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This dissertation seeks to reconstruct the Lectionaries of Antioch and Constantinople as they existed at the time of John Chrysostom. It also relates them to the Byzantine Lectionary as appearing in the tenth century Typicon of the Great Church.

The documentary history of the Byzantine Lectionary, dating back to the seventh century, was examined, so that the material originating in later times and other places could be excluded from it. This left only the earliest layers of development. These were further researched by reading the Homilies of the Church Fathers who came after Chrysostom and before the seventh century. Then the Chrysostom Homilies where divided between Antioch and Constantinople and read, so that a picture of the Lectionary could be formed for each city at his time. The knowledge concerning Constantinople was enriched with the Homilies of Gregory and Nazianzus and Severian of Gabala.
The results showed that the Old Testament readings of both cities were from the Major and Minor Prophets to the exclusion of other books. The Epistle readings were either from Acts or the Pauline Letters. The Gospel readings were generally from John or Matthew. The Lectionaries of the two cities agreed on much, but were not identical. The Epistles only agreed on Feasts. The Gospels agreed for Feasts, Holy Week and the Great 50 Days of Pentecost, otherwise they did not.

These results raise further questions for future studies. For example: What was the role of the anti-Judaizing polemic in the formation of the Antiochian Lectionary? What was the role of the anti-Arian polemic in the formation of the Lectionaries of both Antioch and Constantinople?
In honor and memory of +Archbishop Joseph Elias Tawil, a true Father of the Church
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Tables .................................................................................................................. vii

Introduction ....................................................................................................................... 1

Chapter 1: The Byzantine Lectionary ............................................................................... 7
  1.1 Overview ..................................................................................................................... 7
  1.2 The Typicon – Jerusalem Hagios Stavros Number 40 .............................................. 8
  1.3 Gospel Books ............................................................................................................. 11
    1.3.1 Layers of Historical Development in the Byzantine Lectionary ................. 13
  1.4 Praxapostolos (Acts and Epistles) ........................................................................ 16
  1.5 The Prophetologion ............................................................................................... 18
    1.5.1 The Copenhagen Prophetologion .............................................................. 21
  1.6 The Kontakia of Romanos the Melodist ............................................................... 23
    1.6.1 Various Kontakia of the Lenten and Pentecost Seasons Representing a Different Liturgical Calendar than HS#40 ........................................ 26
    1.6.2 When the Kontakia Agree with HS#40 ...................................................... 32
  1.7 Studies on the Documents as Text Types of the New Testament ....................... 34
    1.7.1 Studies on the Gospel Lectionary ................................................................. 35
    1.7.2 Studies on the Praxapostolos (Acts and Epistles) ...................................... 37
  1.8 The Work of Sebastià Janeras on Hagiopolite Imports in the Byzantine Lectionary .................................................................................................................. 39
    1.8.1 Sunday Orthros Gospels .............................................................................. 39
    1.8.2 Passion Vigil and Royal Hours ................................................................... 42
  1.9 Holy Week Orthros Gospels .................................................................................. 46
  1.10 Conclusion ............................................................................................................... 48

Chapter 2: Was There an Old Testament Reading in the Early Byzantine Liturgy? ...... 50
  2.1 Introduction .............................................................................................................. 50
  2.2 The Evidence for Old Testament Readings in HS#40 .......................................... 53
    2.2.1 The Vigil Liturgies of Christmas, Epiphany and Pascha .......................... 53
    2.2.2 Great Thursday and Great Friday ............................................................... 60
    2.2.3 Did the Liturgy at One Time Have Four Readings? ................................. 70
    2.2.4 Readings between Services ....................................................................... 74
  2.3 Old Testament Readings in Other Eastern Liturgical Traditions ......................... 76
    2.3.1 Present Day Usage ...................................................................................... 77
    2.3.2 Old Testament Readings in Ancient Antiochia ......................................... 78
2.3.3 Old Testament Readings in Ancient Palestine .......................................................... 82
2.3.4 John Chrysostom ........................................................................................................ 86
2.4 Conclusion ..................................................................................................................... 87

Chapter 3: Patristic Witnesses to the Early Byzantine Lectionary ........................................ 89
3.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................... 89
3.2 Leontius Presbyter of Constantinople (ca. 557) ............................................................. 90
   3.2.1 Dating ..................................................................................................................... 91
   3.2.2 Fourteen Sermons ................................................................................................. 94
3.3 Proclus of Constantinople (+446) ................................................................................ 99
   3.3.1 Calendar and Lectionary ....................................................................................... 100
3.4 Fifth Sunday of Lent’s Epistle Borrowed by the Roman Tradition (ca. 550), and the Work of Antoine Chavasse ........................................................ 105
3.5 Severus of Antioch and the Antiochian Tradition (Patriarch from 512-518) 110
   3.5.1 Sermons that Agree with HS #40 ........................................................................ 114
   3.5.2 Gospel Cycles in Severus’ Sermons ................................................................... 118
   3.5.3 Summary of Severus and the Antiochian Tradition ........................................... 135
3.6 Conclusion to Chapter 3 ............................................................................................... 136
3.7 Conclusion for Chapters 1-3 – What we know and what is still to be discovered .............................................................................................................................. 139
   3.7.1 The Fourth Century ............................................................................................... 139
   3.7.2 Fifth Century ......................................................................................................... 140
   3.7.3 500 to 550 AD ...................................................................................................... 141
   3.7.4 550 to 600 AD ...................................................................................................... 142
   3.7.5 600 to 800 AD ...................................................................................................... 143
   3.7.6 The Ninth Century ............................................................................................... 144
   3.7.7 The Tenth Century .............................................................................................. 145

Chapter 4: The Provenance of the Chrysostom’s Homilies ................................................. 146
4.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................... 146
4.2 Traditional Consensus Regarding Provenance .............................................................. 148
   4.2.1 Scholars Who Worked on the Topic ................................................................... 148
   4.2.2 Criteria Used to Determine Provenance ............................................................. 151
4.3 Wendy Mayer’s Challenge ............................................................................................ 153
4.4 Exegetical Series of Biblical Books ............................................................................... 157
   4.4.1 Mayer on Exegetical Series of Homilies ............................................................ 157
   4.4.2 Other Scholars on the Exegetical Series of Homilies .......................................... 159
4.5 Wendy Mayer’s More Cautious Approach .................................................................. 163
4.6 The Work of Frans Van de Paverd ............................................................................. 166
4.7 The Work of Robert C. Hill ......................................................................................... 167
   4.7.1 The Homilies Given Before On the Statues (Antioch, Lent in 387) .................... 168
   4.7.2 The Homilies Given in Conjunction with Those On the Statues ...................... 169
   4.7.3 The Homilies Given after Those On the Statues ............................................... 170
   4.7.4 Other Works from Antioch ............................................................................... 171
TABLE OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Bertonière’s Proposal for the Original Days of the Lenten Kontakia..............27
Table 1.2 The Kontakia of Romanos for Lent and Great Week That Disagree with *Hagios Stavros #40* ..................................................................................................................29
Table 1.3 Kontakia of Romanos for the 50 Days of Pentecost That Disagree with *Hagios Stavros #40* ..................................................................................................................30
Table 1.4 Jerusalem Lenten Sundays Lectionary (*Georgian Lectionary, 5-8th Centuries*) 31
Table 1.5 Kontakia That Agree with HS#40 ............................................................................33
Table 1.6 Readings for the Passion Vigil..................................................................................43
Table 1.7 Readings for the Great Friday Royal Hours ...............................................................45
Table 1.8 Holy Week Orthros Gospels ....................................................................................47
Table 2.1 Vigil Liturgies of Christmas and Epiphany in *Hagios Stavros #40* ...............55
Table 2.2 The Paschal Vigil in *Hagios Stavros #40* ..............................................................58
Table 2.3 A Comparison of the Great Thursday Synaxis and Great Friday Synaxis in *Hagios Stavros #40* ..............................................................................................................65
Table 2:4 Old Testament Inter-Service Readings in *Hagios Stavros #40* ......................75
Table 3.1 Readings from Job During Holy Week.................................................................98
Table 3.2 Gospel Pericopes Discussed by Chavasse .........................................................107
Table 3.3 Lucan Readings in Severus of Antioch .............................................................127
Table 3.4 Lenten Sunday Gospels in *Sinai #210* (861/862 AD) .........................................129
Table 4.1 Traditional Consensus of Provenance of Exegetical Series ..............................153
Table 4.2 Mayer’s List of Homilies of Certain Provenance .............................................165
Table 4.3  Provenance of Homilies According to Van De Paverd and Hill..............178
Table 4.4  Homilies and Dating According to Pradel & Co........................................181
Table 5: 1  The Temporal Cycle of Chrysostom’s Antioch ........................................203
Table 5.2  The Sanctoral and Fixed Calendar of Antioch at Chrysostom’s Time ..........205
Table 5.3  Lenten Readings from On the Statues..................................................207
Table 5.4  Grouping of Homilies On Genesis I-XXXII...........................................209
Table 5.5  Proposed Lenten Lectionary of Chrysostom’s Antioch..........................212
Table 5.6  Easter Vigil Readings...............................................................................222
Table 5.7  Readings for Great (Holy) Week ..............................................................225
Table 5.8  Timeline for Homilies XXXIII-LXVII On Genesis .................................229
Table 5.9:  Johannine Baptismal Pericopes in Hs#40 According to Russo ................233
Table 5.10  Liturgical Pericopes without a Specific Date..........................................235
Table 5:11  Readings of the Fixed and Sanctoral Cycles..........................................245
Table 5.12  Which Biblical Books Were Read and not Read in Antioch...............246
Table 6.1  Gregory of Nazianzus’ Constantinople Orations ......................................266
Table 6.2  Miracle Stories from Matthew in the Byzantine Lectionary ......................271
Table 6.3  Miracle Stories from Luke in the Byzantine Lectionary ............................272
Table 6.4  The Readings of the Moveable Cycle Ca. 380 .........................................274
Table 6.5  The Readings of the Fixed and Sanctoral Cycles Ca. 380.........................279
Table 6.6  Homilies on Genesis by Severian............................................................283
Table 6.7  The Lenten Weekend Gospels of HS#40 ..................................................285
Table 6.8  Severian’s Homilies Based on the Gospel Of John ..................................288
Table 6.9  Chrysostom’s Constantinople Sermons ....................................................298
Table 6.10  Various Pericopes from the Constantinople Homilies ..........................302
Table 6.11 The Temporal Cycle in Constantinople at Chrysostom’s Time ..................306
Table 6.12 The Sanctoral and Fixed Feasts in Chrysostom’s Constantinople ...........314
Table A.1: Synaxarion – Great Lent and Great (Holy) Week ..................................331
Table A.2: Synaxarion – The Great Fifty Days .........................................................335
Table A.3: Synaxarion – After Pentecost .................................................................337
Table A.4: Inter-Service Readings of Hagios Stavros Number 40 .........................340
Table A.5: Menaion – Feasts with Readings at Vespers ...........................................342
Table B.1: Scripture in Proclus’ Homilies .................................................................345
Table C.1: Movable Feasts .......................................................................................347
Table C. 2: Fixed Feasts .........................................................................................349
Table C.3: Sermons Lacking Definite Dates ............................................................351
Table D.1: The Moveable Feasts: Lent and Holy Week .............................................352
Table D.2: Moveable Feasts: Pascha and the Fifty Days .........................................355
Table D.3: Fixed Feasts .........................................................................................357
Table E.1: Scripture in Leontius’ Homilies ...............................................................359
INTRODUCTION

The Lectionary as it existed at the time of John Chrysostom, of course, is part of the history of the Churches of Antioch and Constantinople, and is important for the study of the liturgical calendar of the Byzantine Rite in general. Various scholars have made comments upon it, and noticed certain readings were read for different feasts, and various books were read in certain liturgical seasons.¹ But until now, while lectionary studies have been done for Rome and North Africa, based on the sermons of Gregory I and Augustine of Hippo, no studies have been done to ascertain what Chrysostom may have known as the proper liturgical readings used during his ministry both as a presbyter in Antioch and as bishop in Constantinople.² There are two main reasons for this lacuna when it comes to Chrysostom. One is the large size of the Chrysostom Corpus, and the second is the nature of the sermons themselves, of which many do not make references to the time of the year, or the occasion for which they were preached. Into this vacuum steps this work.


I start with the earliest complete list of the Byzantine Lectionary, which is found in the tenth century manuscript of the *Typicon of the Great Church* (of Constantinople) known as *Hagios Stavros Number 40*.³ This unusual starting place, 550 years after Chrysostom, was chosen because it allows us a frame of reference for the information that we find from the time of Chrysostom. The data from Chrysostom can be compared to the *Typicon* to see where it agrees and is different.⁴ The *Typicon*, assuming that it preserves some ancient usages, also gives us a framework in which to insert disconnected pieces of information so that some sense can be made of them.

In dealing with the *Typicon* it is important to see how its lectionary system evolved. By stating which parts of it can be traced to other times and other places, we eliminate those pieces of the Lectionary as not being from the time of Chrysostom.

Various scholars have done this work; especially Sebastià Janeras has shown which Holy Week scriptural lections originated in Jerusalem, and that the Orthros (Matins) Gospels originated there as well.⁵ Others have examined the manuscripts of the Epistle Book, the Gospel Book and the *Prophetologion* that pre-date the *Typicon*, thus allowing us to date

---


⁴ The *Typicon* is a book consisting of changeable pieces and the rules saying how to insert them into the liturgy for that day. This will be explained at greater length in Chapter 1.

the Byzantine Lectionary to earlier centuries. The manuscripts of the various lectionary books date no earlier than the seventh century. Analysis of the contents of the Lectionary have also singled out the beginning of the seventh century as a period which was formative for the Lectionary, with references to various liturgical commemorations that were instituted at that time. Because the documentary trail of liturgical books goes back no earlier than the seventh century some scholars have proposed that the Byzantine Lectionary dates from that time, or 50 years earlier to the reign of Justinian the Great (reigned 527-565).

To proceed earlier than the seventh century it is necessary to look at the Kontakia of Romanos the Melodist (ca. 518-555?), the subject of Chapter 1, and the Homilies of the Fathers, the focus of Chapter 3. Some of these Homilies are oriented to the calendar and lectionary and yield information on both topics. In particular, we shall look at Proclus of Constantinople (+446), and Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople (ca. 557-8). Because of the connections between Antioch and Constantinople, especially due to the importation of Syrian bishops to Constantinople like Chrysostom and

------------

6 Chapter 1.2 discusses the Gospel Book, Chapter 1.3 the Epistle Lectionary and Chapter 1.4 the Prophetologion.


9 Romanos is discussed at length in Chapter 1. Proclus and Leontius are discussed in detail in Chapter 3.
Severian of Gabala, we shall also look at the Antiochian tradition as exemplified by Severus of Antioch (fl. 512-8).  

To understand and interpret the patristic evidence, however, it is important to know whether or not there was an Old Testament lection in the early Byzantine Liturgy. This will be the focus of Chapter 2, in which the Typicon will be examined for remnants of the practice of reading the Old Testament at the liturgy. The evidence of the Lectionaries of other Churches of the ancient Middle East will also be examined. By ascertaining if the Old Testament was read at the Eucharistic liturgies of other Churches, we will be able to propose the likelihood of the same custom for Constantinople.

Having arrived at a picture of the history of the evolution of the Byzantine Calendar and Lectionary as it existed after Chrysostom, we will see what elements possibly went back to his time, aided by knowing which readings are excluded from consideration. In a process such as this, it is important to know which of Chrysostom’s Homilies came from Antioch, and which from Constantinople. This will be discussed in Chapter 4. The assigning of the Homilies to the two different cities is crucial for seeing the similarities and differences between them. The question of the provenance of the Homilies has been worked on by scholars especially since the seventeenth century. We will be giving particular attention to Wendy Mayer’s challenge to the traditional consensus, which is loosely based on the contents of the homilies. Mayer’s challenge

---

10 Severus of Antioch and his 125 Cathedral Homilies are discussed at length in Chapter 3.

11 These early scholars include Henry Savile, Louis LeNain de Tillemont, Bernard de Montfaucon, Theobald Fix and Jean Stilting. Greater detail and more scholars are discussed in Chapter 4.
briefly stated is: The criteria used in the past to place the *Homilies* in either Antioch or Constantinople were too simplistic. Some of the differences between Chrysostom’s status as a priest or bishop are not solid, and some of the circumstances ascribed to either Constantinople or Antioch could apply to both. The work of other modern scholars who have brought forth new manuscripts or detailed analysis helping to firmly date, understand and locate some of the Chrysostom *Homilies* will also be examined. Once this is done we can then proceed to Chrysostom himself, having the information needed to assign provenance and understand the background of the *Homilies*.

Chapter 5 deals with the Antiochian *Homilies*. Some of the exegetical series have no calendar or lectionary information in them, while others have only a little, but a few have a substantial amount. The *Typicon of the Great Church* will be our constant companion. We shall see what agrees with it, and what is differs from it. The *Typicon* will also allow us to postulate missing pieces of information when only a part of a series of lections is mentioned by Chrysostom. Comparing the information from Chrysostom with that of the roughly contemporary *Armenian Lectionary*\(^{12}\) from Jerusalem and *Burkitt’s Syriac Lectionary*,\(^{13}\) will also allow us to occasionally supply missing information, or state differences between the sources from various locations.


\(^{13}\) Francis Crawford Burkitt, *The Early Syriac Lectionary System*, From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XI (London: Oxford University Press, 1923). This manuscript is from the Syriac speaking Christians of the Euphrates Valley, and is dated by Burkitt to shortly after 474 AD, while others date it earlier. This document is discussed in Chapter 5.5.2.3.
Chapter 6 takes us to Constantinople. This chapter will not only include Chrysostom’s *Homilies* (fl. 398-404), but also the *Orations* of Gregory Nazianzus (fl. 379-381) and the *Homilies* of Severian of Gabala (fl. the same time as Chrysostom). The three taken together will give us a composite picture of Constantinople, and they will affirm each other’s evidence. Here we will see several important things. First, we will see the similarities and differences between the Lectionaries of Constantinople and Antioch at the end of the fourth century. Second, we will see the origins of parts of the Byzantine Lectionary and Calendar. Finally, we will see what customs did not continue into the later Byzantine Tradition.

This information will contribute to a better understanding of the origins and development of the Calendar and Lectionary of both Antioch and Constantinople. It will also generate new questions regarding why certain developments took place. Some of these questions will be stated in the conclusion.
1.1 Overview

The documentation for the complete present day Byzantine Lectionary System dates from the tenth century and later. From the tenth century there exists Jerusalem Hagios Stavros Number 40 (hereafter HS#40) a manuscript of the Typicon of the Great Church of Constantinople which was published by Juan Mateos. In this document are the references to the lections for the Byzantine liturgical services almost identical to how they are today. Prior to this document there are lectionaries or partial lectionaries that go back to the 7th and 8th centuries which agree with HS#40. These documents have been analyzed by various scholars to discern within them layers of development and their history prior to when their present form was finalized. To research the history of the lectionary system to even earlier centuries one is dependent upon the Kontakia of Romanos the Melodist (ca. 518-557) which were used in the vigil liturgy of certain

---


15 Mateos, SJ, Le Typicon de la Grande Église, 2 Volumes.
occasions, and based on the liturgical calendar and lectionary. In this chapter we will see that the documents from the seventh century and later generally agree with each other.

1.2 The Typicon – Jerusalem *Hagios Stavros Number 40*

In the Byzantine Tradition there are two types of Typicon. One is a monastic Typicon which contains the rules of the monastery and might also contain directions on how to worship in the monastic church. The second is used in the cathedral and parish churches and contains the prescriptions needed for the liturgy of the cathedral including lections, hymns and directions for processions. Today we distinguish between the Typicons of Mount Athos, Saint Sabas and the Great Church of Constantinople.\(^\text{16}\) *HS#40*, despite that fact that it comes from the Monastery of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem, is a Typicon for the Great Church of Constantinople. The manuscript was partially translated into French and edited by the late Juan Mateos SJ and published by the Oriental Institute in Rome.\(^\text{17}\)

The manuscript is on parchment with 246 folios and written in the miniscule hand of the tenth and eleventh centuries.\(^\text{18}\) The codex contains many detailed descriptions of places in Constantinople and rubrics specifically for the use of the patriarchal liturgy. Various usages in the liturgy of Palestinian origin, such as a Gospel reading for Orthros, are not integrated into the body of the manuscript, but rather are


\(^{17}\) Mateos, *Le Typicon*.

\(^{18}\) Ibid, I, iv.
placed at the end as appendixes. For these reasons Mateos considers the manuscript not only as originating in Constantinople, but having been produced for actual use in the Capital.\footnote{Ibid, I, ix.} It forms a contrast to Codex 266 from the Monastery of John the Theologian on Patmos which is perhaps a century older. This manuscript lacks many references to place names, details of the processions through Constantinople and the patriarchal liturgy. It is a work based on the Constantinopolitan tradition, but adapted for monastic usage possibly at Saint Saba Monastery near Jerusalem.\footnote{Ibid, I, viii-ix.}

The dating of HS\#40 is fairly certain. The last patriarch that is mentioned is Tryphon (+931), and the transfer of the relics of Gregory the Theologian is noted (circa 950). The codex refers to the Emperor Basil I (reigned 867-886) with no number which means that Basil II (reigned 976-1025) was not known to the copyist. The translation of the relic of the hand of the John the Baptist on January 7, which took place under Romanos II and Constantine VIII between 961-963, is not mentioned either. Finally, Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenete (+959) is referred to simply as “Constantine the pious emperor beloved of Christ.” In a later writings the epithet “Prophyrogenete” is used with his name. Mateos therefore dates Hagios Stavros Number 40 to between 950 and 959 AD.\footnote{Ibid, I, xviii-xix.} Grumel, however, argued that the manuscript was a late tenth century edited copy (ca. 992) of a mid-tenth century source.\footnote{John F. Baldovin, The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy (Roma: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1987), 191. Venance
Hanssens in his review of Mateos’ work calls it a valuable tool, but notes a few problems. Mateos omits the hagiographical notices in the documents and sometimes translates the Greek singular as a plural in French. On the positive side he notes that the indexes are excellent. Irénée Doens also notes that some of the translations into French of place names such as Kyparission and Chora are not accurate. A reviewer in *Irénikon* notes that the work is excellent especially with the indexes and wisely follows the dating of P. Delehaye for the manuscript. It should also be noted that the Greek codex refers to the Scripture lessons with the incipit and desinit of the reading, whereas in French Mateos gives only the name of the book and the modern chapter and verse numbers. The various reservations of these scholars about Mateos’ edition do not affect this work which is concerned with the Lectionary System of Constantinople.

*HS#40* is our oldest almost complete listing of the Lectionary of Constantinople. What are missing are the Monday-Friday lessons outside the seasons of Great Lent and the Fifty Days of Pentecost (Pascha to Pentecost). The lessons for the Liturgy of the Hours are included in the codex and are discussed in the present work. It must be remembered that Constantinople did not have a daily Eucharist outside of the Great Fifty Days from Easter to Pentecost, but it did have Morning and Evening Prayer every

---


day of the year as clearly shown in *HS#40*. The worship of the Great Church was dependent upon this daily cycle of Morning and Evening Prayer as the modern Byzantine Rite continues to be so, especially during Great Lent and Great Week. This makes the lections for the Divine Office of the utmost importance and any look at the lectionary or the liturgical year would be faulty without them. Appendix A lists the readings as found in *HS#40* which will constantly be referred to in this work.

1.3 Gospel Books

The oldest fragment of a Byzantine Gospel Book is *ParG 1155* in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. It is a single folio dated to the seventh century by C. R. Gregory. Burns notes that the fragment contains the end of one and the beginning of another lection contained in the Byzantine Saturday-Sunday cursus. The lessons are in the order of the Gospel narrative, not in the order that they are read in the liturgical year, but the verses not used in the readings for the liturgies are omitted and the liturgical introductions are part of the text.

There are three full copies of the Saturday-Sunday Gospel lectionary that Burns attributes to the eighth century, but this dating is not certain. The manuscripts are

---


29 Ibid, 126.
Dion 627, Athonite Monastery of Karacalla 10 and the Vatican manuscript VatG 2144. Gregory attributes Dion 627 to the eighth-ninth centuries, Karacalla 10 to the ninth century and the Vatican manuscript to the eighth-ninth centuries. Bertonière thinks that the VatG 2144 is a ninth-tenth century work.30

Codex Macedonianus contains not only the Saturday-Sunday lessons, but those for the weekdays as well. It is a ninth-century uncial manuscript and the oldest containing the weekday readings. Braithwaite notes that the weekday system is similar to the one currently used, but is not absolutely identical. The current system seems to have filled gaps left by the earlier system by making lections shorter and therefore yielding more pericopes from each Gospel.31 This discrepancy regarding the weekday lessons after Pentecost in Codex Macedonianus does not affect its relationship to HS#40 which does not contain them. Codex Macedonianus agrees with HS#40 for the Gospel readings that are present in the latter.

Whether one accepts the earliest possible dating of these manuscripts, or the more conservative later dating, the fact remains that they agree with the Typicon of the Great Church as to the contents of the Gospel lectionary; this means that the Byzantine Gospel Lectionary was stable from possibly the seventh century and certainly by the ninth.


1.3.1 Layers of Historical Development in the Byzantine Lectionary

Various scholars have taken this lectionary and analyzed its contents for different strata that would push the date of its composition to earlier centuries. The Gospel lectionary is set up in three cycles. There is the Sunday cycle that generally follows in order and does not repeat itself. The Saturday cycle also follows in order and does not repeat pericopes of Sunday or Saturday. The weekday cursus follows in order and does not repeat pericopes from either Saturday or Sunday. For example, in the 15th Week after Pentecost, the Sunday Gospel is Mt 22:35-46, the Saturday Gospel is Mt 24:1-14 and the weekday Gospels are from Mark chapters 5 and 6.32 Given this data some scholars propose that the Sunday cycle must have been set up first, then followed by the Saturday one, and finally the weekday list.33

David Petras notes that there is some displacement in the Luke cycle consisting of pericopes, which in Jerusalem are read during Lent, but in Constantinople are placed before Lent or before Christmas. Before Lent these are: the fourth Sunday before Lent - The Publican and the Pharisee (Lk 18:10-15) - which in Jerusalem was read the 3rd Sunday of Lent, and the third Sunday before Lent – The Prodigal Son (Lk 15:11-32) - which in Jerusalem was read on the 3rd Sunday of Lent. The 4th Sunday of Lent in Jerusalem was the Good Samaritan (Lk 10:27-33), which in the Byzantine system is before Christmas. The 5th Sunday of Lent in Jerusalem was the Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk 16:19-31), which in the Byzantine system is also before Christmas. In each case they are

out of numerical order in the Byzantine Lectionary.\textsuperscript{34} This fact would lend some credence to Kniazeff’s theory that originally these Lucan Sundays were found in Byzantine Lent, as in Jerusalem, but were later displaced to make room for the reading of Mark.\textsuperscript{35} Petras notes that the Paschal Sundays, Ascension and Pentecost are out of order in the Johannine series, and therefore must have existed before the other days were added to the system.\textsuperscript{36}

Pierre-Marie Gy states that the weekday lections in the Byzantine Epistles and Gospel books must have been composed after the reign of the Emperor Heraclius (reigned 610—641), who brought the Cross to Constantinople in 635 AD, and also introduced Cheese-fare Week immediately before the beginning of Lent. Both the Epistles and Gospels end with Cheese-fare week. The Gospels are out of order from the rest of the weekday system which reads Mark in the previous weeks, but Luke during Cheese-fare week. The Epistles conclude the reading of the Catholic Epistles continued from the preceding weeks.\textsuperscript{37} He sees the Meat-fare and Cheese-fare Gospels as imported from Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{38} Gy also sees the Byzantine Lenten Sunday Epistles and Gospels in place by the second half of the sixth century, because the Epistle for the 5\textsuperscript{th} Sunday of Lent in Rome and Byzantium are identical. The Roman Epistle can be clearly

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid, 120.
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid, 129.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid, 125.
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid, 260.
dated as to when it entered the Roman lectionary (See Chapter 3 on this question.). 39 Gy notes that the Catholic Epistles in the Byzantine lectionary are read only on weekdays, and not on Saturdays and Sundays. This is an Antiochian tradition at odds with the practice of Jerusalem. 40 Finally, he points to Antioch and Severus of Antioch regarding the origins of the Byzantine Sunday Gospel readings (see Chapter 3 on this question.). 41

Yvonne Burns wrote an article proposing to date the codification of the Byzantine Gospel lectionary to the reign of the Emperor Justinian (527-565). She states that the establishment of the Annunciation as a feast on March 25, during Justinian’s reign, led to the Byzantine Church year beginning with Easter instead of a feast of the Incarnation. 42 His reign, being after the Council of Chalcedon (451), which gave new importance to the Theotokos and Constantinople as the chief see of the East, was a time for Feasts of the Theotokos to become more prominent, and for other Churches to copy the imperial city. 43 Velkovska validly questions Burn’s reasoning and evidence on these points noting that one cycle lectionaries only contain feasts and were meant for private usage or very limited usage by bishops. 44 Also, Marian feasts in Constantinople go back to the fifth century, and are related to the introduction of Christmas as a separate feast

39 Ibid, 259.
40 Ibid, 255.
41 Ibid, 257.
43 Ibid, 122.
from Epiphany.\textsuperscript{45} Burns does mention Justinian’s building of numerous churches and these new churches would have needed books which he provided and insured were uniform.\textsuperscript{46} Here she has a valid point, for building activity in his reign was prodigious.\textsuperscript{47} Also, in this Chapter and Chapter 3, as well, the reign of Justinian keeps surfacing as a focal point in the development of the Byzantine Lectionary.

1.4 \textit{Praxapostolos} (Acts and Epistles)

There are 500 manuscripts of the Byzantine Epistle Lectionary and another 200 that contain Epistles and Gospels together.\textsuperscript{48} Often these works are just referred to as “Greek Lectionaries,” but when the authors describe them it is obvious that they are describing Byzantine books. A good example is an article by Carroll D. Osburn wherein she describes the contents of the Apostolos.\textsuperscript{49} Starting in the eighth century the lections in these manuscripts agree with the Byzantine system, but those from before that time do not. This is probably due to the fact that most documents prior to the eighth century

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{46} Burns, “The Historical Events That Occasioned The Inception Of The Byzantine Gospel Lectionaries,” 124.


\end{footnotesize}
are from Egypt. Beginning with the tenth century there are Epistle lectionaries with musical notation showing how to chant the lessons. These are found in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Gr. 382) and St. Petersburg, Russia (Gr. 55 & 775).

Klaus Junack and Kurt Aland propose that the Epistle Lectionary emerged in the 7/eighth century as shown by the existing documents. Aland admits that the system did not develop from nowhere, but evolved gradually over time as shown by patristic references in sermons. What happened in the time frame he mentions is the actual production of a lectionary book as opposed to marginal notes in biblical manuscripts.

Regarding the early history of the Praxapostolos see the above section on the Gospel Book. The authors cited mention this book together with the Gospel Lectionary, and see the two as having developed together. The Epistle Book has three cycles like the Gospel Book; Sundays, Saturdays and weekdays. Like the Gospel Book each cycle is continuous and does not repeat pericopes except for feasts. The three cycles do not duplicate each other, and they are not in order with each other. For example, in the 15th

---


Week after Pentecost the Sunday Epistle is 2 Cor 4:6-15, the Saturday Epistle is 1 Cor 4:17-5:6 and the weekday readings are taken from Galatians chapters 2-4.  

1.5 The *Prophetologion*

The readings from the Old Testament in the Byzantine Lectionary System are largely read during Vespers. There are also prophetic readings at Sext during Lenten ferias, at the Royal Hours for Christmas, Epiphany and Great Friday and at Matins on Great Saturday. The Vigil Liturgies for Christmas, Epiphany and Pascha which combine Vespers and the Liturgy of Saint Basil together also contain Old Testament lessons as does the Vesper-Liturgy for Great Thursday, and the Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified Species served on ferias of Lent. Currently there is no Eucharistic liturgy in the Byzantine lectionary system that has an Old Testament lection unless it is connected to Vespers. This does not mean that these readings are unimportant, however. As stated above the worship of the Great Church of Hagia Sophia was based on daily Matins and Vespers. This is still true today in that the Lenten and Great Week Services of the Byzantine tradition are Matins and Vespers, and if there is a Divine Liturgy it is connected to Vespers, whereas in the Roman Rite the services for Holy Week (except Good Friday) are clearly Eucharistic Liturgies that are not part of the Liturgy of the Hours. Also, in looking at the history of the Byzantine Lectionary, we should not have a prejudiced view wherein only the Eucharistic Liturgy is important.

The Prophetic readings in *HS#40* are listed in Appendix A. What one sees is a system wherein the Old Testament is read at the Liturgy of the Hours and at Divine Liturgies that are connected to Vespers. The *Prophetologion* or Old Testament Lectionary was organized as follows: The lections for Christmas and Epiphany were followed by those for Lent, Great Week and Pentecost. A second smaller section had the readings for fixed feasts beginning with September 1 and ending on August 31, minus Christmas and Epiphany.⁵⁴

There are 174 manuscripts of this book in existence dating from the eighth to the sixteenth centuries.⁵⁵ Of these we are most interested in the ten manuscripts that pre-date *HS#40*. A. Rahlfs describes one of these older manuscripts *Sancti Simeonis* in Trier, Germany (*Trierer Domschatz*, 143). He goes through the manuscript section by section listing the lessons starting with Christmas, Epiphany and Lent.⁵⁶ Each day and reading in this section matches *HS#40*. He proceeds with the Pentecost Season and Fixed Feasts. These lessons also generally agree with *HS#40*, except there are days with readings where *HS#40* has none. These are Pentecost Monday; September 13 (dedication of the Anastasis in Jerusalem) and September 26 (John the Evangelist); October 11 (Fathers of the Councils) and October 26 (Demetrius); November 8 (Archangel Michael), November 13 (John Chrysostom), and November 21 (Presentation

---


of Mary in the Temple); January 1 (Circumcision), January 25 (Gregory the Theologian) and January 27 (Relics of John Chrysostom); May 8 (John the Evangelist); June 24 (Nativity of John the Baptist); July 20 (Prophet Elijah) and August 29 (Beheading of the Baptist).\(^{57}\) What has taken place is an expansion in the number of Fixed Feasts that prescribe Old Testament readings for Vespers. This expansion of the number of feasts that have Vespers’ readings in the fixed calendar is the difference between the two manuscripts. In the most important days of the liturgical year - Christmas, Epiphany, Lent, Great Week and the Season of Pentecost - there is complete accord.

The present day system of Old Testament Readings is a further expansion of the lectionary. Days that were not included in HS\#40 system which now have lections are: November 8 (Archangel Michael); December 5 (Sabas the Sanctified) and December 6 (Nicholas of Myra); The Sunday before Christmas; January 11 (Theodosius founder of monasteries); January 17 (Anthony the Great); January 20 (Euthymios the Great); January 25 (Gregory the Theologian); January 27 (Relics of John Chrysostom); and January 30 (Three Hierarchs); April 23 (Great Martyr George); May 21 (Constantine and Helen); July 20 (Prophet Elijah); July 25 (Ann, Mother of the Theotokos) and July 27 (Panteleimon the Healer) and August 29 (Beheading of the Baptist).\(^{58}\) All of this is an expansion of the fixed feasts or Menaion. The seasons of Great Lent, Great Week and Pentecost were left unchanged.

\(^{57}\) Ibid, 136-146.

\(^{58}\) Ibid, 148-153.
1.5.1 The Copenhagen Prophetologion

The Greek Prophetologion from the University of Copenhagen was published because of the Byzantine musical notations that were attached to the actual texts to be read. In the course of preparing the publication the scholars reviewed the manuscripts available and thus improved the state of knowledge on this particular liturgical book. Carsten Höeg and Günther Zuntz published an article in 1937 outlining in some detail their findings. The first observation is that the manuscripts are very uniform in content, prescribing the same lections for various parts of the liturgical year along with the same instructions and Prokimena Psalms and stichera, thus showing the lectionary was already fixed by the time the extant manuscripts came into existence. The manuscripts that they studied divided into two categories. The larger of these categories consisted of manuscripts that were written in two columns and the rubrics and ecphonetic musical notations were in red. Sections were clearly marked and large initials began lessons. Höeg and Zuntz called this group of manuscripts the C-Type for Constantinople. They did so because of the carefulness of the writing and the high quality of the material and because the manuscripts contain rubrics for the patriarch of Constantinople and his city.

---
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A different and smaller group of manuscripts does not show the same careful concern. The pages are written with only one column and without musical notation. The materials are not as good and neither is the writing. These manuscripts come from Italian libraries and originated in Southern Italy. Although they lack rubrics and musical notation of the C-Type the contents of the lessons remains the same.\textsuperscript{63}

The text of each lesson remains consistent in the tradition and is based on the Lucianic text of the Septuagint.\textsuperscript{64} Individual lessons were corrected in part to give plainer and intelligible forms for the hearers.\textsuperscript{65} And corrections were occasionally made so that the text conformed more to the textus receptus of the Greek Bible. This was not done consistently from one lesson to another, so that even the same lesson repeated for different feast days is altered a different way for each day that it was delivered. An example of this phenomenon is the fifth lesson for the Paschal Vigil (Joshua 5:10-15), which also is the first lesson for Vespers on November 8\textsuperscript{th}. Once the text was set for a particular day however, that text remained fixed and is almost always the same from one manuscript to another.\textsuperscript{66}

The lessons learned from the manuscripts of the \textit{Prophetologion} can be summarized by this statement of Höeg and Zuntz: “It will be useful to keep in mind this

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
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conception of Constantinople as the seat of a strong and conservative tradition about the reading and writing of holy texts.”

Everything that they had to say about the Prophetologion pointed to this conclusion. Once the contents of the book were set, a strong tradition of copying them without change began. The Byzantine Old Testament lectionary system as we have it dates from the eighth century or earlier and is uniform. Engberg gives a good summary of the documentary evidence as we have it and this evidence agrees with HS#40. What the Prophetologion manuscript tradition does not do is tell us how this system came about, and when it came about. For this we depend upon patristic testimonies and we must realize that the history of a book and the history of its contents are not necessarily the same thing.

1.6 The Kontakia of Romanos the Melodist

Romanos the Melodist was born in Emesa (Homs) Syria. He came to live and work in Constantinople at the end of the reign of the Emperor Anastasius I (+518) in the church of the Theotokos in the Cyr quarter. There he began his poetic activity, due to a vision of the Mother of God, and composed his most famous Kontakion hymn: Today the Virgin gives birth... for Christmas. His compositions were written on scrolls wrapped around wooden batons called “kontakia.” There are 89 Kontakions in existence that are attributed to him, but not all are authentic. He died sometime between 555 and 565

67 Ibid, 200.

after a series of earthquakes that happened between 542 and 557. As Arranz notes, Romanos did not invent the Kontakion but he is the most brilliant Kontakion author.  

A Kontakion is a poetic composition of a didactic character sometimes called a “sung sermon.” It is similar to the Syriac “memra” or homily or the “madrash” or instruction in verse or the “sogitha” or canticle after a sermon; all of which exist in the works of Ephrem the Syrian. It could also have been influenced by the metric style of some patristic homilies such as those of Proclus of Constantinople, which are discussed in Chapter 3. Each Kontakion has 18 to 24 or 30 verses often preceded by a hymn (Prooïmion) that is also repeated at the end as a type of summary. These hymns are often well known in the contemporary Byzantine Liturgy where they frequently serve as the Kontakion of the Feast. Examples are: Christmas – *Today the Virgin gives birth...* Epiphany – *Today you have appeared O Lord...* and Pascha – *Though You went down in the tomb O Immortal Life...* During the tenth century the Kontakion was chanted after the office of Pannychis (night vigil service), which was celebrated on the vigils of feasts and Sunday and Wednesday evenings during Lent, and the Paschal Season, and daily during the First Week of Lent and Holy Week. This is why I have included them with the

---


71 Arranz, “Romanos le Mélode”, 900.

liturgical documents for they were part of the liturgy of the Great Church, and not among the patristic testimonies, although they could be placed there as well.  

José Grosdidier de Matons published 55 Kontakions of Romanos in five volumes of *Sources Chrétiennes* (#’s 99, 110, 114, 128 & 283). The tradition ascribes 89 hymns to Romanos, but not all of these are authentic. José Grosdidier de Matons theorizes that there was perhaps another Romanos after the iconoclastic controversy, and his works were mistakenly attributed to Romanos the Melodist. P. Maas and C. Trypanis say that there are 59 authentic hymns and 29 doubtful ones. De Matons considers numbers 13 (Christmas stichera), 25 (the Man Born Blind) and 27 (2nd Hymn for the Resurrection of Lazarus) from the *Sources Chrétiennes* series to be doubtful. He sees numbers 61-65 as authentic (Saint Demetrius, Saints Kosmas and Damian II, Forty Holy Martyrs I & II and Saint Panteleimon) while numbers 66-71 are doubtful (Saint Tryphon, Saint Menas, Saint Stephen I, Saint George I and Saint Matrona). Numbers 72-88 are not authentic (Saint Symeon Stylite, Kosmas and Damian I, Saints Akepsimas, Joseph and Aithalas, John Chrysostom, Saint Philip, Saints Gourias, Samonas and Habib, Saint Nicholas I & II, Saint Ignatius, Saint Stephen II, Saint Basil, Saint George II, Saint

---
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Athenasius, Saint John the Apostle, Nativity of John the Baptist and Saint Theodore I & II). 77

1.6.1 Various Kontakia of the Lenten and Pentecost Seasons Representing a Different Liturgical Calendar than HS#40

Miguel Arranz notes that the Kontakia of Romanos do not always match the readings given for the day in HS#40. Therefore one must ask if there was a different calendar or lectionary when they were written. He offers no solutions or possibilities to explain what might have been the earlier calendar. 78 Gabriel Bertonière does offer some thoughts on this matter. He proposes, since the manuscripts containing the Kontakia are from the tenth century and later, that the hymns have been re-arranged to conform to the Triodion of that era. Basing himself on the Kontakion manuscript Patmos 213 he proposes a re-arrangement of the Hymns as follows in Table 1.3 below. 79 He excludes those Kontakia based on the Gospel of Luke, which he considers to be inserted under the influence of the tenth century Triodion, which was influenced by the Lectionary of Jerusalem. His proposal highlights the series of hymns based on Genesis, and would point out that there must have been an Old Testament reading at the Sunday Eucharist for the hymns to make sense to the congregation. The problem with his exclusions is that we are left without any Kontakia for Wednesdays. Also, he proposes

77 Grosdidier de Matons, Romanos le Mélode, 332.
78 Arranz, “Romanos le Mélode”, 902.
that the Lucan inspired pieces were done on the Sundays prior to Lent where these Gospels are read currently, but we are not aware that Kontakia were performed outside of Lent, Holy Week, the Paschal Season and the eves of great feasts. Both Bertonière’s proposal, and the actual order of Kontakia found in most manuscripts, show that the Lectionary at the time of Romanos was different from HS#40.

TABLE 1.1

BERTONIÈRE’S PROPOSAL FOR THE ORIGINAL DAYS OF THE LENTEN KONTAKIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liturgical Day When Performed</th>
<th>Name of the Kontakion</th>
<th>When the Pericope is read in HS#40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheese-fare Sunday</td>
<td>The Lament of Adam (Pre-Romanos Composition)</td>
<td>1st Friday of Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Wednesday of Lent</td>
<td>Repentance of Nineveh</td>
<td>Easter Vigil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>Adam &amp; Eve; Cain &amp; Abel (Pre-Romanos Composition)</td>
<td>1st Friday of Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>3rd Monday thru 4th Wednesday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>Sacrifice of Isaac</td>
<td>5th Friday of Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>Jacob Blessed by Isaac</td>
<td>6th Monday of Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Monday</td>
<td>Joseph Son of Jacob</td>
<td>6th Wednesday-Friday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A look at the Tables below will show that many of the Kontakia that do not agree with the liturgy readings from HS#40 are based on Luke or Lucan parallels in the other Synoptics. In HS#40 Luke is clearly read from September 23 until the beginning of Lent, but in the Kontakia it shows up both in Lent and the Paschal Season when John was
How can this be explained? One possible answer is that the Pannychis Service (a full liturgical service held at the time associated with Compline) had its own Gospel reading as shown on Holy Thursday in *HS#40*,

and on the first day of Lent in the *Dresden Manuscript 104* (eleventh century) published by Mateos as an appendix in the *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*. Here Mateos notes that the Gospels now printed in the Byzantine books for Great Compline during the First Week of Lent were originally for Pannychis. The Typicon also says that Pannychis is held during Great Week as during the First Week of Lent.

In the present Byzantine Lectionary there are Gospels for Orthros of Holy Week that are not found in *HS#40* which only has Gospels for PRES. It is possible that these Orthros Gospels were originally used for Pannychis, just as the current Gospels used for Great Friday Orthros were read during Pannychis on Holy Thursday night.

Both the Gospels for the First Week and Great Week show a more fluid selection, than in the Liturgy Gospels, with assorted Evangelists being used and chapters not being read in sequence. This is a possible explanation of the Lucan based Kontakia during Lent and Pentecost.

---
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TABLE 1.2
THE KONTAKIA OF ROMANOS FOR LENT AND GREAT WEEK THAT DISAGREE WITH

HAGIOS STAVROS #40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Kontakion and Day performed</th>
<th>Scriptural Basis</th>
<th>Day Read in Hagios Stavros #40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nineveh (Jonah) – 1st Wednesday</td>
<td>Jon 1-4</td>
<td>4th Reading for the Paschal Vigil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C.#1 - Adam &amp; Eve – 1st Sunday</td>
<td>Gen 3</td>
<td>1st Friday of Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C.#28 - Prodigal Son – 2nd Sunday</td>
<td>Lk 15:11-32</td>
<td>Sunday before Meat-fare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C.#39 – Good Thief – 4th Friday</td>
<td>Lk 23:39-43</td>
<td>Good Friday (Probably the original day for the Hymn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C.#4 – Jacob blessed by Isaac – 5th Sunday</td>
<td>Gen 27:1-45</td>
<td>6th Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.C.#5 – Joseph the Patriarch, S.C.#6 – Temptation of Joseph – Holy Monday</td>
<td>Gen 37, 39,41-51</td>
<td>Gen 37 &amp; 39 not read, the rest is partially read 6th Wednesday-Friday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 1.3

**KONTAKIA OF ROMANOS FOR THE 50 DAYS OF PENTECOST THAT DISAGREE WITH HAGIOS STAVROS #40**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Kontakion and Day Performed</th>
<th>Scriptural Basis</th>
<th>Day Read in Hagios Stavros #40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>S.C.</em>#40 – 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Hymn on the Resurrection - Pascha</td>
<td>Jn 20</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Orthros Gospel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miracle of Peter – 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Wednesday</td>
<td>Acts 3:1-10</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S.C.</em>#18 – Wedding at Cana – 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Wednesday</td>
<td>Jn 2:1-11</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S.C.</em>#20 – The Leper – 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Wednesday</td>
<td>Mt 8:1-4; Mk 1:40-44; Lk 5:12-14</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday after Pentecost &amp; 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday of Lent, Lk not read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S.C.</em>#45 – 10 Drachmas – 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>Lk 15:8-9</td>
<td>Not read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S.C.</em>#22 – Possessed Man of Gerasa – 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Wednesday</td>
<td>Mk 5:1-20; Lk 8:26-39</td>
<td>Mk not read; Lk on 22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday after Pentecost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S.C.</em>#23 – Hemorrhaging Woman – 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Wednesday</td>
<td>Mt 9:20-22; Lk 8:43-48</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; 23&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Sundays after Pentecost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>S.C.</em>#24 – Multiplication of the Bread – 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Wednesday</td>
<td>Synoptics not in Jn</td>
<td>Mt on 8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday after Pentecost; others not read</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two more possibilities that need to be mentioned. The first regards the Sundays of Great Lent. The Jerusalem Lectionary read parables of Luke on the Sundays of Lent. They are listed in Table 1.4.
TABLE 1.4

JERUSALEM LENTEN SUNDAYS LECTIONARY (GEORGIAN LECTIONARY, 5-8TH CENTURIES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liturgical Day</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Sunday</td>
<td>Luke 15:1-10 (The Lost Sheep &amp; Coin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sunday</td>
<td>Luke 15:11-32 (Prodigal Son)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Sunday</td>
<td>Luke 10:25-37 (Good Samaritan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Jerusalem Sunday Lenten lections possibly had traveled to other cities for Severus of Antioch preached on the Good Samaritan for the 4th Sunday of Lent as shown below in Appendix C (Sermons 122 & 89). The possibility also exists that Antioch itself developed the Lucan cycle in Lent as will be discussed in Chapter 3. Considering that Romanos went from Syria to Constantinople at the end of Severus’ Patriarchate, could the Lucan lections, transmitted through Antioch, have been tried in Constantinople as well for at least a short time? This is related to the second possibility that the Liturgical practice of the Capital was not unified at the time of Romanos. Remember that Romanos served in the church of the Mother of God in Cyr, and not at the Great Church. Maybe his church was using some of the Lucan lections, while the cathedral was not. Having to choose between several options, the most conservative and probable would be to say Pannychis had its own Gospel readings, and some of these were taken from the Lucan Sunday Lenten cursus. Regarding Kontakia based on Genesis, it would seem

86 Bertonière, The Sundays of Lent in the Triodion, 46-47.
that the best explanation is that the Sunday Kontakia anticipated the weekday Genesis readings, and the ordering of the pericopes was different than that found in HS#40.

1.6.2 When the Kontakia Agree with HS#40

In spite of the fact that several Kontakia disagree with HS#40 it is important to note that several do agree indicating continuity between Romanos’ lectionary and the Great Church lectionary of later ages. The matching occasions are indicated in the Table 1.5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Date or Liturgical Day</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meat-fare Sunday</td>
<td>The Last Judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Before Palm Sunday</td>
<td>Lazarus Saturday I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Sunday</td>
<td>Palm Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Tuesday through Holy Friday</td>
<td>Holy Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paschal Vigil</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Resurrection Hymn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Sunday</td>
<td>Thomas Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday of Pascha</td>
<td>The Samaritan Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension Thursday</td>
<td>Ascension Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost Sunday</td>
<td>Pentecost Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 8</td>
<td>The Nativity of Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 26</td>
<td>St. Demetrius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1</td>
<td>Saints Kosmas and Damian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 25</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 26</td>
<td>The Mother of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 29</td>
<td>Holy Innocents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6</td>
<td>The Baptism of Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7</td>
<td>Saint John the Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2</td>
<td>Hypapante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9</td>
<td>The 40 Martyrs of Sebastea I &amp; II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 29</td>
<td>Saints Peter and Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 20</td>
<td>Prophet Elias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 29</td>
<td>The Beheading of John the Baptist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A quick look at the list will show that the agreement lies in fixed commemorations of the Saints and the Virgin, and fixed and moveable Feasts of Christ. When we move to Sundays the number of agreements drop partially due to the fact that most Sundays did not have a Kontakion performed on them. It is also due to the fact that most of the Sundays of Lent and Pascha, that did have Kontakions, do not match the lectionary of HS#40. The calendar presented to us by the works of Romanos is largely a calendar of fixed and moveable feasts. When we go beyond these feast days to consider Sundays we see that he and HS#40 are often not in agreement.

1.7 Studies on the Documents as Text Types of the New Testament

Some Scripture Scholars did studies on the Greek (Byzantine) lectionaries as text types of the New Testament, beginning in the 1930’s largely at Chicago and Princeton Universities. Although not done as histories of the Byzantine calendar and lectionary cycles, some information was offered on these topics as the various studies were published. The general consensus of the various scholars was that the Byzantine Gospel Lectionary began as a Caesarean version of the New Testament imported from Syria to Constantinople. This basic datum matches what is said in Chapter 3 in several

---

places about the Antiochian origins of the Byzantine Rite. It is another piece of evidence in favor of this theory.

1.7.1 Studies on the Gospel Lectionary

In the *Prolegomena* to the Chicago Series it is noted that there is a remarkable agreement between the various copies of lectionaries of the Gospel texts.\(^{88}\) This agrees with what the editors of the *Prophetologion* observed about that book and points out there was a centralization of church book production in Constantinople. As in the *Prophetologion*, lessons were passed on separately, so that when a new lesson for a feast was added to the book, it does not match the same lesson when used for a different feast. It seems that the lessons were preserved in the state in which they were added to the lectionary. The editors conclude regarding the text type of the Greek Lectionary:

The type more clearly approaching the Byzantine appears to be the same as the Antiochian or Syrian recension disseminated in the Church of Constantinople in the time of the holy Chrysostom and since.\(^{89}\)

This conclusion is modified somewhat as each Gospel is studied.

Ray Harms notes that the weekday Matthew Lessons are fairly homogenous in the manuscript tradition. When the lectionary deviates from the Textus Receptus it agrees with the Caesarean Text. There is even some evidence that some lessons may


\(^{89}\) *Prolegomena to the Study of the Lectionary Text of the Gospels*, 58.
have been from the pre-Caesarean form of the Scripture. Branton in talking about the Lenten lections from Mark also notes that most variants in the texts support the Syrian or the Caesarean text. The lessons from Luke also tend to support the Caesarean text and the pre-Caesarean readings. Metzger says that 70% of the Saturday and Sunday lections contain pre-Caesarean readings, and 55% of Saturday and 60% of Sunday lections contain Caesarean readings. He concludes that the lectionary originated as a pre-Caesarean text that was gradually corrected to conform to the Byzantine family of texts. A study of the weekday lessons leads Bray to the same general conclusion regarding text types.

H. M. Buck studied the Johannine lections and came to two important conclusions. First, the strength of the Caesarean tradition in the John readings outweighs that of other textual traditions. The Johannine lections then originated in a Caesarean textual tradition that gradually conformed to the Byzantine standard. Second, there was a period of time from the 4th to the 10th centuries wherein the Byzantine and Caesarean versions struggled for supremacy with the Byzantine text only

gradually winning out and assuming its final form.\textsuperscript{94} This assumption agrees with the survival of Alexandrian and Byzantine text manuscripts with the Byzantine finally winning out numerically in the ninth century, while the number of Alexandrian codices decreases.\textsuperscript{95}

The lessons of the fixed feasts of the year (Menology) show the greatest variety in text types; probably due to their being introduced into the system at varying times in history. Once they were introduced the lessons were copied faithfully and there is little difference from one lectionary to another in regards to the text of the lections on specific dates. Two ancient days have a Caesarean text, which are the Exaltation of the Cross on September 14 with a reading from John (John 19:6, 9-11, 13-20, 25-28, 30-35), and the Beheading of the Baptist on August 29 with a lesson from Mark (Mark 6:14-30).\textsuperscript{96}

1.7.2 Studies on the \textit{Praxapostolos} (Acts and Epistles)

The text of the \textit{Apostolos} (Epistles) has been studied much less than that of the Gospels.\textsuperscript{97} A study on the Catholic Epistles concludes that there is a strong Alexandrian character in the minority readings, but the over-all result has been a tradition that had


\textsuperscript{95} Wallace, “The Majority Text Theory: History, Methods, and Critique,” 311.


\textsuperscript{97} Wikgren, “Chicago Studies in the Greek Lectionary,” 113-121.
been heavily conformed to the Textus Receptus. An un-published study on Romans finds that there is great uniformity in Epistle lectionaries and support among minority readings for the Codex Alexandrinus. These brief notes on the Epistles are interesting because of their pointing away from the Caesarean text to the Alexandrian. Daniel Wallace points out that the Alexandrian Text first appeared in the second century; had its widest circulation in the third century, and stops being copied after the ninth century. The Byzantine Text does not appear until the fourth century, and is very widely circulated in the ninth century and later.

Klaus Junack’s study points to the Byzantine Text as the original for the Epistles. He studied more manuscripts than the Chicago Studies and the Chicago Studies used the 1873 Oxford Edition of the Textus Receptus as opposed to the Byzantine Imperial Text. If he is correct, the question becomes more one of the origins and composition of the Byzantine Imperial Text rather than the survival of older readings via the lectionary. The Byzantine Imperial Text is Antiochian in its origins, thus also pointing back to Syria for the scriptural version used in Constantinople. The difference between the two scholarly viewpoints (Chicago Studies and Junack) on the scriptural


texts, for our purposes, is that the texts cannot be used to discern various layers of
development in the Byzantine Lectionary, as proposed by the Chicago Studies, for they
all come from the Byzantine Imperial version (Junack’s conclusion).

1.8 The Work of Sebastià Janeras on Hagiopolite Imports in the Byzantine Lectionary

Sebastià Janeras, in his book on Great Friday in the Byzantine Tradition, took a
very serious look at the readings of the various services that constitute the Byzantine
Liturgy for that day. In his work he separates those lections that are found in HS#40
and form the native element in the liturgy, these being the readings for the Vesper-
Liturgies during Holy Week, from those that are imported from Jerusalem. The
lections that were imported from Jerusalem are found in the Passion Vigil on Thursday
night and the Royal Hours on Friday morning. He relates the number of lessons for the
Passion Vigil to the 11 Resurrection Gospels for Sunday Orthros. For that reason we
will start with the Resurrection Gospels, which are also from Jerusalem.

1.8.1 Sunday Orthros Gospels

Despite the fact that Antioch adopted the Sunday Vigil Service with the reading
of the Resurrection Gospel at an early date, as evidenced by Apostolic Constitutions II

103 Sebastià Janeras, Le Vendredi-Saint dans la Tradition Liturgique Byzantine (Studia Anselmiana

104 Ibid, 408-414.

105 Ibid, 122-123.
and *Homily 77 of Severus of Antioch*, Constantinople did not follow this custom until several centuries later.\(^{106}\) The 11 Sunday Orthros Gospels form an appendix in *HS#40*, showing that they are a recent custom the scribe was not comfortable with, and they are not mentioned in the course of the document when various rubrics are given for Sunday Orthros on different days.\(^{107}\) Corresponding to these Gospels are the 11 “Eothina” which are chanted during Lauds after the doxology following Psalm 150. There are also 11 “Exapostilaria” which are chanted immediately before Psalms 148-150 in Lauds. The “Eothina” were composed by Emperor Leo VI (886-912) and the “Exapostilaria” by Emperor Constantine VII (913-959).\(^{108}\) Thus we see that the reading of the Sunday Resurrection Gospel entered the Liturgy of the Great Church before the time of Leo VI.

The fact that there are 11 Gospels is odd and needs to be explained.\(^{109}\) The Armenian Tradition, which is considered to be very close to the ancient Jerusalem usage, has only four Gospels for Sunday Orthros: Mt 28:1-20, Mk 15:45-16:8, Lk 23:50-24:18 and Jn 19:38-20:18; all used on a rotating basis. In the *Armenian Lectionary* of Jerusalem these Gospels are used for the Paschal Vigil (Mt), the second Liturgy of the

---


\(^{107}\) Mateos, *Le Typicon, II*, 170-175.


Vigil (Jn), Pascha morning (Mk) and the Monday of Pascha (Lk).\textsuperscript{110} The Armenian and ancient Jerusalem traditions make sense in that each of the four Evangelists is used in rotation. Another possibility would have been to have eight Gospels to match the Octoechos (eight tones), as happened in Jerusalem by the middle of the ninth century, as shown in the manuscript \textit{Sinai Greek 210}.\textsuperscript{111} The motivation for eleven Gospels in the Byzantine Lectionary appears to be the desire to include all of the resurrection material from the Gospels. Both the Armenian-early Jerusalem four Gospel system, and the later eight Gospel list exclude John 20:19-21:25, which form Gospels 9-11 in the current Byzantine list.\textsuperscript{112} Where do the 11 Gospels come from? After comparing the list of Byzantine Orthros Gospels in \textit{HS#40} with other eastern traditions, Janeras comes to the conclusion that the 11 Sunday Gospels come from the ancient Jerusalem Lectionary for the Week of Pascha starting with the paschal Vigil and ending with Vespers on New Sunday.\textsuperscript{113} They thus formed a kind of wholesale import into the Byzantine Lectionary. And, as we shall see, Janeras also makes a similar claim for the 12 Gospels of the Passion Vigil.

