissing the altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kissing the altar</td>
<td>petitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thanksgiving prayer C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thanksgiving prayer II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eucharist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The comparison of the two rites shows the presence of the same structure, consisting of a triple repetition of psalmody, accompanied by the blessing of the altar, litany, and the offering of incense. The Coptic rites for the dedication of an altar preserves just two units of the psalmody, while the Syriac rite preserves three – hence it can be assumed that in the Coptic rite we have a débris of the original three-psalm unit that reduced the number of psalms to two, eliminating the third element that comprised both psalms 131 and a relatively short psalm 132. The remaining variations of the West Syriac rite from the Coptic one can be easily explained through the separation of the rite for the consecration of an altar from the rite for the consecration of a church: the need to celebrate the consecration of tablitho separately, on special fixed occasions, or before the full dedication service, necessitated the integration of several elements from the rite for the consecration of a church, e.g. the opening rites, the readings. At the same time, the appropriation of this service for the consecration of portable altars obviated the need for the vesting to conclude the service.

The connection between these two rites is not limited to an evident structural similarity: the dependence of the Coptic rite upon the Syro-Antiochene ritual for the consecration of an altar can be demonstrated through the comparison of the texts of the prayers that precede and follow the act of chrismation. In what follows I will provide for

---

284 “[E]lle (= la pierre sacrée)…doit être au préalable consacrée et ointe par l’évêque avec le saint chrême…” (Rahmani, 47).

285 Thus, the rite of the consecration for tablitho concludes with the rubric: “And when they say [the hymn concluding the rite], they begin to give peace [i.e. to greet/kiss] the tablets which are sanctified and reposed upon the table i.e. the altar stripped bare” (Vatican syr. 51, f. 48v; Jerusalem Mark 110, f. 98v; Vosté, Pontificale, 110).
comparison the prayers in the Syro-Antiochene and Coptic rite, underlining the evident parallels between these two texts:  

286 The prayers S1- S3 of the Syro-Antiochene rite were translated from Syriac Catholic Pontifical, with reference to Vatican syr. 51, Jerusalem Mark 110, and the Latin translation in Vosté, Pontificale, 105-107, 110. For the prayers of the Coptic rite, the translation in Horner, Service for Consecration, 19-21, with reference to the Coptic text in ibid., 440-50, 455-57, will be used, with some emendations. The prayers are subdivided into numbered sections/phrases for the ease of reference and comparison. In the Coptic text, whenever an obvious Greek derivative term is used, it is placed in parentheses in Greek, disregarding the variation in Coptic transmission of the text.
### Antiochene Rite

1. Lord God of our salvation, who in the many ways and manifold manner made manifest to us your love for mankind (= φιλανθρωπία),
2. who set up your holy church in all wisdom and understanding, who desired that the order (τάξις) of priesthood to be the type (τύπος) of the angelic and heavenly worship (τεσμήστο).
3. who freed us from pagan vanity and demoniac deception, and deemed us worthy to worship you, the only God.
4. You, Lord our Lord, accept then this our supplication which is present at this time, not because, for the sake of them, we may be (shown) worthy to be capable for all this, but so that you may manifest the exalted abundance of your goodness.
5. For you were the one (who was) our helper in all things, and the culmination (= κεφάλαιον) of your benefactions you have sent to us your only-begotten Son, our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ.

### Coptic Rite

1. Lord of our salvation who manifested your love for man in varied manner and many forms.
2. who established your church in all wisdom and understanding, who had been pleased in the exchange of types (τύπος), so that the order (τάξις) of the high priesthood (ἀρχιερεία) (would be) the angelic (ἄγγελος) and heavenly (οὐράνιον) worship.
3. who set us free from the vanity of material things and the deceits of demons, and made us worthy to minister you, the only God.
4. You, therefore, our Master, King, receive our supplication at this present time, and make us fitting, as we pray to you: do not depart from us, but pass over (and) manifest your goodness.
5. You are always our helper, granting unto us the chief (= κεφάλαιον) of your own benefactions, your only-begotten Son, our Lord, God and Saviour Jesus Christ.

6. who fulfilled the will of the Father, and gave himself to you for our sake as a pure sacrifice, and became the propitiation (καταθλίψις) of the whole world, when he was crucified for us and rose again on the third day, as he said.
7. And after the holy and glorious ascension (ἀνάληψις) he was not separated from his disciples, but sent them the Paraklete (παράκλητος), the Spirit of truth who proceeds from you, the Father.
8. And being filled from him, they who were seen from the beginning as the
ministers (ܢܫܐܝܡܫܡ) of his word, by the working of diverse gifts: they raised up churches, established altars, handed over the baptism of adoption as sons, commanded the laws (ܢܘܛܐ), fixed the canons of priesthood, so that by these mystically may be perfected (what) will be before our eyes in every hour, the sacrifice (in) which he offers himself for our sake, according to all this tradition.

9. To you, God and Father, and to your only begotten Son, and to your all-holy Spirit we draw near, and we entreat you, that you may sanctify and perfect these (tablets) with the oil of goodness (ܡܫܚܐܕܛܝܒܘܬܐ) and the myron of the Spirit,

10. so that we may be fitting to receive the holy and bloodless offering, and as we stand before your altar, as before the throne of your kingdom, we may offer you our supplications for us and for your people, and, with the upright faith and blameless way of life, may taste of the body of the Lord which was given for our sake, and from the precious and propitiating (ܣܝܐ̣ܚܘ) blood which because of us was shed, of our Lord and God Jesus Christ.

[And he raises his voice:] 11. Yea, we entreat you, our most merciful God, send the grace of your holy Spirit and perfect this priestly service which is set before,

12. and make these tables (or tablets) capable of your immortal and heavenly mysteries, holy tablets, the haven of souls which are tempest-tossed, the guide (ܩܘܒܪܡܝܢܘܬܐ) of thoughts and of every practice of virtue, unto the turning from sins voluntary and involuntary, for the freedom from the culpable conscience, for the diligence of good customs, for the fulfillment of all.

287 The ms. read ⲛⲧⲡⲧⲓⲣⲕⲛ “who were the first fruits,” according to Horner’s note (Service for the Consecration, 443 n. 1). Horner corrects the reading to ⲧⲣⲕⲛ in the edition of the Coptic text, but preserves the erroneous reading in the translation (ibid., 19). I have corrected Horner’s translation here.
For you are blessed, God, and your only-begotten Son, and your all-holy Spirit, and to you belongs glory, honour and dominion, now:

for you are the blessed God, with your only begotten Son and the Holy Spirit, to you belongs glory forever.

The second prayer of the rite is joined to the first prayer through the acclamation: in the Syriac rite, through the bishop’s greeting of peace, and in the Coptic rite, through the diaconal call for prayer τῷ κυρίῳ δεηθῶμεν (= τοῦ κυρίου δεηθῶμεν).

PRAYER S2- C2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antiochene Rite</th>
<th>Coptic Rite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lord of all nature and the Creator of all creation.</td>
<td>1. O Lord of every nature and Framer of all your creation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. who wrought and provides all for the salvation and benefit of the race (γένος) of men; who have founded the earth upon her foundation, who alone made the abyss;</td>
<td>2. who creates all and provides (πραγματεύω) good for the race of men; who have founded the earth upon its foundation, who alone wrought wonders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. You, Lord, in every place (and) in every city and country established (‘affixed’) your churches, when you set up (‘fixed’) in them altars, and commanded that the offerings and rational and bloodless sacrifices may be offered in your name, for the salvation of the souls of men.</td>
<td>3. You have founded your churches everywhere in cities (πόλις) and countries (χώρα), you have placed in them altars (θυσιαστήριον), and commanded to be offered (προσφέρειν) to you and for your holy name offerings (προσφορά) and reasonable (λογική) and bloodless sacrifices (θυσία) for the salvation of the souls (ψυχή) of men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. You, by the love for mankind, complete/perfect these altars for the hope of faith and salvation of those who draw near to your divinity, for the renewal of</td>
<td>4. You also at this time through your love for mankind, send the holy Spirit, and complete this mystery (μυστήριον) for the hope of the faith, and salvation (σωτηρία)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

288 Vosté, Pontificale, 106.

289 Horner, Service for Consecration, 20/448.

290 The verb used to translate πραγματεύω here is תגא in the Ethpa’al (passive) form meaning ‘trade, carry on commerce; acquire, obtain, gain’ etc. (J. Payne Smith, A Compendious Syriac Dictionary, 604).

291 R. Payne Smith, Thesaurus syriacum, 1.1090.
of those who come to you, for rest of our souls (ψυχή) and bodies (σῶμα) and spirits (πνεῦμα), and for the forgiveness of sins.  
5. For you are the only compassionate and long-suffering, plenteous in mercy, and to you belongs glory, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, forever. Amen.

The final prayer S3-C3 which we are comparing in both rites concludes the rite of tablithô in the West Syriac rite, and is present as one of the two concluding thanksgiving prayers of the Coptic rite for the consecration of a new altar.

**PRAYER S3-C3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antiochene rite</th>
<th>Coptic rite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We give thanks to you Lord of powers, for all things, for you infused this grace upon holy apostles and upon our righteous fathers.</td>
<td>1. We thank you in all things, Lord God of powers. Take not away from us the grace of your apostles and your righteous ones,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do not restrain, neither withhold (it) from us, sinners, but (as) a sweet and merciful (God), extend (it) also unto us, and grant us, the unfitting, to entreat your majesty, and we shall receive what we ask, so that through all and in every place your all-honorable name may be glorified.</td>
<td>2. restrain it not from us sinners, but as kind and merciful, you extended it unto us, and granted to us, the unworthy, to make request of your greatness, and to obtain those things for which we make request, that in all things your holy name may be glorified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Make complete now your sanctification, we beseech you. [And he raises his voice:] And deem us worthy, pure and unblemished, to stand before these altars which are perfected, and with good conscience to offer you upon them the rational and bloodless sacrifice, not unto judgment or condemnation, but unto the building of your holy church, and unto the increase and progress of all your people, unto the glory and praise of your kingdom.</td>
<td>3. Now, therefore, we entreat you: complete your consecration and make us worthy to stand at this altar, made perfect with immaculate purity, and with good conscience to offer you upon it reasonable and bloodless sacrifices, not for judgment or condemnation, but for the building up of the holy catholic church, for the increase and advancement of all your people, for glory and praise of your kingdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. For sanctified and praised is your magnificent name, now and for ever unto the ages.</td>
<td>4. because sanctified is your name, and abundant your mercy, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, for ever and ever.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The comparison of these three texts demonstrates numerous parallels between the structure, content, and phraseology of these prayers, strongly suggesting their dependence on the same Greek source, perhaps more closely represented by the Syriac translation. The existence of the Greek original for all three prayers is strongly suggested by the use of a number of transliterated Greek terms not only in Coptic, but also in Syriac (S1.2, S1.5, S1.7, S1.8, S1.12), as well as by a number of divergent readings which could have only occurred from a misreading or a variant reading in the Greek manuscript source. Thus, the readings in S1.7 “resurrection” for C1.7 “ascension” suggests a confusion between ἀνάστασις/ἀνάληψις, while in S2.4 the reading “renewal” for S2.4 “rest” may reflect a similar variant reading ἀνανέωσις - ἀνάπαυσις. Another example concerns a curious reading in the epicletic section of the Coptic prayer C1.9 where the Lord is petitioned to “complete” the consecration of the altar “by the oil of his grace and the mystery (παντόστηριον) of the Holy Spirit.” The presence of μῦρον in the identical phrase in S1.9 suggests a confusion of the latter and μυστήριον either by a Syriac or Coptic translator. The presence of such divergent readings between Syriac and Coptic also tentatively suggests that the Coptic Bohairic translation was not done from the Syriac, but from the Greek original of the prayer, and thus the transmission of the ritual into the Coptic Christian use might have occurred during the period when Greek was still one of its liturgical languages for both the church of Antioch and Alexandria. The received text of S1-3 and

292 Horner, 445.

293 The Coptic translator could have perceived an abbreviated transcription of μῦρον for the nomen sacrum contraction for μυστήριον, although without comparison with other mss. of the Coptic rite this is a mere speculation.
C1-3 is already a final result of the transmission and integration of the rite into the respective traditions over several centuries, and contains certain unique characteristics:

1) in the Coptic rite, the epiclesis of the rite, perhaps in the imitation of the baptismal epicleses, is punctuated by the people’s response of “Amen” to every phrase of the section that specified the “fruits” of the transformation of this liturgical object by the coming of the Spirit; aside from this change, and numerous translation issues, the purpose of the rite and its prayers has not been changed – these have preserved its original function as the prayers of the rite for the consecration of an altar, both stationary and portable;

2) in the West Syriac rite the purpose of the rite in question has been changed: it began to be used specifically for the consecration of numerous portable altar tabliðê; for this reason, the prayers S1, S2, S3 frequently contain the plural “altars” or “tablets” (S1.9, 12; S2.4; S3.3) where the equivalent sections of the Coptic prayer have singular, referring to the stationary altar; more importantly, in the prayer S2.4 the epicletic phrase “send the Holy Spirit,” still present in the Coptic, has been most likely excised in the Syriac version. It can be supposed that this was done to emphasize the epicletic section in the preceding episcopal prayer S1.11 and to avoid duplication.

If we perceive the divergences in the Syriac text of the Antiochene rite for tabliðê as a result of a change that was effected upon the rite once it was completely separated from the rites for the consecration of the church, and a ritual for the installation and anointing of the stationary altar has been introduced into the West Syriac rite of church dedication,

---

294 See above Chapter 6.4.
what was the original place of the rite of tablithô? One of the possible answers to this question is found in the description of the rite for the consecration of an altar found in the Nomocanon of the Syriac Orthodox catholicos Gregory Abû’l-Faraj, known as Bar-Hebraeus (1225/26-1286). The excerpt in question, cited below, appears as a “direction” (instruction) or, appended to the canon describing a manner for the consecrating of a church, attributed to Severus of Antioch, which I have discussed above. While being attached as a gloss to the canon of Severus, the text of the instruction provides a view of the rite of dedication quite distinct from either the sixth-century description of an Antiochene rite or from the rite as it appears in the twelfth/thirteenth-century West Syriac archieratika:

1. When/after they keep vigil all night with prayer in the church which is prepared to be consecrated, at the morning time they serve the canon of the dedication (encaenia) of the church. 2. And the bishop declares the sedro and they say the qolo and the psalm, and they read from the Old [Testament] the prayer of Solomon, which begins: “And Solomon rose before the altar of the Lord, and Acts, and the Apostle, and the Gospel, of the Caesarea of Philippi [= Matthew 16]. 3. Then the chief priest [= bishop] turns to the altar upon the step which is before the table of life. And he prays the gehantho [=inclined prayer]: “Lord God of powers.” And he raises his voice: “For [you are] sweet.” 4. Then he makes three crosses upon the altar with his thumb, without myron, with three bows. And he raises his voice: “Yea, we pray,” and gives peace and prays the gehantho: “Lord God of all nature”. And he raises his voice: “For you are the only.” Then he lifts up the horn of myron and casts/pours [it] upon three signs which he inscribed, saying “Alleluia.” Then he makes a mark with his thumb upon the myron, saying “Signed is this holy altar with holy myron, in the name of the Father, and of the

295 See Chapter 6.2.

296 The text of the instruction is translated from Bedjan, Nomocanon Barhebraei, 17-19; for the Latin translation see Mai, Nomocanon, 10.2.10-11. The numbered sections have been added for the ease of reference.

297 At this point, another directio is included in some of the mss. of the Nomocanon – it is, however, absent in the 16th cent. ms. Vatican syr. 132 (see note in Bedjan, Nomocanon, 17): “The consecration of tablithê takes place on Holy Thursday, and on all Thursdays after Easter and until the feast of Ascension. The tablithê will be prepared from pure/chosen wood, that is, the best wooden boards, and from best marble and other stones.” This is evidently the interpolation aimed to appropriate the rite exclusively for the consecration of portable altars.
Son, and of the Holy Spirit.” 5. Then he touches the eastern wall which is behind the table of life, and he inscribes upon it three crosses with his thumb with myron. And at every [signing with the] cross he says: “Christ our God, through the prayer of your holy apostles, and your Mother, the Theotokos, and Mar N. the martyr, bless this sanctuary and us, for blessed is your name, with the Father and the Holy Spirit.” 6. And thus also he will do on the northern side and western, above the door, and on the southern. 7. And then he proceeds into the temple with the lights, and the cross, and fans, and the horn of myron. And he will sign also above the door, and in the northern and western and southern [side/wall]. If temple is [too] great, he will sign upon the columns, and says the very same, while those with him say the antiphons (maˈnyotho). 8. Then he will return to the altar, and will stand before the table of life upon the step. The deacon will proclaim: “Again and again,” and he [=bishop] prays the ghantho: “We give thanks to you.” And he raises his voice: “And make us worthy that with purity.” 9. Then they give peace to the altar, while they say the antiphon (maˈanitho). And after the veneration, they begin the liturgy.

10. When you consecrate the tablīthē, complete the very same rite of the consecration of the altar, as you put all the tablīthē upon the table of life from the northern side. And upon every one of those make sign of crosses without myron, and those with myron, and transfer [these] to the southern [side]. 11. And if there are bones of martyrs, bear them in the coffin/depository [ܒܼܿܓܠܘܣܩܡܐ = γλωσσόκομον], and antiphons, and lights, [and] place them into their depositories/chests.

The last section (10-11) of the description in Bar Hebraeus’ Nomocanon contains instructions for the consecration of the tablīthē, and for the deposition of relics. In the “Pontifical of Michael the Syrian” the latter rite was attached to the full ritual for the consecration of a church, as was shown above (5a-d). In the rite described by Bar Hebraeus, however, the service for the consecration of the altar in a new church is completely identical (10) with the service for the consecration of the tablīthē, which shows that at certain point in the West Syriac liturgical history the rite, today known as the “akolouthia” for the consecration of portable altars, was the rite used for the consecration of any altar, stationary/fixed or portable. The analysis of the structure for the rite provided in the Nomocanon shows the arrangement, having much in common with, but also quite distinct from both liturgical rites of dedication known to us from the
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tradition of the Syriac Church of Antioch. The outline below shows the features common to the rite in Bar Hebraeus and other rites of the West Syriac tradition, the rite for the consecration of the church (SyrEk) and the rite for the consecration of the (portable) altar (SyrT).

Vigil (1) = SyrEk 1a
Sedro, qolo, psalm (2) = SyrEk 4m
OT reading – 1 Kings 8 (2) = SyrEk 3c, SyrT 3b
NT readings – Acts, Epistle, Gospel – Matthew 16 (2) = SyrEk 4d, SyrT 4a
Prayer “Lord God of powers” (3) = SyrT 4b, h, m
three signings of the altar w/o myron (4) = SyrT 4o (= S1)
epiclesis “Yea we pray” (4) = SyrT 4p (= S2)
Peace + prayer “Lord God of all nature” (4) = SyrT 4q
pouring of myron upon the altar in three places with Alleluia (4) = SyrT 4r

signing of the altar (4) = SyrEk 4j-k
anointing of the walls of the sanctuary (5-6) = SyrEk 4m
procession into the nave (7) = SyrT 4m
anointing of the walls of the nave or columns (7) = SyrEk 4m
litany + thanksgiving prayer “We give thanks to you” (8) = SyrT 4u
veneration of the altar (9) = SyrT 5b
eucharist (9) = Coptic rite

The use of the same prayers and ritual actions attests to a close connection between the rite described in Nomocanon and the rites of church dedication as these appear in the “Pontifical of Michael the Syrian.” As the comparison above shows, while the opening rites (vigil, Liturgy of the Word) of the Nomocanon ritual, as well as the segment pertaining to the anointing of the walls, parallel the opening rites of the church dedication in the “Pontifical,” the prayers – as it can be established by their incipits – appear to correspond to those in the rite for the tablîthê.298 This demonstrates the use of these

298 The incipit to the S1 (=C1) prayer, “Lord God of our salvation,” does not appear in Bar Hebraeus’ description – however, the incipit to the epicletic section of the same prayer, ܒܥܝܢܢ ܐܹܝܢ “(yea we pray”) does appear in the same place as in the rite for tablîthê in the “Pontifical” (Vosté, Pontificale, 106). The prayer S1 is prescribed to be read in an inclined position (ܣܐܦܝܓܗܢܟܕ; ms. Jerusalem Mark 110, f. 92r), which may also imply the silent recitation (see the definition of “gehantha” in LEW 577); this
prayers, now confined to the rite for portable altars, in the context of the dedication of the entire church building. Consistently with the description found in the seventh century Coptic account of the dedication for the “sanctuary of Benjamin,” the consecration of the church in Bar Hebraeus begins with the consecration of the altar by anointing (4), which is then continued by consecrating the walls of the sanctuary and the nave (5-7). The sequence of actions (altar – sanctuary walls – church walls) suggests for the rite in Bar Hebraeus a date earlier than for the rites described in the “Pontifical,” even though due to scarcity of textual evidence for the West Syriac rites of dedication prior to the 12th century it is not yet possible to determine with precision, how early the Bar Hebraeus redaction of the dedication rite can be dated. It can be hypothesized, at the same time, that the sequence of prayers found in the rite for the dedication of portable altars belonged to one of the rites which in Syriac Antiochene tradition were used for the purpose of dedicating a church building with an altar.

Another aspect of the rite for the consecration of ŭablîthô which has to be considered concerns the particular ritual use of the psalmody. This feature is absent from the rite in Bar Hebraeus’ Nomocanon, which we just considered. As evident from the outline of the rite for the ŭablîthô in the “Pontifical of Michael the Syrian,” presented earlier, the opening rite of the consecration service consists of three repeated units of psalmody, incense, and prayer (both by the deacon and the celebrant). The similar structure can be discerned in the beginning of the Coptic rite for the consecration of an altar, even though the number of these repeated units has been reduced to two. This peculiar tripsalmic unit at the beginning of the rite stands in contrast with the structure of

explained why the reference to this segment of the prayer could have been omitted from Bar Hebraeus’ account.
the West Syriac ritual for the consecration of a church building where no such feature is found. For this reason, it seems prudent to revisit the liturgical evidence we considered in the previous chapter, the last segments of which were devoted to the analysis of the rite for the consecration of a portable altar (\textit{odiki}) in the hagiopolite Georgian euchologion \textit{Tbilisi A 86} (10\textsuperscript{th} cent.).\textsuperscript{299} In view of the usefulness of our earlier discussion for the current analysis, as well as for the question of the origins of the Byzantine rite of dedication in general, I will restate my earlier points regarding the execution of the psalmody in the Georgian and Armenian rites of dedication:

1. The rite of \textit{odiki} in the Jerusalem-influenced Georgian euchologion \textit{Tbilisi A 86} features as its opening sequence a tripsalmic unit, consisting of Pss 83, 131, and 25. The execution of each psalm is accompanied by a single procession of the clergy, carrying the \textit{odiki}, around the stationary altar – at the end of the procession, the new \textit{odiki} is deposited upon the “old” altar, and a litany and “prayer” is said. This sequence is repeated three times.

2. The Armenian rite of church dedication, exemplified through the eighth-century \textit{maštoc’ Venice 457}, uses Ps 83, but in a different place: this psalm is recited three times during the transfer of the altar into the church by the hands of the clergy, and then Ps 83:4 is recited at the installation of the new altar in its place. At the same time, the chant of Pss 119-121 which precedes this whole sequence is intercalated with the diaconal acclamation, the clergy’s formulaic blessing (“Blessing and glory”), and the signing of the altar.\textsuperscript{300}

3. The tripsalmic structure, attested in the Georgian rite of \textit{odiki} and, with some modifications, also in the Armenian ritual, appears to be native to the hagiopolite liturgical tradition where it constituted one of the core structures of the Sunday resurrectional office between the fifth and tenth centuries.\textsuperscript{301}

To this evidence and conclusions we can add the evidence of the tripsalmic sequence which is attested in the West Syriac rite for the consecration of \textit{tāblīthō}, and

\textsuperscript{299} See Chapter 5.3.3.

\textsuperscript{300} See for more detail, above Chapter 5.3.3 “Psalmody and Procession.”

