Robert F. Taft, S.J.

Quaestiones disputatae;

| The Skeuophylakion of Hagia Sophia and the Entrances of the Liturgy Revisited (2)

PART II LITURGY

B. The Processions

Having studied the site and its edifices as well as possible on the basis of the available evidence, I shall review here some points bearing directly on the relation between the skeuophylakion and the three processions of the Byzantine eucharistic liturgy: the Introit or Little Entrance at the beginning of the Liturgy of the Word, the Great Entrance or transfer of gifts which opens the eucharistic sacrifice proper, and the Recession or exit procession at the conclusion of the service.

I. Reconstructing the Pristine Processions

My views, first stated in 1975, have not changed:

The skeuophylakion, therefore, was the building where the liturgy begins and ends. It was there that the ministers vested and prepared the gifts received from the people. The Prothesis prayer in the early codices is entitled "Prayer that the priest says in the skeuophylakion after putting the bread on the discos." ¹³⁹ It was there, too, that the Great Entrance procession began; it was there that the final prayer of the liturgy, the "Prayer said in the skeuophylakion" ¹⁴⁰ was recited following the exit procession at the end of mass. ¹⁴¹

I asserted this with what appeared to me sufficient logic then, and still does now, on the basis the evidence, updated here where necessary. It shows that:

139 Barberini 336 (BAS), Parenti-Velkovska § 1: Εὐχὴ ἣν ποιεῖ ὁ ἱεφεὺς ἐν τῷ σκευοφυλακίφ ἀποτιθεμένου (sic) τοὺς ἄφτους ἐν τῷ δίσκφ; cf. LEW 309.5-7

140 Εὐχὴ λεγομένη ἐν τῷ σκευοφυλακίῳ. In Barberini 336 (BAS) it is simply called Εὐχὴ τοῦ σκευοφυλακίου Parenti-Velkovska § 22 = LEW 334.21.

141 Taft, Great Entrance 189.

54 Taft

1. The vestments, vessels, and other liturgical and devotional paraphernalia were kept in the skeuophylakion.¹⁴²

2. The patriarch and the other clergy vested in the skeuophylakion where the

vestments were kept,

3. The gifts of bread and wine, offered by the people in the skeuophylakion, were selected, prepared and incensed, and a prayer of offering, the Prothesis Prayer, was said over them – all in the skeuophylakion before the beginning of the liturgy.

4. The patriach entered church for the liturgy only at the Introit, or what is to-

day the "Little Entrance".

5. At the Great Entrance the deacons went out to the skeuophylakion to fetch the gifts, bringing them in to the altar in solemn procession.

6. At the end of the liturgy the left-over gifts were returned to the skeuophy-

lakion and consumed there.

II. Critique

André Grabar and Neil K. Moran have raised objections against this proposed processional route. Though both critics strongly emphasize the argument from convenience, art-historian Grabar argues principally from the history of architecture – i.e., the archeological evidence – whereas Moran deals also with the texts. In discussing their views I shall maintain here the order I used above, considering first the archeological material, reserving the literary evidence for fuller treatment later.

Here is what Grabar says on the topic of the skeuophylakion (I number the texts to facilitate reference):

- [1] Parlant de l'emplacement du «skeuophylakion», l'auteur [Mathews] rejette les conclusions des spécialistes et le place dans un édicule spécial, indépendant de l'église. [2] Cela a pu être le cas, à Sainte-Sophie de Constantinople, mais ne pas être la règle, ce dispositif étant trop peu pratique.
- [3] Même là où une «sacristie» de ce genre, si elle abitrait un grand nombre d'objets précieux, formait un édicule indépendant, on a dû en avoir un autre, sous le toit même de l'église et près de l'autel, qui servait à ranger les vêtements et vases, dont on se servait constamment. [4] A ce propos, il convient de rappeler que, à l'époque envisagée, comme avant, dans l'Antiquité, les grandes salles des édifices monumentaux étaient souvent divisées en locaux distincts à l'aide des barrières de toute sorte qui étaient en bois et pouvaient disparaître par la suite sans laisser de traces (et qu'on ne trouvait donc pas lors des fouilles). A se rappeler aussi des barrières et cloisons légères,

¹⁴² I.e., relics and other sacred objects, along with liturgical books and other manuscripts. The one extant inventory of the H. Sophia skeuophylakion is dated Oct. 1396: F. Miklosich, J. Müller (eds.), Acta et diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi, sacra et profana, 6 vols. (Vienna 1860-1890) II, 566-70; earlier, we have the account of Anthony of Novgorod (section A.IV.3 above) and, later, other Russian pilgrim accounts edited by Majeska, Russian Travelers; cf. also Darrouzès, Recherches 434, 519 note 3.

lorsqu'on se pose la question de l'emplacement de la prothésis dans les églises à une seule abside. 143

Moran's critique raises similar points, though his assault is far more massive and circumstantial. ¹⁴⁴ I give here only the main arguments regarding the skeuophylakion and entrances.

[5] ...it would seem that many scholars 145 find it neither logical nor functional that, after the state had been bankrupted for decades with the construction of Hagia Sophia, the patriarch should be supplied with merely an 'out-house' for the organization of the Little and Great Entrance processions and for his change of vestments. [6] If this were indeed true, Taft's assertion that the patriarch and clergy gather in the skeuophylakion before they enter the church for the liturgy (Taft p. 188) would mean that the patriarch would have to walk some 150 meters along the outside of Hagia Sophia in order to place himself before the royal doors at the beginning of the first entrance. 146 [7] Mathews also neglects to inform his readers that the present day floor of the skeuophylakion is six meters above the level of the nave of the church and it was reached on the east side by 21 steps upward. [8] One would hope it wasn't raining or extremely windy when the patriarch made his entrance. 147 ... [9] As Grabar suggests, could there not also have been a skeuophylakion within the church made of wood thus leaving no trace? 148

Or if not of wood, then set off by curtains:

[10] In as yet unpublished field data Robert Van Nice [†1994] has recorded iron rings behind the porphyry columns of the NE conch [of H. Sophia]. These correspond to a similarly marked area on the southern side, where the royal mitatorium was located. Van Nice supposes that these iron rings served to hold up curtains about these areas. It is thus conceivable that the Great Entrance procession was formed in the curtained off area, just as the imperial procession was formed in the mitatorium behind the SE conch...¹⁴⁹

Theotokos in Blachernai with its skeuophylakion on the south side (section A.II above) poses a particular problem:

[11] The Liturgy of the Great Church was not restricted to Hagia Sophia but was celebrated at other churches. If the processions began in the *skeuophylakion* of the north east corner, it would stand to reason that all other churches in which the Liturgy of the Great Church was celebrated would have to have a similar structure in the north east corner. [12] According to Dirimtekin the Church of Hagia Eirēnē next to Hagia Sophia did have a circular treasury in the north east corner but the *skeuophylakion* of the Hagia Theotokos of Blachernes was located on the south side of the church. [13] In the Great Entrance ceremony the imperial entourage proceeded up the right

- 143 The citation is from A. Grabar's singularly ungenerous review of Mathews, *Early Churches*, in *Cahiers archéologiques* 22 (1972) 242-44, here 244.
- 144 Moran, "Gestaltung," "Enarxis," and "Skeuophylakion."
- 145 None is cited.
- 146 He repeats the same argument almost verbatim in Moran, "Enarxis," 160.
- 147 Moran, "Gestaltung," 178-79. Cf. the same argument in id., "Skeuophylakion," 30.
- 148 Moran, "Gestaltung," 180.
- 149 Ibid. 181 and fig. 1. See Van Nice pl. 11 showing the disturbed state of the pavement, which Moran (ibid. 180-181; "Skeuophylakion," 31) thinks may indicate that furniture had been removed from there.

56 Taft

side of the church in order to meet the clergy approaching from the left. The approach of the clergy from the south rather than from the north of the church of Blachernes would have created serious problems for the enactment of the rite.¹⁵⁰

Finally, the Hagia Sophia skeuophylakion was just too small:

[14] The *skeuophylakion* is about eleven meters in diameter. Taking into consideration the oven and chests in this structure, [15] it is hardly the appropriate place for the formation of a procession. [16] Justinian's ordinance for the Hagia Sophia stipulated that 60 presbyters, 100 deacons and 90 subdeacons were attached to the church. It would even be difficult to accommodate even half of this number within the confines of the *skeuophylakion* for a high feast. ¹⁵¹

I would summarize these arguments as follows:

1. Mathews' views are revisionist, going against the tide of "received doctrine" (1).

2. The system proposed is impractical (2) to the point of being unworkable. The skeuophylakion was too small (14-16), the difference in ground level between skeuophylakion and church made access to the former difficult (7) – to say nothing of the obvious inconvenience, especially in bad weather, of having the patriarch use stairs, or walk 150 m along the outside of the church from the skeuophylakion to the west entrance (8).

3. Though the skeuophylakion of Hagia Sophia may have been a separate edi-

fice outside, this system cannot have been the rule (2).

4. Since the Liturgy of the Great Church was celebrated not just in Hagia Sophia but in other churches too, all of them had to have a skeuophylakion at the northeast corner (11). But the skeuophylakion of Theotokos in Blachernai was to the south (12), thus rendering the Great Entrance, as proposed, problematic (13).

5. Even if there was an outside skeuophylakion serving as treasury, there had to be another, inside sacristy near the altar for the liturgical vestments and vessels (3). This space could have been set off by wooden barriers or curtains,

which is why it has left no trace (4, 9).

III. Preliminary Observations

In general I eschew controversy or public debate, and follow a "Quod scripsi, scripsi" policy, preferring to let informed readers study the evidence and arguments I advance, evaluate how I argue on the basis of that evidence, review the criticisms to which my conclusions have been subjected, and judge for themselves. I return to some of these issues here not only because I have no pretense

¹⁵⁰ Moran, "Skeuophylakion," 30.

¹⁵¹ Ibid. 31.

at infallibility and remain open to reviewing my opinions in the light of what others have to say; but because the relentless polemics engaged in by Neil K. Moran are in some respects not a critique but a misrepresentation of my views. ¹⁵² Au fond, I think the real issue is not my conclusions but how I arrive at them, i.e., method.

1. Method:

Admittedly, some of the texts Moran and I interpret differently can be read in more than one way. My method is to interpret each item of evidence in the light of all the other evidence concerning the same liturgy and church at about the same time. In short, where one does not usually have texts providing detailed information on every aspect of the scenario one is attempting to reconstruct, the methods of comparative liturgy seek a *confluence of evidence* that can be built into a coherent hypothesis without omitting or distorting *any* of the data. As in a jigsaw puzzle, all the pieces of the puzzle have to be used, and all of them have to fit. And where not all pieces of the puzzle are extant, attempts to fill in the blanks have to be intelligent guesses coherent with the whole, and not imaginings that ignore the rest of the puzzle.

For Hagia Sophia, we have plenty of evidence that the original diakonikon or sacristy was an outside skeuophylakion, and none whatever that there was any other sacristy in the vicinity of the narthex or, until the post-iconoclast period, anywhere else. The serious, thorough, honest, fair scholar who wishes to demolish such a construct, must also account for *all of the evidence in an equally coherent way*, and not just pick away at one or another piece, because the construct depends not on the interpretation of individual pieces of the puzzle in isolation, but is totally dependent on their collocation within the whole.

So the issue is not whether this or that document is to be dated nearer to 1010 AD than to 990, or whether the Byzantines could not, in fact, have had a sacristy or baptistry or throne or altar somewhere else. The issue is what does *all* the evidence say, and how can one fit it *all* together coherently?