There is one more question that has to be explored regarding the Sunday Orthros Gospels, namely, where in the service they were read in the ancient

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{110} Janeras, “I Vangeli Domenicali della Resurrezione,” 57,
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{112} Ibid, 159. Frøyshov lists them as: Mt 28:1-20 (used as numbers 1 & 5), Mk 16:2-8, Mk 16:9-20, Lk 24:1-12, Lk 24:36-53, Jn 20:1-10 & Jn 20:11-18.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{113} Janeras, “I Vangeli Domenicali della Resurrezione,” 64-68.
\end{quote}
Constantinopolitan Ordo. They were not read at a pre-Matins vigil as in Egeria, and in the present day Byzantine Sabaitic Service.\textsuperscript{114} Instead, they were read after the Trisagion which followed the Great Doxology.\textsuperscript{115} This placed the Resurrection Gospel at the high point of the morning office, and not in the night-time vigil, and therefore not following at all the tradition and example of Jerusalem, where the resurrection service was held at cockcrow. This radical reworking of a custom taken from Jerusalem shows the creativity of the early Byzantine liturgy as does the list of 11 Resurrection Gospels itself. Below we will see that Janeras posits the same type of importation of lections, and their placing in a new and different context for the Passion Vigil.

1.8.2 Passion Vigil and Royal Hours

The Passion Vigil on Holy Thursday night in \textit{HS\#40} has 12 Gospel readings and is part of Pannychis.\textsuperscript{116} Despite its name which means “all-night” the service was conducted at 9 PM as a kind of solemn Compline, and did not last all night.\textsuperscript{117} The lections stipulated for the office are in Table 1.6.


\textsuperscript{115} Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon}, I xxiii.

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid, II, 76-79.

### TABLE 1.6

**READINGS FOR THE PASSION VIGIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Jn 13:31-18:1</td>
<td>Last Supper Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Jn 18:1-28</td>
<td>Arrest and Trials before Priests and Pilate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Mt 26:57-75</td>
<td>Trial before the High Priest &amp; Peter’s Denial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Jn 18:28-19:16</td>
<td>Trial before Pilate, Death Sentence &amp; Scourging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Mt 27:3-32</td>
<td>Judas, Pilate, Barabbas &amp; Mocking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Mk 15:16-32</td>
<td>Mocking &amp; Crucifixion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – Mt 27:33-54</td>
<td>Crucifixion &amp; Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – Lk 23:32-49</td>
<td>Good Thief &amp; Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – Jn 19:25-37</td>
<td>Mary, Death &amp; Spear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – Mk 15:43-47</td>
<td>Burial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – Jn 19:38-42</td>
<td>Burial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – Mt 27:62-66</td>
<td>Guard at the Tomb (Holy Saturday Gospel)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These Gospels are still used today in the Byzantine Sabaitic Office for Holy Thursday night. Janeras explores where they may have come from in the Jerusalem documents, and concludes that Gospels 1-4 were part of the ancient Jerusalem vigil held at midnight, and described in Egeria’ *Diary*, and noted in the *Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem*. Gospels 5-12 are from other offices for Holy Friday. The 5<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> are from the 1<sup>st</sup> Hour’s Gospel split in two sections, the 6<sup>th</sup> from the 3<sup>rd</sup> Hour, the 8<sup>th</sup> from the 6<sup>th</sup> Hour, the 9<sup>th</sup> from the 9<sup>th</sup> Hour, the 11<sup>th</sup> is from Vespers and the 12<sup>th</sup> from Holy Saturday.

---


Saturday Orthros. There is no correspondence to the 10th Gospel. Why the number 11, which is not usually a liturgical number, and only arrived at by splitting one Gospel in two sections, and adding one that was not part of the Jerusalem tradition (#10)? Janeras suggests that the number 11 was chosen over the number 9 in order to correspond with the 11 Resurrection Gospels. The 12th Gospel is the one for Holy Saturday Matins, and is clearly marked as such in earlier documents, but somehow it was added to the 11 Gospels for Thursday night. We see then that the Byzantines took the entire Good Friday Gospel Lectionary of Jerusalem, and inserted it into one service, which was not held at midnight as was the case with the vigil in Jerusalem. This was a creative borrowing and reworking as we saw with the Orthros Gospels.

Egeria describes a service in the Martyrium complex that took place on Good Friday from noon to 3 PM. This service commemorated the death of Christ and consisted of Psalms and readings from the Old Testament, Epistles and Gospels. The Armenian Lectionary gives us eight Psalms and 20 lections that were used; eight from the Old Testament, eight from the Epistles and four from the Gospels. These were arranged in eight sections with a Psalm opening each section, and only the last four having a Gospel reading. The Georgian Lectionaries present the same lessons, but

---

120 Ibid, 120-121.
121 Ibid, 122-124.
122 Ibid, 60.
somewhat shortened. Eventually the Sabaite Office took this noon office and broke it into four sections to fit into the four Canonical Hours of Prime, Terce, Sext and None. In doing so, eight lessons were omitted from the former system – numbers 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 18 and 19 and four Psalms. This is the system still used in the Byzantine Royal Hours today. They are listed in Table 1.7.

**TABLE 1.7**

**READINGS FOR THE GREAT FRIDAY ROYAL HOURS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Psalm</th>
<th>Old Testament</th>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Hour</td>
<td>Ps 40</td>
<td>Zec 11:10-13</td>
<td>Gal 6:14-18</td>
<td>Mt 27:3-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Hour</td>
<td>Ps 37</td>
<td>Is 50:4-11</td>
<td>Rom 5:6-10</td>
<td>Mk 15:16-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Hour</td>
<td>Ps 8</td>
<td>Is 52:13-54:1</td>
<td>Hebr 2:11-18</td>
<td>Lk 23:32-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Hour</td>
<td>Ps 13</td>
<td>Jer 11:18-12:15</td>
<td>Hebr 10:19-31</td>
<td>Jn 19:23-37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Royal Hours started appearing in Byzantine documents from the 12<sup>th</sup> century and later. They entered the Byzantine Liturgy exactly as they were used in Jerusalem; unlike what we saw earlier with the Passion Vigil and Sunday Orthros Gospels. The Great Church was no longer a creative borrower, but an exact copier.

---

125 Ibid, 200,


The Passion Vigil, Royal Hours and Sunday Orthros Gospels represent almost the entire borrowing of the Great Church from the Jerusalem Lectionary System; the only other borrowed lessons were the Orthros lessons for feast days and Holy Week, which Janeras does not discuss. Even the earliest of these imports from Jerusalem, although ancient traditions in the Holy City itself came to Constantinople centuries later than the time of John Chrysostom, and therefore does not relate to him, or the earliest traditions of the Byzantine Lectionary.

1.9 Holy Week Orthros Gospels

*HS#40* does not indicate Gospels for Holy Week Orthros, even in the Appendices, except for Holy Saturday (Mt 27:62-66). It does, however, direct that Pannychis be celebrated each night during Holy Week, without however listing the Gospels for these services, except for the Passion Gospels on Thursday night.\(^{128}\) The present day Matins Gospels were originally the Gospels used for Pannychis as we saw above with the 12 Passion Gospels. These Gospels are: Mt 21:18-43, Mt 22: 15-23, Jn 12:17-50 & Lk 22:1-30 for Monday through Thursday. Those for Friday are the Passion Gospels already discussed and the one for Holy Saturday is Mt 27:62-66 which is mentioned in *HS#40*.\(^{129}\)

Rolf Zerfass sees the Gospels for Monday through Thursday and Saturday as originating from Jerusalem. Table 1:8 shows their Jerusalem pedigree.


\(^{129}\) Ibid, *II*, 83.
TABLE 1.8

HOLY WEEK ORTHROS GOSPELS\textsuperscript{130}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Byzantine Ordo</th>
<th>\textit{Anastasis} Typicon (tenth century)</th>
<th>\textit{Georgian Lectionary P} (10-eleventh century, refers to 5-8\textsuperscript{th} centuries)</th>
<th>\textit{Georgian Lectionary S} (982 AD, refers to 5-8\textsuperscript{th} centuries)</th>
<th>\textit{Armenian Lectionary} (417-439 AD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Mt 21:18-43</td>
<td>Mt 21:18-22</td>
<td>Mt 21:18-23</td>
<td>Mk 11:12-26</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Mt 22:15-23:10</td>
<td>Mt 22:15-24:2</td>
<td>Jn 12:24-41</td>
<td>Lk 12:35-59</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only lection mentioned in \textit{HS}\textsuperscript{#40}, the one for Holy Saturday, is also the only one that is found in the \textit{Armenian Lectionary}. The two lessons that go with it (Ez 37:1-15 & 1Cor 5:6-9 & Gal 3:13-14) are from Constantinople; for the ones in the Jerusalem \textit{Georgian Lectionary} are Wisdom 2 and Isaiah 33.\textsuperscript{131} The readings for Monday through Thursday correspond the closest to the \textit{Anastasis Typicon}, which is the latest document shown in the Table. This means they were taken into the Byzantine Ordo at a later date as well and would explain their absence from \textit{HS}\textsuperscript{#40}.

\textsuperscript{130} Rolf Zerfass, \textit{Die Schriftlesung im Kathedraloffizium Jerusalems} (Munster Westfalen, Germany: Aschendorffsche Verlagusbuchhandlung, 1968), 143-44.

\textsuperscript{131} Ibid, 144.
1.10 Conclusion

The development of the Byzantine Lectionaries (Gospel, Praxapostolos & Prophetologion) as books was in three stages. First, full biblical codices were marked with marginal notes as to what is read on different occasions. Separate lists of what to read on which day was possibly the origin of the Typicon of the Great Church, which includes these notations. The scriptural version used in the codices was that of Antioch imported into Constantinople. The second stage consisted of Gospels being copied, omitting verses not read in church, and the liturgical introductions included in the text. In this stage the biblical order is maintained even if it is not the liturgical order of the pericopes. An example of this type of book is ParG 1155, a Gospel fragment of the seventh century. Finally, at some point in the 7th or eighth century lectionaries were produced with the lessons in the liturgical order and containing rubrics, Psalms and stichera if needed. Once the full lectionaries came into existence they were carefully copied so that the existing manuscripts are very consistent as to contents and the texts of the lessons themselves.

The oldest Gospel manuscripts agree with HS#40 regarding the lections that are found in the Typicon. The weekday lections first appear in Codex Macedonianus from the ninth century. These weekday lections do not completely agree with the present day system which came into being in the beginning of the eleventh century.132

There were Palestinian imports into the Byzantine Gospel Lectionary. These consist of the Sunday Orthros Gospels added before the time of Emperor Leo VI (886-912). The Orthros Gospels for feasts were added before HS#40 was written, as where the 12 Gospels for the Pannychis of Holy Thursday. The Orthros Gospels in HS#40 are found in the Appendix, showing their foreign origin, and they are not mentioned in the rubrics of the Typicon. The Holy Week Orthros Gospels were borrowed from the Anastasis Typicon. The Readings for the Royal Hours of Great Friday were added in the 12th century.

The lectionary documents that were mentioned in this chapter date from the seventh century and later. The only document before that time are the Kontakia of Romanos the Melodist, which date from the first half of the sixth century, and according to some scholars several Kontakia even predate him. The lectionary references presented to us by Romanos are not in complete agreement with what came later. There is continuity and discontinuity between them. The second half of the sixth century emerges as a time of change between what we see in Romanos and the later documents. This same phenomenon will be observed below in Chapter 3 on Patristic Witnesses to the Lectionary.
CHAPTER 2:

WAS THERE AN OLD TESTAMENT READING IN THE EARLY BYZANTINE LITURGY?

2.1 Introduction

There are no Old Testament lections in the present day Byzantine Eucharistic Liturgy (commonly called the Divine Liturgy), except for those occasions when Vespers is combined with the Divine Liturgy. These days are: Christmas Eve, Theophany Eve, Holy Thursday, and the Paschal Vigil on Holy Saturday, and the Feast of the Annunciation when it falls on a Lenten weekday. At these services the Prophetic lections are clearly read during the Vespers component of the liturgy, and separated from the Eucharist proper by the singing of the Trisagion (*Holy God, Holy Might One, Holy Immortal One, have mercy on us.*), or *All of you who have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ* (Galatians 3:27). After the Trisagion the Epistle and Gospel are read conforming to the pattern of all of the other Divine Liturgies of the year.\(^{133}\) Were there ever Old Testament readings in the Byzantine Divine Liturgy? There are patristic sources and ancient documents that would give an affirmative answer to the question.

Juan Mateos notes that Maximos the Confessor’s (+662) Mystagogy, Chapter 23, refers to the reading of the Law and Prophets.  

*Chapter 23: That the first entrance of the holy Synaxis is a symbol of the virtues of the soul.*

So, now, you who have become the genuine lover of Christ’s blessed wisdom, consider with the mind’s eye the first entrance of the holy Synaxis from the outside error and confusion of material things...

And consider how the soul in fleeing them headlong comes as into a church to an inviolable shelter of peace in the natural contemplation in the Spirit... and before the Word and our great and true High Priest of marvelous grand mystery of divine Providence revealed in the Law and the Prophets, and it receives in each, by the beautiful instruction divinely given in them... And consider again how the soul passes beyond this and concentrates on the one and only summit, the holy Gospel, which collects these principles together into one... Following this, it is permitted to those who love God to see by a divine perception with the undaunted eyes of the mind of the Word of God come to it from heaven and symbolized by the bishop’s descent from his priestly throne.  

The Law and the Prophets are mentioned in the commentary on the Divine Liturgy, and they are discussed in between the entrance into the church (and the bishop subsequently going to the throne), and the bishop descending from the throne to give...  

---


the blessings during the intercessions.\textsuperscript{136} I agree with Taft who thinks that the passage would not make sense if the Old Testament was not proclaimed at the Byzantine Liturgy of Maximos’ time.\textsuperscript{137}

A century later Germanus of Constantinople’s (died circa 740) \textit{Commentary on the Liturgy} does not mention the reading of the Old Testament in the Divine Liturgy, but rather assigns the role of the prophecies to the Psalms of the Antiphons, and the Prokimenon Psalm before the Epistle. In each case (Maximos and Germanus), the liturgical action after the Old Testament lessons or Psalms represents the incarnation; whether it is the Entrance into the Church with the Gospel Book, or the reading of the Gospel.\textsuperscript{138} In the book of Germanus, one could say that he had an idea that there should be Old Testament readings in the Liturgy, but that role had now morphed into the singing of the Psalms. This could possibly mean that the exclusion of the Old Testament lection from the Eucharist occurred during his lifetime, prior to the writing of his book, and he is attempting to justify the exclusion of the Prophetic reading by assigning its function to the Psalms.

\textsuperscript{136} Mateos, \textit{La Célébration de la Parole}, 157.

\textsuperscript{137} Taft, “Were There Once Old Testament Readings in the Byzantine Divine Liturgy?” 301.

2.2 The Evidence for Old Testament Readings in HS#40

Mateos goes into some detail about the Vigil Liturgies of Christmas, Epiphany and Pascha, showing how in the Typicon of the Great Church the final Old Testament lection, which is not from the Pentateuch, actually belongs to the Eucharistic Liturgy proper, and not to the vigil or Vespers service. He also mentions the Liturgy of Holy Thursday, and the Vespers and Matins of Holy Saturday as examples of services with prophetic lections as well as New Testament ones. However, there are some details in the Typicon, which Mateos neglects to mention, which strengthen the argument in favor of a Prophetic lection in the Eucharistic Liturgy proper.

2.2.1 The Vigil Liturgies of Christmas, Epiphany and Pascha

The Christmas Vigil liturgy begins with Vespers, and after the entrance of the Patriarch, and the Prokimenon of Vespers, and the three Little Antiphons of Vespers, the Prophetic lections begin. They number seven, and are interrupted after the third reading with Psalm 86 and a Troparion, and after the sixth lesson by Psalm 92 also with a Troparion. The seventh lesson follows which is Isaiah 9:5-6. There are then rubrics for a full Eucharistic Liturgy. The deacon says a litany and there follows three antiphons called “of the Liturgy,” the Trisagion Prayer and Trisagion, and then the first Prokimenon which is Psalm 2; after the Prokimenon there is not an Epistle, but rather another reading from Isaiah (7:10-8:10) followed by Psalm 75, Hebrews 1:1-12, Psalm 109 with
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139 Mateos, La Célébration de la Parole, 131-133.
Alleluia and the Lucan Nativity Story (Luke 2:1-20).\textsuperscript{140} In this order of service the Eucharistic Liturgy is clearly separated from Vespers by a Litany, three antiphons and the Trisagion; yet it has an Old Testament Prophetic reading. It should also be noted that Vespers had its own three Antiphons, and therefore the Antiphons of the Liturgy are clearly separate from those of Vespers. In the modern Byzantine Rite the Vespers Readings are separated from the New Testament Readings only by the Trisagion; the Antiphons of the Liturgy having disappeared. \textit{HS #40} in this case clearly sets forth the Divine Liturgy for Christmas Eve in a full form with antiphons, and yet a Prophetic lection is maintained after the Trisagion. This is firmer evidence than what was presented by Mateos, who notes the Trisagion, but not the Antiphons and other intervening prayers.\textsuperscript{141}

\textsuperscript{140} Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon de la Grande Église, I}, 149-155.

\textsuperscript{141} Mateos, \textit{La Célébration de la Parole}, 131.
TABLE 2.1

VIGIL LITURGIES OF CHRISTMAS AND EPIPHANY IN HAGIOS STAVROS #40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evening of December 24</th>
<th>Evening of January 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vespers with Ps 140</td>
<td>Vespers with Ps 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance of the Patriarch and clergy</td>
<td>Entrance of the Patriarch and clergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prokimenon of Vespers</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Small Antiphons of Vespers</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litany</td>
<td>Litany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT Readings 1-3: Gen 1:1-13; Num 24:2-18, Mi 4:6-5:3</td>
<td>OT Readings 1-3: Gen 1:1-13; Ex 14:15-29; Ex 15:22-16:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 86:1-7 with Troparion</td>
<td>Ps 66: 2-8 with Troparion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT Readings 4-6: Is 11:1-10; Bar 3:36-4:4; Dan 2:31-45</td>
<td>OT Readings 4-6: Jos 3:7-17; 2 Kgs 2:4-14; 2 Kgs 5:9-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 92: 1-5 with Troparion</td>
<td>Ps 92:1-5 with Troparion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th OT Reading: Is 9:5-6</td>
<td>7th OT Reading: Is 1:16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>Extra Lessons if needed: Gen 32:2-11; Ex 2:5-10; Prokimenon Ps 79:4, 1; Judges 6:36-40, 1 Kgs 18:30-39, 2 Kgs 2:19-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litany</td>
<td>Prayer of the Antiphons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Antiphons of the Liturgy</td>
<td>3 Antiphons of the Liturgy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trisagion Prayer and Trisagion</td>
<td>Trisagion Prayer and Trisagion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prokimenon: Ps 2:7, 8 &amp; 9</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson: Is 7:10-8:10</td>
<td>Lesson: Is 49:8-15 (on Saturday or Sunday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prokimenon: Ps 75: 12, 2</td>
<td>Prokimenon: Ps 26:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistle: Hebr 1:1-12</td>
<td>Epistle: 1 Cor 9:19-10:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleluia: Ps 109: 1-3</td>
<td>Alleluia: Ps 44:2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Full Liturgy)</td>
<td>(Full Liturgy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinonikon: Ps 148:1</td>
<td>Kinonikon: Ps 148:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

142 Mateos, Le Typicon, I, 149-155, 177-183.
The vigil Liturgy for the Epiphany (January 6) has twelve Old Testament lections separated from the New Testament readings by three antiphons of the Liturgy, the Litany (and Prayer) of the Trisagion and the Trisagion itself. The manuscript notes however, that the Prophetic lections numbers eight through twelve are only read if the Patriarch goes to the palace. Otherwise they are omitted, leaving the vigil with seven readings, which have Psalms and Troparia after the third and sixth readings, as in the Christmas Eve Vigil. This is clearly seen above in Table 2.1. If the complete Liturgy is not celebrated, because it is Saturday or Sunday, a thirteenth reading (Isaiah 49:8-15) is read after the Trisagion and before the Epistle. Here Mateos notes that the thirteenth reading was originally the Prophetic lection for the Eucharist, which had dropped out except on days without the full Liturgy. It seems odd that the Vespers without the Eucharistic Liturgy would have preserved the thirteenth Old Testament reading. Perhaps the explanation is to be found in the length of the service. The Typicon states that the Patriarch blessed water twice after the Liturgy; once in the sanctuary and once in the baptistery. Perhaps omitting the Prophetic reading from the Divine Liturgy was a way of saving some time in a fashion that had become customary to do so. When no Eucharist Liturgy was celebrated the service was considerably shorter, and there was no need to omit a reading.

The Vigil Liturgy for Pascha is somewhat more complicated having been subject to several developments. There are fifteen Old Testament readings with the Canticle of

---


Moses (Exodus 15:1-18) after the sixth reading (Exodus 13:20-14:31), and the Canticle of the Three Youths or Benedicite (Daniel 3:52-90) after the fifteenth reading (Daniel 3:1-51). This series of readings then is much longer than those of Christmas or Epiphany, but the Typicon notes that readings eight through fourteen are only read if the Patriarch is taking a long time to perform baptisms. When these lessons are omitted there remains a vigil of seven readings as on Christmas Eve and Theophany Eve. The fifteenth reading then becomes the eighth reading and the first of the Liturgy proper. In HS #40 this lesson is separated from the Epistle by several items. While the Patriarch is entering the church Psalm 31 is sung followed by the baptismal Troparion (All of you who have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. Alleluia), which is followed by Romans 6:3-11, which is not preceded by a Prokimenon.¹⁴⁵ Mateos says that the Benedicite is actually the Prokimenon for the Epistle, and that originally the Daniel lection with the Benedicite was in the Liturgy and immediately preceded the Epistle.¹⁴⁶ The Typicon notes that while the Patriarch is anointing the neophytes with Chrism in the baptistery the cantor sings the baptismal Troparion (Galatians 3:27), and when the Patriarch leads the newly baptized to the church Psalm 31 is sung with verse one as response: Happy the sinner whose fault is removed, whose sin is forgiven. Once inside the church the Psalm is continued, and after it is finished the baptismal Troparion is sung immediately followed by the Epistle without a Prokimenon. This would seem to

¹⁴⁶ Ibid, II, note 1 on page 87.
indicate that Psalm 31 and Galatians 3:27 were inserted between the Benedicite and the reading from Romans breaking the normal rhythm of the service.

TABLE 2.2

THE PASCHAL VIGIL IN HAGIOS STAVROS #40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vespers with Ps 140</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrance of the Patriarch and Clergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prokimenon: Ps 65:4, 1-2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT Readings 1-3: Gen 1:1-5, Is 60:1-16, Ex 12:1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prokimenon: Ps 26:1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT Readings 4-6: Jon 1:1-4:11, Jos 11:5b-15a, Ex 13:20-14:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prokimenon: Ex 15:1-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th OT Reading: Zep 3:8-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Prokimenon: Ps 92: 1-2 |
| 15th OT Reading (always read): Dan 3:1-57 |
| Prokimenon: Dan 3:57-90 |

| Patriarch re-enters the church with Ps 31:5ff |
| No Prayer or Antiphons |
| Baptismal Hymn (Gal 3:27) |
| No Prokimenon |
| Epistle: Rom 6:3-11 |
| Ps 81:8, 1-7, no Alleluia |
| Gospel: Mt 28:1-20 |
| Cherubic Hymn (& full liturgy) |
| Kinonikon: Ps 148:1 (old), Ps 77:65 (new) |

---

The Barberini Euchologion (eighth century) also shows some confusion at this point in the service. Psalm 31:1 is sung after the baptism, and before the Chrismation Prayer. Then the cantor sings the Baptismal Troparion (Galatians 3:27), and the Chrism is administered. Then Psalm 31:5 is sung again, and the celebrant and newly baptized enter the church and celebrate the Divine Liturgy.\(^{148}\) It appears that Psalm 31 was the original Constantinopolitan Psalm for the procession from the baptistery to the church as evidenced in Homily 27 (VIII.51) of Patriarch Proclus (+446).\(^{149}\) Proclus’ Homily 32.6-8 on Pascha quotes and explains Galatians 3:27 twice.\(^{150}\) Proclus’ custom of repeating parts of the service in the homily as is evidenced in his Mystagogia on Baptism (Homily 27), wherein he repeats several times lines from the baptismal promises and the Creed,\(^{151}\) leads one to think that Galatians 3:27 was either sung as a refrain, or was part of the Epistle reading. It seems unlikely that Galatians 3:27 was the Epistle reading because it would mean sacrificing the reading of Romans 6 for a passage not so clearly paschal in character. If sung, it would be the earliest reference to the use of the baptismal hymn in the Byzantine liturgy. Proclus is credited with introducing the Trisagion to the Byzantine Liturgy; perhaps he also introduced the baptismal Troparion


\(^{150}\) Proclus of Constantinople, Proclus Bishop Constantinople: Homilies on the Life of Christ, Jan Harm Barkhuizen, trans. (Brisbane, Australia: Centre for Early Christian Studies Australian Catholic University, 2001), 180.

\(^{151}\) Barkhuizen, “Proclus of Constantinople. Homily 27; Mystagogy on Baptism,” 1-20.
as well.\textsuperscript{152} If part of the Epistle of the day (although unlikely), at some later point in time Galatians 3:27 was added to Psalm 31 as a second or alternative response.\textsuperscript{153} When the anointing with Chrism was added to Christian Initiation in Constantinople, Psalm 31 was duplicated, being sung immediately after baptism, and once again on the way to the church, which formerly would have been one and the same action. Galatians 3:27 became a hymn to be sung during the Chrismation, and was detached from Psalm 31. This then accounts for the singing of the Psalm more than once, and the singing of Galatians 3:27 in two different locations. Psalm 31 was separated from its response, and the addition of the ceremony of Chrismation led to the duplication of liturgical chants both before and after this action.

If one then removes readings eight through fourteen, and re-unites Galatians 3:27 with Psalm 31, a structure is obtained wherein Daniel 3 is clearly the Old Testament reading for the Easter Vigil Eucharist. This gives the Easter Vigil the same general structure as the vigils of Christmas and Epiphany, and the Divine Liturgy has an Old Testament lection as well as those of the New Testament.

\subsubsection*{2.2.2 Great Thursday and Great Friday}

The Vespers and Divine Liturgy for Great Thursday present a different case than what we have seen thus far for the Vigils of Christmas, Epiphany and Pascha. \textit{HS #40}


\textsuperscript{153} Mateos, \textit{La Célébration de la Parole}, 110-111.
states that on Great Thursday after Vespers, at which there are no readings, the ceremony of the Washing of the Feet takes place in the narthex with the reading of John 13: 3-11 before the action, and John 13:12-17 after the washing. This is followed by the Prayer of Entrance and the entrance into the church of the Patriarch and clergy, but no Trisagion or Prokimenon are sung. The first reading (Ex 19:10-19) is followed by Psalm 139:2 and then Job 38:1-21 is read. The second Prokimenon is Psalm 58:2, and the third reading is Isaiah 50:4-11. Psalm 2:2 is the third Prokimenon followed by 1 Corinthians 11:23-32, and Psalm 40:2 with Alleluia precedes the Gospel. The Gospel is a composite consisting of Matthew 26:2-20, John 13:3-17 (Washing of the Feet), Matthew 26:21-39, Luke 22:43-44 (Angel consoles Jesus in the garden), Matthew 26:40-27:2. The complete liturgy is celebrated with the Troparion: Of your Mystical Supper... as both Cherubicon (Great Entrance Chant), Kinonikon (Communion Chant) and Post-communion Chant. Here the Liturgy is very clearly separated from Vespers by the ceremony of the Washing of the Feet (pedilavium) and all of the lections are found in the Eucharistic Liturgy.

None of the readings are located in Vespers even though the first two readings form a continuation of the Vespers’ readings of the first three days of Holy Week. Why is this so? One possibility is that the ceremony of the Washing of the Feet is a later addition to the service. This seems very probable, for the Pedilavium on Holy Thursday appears to have originated in Jerusalem at the end of the fifth century, as shown in the Georgian Kanonarion with the altering of the readings of Holy Thursday so that John

\[154\] Mateos, Le Typicon, II, 73-77.
13:1-30 is no longer read at the evening vigil, but at the Eucharistic Liturgy. The custom possibly spread from Jerusalem to other cities in the East after the fall of the city to the Arabs in 638 AD, when refugees from the Holy City dispersed to many locations. The first testimony to it in Byzantium is from the middle of the eighth century in the Barberini Euchologion 336. If the pedilavium is removed, then Vespers and the Eucharistic Liturgy come together, and it is easy to see that the first two readings are part of the Vespers’ cursus, and the third Old Testament reading is part of the readings for the Divine Liturgy. It should also be noted that the pericope of the Washing of the Feet (Jn 13:3-17) is read twice in the service, first with the Washing of the Feet in the narthex, and again at the Eucharist, which would lead one to think that the Gospel reading of the Eucharist was in place before the pedilavium entered the service. This proposition of the insertion of the pedilavium at a later date is strengthened by the notation in the Typicon that the Patriarch enters the church without candles or incense and there is no Trisagion. This is a rubric preserving a very ancient state of affairs in the Great Church; before the Trisagion was introduced into the Liturgy during the fifth century. The Trisagion is not necessarily omitted because the Divine Liturgy is

158 Mateos, Le Typicon, II, 75.
159 Mateos, La Célébration de la Parole, 112-115.
preceded by Vespers since the Vigil Liturgies of both Christmas and Epiphany have the
Trisagion in their order of service. Also, the omitting of the candles and incense in the
entrance procession harkens back to a time before Emperor Justinian I (ruled 527-565
AD), because the mosaics of San Vitale in Ravenna clearly show an entrance procession
with incense and the cross circa 547 AD. This Synaxis also preserves the ancient ordo
of the bishop entering the church, greeting the people and then the readings begin first,
not the singing of Psalms. This was the order of service at the time of Chrysostom in
both Antioch and Constantinople as shown by Van de Paverd.

Vespers on Great Friday in HS#40 is part of a Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified Gifts.
Five readings are prescribed with the first two from Exodus 33:11-23 and Job 42:12-17;
both are a continuation of the Vespers readings for Holy Week. The next three refer
specifically to the events of Great Friday and are Isaiah 52:13-54:1, 1 Corinthians 1:18-
(Good Thief), Matthew 27:39-54, John 19:31-37 (Lance in Jesus’s side) and Matthew
27:55-61. Mateos notes that these three readings are proper to a Eucharistic

161 Munemoto Yanagi, Eiichi Takahashi, Shigebumi Tsuji & Yasushi Nagatsuka, Byzantium
162 Mateos, La Célébration de la Parole, 129-130.
163 Frans van de Paverd, Zur Geschichte der Meßliturgie in Antiocheia un Konstantinople gegen
Ende des vierten Jahrhunderts. Analyse der Quellen bei Johannes Chrysostomos (OCA 187, Rome 1970), 83-
93, 425-428.
164 Mateos, Le Typicon, II, 81
celebration.\textsuperscript{165} The problem with his remark is that the Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified Gifts normally does not contain special readings in addition to the Lenten readings; except on certain Saint’s days such as March 9, which is the commemoration of the 40 Holy Martyrs of Sebastea.\textsuperscript{166} Mateos also notes that there is no \textit{Dirigatur} (Psalm 140:2) which is normally part of the Pre-sanctified Liturgy.\textsuperscript{167} Another unusual detail of this celebration is the note that the patriarch enters the church without candles and incense as prescribed for Great Thursday.\textsuperscript{168} This rubric refers to a manner of executing the entrance from before the time of Justinian I as noted above. Also, the ordo of patriarchal entrance, greeting of peace and then the first Old Testament reading is maintained as on Holy Thursday. When the Pre-sanctified Liturgy is celebrated for the 40 Holy Martyrs of Sebastea on March 9 the Trisagion is sung before the festal readings\textsuperscript{169} but on Great Friday this is not chanted. The details of the Great Friday celebration match those of the Holy Thursday celebration, except that a Pre-sanctified Liturgy minus the \textit{Dirigatur} is served instead of the full Liturgy as shown in Table 2.3.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[165] Ibid, \textit{II}, 81, note 4.
\item[166] Ibid, \textit{I}, 247.
\item[167] Ibid, \textit{II}, 81, note 3.
\item[168] Ibid, \textit{II}, 75, 81.
\item[169] Ibid, \textit{I}, 247.
\end{footnotes}
# TABLE 2.3

A COMPARISON OF THE GREAT THURSDAY SYNAXIS AND GREAT FRIDAY SYNAXIS IN 

**HAGIOS STAVROS #40**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Thursday</th>
<th>Great Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vespers</td>
<td>Vespers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing of the Feet with reading of Jn 13:3-11 &amp; 13:12-17</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriarch enters the church with the Gospel but without incense or candles and then sits on the throne</td>
<td>Patriarch enters the church with the Gospel but without incense or candles and then sits on the throne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Trisagion or Prokimenon</td>
<td>No Prokimenon (or Trisagion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex 19:10-19</td>
<td>Ex 33:11-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prokimenon – Ps 139:2, 3</td>
<td>Prokimenon – Ps 34:1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb 38:1-27</td>
<td>Jb 42:12-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prokimenon – Ps 58:2, 3</td>
<td>Prokimenon – Ps 21:19, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is 50:4-11</td>
<td>Is 52:13-54:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prokumenon – Ps 2:2, 1-2, 3-4, 5</td>
<td>Prokimenon – Ps 87:7, 2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Cor 11:23-32</td>
<td>I Cor 1:18-2:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleluia – Ps 40:2, 6, 10-11</td>
<td>Alleluia – Ps 68:2-3, 21-23, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Great Litany) and the complete Liturgy with <em>At your mystical supper...</em> for the Cherubicon, Kinonikon and Post-Communion</td>
<td>Great Litany and remainder of the Pre-sanctified Liturgy with <em>Now the powers...</em> as Cherubicon and Kinonikon – Ps 33:9 <em>Taste and see...</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Parts in brackets are not stated in the Manuscript but implied from common liturgical practice.*

---

What is behind this unusual order of service for Great Friday? The Pre-Sanctified Liturgy on Great Friday was eventually considered troublesome by the later Byzantine Tradition, which dropped it around the end of the twelfth century.¹⁷¹ According to Regan, before Byzantium eliminated this usage, however, it did pass to old Rome where it is maintained until the present time.¹⁷² Alexopoulos states that the Roman Pre-sanctified (RomPRES) is unique in its rituals and formularies and is therefore quite “Roman,” and not borrowed from elsewhere. Indeed, in all traditions the PRES appears to be a native tradition, and not borrowed from one tradition to another. He notes that in the presbyteral form of the service, which is the earliest dating from the seventh century, whereas it does not appear in the papal liturgy until the twelfth century, both the consecrated wine and bread are reserved from Holy Thursday, and the whole ritual follows the pattern of the Roman Mass. This custom of reserving the consecrated wine, in addition to the consecrated bread, also appears in the Italian monastic document the Rule of the Master (ca. 500-525), which is the earliest document to mention PRES.¹⁷³ Therefore, the idea of celebrating PRES on Good Friday in Rome may or may not have come from Byzantium but, the RomPRES itself is not a borrowed liturgy, but native to Rome.


One possible explanation of the origin of the Pre-sanctified Liturgy on Great Friday in the Great Church is that it was originally a full liturgy that was later changed to be a Pre-sanctified Liturgy. Sebastià Janeras proposes that there was a full Eucharistic Liturgy in Antioch on Great Friday at the time of John Chrysostom. He quotes section three of Chrysostom’s Great Friday sermon *De coemeterio et cruce* which refers to the priest invoking the Holy Spirit upon the oblations of the Church, and continues to speak of the people approaching to receive Communion. Janeras reconstructs the Great Friday Word celebration in Antioch at the time of Chrysostom from several of his homilies. These homilies also give information that point to a Eucharistic Liturgy as well. *Homily 87 on Matthew* calls Great Friday evening the “the evening of Pascha” and *De beato Philogenio* VI: 4 refers to the crucifixion as Pascha. The Great Friday Homilies also refer to the day as the feast of the cross. The *First Homily on the Cross and Good Thief* refers to the feast of the cross three times. While the *Second Homily on the Cross and Good Thief* mentions the day as a feast four times. It also ends with a reference to receiving Holy Communion. These various pieces of information placed together point to an understanding and celebration of Great Friday similar to the

---

175 *De coemeterio et de cruce*, III.
177 *Homilia I De cruce et latrone*. I:1.
178 *Homilia II De cruce et latrone*. II:1.
179 Ibid. 2:5.
Quatrodeciman Pascha focused on the passion of Christ – a day of fasting that leads to a service that extends into the evening and culminates in the Eucharist.\textsuperscript{180} Apostolic Constitutions Book V exhorts the people to fast all of Great Week, yet only records the Saturday night vigil service.\textsuperscript{181} This work is roughly contemporary with John Chrysostom, and is also from Syria.\textsuperscript{182} In Antioch however, there was more than one service for Great Week as in Jerusalem at the same epoch.\textsuperscript{183} There was some confusion as how to turn the one united ancient Paschal Vigil into two different liturgies on two different days, so that the Easter Sunday observance could focus solely on the resurrection of Christ, thus excluding the Passion. One possible solution to the problem was to transfer the reading of the Passion to the previous Sunday as happened in Rome. With this solution the reading of the Passion culminates in the Eucharist, and no one questions this combination since it is a Sunday celebration.\textsuperscript{184} Another seems to have been what Antioch was doing at the time of John, with a Eucharist on both Friday and Saturday evenings. This solution proved unsatisfactory in the long run for the Friday


Eucharist interrupted the Paschal fast, which should have ended on early Sunday morning with the Easter Eucharist. The fact that it was changed at a later date to a Pre-sancified Liturgy in Constantinople and Syria shows this discomfort. Later in the Byzantine Tradition, because of the paschal fast, even the Pre-sanctified Liturgy was seen as problematic and dropped.185

The possibility that there was a Great Friday Eucharist in Antioch at the time of Chrysostom, and that this custom was imported into Constantinople, helps to explain the unusual features of the Great Friday Service in the Typicon of the Great Church. Especially, it helps to explain why there were three readings in addition to the daily Vespers’ cursus of readings from Exodus and Job. As stated earlier, the Pre-sanctified Liturgy does not normally contain a unit consisting of an Old Testament lection (not from the Pentateuch), Epistle and Gospel and it does normally contain the Dirigatur which is absent on Great Friday. If the Great Friday Synaxis was originally a full Eucharist it would also demonstrate that along with Great Thursday and the Vigils of Christmas, Epiphany and Easter; that the Byzantine Divine Liturgy originally had a lectionary with three readings: a prophetic Old Testament lection, Apostolic Reading and Gospel. Great Saturday Matins also has three lections, which shows that at one time the Byzantines considered three lections as normal for liturgy, as aptly noted by Taft.186


2.2.3 Did the Liturgy at One Time Have Four Readings?

To these considerations must be added another possible question concerning the evolution of the Byzantine Lectionary. Anton Baumstark, basing himself on *Apostolic Constitutions VIII*, proposed that originally the Liturgy of the Word for the Eucharist had four readings; a reading from the Law and one from the Prophets to which were added an Apostolic reading and the Gospel.\(^{187}\) *HS#40* does not contain a liturgy with this four lection system except for the Feast of the Annunciation on March 25 when it falls on a weekday of Lent. The Typicon directs that after Orthros and Terce-Sext there is a procession from the Great Church to the Forum, and then to the basilica in Chalcoprateia. There the patriarch sits immediately on the apsidal throne and Exodus 3:1b-8a (the Burning Bush) is read without being preceded by a Prokimenon. Psalm 95:2 (*Announce his salvation from day to day*) is the Prokimenon before Proverbs 8:22-30 (the first-born before all creation). Then the *Dirigatur* (Psalm 140:2) is listed as the Prokimenon before Hebrews 2:11-18. The Alleluia Psalm is Psalm 71:6-7b followed by Luke 1:24-38.\(^{188}\) In this service it appears that an ancient Synaxis of four readings has been adjusted with the *Dirigatur* to have the same structure as the normal Lenten vespers Synaxis consisting of two readings, and then the *Dirigatur* followed by two additional readings for the Eucharistic Liturgy. There is no Prokimenon before the first reading which is not the normal procedure for Lenten Vespers, so this is noted in the Typicon. The other days when there is no Prokimenon before the first Old Testament


\(^{188}\) Mateos, *Le Typicon, I*, 255.
reading are the vigils for December 25 and January 6, and the liturgies for Holy Thursday and Holy Friday; all ancient days in the calendar.\footnote{Ibid, I, 177; II, 75, 81.}

I am proposing that the \textit{Dirigatur} in the Annunciation Liturgy, with two readings before it and two after it, is a way that the celebration of the feast was adapted to an evening-vesperal context. Janeras proposes that in PRES the readings, \textit{φῶς Χριστοῦ} and \textit{Dirigatur} are of Antiochian origin and the remains of a service consisting of Lenten Biblical lections followed by the evening office.\footnote{Janeras, \textit{Le Vendredi-Saint}, 371.} Van de Paverd is of a similar opinion although he does not refer to the \textit{\textquotedblleft Light of Christ.\textquotedblright}\footnote{Frans van de Paverd, \textit{St. John Chrysostom, the Homilies on the Statue Statues: An Introduction} (Roma: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1991), 191-200.}

Alexopoulos sees the \textit{φῶς Χριστοῦ} as a lucernarium that made its way into PRES by being connected to the reading from Genesis, which in Antioch would have been the only reading according to Van de Paverd,\footnote{Ibid, 190, 194.} then followed by the evening office.\footnote{Ibid, 192} Alexopoulos sees the \textit{Dirigatur} not as a remnant of the Antiochian evening office, but rather as a permanent Prokimenon introduced into the service after which the Epistle would be read if there is one. In his argument Alexopoulos mentions the Annunciation Liturgy and that it uses the \textit{Dirigatur} as the Prokimenon before the Epistle.\footnote{Alexopoulos, \textit{The Presanctified Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite}, 167-183.} I find the use of the evidence from the Annunciation Liturgy to be unsatisfactory. The four

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{Ibid, I, 177; II, 75, 81.}
\item \footnote{Janeras, \textit{Le Vendredi-Saint}, 371.}
\item \footnote{Frans van de Paverd, \textit{St. John Chrysostom, the Homilies on the Statue Statues: An Introduction} (Roma: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1991), 191-200.}
\item \footnote{Ibid, 190, 194.}
\item \footnote{Ibid, 192}
\item \footnote{Ibid, 190, 194.}
\item \footnote{Alexopoulos, \textit{The Presanctified Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite}, 167-183.}
\item \footnote{Ibid, 186-187.}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
readings and the first Prokimenon and Alleluia Psalm clearly refer to the feast of the incarnation while Psalm 140:2 does not. The Byzantine liturgical readings had only one Prokimenon, unless there were numerous lections at a vigil in which a Prokimenon appears after each set of three Old Testament readings. It seems more plausible that Psalm 95:2 was pushed back from before the Epistle to be between the two Old Testament readings in order to make room for the Dirigatur which was added to imitate the structure of the Lenten evening office preceding a Eucharistic Liturgy. If there was originally only one Prokimenon after the two Old Testament Readings and before the Epistle then this structure would agree with the prescriptions of Apostolic Constitutions Book 2, Section 8.

The Feast of the Annunciation on March 25 entered the Byzantine calendar during the reign of Emperor Justinian (ruled 527-565), but prior to that time the Gospel of the Annunciation to Mary was read either before or during the Christmas season. Proclus of Constantinople (+446) preached on the feast of the Birth-giver of God on the Sunday before Christmas or December 26 during the time of Nestorius (428-431). In Homily 1, it is clear that the Gospel passage being commented on is the Annunciation to Mary (Luke 1:26-38). Homily 5 which is also on Mary focuses on the Visitation to Elizabeth (Lk 1:39-56), especially Luke 1:42 (Blessed are you among women), and seems


196 Ibid, 120-121.

more suited to the day after Christmas. So the establishment of March 25 as a Marian feast involved the transfer of a Gospel reading from one date (the Sunday before Christmas) to another date (March 25). Since the Gospel of the Annunciation was transferred from one date to another; is it not possible that the other readings were also transferred with it? Several passages in Proclus’ sermons give the impression that four readings were normal for the Liturgy of the Word at his time. *Homily 13 on Holy Pascha* (13:4) says, “If you disobey the law and think little of the prophets and despise the gospels, and overlook the apostles.” While *Homily 31 on the Resurrection of our Savior* (31:1) declares, “let the law speak, let a prophet declare and apostles proclaim.” This may be only a way of referring to the Bible but, it is interesting that the Psalms are omitted from his list; which by his time they were used for singing in church and not as readings. Given Proclus’ references to four parts of the Bible, and that the readings for the Annunciation match these four parts, it is possible that for a time the Byzantine Liturgy, or least certain days in the calendar, indeed contained four readings as mentioned in *Apostolic Constitutions VIII*. Here it must be noted that Van de Paverd says that in Antioch itself there was only one reading from the Old Testament, which would have matched the more common Byzantine practice. The city of Antioch’s system of three readings won out over that of *Apostolic Constitutions’ Book*.

198 Ibid, 90-96.
200 Ibid, 180.
201 Paverd, *Meßliturgie*, 98.
2:8 four readings, and is still preserved in the important days of Great Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Pascha as well as the vigils of Christmas and Epiphany. This hypothesis, that there were originally Old Testament readings in the Byzantine Eucharistic Liturgy, is important for interpreting the evidence of liturgical readings in the Patristic sources when Old Testament passages are mentioned.

2.2.4 Readings between Services

To complete our discussion of the use of the Old Testament in the Byzantine Liturgy according to HS#40; it is important to mention the reading done in between two services. Sometimes in the evening between Vespers and Pannychis the Scriptures were read, and sometimes after Orthros directions were given that the Scriptures be read until the beginning of the next service, whether it be the Divine Liturgy or Terce-Sext. Such readings would probably not be heard by the entire congregation, which was most likely not present, but someone must have been there for the readings to be performed in the first place. Whether the congregation consisted of the monastics, very devout laity or those who just wanted to learn more from the Bible, there were readings which sometimes included the Old Testament. HS#40 gives twenty-one occasions when there were inter service readings.202 We can postulate more occasions since the Typicon often assumes knowledge that is not specifically stated. An example of this is when it lists only the Epistles and Gospels for the Sundays after Pentecost without stating the Prokimenon Psalms and Alleluia Psalms to be used, and that there is a Eucharistic

202 See Appendix A, Table A.4.
Liturgy on that day. The Table 2:4 shows when these inter-service readings from the Old Testament are indicated or inferred.

### TABLE 2:4

**OLD TESTAMENT INTER-SERVICE READINGS IN HAGIOS STAVROS #40**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>When Read</th>
<th>What is read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheese-fare Wednesday</td>
<td>After Orthros until Terce-Sext</td>
<td>Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese-fare Sunday</td>
<td>After Orthros until the Liturgy</td>
<td>Reading (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Monday of Lent</td>
<td>After Orthros until Terce-Sext</td>
<td>Reading (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1 – Symeon the Stylite</td>
<td>After Vespers</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6</td>
<td>After Vespers-Liturgy while the water is being blessed After this read until Pannychis</td>
<td>Isaiah 35:1-10, Isaiah 55:1-13, Isaiah 12:3-6 Reading (not specified)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Notation for Pascha through Pentecost states that after Orthros the “Apostle” is read and not the Gospel. On some baptismal days – Lazarus Saturday, Pentecost and Epiphany – Acts is read especially the conversion of the Ethiopian (Acts 8:26-39). There are also notations to read the *Discourse on Pentecost* of St. Gregory the Theologian on Pentecost Sunday, and the Decrees of the Councils on the Sunday

---

204 Ibid, *I & II*.
206 Ibid, *I*, 187; *II*, 63, 139
after Ascension. The whole system of readings seems to be very loosely organized but, we can infer that the Old Testament was read during Lent, the Apostle (Acts and Epistles) during the fifty days of Pentecost, the Gospels the rest of the year, and Proverbs when a vigil in honor of a saint was conducted. This means that the Old Testament was heard outside of the liturgical services, but not as often as the apostolic writings or the Gospel.

2.3 Old Testament Readings in Other Eastern Liturgical Traditions

When comparing the Byzantine Tradition with other Eastern Liturgical Families I am not advocating the idea of an early Apostolic Ur-Liturgy that was later diversified. This theory has been largely disproven by scholars who re-examined the ancient evidence without trying to force it into preconceived categories. It is generally agreed by scholars that the fourth century was a time not of liturgical diversification, but of liturgical unification around the great episcopal sees. Taft expresses well in the following quote:

After the peace of Constantine in 313, when Christian worship became the public ceremonial of a Church freed from civil restraints and fast becoming an important social force, liturgical development quickened... This is the period of the unification of rites, when worship, like church government, not only evolved new forms, but also let the weaker variants of the species die out, as the Church developed, via the creation of intermediate unities, into a federation of federations of local churches, with ever-increasing unity of practice within each federation, and ever-


increasing diversity of practice from federation to federation. In other words what was once one loose collection of individual churches each with its own liturgical uses, evolved into a series of intermediate structures or federations (later called patriarchates) grouped around certain major sees. This process stimulated a corresponding unification and standardization of church practice, liturgical and otherwise. Hence, the process of formation of rites is not one of diversification, as is usually held, but of unification. And what one finds in extant rites today is not a synthesis of all that went before, but rather the result of a selective evolution: the survival of the fittest – of the fittest, not necessarily of the best.\textsuperscript{209}

Churches did however, borrow from each other and influence each other. It is possible then, that including both Old and New Testament Readings in the Eucharistic Liturgy was an idea that was spread from one Church to another. In showing which Eastern Churches near Constantinople, now have or did have in the past a lectionary containing both Testaments, strengthens the probability that Constantinople did as well.

2.3.1 Present Day Usage

The Armenian, Assyro-Chaldean and Syro-Antiochian traditions have Old Testament Readings in their present day Eucharistic Liturgies. The Assyro-Chaldean Church still maintains the distinction of having one reading from the law and the second from the Prophets as does Byzantine Lenten Vespers.\textsuperscript{210} The Armenian tradition has had multiple influences over its history from various sources including the Syriac, Antiochian, Hagiopolite, Byzantine and Latin. This makes the usages of this Church of interest for it


often preserves the customs of former eras in its usages that have now been lost by the original donor tradition.\textsuperscript{211} The Syro-Antiochian liturgical tradition is one of the heirs of ancient Antioch, as are the Maronite and Byzantine liturgies. Both the Chaldean and Syro-Antiochian Churches have daughter Churches in India that are now larger and stronger than the mother Church; these being the Syro-Malabar and Syro-Malankara Churches.\textsuperscript{212}

2.3.2 Old Testament Readings in Ancient Antiochia

What happened in ancient Antioch of Syria is crucial to our study for it is this ancient see that donated prayers, customs and bishops like John Chrysostom and Nestorius to Constantinople. Establishing the existence of Old Testament Readings in the liturgy of Antioch is showing that the Byzantine Liturgy sprang from soil where they were used and if they were not used in Constantinople, this shows a strong rupture from its Antiochian origins.

The \textit{Apostolic Constitutions} were collected and published around the year 380, which makes them contemporary to John Chrysostom (+407). They come from the


environs of Antioch, but not the city itself as shown by Frans van de Paverd.\textsuperscript{213} Brian Daley offers the opinion that the book was collected by Archbishop Meletius of Antioch (in office 360-381) in an attempt to gather together orthodox sources and to exclude Arian ones.\textsuperscript{214} There are two passages which refer to Old Testament readings in the Eucharistic Liturgy.

\textit{ApConst II, 57:5-7}

5. Let the reader, standing on a high place in the middle, read the books of Moses, of Joshua the son of Nun, of the Judges, and of the Kings and of the Chronicles, and those written after the return from the captivity; and besides these, the books of Job and of Solomon, and of the sixteen prophets. 6. After two lessons have been read, let some other person sing the hymns of David, and let the people join in singing the refrains. 7. Afterwards let our Acts be read, and the Epistles of Paul our fellow-worker, which he sent to the Churches under the direction of the Holy Spirit; and after that let a presbyter or a deacon read the Gospels, those which I Matthew, and John have delivered to you, and those which the fellow-workers of Paul, Luke and Mark, compiled and left to you.\textsuperscript{215}

\textit{ApConst VIII, 5:11-12}

11. After the reading of the Law and the Prophets, and of our Epistles, and the Acts, and the Gospels he that is {newly} ordained shall greet the church, saying: The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God the Father, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all. And all shall reply: And with your spirit. 12.

\textsuperscript{213} Van de Paverd, \textit{Meßliturgie}, 155-164; 106, 184-86, 527. As found in: Taft, “Were There Once Old Testament Readings in the Byzantine Divine Liturgy?” 281. This entire section is heavily dependent on Taft’s article.

\textsuperscript{214} Brian Daley, class lecture at the University of Notre Dame, Spring of 2009.

And after the greeting he shall speak to the people words of exhortation.²¹⁶

The first quote clearly states that two Old Testament lections are read followed by the singing of Psalms, and then two New Testament readings; an apostolic pericope and then the Gospel read by a presbyter or deacon as opposed to the lector. The second quote clearly states that the two Old Testament readings are one from the Law and one from the Prophets, as found in Byzantine Lenten Vespers. The New Testament has two readings as well, and then follows the sermon. Taft then takes evidence from the Homilies of John Chrysostom on this topic since they are only slightly later than the Apostolic Constitutions.²¹⁷ This material is being reserved for the chapters that will deal specifically with Chrysostom.

The next witness for Antioch is the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of St. Dionysius the Ps. – Areopagite. This 5/sixth century work is of disputed origin,²¹⁸ but the pontifical liturgy that it describes seems to be clearly an Antiochian one with a primitive description of the Rite of Incense at the beginning of the celebration performed by the hierarch.²¹⁹ This rite became the Hûssöyô of the Syriac and Maronite liturgies.²²⁰ Such a liturgical ensemble, wherein there are prayers and hymns specifically for the offering of


²¹⁸ Ibid, 11.


incense, did not develop in the Byzantine Liturgy. Dionysius specifies the content of the liturgical readings only once in the book in Chapter III, 3:4:

The sacred tablets have a lesson for those capable of being divinized... They teach that God himself thus gives substance and arrangement to everything which exists, including the legal hierarchy and society. They lay down the divisions by lot, the distribution and the sharing that have to do with God’s people. They teach the lore of the holy judges, of wise kings and of priests who live in God. They express the powerful and unshakable point of view which enables our forefathers to endure various and numerous misfortunes. From them came wise guidelines for living, the songs which gloriously depict the love of God, the prophecies regarding the future, the works of Jesus the man, the God-given and god-imitating communities and sacred teachings of his disciples. Here is hidden and mystical vision of that inspired man who was the most beloved of the disciples, and the transcendent Word of God concerning Jesus.

Dionysius does not enumerate the exact number of lections in the Eucharistic Liturgy, but he does describe both the Old and New Testaments without any seeming preference for one or the other. This fact combined with the evidence of the Apostolic Constitutions, which predate him, and the present day usage of the Syriac speaking Churches of having Old Testament lections, as mentioned earlier, points to a continuous tradition of using Old and New Testament readings in the Antiochian Churches.

---

2.3.3 Old Testament Readings in Ancient Palestine

2.3.3.1 Jerusalem in the 4th/5th Centuries

The liturgical sources for Jerusalem in the second half of the fourth century and the first half of the fifth century are the *Catechetical Lectures* of Cyril of Jerusalem, *Egeria’s Diary* and the *Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem*. Cyril’s works date from 348 to possibly 380 AD. Egeria is usually dated to around 381-384, and agrees with the Liturgy as presented in the *Armenian Lectionary* according to Renoux. The *Armenian Lectionary* is dated to 417-439 based on internal evidence because Bishop John of Jerusalem who died in 417 is commemorated. The Martyrium of Saint Stephen was dedicated in 439; prior to that his relics were kept in the sacristy of the Mount Zion church beginning in 415. It is the Mount Zion location that fits the *Lectionary* best. Renoux sees the document as translated from Greek to Armenian before the death of Bishop Sahak in 438. It is to the *Armenian Lectionary* that Renoux compares the data of Cyril and Egeria.

---
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Cyril tells his listeners to only read the books that are read in Church and to ignore the rest even in private. He lists 22 books for the Old Testament (omitting Tobit, Judith, the Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach and Maccabees) and 27 for the Testament (excluding Revelations).\footnote{Renoux, “The Reading of the Bible in Ancient Jerusalem,” 389. Catechesis 4:35 & 36 found in the previous article.} In the Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem only 41 books are used: Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, 1, 2 & 4 Kings, 2 Maccabees, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Joel, Amos, Jonah, Micah and Zechariah from the Old Testament; Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts, Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians 1 Thessalonians, 1 & 2 Timothy, Titus, Hebrews, James, 1 & 2 Peter and 1 John from the New Testament. The Lectionary only adds to Cyril’s list the reading from 2 Maccabees for their feast on August 1.\footnote{Renoux, “The Reading of the Bible in Ancient Jerusalem,” 395-396.} There are 315 pericopes in the Armenian Lectionary, but when duplicates are removed the number falls to 260 of which 98 are from the Old Testament.\footnote{Ibid, 396.} When looking at the Armenian Lectionary, and when it uses Old Testament lections several traits become evident.\footnote{The Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem in: Wilkinson, Egeria’s Travels, 181-194.} First, as noted by Renoux, at a Eucharistic Liturgy the Old Testament is never read directly before the Gospel, but there is always an Epistle or Acts in between them.\footnote{Renoux, “The Reading of the Bible in Ancient Jerusalem,” 400.} The Old Testament is very prominent in the readings for Lent and...
Holy Week at non-Eucharistic services, and the vigils for Epiphany and Pascha.\textsuperscript{230} Liturgies with three readings (Old Testament, Epistle and Gospel) are limited to the commemoration of Saints (the Sanctoral). They are: the Prophet Jeremiah on May 1, the Prophet Zacharias on June 10, the Prophet Elisha on June 14, the Ark of the Covenant on July 2, the Prophet Isaiah on July 6, and the Seven Maccabees on August 1, Mary the Theotokos on August 15 and James and David on December 25.\textsuperscript{231} From this evidence is clear that the Jerusalem Church, from 350-450, did not have an Old Testament lection at the Eucharist except on Saint’s days, and at the two great vigils of the year (Epiphany and Pascha). The fourth century Jerusalem Eucharistic Liturgy generally only had two readings, namely an Epistle and Gospel. Below we will examine later historical evidence that shows Old Testament readings at the Eucharistic Liturgy. In the intervening years the Jerusalem Church must have adopted this custom from elsewhere.

2.3.3.2 Narration of the Abbots John and Sophronius (7/8\textsuperscript{th} centuries) and the Georgian Lectionary (5-8\textsuperscript{th} centuries)

The first work recounts the visit of two Palestinian monks to Nilus an anchorite who lived on Mt. Sinai with two disciples.\textsuperscript{232} The following quote, translated by Robert Taft, is crucial for understanding the liturgical ordo of the Liturgy of James (JAS) at the time of John and Sophronius.


\textsuperscript{231} Ibid, 189-192.

\textsuperscript{232} This section is dependent upon: Taft, “Were There Once Old Testament Readings in the Byzantine Divine Liturgy?” 287-8.
And for this reason the ecclesiastical order ordains psalmists, readers, sub-deacons and presbyters; Psalmists to chant and sing with melody and tone and singing, and to lead the people at the “Holy God,” and at the Prokeimenon and Propsalms and Bematika, and the coming forth of the Mysteries the [“We who mystically represent] the Cherubim, and the Koinonika; and readers for the Proverbial and Prophetic and Apostolic [and Historical] Books...233

Taft notes that the quote must be referring specifically to the Eucharistic Liturgy, and not the entire liturgical cursus of Jerusalem, because all of the terms used are from the Divine Liturgy of James (JAS). If one wants to separate out the Old Testament readings, as not part of JAS, then it would be necessary to explain why only one term is not from the Eucharistic Liturgy, while all of the others are.234 It is safer to say that the whole passage refers to the Eucharistic Liturgy, which at that time had acquired Old Testament lections in contrast to what we saw in the Armenian Lectionary.