\textsuperscript{301} See Froshov, “The Resurrection Office of the First Millenium Palestinian Tradition.”
which apparently underlies the structure of the Coptic rite for the consecration of the altar. The West Syriac rite for portable altars (which we can consider a “model” for this recension of the tradition) features three psalms or double sets of psalms (22-23, 25-26, 131-132), intercalated with a diaconal litany, a presider’s prayer, and specific manual acts connected with the altar – 1) the deposition of the altar to be consecrated upon the consecrated altar, and 2) the signing of the former with the bishop’s thumb.302 These manual acts find parallels with the Georgian and Armenian rites referenced above: the deposition of the new altar upon the old one is found in the rite of odiki, while the cross-wise signing of the altar is featured among the rites preceding the introduction and installation of the new altar in the Armenian tradition.303 The difference between the psalms used in these respective rites can be attributed to the indigenous development of the ‘core’ rite for the dedication of an altar in the Syro-Antiochene tradition. The same ‘local’ development can serve also as an explanation for the disappearance of any processional movement connected with the altar – featured in full in the Armenian rite, and in a rudimentary form in the Georgian rite in Tbilisi A 86. The assignment of this rite in the West Syriac tradition exclusively to the consecration of portable altars obviated the need for any processional movement, since both in the West Syriac, Coptic, as well as in the Byzantine tradition, the ritual begins inside the sanctuary with the vested clergy standing around the altar.304

302 Vosté, Pontificale, 99.

303 Conybeare, Rituale armenorum, 4.

304 “Then the bishop vests in his order, and the presbyters with deacons, however many present, vest, and they stand around the table” (Vosté, Pontificale, 97).
It is thus our conclusion that the Georgian rite of *odiki* in *Tbilisi A 86*, the Armenian rite for the dedication of a church first attested in the 8th cent. *maštoc ’*, the West Syriac rite for the consecration of the (portable) altar, and the Coptic rite for the consecration of a stationary altar, all represent different stages and local redactions reflecting the evolution of the *same rite* for the consecration of an altar. This rite appears to have consisted of the tripsalmic unit, which probably included Ps 83, perhaps also Pss 131 and 25, manual acts (installation/deposition of a new altar, signings), and one prayer of consecration. 305 This primitive structure has been preserved in the Armenian ritual of church dedication (initial rites), and in the Georgian rite for the consecration of a portable altar (*odiki*). 306 The rite in the tradition of the Syriac Church of Antioch (and in the tradition of the Coptic church, dependent on the latter) represents a more developed form of the original ‘core’ rite, subtracting the processional/stational movement, adding more hymnography and rubrics, as well as two prayers: an epicletic prayer (*S1/C1*) preceding the original “prayer of consecration” (*S2/C2*), and a prayer of thanksgiving (*S3/C3*). The application of a text-critical principle of *lectio brevior* to the liturgical structure of our rite, 307 leads us to suggest that the rite for the consecration of an altar in the form in which it appears in several Eastern Christian traditions has its origins in the liturgical tradition of Jerusalem. While the similarities between the rites pertaining to the consecration of the altar in Armenian, Georgian, West Syriac, and Coptic traditions can

305 See for the analysis of this prayer in *Tbilisi A 86*, in comparison with the Armenian rite, above Chapter 5.3.3. “Prayer of Consecration.”

306 See Chapter 5 “Conclusions.”

307 See the discussion of Anton Baumstark’s formulated principle of the move from “simplicity to increasing enrichment,” evident in liturgical development, in Taft, “Anton Baumstark’s Comparative Liturgy Revisited,” 198, 201-02.
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be taken as evidence of a common origin for these rites, it remains to be seen whether this
Syro-Palestinian ancestry can be detected in the received text of the Byzantine rite of
church dedication, specifically, of the rite of *kathierōsis*, pertaining to the consecration of
the altar and the church building.

6.6 The Prayers of the Byzantine Rite of *Kathierōsis*, and Their Sources.

While the development and cross-pollination of the rites for consecrating of an
altar certainly presents a considerable interest for a liturgical historian, what does the
above evidence has specifically to do with the problem of historical origins of the
Byzantine rite for the consecration of a church? The comparative analysis of the prayers
of the West Syriac rite for the consecration of a (portable) altar and those of the
Byzantine rite of *kathierōsis*, which follows below, makes evident the similarity between
the texts which certainly speaks of some degree of relationship between these liturgical
prayers. It should be noted that some of the prayers constituting the integral part of the
Byzantine ritual of dedication were either excluded from our consideration at the moment
(the prayer K2 Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν ὁ ἁγιάσας τὰ ρεῖθρα) or deferred until later point in
our discussion (the opening prayer K1 Ὅ θεος ὁ ἄναρχος καὶ ἀιόιος). Instead, I have
specifically chosen to highlight the prayers of the Byzantine ritual which show an evident
similarity with the prayers of the West Syriac rite.308

308 The segments of the West Syriac prayers S1 and S3 which show an evident similarity with the
Byzantine prayers have been underlined, while the most significant Syriac terms were placed in parentheses
and transliterated.
The Comparison of the Byzantine Prayer K3 and of the Syro-Antiochene Prayer S1.

Byzantine Rite

1. Κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς,

2. ο θείν άγίαν σου ἐκκλησίαν ἀῤῥήτῳ σοφίᾳ θεμελίωσας, καὶ ἁγγελικής ἐν οὐρανῷ λειτουργίας τής ἱερωσύνης τάξειν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς συστησάμενος.

3. σὺ δέσποτα μεγαλόδωρε, πρόσδεξαι καὶ νῦν δεομένους ἡμᾶς, οὐκ ἀξίους ὀντας περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως θανάτων μοι ἐθέλησαν, ἀλλὰ πρός τὸ τὰς ἱερωσύνης ἐν οὐρανῷ λειτουργίας τὴς ἱερωσύνης τάξειν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς συστησάμενον,

4. οὐ δὲ ἐπάυσω τὸ ἀνθρώπινο γένος πολυτρόπως εὐεργετῶν, κεφάλαιον δὲ ἡμῖν τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν ἐδωρήσω τὴν ἐν σαρκὶ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου υἱοῦ παρουσίαν,

5. ὃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐφθεὶς, καὶ λάμψας τοῖς ἐν σκότει φῶς σωτηρίας, ἀνήνεγκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν θυσίαν, καὶ γέγονεν τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς ἱλαστήριον, κοινωνοὺς ἡμᾶς τῆς ἰδίας ἀναστάσεως ποιησάμενος.

6. καὶ ἀναληφθεὶς εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, ἐνέδυσε τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὰς καὶ ἀποστόλους, καθὼς ἐπηγγείλατο, δύναμιν ἐξ ὑψου, ἥτις ἐστὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ προσκυνητὸν καὶ παντοδύναμον, τὸ ἐκ σοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον.

Syro- Antiochene Rite

1. Lord God of our salvation, who in the many ways and manifold manner made manifest to us your love for mankind (= φιλανθρωπία),

2. who raised up your holy church in all wisdom and understanding, who desired that the order (tâksô) of priesthood to be the type (tûpsô) of the angelic and heavenly worship (tésmêsthô),

3. who freed us from pagan vanity and demoniac deception, and deemed us worthy to worship you, the only God.

4. You, Lord our Lord, accept then this our supplication which is present at this time, not because, for the sake of them, we may be (shown) worthy to be capable for all this, but so that you may manifest the exalted abundance of your goodness.

5. For you were the one (who was) our helper in all things, (and) as the culmination (qêphâlâyôn) of your benefactions you have sent to us your only-begotten Son, our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ,

6. who, when he fulfilled the will of the Father, was delivered to him for our sake as a pure sacrifice, and became the propitiation (hûsôyô) of the whole world, when he was crucified and tasted death, and rose on the third day as he said; who not even after his holy and glorious resurrection was separated from his disciples, but also sent them the Paraklete (pârâklitô), the Spirit of truth who proceeds from you, the Father.


310 Vatican syr. 51, f.; Jerusalem Mark 110, f. 92r-94r; Vosté, Pontificale, 105-106.

311 Cf. Heb 1:1 ἐπιμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως.

312 J. Payne Smith, Compendious Syriac Dictionary, 204b.

313 Syriac Catholic Pontifical adds “and from him” (ibid., 297).
from him, they who were seen from the beginning as the ministers (μσάμσόνε) of his word by the working of diverse gifts: they raised up churches, established altars, handed over the baptism of adoption as sons, commanded the laws (νόμυσέ), fixed the canons of priesthood, so that by these mystically may be perfected (what) will be before our eyes in every hour, the sacrifice (in) which he offers himself for our sake, according to all this tradition. 9. To you, God and Father, and to your only begotten Son, and to your all-holy Spirit we draw near, and we entreat you, that you may sanctify and perfect these (tablets) with the oil of goodness (μêš ḥô d-tâybūthô) and the chrism (mûrôn) of the Spirit, 10. so that we may be fitting to receive the holy and bloodless offering, and as we stand before your altar, as before the throne of your kingdom, we may offer you our supplications for us and for your people, and, with the upright faith and blameless way of life, may taste of the body of the Lord which was given for our sake, and from the precious and propitiating (husâyâ) blood which because of us was shed, of our Lord and God Jesus Christ.

And he raises his voice: 11. Yea, we entreat you, our most merciful God, send the grace of your holy Spirit and perfect this priestly service which is set before, and make these tables (or tablets) capable of your immortal and heavenly mysteries, holy tablets, the haven of souls which are tempest-tossed, the guide (qūbernîtûthô = κυβερνήτης) of thoughts and of every practice of virtue, unto the turning from sins voluntary and involuntary, for the freedom from the culpable conscience, for the diligence of good customs, for the

---


315 or “diverse working of gifts.”
fulfillment of all righteousness. 13. For you are blessed, God, and your only-begotten Son, and your all-holy Spirit, and to you belongs glory, honour and dominion, now:

In both Greek and Syriac versions this prayer contains an extended anamnetic section, enumerating the works of divine economy with respect to God’s founding and sustaining the church. This narration is introduced in the Syriac recension by the inclusion in the very beginning (1) of a partial citation of Heb 1:1 (πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως). Both redactions, however, refer in the beginning to the divine act of establishing the church which appears to be contrasted with the divine creation through the use of Prov 3:19 (ὁ θεὸς τῇ σοφίᾳ ἐθεμελίωσεν τὴν γῆν, ἠτοίμασεν δὲ οὐρανοὺς ἐν φρονήσει). The contrast between the founding of the church and the creation of earth is emphasized in the passage that follows: the church, specifically its liturgy (τῆς ἱερωσύνης τάξιν) is established to be the earthly projection (“antitype”) of the heavenly ‘model’: the angelic worship in the celestial sanctuaries (2). The summary narration of the economy of Christ that follows, the parousia of Jesus is described as a “culmination/heading (κεφάλαιον) of the benefactions,” thus through an allusion to Heb 8:1 referencing Christ’s high priestly ministry. The prayer further underlines the high priesthood of Christ, speaking of his self-offering as a “(pure) sacrifice,” his death, resurrection, ascension and the descent of the Spirit upon the apostles enabling them for the founding of churches and altars, and for the celebration of the sacraments. The term used to describe Christ’s self-sacrifice, “a propitiation of the whole world” (τοῦ κόσμου παντός

316 The same passage appears to be the source for the phrase in the Byzantine prayer οὐ δὲ ἐπαύσω τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος πολυτρόπως εὐεργετῶν (4, emphasis mine). The Syriac text heavily paraphrases the phrase (“for you were our helper in all things”), but still appears to be dependent on the same original.
ἱλαστήριον) is curious: being a fusion of Rom 3:25 and 1 John 2:2, is found only a few times in the patristic literature: in the works of Origen, Basil of Caesarea, the kontakion of Romanos the Melodist, the homily of Germanos I of Constantinople for the Annunciation of the Theotokos. The application of the term in the latter two instances to Mary, rather than to Christ, finds resonance among the Byzantine hymnography, where it is found exclusively among the theotokia. This apparent shift in application of the term, attributable to the sixth-eighth centuries, suggests, at the same time, a somewhat earlier date for the prayer in question, since in both Greek and Syriac versions this biblical type is applied to Christ.

The most significant divergence between the Greek and the Syriac recensions of this prayer, otherwise quite close to each other, is the presence in the Syriac version of a full-fledged epiclesis, which is essentially repeated twice as the petition 1) to the Trinity – “that you may sanctify and perfect these with the oil of goodness and the myron of the

317 ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως (Rom 3:25); καὶ αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστιν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, οὗ περὶ ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου (1 Jn 2:2).

318 Ἐδει δὲ τὸν κύριον ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεώσασθαι θανάτου καὶ ἱλαστήριον γενόμενον τοῦ κόσμου πάντας δικαιῶσαι ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι (Fragm. in Lucam 70 = Origenes Werke 9.2, GCS 49/35).

319 The phrase in Basil’s Ep. 260.9 is nearly word-for-word citation of the line from Origen’s commentary mentioned in the footnote above.

320 Romanos applies the term to Mary, using it in his kontakion for the Nativity of the Theotokos: Τύπος κιβωτοῦ προτετύπωται Παρθένος τέξασα θεός, ἱλαστήριον τοῦ κόσμου (Cant. 13.24).

321 Ὡ παρθένε, χαρᾶς ἐπουρανίου πρόξενος· τερπνὸ καὶ θαυμαστὸν οἰκητήριον, καὶ τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς ἱλαστήριον (Or. 3, PG 98:329); a better edition of this homily is found in ed. D. Fecioru, “Un nou gen de predica in omiletica orthodoxa,” Biserica Ortodoxa Romana 64 (1946): 65-91, 180-92, 386-96; for the ET see Mary B. Cunningham (trans.) Wider than Heaven: Eighth-Century Homilies on the Mother of God, Popular Patristics 35 (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2008), 221-246.

322 Meatfare Tuesday, Matins, 8th ode of the canon, theotokion (TR 51); Thursday of the First Week, Matins, 9th ode (TR 183); Friday of the First Week, Matins, 9th ode, theotokion (TR 199); Friday of the Third Week, Matins, 9th ode, theotokion (TR 339); Saturday of the Fifth Week, Matins, Canon of the Akathist, ode 4 (TR 512); Dec 7, Matins, 1st ode, theotokion (MR Nov/Dec 410). Of the above, only in the canon for the 1st Thursday of Lent the term ἱλαστήριον τοῦ κόσμου refers to Christ, not to Theotokos.
Spirit” – and 2) to the Father: “send the grace of your Holy Spirit and perfect this priestly
service which is set before, and make these tables capable of your immortal and heavenly
mysteries.” The doubling of the epiclesis in the course of a relatively short passage
suggests the later interpolation and expansion aimed at the imitation of the epiclesis of
the eucharistic liturgy. The sequence “send- make- perfect” finds certain correspondence
among the epicleses of the West Syrian anaphorae, particularly in the two versions of
SyrJAS:

1) the version of SyrJAS edited from the tenth-cent. ms. BM Add. 14499 contains
   “send (ܫܕܪ) upon us and upon these gifts offered” in the epiclesis, and “make
   (ܢܥܒܕ)” for the words over the bread and over the cup;

2) the briefer version of SyrJAS edited from the thirteenth/fourteenth-cent. ms.
   BM Add. 14693 uses the verb “send” in the epiclesis, “make” for the words
   over the bread, and “perfect (ܠܐܢܫܡ)” for the cup.

The verb “perfect (ܠܐܢܫܡ),” being a translation of Greek τελειόω, is likewise found in a
number of later West Syriac anaphorae in the context of eucharistic consecration. The
presence of this verb, not found in the anaphoral texts before the thirteenth/fourteenth
century, confirms a late date for the interpolation of the epiclesis into the prayer S1 for
the consecration of a (portable) altar.

By contrast, the corresponding section of the Byzantine prayer does not contain
an explicitly epicletic petition, but addresses the Father, asking him to “fill” the house

323 ed. Odilo Heiming, Anaphorae Syriacae 2.2, 150-151; also LEW 88-89; Hanggi- Pahl, Prex
   eucharistica, 271-272.


325 Brock, “Epicleses in the West Syrian Anaphoras,” in Crossroad of Cultures, 186.
with his glory, and to “show” the altar as the “holy of holies.” There is no petition for the sending down of the Spirit upon the altar, in a manner similar to the eucharistic or baptismal epicleses – rather, the two petitions pertaining to the church and the altar express the petition for the indwelling of divine grace through the use of scriptural language:

1. τῆς θείας σου πλήρωσον δόξης alludes to the presence of God filling the tabernacle upon its consecration by Moses, following the divine command, in Ex 40:34-35: καὶ ἐκάλυψεν ἡ νεφέλη τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου, καὶ δόξης κυρίου ἐπλήσθη ἡ σκηνή... ὅτι ἐπεσκύπευεν ἐπ’ αὐτήν ἡ νεφέλη καὶ δόξης κυρίου ἐπλήσθη ἡ σκηνή; the divine presence is described in the similar terms at the dedication of Solomon’s Temple in 1 Kings: ὅτι ἔπλησεν δόξα κυρίου τὸν οἶκον (8:11, cf. 2 Chron 5:14);

2. τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ παγένωρ θυσιαστήριον ἁγίων ἁγίων ἀνάδειξον: can also be construed as an allusion to the Mosaic consecration of the tabernacle in Ex 40 where it is stated that upon the anointing with oil of the tent, and all the vessels (πάντα τὰ σκεύη αὐτῆς), they will become holy (ἔσται ἁγία), while the altar, upon anointing, will become “holy of the holies (καὶ ἔσται τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἁγίου τῶν ἁγίων)” (40:9-10). At the same time, however, the use of the verb ἀναδείκνυμι is attested in the context of eucharistic epicleses, specifically in the epiclesis of the ByzBAS, some West Syrian anaphorae, but in a

---

326 καὶ ἐγάσαι καὶ ἀναδείξαι... τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον σῶμα... (Arranz, L’eucologio costantinopolitano, 484).

327 See the list of examples of using the Syriac verb ṳḥawwe, corresponding to ἀναδείκνυμι, in Brock, “Epicleses in the West Syrian Anaphoras,” 186.
remarkable parallel to the phrasing of the K-3 prayer from the Byzantine rite of dedication – in the Egyptian recension of BAS, both Greek and Sahidic versions of which preserve the expression ἀναδείξαι ἅγια ἁγίων, with the reference to the consecration of the eucharistic gifts. In the context of the development of Basilian anaphorae, the lack of reference to the precise manner of conversion of the eucharistic elements in Egyptian Sahidic BAS (ES-Basil) has been seen as a sign of antiquity of this form, reflecting the sanctifying effect the presence of the Spirit had upon the gifts and the worshippers. In the context of the Byzantine prayer for the consecration of a church and altar the scope of the sanctifying divine presence is narrower: it affects the altar within the newly consecrated church building, appointing/showing it an ecclesial equivalent of the “holy of holies” of the Mosaic tabernacle or Solomonic Temple.

If we choose the principle of lectio difficilior as a criterion to determine the original form of this prayer, the Byzantine form of this prayer would appear more archaic than S1, being more succinct in comparison with the Syriac version, and containing the petition for the divine presence in the newly built church and its altar which is more consistent with the allusion to the heavenly temple in the beginning of the prayer, than a more straightforward petition for the descent of the Spirit in the Syriac version.

328 See the edition of Greek and Coptic versions of the anaphora of BAS in Achim Budde, Die ägyptische Basilios-Anaphora: Text, Kommentar, Geschichte, Jerusalemer theologisches Forum 7 (Münster: Aschendorff, 2004), 160-161; and the discussion of the epiclesis of the Egyptian BAS in ibid., 378-430, and also idem, “Wie findet man ‘ägyptisches Heimatgut’? Der ägyptische Ursprung der Basileios-Anaphora in der Diskussion,” in Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark, 680-81; Fenwick, Anaphoras of St Basil and St James, 168-191.

329 Fenwick, 180-81.
It does seem, however, that while the form of the Byzantine prayer may be more antique, its position in the rite following the actions sanctifying the church and the altar by anointing is inconsistent with its content: it effectively petitions for the accomplishment of the actions which were already completed by that time. Thus, one could suggest that the position of this prayer in the Syriac rite for the consecration of an altar could correspond more closely to the place of this prayer in the rite underlying the Byzantine rite of *kathierósis*.

6.6.2 The Syro-Antiochene Prayer S2 and the Byzantine Prayer for the Consecration of the *Antimensia*.

In one of the preceding chapters, I have already offered a comparison of the prayer for the consecration of the altar from the Georgian (hagiopolite) archieraticon *Tbilisi A 86* with the prayer after the installation of the altar in the Armenian rite of dedication, and with the prayer for the consecration of the antimensia that have been discovered in several Byzantine euchologia. In this section, the corresponding prayer of the West Syrian rite for the *tablithê* is added to the other three witnesses, all placed in parallel columns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Armenian</th>
<th>Georgian</th>
<th>Syriac</th>
<th>Byzantine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lord God almighty</td>
<td>1. Lord God of powers, who are the creator of all the creatures,</td>
<td>1. Lord of all nature and the Creator of all creation,</td>
<td>1. Ὁ πάσης φύσεως δεσπότης, καὶ κτίσεως ἀπάσης δημιουργὸς,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. who established the earth upon its</td>
<td>2. who alone has spread out the</td>
<td>2. who wrought and provides all for the salvation and benefit of the race (γένος) of men; who have founded the earth upon her foundation,</td>
<td>2. ὁ πάντα πάντοτε ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος ἐπ’ εὐεργεσίᾳ καὶ σωτηρίᾳ τοῦ γένους τῶν ἄνθρωπων, ὁ θεμελιώσας τὴν γῆν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Armenian</th>
<th>Georgian</th>
<th>Syriac</th>
<th>Byzantine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>foundation, and alone have created many powers.</td>
<td>heavens and established the earth upon its foundation;</td>
<td>who alone made the abyss;</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τὴν ἁφαλείαν αὐτῆς, καὶ ποιῶν θεμάσια.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. You Lord of all the earth &lt;for all generations&gt; have strengthened your holy church and commanded to establish the altar therein and to offer sacrifices and rational offerings which are presented without blood to your holy name for the salvation of the human race.</td>
<td>3. You, Lord, in the cities and villages have founded the churches, you have raised in it altars and commanded the sacrifices and bloodless offerings to be offered for the sake of your holy name for the redemption of the human race.</td>
<td>3. You, Lord, in every place (and) in every city and country established (‘affixed’) your churches, when you set up (‘fixed’) in them altars, and commanded that the offerings and rational and bloodless sacrifices may be offered in your name, for the salvation of the souls of men.</td>
<td>3. σὺ μόνος πανταχοῦ κατὰ πόλιν καὶ χώραν ἱδρύσας τὰς ἐκκλησίας, ἐπηζέας ἐν αὐταῖς θυσιαστήριον καὶ ἐκέλευσας ἐν αὐταῖς θυσίας καὶ προσφορὰς λογικὰς καὶ αναμάκτους προσφέρειν τῷ ὀνόματι σου εἰς σωτηρίαν τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Likewise also now, Lord, send your holy sanctifying Spirit and sanctify this altar for the hope of the faithful, for the salvation of all men and those who stand before the great glory of your name, for the renovation of souls, and for the good pleasure of your will, | 4. Now you, Lord of all, look down upon this odiki and sanctify it by your Holy Spirit, so that on the mountains and in caves, holes and in sea and in every place of your dominion be celebrated upon it the bloodless sacrifice of your only-begotten Son unto communion and remission of sins of all who with the knowledge of holiness offer before you, for the union of the people and for the communion of the divine mystery which is celebrated | 4. You, by the love for mankind, complete/perfect these altars for the hope of faith and salvation of those who draw near to your divinity, for the renewal of soul and body and spirit, for the remission of sins. | 4. καὶ νῦν ἐξαπόστειλον τὸ πνεῦμα σου τὸ ἄγιον καὶ ἀγίασαν τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦτο εἰς ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας, τῶν προσώπων τῇ σῇ ἀγαθότητι, [εἰς ἀνανέωσιν] ψυχῆς καὶ σῶματος καὶ πνεύματος, καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.
It would be redundant to repeat in this section everything that what was already said with regards to this prayer in the previous chapter. Through the comparison of Armenian and Georgian (hagiopolite) versions of this prayer, it was, I believe, possible to demonstrate that this succinct epicletic prayer belonged to the core of the rite for the consecration (dedication, installation) of a new altar in the rite of Jerusalem.