2. Some Reflections on the Critique:

With this premise in mind, before turning to a review of the sources I would address these criticisms as follows:

- 1. The first argument is hardly worth attending to. The issue is not whether
- 152 Moran, "Gestaltung," esp. 178-81; id., "Enarxis," a confusing article on the Enarxis of BAS that is more a series of notes than a coherent essay with a perceptible line of argumentation; id., "Skeuophylakion," little more than a summary of "Gestaltung." On Moran's misrepresentation of my views, even to the point of imagining what my motives were for some of my opinions ("Enarxis," 161), the reader who wishes a third-party evaluation may consult H. Brakmann's review of Moran, "Gestaltung," in *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 24 (1982) 386-87.

58 Radgov agaid to Taft (adgovale ad)

Mathews agrees with "received doctrine," but whether he is right or wrong. A scholarly field advances only by having someone challenge and nuance, even overturn, received views. The triple-apse sanctuary arrangement of the Middle-and Late-Byzantine church and its liturgy as we know it still were taken as paradigmatic until Mateos' studies in the Typikon of the Great Church, ¹⁵³ and Mathews' work on the early churches of Constantinople, ¹⁵⁴ demonstrated (in my view, beyond cavil) that for the pre-iconoclast period this was dead wrong.

Behind Grabar's objections there is also a methodological issue. Grabar simply denies the value of a functional study of church buildings – i.e. on the basis of their liturgical use – except for the sanctuary area. ¹⁵⁵ Here we must distinguish. It is one thing to say the architectural form and style of a church building – whether the church is basilical, cross-in-square, or simply a large room inside a monastery building; whether it is roofed or domed; with pendentives or squinches; with curved outside apses or internal rectangular pastophoria – may have nothing to do with the liturgy celebrated within the space.

But with respect to the issues Mathews raises, form indeed follows function. The issue is not architectonics but the *liturgical disposition of the church*: the presence/absence, location, and purpose of liturgical furnishings (altar, throne, synthronon, ambo), auxiliary chambers (pastophoria, galleries, gynaecea, diakonikon, prothesis, narthex), outbuildings (baptistry, skeuophylakion, atrium, porticoes), access (entrances, stairs), etc. For the interpretation of these and their use, a functional approach is not only useful; it is sometimes indispensable, as Mathews' book (and, I think, some of my own work¹⁵⁶) shows.

This does not mean, of course, that every building with an atrium or narthex or galleries or pastophoria housed the same liturgy. *Pace* the common attempts to exaggerate East-West differences, the commonality across the spectrum of Late-Antique liturgy was broad. But it does mean that clear shifts in the arrangement of church space can and sometimes do signal notable shifts in liturgical usage, as I have detailed elsewhere for Byzantium. ¹⁵⁷

But I have no wish to argue these points on theoretical grounds. The issue is not what one might wish to imagine was convenient or possible. The issue is

¹⁵³ Mateos, Typicon I-II; id., Célébration.

¹⁵⁴ Mathews, Early Churches.

¹⁵⁵ Grabar's review (note 152 above) 243-44. Christine Strube in her excellent and detailed review of Mathews' book also thinks he exaggerates the importance of liturgical planning (*Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 67 (1974) 408-413, here 413, but again, I would agree only if one is talking about architectonics (basilica, cross-in-square ...) and structural elements (galleries, pillars, roof or domes ...).

¹⁵⁶ Taft, *The Byzantine Rite* 33-34, 61. Similarly, for the Syrian traditions, id., "Some Notes on the Bema in the East and West Syrian Traditions," OCP 34 (1968) 326-359; "On the Use of the Bema in the East-Syrian Liturgy," *Eastern Churches Review* 3 (1970) 30-39; the latter two studies are revised in id., *Liturgy in Byzantium* ch. VII, VIII.

¹⁵⁷ Taft, The Byzantine Rite 33-34, 71-74.

what was. My reconstruction of the ritual, albeit hypothetical, is based on the incontrovertible fact that the sources give bema and skeuophylakion as the two poles of the processions, and there is no way around it in this early period unless one wishes to "suppose" that there "could have been" some other area in the church where the gifts were prepared and to which they were returned. Of course there could have been. There could have been almost anything. The Trojan Horse could have been housed in the atrium, if guesswork is to be our method of choice.

2. The question of the size of the skeuophylakion is more a legitimate objection for Hagia Eirene, where the supposed northeast skeuophylakion rotunda is only 4 m in diameter. 158 But the Hagia Sophia skeuophylakion has an interior diameter of 11 m, and one can accomodate a lot of people on floor space that large, especially if we recall that the building had an upper storey where much of the paraphernalia not in every-day use could have been stored. Furthermore, the sources have the emperor and/or patriarch and their retinues enter the skeuophylakion on more than one occasion. 159 If the skeuophylakion of Hagia Sophia had enough room to accomodate the imperial ceremonial, it is difficult to argue it could not have accomodated the church ritual too. The number of clergy instituted by Justinian served the entire Great Church complex of churches served by the patriarchal clergy, including Hagia Sophia, Hagia Eirene, Hagia Theotokos in Chalkoprateia, and Hagios Theodoros of Sphorakios. 160 We can presume they served in shifts and not all of them together at every service in each church. On stational days the Introit procession was arriving from another shrine. On days when the liturgy was not preceded by a procession, the Introit formed in the narthex. Some of the clergy - how many we do not know - doubtless assisted the patriarch in the skeuophylakion and escorted him in procession from the skeuophylakion to the narthex for the Introit. At the Great Entrance, originally only the deacons went to the skeuophylakion to fetch the gifts, 161 nor is it necessary to suppose that all those who accompanied the procession actually entered the skeuophylakion. Besides, the Hagia Sophia skeuophylakion is larger than the alternate spaces proposed to substitute for it (3-4, 10 above), 162 so it is difficult to grasp the logic of this objection.

The rest of the argument from practicality depends, ultimately, on what the Byzantines, not we, would deem practical or impractical, and the Byzantines

¹⁵⁸ See Mathews, Early Churches 84 fig. 44.

¹⁵⁹ See for example *De cerimoniis* I, 44 (35) above, A.IV.1 text 3-7; 10/11th c. codex *Dresden A 104*, Dmitrievskij, *Типиконы* 124, 137-38, 149-50, 159, 173, 242; also Darrouzès, *Recherches* 47, 62 note 4, 316, 354 note 2.

¹⁶⁰ See note 132 above.

¹⁶¹ Taft, Great Entrance 203-6.

¹⁶² See Van Nice pl. 2, 11.

Taft

surely had a different sense of liturgical practicality than I. What could be less practical than having the patriarch climb all the way up the stairs to the galleries with the sacrament to give the imperial party communion, a practice that must have disrupted the progress of the liturgy considerably? Yet we see this in the *De cerimoniis* at liturgies the emperor attended from the galleries. All that is really beside the point, however. The issue is not what was practical, *but what was*.

Returning in 1986 to the inconvenience of having the patriarch walk from the outside skeuophylakion to the narthex, Moran asks rhetorically: "Are we to believe that in processions coming from other churches the patriarch had to take this circuitous route into the church?" Here as in other places, Moran is tilting at windmills. Neither Mathews 165 nor I have ever suggested any such thing for the Introit of a liturgy immediately following a stational procession. On the contrary, I state the opposite unambiguously: "The clergy entered from outside after vesting in the outside skeuophylakion (cf. *Codex Pyromalus* and the version of Johannisberg ...) or, on stational days, wherever the procession originated." 166

Moran also returns in his later article to the difference in floor level: "Justinian built his church upon the rubble of the older church and therefore the original floor level of the skeuophylakion is lower than that of the church. To judge by the plan published by Emerson Swift (fig. 34) and Dirimtekin (plan 2), this difference could be as much as four meters." The skeuophylakion interior floor-level before being excavated was six meters higher than the level of the nave, but that is not the original level either of the ground or of the skeuophylakion floor. As the recent excavation of the skeuophylakion interior has shown, however, its floor level is in fact *higher* than that of Justinian's basilica, though hardly enough to cause a problem. Justinian's Hagia Sophia, the third on the site, was built on the ruins of the previous Hagia Sophia that burned down in the Nike riot of January 523. But Mainstone says that the original floor level of the skeuophylakion is "only slightly above that of the [present] church," and trial holes in the nave of Hagia Sophia have shown natural bed-rock not far below the present floor level.

¹⁶³ De cerimoniis I, 10, 39 (30), Vogt I, 70-71, 155, 173.

¹⁶⁴ Moran, "Skeuophylakion," 30.

¹⁶⁵ Mathews, Early Churches 138-47. 166 Taft, Great Entrance 192 note 51.

¹⁶⁷ Moran, "Skeuophylakion," 31.

¹⁶⁸ Mathews, Early Churches 12-14; Mainstone 129, 133-34: the original basilica of Constantius, consecrated in 360, was burned in 404 in the riots accompanying Chrysostom's exile and rebuilt and rededicated as the second, "Theodosian" H. Sophia in 415.

¹⁶⁹ Mainstone 137, and see the post-excavation plan in *ibid*. 277 plan A8, which shows no significant difference in floor level between the two edifices.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid. 136.

steps to go from one to the other via the small door in the north wall of the northeast bay of Hagia Sophia, as Majeska has suggested, ¹⁷¹ there could not have been many of them. But unless someone finds a way of removing the counterfort that now blocks this whole area, we shall probably never know. Equally anachronistic is the argument from the difficulty of having the patriarch mount the stairs leading up to that later level: the stairs and the entrance to which they lead are both Turkish, not Byzantine. ¹⁷²

As for the wind and weather, of course it could have caused problems, not only for the entrances of the eucharist but for the incessant roaming around, often outside, that the *De cerimoniis* prescribes for the imperial ritual, to say nothing of the whole stational liturgy system of the Great Church, as we shall see below. But Hagia Sophia was surrounded by enclosures and porticoes which, like the fora and main streets of Late-Antique Constantinople, may well have included sheltering arcades. ¹⁷³ Paul Silentiary, *Descriptio S. Sophiae* 590-616, describes courtyards (αὐλαί) similar to the west atrium surrounding the basilica on the other sides too:

[590] Now on the western side of this divine church you will see a court (αὐλήν) encompassed by four aisles: one of these is joined to the narthex, while the others are open wide, and various paths lead to them…¹⁷⁴

[612] And outside the divine church you may see everywhere, along its flanks and boundaries, many open courts (αὐλὰς ἀσκεπέας). These have been fashioned with cunning skill about the

holy building that it may appear bathed all round by the bright light of day. 175

Balsamon also witnesses to such porticoes or courtyards surrounding Hagia Sophia. Commenting on canon 76 of Trullo forbidding commerce within the sacred precincts of a church, ¹⁷⁶ he recounts how the Constantinopolitan patriarchs ordered buyers and sellers at Hagia Sophia expelled "from both the Augusteon ¹⁷⁷ and the areas around the pronaos of the most-holy Great Church of God (ἀπό τε τοῦ Αὐγουστεῶνος καὶ τῶν προσεχεστέρων μερῶν τῷ προνάῳ τῆς ἁγιωτάτης τοῦ Θεοῦ Μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας)." ¹⁷⁸ Some protested that "the

171 Majeska, Russian Travelers 219, cf. 182-83.

172 These stairs, later removed, are still visible in Antoniades II, plate 53 facing p. 148.

173 Mathews, Early Churches 89-91; Taft, Great Entrance 194-203; cf. Majeska, "Skeuophylakion," note 28.

174 Here the Silentiary considers the exonarthex as the closed aisle of the four-sided atrium: Mango, Art 85 note 139.

175 Friedländer 244; Bekker, Silentiarius 29-30 (note 39 above); trans. Mango, Art 85.

176 Nedungatt-Featherstone 157.

177 The Augusteon was the forum between H. Sophia and the palace, by the 12th c. considered the south forecourt of H. Sophia: Mango, *Brazen House* 42-47 and figs. 1-5, 28; C. Mango, J. Parker, "A Twelfth-Century Description of St. Sophia," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 14 (1960), 233-245, here 242; Baldovin 168-69.