The Georgian Lectionary is dated to the 5-eighth century, based on internal evidence from the document, although the manuscripts themselves date from the 10-11th centuries.235 In this document the divine liturgies generally have an Old Testament lection, but the number of readings varies. The Sunday of Meat Fare (two Sundays before Lent) has three readings – Jeremiah 30:23-28, Romans 14:14-26 and Matthew

234 Ibid.
The First Sunday of Lent has four readings – Proverbs 8:11-21, Jeremiah 10:6-10, Romans 11:1-5 and Luke 15:1-10. The Sunday after Easter has three New Testament readings only – Acts 5:34-42, 1 John 1:1-7 and John 1:1-17. This Lectionary is in harmony then with *The Narration of Abbots John and Sophronius* in that there are readings from both Testaments in the Liturgy.

Taft notes that JAS has lost the Old Testament lections before the Epistle in a period prior to the ninth century, when the first manuscript (*Vatican Gr. 2282*) appears, which does not mention them. This means that Jerusalem went from not generally having Old Testament readings at the Eucharistic Liturgy, to having them at the time of John and Sophronius and the *Georgian Lectionary*, and then lost them by the ninth century. This is normal liturgical history. Things are added to the liturgy, and then subtracted from it. Customs are borrowed and discarded at various times in history.

2.3.4 John Chrysostom

There is evidence in the homilies of John Chrysostom for the reading of the Old Testament in the Eucharistic Liturgies of both Antioch and Constantinople as aptly
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236 Ibid, 42-43.
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demonstrated by Van de Paverd. This evidence will be placed to the side for now, and dealt with in the chapters on Chrysostom.

2.4 Conclusion

The question, of whether or not there was an Old Testament reading in the early Byzantine liturgy, is important not only for HS#40 and the documents that follow it, but also for the patristic sources that predate it. The liturgical documents that we have agree with HS#40, but it is obvious that this Typicon stands at the end of an evolutionary process. Originally, there was an Old Testament lection in the Byzantine Eucharist, but it eventually dropped out, and only the prophetic lections for Vespers, Great Lent and Great Week remained. After the tenth century the number of Old Testament readings in the lectionary was slightly increased when the number of Vespers services with readings was increased. The patristic evidence shows indications of Old Testament lections, and these had an influence on the liturgical year in Constantinople. This was examined in greater detail in Chapter 1, and will also be seen in Chapter 3. The dropping of the Old Testament reading from the Eucharist also created a disjuncture in the hymnody of the Church, which refers often to Old Testament characters and stories that are never actually read in the liturgy according to HS#40. One obvious example is the present day Great Monday Bridegroom Service, which is formally dedicated to Joseph son of Jacob in the Synaxarion of the day, even though the readings and most of

---

241 Van de Paverd, Meßliturgie, 94-97, 428-430.
the hymns do not mention him. This dropping of the Old Testament readings from the Eucharistic liturgy, and their slight increase at a later date in Vespers, makes the history of the use of the Old Testament in the liturgy the most complicated part of the history of the Byzantine Lectionary and Liturgical Year.

\[^{242}\] Mother Mary, *Lenten Triodion*, 511-516.
CHAPTER 3:
PATRISTIC WITNESSES TO THE EARLY BYZANTINE LECTIONARY

3.1 Introduction

To discern the history of the Byzantine Lectionary system previous to the seventh century it is necessary to look at patristic evidence. Without doing this the history of the lectionary begins in the air without anything coming before the first documents that survive from that century. To neglect to do so also cuts of the Byzantine Tradition from the very church leaders who are credited with forming it. Also, ignoring the patristic evidence makes it very difficult to see the connections between the early Byzantine Tradition and Antioch.

In this chapter the works of St. John Chrysostom will be largely placed to the side to be dealt with in the chapters that will be specifically dedicated to him. We will examine the 14 Homilies of Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople, from the sixth century and the 39 Homilies of Proclus of Constantinople from the fifth century. In both we will see strong evidence for an Old Testament lection in the early Byzantine Divine Liturgy. It will also be evident that both represent different phases in the history of the Lectionary; Proclus belonging to the original Antiochian heritage of the Lectionary, while Leontius is our first witness to an altered tradition that will in the following century become enshrined in HS#40. The work of Antoine Chavasse on the early Roman
Lectionary also points the traditions of HS#40 regarding the Lenten Epistles from Hebrews.

Much of the chapter is dedicated to an analysis of Severus of Antioch’s (512-518) 125 Cathedral Homilies. His homilies give us a good picture of the early Antiochian lectionary tradition. This information allows us to see the connections between the early Byzantine tradition and the Antiochian tradition, and it allows us to see how this early tradition was altered to create the present Byzantine system.

3.2 Leontius Presbyter of Constantinople (ca. 557)

Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople, is so called to distinguish him from Leontius of Byzantium who flourished from 520 to 543 AD and was involved in the defense of the Council of Chalcedon. Leontius the Presbyter, as can be surmised from his sermons, was a parish priest of an average parish in Constantinople that served a variety of people. His homilies have only come to the attention of scholars since 1972 when Michel Aubineau published two of his paschal homilies. The reason why Leontius was over-looked in the past was that his sermons were not passed down in one block, but in Patristic Lectionaries, and several of them were attributed to other authors


244 Pauline Allen & Cornelis Datema, editors, Leontius Presbyter of Constantinople: Fourteen Homilies (Byzantina Australiensia 9; Brisbane: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1991), 1-8.

such as Proclus of Constantinople (III, XI), John Chrysostom (XII-XIV) and others also named Leontius.\textsuperscript{246} Maurice Sachot claimed to have identified 25 homilies from the hand of Leontius.\textsuperscript{247} This number was reduced to 14 by Cornelis Datema and Pauline Allen, who gathered the sermons together and published a critical edition of them in Greek, which was followed several years later by an English translation.\textsuperscript{248} Leontius’ Homilies are very much tied to the liturgical calendar and consist largely of explanations of the readings of the day.\textsuperscript{249} For the reader these are conveniently introduced with such expressions as: “you have just heard (ἡκουεϛ)” or “it was read (λέγοντος).”\textsuperscript{250} Because of his close following of the liturgical year and Lectionary, Leontius is an important witness to both as they existed at his time.

3.2.1 Dating

The dating of Leontius’ Homilies is not easy, for he does not refer to Emperors and wars or other clearly datable phenomena with one exception. In Homily I:1 on John the Baptist, he clearly states that the congregation had just experienced an earthquake,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{247} Maurice Sachot, “Les Homélies de Léonce Prêtre de Constantinople,” \textit{Revue des Sciences Religieuses} 51:2-3 (177), 234-245.
  \item \textsuperscript{249} Datema & Allen, \textit{Leontii Presbyteri Constantinopolitani Homiliae}, 37-40.
  \item \textsuperscript{250} Allen & Datema, editors, \textit{Leontius Presbyter of Constantinople: Fourteen Homilies}, 15.
\end{itemize}
and he calls it a divine chastisement to awaken those whom God loves. Originally in Constantinople, the second Sunday before Christmas was dedicated to John the Baptist, but during the time of Justinian the birth of the Forerunner was changed to June 24 as recorded in one of his letters from 561. The question is on which date was Leontius preaching, before Christmas or in June? Cornelis Datema says that a search of the historical records for sixth century Constantinople shows only one earthquake in December, and none in June. The earthquake was on December 14, 557 and the following Sunday of December 17, 557 was the Second Sunday before Christmas traditionally dedicated to John the Baptist. Thus, Leontius must have preached this sermon in that year.

Another piece of information in the sermon that supports this conclusion is Leontius’ reference to the Gospel of the previous day being the Annunciation to Zachary (Homily I:3). In HS#40 the birth of the Forerunner is on June 24 and the Conception on September 23, not on two consecutive days. When the nativity of John was on the 2nd Sunday before Christmas, the reading of the conception on the day before would be a natural part of the pre-Christmas season and course reading of Luke. Also, the strong connection between consecutive Saturdays and Sundays in the Byzantine Tradition is

---

252 Datema & Allen, Leontii Presbyteri Constantinopolitani Homiliae, 15.  
255 Mateos, Le Typicon, I, 43, 319.
evidenced by such groupings as the Saturdays and Sundays before and after Christmas, before and after Theophany, before and after the Holy Cross, and Lazarus Saturday and Palm Sunday.256 Thus the story of John the Baptist being read on two consecutive days fits much better with a Saturday and Sunday scenario, and not with the fixed date of June 24.

Valuable considerations for the dating of Leontius’ sermons are also given by Brian Daley. He calls attention to two dogmatic considerations. First, in reference to Leontius’ Christology he says:

His Christ is clearly the ‘Neo-Chalcedonian’ Christ of Justinian and the Second Council of Constantinople (553): truly flesh and blood, yet at the core of his personal identity unquestionably the Word of God. It is the radiant beauty of his godhead that convinces the Magi the infant in the cave is the goal of their searching (XII, 146-51), and moves the crowd on Palm Sunday to recognize him as victorious Lord...257

Then, referring to Leontius’ Trinitarian theology expressed in the Good Friday Homily (VII),258 and influences from Irenaeus of Lyons and Cyril of Alexandria, Daley says:

Jesus prays, simply to reveal the Father more fully to his hearers. ‘For the divine economy has this as its purpose, that the Father may reveal the Son and that the Son may reveal the Father, and that in the same way the Holy Spirit may also be revealed between (metaxu) Father and Son’ (VII, 72-100). Once again, late sixth-century Constantinople, where Cyril was the main touchstone of orthodoxy, would be a plausible setting for such a formulation, which stresses both the divine unity of the Father

and Son and the ‘economic’ role of both in sending the Spirit (cf., e.g. Cyril, In Joh Ev 11.1 (PG 74. 452 C9-D7).259

These two dogmatic points, along with the earthquake, place Leontius in the sixth century. This is the best and only evidence that we have to date him. We accept that Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople, preached in 557-8, and is therefore a patristic witness to the Lectionary and liturgy of Constantinople at that time.

3.2.2 Fourteen Sermons

There are three occasions in Leontius’ preaching when he refers to the Old Testament reading in a liturgy that is not a vigil. His sermon on the Transfiguration was delivered during a time when the Gospel of Matthew was being read and commented upon in course (Homily XIV). During this sermon he explains I Kings 5:2-3, the table of Solomon, and compares it to the Eucharist (XIV:1-4).260 Homily III:12 on Palm Sunday refers to Zechariah 9:9-15,261 which HS#40 places as the third reading of Vespers on the evening before Palm Sunday.262 Leontius usually only refers to the readings of the Eucharistic Liturgy, or at least the principle liturgy of the day, which leads me to conclude that this reading was part of the Palm Sunday Eucharist and not Vespers. This data confirms a theory of Robert Taft that when the OT lesson was removed from the Byzantine Eucharist, at least on feast days, it was not lost, but traveled back to Vespers.

261 Ibid, 34 & 55.
262 Mateos, Le Typicon, II, 65.
where it was added to the two readings already there thus yielding a total of three.\textsuperscript{263}

On Pentecost (XI:21) Leontius refers to Exodus 4:10 (Moses saying; I am slow of speech and tongue), which may have been part of the readings of the day.\textsuperscript{264} Leontius is thus a further patristic witness to the Byzantine Liturgy originally having an Old Testament reading at the Eucharist.

The Gospel readings quoted by Leontius for the major Feasts of the Liturgical Year agree with \textit{HS#40}. He has Matthew 28 (\textit{VIII:S & IX:6}) at the Paschal Vigil, and John 1 (\textit{VIII: 16}) at the Pascha morning Liturgy.\textsuperscript{265} His Palm Sunday Gospel is from John and includes the anointing at Bethany (\textit{II & III}), and he refers to the Resurrection of Lazarus as read the day before (\textit{II: 21 & III: 24}).\textsuperscript{266} The Mid-Pentecost Gospel matches (\textit{X}), as

\textsuperscript{263} Robert Taft, class notes for course on the history of the Byzantine Liturgy given at Boston College in the spring of 1977. A look at Appendix A shows only 6 days when Vespers has 3 readings that fall into the pattern of 1 from the Law, and then 2 Prophetic Readings; they are Palm Sunday, Pentecost, September 14 and three Marian feast days that share the same readings (September 8, February 2 & August 15). These days look like there might have been only 2 readings from the Law and the Prophets as on ferias of Lent and then the Eucharistic Liturgy's reading from the Prophets was added to them. The other days in the Byzantine Calendar with 3 readings at Vespers do not follow the same pattern, but may omit the Law or read only from it or only from the Prophets. Some days have NT readings instead. Palm Sunday and Pentecost Sunday are ancient days on the Calendar and the 4 fixed feasts mentioned were all in place during the course of the sixth century (P. Bernardakis, “Le Culte de la Croix chez les Grecs,” \textit{Échos d'Orient} 5(1901-1902), 195. Davide M. Montagna, “La Liturgia Mariana Primitiva: Saggio di Orientamento,” \textit{Marianum} 24 (1962), 95, 118.

\textsuperscript{264} Allen & Datema, \textit{Leontius Presbyter of Constantinople: Fourteen Homilies}, 140 & 153.

\textsuperscript{265} Ibid, 96-97.

does the reading of John 7:37-53 on Pentecost (XI & XIII). On Christmas morning the account of the Magi was read (XII:5).

While noting agreements between Leontius’ sermons and HS#40 it is important to note that the information Leontius gives for Pascha agrees with the Typicon. He has Matthew 28 read at the Vigil (VIII: 5 & IX: 6), and possibly Zephaniah 3:8-15 as well (VIII: 8 & 9). At the Pascha morning Liturgy the faithful sing: All of you who have been baptized into Christ... (Gal 3:27) (VIII: 14 & IX: 5), and: This is the day the Lord has made... (Ps 117: 24; IX:1 & VIII:2 & 3). The Gospel for Pascha morning is the Prologue of John’s Gospel (VIII:16). For the greatest Feast of the year the Liturgy appears to be well settled at his time.

Leontius’ Lectionary does not agree with HS#40 on some of the days before the feasts, and some of the apostolic readings. The Man Born Blind is read on the Tuesday before Mid-Pentecost (X:9), and we do not have evidence from him to know if it was read on the 6th Sunday of Pascha. The resurrection of Lazarus was read on the day before Pentecost (XI:26) in addition to the day before Palm Sunday (II: 21 & III: 24). The reading of the raising of Lazarus on the Day of the Dead before Pentecost Sunday is actually more suited to that occasion and the baptisms on Pentecost, as will be

268 Ibid, 167.
269 Ibid, 96-97.
270 Ibid, 119.
271 Ibid, 34 & 140.
explained in Chapter 5, than the conversation of Christ with Peter in John 21:15-25 as in HS#40.\textsuperscript{272} The choice of this reading in HS#40 shows a desire to end the course reading of John on that day and ignores the theme of the day’s liturgy – the remembrance of the departed, and preparation for baptism on Pentecost Sunday. As mentioned above John the Baptist’s Conception and Nativity were commemorated on the second weekend preceding Christmas. The reading from Acts 12:1-19 (X 4 & 5) for Mid-Pentecost is different, and the Pentecost reading from Acts (XI:22 & XII:18) is longer than in HS#40. The Matthew Gospel for the Paschal Vigil is also longer including the guards at the tomb (\textit{VII:6}), which would indicate this story was not yet read at Holy Saturday Matins as in the Typicon. This is consistent with the idea that this reading for Holy Saturday (Matthew 27:62-66) was imported from Jerusalem at a later date.\textsuperscript{273}

Although the Book of Job was read in Jerusalem and other Churches during Lent; its use during Holy Week is unique to Constantinople, and Leontius is our first witness to this practice.\textsuperscript{274} A look at Table 3.1 shows that Leontius and HS#40 do not agree exactly on the pericopes; with those of HS#40 being generally longer and the one for Great Friday having no overlap at all. In looking at the readings as found in Leontius there is a clear pattern: Job is rich and pious; he is deprived of his wealth and children; he is afflicted in body, and finally he is rewarded by God and intercedes for his friends. In a system where Job is a type of Christ, this choice of readings makes great sense

\textsuperscript{272} Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon}, II, 137.


\textsuperscript{274} Ibid, 61-62.
paralleling Christ’s divine status, innocent suffering and afflictions and his exaltation and intercession before the Father for us as in Philippians 2:5-11. The lections in HS#40 focus on Satan’s accusations and Job’s innocence and his final reward, but the role of intercession is omitted. The desire of the Typicon to read the end of the book of Job deprives the listener of the important lesson of intercession. So HS#40’s version presents the wealth and innocence of Christ, and his reward, but omits his office of High Priest interceding for us (Heb 6-10). In this regard the change from Leontius’ time to HS#40 shows a different outlook and emphasis.

**TABLE 3.1**

**READINGS FROM JOB DURING HOLY WEEK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leontius Presbyter of Constantinople – Homilies IV-VII</th>
<th>HS#40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday – Jb1:1-5 - Job’s wealth &amp; piety</td>
<td>Jb 1:1-12 - Job’s wealth &amp; piety; Satan’s accusation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday – Jb 2:7-13 – Boils &amp; Job’s innocence before his wife &amp; friends</td>
<td>Jb 2:1-10 – Satan’s 2nd accusation, boils &amp; Job’s innocence before his wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday – none given</td>
<td>Jb 38:1-21 – Job’s ignorance before the Creator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday – Jb 42:7-11 – Job intercedes for his friends &amp; is rewarded by God</td>
<td>Jb 42:12-17 – Job’s property and family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Lectionary at the time of Leontius is definitely recognizable, in its general outlines, as Byzantine especially with the reading of Job during Holy Week. It shows
continuity with HS#40, especially on the great feasts like Pascha and Pentecost. There are, however, differences when it comes to the lesser days that precede the feasts, and in the Epistle readings for the feasts. The Byzantine Tradition is solidifying and becoming closer to the Typicon at the time of Leontius, but it is not quite settled yet.

3.3 Proclus of Constantinople (+446)

Proclus was the first bishop of Constantinople who was born and raised in that city. He also spent most of his life serving at the Great Church. He started as the secretary for Patriarch Atticus (405-425), who ordained him first as a deacon and then as a presbyter. In 426 Patriarch Sisinnius ordained him the bishop of Cyzicus, but the inhabitants of that city elected Dalmatius instead, and Proclus never took the see, but remained in the Capital as a well-received preacher. When Maximian died in 434, Proclus was chosen to replace him as bishop by Emperor Theodosius II with the backing of the Emperor’s sister Pulcheria. He held the office until his death in 446. He opposed Nestorius’ use of the title “Christotokos” with his Homily 1 on the Theotokos in either 429 or 430. As the bishop of Constantinople he reconciled the followers of John Chrysostom to the Church by bringing his remains to the Capitol in 438.


His homilies are all attributed to his 20 year tenure as a bishop: *Homilies XIII and VII* before he became Patriarch; *I* and *XXIII* during Nestorius’ time; *II* and *IV* after Nestorius and *XII* and *XVII* after 429. Some of his sermons were passed down under other names and were only recovered in the last century. These are called the “New Sermons” by Leroy and are numbers *XXVI* through *XXXIV*. For our purposes Proclus’ sermons were all preached in the Great Church except for *Homily XII* on Pascha, and *Homily XVII* on St. Stephen preached at the church of St. Stephen, and they are all limited in time to his episcopacy. This makes him a reliable witness to the liturgical calendar and Lectionary of the Great Church of his time.

3.3.1 Calendar and Lectionary

*Homily XXXVI* is important as witness to a Liturgy with an Old Testament reading as well as the Epistle and Gospel. Barkhuizen describes the contents of the sermon as follows:

The homily can be divided into three main sections (apart from the introduction): Proclus’ exposition of the homily’s theme (the brevity of human life) is presented in two large sections, paragraphs 2-5 and 6-9. Paragraphs 2-5 are in the form of a picturesque description based on the cycle of life (from conception to death), while 6-9 constitute an exegesis of 1

---

278 Leroy, *L’Homilétique de Proclus de Constantinople*, 158.

279 Ibid, 173.


The homily comments on Luke 4:38ff, 1 Timothy 6:6-8 and Micah 6:3-4. The three readings are not necessarily related to each other, and Proclus’ theme of the brevity of life and the importance of being rich in virtue and not earthly possessions. If Proclus was looking for scriptures to back up his theme Ecclesiastes 1:1ff would have suited him better, as would have the Parable of the Rich Fool (Lk 12:16-21), and certainly not the miracle of a person’s life being extended. Of the three readings it is 1 Timothy that serves his purpose. The Gospel and Prophetic lections are commented on at the end of the sermon so as to not neglect the readings of the day. This fact points to a liturgical Ordo with both Old and New Testament readings in it.

Proclus’ sermons are listed in Appendix B. A look at the list shows the development of the Liturgical Year at his time. In *Homily III:4* he lists the great Christian Feasts as Christmas, Epiphany, Pascha, Ascension and Pentecost. Our list shows that these feasts had already attracted to themselves secondary commemorations. Thus we see at least one week proceeding Christmas with the Annunciation. The day after Christmas is the Feast of the Theotokos, which is followed by St. Stephen, the Holy Innocents and the Circumcision of Christ. Epiphany (Theophany) does not show any

---


related commemorations in Proclus. Before Pascha we see Palm Sunday and Great Thursday and Great Friday. After Pascha are Thomas Sunday and the Ascension. Pentecost Sunday at the end of the 50 days has attracted to itself the Commemoration of all of the Martyrs one week later. Proclus did not only preach on feast days; for we have *Homily VIII* on the Transfiguration which was preached during a *bahnlesung* of Luke, and *Homily XXXVI* on the brevity of life, which appear to have been delivered on ordinary Sundays. What survives from Proclus’ sermons is not an entire liturgical year, but it does indicate that there was a fairly developed one at his time. It is hard to imagine that Christmas, which only began to be celebrated in Constantinople at the time of Gregory Nazianzus (ca. 380 AD), could have attracted to itself so many lesser commemorations, and the other older Feasts would not have done so as well.  

There is one consideration that may explain why Christmas would have attracted so many lesser commemorations, which is a *bahnlesung* of Luke at this time of the year. The Gospel of Luke lends itself to two Sundays before Christmas, with one dedicated to St. John the Baptist, and the other to the Theotokos, as discussed above with Leontius Presbyter of Constantinople. It naturally continues through Christmas, the day of the Theotokos (December 26), the Circumcision of Christ (January 1) and Theophany (January 6). After all of this material from chapters 1-3 of Luke, the chapters on the ministry of Jesus start relaying miracles and parables, which are used for lessons for the

---


Saturdays and Sundays after Epiphany as discussed below in Severus of Antioch. This would mean that the introduction of the Christmas Festival and the decision to follow Luke’s Gospel for the time around Christmas led to the development of a number of commemorations at this time of the year. If this is so, the development of this part of the calendar took place between the time of Gregory of Nazianzus through that of Proclus, a period of 40 or so years. Later on the moving of John the Baptist’s Nativity to June 24, and the Annunciation to March 25, meant that the pre-Christmas season underwent a simplification, and the Gospel of Matthew became more prominent in that season.

The calendar presented to us by Proclus agrees with the Typicon of the Great Church except for the Annunciation, which was moved from before Christmas to March 25. Several readings preached on by Proclus agree with HS#40. Pascha shows a great affinity with Matthew 28 at the vigil, Psalm 31 (Homily XXVII), the baptismal chant: All of you who have been baptized..., (Homily XXXII) and the Prologue of John’s Gospel at the morning Liturgy (Homily XV). Thomas Sunday (Homily XXXIII) naturally agrees with John 20, as does Ascension (Homily XXI) with Acts 1. The Great Friday Epistle is 1 Corinthians 1:23 (Homily XI), and the Good Thief (Lk 23:39-43) is mentioned as well (Homily XXIX). The Palm Sunday Gospel is definitely from John (Homily IX), but it is difficult to tell which Gospel is primary in the Holy Thursday Sermon which quotes freely from all four on the betrayal of Judas (Homily X). Christmas (Homilies II, IV, XXIII, XXIV & XXXV) has both the

---

286 Mateos, Le Typicon, I, 253-259.
Lucan and Matthean pericopes as does the Typicon. The story of the Holy Innocents (Homily XXVI) is only found in Matthew, as the circumcision of Christ is only found in Luke (Homily XXII). The Feast of the Theotokos (Homily V) on December 26 uses the Visitation (Lk 1:39-55), and not the Flight to Egypt (Mt 2:13-23) as does the Typicon. The story of St. Stephen is found only in Acts 6 (Homily XVII). Epiphany has the Matthean and Lucan pericopes, Psalm 117:26-27 and Titus 2:11 matching the Typicon perfectly (Homilies VII & XXVIII). The All Saints Epistle appears to be from Hebrews 11 & 12 (Homily XXXIV), while that for St. Paul is 2 Corinthians 11:21-12:9 (Homily XVIII), both match HS#40. St. Andrew’s feast has two Gospels commented upon: Matthew 4:18-23 and John 1: 35-42 (Homily XIX). The Typicon places the John pericope first, and the Matthew one as an alternative reading for St. Andrew’s day.287

Proclus gives us incomplete information about the Lectionary, but it is important to note that the more ancient the feast, the more likely he is to agree with the Typicon, and he also does so where the story is found in only one book of scripture. The newer commemorations are not so much in accord, or he may agree with one reading and not mention the others. Regarding Christmas, he likes Psalm 103:24 and mentions it frequently in two sermons (Homily II & XXXV), while the Typicon does not mention it at all. Leontius Presbyter of Constantinople says Psalm 46:2 is the responsorial Psalm for Christmas (Homily XII), which is also ignored by the Typicon. The calendar and

287 Mateos, Le Typicon, I, 119.
Lectionary were developing at the time of Proclus, but they were not settled. Some elements are the same as the tenth century Typicon, but others are different.

3.4 Fifth Sunday of Lent’s Epistle Borrowed by the Roman Tradition (ca. 550), and the Work of Antoine Chavasse

The Epistle for the Fifth Sunday of Lent in the old Roman lectionary (Hebrews 9:11-15) is the same as the Fifth Sunday of Lent in the Byzantine Lectionary. Chavasse, who did extensive work on the history of Roman lectionary, proposed that it was borrowed by Rome from Byzantium after 550 AD when the Scrutinies were moved from the Sundays of Lent to weekdays, taking with them their Epistle and Gospel readings.288 They were moved to the Third Friday, the Fourth Wednesday and the Fourth Friday of Lent before Pope Gregory’s sermons on the Gospels were delivered in 590-593.289 The Gospel readings of the three weekdays were moved to the Sundays, but the Epistles did not follow, but instead new ones where chosen (Ephesians 5:1-9; Galatians 4:22-31 and Hebrews 9:11-15). The conclusion that the Fifth Sunday was borrowed from Byzantium is based on the fact that this Epistle is not in harmony with the other Roman Lenten Epistles, and that according to the Comes of Würzburg the book of Hebrews is to be read during January and the beginning of February.290 Chavasse states these Readings


from Hebrews in the *Comes* were in place before the Alexandrian Pascha was accepted in Rome ca. 525-30.\(^{291}\) This would mean that the Byzantine Lenten Sunday Epistles were in place prior to the borrowing of the Fifth Sunday Epistle by Rome sometime after 550 and before 590.

In his article, “La Structure du Carême et les Lectures,” Chavasse mentions an idea that there was a common list of Sunday Gospel readings shared by Rome and Constantinople in the sixth century:

Rome et Byzance sont parties toutes deux d’une liste commune de pericopes dominicales, liste qui, en particulier, débutait et finissait de la même façon. L’évolution s’est faite, de part et d’autre, d’une façon partiellement indépendante, et des divergences se sont introduites dans l’utilisation de cette veille liste. Mais des points demeurent fixes, et les repères qu’ils constituent aident à comprendre ce qui s’est passe à Rome.\(^{292}\)

This idea is very important for the history of both lectionary traditions so it merits an examination here. Table 3.2 gives the pericopes that Chavasse discusses in his article.

---


\(^{292}\) Chavasse, “La Structure du Carême, » 104.
TABLE 3.2

GOSPEL PERICOPES DISCUSSED BY CHAVASSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gospel Pericope</th>
<th>Ancient Roman Lectionary</th>
<th>Byzantine Lectionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt 22:2-14</td>
<td>8th Sunday after January 1</td>
<td>14th Sunday of Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 15:21-28</td>
<td>10th Sunday after January 1, Last Sunday before Lent</td>
<td>17th Sunday of Matthew Last Sunday before Pre-Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 8:4-15</td>
<td>Sexagesima</td>
<td>4th Sunday of Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 18:31-43</td>
<td>Quinquagesima</td>
<td>14th Sunday of Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 6:16-21</td>
<td>Ash Wednesday</td>
<td>Cheese-Fare Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 25:31-46</td>
<td>1st Monday of Lent</td>
<td>Meat-Fare Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 23:1-12</td>
<td>2nd Tuesday of Lent</td>
<td>14th Saturday of Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 21:33-46</td>
<td>2nd Friday of Lent</td>
<td>13th Sunday of Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 15:11-32</td>
<td>2nd Saturday of Lent</td>
<td>Prodigal Son (Sunday before Meat-Fare)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 5:1-11</td>
<td>2nd Sunday after Pentecost</td>
<td>1st Sunday of Luke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quick look at the list shows that keeping the pericopes in the Roman order does not at all match with their Byzantine order, and that the lections read on Sunday in the Byzantine tradition passed to weekdays in the Roman lectionary. Chavasse reconstructs scenarios wherein the weekday lections in the Roman Evangelistary were originally used on Sundays. He talks about the three pre-Lenten Sundays in the Byzantine Rite (Luke 15:11-32, Matthew 25:31-46 & Matthew 6:16-21) and presupposes that they were originally pre-Lenten in the Roman system as well. The problem with this is not only that they are found on weekdays of three different Lenten weeks of the Roman lectionary, but also in reverse order. The point of commonality is that the

---
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Matthew Gospel on fasting (Mt 6:16-21) begins Lent on Ash Wednesday and is the day before Lent in Constantinople (Cheese-Fare Sunday). The Gospel is obviously well suited to begin a fasting period with Jesus’ instructions on the topic.

Also, in regards to Lent Chavasse notes that Matthew 15:21-28 (the Canaanite Woman) was the last Gospel at the end of February in the ancient Roman system before Lent began in March. It has a similar function in the Byzantine Tradition serving as the last Gospel before the pre-Lenten Sundays begin. This Gospel is somewhat of a problem in the Byzantine system since it is a Matthew lection found in the latter part of the Lucan cycle, and even in the Matthew list it is out of order and should follow the 9th Sunday. In the ancient system that Chavasse proposes for Rome it would have come immediately before the three week catechumenate began. The content of the Gospel was well suited for this purpose as it hints at the salvation of all the nations. Is this a tradition that passed from Rome to Constantinople? Was this Gospel originally before Lent in Constantinople and then pushed backward as the pre-Lenten period developed? If so, instead of necessarily backing Chavasse’s idea of a common Romano-Byzantine Sunday Lectionary, it would lend credence to the idea that the Matthew Cycle of Constantinople originally continued into Lent, and was pushed backwards in order to make room for the Lucan and Markan lections.

Quinquagesima Sunday has the same Gospel (Luke 18:31-43, the Blind Beggar) as the 14th Sunday of Luke in the Byzantine system. This is not a close proximity in time at

---
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all since in HS#40 it is the 30th Sunday after Pentecost and therefore the 7th before Lent. If however, one accepts the possibility that originally the Luke Cycle in Byzantium started two Sundays before Christmas and continued through Lent, as will be discussed below, and elsewhere in this chapter, then the pericope could have been much closer to Lent falling at the end of February or the beginning of March.


The problem with Chavasse’s theory is that he has to explain why so many lections in the proposed Romano-Byzantine system later ended up on weekdays in Rome. Also, the pericopes are almost never in the same order in both systems. One would think that a coherent system would have been adapted in a more orderly fashion at least keeping the pericopes in order even if transferring them to weekdays. It should also be noted that none of these readings are found in Holy Week or the 50 days of Pentecost, but come from a period when the Lectionary was being filled out beyond its most primitive form of a three week Lent and the Paschal Season of 50 days. There are some points of contact as mentioned above, especially regarding Ash Wednesday (Mt 6:16-21), the Canaanite Woman (Mt 15:21-28), the Blind Beggar (Lk 18:31-43) and

---
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the Call of Peter (Lk 5:1-11). This would suggest to me, rather than a common list of Sunday Gospels, individual lections being imported from one Church to the other, or chosen independently by both for their suitability to the occasion. If the Gospels just mentioned were imported from Constantinople by Rome than there is some further evidence for some Sunday Gospels being in place in Constantinople during the second half of the sixth century.

3.5 Severus of Antioch and the Antiochian Tradition (patriarch from 512-518)

Most scholars agree that the origins of the Liturgy of Constantinople are to be sought in Antioch of Syria. Robert Taft states regarding the Antiochian origins of the Byzantine Liturgy:

Its two Eucharistic prayers, BAS and CHR, are both unmistakably Antiochian-type Anaphoras.

Its pristine native Cathedral Hours, the Asmatike Akoluthia of the Great Church, before being replaced by the hagiopolite Sabaitic monastic rite, was also Antiochian, as betrayed by its single Vesperal Psalm (Ps 140), instead of the four of the Sabaitic rite (Psalms 140, 141, 129, 116).²⁹⁹

Of the other possible examples of the Antiochian origins of the Byzantine Liturgy, I mention the Byzantine Pre-sanctified Liturgy (PRES). Both Frans van de Paverd and Sebastià Janeras observe that at the core of the Byzantine PRES remains the fourth century Antiochian Lenten Synaxis, consisting of the reading of Genesis and sermon immediately followed by Antiochian Vespers, consisting of the bringing in of the light

(The Light of Christ enlightens all mankind), and the singing of Psalm 140 with its refrain (Psalm 140:2 – Let my prayer rise like incense before you and the lifting up of my hands like an evening sacrifice). Then follow extensive intercessions for the catechumens, those about to be enlightened, the sanctification of daily life with the Angel of Peace Litany, and praying for the whole world with the Litany of Peace. After this basic block there follows the entrance of the Mysteries and the reception of Holy Communion. Today the Antiochian core is preceded by Vespers as prescribed in the Typicon of Saint Sabas starting with Psalm 103 and ending with the vesperal hymn Phos Hilaron.300

Stefanos Alexopoulos has challenged this view that the core of the Presanctified Liturgy was a readymade unit borrowed from Antioch. Rather, he sees the Byzantine PRES as composed in Constantinople as indeed all types of PRES are unique to the liturgical tradition that produced them.301 Some of the material in the Byzantine PRES comes from Syria, however. Alexopoulos sees that the readings and Phos Christou came together as a unit from Syria.302 The Dirigatur (Psalm 140:2) he sees as not from Syria, and was added independently to the service as a Prokeimenon.303 The litanies in PRES are from the Cathedral Office of Constantinople, but the origins of the Catechumen petitions are from Antioch and so too are the Photizomenoi petitions.304 Much of the


301 Alexopoulos, The Presanctified Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite, 127.


303 Ibid, 186.
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Liturgy of Constantinople is of Antiochian origin and pieces of the Constantinopolitan liturgy were used to construct the Byzantine PRES. Thus in Alexopoulos’ view Byzantine PRES is a product of Constantinople, but some of its building blocks are directly from Syria, and others are parts of the liturgy that were originally taken from Syria, but redone to form the Byzantine Rite or usage of Hagia Sophia.

According to Pierre Gy, because the Liturgy of the Hours and the Eucharistic Liturgies of Constantinople were of Antiochian origin, it is not unreasonable to assume that at least some of the lectionary also traveled from Antioch to Constantinople.305 This is where the 125 Cathedral Homilies of Severus of Antioch are useful. They are clearly dateable and when compared with HS #40 will show some strands of continuity between the two cities. The differences between the two will have to be examined to see if they agree with other patristic witnesses in which case they may indicate earlier traditions that were lost.

The 125 Cathedral Homilies of Severus of Antioch were originally delivered in Greek, but only survive in a Syriac translation made by Paul of Callinicos, and later carefully revised by James of Edessa in the early eighth century using a Greek manuscript as a guide.306 The Cathedral Homilies do not survive in Greek because they were condemned in Constantinople in 536, and the Emperor Justinian ordered them destroyed. Nevertheless, they did survive for some time and were referred to by the

Council of Constantinople in 681 before being totally lost in Greek.\footnote{307} They were gradually translated into French and published over a long period of time from 1911 to 1976 by *Patrologia Orientalis*, thus becoming available to the non-speaker of Syriac.\footnote{308} The *Homilies* were given by Severus after he was elected Patriarch of Antioch in November of 512, and they continue until November of 518, when he was forced out of office.\footnote{309} Most of the homilies are datable due to the Liturgical Calendar that they tend to follow strictly. Some of the homilies, that do not note the liturgical occasion when they were given, can be dated to within a month or two depending upon the certain dating of homilies that either preceded or followed them.\footnote{310} Appendix C below lists the *Homilies* with their dates, and notes on whether or not they agree with *HS #40* as well as Scriptures commented upon. The following will treat the *Homilies* as they relate to *HS #40*; those that agree and those that do not agree; and those that show evidence of lectionary cycles and leaving to the side homilies that do not mention scripture readings. As stated above this will show continuity in the lectionary system of the two great cities, and differences and possibly various traditions that died out in Constantinople.

\footnote{307} Ibid, 14-15.


\footnote{309} Brière, “Introduction Générale a toutes les Homélie,” 8-14.

\footnote{310} Ibid, 50-62.
3.5.1 Sermons that Agree with HS #40

There are six occasions in the Liturgical Year of Antioch when the sermons of Severus mention readings that agree with HS #40. They are Christmas, Epiphany, the season of Lent, Great Friday, Easter, and Mid-Pentecost.311 Christmas, Epiphany and Easter each have more than one sermon preached on them thus making our references to these feasts quite certain. The Christmas Homilies are Numbers VII, XXXVI, LXIII, LXXXIII, CI and CXV with Numbers LXIII, LXXXIII and CXV actually referring to the readings.312 Both the Lucan and Matthean accounts of the nativity are referred to, and the story of the Magi is mentioned in CXV. In HS #40 the Lucan story is at the Vigil Liturgy, and the story of the Magi is read at the Christmas morning Liturgy. The agreement of the readings of Constantinople and Antioch is significant for the Jerusalem and Armenian traditions read Matthew 1:18-25 (the story of the Magi was read in Bethlehem)313, Basil the Great in Cappadocia read Matthew 1:18-2:12314 and in Rome they read the Prologue of John (John 1:1-18).315 What to read for Christmas liturgy is not as self-evident as one might think, and especially the choice of the story of the Magi is significant and almost unique to these two cities.

311 Pierre-Marie Gy mentions these occasions except Great Friday. Gy, “La Question du Système des Lectures de la Liturgie Byzantine,” 251-261.

312 Patrologia Orientalis, volumes 8:2; 286-313, 20:2; 399-420, 26:3; 307-324.


The Epiphany homilies that mention readings are *Numbers LXVI, LXXXV, CII* and *CXVII*.\(^{316}\) Other homilies for the same feast are *Numbers X, XXXVIII, LXXXIV, CII* and *CXVI*. In these homilies both the Matthean and Lucan accounts are mentioned and in Constantinople Luke is read at the Vigil, and Matthew at the morning liturgy. Here it should be noted that the accounts in Mark and John are not mentioned, and it seems not used in either city. The Markan account only entered the Great Church of Constantinople as the Orthros Gospel for the feast day, at a later date in history as shown by the fact that it is in the Appendix of *HS #40*, and not actually mentioned in the order of service for the feast itself.\(^{317}\)

*Homily XXII* is the only sermon that survives from Great Friday. In it Severus comments on the cry of abandonment of Christ (Mt 27:46; Mk 15:34), and the promise by Christ to the Good Thief (Lk 23:43).\(^{318}\) The Gospel reading for the Great Friday Pre-sanctified Liturgy in *HS #40* is the entire chapter 27 of Matthew (without verses missing) with two interpolations; the first being the story of the Good Thief (Lk 23:39-43), and the second being the lancing of Jesus’ side and the flow of blood and water (Jn 19:31-37). Thus, this Gospel lesson matches Severus’ homily with the exception of the Johannine interpolation.\(^{319}\) This second interpolation can be explained by the fact that the Great Church in Constantinople possessed the sacred Lance that had pierced Christ’s


\(^{318}\) *Patrologia Orientalis*, 29:1, 52; 37:1.

side, and this relic was venerated on Great Thursday and Great Friday mornings until noon in the Great Church.\textsuperscript{320}

We must look to Antioch for the origins of the reading of the Matthew Passion Story and the insertion of the Good Thief pericope, for both are in Severus’ \textit{Homily XXII}, and in the Antiochian sermons of John Chrysostom. Sebastià Janeras points out that John’s \textit{Homily LXXXVII on Matthew} clearly states that on Great Friday evening the Matthew Passion is read publicly, and not hidden from the world.\textsuperscript{321} In his three Great Friday sermons; \textit{On the Cross and the Thief I & II} and \textit{On the Cemetery and the Cross}; Chrysostom explains to his congregation why the Good Friday Synaxis is held in the cemetery church and not in one of the city churches. His explanation is that the Passion of Christ destroyed the power of death, and that Christ descended after his death to the underworld, where He liberated the just and brought them to Paradise. Thus He could indeed say to the Good Thief: \textit{Today you will be with me in Paradise} (Lk 23:43). The cemetery containing the graves of the faithful, many of whom are saints, is therefore a very good place to celebrate this victory over death.\textsuperscript{322} Given this emphasis of victory over death, and the opening of Paradise, the story of the Good Thief was a most useful pericope for reading and preaching. I propose that the story of the Good Thief was added to the Matthew Passion reading in Antioch, as evidenced by both Chrysostom’s

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{320} \textit{Ibid}, II, 73, 79.
\item \textsuperscript{321} Janeras, \textit{Le Vendredi-Saint dans la Tradition Liturgique Byzantine}, 350-351; Chrysostom, \textit{Homily on Matthew LXXXVII}, 1.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
and Severus’ homilies, and then in Constantinople the pericope on the sacred Lance was added as well to the Matthew Passion reading, due to the presence of that relic in the Great Church.

There are two homilies for Easter, *Numbers XXIII* and *XLIII*. Both mention the Prologue of John’s Gospel. This is the Gospel read on Easter morning in *HS #40*, but on Christmas in Rome as mentioned earlier. Closer to Antioch in Jerusalem this was the Gospel prescribed for the Sunday after Easter. In Burkitt’s *Syriac Lectionary* it is an alternate reading for Epiphany. The Prologue of John does not automatically lend itself to the celebration of Easter. It seems to have its origin as a Gospel for a new beginning; which in Antioch was Easter, in Mesopotamia on Epiphany, but in Rome the birth of Christ, and in Jerusalem the Sunday after Easter.

Severus noted on the first Sunday of Lent that Genesis was read during Lent. In this he agrees with Chrysostom who mentions the same custom. The same general custom is also found in Burkitt’s *Syriac Lectionary*. Ambrose of Milan mentions the

---

reading of both Genesis and Proverbs during Lent, which is what HS #40 calls for.\textsuperscript{330} The correspondence here between Severus and HS #40 is in the general custom, and not the specific lections for each day, since Severus does not give us this information. Finally, Severus’ sermon on Mid-Pentecost mentions the same Gospel as in HS #40 which is John 7:14.\textsuperscript{331} This is not surprising since the Gospel narrative takes place in the middle of the Hebraic Pentecost period.

These few days that the readings of Constantinople agree with Severus’ sermons are all ancient. Christmas entered the Antiochian Calendar around 375 AD as noted by Chrysostom, and it began to be celebrated in Constantinople by Gregory of Nazianzus in 380.\textsuperscript{332} It is worthy of note that both cities used the Gospel of the Magi, which would lead one to think that the lection went from Antioch, where it was already in place, to Constantinople. All of these readings that agree between the two cities could have been in place by the time of Chrysostom, and have traveled from Antioch to Constantinople around the latter part of the fourth century.

3.5.2 Gospel Cycles in Severus’ Sermons

In HS #40 the Gospel of Luke is read starting with the Seventeenth Sunday after Pentecost, which normally would be in September, but another rubric specifically calls

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Severus of Antioch, Homily XLVI, Patrologia Orientalis, 35:3; 287-307.}
\footnote{Talley, The Origins of the Liturgical Year, 137.}
\end{footnotes}
for it to start on September 23,\footnote{Mateos, Le Typicon, II, 91.} and it continues until the beginning of Lent. Matthew begins the day after Pentecost, and continues until the Luke cycle starts.\footnote{Ibid, II, 141-167.} In Severus’ sermons scattered evidence points to the Gospel of Luke beginning with the pre-Christmas preparation, and continuing through Great Lent. John is read during the Paschal Season, and Matthew after that time until the Pre-Christmas cycle starts. The major difference with HS #40 being that Mark is not read on Saturdays and Sundays during Lent, otherwise the basic idea is the same; to have course readings of three Gospels during the year although Matthew and Luke begin and end on different days than in HS #40, due to the absence of Mark during Lent.

3.5.2.1 A Matthew Cycle in Severus’ Sermons

There is evidence for a Matthew cycle during autumn in Severus’ homilies. In 515 he gave several sermons that can be approximately dated. Homily LXXIX on Matthew 15: 5-6, 11 follows Homily LXXVIII given on the Feasts of the Martyrs Tarachos, Probos and Andronicos given on Sunday September 6, 515, while after it is Homily LXXX, which was given on his anniversary of episcopal ordination, November 18, 515. Then Homily LXXXI on Matthew 17:24-27 was delivered, followed by Homily LXXXII on Matthew 18:1 (the next pericope in the Gospel). The next was Homily LXXXIII on Christmas.\footnote{Patrologia Orientalis, 29:1, 58.} From the year 516 Homily XCVIII is on Matthew 12:18-32. It is preceded

\footnote{Mateos, Le Typicon, II, 91.} \footnote{Ibid, II, 141-167.} \footnote{Patrologia Orientalis, 29:1, 58.}
by *Homily XCVII on St. Thecla* given on September 24, 516, and followed by *Homily XCIX* on his anniversary given on November 18, 516.\textsuperscript{336} Thus, there are sermons from two years in a row, that would indicate a Matthew cycle continuing in the autumn, but not beginning at that time for the lowest chapter number read is 12. The system was not necessarily that strict either, for Pascha was April 19 in 515 and on April 3 in 516.\textsuperscript{337} In a strict system *Sermon XCVIII* on Matthew 12 in October, 516 should have been on a higher chapter number than *Sermon LXXIX* on Matthew 15 in 515, for Pascha was earlier that year and not later.

There are sermons that do not harmonize with this hypothesis. *Sermon XXXIII* in October, 513 is on the Man Born Blind (John 9).\textsuperscript{338} In the current Eucharistic Lectionaries of the Syriac Churches (Syrian, Maronite, Chaldean, Syro-Malabar and Syro-Malankar) this pericope is read on the 6\textsuperscript{th} Sunday of Lent among the Syro-Malankars,\textsuperscript{339} both Catholic and Orthodox, and the Chaldeans read it the 9\textsuperscript{th} Sunday after Pentecost.\textsuperscript{340} The other Syriac Churches do not currently use it in the Eucharist. In Burkitt’s *Syriac Lectionary* it was read on the Sunday of Mid-Lent.\textsuperscript{341} When we look at the Sanctoral, as presented to us by Severus, the only saint’s day in October is Saints Sergius and Bacchus

\textsuperscript{336} Ibid, 29: 1, 60.

\textsuperscript{337} Ibid, 29: 1, 57, 59.

\textsuperscript{338} *Patrologia Orientalis*, 29: 1, 53.


\textsuperscript{340} Ibid, 535.

\textsuperscript{341} Burkitt, *The Early Syriac Lectionary System*, 6.
on October 1 (*Sermon LVII*). There is no apparent reason why this text was used in October; the actual pericope itself fared poorly in the subsequent Syriac Tradition only being used by the Chaldeans and the Church of the Syro-Malankars.

*Homily CXIII* delivered in November, 517 is on the Lucan Beatitudes (Lk 6:20-25). 342 In the present Syriac Lectionaries it is used by the Maronites and Syriacs (both West Syrian Traditions) on the feast of the 40 Martyrs of Sebastea on March 9; 343 on the 2nd Saturday of Lent among the Syriacs, 344 and the 3rd Sunday after Pentecost among the Chaldeans. 345 In the Sanctoral in Severus’ sermons, the Martyr Romanos is celebrated in November, as is the dedication of the Great Church of Antioch (*Homilies XXXV, LXXX, XCIX & CXII*). In HS#40 the Lucan Beatitudes are used in the commemoration of eremitical monks on October 21 (Hilarion), January 17 (Anthony) and May 23 (Symeon), thus this pericope has a different function in the Byzantine Tradition than the Syrian. 346 If this pericope was used for martyrs in general in the Syrian Tradition, then it could have been used for the Feast of the Martyr Romanos in November, or for another martyr unknown to us.

342 *Patrologia Orientalis*, 29: 1, 61.


345 Ibid, 532.


121
Sermon CIV on Matthew 22:15 was delivered in January, 517. This pericope on paying taxes to the emperor is not used in the modern Syriac mass Lectionaries, nor was it used in Burkitt’s ancient Syriac Lectionary. Severus’ sermons refer to the Monk Anthony and the Martyr Babylas as commemorated in January. The later and early Syriac traditions give us no clue as to why this pericope was used, and HS #40 places it on the 13th Saturday after Pentecost, which is also of no use in determining why this lection may have been read in January in Severus’ Antioch.

Finally, Homily CXXIV on Peter’s faith (Matthew 16:13) was preached in May, 518, which that year was before Pentecost Sunday. The present day Syriac, Maronite and Chaldeans use this pericope both for the first Sunday of November (the Dedication of the Church), and the Feast of Saints Peter and Paul on June 29. HS#40 also uses it for the dedication of a church and June 29. Burkitt’s Lectionary also uses it for the feast of Saints Peter and Paul held on the Tuesday after Easter. Severus’ Sanctoral for May included Saint Athanasius of Alexandria and Saint Thallelaios (Homilies #91 & 110),

---

347 *Patrologia Orientalis*, 29:1, 60.


349 Burkitt, *The Early Syriac Lectionary System*.


351 *Patrologia Orientalis*, 29: 1, 62.


which does not explain its use. Given this lection’s strong association with the
dedication of a church, and the memory of Peter and Paul, it would seem possible that
Severus used it for like purposes.

Of the four sermons that disrupt our proposition of a Matthew Cycle in Antioch,
we see that the Lucan Beatitudes (Lk 6:20-25) and Peter’s Profession of Faith (Mt 16:13)
have strong associations with particular occasions, being the celebration of the martyrs
(Lk), the dedication of a church (Mt), and the commemoration of the Chief Apostles
(Mt). The lection on paying taxes to the emperor (Mt 22:15) is an orphan forgotten in
the contemporary Syriac lectionaries, and the Healing of the Blind Man in John (Jn 9:1-
41) is used by the Chaldeans and Malankars only. It is important to note that the Gospel
of Mark does not figure in these exceptions, and that they occur in four different
months in three different seasons. This would lead one to think that these Gospels
were used by Severus to fit a specific occasion, and were not part of lectio continua.

3.5.2.2 A Luke Cycle in Severus’ Sermons

In *Homily IV* Severus mentions that the first chapter of the Gospel of Luke was
being read in the time before Christmas as was the custom.\(^{355}\) *Homily II* is on the
Annunciation. Montagna sees with these homilies a pre-Christmas season in Antioch
consisting of one Sunday dedicated to John the Baptist, and the second to the

Annunciation.\(^{356}\) He sees at least the Sunday of the Annunciation also present in Proclus of Constantinople in the fifth century, which was later moved to the fixed date of March 25.\(^ {357}\) Two pre-Nativity Sundays dedicated to the Forerunner and Theotokos makes sense from the standpoint of lectio continua of Luke, including the Vigil Liturgies of Christmas and Epiphany. It also helps to explain an oddity in the pre-Christmas Sundays of HS #40. The Second Sunday before Christmas has a specific Epistle (Colossians 3:4-11), but not a specific Gospel.\(^ {358}\) Did it lose its Gospel reading? The Antiochian Gospel for this Sunday is read on September 23 in Constantinople, which is called “New Year,” and is the beginning of the Luke Cycle in HS #40.\(^ {359}\) The pericope is Luke1:1-25, 76-77, 80 which covers the conception of John, and continues with Zachary’s prophecy that John will go before the Lord to prepare his way.\(^ {360}\) The Epistle for the Second Sunday before Christmas speaks of the appearance of the Lord. This is an appropriate pre-Christmas even pre-Epiphan Epistle reading, but that the Gospel would be left to chance is odd. The Sunday before Christmas is a tighter package based on Matthew’s Genealogy (Mt 1:1-25), and a reading from Hebrews (Heb 11:9-40) referring to the tribulations of the Old Testament Saints, some of whom were mentioned in the

---


\(^{357}\) Ibid, 101.

\(^{358}\) Mateos, Le Typicon, I, 135.

\(^{359}\) Ibid, II, 91.

\(^{360}\) Ibid, I, 319.
Genealogy and pointing forward to us. Matthew’s Gospel lends itself to only one Sunday before Christmas, unless one wants to focus on Joseph’s Dream (Mt 1:18-25), and thus make two lessons. So, why even note the Second Sunday before Christmas, unless this Sunday at another time in history had a special commemoration attached to it, as in Antioch, and the Epistle for this commemoration is still in place, even though the Gospel lection has disappeared? What we saw above with Leontius Presbyter of Constantinople would lead me to think that the second Sunday before Christmas was indeed originally dedicated to John the Baptist in Constantinople, as in Antioch.

Severus’ Homilies XXXVI and LXXXIII on Christmas mention the Lucan as well as the Matthean details of the story. Homily XXXVIII on Epiphany comments on the Lucan version of the baptism of Christ (Lk 3:21-22), and Homily CXVIII on the Repentant Woman (Lk 7:36) was given in January, 518 sometime after Epiphany. Homily LXXXIX for the 3rd or 4th Sunday of Lent is on the Good Samaritan (Lk 10:30). These homilies point to a Lucan Cycle of Gospels beginning before Christmas and continuing through Lent.

The one problem in this scenario is Homily CXX on the Matthean version of the Lunatic Son (Mt 17:14-21), which was given on the First Sunday of Lent. This is

361 Ibid, I, 137.
obviously not a Lucan pericope, but was it substituted for the Lucan version (Lk 9:37-43)? The Lucan version of this story says that Jesus cured the boy and gives no
pronouncement by Him (Lk 9:42). The Markan version of the story has a
pronouncement by Christ on the necessity of prayer (Mk 9:28) to expel the demon, and
the variant reading which was more common in the East said, “prayer and fasting.” In
the Matthew rendition, Christ speaks about lack of faith (Mt 17:20), and again in the
variant reading “prayer and fasting” is added. A lesson that mentions prayer and fasting
is more suitable for Lent than one that does not. Thus, I propose that the Matthean
version was substituted for the Lucan story by Severus’ time. If the Lucan version of the
story is inserted instead of Matthew, we see that the chapter numbers of the previous
sermon on the Repentant Women (Lk 7:36), the Lunatic Son (Lk 9:37) and the Good
Samaritan (Lk 10:30) follow in order.
TABLE 3.3
LUCAN READINGS IN SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date or Day</th>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sunday before Christmas</td>
<td>Luke 1</td>
<td>John the Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Sunday before Christmas</td>
<td>Luke 1</td>
<td>Annunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Vigil Liturgy</td>
<td>Luke 2</td>
<td>Lucan Nativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiphany Vigil Liturgy</td>
<td>Luke 3</td>
<td>Ministry of John the Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain Days</td>
<td>(Luke 4:1-7:35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A January Sunday</td>
<td>Luke 7:36-50</td>
<td>Repentant Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain Days</td>
<td>(Luke 8:1-9:36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain Days</td>
<td>(Luke 9:43-10:28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd or 4th Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>Luke 10:30-37</td>
<td>Good Samaritan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is evidence also from Constantinople for a Lucan cursus that began before Christmas, as noted above, and continued through Lent. Proclus of Constantinople’s Homily VIII on the Transfiguration of Christ clearly states that Luke was being read on different days:

> Come, friends, and let us today, without hesitation, touch on the treasures of the gospels, in order that we may from there, as is our custom, draw wealth, which is distributed in abundance, and is nowhere ever exhausted. Come to the all-wise one who guides us on our way, and let us again follow Luke.\(^ {366} \)

This Homily follows Homily VII On the holy Theophany, and precedes Homily IX On the Palm-Branches, thereby placing it sometime in the winter.\(^ {367} \) It should also be noted

---

\(^ {366} \) Barkhuizen, Proclus Bishop of Constantinople: Homilies, 141

\(^ {367} \) Ibid, 125-129; 149-153.
that in Leroy’s *Table des citations scripturaires* on Proclus’ Homilies, there are only three verses of Mark that are listed: 5:17; 11:14; 14:5. 81 verses are listed from Matthew, 53 from Luke and 81 from John. Barkhuizen in his indexes notes in the category of direct quotes there are in Proclus 38 from Matthew, only 1 from Mark, 28 from Luke and 43 from John. In a separate index of Scriptural Allusions he notes 95 from Matthew, 14 from Mark, 61 from Luke and 42 from John. Both scholars indicate a very scant use of Mark in Proclus’ sermons in the fifth century, but an abundant use of the other three Gospels. One could legitimately wonder if this did not reflect the Lectionary in use at that time.

There are two Kontakia by Romanos the Melodist that take place during Lent based on Lucan Gospel readings. They are *S.C. #28 on the Prodigal Son* (Lk 15:11-32) sung on the Second Sunday of Lent and *S.C. #30 on the Rich Man and Lazarus* (Lk 16:19-31) sung on the Sixth Wednesday of Lent. Any time that one of Romanos’ Kontakia does not match *HS #40* we should take note, since the majority of them do match the current lectionary system. This question was discussed in Chapter 1:5.

---


369 Ibid, 386-388.


The string that ties these bits of information together from Romanos and Severus, regarding Lenten Lucan Gospel readings, is the Jerusalem Evangeliary Sinai #210, as suggested by Alexis Kniazeff. Other scholars date this Gospel Book to A.D. 861/862 which is accepted by Bertonière.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday of Meat-fare</td>
<td>Luke 7:36-50</td>
<td>Story of the Sinful Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday of Cheese-fare</td>
<td>Matthew 6: 16-33</td>
<td>On Fasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>Luke 15:11-32</td>
<td>Parable of the Prodigal Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>Luke 18:9-14</td>
<td>Parable of the Pharisee and Publican</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This document agrees with the 5-eighth century Georgian Lectionary mentioned in Chapter 1, except for Meat Fare Sunday where the Georgian has Mt 6:34-7:21 (Do not judge), and the First Sunday of Lent where the Georgian has Lk 15:1-10 (Lost Sheep & Coin). In Sinai #210 the Parable of the Good Samaritan is on the Fourth Sunday of Lent.

373 Bertonière, The Sundays of Lent in the Triodion, 40.

matching Severus *Homily LXXXIX*, while the Parable of the Prodigal Son on the Second Sunday of Lent matches Romanos’ *Kontakion #28*, and the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus on the Fifth Sunday corresponds with Romanos *Kontakion #30* for the Sixth Wednesday of Lent. We thus see in the Jerusalem Gospel Book a series of Lucan Sunday Gospels for Lent that matches both Romanos and Severus. This indicates there was an early Antiochian tradition for the reading of Luke during Lent, which was later altered in Constantinople to Mark. If we look at *HS#40* we see the Lucan lessons for the Sundays of Lent in Jerusalem listed above are used either before Lent starts (The Prodigal Son and The Pharisee and Publican), or before Christmas (The Good Samaritan and The Rich Man and Lazarus).\(^{375}\) They are not forgotten or relegated to weekdays, nor are they kept in numerical order, but the order is different than that found in *Sinai #210*.