Subsequently, I have also shown, with the reference to the work of Gregorios Ioannides, that this hagiopolite prayer has entered into the liturgical use of the Byzantine periphery (South Italy, Sinai, Cyprus) where it was employed as part of an independent rite for the consecration of the portable altars (antimensia), or for the installation of a new altar. It was evident, however, that the extant Greek redaction of this prayer has undergone some emendation, most likely, due to its passage through a ‘sift’ of another local usage. The comparison of the Byzantine and the West Syriac redactions of this prayer shows that the use of the Syriac church of Antioch may have been such an intermediary stage, since a few distinctive characteristics of the text which emerge in the Byzantine version are also found in the Syro-Antiochene rendering of the prayer:

330 See Chapter 5.3.3, 5.3.3.2.
1. ὁ πάσης φύσεως δεσπότης/ܐܟܝܢܕܟܠܡܪܝܐ appears in only two of the four versions of this prayer (not considering the Coptic rendition as quite close and likely dependent on the Syriac); a search through the database of the Greek patristic corpus for the expression ὁ δεσπότης τῆς φύσεως reveals that the largest number (thirteen) of uses for this expression is found among the works of John Chrysostom,331 which may place this particular phrase among the liturgical formulas present in the use of the church of Antioch;

2. ὁ πάντα πάντοτε ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος/ܘܡܬܬܓܪܥܒܕܟܠܫܥܕܟܠܗܘ: the examination of this expression (assisted, again, by the database search)332 shows that, out of 12 instances of the use of these precise terms in this precise order, nine instances are found in the works of John Chrysostom,333 and one – in spurious works of the latter father.334 Moreover, despite the generally non-liturgical character of the use of this expression in the oeuvre of Chrysostom, many of these bear remarkable similarity to the phraseology of the presanctus of CHR, also attested in the Syriac anaphora of the Apostles (SyrAp), another progeny of the original Antiochene eucharistic prayer335:

331 Adv. Judaeos 6.4 (PG 48:912); In Pentecosten sermo I (PG 52:806); In Gen. 6.2 (PG 53:56), 13.4 (PG 53:110), 28.5 (PG 53:259), 40.2 (PG 53:370), 41.6 (PG 53:383), 46.2 (PG 54:424), 50.1 (PG 54:448), 56.3 (PG 54:490), 59.3 (PG 54:517), Expositio in Ps 49.2 (PG 55:244), Fragm. in Jeremiam 1.7 (PG 64:749); the search through the database Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (accessed Dec 19, 2010) was facilitated through the services of the Hesburgh Library of the University of Notre Dame.


334 Ecloga 34 = Homily on Christmas (PG 63:823).
CHR: ...οὐκ ἀπέστης πάντα ποιῶν ἑως ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνήγαγες...  

SyrAp: καὶ οὐκ ἀπέστης πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος, ἕως τὴν φύσιν τὴν πεσοῦσαν ἀνέστησε...  

Chrysostom:
Adv. Judaeos 8.2: καὶ οὐ πρότερον ἀπέστη πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος, ἔως τὴν φύσιν τὴν πεσοῦσαν ἀνέστησε...  
ibid., 8.3: καὶ δι’ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ δι’ ἑτέρων πολλῶν πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος, ἔως ἄν αὐτὸν εἰς ἑπίγνωσιν ἔπεισε...  
Hom. on Ascension: πῶς οὐ πρότερον ἀπέστη πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πάσχων καὶ πραγματευόμενος...  
Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt 8.4: καὶ οὐ διέλιπεν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἕως τέλους πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ γένους τοῦ ἡμετέρου...  
Letter 53: εὖ γὰρ ὅτι οὐ παύσῃ πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος... etc.

Taft has discussed the parallels between the expression πάντα ποιῶν in the CHR text and the expression πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος found in Chrysostom’s writings, noting its connection with Eph 2:4-7. By contrast with the other expression in CHR which, to Taft’s estimation, could have been authentic contributions of the Greek father to the Antiochene eucharistic prayer (Ur-CHR = Ur-SyrAp), the phrase πάντα ποιῶν appears in both CHR and SyrAp, and thus belonged to the Ur-text of the

---

336 Barberini gr. 336, f. 29v = Parenti-Velkovska, 76.
337 ed. A. Raes, Anaphorae Syriacae 1.2, 214; “all (Δα)” is added in some of the manuscripts of SyrAp.
338 PG 48:929.
339 PG 48:931.
341 PG 52:497.
342 PG 52:638.
343 Taft, “Authenticity,” 43-44.
‘Anaphora of the Apostles’ before it was transformed into CHR by the hand of Chrysostom himself. With respect to the expressions common to both anaphorae, and also occurring in the authentic works of the father, Taft proposed that such expressions were part of stock liturgical language (Formelgut) and, as such, may have actually influenced Chrysostom’s writing, rather than other way around. In the case of the prayer for the consecration of an altar S1, one could observe that the textual parallels with the authentic (and spurious) Chrysostomika is even more exact that between the latter and the anaphoral texts of the Antiochene origin. Since the expressions in question do not appear in the sources that may reflect the ‘hagiopolite’ redaction of the same prayer (columns 1-2 above), the redaction found in the West Syrian and Byzantine rites (columns 3-4) may be the product of the reworking of the original Jerusalem prayer by the addition unto it the expressions derived either from the works of John Chrysostom, or from the Antiochene Formelgut, which may have served as a ‘source’ for Chrysostom also.

The notable divergence between the Greek and Syriac texts, representing the same redaction of the prayer, is the absence of the imperative verb “send” (= ἐξαπόστειλον, 4) in the petition for the consecration of the altar: the Syriac does not mention the Spirit at all, asking merely for God to “perfect these altars ( dehydration  ).” Since all other versions of this prayer, including the Coptic recension, contain the explicit

344 Ibid., passim, 27-38.
345 Ibid., 49-50.
346 E.g. Jerusalem Mark 110, f. 94v; Vosté, Pontificale, 107.
347 Horner, Service for the Consecration, 20 (ET)/450: “send thy Holy Spirit, and complete this mystery.”
epiclesis, we might assume here the work of a later redactor’s hand, attempting to remove the doublet to the more explicit and prolix epiclesis present in S1. Being associated, in all the Oriental recensions of the rite, with the consecration of the altar by the effusion of the oil/myron upon a new altar that follows after, the presence of the epiclesis is natural and thus original for this prayer – the outpouring of oil visualizes through a liturgical manual act the descent of the Spirit, which is asked for in prayer.

6.6.3 The Thanksgiving Prayer (S3) and the Byzantine Prayer K4.

Byzantine Rite

1. Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων, ὅτι ἔξεχες χάριν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁγίους σου ἀποστόλους, καὶ τοὺς άσιοὺς ἡμῶν πατέρας ἥξιώσας διὰ πολλῆν φιλανθρωπίαν καὶ μέχρι ἡμῶν τῶν ἀμαρτολόν καὶ ἁγαθοῖν δούλων σου ἐκτείναι.

2. Διὸ δεόμεθα σου δέσποτα πολυέλεε, πλήρωσον δόξης καὶ ἁγιασμοῦ καὶ χάριτος τὸ θυσιαστήριον σου τοῦτο εἰς τὸ μεταποιεῖσθαι τὰς ἐν αὐτῷ προσφερόμενας σοι ἁγιασμότως καὶ μετατρέπει τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου ὑιοῦ πρὸς σωτηρίαν παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ σου καὶ τῆς ἡμῶν ἀναξιότητος.

3. Εἰς τὸ μεταποιεῖσθαι τὰς ἐν αὐτῷ προσφερόμενας σοι ἁγιασμότως καὶ μετατρέπει τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου ὑιοῦ πρὸς σωτηρίαν παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ σου καὶ τῆς ἡμῶν ἀναξιότητος.

Antiochene Rite

1. We give thanks to you Lord of powers, for all things, for you infused this grace upon holy apostles and upon our righteous fathers. 2. Do not restrain, neither withhold (it) from us, sinners, but (as) a sweet and merciful (God), extend (it) also unto us, and grant us, the unfitting, to entreat your majesty, and we shall receive what we ask, so that through all and in every place your all-honorable name may be glorified. Fill now [with] your sanctification, we beseech you.

And he raises his voice: 3. And deem us worthy, pure and unblemished, to stand before these altars which are perfected/fulfilled, and with good conscience to offer you upon them the rational and bloodless sacrifice, not unto judgment or condemnation, but unto the building of your holy church, and unto the increase and progress of all your people, unto the glory and praise of your kingdom.

4. For sanctified and praised is your magnificent name, now and for ever unto the ages.

---

348 Barberini gr. 336, f. 155v-156r = Parenti-Velkovska, 162.

349 Syriac Catholic Pontifical, 281-82; Vosté, Pontificale, 110.
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The thanksgiving prayer of the Byzantine rite of *kathierósis* (consecration of the altar and the church) stands as a concluding prayer of this rite, followed by the deacon’s exclamation Ἐν εἰρήνῃ προέλθωμεν.\(^{350}\) The corresponding prayer of the West Syriac rite for the *tablīthē* also concludes the rite which, in this tradition, is not followed by the encaenia and the deposition of relics, but ends with the veneration of a new altar by the clergy. The comparison of the two texts – Byzantine and West Syriac – shows that the prayers correspond only partially: the thanksgiving segment is quite close in both texts (1-2), but in the concluding segment (3-4), expressing the purpose of the consecration of an altar that just occurred, the texts diverge. The Byzantine prayer merely refers to the eucharistic change, while the West Syriac prayer appeals to the act of the clergy’s standing before the altar and offering of the eucharist, using the language similar to the concluding section of prayer *S1* (10).

At the same time, the segment of the Byzantine prayer which does not correspond to the West Syriac prayer finds some parallels with another Byzantine prayer *Κύριε κύριε ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι σου τῷ κορυφαίῳ*, already discussed in a preceding chapter.\(^{351}\) As stated before, this prayer appears within the rite for the “establishing of an altar by two or three presbyters” in the euchologion *Sinai gr. 973*,\(^{352}\) and as an optional prayer for the “affixing” of an altar in another 12th cent. euchologion *Vatican gr. 1970*.\(^{353}\) Since this prayer was already discussed in the context of the hagiopolite rites for the dedication of

---

\(^{350}\) For more on this dismissal formula, see Taft, *Communion, Thanksgiving, and Concluding Rites*, 571-75.

\(^{351}\) See Chapter 5.3.3.2.

\(^{352}\) f. 96v.

\(^{353}\) f. 214v.
an altar, I will only cite a segment of that prayer which appears to bear resemblance to the thanksgiving prayer of the *kathierósis* rite:

K-4
πλήρωσον δόξης καὶ ἁγιασμοῦ καὶ χάριτος
tὸ θυσιαστήριον σου τοῦτο

eἰς τὸ μεταποιεῖσθαι τὰς ἐν αὐτῷ
προσφερομένας σοι ἀναμάκτους θυσίας
eἰς τὸ ἄχραντον σῶμα καὶ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα
tοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν
Ἱησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου υἱοῦ

The comparison shows that in the middle segment of the prayer formula the language of the two text is quite close. This certainly can be attributed to the Formelgut material common to the prayers pertaining to the consecration of a church, rather than to strict dependence relationship between the two texts – this, however, does not remove the question, of which tradition such stock language would be characteristic. The correspondence between the prayer Sin2 found in peripheral Byzantine euchologia and the second prayer of the Armenian rite for the dedication of a church has been noted before.354 The presence of this expression not only in the Byzantine, but also in the Armenian material is certainly suggestive of a hagiopolite influence underlying the composition of the thanksgiving prayer K4 in the Byzantine rite of *kathierósis*. The discovery of parallels (and, possibly, antecedents) of this Byzantine prayer in the West

354 See again Chapter 5.3.3.2; Conybeare, *Rituale armenorum*, 7.
Syriac (1-2) and Armenian rites (3) pertaining to the dedication of an altar may strengthen our general argument in favour of the Syro-Palestinian background of the corresponding Byzantine rite.

6.7 The Rite of Dedication in Constantinople and Syro-Palestinian Background.

In our research, we were not able to uncover any evidence which attest to the ritual practice of consecrating a new altar by anointing in Constantinople prior to the appearance of this rite in the euchologion Barberini gr. 336 at the end of the eighth century, with one possible exception, which shall be reviewed shortly. Even though the “argument from silence” in the absence of complete liturgical formularies, deriving from Constantinople, is certainly not the strongest, the lack of any mention of the anointed altar in the sources which can be identified as Constantinopolitan,355 has to be accounted for. The sources, which we surveyed above356 and which refer to the dedication of the churches in Constantinople in the sixth century, demonstrate features which connect the sixth-century church dedications with the rite of encaenia as it appears in the euchologion Barberini: vigil on the eve of dedication, the beginning of the dedication liturgy at another location in the city, stational procession with the relics (or the Gospel book), Ps 23:7 as a processional chant.357 This structure of the stational liturgy can also be

355 See, however, Paul L. Gavrilyuk, “Did Pseudo-Dionysius Live in Constantinople?” Vigiliae Christianae 62 (2008): 505-14, who argues for the Constantinopolitan origin of Dionysius’ works on the basis of the similarity of the baptismal rites – the view, however, is not reflective of scholarly consensus.

356 See Chapter 4.2.

357 Theophanes, Chronographia (de Boor, 1.228, 238); John Malalas, Chronographia (Dindorf, 486).
discerned in the celebration on the annual feast of the dedication of Hagia Sophia in the tenth century Canonarion-Synaxarion (Typicon) of the Great Church. However, the sources are silent with regards to the ceremony for the consecration of a church by anointing which should have preceded the encaenia ceremony, if the rite in Barberini gr. 336 could have been dated significantly earlier than the period in which it appeared – the second half of the eighth century.

6.7.1 The Anointing at Dedication in Constantinople? Maximus the Confessor.

The only, possibly Constantinopolitan piece of evidence, dated before the eighth century, which contains a reference to the use of anointing at the consecration of a church, is found in the account of interrogation endured by Maximus the Confessor at Constantinople in May 655, as recorded by his disciple Anastasios Apokrisiarios.359 Responding to a (rhetorical) question of his accuser whether a Christian emperor could be considered a “priest” (οὐκ ἔστι πᾶς βασιλεὺς Χριστιανὸς καὶ ἱερεύς), Maximus defies the idea, listing the priestly functions which the emperor cannot perform:

he does not have access to the altar, and after sanctification of the bread, he does not raise it, saying ‘holy things to the holy,’ he does not baptize, nor does he perform initiation with myron, he does not ordain…, he does not anoint the churches (οὔτε χρίει ναοὺς), he does not bear the symbols of priesthood…”

It is not clear whether under “anointing of the church” here Maximus meant the anointing of the church walls, of both of the altar and the church: the anointing of the walls of the church – as we have seen in our overview of the West Syrian rite for the consecration of a

358 Mateos, OCA 165, 1.144-146.
360 PG 90:117B; ET is cited after Dagron, Emperor and Priest, 170 (with emendations).
church – does not necessarily imply the anointing of the altar. Additionally, the details of Maximus’ biography do not allow us to conclude with certitude that the liturgical practice which he may have had in mind was the liturgical tradition of Constantinople, rather than Syria or Palestine.\footnote{For the succinct overview of Maximus’ life, see Andrew Louth, \textit{Maximus the Confessor} (London: Routledge, 1996), 3-19.} The very brevity of this father’s remark in the course of his trial simply does not constitute a sufficiently solid body of evidence for us to conclude that the ritual custom of anointing was used in Constantinople in the mid-seventh century.

6.7.2 Possible Allusions to the Church Dedication Rite in the Commentary of Germanus of Constantinople.

The church is the temple of God, a holy place, a house of prayer, the assembly of the people, the body of Christ; her name is the “bride of Christ.” She is cleansed by the water of his baptism, sprinkled by his blood, clothed in bridal garments and sealed with the myrrh/myron of the Holy Spirit according to the prophetic saying: “your name is like a poured out myrrh” (Cant 1:3), “we will run into the sweet smell of myrrh” (Cant 1:4), which is “as a myrrh upon the head, running down upon the beard, the beard of Aaron” (Ps 132:2).\footnote{Historia ecclesiastica et contemplatio mystica 1; ed. and ET Paul Meyendorff in Germanus of Constantinople, \textit{On the Divine Liturgy} (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1999), 57 (with minor changes).}

This passage derives from the liturgical commentary attributed to Germanus, the patriarch of Constantinople in 715-730,\footnote{See for the issues with the attribution of this commentary, including the discussion of the manuscript tradition, Bornert, \textit{Commentaires byzantins de la divine liturgie}, 125-60.} and the renowned defender of icons during the first period of iconoclasm.\footnote{For the brief biography, see ed. Ralph-Johannes Lilie, \textit{Die Patriarchen der ikonoklastischen Zeit, Germanos I.- Methodios I.} (715-847), Berliner Byzantinische Studien 5 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999), 5-21; for the analysis of the written sources, connected with Germanus’ name in the course of the iconoclast controversy, see John Haldon, Leslie Brubaker, \textit{Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (ca 680-850): the Sources}, Birmigham Byzantine and Ottoman Monographs 7 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 246-48.} The terminology used in this excerpt had apparently drew the attention of one of the early contributors to the study of the Byzantine dedication
rites, Chrisostomos Konstantinidis. In his essay, published in 1953, Konstantinidis saw in Germanus’ excerpt an allusion to the principal elements constituting the Byzantine rite of church dedication.\textsuperscript{365} Further, in a phrase further in his commentary, ἱεράρχαις κατακοσμηθείσα καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἅγιοις αὐτῶν λειψάνοις ἐνθρονισθεῖσα,\textsuperscript{366} he saw an allusion to the final ‘element’ of the Byzantine dedication rite – the deposition of relics. This reference, for Konstantinidis, indicates “le caractère essentiel et principal de la déposition de reliques dans la dédicace.”\textsuperscript{367} This affinity which Konstantinidis found between Germanus’ commentary and the earliest Byzantine text for the dedication rites in the euchologion Barberini gr. 336, allowed him to propose the figure of the patriarch Germanus as a “probable redactor” of the Byzantine rite of dedication in the beginning of the eighth century.\textsuperscript{368}

It is indeed compelling to associate the sequence of the clauses in this passage, predicated upon the church as the “bride of Christ” with the order of the ritual actions in the Byzantine rite for the consecration of the church and the altar, as it appears in the Byzantine euchologies of both early and later recensions:

1) τῷ ὕδατι τοῦ βαπτίσματος αὐτοῦ καθαρθεῖσα,
2) καὶ τῷ αἵματι ραντισθεῖσα τῷ αὑτοῦ
3) καὶ νυμφικῶς ἐστολισμένη


\textsuperscript{366} Cited in “Ordo de la dédicace,” 208. The phrase constitutes a textual variant, not found in the earlier manuscripts, and hence also absent from the critical text of the commentary, which instead of καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἅγιοις αὐτῶν λειψάνοις ἐνθρονισθεῖσα has ἐν μάρτυσι τελεωθεῖσα (Meyendorff, 57). This certainly undermines the entire argument of Constantinidis regarding the presence of relics at the early 8th century dedication – if the passage in question refers to the rite of dedication at all.

\textsuperscript{367} Ibid., 210.

\textsuperscript{368} Ibid., 215.
Conceived as a reflection of the ritual order of manual acts effecting the consecration of the church – and, more specifically, of the altar – these clauses could be taken to refer to the 1) washing of the altar with water, 2) washing with wine, 3) vesting; and 4) anointing with chrism. While the final vesting of the altar in the euchologion Barberini follows, rather than precedes the chrismation, the wiping of the washed altar with the “newly-made cloth” may be conceived as an equivalent to such a symbolic “vesting.”369 While the analogy noted by Konstantinides is certainly remarkable – even though his argument for the presence of relics in this rite of dedication is dubious,370 it is far from conclusive, considering the genre of symbolic exegesis to which Germanos’ commentary belongs. The reference to the church “sealed with the chrism” may indicate that the rite of anointing of the altar was present and known in the rite of Constantinople in the early eighth century, and it is to this rite, possibly formed under Syro-Palestinian influence, that the deposition of relics was attached when such rite became mandatory in the aftermath of the first period of iconoclasm.371

6.7.3 One or Two Days? The “Preface” to the Rite of Kathierósis in Barberini gr. 336 et alia.

Thus, the rite for the consecration of a new altar and a church in the eighth-cent. 

Barberini gr. 336 itself remains the first significant source attesting to the use of washing

---

369 καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο λαμβάνει σάβανον καινοσυγρήν καὶ ἐπιτίθεσιν ἐπάνω τῆς τραπέζης καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἀποσπογγίζει αὐτήν (Parenti-Velkovska, 160).

370 See fn. 366 above.

371 See Appendix I.
and anointing of the altar with myron. The rite is introduced with a rather succinct rubric, dealing specifically with the preparation of the altar before the beginning of the rite and prior to the arrival of the bishop with the accompanying clergy. As I have already discussed in Chapter 4, this “shorter” recension of the rubric is found in four Byzantine euchologia: the already-mentioned Barberini, Sinai gr. 959 (10th cent.), South Italian euchologion Bodleianus Auct. E. 13 (12th cent.), Ottoboni gr. 434, and the 12th/13th cent. Melkite pontifical BM Or. 4951. It is quite possible that the recension of the rite of church dedication found therein can be attributed to the “older Constantinopolitan” tradition, preceding or contemporary with the period of the first iconoclasm. The brevity of the initial rubric in Barberini gr. 336 illustrates the archaic characteristics of this tradition of liturgical texts:

Τάξις γινομένη ἐπὶ καθιερώσεως ἁγίου ναοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ ἁγίας τράπεζης πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας τῶν ἐγκαινίων.

Πρὸ τοῦ παραγενέσθαι τὸν πατριάρχην ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι ἑγκαινίζεσθαι ναῷ, προπέμπεται ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν χειροτονιῶν, καὶ παρασκευάζει τοὺς μαρμαράριους στῆσαι τὴν τράπεζαν· καὶ πληροῦντων αὐτῶν τὸ ἔργον καὶ ἀναχωροῦντων, εἰσέρχεται ὁ πατριάρχης ἐν τῷ ναῷ.

Καὶ πάντων τῶν λαίκων ἐξερχομένων, καὶ μηδενὸς ἐσοὶ μένοντος σὺν αὐτῷ πλῆν κληρικῶν μόνων, καὶ πανταχόθεν ἀσφαλιζομένης τῆς ἐκκλησίας ποιεῖ εἰς τῶν διακόνων εὐχὴν.

The order at the consecration of the holy temple and of the holy table in it one day before the encaenia.

Before the arrival of the patriarch into the church to be dedicated, the <official> in charge of the ordinations is sent beforehand and he instructs the marble masons to set the [altar] table. And when they have finished the work and have departed, the patriarch proceeds into the temple.

When all of the lay people have exited [the church], and none was left inside with him but only the clergy, and the church was shut from all sides, one of the deacons makes the prayer (= litany).

This preface is then followed by the recitation of the great synapte by the deacon, while the patriarch prays, kneeling, before the doors of the sanctuary, “since the [altar] table deposited therein has not yet been consecrated” (f. 146r). By comparison with the
Barberini, the later euchologies, containing the same recension of the preface, make one crucial alteration to the text, apparently reflecting changes in liturgical arrangement of the dedication rites: the clause πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας τῶν ἐγκανίων (‘one day before the encaenia’) is removed from the inscription of the rite and transferred to the beginning of the opening rubric itself, which now reads:

Πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας τῶν ἐγκανίων πρὸ τοῦ παραγενέσθαι τὸν πατριάρχην...
One day before the encaenia, before the arrival of the patriarch…

Such minor alteration, apparently deemed insignificant by the major scholarship, makes the difference with regards to the arrangement of the rites of dedication/consecration within one liturgical day: if Barberini euchologion appears to imply that the rite of kathierósis is celebrated in its entirety the day before the encaenia with the deposition of relics, the subsequent euchologia, through a minor punctuation change indicated that at the time when this redaction of the euchologia was produced, it was the preparation of an altar by the workers which was to be done one day prior, not the entire rite of consecrating the church and an altar. However, the work of physical preparation of the site (altar) for the consecration was still entirely delegated to the “marble masons” with merely a supervision from an official of the patriarchal court, “one in charge of ordinations” glossed in the Ottoboni euchologion as ῥομνήμων.375

372 Parenti-Velkovska, 156.

373 Sinai gr. 959, f. 128v; Bodleian Auct. E. 5. 13, f. 133v (Jacob, 331); Ottoboni gr. 434, f. 88v. The Ottoboni euchologion has a raised dot (·) after τῶν ἐγκανίων, but the clause is placed within the body of the text.