178 PG 137:773BC. I find no trace of such patriarchal edicts in the Patriarchal Registers: V. Grumel, Les Regestes du Patriarcat de Constantinople, I: Les actes des patriarches, fasc. 1-3 (Le Patriarcat byzantin, série I, Kadiköy-Istanbul 1932, 1936; Bucharest 1947); V. Laurent, fasc. 4

canon names as church enclosures the pronaos of each church, but not the fountains and the other parts of the sacred basilicas attached to them (ώς περιβόλους ἐππλησιαστιποὺς ὁ πανὼν ὀνομάζει τοὺς προνάους ἑπάστου ναοῦ, οὐ μὴν τὰς φιάλας παὶ τὰ ἕτερα μέρη τῶν θείων ναῶν τὰ συνηνωμένα αὐτοῖς)." Since it would not occur to any Christian to engage in trade in the middle of the church or in its vestibule (ἐν μεσονάῳ ἢ προνάῳ), Balsamon continues, the real problem is to distinguish what is "within the sacred enclosures (ἔνδον τῶν ἱερῶν περιβόλων)" of the church and the rest of the enclosures (περίβολοι) within its precincts. ¹⁷⁹ Among the latter places "otherwise joined (ἀλλοτρόπως ποινωθέντας)" to the sacred precincts, which "are called part of the church but are not said to be sacred enclosures (Ταῦτα γὰρ μέρη μὲν τῆς ἐππλησίας λογίζονται, ἱεροὶ δὲ περίβολοι οὐ λεχθήσονται)" ¹⁸⁰ – i.e., areas continguous to the church but not designated for exclusively religious purposes – he lists "the lavers and the gardens and the colonnades attached to the church ... (τὰ λουτρὰ καὶ τοὺς κήπους καὶ τὰς στοὰς τὰς συνηνωμένας ταῖς ἐκπλησίαις ...)." ¹⁸¹

Similarly, in the text cited above in section A.V., Balsamon distinguishes the pronaos or narthex and gynaecea from the $\pi \varrho o \alpha \acute{\nu} \lambda \iota \alpha$ (3). The latter were "common", i.e., not for sacred use and therefore accessible to everyone without restriction (3), part of what Balsamon's commentary on Trullan canon 76 places outside the sacred precincts (though Balsamon does not use the term $\pi \varrho o \alpha \acute{\nu} \lambda \iota \alpha$ there).

In the absence of archeological evidence it is not clear how all this should be interpreted. Virtually every construction now outside the main rectangle and apse walls of Hagia Sophia (nave, aisles, apse, narthex and outer narthex) except the three surviving access ramps at the southwest, northwest, northeast, plus the Little Baptistry and skeuophylakion, would have to be removed to get an accurate idea of what the area surrounding the church was like. ¹⁸² One thing is clear, however: Hagia Sophia was ringed about with all sorts of porticoes and forecourts. And Theophanes' *Chronographia* describes similar porticoes at the Nea. ¹⁸³ So in the light of the Silentiary's description cited above, it seems reasonable to propose that these porticoes may have been similar to the atrium on the

(Paris 1971); fasc. 1, (2nd ed. Paris 1972); or in J. Oudot, *Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani acta selecta*, 2 vols. (Fonti codificazione canonica orientale, serie II, fasc. III-IV, Vatican 1941-Grottaferrata 1967).

¹⁷⁹ The 12th c. *Ekphrasis* (lines 34-35) also distinguishes between "enclosure (περίβολον)" and "holy place (τὸ ἱερόν)" – i.e., the church proper: Mango-Parker, "Twelfth-Century Description," (note 177 above) 236.

¹⁸⁰ PG 137:773C-776A.

¹⁸¹ Loc. cit.

¹⁸² Mainstone 122-24, 135-36, cf. 270-71 pl. A2.

¹⁸³ Theophanes Chronographia V, De Basilio Macedone 86, ed. I. Bekker, Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus (CSHB, Bonn 1838) 328 lines 2 ff; Mango, Art 195.

west. Schneider's 1939 excavations of the west atrium show it to have been just a bit less than the width of the basilica, and to have extended ca. 42 m westward from the outer narthex. It was an open court surrounded by a roofed arcade, walled on the outside but with pairs of columns alternating with piers on the inner, courtyard side. In short it was somewhat like the square cloister of so many western monasteries. The outside north and south walls were pierced with three doors, and there was probably a door in the west wall too. To the east were the doors into the exonarthex. 184

But even apart from such possible sheltering walkways, objections that the weather would have rendered an Introit or Great Entrance from outside unfeasible ignore the fact that outside processions sometimes several kilometers long were a standard element of Byzantine ritual¹⁸⁵; that on stational days the Introit or first entrance of the liturgy was often arriving not just from an outbuilding but from much further away; that the imperial party always had to process outside while crossing over from the palace to Hagia Sophia for the liturgy; 186 that both baptistries of Hagia Sophia were also outbuildings (section A.I.5 above), and it was from the Great Baptistry that the procession of the neophytes took place at the Easter Vigil. 187 Indeed, Byzantine rituals like codex Dresden A 104 and the De cerimoniis document the comings and goings of the patriarch and imperial cortège to and around Hagia Sophia and its gallery chambers and outbuildings with such dizzying frequency that I find it difficult to give much weight to this objection. 188 At any rate, the only evidence I know of for any worries about the weather is De cerimoniis I, 39 (30), which, in the ceremonial for Annunciation when it coincides with the Third Sunday of Lent, indicates a change in the procession route if it is windy. 189

3. Nowhere does Mathews or I generalize the Hagia Sophia skeuophylakion system beyond the rite of Constantinople. Mathews has advanced evidence for an outside skeuophylakion in a few pre-iconoclast churches of Constantinople (even one very small church, so it is not just a question of buildings the size of Hagia Sophia). He juxtaposed this evidence with the absence of evidence in that period for any other system, documented the introduction of the triple-apsed sanctuary in Constantinopolitan churches after Iconoclasm, and drew the con-

¹⁸⁴ See the thorough exposition and illustrations in Strube, *Eingangsseite* chaps. 1-2; also Mainstone 120-21 plate 149; 270-71 pl. A2; Van Nice pl. 1, 9.

¹⁸⁵ There were processions on 68 days a year, an average of about one every five days, the patriarch took part in about half of them, the emperor and his retinue in seventeen of them, and some processions were as long as 4-5, even 10 km. See Baldovin 181-204, esp. 196-99.

¹⁸⁶ See Ebersolt, *Ste-Sophie* 14-17 and the plan; Mango, *Brazen House* 23 fig. 1; Antoniades I, pl. 16, between pp. 48-49.

¹⁸⁷ Mateos, Typicon II, 84-90.

¹⁸⁸ On the comings and goings to and from the skeuophylakion of H. Sophia see note 159 above.

¹⁸⁹ Vogt I, 157; cf. Baldovin 202.

64 Taft

clusion that this represented a change. This Middle-Byzantine system may have been the rule elsewhere much earlier. But we are dealing here with the rite of the Great Church, and in studying a tradition, one begins not with derivatives but with the prime analogate. If one is studying the Roman rite one starts in Rome, not with some mission station in Samoa. And the prime analogate for the Byzantine rite is what was done in Hagia Sophia, its cathedral church, as is obvious from the fact that sources from the fact that sources from the periphery appeal to that usage for justification. ¹⁹⁰

Of course Hagia Sophia was Hagia Sophia, and the sumptous imperial and patriarchal solemnity of its liturgy cannot without adjustment be automatically extended to every parish church, as I make perfectly clear in my history of the Byzantine rite, 191 But the historian can only argue from the evidence, and our evidence for many aspects of the early history of this liturgy deals with the cathedral church of the Byzantine rite where this history was first made. Moran seems to feel that the difference between the solemn liturgy in Hagia Sophia and other services in more modest churches is not taken into consideration in liturgical studies. 192 But in fact I have studied the history of the Byzantine rite across the entire spectrum of its extant sources, from Hagia Sophia to the monasteries of Sinai, Athos, and Italy, to the local traditions of the Byzantine periphery. In my study on the Great Entrance I stated quite explicitly that the partiarchal liturgy with imperial participation had more splendor than other services, but that "the entrance it describes ... was undoubtedly of the same sort in its essentials as the Great Entrance of any liturgy in the capital." 193 That statement can still stand not only for the Great Entrance but also for other elements of the rituals in the capital - i.e., as far as the cathedral liturgy of Constantinople is concerned in the period anterior to Iconoclasm (726-843).

4. Of course the rite of the Great Church was celebrated in other churches not only of the capital but elsewhere. Those churches, as we saw just above, were solicitous to follow the lead of the Great Church in matters liturgical. ¹⁹⁴ But it is completely specious to argue that all churches of the rite had to have an outside skeuophylakion off the northeast corner (11). All churches had to have a place where the gifts were prepared before the liturgy, fetched at the Great Entrance, and returned after communion. It was in no way necessary for it to be in the same place as the skeuophylakion of the Great Church, nor have I ever proposed

¹⁹⁰ Protheoria 9-10 (ca. 1085-95 AD), PG 140:429B-C; Elias of Crete (ca. 1111-1135), V. Laurent, "Le rituel de la proscomidie et le métropolite de Crète Élie," REB 16 (1958) 116-142, here 122-23, 134-35, 141-42 (for the date, 118-21).

¹⁹¹ Taft, The Byzantine Rite 43 ff, 52-77 passim.

¹⁹² Moran, "Skeuophylakion," 30.

¹⁹³ Taft, Great Entrance 196-97 (emphasis added).

¹⁹⁴ See note 190 above.

such a thing. My history of this aspect of Byzantine liturgy has detailed how this system was eventually abandoned even in Constantinople, without in any way implying that the rite of the Great Church ceased thereby to be the rite of the Great Church. The old skeuophylakion in the basilica of the Byzantine Catholic Badia Greca di Grottaferrata just south of Rome was in the chamber that is now a chapel just off the southwest corner of the nave. Natalia Teteriatnikov of Dumbarton Oaks has identified a prothesis niche, semicircular or rectangular, outside the sanctuary in the nave wall as characteristic of the cave-churches of Cappadocia. The ceremonies relative to the prothesis space depended, obviously, on where that space was. So Moran's argument from Blachernai is irrelevant: if the procession began on the south side, it obviously followed a different route from the procession at Hagia Sophia and other churches where it began on the opposite side.

5. The final argument is just rhetoric. Could there have been another sacristy set off with curtains or rails? Of course there could have. There could have been a barbershop in the galleries, since there was just about everything else there. 196 The question is not what could have been but what was. All evidence points to the fact that the skeuophylakion of Hagia Sophia is the still standing rotunda off the northeast corner. Moran advances archeological evidence in Hagia Sophia of rings from which curtains may have been hung, and of repaired floorwork. 197 But unless we know the date of these rings and the purpose of the curtains that hung from them, their mere existence tells us nothing. Could these curtains have set off an area in the nave where the gifts were gathered and prepared, perhaps on a credence or small movable altar? Of course they could have. We have numerous witnesses to such movable credences for use at communion, 198 and there is no reason whatever why such a system could not be conceivable for the preparation of the gifts. Almost anything is conceivable. But then why are there rings on both sides of the church? Does one wish to postulate not one but two impro-

¹⁹⁵ N.B. Teteriatnikov, The Liturgical Planning of Byzantine Churches in Cappadocia (OCA 252, Rome 1996) ch. 2.

¹⁹⁶ I detail the myriad uses of the galleries, not all of them noble, in R. F. Taft, "Women at Church in Byzantium: Where, When – and Why?" section A.IV.1 (forthcoming in DOP 52 [1998]); see also Mathews, Early Churches 128-9; V. Ruggieri, "Katêchoumenon: uno spazio sociale," in E. Carr, S. Parenti, A.-A. Thiermeyer, E. Velkovska (eds.), ΕΥΛΟΓΗΜΑ. Studies in Honor of Robert Taft, S.J. (Studia Anselmiana 110 = Analecta Liturgica 17, Rome 1993) 389-401.