3.5.2.3 A Johannine Cycle in Severus’ Sermons

In Severus’ *Homilies* there are three sermons for the Paschal Season in the year 514 which comment on the Gospel of John. They are *XLIII* on the Prologue of John’s Gospel (John 1:1-17) given on Easter morning; *XLV* on Mary Magdalene (John 20:17) given after the Wednesday after Thomas Sunday, but before Mid-Pentecost, and *XLVI* on Mid-Pentecost (John 7:14).\(^{376}\) The other homilies in close proximity to these that do not mention the Gospel of John are: *XLIV* is on the faithful departed, and was given the

---


\(^{376}\) Brière, “Introduction Générale a toutes les Homélies,” 54-55.
second week of Pascha; XLVI is on the Ascension, and XLVII is on Pentecost. All of these omissions can be explained; for the commemoration faithful departed did not require a Johannine reference, the Ascension is in Luke-Acts (Lk 24:50-53 & Acts 1:6-12), and the Pentecost story is told in Acts (Acts 2:1-41).

So there are three references to readings from John during the 50 days of Pentecost. Did Antioch have a Johannine Cycle of readings for this season at the time of Severus? The answer is affirmative, when we look at the logic of the readings. Pascha morning begins the series with John 1. The Feast of Mid-Pentecost was seemingly produced by the course reading of John, for it is the only Gospel (Jn 7:14-31) that mentions this feast. Severus in his homily is also justifying the celebration of the day to the faithful, which means the feast was not self-evident to them. The homily on Mary Magdalene (XLV) falls on the Third or Fourth Sunday of Pascha. The Byzantine Tradition has on the Third Sunday of Pascha a commemoration in honor of her, and the other Myrrh Bearers, as well as Joseph of Arimathea, but using Mark’s Gospel for the Liturgy (Mk 15:43-16:8), and thereby breaking the Johannine series. Instead, in Severus, we find the Johannine Gospel that could be the equivalent to the Byzantine Markan lesson, or one focused only on Mary Magdalene, depending on where the pericope began and ended. The pericope itself is out of numerical order being higher in number than the reading of Mid-Pentecost (John 7), which would point to a special occasion as would the

---

377 Ibid, 54-55.
fact that the appearance to Mary Magdalene did not historically happen on the Third or Fourth Sunday of Pascha, but on Pascha itself. Thus Antioch might have had at that time something resembling the Byzantine Feast in honor of those who buried Christ, possibly focusing on Mary Magdalene, as does the Fourth Gospel’s resurrection narrative itself. For this day the Gospel of John was read, which means that in Severus’ time the Johannine series during the Paschal season was not broken. This fact combined with the others presented regarding the reading on Pascha morning and Mid-Pentecost, point to a Johannine cycle during the days of Pentecost in Antioch during Severus’ lifetime and possibly earlier.

There are two homilies about Johannine pericopes that do not fit this schema of a course reading of John during the days of Pentecost. The first is Homily XXXIII on the “Man Born Blind” which was given in October of 513. This sermon was discussed earlier, and despite its strong position in the Byzantine Lectionary on the Sixth Sunday of Pascha, it has become little used in the present day lectionaries of the Syriac speaking Churches, except the Syro-Malankars and Chaldeans. The second is Homily CXIX on the Wedding at Cana (John 2:1-12) given on the Sunday before Lent starts on February 25, 518. In the present day Syriac Churches, except for the Chaldeans, this is the pericope read on the Sunday that opens Lent, which is called Cana Sunday. The

---

380 Mateos, Le Typicon, II, 125. See the notes for 1.3.4.2.1.
appearance of this lection on the Sunday to open Lent indicates a trend in the Syriac Tradition away from the course reading of the Gospels, to one where each Sunday has a theme, and the readings are chosen for that theme, as evident in the present day lectionaries of these Churches.  

In HS #40 there is very clearly a Johannine Cycle of readings for the fifty days of Pentecost. It is only broken on Easter Tuesday to read the Emmaus story (Lk 24:21-35); the Third Sunday of Pascha in honor of Joseph of Arimathea and the Myrrh Bearers (Mk 15:43-16:8), and on Ascension Thursday (Lk 24: 36-53). Of these three exceptions the easiest to explain is Ascension Thursday since this story is not found in John’s Gospel, but in Luke-Acts. The reading of the Road to Emmaus on Tuesday copies the Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem; so somehow this day became the occasion to read this pericope from Luke’s Gospel in Constantinople as well.

The Third Sunday of Pascha presents another problem however, for the reading is from Mark (Mk 15:42-166:8), and not from John, and when we look at the Armenian Lectionary this lection from Mark is designated for Easter Sunday morning. How did it end up on the Third Sunday of Pascha in the Byzantine Tradition? A look at the Armenian Lectionary offers a possible solution. The Paschal Vigil Liturgy in Jerusalem


385 “Armenian Lectionary,” Wilkinson, Egeria’s Travels, 188.

386 Ibid.
had Matthew 28:1-20 as its Gospel reading as does HS #40.\textsuperscript{387} Immediately, after the Liturgy in the Martyrium, the bishop and faithful went to the Tomb in the Anastasis, and read John 19:38-20:18 (burial, empty tomb and appearance to Mary Magdalene), which was followed by the Eucharist.\textsuperscript{388} This second Paschal Night Eucharist has been interpreted by Talley as a special service in honor of the Myrrh Bearing Women and the empty Tomb, which seems logical given the sole reading for it is from John’s Gospel and its location at the Tomb.\textsuperscript{389} The next morning at dawn another liturgy was held in the Martyrium with the Markan version of the burial and empty tomb (Mk 15:42-16:8), thus repeating a special service in honor of the Myrrh Bearers. As the Jerusalem traditions began to spread to other Churches, they encountered established ones that may or may not be altered. The reading of John 1 in Constantinople and Antioch on Pascha morning, was too strong to move. The Emmaus story was able to enter the Easter Tuesday Liturgy in Constantinople, even though this day was dedicated to the Mother of God, and the Lucan pericope says nothing about her.\textsuperscript{390} The Sunday after Pascha is in honor of the Appearance to Thomas, and takes place on the Sunday that John’s Gospel indicates that it happened (Jn 20: 26).\textsuperscript{391} This left the Third Sunday of Pascha as the first available Sunday to use for a commemoration of Joseph of Arimathea and the Myrrh

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{387} The Armenian Lectionary, Wilkinson, Egeria’s Travels, 188. Mateos, Le Typicon, II, 191.
\textsuperscript{388} The Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem, Wilkinson, Egeria’s Travels, 181-194.
\textsuperscript{389} Talley, The Origins of the Liturgical Year, 54.
\textsuperscript{390} Mateos, Le Typicon, II, 101.
\textsuperscript{391} Ibid, II, 109.
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Bearers. We see in Constantinople the Hagiopolite Markan Gospel from Pascha morning being used at the Third Sunday Liturgy, and in Severus we see the Johannine reading from the second Eucharist held on Saturday night. Thus both Churches introduced a Sunday in honor of the Myrrh Bearers, but Antioch did not divert from the reading of John’s Gospel during the Paschal Season, whereas Constantinople did.

3.5.3 Summary of Severus and the Antiochian Tradition

*HS #40 and Severus’ Antiochian Tradition* shared the same Gospel readings for the Liturgies of Christmas, Epiphany, and Great Friday, Pascha morning and Mid-Pentecost. They also possibly shared the same Gospel lesson connected to both the dedication of a church and the memory of Saints Peter and Paul (Mt 16:13-20). Equally they shared the idea of the reading of Genesis during Lent. Van de Paverd says that only Genesis was read on weekdays of Lent in Antioch, because John Chrysostom in his three series of sermons on Lent never mentions Proverbs as having just been read to or heard by the assembly.⁹² Also, according to Chrysostom Genesis, not Exodus, was read during the first three days of Holy Week.⁹³ Chrysostom’s commentaries on Proverbs and Job are not in the form of sermons, but rather of notes for reading and some sections of the books are not commented on at all.⁹⁴ In his *Commentary on Job* Chrysostom never

---


⁹³ Ibid, 189.

connects the figure of the suffering Job to that of Christ. The fact that Chrysostom did not use Job and Proverbs for exegetical sermons, would support the conclusion that they were not read in church in his time, although they were considered part of the canon of Scripture in Antioch. As noted earlier Chrysostom also mentions the reading of Acts during the Easter Season. At an earlier time than HS #40 Constantinople and Antioch seemed to have shared the idea of reading only the Gospels of John, Matthew and Luke during the course of the church year and omitting Mark. Thus when Antiochian lectionary traditions were brought to Constantinople they included much more than the Gospel readings of a few feast days.

3.6 Conclusion to Chapter 3

In the Homilies of Proclus and Leontius there is clear evidence for an Old Testament reading in the early Byzantine Divine Liturgy. Both comment upon Old Testament and New Testament texts in the same sermon. Proclus’ Homily XXXVI: On the Brevity and Futility of Human Life is a good example. In this Homily the three readings from Micah, 1Timothy and Luke do not coordinate with each other, leading one to surmise that each book was being read as part of a lectio continua. Only the reading from 1Timothy suited the preacher’s purpose, but he felt obliged to mention the other readings of the day. Leontius’ Homily XIV on Matthew’s account of the

395 Ibid, 100.

Transfiguration also has an Old Testament Lection (1Kings 5:2-3), that does not relate to the Gospel of the day, yet is commented upon. This would indicate a series of simultaneous lectio continua of each Scriptural book within the same Liturgy as we saw with Proclus.

Much of this chapter was devoted to an analysis of the Lectionary as presented in the 125 Cathedral Sermons of Severus of Antioch (Patriarch from 512-518). In this investigation it was found that the Gospel Lectionary of Antioch at the time of Severus consisted of a Johannine cycle during the fifty days of Pentecost, followed by the reading of Matthew continuing into December. The Lucan cycle began two Sundays before Christmas, and went through the Sundays of Lent. Genesis was read on the weekdays of Lent, and the first three days of Holy Week as attested to by Saint John Chrysostom. The Gospel readings for the great dominical feasts of the year agreed with those used in Constantinople in HS#40.

The lectionary system of Antioch, as presented to us by Severus, agrees with the information for Constantinople that we found in the works of Proclus and Romanos the Melodist. The conclusion to be draw is that the two cities were sharing a common lectionary tradition, or at least strongly influencing each other in the 5th and early 6th centuries. This system has points of continuity with HS#40, but also noticeable differences especially the absence of the Gospel of Mark during Lent, and the books of Exodus, Proverbs and Job from the Lenten and Holy Week Vesper Liturgies.

Leontius presented information to us that was more in keeping with the traditions of HS#40. From his time onward (second half of the sixth century) the sources
agree more and more with the later Byzantine Lectionary system. How was the change made from the older Antiochian style tradition to what is found in the present day Byzantine Lectionary? The best way to explain the development is to see it as a series of additions and adjustments caused by them. There was no creation ex nihlo, but the older system was added to and adjusted accordingly. To the Lenten evening reading cycle of Genesis were added Proverbs, and Exodus replaced Genesis during Holy Week, and Job was added to Holy Week. The Gospel of Mark was inserted into Great Lent, which meant the Gospel of Luke had to be pushed back to make space. This in turn caused the time devoted to the reading of Matthew to be shortened, and the two Gospels ultimately ended with the same number of Sundays on which to be read. In this process the position of the Gospel of Luke in the tradition was weakened by two means. First, the Lucan readings for the two Sundays before Christmas were moved to the fixed dates of September 23, March 25 and June 24. Secondly, during the most famous times of the year a preference was given to the Gospel of Matthew. In HS#40 Luke is read on Christmas Eve, Theophany Eve (a relic of its former preeminence), and some Marian and sanctoral feasts, and “regular” Sundays. When more famous times of the year are approaching, such as the two Sundays before Lent, and the Sunday before Christmas, it is replaced by Matthew. The Lectionary continued to develop over the later centuries, but it did so within the new system created when Mark, Exodus, Proverbs and Job were added to the older Antiochian tradition. The dropping of the Old Testament lection from the Divine Liturgy was also a major alteration to the older Antiochian Tradition.
3.7 Conclusion for Chapters 1-3 – What we know and what is still to be discovered

In a lectionary each day and season is a tradition unto itself, and each reading and Psalm is also a tradition by itself. We have seen in this chapter that some days and readings remained the same over the centuries in Constantinople, and others changed. Most of the evidence examined had to do with Gospel readings and Old Testament lections for Lent and vigils. The Epistles were seldom mentioned in our sources, and showed great change over the years when they were mentioned as did the Psalms. In order to make some sense of all of this information I shall proceed in chronological fashion giving a summary for each era. The summary however will work in reverse order from the Chapters 1-3 which began with HS#40 (tenth century) and went backwards. Instead we shall begin at the fourth century and go forward. This will point out the questions that need to be answered as we deal with the witness of John Chrysostom himself.

3.7.1 The Fourth Century

The Liturgical Year and Calendar, as they existed at that time, traveled from Antioch to Constantinople where they were mixed with other traditions. The Scriptures in the Antiochian version, that will later become the Byzantine Imperial Text, traveled the same road, and eventually markings are made in their margins noting which readings to do for certain days. From John Chrysostom we know that Genesis was read during Lent, and the first three days of Holy Week, and the Acts of the Apostles during the 50 days of Pentecost. It still needs to be determined which lections were read on which days in his time. Also, we know from him that there were festal readings that
pertain to the various feasts, which also need to be determined. Gregory Nazianzus tells us that Christmas was introduced to the City around 380, and our evidence shows both cities read the story of the Magi for this feast. Chrysostom only comments on the Gospels of John and Matthew, and it will have to be investigated to see if his sermons for these two Gospels cover a full year meaning that they were the only Gospels read at that time in these Churches.397

3.7.2 Fifth Century

In the fifth century we had the testimony of Proclus of Constantinople (+446) - the first native son to be the bishop of the city (Appendix B). In his writings the Gospel of Luke is definitely present and seems to have been the catalyst for the development of a pre-Christmas and Christmas Seasons. There are two Sundays before Christmas; the first dedicated to John the Baptist and the second to the Annunciation to the Theotokos. After Christmas follows the Circumcision on January 1, and the Baptism of Christ on January 6, with special days for the Theotokos on December 26, Saint Stephen on December 27, and the Holy Innocents on December 29.

Pascha has attracted to itself some special days as well. Proclus gave sermons for Palm Sunday, Great Thursday, Great Friday and Thomas Sunday. Ascension Thursday follows 40 days later, and then Pentecost Sunday, which is followed by All Saints Sunday. There are also sermons for Saints Peter and Paul on June 29, and Andrew on November 30.

Proclus’ sermons usually comment upon the Gospel readings that are now part of the Byzantine Tradition. A lesser number of Epistles agree with the later Byzantine tradition. These are: Epiphany, Great Friday, Ascension, Pentecost, All Saints and Saints Peter and Paul. Proclus likes the Psalms and mentions them, but the ones sung in his day seldom match HS#40. One of the most marked features of his sermons is the strong presence of the Gospel of Luke.

3.7.3 500 to 550 AD

From the first half of the sixth century we have the Kontakia of Romanos the Melodist (Appendix D). We saw with his works two contradictory facts. First, there is great agreement between him and HS#40 regarding the fixed and moveable feasts, and these are now expanded to include two Sundays before Lent as well as the two before Christmas from the previous century. Lazarus Saturday has appeared and each day of Holy Week is observed. Theophany is followed by a day for John the Baptist (January 7), and Hypapante (February 2) has entered the Calendar completing the Lucan Christmas cycle. He also wrote Kontakia for some Saints like Demetrius (October 26) and Elijah (July 20).

Second, however, there is almost no agreement between his Kontakia for the Sundays and Wednesdays of Lent with HS#40. The same holds true for the Sundays and Wednesdays of the Paschal period. We noted especially here the strong presence of the Gospel of Luke during times when Mark and John are read according to HS#40.

In the same time frame is Severus of Antioch (patriarch from 512-518) (Appendix C). He was studied due to his witness to the Antiochian tradition, which was shared
with Constantinople in the fourth century and possibly later. His agreements with the Byzantine Tradition are few, but important. He states that Genesis is read during Lent, he comments on the same Good Friday Gospels as Chrysostom and other Byzantines, and he read the Prologue of John for Pascha. Severus observed Mid-Pentecost and two pre-Christmas Sundays from Luke’s Gospel, and Christmas and January 6 all with the same Gospel readings as Constantinople.

We found in his sermons evidence for the course reading of the Gospels of Matthew, Luke and John during the church year. Evidence was also found in our Byzantine sources for a similar type of distribution of the same three Gospels during the liturgical year. In Severus’ sermons, however, the auxiliary feasts added around Christmas, due to the influence of the Gospel of Luke, are not as fully developed as in Proclus’ sermons, or his sermons for these occasions are not preserved. Severus gives us a fuller picture of the Antiochian tradition, and its possible connections to Constantinople.

3.7.4 550 to 600 AD

In the second half of the sixth century we examined Leontius Presbyter of Constantinople (Appendix E). His fourteen sermons give a good picture of the liturgical calendar and lectionary of that time, for they are full of references to readings and Psalms, and often even mention what was done the day before at the Liturgy. The only drawback to his corpus is its brevity consisting of only 14 sermons.

One of the noticeable features of his sermons is the reading of Job during Holy Week. This custom is unique to Byzantium, and he is the first to mention it. Whenever
Leontius remarks on Sunday or Feast Day Gospels they agree with *HS#40*. Often the day before the Sunday or feast does not agree, however. His noting of Epistles, Prophetic readings and chants are often different than *HS#40*, with the major exception of Pascha where they agree well together. He has several Saturday and Sunday combinations that are still found in the Byzantine Tradition today, namely: Lazarus Saturday and Palm Sunday; Pascha Night and Morning; and the Saturday of the Dead with Pentecost Sunday.

In the second half of the sixth century we have evidence from Rome that the Byzantine Sunday Lenten Epistles from Hebrews were in place. Rome borrowed the one for the Fifth Sunday, and Chavasse was at a loss to explain its presence in the Roman lectionary as anything but an import from Constantinople, for it does not agree with the general theme of the other Roman Lenten Epistles.

3.7.5 600 to 800 AD

It is during the seventh and eighth centuries that the first surviving lectionaries of the Epistles, Gospels and Prophets were published. They agree completely with *HS#40* in regards to what is read. The text itself is the Imperial Byzantine version, and is very stable from lectionary to lectionary over the centuries. We see in these lectionaries evidence of a strong centralization of the Church’s liturgy. There is no variation except for the celebration of local saints. At a later historical period when musical notation is added to the books for the sake of chanting the lessons; that will be uniform as well.
With all this evidence for centralization there is no indication of when this work was done. All we have is the paleographical evidence of the manuscripts, which cannot be dated exactly.

The stable Byzantine lectionary tradition has several noticeable traits that set it off from its earlier versions. Proverbs is read in Lent in addition to Genesis, and Exodus during Holy Week with Job. Mark is read during Lent, and Matthew now begins after Pentecost Sunday and ends in September, and Luke begins at that time and goes until the beginning of Lent. There is a tendency to read the beginning and end of each book of Scripture, while missing things in-between, and sometimes to do this the reading is not that relevant to the celebration of the day. For example, the end of the Gospel of John is read on the Saturday of the Dead before Pentecost, and end of Job on Good Friday. Both days in the sermons of Leontius have readings from the same books that are more suited to the day being observed (the resurrection of Lazarus and the intercession of Job).

3.7.6 The Ninth Century

Janeras’ work shows that Scripture readings from Jerusalem entered Constantinople during the ninth century, but they were confined to Orthros and/or Pannychis by HS#40. This is the same period in history when the Studite reforms were

3.7.7 The Tenth Century

With the tenth century we arrive at HS\#40. In this Typicon we see the Byzantine Lectionary still in use today, except for the weekdays after Pentecost. These existed at that time, but were not included in the conservative Great Church tradition. There is continuity with the past and differences. In short, the continuity tends to be with the readings for the fixed and moveable feasts. The lack of continuity is shown on the weekdays and Sundays that are not feasts. With John Chrysostom we will explore the early history of this tradition and hopefully find strands of tradition that continued, and others that did not. Hopefully this will help us to understand the evolution of the Byzantine Rite and its Antiochian roots.
CHAPTER 4: 
THE PROVENANCE OF THE CHRYSOSTOM’S HOMILIES

4.1 Introduction

In approximately 855 AD, Patriarch Photius of Constantinople published his
*Bibl... descript the manuscripts located in his library. The book was frequently copied, and excerpts from it were used as introductions to ancient Christian and pre-Christian books during the Middle Ages. In this way his opinions on the homilies of John Chrysostom were propagated for centuries. Photius claims that once John became a bishop, he did not have time to extensively prepare his sermons and to edit them after they were given, but he would have had this time as a presbyter in Antioch. Thus, any sermon that is well prepared must come from Antioch, and those that are not so polished originated in Constantinople.

The fact, that Photius put forth such a theory, shows that even in his time the actual provenance of most of the sermons was unknown. They were passed down under the name of, “Our Father among the Saints, John Chrysostom Archbishop of
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Constantinople.” There was only an occasional reference in the title to indicate when or where they were given, and these indications were sometimes deleted in later manuscripts. ⁴⁰¹ So the homilies were often attributed to either of the two cities based on Photius’ idea.

Beginning in the sixteenth century, Photius’ proposal slowly came under scrutiny, and the homilies began to be reassigned to either city based on their contents as will be shown below. But, another dominant idea emerged which was that of chronology. This idea, like that of Photius, presupposed that Chrysostom had more time to preach as a presbyter than as a bishop. Therefore, the longer exegetical series must stem from Antioch, and the shorter ones from Constantinople. This presupposition often colored how the internal evidence of the homilies was interpreted. This idea was only overcome with time as will be shown.

In recent years, Wendy Mayer has challenged as too simplistic the categories that previous scholars used to separate the homilies between the two cities. They took for granted ideas and categories that are not as different or exclusive as often supposed. She urges caution, and says that assigning a homily to either city can only be done after the opposite city is excluded by evidence unique to one city. She also cautions that the large exegetical series were not delivered during one year or season, but are collections

of homilies given over several years. Her more cautious approach will be outlined below.\textsuperscript{402}

This chapter is important for this project. To determine the Lectionaries of Antioch and of Constantinople it is essential that the homilies be divided between the two cities. If a homily cannot be assigned to either place, it must be used only with caution in the process of gathering liturgical data. The chronology or year of the homilies is not that important to the project, but their place in the liturgical year is crucial.

4.2 Traditional Consensus Regarding Provenance

4.2.1 Scholars Who Worked on the Topic

The confessional conflicts and polemics of the Reformation and Counter-reformation Eras created much interest in the works of Chrysostom, who was called upon to bolster the arguments of both sides. In particular, the Greek text came to the foreground, because both Catholics and Protestants accused each other of badly translating the Greek into Latin to suite their own purposes. In this way projects were begun to publish the Greek text, whereas the Latin version was already in circulation.\textsuperscript{403} Sir Henry Savile (+1622) of England published Chrysostom’s Greek works in eight

\textsuperscript{402} Ibid, Chapters 3 & 4.

volumes in 1613 at his own expense. He followed the criteria of Photius, and thus attributed the polished homilies to Antioch, and the less refined ones to Constantinople.

After Savile, the scholars began to move away from Photius’ opinion, and looked for internal evidence in the homilies, and data from history in order to date and place the homilies. Louis Sébastian LeNain de Tillemont (+1698), a historian of the Early Church, painstakingly assembled all the documentation known at the time relating to this subject in 22 volumes. He was very much appreciated by Edward Gibbon who quotes him 250 times, which makes him Gibbon’s largest secondary source. Tillemont started assigning the homilies to the two cities, and came up with a partial chronology, but there were series such as Romans that he admitted he could not place in time or space.

Bernard de Montfaucon OSB (+1762) had great influence on the texts used for future Chrysostom studies by publishing 13 volumes in Greek in Paris from 1718 to 1738, using Savile’s edition as a control. Montfaucon was in turn edited by Theobald Fix and republished from 1834 to 1839 and, most importantly, they were edited and
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republished by Migne in 1863. Migne’s edition is now used as the standard in patristic studies. Montfaucon gives chronology precedence over provenance, and looks for connections between homilies.

Jean Stilting (+1762) was most interested in chronology, but he did divide the homilies between Antioch and Constantinople. Similarly, Gerhard Rauschen (+1917) was concerned with chronology. He saw Chrysostom’s first year homilies as brief, because the preacher yielded his place to the bishop. Hans Lietzmann (+1942) was able to summarize the discussions of two centuries in one article in 1916. Max von Bonsdorff (+1967) was most concerned with the chronology of the first two years of John in both Antioch and Constantinople. His methods and assumptions affected the scholars who came after him. Mayer sees Chrysostomos Baur (+1962) as the standard reference work on Chrysostom, but in her estimation he used minimal evidence to date and place the homilies. These scholars over time came to a general consensus on the
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provenance of the homilies, but it is not absolutely unanimous. Mayer summarizes their findings in tables on provenance and chronology in her book.\footnote{Mayer, \textit{The Homilies of St John Chrysostom – Provenance}, 255-270.}

4.2.2 Criteria Used to Determine Provenance

Chapter 2 of Mayer’s book gives the criteria that various scholars used to place the homilies. They are briefly described here, so as to show how the traditional consensus came about. Some of the sermons have information regarding date and place in the titles.\footnote{Ibid, 278.} There are references to the personal status of Chrysostom as either a bishop or presbyter in some sermons. There are also some indirect references to John’s personal status in sermons, where the bishop is referred to as being another person other than the preacher or the author says he sits on a throne.\footnote{Ibid, 279-289.} The city of Antioch is referred to directly only once in \textit{In Cor. homilia 21}, but there are descriptions of features or history of both Antioch and Constantinople in some sermons.\footnote{Ibid, 289-302.} Part of the references to the cities refers to ethnic groups living in the city and languages, such as Syriac, spoken in the city or in nearby areas.\footnote{Ibid, 302-4.} Geographical references are made to nearby locations and landscape features as well as native vegetation.\footnote{Ibid, 305-7.} Both cities had monks, but Chrysostom’s references to those of Antioch tend to be positive, and the remarks on
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Constantinople’ monks, led by Isaac, are generally negative. Antioch also had monks living on the nearby mountains. The Olympic Games were banned in Constantinople in 393 AD, but were still held in Antioch. There are also references to the liturgies of the cities. This liturgical data needs to be taken with the greatest caution, for the past scholars did not have the benefit of Van de Paverd’s magisterial works on liturgy at the time of Chrysostom, and if homilies are ascribed to the wrong cities, then the conclusions draw from them regarding the liturgy of the city are faulty as well.

The final category that Mayer describes is famous people and events. These include the eunuch Eutropius, the imperial family, the monk Julianus Sabas and the plot against the Emperor Valens in 372 AD. There are also mentions of the riots in Antioch in 387 AD, various wars or wars in general, and the visit of Julian the Apostate to Antioch in 361-2 AD. The general consensus, built upon these criteria, for the large exegetical series is given in Table 4.1. Tables listing the general consensus for most of Chrysostom’s homilies are given by Mayer in her book.
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TABLE 4.1
TRADITIONAL CONSENSUS OF PROVENANCE OF EXEGETICAL SERIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antioch</th>
<th>Constantinople</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homiliae in Genesim I-LXVII</td>
<td>In Acta apostolorum homiliae I-LV (XLI-possibly A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermo in Genesim I-IX</td>
<td>In Philippenses homiliae I-XV (I &amp; XV – possibly A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Matt. homiliae I-XC</td>
<td>In Colossenses Homiliae I-XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Ioh. homiliae I-LXXXVIII</td>
<td>In 1 Thess. homiliae I-XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Rom. homiliae I-XXXII (VIII &amp; XXIX – possibly CP)</td>
<td>In 2 Thess. homiliae I-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 1 Cor. homiliae I-XLIV</td>
<td>In Heb. Homiliae I-XXXIV (XIV – possibly A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2 Cor. homiliae I-XXX (XXVI – possibly CP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Eph. homiliae I-XXIV (IX, XI &amp; XXI – possibly CP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 1 Tim. homiliae I-XVIII (VIII – possibly CP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2 Tim. homiliae I-X (IV – possibly CP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Titum homiliae I-VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Wendy Mayer’s Challenge

Mayer’s Chapter Three questions the validity of the criteria described above. Regarding the titles on the homilies, she notes that they were sometimes changed from one manuscript to another. She gives four criteria for determining the validity of the titles, with the content of the homilies being the most important and controlling factor in forming a judgment. These criteria are as follows: First, if the title and the contents of the homily are in accord then the title is valid. Second, if the title and the contents of
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the homily are not in agreement; then precedence is given to the data of the homily over that of the title. Third, if the data of the title and homily are independent, but not conflicting, then the title is probably reliable. Finally, if the title information is open to interpretation, and the contents of the homily offer inadequate information, then a judgment should be avoided.430

Much of the criteria have to do with Chrysostom’s personal status as a priest or bishop, and how he is related to other speakers who are present. Mayer notes that presbyters also sat on thrones, as did bishops, and both have authority (προστασία) in the Church. Even Chrysostom’s separation of the roles of presbyter and bishop are not clear in his book De sacerdotio. The bishop preached last in Jerusalem and Antioch, but we are not certain of this custom in Constantinople. Finally, we do not know enough about the duties of bishops and presbyters in both Constantinople and Antioch to make judgments about their work loads, and who was busier than the other.431 On the positive side, Chrysostom reserved the title “common father/teacher/shepherd” to the bishop. “Teacher” refers to a homilist of different status than John, but “common fathers” is used in more than one way by Chrysostom.432

When referring to Antioch or Constantinople, one has to discern whether or not John is speaking about where he is at the present moment, or about another place known to his congregation, or from his own past history. Often the imperial exempla are

430 Ibid, 321.
432 Ibid, 341, 344-5, 349.
too vague to refer absolutely to Constantinople, especially considering that Antioch was an imperial residence until 378. Both cities moved the bodies of saints from one location to another, and extra-urban burial sites were known to both. Imperial officials were found in both cities, and both had the buildings and features of a typical imperial Roman city such as baths. There was Syriac speaking people in both cities as well as Jews.\textsuperscript{433} To cross the sea, however, means one is in Constantinople, and to cross the river in Antioch. Antioch had a 45 day Olympiad, so when Olympics are referred to as being a local event then Antioch is the place, for they were no longer held in Constantinople.\textsuperscript{434}

Chrysostom's terminology is vague when referring to heresies and sometimes a “heresy” is really a schism; so placing homilies based on heresies is risky.\textsuperscript{435} Monasticism is not as clearly defined between the two cities as is commonly portrayed; both probably had urban and rural monks. It is acknowledged that monks were generally referred to in a positive way in Antioch and in a negative way in Constantinople.\textsuperscript{436} When the famous monk Julianus Sabas is mentioned, it has to be ascertained whether or not the congregation actually met him (Antioch), or only heard of him.\textsuperscript{437}

Some imperial exempla are certain such as Eutropius being a eunuch. J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz reminds us that many imperial officials suffered disgrace, and therefore an

\textsuperscript{433} Ibid, 372-406.
\textsuperscript{434} Ibid, 435, 438.
\textsuperscript{435} Ibid, 413.
\textsuperscript{436} Ibid, 428, 432, 434, 435.
\textsuperscript{437} Ibid, 458.
anonymous official who fell from favor cannot automatically assumed to be Eutropius.\textsuperscript{438} The Emperor Arcadius had difficulties with almost continuous wars, but it must be remembered that the Emperor Theodosius had trouble with wars as well from 386-394 AD, which was during the time of John’s ministry.\textsuperscript{439} The plot against the Emperor Valens in 372 AD could be referred to in a remote manner, even in Antioch where it occurred, due to the passage of time.\textsuperscript{440} The description of the events surrounding Julian the Apostate’s time in Antioch in 361-2 AD in \textit{De laudibus s. Pauli homilia} 4 are seen by Mayer as definitely originating in Antioch.\textsuperscript{441}

In the charts at the end of Chapter 3 Mayer lists the criteria as valid, uncertain or invalid thus summarizing the chapter.\textsuperscript{442} The criteria that have been used to identify the provenance of homilies are listed in Table 16, and each type of evidence is broken into three categories of valid, uncertain and invalid depending on the contents of the homilies.\textsuperscript{443} First, manuscript titles are considered invalid if there is nothing in the homily to support the title. Second, references to the personal status of Chrysostom are considered invalid if the episcopal or presbyteral offices are discussed in general and not applied directly to the speaker. Third, when features of a city are mentioned, unless


\textsuperscript{439} Mayer, \textit{The Homilies of St John Chrysostom – Provenance}, 450-1.

\textsuperscript{440} Ibid, 459.

\textsuperscript{441} Ibid, 462.

\textsuperscript{442} Ibid, 465-8.

\textsuperscript{443} Ibid, 467-8.
they can be definitely tied to either Constantinople or Antioch, they are not valid for identification. For example imperial exempla were common to both Antioch, a former imperial residence, and Constantinople and both cities moved the bodies of martyrs. Fourth, demography, there were Anomoeans and Jews in both cities. Fifth, geographical information is invalid if it is not clearly tied to the present location of the preacher and congregation, but mentioned in a factual way or a general list of locations. Sixth, references to monks in a non-specific way are not a valid indication of a city for monks were everywhere. Seventh, the Olympic games must be referred to as local, and not in general, to be Antioch. When it comes to liturgy Mayer considers references to the frequency of preaching or gatherings as invalid. Finally, when recent historical events are mentioned they must be directly tied to the location to be valid. Mayer’s Table 17 applies these criteria to various homilies. When several criteria apply to one homily it is listed as of certain provenance. When no criteria can definitely be tied to a homily it is listed as uncertain.444

4.4 Exegetical Series of Biblical Books

4.4.1 Mayer on Exegetical Series of Homilies

The most important challenge to the provenance of the exegetical series is the question of whether or not they were actually given as a continuous series, or were made into a series at a later date by an editor. Mayer refers to this in passing several

444 Ibid, 469-73.
times, but does not dwell on the topic, since she and Pauline Allen dealt with it in earlier articles on *ad Philippenses*, *ad Colossenses* and *Hebrews*.\(^{445}\) Their article on *ad Colossenses* points out that there are several series of Chrysostom homilies that were put together at a later date by editors, and therefore were not delivered in succession.\(^{446}\) They also point out, that often one of the larger exegetical series is placed at either Antioch or Constantinople based on only one reference found in only one homily.\(^{447}\) They then proceed to call into question the unity of the larger series by starting with *ad Colossenses*. They show that *Homily VII* is from Antioch, and *Numbers VIII* and *X* may possibly be from Antioch, while *Homily III* is definitely from Constantinople, and possibly *Number IX* as well.\(^{448}\) Thus, *ad Colossenses* was not originally a series preached in succession, but one collected and created at a later date by an editor. *Ad Philippenses* yields no definite data that can ascribe any homily to either city.\(^{449}\) The series is actually a combination of sub-series consisting of *Homilies I & II, IV-VI* and *VII-X* on connected series of verses.\(^{450}\) Only *Numbers VI & VII* show evidence


\(^{447}\) Ibid, 23.

\(^{448}\) Ibid, 334-5, 337, 339 & 342.


\(^{450}\) Ibid, 278.
of being delivered in succession to the same audience, and possibly *Homilies I & IX* as well.\footnote{Ibid, 284.} Their article on *Hebrews* places *Homilies IV, X, XIV* and possibly *XVII* from Antioch, while *Number XIII* is from Constantinople.\footnote{Allen & Mayer, “The Thirty-four Homilies on Hebrews,” 334-5, 337, 339 & 342.} By showing that these three exegetical series were not preached as a continuous series of homilies, and only collected and edited as such at a later date; they throw into doubt that some of the other large exegetical series were ever preached in succession as well.

4.4.2 Other Scholars on the Exegetical Series of *Homilies*

Some suspicions were raised about the larger exegetical series of homilies even before Allen and Mayer. Chrysostomos Baur is of the opinion that the exegetical series are actually compositions in the form of homilies, or at least they were revised for publication after being delivered.\footnote{Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time, Volume 1*, 200-2, 222.} Harkins comes to a similar conclusion, when he states that there are two manuscript families of the *Commentary on John*. Family A is rougher and more personal, and most likely the original tradition. Family B was created when the rougher material was rewritten to make it more polished, and some additions were made to the text.\footnote{Harkins, “The Text Tradition of Chrysostom’s Commentary on John,” 412.} The implication of Harkins’ findings does support Baur’s idea of revision of homilies for publication, and they could also support the idea of collecting the homilies together as a series at a later date. The rewriting would help to form the homilies from different origins into a unified whole.
Marie-Émile Boismard concurs that there are two manuscript recensions regarding the *Commentary on John*. The Long Recension is present in a number of Greek manuscripts dating from the 9th through the 11th centuries. The earliest copy of the Long Recension is in a Syriac manuscript of the 6th-7th centuries in the London British Library (#14561). Obviously, the longer recension predates this Syriac manuscript. The Shorter Recension was examined in two manuscripts of the tenth century; one from the Vatican Library Palatine Collection 32, and the other from Mt Athos Koutloumos Monastery 32. In the Shorter Recension, the individual sections are entitled as “Treatise” not as “Homilia.” In the Long Recension, the scripture quotations are often from the Antiochian Text, whereas in the Shorter Recension they are from the Byzantine Text.

Boismard continues and notes that the Shorter Recension Commentary is actually made up of two sources; one which is an actual commentary on John and the other is homiletic material, that was later grafted on to the commentary by an editor. He notes that the scripture quotes in the commentary are from Antiochian text, and those of the homiletic material from the Byzantine.

The ultimate conclusion of Boismard is that the compiler of the *Commentary on John* was a student of Diodorus of Tarsus, who saved his condemned master’s commentary on John by combining it with homiletic material of Chrysostom. This conclusion is based on the premise that the source of the material of the commentary

---


sections is different from that of the homiletic sections, and that in Constantinople Chrysostom would have used the Byzantine Text for his homilies, and that in Antioch the Antiochian, as would have Diodorus of Tarsus.\textsuperscript{457} I disagree with this opinion, regarding the use of textual traditions, since the evidence points to the initial use of the Antiochian Text in Constantinople as noted in Chapter One. The difference in scriptural text types could definitely support the idea of two sources being conflated together, and in the homiletic one the scriptural quotations were made to conform to the version known by the editor of that particular source. These considerations mean that the \textit{Commentary on John} will have to be used with some caution for this project. Sometimes the homiletic material will be separated from the commentary proper, for the two may have originally been delivered on different occasions, even if both are from John Chrysostom.

Chrysostom’s \textit{Homilies on Acts} were handed down in three different recensions. Like the \textit{Commentary on John} there are rough and polished versions, and in addition there is a third composite version that is a combination of the first two. The \textit{editio princeps} of the homilies in Greek was produced by Hieronymus Commelin in 1603, and is based on the mixed tradition. This was largely reprinted by Montfaucon and Fix.\textsuperscript{458} The rough text is the original, which survives in 12 manuscripts, and the polished text is a

\textsuperscript{457} Ibid, 174-175.

Francis Gignac outlines eight general categories of the corrections made by the later editor of the rough version to produce the polished one. Some of the changes were made for the sake of style, others were made because the editor did not always understand Chrysostom, and wanted to make sense of the material. Sometimes the editor wanted to enhance the presentation of a certain character in the narrative, or cover over unseemly details, and finally there were expansions of the sermonizing material. Sometimes the smooth version of a sermon may be 17% longer than the rough one. Gignac calls for a new critical edition of the homilies based on the rougher version, but it has not yet appeared to my knowledge. Gignac’s observations on the three versions of the Homilies on Acts call for some caution when reading the homilies. He does not mention any circumstances wherein material was removed from the homilies. The addition of material could cause problems, if the added material is being used to determine the provenance of a particular homily, or other important information.

With these considerations it will be necessary to be very cautious in using some of the larger exegetical series. Only homilies of certain provenance according to Mayer, and the scholars to be discussed below, may be accepted as such. Other homilies may be related to them, however. Also, homilies can be related to each other to form small series within a larger set, thus giving evidence of homilies delivered at several liturgies in

---
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succession. Homilies from the larger series that speak of the same scripture passages as other homilies may be used in tandem with them.

4.5 Wendy Mayer’s More Cautious Approach

Mayer accepts the different categories of evidence that are described above, such as personal information about John Chrysostom, the description of historical events and people and descriptions of Antioch and Constantinople. Her new position compared to previous scholars is how this evidence is understood, assessed and interpreted. She proposes that the data of each homily be examined on its own, and not be colored by ideas of chronology, or data from other homilies in the same series. In fact, the internal data of the homily must always have priority over other considerations.\textsuperscript{461} Her method also includes not necessarily taking the data at face value. She points out that a homily by nature is directed to a specific end and this colors its content. Rhetoric is also a factor in homilies. Exempla are from a common usage with a life of their own. Rhetorical forms such as psogos (invective) and encomium (praise) and hyperbole also influence the contents of a sermon. Finally, she mentions perspective as a factor that influences homilies and their contents. There is the perspective of the preacher, the society and the faction of Christianity to which the preacher and congregation belonged.\textsuperscript{462} All of these factors must be taken into consideration when examining the information taken from the homilies.

\textsuperscript{461} Mayer, \textit{The Homilies of St John Chrysostom – Provenance}, 477-480.

\textsuperscript{462} Ibid, 480-5.
Mayer’s method prioritizes internal data over all other factors, and provenance over chronology. Her method for evaluating the provenance of the homilies is set out in this quote:

First-Set out all of the evidence which may be indicative of provenance within the homily.
Second-Assess each item for validity.
Third-Discard those that are patently invalid.
Fourth-Carefully assess the relative weight of the remaining items.
Fifth-Determine whether any are ostensibly in conflict.
6 A.1 If there is no conflict, determine whether there is a heavier weighting in one direction.
6. A.2 Assess the degree of certainty and draw a conclusion.
6. B.1 If there is a conflict, determine whether there is a heavier weighting in one direction.
6. B.2 If there is a heavier weighting, then re-examine the evidence for the other direction to see if there are invalid assumptions. Also assess for validity of assumption the evidence which appears to take priority.
6. B.3 If necessary, realign the weightings.
6. B.4 When satisfied that exploration of the data cannot be carried any further, assess the degree of certainty and draw a conclusion.
Seventh-Hold ambiguous data in reserve.
Eighth-When a new criterion is developed, or an assumption verified or dismissed, re-examine the ambiguous data to see whether the ambiguity is resolved in any instance.
Ninth-In instances where ambiguity is removed and the data takes on a particular weighting, go back to those homilies which contain the data and repeat steps 5-6.\textsuperscript{463}

The result of Mayer’s method is a limited list of homilies that are of certain provenance given in Table 4.2. She states that she did not examine all of Chrysostom’s homilies in detail and that the list will increase as further investigations are carried out.\textsuperscript{464}

\textsuperscript{463} Ibid, 488.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antioch</th>
<th>Constantinople</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Cum presbyter fuit ordinatus</em></td>
<td><em>Contra Anomoeos homilia XI</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De incomprehensibili dei natura homiliae I &amp; II</em></td>
<td><em>De Christi divinitate</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De beato Philogonio</em></td>
<td><em>De s. Phoca</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Adversus Iudaeos or. I, V &amp; VI</em></td>
<td><em>In Eutropium</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In kalendas</em></td>
<td><em>In Acta apost. homilia IX</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De statuis homiliae II, III, V, VI, XIV, XV, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI</em></td>
<td><em>In Colossenses homiliae II &amp; III</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De s. pentecoste homilia I</em></td>
<td><em>Homilia Dicta postquam reliquiae mart.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De laudibus s. Pauli homilia IV</em></td>
<td><em>Homilia Dicta praesente imperatore</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De s. Meletio</em></td>
<td><em>Contra ludos et theatra</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De s. Babyla</em></td>
<td><em>In illud: Messis quidem multa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In s. Ignatium</em></td>
<td><em>In martyrres omnes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In s. Eustathium</em></td>
<td><em>Adversus eos qui non adfuerant</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De ss. Martyribus</em></td>
<td><em>De studio praesentium</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In s. Iulianum martyrem</em></td>
<td><em>Adversus catharos</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In principium Actorum homiliae I &amp; II</em></td>
<td><em>Homilia Dicta in templo s. Anastasiae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De eleemosyna</em></td>
<td><em>Homilia Dicta postquam presbyter Gothus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In illud: In faciem ei restiti</em></td>
<td><em>In illud: Pater meus usque modo operatur</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Laus Diodori</em></td>
<td><em>In illud: Filius ex se nihil facit</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sermo I &amp; VIII in Genesim</em></td>
<td><em>De Eleazar et septem pueros</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In Matt. homilia VII</em></td>
<td><em>In illud: Quia quod stultum est dei</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In Ioh. homiliae XII/XI</em></td>
<td><em>In martyrres omnes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In 1 Cor. homilia XXI</em></td>
<td><em>In Eph. homilia XI</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In Colossenses homilia VII</em></td>
<td><em>In Heb. homilia XIII</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In Heb. homilia 14</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De paenitentia homilia V</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In diem natalem</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In ascensionem</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

464 Ibid, 510.
4.6 The Work of Frans Van de Paverd

Frans Van de Paverd’s book on the *Homilies on the Statues* does a masterful job of tying together the contents of the homilies and their historical background.\(^{466}\) The result is a very secure location of the homilies in both time and space at Antioch in the year 387. He also relates the homilies one to another thus assuring the reader that the entire corpus belongs together.\(^ {467}\) He further relates the corpus to the sermon *Nuper dictorum* (*Ad illuminandos Cat. II*).\(^ {468}\) Mayer on the other hand omits from *De statuis* numbers 1, 4, 7-13 and 16 as being of insecure provenance thus implicitly questioning their inclusion in the group.\(^ {469}\) She also does not acknowledge *Nuper dictorum* to be of certain provenance.\(^ {470}\) Because of the scholarship in his book, I am accepting Van de

\(^{466}\) Van de Paverd, *St. John Chrysostom, the Homilies on the Statues: An Introduction*.

\(^{467}\) Ibid, this is summarized in the chart on pages 363-4.

\(^{468}\) Ibid, 230.


\(^{470}\) Ibid, 511-2.
Paverd’s conclusions over those of Mayer, when it comes to *De statuis* and the one additional sermon that he relates to this series. In addition, I consider Van de Paverd’s work a type of anchor and any homilies that can be securely tied to *De statuis* will also be accepted as from Antioch. Furthermore, in Chapter 5 on Antioch, Van de Paverd’s dating of the *Homilies on the Statues* and their rearrangement in order will be followed due to the evidence presented in his book.\footnote{Van de Paverd, *St. John Chrysostom, the Homilies on the Statues: An Introduction*, 290-358.}

4.7 The Work of Robert C. Hill

Hill has translated and studied the works of the Antiochian Fathers on the Old Testament, from the time of the First Council of Nicaea (325 AD) until the Council of Chalcedon (451 AD). These include all of the works of Chrysostom on this subject,\footnote{Robert Charles Hill, *Of Prophets and Poets: Antioch Fathers on the Bible* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2007). The list of his translations is on pages 11-12 of this book. Also: Robert Charles Hill, *Reading the Old Testament in Antioch* (The Bible in Ancient Christianity, Volume 5. Leiden: Brill, 2005).} which number over 150.\footnote{Robert Charles Hill, “St. John Chrysostom: Preacher on the Old Testament,” *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 46:3-4 (2001), 267.} Because Hill is both a translator and a scholar, specializing in the Antiochian Fathers; I am taking very seriously his observations as to the time and place of Chrysostom’s Old Testament works, and their relationship to each other and Chrysostom’s other homilies.\footnote{A list of his articles, as of 2007, can be found on pages 165-167 of: *Of Prophets and Poets: Antioch Fathers on the Bible*.} These are presented below and they will form part of our list of the homilies of John that are of certain provenance.
4.7.1 The Homilies given before On the Statues (Antioch, Lent in 387)

The two homilies, On the Obscurity of the Old Testament, were given in Antioch on two days close together, for John refers in the Second Homily to the one given the “other day (πρώην).” They were followed by the series of three homilies called De diabolo tentatore of which Homily I refers back to On the Obscurity of the Old Testament. The six Homilies on Isaiah 6, called Vidi Dominum, stem from Antioch. Hill sees Homilies II, III, V and VI as part of a series with Homily VI referring to the approaching Lent. Homily IV refers to the summery weather rather extensively, and King Uzziah’s death, which had not been mentioned in Homily III. Homily II refers to themes of the previous homily that are not found in Homily I. There were then at least two occasions when Isaiah 6:1 was publically read in Antioch; one in the winter before Lent and the other during the summer.

Homily I appears to have been preached on the feast day of a martyr. Chrysostom refers to the people having enthusiastically kept an all-night vigil, which

---
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matches the description of how martyrs’ days were celebrated at that time. They also ask forgiveness of their sins in Psalms which could refer to the Antiochian usage of Psalm 140 for Vespers and Psalm 62 for Matins. He also refers to the celebration of the Word and Eucharist. He reminds them that they sang Psalm 2:11 (Serve the Lord with fear; with trembling bow down in homage) and that they should pay attention to what they sang, and worship in fear and trembling. It is in the context of this Psalm that he introduces his comments on Isaiah 6:1, and they are an appeal for good and reverent behavior in church.

4.7.2 The Homilies given in conjunction with those On the Statues

Hill sees the Three Homilies on David and Saul as given after Homily XX on the Statues. The basis for this decision is: that in Homily I, the Preacher refers to the fact that he had preached on the subject of oaths very extensively, which is one of the main themes of On the Statues including Homily XX. Chrysostom also mentions that the


485 Ibid, 50.

486 Ibid, 51-54.


Parable of the Merciful Master (Matthew 18:23-35) had just been read to the congregation the other day (πρώην), and this parable was the subject of Homily XX on the Statues. 489 Van de Paverd places Homily XX on the Sixth Friday of Lent, April 9. 490 The Three Homilies On David and Saul focus on the clemency (ἐπιείκεια) and gentleness (πραότης) and forbearance (ἀνεξικακία) of David, which Hill sees as an appeal to Constantinople for clemency for the recent transgression against the imperial majesty. 491 I think that another interpretation of the purpose of the homilies could be that Chrysostom was trying to prove to his audience that imperial clemency would be a show of strength, and not of weakness. The same virtue of clemency could also be practiced by any person whose enemy falls under his/her power. 492 Following Hill, I accept that the Three Homilies on David and Saul were given shortly after Homily XX on the Statues, and I accept Van de Paverd’s dating of that homily to the Sixth Friday of Lent, 387.

4.7.3 The Homilies given after those On the Statues

The Five Homilies on Hannah were delivered before and after Pentecost Sunday in 387, beginning on June 7, which was two days before the Feast of the Ascension. 493 There is one homily missing after Homily III, because Homily IV talks about the second half of the first verse of Hannah’s prayer (1 Samuel 2:1), saying that the first part of the

489 Ibid, 10.

490 Van de Paverd, St. John Chrysostom, the Homilies on the Statues: An Introduction, 364.


verse had already been explained.\textsuperscript{494} This is not done in \textit{Homily III}. \textit{Homily IV} says that the Feast of Pentecost will be tomorrow,\textsuperscript{495} and \textit{Homily Five} says that Pentecost has now passed.\textsuperscript{496} The \textit{Homilies} are clearly related to the \textit{On the Statues} by a reference in \textit{Homily I} to the previous period of fasting that was now over,\textsuperscript{497} the events relating to Bishop Flavian’s trip to Constantinople, and his return to Antioch, as well as references to the admonitions against taking oaths.\textsuperscript{498} The purpose of the series is stated in \textit{Homily III}:

\begin{quote}
What good do Hannah and the stories about her do me? Childless women will be able to learn how to become mothers, and mothers will in turn know what is the best way of bringing up children.\textsuperscript{499}
\end{quote}

4.7.4 Other Works from Antioch

The \textit{Homily on Jeremiah 10:23} is assigned to Antioch, based on Chrysostom’s reference at the beginning of the sermon to the celebrations of the Saints – Bishop Eustathius and the Martyr Romanos (November 18) – that had just passed.\textsuperscript{500} The \textit{Homily on Psalm 42} is likewise ascribed to Antioch for two reasons. First, Chrysostom seems to be referring to himself as a priest.\textsuperscript{501} Second, he refers to a previous homily on

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{494} Ibid 322.
\textsuperscript{495} Ibid, 111.
\textsuperscript{496} Ibid, 122.
\textsuperscript{497} Ibid, 65-66.
\textsuperscript{498} Ibid, 67.
\textsuperscript{499} Ibid, 97.
\textsuperscript{500} Hill, \textit{St. John Chrysostom: Old Testament Homilies; II}, 3, 7.
\end{flushright}
Melchizedek, which is *Homily VII Against the Jews* and to the Jewish Holy Days that were celebrated recently. The *Homily on Psalm 146* is ascribed to Antioch because of the reference to monks living on the mountains.

Regarding the *Homily on Psalm 146*, I disagree with Hill’s opinion that it was preached on Holy Saturday. The sermon appears to me to have been delivered on Palm Sunday, and not Holy Saturday. Chrysostom refers to going out to meet Christ, and exhorts his congregation that works of piety are better than palms and branches. He says that he had gone out with the congregation (in procession?) offering them a sermon instead of palms and branches. He then uses the story of Paul in prison, in Philippi (Acts 16:16-40), to show the importance of hymn singing at night. In the *Commentary on Acts*, the same pericope is used to encourage prayer at night and not necessarily hymns. In *Psalm 146* Chrysostom encourages prayer both day and night, but he does not refer back to the Philippi imprisonment story. It seems to me, that these various pieces of the sermon are encouraging the people to participate in the Holy Week services, and that he is speaking on Palm Sunday looking forward to the coming week.

---
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Hill sees Chrysostom’s *Eight Sermons on Genesis* as composed in Antioch.  

Sermon I refers to the “the father and teacher of us all,” and Sermon VIII refers to “the presence of the teacher.” The sermons break into two groups by their reference to the previous sermon. Thus, Sermon II refers to I, and III to Number II, and Sermon IV to Sermon III, and Sermon V to Number IV.  

Sermon VI refers to a sermon that is no longer extant, which forms a break in the series.  

Sermon VII refers to Number VI, and Sermon VIII refers to Number VII. Thus this sub-series is linked together. Both sub-series are linked to a sermon (I and VIII) that mentions the bishop as being a person other than the preacher, and therefore the sermon is from Antioch. If these *Eight Sermons* are one series or two combined together, although Hill does not mention this possibility, they would still all be from Antioch.

The *Sixty-seven Homilies on Genesis* are traditionally assigned to Antioch, and Hill agrees with this opinion. The series is broken into two sub-series; Numbers I to XXXII, and Homilies XXXIII to LXVII. What separates them is the reference in Homily XXXIII to the break caused by the Easter Season, and now the explanations of Genesis are being

---
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Mayer admits that only *Homily XII* is from Antioch for sure.\(^{515}\) *Homily XII:1* does refer to the “Jews” in a negative fashion which indicates Antioch.\(^{516}\) *XII:2* mentions a previous homily directed to those who undervalue the feast of Easter, but this description does not fit any of the previous homilies in the series.\(^{517}\) *Homily XIII:3* reviews some of the material from *Homily XII* before moving on to new material indicating a link between the two.\(^{518}\) While accepting the traditional assignation to Antioch, it is necessary to be aware of the two sub-sections in the collection, and the interruption caused by other of sermons outside of the series.

We move to Chrysostom on the Sages – Job, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. Although, they are not sermons, they do contain some liturgical information, so their city of origin is relevant. It is important to note that in his *Commentary on Job* John never links Job to Christ.\(^{519}\) This fact has bearing on the lectionary, for we do not see Job in the Byzantine Lectionary until the second half of the sixth century in Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople, who does link the book to Christ as mentioned earlier. Hill does not offer a city of origin for the work in either his Introduction, or an earlier

\(^{514}\) Ibid, 5.


\(^{517}\) Ibid, 157.

\(^{518}\) Ibid, 170.

article. A complete manuscript of the *Commentaries on Proverbs and Ecclesiastes* was only discovered in 1959 by Marcel Richard at the monastery of St. John the Theologian on Patmos. *Patmos #161* is a tenth century manuscript. Hill translates this manuscript into English, and proposes that both works are from Antioch. The *Commentary on Proverbs* is an early work which echoes the *Eight Sermons on Genesis, On the Statues, David and Saul, and Homilies on Hannah*. He notes that no Christological connections are made in the work on Proverbs. This is important information for the lectionary as well, for Van de Paverd notes that the sermons on Genesis do not mention Proverbs as being read in the Lenten services. It is very possible, that Proverbs and Job were not read in the Lenten services at Chrysostom’s time, because they did not figure high on the Antiochian agenda. As Hill notes, the authors of the books were not considered prophets, and the books are not frequently commented upon in the Christian East, unlike the West.

---


523 Ibid, 3-5.

524 Ibid, 25.


The Commentary on the Psalms only consists of Psalms 4-13, 44-50, 109-118 and 120-150, and so parts are missing. Hill sees the work as from Antioch, for references are made to St. Babylas of Antioch (Psalm 111), and the Emperor Julian the Apostate’s visit to the city (Psalm 148). The commentary on Psalm 47 mentions that the work is given in a place of teaching (διδασκαλεῖον), which means the commentaries are more lectures than sermons. The Commentary is from Antioch, and therefore the liturgical information that it contains pertains to that city.

4.7.5 The Homilies from Constantinople

Hill sees the Homily on Isaiah 45:6-7 as originating in Constantinople. He bases his opinion on certain manuscripts that mention Hagia Eirene, which was near Hagia Sophia and was part of the same complex of buildings, as the place of delivery. Chrysostom was also the second homilist of the day, following upon the first who preached on the psalm of the day. The bishop would have been the final homilist at the liturgy after the priest(s) had spoken.


529 Hill, St. John Chrysostom: Commentary on the Psalms, Volume I, 8, 298.

The 2 *Homilies on Psalm 49:16* are also from Constantinople, for John Chrysostom is the second speaker at the Liturgy, as mentioned in the *Homily II*.\(^{531}\) I note that in the *Homily I*, Chrysostom mentions the women in the galleries of the church.\(^{532}\) Having galleries or balconies in the church building was a typical feature of the churches in Constantinople as seen in Hagia Sophia, Hagia Eirene, Saints Sergios and Bachos and other churches, but not in Syria except the cathedral in Antioch.\(^{533}\) There were galleries in the Martyrium in Jerusalem, and later on in Santa Agnese and Santa Maria in Cosmedin in Rome, where they were added in imitation of Constantinople.\(^{534}\) The homilies of certain provenance according to Van de Paverd and Hill are in Table 4.3.


\(^{532}\) Ibid, 98.


\(^{534}\) Ibid, 168-174.
### TABLE 4.3

**PROVENANCE OF HOMILIES ACCORDING TO VAN DE PAVERD AND HILL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homilies From Antioch According to Van de Paverd and Hill</th>
<th>Mayer’s Opinion of the Same Homilies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>De statuis</em> – all homilies</td>
<td>Accepts <em>Homilies II-III, V-VI, XIV-VX, XVII-XXI</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ad illuminandos cat. II</em></td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De prophetiarum obscuritate</em> – 2 homilies</td>
<td>No assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De diabolo tenatatore</em> – 3 homilies</td>
<td>No assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In illud: Vidi dominum</em> – 6 sermons</td>
<td>Accepts <em>Homilies II &amp; III</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De Davide et Saule</em> – 3 homilies</td>
<td>No assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De Anna</em> – 5 sermons</td>
<td>No assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah 10:23 – <em>In illud Domine non est in homine</em></td>
<td>No opinion offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalm 42 – <em>In Psalmum XLI: Quemadmodum disiderat cervens ad fontes aquarum</em></td>
<td>No opinion offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In psalmum 145</em></td>
<td>No assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sermo I-VIII in Genesium</em></td>
<td>Accepts <em>Numbers I &amp; VIII</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Homiliae I-LXVII in Genesium</em></td>
<td><em>Homily XII</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Commentary on Proverbs</em></td>
<td>No opinion offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Commentary on Ecclesiastes</em></td>
<td>No opinion offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Exp in psalmos</em></td>
<td>No opinion offered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Homilies from Constantinople According to Hill**

| Isaiah 45:7 – *In illud Isaiae: ego dominus feci lumen*    | No assessment                        |
| 2 on Psalm 49:16 – *In illud: Ne timueritis*              | No assessment                        |

4.8 Wendy Pradels, Rudolf Brändle and Martin Heimgartner

*Adversus Iudaeos* was a series of homilies, given by Chrysostom in Antioch, attacking those Christians who participated in the September Jewish festal services and fasting. The series *Adversus Iudaeos* consists of eight homilies in Montfaucon and Migne, yet the manuscript tradition usually only published numbers *IV* through *VIII* and some manuscripts did include *Discourse I* as well. Montfaucon was the first to add
numbers II and III to the series.\(^{535}\) *Discourse III* was never part of the series before Montfaucon, and modern scholarship has removed it from the series leaving seven discourses.\(^{536}\)

Pradels, Brändle and Heimgartner (from now on Pradels) discovered and published a manuscript (*Lesbos Cod. Gr. 27*), with a hitherto unknown section of *Discourse II*.\(^{537}\) In this manuscript, the discourse is three times longer than in Migne, thus providing 200% more material to read and use.\(^{538}\) From this previously unknown material, Pradels has determined that *Discourse II* follows *Discourse IV* and precedes *Discourse V*. *Discourse II* promises, that if the congregation returns for the next service in sufficient numbers, John will explain why Jerusalem is perpetually in a ruin, which is the subject matter of *Discourse V*. *Discourse II* refers to a previous sermon, which persuaded many not to participate in the Jewish rites for the September Holy Days; this is *Discourse IV*.\(^{539}\) From the placing of the recovered *Discourse II*, Pradels then proceeds to dating the homily sequence. *Discourse I* is from 386 and the remaining discourses from August and September of 387. This dating is accomplished by relating the contents


\(^{536}\) Ibid, 91.


of the homilies to the various Jewish Holy Days; Rosh Hashanah referred to as “their trumpets” and Yom Kippur as “their fasts.” They also coordinate the dating of the Jewish and Julian Calendars of the time to the discourses. The end result is a convincing body of evidence that is summarized in a chart of the dates of Discourses I, II & IV-VIII that also includes De incomprehensibili Dei natura contra Anomoeos I, Expositio in Psalmum 41, and In diem natalem.