374 The Parenti-Velkovska edition of Barberini gr. 336 punctuates the sentence in accordance to the reading of other manuscripts of ‘older’ Constantinopolitan recension, in direct contradiction to the actual manuscript evidence; I have found no comment in the text why such choice was made (see p. 156). The only work where this excerpt of the Barberini ms. was punctuated correctly, but without any comment, is an otherwise quite succinct dissertation by Donato Diamante, “L’eucologio Sinai 959,” Dissertatio ad doctoratum (Pontificium Institutum Orientale, Rome, 1994), 1.57.
The possibility of the rite in Barberini gr. 336 having been celebrated on the eve of the day when the rite of encaenia was to be celebrated, can be supported through a close reading of a similar rubric prefacing the latter rite in this euchologion:

Τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν ᾧ καθιεροῦτα ὁ εὐκτήριος οἶκος, γινομένου λυχνικοῦ καὶ πανυχίδος ἐν μιᾷ τῶν σύνεγγυς τοῦ καθιερωθέντος εὐκτήριου ἐκκλησίων, τῇ καὶ δηλωθησομένη διὰ τοῦ κηρυκτικοῦ τῶν συνάξων, ἕνθα δηλωθησομένη συνάπτη τρισαγίου, αὐτὸς ἐπεύχεται ταῦτα: On the same day in which the house of prayer is consecrated, the vespers and the pannychis take place in one of the churches close to the house of prayer that was consecrated, which is announced by the herald of the assemblies, where also the holy relics remain for the view. Early in the morning, the patriarch arrives there, and as the deacon does the litany of the Trisagion, he prays this:

The logical understanding of this rubric depends on the proper syntactical connection between several parts of this sentence(s). Vincenzo Ruggieri, in the first edition of the text of the rite according to three euchologies of the “older” recension, appears to have understood the entire rubric as constituting one grammatical sentence – hence, the “early in the morning, the patriarch arrives” occurs “on the same day in which the house of

375 f. 88v; the title hieromnémôn appears to be attested for the first time in the anonymous Taktikon from ms. Hierosol. gr. 24 (a.k.a. Taktikon Benešević) dated to 934-944 (see Nicolas Oikonomidès, ed. Les listes de préséance byzantines des IXe et Xe siècles, Monde byzantin [Paris: Editions du CNRS, 1972], 243, where it is listed as 10th among the archons of the patriarch of Constantinople (ἡ καθέδρα καὶ ἡ τάξις τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ πατριάρχου). J. Darrouzès seems to consider the office to have been older than the 10th century, and to have possessed a significant liturgical role (Recherches sur les ΟΦΦΙΚΙΑ de l’église byzantine, Archives de l’Orient Chrétien 11 [Paris: Institut Francais d’Etudes Byzantines, 1970], 368-73); it may be reasonable, therefore, that the office of hieromnémôn who was “in charge of ordinations” already existed at the time of Barberini gr. 336. The earliest Slavonic version of the text of dedication rite in the ms. Rus. Nat. Library Gilf. 32, dated to 1286, consistently renders as ιεροψηφικός (‘holy commemorator’), but glosses it differently each time – first (f. 163v); after the ed. Biljana Jovanović-Štipčević, “Священник чинови освећења и обновљења храма из 1286. године,” Arheografski prilozi 9 [1987], 85-116) as ипъ щеннопоминатель (‘some deacon’) and the second time with црковник, a calque of ἐκκλησιαστικός (f. 168v). By contrast the 11th-12th cent. Georgian translation in mss. Tbilisi S 143 and Sinai Georgian O. 73 designate the official in question as “the herald of the bishop/catholicos (არქიეპისკოპოს/რაზმებ<k/>რი [Kekelidze’s translation], ქადაგი მღდელთმოძღური)” (Tbilisi S 143, p. 310; Kekelidze, LGP 37; Sinai Georgian O. 73, f. 257v). In both Georgian and Slavonic receptions of the Byzantine rite of dedication we can observe the attempt to integrate into a new liturgio-ecclesiastical setting a rubric pertaining to the text’s original Constantinopolitan Sitz im Leben.
prayer is consecrated,” while the vespers and pannychis occur (presumably) the evening before, although this is not mentioned.376 Such interpretation would place both rites – kathierósis and encaenia – on the same day, presumably in a consecutive order, as it is done in the “new” redaction of the dedication rite in the euchologion Coislin 213 and in the received Russo-Slavic practice of the rite today.377 In the interpretation of the editors of the entire Barberini euchologion, Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, it seems that it is the vespers and the pannychis service which takes place on the same day as the kathierósis of the new church, while the encaenia begins with the arrival of the patriarch at dawn in one of the neighbouring churches.378 I am inclined to accept the interpretation which can be inferred from Parenti and Velkovska’s translation: the clause τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν ἧν καθιεροῦται… appears to modify the genitive absolute clause γινομένου λυχνικοῦ καὶ πανυχίδος, i.e. the vespers and pannychis in one of the nearby churches occur on the same day as the rite of consecration of the new church, i.e. by implication, on the eve of the celebration of encaenia, which will culminate in the eucharistic liturgy. Moreover, this seems to be the precise raison-d’être of this stipulation to have the relics and the evening services in the other church – because the services of the consecration of an altar and a building are taking place in the new church. The arrangement of the two rites in

376 “Il giorno stesso della consacrazione della casa di preghiera, celebrati il vespero e la pannychis in una delle chiese vicine all’oratorio consacrato… il patriarca arriva li all’alba” – “Consacrazione e dedicazione,” 97.

377 Although even in Coislin 213, the celebration of both rites on the same day is still presumed to be optional: upon the conclusion of the rite of kathierosis, marked by an unambigious καὶ τελειοῦται πᾶσα ἡ ἀκολουθία (Duncan, 20), the bishop is prescribed to unvest and “rest a little (μικρὸν αὐτὸς ἀναπαύεται),” and only then it is stated that if “he is able to complete the entire kathierósis and dedication of the temple on the same day (εἴπερ δύναται κατ’ αὐτὴν ἔκεινην τὴν ἡμέραν τελειώσαι τὴν ἀληθὴν καθαρόσιν καὶ τοῦ ἐγκαινισμοῦ τοῦ ναοῦ),” he has to be re-vested into the hierarchal garments (f. 16r = ibid., 21).

378 “Il giorno stesso della consacrazione della casa di preghiera, si celebrano i vesperi e la vigilia in una delle chiese vicine all’oratorio consacrato… Il patriarca vi giunge all’alba, e mentre il diacono propone la preghiera…” (Parenti-Velkovska, 331).
the Barberini euchologion appears already to be an attempt to synthesize into one cursus of services the two overlapping rites, and to find a common-sense solution for the conundrum.

It is reasonable to suppose that the immediate cause of this two-day arrangement of the rites of dedication in *Barberini* lies in the need for every church dedication service to include the deposition of relics, as stipulated by the Canon 7 of the II Nicaea (787).\textsuperscript{379} At the same time, the antecedent to this practice can also be found in the Syro-Antiochene liturgical tradition – specifically, in the canon, containing the description of the two-day arrangement of the rites of dedication, and attributed to Severus of Antioch.\textsuperscript{380} As has been suggested earlier, the organization of the services for the consecration of a church implied the installation and consecration of the altar by the bishop on the first day, and the deposition of relics in the church (if there is a *bet-sahde*), on the second day. It is the latter celebration which is followed by the liturgy of the Word and the eucharist. It also has to be recalled that not only was the second rite optional, contingent upon the presence of a martyrion within the church – it was also not considered pertaining to the “consecration of a church” in a strict sense, as specified in the *Synodicon* version of the canon.\textsuperscript{381} The position of a martyrion within the liturgical space of the North Syrian basilicas (in a space, separated from the altar table) also allows one to speak of the “second” rite, pertaining to the deposition of relics as supplementary to the consecration of the church per se. One may suggest that in originally arranging the

\textsuperscript{379} Mansi 13.427.

\textsuperscript{380} Vööbus, *West Syriac Synodicon*, 159; Bedjan, *Nomocanon*, 17; it was discussed earlier in this chapter, see 6.2.

\textsuperscript{381} Vööbus, 159.
rites for the dedication of a church as a two-day celebration with the *kathierōsis* on the eve, and the *encaenia* + liturgy in the morning, the redactors of the rites were guided by the Syro-Antiochene model, represented already in the sixth-century “canon of Severus.” The later local development of the dedication rites within the tradition of Constantinople necessitated the eventual amalgamation of the two services into a continuum, favouring the celebration on the same day, as already can be seen in other euchologies containing the “older” recension of the Byzantine rites of dedication.

6.7.4 The Opening Prayer (K-1) of the Byzantine Rite of *Kathierōsis*, and Its Significance.

Having shown, to the extent that is possible, an apparent close correspondence between two out of four prayers from the rite of *kathierōsis* with the prayers of the West Syrian rite of *tablīthē*, we shall now look at the opening prayer of the Byzantine rite (K-1), trying to establish the function of this prayer, and its role within the structure of the rite. In the “older” recension of the Byzantine dedication rite, this is the first prayer of the celebrant, which follows the entry of the clergy into the church and the sealing of the doorways of the church (*πανταχόθεν ἀσφαλισμένης τῆς ἐκκλησίας*). Further, the *Barberini* text indicates that upon the deacon’s exclamation “In peace let us pray to the Lord,” the patriarch kneels before the doors of the sanctuary (*παρὰ τὰς θύρας τοῦ ἱερατείου*), and as he rises (*ὅτε ἀναστῇ ὁ πατριάρχης*), the deacon continues his litany with a petition which includes a pertinent reference to rising up:

---

382 Parenti-Velkovska, 156.
Help us, save us, have mercy on us, raise us up (ἀνάστησον), and preserve us, God, by your grace.383

The prayer in question is placed following the thirteen petitions of the diaconal litany, with the rubric preceding the text:

And the patriarch, when he is kneeling, and when he stands up (ἐν τῷ γονυκλίναι ἐν τῷ ἑστάναι αὐτόν), and the deacon’s litany takes place, prays saying thus…384

The sense of the rubric appears to contradict the meaning of the rubric placed before the litany, with the latter giving the impression that the bishop is to rise up at once upon the deacon’s call.

The rubric just cited presupposes that the prayer which follows should be recited by the patriarch while he is kneeling, after he resumed the upright posture, and while the deacon is proclaiming the litany. This apparent contradiction is somewhat alleviated once we recall a hapax reading in one of the sources for the “older” redaction of the dedication rite, the 12th/13th cent. Melkite pontifical BM Or. 4951385: in this euchologion, as we showed above, the prayer K-1 is effectively separated into two:

K-1 (Barberini gr. 336, f. 148v-149r)

...ίνα καὶ ἐν τούτῳ εὐλογῶμεν σε ψαλμοῖς καὶ μυστικαῖς λειτουργίαις, καὶ τὴν σὴν εὐσπλαγχνίαν διὰ παντὸς μεγαλύνωμεν.

Ναί, δέσποτα κύριε ὁ θεός, ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, ἡ ἐλπὶς πάντων τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς...

BM Or. 4951386 (ET Black)

...in order that we may bless thee in it, by prayer and praise and the holiness of the mysteries, and may magnify continually thy compassion, Amen.

O Lord, our Lord, and our God, and our Saviour, the hope of all the ends of the earth...

383 Ibid., 156.

384 Ibid., 157.

385 Ed. Black, Rituale melchitarum; see Chapter 4.1.

386 Black, Rituale melchitarum, 76.
This variant in a later manuscript of a non-Constantinopolitan origin may be considered an aberration in the transmission of the text of the prayer into a different language and local tradition, had there been no internal evidence supporting the perception of a ‘dual’ character of this prayer which the Melkite pontifical appears to have expressed through introducing a clear separation between the two segments.

Indeed, even thematically, the prayer **K-1** appears to fall neatly into two segments:

1. a preparatory/penitential prayer of the main celebrant (bishop/patriarch) *pro seipso* (**K-1a**):
   
   Yourself, immortal and most bountiful King, remember your compassions and your mercies for they are from the ages, and do not reject us, polluted by many sins, nor violate your covenant on account of our impurity, but overlook even now our transgressions, and empower us, and enable, by the grace and coming of your holy and life-giving Spirit, to complete without condemnation the dedication of this temple, and to perform the consecration of the altar which is in it…  

2. an epicletic prayer for the sanctification of the “house” and the altar within it (**K-1b**):
   
   …hear us sinners who pray to you, and send down your all-holy, adorable and all-powerful Spirit, and sanctify this house; fill it with eternal light, elect it unto your dwelling, make it the place of the dwelling of your glory, adorn it with your divine grace above this world… Preserve it unshaken until the end of the age, and the altar which is in it manifest as holy of holies by the power and action of the all-holy Spirit; glorify it above the propitiatory according to the law, so that the sacred services performed upon it may reach unto your holy and noetic altar above heavens, and bring down to us the grace of your pure overshadowing; for we trust not upon the work of our unworthy hands, but upon your infinite goodness.  

Provided that the laity has been completely excluded from this ceremony, it is not surprising to see that also the second part of the prayer (**K-1b**) possesses a strictly ‘clerical’ intent, referring to the clerics “who pray unto [God],” and to “the work of

---

387 I cite my translation from above, Chapter 4.1.1; Parenti-Velkovska, 158.

388 Ibid.
[their] unworthy hands.” At the same time, the penitential language concentrated in the first segment (K-1a) may allow one to characterize it as a prayer of preparation for the clergy present for the celebration of this service. The late provenance of the insertion of “Amen” in the Melkite pontifical, and the absence of such feature in the Greek manuscript tradition does not allow us to conclude definitively that these two segments, after these became part of the Byzantine rite for the consecration of the church, were ever perceived as two prayers. However, the lack of evidence that the Greek manuscript tradition ever considered this prayer K-1 as two, does not prevent us from suggesting that originally these could have been two prayers, integrated into one. The perception of this prayer as consisting of two clearly separated segments may explain the rubric preceding it, that apparently refers to patriarch reciting this prayer kneeling and then rising up: the bishop could have been kneeling during the penitential/preparatory segment of the prayer. Indeed, the text of the “older” redaction of the dedication rite does not contain any reference to the patriarch rising up – however, this text also does not refer to the patriarch ever entering the sanctuary for the washing and anointing of the altar, which clearly takes place within the altar area, not outside.389

A better perception of the function and significance of this prayer may be gathered once we consider the literary allusions underlying this complex, two part text, particularly the scriptural citations, and parallels with other Byzantine prayers pertaining to the church dedication, such as the prayer K-3 of the same ritual and Sin2 from the rite of hedrasis in the twelfth-cent. euchologion Sinai gr. 973:

389 This seeming omission has apparently been corrected in the “new” redaction of the dedication rite, e.g. in the “Strategios Euchologion” Coislin 213, which mentions, following the exclamation of the diaconal litany: καὶ λεγομένου τοῦ ἀμήν, εἰσπορεύεται ὁ ἄρχων καὶ ἱσταται πρὸ τῆς ἁγίας τραπέζης... (f. 13r = Duncan, 16).
Κ-1

Ναὶ, δέσποτα κύριε ὁ θεὸς, ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, ἡ ἐλπὶς πάντων τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς, ἐπάκουσον ἡμᾶς τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν δεομένων σου, καὶ κατάπεμψον τὸ πανάγιόν σου καὶ προσκυνητὸν καὶ παντοδύναμον πνεῦμα, καὶ ἀγίασον τὸν οἶκον τούτον·

πλήρωσον αὐτὸν φωτὸς ἡμῖν, αἰρέταις αὐτὸν εἰς κατοικίαν σήν,

καὶ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς, καὶ τὰ ὅτα σου προσέχοντα εἰς τὴν δέησιν τῶν εἰς φόβο σου καὶ εὐλαβεία ἐν αὐτῷ εἰσίοντος

καὶ ἐπικαλούμενον τὸ πάντιμον καὶ προσκυνήτων ὅνομά σου· ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσωνταί σε, καὶ σὺ εἰσακούσῃ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω, καὶ ποιήσῃς καὶ λειμαρνήσῃ.

Φυλάξον αὐτὸν ἐναπόκεισθαι τῷ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἀσάλευτον,

καὶ τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ θυσιαστήριον ἁγιον ἁγιόν ἁγιόν ἁγιόν ἁγιόν ἁγιάζον τῇ δύναμει καὶ ἐνεργεία τοῦ παναγίου σου· πνεύματος·

Sin2  καὶ τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ παγένειν θυσιαστήριον ἁγιον ἁγιον ἁγιον ἁγιον ἁγιον ἁγιον ἁγιον ἁγιον ἁγιον ἁγιαζον

The marshalling of the scriptural references above shows clearly that, apart from the psalmic texts speaking of the divine indwelling of his consecrated sanctuary, a significant number of allusions point to one specific text: the prayer of king Solomon at the feast of

Sources

Ps 64:6

Κ-3  ὅν ἡμεῖς οἱ ἁμαρτολοὶ…

+ 1 Kgs LXX 8:11 (ὅτι ἐπλήσθη ἡ δόξα κυρίου τοῦ οἴκου), cf. 2 Chron 5:14

Ps 25:8b

1 Kgs LXX 8:29a

1 Kgs LXX 8:29a, c

1 Kgs LXX 8:52, cf. Ps 129:2

1 Kgs LXX 8:30a, cf. 8:34, 36, 39, 43, 49

1 Kgs LXX 8:23

1 Kgs LXX 8:30c, cf. 8:34, 36, 39, 43, 50
the first dedication of the First Temple in Jerusalem (1 Kgs. LXX 8:23-53; cf. 2 Chron. LXX 5:14-42). The prayer is not cited in full, as in the West Syrian rite for the consecration of a church,\(^{390}\) but the number of citations integrated into the text of the prayer reveal this as a major source of theological and typological reflection. Moreover, the very instruction for the patriarch to kneel before the doors of the sanctuary may have been based upon Solomon’s kneeling and rising before the altar at the time of its dedication in 1 Kings:

\[
καὶ ἀνέστη [Σόλομων] ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κυρίου ὀκλακώς ἐπὶ τὰ γόνατα αὐτοῦ καὶ αἱ χεῖρες αὐτοῦ διαπεπετασμέναι εἰς τὸ οὐρανὸν (8:54);
\]

\[
καὶ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰ γόνατα ἐναντὶ πάσης ἐκκλησίας Ισραήλ καὶ διεπέτασεν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ οὐρανόν (2 Chron 5:13).
\]

The figure of Solomon occasionally features in the Byzantine literature in the context of the scriptural model of a divinely-anointed basileus.\(^{391}\) It is remarkable that at the beginning of the rite of dedication of a church, it is the patriarch who assumes the function of a “Solomonic” figure, kneeling and rising before the altar of the Lord, and reciting the prayer peppered with allusions to Solomon’s scriptural prayer. The references to Moses, Besalel, Solomon, and at last the apostles, seek to bring into balance the figure of the king-dedicator, especially significant given the prominent role the Roman emperors possessed as dedicators of temples, first pagan, then Christian.\(^{392}\) It is possible that the use in the prayer K-1 of the phrase possibly derived from K-3, asking to “show the altar to be the holy of holies” emphasizes both Solomonic and Mosaic model

\(^{390}\) Vosté, Pontificale, 84-87.

\(^{391}\) Dagron, Emperor and Priest, 50, 109-110.

\(^{392}\) See above, Chapter 1.
for the celebrant, thus anticipating the culmination of the consecration rite in the
outpouring of the myron upon the new altar.

6.8 Concluding Remarks

Through comparative analysis of the prayer texts of the West Syrian and
Byzantine tradition, it was possible to show a common thread of tradition underlying
three prayers of the Byzantine rite, and the three prayers of the Syro-Antiochene rite for
the consecration of a (portable) altar. Two of the Byzantine prayers in question – K3 and
K4 – have entered into the Byzantine rite for the consecration of a church and an altar.
The third one, Ὁ πάσης φύσεως δεσπότης, the prayer present in various redactions across
several Eastern Christian liturgical traditions (Syro-Antiochene, Coptic, Armenian,
Georgian), had entered the Byzantine liturgical manuscripts through marginal rites for the
installation of an altar. Paradoxically, a shorter recension of this prayer will eventually
find itself a place within the “new” redaction of the Byzantine rite of dedication,
exemplified by the “Euchologion of Strategios,” Coislin 213.393

The particular characteristics shared by the rites for the consecration of the altar
across several Eastern Christian liturgical rites are thus not limited to the use of oil or
chrism at anointing, but also include the use of same or similar prayers and psalms.

393 It has become the prayer concluding the installation of a new altar, which precedes the rite of
kathierōsis in the “new” recension; see further, Appendix II.

394 It is for this reason that we excluded from our comparative analysis the East Syriac rite for the
dedication of an altar, which includes many unique and fascinating features, such as the use of epiclesis
over the oil which is subsequently used to consecrate the altar (see Toma, Mystery of the Church; Yakan,
“La consécration de l’huile pour la sanctification de l’autel”) – I could not find enough common features in
the structure and prayers of the rite for it to have relevance for the history of the Byzantine rite of
The similarity can be best visualized by means of a comparative table that follows, with common elements highlighted:\footnote{It is to be noted that for the Byzantine rite in this table, only the latter part of the rite of \textit{kathierōsis} is included.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Armenian</th>
<th>Georgian</th>
<th>West Syriac</th>
<th>Coptic</th>
<th>Byzantine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>outside of the church:</td>
<td>83 procession,</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>[Litany, prayers K1, K2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119-120-121</td>
<td>prayer</td>
<td>incense,</td>
<td></td>
<td>washing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the door:</td>
<td>131 procession,</td>
<td>25-26</td>
<td>25, 26, 92</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 (x3)</td>
<td>prayer</td>
<td>incense,</td>
<td></td>
<td>50:9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the sanctuary:</td>
<td>25 procession,</td>
<td>131-132</td>
<td>prayer I</td>
<td>pouring of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 (x3)</td>
<td>prayer</td>
<td>prayer I</td>
<td></td>
<td>chrism anointing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 83:4</td>
<td>prayer S1</td>
<td>prayer C1=S1</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>installation of the altar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prayer H</td>
<td>prayer H</td>
<td>prayer S2 = H</td>
<td>prayer C2=S2=H</td>
<td>incense anointing of the church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purification</td>
<td>pouring of myron,</td>
<td>anointing</td>
<td>pouring of</td>
<td>prayer K4=S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>anointing w/Alleluia</td>
<td>w/myron</td>
<td>myron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anointing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>w/Ps 44, 83</td>
<td>anointing w/Ps 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dismissal prayer</td>
<td>thanksgiving</td>
<td>thanksgiving</td>
<td>thanksgiving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prayer S3</td>
<td>prayer C3=S3</td>
<td>prayer K5=S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However problematic an attempt to find a common ground between the rites for church dedication across several Eastern Christian traditions may seem in view of our methodological presuppositions, the presence of liturgical texts used for the same or similar purpose among several liturgical rites warrants an attempt at an explanation. In dedication. To a lesser extent, the same criterion applies for the Western rites for the dedication of a church and an altar, which I have looked at briefly in Chapter 4.3.
view of our discussion of the hagiopolite rites for the consecration of an altar in the preceding chapter, it appears reasonable to suggest the following:

1. The anointing of the altar with *myron* /perfumed oil enters into the liturgical practice of Eastern Christianity through the Syro-Palestinian influence no later than late fifth-early sixth century, even though it might not have reached Constantinople until the eighth century (*Barberini gr. 336*). The spatial separation of the reliquary from the altar in the Syriac tradition would have highlighted the anointing as the most significant act of the dedication ceremony.