¹⁹⁷ Moran, "Gestaltung," 181; id., "Skeuophylakion," 31.

¹⁹⁸ Chronicon paschale for 624 AD, ed. Dindorf I, 714 = PG 92:1001BC (cited below section B.VII); 8/9th c. Narratio de S. Sophia 16, ed. Preger 94; trans. Mango, Art 99; 10th c. De cerimoniis I, 1, 9, 10, 32 (23), 39 (30), 44 (35), 56 (47), 57 (48), 59 (50), Vogt I, 13, 47, 56, 59, 61, 65, 70-71, 124, 155, 173; 10th c. pontifical diataxis in British Library Add. 34060, ed. R.F. Taft, "The Pontifical Liturgy of the Great Church according to a Twelfth-Century Diataxis in Codex British Museum Add. 34060," I: OCP 45 (1979) 279-307; II: 46 (1980) 89-124, here I, 302-3, §X.13 (also in id., Liturgy in Byzantium ch. II).

66 Taft

vised prothesis spaces in Hagia Sophia? The only way to get a firm grip on what such rings, undated as far as I know, could indicate is via concrete evidence. And we have no literary evidence before the *De officiis* of a diakonikon anywhere within the church.

Of course when faced with a complete absence of evidence, we are forced to hypothesize. But not when there is, in fact, a consistent body of evidence, both archeological and literary, informing us that processions went to and from the skeuophylakion, and that the skeuophylakion was a rotunda off the northeast end of the church. No literary evidence whatever before the *De officiis* can be interpreted to mean there was any substitute prothesis or sacristy anywhere else. I argued for just such a system as soon as the evidence of the *De officiis* warranted it.¹⁹⁹ The point is not what could have been but what the evidence shows. Everything else is not hypotheses but guesswork.

In the same context, Moran challenges my statement, following Mathews, that in Hagia Sophia "there are simply no auxiliary chambers whatsoever," 200 by adverting to the Passageway of St. Nicholas and the complex of buildings behind the altar. Again, this is tilting at windmills. Mathew's argument concerning auxiliary chambers, as is perfectly clear from the entire context of the discussion, concerns auxiliary chambers or divided off areas within the main body of the ground floor of the building, and has nothing to do with the narthex, the galleries with their imperial chambers, or with the several auxiliary structures around the building, which Mathews also discusses. 202

All the above objections and hypotheses are interesting. Unfortunately, I can only argue from the evidence, and the evidence, both literary and archeological is clear. To make the best of this clear evidence is the method I consider preferable to conjuring up an imaginative ideal on some points where the evidence is uncomfortable. In the absence of any confirmatory documentation, such fantasies can hardly be judged more reliable than science fiction.

But let us look again at the evidence for the processions in the light of the archeological data we have seen above.

IV. Reviewing the Evidence

The shape of the three processions of the Byzantine eucharistic liturgy – the Little Entrance, the Great Entrance, and the Recession – is related to: [1] the location of the sacristy where the patriarch vests and makes his offerings before the service, where the deacons went to fetch the gifts at the Great Entrance, and to

¹⁹⁹ Taft, Great Entrance 200-3.

²⁰⁰ Ibid. 182.

²⁰¹ Moran, "Gestaltung," 180; cf. id., "Skeuophylakion," 30-31.

²⁰² Cf. Mathews, Early Churches, index.

which the clergy return the leftover gifts at the end of the service; [2] just when and how the patriarch made his entrance into the church; [3] the route of the processions. No argument can be made from the fact that the sources may use different terms (skeuophylakion, diakonikon, prothesis) for this sacristy. "Words are words, things are things," and the Byzantines were notorious for using a multiplicity of terms for the same thing, and it is perfectly obvious that one and the same early liturgical ms uses skeuophylakion or diakonikon interchangeably in the exact same context for the exact same locale.²⁰³

1. 10/11th c. BAS in the Pyromalus Codex and the Version of Johannisberg: My reconstruction of the original processions depends, in part, on my interpretation of two sources of the Liturgy of St. Basil, the Pyromalus Codex and the Latin version of Johannisberg. 204 In both these sources the patriarch vests and makes his offerings in the skeuophylakion before the beginning of the liturgy. Since in Hagia Sophia, at least originally, and perhaps in some other churches of the capital, this skeuophylakion was a separate edifice, adjacent to the church proper, which served as a treasury or storehouse for the relics, liturgical vestments and vessels, and other liturgical paraphernalia (processional crosses, thuribles, etc.), I concluded that at the Introit on non-stational days, the patriarch entered the church from this outside skeuophylakion. Further, since that is where the gifts had been prepared, it seemed logical to conclude they had to be fetched from there at the Great Entrance, and returned there after the service.

Since this interpretation has been challenged, let us take a closer look at these two invaluable sources of 10/11th-century BAS.

203 E.g, the 8th с. Barberini 336, Parenti-Velkovska §§ 1, 22, 277-279; 10th с. Sevastianov 474, N.F. Krasnosel'cev, Сведения о некоторых литургических рукописях Ватиканской Библиотеки (Kazan 1885) 237, 279; further references in Taft, Great Entrance 202 note 77. Commenting on the latter, Moran, "Skeuophylakion," 31, misses the point. I am not postulating "a confusion in terminology," but simply indicating the well-known fact that the Byzantines use different terms interchangeably for the same reality – as is perfectly obvious from the mss cited.

204 Cf. esp. Taft, *Great Entrance* 187-88, 267-70. However, my interpretation in no way depends solely on these sources, as Moran "Enarxis," 160, infers: "The intellectual basis for this deduction is said to be provided by rubrics in the codex Pyromali and the contemporary Latin translation from Johannisberg ..." The logic of Moran's objection against my arguing from these sources of BAS is weakened by his later objection ("Skeuophylakion," 30; cf. "Enarxis," 157) that I take CHR rather than BAS as the model of liturgical evolution in Constantinople. Actually, in my works I cite scores of mss of BAS, never failing to take account of the structure and rubrics the BAS formulary presents in the euchology mss I have studied (cf. Taft, *Great Entrance* 439-46, and BAS in the index, p. 457; id., *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, IV: *The Diptychs* (OCA 238, Rome 1991) 197-200, and BAS in the index, p. 201. Most mss listed also contain BAS, which in every case was exploited, where relevant, in the monograph in question). Besides, the objection is irrelevant. Though BAS was indeed the chief liturgy in Constantinople during the first millennium, ceding place to CHR only in the 11th century, *structurally and ceremonially* both liturgies were (and are) exactly the same.

a. The Sources

The *Pyromalus Codex* is a now lost Greek text of BAS edited by Goar from a ms provided him by a certain Isidore Pyromalos of Smyrna, hierodeacon of the Greek Orthodox Monastery of St. John on Patmos. ²⁰⁵ The Johannisberg version is a Latin translation of a remarkably similar though not identical Greek ms of BAS. The German humanist Georg Witzel (1501-1573) discovered this version in a Latin ms in the library of the Monastery of Johannisberg on the Rhine near Mainz, and edited it. ²⁰⁶ Though this Latin ms, too, has vanished, doubtless in the fire that destroyed the monastery library in the 19th century, ²⁰⁷ its text remains available in Witzel's 1546 *editio princeps* and in several later editions. ²⁰⁸

These two sources of BAS are especially precious since they witness to the patriarchal liturgy of the Great Church. The title of the *Pyromalus Codex* (section B.IV.1.b § 1) states this explicitly. Furthermore, both sources mention a patriarch – a rarity in euchology rubrics. In pre-12th century BAS that could only be the patriarch of Constantinople, since the Byzantine liturgy was not in use in the other Greek patriarchates before this period.²⁰⁹

The similarity of these two texts was underlined from the start by Goar and others. André Jacob says of them and their date: "... ces deux textes, étroitement apparentées, remontent au moins au Xe siècle (cfr Brightman, p. LXXXIX) et représentent le plus ancien *ordo* patriarcal constantinopolitain connu à ce jour. In an earlier study Jacob attributed to the Johannisberg version a value for the history of the liturgy of the Great Church that would justify my reliance on it:

Quoiqu'il en soit des origines de cette traduction, elle n'en constitue pas moins un des documents plus importants pour l'histoire des usages liturgiques de la Grande Église de Constantinople. En

²⁰⁵ Goar 153-56; on this ms and the Johannisberg version, see Jacob, Formulaire 7-8; id., "Otrante," 52-53; "Concélébration," 252 (note).

²⁰⁶ Or so Witzel claims on ff. av^v-avi^r of his 1546 edition, and f. aiij^v of the 1555 edition (see note 208 below).

²⁰⁷ LEW lxxxiv; Jacob, "Otrante," 52 note 4.

²⁰⁸ G. Witzel, Liturgia S. Basilii Mag. nuper e tenebris eruta, et in lucem nunc primum edita. Cum Praefatione Georgij Vuicelij (Mainz 1546) ff. aij^r-f^v; id., Exercitamenta syncerae pietatis multo saluberrima inter quae lector habes Liturgiam seu Missam S. Basilij Mag. recognitam ... (Mainz 1555) ff. Aiiij^r-Dij^v; J. Cochlaeus, Speculum antiquae deuotionis circa missam, et omnem alium cultum Dei: ex antiquis, et antea nunquam euulgatis per typographos auctoribus, à Ioanne Cochlaeo laboriose collectum ... (Mainz 1594) 117-32; Jean de Saint-André, Liturgiae siue Missae Sanctorum Patrum: Iacobi apostoli & fratris Domini. Basilij magni, è vetusto codice Latinae tralationis. Ioannis Chrysostomi, interprete Leone Thusco ... (Paris 1560) 31-50. Cf. Taft, Great Entrance xxvii, xxix.

²⁰⁹ On the liturgical Byzantinization of the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, cf. Taft, *The Byzantine Rite* 57 and 64 note 31.

²¹⁰ Goar 153, 156-57; cf. A. Strittmatter, "Notes on the Byzantine Synapte," *Traditio* 10 (1954) 51-108, here 71 note 28; Jacob, "Otrante," 52-53; id., "Concélébration," 252 (note).

²¹¹ Jacob, "Concélébration," 252 (note).

effet, les rubriques assez circonstanciées qu'elle contient nous permettent de reconstituer dans ses grandes lignes la Liturgie patriarcale telle qu'elle se pratiquait à Constantinople dans le courant du XIe siècle, voire même à la fin du Xe.²¹²

Here Jacob does what one must do with all liturgical sources, carefully distinguishing the date of the extant document from the date of the shape of the liturgy it preserves. The Johannisberg version is a Latin translation of unknown date, ²¹³ from a Greek redaction of BAS remarkably similar to but not identical with the BAS the of the Pyromalus ms. Since both Greek mss are lost, as well as the Johannisberg Latin ms, the version and the underlying Greek texts must remain undated. In such circumstances, one can only estimate the date of the BAS formulary in these mss on the basis of internal evidence. Drawing on this evidence and on the work of Jacob, I had postulated a 10th-century date for the BAS formulary, which retains several antiquarian characteristics, e.g.:

- 1. The opening blessing of the Enarxis²¹⁴ is missing in both texts. This liturgical element, first seen in the 10th-century Italo-Greek codex *Grottaferrata* $\Gamma\beta$ *IV* (BAS, ff. 2^v-3^r, CHR, f. 17^{r-v}),²¹⁵ *Codex Sancti Simeonis* (ante 1030 AD) preserved in Ambrose Pelargus' 1541 Latin version,²¹⁶ 11th-century CHR of codex *Grottaferrata* $\Gamma\beta$ II^{217} and the Arabic pontifical,²¹⁸ becomes common only in mss of the 12th century.²¹⁹
- 2. The Great Synapte is not at the beginning of the Enarxis, but in its earlier position at the Trisagion, as well as in its original position just before the Great Entrance.²²⁰ Only from the 11th century does the litany begin to appear at the beginning of the Enarxis, as in CHR of the Arabic pontifical²²¹ and *Sinai*

²¹² Jacob, "Otrante," 52.