In diem natalem, on Christmas, is included in the list for it clearly refers to the Discourses Against the Jews. She includes Expositio in Psalmum 41, because it refers to the Jewish feasts, but in a slightly more remote manner than Discourse VIII, therefore she places it on the Sunday following it. Discourse I refers to the first sermon against the Anomoeans, which is why De incomprehensibili Dei natura contra Anomoeos I is included in her timeline. Regarding the same sermons, Mayer sees Discourses I, V & VI, De incompr. I and In diem natalem as from Antioch, while she offers no opinion on the other sermons discussed. The results of Pradel’s work are summarized in Table 4.4.

541 Ibid, 103-106.
542 Ibid, 106.
544 Ibid, 102-103.
545 Ibid, 92.
TABLE 4.4

HOMILIES AND DATING ACCORDING TO PRADEL & CO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homily Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De incomprehensibili Dei natura contra Anomoeos I</td>
<td>Sunday, 2 or 30 August, 386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversus Iudaeos I</td>
<td>Sunday, August 9 or September 6, 386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversus Iudaeos III</td>
<td>Sunday, January 387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversus Iudaeos IV</td>
<td>Sunday, August 29, 387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversus Iudaeos II</td>
<td>Sunday, September 5, 387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversus Iudaeos V</td>
<td>Thursday, September 9, 387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversus Iudaeos VI</td>
<td>Friday, September 10, 387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversus Iudaeos VII</td>
<td>Sunday, September 12, 387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversus Iudaeos VIII</td>
<td>Sunday, September 19, 387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expositio in Psalmum 41</td>
<td>Sunday, September 26, 387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In diem natalem</td>
<td>Saturday, December 25, 387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9 Methodology for the Following Chapters

In the Preface of her book, Wendy Mayer notes the following trend:

In the field of Patristics, the last quarter of the twentieth century has seen an increasing move away from research on theological and doctrinal controversies towards an interest in the social aspect of religion, a move particularly noticeable in the area of liturgy.  

This work is an example of the trend that she is talking about. In trying to discover the lectionary at the time of John Chrysostom doctrinal controversies are tools to place a

---


homily of John in one time or place versus another. This is a work of historical reconstruction, so certainty about the provenance of Chrysostom’s homilies is obviously very important. Ascribing a homily to the wrong city could lead to faulty conclusions regarding the liturgy in that city, especially if Antioch and Constantinople are following different traditions, when it comes to the same day in the liturgical calendar.

Mayer’s book is very important for this project, and is taken seriously. Any homily that she asserts is of certain provenance will be accepted as such, and be the gold standard. At the same time, Mayer strikes me as sometimes too cautious, and homilies that she lists as probable or possible are also really of certain origin. I have also accepted the opinions of Van de Paverd, Hill and Pradel on the homilies that they studied. This expanded list of homilies will be accepted as of certain provenance.

As stated earlier, Mayer sees that further work is needed on homilies that she did not investigate. If my investigations lead me to be certain about some of these homilies, this will be stated, and the homily added to the list of certain origins. Also, homilies of uncertain origins, especially from the large New Testament exegetical series, will be related to those of certain provenance when these homilies mention the same scripture readings. For example, some of the homilies of De Statuis mention the readings of the day. These will be cross checked with the homilies on these readings from the large exegetical series.

\footnote{Van de Paverd, \textit{St. John Chrysostom, the Homilies on the Statues: An Introduction}, 3-13.}
It is the New Testament exegetical series that will be approached with the greatest caution. Allen and Mayer have placed doubts that these series were ever delivered as a continuous series, but rather are combinations of smaller homily series collected together at a later date. Gignac, Baur, Harkins and Boismard have pointed out that at least the *Commentary on John* and the *Acts of the Apostles* were reworked by later editors.

Sermons originating from one city on the same biblical books and the same liturgical feasts can be viewed together. This will allow a judgment to be formed as to whether there was a stable lectionary, especially for weekdays of Lent, or if the presider had some freedom to choose the lections. The comparing of homilies for the same feast, such as Pascha, will also allow a judgment to be made if the readings for the feasts were fixed.

Mayer’s book has made the designation of the city of origin for the Chrysostom corpus more difficult, but also more certain. As information from homilies of uncertain provenance is compared and related to those of certain origin, a picture will emerge that is generally reliable even if parts of it are uncertain or conjectural. This project can go forward not being limited to Mayer’s list and what I have added to it from Van de Paverd, Hill and Pradel, but using the entire Chrysostom corpus. Mayer’s list will anchor the project and some information will be listed as possible or probable, but a clear picture should still emerge as the relationships between homilies are examined and liturgical units are discovered and placed in context.
CHAPTER 5:
ANTIOCH

5.1 Introduction

This chapter on the lectionary of Antioch in the time of Chrysostom is concerned first with the Liturgy of the Word including the number and types of readings. Second, the number of sermons given at a Liturgy will be discussed together with the effect of having more than one sermon per service, as well as the effects of Chrysostom’s ideas concerning preaching. Third, the two main parts of the Liturgical Year will be explained: the Moveable Cycle based on Easter, and the Fixed and Sanctoral Cycles based on the dates of the annual calendar. Fourth and finally, we will seek to recover any evidence for the Lectionary that can be gleaned from Chrysostom’s homilies.

According to the magisterial study of Frans Van de Paverd on the Eucharistic Liturgy in Antioch and Constantinople, Eucharistic Liturgies were celebrated regularly in Antioch on Friday, Saturday and Sunday outside of Lent. During Lent there was a daily non-Eucharistic Synaxis Monday through Friday, and the Eucharistic Liturgy was served on Saturday and Sunday.\textsuperscript{550} The documents he quotes regarding when the faithful heard the scriptures read and explained in church, likewise point to Friday, Saturday and

\textsuperscript{550} Van de Paverd, \textit{Meßliturgie}, 61-81.
Sunday and the weekdays of Lent.\textsuperscript{551} The conclusion that must be drawn is that in Antioch, at the time of Chrysostom, there were no readings connected to the Liturgy of the Hours, except during Lent. The lectionary of Antioch, at the time of Chrysostom, is therefore largely a Eucharistic lectionary and a lectionary for weekday evenings of Lent. This is a different tradition from the Egyptian monastic office that had readings at every morning and evening service.\textsuperscript{552} It is in keeping, however, with the later Byzantine tradition, found in $HS\#40$, which relegated the Gospels for Matins to an appendix. It also limited readings at Vespers to Lent, Holy Week and certain feast days as can be seen in Appendix A.\textsuperscript{553}

5.2 The Number of Readings in the Services

5.2.1 The Divine Liturgy

Frans Van de Paverd has shown that the Eucharistic Liturgy of Antioch, at the time of Chrysostom, had three readings (Prophet, Apostle and Gospel) with one Psalm sung between the prophetical and apostolic readings.\textsuperscript{554} \textit{Apostolic Constitutions}, which is from Syria and dates to slightly before Chrysostom’s time, presents a different schema.\textsuperscript{555} \textit{Book VIII} prescribes four readings (Law, Prophet, Apostle and Gospel) for the

\textsuperscript{551} Ibid, 83-137.

\textsuperscript{552} Taft, \textit{The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West}, 58-65.

\textsuperscript{553} Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, II}, 170-175, 180-185.

\textsuperscript{554} Van de Paverd, \textit{Meßliturgie}, 136-137.

Liturgy with one Psalm to be sung between the Old Testament and New Testament readings. 556 *Book II:39* mentions only the Law, Prophets and Gospel; 557 whereas *Book II: 57* mentions the four readings and a Psalm as noted in *Book VIII*. 558 Later on in *Book II*, the Sunday synaxis is described once again, but this time only the reading of the Prophets and the preaching of the Gospel is mentioned. 559 There is no mention of an Epistle in *Book II*, and even the Gospel reference could refer to the sermon, and not necessarily an actual evangelical reading. This information points out the composite nature of *Apostolic Constitutions*, and the importance of separating it from the Antioch of Chrysostom’s time. 560 For our knowledge of Antioch, in the latter fourth century, we are largely dependent upon the works of Chrysostom.

The order of readings at Chrysostom’s time is as follows. The first lesson read at the Eucharist was from the prophets, not the Law or Books of Moses, and the second was from the apostle (Epistle). Van de Paverd quotes several of Chrysostom’s sermons to prove this point. The homilies he quotes – *Romans XXIV:3* and *1 Corinthians XXXVI:5* - are traditionally ascribed to Antioch. 561 The third reading was from the Gospel. 562

---


Regarding the singing of the Psalm between the Lessons at the Liturgy, Chrysostom’s *Commentary on the Psalms* notes the *hypocoi* (ὑπακοή) or sung response by the congregation of Psalm 117/118:24 on Easter, and Psalm 144/145:15 at Christian Initiation. *De Statuis XVII:1* notes the response for Psalm 71 on the Fourth Saturday of Lent, and the *Homily on Holy Week* or *In Psalmum 145:2* notes a response also (Psalm 145:2), as does *In Psalmum 41/42*. While this does not give us precise information regarding which Psalms were sung during the year, it does demonstrate that Psalms were used between the liturgical readings.

Hence, when it comes to Eucharistic Liturgies in Antioch, at John Chrysostom’s time, we are looking for references to three readings: one from the Prophets, one from the Apostle and one from the Gospel with only one Psalm functioning as a responsorium.

5.2.2 The Lenten Evening Synaxis

Van de Paverd states that there were daily evening Lenten services in Antioch Monday through Friday. As proof, he quotes a number Chrysostom’s homilies from several different series. These are *Adversus Judaeos III:4*, *Homiliae in Genisim I-XXXII*, *De Statuis VI:3,X:1, XII:1, XV:1, XV:6, XVIII:1*, and *In Genesim sermo V:3*. All of these series

are traditionally ascribed to Antioch.\footnote{Mayer, Provenance, 469-473.} Because the daily Lenten services are attested to in several different homilies from different series it is clear that these services were an annual occurrence, and not unique to the year that the \textit{Homilies on the Statues} were given. The Lenten service schedule consisted of a 3 PM Word Service, immediately followed by Vespers, Monday through Friday, with the Eucharistic Liturgy celebrated on Saturdays and Sundays in the morning.\footnote{Van de Paverd, \textit{On the Statues: An Introduction}, 163-165, 185-7.}

The Monday through Friday services were different from the Eucharistic Liturgies in several ways. First, as noted, they were held at 3 PM and not in the morning. Second, there was only one reading, not three, and it was from Genesis. This custom of reading Genesis was almost universal at that time since it appears in Antioch, Milan, Jerusalem and Caesarea of Cappadocia.\footnote{Ibid, 189-190.} The difference between Antioch and the later Byzantine tradition was the absence of a second reading from Proverbs in Antioch.\footnote{Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, II}, 12-63.} Because of the existence of a reading from Proverbs in the Byzantine Tradition, there is sometimes a tendency to posit the same for ancient Antioch. But, as Van de Paverd has pointed out, there are no references in Chrysostom’s 54 Lenten homilies to Proverbs as having just been read during the service.\footnote{Van de Paverd, \textit{On the Statues: An Introduction}, 193-4. Van de Paverd gives the Lenten homilies as follows: 14 from \textit{De Statuis} given on weekdays, \textit{In Genesim Homiliae II-XXXII}, \textit{In Genesim sermones I-VIII}, and \textit{De diabolo tentatore I-II}. See also: Van de Paverd, \textit{Meßliturgie}, 98-100.} This absence of Proverbs from the reading schedule
fits with its low ranking in the Antiochian mindset of that time, where its author was not considered as a “prophet.”

Why was Genesis read during Lent, and in such diverse locations? If we look at Chrysostom’s works several reasons for this emerge. In the *Homilies on Genesis*, Chrysostom’s moral exhortations cover just about every topic imaginable, so Genesis was good for teaching basic Christian behavior and ethics. Another reason was his affinity for the Patriarch Abraham, similar to that he held for St. Paul. He often mentions Abraham as an ethical example for the Christian, but more importantly, he speaks of Abraham’s faith, and how it preceded the Law and was higher than the Law. Finally, Chrysostom mentions the importance of teaching everyone the Judeo-Christian doctrine of creation and its goodness, and that the Creator is the only God. These doctrines were especially useful in dealing with pagans, Manicheans and Gnostics of various types.

Third characteristic, during the weekday Lenten service, there was only one sermon given, unlike the several at the Eucharistic Liturgies. This means that the preacher did not have to rush or cut short his sermon to make way for another preacher. It also meant that the preacher had to cover all the material for the day, since

---


571 To name a few: Marriage in XXI: 12; almsgiving in XXI: 23; build virtue and scorn sin in XXII: 22; hope in God in XXV: 22; praising and thanking God in XXVI: 20.


no other speaker could be delegated to discuss certain aspects of the readings or the celebration. In this respect, Chrysostom’s weekday Lenten sermons from Antioch are different from his other sermons, where he often made time for another speaker and/or counted on the other speakers to explain things that he did not touch upon.

To summarize then; there were weekday Lenten services in Antioch at 3 PM from Monday through Friday. At these services only Genesis was read and only one homilist spoke.

5.3 The Sermons at Liturgical Services

5.3.1 Eucharistic Services

As we have seen, at the Eucharistic Liturgy in Antioch more than one homily was regularly given. In Homily XXXVI: 4 on First Corinthians Chrysostom states that two or three (clergy) preach at the Eucharistic Liturgy. This statement is in partial harmony with Apostolic Constitutions which mentions that the presbyters preach one by one followed by the bishop who is last. Egeria states the same for Jerusalem. I say partial harmony, for in Antioch not all could speak, but there was a limit of three. This means the custom of each presbyter and the bishop speaking had never been established there, or more likely, it was being gradually limited in order to save time. This possibility

575 Van de Paverd, Meßliturgie, 130.


577 Maraval, Égérie: Journal de Voyage, XXV: 1, 247.
seems probable, in that Chrysostom complained a number of times that people were not staying the full two hours for the service.\textsuperscript{578}

The custom of preaching two or three sermons per service created several situations. First, one preacher was not responsible for the readings of the day, commentary on the liturgical season or feast, and addressing problems that were of concern to the community. These could be distributed between the various preachers of the day. Second, there also would have been time for detailed commentary on biblical books, as the other preachers would have handled the topics of immediate concern. This explains why Chrysostom could give his exegetical series, that could continue from one liturgical season to another, without noting the season or feast of the day. An example of this is the series of 67 Homilies on Genesis of which I-XXXII were given before Holy Thursday and XXXIII-LXVII were given after Easter.\textsuperscript{579}

The dividing of the sermon topics of the day among two or three preachers is mentioned by Chrysostom several times. In Homily II on the Maccabees, he says that he must cut his sermon short so that “our common teacher (Bishop Flavian)” could speak more fully on the Maccabees.\textsuperscript{580} In the Homily on Philogonius, Chrysostom says that the bishop knows much more about the saint, so he instead will turn his attention to another topic. The new topic is the feast of Christmas, which will arrive in five days, and

\textsuperscript{578} Homélie sur le Baptême de Notre Seigneur et l’Épiphanie, 1 ; Homélies sur l’Inscription des Actes, I: 2, III: 2, Jean Bareille, Œuvres Complètes de Saint Jean Chrysostome : Traduction Nouvelle (Paris : Librairie de Louis Vives, 1864, 1866), III, 602 ; V, 96, 126.

\textsuperscript{579} Homily XXXIII, in: Hill, St. John Chrysostom: Homilies on Genesis 18-45, 276.

\textsuperscript{580} Homily II: 5 on the Maccabees, as found in: Mayer, St. John Chrysostom: The Cult of the Saints, 152.
it seems that the people of Antioch are not very interested in observing it.\textsuperscript{581} This shows how the liturgical occasion of the day was left to another speaker, so Chrysostom turns his attention to a problem in the community. He does the same in Discourse VI Against the Judaizing Christians, ignoring the Martyr’s Feast in order to continue his series of sermons against Judaizing practices.\textsuperscript{582}

The topics for the day’s sermons must have been assigned ahead of time, otherwise Chrysostom would not have known on what the bishop would talk about as just mentioned above. His own sermons show that his topic was limited in scope. In Homily I on the Statues he asks the congregation what they wished him to speak about from the readings. Yet, all his suggestions refer only to 1Timothy, chapter 5. He never mentions the prophetic or evangelical readings.\textsuperscript{583} It would seem that day his assignment was the Epistle only. In De Statuis Homily II:13 he even refers to, “The customary table from St. Paul,” clearly indicating his usually assigned topic is the apostolic reading.\textsuperscript{584}

Several times during this series On The Statues, he only discourses on the Epistle of the day (Homilies I, II, XVI & XVIII) and twice on the Prophetic Reading (Homilies III & XV).\textsuperscript{585}

\textsuperscript{581} Concerning Blessed Philogonius in: Mayer & Allen, John Chrysostom, 191.


\textsuperscript{583} Concerning the Statues, Homily I: 2, in: NPNF, IX, 331.

\textsuperscript{584} Ibid, Homily II: 13, in: NPNF, IX, 348.

\textsuperscript{585} Van de Paverd, St. John Chrysostom, The Homilies on the Statues, 3-11.
Even his Antiochian sermon on the Epiphany is focused solely on the reading from Titus 2, and the theology of the feast.\textsuperscript{586}

The custom of having more than one sermon at a Eucharistic celebration in late fourth century Antioch made the exegetical series on Biblical books possible. It also meant that no one sermon contained references to all of the readings of the day, the liturgical season, and important issues in the life of the congregation, as we are used to today. Even from a historical point of view, St. Proclus of Constantinople (+446), who was a younger contemporary of St. John Chrysostom, gave sermons that had all of these three areas of concern in them, as shown in Chapter 3, above. Yet, in Chrysostom’s Antioch, these sermon topics were divided, and this makes the historical evidence from Chrysostom’s sermons more fragmentary than one would have initially thought. From the exegetical series delivered in Antioch I could find no information on the liturgical year or lectionary in the series on \textit{I Corinthians}, the \textit{Commentary on Galatians, Eight Sermons on Genesis}, the \textit{Commentary on the Gospel of John, Philemon, Romans, 1 Timothy} and \textit{Titus}. Other series like \textit{2 Corinthians} and \textit{2 Timothy} had only one reference each, and \textit{Matthew} had two pieces of information.

5.3.2 Lenten Weekday Services

As noted above, there was only one sermon at the weekday Lenten synaxis, and there was only one Scriptural reading from the book of Genesis. The instructions for the \textit{photizomenoi}, or those about to be baptized, were not part of the evening homily, but

Van de Paverd gives a detailed discussion on this issue referring to several of Chrysostom’s homilies as evidence. The most important are *De Diabolo Temptatore II:1* and *In Genesim Homilia XII:1* wherein the instructions for the photizomenoi and the afternoon services are clearly separated from each other.⁵⁸⁷

The fact of having only one homily on Monday through Friday during Lent makes these homilies different from those at the Eucharistic Liturgies for the preacher had to cover all needed topics. This is seen in the series *On the Statues or To the People of Antioch*. In the weekday sermons from this series (#IV-XIV, XIX-XX) more topics are covered than in the weekend sermons. Chrysostom begins *Homily VII* by saying:

Yesterday, I discoursed to your Charity in many words, and upon many subjects; and if out of this variety, it be not possible for you to retain all, I wish more particularly to recall to memory...⁵⁸⁸

If we then look at *Homily VI*, we see these topics: fear of the civil powers, the embassy to the Emperor, Jonah, fear of death, suffering patiently, chastisement, freedom from sin, the Three Children in the Furnace, sin is the only evil, prosperous sinners, divine judgment and the intercession of the saints.⁵⁸⁹ All of these topics are tied together, yet more territory is covered than in *One Corinthians Homily XXI*, wherein he explains verses from the Epistle and then talks about the lack of concern for the poor in Antioch.⁵⁹⁰

---


⁵⁹⁰ *1 Corinthians, Homily XXI* in: *NPNF, XII*, 118-125.
The other large Lenten series that we have from Chrysostom is *In Genesim Homilae (Homilies on Genesis) Numbers II-XXXII*. This series does not cover as many topics as *On the Statues*, but adheres to the pattern in other exegetical series; where verses are commented upon with a moral exhortation tied usually to the last verse. Why is this series so different from *On the Statues*? One possible answer is that Bishop Flavian was not away, and maybe he told John to stay on topic.\(^{591}\) Another is that the situation was not dire, as during the time *On the Statues*.\(^ {592}\) A third answer, that must be given serious consideration, is Chrysostom’s view of the Bible and how Christians read and understand it. This will be given below.

### 5.3.3 Chrysostom’s Preaching Habits

One key concept in Chrysostom’s exegesis is “precision” or “*akribeia*” in Greek. In his thought every single Scriptural word is important, and must not be overlooked, but has a meaning. Robert Hill, in an article on this concept in Chrysostom’s sermons, illustrated it with eleven quotes from the *Homilies on Genesis* using *Homilies VII, X, XIII, XV, XXII, XXIV, XXIV, XXVI, XLII* and *XLV*.\(^{593}\) The concept is by no means limited to this series. Here is a quote from *Homily L on John*:

---

\(^{591}\) Bishop Flavian was away to see the Emperor during *On the Statues*. Van de Paverd, *The Homilies on the Statues*, 48-159.

\(^{592}\) The population was in fear of a severe imperial punishment for the riots. This is evident in a number of the *Homilies on the Statues*. Ibid, 4-10.

In the divine Scriptures there is not a word which has no purpose, for they have been completely inspired by the Holy Spirit. Therefore, let us examine every word with care.  

With this basic predisposition, Chrysostom could only go through the biblical books slowly, and not only verse by verse, but even word by word. Another related reason why Chrysostom went through the biblical books verse by verse is his desire that the congregation would understand and remember what was explained to them. Here are a few quotes from the *Commentary on John* to illustrate this point:

Let us not listen perfunctorily. The reason we are giving our interpretation a little at a time is that all things may become easily intelligible for you, and may not escape your memory.  

Dearly beloved children, the reason why we have fed you little by little with thoughts from the Scriptures, and have not poured them all out at once, is that we might make it easy for you to hold fast those already given to you.  

Furthermore, it is with the following end in view that we are only gradually analyzing the content of the Scriptures. We hope that it may be possible for you to receive them with ease, and store them in the treasury of your mind, and thus strive to remember them all.

---

An underlying current, behind these and other similar statements, was perhaps the impatience of the congregation with the pace of the sermons. Hearing the Scriptures explained a few verses at a time meant that biblical stories were divided up, such as the words on persecution after the mission of the twelve apostles, which merited three homilies in the Matthew series. One wonders if dividing a story into several pieces was helping people to remember them, as Chrysostom wanted, or hurting the process. Of course, these sermons bore little or no relationship to the actual readings of the day.

A third reason why Chrysostom went slowly in his explanations was the need to stop and spend part of his time on moral exhortations. This quote from Homily XVI on the Statues says it plainly:

> Lo! This is the second year that I am discoursing to your Charity; and I have not yet been able to explain a hundred lines of the Scriptures. And the reason is, that ye need to learn of us what ye might reduce to practice at home, and of yourselves; and thus the greater part of our exhortation is consumed on ethical discourse.

The ethical discourse became part of every homily in each exegetical series. Sometimes, they are longer such as the comments on lack of concern for the poor in Antioch in the Homilies on First Corinthians, Homily XXI. At other times they are shorter, as the comments on virginity in Homily XIX of the same series, but they are there.

---

598 Homilies XXXIII-XXXV, Saint Chrysostom Homilies on the Gospel of Saint Matthew, NPNF, X, 219-238.
599 Homily XVI: 5, Concerning the Statues, NPNF, IX, 446.
600 Homily XXI: 8-11, Homilies on First Corinthians, NPNF, XII, 122-125.
601 Ibid, Homily XIX: 7, 111.
Given, then, Chrysostom’s preferences on how to compose a homily, we do not find in his homilies a global scope of the day’s readings or feast. We find a part of a reading and some theological reflections on the liturgical time, if it is noteworthy. But, we always find the moral exhortation regarding some problem in the community.

5.4 The Liturgical Calendar of Antioch and the Frequency of Services

The Liturgical Calendar is made up of three main components. The first is the Temporal or Moveable Cycle which is focused on Easter (Pascha), either leading up to it (Lent and Holy Week) or flowing from it (Pentecost and Weeks after Pentecost). The second element is the Nativity-Epiphan celebration and the third element is Saints’ days.

5.4.1 The Temporal Cycle

As noted above, outside of Lent there were three Eucharistic Liturgies a week in Antioch on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays. If there were Saints’ days to observe then additional liturgies were celebrated as well.\textsuperscript{602} The key document regarding the Friday through Sunday celebrations is \textit{In ep. 1 ad Tim. Homilia V: 3}, which clearly refers to these three days and martyrs’ days as well as liturgical days.

Mayer is unsure about the provenance of this homily.\textsuperscript{603} The fact that it mentions a Eucharistic Liturgy on Friday can be taken as proof that it is from Antioch. There is

\textsuperscript{602} Van de Paverd, \textit{Meßliturgie}, 61-68.

\textsuperscript{603} Mayer, \textit{Provenance}, 472.
evidence that the Churches which geographically surrounded Antioch had liturgy on Friday. These are Jerusalem to the south as seen in Egeria, Mesopotamia to the East attested to by Bishop Maruta of Maiperg, Cyprus to the West related by Epiphanius and Cappadocia to the North as mentioned by Basil the Great in Letter 93. Given that the areas surrounding Antioch had the custom of liturgy on Friday; it is easy to understand how Antioch could have also adopted the custom.

The custom of a Friday Eucharist, also helps to explain the question of the Holy Week Liturgies in Antioch, as discussed above in Chapter 2. Recall that Sebastià Janeras proposed that there was a Good Friday Eucharist in Antioch held in the evening. There were also the Saturday evening Easter Vigil Liturgy and an Easter Sunday morning Eucharist. Both Friday and Saturday Eucharists were held in the morning, during most of the year, because these days were not days of total fasting from food. But, during Holy Week, they were days of total fasting, which called for a delay in the celebration of the Eucharist, until such time as the fast could be broken. On Easter Sunday there was no fast, therefore the Liturgy was celebrated in the morning as on any Sunday.

In the Byzantine Tradition, a Eucharistic Liturgy on Friday never developed, except for the Pre-sanctified Liturgy during Lent, and during the fifty days of Pentecost. Since that the Byzantine Tradition does not know a regular Friday Eucharistic Liturgy, it would seem safe and prudent to posit that Homily V on 1 Timothy

605 Janeras, Le Vendredi-Saint dans la Tradition Liturgique Byzantine, 386-387
is indeed from Antioch, and contains information about the Liturgy in Antioch at Chrysostom’s time.

It has already been mentioned that there were daily non-Eucharistic services, Monday through Friday, during Lent in Antioch. How long was Lent? Often Lent is combined with Holy Week for the sake of counting the days of fasting. So the question of the length of the fast normally includes Holy Week, even if not mentioned as such. Van de Paverd proposes that the Antiochian fast was eight weeks long, as was the case in Egeria’s Jerusalem, and later on under Patriarch Severus of Antioch. For proof he dates and arranges the homilies, Ad finem ieiunii, Nuper dictorum, Epul. Ss. Mart., and Homily XVIII of De statuis, in relationship to each other and during Holy Week and the week that precedes it. These homilies can only be properly related to each other over an eight week, and not a seven week Lent. Regarding the Byzantine Lent-Holy Week combination of only seven weeks Van de Paverd sees it as originating in Cappadocia.

Chrysostom makes a statement in Homily VI of On Isaiah 6 that Lent was lengthened by the fathers. This comment lends further credence to an eight week Lent in Antioch. At the same time, it shows that there was a shorter Lent at an earlier historical period. This superseded shorter Antiochian Lent could possibly be the source of the Byzantine practice. It is also important to remember that Apostolic Constitutions

608 Ibid, 250-255, 358.
609 Ibid, 254.
610 Hill, St. John Chrysostom, Old Testament Homilies, II, 110
Book V, xiii: 3-4 also talks about a seven week Lent and Holy Week combination.\(^{611}\)

Apostolic Constitutions Book V, xx: 19 also stipulates Saturday and Sundays as Eucharistic days without mentioning Fridays.\(^{612}\) This raises the possibility that at least some of the liturgical differences between Antioch and Constantinople, at the time of Chrysostom, may be due to newer customs being adopted in Antioch, and Constantinople resisting these changes.

Chrysostom’s Homily on the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ mentions daily Eucharistic Liturgies being celebrated during the week after Easter.\(^{613}\) This homily is referred to by On the Inscription of the Acts I:2 (In principium actorum). Homily II: 6 from the same series, talks about Antioch, Bishop Flavian and Saints Peter and Paul. Thus, with certainty, we can say that celebrating daily Easter Week liturgies was an Antiochian custom in the latter part of the fourth century.\(^{614}\)

The temporal cycle of Antioch, at the time of John Chrysostom, consisted of eight weeks of Lent-Holy Week with daily services. Easter Week as well, also had daily services, making a total of nine weeks with daily services with readings. The other forty-three weeks of the year had readings, sermons and the Eucharist on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. To this list, we must also add Ascension Thursday, for it is mentioned in

\(^{611}\) Apostolic Constitutions Book V, xiii: 3-4 as found in: Marcel Metzger, Les Constitutions Apostoliques, Tome II (Sources Chrétiennes 329, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1986), 247.


\(^{613}\) Chrysostom, De resurrectione D.N.J. Chr. 5. Van de Paverd, Meßliturgie, 77-8.

\(^{614}\) Van de Paverd, Meßliturgie, 78.
Apostolic Constitutions, and Chrysostom preached a sermon for it. This makes a temporal lectionary of 193 days, depending of course on when Easter falls from year to year. This cycle would have consisted of 38 Lenten services with only one reading from Genesis, and 155 Eucharistic Liturgies with three readings. To this must be added the Sanctoral and fixed feasts cycle. See Table 5:1 for a summary of the Temporal Cycle.

---


616 Chrysostom, De ascensione domini (Migne 50.441).
TABLE 5: 1

THE TEMPORAL CYCLE OF CHRYSTOM’S ANTIOCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of the Year</th>
<th>Weekends</th>
<th>Weekdays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Weeks of Fasting</td>
<td>Saturday &amp; Sunday Eucharist with 3 Readings &amp; 1 Psalm</td>
<td>Monday-Friday 3 PM Synaxis, Genesis only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Week</td>
<td>Palm Sunday with 3 Readings &amp; 1 Psalm</td>
<td>Monday-Wednesday, Genesis only Thursday &amp; Friday with 3 Readings, Saturday Vigil with many Readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Week</td>
<td>Sunday and Saturday with 3 Readings including Acts, John &amp; 1 Psalm</td>
<td>Monday-Friday with 3 Readings including Acts, John &amp; 1 Psalm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Time of Pentecost</td>
<td>Saturday and Sunday with 3 Readings including Acts, John &amp; 1 Psalm</td>
<td>Friday with 3 Readings including Acts, John &amp; 1 Psalm; Ascension Thursday with 3 Readings &amp; 1 Psalm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 “Regular” Weeks</td>
<td>Saturday and Sunday with 3 Readings &amp; 1 Psalm</td>
<td>Friday with 3 Readings &amp; 1 Psalm; Martyr’s Day with 3 Readings &amp; 1 Psalm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.2 The Sanctoral and Fixed Cycles

The commemoration of the Saints in the calendar of the local Church is a custom that predates the observance of Lent.\textsuperscript{617} The commemoration of Saints was originally totally local, and centered on the tomb of the saint, but towards the end of the fourth century local Churches began to borrow saints’ days from each other. The fixed feasts of Christ began sometime in the third century with the celebration of Epiphany, and this

increased in the fourth century with the addition of Christmas. As the 40 day Lent was adopted in the fourth century, there was a gradual adaptation of what to do with saints’ days that fell during the period of fasting. With Chrysostom, we see that saints’ days were not suppressed in favor of the Lenten observance, as they were in the later Byzantine rite. The Sanctoral at the time of John Chrysostom presents us with a calendar in transition. It is acquiring new days, but is not as full as it would be in later centuries. Lent is now part of life, but the relationship between fasting and celebrating saints’ days has not been settled. Table 5.2 presents this calendar as reconstructed by Baur.

---


TABLE 5.2
THE SANCTORAL AND FIXED CALENDAR OF ANTIOCH AT CHRYSTOM’S TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Feast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 6</td>
<td>Epiphany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7</td>
<td>St. Lucian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January ?</td>
<td>Sts. Juventius &amp; Maximinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 24</td>
<td>Bishop Babylas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 22</td>
<td>St. Drosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20</td>
<td>Sts. Bernice, Prosoce &amp; Domina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31</td>
<td>St. Barlaam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24</td>
<td>St. John the Baptist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1</td>
<td>Sts. Bernice, Prosdoce &amp; Domina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8</td>
<td>St. Pelagia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 17</td>
<td>St. Ignatius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 18</td>
<td>St. Romanos the Martyr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 6</td>
<td>St. Stephen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 20</td>
<td>St. Philogonius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 25</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 26</td>
<td>St. Julian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 27</td>
<td>Sts. James &amp; John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 28</td>
<td>Sts. Peter &amp; Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain date</td>
<td>St. Eustathius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain date</td>
<td>St. Meletius, Bishop of Antioch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5 The Lectionary Readings

5.5.1 The Temporal Cycle

The Temporal or Moveable Cycle refers to the Sundays and weeks of the year either leading up to the celebration of Easter or flowing from it. Those leading up to Easter are Lent and Holy Week. Those flowing from it are the fifty days of Pentecost, and the time afterwards that often is called Sundays and Weeks after Pentecost in the Byzantine Tradition. 621

5.5.1.1 Great Lent

The homily series *On the Statues (De Statuis)*, also called *To the People of Antioch (Ad Populum Antiochenum)*, provides lectionary information for Lent mainly because it is not an exegetical series. In this series, when not talking about the riot and the statues of the imperial family, Chrysostom is mainly concerned about the Epistle of the day. It would be safe to assume that was his preaching assignment. Table 5.3 below shows the lectionary information that can be gleaned from *On the Statues*. I use the timeline set up by Van de Paverd. 622

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liturgical Day</th>
<th>Homily Number</th>
<th>Scriptural Pericope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sunday before Lent</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1 Tim 5:22-6:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday before Lent</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>1 Tim 6:17[-21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday before Lent</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>JL 2:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Friday of Lent</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Gen 3:8?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Saturday of Lent</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Zech 5:1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Saturday or Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>Phlm 1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown weekday</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen 25:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Saturday of Lent</td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>Ps 71:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>Phil 4:4[-9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Weekend of Lent</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>Mt 18:23-33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 5.3, Psalm 71:18 – *Blessed be the Lord God of Israel who alone does wondrous things* - is obviously a hypacoir or sung Psalm as Chrysostom mentions in *Homily XVII: 1*.\(^{624}\) The verse numbers between brackets [] are possible reconstructions, but not mentioned by Chrysostom. Genesis 3:8 has a question mark because Chrysostom does not say it was read, although he comments on it. I placed it in the Table because it is part of the Byzantine lection for the First Friday of Lent – Genesis 2:20-3:20.\(^{625}\) Another reading from Genesis, that is definite, is Isaac’s prayer for his wife to bear children (Genesis 25:21).\(^{626}\) This particular pericope is omitted in the Byzantine

---

\(^{623}\) Ibid, 192-4.

\(^{624}\) Chrysostom, *Concerning the Statues, Homily XVII: 1* in *NPNF, IX*, 452.


Tradition. The Epistle for the Fourth Sunday is possibly tied to a mid-Lent commemoration. *Homily XVIII:1 On the Statues* begins with Chrysostom noting that the people were rejoicing that half of the fast was now over. *Homily XV:16 on Genesis* notes also that half of the Fast is over, but Chrysostom uses that fact to stir the people to greater effort. This may be a reverse comment, whereas the congregation is rejoicing, Chrysostom is issuing a warning. The comments on Matthew 18:23-33 in *Homily XX* do not say that this passage was actually read, which makes sense, because, only Genesis was read Monday-Friday. His comments on it may be looking forward however, to the Saturday or Sunday Gospel of the sixth weekend of Lent. More will be said about this below.

The other large Lenten series, from John Chrysostom, is *Homilies I-XXXII on Genesis*. These homilies do refer to each other forming small groups. The groups can be separated one from another when the link is broken and a homily does not refer to the previous one. Based on this method I have broken them down as follows in Table 5.4:

---


629 *Homily XV: 16-17*, Hill, St. John Chrysostom: *Homilies on Genesis*, 1-17, 204-5.
TABLE 5.4

GROUPING OF *HOMILIES ON GENESIS* I-XXXII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liturgical Time</th>
<th>Homilies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The First Week of Lent</td>
<td><em>Homilies II-IV</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Second Week of Lent</td>
<td><em>Homilies V-XI</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Third Week of Lent</td>
<td><em>Homilies XII-XVI</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Week of Lent</td>
<td><em>Homilies XVII-XIX</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Week of Lent</td>
<td><em>Homilies XX-XXI</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Week of Lent</td>
<td><em>Homilies XXII-XXVIII</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Week of Lent</td>
<td><em>Homily XXIX</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Week (Holy Week)</td>
<td><em>Homilies XXX-XXXII</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Homily XXVII On Genesis* ends up being on the Sixth Friday of Lent. In it, Chrysostom refers to the story of the Merciful Master or Unforgiving Servant or 10,000 Talents (Matthew 18:23-33). He likewise had commented upon this parable in *Homily XX On the Statues* which was also on the Sixth Friday of Lent. As stated above, there was

---

630 *III*: 1 refers to *II*; *IV*: 3 refers to *III*. Hill, *Homilies on Genesis*, 1-17, 39, 52.

631 *VI*: 9 refers to *V*; *VII*: 1 refers to *VI*, *VIII*: 1 refers to *VII*, *IX*: 6 refers to *VIII*; *X*: 7 refers to *IX*; *XI*: 5 is a Sunday; Ibid, 82, 91, 105, 119, 131, 145-6.

632 *XIII*: 3 refers to *XII*; *XIV*: 1 refers to *XIII*; *XV*: 1 refers to *XIV*; *XVI*: 14 refers to *XV*; Ibid, 170, 180, 194, 216.


634 *XXI*: 3 refers to *XX*; *XXII*: 1 refers to *XXI*; Ibid, 52, 68.

635 *XXIV*: 1 refers to *XXIII*; *XXV*: 1 refers to *XXIV*; *XXVI*: 7 refers to *XXV*; *XXVII*: 1 refers to *XXVI*; *XXVIII*: 1 refers to *XXVII*; Ibid, 104, 124, 149, 162, 183.

636 *XXIX* does not openly refer to other homilies.

637 *XXX*: 1-2 says it is Great Week. *XXXI*: 1 refers to *XXX*. *XXII* is Great Wednesday according to *XXXIII*: 3; Ibid, 220-1, 237, 277.

no Gospel reading on Fridays of Lent. The fact that he preached on this Gospel on the Sixth Friday of Lent of two different years, leads one to wonder if he was looking forward to the Saturday or Sunday Gospel. The final piece of evidence is *Homily I on David and Saul*, which refers to Matthew 18:23-33 as having been read the other day. Chrysostom likes the story, but if he was not assigned to preach on the Gospel for the weekend, the only way to say something about it would have been to anticipate it ahead of time.

This is all the specific information that can be gathered about the Lectionary of Antioch during Lent. When it is analyzed we arrive at several tentative conclusions. First, the Epistles are only from St. Paul and they are read in order. There was only one weekend for both 2 Timothy and Titus, namely the First Saturday and Sunday of Lent. For the 2 Timothy reading, I suggest chapter 3:1-7 as will be explained below. I wonder if this short time for 2 Timothy and Titus had to do with the dates of Easter from year to year, and the greater or lesser intervening time, or if it was felt that these two Epistles were duplicating 1Timothy. Chrysostom’s *Commentary on 1Timothy* has 18 homilies; the *Commentary on 2Timothy* has 10 and that on *Titus* has 6. This may indicate that these Epistles were seen as somewhat repetitious of 1Timothy. The next Epistle to be read after Philemon would be Hebrews. This would have covered the Third through Seventh Weekends (five weekends), minus a Mid-Lent observation on the Fourth Sunday of Lent, and possibly Palm Sunday. It is a possibility then, that the Byzantine system of reading

---


640 *NPNF*, XIII, 403-5.
Hebrews on all weekends of Lent is an expansion of an earlier practice based on reading the Pauline Epistles in order.\textsuperscript{641}

The two prophetic readings on the Sunday before Lent (Joel 2:16) and the First Sunday of Lent (Zechariah 5:1-4) lead us to make several conclusions. First, they really are not all that relevant to Lent. They seem to be part of a course reading of the Minor Prophets, yet eight different prophets have been skipped in between the two readings - Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah and Haggai. This means that Zechariah and Malachi were going to be read for the remainder of Lent. If this is the case there are several Messianic passages in both books that would have been appropriate lessons for leading up to Holy Week. Zechariah 9:9 is mentioned below as a possible reading for Palm Sunday. The other possibility is that the Minor Prophets were being hastily finished in order to make room for something else. My guess would be, if this is the case, the open space was for Isaiah. Possibly after the prophetic lection was removed from the Divine Liturgy, then Isaiah ended up at Terce-Sext in Constantinople.\textsuperscript{642}

The Matthew Gospel (Matthew 18:23-33) reading on the Sixth Saturday or Sunday of Lent, points to Matthew’s privileged position in Antioch. It was read during most of the year, including Holy Week, where it held unique sway. It also was read on Christmas and Theophany as will be discussed below. The proposed reconstruction of

\textsuperscript{641} Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, II}, 19-65.

\textsuperscript{642} Ibid, 13-63.
the Lenten Lectionary of Antioch is in Table 5.5. It is obviously vague and lacking in specifics.

**TABLE 5.5**

PROPOSED LENTEN LECTIONARY OF CHrysostom’s ANTIOCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liturgical Time</th>
<th>Old Testament</th>
<th>Psalm</th>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Week of Lent</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Sunday</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Week of Lent</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Saturday</td>
<td>Is or Zech</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Phlm</td>
<td>Mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sunday</td>
<td>Is or Zech</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>Mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Week of Lent</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Saturday</td>
<td>Is or Zech</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>Mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Sunday</td>
<td>Is or Zech</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>Mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Week of Lent</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Saturday</td>
<td>Is or Zech</td>
<td>Ps 71:18</td>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>Mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Sunday</td>
<td>Is or Zech</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>Mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Week of Lent</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Saturday</td>
<td>Gen 25:21?</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>Mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Sunday</td>
<td>Is or Zech</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>Mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Week of Lent</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Saturday</td>
<td>Is or Zech</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>Mt 18:23-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Sunday</td>
<td>Is or Zech</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>Mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Week of Lent</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5.1.2 Great (Holy) Week

For John Chrysostom, Lent and Great (Holy) Week were two distinct entities. He refers to Lent as the fast that is over, and calls on people to intensify their fasting during Great Week. This is shown in the *Homily on Holy Week* (Hill calls it the *Homily on Psalm 146:1*) and in *Homily XXX:1-3 on Genesis*. In his thinking, he is in complete harmony with *Apostolic Constitutions* which does likewise. Therefore, the division in this chapter between Holy Week and Lent is not only convenient, but also matches how Chrysostom and his congregation would have thought of the liturgical time in question as two different things.

Hill thinks that the *Homily on Holy Week (Psalm 146:1)* was given on Holy Saturday. As mentioned above, however, I strongly disagree with his opinion. I think that rather the sermon was given on Palm Sunday, and is looking forward to Holy Week, and encouraging the people to pray, fast and participate in the services. The beginning of the sermon refers to Palm Sunday in an ethical way. Chrysostom is not worried about people who carry branches, but with those who praise God. He asks them to take the


647 Ibid, 118-126.
Psalm of the day, Psalm 145/146:1 (*My soul praise the Lord, I will praise the Lord during my life*), to heart and to praise God.  

The Psalm of Palm Sunday was Psalm 145/146. What were the readings? Chrysostom gives us almost nothing to go on. Using the principle of reading the proper things for the feasts, we can assume that the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem was read, but from which Evangelist? The Byzantine Tradition reads John 12:1-18, which starts with the important phrase, “Six day before Passover.” This announces the coming celebration of the Pasch, which, as will see below, Chrysostom still considered to be the death of Christ on Friday, not Easter. It also contains both the stories of Mary anointing the feet of Jesus, which Christ relates to his burial, and the entry into Jerusalem. Of all the Evangelists John’s account fits best the outlook of late fourth century Antioch to Great Week, where Pascha is Holy Friday and not Easter Sunday.

What of the other readings? Matthew 21:5 and John 12:15 both refer to Zechariah 9:9, making it a good candidate for the prophetic lection. The Epistle is another matter. The Byzantine Tradition uses Philippians 4:4-9, 649 which *Homily XVIII:3 On the Statues* says was used on the Fourth Sunday of Lent. 650 The *Armenian Lectionary* indicates Ephesians 1:3-10651 and *Burkitt’s Lectionary* gives Romans 13:10-14:4. 652

---

modern Syriac Church lectionaries use 1 John 2:7-17 or Romans 11:13-24. Given such different possibilities and no hints from Chrysostom, I do not propose a New Testament Epistle for Palm Sunday.

The services for the first three days of Great (Holy) Week in late fourth century Antioch followed the same pattern as the Lenten services. The book of Genesis continued to be read before Vespers, and Chrysostom continued to comment upon it in his usual verse by verse manner. *Homilies XXX-XXXII on Genesis* were given on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of Holy Week. *Homily XXX* clearly states that Lent is over and Great Week has begun. *Homily XXXI* refers back to *Homily XXX,* and *Homily XXXIII* clearly says that *Homily XXXII* was given before the Thursday of the Betrayal (Holy Thursday). These connections are further affirmed by *Homily II on the Betrayal by Judas* which begins by referring to Abraham (*Homily XXXII on Genesis*). We do not know which pericopes of Genesis were read on Monday through Wednesday of Holy Week, but Genesis was definitely read, and there is no mention of other books being used.

Chrysostom calls Holy Thursday the “Thursday of the Betrayal” focusing more on the betrayal by Judas than the Last or Mystical Supper. In his two sermons for this day,

---


655 Ibid, 237.

656 Ibid, 276.


658 Ibid.
he does admit that the Eucharist began at the Last Supper, and that the Eucharist was being celebrated this day. This emphasis upon the betrayal by Judas, helps to explain why the Byzantine Gospel for the Divine Liturgy of the day, starts so far before the Last Supper and continues so far past it in time (Matthew 26:1-27:2 with John 13:3-17 and Luke 22:43-44 added in). It includes the anointing by the woman at the house of Simon the Leper, the deal between Judas and the priests, the foretelling of the betrayal and the actual betrayal with the kiss. It stops just short of the death of Judas (Matthew 27:3-10). The story of the Anointing by the Woman in Bethany is mentioned by John in *Discourse V Against the Judaizing Christians* as a story told in all the Churches. In *Homily I on the Betrayal* John Chrysostom mentions all of these things using almost exclusively Matthew’s Gospel. He never says however, “you just heard,” but given the description in *Homily XXXIII on Genesis*, it seems logical that the reading would have included all of these elements. This is further supported by comments in the two *Homilies on the Good Thief*. Thursday was the day of the Betrayal, and all things pertaining to that had to be read.

---


662 Hill, St. John Chrysostom: Homilies on Genesis #18-45, 276

663 1er Homélie sur la Croix et le Bon Larron, 2; 2eme Homélie sur la Croix et le Bon Larron, 2 in: Jean Bareille, Œuvres Complètes de Saint Jean Chrysostome (Paris : Librairie de Louis Vives, 1865), IV, 14-17, 29-32.
Chrysostom gives us no information on the Epistle, prophetic lection or the Psalm for Holy Thursday. The Byzantine Tradition, the Armenian Lectionary and Burkitt’s Lectionary all agree on 1 Corinthians 11:23-32 as the Epistle for the Last Supper Liturgy. Both Burkitt’s Lectionary and the Armenian Lectionary mention Psalm 23; otherwise there are no further agreements between the sources. The Byzantine Prophetic lection for the liturgy is Isaiah 50:4-11 which refers to the suffering of Christ and not the Last Supper. Chrysostom’s Sermon Against the Marcionists and Manichaeans, also known as Let This Cup Pass, while talking about the Agony in the Garden, mentions the many prophecies about the cross in the Old Testament. This would tend to support the use of the Isaiah reading. For the time being, we will accept the I Corinthians 11:23-32 reading as being very likely the one used in Antioch, but propose the Isaiah lection only with caution.

Chrysostom calls Great and Holy Friday (Good Friday) the day of the cross or the day of the death on the cross. His comments on the day are based mostly on the Gospels with emphasis upon the Good Thief (Luke 23:39-43). The actual Gospel reading for the day is not specified, but the Byzantine one would fit his sermon (Matthew 27:1-61, with additions from Luke 23:39-43 on the Good Thief and John 19:31-37 on the

665 Mateos, Le Typicon, II, 75.
666 Chrysostom, Against the Marcionists and Manichaeans in NPNF, IX, 201-207.
667 Homily XXXIII, Homilies on Genesis, 18-45, 286. 1er Homélie sur la Croix et le Bon Larron, 1, Bareille, Œuvres Complètes de Saint Jean Chrysostome (1865), IV, 12-14.
It is fairly certain that Matthew’s Gospel was read, because of the comment in *Homily LXXXVII:1 on Matthew* stating that these things are read publically on the “great eve of the Passover.” It is also possible, that at Chrysostom’s time in Antioch, only the Matthew verses were read, and the Good Thief account from Luke was added later, because it was so popular in sermons. Regarding the spear; it was a relic kept in the cathedral in Constantinople, and that pericope may have been added there as discussed in Chapter 2.

Regarding the other readings for Good Friday; Chrysostom does not say much. He does not mention any Old Testament passage in a strong way. He does talk about Christ being the new Paschal Lamb (I Corinthians 5: 6-8). This pericope would not only harmonize with his sermon, but also with the Eucharist that was celebrated that evening. The Byzantine Epistle for Good Friday Vespers is 1 Corinthians 1:18-2:2 on the folly of the cross, the verses on Christ the Paschal Lamb are read at Holy Saturday matins. *Burkitt’s Lectionary* has Hebrews 9:11-28. The *Armenian Lectionary* has eight Epistles, eight prophetic lections, and four Gospels in a service that is three hours

---


669 *Homily LXXXVII:1 on Matthew*, NPNF, X, 516,


long. It is not a regular liturgy, but a special Word service focusing on readings about the cross and therefore not a good comparison with Antioch’s Liturgy. Of the two choices from 1 Corinthians, chapter 1 or 5, I would think that the reference to Christ as the New Passover is more likely (Chapter 5). The Byzantine prophetic lection for Good Friday Vespers is Isaiah 52:13-54:1 – the Fourth Suffering Servant Song. This is an excellent reading for Good Friday, but Chrysostom makes no reference to it, so we could consider it only a possibility. It is one of the eight readings for Good Friday afternoon in the Armenian Lectionary.

The Easter Vigil is briefly described by Chrysostom in the Inscription of the Acts, Homily IV: 5 as follows:

On the Great Saturday the betrayal, the crucifixion of the Our Lord, his death according to the flesh and his entombment.

This describes a Paschal celebration focused on the death of Christ as with the Quatrodecimans. He does say in the 2nd Homily on the Resurrection that Christ rises on Saturday night, so we can imagine that the resurrection account was incorporated into the Gospel reading. Thus, the reading was probably Matthew 26:47-28:20.

676 Mateos, Le Typicon, II, 81.
679 Homélie Contre Ceux Qui S’Enivrent et sur la Résurrection, 4. Bareille, Œuvres Complètes de Saint Jean Chrysostome (1865), IV, 75-78.
In the same homily, Chrysostom says that the Lord desired to celebrate the Pasch with us, and it is the same for the resurrection, thus separating the two events – Good Friday and Easter. In *Concerning Saint Philogonius* he describes the crucifixion as Pascha. The separation of the original unitive Paschal Vigil, described in *Apostolic Constitutions Bk V,XIX:3-8*, into two days (Friday and Saturday) must have occurred shortly before John began to preach. Chrysostom describes the death of Christ as Pasch and not the resurrection; in this he matches the terminology of *Apostolic Constitutions* which has just one service for Holy Week held on Saturday evening. We will therefore avoid the term Paschal Vigil and use the days of the week instead – Holy Friday, Holy Saturday and Easter. In this way I hope to avoid confusion for certain words used by Chrysostom, like Pascha, now have a different meaning.

Chrysostom does not describe the Epistle and the Old Testament readings for the Easter Vigil in his Easter sermons. I posit a proposal for them, with caution, because of the fact that his Saturday night vigil was still concerned with both the death and resurrection of Christ, and not solely the resurrection. Services that focus only on the resurrection, such as in the *Armenian Lectionary* and the Byzantine tradition, could be

---

680 Ibid, 2.
683 Ibid, 232-34.
misleading in this regard having been changed to be more resurrection oriented. The proposal is from the methods of comparative liturgy. Table 5.6 shows the Vigil readings of HS#40, the Armenian Lecionary of Jerusalem, Burkitt’s Syriac Lecionary and the ninth century marginal notes by one hand from the fourth century Codex B (Vatican Gr. 1209) discovered by Pietro Versace.

---


687 Burkitt, The Early Syriac Lecionary System, 10.

When we look at the four columns there are only two readings that are common to all four: the crossing of the Red Sea (Ex 13:20ff) and the Three Youths in the Furnace (Dan 3:1ff). These are readings that refer to deliverance from death and therefore resurrection. Only the one from Exodus is among those considered by Thomas Talley to be original to the celebration based on the “Poem of the Four Nights.” His theory has

---

been discredited by Clemens Leonhard who proved that this poem is a latter composition and has no connection to early Christian practice.\(^{690}\) Also, Bradshaw’s investigation of the existing sources has shown no common origins or ur-list of vigil readings.\(^{691}\) When we lower the number to three columns, we can add the Matthew Resurrection narrative (Mt 28:1ff), the New Zion (Is 60:1-13), the story of Jonah (Jon 1:1ff) and the Binding of Isaac (Gen 22:1-18). This leaves out the story of the creation (Gen 1:1ff). The story of Isaac is included, and it can be understood as referring to the sufferings of Christ. We have to reduce to only two columns to include the story of the Passover Lamb (Ex 12), which is in Melito of Sardis from the second century.\(^{692}\) This information shows that the readings related to the resurrection were on the ascendance, and the ones related to the passion were declining. The fact that the Binding of Isaac was an “extra lesson” in HS#40 shows this trend moving away from the commemoration of the death of Christ to focus on the resurrection. This is why I urge caution in relating these lists to the time of Chrysostom. Given that Chrysostom’s celebration included both the Passion and Resurrection of Christ as mentioned above; I would posit for his celebration the ancient Christian Passover theme readings of the Binding of Isaac because it is reflected in John 19:17, the Paschal Lamb and the Crossing


\(^{692}\) Ibid.
of the Red Sea.\textsuperscript{693} To these I would add the Three Youths in the Furnace, and Jonah, as newer readings stemming from the interest in the celebration of the resurrection of Christ.

What about Romans 6? It appears only in HS\#40 in the above table, yet it has three things to recommend it. First, there is the Gospel reading for the vigil which includes the suffering and death of Christ as well as the resurrection. Romans chapter 6 likewise focuses on these two aspects of the paschal mystery making it a good companion to the Gospel reading. Second, the Easter Vigil was a time for baptisms which the Epistle also mentions, and relates to both the death and resurrection of Christ. Third, Chrysostom’s baptismal theology was strongly influenced by Romans 6. This can be seen in \textit{Baptismal Instructions VII}:20-23 and \textit{X}:8-11 wherein a Romans 6 baptismal theology is expounded.\textsuperscript{694} Chrysostom’s theology would have favored the reading of Romans 6 at the service, and we can also ask how much did the Easter Vigil itself influence his theology? This might be a question of which came first: the reading or the theology? Chrysostom participated in the life and liturgy of the Church long before he gave his catechetical lectures sometime during the years 388-390.\textsuperscript{695} Would not the liturgy of the Church have had some influence on his thought? An Easter Vigil with a Gospel reading including both the passion and resurrection of Christ, the reading of

\textsuperscript{693} Bradshaw & Johnson, \textit{The Origins of Feasts, Fasts and Seasons in Early Christianity}, 44


\textsuperscript{695} Ibid, 15-18.
Romans 6 and the baptism of neophytes is a possible source of Chrysostom’s baptismal theology.

The readings for Holy Week are summarized below in Table 5.7.

### TABLE 5.7
READINGS FOR GREAT (HOLY) WEEK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Old Testament</th>
<th>Psalm</th>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holy Monday</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Tuesday</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Wednesday</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.1.3 The Great Fifty Days

Chrysostom’s Easter Sunday morning sermon does not give any indication of the readings.\(^{696}\) We do know however, that this was when the reading of the Acts of the

Apostles began, which continued until Pentecost Sunday. Also, Psalm 118:24 – *This is the day the Lord has made* - was the Psalm of the day.

Chrysostom’s Ascension Homily offers few clues on the readings of the day. Following the principle of reading the things that refer to a feast on that day, it is safe to assume that the Epistle was Acts 1:1-12 and the Gospel was Luke 24:36-53. These are the readings of the Byzantine Tradition. The *Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem* has the same readings, but with a few added verses. Burkitt’s *Syriac Lectionary* matches the Byzantine, except for the Epistle being one verse shorter. The two Pentecost Homilies, while affirming that Pentecost is a baptismal day in Antioch, offer no comments on the Lectionary. Again, using the principle of the readings referring to the feast, it is safe to assume that the Epistle was Acts 2:1-11 as in the Byzantine Tradition. The *Syriac Lectionary* reading has more verses, and the Jerusalem one matches it.

---


702 Burkitt, *The Early Syriac Lectionary System*, 12.

703 *1er Homélie sur la Pentecôte, 3; 2ème Homélie sur la Pentecôte, 3*. Bareille, *Œuvres Complètes de Saint Jean Chrysostome* (1865), IV, 103-105, 121-123.


705 Burkitt, *The Early Syriac Lectionary System*, 12.

The *Homilies on Genesis, Numbers XXXIII-LXVII*, were given in relatively close succession after Pascha. Hill, following De Montfaucon, says that the series resumed after Pentecost Sunday from its Holy Week hiatus.\(^707\) I strongly disagree with this interpretation. Their opinion, concerning the length of the break in the series, is based on the following quote from *Homily XXXIII:1*.