2. The Ps 83 + prayer H, with a possible addition of other psalms (131, 25) to form a characteristic tripsalmic unit, shaped the core structural element of the hagiopolite rite for the installation and dedication of a new altar. At the same time, the Jerusalem church probably possessed a variety of ritual practices for the consecration of a church, which may have involved also the deposition of relics *sub altare*.

3. The presence of these elements in the West Syriac rite for the consecration of portable altar tablets may speak of the appropriation of this hagiopolite rite, with the addition of two other prayers (S1 and the thanksgiving prayer S3), by the Syriac church of Antioch, where it formed the sequence of three psalms and three prayers (S1, S2, and S3), with the anointing of the altar coming between S2 and S3.

4. This is the structure eventually adopted wholesale by the Coptic liturgical tradition, in addition to the independent (and also perhaps Syrian-influenced) rite for the dedication of a church *building*.
5. In the case of the Byzantine rite, however, only prayers S1 and S3 appear to have been adopted. While the order of the prayers themselves has been preserved, their relation to the chrismation of the altar has been somewhat disrupted: in the Byzantine rites, the prayer S3/K5 still remains the thanksgiving prayer, but S1/K3 now follows, rather than precedes the anointing.

6. At the same time, a few elements which still may be considered “hagiopolite” appear to be present: a) the sequence of the Psalms 83, 131, 25 – with the addition of several others – is the same as in the Georgian rite for the odiki in Tbilisi A 86 which may allow one to speak of a débris of a hagiopolite tripsalmic unit still visible here; b) the second part of the thanksgiving prayer K4 bears a sporadic similarity to the prayer within the Armenian rite of church dedication.

7. One suggestion regarding the absence of the hagiopolite prayer S2/H/Sin1/Cy1 Ὅ πάσης φύσεως δεσπότης in the Byzantine rite of church dedication could be that its integration into the Syro-Antiochene rite for the consecration of tablithē occurred later than the time when the elements of the latter were appropriated into the rite of Constantinople: thus, the two rites, one including S1-S3, and the other, including S2, existed separately, and in this way, as two separate rites, “cross-pollinated” Byzantine liturgical tradition. However, in the absence of solid evidence, this could be quite a speculative hypothesis.

8. Finally, the prayer K-1 Ὅ Θεὸς ὁ ἄναρχος καὶ ἄειδος, not containing any explicit parallels with the prayers of the Antiochene rite for the consecration of a (portable) altar, may be an authentic Constantinopolitan development, although textual cross-pollination with K-3 is still possible, thus providing an illustration of
a complicated relationship of interaction, fusion, and mutual influence between the liturgical texts of the Byzantine tradition.
CONCLUSION

The Christian rites for the dedication of a church and an altar had emerged as a direct result of the legal possibility for Christian communities to construct and inaugurate public buildings of worship in the aftermath of the fourth-century changes in the life of the Church. The rite for the dedication of a church and an altar formed within the Byzantine liturgical tradition, the tradition of Constantinople, from the fourth to eighth century, represents a synthesis of several traditions, ritual practices, and ideologies aiming to express the sacred character of a liturgical space. This dissertation attempted to delineate and dissemble the multifaceted nature of the first “rite” in the sequence of the Byzantine rite of dedication, the rite of *kathierōsis* – the consecration of a church and an altar. Our analysis has further complicated the quite evident “two-rite” shape of the Byzantine rites of dedication, presented in the beginning of this thesis. Aside from seeing the Byzantine dedication rite as consisting of *kathierōsis* (consecration of a church/altar) and *encaenia* (entrance, deposition of relics), a careful reading of the evidence allows one to discern overlapping elements, ritual units, and local traditions even within these two “larger” structural blocks: e.g. the consecration of a church building and the consecration of an altar as separate rites. Further, I have argued that the psalmody and prayers accompanying and concluding the washing-chrismation of the altar in the Byzantine rite contain the débris of the hagiopolite tripsalmonic structural unit and two prayers, likely derived from Antioch. The appropriation of the elements of the Syro-Palestinian rites
into the framework of the Constantinopolitan tradition provides an important example of the “traffic” of liturgical material and the mutual influence and interaction between the liturgical rites of Eastern Christianity.

Chronologically, the formation of the Byzantine rite for the dedication of a church can be conceived through the following stages:

1. Fourth-fifth centuries: despite the scarcity of evidence, it is possible to conclude that in some places the dedication of a church took place with the assembly of multiple clerics and bishops for the celebration of a eucharist. As far as other ritual actions are concerned, the influence of the Roman civil liturgy (*dedicatio*) upon the Christian rites of dedication is possible in the major cities of the empire; on the other hand, the evidence for the anointing of altar with oil in Syrian Christian communities exist already in the second half of the fourth century – in this, the initiation and scriptural patterns (Exodus 40, Lev 8) may have been instrumental.

2. Sixth-eighth centuries: while the Constantinopolitan sources attest to the existence of a solemn procession with relics, other local rites – Jerusalem, Antioch – witness to the mixed variety of usages, including the installation of an altar, deposition of relics, as well as the anointing of a altar and anointing of a church. The anointing of the altar in the Syro-Antiochene tradition may date to the second half of the fifth century, but such evidence for the imperial city is lacking.

3. Seventh-eighth centuries: given the affinity of liturgical texts between the rite of kathierosis in the euchology *Barberini gr. 336* and one of the Syro-Antiochene rites for the altar consecration, it can hypothesized that the latter was imported
and appropriated in Constantinople no later than the early eighth century. While it is possible that this rite was conjoined to the proper Constantinopolitan deposition of relics, according to the manner delineated in the “canon of Severus” for the West Syriac tradition, the deposition of relics could not have been a mandatory element of the dedication rites until the aftermath of the first period of iconoclasm (see Appendix I). The implication that the iconoclast rejection of icon veneration entailed the similar rejection for the cult of relics necessitated the use of relics at dedication be made indispensable at the II Nicaea in 787.

4. Eighth to eleventh century: with the formation of the first “synthesis” of the Byzantine rites of dedication in the “older” recension of the Byzantine euchology, the further evolution of the rite has not been impeded. The “new” recension of the dedication rites exemplified in the euchologion Coislin 213 (1027 CE) saw the final merger of the kathierósis and encaenia into one continuous rite, celebrated in sequence, and the addition of another rite for the installation of an altar to the beginning of the ceremony (see Appendix II). The variety of local usages at the dedication of a church in the late Byzantine tradition requires a further, separate study – however, one example of such local development can be seen in the earliest, fourteenth-century witness to the Slavic rite for the consecration of a church.

The interaction and cross-pollination of liturgical texts and usages parallels the exchange of theological themes. The early evidence to the practice of altar consecration in the Christian East demonstrates that the custom of consecrating a new altar by anointing with the oil/chrism at least in some regions can be dated back to the late fourth
century, but no later than the sixth-seventh century. The context of our first witness to
the Christian practice of anointing the altars (Ephrem’s *Hymn. Virg.* 4.10) suggests the
Old Testament background for this ritual – the anointing at the consecration of the
tabernacle in Ex 29, 40 and Lev 8. The Syro-Palestinian provenance of the majority of
our witnesses to the anointing of the altar suggests the connection with the crucial
significance of the anointing with oil in the context of initiation in Syriac traditions. As
our reading of several fourth- to sixth-century sources show, the anointing of the altar had
a strong Christological motif: the anointing implied the presence of the “Anointed One,”
and the altar becomes endowed with a Christic identity. It was perhaps the association
between the anointing of the altar and anointing at the initiation which brought more
elements of the initiation rite into the service, such as the chant of *Alleluia*. However, as
we had shown, the Byzantine rite of dedication, studied through the comparative
methodology, does not contain the analogy between the consecration of an altar and the
initiation of a human being: rather, it is the consecration of baptismal waters which has
become the guiding model/paradigm for the outpouring of the oil upon the newly
consecrated altar. Such understanding of the ritual act of anointing has profound
implications: the altar is consecrated in view and in anticipation to its subsequent
liturgical use in the course of the eucharistic liturgy. This rite, which has as its central
focus the consecration of the altar by epicletic prayer and anointing, serves to prepare a
table for eucharistic celebration. At the same time, however, as it follows from the
prayer texts themselves (esp. prayer K-3 of the Byzantine rite), it serves to convert the
altar and the church into an icon of the heavenly temple, a locus of earthly reflection of
the “angelic liturgy” in the true temple of Christ’s body (John 2:21), made of “the living and firmly set and well-wrought stones of men’s souls.”\footnote{Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 10. 4. 65.}
APPENDIX I TO CHAPTER 6:


One of the most important variations to the order of the kathierôsis among the Greek liturgical manuscripts is found in the euchologion Ottoboni gr. 434,² dated to 1174/75, judging from its paschalia table (f. 98v-100v).³ The euchologion Ottoboni gr. 434 is an episcopal euchologion that comes from the periphery of the Byzantine realm, most likely from Palestine.⁴ Thiermeyer suggests that the core of the euchologion is a “Palestinian (likely Melkite) copy of the old Constantinopolitan euchologion,” which was subsequently copied down and expanded.⁵ Thus, this euchologion may represent an example of the expansion of the Constantinopolitan tradition to the peripheries of the Byzantine liturgical realm, to the detriment of local liturgical customs such as the hagiopolite liturgical rite. Several features of this euchologion, particularly the position

² The codex has been thoroughly studied in the doctoral dissertation by Abraham-Andreas Thiermeyer (produced under the direction of Robert F. Taft), “Das Euchologion Ottoboni Gr. 434 (12. Jahrhundert),” Thesis ad Lauream (Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, Roma, 1992); partially published as Das Euchologion Ottoboni Gr. 434 (Palästina 1174/75), Excepta ex Dissertatione ad Doctoratum (Romae: PIO, 1992). It is this publication that I will be citing in what follows, except when a specific reference to the full text of the dissertation is needed.

³ Thiermeyer, Das Euchologion Ottoboni, 78-79.

⁴ Ibid., 101-102.

⁵ Ibid., 118. Thiermeyer’s comparison of one of the scribal hands that copied Ottoboni gr. 434 and the handwriting of three other Palestinian manuscripts (Gospel lectionaries Sinai gr. 180, Sinai gr. 220 and Sinai gr. 232), belonging to the “Cypriote Palestinian style,” connect the former with this handwriting style and thus place it within the Palestinian realm (ibid., pp. 67-69).
of BAS before CHRYS and PRES in this text\textsuperscript{6} and the beginning of the ordo of CHRYS with the Prayer for the Catechumens,\textsuperscript{7} connect this text with the “old recension” of the Constantinopolitan euchologion, exemplified by its earliest witness, Barberini gr. 336. Even though the ms. itself can be dated to 1174/75, it shows signs of later emendations, particularly of specific bishops’ names in the diptychs that allows Thiermeyer to suppose the use of this euchologion either in the diocese of Bethlehem or Mt. Sinai in the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{8} The extensive use of Arabic marginalia mainly identifying the titles of prayers and rituals may also suggest a connection with either Palestine or Sinai.\textsuperscript{9} None of these sees were metropolitan sees, which may explain the reason the episcopal euchologion as

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{6} Mss. that position BAS before CHRYS, hence reflecting a more ancient recension of the Byzantine euchologion, include Barberini gr. 336 (8\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Grottaferrata Γ.β. IV (10\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Leningrad gr. 226 (10\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Sebastianov gr. 474 (10\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Grottaferrata Γ.β. XXIX (10\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Sinai gr. 958 (11\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Sinai gr. 959 (11\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Leningrad glagol. 2 (11\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Sinai iher. 89 (11\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Grottaferrata Γ.β. XV (11\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Sinai gr. 961 (11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Sinai gr. 962 (11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Vatican gr. 1970 (12\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Paris B.N. gr. 347 (12\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Paris nouv. acquis. lat. 1791 (12\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Sinai gr. 1036 (12-13\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Arabic version dated to 1260, Berlin gr. 347 (13\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Athens EBE 662 (13\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Grottaferrata Γ.β. XII (14\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Paris B.N. gr. 324 (14\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Moscow Synod gr. 261 (14\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Patmos 721 (14\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Athos Panteleimon 17 (1409), Athos Lavra 1187 (1421), Athens EBE 661 (15\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Athens EBE 685 (15\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Sinai gr. 972 (15\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Paris B.N. gr. 2509 (15\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Athos Lavra L.154 (16\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Rome Corsini gr. 7 (16\textsuperscript{th} cent.); see Thiermeyer, Das Euchologion Ottoboni, 102-103, also see Parenti, “Influssi italo-greci,” 153-154.

\textsuperscript{7} Other mss. that feature CHRYS beginning with the Prayer of the Catechumens include: Sebastianov gr. 474 (10\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Sinai gr. 958 (11\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Sinai gr. 959 (11\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Sinai gr. 961 (11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Sinai gr. 962 (11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Vatican gr. 1970 (12\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Paris nouv. acquis. lat. 1791 (12\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Sinai gr. 1036 (12\textsuperscript{th}-13\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Paris B.N. gr. 324 (14\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Berlin gr. 347 (13\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Paris B.N. gr. 324 (14\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Athens EBE 661 (15\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Athens EBE 685 (15\textsuperscript{th} cent.); see Thiermeyer, Das Euchologion Ottoboni, 103-104; Jacob, “Tradition manuscrite de la liturgie de Saint Jean,” 126-128.

\textsuperscript{8} The liturgical diptychs in Ottoboni gr. 434 mention bishops Abraham and Joseph (f. 12v, 21v), the first of whom Thiermeyer tentatively identifies either with Abraham, bishop of Bethlehem in 1460-68 (Fedalto, Hierarchia 2.1018) or Abraham, bishop of Mt. Sinai circa 1430 (ibid., 2.1045). Neither Joseph or Joasaph could be identified (Thiermeyer, Das Euchologion Ottoboni, 77).

Ottoboni gr. 434 does not have the rite for episcopal ordination. Moreover, the rite for the consecration of a church in Ottoboni consistently uses the term ἐπίσκοπος where the euchologion Barberini gr. 336 ὁ πατριάρχης, as, e.g., in the preface to the rite:

Barberini gr. 336, f. 145v:
Πρὸ τοῦ παραγενέσθαι τὸν τὸν πατριάρχην ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι ἐγκαινίζεσθαι ναὸν προπέμπεται ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν χειρωτονίων καὶ παρασκευάζει τοὺς μαρμαρίους στήσαι τὴν τράπεζαν. καὶ πληροῦντων αὐτῶν τὸ ἔργον καὶ ἀναχωρόντων εἰσέρχεται ὁ πατριάρχης ἐν τῷ ναῷ, καὶ πάντων τῶν λαίκων ἐξερχομένων καὶ μηδενὸς ἐσῳ μένοντος σὺν αὐτῷ πλὴν κληρικῶν μόνων...

Ottoboni gr. 434, f. 88v:
Πρὸ μίας ἡμέρας τῶν ἐγκαινίων, πρὸ τοῦ παραγενέσθαι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι ἐγκαινίζεσθαι ναὸν, προπέμπεται ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν χειρωτονίων, καὶ παρασκευάζει τοὺς μαρμαρίους στήσαι τὴν ἁγίαν τράπεζαν. καὶ πληροῦντων αὐτῶν τὸ ἔργον καὶ ἀναχωρόντων, παραγίνεται δὲ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος καὶ εἰσέρχεται ἐν τῷ ναῷ, καὶ πάντων τῶν λαίκων ἐξερχομένων καὶ μηδενὸς ἐσῳ μένοντος ἐσῳ μένοντος πλὴν κληρικῶν μόνων σὺν αὐτῷ...

If we thus look at the rite for the consecration of a church in euchologion Ottoboni, we observe that this, shorter recension of the preface to the rite, describing the construction of an altar prior to the patriarch’s/bishop’s arrival, connects Ottoboni with the tradition of euchologia that feature the same recension in the same rite: Barberini gr. 336 (8th cent.), Sinai gr. 959 (11th cent.), Bodleianus Auct. 5.13 (12th cent.), as well as the 11th-12th century Melkite euchologion and, to an extent, Sinai iber. 73 (12th-13th cent.). It is fair to assume, as I did earlier, that this recension in the rite of consecration of a church reflects an “older” recension of the Constantinopolitan

10 Thiermeyer, Das Euchologion Ottoboni, 75-79, 101-102.
11 With the exception of the rubric describing the incensation of a church after the consecration of an altar, where the celebrant is named ἀρχιεπίσκοπος (f. 91v; see BAR f. 153v – Parenti-Velkovska, 160).
12 Parenti-Velkovska, 156.
13 ff. 88v-93v.
14 Black, Rituale Melchitarum, 37-38, 72.
15 ff. 257v-258v.
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euchologion that came into existence shortly before iconoclasm. By contrast to other euchologies of this older recension, the rite of the *kathierōsis* in *Ottoboni gr. 434* has a unique characteristic which sets it apart from any other euchologies containing the rites for the dedication of a church: unlike *Barberini gr. 336* and subsequent euchologies, *Ottoboni* does not contain the rite for the *encaenia* of the church that includes the rite for the deposition of relics. I have noted before that it was characteristic for the earlier recension of the Byzantine dedication rites to present the consecration of the church and an altar on the one hand, and the *encaenia* with the deposition of relics, on the other, as two distinct rites, while situating these side-by-side in the textual framework of a liturgical book. A number of euchologies, for a specific historic reasons, which I will discuss further, feature the rite for the deposition of relics *without* the rite for the consecration of a church. None of the Byzantine euchologies that came into my purview featured the rite for the consecration of a church *without* the encaenia/deposition of relics, with the sole exception of *Ottoboni gr. 434*. In this euchology, instead of concluding the rite of *kathierōsis* with a dismissal (as in *Barberini gr. 336* et al.) or indicating a transition to the rite of the *encaenia/deposition of relics* (as in *Coislin 213* and its descendants), the ritual concludes with this rubric that follows the *ekphonēsis* of the prayer of inclination Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι κύριε ὁ θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων (ff. 93r-v):

Εὐθὺς, Δόξα σοι Χριστὲ ὁ θεὸς, ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν:  
Καὶ ἀπόλουσις. Εἰ δὲ ἔστιν προσφορά,  
λειτουργεῖται αὐτίκα ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος,  
ἀντὶ καὶ τοῦ χερουβικοῦ, ψάλλεται ὅπερ  
ψάλλεται εἰς τὰ ἐγκαίνια τῆς μεθ[άλης]  
ἐκκλη[σίας].

Then, “Glory to you, Christ God, our hope”. 
And the dismissal. If there is an offering,  
[the liturgy of] Basil the Great is served.  
And instead of the Cherubic hymn, they  
sing what is sung at the Encaenia of the  
Great Church.

---

16 *Ottoboni gr. 434*, f. 93v.
This rubric concludes the rite of consecration of a church in euchologion Ottoboni and is followed by the rite for the presbyteral ordination, indicating thus that no service for the deposition of relics was intended to follow the dedication rite in this euchologion. The marginal note on f. 88r ‘ἐγκαινισμὸς ἐκκλησίας’ and the Arabic marginalia on f. 93v, indicating the end of the service, all suggest that the rite found at ff. 88v-93v is the rite of dedication of a church in this euchologion. Instead of the rite of *encaenia* on the same or the next day (the rubric in *Barberini* gr. 336 is ambiguous, as we have noted), the rite in *Ottoboni* gr. 434 concludes with the dismissal and eucharistic liturgy following immediately (αὐτίκα), if the eucharist is celebrated on that day (εἰ δὲ ἐστιν προσφορά).

*Basil’s Liturgy on the Day of Dedication?*

The indication of the rubric regarding the celebration of Basil’s liturgy on the day of church dedication is unique and does not seem to occur in any other liturgical source. As is well known, contemporary Byzantine rite usage limits the celebration of BAS to ten times per year: the five Sundays of Lent, January 1, the eves of Christmas and Epiphany, Holy Thursday and Holy Friday. The most ancient Byzantine euchologia, however, consistently place the formulary of BAS before the one of CHR, which indicates that in the earlier recension of the Byzantine rite, from the eighth to at least the eleventh century,

---

17 This marginalium is placed above the customary title of the rite Τάξις γινομένη ἐπὶ καθιερώσεως etc. (see Parenti-Velkovska, 156). An Arabic note on the right margin opposite the title contains the translation of the regular title of the ritual. I am grateful to Prof. Irfan Shahid for helping me to decipher the Arabic marginalia in this manuscript.

18 The Arabic note is positioned on the left margin across from the rubric cited above (f. 93v).


20 See e.g. Zerbos, *Εὐχολόγιον τὸ Μέγα*, 75.
BAS remained the principal liturgy for Sundays and festivals, whereas CHR was reserved for ferial celebrations. As we have pointed out several paragraphs earlier, it is precisely this feature which places *Ottoboni gr. 434* firmly in the tradition of the earlier recension of the Constantinopolitan euchologion. For our purposes it is sufficient to ascertain that various reasons have been proposed by scholarship for the ultimate “victory” of CHR over BAS in the liturgical use of the Byzantine rite. Jacob singled out the brevity of the anaphora of CHR compared to the one of BAS as one of the principal reason behind the change, based on the witness of the response attributed to the eleventh-century Athonite monk and translator Euthymius Mt’ac’mindeli (d. 1028) who attests to nearly the same arrangement of liturgical ordines as in contemporary practice: BAS reserved for fasting periods, CHR throughout the year. Stefano Parenti, on the basis of euchology evidence, proposed the period from the ninth to eleventh century as *post quem* and *ante quem* dates.

---


22 See Thiermeyer, *Das Euchologion Ottoboni*, 102-103.

23 The question that Euthymios was clarifying for his interlocutor concerned the authenticity of JAS as it was waning from the usage of the Georgian Church in this period. Euthymios expressed the opinion that JAS “is without doubt authentic and was originally used in the Greek churches. But when St. Basil and blessed John Chrysostom composed their own liturgies, the people accepted these, due to their brevity (სიმოკლისათვის), but the liturgy of the apostle James was forgotten. But today all celebrate the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, but in Lent they celebrate St. Basil the Great.” Then Euthymius asserts the equivalent validity of the liturgies of James, Peter, Basil and Chrysostom. We cited the text after ms. Tbilisi A 450, f. 565v-566, as cited in Kekelidze, *Liturgiceskie gruzinskie pamiatniki*, 152. The erotapokriseis of Euthymius were first published by Gobron (Mikhail) Sabinin in *Sak’artvelos samot’xe: sruli aghceraj ghuac’li’a da vnebat’a sak’artvelos cmidat’a* (St. Petersburg, 1882), 423-436 and in T’edo Zhordania, *K’ronikebi* (Tbilisi, 1892-1897), 2.83-87; German trans. Gregor Peradse, “Ein Dokument aus der mittelalterlichen Liturgiegeschichte Georgiens,” *Kyrios* 1 (1936): 77; see also Jacob, “Histoire du formulaire,” 54; Parenti, “La ‘vittoria’ della liturgia di Crisostomo,” 911.
between which the change have definitely taken place and CHR replaced BAS as the principal liturgy in the Constantinopolitan cathedral system. Parenti discounts the brevity as a principal reason behind the change and cites the increased frequency of eucharistic celebration as one of the possible contributing factors. The lack of any known canonical regulation regarding the elevation of CHR as the principal Byzantine liturgy also allowed Parenti to associate the change with the evolution of Byzantine spirituality which came as a consequence of the Studite monastic reforms.

A different solution to the “when and why” aspects of the question was proposed by Stefanos Alexopoulos who pointed at the application of the term ἀντίτυπα to the eucharistic elements in BAS, making a connection with the Iconoclasts’ use of the terms εἰκών and τύπος with respect to the eucharistic body and blood of Christ. The position of this scholar places the change in question at least a century earlier, in the period between the first (ca. 730-787) and second (815-843) outbreaks of iconoclasm; moreover, from being a gradual change resulting from the change in eucharistic

---


26 In the epiclesis: θαρροῦντες προσεγγίζομεν τῷ ἁγίῳ σου θυσιαστήριῳ, καὶ προθέντες τὰ ἀντίτυπα τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου... (Zerbos, Εὐχολόγιον τὸ Μέγα, 89).

spirituality, Alexopoulos sees the major underlying reason to be doctrinal, which in turn would make the “victory” of CHR to be a “reaction” of the orthodox party “to the eucharistic theology of the iconoclasts” and hence, a “deliberate reform in the liturgical practice of Constantinople.”