²¹³ Loc cit.

²¹⁴ LEW 362.25-26

²¹⁵ S. Parenti, L'eucologio manoscritto Γ.β. IV (X. sec.) della Bibliotheca di Grottaferrata. Edizione (Excerpta ex Dissertatione ad Doctoratum, Rome, PIO 1994) §§ 4, 31.

²¹⁶ Pelargus f. B1^v. On this source see Taft, Great Entrance xxvii-viii.

²¹⁷ Muretov, К матерлиалам 3.

²¹⁸ Bacha 412, 443 (§ 2). Here again, I am distinguishing the date of the ms (1240 AD) and the date of the shape of the liturgy it reports. For the 11th c. date of the latter, see the arguments of Jacob, Formulaire 297-300.

²¹⁹ G.I. Passarelli, L'eucologio Cryptense Γβ VII (sec. X) (Analekta Vlatadon 36, Thessalonika 1982) 39-40; id., "Osservazioni," 75-85; Mateos, Célébration 29-31.

²²⁰ See for example Pelargus ff. B2^v-B3^v, C^{r-v}; *British Library Add. 34060*, Taft, "Pontifical Liturgy" I, 286-87, II, 111-12; A. Jacob, "Une version géorgienne inédite de la Liturgie de S. Jean Chrysostome," *Le Muséon* 77 (1964) 65-117, here 93-94, 99-100. Cf. Mateos, *Célébration* 29-31; Taft, "Pontifical Liturgy" II, 111-12; Strittmatter, "Synapte" (note 210 above). 93-94, 99-100.

²²¹ Bacha 412-13, 443-44 (§ 2).

- Georg 89.²²² At the same time, it begins to disappear at the Trisagion and before the Great Entrance, as in 11th-century codex Grottaferrata $\Gamma\beta$ II.²²³
- 3. Neither of our BAS texts has the Gospel Prayer,²²⁴ a Palestinian formula from JAS²²⁵ first found in the Byzantine eucharist in the 11th-century, in the Arabic pontifical²²⁶ and codex *Grottaferrata* $\Gamma\beta$ II.²²⁷
- 4. The *Nemo dignus* prayer before the Great Entrance is absent, a lacuna in no source later than the 10th century.²²⁸
- 5. The *lavabo* comes after the deposition of gifts, not, as later, before the Great Entrance, a shift first observable in the 11th century and common only from the 12th.²²⁹
- 6. The *Orate fratres* dialogue and the diakonika introducing the Pax and Creed have retained their 10th-century Constantinopolitan form.²³⁰
- 7. The BAS formulary ends with the Opisthambonos Prayer. There is no additional final blessing or the other material found in mss from the 10th century on.²³¹

The most important of these is § 4: no source later than the 10th century lacks the *Nemo dignus* prayer.²³²

So I had solid evidence not only for proposing a 10th-century date for the two sources in question,²³³ but also for dating them somewhat earlier than the ancient Arabic version of CHR, for the reasons given above (§§ 1-3). Of course

- 222 Jacob, "Version géorgienne," 88-90
- 223 Muretov, К материалам 3-4; Mateos Célébration 30.
- 224 LEW 317.24-372.2.
- 225 PO 26.2:172.12-19.
- 226 Bacha 421, 452 (§ 11). Cf Jacob, Formulaire 299; Mateos, Célébration 139-41.
- 227 Muretov, К материалам 4.
- 228 Taft, Great Entrance 122-30.
- 229 Ibid. 165-66, 168-72.
- 230 Ibid. 378-83, 406-7.
- 231 Our earliest witnesses to the first elements of new material are two 10th-century Italo-Greek euchologies. Codex *Grottaferrata* Γβ IV (f. 27°) has only Ps 112/113:1b between the Opisthambonos and the Skeuophylakion Prayer, which ends the formulary (S. Parenti, *L'eucologio manoscritto* Γ.β. IV (X. sec.) della Biblioteca di Grottaferrata, note 215 above, § 57), whereas St. Petersburg 226 follows Ps 112/113:1b with the diaconal "Let us pray to the Lord" and the Skeuophylakion Prayer, then "Glory be to the Father...," the request for a blessing, and a final blessing without the intervening material found today: Krasnosel'cev (note 203 above) 295, corrected by Jacob, *Formulaire* 162.
- 232 Apropos of which Jacob, "Concélébration," 252 (note), remarks: "Il est donc fort possible que la prière Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος n'ait pas été officialment adoptée à Constantinople avant la seconde moitié du X^e siècle, du moins dans la messe patriarcale." There is not even a Skeuophylakion Prayer at the consummation of the gifts in our two sources, but that cannot help us in dating them, since that formula is witnessed to already in the 8th c. *Barberini Gr. 336* (Parenti-Velkovska § 22 = LEW 344.21-35).
- 233 Despite Moran's insinuation that I finessed my dating of these sources in order to fit them into a preconceived theory: "It was likely to bypass the problematic of this source [= Arabic CHR] that Taft assigns codex Pyromali to the tenth century": Moran, "Enarxis," 161.

here, as always, we are in the realm of hypothesis in trying to date any source not securely anchored in time by explicit evidence from a colophon date or from some other direct internal or external witness. Liturgical sources – especially of less frequently celebrated rituals like the pontifical rite²³⁴ – often betray an archaizing conservatism, maintaining antiquarian characteristics older than the actual date of the document itself. This further weakens the *argumentum ex silentio*. Even when one can establish, on the basis of elements present in the liturgical formulary, a date *ante quem non*, to argue for a date *post quem non* on the basis of what the formulary lacks remains hazardous, since there is always a timelapse between the first appearance of an innovation and its general acceptance in the ms tradition.

On the other hand, in favor of dating BAS in our two sources slightly later than the 10th century one could advance other internal evidence. The title in the *Pyromalus Codex* (1) designates the BAS formulary only for certain feasts. From that one can conclude that BAS, no longer the main liturgy of the Great Church, was already restricted to limited use on certain days only, a shift that occurs at the turn of the millennium.²³⁵ The fact that the Monogenes troparion is already in place as *perisse* of the Second Antiphon, as in the Arabic pontifical²³⁶ and the *Protheoria* 12 (ca. 1085-95 AD),²³⁷ would also favor an 11th-century dating.²³⁸

Although Moran ignores all the other internal evidence, the 11th century is in fact the date he proposes on the basis of the Third Antiphon refrain, $\Sigma \tilde{\omega} \sigma o v \tilde{\eta} \mu \tilde{\alpha} \zeta$, 239 a usage not found at the eucharist in the 10th-century Typikon of the Great Church, but only in sources from the 11th-century on. Since our two BAS formularies manifest some decidedly 10th-century characteristics, and a couple of the 11th, I can live comfortably with assigning them a 10/11th-century date at the turn of the millennium – but not with the gratuitous innuendo that for the sake of argument I would deliberately date a source earlier than the evidence warranted. See the proposed of the 11th of the evidence warranted.

²³⁴ On "Baumstark's Law" in this regard, see A. Baumstark, "Das Gesetz der Erhaltung des Alten in liturgisch hochwertiger Zeit," Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft 7 (1927) 1-23; id., Comparative Liturgy (Westminster MD 1959) 27 ff; cf. Taft, Great Entrance 159, id., Diptychs (note 204 above) 146.

²³⁵ On the whole question of the relation of CHR to BAS, see Jacob, *Formulaire* 52 ff, 254, 499-503; id. "La tradition manuscrite de la Liturgie de S. Jean Chrysostome (VII^e-XII^e siècles)," in B. Botte et alii (eds), *Eucharisties d'orient et d'occident* II (Lex orandi 47, Paris 1970) 109-138, here 114 ff, 137-38; cf. Taft, *Great Entrance* xxxi-ii.

²³⁶ Bacha 415-16, 445-47 (§ 5).

²³⁷ PG 140:434C.

²³⁸ For other sources see Mateos, Célébration 50-52, 54.

²³⁹ Moran, "Enarxis,", 161-62; cf. id., "Skeuophylakion," 30.

²⁴⁰ Mateos, Typicon II, 284-85; id., Célébration 53-54.

²⁴¹ See note 233 above.

b. The Texts

PYROMALUS²⁴²

1. Τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατοὸς ἡμῶν Βασιλείου τοῦ μεγάλου ἱεοουογία κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας ἐν ταῖς ἰδίαις ἑοοταῖς λέγομένη.

- 4. Εὐχὴ ἥν ποιεῖ ὁ Πατριάρχης ἐπὶ τῆ προθέσει τοῦ ἁγίου ἄρτου· Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ... [= Prothesis Prayer²⁴³].
- 5. Ποὸ τῆς ἐλεύσεως τοῦ Πατριάρχου, οἱ ἱερεῖς, καὶ οἱ διάκονοι οἱ συλλειτουργοῦντες, εἰσέρχονται εἰς τὸν ναόν· καὶ ἱσταμένων πρὸ τῶν ἁγίων θυρῶν, ὁ πρῶτος τῶν ἱερῶν κλινόμενος, ταύτην τὴν εὐχὴν λέγει μυστικῶς· Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, οὖ τὸ κράτος ἀνείκαστον ... [Prayer of First Antiphon²⁴⁵].

JOHANNISBERG²⁴⁴
1. De Libro
Sacramentorum in primis
Missa Sancti Basilij
Magni.

- 2. Primum patriarche cum sequentis ordinis Clero ecclesiasticis vestimentis induto, 3. offeruntur in Sacrario ab oblationarijs, mundatæ ac compositæ oblatæ, à populis susceptæ, quas ponit in patenis, & adolens super eas incensum,
- **4.** dicit hanc Orationem: Domine Deus noster ... [Prothesis Prayer].
- 5. Tunc ante aduentum Pontificis, intrant Ecclesiam Presbyter & Diaconus, & stantibus ante cancellos, dicit Presbyter, inclinato capite, hanc Orationem secretè: Domine Deus noster, cuius potestas est sine numero ... [Prayer of First Antiphon].

At the Third Antiphon of the Enarxis, the rubrics resume as follows:

- 6. Καὶ τοῦ ᾿Αοχιερέως ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου ἐν ῷ ἐκαθέζετο ἐν τῷ κάτω μέρει τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀνισταμένου καὶ εἰς τὸ ἄγιον βῆμα εἰσερχομένου·
- 7. ὁ διάκονος λέγει Έν εἰρήνη τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν· Καὶ τὰ ἕξης.
- 6. Et procedit pontifex,
 - 7. Diaconus dicit: In pace Dominum postulemus ...

²⁴² Goar 153-56.

²⁴³ LEW 309.5-21.

²⁴⁴ Witzel, Liturgia S. Basilii (note 208 above) ff. biij biiij.

²⁴⁵ LEW 310.15-311.2.