I am aware that you for your part have possibly forgotten everything on account of the lapse of many days in the meantime and the fact that we have directed our sermon to other themes. The arrival of the sacred festival interrupted our series: it was not appropriate for us while celebrating the Lord’s Cross to have instruction on other matters; instead, each time we felt the need to lay before you a table suited to the occasion. This, of course, was the reason why, when the day of the Betrayal arrived, we interrupted the sequence of our instruction in response to need and directed our words to the betrayer, and then in turn proposed for your consideration thoughts about the Cross. Then, when Resurrection day dawned, it behooved us to instruct your good selves on the Lord’s Resurrection, and next to provide you in the days following the Resurrection with a demonstration of it through the wonders that happened afterwards, when we took up the Acts of the Apostles and from there laid before you the customary feast, offering particular exhortation day after day to those who had just been granted the favor of baptism.\(^708\)

The passage initially offers no problem. The series on Genesis stopped on Holy Wednesday, so that on Holy Thursday (Betrayal), on Good Friday (Cross) and on Resurrection day (Easter) the feast of the day could be focused on. This is clear. The problem is: when did he preach on the Acts of the Apostles? Hill, following De Montfaucon, says that the preaching on the Acts continued until Pentecost Sunday. This

\(^{707}\) Hill, *St. John Chrysostom: Homilies on Genesis*, 1-17, 5.

is what I disagree with. Although, the book was read from Easter through Pentecost Sunday, as stated above; there were no daily Eucharistic Liturgies during the latter fourth century as in HS#40 for the 50 Days.\footnote{Mateos, Le Typicon, II, 97-137.} Instead, as we have seen earlier, there were only daily liturgies during the first week after Easter, and these involved the newly baptized whom Chrysostom mentions, the following weeks had Eucharists on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays as per the normal pattern. This first week is what I think Chrysostom was talking about in the quote. Therefore, the series on Genesis resumed not after Pentecost Sunday, but after Easter Week at the regular Friday, Saturday and Sunday Eucharists. I base the following timeline on this premise.

As with Homilies I – XXXII; Homilies XXXIII-LXVII On Genesis refer to each other in small groups with the succeeding homily referring to the preceding one. There are also references to days when no homily was given, and to three homilies that are not recorded in the series. The proposed timeline is in Table 5.8. Please note that based on what was said earlier about frequency of services, a weekend is usually Friday, Saturday and Sunday. Weekdays noted, other than Fridays, would be Saints’ days.
TABLE 5.8

TIMELINE FOR HOMILIES XXXIII-LXVII ON GENESIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Homilies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Weekend after Easter</td>
<td>XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Week after Easter</td>
<td>XXXVI, XXXVII, blank day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Weekend after Easter</td>
<td>XXXVI, XXXIX, XL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Weekend after Easter</td>
<td>XLV, XLVI, XLVII, XLVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Week after Easter</td>
<td>L, LX, LXI, LIX, Sunday (blank day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Week after Pentecost</td>
<td>LVI, LVII, LVIII, Grain on the Sabbath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Week after Pentecost</td>
<td>LXI, LXII, LXIII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

710 XXXIV: 1 refers to XXXIII; XXXV: 7 refers to XXXIV; Hill, Homilies on Genesis 18-45, 289, 309.
711 XXXVI: 1 refers to almost every day; XXXVII: 2 refers to XXXVI; Ibid, 324, 341.
712 XXXIX: 1 refers to XXXVIII; XL: 1 refers to XXXIX; Ibid, 374, 389.
713 XLII: 1 & 27 refers to XLI; XLIII: 2 refers to XLII; XLIV: 1 & 3 refers to the Samaritan Woman as yesterday, and XLIII as two days ago; Ibid, 418, 432, 436, 455-6.
714 XLVI: 1 refers to XLV; XLVII: 2 refers to XLVI; XLVIII: 1 refers to XLVII; Hill, Homilies on Genesis 46-67, 3, 14, 25
715 L: 1 refers to XLIX; Ibid, 50.
716 LI: 1, the day before yesterday is L; LII: 1 refers to LI; LIII: 1 refers to LI; Call of Matthew; LIV: 1 refers to Call of Matthew as yesterday, and LIII as day before yesterday; LV: 1 refers to LIV; Ibid, 56, 66, 79, 92, 107.
717 LVI: 1 refers to LV; LVII: 1 refers to LVI; LVIII: 1, 2, 16 refers to LVII; Grain on the Sabbath (missing), LIX: 1 refers to Grain on the Sabbath, 4 refers to LVIII as day before yesterday; LX: 1 refers to LIX and LVIII; Ibid, 119, 133, 154, 162, 166, 177.
718 LXI: 1 refers to LX as day before yesterday; LXII: 1 refers to LXI as day before yesterday; LXIII: 1 refers to LXII; Ibid, 186, 198, 212.
719 LXV: 1 refers to LXIV; Ibid 243.
720 LXVII: 1 refers to LXVI as day before yesterday, Ibid, 265.
The purpose of Table 5.8, and the calculations behind it, was to place in the year the missing sermons on the Samaritan Woman (John 4), the Call of Matthew (Matthew 9:9-13) and the Sabbath Grain (Matthew 12:1-8). It must be noted that the last pericope is uncertain. Chrysostom refers to Christ silencing the Jewish authorities and that is all. In Matthew’s Gospel, the Sabbath Grain is the first controversy involving the authorities after the Call of Matthew. In Luke, these two stories are only separated by six verses (Luke 5:27-32; 6:1-11), and Hill thinks that Chrysostom is referring to the Lucan version and not the Matthew one.\textsuperscript{721}

The Story of the Samaritan Woman (John 4:4-42) is on the Fourth Weekend after Easter, which is where it is in the Byzantine Lectionary.\textsuperscript{722} This story, combined with the Healing of the Paralytic (John 5:1-18), read the Sunday before it, and the Healing of the Man Born Blind (John 9:1-41), read the Sunday after it in the Byzantine Tradition,\textsuperscript{723} form a baptismal catechesis, with a parallel in the Roman readings for Lent. The Roman cycle consists of the Samaritan Woman, the Man Born Blind and the Raising of Lazarus (John 4, 9 & 11).\textsuperscript{724} Lucien de Bruyne proposes these scenes as part of the pre-baptismal catechesis because they are found depicted in the baptisteries of Dura Europos (third century) and Naples (fourth century). His reasoning is that if the sacramental liturgy


\textsuperscript{722} Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, II}, 123.

\textsuperscript{723} Ibid, 119, 123, 125.

determined the shape of the baptismal building, then the decoration also would not be left to chance, but also relate to the sacraments. 725 Martimort also agrees with him, and connects baptismal catechesis to the art of the catacombs, which is ultimately not funereal, but baptismal. 726

The ancient Coptic Liturgy used in its Lenten Lectionary the same pericopes as the Roman pre-baptismal Gospels – John 4, 9 & 11 – with the addition of the Paralytic at Bethesda (John 5:1-18). The ancient Copts and Byzantines shared the additional story of John 5. Both Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria commented on these pericopes using baptismal imagery and allusions, even connecting them to the baptismal liturgy. 727

The Resurrection of Lazarus was found twice in the Byzantine Lectionary at the time of Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople (ca. 557), on the day before Palm Sunday and the day before Pentecost. Thus, this pericope also had a pre-baptismal function in the earlier Byzantine Tradition in light of baptisms on Lazarus Saturday and Pentecost Sunday. 728

Chrysostom’s Homilies on Pentecost, referred to earlier, state that Pentecost was a baptismal day in Antioch. It is logical to conclude that these three particular Sunday Gospels came to be used because of baptisms on Pentecost Sunday. The fact, that the

728 See Appendix E. Also, Mateos, Le Typicon, II, 137.
readings are out of order points to their purpose as catechesis, and that they are not just part of the bahnlesung of John’s Gospel. Nicholas Russo indicates even more readings of the Byzantine John cursus are baptismal. He notes that the Wedding at Cana (John 2), the High Priestly Prayer (John 17:1-13) and the reading for Pentecost Sunday itself (John 7:37-53) are baptismal in nature in addition to the readings already mentioned.\textsuperscript{729} He supports his conclusions with references to the way that some fourth-sixth century Western and Egyptian Fathers discussed these pericopes. These are Athanasius of Alexandria (+373), Cyril of Alexandria (+444), Caesarius of Arles (+542) and Maximus of Turin (ca +408-423).\textsuperscript{730} Most likely John’s Gospel entered the Antiochian Lectionary exactly as a preparation for baptisms on Pentecost, and this shows the importance of Pentecost as a baptismal feast in Antioch. We must also conclude that the system of lections was imported from the West or from Egypt. Table 5.9 lists the Johannine pericopes that Russo points out with the addition of the Resurrection of Lazarus, and when they are read in HS#40.

\textsuperscript{729} Russo, “The Origins of Lent,” 278.
\textsuperscript{730} Ibid, 280-7.
TABLE 5.9:
JOHANNINE BAPTISMAL PERICOPES IN HS#40 ACCORDING TO RUSSO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pericope</th>
<th>When Read in HS#40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jn 2:1-11 – Wedding at Cana</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} Monday after Easter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 5:1-15 - Healing of Lame Man at Pool of Bethsaida</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th} Sunday of Easter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 4:5-42 – Samaritan Woman at the Well</td>
<td>5\textsuperscript{th} Sunday of Easter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 9:1-38 – Man Born Blind</td>
<td>6\textsuperscript{th} Sunday of Easter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 17:1-13 – High Priestly Prayer</td>
<td>7\textsuperscript{th} Sunday of Easter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 11 – Resurrection of Lazarus</td>
<td>Day before Palm Sunday, but also the day before Pentecost Sunday in Leontius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn 7:37-53 – Rivers of Living Water</td>
<td>Pentecost Sunday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reference in *Homily XLIV* to the Samaritan Woman is the only reference by Chrysostom to the reading of John’s Gospel in the liturgy, besides the existence of the *Commentary on John* itself.

The two stories from Matthew or Luke (The Call of Matthew and the Controversy with the Jewish Leaders) are more problematic. They are definitely out of order being right before and right after Pentecost Sunday. Were they read at the Liturgy, or did they suit Chrysostom’s purposes for his sermon for that particular day? I think that the latter is the answer. The Call of Mathew would be appropriate for a feast day in his honor, but we do not know if this is the case. It is a possibility however, that there was a feast day for Matthew in Antioch. The controversy with the Jewish leaders would suit Chrysostom’s purpose as seen in the *Discourses Against the Judaizing Christians*. Of the

\footnote{Ibid, 278.}
two homilies then, the first may have been for a feast day of Saint Matthew, or suited Chrysostom’s purposes for that day. The one on the controversy would have suited Chrysostom’s purposes for some reason. Neither really qualifies as being part of the \textit{bahnlesung} of Matthew for they are too early in the year.

5.5.1.4 Weeks after Pentecost

There are a number of Chrysostom’s homilies that clearly state the day’s readings, yet the homily itself cannot be placed accurately within the Liturgical Year. These homilies are still valuable because they let us know which books and pericopes were read. Perhaps in the future some new information will allow these lections to be given an exact location in time. They are listed in Table 5.10
TABLE 5.10

LITURGICAL PERICOPES WITHOUT A SPECIFIC DATE

*De Compunctione or On Lowliness of Mind;* readings - Philippians 1:18 & Matthew 15:21-28 (Canaanite Woman) after *Against the Anomoeans Homily V,* in December\(^{732}\)

Death of John the Baptist, Matthew 14:1-12 or Mark 6:14-29\(^{733}\)

*Homilies XII, XV & XXIII on Ephesians* (Ephesians 4:17, 4:31 & 6:14)\(^{734}\)

*Homily on Jeremiah 10:23*\(^{735}\)

*Homily VII on 2 Timothy* (2 Timothy 3:1-7)\(^{736}\)

*Homily on Tribulations* (Romans 8:28)\(^{737}\)

The first item on the list might be the most valuable since we know its general time is December. This would mean that the progression through Matthew had reached chapter 15 leaving chapters 16-25 to be read during December, January, February, March and April up until Holy Week. The progression of the Epistles has reached Philippians, meaning since Pentecost Sunday, Romans, I & 2 Corinthians, Galatians and Ephesians had already been read. From December through Holy Week the remainder of Philippians, Colossians, 1 & 2 Thessalonians, 1 & 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon and Hebrews remained. We have seen that 1 Timothy ended just before Lent began, and 2

---


\(^{733}\) Homily XXVIII: 4 on 2 Corinthians, in: *NPNF,* XII, 410.

\(^{734}\) Homilies XII, XV & XXIII On Ephesians in: *NPNF,* XIII, 109-112, 121-125, 163-166.


\(^{736}\) Homily VII On 2 Timothy in: in *NPNF,* XIII, 500-4

Timothy, Titus and Philemon were given only one day each. This left four or five weekends for Hebrews depending on what was used on Palm Sunday.

The death of John the Baptist (Matthew 14) must have recently preceded the pericope on the Canaanite Woman (Matthew 15), if the Gospels were read in order. Jerusalem at this time remembered his death on August 29, but we do not know if the commemoration had spread to Antioch by the 380’s.\(^{738}\) The Homily on Romans 8:28 would have been during the summer. I have listed the three homilies from Ephesians (\(XII, XV & XXIII\)) because each one is concerning one verse only.\(^{739}\) The other sermons in this exegetical series list a verse and then Chrysostom’s commentary, and each sermon lists at least several verses. These homilies on the other hand list only one verse which is duplicated in either the preceding or following sermon. I propose therefore that they were regular liturgy sermons that were placed in the series at a later date. If this is correct, then Ephesians 4:17 (\(XII\)), 4:31 (\(XV\)) and 6:14 (\(XXIII\)) were read sometime in or around November. I propose Homily VII on 2 Timothy (3:1-7) for similar reasons – its verses are duplicated in Homily VIII, which follows the regular pattern of individual verses followed by commentary.\(^{740}\) Above we proposed that 2 Timothy would have only been read on the First Saturday of Lent, therefore making these verses the reading of that day. We have no hints as to when the Jeremiah text was read.

---


\(^{739}\) Homilies XII, XV, XXIII, Homilies on Ephesians, NPNF, XIII, 109-112, 121-125, 163-166.

\(^{740}\) Homily VII On 2 Timothy, NPNF, XIII, 500-504.
5.5.2 The Fixed Cycle and the Sanctoral

Having treated the Temporal Cycle of the year we now move on to the Fixed Cycle of Feasts and Sanctoral in late fourth century Antioch. They consisted simply of Christmas, Epiphany and a number of Saints days. As of yet, there was no pre or post-Christmas season and the same for the Epiphany. These two Christological feasts were one day celebrations just like those of the Saints.

5.5.2.1 Christmas

Chrysostom’s Christmas Sermon refers to Against the Judaizers and On St. Philogonius. It also mentions “our common father (Bishop Flavian)” firmly anchoring it to Antioch. The sermon mentions events from St. Luke’s Gospel: the Annunciations to Zachary and Mary (Luke 1) and the Census (Luke 2:1-2). It does not mention the angels, the angelic hymn or the shepherds (Luke 2:8-20). It does mention the star and the Magi (Matthew 2:1-12). It does not say which Gospel was actually read, or which Epistle or Prophetic reading. The fact that the angels and shepherds are missing from the homily, points to the story of the Magi as the reading of the day. Concerning Blessed Philogonius affirms this hypothesis. In this homily John is encouraging the congregation to celebrate the feast on December 25, and he focus his attention on the visit of the Magi. He does

741 Homélie sur la Fête de la Nativité de Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ, 5, 6 & 7 in : Bareille, Œuvres Complètes de Saint Jean Chrysostome (1864), ill, 590-597.

742 Ibid, 2-6.
not mention the visit of the shepherds.\textsuperscript{743} The later Byzantine Tradition settled on the story of the Magi for the Christmas day Gospel reading.\textsuperscript{744} The \textit{Armenian Lectionary} read it on January 6 in Bethlehem, but not in Jerusalem which used Matthew 1:18-25.\textsuperscript{745} The \textit{Georgian Lectionary} has Matthew 1:18-25 at the vigil liturgy in Bethlehem, and Matthew 2:1-23 at the Christmas day liturgy, thus combining the traditions of Bethlehem and Jerusalem together.\textsuperscript{746}

It seems that in the late antique and early Byzantine era this particular Gospel scene concerning the Nativity of Christ captured the imagination of the believers. There is a seventh century mosaic of the Adoration of the Magi, which used to be in the Old St. Peter’s Basilica, and is now in Santa Maria in Cosmedin in Rome.\textsuperscript{747} There are also other ancient mosaics and paintings of the Adoration of the Magi even going back to the catacombs.\textsuperscript{748}

5.5.2.2 Epiphany

Chrysostom’s Antiochian sermon on the Epiphany clearly states that the Epistle for the Feast is Titus 2:11-17. He does not state the Gospel passage, but he does quote


\textsuperscript{744} Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon}, I, 159.

\textsuperscript{745} Wilkinson, \textit{Armenian Lectionary}, 181.

\textsuperscript{746} Tarchnischvili, \textit{Le Grand Lectionnaire de l’Église de Jérusalem (V-VIII Siècle)}, I, 10, 13-4.


\textsuperscript{748} Martimort, “L’Iconographie des Catacombes et la Catéchèse Antique,” 107.
the Gospel of Matthew’s version of the baptism of Christ several times, which may be an indication that this was the version read in church.\footnote{Homélie sur le Baptême de Notre Seigneur et l’Épiphanie, 2-3 in: Bareille, Œuvres Complètes de Saint Jean Chrysostome (1864), III, 604-610.} Chrysostom said, in *Homily IV:5* of The Inscription on the Acts, that at each feast or commemorative day whatever pertains to that day is read.\footnote{Homely IV: 5, Homélies sur l’Inscription des Actes, in: Bareille, Œuvres Complètes de Saint Jean Chrysostome (1866), V, 147-149.} Following this custom, Matthew’s account of the baptism (Matthew 3:13-17) would have been the best to read, because the Lucan version separates the descent of the Spirit from the actual baptism (Luke 3:21-22). This gives then Matthew 3:13-17 and Titus 2:11-17 as the readings of the day, with no indication of the prophetic lection or the Psalm.

A further indication of the reading from Matthew may be the earliest surviving mosaics and paintings of the baptism of Christ from the third century onwards. These works clearly show the Spirit in the form of a dove over Christ’s head and the hand of the Forerunner firmly placed on Christ’s head.\footnote{Lucien de Bruyne, “L’Initiation Chrétienne et Ses Reflets dans l’Art Paléochrétien,” Revue des Sciences Religieuses 36 (1962), 59-62.} A famous example is in the Arian Baptistery of Ravenna dating from about 500 AD.\footnote{Yanagi, *Byzantium*, 21-2.} Chrysostom’s hearers would recognize this scene from their own baptism. Chrysostom, in his baptismal catechesis, states that the neophyte receives the Spirit when the priest places his hand on their head for the immersion.\footnote{Second Instruction: 24 in: Paul W. Harkins, *St. John Chrysostom: Baptismal Instructions* (New York: Newman Press, 1963), 52.} The artwork in the baptistery, the reading of the Matthew

---

\footnote{Homélie sur le Baptême de Notre Seigneur et l’Épiphanie, 2-3 in: Bareille, Œuvres Complètes de Saint Jean Chrysostome (1864), III, 604-610.}

\footnote{Homely IV: 5, Homélies sur l’Inscription des Actes, in: Bareille, Œuvres Complètes de Saint Jean Chrysostome (1866), V, 147-149.}


\footnote{Yanagi, *Byzantium*, 21-2.}

version of the Baptism of Christ, and the believer’s memory of his own initiation would all have been in harmony.

5.5.2.3 Saints’ Days

John Chrysostom’s sermons describe the celebration of the martyr’s day in late fourth century Antioch, in terms that sound like the beatification or canonization of a new saint, in Vatican City, in today’s world. His description is far removed from the quiet commemoration, done mostly in the form of a meditation, at a weekday service attended by only those few people who attend all weekday services, whether it is a special day or not. Here I will describe the martyr’s day liturgy from his sermons, so that we may know what lectionary elements we are seeking evidence for.

The celebration would sometimes begin with a procession, held on the afternoon before the feast, from the city to the Martyrium (the church containing the martyr’s tomb). This procession was led by the clergy, sometimes including the bishop, and on a rare occasion included carrying the relics of the saint. Once at the martyr’s grave, a vigil was held that consisted of singing Psalms, but no readings are mentioned. Homily I on Isaiah 6 mentions the singing of Psalm 2:11 – *Serve the Lord with fear; with trembling bow down in homage.* It is not clear from the text if this was sung at the vigil or the Eucharistic Liturgy. In the morning there was the Eucharistic liturgy with readings,

---


sermons and the Mysteries.\textsuperscript{756} Chrysostom mentions that people were noticeably enthusiastic for these celebrations.\textsuperscript{757} The devotion to the Saint was not limited to the feast day either. People kept images of St. Meletius (+381), late bishop of Antioch, at home on rings, cups, seals and bedroom walls.\textsuperscript{758} The faithful could pray at the tombs of the martyrs and take holy oil from them to anoint themselves.\textsuperscript{759}

In Chrysostom’s sermons on the saints, there is no indication of what the liturgical readings were for these celebrations. There is, I believe, an indication of the Old Testament lesson in the \textit{Homilies on Isaiah 6 (In illud: Vidi dominum)}. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Hill thinks that the series really consists of \textit{Homilies II, III, V & VI}. \textit{Numbers I & IV} were added later to the group because they are on the same pericope of Isaiah 6:1ff. Both \textit{Homilies I & IV} describe what seems to be a martyr’s day celebration, for they mention a vigil and the enthusiasm of the people, as just noted in the description above.\textsuperscript{760} \textit{Homily III} actually states that today is a Saint’s Day, but the bishop will speak on the martyrs.\textsuperscript{761} Two of Chrysostom’s sermons on saints mention that the martyrs are in heaven with the angels, cherubim, seraphim and the King of heaven.\textsuperscript{762}

\textsuperscript{756} A \textit{Homily on Martyrs 664:10} in: Mayer & Allen, \textit{John Chrysostom}, 95.


\textsuperscript{758} Ibid: 3, 43.

\textsuperscript{759} A \textit{Homily on the Martyrs 664:45-55} in: Mayer & Allen, \textit{John Chrysostom}, 96.

\textsuperscript{760} Hill, \textit{St. John Chrysostom: Old Testament Homilies; II}, 50 & 86.

\textsuperscript{761} Ibid, 68.

Isaiah 6:1ff would be an excellent reading for this emphasis on being in heaven with the angels, and worshipping God, as would the singing of the Sanctus during the anaphora. Also, Psalm 2:11, mentioned above, would be an excellent Psalm to be sung after Isaiah 6:1ff is read. Homilies I & IV do not really belong to the series On Isaiah 6, and seem to be describing a saint’s day celebration. Homily III was given on a saint’s day. These homilies, taken together, all point to Isaiah 6:1ff as the Old Testament lesson for a martyr’s day.

Using the principle mentioned earlier, that the readings were appropriate to the feast or commemoration; one more Old Testament lesson may be posited for a saint’s day, and one Gospel reading. It would be logical for the Feast of the Maccabees on August 1 that their story would be read. Chrysostom’s sermons focus on the mother and the seven boys and their story is told in 2 Maccabees chapter 7. It is logical that this was the prophetic reading for August 1. On June 24, it would be logical to read the story of the Birth of the Baptist from Luke 1:5-25 & 57-80.

Chrysostom’s neighbors to the east were the Syriac speaking Christians of Edessa and surrounding areas in Eastern Syria. Burkitt’s Syriac Lectionary (B. M. Add. 14528) presents two sets of possible lessons for the commemoration of martyrs, and two possible sets of lessons for the commemoration of bishops. This manuscript is from the Syriac speaking Christians of the Euphrates Valley, and is dated by Burkitt to shortly

after 474 AD. Baumstark dated the document earlier to before the Council of Ephesus in 431 AD, because it lacks a specific feast day for the Virgin Mary, which he sees as unlikely after that Council’s ratification of the title *Theotokos*. Recently, Merras has challenged Burkitt and Baumstark regarding the date of the contents of the manuscript, and not its actual date of publication. Merras makes points related to Christmas, Epiphany and Holy Week. Christmas is simultaneously a celebration of Christ and his mother, or the virgin birth and the Virgin who gave birth. Epiphany is presented as a day celebrating the incarnation, redemption and baptism. Paschal baptism was introduced at the end of Ephrem’s life in Edessa (363-373 AD) and is absent from this lectionary. Finally, Merjas mentions Holy Week lacks Palm Sunday. Thus, she dates the contents of the manuscript from 350 to 390 AD. If she is correct, this lectionary is roughly contemporaneous with Chrysostom. It does not list Isaiah 6:1ff as a saint’s day reading, however.

Chrysostom’s neighbor to the south was Jerusalem. The *Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem* is generally dated to the years 417-439. Like most documents, its roots are deeper than its date of writing, and Renoux sees nothing in it that would contradict

---

765 Ibid, 5.


768 Renoux, “The Reading of the Bible in Ancient Jerusalem,” 391.
what Egeria witnessed in 381-384. This makes the document roughly contemporary to Chrysostom. In the *Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem* there is one set of lections given for all martyrs – Romans 8:28-39, Psalm 116:1 and Matthew 10:16-22. Bishops John and Cyril of Jerusalem share the same readings for their commemorations – 2 Timothy 4:1-8, Psalm 116:1 and John 10:11-16. There is no note, however, saying that these readings are for all bishops. It is interesting to note that martyrs and bishops are the same two categories of commemorations with standardized readings in Burkitt’s *Lectionary*.

The later Byzantine Tradition also tended to standardize the readings for various categories of saints. The Old Testament lection had disappeared from the Divine Liturgy by the time of *HS#40*, so there are no references to Isaiah 6:1ff or any other prophetic lection for saints’ days. Until further documentation becomes available, Isaiah 6:1ff remains a possibility, but not a certainty as the prophetic reading used for the martyr’s day Eucharist in Antioch.

The limited knowledge of the readings for the Fixed Cycle and Sanctoral is summarized in Table 5: 11.

---

769 Ibid, 393.


TABLE 5:11

READINGS OF THE FIXED AND SANCTORAL CYCLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>OT Reading</th>
<th>Psalm</th>
<th>NT Reading</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christmas – Dec 25</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Mt 2:1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiphany – Jan 6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Ti 2:11-17</td>
<td>Mt 3:13-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyr’s Day</td>
<td>Is 6:1-8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John the Baptist – June 24</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Lk 1: 5-25  &amp; 57-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maccabees – Aug 1</td>
<td>2 Mc 7:1-41</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Conclusions: Patterns in the Lectionary of Antioch

5.6.1 Summary of Data

What have we discovered about lectionary patterns in Chrysostom’s Antioch?

We have seen, first of all, which biblical books were read and which ones were not read.

Table 5.12 shows the books that were used and when, and which ones were avoided.

Why certain books were read in church and others were not is important and will be discussed later. The table will also serve as a handy summary for our knowledge.
TABLE 5.12
WHICH BIBLICAL BOOKS WERE READ AND NOT READ IN ANTIOCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Testament Books Read</th>
<th>When Read</th>
<th>Old Testament Books not Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books of Moses – Gen</td>
<td>Mon-Fri during Lent; Mon-Wed of Holy Week</td>
<td>Ex, Lv, Nb, Dt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Sung at all services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major and some Minor Prophets</td>
<td>At all Eucharistic Liturgies</td>
<td>Am, Ob, Jon, Mi, Na, Hab, Zp, Hg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Testament Books Read**

| Jn & Acts                | Great 50 Days of Pentecost   |                              |
| Mt                       | All year except when Jn is read |                              |
| Pauline Epistles         | Read in order throughout the year, except when Acts is read | Catholic Epistles & Revelation |

1. Genesis was read on 35 weekdays of Lent and the first three days of Holy Week.

   The other books of the Law were not read except at the Easter Vigil.

2. Holy Week had Eucharistic Liturgies for Holy Thursday, Holy Friday and Holy Saturday (Easter Vigil).

3. The Historical Books, except for 2 Maccabees 7, and Wisdom Literature were not read in church.

4. The prophetic books were read at the Eucharistic liturgies. Given that there were about 155 divine liturgies a year, there obviously had to be some choices made as to
what to read and what to omit. Few actual readings were found, so our knowledge of
what was read and omitted is very small.

5. The Gospel of Matthew was read for most of the year, beginning after Pentecost
through the Easter Vigil. In December Matthew 15:21-28 was read and the Sixth
Weekend of Lent Matthew 18:23-33 was read. This gives some idea of the pace going
through the Gospel. Festal readings tended to be from Matthew.

6. Occasionally a sermon is based on Luke, like the series on the Rich Man and
Lazarus, but these seem to suit the preacher’s purpose more than reflect the actual
liturgical readings.

7. John’s Gospel was read from Easter through Pentecost as was the Acts of the
Apostles. The Samaritan Woman (John 4:5-42) was definitely read, and with it we
suppose the series also containing the paralytic at the Pool of Bethesda (John 5:1-15)
and the man born blind (John 9:1-38).

8. Pauline Epistles were read in order from after Pentecost through Lent
accompanying the Gospel of Matthew. Festal Epistles were appropriate for the feast
being celebrated.

9. Feast days tended to be one day events with appropriate readings taken from
the Gospel of Matthew, the Pauline Epistles and the Prophets.

5.6.2 Questions that Need Answers
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The information discovered and presented leads to questions, some of which are beyond the scope of this work. I present them in brief, but these are topics for further study and investigation.

5.6.2.1 Set Readings

First, were there actual set readings at Chrysostom’s time, or did they just read certain books during certain seasons? We have seen that there were designated readings for feast days. We also saw a few readings for other days such as the Samaritan Woman (John 4:4-41), the Merciful Master (Matthew 18:23-33) and the Canaanite Woman (Matthew 15:21-28). Where these read every year? Were there other designated pericopes? Presently we do not have enough evidence to be sure. We do have some evidence for an educated guess, however. The Commentary on John, Homily XI says:

> What can it be then, that I ask of you? Let each one of you, on some day of the week, even on the Sabbath itself, take in his hands the selection of the Gospels that is going to be read to you. Read it frequently as you sit at home in the time intervening, and often ponder with care the thoughts stored up in it and examine them well…. thus prepared come to the sermon.\(^{773}\)

This quote would seem to indicate a set series of lections that one can read ahead of time. The quote is from the exegetical series on John, and I think it refers more to that series, than the actual Sunday Gospel. The hearer could remember the previous liturgy’s commentary and proceed on to the following verses in the Gospel.

Homily XIX on the Acts of the Apostles talks about the people’s poor attitude towards the readings in church:

After him begins the reader, “The Prophecy of Esaias,” and still none attends, although Prophecy has nothing of man in it. Then after this, he says, “Thus saith the Lord,” and still none attends. Then after this punishments and vengeances, and still even then none attends. But what is the common excuse? “It is always the same things over again.”

From the context is clear that what is being talked about is the actual reading done in the liturgy. It is these readings that elicit the comment, “It is always the same things over again.” This comment is probably the strongest single piece of evidence that there was an order of lessons and they were repeated yearly. There is no other way to account for the comment. Further on in the homily, Chrysostom admits that they are the same and compares them to the theater. People run off to see the same plays many times and it does not bother them, so why does the reading of the Scriptures bore them? He further states that, “For it is not possible, I say not possible, ever to exhaust the mind of the Scriptures.” There still could have been some flexibility in what was read, but it could not have been something totally new every year. New things would not have bored Saint John’s congregation; or at least not have solicited the expression, “always the same things.”

---
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5.6.2.2 The Absence of the Reading of the Law

In Chrysostom’s Antioch the Old Testament lesson was taken from the Prophetic Books, not the Law. Yet, *Apostolic Constitutions Book II:*LVII,5 calls for the reading of the Law and Prophets.⁷⁷⁶ Did Antioch never read from the Law? Or was the Law removed from the Liturgy due to the Judaizing Christians? The *Discourses Against the Judaizing Christians*, as noted in Chapter 4, refer to those Christians who followed Jewish fasts and feasts. These feasts and seasons are decreed in Exodus 12, 23:14-19; Leviticus 16, 23 and Deuteronomy 16. Were these books removed from the Liturgy so that Christians would not hear about the Jewish liturgical year? We may never have an answer to these questions, but the end result is that for Chrysostom, Moses is the author of Genesis more than he is the lawgiver.

5.6.2.3 The Role of Anti-Arian Polemic in the Lectionary

The reading of the Gospel of John during the Great 50 Days is an ancient tradition preserved in the Byzantine Church and attested to by Chrysostom as noted earlier. In his *Commentary on Saint John the Apostle and Evangelist*, Chrysostom uses *Homilies I-XV* to comment on the Prologue of John’s Gospel (John 1:1-18).⁷⁷⁷ These Homilies are largely concerned with anti-Arian polemic. Was the reading of John

---


introduced into the Liturgy for this purpose? Or, was it an extension of a pre-Pentecost baptismal catechesis, or both?

5.6.2.4 Other Missing Books

Table 5.11 shows that the Historical Books and Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament were not read in the liturgy of Chrysostom’s day. In the New Testament, the Gospels of Mark and Luke, the Catholic Epistles and Revelation were not read in the liturgy. These books were quoted by Chrysostom and others, but not read in church. It would be enlightening to investigate why this was so.

5.6.3 Concluding Comment

What we have discovered about the lectionary of Antioch, at the time of John Chrysostom, is similar to excavating the foundations of an ancient church. We find pieces of the foundation, and chart them out on a grid, and then connect the lines together. This is fine as long as all the important parts of the foundation survived. If the foundations of a tower or staircase or transept did not survive then our picture and conclusions will be faulty. We have excavated Chrysostom and found partial ruins. Any new evidence in the future will force us to re-evaluate what we know, and will prove or disprove the conclusions that were drawn from the evidence at hand.

6.1 Introduction

Our knowledge of the liturgical situation in Chrysostom’s Constantinople is not limited to his *Homilies*. There are also the writings of the church historians Socrates and Sozomenos, as well as the *Orations* of Gregory Nazianzus and the *Homilies* of Severian of Gabala. The information put forth in this chapter will be from these sources. First, we will describe the Liturgy of the Word including the number and types of readings, the psalmody and the number of sermons. Second, the *Orations* of Gregory Nazianzus will be examined to see what they can tell us about the liturgical calendar and lectionary before the time of Chrysostom. Third, Severian of Gabala’s *Homilies* will be analyzed, and fourth, the *Homilies* of Chrysostom will be studied for information on these topics. Finally, all the information from Nazianzus, Severian and Chrysostom will be compiled together to produce a composite picture of the lectionary and liturgical calendar at the time of Chrysostom’s episcopate.
6.2 The Liturgy of the Word in Constantinople

For our knowledge of the Liturgy of the Word in Chrysostom’s Constantinople, we turn once again to the magisterial work of Frans Van de Paverd, and to some information from other sources as well.

6.2.1 Frequency of Services

Van de Paverd states that the Eucharistic Liturgy was regularly celebrated on Saturdays and Sundays in late fourth century Constantinople. This conclusion is based on Chrysostom’s Homily XXIX:3 on Acts, Homily I on Psalm 48:17 (or In illud: Ne timueritis homilia I), and the historians Socrates and Sozomenos.779 Mayer is unsure about the provenance of these two Chrysosotom Homilies.780 But, regarding Homily XXIX on Acts, the liturgical information is from the second part of the homily. As we noted in Chapter 4, it is in the second part of each Homily on Acts that we occasionally find information that locates this part of the homily in Constantinople. These references include information that Chrysostom is a bishop,781 once a recent earthquake is mentioned,782 and finally Antioch and Syria are referred to several times as foreign places, not as the places where the speaker and congregation are located.783 Therefore, it seems certain that the information in the second part of each Homily on Acts refers to

779 Van de Paverd, Meßliturgie, 422-424.
780 Mayer, Provenance, 470-1.
781 In acta apostolicae, Homilia III, NPNF, 1st Series, XI, 23; Homilia IX, 63; Homilia XLIV, 271.
782 In acta apostolicae, Homilia VII, NPNF, 1st Series, XI, 47.
783 In acta apostolicae, Homilia XXV, NPNF, 1st Series, XI, 163; Homilia XL, 245; Homilia XLVI, 281.
Constantinople. Charles Hill is confident that *Homily I on Psalm 48/49:17* is from Constantinople, due to the mention of galleries in the church, which was a feature of church architecture in Constantinople.\(^{784}\) A cautionary note however, there were also balconies in the Great Church of Antioch.\(^{785}\) Chrysostom also refers to the congregation as his fold, which is possible for a priest to say, but more likely for a bishop who is the chief shepherd.\(^{786}\) With the added data from the two church historians – Socrates and Sozomenos - we are on firm ground for the regular celebration of the Eucharist on Saturdays and Sundays, even if we have some doubts regarding the provenance of Chrysostom’s *Homily I on Psalm 48/49:17*.

In his book Van de Paverd does not comment on the Lenten services in Constantinople as he did for Antioch.\(^{787}\) But, Severian of Gabala’s *Six Homilies on Creation (In cosmogoniam homiliae I-VI)* give evidence of a Lenten weekday evening synaxis.\(^{788}\) *Homilies I and III* mention that it is evening, and *Homilies III and IV* both comment on Psalm 140/1:1: *Let my prayer rise like incense before you* – the classic Vesper’s psalm.\(^{789}\) This evidence from Severian combined with the fact that the later Byzantine Tradition has a weekday evening Lenten service with the reading of


\(^{787}\) See chapter 5 for this discussion. Van de Paverd, *Mefliturgie*, 70-72.


\(^{789}\) Ibid, 31, 47 & 59.
Genesis;\textsuperscript{790} makes it safe to posit that there was a weekday Lenten evening service with the reading of Genesis in Chrysostom’s time.

The Lent-Holy Week combination in Constantinople was seven weeks in length. Sozomenos states this in his \textit{Ecclesiastical History},\textsuperscript{791} and the same system is found in \textit{HS#40}.\textsuperscript{792} Severian of Gabala has sermons for both Holy Thursday and Holy Friday establishing that these days were observed at the time of Chrysostom, although not during Nazianzus’ time as will be noted below in Section 6.3.\textsuperscript{793}

Van de Paverd does not comment upon the celebration of the fixed feasts of Christ, martyr’s days and the days after Easter. Nazianzus mentions the Nativity, January 1 and Epiphany as will be demonstrated in section 6.3. Nazianzus and Chrysostom both gave homilies for saints’ days in Constantinople, as will also be shown below in sections 6.3 and 6.5. Regarding the time between Easter and Pentecost Sunday, Nazianzus does mention the feast of the Ascension in \textit{Orations XXXVIII} and \textit{XLI}.\textsuperscript{794} Severian of Gabala also has a homily on the Ascension.\textsuperscript{795} He also has two sermons that were delivered on

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{790} Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, II}, 11-63.
\textsuperscript{792} Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, II}, 11-91.
\textsuperscript{794} \textit{Oration XXXVIII}: 16 in: Daley, \textit{Gregory of Nazianzus}, 126. \textit{Oration XLI}: 5 in: \textit{NPNF, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Series, VII}, 381.
\end{flushright}
successive days commenting upon John 7:14 and John 7:37 & 41.\textsuperscript{796} John 7:14-30 became the Byzantine reading for Mid-Pentecost and John 7:37-53 & 8:12 became that for Pentecost.\textsuperscript{797} If these two homilies were not given on a Saturday and Sunday, but instead on two weekdays, they raise the possibility that there were daily Eucharists in Constantinople from Easter to Pentecost, with a \textit{bahnlesung} from John’s Gospel, as would be the later tradition in \textit{HS#40}.\textsuperscript{798}

The calendar and lectionary of Constantinople at Chrysostom’s time celebrated the Eucharistic Liturgy on all Saturdays and Sundays for a total of 104 days per year. There were also 35 weekday services for Lent and Holy Week. There may have been weekday services from Easter to Pentecost also, which would have been an additional 35 days. There were also saints’ days, Christmas, January 1 and Epiphany. The greatest number of days with lectionary readings was 177 plus saints’ days. If there were no daily services during the Easter season, then the number would be 143 plus saints’ days.

6.2.2 The Number of Readings in the Eucharistic Liturgy

The first reading in the Eucharistic Liturgy was from the Major or Minor Prophets. Chrysostom relates in \textit{Homily XIX:5 on the Acts} the procedure that was used for reading aloud in church, including the deacon’s command, “Let us attend to the reading.” Then the Prophet’s name was announced by the reader, and then followed

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{796} \textit{In illud: Quomodo scit litteras & Contra Iudaeos et Greacos et haereticos.} Datema, “Towards a Critical Edition of the Greek Homilies of Severian of Gabala,” 112-3.
  \item \textsuperscript{797} Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, II}, 121 & 139.
  \item \textsuperscript{798} Ibid, 95-139.
\end{itemize}
the actual lection. Chrysostom pointed out in particular the Prophet Isaiah. 799 Homily XXIX:3 on Acts also states that the Prophets were read in church. 800 As noted above, Mayer is uncertain about the provenance of these Homilies, but the information Van de Paverd has taken from the Homilies on Acts is from the second part of each Homily, which is most likely from Constantinople. Severian of Gabala, in Homily I:3 on Creation compares the Old and New Testament authors, saying the twelve Minor Prophets are like the Twelve Apostles, and the Four Major Prophets are like the Four Evangelists. 801 The books of Moses and the Historical Books are excluded from the comparison, lending support to the conclusion that the first liturgical reading was from the Prophets, and not the Law.

The second reading was from the Epistles or Acts. Van de Paverd quotes Chrysostom’s Homily III:4 on 2 Thessalonians as evidence. 802 An Epistle is also mentioned in Chrysostom’s Homily 29:3 on Acts and Homily VIII:4 on Hebrews. 803 Mayer is unsure as

---


802 Van de Paverd, Meßliturgie, 431-4.

to the provenance of these *Homilies*, but those on Acts seem to be more certain, as noted earlier.

The third reading was from the Gospel producing a three lection system. Van de Paverd quotes Chrysostom’s *Homily on Hebrews VIII:4* and the historian Philostorgos, *HE III:5*. *Homily XXIX:3 on Acts* also mentions a Gospel reading. Again, Mayer is unsure of the provenance of the *Homilies*, but Philostorgos’ testimony affirms Van de Paverd’s conclusion.

One psalm was sung between the Prophetic lesson and the Epistle. Here Van de Paverd’s evidence is three *Homilies* by Chrysostom, i.e. *On Saint Phocas the Martyr 1-3, New Homily V:2 (De studio presentium)* and *New Homily X (In illud: pater meus usque modo operatur)*. Mayer does not question the Constantinopolitan provenance of any of these *Homilies*. The three lection system with one responsorial psalm is also illustrated in Chrysostom’s *Homily on Isaiah 45:6-7 (In illud Isaiæ: Ego dominus Deus)*. The sermon is on Isaiah 45:6-7, but also describes the other readings of the day as 2 Corinthians 6 or 11, Mathew 9:20-22 and Psalm 137. This *Homily* is traditionally ascribed to Constantinople because Chrysostom is the second preacher of the day. Mayer is

---

again uncertain about provenance.\footnote{Mayer, \textit{Provenance}, 470.} The custom of the bishop being the final preacher at the Liturgy was noted, however, by Chrysostom in \textit{Homily XXXIII on Acts}.\footnote{\textit{The Acts of the Apostles, Homily XXXIII, NPNF, 1st Series, XI}, 205.}

6.2.3 The Evening Lenten Synaxis

There was during Lent a weekday evening synaxis with the reading of Genesis and the celebration of Vespers as in Antioch.\footnote{This is discussed in Chapter 5. Van de Paverd, \textit{Meßliturgie}, 70-7, 98-100. Van de Paverd, \textit{The Homilies on the Statues}, 161-201.} Severian of Gabala gives further evidence for Lenten services and the reading of Genesis with a number of homilies based on \textit{Genesis} in addition to the \textit{Homilies on Creation I-VI (In cosmogioniam homiliae I-VI)}. These are: \textit{Quomodo animam Adamus; De sacrificiis Caini; De Noe et filiis eius; de cherubim et in prophetam Oseam; Homilia de Noe et de arca} and \textit{In illud: Pone manum tuam}. All of these homilies state that it is Lent, or that they are part of a series on \textit{Genesis}.\footnote{Datema, “Towards a Critical Edition of the Greek Homilies of Severian of Gabala,” 110—1.} Hence the later Byzantine practice of the reading of Genesis at weekday Lenten Vespers was in existence at this time period.\footnote{Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, II}, 11-63.}

6.2.4 The Sermons at Liturgical Services

As in Antioch, there were often two or three preachers at the Eucharistic Liturgy with the bishop speaking last.\footnote{\textit{The Acts of the Apostles, Homily XXXIII, NPNF, 1st Series, XI}, 205.} He sometimes preached after a priest spoke first,\footnote{\textit{The Acts of the Apostles, Homily XXXIII, NPNF, 1st Series, XI}, 205.} as
was noted by Gregory Nazianzus.\textsuperscript{818} Chrysostom sometimes preached after one or two other bishops had spoken.\textsuperscript{819} The principal was that the bishop of the city spoke last, whether he was preceded by other visiting bishops or his own priests.

The description of the Liturgy of the Word at Chrysostom’s time shows that it had the same basic structure as that of Antioch. There was one reading from the Prophets, one responsorial Psalm, one Epistle and one Gospel reading. These were followed by two or three sermons with the resident bishop of the city always preaching last.

6.3 Gregory Nazianzus

6.3.1 Introduction

In the autumn of 379 the Synod meeting in Antioch, under the presidency of Bishop Meletius of Antioch, asked Gregory Nazianzus to go to Constantinople to care for the pro-Nicene party there. In the eastern imperial Capital he was hosted by his first cousin Nonna, who was the wife of Senator Ablabius. She housed him and gave him a hall on their property to use as a church. He named the building “Anastasia” or Resurrection, and began caring for his flock. He stayed in Constantinople until the


\textsuperscript{818} Oration XXIII: 5 in: \textit{FOTC} 107, 135.

\textsuperscript{819} Van de Paverd, \textit{Meßliturgie}, 444 note 2. Paverd notes as evidence: \textit{Homilia nova X}, \textit{Homilia}, \textit{In illud: Filius ex se nihil facit}. 
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summer of 381, when he returned to the family estate of Karbala near Arianzus in Cappadocia.\textsuperscript{820}

*Orations XX-XLII*, minus XXXV which is spurious, date from Gregory’s 18-20 month ministry in Constantinople.\textsuperscript{821} Compared to those of his Nazianzus period (*Orations I-XIX*) they are considered to be more theologically rich, due to the struggle against the various Arian factions.\textsuperscript{822} John Chrysostom arrived in Constantinople 17 years after Nazianzus left (398). Hence the knowledge we derive from Gregory will help us to see the situation that Chrysostom inherited, and will also allow us to note any changes that may have taken place in the intervening years between the two bishops. There are nine *Orations (XXI, XXIV, XXIX, XXXII, and XXXVII-XLI)* with some information regarding either the liturgical calendar or lectionary. In Table 6.1 they are marked with an asterix (*).

Daley notes that the trilogy on Christmas and Epiphany, consisting of *Orations XXXVIII-XL*, may have been given on January 5-6, with the first at a vigil liturgy, the second at a night vigil and the third in the morning.\textsuperscript{823} This scenario seems unlikely to me for liturgical and historical reasons. First, are the liturgical reasons. The vigil usually

---


\textsuperscript{821} Daley, *Gregory of Nazianzus*, 15.


\textsuperscript{823} Daley, *Gregory of Nazianzus*, 197-8, note 106.
culminates in the Eucharist and does not follow it, because receiving the Eucharist was considered as breaking the fast. Nazianzus elsewhere pointed out that the Eucharist was received before eating other food, of course, implying that one fasted before Communion and ate after it. 824 This situation was seen in the Chapter 5, when the celebration of a saint’s day was described with the Eucharist taking place in the morning after the all-night vigil. Also, the celebration of the Easter Vigil culminated in the Eucharist as was seen in Chapter 5. This is also demonstrated in HS#40 where the vigils of Christmas and Pascha culminate in the Eucharist, after which the congregation was dismissed. The next morning there was Morning Prayer (Orthros) and a second Eucharist for the same feasts. 825

HS#40 does have curious rubrics for January 5, wherein the congregation is not dismissed after the vigil Liturgy, but remains for the Blessing of the Water. Then reading the Scripture is prescribed until the beginning of Pannychis. 826 I think this rubric for Pannychis referred only to those who would be baptized the next morning. 827 Otherwise, the congregation would have been asked, in fact, not only to fast on January 5, but that fast would have actually continued into the late morning of January 6. It would have been appropriate, however, for the candidates for baptism to fast until they were initiated. There may also be a scribal error, omitting a note that there is only a night vigil

826 Ibid, 183-185.
827 Ibid, 185.
if January 5 is a Saturday or Sunday, in which case there is no fasting during the day, and the Liturgy is served in the morning as usual. Such a note is found on December 24 for the celebration of Christmas.\textsuperscript{828}

The second liturgical reason, as noted above and likewise in Chapter 5, is that in both Constantinople and Antioch the reading of the Scriptures and preaching were activities very strongly connected to the celebration of the Eucharist. Only on Mondays through Fridays during Lent was reading and preaching not connected to the Eucharist. So, while a sermon at a vigil service was not impossible, it seems unlikely. For these reasons I place Nazianzus’ \textit{Oration XXXVIII} on December 25 and not January 5. \textit{Oration XXXIX} was delivered on January 5 at an evening vigil liturgy, and \textit{Oration XL} was preached at a morning liturgy. This would harmonize with the later Byzantine tradition as well.\textsuperscript{829}

Second, are the historical reasons. The doubts about the Nativity of Christ and the Baptism of Christ being separate feasts are based on an article by Martin J. Higgins published in 1952, in which he states that in 602 the two feasts were celebrated together on January 6. He proposed that the celebration of December 25 was not permanent in the calendar of Constantinople, but was having difficulty establishing itself.\textsuperscript{830} This article generated a note by Mayer and Allen in their book on Chrysostom.\textsuperscript{831}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{828} Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, I}, 155.
\textsuperscript{829} Ibid, 177-189.
\textsuperscript{830} Martin J. Higgins, “Note on the Purification (and the date of Nativity) in Constantinople in 602,” \textit{Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft} 2 (1952), 81-83.
\textsuperscript{831} Mayer & Allen, \textit{John Chrysostom}, note 18 on page 208.
\end{footnotes}
and comments by Brian Daley as noted above and other authors as well.\textsuperscript{832} Higgins’ article was written some years before the homilies of Proclus of Constantinople and Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople, became well known in the 1960’s and 1980’s.\textsuperscript{833} The *Homilies* of both were discussed in Chapter 3, but I present some information here because the argument based on them is crucial to how we interpret the data from Nazianzus. The *Homilies* of both authors clearly have Christmas and Epiphany as separate feasts. Proclus in the fifth century states:

> The past feast of the nativity of our great God and our Savior Jesus Christ (Tit 2:13) is glorious and precious, but more glorious and more precious is his present divine baptism. But we do not extol this feast as if that one is less important, but in order that we may, having contemplated the sequence that takes place by divine dispensation in respect of these matters, prepare ourselves for greater virtue.\textsuperscript{834}

Here it is clear that the Nativity of Christ and Epiphany were separate feasts on different days. Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople’s *Homily on the Nativity* in the sixth century, clearly focuses solely on the story of the Magi (Matthew 2:1-12), and the birth of Christ.\textsuperscript{835} I would have to agree with the comment of Allen and Datema regarding Higgins’ article:

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{832} Daley, *Gregory of Nazianzus*, 117.


\end{footnotes}
Although there is evidence to suggest that in the year 602 the feast of the Nativity was celebrated in Constantinople on 6 January, this must have been a temporary and short-lived change, and we should imagine Leontius delivering his homily on 25 December.\textsuperscript{836}

When we combine the various pieces of liturgical and historical evidence together, it seems evident that Christmas and Epiphany were separate feasts in Constantinople at Nazianzus’ time (fourth century), as well as those of Proclus (fifth century) and Leontius (sixth century).

In order to facilitate our discussion of the liturgical material in the Constantinopolitan \textit{Orationes} of Nazianzus, they are listed in Table 6.1. The English and Latin names of each are noted as well as the probable date of delivery. Those with some information on either the calendar or lectionary are marked with an asterix (*).

\textsuperscript{836} Ibid, 167.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oration Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Latin Name</th>
<th>English Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>Early autumn 379</td>
<td>De dogmate et constitutione episcoporum</td>
<td>On Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI*</td>
<td>May 2, 380</td>
<td>In laudem Athanasii</td>
<td>On St. Athanasius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII</td>
<td>September 379</td>
<td>De PACE II</td>
<td>On Peace 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII</td>
<td>Late spring 380</td>
<td>De PACE III</td>
<td>On Peace 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV*</td>
<td>Oct 2, 379</td>
<td>In laudem s. Cypriani</td>
<td>On Cyprian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV</td>
<td>Summer 380</td>
<td>In laudem Heronis Philosophi</td>
<td>In Praise of Hero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>Summer 380</td>
<td>In seipsum</td>
<td>On Himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII</td>
<td>Summer 380</td>
<td>Theologica I</td>
<td>1st Theological Oration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII</td>
<td>Summer 380</td>
<td>Theologica II, De theologia</td>
<td>2nd Theological Oration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX*</td>
<td>Summer 380</td>
<td>Theologica III, De Filio</td>
<td>3rd Theological Oration, On the Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Summer 380</td>
<td>Theologica IV, De Filio</td>
<td>4th Theological Oration, On the Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXI</td>
<td>Summer 380</td>
<td>Theologica V, De Spirito sancto</td>
<td>5th Theological Oration, On the Holy Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXII*</td>
<td>Winter 380</td>
<td>De moderatione in disputando</td>
<td>On Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIII</td>
<td>Late spring 380</td>
<td>Contra Arianos et de seipso</td>
<td>Against the Arians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIV</td>
<td>May 380</td>
<td>In Aegptiorum adventum</td>
<td>Arrival of the Egyptians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVI</td>
<td>November 29 or December 7, 380</td>
<td>De seipso, etc.</td>
<td>On Himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVII*</td>
<td>December 380</td>
<td>In Matth. XIX, 1-12</td>
<td>On Matthew 19:1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXVIII*</td>
<td>December 25, 380</td>
<td>In Theophania</td>
<td>On the Theophany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIX*</td>
<td>January 5, 381</td>
<td>In sancta lumina</td>
<td>On the Holy Lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XL*</td>
<td>January 6, 381</td>
<td>In sanctum baptisma</td>
<td>On Baptism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI*</td>
<td>Pentecost 379/380</td>
<td>Ejusdem in Pentecosten</td>
<td>On Pentecost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLII</td>
<td>July 381</td>
<td>Supremum vale</td>
<td>Last Farewell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Contains Lectionary or calendar information.

(*) means the *Oration* contains lectionary and/or calendar information. Orations XX-XXXII, XXXIII-XL are dated by Daley, he notes that XLII was perhaps reworked at a later date: Daley, *Gregory of Nazianzus*, 16-19, 21-22. Orations XI according to SC 358 must be before 381. Daley excludes 379 as too early leaving only 380: Claudio Moreschini, *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 38-41* (SC 358, Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1990), 82-3.
6.3.2 The Temporal Cycle

The Temporal or Moveable Cycle is centered on the celebration of Pascha (Easter). The time before Easter is known as Lent and Holy Week, and the time after Easter in the Byzantine Tradition is noted as weeks and Sundays after Pascha followed by those after Pentecost.\textsuperscript{838} From Gregory’s \textit{Oration}s we know that Lent, Pascha, Ascension and Pentecost Sunday were observed in Constantinople at his time. \textit{Oration} \textit{XLI} is on Pentecost. \textit{Oration XXXVIII:16 On Theophany} mentions both Pascha and Ascension.\textsuperscript{839} \textit{Oration XL:30 On Baptism} relates that Christ fasted 40 days after his baptism and before his temptation, but we fast 40 days to prepare for Easter.\textsuperscript{840} In his various descriptions of the liturgical year, and the “mysteries of Christ,” it is important to note that Gregory Nazianzus never mentioned the triumphal entry of Christ into Jerusalem, known as Palm Sunday, nor the Last Supper.\textsuperscript{841} He noted in \textit{Oration XL:24} that the baptismal days are Epiphany, Pascha and Pentecost.\textsuperscript{842} These match HS#40 minus Lazarus Saturday.\textsuperscript{843} They also agree with the baptismal days for Antioch stated in

\textsuperscript{838} Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, II}, 109-167.

\textsuperscript{839} Daley, \textit{Gregory of Nazianzus}, 126.

\textsuperscript{840} \textit{Oration XL: 30} in: Moreschini, \textit{Discours 38-41} (Sources Chrétien\-nes 358), 267.

\textsuperscript{841} There are several passages where Gregory talks the “mysteries of Christ.” These are: \textit{Oration XXXVIII: 16} in Daley, \textit{Gregory of Nazianzus}, 125-6. \textit{XL: 5} in: Moreschini, \textit{Discours 38-41} (Sources Chrétiennes 358), 325-7.

\textsuperscript{842} \textit{Oration XL: 24} in Moreschini, \textit{Discours 38-41} (Sources Chrétiennes 358), 251.

\textsuperscript{843} Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, I}, 185; \textit{II}, 63, 85 & 137
Chapter 5, and the *Letter of Macarius of Jerusalem to the Armenians*.\(^{844}\) The baptismal days changed by the time of Chrysostom, who noted only Paschal baptism.\(^ {845}\) Chrysostom also stated that baptisms were not performed at Pentecost, for the fasting of Lent prepared for baptism [at Easter].\(^ {846}\) These few citations from Gregory give us a basic moveable liturgical year that consisted of Lent, Pascha, Ascension, Pentecost and the time afterwards.

What were the liturgical readings of the moveable feasts and seasons? Only *Oration XXXVII On Matthew 19:1-12*, given in the first part of December, 380, is a commentary on scripture and appears to be based on the reading of the day. Its time of delivery in December would preclude a Lucan Cycle that begins in September as in *HS#40*.\(^ {847}\) It would not exclude a Lucan Cycle beginning the Second Sunday before Christmas as noted in Chapter 3 with Proclus of Constantinople and Severus of Antioch. Other clues must be sought to see if the Gospel of Matthew was read for most of the year, or if there was in existence at that time readings from Luke during part of the year.

In *Oration XXXVIII:16* there appears to be an outline for at least part of the liturgical year. This quote is given below in its entirety since it is crucial for our discussion.


A little later, then, you will also see Jesus cleansed in the Jordan with the same bath that cleanses me – or rather, making the water holy by his cleansing, for the one who “takes away the sin of the world” had no need of purification; and [you will see] the heavens rent open, and Jesus witnessed to by his kindred Spirit; [you will see him] tempted, and conquering his tempter, and served by angels; [you will see him] “healing every disease and every weakness,” and giving life to the dead – as he must also do to you, who are dead in your heretical opinions – and driving out demons, some by himself and others through his disciples; [you will see him] feeding thousands with a few loaves, and walking on the sea, and betrayed and crucified – and crucifying with himself, my sin: offered as a lamb, offering as a priest, buried as a human being and raised a God, and then ascending and coming again with the glory that is his. How many festivals there are, for each of the mysteries of Christ! Yet there is one conclusion to all of them: my perfection, my re-shaping, my return to the first Adam.\footnote{Oration XXXVIII: 16 in: Daley, Gregory of Nazianzus, 125-6.}

The first part of the paragraph refers to the coming feast of the Baptism of Christ on January 6. The way the lines are worded exclude the Lucan version of the story, wherein the Spirit descends on Jesus after the baptism while He was praying (Luke 3:21-2).

\textit{Oration XXXIX:15-16} describes the baptism of Christ using Matthew 3:13-17, and explains the conversation between Christ and the Baptist found only in that Gospel.\footnote{Oration XXXIX: 15-16 in: ibid, 135-6.}

The Matthean version of the Baptism of Christ is read in HS\#40\footnote{Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon}, I, 187.} and also in Chrysostom’s Antioch as we saw in Chapter 5, so there appears to be continuity here in the tradition from Nazianzus’ time.