Certainly, the absence of known canonical legislation that would stipulate the appropriate times for the celebration of BAS or CHR, particularly in the acta or canons of the anti-iconoclastic council of 787, remains a weaker point of this hypothesis. Also, the potential problematization of the term ἀντίτυπα by iconophiles as a consequence of iconoclast use of the terms εἰκών and τύπος with respect to the eucharistic gifts is seemingly incongruent with the use of the same term (albeit, admittedly, in a non-eucharistic context) in the text of the rite of church dedication, which precisely first


29 Many examples of canonical legislation on liturgical matters is found in the canons of the Quinisext Council (in Trullo) of 692, see canons 19, 28, 29, 32, 52, 55, 56, 57, 58, 66, 74, 75, 78, 80, 81, 90, 99, 101 (Rhalis-Potlis, Syntagma 2.295-554); on canon 52 of the Synod in Trullo, which prescribes the times of the celebration of PRES, see Alexopoulos, Presanctified Liturgy, 45-46.

30 The argument in favor of the eighth-ninth century as the time of the decline of BAS in prominence may be bolstered by a collection of canons on diverse matters (Κεφάλαια περὶ διαφόρων ύποθέσεων), attributed to patriarch Nicephoros I of Constantinople and published from two different ms. sources by J.B. Pitra (Juris ecclesiastici graecorum historia et monumemta [Rome, 1869] 2.320-27) and Aleksey Dmitrievskij (Opisanie liturgicheskix rukopisej 3.237-38). One of the canons in this collection (canon 3 in Pitra’s edition) refers to a decision by patriarchs “Nicephoros and Tarasios” (sic) which attests to the practice of seeing BAS as befitting the days of the fast, but also cites the opinion attributed to Tarasios that “nothing prohibits to celebrate the liturgy of Basil the Great on the holy day of Pentecost, on the day of Transfiguration, and on the feast of Presentation” (Pitra, 2.321; Dmitrievskij, 3.238). Alexopoulos cites this document and observes that this text is too anachronistic to be judged authentic (“Influence,” 133-34; see also Parenti, “Vittoria,” 909-911). Jean Darrouzès has pointed out that no contemporary authentic source gives evidence of any legislative activity of patriarch Nicephoros, while genuine canonical commentaries seem to be ignorant of Nicephoros’ canons, confirming that the collection is spurious, most likely originating in the 10th-first half of 11th century (in Venance Grumel, ed. Jean Darrouzès, Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarchat de Constantinople, vol. 1, fasc. 2-3, Le Patriarchat Byzantin I [Paris: Institut Francais d’Etudes Byzantines, 1989], N. 406-407, pp. 49-53, esp. 52; cf. ibid., N. 373a, p. 33). Hence, the evidence of these “canons of Nicephoros” regarding the appropriate times for the celebration of BAS must be attributed to the time where it seems to have been already firmly established (10th-11th cent.), as also other contemporary sources confirm.

604
appeared in the shape known to us, as we argue, in the aftermath of iconoclasm. It seems more likely, that the “reform” that installed CHR as the primary eucharistic rite in Constantinople was not abrupt, but a gradual process that came to completion by the early eleventh century: since Euthymius Mt’ac’mindeli attests to the reservation of BAS for Lent in the practice of which he was aware, it is plausible that the “victory” of CHR over BAS in Greece and Constantinople was already in place at that time. Likewise, Jacob has pointed out that, despite the fact that BAS precedes CHR in many important tenth-century euchologia, this does not necessarily signify the precedence of BAS in liturgical practice.

Nevertheless, I believe that the connection with iconoclasm, first indicated by Alexopoulos, provides a promising lead in order to determine the Sitz im Leben for the use of BAS as the ‘conclusion’ of the kathierosis rite, in lieu of the encaenia with the deposition of relics, which we observe in Ottoboni gr. 434. Aside from other indications, placing euchologion Ottoboni firmly in the tradition of the ‘ancient euchologion of Constantinople,’ the unique rubric prescribing the celebration of BAS on the day of the

31 I refer to the phrase καὶ ἀντίτυπον τῆς ἁγγελικῆς ἐν οὐρανῷ λειτουργίας τῆς ἱερωσύνης τάξιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς συστησάμενος (ms. Barberini gr. 336, f. 153v; Parenti-Velkovska, 161) from the prayer III of the rite, following the consecration of the altar and the church. Admittedly, the term is not used here in reference to eucharistic gifts before or after the consecration, but we could speculate that has this term been considered problematic, iconophiles could have chosen to remove it from the text of dedication liturgy, or at least to suppress the rite in the course of their “deliberate reform” (see Alexopoulos, “Influence,” 135).

32 This is also confirmed by the Constantinopolitan Typikon of patriarch Alexius the Studite (preserved only in the Slavonic translation), redacted by Alexius between 1034 and 1043. The rubric found after the description of the Theophany vigil states that BAS is celebrated “on all days of fast (въ всѣ дни поста),” specifically, the Sundays of Lent (except Palm Sunday), the eves of Christmas and Theophany, the memory of St. Basil, Holy Thursday and Holy Saturday. – f. 124v-125r; ed. A.M. Pentkovsky, Типикон патриарха Алексия Студита в Византии и на Руси (Moscow: Moscow Patriarchate, 2001), 315; noted also by Parenti, “La vittoria,” 912.

33 Jacob, “Histoire du formulaire,” 52-56. Jacob points out that while e.g. in ms. Grottaferrata Γ.β. IV (10th cent.) BAS precedes CHR, it is CHR that contains more detailed rubrics (ibid. 53).
consecration of a church may be regarded as another mark of an archaic source underlying this redaction of the rite. Indeed, none of the other three euchologia, reflecting an “ancient (shorter) redaction” of the Byzantine dedication rite take care to mention which of the two liturgies then in use in the capital (BAS/CHR) should be celebrated in conclusion of the dedication rite. But if one takes it as confirmed that BAS was the normal Sunday/feastday liturgy in eighth-century Constantinople, it is fair to presume that on the occasion of church’s solemn dedication, it was BAS that was used. The rubric, which would prescribe the use of BAS for the day of church’s dedication, will most likely reflective of that period when the church of Constantinople used BAS as its principal liturgy for Sundays and feast days, i.e., it will reflect an eighth-ninth-century practice, when the celebration of BAS in Constantinople and Greece was not yet limited to few days per year. While the text of the dedication rite in ms. Ottoboni gr. 434 shows signs of adaptation for the use in a provincial diocese on Byzantine periphery (Palestine or Sinai), primarily seen in the substitution of ἐπίσκοπος for πατριάρχης throughout the text,34 the “irregular” use of BAS in conclusion of the dedication rite points at the Constantinopolitan origin and an early, mid-eighth-century date for its Vorlage, roughly contemporary or earlier than the euchologion Barberini gr. 336.

It is precisely the absence of the encaenia rite in Ottoboni gr. 434 that make it conceivable that the redaction of the liturgical source underlying the Ottoboni euchologion may be attributed to the time of the first period of the iconoclast controversy

---

34 With, again, the exception of f. 91v: καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐμὴν, ἐποίδιοσται τῷ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ θυματὴρ[ιν] καὶ θωμᾶ τὴν ἄγιαν τράπεζαν... Ἐν τῷ θωμαν τὸν ἀρχιεπίσκοπον... [after the incensation and anointing of the walls and columns] κλινόμενος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος πρὸς τὴν ἄγιαν τράπεζαν, ἐπεύχεται ταῖς... This discrepancy may indicate that the title “archbishop” appearing in the text may be the mark of the original text, while the substitution of the celebrant’s title to “bishop” is a trace of the euchologion’s adaptation to the needs of a peripheral see. It is likely, therefore, that the text of the euchologion underlying the redaction of ms. Ottoboni gr. 434 may derive from Constantinople.
(ca.730-787) which would make the Ottoboni redaction of the ritual anterior to the redaction represented in the euchologion Barberini gr. 336. It is a general presumption of the sources in the aftermath of the II Nicaea council (787) that the iconoclast movement, including one of the most active proponents of the doctrine, emperor Constantine V, rejected the concept and practice of the veneration of the saints’ relics, and even used to destroy some relics to prevent such veneration. Recent studies produce a more balanced picture of iconoclasts’ actual views and actions with regards to relics, questioning the presumption of later sources of the full-scale campaign to remove both relics and icons from the church’s use.35

However, while it is doubtful that the iconoclasts did indeed practice the destruction of relics, it may be certain that particularly Constantine V had theological considerations against such practice.36 In his apologetic work attacking Constantine (even though written more than forty years after the emperor’s death37), Nicephorus of Constantinople gives a description which may characterize the iconoclasts’ stance upon the manner in which the churches must be consecrated:

[The temples] are holy on account of the sacrifices that are performed and of the sacred prayers and invocations which are said by priests at their


37 Alexander, Patriarch Nicephorus, 182-188; Haldon-Brubaker, Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era: Sources, 256-57.
foundation/dedication (Ἅγιοι εἰσιν οὗτοι, διὰ τὰς τελουμένας θυσίας, καὶ τὰς ἱερὰς εὐχὰς καὶ ἑπικλήσεις, τὰς ἐπὶ ἑδραιώσεων αὐτῶν ἱερολογουμένας).  

While it is not clear whether this passage represents the thoughts of Constantine himself or of another unknown writer, it may have accurately reflected the iconoclasts’ views with regards to the liturgical arrangement by means of which the church was to be consecrated: by prayers and epicleses, without the deposition of relics. If such identification is correct, it may be possible to suggest eighth-century Constantinople before or immediately after the end of the first iconoclast period for the more accurate Sitz im Leben of the dedication rite in Ottoboni gr. 434, the time period when the rite of consecration of church and altar was introduced into the liturgical practice of Constantinople.

We have speculated earlier, judging from (later) descriptions of the West Syriac rituals of dedication, that also in Constantinople in the sixth-seventh century, the rites of consecration of the church and the altar may have been celebrated on the eve of the day of dedication, at the same time with the solemn vigil-pannychis. The Ottoboni euchologion demonstrates the arrangement when the rite of kathierósis is transferred to the morning and the eucharistic liturgy is appended to this very rite, while the rite of the “opening of doors” and of the deposition of relics are seemingly suppressed. Such an arrangement of the dedication rituals most likely came about due to temporary suppression of the rites involving the relic deposition at the time of iconoclasm – and, presumably, this was the practice reflected in the liturgical source that served as a

38 Nicephorus, Antirrheticus 3.54 (PG 100:477C).

39 Hennephof considered it a part of Constantine’s hypothetical “third peusis” (no. 184; Textus, 57), which has not been generally accepted, see Haldon-Brubaker, Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era: Sources, 255 n. 44.
Vorlage for the Ottoboni euchologion. Since the rite in this episcopal euchologion was most likely used by a peripheral see in Palestine or on Sinai, the rite of *encaenia* with the deposition of relics never came to be included in the euchologion, appended to the rite of *kathierôsis*.

*The Use of BAS on the Day of Dedication: euchologion Grottaferrata Γ.β. VII.*

The use of BAS at the celebration of the dedication of a church may be indirectly confirmed by the tenth-century euchologion *Grottaferrata Γ.β. VII*, originating in Southern Italy.40 This composite euchologion, reflecting the practice of Byzantine periphery (in this case, Southern Italy),41 features a number of “prayers on/behind the ambo (εὐχὴ ὀπισθάμβονος),” a standard feature of the Constantinopolitan ordo of BAS and CHRYΣ,42 the next to last prayer in the ordo.43 Thirty three such prayers, specific for different Sundays and feasts of the liturgical year, are listed following the ordo of the liturgy of Chrysostom,44 two – following the text of Basil’s liturgy45 and one – in the

---


41 Passarelli, 18-21, 56-62; Jacob, “Tradition manuscrite de la liturgie,” 123-124. Due to a composite nature of the source, it is not possible to determine conclusively whether it was BAS or CHRYΣ which had precedence in Γ.β. VII (Jacob, 124).


43 Thus it is in *Barberini gr. 336* where the prayer is called εὐχὴ ἐπιστάμβονος. On this variant term, see Taft, *Communion*, 596-98; Jacob, “Où était recitée la prière,” 313.

44 ff.13'-26', ed. Passarelli, §35.5-67 (78-86).
ordo of the liturgy of St Peter (the Byzantinized ordo of Roman mass).⁴⁷ The second of
the opisthambonos prayers that follow the ordo of the liturgy of Basil, bears the
inscription Εὐχὴ ὀπισθάμβονος εἰς ἐγκαίνιαν,⁴⁸ indicating that such prayer may have
been specific for the celebration of the liturgy on the occasion of a dedication of a church,
or for the celebration of the liturgy on the annual feast, commemorating such dedication.

Furthermore, the prayer itself (incipit: Ὅ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν
Ἱησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὦ ὁ ἐν εὐλογητῷ εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας, ὃ διὰ καταπετάσματος) appears to
derive from the rite of dedication or commemoration of dedication: it is the prayer
identical with the one in the Constantinopolitan euchologion of Strategios Coislin 213 (f.
17v-18r),⁴⁹ where it precedes the entrance of the patriarch into the church to be dedicated.
Likewise, it is found in the eleventh-century euchologion Sinai gr. 959 as the prayer of
the litê (stational procession)⁵⁰ at the commemoration of a dedication of a church.⁵¹ The
inscription of this prayer in the euchologion – Εὐχὴ εἰς λιτὴν τῶν αἰκαινίων (sic) τῆς
ἀγιωτάτης μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας, λέγεται πρὸ τῆς εἰσόδου πρὶν εἰπεῖν τὸ Ἀρατε πύλας οἱ
ἀρχωντες [ὑμῶν] – allocates it the same position in the rite, as indicated by the rubric of
Coislin 213, just before the entrance into the church and the incantation of the entrance

---

⁴⁵ ff. 130'-131', ed. Passarelli, § 303-304 (166-7).
⁴⁷ f. 137v, ed. Passarelli, § 334.4 (174).
⁴⁸ Passarelli, 166.
⁴⁹ Duncan, Coislin 213, 22-23
⁵¹ ff. 71v-72v.
verse of Ps 23:7.\textsuperscript{52} It should be noted that the text of this opisthambonos prayer in Grottaferrata Γ.β. VII contains one important variant: unlike Coislin 213 which, in the rite of dedication (f. 17\textsuperscript{v}-18\textsuperscript{r}), uses the phrase τὸν έγκαινισμόν ἐφορτάζοντας τοῦ σεβασμίου ναοῦ ἀγίου τοῦ,\textsuperscript{53} the text of the prayer in the rite for the annual commemoration of the encaenia in Sinai gr. 959 and the same Coislin 213 (ff. 84\textsuperscript{r}-\textsuperscript{v}) employ the variant phrase τὴν ἀνάμνησιν ἐφορτάζοντας τοῦ ἐγκαινισμοῦ ταύτης τῆς ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας.\textsuperscript{54} The use of the latter variant in the Grottaferrata euchologion\textsuperscript{55} confirms that the opisthambonos prayer in question was used at the annual commemoration of a dedication of the church, rather than at the occasion of the dedication itself. Moreover, it is likely that the lite procession, as described in Sinai gr. 959 and Coislin 213, was the original setting for this prayer and its placement among the opisthambonoi may be a secondary development. What is more conspicuous for our purposes here is the placement of this prayer intended “for encaenia” as the second (or third\textsuperscript{56}) opisthambonos prayer following the ordo of Basil’s liturgy: can this placement be taken as another indication that the liturgy of Basil was celebrated on the occasion of the dedication of a church or of a commemoration of such dedication?\textsuperscript{57} The prayer, which

\textsuperscript{52} The inscription is found on f. 71\textsuperscript{r}, the prayer – ff. 71\textsuperscript{v}-72\textsuperscript{r}; the text of the rubric in Sinai gr. 959 (ff. 72\textsuperscript{r}-\textsuperscript{v}), regarding the variations in the prayer in question, depending on the patron of a specific church, closely corresponds to a similar rubric within the rite of encaenia in Coislin 213 (f. 18r; Duncan, 23).

\textsuperscript{53} Duncan, 23.

\textsuperscript{54} Sinai gr. 959, f. 71\textsuperscript{v}; Duncan, 128-129.

\textsuperscript{55} Passarelli, § 304 l. 7-8, p. 166.

\textsuperscript{56} The euchologion Grottaferrata Γ.β. VII does not cite the opisthambonos prayer in the text of the Basilian liturgy itself, referring back to the preceding text of the euchologion, even though the reference is unclear (ἐὐχή ὑπεσθάμβων τοῦ ἁγίου Βασίλειου. προεγράψῃ; f. 130\textsuperscript{r}, Passarelli §301.3, p. 166).

\textsuperscript{57} The prayer, which
appears as first opisthambonos prayer following the ordo of Basil’s liturgy in Γ.β. VII (incipit: Τελέσαντες τὴν ιερὰν λειτουργίαν καθὼς προετάχθημεν), also is featured in Barberini gr. 336 (f. 255v-256r) and in another 10th century euchologion from Southern Italy, Grottaferrata Γ.β. IV (f.). In the latter euchologion, however, it is the first opisthambonos in a ‘series’ of several prayers that follow the text of the liturgy of Chrysostom. Consequently, the position of the second prayer, εὐχὴ εἰς ἐγκαίνια, after the ordo of the liturgy of Basil, does not necessarily signify that certain prayers would be necessarily associated with specific liturgical ordines, in this case, Basil’s liturgy. The composite character of Γ.β. VII should perhaps bar us from drawing inferences, based on the position of the opisthambonoi prayers within the framework of the euchologion, which would make the testimony of Ottoboni gr. 434, a Palestinian euchologion, even more significant.

---

57 As is the opinion of Abraham-Andreas Thiermeyer, Das Euchologion Ottoboni, 117; Parenti seems to concur with this conclusion (“La ‘vittoria’ della liturgia di Crisostomo,” 916, 916 n. 19).


59 f. 27r-v; ed. Stefano Parenti, L’eucologio manoscritto Γ.β. IV (X sec.), 16 (§ 58).

60 ff. 17r-27r; Parenti, L’eucologio Γ.β. IV, 8-16 (§ 29-58); see also idem, “La ‘vittoria’ della liturgia di Crisostomo,” 919-920.

61 Passarelli, 18-21, 203-205. The editor isolates within this euchologion three different euchologia as the composite elements of Γ.β. VII: “euchologion A” (ff. 1-13), “euchologion B,” (ff. 29-129) and “C” (ff. 129-175). The liturgy of Basil and the opisthambonoi that follow its text are attributed, therefore, to the latter layer of this liturgical ms (see Passarelli, 18).

62 Pointing that Γ.β. VII is “a composite ms” where the Presanctified liturgy, as well as the liturgies of Basil and Peter form an addendum following the ordo of the liturgy of Chrysostom, Taft contends that, for this reason, “not much can be argued from the ordering of its Opisthambonoi.” (Taft, Communion, 613).
APPENDIX II TO PART II:
THE RITE FOR THE INSTALLATION OF AN ALTAR IN THE BYZANTINE
EUCHOLOGION COISLIN 213.¹

Introduction

As it has been discussed several times throughout this dissertation, it is customary
in discussing the Byzantine rites of church dedication to distinguish between the rites of
καθιέρωσις (consecration of the altar and the church building) and of ἐγκαίνια
(dedication, incl. the opening of doors and the procession with the deposition of relics),²
which, since the appearance of the earliest complete Byzantine text of the rite in the late
eighth-century euchologion Barberini gr. 336 (f. 145v- 159r), always appeared side-by-
side in subsequent Byzantine euchologia.³ The rite for the consecration of an altar and
for the encaenia in the euchologion Paris B. N. Coislin 213, (further – COI) deriving
from eleventh-century Constantinople, while containing the majority of the prayer texts

¹ An earlier version of this section was presented as a paper (with the same title) in “Problems in
the Early History of Liturgy” seminar at the annual meeting of the North American Academy of Liturgy,
January 10, 2011.

² E.g. Ignazio M. Calabuig, “The Rite of the Dedication of a Church,” in ed. Anscar J. Chupungco,
Handbook for Liturgical Studies, vol. 5: Liturgical Time and Space (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press,
2000), 347; Mikhail Zheltov, “Комментарии” in Освящение храма: сборник (Moscow: Izdatel'skij Sovet
Russkoi Pravoslavnoj Cerki, 2006), 353.

³ The 12th century euchologion Ottoboni gr. 434 constitutes a unique exception, containing the rite
of καθιέρωσις ending with the rubric for the celebration of the divine liturgy, without the rite of encaenia
(f. 93v); the euchologia which contain the rite of encaenia without the καθιέρωσις rite are discussed
further.
and manual acts, exhibits several significant changes. The rite of *kathierósis* in COI, bearing the title τάξις γινομένη ἐπὶ καθιερώσει ναοῦ καὶ ἱδρύσει τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ ἁγίας τραπέζης, appears to be completely integrated with the rite of *encaenia*: the second rite does not appear under its own title as in *Barberini gr. 336* (f. 156v, τάξις γινομένη ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐγκαινίοις τοῦ ἣδη καθιερωθέντος ἁγίου ναοῦ). Even though the end of the *katherós* rite is clearly indicated (f. 16r καὶ τελειοῦται πᾶσα ἡ ἀκολουθία) – the bishop is directed to unvest and to “rest a little (μικρὸν... ἀναπαύεται)” – it appears that it is on the same day, if not directly afterwards, that the rite of *encaenia* is expected to be performed. More significantly, the COI euchologion expands the introductory rubric leading into the rite of *kathierósis*, filling it with exhaustive detail regarding the preparation of the altar table for the subsequent service of consecration. Aside from listing the materials necessary for consecration of an altar, and precise quantities thereof, providing for the preparation of various kinds of altars (built on four pillars, one pillar, solid base, or from *spolia*), COI assigns to the clerics themselves to perform the construction of the altar table, accompanied by the prayer of the celebrant, and by psalmody.

Such attention to detail in the rubrics describing the installation of a new altar in the church to be consecrated sets the Byzantine rite of dedication apart from other Eastern and contemporary Western rites of dedication. However, can this rite of installation of a new altar be a completely indigenous Constantinopolitan development, marking an increase in ritualization of even practical and mundane aspects of the ritual, or can we detect in these rubrics an attempt to integrate into the fabric of a Byzantine ritual some elements of a non-Constantinopolitan material? In what follows I will characterize (what
I termed as) three “recensions” of the introductory rubric/“Preface” to the Byzantine *kathierôsis* rite in order to see the gradual development and sophistication of this liturgical rubric. Then I will look at some similar rites found in the peripheral Byzantine euchologia and, on the basis of the material discussed, will make a hypothesis with regards to the origins of the “installation rite” among the Byzantine rites of dedication.

**A “Georgian” Recension of the “Preface.”**

We have already discussed the peculiar features the “preface” – the introductory rubric to the rite of *kathierôsis* – in the “older” recension of the Byzantine rite of dedication, represented by *Barberini gr. 336* and three other manuscript witnesses. Before we turn to COI and observe significant changes which the initial rites of the service of consecration/dedication of a church had experienced from the eighth to the eleventh century, we should draw our attention to another recension of the Byzantine rite for church dedication, preserved only through the Georgian translation in two euchologia, *Tbilisi S 143* (before 1022 CE) and *Sinai Georgian O. 73* (12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> cent.). The first euchologion in question, as determined by Kekelidze, was translated from the Greek *(bardzulisagan k’art’ulad)* by Georgian Athonite monk and translator Euthymius

---

4 See Chapter 6.7.1.

5 It was not possible for me to work with the original manuscript of *S 143* or its microfilm – for this reason I rely on the Russian translation of its text in Korneli Kekelidze, Литургические грузинские памятники в отечественных книгохранилищах и их научное значение (Tbilisi: Bratsvto, 1908), 37-40; see also the description of the ms. in T. M. Bregadze et al., *K’art’ul xelnacert’a ağeriloba qop ’ili K’art veilt’a şoris cera-kit’xis gamavrc’elebeli sazogadoebis (S) kolek ’c’tisa*, ed. Elene Metreveli (Tbilisi: Georgian SSR Academy of Sciences, 1959), 1.152-54.