- Κύοιε ὁ Θεός [Introit Prayer²⁴⁶]. ... [Introit Prayer].
- 8. Ὁ ᾿Αρχιερεὺς λέγει· Δέσποτα 8. Pontifex dicit: Domine Deus noster

At the Great Entrance, during the Cherubic Hymn, the gifts are brought to the altar, but the rubrics do not say from where:

- προτίθενται τὰ ἄγια δῶρα, ὑπὸ τῶν munera à Presbyteris ... ιεοέων ...
- 9. Ἐνταῦθα ἐξάγονται, καὶ 9. Interea deportantur & deponuntur

At the end of the service in both texts, the recession is presented as follows:

- σης τὰ ἄγια εἰς τὸ σκευοφυλάκιον Πληρωθήτω τὸ στώμα μοῦ.
- 11. Ὁ διάκονος 'Ορθοὶ μεταλαβόν-
- θωμεν.
- 13. Ὁ ᾿Αρχιερεὺς μετὰ ταῦτα, ὅπισθεν τοῦ ἄμβωνος ἀπέρχεται καὶ ὁ διάχονος λέγει. Τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.
- 15. Καὶ οἱ ὑπερήται ἀποχρίνονται αμήν.
- 16. Καὶ εἰς τὸ σκευοφυλάκιον ἀπέρ- 16. Et pergunt in Sacrarium tollere χονται καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ ἐκδύουσιν ἐγγὺς τῆς ποοθέσεως.

- 10. Εἶτα τῆς μεταλήψεως τελειωθεί- 10. Post Communionem autem portantur munera in Sacrarium, cantanεἰσφέρονται πάντων ψαλλομένων τό· tibus omnibus hæc: Repleatur os nostrum ... Halleluia.
 - 11. Diaconus: Rectè qui accipuimus
- 12. Ὁ διάπονος· Ἐν εἰρήνῃ προέλ- 12. Diaconus: In pace procedamus, in nomine domini.
 - 13. Pontifex post hæc vadit retrò lectorium, et dicit Diaconus: In pace dominum postulemus.
- 14. Ὁ ᾿Αρχιερεύς· Ὁ εὐλογῶν. 14. Pontifex: Qui benedicis ... Amen.
 - 15. Et repetunt Ministri: Amen.
 - vestimenta sua.

2. Summary:

From these texts it seems clear to me, at any rate, that:

- 1. Before the liturgy the patriarch and clergy are in the "sacrarium" or sacristy (2).
- 2. From the parallels in the related Greek text, it is obvious that this "sacrarium" is the skeuophylakion where the gifts are prepared (3-4) and to which they are returned after communion (10).
- 3. I take this skeuophylakion to be the northeast rotunda just outside Hagia Sophia, in agreement with all the extant evidence and all its reputable interpreters.

- 4. After vesting (1), which the text seems to imply was also done in the skeuo-phylakion that is where the vestments and other paraphernalia needed for the Introit procession²⁴⁷ were kept, where the clergy are before the service, and where they unvest after it (16) the "oblationaries" present to the patriarch in the skeuophylakion the offerings previously received from the faithful (3). The patriarch places them on the patens, incenses them, and recites the Prothesis Prayer (3-4).
- 5. Then before the "arrival (ἔλευσις/adventus)" of the patriarch i.e., before the Introit or "Little Entrance" of the liturgy one presbyter and a deacon go before the Holy Doors of the chancel and begin the Enarxis with the Prayer of the First Antiphon (5) (at that time the initial blessing had not yet been added to the rite²⁴⁸).
- 6. At the Great Entrance the gifts are fetched and placed on the altar (9). The rubrics say they were "brought out" without saying from where. But since they were prepared in the skeuophylakion (3-4), it is hard to imagine where else they could have brought from.
- 7. At the end of the liturgy the leftover gifts are returned to the skeuophylakion (10), where the clergy unvest (16).
 - Let us examine each of these processions to and from the skeuophylakion.

V. The Introit

The first or "Little Entrance" has already been adequately treated by Mateos, Mathews, Strube, and, to some extent, myself.²⁴⁹ The central element in the views of these authors is that the "Little Entrance" was the original Introit of the Byzantine eucharist – i.e., a procession into the church from outside. In *The Great Entrance*, where I treat the "Little Entrance" only in passing, I remarked that "the first introit was – at least on non-stational days – beyond any doubt a procession from the skeuophlakion through the atrium²⁵⁰ and in the main door at the front (west) end of the church."²⁵¹ Admittedly, this generalization re-

We see such objects as the processional cross, evangeliary, candles, and thurible borne in the Introit of liturgies preceded by a stational procession: *De Cerimoniis* I, 1, 9, 26 (17), 27 (18), 31 (23), 35 (26), 36 (27), 37 (28), 39 (30), Vogt I, 24, 58, 95, 103, 122, 134-35, 139, 146, 154; cf. id., *Commentaire* I, 128; Mathews, *Early Churches* 142. It is not unreasonable to suppose their use in the Introit of non-stational eucharists, too.

²⁴⁸ See above at notes 214-218.

²⁴⁹ Taft, Great Entrance 187-89, 192, 196; id., Beyond East and West. Problems in Liturgical Understanding (2nd ed. Rome 1997) 212-16; "Pontifical Liturgy" II, 105-10; "The Liturgy of the Great Church" = id., "The Liturgy of the Great Church: An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm," DOP 34-35 (1980-1981) 45-75 = id., Liturgy in Byzantium, ch. I, here 50 ff.

^{250 &}quot;Atrium" here was a slip of the quill; read "narthex" instead.

²⁵¹ Taft, Great Entrance 196.

quired nuancing, which I provided in a later study where I deal with the Introit ex professo.²⁵² What I proposed there can be summarized in three points:

1. On non-stational days the patriarch was in the skeuophylakion before the liturgy. This is confirmed by the place of ordination to minor orders in the early sources.

2. One priest and a deacon presided over the Enarxis, while others of the clergy escorted the patriarch to the narthex to await the Introit before the Imperial Doors. So even on non-stational days the patriach made a real entrance from outside. Exactly when and how the patriarch and his escort went from the skeuophylakion to the narthex, however, we do not know.

3. Later, probably by the 11th century, ²⁵³ the outside skeuophylakion falls into disuse, even disappears, the bishop vests in the church and is present at the liturgy from the start, where he awaits the Introit seated at a throne first in the narthex, later in the nave. Displacements in the place of minor ordinations follow these peregrinations of the bishop.

Let us review the evidence for these developments.

1. The Patriarch in the Skeuophylakion:

In the earliest extant sources of the Byzantine pontifical liturgy, BAS in the Johannisberg and Pyromalus redactions, the patriarch is in the skeuophylakion for the Prothesis Prayer before the liturgy proper begins (section B.IV.1.b § 4). The next generation of pontifical sources, by which time the outside skeuophylakion had probably fallen into disuse, either make no mention of the bishop assisting at the Prothesis rite before the liturgy²⁵⁴ or skip over that rite entirely,²⁵⁵ doubtless because the gifts were prepared without the bishop assisting. The bishop, waiting in the narthex or nave, had not yet entered the sanctuary area where by that time the gifts were prepared, and so could make his offerings only

252 Taft, "Pontifical Liturgy" II, 105-10.

254 Arabic CHR, Bacha 410-11, 442-43 (§ 1).

²⁵³ Here again, Moran misrepresents my views: "Taft believes that the Great Entrance was still enacted from outside the church in the late twelfth century" (Moran, "Skeuophylakion," 29, referring to Taft, *Great Entrance* 198). In fact, I state clearly that I am talking about "the pre-iconoclast Great Entrance" (*ibid.* 199). And the source I cite (*ibid.* 197-98), though incorporated into the version of Leo Tuscan (1173-1178 AD), I clearly identify as "from a diataxis that goes back at least as far as the 10th century" (*ibid.* 197). In the same context I state that "It is not until the 10th century that the tripartite apse at the east end of Constantinoplitan churches becomes general" (*ibid.* 184). Cf. also Taft, *The Byzantine Rite* 71-74. However, the text of Anthony of Novgorod, which I neglected in the latter work, states clearly that in 1200 AD the outside skeuophylakion was still the prothesis (section A.IV.3 §§ 2-7 above).

²⁵⁵ The roll Jerusalem Stavrou 109; British Library Add. 34060, Taft, "Pontifical Liturgy" I, 284-85; the archieratikon of Gemistos, ed. Dmitrievskij, Onucanue II, 301-4; and of the Andreas Skete codex, ibid. I, 167-69.

later – which is exactly what we see in later sources of the pontifical. But I have already detailed all this elsewhere. ²⁵⁶.

Apropos of the bishop reciting the Prothesis Prayer in the skeuophylakion, Moran notes that in BAS of Barberini Gr. 336, "this prayer is followed by the prayers of the three antiphons and the prayer of the Little Entrance. The patriarch is not present for the three antiphon prayers so why should he be present for the prothesis prayer?"257 This illustrates perfectly how Moran's and my methods differ. Prescinding, for the moment, from the fact that Moran himself had strongly argued in two earlier articles that the patriarch was, in fact, present in the nave for the Enarxis and therefore, inevitably for the three antiphon prayers, 258 there is, of course, no reason whatever why the patriarch should be in the skeuophylakion for the Prothesis Prayer. The whole point is not what could, should, or may have been, but what the extant evidence says was. When two reliable documents, Pyromalus and Johannisberg BAS, state unambiguously that the patriarch was, in fact in the skeuophylakion just before the liturgy, my method is to attempt to deal with what the evidence says was, rather than to imagine what might/could/should/must have been despite the evidence. I have no stake in locating the patriarch in the skeuophylakion before the liturgy. I do so only because the documents do. 259

2. The Patriarch in the Narthex:

Next, we find the patriarch in the narrhex before the Imperial Doors, awaiting the moment of the Introit. The 10th-century pontifical diataxis of codex *British Library Add. 34060* describes this stage as follows:

- **I.1.** When the archdeacon has received permission, the enarxis begins and the antiphons are sung. **2.** And when the time comes for the introit, the bishop is seated before the beautiful doors (παθήμενος ὁ ἀρχιεφεὺς πρὸ τῶν ὡραίων πυλῶν) and bows three times to the east. **3.** Then after the archdeacon who is carrying the holy Gospel says, "Let us pray to the Lord," and those standing nearby say, "Kyrie eleison," the bishop bows slightly and prays this prayer: "O Master, Lord our God ..." [= Introit Prayer]. **4.** Then he kisses the Gospel without bowing, and supported by two archontes [= deacons] he enters and goes up to the holy doors. **5.** And after bowing to them and kissing the holy icon in the joint to the left, he goes into the sanctuary.²⁶⁰
- 256 Taft, Great Entrance 265-70. To the sources cited there, add the latest editions of the pontifical: Âρχιερατικόητь (Rome 1973) 61-66, and ἀΑρχιερατικόν (Athens 1994) 18-19, where the bishop makes his commemorations and says the Prothesis Prayer just before the Great Entrance procession.
- 257 Moran, "Skeuophylakion," 30.
- 258 Moran, "Gestaltung," 179-80; id., "Enarxis," 160-61.
- 259 A parallel Introit ritual existed in the Badia Greca di Grottaferrata south of Rome, which has preserved both its Byzantine rite and its unbroken union with Rome since before the East-West schism. The skeuophylakion was the chamber off the southwest corner of the nave that is now a chapel. At stational services the hegumen waited there until the Third Antiphon of the liturgy to make his entrance (private communication from my colleague Prof. Stefano Parenti).
- 260 Taft, "Pontifical Liturgy" I, 284-87 and note 12; II, 105-7.

Just how and when the patriarch went from the skeuophylakion to the narthex is open to speculation. On the basis of the rubric in the Johannisberg version that "before the arrival of the patriarch a presbyter and a deacon enter the church" for the Enarxis (section B.IV.1.b § 5), I had proposed that the patriarch and the other clergy were still "in sacrario" (3-5) – i.e., in the skeuophylakion, and entered the church proper only later (6).