Then Nazianzus continued his description with the temptation of Christ. The Matthean version (Matthew 4:1-11) is implied, for it is the only one that gives the
dialogue with Satan with the various temptations, and records the angels ministering to Christ. The Lucan version (Luke 4:1-13) does not mention the angels, and Mark (Mark 1:12-3) does not give the description of the temptations, but does note the angels. The temptation of Christ according to Matthew is read in the Byzantine Tradition on the Saturday after January 6.\textsuperscript{851}

Gregory continued his description by discussing five types of miracles: healings, raising the dead, driving out demons, feeding thousands and walking on the sea. All of these types of miracles appear in the Matthean part of the Byzantine Lectionary for Saturdays and Sundays. They are listed below in Table 6.2.

\textsuperscript{851} Ibid, 189.
### TABLE 6.2

**MIRACLE STORIES FROM MATTHEW IN THE BYZANTINE LECTIONARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scriptural Reference</th>
<th>Name of the Story</th>
<th>When Read in HS#40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt 8:1-4</td>
<td>Cure of the Leper</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Sat. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 8:5-13</td>
<td>Cure of the Centurion’s Servant</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sun. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 8:14-17</td>
<td>Cure of Peter’s Mother-in-law</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sat. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 8:28-34</td>
<td>Gerasene Demoniacs</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sun. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 9:1-8</td>
<td>Cure of the Paralytic</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sun. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 9:18-26</td>
<td>Raising the Official’s Daughter</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sat. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 9:27-34</td>
<td>Cure of 2 Blind Men and Cure of the Mute</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sun. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 14:13-21</td>
<td>Feeding of the 5,000</td>
<td>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sun. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 14:22-33</td>
<td>Walking on the Sea</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sun. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 15:32-39</td>
<td>Feeding the 4,000</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sat. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 17:14-21</td>
<td>Cure of the Possessed Boy</td>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sun. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 20:29-34</td>
<td>Cure of the 2 Blind Men of Jericho</td>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sat. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of these were read at Nazianzus’ time? We can be certain of the raising of the official’s daughter (Matthew 9:18-26), the feeding of the 5,000 (Matthew 14:13-21), and the walking on the sea (Matthew 14:22-33), for they are all unique stories. There are multiple possibilities for cures and several for expelling demons. Gregory’s reference to the disciples expelling demons is problematic. In Matthew this is referred to in a summary way with the mission of the twelve (Matthew 10:1-15), but there is no actual pericope about a disciple expelling a demon. In the story of the Possessed Boy (Matthew 17:14-21) we are told that the disciples tried, but failed to expel the demon. One possibility is that Gregory is referring to the *Acts of the Apostles*. Peter cured demon-

---

possessed people (Acts 5:16), and Paul expelled the oracular spirit in Philippi (Acts 16:18).

When we apply the same schema of five types of miracles to Saint Luke’s Gospel, it does not fit as well as Matthew’s Gospel, because the story of The Walking on the Sea (Matthew 14:22-33) is absent from Luke. He does however, have two stories of the raising of the dead: the Widow’s Son (Luke 7:11-17) and Jairus’ Daughter (Luke 8:40-56). Most of Luke’s stories of healings, feeding the 5,000 and expulsion of demons are the parallel stories to those in Matthew. Table 6.3 lists the Lucan stories that fit Nazianzus’ five categories of miracles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scriptural Reference</th>
<th>Name of Story</th>
<th>When Read in HS#40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lk 4:31-37</td>
<td>Cure of the Demoniac</td>
<td>17th Sat. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 4:38-39</td>
<td>Cure of Peter’s Mother-in-law</td>
<td>Not read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 5:12-16</td>
<td>Cure of the Leper</td>
<td>Not read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 5:17-28</td>
<td>Cure of the Paralytic</td>
<td>18th Sat. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 7:1-10</td>
<td>Cure of the Centurion’s Slave</td>
<td>21st Sat. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 7:11-17</td>
<td>Raising of the Widow’s Son</td>
<td>19th Sun. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 8:26-39</td>
<td>Gerasene Demoniac</td>
<td>22nd Sun. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 8:40-56</td>
<td>Raising of Jairus’ Daughter</td>
<td>23rd Sun. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 9:10-17</td>
<td>Feeding of the 5,000</td>
<td>Not read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 9:37-43</td>
<td>Demon Possessed Son</td>
<td>24th Sat. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 11:14-23</td>
<td>Jesus and Beelzebub</td>
<td>Not read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 13:10-17</td>
<td>Cure of the Crippled Woman</td>
<td>26th Sun. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 14:1-6</td>
<td>Man with Dropsy</td>
<td>29th Sat. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 18:35-43</td>
<td>Cure of the Blind Beggar</td>
<td>30th Sun. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Describing the Paschal Vigil Gospel, Gregory stated “betrayed and crucified... buried as a human being and raised as God.” This matches Chrysostom’s description of the Gospel for the Easter Vigil on Holy Saturday evening, which we proposed in Chapter 5 as Matthew 26:47–28:20. There is nothing in Gregory’s description that would lead one to think there was a Holy Thursday Liturgy, or one for Good Friday either. He did note the Feast of the Ascension of Christ, however. The readings for this Feast are logically Acts 1:1-12 and Luke 24:36-53, as found in the Byzantine Tradition. After the Ascension Nazianzus noted the Second Coming of Christ. In the Byzantine Tradition this could refer to the Gospel of the Last Judgment (Matthew 25: 31-46), which is read on Carnival or Meat-fare Sunday (two Sundays before Lent begins). The best apostolic reading for Pentecost is Acts 2: 1-11, also found in the Byzantine Tradition, which Gregory commented on it in the Pentecost Oration. Nazianzus’ description of feasts with its lack of Palm Sunday and Holy Thursday and Friday, but including Pascha,

853 On the Great Saturday the betrayal, the crucifixion of the Our Lord, his death according to the flesh and his entombment. My translation, 4eme Homélie sur Inscription des Actes, 5 in: Bareille, Œuvres Complètes de Saint Jean Chrysostome (1866), V, 147.

854 Mateos, Le Typicon, II, 129.

855 Ibid, 3.

856 Ibid, 139.

857 Oration XLI: 12 in: Moreschini, Discours 38-41 (Sources Chrétiennes 358), 341-343.
Ascension, and Pentecost Sunday matched that of *Apostolic Constitutions, Book V, xiii, 1-4 & xx, 1-4.*

The readings for the moveable feasts of the liturgical year in Constantinople ca. 380, as taken from Gregory’s Orations, are listed below in Table 6.4.

### TABLE 6.4

**THE READINGS OF THE MOVEABLE CYCLE CA. 380**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of the Year</th>
<th>Pericope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Unspecified Saturdays & Sundays | Mt. 9:18-26 – Raising of the Official’s Daughter  
Mt. 14:13-21 – Feeding of the 5,000  
Mt. 14:22-33 – Walking on the Sea  
Assorted healings  
Assorted exorcisms |
| Beginning of December     | Mt 19:1-12 – On Marriage                     |
| Before Lent               | Mt 25:31-46 – Last Judgment                  |
| Paschal Vigil             | Mt. 26:47-28:20 – Betrayal, Crucifixion, Burial and Resurrection of Christ |
| Ascension Thursday        | Acts 1:1-12 & Lk. 24:36-53                   |
| Pentecost Sunday          | Acts 2:1-11                                   |

6.3.3 The Fixed Cycle and Sanctoral

The Sanctoral and Fixed Cycles, characterized by feasts of Christ and saints’ days, follow the calendar dates of the year regardless of on which day of the week they occur.

---

Gregory does give us some information to help discern which saints’ days were celebrated in Constantinople at his time. *Oration XXI* concerning Saint Athanasius of Alexandria was delivered on May 2, 380. *Oration XXIV* in praise of St. Cyprian was preached on October 2, 379. This particular *Oration* is interesting because Gregory was confused as to which Cyprian was being celebrated. He spoke about Cyprian of Carthage (+258), but the actual saint of the day was Cyprian of Antioch in Pisidia (+304).\(^859\) It is important to note that all three saints – Athanasius and the two Cyprians – were not local saints, but imported commemorations. This was in keeping with the post-Constatinian customs of moving saints bodies from one location to another (*translatio*), and dismembering (*dismemberatio*) them for relics that could be distributed far and wide.\(^860\) *Oration XXXII* was delivered on the feast of several unnamed martyrs in 379.\(^861\) We have then a minimum of three saints’ days.\(^862\)

The question of the feasts of Christ celebrated in Constantinople is more complicated than that of the saints. *Orations XXXVIII–XL* firmly established the celebration of Christmas and Epiphany as discussed above. We also saw in *Oration XXXVIII:16* a reference to the temptation of Christ which the Byzantine Tradition keeps

-----------


\(^860\) Bradshaw and Johnson, *The Origins of Feasts, Fasts and Seasons in Early Christianity*, 182.

\(^861\) Ibid, 192.

\(^862\) For notes on the *Orations* see Table 6.1 above.
on the Saturday after Epiphany. There is a key passage in *Oration XLI:5 (On Pentecost)* that relates to the celebrations of the liturgical year.

We are keeping the feast of Pentecost and of the Coming of the Spirit, and the appointed time of the Promise, and the fulfilment of our hope. And how great is the Mystery. The dispensations of the Body of Christ are ended; or rather, what belongs to His Bodily Advent (for I hesitate to say the Dispensation of His Body, as long as no discourse persuades me that it is better to have put off the body), and that of the Spirit is beginning. And what were the things pertaining to the Christ? The Virgin, the Birth, the Manger, the Swaddling, the Angels glorifying Him, the Shepherds running to Him, the course of the Star, the Magi worshipping Him and bringing Gifts, Herod's murder of the children, the Flight of Jesus into Egypt, the Return from Egypt, the Circumcision, the Baptism, the Witness from Heaven, the Temptation, the Stoning for our sake (because He had to be given as an Example to us for enduring affliction for the Word), the Betrayal, the Nailing, the Burial, the Resurrection, the Ascension [sic].

Here Gregory was looking back over the Liturgical Year beginning with Christmas. He described first the Lucan Nativity story (Luke 2:1-20) with the Virgin, birth, manger, swaddling clothes, the angels and the shepherds. He then switched to the Matthew story of the Magi (Matthew 2:1-12) with the star, Magi and gifts. He continued with Matthew’s narration mentioning the murder of the children, the flight to Egypt and the return from Egypt (Mathew 2:13-23). These last three stories form the Byzantine Gospel reading for the Sunday after Christmas. Then he noted the Circumcision of Christ (Luke 2:21). This event is out of chronological order in his description, but not out of

---

863 For *Oration XXXVIII* see the above discussion in the Introduction to this section. Mateos, *Le Typicon*, I, 189.


liturgical order for the Byzantine Tradition which reads it on January 1.\footnote{Ibid, 171.} The Sunday after Christmas must always come before January 1, except when Christmas is on a Sunday, and then January 1 is also a Sunday. This leads to the conclusion, that at Nazianzus’ time, the Gospel pericopes for what are now known as the Sunday after Christmas, and the Feast of the Circumcision of Christ on January 1, were already in place.

The passage continues with the Baptism of Christ and the Temptation which have been discussed earlier. Then there is a reference to the “stoning for our sake.” The only candidate for this story is John 8:59. The stoning of Stephen in Acts 7:54-60, and that of Paul in Acts 14:19-20, are not good options, for Gregory was speaking clearly about the earthly life of Christ. This pericope of John was read on the Fifth Sunday of Lent in the ancient Roman Lectionary, and on the 5\textsuperscript{th} Tuesday after Easter in the Byzantine Lectionary.\footnote{Walter Howard Frere, \textit{Studies in Early Roman Liturgy: Volume II, The Roman Gospel-Lectionary} (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 1934), 9 & 38. Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, II}, 123.} The Theologian then continued with references to the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension. Note again, as in \textit{Oration XXXVIII:16}, there was no description of either Palm Sunday or the Last Supper.

What were the liturgical readings for the Fixed and Sanctoral Cycles? Nazianzus gave no indication for saints’ days. He did, however, give us information for the feasts of Christmas and Epiphany. It was noted above that he described the baptism of Christ using the Matthew account (Matthew 3:13-17), this was followed by a description of the
Temptation of Christ that was also based on Matthew (Matthew 4:1-11). This gives us Gospel pericopes for January 6 and the following Saturday. If the Temptation was read on Sunday instead, it would match the custom of having a special reading the Sunday after a great feast, as seen with the special reading for the Sunday after Nativity, and the reading of John 20: 19-31 on the Sunday after Pascha, which Apostolic Constitutions Book V: xx, 1 mentions, but Gregory does not.\textsuperscript{868}

The readings for Christmas are also hinted at by Oration XXXIX: 14.\textsuperscript{869} Nazianzus was looking back from January 6 to the Nativity of Christ. He noted the Magi, the angels and the shepherds. This would match the Byzantine Tradition of reading the Lucan account (Luke 2:1-20) at the vigil liturgy, and the Magi (Matthew 2:1-12) at the morning liturgy. We have seen earlier the reading for the Sunday after Christmas (Matthew 2:13-23), and for the Circumcision on January 1. Oration XXXIX: 14 also noted Symeon and Anna, which is the story of the Hypapante or Presentation (Luke 2: 22-39). This pericope is read in HS#40 on February 2.\textsuperscript{870} The reading for January 1 in the Byzantine Tradition is Luke 2:20-21, 40-52, skipping over the Meeting in the Temple.\textsuperscript{871} Gregory’s description would lead one to think, that at his time, the Meeting in the Temple was read on January 1. In this way all of the passages about the birth and childhood of Christ would have been read before January 6. The commemoration of the Christ Child would have


\textsuperscript{869} Oration XXXIX: 14 in: Daley, Gregory of Nazianzus, 134.

\textsuperscript{870} Mateos, Le Typicon, I, 225.

\textsuperscript{871} Ibid, 171.
been left behind, so that the congregation could now concentrate on the adult Christ, who was being manifested to the world. This would also keep a straight time line from Christmas through Epiphany to the Passion, Resurrection, Ascension and Pentecost without overlaps. At a later date, when the two Sundays before Christmas came to commemorate the birth of John the Baptist (Luke 1:5-25 & 57-80), and the Annunciation to Mary (Luke 1:26-38), as discussed in Chapter 3, the same kind of linear timeline was also maintained.

Our knowledge of the readings of the Fixed and Sanctoral Cycles from Gregory Nazianzus is presented below in Table 6.5.

TABLE 6.5

THE READINGS OF THE FIXED AND SANCTORAL CYCLES CA. 380

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>Pericope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 24</td>
<td>Vigil of Christmas</td>
<td>Lk 2:1-20 - Angels and the Shepherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 25</td>
<td>Christmas Day</td>
<td>Mt 2:1-12 - Magi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 26-31</td>
<td>Sunday after Christmas</td>
<td>Mt 2:13-23 – Flight to Egypt, massacre and return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1</td>
<td>Circumcision of Christ</td>
<td>Lk 2: 20-52 – Circumcision, Presentation, finding the boy Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6</td>
<td>Epiphany</td>
<td>Mt 3:13-17 – Baptism of Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7-12</td>
<td>Saturday after Epiphany</td>
<td>Mt 4:1-11 – Temptations of Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throughout the year</td>
<td>Saints’ Days</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3.4 Summary of Gregory Nazianzus

1. Gregory of Nazianzus, called “The Theologian” in the Byzantine Tradition, was in Constantinople from the autumn of 379 to the summer of 381. During this time he gave 22 Orations that survive, of which nine have some information on the liturgical year and lectionary.

2. Lent, Pascha, Ascension Thursday and Pentecost Sunday were observed. There is no evidence for Palm Sunday, Holy Thursday or Holy Friday.

3. The Baptismal days were Epiphany (January 6), the Easter Vigil and Pentecost.

4. In the Moveable Cycle the Gospel of Matthew predominated with emphasis on the miracles of Christ. Some pericopes were also from the teachings of Christ (Oration, *On XXXVII Mt 19:1-12*). The Last Judgment (Matthew 25) was also read.

5. The Sanctoral consisted of at least 3 Saints including the commemoration of non-local saints.

6. Christmas was followed by one Sunday and the Circumcision on January 1.

7. Epiphany celebrated the Baptism of Christ, and was followed by one Saturday focused on the Temptations of Christ.

8. The readings for saints’ days are unknown.

9. Matthew dominates in the readings for Christmas and Epiphany, but Luke is also used for Christmas Eve and January 1.

10. There are strands of continuity in the Gospel readings, between what Gregory relates, and the later Byzantine Tradition, for both feasts and regular Saturdays and Sundays.
6.4 Severian of Gabala

6.4.1 Introduction

Severian was the bishop of Gabala (today Jeblé) on the Mediterranean coast of Syria. We know almost nothing about him except for the time he was in Constantinople (398-404). At first, he was Chrysostom’s friend and took care of the Great Church in 401 while John was in Asia Minor. Later he turned against Chrysostom, and participated in the Synod of the Oak (autumn 403). He died sometime before 425. All of his extant sermons were given in Constantinople, and ironically most survived as attributed to Chrysostom. Over the last 100 years his sermons have been gradually extracted from the Chrysostom Corpus, and some were discovered preserved in other languages, and today they number about 60. The most complete list of them with the Latin names and CPG numbers is by Carter. Many of the sermons are very much oriented to the Liturgical Year and the lectionary and offer valuable information.

6.4.2 Information on the Temporal Cycle from Severian

6.4.2.1 Lent and Holy Week

It was stated earlier that Severian has a number of Homilies on Genesis which show that this book was read in Constantinople during Lent as in Antioch. It should also


be noted that in the *Homilies* Severian never referred to Proverbs as being read publically, similar to Chrysostom in Antioch, as stated in Chapter 5. The *Homilies* on Genesis are listed in Table 6.6. Of note among them is the one on the creation and fall of Adam (*Quomodo animam acceperit Adamus*). According to the contents of the Homily, this reading was done on the First Friday of Lent, so that the creation of humanity on the sixth day (Genesis 1:26-31) would be read on the sixth day of the week. Further, the fall of Adam was read on the First Friday pointing forward to the crucifixion of Christ on Holy Friday that would remedy it.874 This pericope was also read in Antioch on the same day, as noted in Chapter 5. The second homily of note is *In illud: Pone manum tuam*, because it is not read in *HS#40*. As Severian’s sermons are examined we will see that there are a number of pericopes that were read at his time that are not found in *HS#40*.

---

### TABLE 6.6
**HOMILIES ON GENESIS BY SEVERIAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Homily</th>
<th>Scripture Discussed</th>
<th>Time of Year from internal evidence</th>
<th>HS#40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In cosmogoniam I-VI</td>
<td>Gen 1:1-2:4</td>
<td>Beginning of Lent</td>
<td>1st Mon-Wed of Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quomodo animam acceperit Adamus</td>
<td>Gen 2:7-3:24</td>
<td>1st Fri of Lent</td>
<td>1st Fri of Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De sacrificis Caini</td>
<td>Gen 4:1-16</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2nd Tues of Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homilia de Noe et de arca</td>
<td>Gen 7:1-23</td>
<td>Middle of Lent</td>
<td>3rd Tues-Thurs of Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Noe et filii eius, de cherubim et in prophetam Oseam</td>
<td>Gen 9:18-28</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4th Wed of Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In illud: Pone manum tuam</td>
<td>Gen 24:2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Not read</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Severian has one homily, *De paenitentia et de compunctione*, which states that a pericope from Mark was just read aloud. It is the story of the healing of the cripple let down through the roof (Mark 2:1-12), and the Epistle for the day was 2 Corinthians 12 & 13. Pericopes from Mark have been extremely rare in this study. According to *HS#40* the Markan version of this story is the Gospel for the Second Sunday of Lent. The *Homily* itself gives no exact date for its preaching, but it concerns repentance and contrition and that God is quick to save and slow to punish; in which there is also a marvellous [sic] story about Rahab (*De paenitentia et de compunctione*)," 2014, on line.

---


almsgiving which are certainly suitable topics for Lent, although not limited to Lent.

Chrysostom gave a sermon on the Matthean version of the same story shortly after the Twelfth Homily against the Anomoeans. He was enthroned in Constantinople on February 26, 398 which would date this homily to early March, the time of Lent.

Severian preached a sermon on the Matthew version of the third prediction of the passion (Matthew 20:17-19, De serpente homilia). The day’s readings also included Galatians 3:1 as the Epistle, and Psalm 65/66:4 as the responsorial psalm. The prophetic lesson was not noted. The Homily is focused on the cross, and goes on to talk about the bronze serpent lifted up by Moses in the desert (Numbers 21:4-9), and Moses holding his arms in prayer while the Hebrews fight the Amalekites (Exodus 17:9-15). The Markan version of this pericope is part of the Byzantine Gospel for the Fifth Sunday of Lent (Mark 10:32-45). Thus, we see two out of the five Lenten Sunday Gospel pericopes of the Byzantine Tradition appearing in Severian, whether in the Matthean or Markan versions. Was the Matthean version of these pericopes already in place and later substituted by Mark? Since Severian spoke on the Markan version of the Paralytic and Chrysostom on the Matthean version, this seems probable. Table 6.7 shows the Markan and Matthean pericopes and when they are read in HS#40.

878 On the Paralytic Let Down through the Roof: 1 & 3, NPNF, 1st Series, IX, 211, 214.
879 Baur, Chrysostom and His Time, II, 13.
880 Bareille, Œuvres Complètes de Saint Jean Chrysostome, VI, 129-144.
881 Mateos, Le Typicon, II, 57.
TABLE 6.7
THE LENTEN WEEKEND GOSPELS OF HS#40882

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liturgical Day</th>
<th>Lenten Gospel Pericope</th>
<th>Matthew Parallel</th>
<th>Day Mt is Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Sat. of Lent</td>
<td>Mk 2:23-3:5 – Disciples on the Sabbath and cure of the withered hand</td>
<td>Mt 12:1-14</td>
<td>Not read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Sun. of Lent</td>
<td>Jn 1:44-52 – We have found the One</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Sat. of Lent</td>
<td>Mk 1:35-44 – Cleansing of the Leper</td>
<td>Mt 8:2-4</td>
<td>Not read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Sun. of Lent</td>
<td>Mk 2:1-12 – Healing of the paralytic</td>
<td>Mt 9:2-8</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sun. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Sat. of Lent</td>
<td>Mk 7:31-37 – Healing of the deaf man</td>
<td>Mt 15:29-31</td>
<td>Not read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Sun. of Lent</td>
<td>Mk 8:34-9:1 – Take up your cross</td>
<td>Mt 10:38-39; 16:24-27</td>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sat. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sat. of Lent</td>
<td>Mk 8:27-31 – Peter’s faith &amp; 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; prediction of the Passion</td>
<td>Mt 16:13-27</td>
<td>June 29, Sts. Peter &amp; Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sun. of Lent</td>
<td>Mk 9:17-31 – Healing of the mute boy and 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; prediction of the Passion</td>
<td>Mt 17:14-23</td>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sat. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sat. of Lent</td>
<td>Mk 2:14-17 – Call of Levi</td>
<td>Mt 9:9-13</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sat. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sun. of Lent</td>
<td>Mk 10:32-45 – 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; prediction of the Passion and James and John</td>
<td>Mt 20:17-28</td>
<td>Not read</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike what we have seen above with the miracle stories of Matthew and Luke, many of the parallel pericopes of Matthew and Mark are not repeated. It seems that the appropriate time for them was considered to be only Lent. They focus on the cross, faith, repentance and healing; these are themes suitable for the preparation for Pascha and Paschal baptism.

---

In Chapter 3, it was shown that the *Homilies* of both Proclus of Constantinople and Severus of Antioch indicated a course reading of the Gospel of Luke, beginning two weeks before Christmas, and ending on the Fifth Sunday of Lent. How did this come about since both *HS#40* and Severian seem to be in agreement in reading Mark? I propose the answer lies with Gregory of Nazianzus’ view, stated above, that the life of Christ is commemorated from Christmas through the feast of the Ascension. Once this idea took hold, the reading of Luke became a way of commemorating the life of Christ without repeating the Matthean pericopes read earlier in the liturgical year. Remember that Proclus clearly mentioned the story of the Transfiguration of Christ within a course reading of Luke (*Homily VIII*). Later, when some commemorations such as the Annunciation and the Birth of the Baptist were moved to fixed dates in the sixth century, the older Lenten system of Gospel readings came back into use.\(^{883}\)

It was also noted earlier that Severian has sermons for both Holy Thursday and Holy Friday. His Holy Thursday Sermon (*Homilia de lotione pedum* or *In proditionem servatoris*) focuses on the Washing of the Feet (John 13: 3-17), which is a contrast to Chrysostom’s emphasis upon the betrayal by Judas in the *Homilies on the Thursday of the Betrayal*.\(^{884}\) The Byzantine Gospel for the Holy Thursday Liturgy includes the Washing of the Feet from John, which is inserted into the Matthean account of the Last Supper.\(^{885}\)

---

\(^{883}\) See Chapter 3.

\(^{884}\) For Chrysostom see Chapter 5. Wenger, “Une homélie inédite de Sévérien de Gabala sur le lavement des pieds,” 219-234.

If not already in place at Severian’s time, his sermon could have paved the way for its future inclusion. Severian’s *Holy Friday Homily (Hodie incipiamus, karisimi, de crucis trophaeo praedicare)* focuses largely on the Good Thief. In this emphasis upon the Good Thief, he was in harmony with the sermons of both Chrysostom and Severus of Antioch. The popularity of this theme is probably what lead to the pericope on the Good Thief (Luke 23:39-43) being inserted into the Matthean Passion narrative on Holy Friday.

6.4.2.2 The Great 50 Days of Pentecost

In Chapter 5.5, we saw only one indication that the Gospel of John was read during the Easter Season in Antioch with the story of the Samaritan Woman (John 4:4-42). We saw that Russo proposes that this pericope was possibly part of an ancient pre-baptismal catechesis also consisting of the Wedding at Cana (John 2:1-11), the Cure of the Paralytic (John 5:1-18), the Cure of the Man Born Blind (John 9:1-41), the High Priestly Prayer of Christ (John 17:1-13), the Resurrection of Lazarus (John 11:1-44) and the Gospel of Pentecost Sunday (John 7:37-53 & 8:12). Severian has six *Homilies* on John thus confirming its use in Constantinople. Table 6.8 shows these sermons and their place in the lectionary.

---


887 For Chrysostom see Chapter 5, for Severus see Chapter 3.

### TABLE 6.8

**SEVERIAN’S HOMILIES BASED ON THE GOSPEL OF JOHN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Homily</th>
<th>Gospel Pericope</th>
<th>Time from internal evidence</th>
<th>HS#40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>In illud: In principio erat verbum</em></td>
<td>Jn 1:1-17 – John’s Prologue</td>
<td>After people were baptized</td>
<td>Resurrection Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In illud: Quomodo scit letteras</em></td>
<td>Jn 7:14 – Mid-Pentecost</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Mid-Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Contra Iudaeos et Graecos et haereticos</em></td>
<td>Jn 7:37-41 – Living water</td>
<td>The day after <em>Quomodo scit letteras</em></td>
<td>Pent. Sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De caeco nato</em></td>
<td>Jn 9:1-41 – Man born blind</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6(^{th}) Sun. of Easter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De Christo pastore et ove</em></td>
<td>Jn 10:11 – I am the Good Shepherd</td>
<td>St. Acacius Day, May 8</td>
<td>Used for Bishop Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De Serpente Homilia</em></td>
<td>Jn 17:3 – High Priestly Prayer of Christ</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Sun. before Pent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *Homily on John 1:1* shows that the Prologue of John was read on Resurrection Sunday morning, where it is still read in the Byzantine Lectionary, and appeared in the patristic sources of Chapter 3. Carter proposes that this homily was given shortly after Epiphany (January 6), because it refers to the newly baptized, but I disagree since it has already been shown above that January 6 was not a baptismal day during Chrysostom’s episcopate.  

\(^{889}\) The *Man Born Blind* is part of the baptismal

---


catechesis mentioned earlier. The *Ascension Homily* has an apostolic reading from Acts 1, and comments extensively on John 20:19-31.\(^{891}\) This Gospel reading it is quite unique for other sources like the *Armenian Lectionary*, *Burkitt’s Lectionary* and *HS#40* use Luke 24:36-53 as the Gospel for the Ascension.\(^{892}\) Using the Johannine pericope for the Ascension, however, does keep John as the exclusive Gospel of the paschal season.

The two *Homilies* on John 7, because they follow each other, raise the question of daily liturgies during the Great 50 Days. If they were read on a weekend, the only possible weekend is the 3\(^{rd}\) Saturday and Sunday of Easter, displacing the Myrrh Bearing Women, but this would be out of order jumping from John 6 to 7, and then back to John 6. The 2\(^{nd}\) Sunday is Doubting Thomas which is mentioned in *Apostolic Constitutions Book V, xx, 1*,\(^{893}\) and the 4\(^{th}\) through 7\(^{th}\) Sundays are the pericopes of the baptismal catechesis.\(^{894}\) So these two homilies were given either on the third weekend of Easter, or on two weekdays, which would mean there were daily liturgies during the 50 Days. There is nothing in them to indicate either choice.

---

\(^{891}\) PG, 52, 773-792.


6.4.2.3 The Time after Pentecost

Normally, we would look to the Gospel of Matthew for the pericopes after Pentecost, because of its use in the Byzantine Tradition for that purpose.\(^{895}\) Severian has a number of homilies on texts from Matthew, but with the exception of two, either it is a proof text for a dogmatic homily, or it is dealt with in the Christmas-Epiphany season.\(^{896}\) There are two homilies that are based on the Gospel of the day. They are: \textit{In illud: In qua potestate haec facis} (Matthew 21:23-27), and \textit{Contra Judaeos, in serpentem aeneum} (Matthew 21:28). They follow each other indicating a \textit{lectio continua}, but they give no evidence for when they were preached.\(^{897}\) Neither pericope is read in \textit{HS#40}.\(^{898}\)

6.4.2.4 The Time after Epiphany

We now consider the Gospels for the Sundays that are traditionally called the pre-Lenten Sundays in the Byzantine Tradition.\(^{899}\) These are: Zacchaeus (Luke 19:1-10), the Canaanite Woman (Matthew 15:21-28), the Pharisee and Publican (Luke 18:10-14), the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11-32) and the Last Judgment (Matthew 25:31-46).\(^{900}\) I signal these out first, because Severian has homilies on three of them: the Canaanite Woman

\(^{895}\) Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, II}, 141-57.


\(^{897}\) Ibid, 113-4.

\(^{898}\) Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, II}, 224.


\(^{900}\) Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, II}, 3 & 167.
(In Chanaanaeam et Pharaonem), on Zacchaeus (De caeco et Zacchaeo), and the Prodigal Son (In filium prodigum) with 2 Corinthians 11 as the Epistle. The Homily on the Prodigal Son was given soon after Theophany and was the reading of the day. Second, these five Gospels in HS#40 are out of sequence. The Lucan pericopes are from chapters 19, 18 and 15, and in that order, and there are the two pericopes from Matthew inserted among them. Before the pericope on Zacchaeus the Byzantine Lucan Gospels generally follow the numerical chapter order on Sundays. The Canaanite Woman should be before the 9th Saturday after Pentecost, or after the 9th Sunday after Pentecost, it would then be in proper order. Instead it is read about six-seven months later. The Last Judgment belongs after the 16th Sunday after Pentecost, making it read about four months later than if kept in order. Clearly these Gospel readings have been re-arranged for a purpose.

What was the purpose? The Lucan readings all have the themes of repentance and forgiveness. The Canaanite Woman is about faith, healing and the mission to the Gentiles. The Last Judgment is about the Parousia, reward and punishment. Were these Sunday Gospels originally connected to a special post-Epiphan period? Talley wrote extensively on the Alexandrian post-Epiphan 40 Day Fast in imitation of the fasting of

---

902 PG, 59, 629.
904 Ibid, 151.
Christ, and proposed that the Byzantine Lenten Sunday Gospels were a remnant of it;\textsuperscript{906} although Gabriel Bertonière has disproven that the Byzantine Markan lections came from Egypt.\textsuperscript{907}

I am proposing now that the Byzantine pre-Lenten Gospels are a remnant of a post-Epiphany period, although not necessarily from Egypt, or at least they form an alternative Lenten Sunday Lectionary displaced to this position. First, to these five Gospels must be added the Sunday after Epiphany, which is Matthew 4:12-17.\textsuperscript{908} This pericope ends: \textit{Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand}. This sets the stage for the penitential period, which the Lucan Gospels pick up on with their stories of repentance and forgiveness. With the Sunday after Epiphany there are a total of six Gospel readings, and depending on which day of the week January 7 fell, should provide enough Sundays for the 40 day period. This parallels \textit{HS#40} which has Five Sundays of Lent plus a special Gospel to open the season on Cheese Faire Sunday (Matthew 6:14-21).\textsuperscript{909}

In the ancient lectionary systems for Lent we find several trends. One is a pre-baptismal catechesis of Johannine lessons as was used in both Rome and Alexandria.\textsuperscript{910} A second was the Jerusalem Gospel lections taken from Luke, and focused on

\textsuperscript{906} Talley, \textit{The Origins of the Liturgical Year}, 189-203.
\textsuperscript{907} Bertonière, \textit{The Sundays of Lent in the Triodion : The Sundays Without a Commemoration}, 34.
\textsuperscript{908} Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, I}, 189.
\textsuperscript{909} Ibid, \textit{II}, 11.
repentance that we saw in Chapter 1.5. A third choice is the Byzantine Lectionary, which points forward to the Cross and Passion from the Third Sunday of Lent through Palm Sunday. These Byzantine post-Epiphany Gospels could possibly be from a penitential lectionary that made its way to Constantinople, and because there were already Lenten Sunday Gospels in place, it ended up in a post-Epiphany or pre-Lent location, the two being virtually simultaneous.

When counting the 40 days, beginning on January 7, they end on February 15. If we begin counting 50 days for the Byzantine Lent and Holy Week on February 16 we arrive to April 6 as the 50th day. Of course, the counting would have to start on a Monday, and February 16 is not necessarily a Monday, but if the Monday after February 15 is February 22, then the last day to end the 50 days is April 13. This time frame (April 6 thru April 13) is common for Easter. Thus the post-Epiphany or pre-Lent period in the Byzantine Calendar is often, but not always, about 40 days long. When the Paschal celebrations are earlier than April 6, the Byzantine Gospel lectionary omits the pericope of the Canaanite Woman and that of Zacchaeus if needed. Because the Lucan pericopes are out of order, and mixed with two from Matthew, they cannot be considered just the continuation of the Lucan cursus. They form a special group by themselves.


912 Mateos, Le Typicon, I, 39, 47, 57 & 67.
6.4.3 The Epistle and Prophetic Readings of the Eucharist

A word must be added here about the Epistles referred to by Severian which are few in number and have been noted as they appear. Ascension Thursday has Acts 1 as its apostolic reading. The Homily on the Prodigal Son has 2 Corinthians 11 and the Homily on Penance and Compunction, which we proposed for the Second Sunday of Lent, has 2 Corinthians 12 & 13. The Homily on the Serpent, which we proposed for the Fifth Sunday of Lent, has Galatians 3:1. The reading for Ascension is logical since it tells the story of Christ’s ascension into heaven. The remaining three do follow in numerical order going through 2 Corinthians and then arriving at Galatians, the next book of the New Testament. The logic behind the readings definitely seems to be going through the Pauline Epistles in order, although at a slow pace that would not allow them to be finished in one year. The readings do not correspond with the Gospels, except for Galatians on the Fifth Sunday of Lent. Severian seems to be surprised that the reading from Galatians and the Gospel from Matthew match each other in theme.\(^{913}\) This would mean he was used to the readings not being coordinated; the Byzantine liturgy maintains this system until today, and only coordinates the readings for feasts. The pericopes listed by Severian are not the pericopes used in \(HS\#40\), which uses 1 Corinthians 6:12-20 for the Prodigal Son, Hebrews 1: 10-2:3 for the Second Sunday of

\(^{913}\) Bareille, \Œuvres Complètes de Saint Jean Chrysostome, VI, 129.
Lent and Hebrews 9:24-28 for the Fifth Sunday.\textsuperscript{914} There is no information offered for the prophetic readings of the Eucharistic Liturgies.

6.4.4 Information on the Sanctoral and Fixed Cycles from Severian

Regarding the Sanctoral, Severian only mentions the martyr Acacius, John the Baptist, and the New Testament Saints Archippus and Philemon in passing.\textsuperscript{915} He does not preach on them and gives no clues to the readings used for the celebration of the saints. In HS\#40 Acacius was commemorated on May 8, Archippus and Philemon on July 6, and the deposition of the head of John the Baptist on February 24 in his church in the Sphorace district of ancient Constantinople.\textsuperscript{916}

Likewise, for the fixed feasts of Christ, Severian gives little indication as to the readings that were used. He has sermons on Theophany and the Incarnation, but they offer no information on the lectionary. His Sermon on the Temptation of Christ follows the Matthean version (Matthew 4:1-11) without any indication when it was given.\textsuperscript{917} This pericope was also noted above with Nazianzus, and is read the Saturday after Epiphany in the Byzantine Lectionary.

\textsuperscript{914} Mateos, Le Typicon, II, 31 & 55.


\textsuperscript{916} Mateos, Le Typicon, I, 239 & 285 & 333.

6.4.5 Summary of Severian of Gabala

1. Severian was in Constantinople at the same time as Chrysostom, and his 60 or so homilies all date from that city and that time.

2. He has left *Sermons* on Genesis that were clearly given during Lent.

3. There are two sermons that agree with the Byzantine Sunday Gospels for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 5\textsuperscript{th} Sundays of Lent. This lends credence to the opinion that this Lenten Sunday cycle is from the late fourth century.

4. His sermons on the Gospel of John make it quite clear that John was read during the Great 50 Days of Pentecost. The Prologue of John was read on the Sunday of the Resurrection, the Ascension Gospel used Doubting Thomas from John and not Luke’s narrative, and there is no information for Pentecost. There may have been daily liturgies during the 50 Days as found in *HS#40*.

5. The Sundays before Lent in the Byzantine Tradition were pointed out because Severian has homilies for three of the five Sundays. The Sundays are clearly a special group with pericopes out of order and from both Matthew and Luke. The proposal was made that these Sunday Gospels might be a remnant of a lectionary for a post-Epiphany season; or represent an alternative Sunday Lenten Lectionary.

6. Few Apostolic readings are mentioned, although they do follow in Biblical order, but do not match the Byzantine system. The Prophetic lections for the Eucharistic Liturgies are not stated.
7. There is little information for the Fixed and Sanctoral Cycles. He does have a homily
on the Matthean version of the Temptation of Christ which Nazianzus also
commented upon.

6.5 John Chrysostom

6.5.1 Introduction

John Chrysostom was chosen to be bishop of Constantinople in October 397
after the death of Nectarios. The Synaxarion says he was consecrated on December 15,
397, but he was not enthroned until February 26, 398. His second exile began on June
20, 404 and he died in exile on September 14, 407.\(^\text{918}\) His active ministry in
Constantinople was about half the number of years that he preached in Antioch.
Consequently the corpus of sermons is smaller. Table 6.9 lists his Constantinople
homilies according to Baur, with Mayer’s opinion as well. There are a few other sermons
from Constantinople that Baur does not note as such, but they will be referred to as
needed. As was the case in Antioch, the exegetical series do not contain much calendar
or lectionary information. I found none at all in the series \textit{In Col., In Phil., In I Thess.}, and
\textit{In II Thess.} The occasional sermons offered more useful information, but of a limited
quantity. The scant lectionary and calendar information from Chrysostom’s
Constantinopolitan \textit{Homilies} is placed in context when it is combined with that from
Gregory Nazianzus and Severian of Gabala.

\(^{918}\) Baur, \textit{Chrysostom and His Time, II}, 13 & 295.


TABLE 6.9

CHRYSOSTOM’S CONSTANTINOPLE SERMONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Sermon</th>
<th>Mayer’s Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contra Anomoeos homilia XI</td>
<td>Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In martyres Aegyptios</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De s. hieromartyre Phoca</td>
<td>Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Eutropium I &amp; II</td>
<td>Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De regressu</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De recipiendo Severiano</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermo post reditum</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Acta apostolorum homiliae I-LV</td>
<td>Homily IX, Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Phil homilia IX (only)</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Col homiliae I-XII</td>
<td>Homily II &amp; III, Const.; Homily VII, Ant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In I Thess homiliae I-XI</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In II Thess homiliae I-V</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Philemon homiliae I-III</td>
<td>No sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicta post reliquiae martyrum</td>
<td>Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicta praeente imporatore</td>
<td>Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quod frequenter conveniendum sit</td>
<td>Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversus eos qui non adferant</td>
<td>Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De studio praeentium</td>
<td>Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversus catharos</td>
<td>Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra ludos et theatra</td>
<td>Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicta in templo s. Anastasiae</td>
<td>Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habita postquam prebyter Gothus</td>
<td>Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In illud: Pater meus usque modo operatur</td>
<td>Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In illud: Messis quidem multa</td>
<td>Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In illud: Filius ex se nihil facit</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\[919\] Mayer, Provenance, 203-4, 469-473, 509-512.
6.5.2 Information on the Temporal Cycle from Chrysostom

Regarding the pre-Lenten and Lenten lections, Severian had sermons that agreed with *HS#40*, and Chrysostom does not contradict this schema. Chrysostom has a sermon on the Canaanite Woman (Mathew 15:21-28) which clearly states this pericope is the reading of the day, but does not indicate the time of year when the homily was delivered.\(^{920}\) As noted earlier, this pericope was also commented upon by Severian and is part of the pre-Lenten series in the Byzantine Lectionary. Chrysostom preached on the Matthean version of the Paralytic Who Was Let Down from the Roof (Matthew 9:2-8). The Markan version of this story is read the Second Sunday of Lent in *HS#40*, and was also preached on by Severian as noted above.

There is an important testimony from Chrysostom on baptismal dates, and concerning the Epistle for the Easter Vigil. *Homily I on Acts* states very firmly that there are no baptisms on Pentecost Sunday in Constantinople.\(^{921}\) This is very important information, for it does not agree with what was observed both before and after Chrysostom’s time. As seen above, Gregory Nazianzus remarked on three baptismal dates, namely Epiphany, Pascha and Pentecost. These are maintained in *HS#40* with the addition of Lazarus Saturday. This means either Chrysostom or his predecessor Nectarius was responsible for a reduction in the number of baptismal days. Chrysostom explains that baptism is prepared for by fasting, and there is no fasting in the Paschal

\(^{920}\) *Homélie sur le Renvoi de la Cananéenne*, Bareille, Œuvres Complètes de S. Jean Chrysostome, IV.

Season. He goes on to explain that those who sin after baptism are punished more severely by God than the non-baptized, so it behooves the candidate to prepare properly for baptism by fasting, and the implication is that those who do not fast are more likely to sin after baptism.\footnote{Ibid, 8.} The Byzantine Epistle for the Easter Vigil is Romans 6:3-11.\footnote{Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon}, II, 91.} It is the only baptismal day on which the Epistle refers primarily to baptism and not to the feast day.\footnote{The other Epistles are: January 6 – Titus 2:11-3:7; Lazarus Saturday – Hebrews 12:28-13:8 and Pentecost – Acts 2:1-11. Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon}, I, 187; II, 65 & 139.} This reading could have been placed in the Easter Vigil to emphasize it as the premier day for initiation. It would be reasonable to think that either Chrysostom or Nectarius was responsible for this selection. Chrysostom especially embraced the Romans’ 6 theology of baptism as noted in Chapter 5.

Regarding the Sundays after Easter, Chrysostom commented on the Gospel of the Samaritan Woman at the Well (John 4:5-42).\footnote{Homilia \textit{dicta in templo Sanctae Anastasia}, PG 63, 493.} This Gospel, as noted earlier, is the Fifth Sunday after Easter in the Byzantine Tradition, and is part of a possible baptismal series. This same pericope was also noted in Chapter 5 as being read in Antioch after Easter. As stated above, Severian preached on the Man Born Blind which is also a part of this Johannine paschal season lectionary series.

The \textit{Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles (In Acta apostolorum homiliae)} is part of the Constantinopolitan corpus as noted above. Chrysostom does not spend time explaining why this book is read during the Easter season as he did in Antioch, but he
does comment in *Homily I* that the present time is not Lent.\(^{926}\) The Byzantine Tradition maintained the reading of the Acts during the Great 50 Days, so it seems appropriate to assume that it was read at Chrysostom’s time as well.\(^ {927}\) Chrysostom does not mention any particular passages as read on specific days, but using the principle of reading the appropriate passage for the feast, we can posit Acts 1:1-12 for Ascension Thursday and Acts 2:1-11 for Pentecost as maintained in *HS#40*.\(^ {928}\) It should be noted that the first part of *Homily IV on Acts* comments on Acts 2:1-13, the reading for Pentecost.\(^{929}\) The verses of the lection for Ascension Thursday are commented on in *Homilies I-III*.\(^ {930}\) There is no further information that would allow us to posit certain pericopes for particular days.

There are a number of pericopes that Chrysostom refers to that cannot be located during the year. They are important because we know they were read, and because they often do not agree with *HS#40*. This disagreement shows the Byzantine Lectionary evolved and changed over time. Table 6:10 lists these pericopes.

---


\(^{927}\) Mateos, *Le Typicon, II*, 95-139.

\(^{928}\) Ibid, 129 & 139.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homily</th>
<th>Pericope</th>
<th>HS#40&lt;sup&gt;931&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Door Is Narrow&lt;sup&gt;932&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Mt 7:14</td>
<td>Not read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prophet Elias&lt;sup&gt;933&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Lk 4:25</td>
<td>June 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Eutropius, Homily II&lt;sup&gt;934&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Lk 7:36-50, or Mt 26:6-13, or Mk 14:3-9, or Jn 12:1-8</td>
<td>Lk - Sept 16, Sat after Sept 14; Mt – Holy Thursday; Mk – not read; Jn – Palm Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Hebrews, Homily XXVII&lt;sup&gt;935&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 Tm 2:9</td>
<td>Not read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah 45:6—7&lt;sup&gt;936&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Is 45:6-7, Ps 137, 2 Cor 6:3-10 or 11:22-33, Mt 9:20</td>
<td>2 Cor 6 – 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sun. after Pent; 2 Cor 11 – June 29; Mt – 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sat. after Pent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage, Homilies I &amp; II&lt;sup&gt;937&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>I Cor 7:1-2, I Cor 7:39-40</td>
<td>Neither is read</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Epistle readings listed in Table 6.10 are either not read in HS#40, or not read in conjunction with the same Gospel pericope that is given. This shows that the Epistle lectionary was altered over time. In fact, what we learned about the Epistle lectionary for Antioch in the previous chapter seems to correspond more to HS#40 than what we learned in:


932 Homélie sur la nécessité de régler sa vie selon Dieu. Sur le texte: La Porte est étroite, in : Bareille, Œuvres complètes de Saint Jean Chrysostome, IV.

933 Homélie sur le Prophète Elie, Sur la Veuve et sur l'Aumône, in: Bareille, Œuvres complètes de Saint Jean Chrysostome, IV

934 On Eutropius, Homily II: 1, in: NPNF, 1<sup>st</sup> Series, IX, 253.

935 Homilies on Hebrews, Homily XXVII in: NPNF, 1<sup>st</sup> Series, XIV, 497.


see above for Constantinople. The Gospel pericopes that we have seen so far in Constantinople tend to agree more with HS#40 than the Epistle readings. More will be said about this in the conclusion.

6.5.3 Information on the Sanctoral and Fixed Cycles from Chrysostom

There is little information on the Fixed Cycle and Sanctoral in Chrysostom’s Constantinople Homilies. The Epistle reading for January 6 is Titus 2:11 as in Antioch. This corresponds with HS#40. Regarding the Saints’ days we learn that Psalm 138/9:11-12, (In my wantonness let light be as night. Darkness won’t be made dark by you, and night will become as bright as day. Its darkness will be like its light.) was sung at night during the vigil. Psalm 140/1:1 (With my voice I cried out to the Lord, with my voice I made supplication to God.) was used for the Eucharistic Liturgy for Saint Phocas’ day. Neither Psalm is used for the same purposes in HS#40. From Chrysostom’s homilies we learn of the veneration of Saint Phocas and the Maccabees. There are two other homilies on unnamed martyrs, one of whom was an Egyptian.

940 Homily after the Remains of the Martyrs, etc. (New Homily I) 470:35, in: Mayer and Allen, John Chrysostom, 89.
6.5.4 Summary of John Chrysostom

1. Chrysostom was active in Constantinople from February of 398 until June of 404.

2. Little lectionary information is given by Chrysostom, but what is given tends to agree with Nazianzus and Severian of Gabala.

3. He preached on the Canaanite Woman and the Paralytic Let Down from the Roof agreeing with Severian and HS#40.

4. Baptism was administered only at the Easter Vigil. This is the only baptismal day where the Epistle is primarily about baptism (Romans 6).

5. The Samaritan Woman at the Well (John 4) is commented upon.

6. The Epistles mentioned generally do not agree with HS#40 while the Gospels do.

7. Some Epistles and Gospels mentioned are not read in HS#40.

8. The Epiphany Epistle is Titus 2:11 as in Antioch and HS#40.

9. No lections are given for the martyrs, but the Psalm for the vigil was Psalm 138/9:11 and the Psalm for the Eucharistic Liturgy was Psalm 140/1:1.

10. Saint Phocas and the Maccabees were celebrated.

6.6 The Liturgical Calendar and Readings in Constantinople

Our three principle witnesses to the liturgical calendar and lectionary in Constantinople at the time of Chrysostom were Gregory Nazianzus, Severian of Gabala, and Chrysostom himself. Each one has been examined individually allowing us to see the contribution of each one to our knowledge. This has also allowed us to see any changes over time in the calendar and lectionary. The principal change from Nazianzus’ time to
that of Chrysostom and Severian was the reduction in the number of baptismal days from three (Epiphany, Easter and Pentecost) to only one – the Easter Vigil. There was also the introduction of the observation of Holy Thursday and Holy Friday. Otherwise, none of the three authors contradicts the others. Here it must be remembered that Nazianzus was the Nicene bishop of the city for a while, and so was Chrysostom, and Severian was Chrysostom’s delegate for several months. Thus our three authors were serving in the same role and churches. They do not represent variant traditions in the same city, but rather only the tradition of the episcopal service and church of the Nicene Party. Now it is time to compile the evidence from all three together to reconstruct as far as possible the calendar and lectionary of Constantinople ca 400.

6.6.1 The Temporal Cycle

Table 6.11 lists the days and readings for the Temporal Cycle as reconstructed from Nazianzus, Chrysostom and Severian. The contributions of each of our three witnesses are noted with symbols, but there are no footnotes for the references were given when each author was examined on an individual basis. Seeing all of the evidence together allows us to see larger patterns in the Constantinopolitan system. Some lacunae are filled with information from HS#40, because these lacunae are parts of small series, such as the Sundays of the 50 Days of Pentecost, for which most of the evidence was already given by our authors. The readings that agree with HS#40 are indicated with an asterix (*) so that the continuity and discontinuity between the situation ca 400 and the tenth century may be noted. The Table will be followed by comments and observations.
TABLE 6.11
THE TEMPORAL CYCLE IN CONSTANTINOPLE AT CHRYSOSTOM’S TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liturgical Day</th>
<th>OT Reading</th>
<th>Psalm</th>
<th>NT Reading</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Lent/Post Epiphany Season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Sun</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>^*Zacchaeus – Lk 19:3-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sun</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+^*Canaanite Woman – Mt 15:21-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Sun</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>^*Pharisee &amp; Publican – Lk 18:10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Sun</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>^2 Cor 11</td>
<td>^*Prodigal Son – Lk 15:11-32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Sun</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>#*Last Judgment – Mt 25:31-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Sun</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+*Lk 4:25 or parallels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sun</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>^2 Cor 12-13</td>
<td>*Paralytic Let Down from the Roof ^Mk 2:1-12, +Mt 9:1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Sun</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>^*Carry your cross – Mk 8:34-9:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Sun</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>*Epileptic Boy &amp; 2nd Prediction of the Passion – Mk:17-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Sun</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+Ps 65/6:4</td>
<td>+Gal 3:1</td>
<td>*3rd Prediction of the Passion - +Mt 20:17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great &amp; Holy Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Before Easter</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liturgical Day</td>
<td>OT Reading</td>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>NT Reading</td>
<td>Gospel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Sat.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+*Rom 6:3-11</td>
<td>#Mt 26:47-28:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Great 50 Days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Sun (Easter)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+Acts</td>
<td>^*John’s Prologue – Jn 1:1-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sun</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+Acts</td>
<td>*Doubting Thomas – Jn 20:19-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Sun</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+Acts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Sun</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+Acts</td>
<td>+*Samaritan Woman – Jn 4:542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension Thurs</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+Acts 1:1-12</td>
<td>^Jn 20:19-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Sun</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+Acts</td>
<td>*High Priestly Prayer – ^Jn 17:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost Sun</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+Acts 2:1-11</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Days (Weekdays?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>^Jn 7:14; 7:37-41; 16:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After Pentecost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown day</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+Mt 7:14 – Narrow gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown day</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>#*Mt 8:1-4 – Leper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown day</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>#*Mt 8:5-13 – Centurion’s Servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown day</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>#*Mt 8:14-17 – Peter’s Mother-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liturgical Day</td>
<td>OT Reading</td>
<td>Psalm Reading</td>
<td>NT Reading</td>
<td>Gospel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown day</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>#* Mt 8:28-34 – Gerasene Demoniacs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown day</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>#* Mt 9:1-8 - Paralytic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown day</td>
<td>+Is 45:6-7</td>
<td>+Ps 137</td>
<td>+ 2 Cor 6:3-10 or 11:22-33</td>
<td>#* Mt 9:20 – Hemorrhaging Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown day</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>#* Mt 9:27-34 – 2 Blind Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown day</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>#* Mt 14:13-21 – Loaves &amp; Fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown day</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>#* Mt 14:22-33 – Walk on Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown day</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>#* Mt 15:32-39 – 2nd Loaves Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown day</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>#* Mt 17:14-21 - Epileptic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Dec</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>#* Mt 19:1-12 - Divorce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown day</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>#* Mt 20:29-34 – 2 Blind Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown day</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>^Mt 21:23-27 – Authority of Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Mt 21:23-27</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>^Mt 21:28 – 2 Sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown day</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+Tim 2:9</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown day</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+1 Cor 7:1-2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1 Cor 7:1-2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+1 Cor 7:39-40</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncertain Pericopes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lent</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+*Lk 4:25 or parallels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Jul or Early Aug</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+*Lk 7: 36-50 or parallels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: # - Gregory Nazianzus; ^ - Severian of Gabala; + - John Chrysostom; * - agrees, at least in part, with HS#40; italics – supplied from HS#40
There are two Lucan pericopes to note: Luke 4:25 and Luke 7:36-50. The first is clearly given during Lent and is about almsgiving. I have placed this as the first Sunday in Lent in place of the current reading of John 1:44-52, which is part of the Feast of the Prophets.\textsuperscript{945} There is no documentation as to when this commemoration was introduced into the Calendar. It seems logical that it came into being after the Prophetic lection had been dropped from the Eucharistic Liturgy as noted in Chapter 3. Once this had occurred, the three Old Testament readings per day for Terce-Sext and Vespers would have stood out in bolder relief, making Lent a special time for reading the Old Testament Prophets. A celebration of the Prophets in the Lenten season would then seem in order, even though they have their own annual fixed days in the sanctoral such as Nahum on December 1, Habakkuk on December 2 and Moses on September 4.\textsuperscript{946} The possibility also has to be considered that the story of the rejection at Nazareth (Luke 4) was especially chosen by Chrysostom as suiting his purposes for the day.

The second Lucan pericope, Luke 7:36-50, seems to have been chosen by Chrysostom because the scene of the sinful woman clinging to the feet of Jesus matched the actions of Eutropius clinging to the altar. I do not think that it shows a Lucan cycle in use in the summer time. It is also possible that it was used for a saint’s day. \textit{HS#40} uses

\textsuperscript{945} Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, II}, 21-23.

\textsuperscript{946} Ibid, \textit{I}, 121 & 15.
this Gospel pericope for the Martyr Euphemia on September 16 and July 11.\textsuperscript{947} As noted above, the \textit{Homily on Eutropius II} was given in late July or early August.

I have placed the reading of the story of Joseph son of Jacob (Genesis 37:2-50:26) on Monday through Wednesday of Holy Week. This is done based on the \textit{Kontakion} of Romanos on Joseph, which was sung on Holy Monday, as noted in Chapter 1. \textit{HS\#40} reads Exodus instead of Genesis during Holy Week.\textsuperscript{948} It would seem that this custom must post-date Romanos’ \textit{Kontakion}, or the \textit{Kontakion} was not timed to match the lections in church. Also, in Chapter 5 we saw that Antioch continued to read Genesis through Holy Wednesday.

In the Sundays of the Great 50 Days I have supplied the pericope of Doubting Thomas on the Second Sunday. This custom is promoted in \textit{Apostolic Constitutions Book V}, 20:1 and \textit{HS\#40} as noted in Chapter 5. I have left the Third Sunday, now dedicated to the Myrrh Bearers, open for there are the two sermons on John 7 by Severian that may be either for weekdays or a weekend. If for a weekend, the Third Sunday is the only one that has not yet been assigned a specific Gospel. The Paralytic at the Pool of Siloam (John 5:1-15) is supplied, because it is part of the series on baptism, for which the two other Sundays were preached upon by our authors.

When it comes to the lections listed for after Pentecost, it must be realized that some could have been read on Saturdays and some on Sundays, being that these were the two standard days for Eucharistic Liturgies. The Post-Pentecost Gospel lections, it

\textsuperscript{947} Ibid, 37 & 337.

\textsuperscript{948} Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon, II}, 69-81.
appears certain, were a series from Matthew. Every *Homily* from all three authors commented on Matthew, except for a few that can be explained. The reading of Matthew 19:1-12 in early December lends itself also to the idea of a Matthew cursus. Although this pericope is about four months away from Easter, it would have been followed by the Nativity Gospels, the Theophany Gospels, the Post-Epiphany/Pre-Lent Gospels, the Lenten Gospels and the Holy Week pericopes. So the beginning of December was the correct time to begin winding down the course reading of Matthew, except, of course, for those pericopes that would be read for the feasts and seasons already noted. Of the two Matthean selections noted after Matthew 19:1-12; Matthew 20:29 takes place before the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem (Matthew 21:1-11), and is not tied to any particular day, and Matthew 21:23 takes place after the Entry, but also is not clearly connected to a particular day. Both readings could have been part of the *bahnlesung* of Matthew outside of the special seasons.

The Epistles in Table 6.11 are overwhelmingly from 1 & 2 Corinthians, and they are found in the Post-Epiphany and Lenten seasons in order, and not in order after Pentecost. There were not that many references to Epistles, so it is very difficult to decide if the fourth century lectionary of Constantinople was dominated by these two books, or if the bishop-celebrant was insisting on their being read for his special purposes. The readings for Pre-Lent and Lent are from Severian and in order. Those for after Pentecost are from Chrysostom and not in order. Given this limited amount of evidence I suggest that Severian was following the standard lectionary of the city, while Chrysostom was occasionally changing the lections in order to suit his purposes. This
would mean that the system was not completely obligatory. Also, these lections have almost no correspondence to *HS#40*, but the ones we saw for Antioch do relate to the later Byzantine Lectionary. It would seem that at a later time the Epistle Lectionary system of Antioch was imported into the Capital.

We know little about the Old Testament readings outside of Lent. The reading of Isaiah 45:6-7, in conjunction with Matthew 9:20, leads me to think that the prophets were read in order beginning after Pentecost. Isaiah is the first major prophet and he is alongside the earlier chapters of Matthew. This is a tentative conclusion at best, because there are no other prophetic readings listed to help us figure out if there was any system in operation.

Table 6.11 shows us very little about the Old Testament lections that were used and little about the Epistles. It does show us however, many Sunday Gospel lections. The Gospels caught the attention of our preachers more often than the other readings. Also, it seems that the Gospel pericope system was solidified before the other readings.

### 6.6.2 The Sanctoral and Fixed Cycles

Table 6.12 lists the days and readings for the Fixed and Sanctoral Cycles as reconstructed from Nazianzus, Chrysostom and Severian. The contributions of each of our three witnesses are noted with symbols, but there are no footnotes for the references were given when each author was examined on an individual basis. Seeing all of the evidence together allows us to see larger patterns in the Constantinopolitan system. Some information on saints is supplied from Mayer and Allen’s book on John Chrysostom. The readings that agree with *HS#40* are indicated so that the continuity
and discontinuity between the situation ca 400 and the tenth century may be noted.