Mt’acmindeli (d. 1028), as follows from one of the ms. colophons (p. 195). It may be deduced, therefore, that a lost Greek Vorlage for Euthymius’ translation was a peripheral Byzantine euchologion, perhaps originating on Mt Athos. The recension of the rite in the later euchologion Sinai Georgian O. 73 does not contain some of the features of S 143 possibly derived from hagiopolite tradition, but the recension of the initial rites preceding the service of consecration of an altar in both manuscripts are very similar.

Sinai Georgian O. 73 (12\textsuperscript{th}-13\textsuperscript{th} cent.), f. 257r-258v

\[1\] The Rite\textsuperscript{8} for the Blessing of the Church which is Dedication.

\[2\] Before the first day of the dedication, the herald of the catholicos or another priest whom he also will send arrives and brings in the stonemasons and they will fix the tablet of the altar, so that nothing would be wanting. And they will set the place for the deposition of the [relics of] the martyrs; and they depart. And he prepares as many of antimensia\textsuperscript{9} as he wishes.

\[3\] And in the evening they celebrate the order and vigil\textsuperscript{10} of dedication. And they proclaim the readings: (a) the reading from the [Book of] Kings: “And Solomon finished all the work which he made” [1 Kings 8:1ff]; (b) the reading from Proverbs: “The Wisdom:” [9:1ff]; (c) the prophecy of Haggai: “And the angel said to Haggai:” [1:13ff].

\[4\] But the next day, only at the second

---

\textsuperscript{7} Kekelidze, Liturgičeskie gruzinskie pamiatniki, 32; on Euthymius see Michael Tarchnišvili, Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur, Studi e Testi 185 (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1955), 126-154, his translation of the church dedication rite is referred to on p. 151.

\textsuperscript{8} lit. ‘prayer’.

\textsuperscript{9} cod. singular.

\textsuperscript{10} lit. ‘praise’. 

Tbilisi S 143 (11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} cent.) (RT = Kekelidze 37-38)

\[1\] The Order of the Dedication, that is of the Blessing of the holy Church, translated by the blessed Euthymius from the Greek.

\[2\] One day before the consecration of the church, the herald of the bishop or any of the priests, having taken the stonemason with him, constructs with his help the table in the sanctuary, and selects the place for the deposition of holy relics. Then he departs and prepares the antimensia, as many as he wishes.

\[3\] In the church to be consecrated, they celebrate vespers and matins according to the order. At vespers they read three OT readings: (a) Kingdoms: “And Solomon finished”; (b) Proverbs: “The Wisdom made herself a house”; (c) prophecy of Haggai “And the Angel of the Lord said to Haggai”.

\[4\] But the next day, only at the second
hour of the day, they empty the church and leave no one in it at all. And the catholicos enters with the priests, deacons, monks, subdeacons also with the builder of the church they bring in; and no other shall enter into the church at this time and thence they lock the doors of the church altogether. [5] And they vest the catholicos who will celebrate the consecration. As a vestment over his proper garment, they wrap him cross-wise with the holy sabanon, that is, the clean cloth, and they say the psalm 50: “Have mercy on me, O God, according to [your] great mercy.” [6] All together sing [it] and when they finish the vesting, they take down the tablet [of the altar] and they wrap the pillars with parchment. [7] The deacon performs the kverexi, while [all are?] kneeling: “In peace let us pray to the Lord.”

This recension of the initial rites for the ritual of church dedication, based on the lost Greek original, may represent an intermediary stage, slightly earlier than, or roughly contemporary to the development of the recension in COI. The “Georgian” recension preserves the division between the day of preparation, reserved to the work of stonemasons, and the day when the consecration and the rite of encaenia will be celebrated.

At the same time, many new features are present: the patriarchal official now is concerned with the preparation of an altar for the deposition of relics, and for the consecration of antimensia (portable altars). The initial rites celebrated at the first procession of the bishop into the church still resemble the primitive form featured in the Barberini euchologion, but again with the addition of few features: the vesting of the

[4] On the next day, at two hours of the day, the patriarch or bishop enters the church only with priests, deacons, monks, subdeacons and with the founder (of the church). They lock the doors shut, [5] and they put over the vestments of a bishop who performs the consecration, a sabanon in a cross-wise fashion, i.e. a pure cloth, while singing the psalm “Have mercy on me, O God, according to your great mercy.” [6] After this, they take off the tablet of the altar and wrap the pillars (of the altar) with the parchment. [7] The deacon proclaims the litany: “Let us bow down and pray to the Lord.”

11 “Monch, Nonne” – ADW 811.

12 See for the thorough treatment of the history of antimension in Izzo, Antimension.
patriarch into a clean “cloth,” apparently to prevent the damage to the liturgical vestments, and the clergy is now responsible for the dis-assembling of the altar before it will be consecrated: they “take down the [altar] tablet and wrap the pillars with parchment,” again, in order to prevent the spillage, presumably of the myron with which the altar was to be anointed. All these actions are accompanied by the chanting of ps 50 (51). Thus, one can detect in this expanded “preface” the tendency to solemnize the preparation of the physical space for consecration – however, these developments are still in its primitive stage.

“New Recension” of the “Preface”: Coislin 213.

COI, a Constantinopolitan euchologion copied in August 1027 and acquired by Strategios, the presbyter of the Great Church (according to the colophon on f. 211r), is the earliest euchologion containing the “longer” version of the initial rites preceding the rite of kathierosis, other early witnesses being ms. Vatican gr. 1872 (12th cent.), and so-called “Euchologion of Cardinal Bessarion” Grottaferrata Γ.β. Ι, more recently re-dated to the thirteenth century. This “longer” version eventually has made its way into the textus receptus of the Byzantine rites for the dedication of a church in both its Greek and Russo-Slavic modern recensions. In what follows I present the translation of the initial

13 κτηθεῖσα Στρατηγίῳ πρεσβυτέρῳ τῆς Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν πατριαρχικῶν εὐκτηρίων – see the reproduction of the colophon in Duncan, vii; see also Panagiotis Kalaïtzidis, “Il prebîutero Στρατηγίος e le due note bibliografiche del codice Paris Coislin 213,” Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata III s. 5 (2008): 179-184.

rites from COI (f. 8v-11v), adding my numbering and section titles for clarity, and providing a parallel Greek text for the passages deemed to be of most importance.

**Introduction: preparation of an altar for consecration**

1. One day prior, the <official> in charge of ordinations – or the hieromnêmôn or some other entrusted with ecclesiastical ministry – reaches this temple, <and> prepares the stone-cutters to adorn the table, and to set <it> upon the pillars, as it needs to be established. Arriving after this, the bishop takes three particles of the holy martyrs’ relics, which need to be deposited after the sacred rite into a “tomb” prepared between the pillars [of the altar] toward the east, if the pillars support the altar table.

2. If a base (βωμὸς) holds it, either made of a single stone or put together from many stones, (these will be placed) into a depository made by the master in the middle of the base on its side turned toward the synthronon.

**Preparation of the relics for the rite of dedication**

3. And, having put these three particles of the relics into the treasure-box (γλωσσόκομον) like a casket (δομιον καμπτρίω), with which these also shall be deposited. This box is placed onto the holy diskos and, having put over it the so-called “star,” covers it with the cover of the diskos, and he carries and leaves (the relics) in some sacred temple close by, where also vespers (λυχνικόν), pannychis and orthros are celebrated.

**Preparation of materials for the consecration rite**

4. Afterwards, the hieromnêmôn, or another ecclesiastical <official> comes again and prepares the necessary things which all need to be new and unspoiled, of which each thing (must be at hand): two linen cloths (σαβανά), which are white linens (συνδόνας), three towels (μαντήλια), three belts, carpets, that is – the prayer rug and a pillow, papyrus made of grass (χάρτην χόρτινον), cut into two or three, corresponding to the thickness of the pillars that underlie the [altar] table; a string, i.e. the thin rope (σφήκωμα, ὁ ἐστὶ σχοινίον λεπτόν), mastic, wax and crushed marble, a pot, a vessel for hot liquids (θερμηρὸν ἀγγεῖον), a vessel or ewer (σίτλαν ἢ ἐπιχύτην), either copper or ceramic; four sponges, white nitre (νίπτρον λευκὸν), the candle or the so-called “lamp” (λύχνος), the torch, lead pipes and wicks [for the lamps], two ewers, one full with the flavoured wine or [simple] wine (οἴνανθης ἢ οἴνου πλήρη), another with myron – but not like some wrote “a collaphon of flavoured or plain wine, and a collaphon of chrism,”
for *collaphon* is a large measure, weighing half of a liquid σαϊτης [~10 l.], i.e. sixty five *xestai* […].

5. Having thus made ready these things, the ecclesiastical <official> above orders to melt the wax in the pot and thus puts aside the mastic, and similarly puts aside the crushed marble, which quantity corresponds to the quantity and size of the pillars; then he instructs to take out of the temple anything that can be moved, and not to light any lamps.

**Arrival of the bishop and the closure of the church, vesting**

6. When the bishop arrives, the [altar] table is removed from its pillars and put to the side by one of the walls.

7. And all lay people are cast out, but inside remain only the priests and other clergy and servants, as well as everything necessary for the consecration. As the doors of the temple are firmly shut from all sides, the bishop is vested in all episcopal garments, and the bishops, priests, and servants who are with him put on their own garments.

8. But upon [the bishop] who is going to celebrate the consecration, they put on a linen garment (σάυανον) over the sacred vestments, which stretches from his chest to the feet, but from the back is held from both sides under his armpits and tied together, in the middle being tied up by a belt. And upon each of his arms they put the towels, tied with the belts.

**Preparation of the pillars/columns for the installation of an altar**

9. And thus having been vested, [the bishop] enters with his entourage into the sanctuary (θυσιαστήριον), and when he gives order, the bring to him the papyrus, which they should have cut so that each of the pillars of the altar may be wrapped around with it. Cutting it as necessary, they fold into two the upper part [of the papyrus] which must be toward the top [of the pillar], the shorter part of the fold they bend inwards, but the lower part [of the papyrus] they make straight, for the hot wax with mastic will be poured from the top. The papyrus must be folded in two, so that it will be able to keep in [the wax-mastic], but also to hold it by a thumb’s measure around the pillar, so that the wax-mastic may not overflow.

10. Thus, as it was said, they surround each pillar with the papyrus, they tie from the outside with the string (σφηκώματι), wrapping it three times from above and three times from below. Then, pulling together the ends of the upper and lower bands, they bring [these] around the middle and crossing these together, they make a sign of the cross between the upper and lower bands and thus they draw these and tie these in the back.

11. After these things, they put the crushed marble around the upper extremities of the pillars, but the protruding ends of the papyrus, lest the wax-mastic flow out through some small opening. And when they bring the pot [where the wax-mastic was boiled], they pour the wax-mastic upon the pillars until the papyrus fills to the brim – when it is let loose, the wax mastic is cooled off, for it is very hot.

---

15 I have omitted a brief discussion regarding the precise quantities of wine and chrism to be used.
Prayer for the installation of an altar

12. The bishop prays thus:

Κύριε ὁ θεὸς καὶ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, ὁ πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τοῦ γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων, πρόσδεξαι τὴν δέησιν ἡμῶν τῶν ἄναξίων δούλων σου καὶ ἰκάνωσον ἡμᾶς ἔπι τῆς παρούσης ὥρας εἰς τὸ ἀκατακρίτως τὸν ἐγκαινισμὸν ἐπιτελέσαι τοῦ ναοῦ τούτου τοῦ πρὸς σὴν δοξολογίαν ὑκοδομηθέντος ἐπὶ ὀνόματι τοῦ ἁγίου τοῦδε καὶ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ ποιήσασθαι τραπέζης.

Ἐκφώνησις· Ὅτι πρέπει σοι πᾶσα δόξα, τιμή καὶ προσκύνησις, τῷ πατρί, καὶ τῷ υἱῷ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰωνίους.

Our Lord God and Saviour who does and works all things for the salvation of the human kind, receive the prayer of us, your unworthy servants, and enable us upon the present day, without condemnation, to perform the dedication of this temple, built for your doxology, in the name of the saint N., and to make the raising of the table which is in it.

Exclamation. For to you belongs all glory, honor and worship, to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit, now and ever and unto...

The psalmody and the completion of the rite.

13. And after Amen, he takes the table, together with the concelebrants, calling forth also some master (builder), if it would be necessary, and they set the table upon the pillars, while they sing three times psalm 144, I will lift you up, my God, my King. They say the Glory (δοξάζουσι), and as the wax mastic, that has poured over, is being scraped off and the spots cleaned upon which it had poured, again they say the psalm 22, The Lord shepherds me and I lack nothing. When this is finished, they say the Glory (δοξάζουσι), and the bishop says: 

Blessed is our God, always, now and ever and unto ages of ages, Amen.

Then, with their hands they press down the table slightly so that the pillars would join together with it and (the tablet) would be properly established (καλῶς ἱδρυθῆναι).

Instructions for the installation of different kinds of altar tables

14. This all takes place, however, if the table is supported by the pillars, or one pillar, but if a tetragonal base underlies (the tablet), (and) if the tablet set upon this base also happens to be tetragonal, the wax mastic is poured upon the four corners (ταῖς τέσσαρις γωνίαις) and thus the establishment (καθίδρυσις) is complete. But if the tablet is put together from diverse marble (pieces), all other (pieces) are put together by the master builder (παρὰ τοῦ τεχνιτοῦ), but the middle tetragone is established/fixed with the wax mastic, without tying the parchment, and without some other things that follow.

14. And after the table had been established (μετὰ δὲ γε τὸ καθιδρυθῆναι τὴν τράπεζαν), a carpet (τάπης) and a pillow are immediately put before the holy doors, and as the archdeacon says Bowing the knees [in peace let us pray to the Lord], the bishop kneels upon these and prays thus:

[here follows the first prayer of the rite for the consecration of an altar]

The comparison of this extended set of rubrics with a shorter recension thereof in Barberini gr. 336 and other euchologies of this tradition reveals a higher level of integration between the rites of kathierόσis of an altar and church with the rites of
encaenia with the deposition of relics: in COI (as well as in the earlier “Georgian” recension) the preparations for depositing the saints’ relics into the altar and the instructions for the celebrating the divine office in honor of the dedication are introduced already in the beginning of the “first” dedication rite. The rite in COI records the change in the size of relics to be deposited: while in Barberini at the end of the eighth century the size of a relic is not specified, the “three particles” deposited into a case or treasury-box may indicate the reduction in size of a relic portion which, since 787 has become a mandatory element in the consecration of new churches. The provisions with regards to different types of altar tables which may be used for new churches – a table on four/five pillars, a tablet on one pillar or a solid base, or a table with a base put together from the recycled marble pieces (spolia) – also reflects, it seems, the altered economic circumstances of Byzantium which saw the significant decline in the supply of newly quarried marble from the 6th century onwards, “while the use of spolia became common.”

At the same time, the most interesting aspect of this rubric as a liturgio-historical source emerges when we compare it to what we termed as an “intermediate” recension of the initial rites – i.e. the “Georgian” recension. The latter version of the “preface” to the dedication rite contains many elements which are found again in COI: preparation of the place for depositing the relics, instructions for vigil (incl. the lectionary), vesting of the

16 Canon 7 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council (Mansi 13.427).

17 S[lobodan] C[určić], “Marble,” in ed. Alexander Kazhdan, Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, 2.1295; according to Robert Ousterhout, “[a]rchaeological examination of quarry sites has failed to find any conclusive evidence for use after about the sixth century. Even at the famed Prokonnesos quarries on Marmara Adasi, there is no evidence for quarrying in the post-Iconoclastic period.” (Master Builders of Byzantium [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, 2008], 139; further on the use of spolia in the Byzantine architecture, see ibid., 140-145.
bishop, removal of the altar tablet from the pillars, and wrapping the pillars with the parchment (not papyrus!). However, what is lacking in Tbilisi S 143 and Sinai Georgian O. 73 is precisely the liturgical service of prayer and psalmody which accompanies these ritual actions:

- prayer Κ. ὁ Θ. καὶ Σ. ἡ ὁ πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος
- deposition of the altar upon the pillars
- Ps 144 + Glory
- Ps 22 + Glory
- bishop’s exclamation: Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν.

Execution of the Psalmody

The manner of the execution of the psalmody in our text corresponds precisely to the execution of the psalms elsewhere in the same rite of kathierósis, specifically at the chanting of the psalms which accompany manual acts of the consecration ceremonial. If we refer just to the text of the same rite from the same COI codex, the similarity is apparent: thus, during the washing of the altar with water, in the manner similar to the baptismal washing or the Constantinopolitan rite of washing of the altar on Holy Thursday, the clergy chant Ps 83, concluded in this manner:

Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τέλειαν ἐκπλυσίν καὶ ἀπάσμηξιν, δοξάζουσι, καὶ λέγει ὁ ἀρχιερεύς·
Δόξα τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας. (f. 13v)

After the washing of the altar with the flavoured or simple wine (οἰνάνθης ἢ οἴνου), during which the bishop chants Ps 50:9 and adds the rest of the psalm and,

δοξάζουν λέγει· Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πάντοτε, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας
tῶν αἰώνων. Ἄμην (f. 14r).18

18 Duncan, 17.
Similarly, the chanting of Ps 132 during the anointing of the altar with oil ends with *Glory* and the bishop’s acclamation Δόξα σοι, ἁγία τρίας, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (f. 14r), and the execution of Ps 131 during the vesting of the new altar ends with *Glory* and the bishop’s exclamation Δόξα τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. The only exceptions to the rule are Ps 92 (chanted during the vesting of the altar into the outer garment) and Ps 25 (said during the incensation of the church) – both these psalms end with *Glory*, but the rubric makes no note of any formulae spoken by a bishop.

The function of these psalms as chant “covering” liturgical action seems clear, as such are supposed to be chanted once or many times (ἅπαξ ἢ πολλάκις) while the manual acts are being completed. The bishop’s formula, always concluding with “unto ages of ages” bears a similar role to the doxology at the end of the antiphons in the Byzantine liturgical psalmody, as well as to its variant, the “hanging doxology” (Taft) during the post-communion rites in the ordo of Byzantine liturgy of Chrysostom or Basil. The function of these psalms as chant “covering” liturgical action seems clear, as such are supposed to be chanted once or many times (ἅπαξ ἢ πολλάκις) while the manual acts are being completed. The bishop’s formula, always concluding with “unto ages of ages” bears a similar role to the doxology at the end of the antiphons in the Byzantine liturgical psalmody, as well as to its variant, the “hanging doxology” (Taft) during the post-communion rites in the ordo of Byzantine liturgy of Chrysostom or Basil. In the course of continuous chanting of the psalmody during the ritual actions of the dedication rites, the exclamation by the bishop signified the end to the chanting corresponding to the end of a specific liturgical act.

*An “Independent” Rite for the “Installation” of an Altar?*

The inclusion of a complete liturgical service, consisting of one celebrant’s prayer and the psalmody with a concluding episcopal acclamation, into the preliminary rites for the dedication of a church in COI raises the question with regards to the origins of this

---

“rite.” Was it an expansion of the already existing rite of *kathierósis*, having emerged from necessity to accompany the manual acts of preparing the altar with the text – or was it an incorporation of an already existent independent rite for the installation of a new altar? Our inclination toward the latter solution is based upon the evidence of an independent “installation rite” preserved in two South Italian euchologia, the euchologion of the Monastery of the Theotokos τοῦ πατήρος *Vatican gr. 1970*,20 a collection of diverse liturgical material (including the liturgies of Basil, Chrysostom, Peter, Mark, and James, and a fragment of the Byzantine rite for the consecration of churches21), and a thirteenth-century euchologion ms. *Vatican gr. 1552*. Both of these manuscripts feature the rite for the “establishing” of the altar by the bishop (τάξις γινομένη ἐπὶ ἑδραιώσεως ἁγίας τραπέζης, *Vatican gr. 1970*, f. 11v, 212r; *Vatican gr. 1552*, f. 35r-36r) which in turn is quite similar to the service of prayer and psalmody incorporated into the opening ceremonies of the *kathierósis* rite in COI. In my translation below I cite the text according to the first ms., noting the variations found in *Vatican gr. 1552*.

Τάξις γινομένη ἐπὶ ἑδραιώσεως ἁγίας τραπέζης.

The Rite for the establishing of the holy altar table.

Ὁ διάκονος. Εὐλόγησον δέσποτα.

The deacon: *Bless, master.*

Ὁ ἱερεὺς. Ἐὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία.

The priest (=bishop): *Blessed is the kingdom.*

Καὶ τοῦ διάκονου λέγοντος τὴν συναπτὴν, ὁ ἁρχιερεὺς ἐπεύχεται ταύτην τὴν εὐχήν: Κύριε θεὸς καὶ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν,

And while the deacon is saying the litany, the bishop prays this prayer:

καὶ πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τοῦ γένους τῶν ἄνθρωπων, πρόσδεξαι τὴν δέησιν τῶν ἄναξίων δύολων σου, καὶ ἰκανῶ- [f. 212r]-σον ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς παρούσης ὥρας, εἰς τὸ ἀκατακρίτως τὸν

= COI


21 These fragments include the rubrics and prayer for the deposition of relics (f. 11r-v), the rubrics and two prayers for the Byzantine rite of church consecration (f. 13r-14v).
Ἐγκαινισμὸν ἐπιτελέσθαι τοῦ ναοῦ τούτου, πρὸς τὴν δοξολογίαν οἰκοδομηθέντος ὄνοματι τοῦ ἁγίου σου τοῦ δείνος, καὶ [ἐδραίωσιν] τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ ποιήσασθαι τραπέζης. Ἐκφώνησις: Ὄτι πρέπει σοι πᾶσα δόξα, τιμή καί.

Εἶθ᾽ οὕτως, κρατοῦντων τῶν ιερέων τὴν τράπεζαν καὶ ψάλλοντων, καὶ τοῦ ἁρχιερέως ἐπιχέοντος τὴν κηρομάστιχον, τὸν ῥμδ᾽ ψάλλον ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ· Ἐκφώνησις: Ὁ λόγος τοῦ ἁγίου, τὸ κορυφαῖον τοῦ ἀποστόλου Πέτρου φήσας...

The rite for the installation of an altar very much resembles the service for the installation of an altar in COI and the later euchologia – however, this is a completely independent service, with its own opening exclamation and the diaconal litany. The function of the rite remains the same – to affix the stone tablet of the altar to the supporting pillars with the help of wax-mastic, accompanying these actions by psalmody.

The inclusion of only one psalm (Ps 144) in this rite may signify that the use of two psalms in COI (144 and 22) was an expansion of an earlier shorter service. The only discrepancy between the two euchologia containing an independent rite for the installation of an altar was the inclusion into the rite in Vatican gr. 1552 of another prayer, Δέσποτα κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τῷ κορυφαίῳ τῷ ἄποστόλῳ Πέτρῳ φήσας...

Another version of this prayer is included also in Vatican gr. 1970, but in a different position (f. 214v) and with a different title: Εὐχὴ ἄλλη ἐπὶ τραπέζης πηγνυμένης ἐν ἁγίῳ θυσιαστηρίῳ (‘another prayer for the [altar] table affixed in the holy...
altar”).22 – the copyist of the Vatican gr. 1552 apparently decided to include another option for the celebrant’s prayer within the rite itself.

The same term – πήγνυσις - which was used for the second alternative prayer in Vatican gr. 1552, appears also in the number of Greek euchologia in connection with the prayer already familiar to us, the bishop’s prayer in COI and in the two euchologia cited above, Κύριε θεὸς καὶ σωτήρ ἡμῶν, ὁ πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος. Occasionally, it appears within the compendia of liturgical prayers completely independently, such as in Grottaferrata Γ.β. II (f. 133v, 12th cent.) or Vatican gr. 1538 (f. 198r-v; 16th cent.), here with the title εὐχὴ εἰς ἐγκαινισμὸν ἐκκλησίας.