As Moran points out, the corresponding rubric in the *Pyromalus Codex* says the clergy enter the ναός, which can mean either the church or its inmost part. ²⁶¹ Furthermore, the Pyromalus ms, in a rubric not found in the related Johannisberg version, has the patriarch rise from his throne in the lower part of the church and enter the sanctuary at the Little Entrance (6). So the patriarch must have been seated at a throne in the lower nave beforehand. This is confirmed by the fact that in both Johannisberg and Pyromalus BAS, the patriarch recites the Introit Prayer *after* entering the nave (6-8), and not before the Imperial Doors from the narthex into the nave, as in the earlier system. But this is precisely what I affirm in a study Moran ignores:

The Byzantine liturgy once began with the introit. When the enarxis or rite of three antiphons was added before the introit, it was celebrated at the pontifical liturgy by one presbyter and one deacon at least through the 17th century. In the 10th century sources the bishop and other ministers still vested in the skeuophylakion and did not enter the church until the introit (third) antiphon. When the outside skeuophylakion fell into disuse it became customary for the bishop to await the introit in the narthex, seated before the "Beautiful Doors" leading into the nave. This intermediate use is what we find in our document [= codex *British Library Add. 34060*]. ²⁶²

In the same study I add that in the *Pyromalus Codex* from the same period, "the bishop apparently entered before the antiphon to await the introit from a throne in the nave," and propose that this agrees with the 11th-century order of the service in the Arabic pontifical. In this ms of 1260 AD²⁶⁴ from the Melkite Patriarchate of Antioch, 265 the bishop is already in church for the beginning of the liturgy, since the priest comes to seek his blessing to begin the Enarxis. 266 As in the solemn Russian pontifical rite today, the bishop apparently sat at his "lower throne ($\mathring{\eta} \chi \mathring{\alpha} \tau \omega \chi \alpha \theta \acute{\epsilon} \delta \varrho \alpha$)" in the center of the nave from the beginning of the

²⁶¹ Moran, "Enarxis," 160; id., "Gestaltung," 179-80, id., "Skeuophylakion," 30. Note, however, that the first meaning given in H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, A Greek English Lexicon (9th ed. Oxford 1966) 1160, and Lampe (note 135 above) 897, is not the nave but the entire building.

²⁶² Taft, "Pontifical Liturgy" II, 105-6

²⁶³ Ibid. II, 106 note 89.

²⁶⁴ Bach 405. On the date of the liturgy in this source see note 218 above.

²⁶⁵ The patriarchs of Antioch are given precedence and commemorated in the anaphora: Bacha 464; cf. Jacob, *Formulaire* 299.

²⁶⁶ Bacha § 2, pp. 412, 443.

²⁶⁷ Mateos, Typicon II, 299.

liturgy until the Little Entrance, when he enters the sanctuary.²⁶⁸ A lengthy rubric describes in detail the Introit in this Arabic archieratikon:

1. And when the procession has already gone out toward the central Imperial Door of the church, and before them go the porter and two subdeacons, with two candelabra in their hands on which are two lighted candles, and the deacons go before the bishop (ra'īs al-kahanah),²⁶⁹ 2. and the archbishop (ra'īs al-asāqifah) stands in the middle of the door, and the deacons inside the door lined up on his right, and the priests in front of them, with the seniors of the two orders beside the archbishop, and all standing according to rank, one after the other. 3. Then come the Gospel carried by the archdeacon, and the censer (timiaton) carried by the second deacon.

4. And when all are in place, the archdeacon says in a low voice: "In peace let us pray to the Lord." The second deacon, holding the censer in his left hand, the incense in his right, makes a sign to the bishop, who says in a low voice the Incense Prayer, and at the end of the prayer he concludes with the [sign of the] cross. And while he does this, the deacon puts incense in the censer and incenses to the right, then to the left, and then the archbishop.

5. Then the archbishop says the following prayer, which begins: "Lord and Master our God, who have established in heaven the orders and armies of angels to minister to your glory ..."²⁷⁰ And he raises his voice: "For to you belongs all glory, honor and worship ... Amen."

6. The deacon exclaims: "Wisdom, arise!"

7. Those carrying the candles go forward, then come the deacons two by two according to rank, and the archbishop walks last, and two deacons support his hands out of respect and honor.

8. And each of them kisses the hand he is supporting when he first takes it, and when he lets go of it at the door of the sanctuary. The priests go behind him [the bishop], two [by two].

9. The lectors say: "Come, let us worship and bow down ..." [LXX Ps 94:6a²⁷¹].

10. The deacons enter the sanctuary first, the archdeacon puts the Gospel on the awesome altar and the second deacon incenses. The deacons split into two groups, half on the right, half on the left of the altar.

11. When the archbishop arrives at the door of the sanctuary, he prostrates three times, then enters and stands by the altar ... and the priests stand half on his right and half on his left ... 272

This text presents a penultimate stage in the evolution of the pontifical Introit, in which the bishop is already present inside the church (1-5) for the Enarxis, but the Introit Prayer is still said at the Imperial Doors of the church (5), not before the Holy Doors of the sanctuary (8), as in the modern rite. At the Introit the procession goes off to the Imperial Doors in the back of the church (1-3), where the Introit Prayer and other formalities are accomplished (4-5), then returns through the nave and enters the sanctuary (7-11).

268 Taft, "Pontifical Liturgy" II, 106.

270 Introit Prayer, LEW 312.14-30.

271 Traditional εἰσοδικόν verse, final verse of the Third Antiphon psalm for ordinary days; cf. Mateos, Célébration 85-86.

272 Bacha 417-18, 448-49 (§ 8). I am grateful to my Arabist colleagues Samir Khalil Samir, S.J., and René Lavenant, S.J., for their assistance with the Arabic of this text. The French translation of Bacha is somewhat free and not always completely accurate.

²⁶⁹ Bacha 448, translates this "archiprêtre," which is its literal sense, but the Greek equivalent, ἀρχιερεύς, means not "archipriest" in the modern meaning of the term (protopresbyter) but "bishop." Cf. Taft, "Pontifical Liturgy" I, 296-97 note 50.

Since all this seems to agree with Moran's interpretation of the same documents (except for *British Library Add. 34060*, which he ignores) I am frankly at a loss to grasp the thrust of his polemic, apart from the issue of where the skeuophylakion was located. On that point he says, "Rather than implying that the patriarch was in the skeuophylakion before his arrival, the texts could just as well be interpreted to imply a sacristy in the narthex." In fact, the texts we are dealing with imply nothing whatever about where the sacristy was. The interpretation that the skeuophylakion was in a separate edifice outside the church is based entirely on these three simple facts:

1. The texts put the patriarch in the skeuophylakion.

2. Every single scrap of related evidence I know of locates the Hagia Sophia

skeuophylakion in the outside rotunda.

3. No evidence whatever, archeological or textual, provides the slightest basis for locating a sacristy in the narthex in this or any other period of the rite of the Great Church.

3. The Place of Minor Orders

The patriarch's presence in the skeuophylakion before the opening of the liturgy in church is corroborated by the fact that minor orders, conferred before the Introit of the liturgy in Byzantine usage even today, formerly took place in the skeuophylakion. Let us review this evidence too:

1. Some of the earlier sources – 8th-century *Barberini Gr. 336*,²⁷⁴ 11th-century *Paris Coislin 213*, 13th-century *Grottaferrata* $\Gamma\beta$ I^{275} – place the minor ordinations in the skeuophylakion before the Introit of the liturgy. This was so, I believe, because that is where the bishop was before the liturgy began.

2. Several later sources continue to reflect this earlier tradition even after the outside skeuophylakion had doubtless fallen into disuse. They provide a rubric placing the conferral of orders "in the diakonikon or even before the great doors of the nave at the Introit ... (ἐν τῷ διακονικῷ ἢ καὶ πρὸ τῶν μεγάλων τοῦ ναοῦ πυλῶν ὅτε μέλλει εἰσοδεύειν ...)."²⁷⁶ We see this from as early as the pontifical euchology of *Paris Coislin 213* (1027 AD), to as late as codices *Paris Gr. 2509* (15th c.), *Barberini Gr. 390* (16th c.), and the 1570 Venice euchology (εἰς τὸ ἔξω θρονίον τοῦ νάρθηκος).²⁷⁷

3. Symeon of Thessalonika († 1429), De sacris ordinationibus 179, places the

273 Moran, "Gestaltung," 179.

277 Goar 204-5; Morin, Commentarius 84, 107.

²⁷⁴ Parenti-Velkovska § 165.2: ἐν τῷ διαπονιπῷ, which in this ms is a synonym for skeuophylakion, as can be seen in §§ 1.2, 22.1; cf. Goar 204; Morin, Commentarius 71.

²⁷⁵ Arranz, Eucologio 161 and apparatus: ἐν τῷ διακονικῷ. Cf. Goar 204; Morin, Commentarius 81.

²⁷⁶ Arranz, Eucologio 161 apparatus; Goar 204; Morin, Commentarius 84.

minor ordinations "before the Enarxis of the liturgy, at the doors below (πρὸ τοῦ τῆς ἱερουργίας ἐγάρξασθαι, κάτωθεν ἐν ταῖς πύλαις),"²⁷⁸ which earlier, in ch. 162, he specified as "before the Imperial Doors (πρὸ τῶν βασιλικῶν $\pi \nu \lambda \tilde{\omega} v$)"²⁷⁹ – clearly the doors from the narthex into the nave, since he distinguishes them from the "Holy Doors (ἱεραὶ πύλαι)" leading into the bema. ²⁸⁰ But in fact by this time the bishop was already in the nave for the Enarxis. In Symeon's De sacra liturgia 79 and 83,281 and Expositio de divino templo 46-56,²⁸² it is clear that the bishop enters the church before the liturgy, vests in the nave, where he stays "outside ($\xi \xi \omega \theta \epsilon v$)," until the Introit, i.e., "outside the bema and staying below (ἔξω τοῦ βήματος καὶ κάτω ἱστάμενος)," reciting the prayers, while the priest leading the Enarxis is "inside (ἔνδον)" the sanctuary saying the prayers. At the Introit, the other clergy and ministrants come to fetch the bishop at the Imperial Doors at the west end of the nave, and that is where the minor ordinations also take place. Whether the clergy go out into the narthex for that purpose is not clear. Centuries before Symeon, ca. 1085-95 AD in the *Protheoria* 11 and 14, we see a similar pontifical rite: one priest presides over the Enarxis, while the bishop "waits in the middle (εἰς μέσον ἑστώς)" of the church for the Introit at the Third Antiphon.²⁸³

It seems reasonable, then, to hypothesize that the displacement of minor ordinations from the skeuophylakion to the narthex was provoked by a shift in the location of the sacristy. When, in the course of the 8-10th centuries, the Enarxis gradually became prefixed to the liturgy on non-stational days²⁸⁴ and the bishop came to await the Introit in the narthex, that too became a convenient place to hold minor ordinations. Once the Enarxis had become an integral part of every Byzantine Divine Liturgy, and the bishop was in the church from the start of the service, the ordinations came to be celebrated where the bishop was, at the lower throne in the nave.

It seems, then, that the place of the ordinations follows step by step the displacements of the bishop who conferred them. His displacements, in turn, follow the development of the first part of the Divine Liturgy, and the concomitant change in venue of the vesting before the liturgy from skeuophylakion to nar-

²⁷⁸ PG 155:372D.

²⁷⁹ PG 155:368B.

²⁸⁰ PG 155:370A.

²⁸¹ PG 155:256, 261-64.

²⁸² PG 155:717-720.

²⁸³ PG 140:432B, 436C-D. On the dating see J. Darrouzès, "Nicolas d'Andida et les azymes," REB 32 (1974) 199-203.

²⁸⁴ This process, first observable ca. 730 AD in the commentary of Germanus 23 (ed. Meyendorff 72-73) and not completed by the 10th c. Typikon of the Great Church (Mateos, *Typicon* II, 283-85) is described in id., *Célébration* 34-45; Taft, *Beyond East and West* (note 249 above) 207-16; Baldovin 214-18.

thex to nave. Otherwise how does one explain these displacements? If the sacristy was always inside the church, as Moran would have it, what possible reason could there have been for changing the place of the ordinations?