The Table will be followed by comments and observations.
### TABLE 6.12

**THE SANCTORAL AND FIXED FEASTS IN CHRYSTOSTOM’S CONSTANTINOPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Day</th>
<th>OT Reading</th>
<th>Psalm</th>
<th>NT Reading</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~Sept 16 – St. Euphemia</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Oct 2 – St. Cyprian of Pisidia</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Oct 6 - St. Thomas Apostle</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Nov 6 - St. Paul Bp of Const.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Nov 30 - St. Andrew Ap</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Dec 24 – Christmas Eve</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>*Lk 2:1-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Dec 25 – Christmas Day</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>*Mt 2:1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Dec 27 - St. Stephen Proto-martyr</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Sun after Christmas</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>*Mt 2:13-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># January 1 - Circumcision</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>*Lk 2:20-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#* January 6 - Epiphany</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>+*Titus 2:11</td>
<td>*Mt 3:13-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#^* Sat after Jan 6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>*Mt 4:1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Jan 9 – St. Phocas</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Ps 140/1:1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ Jan 22 – St. Timothy Ap</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^ Feb 24 – John the Baptist</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#* May 2 – St Athanasius of Alexandria</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^* May 8 – Martyr Acacius</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^* May 11 - St. Mocius</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^* Jun 29 – Sts Peter &amp; Paul</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^* Jul 6 – Sts Archippus &amp; Philemon</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^* Aug 1 – Maccabbee Brothers</td>
<td>2 Mc 7:1-42</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Remains of the Martyrs – date &amp; names unknown</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Egyptian martyr – date and name unknown</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: # - Gregory Nazianzus; ^ - Severian of Gabala; + - John Chrysostom; * - agrees with HS#40 at least in part; ~ supplied from John Chrysostom by Mayer & Allen, pages 20-3.
The number of saints in the above table is 18, if we count the un-named ones. This is the same number of saints that was proposed by Baur for Antioch in the previous chapter. The difference between Constantinople and Antioch is that in Antioch most of the saints were local, whereas in Constantinople a few were local, and most were honored by importing relics into the Capital. This was an activity that Chrysostom was involved in as shown by his role in the importation of the relics of Saint Phocas, and his letters offering to send relics and to receive relics from other clergy. We have very little information about the liturgies for the saints except the two references to the Psalms that were sung. I have supplied the reading from 2 Maccabees 7 for August 1, because this feast refers to the events in that reading.

We see in the Gospel lections that a Christmas season and an Epiphany season were developing. This phenomenon seems to have been at least partially encouraged by the idea of Gregory Nazianzus, remarked on earlier, that the life of Christ was commemorated starting with Christmas and ending with the feast of the Ascension and Last Judgment. This idea would become more prominent in a few years, and is evident in the sermons of Proclus and the Gospel lectionary in use at his time.

We have no Old Testament lections commented upon by our three authors and only one Epistle for the fixed feasts. As in Table 6.11 we have more knowledge about

---

951 This is discussed in Chapter 3.
the Gospel readings than the other lections. The Gospel readings generally tend to agree with *HS#40*.

6.7 Summary: The Lectionary and Calendar of Constantinople ca 400

1. Our three principle witnesses were Gregory Nazianzus from 379-381, Severian of Gabala and John Chrysostom from 398-404. This represents a time span of about 25 years.

2. The discernable change between Nazianzus’ time and Chrysostom and Severian’s time was the reduction of baptismal days from three (Epiphany, Pascha & Pentecost) to only one – the Easter Vigil. There was also the introduction of liturgies for Holy Thursday and Holy Friday. There is no evidence for the celebration of Palm Sunday, either for or against the custom.

3. The Christmas Season and its Gospel lectionary were developing with the Vigil Liturgy, Feast day, Sunday after Christmas and January 1 – the Circumcision.

4. The Theophany Season and its Gospel Lectionary were developing with the Vigil Liturgy, Feast day, Saturday and Sunday after Epiphany.

5. The number of saints being celebrated was 18 for certain, due mostly to the importation of relics. We know little about the saints’ liturgy except for the nocturnal procession and the use of the Psalms.

6. Five Post Epiphany/Pre-Lenten Sunday Gospels were in place.

7. Four of Five Lenten Sunday Gospels were in place. It seemed that the same pericope from either Matthew or Mark was acceptable.
8. Holy Week was developing. Most likely the story of Joseph son of Jacob from  
   Genesis was read on Holy Monday through Holy Wednesday. The Holy Thursday  
   Gospel included the Washing of the Feet with the Betrayal and Last Supper. The Holy  
   Friday Gospel included the Good Thief in the Passion narrative. The Paschal or Easter  
   Vigil still included the reading of the Passion as well as the Resurrection.

9. John’s Gospel was read during the Great 50 Days. Most of the Sunday Gospels for  
   the Paschal Season were already in place.

10. After Pentecost Sunday there was a *bahnlesung* of Matthew’s Gospel that lasted  
   until shortly before Christmas.

11. There was a predominance of Epistles from 1 & 2 Corinthians among the few  
    references to Epistles. The limited references make conclusions difficult. It is  
    possible that the Constantinopolitan Epistle Lectionary was discarded in favor of that  
    of Antioch at a later date.

12. There are not enough Old Testament lections references to be certain of a pattern.  
    Perhaps they were read in order beginning with the Major Prophets and then  
    proceeding to the Minor Prophets.
7.1 HS#40 and the Documents of the Byzantine Lectionary

We began our study with the tenth century Jerusalem manuscript, *Hagios Stavros #40*, of the *Typicon of the Great Church* (of Constantinople). Examining this source we were able to distinguish between the original core of the document and the lectionary imports from Jerusalem. These imported pericopes were largely confined to the services of Orthros, the Royal Hours and *Pannychis*. Once these lections were eliminated; the Byzantine Lectionary contained lessons for:

1. Eucharistic liturgies on Saturdays and Sundays throughout the year.
2. Daily Eucharistic liturgies during the Great 50 Days of Pentecost.
3. Lections for the Eucharist on fixed feasts and saints’ days.
4. Lessons for the Liturgies of Holy Thursday, Friday and Ascension Thursday.
5. Readings for weekday Vespers during Lent, which may culminate in the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts.
6. Readings for Tierce-Sext on weekdays of Lent.
7. Readings at Vespers in the evening before some of the feasts.

Of these seven elements, only numbers six and seven were not mentioned at the time of Chrysostom in either Constantinople or Antioch. All the others were mentioned in whole or in part by Chrysostom, and the other authors examined in this dissertation.
Studying the manuscripts of the Gospel Book, Epistle Book and Prophetologion, we saw that some of these manuscripts date as early as the seventh century and agree with HS#40. Analysis of the contents of HS#40 also points to beginning of the seventh century, or possibly 50 years earlier, as the time when the lectionary system was formalized. To go earlier than the seventh century we had to look at patristic sources which were largely homilies.

7.2 The Reading of the Old Testament in the Early Byzantine Liturgy

We dealt with the question of whether there was an Old Testament reading in the early Byzantine Eucharistic Liturgy. This question was answered in the affirmative on the basis of several sources of evidence. These were:

1. First, examining HS#40 showed that in the vigil liturgies for Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Holy Thursday and Holy Friday, the Prophetic readings were an integral part of the Eucharistic Liturgy on these occasions, and not just of the Vespers component of the service as in the present day Typicon.

2. Second, the patristic sources that we examined, including; Chrysostom, Proclus of Constantinople, Romanos the Melodist, and Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople, all showed that an Old Testament reading was part of the Eucharistic Liturgy at their respective lifetimes.

3. Third, the examination of other liturgical traditions, that surrounded Constantinople, also showed Old Testament readings were used in these respective Churches. These were: Apostolic Constitutions from fourth century Syria; the Armenian and Georgian
Lectionaries of Jerusalem; and several contemporary Middle Eastern Church liturgical traditions.

4. Fourth, the Byzantine evidence overwhelmingly pointed to a reading from the Major or Minor Prophets. Other Old Testament books were not normally read unless it was a vigil liturgy for a great feast.

7.3 The Reading of the Gospel of Luke in the Lectionary

Several of the Patristic sources that were examined, that post-dated Chrysostom, showed a strong position for the Gospel of Luke in the Byzantine and Antiochian Lectionaries. These were Proclus of Constantinople, Romanos the Melodist and Severus of Antioch. These authors are dated from 430 – 530 AD. The Gospel Lectionary of Jerusalem ca. 1000 also agreed with these Fathers. We showed that the Lucan cycle had the following characteristics:

1. It began two weekends before Christmas with the Annunciation to Zechariah and the birth of John the Baptist.

2. The Sunday before Christmas observed the Annunciation to Mary.

3. The Lucan Nativity story was read at the vigil liturgy for Christmas.

4. On January 1, the remainder of Luke Chapter 2 was read.

5. The ministry of John the Baptist was read at the vigil liturgy for Epiphany.

6. After Epiphany the Gospel of Luke continued to be read in order through the Fifth Sunday of Lent.
The rationale for the reading of Luke from mid-December through Lent seemed to have been expressed unknowingly by Gregory Nazianzus, who stated that the Church observed the earthly life of Christ from Christmas through Ascension. This particular system for the reading of Luke began to be disassembled when the commemorations relating to the birth of Christ and John the Baptist were placed on fixed dates – September 23, February 2, March 25 and June 24. The beginning of the reading of the Gospel of Luke was moved to September 23, thus reducing the number of Sundays on which Matthew was read, and terminated before Lent began. The Gospels of Matthew and Mark filled the void caused by the removal of Luke from Lent, and some of the times around Christmas and Epiphany, thus producing the system in HS#40.

7.4 Severus of Antioch and the Antiochian Lectionary

Severus of Antioch was examined at some length in Chapter 3 to determine the relationship of the lectionary of his Church to that of Constantinople at the same time period. The similarities consisted of the following:

1. The reading of Genesis on weekdays of Lent.
2. The reading of John and Acts during the great 50 Days of Pentecost.
3. The reading of Matthew from after Pentecost until three weekends before Christmas.
4. The reading of Luke beginning two weeks before Christmas through the Fifth Sunday of Lent.
5. Great Feasts like Christmas, Epiphany, Holy Thursday, Holy Friday, Easter and Ascension Thursday had the same Gospel readings.

The main difference between the Lectionary of Severus’ time and that of Chrysostom’s time in Antioch was that in Chrysostom’s time the Gospel of Luke was generally not read in church.

7.5 Leontius Presbyter of Constantinople

In Chapter 3, Leontius Presbyter of Constantinople was the first Father giving evidence of the lectionary system as found in HS#40. There are only 14 Homilies that survive, but they are rich in information. We saw and noted his contributions to our knowledge.

1. He made the first references to the Book of Job being read during Holy Week at the evening liturgies, although his pericopes did not exactly match those of HS#40.

2. Leontius made the first reference to Lazarus Saturday being a baptismal day as in HS#40. He also noted that Epiphany, Easter and Pentecost were baptismal days, thus returning to the custom in use at the time of Gregory Nazianzus in Constantinople, as noted in Chapter 6.3.

3. He had the same Gospel readings for Lazarus Saturday, Palm Sunday, the Easter Vigil, Easter Day, Mid-Pentecost and Pentecost Sunday as in HS#40.

4. Some of the weekdays did not agree with HS#40 in regards to their Gospel readings.
5. The observation of the Annunciation to Zechariah and the birth of the Baptist were still on the second weekend before Christmas, and not on September 23 and June 24 as in HS#40.

6. He gave strong evidence for the reading of the Old Testament in the Eucharistic liturgy, and the books read were not limited to the Major and Minor Prophets as in Chrysostom’s time.

7.6 The Provenance of Chrysostom’s Homilies

In Chapter 4 we saw that beginning with Patriarch Photius of Constantinople, Chrysostom’s *Homilies* were assigned to either Antioch or Constantinople depending upon how polished they were, with the more polished works assigned to Antioch. A theory during the Baroque era (seventeenth century) placed the longer series of *Homilies* in Antioch, reasoning that Chrysostom had more time to deliver such a series as a priest. In the eighteenth century the *Homilies* began to be assigned to the two cities based on their contents. This system looked for internal references to times, places, people and events to date and place the *Homilies*. The problem with this system was that some of the exegetical series have little of this information, and often a whole series is attributed to one city based on only one reference in one homily.

Wendy Mayer challenged this system as being too simplistic. She saw some of the exegetical series as brought together at a later date by editors, therefore one reference in one homily does not necessarily apply to the whole series. She also questioned some of the criteria used to distinguish one city from another. She would
have liked to see multiple pieces of evidence used, internal to each homily, in order to assign it to either Antioch or Constantinople.

We examined Frans Van de Paverd’s book on *De Statuis*, Robert C. Hill’s translation of the Chrysostom’s *Homilies* on the Old Testament, and Wendy Pradels’ articles on the series *Against the Judaizing Christians*. These helped us to assign sure dating and provenance to these particular *Homilies*, and some others that relate to them.

The question of the provenance of Chrysostom’s *Homilies* was important because we did find some differences between the lectionaries and calendars of the two cities. But, many of the large exegetical series offered no information at all regarding either topic. The *Homilies on the Statues* and the *Homilies on Genesis* offered the most information of any of the larger series. Generally the smaller series of three to five homilies had more useful information than the larger series. Frequently the homilies that stand alone had information to give regarding the lectionary and calendar.

7.7 The Liturgy and Lectionary of Antioch

In Chapter 5, depending on Frans Van de Paverd’s magisterial work on the Liturgy at the end of the fourth century in Antioch and Constantinople, we concluded that the Liturgy of the Word in Antioch had an Old Testament reading, one Psalm, an Epistle and a Gospel reading. These were followed by two to three sermons. The Eucharistic liturgy was normally celebrated on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays and saints’ days. During Lent the Eucharist was offered on Saturdays and Sundays, while
Mondays through Fridays during Lent, there was at 3 PM a reading from Genesis, followed by one sermon and then Vespers was prayed. There were special liturgies for Holy Thursday and Holy Friday, and each day of Easter Week and Ascension Thursday.

Chrysostom’s exegetical series on New Testament books followed the biblical book verse by verse, and seldom have any information that can be used to date or place the homily, or even tie it to the reading of the day. Yet, from the information that can be gleaned from his *Homilies*, we did discover some characteristics of the calendar and lectionary at his time:

1. John and Acts were read during the 50 Days of Pentecost. The story of the Samaritan Woman at the Well (John 4) was definitely read, leading to the possibility that the small series consisting of it, with the stories of the Paralytic at the Pool of Bethesda, and the Man Born Blind were also read.

2. Genesis was read at the 3 PM Lenten Service, Mondays through Fridays.

3. The Gospel of Matthew was read from after Pentecost Sunday through Holy Week and the Easter Vigil. Matthew 15:21-28 (The Canaanite Woman) was read in December, and Matthew 18:23-33 (The Unforgiving Servant) on the Sixth Weekend of Lent.

4. Holy Thursday was called the Day of the Betrayal, and the Gospel of Matthew included material related to the betrayal by Judas as well as the Last Supper.

5. Holy Friday was referred to as Pascha; therefore we avoided using this term for Easter.
6. The Easter Vigil Gospel contained both the reading of the Passion and the Resurrection of Christ.

7. The Pauline Epistles were read in order beginning after Pentecost Sunday. The Catholic Epistles were not read.

8. The Old Testament readings were from the Major and Minor Prophets. Other books were referred to, but not mentioned as having been read aloud.


10. The Epiphany Epistle was Titus 2:11, and the Gospel was Matthew 3:13-17.

11. The Prophetic reading for saints’ days was Isaiah 6:1.

7.8 The Liturgy and Lectionary of Constantinople

In Chapter 6 we once again turned to Frans Van de Paverd’s magisterial book, and we saw that the Liturgy of the Word in Constantinople, like that of Antioch, contained a reading from the Prophets, one Psalm, an Epistle reading and a Gospel reading. There were also multiple sermons given as in Antioch.

The source for homilies was not limited to Chrysostom. There were also the Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus, from twenty years previous to Chrysostom’s episcopate, and the Homilies of Severian of Gabala from the same time as Chrysostom. Ultimately these two non-Chrysostom sources offered us more information than did Chrysostom. The three authors supported each other’s information, however. Gregory of Nazianzus’ Orations gave information regarding the time around Christmas and Epiphany. He also specifically mentioned a number of the miracles of Christ as having
been read in church. Severian of Gabala’s Homilies generally provided information regarding both the calendar and the lectionary.

We were able to learn more about the lectionary and calendar of Constantinople than that of Antioch, due to having more than one author’s works to examine. The noteworthy features of the calendar and lectionary of Constantinople were as follows:

1. Too little information was given on the Epistles to discern a pattern for them.
2. The Old Testament reading was from the Major or Minor Prophets, but there is not enough information to discern a pattern.
3. Genesis was read on weekdays of Lent, with Genesis 2:7-3:24 on the First Friday of Lent.
4. There is evidence that the Lenten Saturday and Sunday Gospel pericopes were taken from the parallel stories in either Matthew or Mark. These matched HS#40.
5. Acts and John were read during the Great 50 Days of Pentecost. Because of Severian of Gabala’s Homilies we have more information about which Gospel pericopes were read than in Antioch.
6. Matthew was read from after Pentecost Sunday through the Easter Vigil. Matthew 19:1-12 was read in December, and Miracle Stories were included in the lectionary.
7. What are now known as the Pre-Lenten Sunday Gospels in the Byzantine Lectionary may have originated as Post-Epiphany readings focused on repentance.
8. There were special Gospel readings associated with the time immediately after Christmas, and the time immediately after Epiphany.
9. In Chrysostom’s time the only baptismal day was the Easter Vigil. In Gregory of Nazianzus’ time there were three days – Epiphany, the Easter Vigil and Pentecost Sunday. *HS#40* maintains these three days and adds to them Lazarus Saturday, the day before Palm Sunday. The baptismal days of *HS#40* are also found in Leontius, Presbyter of Constantinople in the sixth century.

7.9 A Comparison of the Lectionaries of Antioch and Constantinople

On the basis of our knowledge of the Lectionaries of both Antioch and Constantinople, we are able to make a brief comparison between the two of them. The Lectionaries of the two cities had in common at the time of Chrysostom the following traits.

1. Genesis was read on Mondays through Fridays of Great Lent. The pericope for the First Friday of Lent was the Fall of Adam, which is maintained in *HS#40*.

2. The readings for Holy Week, Epiphany and Christmas were the same for both cities and match *HS#40*.

3. The Acts of the Apostles and the Gospel of John were read during the Great 50 Days of Pentecost as is the custom in *HS#40*, and the Sunday Gospels appear to be the same as in *HS#40*.

4. The Old Testament Reading was from the Major or Minor Prophets. *HS#40* does not have an Old Testament Reading for the Eucharistic Liturgy except at vigils.
The assigning of the provenance of the *Homilies* to the two cities was important because there are differences between them. The dissimilarities that we noted were:

1. The progression of the Sunday Gospels of Matthew was different between the two, with different Gospels being read for the beginning of December, and the Sixth Weekend of Lent. Possibly all of the Gospels for Lent were different between the two cities. The Constantinople Lenten Sunday Gospels agreed with *HS#40*. Many of the Matthew Gospels in Constantinople are read in *HS#40*, but on different days.

2. The information on the Epistles was scanty, but what does exist shows that the Lectionaries of the two cities did not agree. The general schema of Antioch, of reading the Pauline Epistles in order, agrees more with *HS#40* than does the evidence from Chrysostom’s Constantinople.

3. There was more evidence from Constantinople than Antioch regarding special Gospels for after the Nativity and Epiphany Feasts, and these agree with *HS#40*.

**7.10 Questions to Be Examined**

Reviewing the information that has been learned thus far, leads to several questions that warrant future study, among which four seem especially noteworthy. The first regards the Old Testament Reading. Why was the Old Testament Reading only from the Prophets in Chrysostom’s time? Was there originally a reading from the Law that was suppressed? What is the relationship between this ignoring of the Law and the struggle against the Judaizing Christians in Antioch?
The second question regards the anti-Arian polemic in both Antioch and Constantinople. Both cities, at one time, had Arian and Nicene congregations, and in the case of Antioch simultaneous Arian and Nicene bishops. Was this struggle reflected in the choice of readings? As noted in Chapter 5, *Chrysostom’s Commentary on John* has anti-Arian polemics. We saw a strong position for miracle story Gospels in Constantinople. What is the relationship between this fact and the use of miracles in Chrysostom’s *Against the Anomoeans, Homilies XI and XII*?

Third, after Chrysostom’s time, we noted a strong position for the reading of the Gospel of Luke, which began two weekends before Christmas and continued through the Fifth Sunday of Lent. There was evidence for this custom in Constantinople, Antioch and Jerusalem. Where did it originate? It existed in Constantinople from about 430 to 550. Why was it changed?

The fourth question is related to the third. We noted that Leontius of Constantinople was our first witness regarding the Lectionary of Constantinople that largely agrees with *HS#40*. Compared to earlier eras; *HS#40* has two readings for Lenten Vespers not one, the Gospel of Mark is read during Lent, and the Gospel of Matthew is always given precedence over Mark and Luke. What caused this change?

These are some of the questions that can be asked; more will surely follow.
APPENDIX A:

THE READINGS OF HAGIOS STAVROS NUMBER 40

TABLE A.1:

SYNAXARION – GREAT LENT AND GREAT (HOLY) WEEK\textsuperscript{952}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liturgical Time of the Year</th>
<th>Epistle/OT</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday before Meat-fare –</td>
<td>I Cor 6:12-20</td>
<td>Lk 15:11-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prodigal Son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday of Meat-fare</td>
<td>I Cor 10:23-28</td>
<td>Lk 21:8-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday of Meat-fare –</td>
<td>I Cor 8:8-9:2</td>
<td>Mt 25:31-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday of Cheese-fare</td>
<td>Jl 2:12-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jl 4:12-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday of Cheese-fare</td>
<td>Zec 8:7-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zec 8:19-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday of Cheese-fare</td>
<td>Rom 13:11b-14:4</td>
<td>Mt 6:14-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{952} Juan Mateos, \textit{Le Typicon de la Grande Église}, II, 2-91
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liturgical Time of the Year</th>
<th>Epistle/OT</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Week of Lent Monday</td>
<td>Is 1:1-20; Gen 1:1-13; Prov 1:1-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Is 1:19-2:3; Gen 1:14-23; Prov 1:20-33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Is 2:3-11; Gen 1:24-2:3; Prov 2:1-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Is 2:11-27; Gen 2:4-19; Prov 3:1-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Is 3:1-14; Gen 2:20-3:20; Prov 3:19-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Hebr 1:1-12; Mk 2:23-3:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>Hebr 11:24-26, 32-40; Jn 1:44-52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Week of Lent Monday</td>
<td>Is 4:2-5:6; Gen 3:21-4:7; Prov 3:34-4:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Is 5:7-16; Gen 4:8-15; Prov 5:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Is 5:16-25; Gen 4:16-26; Prov 5:15-6:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Is 6:1-12; Gen 5:1-24; Prov 6:3-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Is 7:1-14; Gen 5:32-6:8; Prov 6:20-7:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>Hebr 3:12-14; Mk 1:35-44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>Hebr 1:10-2:3; Mk 2:1-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Week of Lent Monday</td>
<td>Is 8:13-9:6; Gen 6:9-22; Prov 8:1-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Is 9:8-16; Gen 7:1-5; Prov 8:32-9:11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Is 10:12-20; Gen 7:6-9:2; Prov 9:12-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Is 11:10-12:2; Gen 7:11-8:4; Prov 10:1-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Is 13:2-13; Gen 8:4-21; Prov 10:31-11:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>Hebr 10:32-38; Mk 7:31-37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>Hebr 4:14-5:6; Mk 8:34-9:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liturgical Time of the Year</td>
<td>OT/Epistle</td>
<td>Gospel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **4th Week of Lent**
  Monday                      | Is 14:24-32
  Gen 8:21-9:7; Prov 11:19-12:6 |        |
| Tuesday                     | Is 25:1-9
  Gen 9:8-17; Prov 12:8-22 |        |
| Wednesday                   | Is 26:21-27:9
| Thursday                    | Is 28:14-22
  Gen 10:32-11:9; Prov 13:19-14:6 |        |
| Friday                      | Is 29:13-23
  Gen 12:1-7; Prov 14:15-26 |        |
| **4th Saturday**            | Hebr 6:9-12 |        |
| **4th Sunday**              | Hebr 6:13-20 |        |
| **5th Week of Lent**
  Monday                      | Is 37:33-38:6
  Gen 13:12-18; Prov 14:27-15:4 |        |
| Tuesday                     | Is 40:18-31
  Gen 15:1-15; Prov 15:7-19 |        |
| Wednesday                   | Is 41:4-14
  Gen 17:1-10; Prov 15:20-29 |        |
| Thursday                    | Is 42:5-16
  Gen 18:20-33; Prov 16:17-33 |        |
| Friday                      | Is 45:11-17
  Gen 22:1-18; Prov 17:17-18:5 |        |
| **5th Saturday**            | Hebr 9:24-28 |        |
| **5th Sunday**              | Hebr 9:11-14 |        |
| **6th Week of Lent**
  Monday                      | Is 48:17-49:4
  Gen 27:1-41; Prov 19:16-25 |        |
| Tuesday                     | Is 49:6-10
  Gen 31:3-1; Prov 21:3-21 |        |
| Wednesday                   | Is 58:1-11
| Thursday                    | Is 65:8-16
  Gen 46:1-7; Prov 23:15-24:5 |        |
| Friday                      | Is 66:10-24
  Gen 49:33-50:26; Prov 31:8-31 |        |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Scripture References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lazarus</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Hebr 12:28-13:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Sunday</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen 49:1-12; Sph 3:14-19; Zec 9:9-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phil 4:4-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy and Great Week Monday</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jn 11:1-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ez 1:1-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex 1:1-20; Job 1:1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ez 2:3-3:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex 2:11-22; Job 2:1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday – Tierce-Sext Washing of the Feet Divine Liturgy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jer 11:18-12:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex 19:10-19; Job 38:1-21; Is 50:4-11; I Cor 11:23-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday – Passion Vigil</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jn 13:3-11; 13:12-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 26:2-20; Jn 13:3-17; Mt 26:21-39; Lk 22:43-44; Mt 26:40-27:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday – Tierce-Sext Vespers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zec 11:10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex 33:11-23; Job 42:12-17; Is 52:13-54:1; I Cor 1:18-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday – Matins Vigil</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 27:1-38; Lk 23:39-43; Mt 27:39-54; Jn 19:31-37; Mat 27:55-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ez 37:1-14; 1 Cor 5:6-8; Gal 3:13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen 1:1-5; Is 60:1-16; Ex 12:1-11; Jonah 1:1-4:11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE A.2:

SYNAXARION – THE GREAT FIFTY DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of the Year</th>
<th>Epistle/OT</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holy &amp; Great Pascha Vespers</td>
<td>Acts 1:1-8</td>
<td>Jn 1:1-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jn 20:19-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of Renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday – the Apostles</td>
<td>Acts 1:12-17, 21-26</td>
<td>Jn 1:18-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday – the Theotokos</td>
<td>Acts 2: 14-21</td>
<td>Lk 24:21-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday – (Stephen)</td>
<td>Acts 2:22-36</td>
<td>Jn 1:25-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday – Peter &amp; Paul</td>
<td>Acts 3:1-8</td>
<td>Jn 2:12-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday – (John the Baptist)</td>
<td>Acts 3:11-16</td>
<td>Jn 3:22-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Week after Pascha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Pascha – Thomas Sunday</td>
<td>Acts 5:12-20</td>
<td>Jn 20:19-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Acts 4:1-10</td>
<td>Jn 3:13-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Acts 4:23-31</td>
<td>Jn 5:24-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Acts 5:1-11</td>
<td>Jn 5:30-6:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Acts 5:21-32</td>
<td>Jn 6:14-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Week after Pascha – Sunday of the Myrrh Bearers</td>
<td>Acts 6:1-7</td>
<td>Mk 15:43-16:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Acts 6:8-7:5 &amp; 47-60</td>
<td>Jn 4:46-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Acts 8:5-16</td>
<td>Jn 6:27-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Acts 8:26-39</td>
<td>Jn 6:40-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Acts 8:40-9:19</td>
<td>Jn 6:48-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Acts 9:19-31</td>
<td>Jn 15:17-16:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Week after Pascha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Acts 10:21-33</td>
<td>Jn 7:1-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of the Year</th>
<th>Epistle/OT</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday of Mid-Pentecost</td>
<td>Acts 14:6-18</td>
<td>Jn 7:14-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Acts 10:34-43</td>
<td>Jn 8:12-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Acts 10:44-11:10</td>
<td>Jn 8:21-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Acts 12:1-11</td>
<td>Jn 8:31-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Week after Pascha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Acts 11:19-26, 29-30</td>
<td>Jn 4:5-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Acts 12:12-17</td>
<td>Jn 8:42-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Acts 12:25-13:12</td>
<td>Jn 8:52-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Acts 15:5-12</td>
<td>Jn 10:17-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Acts 15:35-41</td>
<td>Jn 10:27-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Week after Pascha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Acts 16:16-34</td>
<td>Jn 9:1-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Acts 17:1-7</td>
<td>Jn 11:47-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Acts 17:19-28</td>
<td>Jn12:19-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Acts 18:22-28</td>
<td>Jn 12:36-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension Thursday – Vespers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acts 1:1-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Acts 19:1-8</td>
<td>Jn 14:1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Acts 20:7-12</td>
<td>Jn 14:10-17, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Week after Pascha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday of Nicaea 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vespers</td>
<td>Gen 14:14-20; Deut 1:8-17; Deut 10:14-21</td>
<td>Jn 17:1-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divine Liturgy</td>
<td>Acts 20:16-17, 28-36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Acts 21:26-32</td>
<td>Jn 16:2-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Acts 23:1-11</td>
<td>Jn 16:15-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost Sunday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vespers</td>
<td>Num 11:16-29; Joel 2:23-3:5; Ez 36:24-28</td>
<td>Jn 7:37-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divine Liturgy</td>
<td>Acts 2:1-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE A.3:
SYNAXARION – AFTER PENTECOST\(^{954}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Time of the Year</th>
<th>Epistle/OT</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday after Pentecost – the Holy Apostles</td>
<td>Eph 5:8-19</td>
<td>Mt 18:10-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday after Pentecost – Archangels Michael &amp; Gabriel</td>
<td>Hebr 2:2-10</td>
<td>Jn 1:43-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(^{nd}) Saturday 2(^{nd}) Sunday</td>
<td>Rom 3:19-26 Rom 2:10-16</td>
<td>Mt 7:1-8 Mt 4:18-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(^{rd}) Saturday 3(^{rd}) Sunday</td>
<td>Rom 3:28-4:3 Rom 5:1-10</td>
<td>Mt 7:24-8:4 Mt 6:22-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(^{th}) Saturday 4(^{th}) Sunday</td>
<td>Rom 6:11-17 Rom 6:18-23</td>
<td>Mt 8:14-23 Mt 8:5-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(^{th}) Saturday 5(^{th}) Sunday</td>
<td>Rom8:14-21 Rom 10:1-10</td>
<td>Mt 9:9-13 Mt 8:28-9:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(^{th}) Saturday 6(^{th}) Sunday</td>
<td>Rom 9:1-5 Rom 12:6-14</td>
<td>Mt 9:18-26 Mt 9:1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8(^{th}) Saturday 8(^{th}) Sunday</td>
<td>Rom 13:1-10 1 Cor 1:10-18</td>
<td>Mt 12:30-37 Mt 14:14-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9(^{th}) Saturday 9(^{th}) Sunday</td>
<td>Rom 14:6-9 1 Cor 3:9-17</td>
<td>Mt 15:32-39 Mt 14:22-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10(^{th}) Saturday 10(^{th}) Sunday</td>
<td>Rom 15:30-33 1 Cor 4:9-16</td>
<td>Mt 17:24-18:4 Mt 17:14-23a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11(^{th}) Saturday 11(^{th}) Sunday</td>
<td>1 Cor 1:3-9 1 Cor 9:2b-12</td>
<td>Mt 19:3-12 Mt 18:23-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12(^{th}) Saturday 12(^{th}) Sunday</td>
<td>1 Cor 1:26-29 1 Cor 15:1-11</td>
<td>Mt 20:29-34 Mt 19:16-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13(^{th}) Saturday 13(^{th}) Sunday</td>
<td>1 Cor 2:6-9 1 Cor 16:13-24</td>
<td>Mt 22:15-22 Mt 21:33-42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Time of the Year</th>
<th>Epistle/OT</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>1 Cor 4:1-5</td>
<td>Mt 23:1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>2 Cor 1:21-2:4</td>
<td>Mt 22:2-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>1 Cor 4:17-5:5</td>
<td>Mt 24:1-9, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>2 Cor 4:6-15</td>
<td>Mt 22:35-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>1 Cor 10:23-26</td>
<td>Mt 24:34-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>2 Cor 6:1-10</td>
<td>Mat 25:14-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>1 Cor 14:20-25</td>
<td>Mt 25:1-13 or Lk 4:31-36 Lk 5:1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>2 Cor 6:16-7:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>1 Cor 15:39-45</td>
<td>Lk 5:17-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>2 Cor 9:6-11</td>
<td>Lk 6:31-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>1 Cor 15:58-16:3</td>
<td>Lk 5:27-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>2 Cor 11:31-12:9</td>
<td>Lk 7:11-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>2 Cor 1:8-11</td>
<td>Lk 6:1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>Gal 1:11-19</td>
<td>Lk 8:5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>2 Cor 3:12-18</td>
<td>Lk 7:1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>Gal 2:16-20</td>
<td>Lk 16:19-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>2 Cor 5:1-10</td>
<td>Lk 8:16-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>Gal 6:11-18</td>
<td>Lk 8:27-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>2 Cor 8:1-5</td>
<td>Lk 9:1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>Eph 2:4-10</td>
<td>Lk 8:41-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>2 Cor 11:1-6</td>
<td>Lk 9:37-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>Eph 2:14-22</td>
<td>Lk 10:25-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>Gal 1:3-10</td>
<td>Lk 9:57-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>Eph 4:1-7</td>
<td>Lk 12:16-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>Gal 3:8-12</td>
<td>Lk 10:19-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>Eph 5:8b-19</td>
<td>Lk 13:10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>Gal 5:22-6:2</td>
<td>Lk 12:32-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>Eph 6:10-17</td>
<td>Lk 14:16-24; Mat 22:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>Eph 1:16-23</td>
<td>Lk 13:19-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>Col 1:12-18</td>
<td>Lk 17:12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>Eph 2:11-13</td>
<td>Lk 14:1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>Col 3:4-11</td>
<td>Lk 18:18-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>Eph 5:1-8a</td>
<td>Lk 16:10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>Col 3:12-16</td>
<td>Lk 18:35-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday</td>
<td>Col 1:2b-7a</td>
<td>Lk 17:3-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday</td>
<td>1 Tim 1:15-17</td>
<td>Lk 19:1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Time of the Year</td>
<td>Epistle/OT</td>
<td>Gospel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32\textsuperscript{nd} Saturday</td>
<td>1 Thess 5:14-23</td>
<td>Lk 18:2-8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32\textsuperscript{nd} Sunday</td>
<td>1 Tim 4:9-15</td>
<td>Mt 15:21-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33\textsuperscript{rd} Saturday</td>
<td>2 Tim 2:11-19</td>
<td>Lk 20:46-21:8a; 14:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33\textsuperscript{rd} Sunday</td>
<td>2 Tim 3:10-15</td>
<td>Lk 18:10-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday before Meat fare</td>
<td>Of choice</td>
<td>Of choice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE A.4:
INTER-SERVICE READINGS OF HAGIOS STAVROS NUMBER 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>When read</th>
<th>What is read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheese-fare Wednesday</td>
<td>After Orthros until Tierce-Sext</td>
<td>Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese-fare Sunday</td>
<td>After Orthros</td>
<td>Reading (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Monday of Lent</td>
<td>After Orthros until Tierce-Sext</td>
<td>Reading (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazarus Saturday</td>
<td>After Orthros when the Neophytes enter the church until the Liturgy starts</td>
<td>Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acts 8:26ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascha Morning</td>
<td>After Orthros</td>
<td>Apostle (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Tuesday</td>
<td>After Orthros</td>
<td>Apostle (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Wednesday</td>
<td>After Orthros</td>
<td>Apostle (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Thursday</td>
<td>After Orthros</td>
<td>Apostle (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Sunday</td>
<td>After Orthros</td>
<td>Apostle (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Monday</td>
<td>After Orthros</td>
<td>Apostle (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension Thursday</td>
<td>After Orthros</td>
<td>Apostle (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday after Ascension</td>
<td>After Vespers until Pannychis begins</td>
<td>Apostle (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday after Ascension</td>
<td>After Orthros</td>
<td>Decrees of the Holy Synods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost Eve</td>
<td>After Vespers until Pannychis</td>
<td>Apostle (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost Morning</td>
<td>After Orthros</td>
<td>Discourse on Pentecost by Gregory the Theologian Acts 8:26-39ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After the Neophytes enter until the Liturgy starts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1 – St. Simeon the Stylite</td>
<td>After Vespers</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 8 – Nativity of the Theotokos</td>
<td>After 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Vespers</td>
<td>Reading (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 14 – Exaltation of the Cross</td>
<td>After 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Vespers</td>
<td>Reading (not specified)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Reading Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 18 – dedication of the basilica in Chalcoprateia</td>
<td>After Vespers</td>
<td>Reading (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 24 – Christmas Eve</td>
<td>If there is no Vespers-Divine Liturgy</td>
<td>Reading (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6 - Epiphany</td>
<td>After Vespers-Liturgy while water is being blessed</td>
<td>Isaiah 35:1-10; 55:1-13; 12:3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After this read until Pannychis begins</td>
<td>Reading (not specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After Orthros, after the Neophytes enter the church</td>
<td>Acts 8:26ff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A.5:

**MENAION – FEASTS WITH READINGS AT VESPERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Epistle/OT</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; – Vespers Liturgy</td>
<td>Wis 3:1-9; Wis 4:7-15, Wis 5:15-6:3 1 Tim 3:13-4:5</td>
<td>Lk 4:16-22a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday before September 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 Cor 2:6-9</td>
<td>Mt 10:37-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday before September 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Gal 6:11-18</td>
<td>Jn 3:13-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; – Vespers Liturgy</td>
<td>Ex 15:22-26; Prov 3:11-18; Is 60:11-16 1 Cor 1:18-24</td>
<td>Jn 3:13-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday after September 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1 Cor 1:28-29</td>
<td>Lk 7:36-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday after September 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Gal 2:16-20</td>
<td>Mk 8:34-9:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday before Christmas</td>
<td>Col 3:4-11</td>
<td>Gospel of the Sunday Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday before the Fathers</td>
<td>Gal 3:8-12</td>
<td>Mt 12:15b-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday before Christmas, Sunday of the OT Fathers</td>
<td>Hebr 11:9-40</td>
<td>Mt 1:1-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Epistle/OT</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday after Christmas</td>
<td>Hebr 9:1-7</td>
<td>Lk 1:39-56 or Mt 3:1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday after Christmas</td>
<td>Gal 1:11-19</td>
<td>Mt 2:13-23 or Mk 1:1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday before January 6</td>
<td>Acts 19:1-8 or 1 Tim 3:13-4:5</td>
<td>Mt 11:2-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday before January 6</td>
<td>2 Tim 4:5-8</td>
<td>Mk 1:1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6 – Vigil Liturgy</td>
<td>Gen 1:1-13; Ex 14:15-29; Ex 15:22-16:1; Josh 3:7-17; 2 Kgs 2:4-14; 2 Kgs 5:9-14; Is 1:16-20; [Gen 32:2-11; Ex 2:5-10; Jgs 6:36-40; 1 Kgs 18:30-39 ; 2 Kgs 2:19-22] (Is 49:8-15); 1 Cor 9:19-10:4 or 1 Cor 10:1-4; Is 35:1-10; Is 55:1-13; Is 12:3-6</td>
<td>Lk 3:1-18; Mt 3:13-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the Blessing of Water Morning Liturgy</td>
<td>Tit 2:11-3:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday after January 6</td>
<td>Eph 6:10-17</td>
<td>Mt 4:1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday after January 6</td>
<td>2 Tim 1:6-10</td>
<td>Mt 4:12-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2 – Vespers Liturgy</td>
<td>Gen 28:10-17; Ez 43:27-44:4; Prov 9:1-11</td>
<td>Lk 1:22-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hebr 7:7-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25 – Afternoon Liturgy</td>
<td>Ex 3:1b-8a; Prov 8:22-30; Hebr 2:11-18</td>
<td>Lk 1:24-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 29 – Vespers Liturgy</td>
<td>1 Pt 1:3-9; 1 Pt 1:13-19; 1 Pt 2:11-24 2 Cor 11:21b-12:9</td>
<td>Mt 16:13-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 16 – Fathers of Chalcedon – Vespers Liturgy</td>
<td>Gen 14:14-20a; Dt 1:8-17; Dt 10:14-27 Hebr 13:7-16</td>
<td>Mt 5:14-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 6 – Vespers Liturgy</td>
<td>Ex 24:12-18; Ex 33:11-34:8; 1 Kgs 19:3b-16 2 Pt 1:10-19</td>
<td>Mt 17 :1-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B:

THE SERMONS OF PROCLUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE

TABLE B.1:

SCRIPTURE IN PROCLUS’ HOMILIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occasion &amp; Homily</th>
<th>Old Testament</th>
<th>Psalm</th>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Before Christmas – Annunciation</td>
<td>Ez 44:1-2</td>
<td>103:24 2:7*</td>
<td>Lk 2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XXIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XXIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XXXV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theotokos, December 26*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 1:42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Stephen, December 27*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acts 6:9ff*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XVII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Innocents, December 29*</td>
<td>47:1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 2:16-18*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XXVI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumcision, January 1*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 2:21*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XXII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XXVIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfiguration (no date)</td>
<td>88:13*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasion and Homily Number *Agrees with HS #40</td>
<td>Old Testament</td>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>Epistle</td>
<td>Gospel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Sunday*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jn 12:13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Thursday Evening*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jn 13:1-20 &amp; Betrayal of Judas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Friday Afternoon*</td>
<td></td>
<td>23:7</td>
<td>1 Cor 1:23-25*</td>
<td>Jn &amp; Good Thief (LK)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XXIX</td>
<td>Ex 12-15*</td>
<td>23:10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jn 1:1-18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>92:1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XXVII (Mystagogy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>92:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XXXI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gal 3:27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XXXII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Sunday*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jn 20:19-31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XXXIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension Thursday*</td>
<td></td>
<td>46:1-5*</td>
<td>Acts 1:6-12*</td>
<td>Lk 24:50-53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XXI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XXXVII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acts 2:1-13*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XVI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Saints (Martyrs)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hebr 11-12*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XXXIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, June 29*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Cor 11:21-12:9*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XVIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrew, November 30*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 4:18-23*</td>
<td>Jn 1:35-42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XIX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life is Short (no date)</td>
<td>Mi 6:3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Tim 6:6-8</td>
<td>Mt 8:14ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homily XXXVI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX C:**

**THE HOMILIES OF SEVERUS OF ANTIOCH**

**TABLE C.1:**

**MOVABLE FEASTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church Year</th>
<th>Homily Number and Date</th>
<th>Scripture/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Friday before Lent</td>
<td>#15, Feb 22, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sunday before Lent</td>
<td>#119, Feb 25, 518</td>
<td>Jn 2 – Wedding at Cana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*First Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>#16, Feb 24, 513</td>
<td>*Genesis is read during Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#39, Feb 16, 514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#68, Mar 8, 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#87, Feb 21, 516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#105, Feb 12, 517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#120, Mar 4, 518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Third or Fourth Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>#89, Mar 20, 516</td>
<td>Lk 10:30 – Good Samaritan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#122, Mar 25, 518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Palm Sunday</td>
<td>#20, Mar 31, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Great Friday</td>
<td>#22, Apr 5, 513</td>
<td>*Mt 27 &amp; *Lk 23:39-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Easter</td>
<td>#23, Apr 7, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#43, Mar 30, 514</td>
<td>*Jn 1:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Jn 1:16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Wednesday after Easter, Commemoration of the Departed</td>
<td>#44, Apr 9, 514</td>
<td>2 Tm 4:7-8, Jn 20:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Magdalene</td>
<td>#45, 514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mid-Pentecost</td>
<td>#46, Apr 23, 514</td>
<td>*Jn 7:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ascension of Christ</td>
<td>#24, May 16, 513 #47, May 8, 514 #71, May 28, 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Pentecost Sunday</td>
<td>#25, May 16, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday after Pentecost</td>
<td>#48, May 23, 514 #74, June 12, 515 #92, May 27, 516</td>
<td>Announces Apostles’ Fast Acts 3:1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catechesis on the First Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>#40, Feb 16, 514 #69, Mar 8, 515 #88, Feb 21, 516 #106, Feb 12, 517 #121, Mar 4, 518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catechesis on Holy Wednesday</td>
<td>#21, Apr 3, 513 #42, Mar 26, 514 #70, Apr. 15, 515 #90, Mar 30, 516 #109, Mar 22, 517 #123, Apr 11, 518</td>
<td>On the Creed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE C. 2:

**FIXED FEASTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church Year</th>
<th>Homily # &amp; Date</th>
<th>Scripture/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 3, Dedication of the Great Church of Antioch</td>
<td>112, 517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 18, *Martyr Romanos &amp; his Anniversary</td>
<td>35, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80, 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99, 516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 14, St Drosis</td>
<td>100, 516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114, 517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Christmas</td>
<td>2, 512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4, Dec 16, 512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94, 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95, 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96, 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dec 25, Christmas</td>
<td>7, 512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63, 514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83, 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101, 516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115, 517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dec 29, Holy Innocents</td>
<td>8, 512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64, 514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1, Sts *Basil &amp; Gregory the Theologian</td>
<td>9, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37, 514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Jan 6, Baptism of Christ</td>
<td>10, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38, 514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66, 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84, 516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85, 516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102, 517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103, 517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116, 518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117, 518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 26, St Stephen</td>
<td>7, 512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Jan 6, Baptism of Christ</td>
<td>10, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38, 514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66, 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84, 516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85, 516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102, 517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103, 517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116, 518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117, 518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*More Luke than Matthew

*Mt – Magi, Nm 24:17-Balaam

*Lukian Account

*Mat 3:15, Ps 76:17-21

4 Kgs 11:19-21

Ps 73:13-14, Mt Account

*Is 35:1-2 (LXX)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church Year</th>
<th>Homily # &amp; Date</th>
<th>Scripture/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Jan 17, St Anthony</td>
<td>#12, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#86, 516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 23 or 24, St Babylas</td>
<td>#11, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2, Theotokos</td>
<td>#14, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#67, 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mar 9, 40 Martyrs of Sebastea</td>
<td>#18, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#41, 514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, St Athanasius of Alexandria</td>
<td>#91, 516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*May 20, St Thallelaios</td>
<td>#110, 517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 1, Sts Procopius &amp; Phocas</td>
<td>#72, 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun ?, St Theodore</td>
<td>#26, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun ?, St Barlaha (Barlaam)</td>
<td>#73, 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Jun 18, St Leontius</td>
<td>#27, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#50, 514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Jun 21, St Julian</td>
<td>#75, 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 3, Apostle Thomas</td>
<td>#28, 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 5, Martyr Dometius</td>
<td>#51, 514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 21, Deceased poor and strangers</td>
<td>#76, 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 27 or Sept 2, St Symeon Styliite</td>
<td>#30, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Aug 1, Maccabees Brothers</td>
<td>#52, 514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 6, Martyrs Tarachos, Probos &amp; Andronicos</td>
<td>#78, 515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sept 14, Dedication of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem</td>
<td>#31, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sept 23 or Oct 14, John the Baptist</td>
<td>#32, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John’s entire life is remembered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 25, St Thecla</td>
<td>#97, 516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1, Sts Sergius &amp; Bacchus</td>
<td>#57, 514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Agrees with HS#40
### TABLE C.3:
SERMONS LACKING DEFINITE DATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Time of Year</th>
<th>Homily Number &amp; Date</th>
<th>Scripture/ Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Agrees with HS #40</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 513?</td>
<td>#33, 513</td>
<td>Jn 9 – Man born blind Rebel Vitalian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#34, 513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 514</td>
<td>#55, 514</td>
<td>Leaving on Trip Visit to Kinnersrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#56, 514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 514</td>
<td>#58</td>
<td>In Cyr, 3 Homilies on the Flesh of Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November-December, 514?</td>
<td>#62</td>
<td>Assorted Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 514?</td>
<td>#49, 514</td>
<td>Rom 5:12 &amp; 1 Cor 15:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 514?</td>
<td>#53, 514</td>
<td>Calamity in Alexandria On the Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#54, 514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 515?</td>
<td>#77, 515</td>
<td>On the Resurrection Gospels read on Saturday Night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September-October, 515?</td>
<td>#79, 515</td>
<td>Mt 15:5-6, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 515</td>
<td>#81, 515</td>
<td>Mt 17:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#82, 515</td>
<td>Mt 18:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 516</td>
<td>#93, 516</td>
<td>Letters of Dioscorus of Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 516?</td>
<td>#98, 516</td>
<td>Mt 12:18, 31-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 517?</td>
<td>#104, 517</td>
<td>Mt 22:15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lent 517, March?</td>
<td>#107, 517</td>
<td>Answers to Questions – Is 19:18 Answers to Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#108, 517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 517?</td>
<td>#111, 517</td>
<td>In Égée – Answers to Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 517? Or later</td>
<td>#113, 517</td>
<td>Lk 6:20-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 518</td>
<td>#118, 518</td>
<td>Lk 7:36 – Sinful Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 518?</td>
<td>#124, 518</td>
<td>Mt 16:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#125, 518</td>
<td>On the Trisagion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D:

THE KONTAKIA OF ROMANOS THE MELODIST

TABLE D.1:

THE MOVEABLE FEASTS: LENT AND HOLY WEEK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liturgical Day and the Title of the Hymn</th>
<th>Prominent Scriptural References</th>
<th>When these Scriptures are read according to HS #40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday of Meat Fare (Carnival) – Hymn on the Last Judgment (Ox. #34, S.C. #50)</td>
<td>Dan 7-12, 1 &amp; 2 Thess, Rev, Mt 25</td>
<td>Mt 25 read on Sunday of Meat fare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday of Cheese Fare – Hymn of the Ascetics (Ox. #55, S.C. #53)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Wednesday of Lent - Hymn on the Repentance of Nineveh (Ox. #52, S.C.)</td>
<td>Jon Chapters 1-4, esp. 3</td>
<td>4th Reading for the Easter Vigil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Sunday or 2nd Wednesday of Lent – Hymn on Adam &amp; Eve (Ox. #51, S.C. #1)</td>
<td>Gen 3</td>
<td>1st Friday of Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sunday of Lent – Hymn of the Prodigal Son (Ox. #49, S.C. #28)</td>
<td>Lk 15:11-32</td>
<td>Sunday before Meat Fare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Wednesday of Lent</td>
<td>On the Nika Revolt (Ox. #54, S.C. #54)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>Hymn on Noah (Ox. #40, S.C. #2)</td>
<td>Gen 6:9-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Wednesday of Lent</td>
<td>On the Triumph of the Cross (Ox. #22, S.C. #38) <strong>Originally for Good Friday</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Friday of Lent</td>
<td>Adoration of the Cross (Ox. #23, S.C. #39) <strong>Originally for Good Friday or September 14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>Abraham’s Sacrifice of Isaac (Ox. #41, S.C. #3)</td>
<td>Gen 22:1-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Wednesday of Lent</td>
<td>Penitence (S.C. #55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Thursday of Lent</td>
<td>On the Infernal Powers (Ox. #21, S.C. #37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Sunday of Lent</td>
<td>Jacob blessed by Isaac (Ox. #42, S.C. #4)</td>
<td>Gen 27:1-45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Wednesday of Lent</td>
<td>The Rich Man &amp; Lazarus (Ox. #50, S.C. #30)</td>
<td>Lk 16:19-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Saturday of Lent</td>
<td>Raising of Lazarus (Ox. 314 &amp; 15, S.C. #26 &amp; 27)</td>
<td>Jn 11:1-44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Sunday</td>
<td>Hymn on Palms (Ox. #16, S.C. #32)</td>
<td>All 4 Gospels referred to, HS #40 reads John 12:1-18</td>
<td>Palm Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Monday</td>
<td>Joseph the Patriarch (Ox. #43, S.C. #5)</td>
<td>Gen 37:39-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Temptation of Joseph (Ox. #44, S.C. #6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Tuesday</td>
<td>The 10 Virgins I &amp; II (Ox. #47 &amp; 48, S.C. #31 &amp; 51)</td>
<td>Mt 25:1-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Wednesday</td>
<td>Sinful Woman (Ox. #10, S.C. #21)</td>
<td>Mt 26:6-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Thursday</td>
<td>Judas &amp; the Washing of the Feet (Ox. #17, S.C. #33) – Denial of Peter (Ox. #18, S.C. #34)</td>
<td>Jn 13:1-30 &amp; Synoptics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Friday – Mary at the Cross (Ox. #19, S.C. #35)</td>
<td>Hymn on the Passion (Ox. #20, S.C. #36)</td>
<td>Jn 19:25-27</td>
<td>All 4 Gospels used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jn 19:25-27</td>
<td>All 4 Gospels used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jn 19:25-27</td>
<td>All 4 Gospels used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE D.2:**

MOVEABLE FEASTS: PASCHA AND THE FIFTY DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liturgical Day and Title of the Hymn</th>
<th>Prominent Scriptural References</th>
<th>When these Scriptures are read according to HS #40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easter – 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Hymn on the Resurrection (Ox. #29, S.C. #40) 2nd Hymn on the Resurrection (Ox. #24, S.C. #41) 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Hymn on the Resurrection (Ox. #25, S.C. #42) 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Hymn on the Resurrection (Ox. #28, S.C. #43) 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Hymn on the Resurrection (Ox. 326, S.C. #44)</td>
<td>Mostly Jn 20:1-18 Mostly Mt 28</td>
<td>Mostly Jn 20:1-18 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Orthros Gospel (Not read in the sixth century) Easter Vigil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Wednesday – On the Healing of the Lame Man by Peter &amp; John (Ox. #39)</td>
<td>Acts 3:1-10</td>
<td>Easter Friday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Sunday – On the Doubt of Thomas (Ox. # 30, S.C. #46)</td>
<td>Jn 20:19-31</td>
<td>Thomas Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Wednesday after Easter – Wedding at Cana (Ox. #7, S.C. #18)</td>
<td>Jn 2:1-11</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Monday after Easter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday of Pascha – Myrrh Bearer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Wednesday after Easter – Healing of the Leper (Ox. #8, S.C. #20)</td>
<td>Mt 8:1-4; Mk1:40-44, Lk 5:12-14</td>
<td>Mt - 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday after Pentecost; Mk - 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Saturday of Lent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday of Pascha – 10 Drachmas (Ox. #27, S.C #45) The Paralytic</td>
<td>Lk 15:8-9 Jn 5:1-15</td>
<td>Not read in HS #40 4th Sunday of Pascha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday of Mid-Pentecost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday of Pascha – Samaritan Woman (Ox. #9, S.C. #19)</td>
<td>Jn 4:5-42</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday of Pascha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Wednesday after Easter – Possessed Man of Gerasa (Ox. #11, S.C. #22)</td>
<td>Mt 8:24-34; Lk 8:26-39; Mk 5:1-20</td>
<td>Mt read 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday - Pentecost; Lk - the 22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Sunday after Pentecost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Scripture References</td>
<td>Next Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Wednesday after Easter – Hemorrhaging Woman (Ox. #12, S.C. #23)</td>
<td>Mt 9:20; Mk 5:7, Lk 8:44</td>
<td>Mt - 6th Sunday after Pentecost; Lk - 23rd Sunday after Pentecost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension Thursday (Ox. #32, S.C. #48)</td>
<td>Ps 46:6, Acts 1, Lk 24</td>
<td>Ascension Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Sunday of Pascha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Wednesday after Easter – Multiplication of the Breads (Ox. #13, S.C. #24)</td>
<td>Mt 14:15; Mk 6:35; Lk 9:12; Jn 6:1-15</td>
<td>Mt – 8th Sunday after Pentecost; Jn 5th - Wednesday after Easter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost (Ox. #33, S.C. #44)</td>
<td>Acts 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Acts 2 - Pentecost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecost Monday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Saints Sunday – On All the Saints (Ox. #59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE D.3:

**FIXED FEASTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liturgical Day and Title of the Hymn</th>
<th>Prominent Scriptural References</th>
<th>When these Scriptures are read according to <em>HS</em>#40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 8 – Nativity of the Virgin Mary (Ox. #35) October 26 – St. Demetrius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 17 – 3 Youths in the Furnace (Ox. #46, S.C. #8)</td>
<td>Dan 3</td>
<td>Easter Vigil #15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 25 – 1st Hymn on the Nativity of Christ (Ox. #1, S.C. #10)</td>
<td>Num 23 &amp; 24; Lk 2, Mt 1 &amp; 2; Ps 44:13; Ez 44:2</td>
<td>Num – Christmas Vigil; Lk 2 – Christmas Vigil; Mt 2 – Christmas Day; Ez 44 – Vespers of Marian Feasts; Ps 44:13 – Alleluia Psalm for Sept 8 &amp; Aug 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 26 – Theotokos – 2nd Hymn on the Nativity of Christ (Ox. #2, S.C. #11) 3rd Hymn on the Nativity of Christ (S.C. #12)</td>
<td>Mt 2:16-18</td>
<td>December 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 29 – Holy Innocents &amp; Flight to Egypt (Ox. #3, S.C. #15)</td>
<td>Is 7:23-9; Mt 4:15-16</td>
<td>Is – Christmas Vigil #8; Mt – Epiphany Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6 – Epiphany – 1st Hymn for Epiphany (Ox. #5, S.C. #16)</td>
<td>Ps 94:7</td>
<td>January 6 is a baptismal day in <em>HS</em> #40 This Psalm is not used in <em>HS</em>#40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7 – St. John the Baptist – 2nd Hymn for Epiphany (Ox. #6, S.C. #17) Hymn to the Neophytes (Ox. #53, S.C. #52)</td>
<td>Lk 2:22-38</td>
<td>February 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Scripture References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9 – 40 Holy</td>
<td>Martyrs of Sebastea I &amp; II (Ox. #57 &amp; 58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25 – Annunciation I (Ox. #37, S.C. #9)</td>
<td>Ps 103:33, 143:5, Is 66:1, Ex 3:1-3, Lk 1:26-38</td>
<td>Ex &amp; Lk – March 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 29/30 – Mission of the Apostles (Ox. #31, S.C. #29)</td>
<td>1 Kgs 17; 2 Kgs 2:9-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 20 – Prophet Elijah (Ox. #45, S.C. #7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 29 – Decapitation of John the Baptist (Ox. #38)</td>
<td>Mk 6:17-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E:

THE HOMILIES OF LEONTIUS PRESBYTER OF CONSTANTINOPLE

TABLE E.1:

SCRIPTURE IN LEONTIUS’ HOMILIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liturgical Day and Homily Number</th>
<th>Psalms &amp; Chants</th>
<th>Scriptures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sunday before Christmas – Commemoration of John the Baptist – Homily I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 1:1-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Liturgy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 1:57-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Liturgy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Nativity of Christ – Homily XII</td>
<td>Ps 46:2</td>
<td>*Mt 2:1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfiguration read on Sunday – Homily XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Kgs 5:2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 16:21-17:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Palm Sunday – Homilies II &amp; III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Liturgy</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Jn 11:1-45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE E.1 (CONTINUED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holy Week</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Monday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Tuesday – <em>Homily IV</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Wednesday – <em>Homily V</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Thursday – <em>Homily VI</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Friday – <em>Homily VII</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter – <em>Homilies VIII &amp; IX</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-Pentecost – <em>Homily X</em></strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday Liturgy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday Liturgy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pentecost – <em>Homilies XI &amp; XIII</em></strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Liturgy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Agrees with HS#40; ^partially agrees with HS#40
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