This prayer also appears in four (known to me) 12th century euchologia - Grottaferrata Γ.β. II (f. 123v-125v), Vatican gr. 1811 (f. 62r-64v), Vatican gr. 1875 (f. 117v -120r), Barberini gr. 431 (f. 99v-101v) – containing a rite for the deposition of relics, independent from the rite for the consecration of a church and the altar. The rite in question is attributed to patriarch Nectarius of Constantinople (381-398), an obvious anachronism, meant presumably to make a statement with regards to the origin of this rite in the ritual practice of the imperial city. This rite, entitled “The Rite for the encaenia of the temple [which was] already consecrated (Τάξις γινομένη ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐγκαινίοις τοῦ καθεροθέντος ναοῦ),” is essentially the self-standing service for the deposition of relics closely resembling the shape of this service within the Byzantine rites of church dedication. However, after the procession with the saints’ relics and the deposition thereof at the base of the altar, the service concludes with the rubric “And they affix the

holy altar (καὶ πίγνουσιν τὴν ἁγίαν τράπεζαν)” and with the prayer Κύριε ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν, ὁ πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος, followed by the divine liturgy.

The apparent independent character of the rite for the installation of an altar and, especially, of the celebrant’s prayer at the center thereof, makes one consider a possibility that this “rite” may be an independent structural unit introduced into the Byzantine rites for the dedication of churches from a different liturgical tradition. In order to identify the origins of this unit, one has to return to our previous discussion of the hagiopolite rite for the consecration of an altar where I have drawn attention to a version of an “installation rite,” “The Rite for the installation of an altar by two or three presbyters (ἀκολουθία ἐπὶ ἑδράσεως θυσιαστηρίου ἐπὶ δυῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἢ τριῶν γινομένη)” found in the twelfth-century euchologion Sinai gr. 973 (f. 95v-96).23 The rite in question somewhat resembles the installation rites in Vatican gr. 1970 and Vatican gr. 1552, as it includes the deposition of the tablet upon the (unidentified) base – however, the redaction of the initial prayer of the main celebrant is markedly different: this is exactly the prayer Ὁ πάσης φύσεως δεσπότης which I have tried to identify as the element originating in Jerusalem.

The similarity between this prayer and the prayer which made its way into the Constantinopolitan tradition through COI is notable, at least in its initial part:

\[
\begin{align*}
\textbf{Sin. gr. 973 (}=\textbf{H=S2=C2}) & \quad \textbf{COI} \\
\text{Ὁ πάσης φύσεως δεσπότης, καὶ κτίσεως ἀπάσης ἀποικίας,} & \quad \text{Κύριε ὁ Θεός καὶ σωτήρ ἡμῶν,} \\
\text{ὁ πάντα ποιῶν πάντοτε καὶ} & \quad \text{ὁ πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος ἐπὶ σωτηρία τοῦ γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων,} \\
\text{πραγματευόμενος ἐπὶ ἑυεργεσία καὶ} & \\
\text{σωτηρία τοῦ γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων} & \\
\text{ὁ θεμελιώσας τὴν γῆν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀσφαλείαν} & \quad \text{πρόσδεξαι τὴν δέησιν ἡμῶν τῶν ἀναξίων} \\
\text{αὐτῆς, καὶ ποιῶν θαυμάσια.} & \quad \text{δούλων σου...} \\
\text{σὺ δέσποτα κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ χώραν...} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

It would appear, therefore, that the rite for the installation of a new altar in the Byzantine tradition, incorporated within the structure of the preparatory actions in the beginning of the Byzantine rite for the dedication of a church, could have been an integration of an independent rite for the construction/installation of altars which, in turn, as shown by the similarity of the prayer texts, may be an adaptation of a rite for the deposition and dedication of an altar, originating within the liturgical practice of the Holy City of Jerusalem.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coislin 213 (1027 CE)</th>
<th>Sinai gr. 973 (1153 CE)/ Vatican gr. 1970 (12th c.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patriarch’s entrance into the temple and preparation of relics &amp; materials</strong></td>
<td>Opening litany by the deacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expulsion of the people from the church</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation of the altar</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patriarch – prayer Κύριε ὁ θεὸς καὶ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν ὁ πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος [shorter redaction]</strong></td>
<td>Priest (SIN.973)/ bishop (VAT.1970) – prayer Κύριε ὁ θεὸς καὶ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν ὁ πάντα ποιῶν καὶ πραγματευόμενος [shorter red. VAT, longer SIN]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peace &amp; prayer II [only SIN]</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Installation of the altar</strong></td>
<td>Installation of the altar: καὶ βάλλει γομφωτήρ καὶ λάδανον, καὶ μύρον, καὶ θυμίαμα, καὶ λίβανον, πρὶν ἐπιθεῖς τὴν ἁγίαν τράπεζαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 144 + Glory</td>
<td>Ps 144 + Glory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 23</td>
<td>Peace &amp; litany &amp; dismissal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III TO PART:

A SLAVIC RITE FOR THE CONSECRATION OF A CHURCH IN MS. RNB SOFIA

1056 (14TH CENT.)

One of the most interesting examples of the adaptation of secondary dedication rites in the Byzantine periphery comes from the Slavic branch of the Byzantine liturgical tradition, especially as it was adapted in the Russian lands. It has been noted in the scholarship that the peculiarities of Russian liturgical books prior to the adaptation of the diatxis of patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos through Bulgaria in the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries reflect a very distinctive liturgical tradition which cannot be identified with the merely local adaptation of the ‘pure’ tradition of Constantinople. The presence of certain Palestinian elements (e.g. prayer of commixture) in the order of the divine liturgy led some scholars to suggest that the recension of the Byzantine rite behind the Russian pre-Philothean liturgical books came either through Sinai, or through Southern Italy.

---


a recent comprehensive study of the formulary of the eucharistic liturgy in the Russian liturgical books before the fourteenth-fifteenth-century reform, Zheltov has shown that peculiarities in the liturgical ordo in the manuscript euchologia are quite consistent and apparently reflect a common source tradition, which falls within the range of the Byzantine rite of Constantinople, but is clearly different from the rite of the Hagia Sophia. According to Zheltov’s reconstruction, the initial redaction of the Slavic liturgical ordines was accomplished in Bulgaria around the ninth and tenth centuries. Thereafter, in the thirteenth/fourteenth-century Rus this redaction was then supplied with a number of additional prayers and rubrics of “various origin”; this redaction in the supplanted form was the one to be entirely revised as a result of the fourteenth/fifteenth-century reform. Excluding South Italy as the possible point of origin for the unidentified recension of the Greek-Byzantine liturgical tradition reflected in the Russian liturgical books, Zheltov suggests Thessaloniki as a possible locus and source. On the other hand,

---

3 As argued in Slutsky, “Vizantijskie liturgičeskije činy,” 18; also in Basil Lourié, “Святой Кирилл перед мощами святого Климента,” in ed. G. Bakalov, Общото и специфичното в балканските култури до края на XIX в.: сборник в чест на 70-годишнината на проф. В. Токова-Зачимова (Sofia, 1999), 77; cf. Taft, Communion, Thanksgiving and the Concluding Rites, 680-683; for the criticism of the Sinai connection, as well as of the hypothesis regarding any direct influence of Oriental liturgies upon Slavic liturgical traditions, see Zheltov, “Čin Božestvennoj liturgii,” 298 n. 183, 341 n. 432.

4 See e.g. F. J. Thomson, “Early Slavonic Translations – an Italo-Greek Connection?” Slavica Gandensia 12 (1985): 221-234; Taft, Communion, Thanksgiving and the Concluding Rites, 681-683; on the use of the Palestinian henosis formula in South Italy, see André Jacob, “Deux formules d’immixtion syro-palestiniennes et leur utilisation dans le rite byzantin de’Italie méridionale,” Vetera Christianorum 13 (1976): 29-64; Taft, Precommunion Rites, 392-398; Zheltov notes, however, that the appearance of the Syro-Palestinian henosis formula in Old Russian books before the 12th century would suggest that the “Old Russian liturgy was following the model other than the South Italian…” (Zheltov, “Čin Božestvennoj liturgii,” 331 n. 358).

5 Zheltov, “Čin Božestvennoj liturgii,” passim, esp. 328-335.

6 Ibid., 333-335, 345-347.

7 Ibid., 346-7; see also for the characterization of the same tradition, Aleksej Pentkovsky and Maria Jovčević, “Праздничные и воскресные блаженны в византийском и славянском богослужении VIII-XIII вв.,” Palaeobulgarica 25.3 (2001): 57, and on the basis of Slavonic liturgical lectionary in A.M.
the series of additions to the core euchological recension that occurred in the thirteenth-fourteenth centuries were most likely not derived from the Bulgarian influence, but were the product of a local Russian adaptation of the Greek liturgical books. It is possibly to this period of influence that the *trebnik* (rituale) *RNB Sofia 1056* may be attributed, as well as the very singular rite for dedication of the church contained therein.

The rite of dedication in *Sofia 1056* has the title "存ъ цищению" (Чинъ цищению) “The Rite of Consecration,” and incorporates the rites for deposition of relics, construction of an altar, and its consecration. Aside from the bishop (*стълъ*) as its main celebrant, it features a “priest” who recites the Prayer of the Trisagion as the service begins, but does not give the *ekphonesis* as customary at the end. Just as in the rite of encaenia in the Constantinopolitan euchologia, the rites of dedication are interposed between the initial prayer (originally, the litany) “of the Trisagion” and the actual chant of the hymn, which is found just before the lectionary for the eucharistic liturgy, thus implying that in this

---


9 The manuscript is described as *trebnik* (‘book of needs’ i.e. occasional rites) in the first register of the manuscripts of Novgorod Sofia Library compiled in December 1784 (D.I. Abramovich, Описание рукописей С.-Петербургской Духовной Академии: Софийская библиотека [St. Petersburg, 1905], 1.xxx). The ordination rites from this *trebnik* were published by Mikhail Zheltov in “Чинъ рукоположений по древнейшему славянскому списку, рукопись РНБ. Соф. 1056, XIV в.,” *Vestnik PSTGU I: Bogoslovie. Filosofia* 14 (2005): 147-157, who also provides a comprehensive description of the manuscript (p. 148-150). I am deeply grateful to Michael Zheltov for providing me with copy of the ms. folia to use in my dissertation.

10 In the reproduction of the relevant Slavonic text of the ms., I disclose the abbreviations put under the *titla* in the original, while keeping the orthography intact.

11 по мб гать трпму и не възглаътъ по обачао (f. 92r).

12 Таке етъ го “Then, Holy God” (f. 94v). The lectionary for the liturgy of dedication includes the prokeimenon Ps 92:5, 1; Hebrews 9:1[-7?], Alleluia ps. 86:1, 3; Matthew 16:13[-18]. After the lectionary for liturgy, the scribe placed the note on the Gospel reading for Matins (John 10:22ff.), the
case the enarxis with three antiphons was omitted. The structure of the rite of dedication is quite unusual:

1. Prayer of the Trisagion by the priest, without the ekphonesis.
2. Bishop places the martyrs’ relics “at the appointed place in the church” (в предъе[ч]ене мѣсто иже къ цѢкву). All present are given candles.
3. Prayer: Гдѣ бы нашъ иже докрѣбы, ради МѢчный твоисѣ (= ΑѢрос по курье ὁ θεός ἡμῶν, ὁ διὰ τῶν καλλινικῶν σου μαρτύρων).
4. Sealing of relics with resin, wax and wax-mastic.
6. Bishop affixes the upper tablet of the altar.
7. The altar is washed with warm water and with rose water (радостамою = ῥοδόσταγμα) with the chant of Ps. 50.
8. Anointing of the altar with “holy oil” (ЄѢмисъ масломъ) with the chant of Ps. 23.
9. Censing of the altar.
10. Anointing of the altar with the chrism, using the formula “The seal and gift of the Holy Spirit, amen”. Incensation and anointing with chrism on the four corners of the altar.
11. Incensation of the altar all around, with the chant of Ps. 83.
12. Vesting of the altar into the “clean linen,” placing of the outer garment (ιѢдити = ἐνδυτή), and the antimension, as well as the Gospel book.
13. Prayer: (ΧѢлам’ та гдѣ бы нашъ, яко илам’ еси = ΕѢχαριστοιμѣн σου курье ὁ θεός τѣν δυνάμεων ὃτι ἐξέχεας; Κ4).
14. Trisagion.
15. Rubric regarding the anointing of the walls: “but he will anoint with chrism on the four walls of the church, saying ‘The seal [and] gift of the Holy Spirit, amen’.”

rubrics on koinonikon, and regarding the OT readings for Vespers, presumably on the eve of dedication (1 Kings 8:22ff, Proverbs 3:19ff, Proverbs 9:1ff) (f. 94v-95r). The lectionary is clearly out of proper liturgical order, and most likely reflects the desire of the scribe to add missing elements after the text was already complete; for a similar case regarding the prayer Nemo dignus in BAS in another Novgorod euchologion Sofia 519 (13th cent.; f. 8v-9v), noted by Zheltov, “Chin Bozhestvennoj liturgii,” 287.

13 All other celebrant’s prayers from this point are recited by the bishop.
14 Coislin 213, f. 22v-23r, ed. Duncan, 30-31.
15 The ms. text states: с пеклоомъ и коскомъ и коскомъ (‘with resin, wax, and wax’; f. 92v-93r), but I suspect a scribal error here, the correct reading of the third term being коском (αѢтитъ) ‘wax-mastic’. The page break occurs in the middle of the last word, which is likely to have contributed to the error.
16 Coislin 213, f. 22v, ed. Duncan, 30.
17 а помажетъ моромъ на дѢй стѢпахъ цѢкви, оѢл печать [и] даръ [АѢха] ѐтаго, аминъ (f. 94v).
16. Lectionary for the liturgy, matins, and vespers of dedication.

This is a quite unusual rite for the consecration of the church, essentially a fusion of the independent rite for the deposition of relics with the construction/installation of an altar by the bishop, and subsequent consecration of the altar by washing and anointing with unspecified “holy oil” and with chrism, followed by the chrismation of the church’s walls,\(^{18}\) vesting of the altar, and final prayer (K4).

The two prayers that open the ceremony in *Sofia 1056* are well attested in the number of Greek euchologia, including the Constantinopolitan “Euchology of Strategios” (*Coislin 213*, f. 22v-23r), the Rossano (South Italian) codex *Vatican gr. 1970* (12\(^{\text{th}}\) cent.), another South Italian euchologion *Vatican gr. 1872* (12\(^{\text{th}}\) cent.), *Jerusalem Hagios Sabas 362* (607) (14\(^{\text{th}}\) cent.),\(^{19}\) *Athens EBE 662* (12\(^{\text{th}}\)-14\(^{\text{th}}\) cent.),\(^{20}\) *Athens EBE 2473* (15\(^{\text{th}}\) cent.), *Athens EBE 663* (15\(^{\text{th}}\)-16\(^{\text{th}}\) cent.),\(^{21}\) *Vatican gr. 1872* (12\(^{\text{th}}\) cent.),\(^{22}\) and *Paris BN Suppl. gr. 1272* (15\(^{\text{th}}\) cent.). However, in all these euchologies, including the Russian Slavic *trebnik Russian National Library Solov. 1085/1194* of 1505 CE,\(^{23}\) the order of the prayers

---

\(^{18}\) The ms. places the rubric regarding the anointing of the walls of the church after the rubric prescribing the singing of the Trisagion (f. 94v), and preceding the lectionary for the liturgy of dedication. However, if we follow the strict sense of the rubric, the anointing of the church walls takes place during the Trisagion, which is unlikely, as specific ritual actions during the chanting of Trisagion would not allow for the performance of additional acts outside the sanctuary: according to a Russian archieratikon *State Historical Museum Synod 600* (1400 CE), the bishop blesses with the candles after the ‘Small Entrance,’ and recites Ps. 79:15-16 during the chant of the Trisagion (Zheltov, “Arxierejskoje bogosluženie,” *PE* 3.566-575; idem, “Čin Božestvennoj liturgii,” 323-325). It seems more reasonable to suppose that the scribe added here the rubric, describing the action which takes place earlier, e.g. after the incensation and vesting of the altar.

\(^{19}\) Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie*, 2.295-320.

\(^{20}\) f. 114r-115r.

\(^{21}\) For both see Trempelas, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 2.145.

\(^{22}\) f. 78r-79v.
is different from *Sofia 1056*: the prayer Θεός τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ὁ ἅγιος τῶν ἁγίων is positioned in the *first* place, while the prayer Δέσποτα κύριε ὁ θεός ἡμῶν, ὁ διὰ τῶν καλλινικὸν σου μαρτύρων is always found in the *second* place. As in the Greek euchologia *Athens EBE 2473* (15th cent.), *Athens EBE 663* (15th-16th cent.), *Kitiou 18* (16th cent.),24 some of the Russian *trebniks* incorporate these two prayers at the end of the dedication rite, following the prayer after the deposition of relics.25 However, even in such cases, the order of the prayers remains intact.

Only two among the mss. mentioned above attempt to incorporate these two prayers for the deposition of relics into the very framework of the Byzantine rite of dedication, placing these either at the end of the entire *ordo* (*Athens EBE 2473*) or following the prayer Κύριε ὁ θεός ἡμῶν πρεσβείας τῆς ἁγίας (*Athens EBE 663*).26 In earlier mss., ranging from the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries, the set of these two prayers constitute a separate and, perhaps, alternative *ordo* for the deposition of relics, as follows from the inscription of the first prayer in *Coislin 213* εὐχὴ ἑτέρα εἰς τὴν κατάθεσιν.

The initial hypothesis of Vincenzo Ruggieri that this two-prayer set originated within the Byzantine rite of dedication and represented a non-Constantinopolitan “alternative” to the two-prayer set in the Constantinopolitan euchologia27 was questioned

---

23 The text of these prayers in *RNB Solov. 1085/1194* was published by Michael Zheltov in “Две византийские молитвы на перенесение св. мощей,” *Bogoslovskie Trudy* 40 (2005): 122-127.


25 So in the ms. trebniks *RNB Synod 268*, f. 103v; *Sofia 1070*, f. 343; *Sofia 1071*, f. 59; cited after Prilutsky, *Castnoe bogosluženie v Russkoi Cerkvi*, 26-27.

26 Trembelas, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 2.145.

by Zheltov who pointed out that the second half of the first prayer in the set is nearly identical with the first prayer of the rite for the *encaenia* in the Constantinopolitan rite of dedication (*Ε1 Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ πιστὸς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου*) and thus cannot have originated independently of the rite in the imperial capital.\(^28\) Having noted the textual dependence of the prayers “for the deposition of relics” upon the prayers in the Byzantine rite of dedication, Zheltov argued that these two prayers most likely constituted an independent ritual for the deposition of relics into/under the altar *outside* of the rite of church dedication.\(^29\) Originally developed as a rite secondary to the deposition of relics at the church dedication, by the fourteenth-fifteenth century in some localities these two prayers began to be incorporated into the dedication rite itself, as “doublets” to the already existing pair of prayers (*Ε1, Ε2, Ε3*). The prayer *Ε1* is also found in this precise “amended” form in another position, as a *opisthambonos* prayer for the feasts of martyrs (*εἰς μάρτυρας*), e.g. in the tenth-century euchologion *Grottaferrata Ι.β. VII*,\(^30\) hence the variant of this prayer with a “prefix” themed after the memory of a saint was current in...

\(^{28}\) Zheltov, “Dve molitvy.” Additionally, the prayer Δέσποτα κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ διὰ τῶν καλλινικῶν σου μαρτύρων shows thematic, if not direct dependence, upon the Constantinopolitan prayer *Ε1*, e.g.

\begin{center}

\textbf{Ε1:} \\
...ὁ χαρισάμενος τοῖς ἁγίοις σου μάρτυσιν τὸν ἁγίαν τὸν καλὸν ἀγονίσασθαι...

...καὶ χάρισαι ἡμῖν τοῖς ἀναξίοις σου δόσεως μέρος καὶ κλήρουν ἐχειν μετ’ αὐτῶν, ἵνα μιμηταί αὐτῶν γινόμενοι...

\end{center}

\begin{center}

Prayer for the dep. rel.: \\
...ὁ διὰ τῶν καλλινικῶν σου μαρτύρων καταγονισάμενος τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἡμῶν διάβολον, χάρισαι ἡμῖν τοῖς σοὶ σοὶ σικέταις μέρος ἔχειν καὶ κοινωνίαν μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων σου, δὸς ἡμῖν καὶ μιμεῖσθαι αὐτῶν τὸν ζῆλον καὶ τὴν ἐλπίδα...

Textual parallels in these two prayers demonstrate that also the second prayer for the deposition of relics might have been inspired by the Constantinopolitan prayer coming from the rite of dedication of a church, and therefore, may also be ascribed to the tradition of the capital.

\(^{29}\) Zheltov, “Dve molitvy.”

the ecclesiastical use probably before this prayer was appended and reappropriated as a
“prayer for the deposition of relics.”

It appears that the rite for the deposition of relics at the beginning of the
dedication rite in Sofia 1056 provides the missing information regarding the placement of
the two prayers in conjunction with other ritual elements: these two prayers frame the
ritual actions of sealing the relics into the enclosure inside the altar. The reverse order of
these two prayers, unlike all of the known Greek euchologia, may be due either to the
error in transmission of a lost Greek original into the Slavic realm, or to the anomality in
the Greek original.

This combination (deposition of relics + construction of the altar + consecration
of the altar + liturgy) bears some resemblance to the already discussed rite for the
encaenia in four twelfth-century South Italian euchologies (Grottaferrata Γ.β. II, Vatican
gr. 1811, Vatican gr. 1875, Barberini gr. 431), where the deposition of relics is followed
by the prayer for the establishment of the altar table and the eucharistic liturgy.31 In this
rite, that has survived only in Slavonic translation, a further development of this ritual
development can be detected: the placement of the relics into the altar is followed by
their sealing with material used for the construction of the stone altars (as well as their
repair32) in the Byzantine euchologia, but further, the full-fledged ceremony for the
consecration of the altar and the church is included that acquires certain ritual elements
from the Constantinopolitan rite.

31 See above, Appendix II to Part II.

32 As in e.g. the rite for the restoration of the altar table that has been shaken (τάζις γινομένη ἐπὶ
σαλευτείσῃ ἁγίᾳ τραπέζῃ), see Paris BN Coislin 213, ff. 19v-22r et al.
Thus, the Slavonic rite in *Sofia 1056* is a composite ritual, comprising an
(originally independent) rite for the deposition of relics, consecration of the altar with by
washing and anointing with “holy oil,”\(^{33}\) and conclusion, most likely derived from the
“Rite for the altar that has been moved/shaken (ἐπὶ σαλευθείση ἁγίᾳ τραπέζῃ).” The rite
of dedication of a church in this odd conjunction of elements, collected from different
secondary rites of purification or consecration of an altar, certainly represents a “hapax”
within the array of Byzantine dedication rites. However, it bears a passing resemblance
to the ordo of *encaenia* in a consecrated church, an independent redaction of the second
part of the Byzantine dedication ceremony, attested in the South Italian euchologies, and
thus may be a reflection of a lost Greek tradition that had passed into the use of the
Russian church in the time before the appropriation in Rus’ of the new, Philothean
redaction of the euchologion at the end of the fourteenth century.\(^{34}\)

---

\(^{33}\) The Russian church council of Vladimir (1274) chastised the clergy for not differentiating
between two anointings at baptism, with oil and chrism respectively: they “unwisely mix[ed] the divine
chrism with oil and thus anoint the whole body of the baptized” (in ed. A.S. Pavlov with V.N. Beneševič,
*Памятники древнерусского канонического права, 1: Памятники XI-XV в.,* 2nd ed. [St Petersburg,
1908], 93).

\(^{34}\) On the appropriation of the diataxis of the patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos in Rus’, see A.M.
Pentkovsky, “Из истории литургических преобразований в Русской Церкви в третьей четверти XIV
столетия (Литургические труды святителя Алексия,, митрополита Киевского и всей Руси,” *Simvol* 29
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