4. Summary:

The evidence we have reviewed confirms, I think, the chief elements of my hypothesis concerning the original shape of the Introit:

1. On non-stational days the clergy were in the skeuophylakion before the Introit.

2. In Hagia Sophia and at least some of the other churches of Constantinople, that skeuophylakion was a separate edifice outside the church proper.

3. The original Introit was a procession into the church to begin the liturgy.

4. So at some time before or during the Enarxis, the patriarch and other clergy not involved in that ritual had to leave the skeuophylakion and go to the narthex to form this procession. When or how they did so, we have no idea.

5. The bishop and his retinue await the Introit in the narthex before the "Beautiful Doors" (πρὸ τῶν ὡραίων πυλῶν)," – i.e., the main central or "Imperial Doors" leading from the narthex into the nave²⁸⁵ – where the patriarch recited the Introit Prayer before entering the church.

6. The final stage is today's usage, with the bishop's Introit into the church reduced to an entrance into the sanctuary. The bishop enters the church before the liturgy, vests, confers minor orders, if there are any, at his throne in the nave, where he awaits the Introit.²⁸⁶ We see this already in the pontifical diataxeis of Demetrios Gemistos (ca. 1390 AD)²⁸⁷ and the Athos Andreas Skete codex (15th c.).²⁸⁸

7. The progressive removal of the ordination rites from the skeuophylakion to the narthex, and later from there to the bishop's "lower throne (ἄνω κάθεδοα)" in the nave, has nothing to do with the ordinations per se, but everything to do with where the ordaining bishop happened to be. Minor orders were conferred not at the altar during the eucharistic liturgy, like major orders (deacon/deaconess, presbyter, bishop), but before the liturgy at the station where the bishop awaited the Introit. Originally, this was the skeuophylakion. The shift in the liturgical disposition of the Byzantine church from outside skeuophylakion to inside prothesis chamber or side-apse,

286 Taft, "Pontifical Liturgy" II, 106. I discuss the sources of the Byzantine pontifical in *ibid*. II, 90-98.

²⁸⁵ On these doors, not to be confused with the singular ὡραία πύλη leading into south forehall of the narthex of H. Sophia (Strube, *Eingangsseite* 40, 46, 49-52, 68) and their various appelations, see Taft, "Pontifical Liturgy" I, 284 and note 12, and the sources cited there.

²⁸⁷ Dmitrievskij, Описание II, 304.

²⁸⁸ Dmitrievskij, Описание I, 168.

necessitated the change in where the bishop sat to await the Introit or Little Entrance. But the original venue of minor orders confirms that the bishop was in the skeuophylakion before the liturgy, and went from there to the church for the Introit.

So the Pyromalus and Johannisberg texts of pontifical BAS whose rubrics I cited are by no means isolated witnesses to the system I propose.

VI. The Great Entrance

Concerning the Great Entrance there is nothing new to be added to what I already detailed over twenty years ago in my lengthy study of the rite. ²⁸⁹ The argument for the Great Entrance is an exact parallel of what I said above concerning the Introit:

- 1. The gifts were prepared in the skeuophylakion, so that is where they had to be fetched. The earliest source to speak of the "bringing in of the presanctified gifts to the sanctuary from the skeuophylakion," 290 at the Great Entrance, the *Chronicon Paschale* for the year 615 under Patriarch Sergius I, is referring to the Liturgy of the Presanctified, but the Great Entrance processions in Presanctified and in the full Divine Liturgy are exact parallels. As late as the 12th-century *Dresden A 104*, a ms in which it is perfectly clear that the oftmentioned skeuophylakion is the outside rotunda we have been speaking about, 291 also attests that at the Holy Thursday eucharist the gifts are brought in from the skeuophylakion. 292 And in 1200 Anthony of Novgorod still testifies to the fact that at Hagia Sophia, at least, the outside skeuophylakion was still the place of the prothesis. 293
- 2. That skeuophylakion was a separate edifice outside Hagia Sophia.
- 3. So the Great Entrance, like the Little Entrance, was a real entrance from outside. Balsamon's reference to the procession passing through the women's narthex (section A.V above) confirms that explicitly.²⁹⁴
- 4. What route the procession followed remains a matter of speculation.

 Regarding the final point, I had formerly proposed that the deacons in the

²⁸⁹ Taft, Great Entrance.

²⁹⁰ Dindorf I, 705-6 = PG 92:989AB: ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τοῦ εἰσάγεσθαι τὰ προηγιασμένα δῶρα εἰς τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἀπὸ τοῦ σκευοφυλακίου μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν τὸν ἱερέα, Κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σον ... (the ekphonesis referred to concludes the Second Prayer of the Faithful just before the Great Entrance of the Presanctified Liturgy: LEW 348.16-18). Cf. Taft, Great Entrance 76, 194.

²⁹¹ See note 76 above.

²⁹² Dmitrievskij, Типиконы 124.

²⁹³ See above at note 120.

²⁹⁴ Nor is the argument weakened by the 10th c. rubrics in the version of Leo Tuscan: see Taft, Great Entrance 197-99.

Great Entrance procession used the door in the east end of the north aisle, ²⁹⁵ an hypothesis supported by Balsamon's witness to the Great Entrance procession passing through the women's narthex (section A.V above). Here all I would add to that hypothesis is the possibility that in going to the skeuophylakion to prepare the procession, the clergy may have exited the basilica by the smaller entrance in the northeast bay of the aisle across from the skeuophylakion. On reentering the basilica with the gifts, the Great Entrance procession may have used the same door, or the main door in the east end of the north aisle, or even the central doors in the north aisle ca. 29 meters away, since one might question the suitability of using a smaller "service entrance" to accomodate a solemn procession bearing large vessels and probably accompanied by ornately vested clerics bearing candles, thuribles, processional crosses, and other processional accoutre-

Once inside the basilica, we know the procession entered the sanctuary via the solea and Holy Doors.²⁹⁶ So if the ministers entered at the eastern end they would probably have moved westward down the north aisle, then south through the central colonnade and directly across to enter the solea by the ambo-plinth at its west end. Had they entered via the central doors in the north aisle, they would have moved directly south across the nave to enter the solea by the ambo. All this, however, is speculation.

Moran, in addition to his other arguments against my views, notes that the closing of the doors of the church after the dismissal of the catechumens would render a Great Entrance from outside problematic. Ca. 628-630, Maximus Confessor, Mystagogia 15, informs us "that after the holy reading of the Gospel and the dismissal of the catechumens, there takes place the closing of the doors of the holy church of God, which signifies the passing of the material world ... and the entrance into the spiritual world ... of those who are worthy."297 Moran comments: "Would then a ceremonial opening of the central door of the north side at the Great Entrance at the beginning of the Mass of the Faithful go without mention in Maximus' 7th century liturgical commentary or in the Historia Ecclesiastica of St. Germanos?"298

What would or would not be mentioned by a commentator is not always a convincing argument. Except for the Sanctus, Maximus skips the whole anaphora,²⁹⁹ a far more important element than the opening and closing of doors. Furthermore, the closing of the doors had doubtless become a formality after the dismissals of the catechumens fell into disuse, though it is not at all clear

²⁹⁵ Ibid. 188-89.

²⁹⁶ Ibid. 195-96.

²⁹⁷ PG 91:693BC.

²⁹⁸ Moran, "Gestaltung," 180.

²⁹⁹ Mystagogia 18-20, PG 91:696.

when that happened. The history of the catechumenate in Constantinople remains to be written.³⁰⁰ The council in Trullo (692) is the last time catechumens appear in Byzantine canonical legislation,³⁰¹ and the ambiguity of other 7thcentury witnesses already show a weakening of the tradition. Maximus' Mystagogia 14-15, seems to speak of the dismissal of the catechumens at the Byzantine Divine Liturgy as if it were still an effective reality, 302 and his Vita refers to "the prostration of the unbaptized in the pronaos (ἀμυμήτων ἐν τῷ προνάω πρόπτωσις)."303 But in his Scholia in librum De ecclesiastica hierarchia of Ps.-Dionysius, Maximus says the dismissal of the catechumens was a dead letter (où γίνεται). 304 Later canonical collections may include already existing legislation regarding the catechumenate, but such anthologies continue to reproduce earlier texts long after they had lost all force. So it is not altogether clear how effective an instituion the catechumenate had remained even at the time of Trullo.

But even if the dismissal and closing of the doors were still in force, I do not think that would ipso facto exclude a Great Entrance procession from the skeuophylakion in the light of the evidence adduced.

VII. The Recession

The Chronicon paschale for 624 AD, under Patriarch Sergius I (610-638), is our earliest witness to the conclusion of the Byzantine communion ritual:

ψάλλεσθαι 2. μετὰ τὸ μεταλαβεῖν σκευοφυλάκιον ἀποκαθιστᾶν τὰ τίμια διπίδια, δισκάρια καὶ ποτήρια καὶ ἄλλα ἱερὰ σκεύη, 4, μετὰ τὸ ἐκ

1. Τούτω τῷ ἔτει μηνὶ ἀρτεηισίω, 1. In this year [624 AD] in the month κατὰ Ῥωμαίους μαΐω τῆς ιβ' ἰνδικ- of Artemesius - May, according to the τιῶνος, ἐπὶ Σεργίου πατριάρχου Romans – on the 12th indiction, under Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, ἐπενοήθη Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople, an innovation was made in the chantπάντας τῶν ἁγίων μυστηρίων 3. ἐν ing: 2. that – after all have received the τῷ μέλλειν τοὺς κληρικοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ Holy Mysteries, 3. when the clergy are about to return to the skeuophylakion the precious rhipidia, chalices and patens and the other sacred vessels,

³⁰⁰ In the meantime, in addition to Arranz's massive work on the liturgical documents - Arranz, "Sacrements," I.1-10 - the older study of A. Almazov, История чинопоследования крещения и миропомазания (Kazan 1884) is still useful.

³⁰¹ Canons 78 und 95, Nedungatt-Featherstone 159, 174-77.

³⁰² PG 91:692-3 (date from P. Sherwood, An Annotated Date-list of the Works of Maximus the Confessor [Studia Anselmiana 30, Rome 1952] 32, 61); cf. Mathews, Early Churches 128, 152.

³⁰³ R. Devreesse, "La vie de S. Maxime le confesseur et ses récensions," Analecta Bollandiana 46 (1928) 22 line 6 (= BHG 1234).

³⁰⁴ PG 4:141C. This text is not among those whose authenticity has been challenged: see H.U. von Balthasar, "Das Problem der Dionysius-Scholien," in id., Kosmische Liturgie. Das Weltbild Maximus' des Bekenners (2nd ed. Einsiedeln 1961) 644-672.

τῶν παρατραπεζίων καὶ τὴν διάδοσιν ἀποτεθῆναι πάντα εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν τράπεζαν, 5. καὶ ψαλθῆναι τὸν τελευταῖον στίχον τοῦ κοινωνικοῦ, 6. λέγεσθαι καὶ τοῦτο τὸ τροπάριον, Πληρωθήτω τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν αἰνέσεως κύριε...³⁰⁵

4. after the distribution of communion from the side tables³⁰⁶ everything is brought back to the holy altar, 5. and after chanting the final verse of the koinonikon – 6. this troparion also be sung: "May our mouth be filled with your praise, O Lord …"

The text is straightforward enough, except for its reversal of the proper order in 3-4: after communion (2, 4) the vessels with the sacred gifts are first brought to the altar (4) and put in order, then removed to the skeuophylakion (3). The beginning (1) and end of the text (6), announcing the introduction of a new concluding communion refrain, is the point of the chronicle entry. After recording for posterity the date of the liturgical innovation (1), the chronicler ascends in climactic crescendo to indicate the part of the liturgy where the new refrain had been introduced. After the distribution of communion to the laity (2, 4), when the gifts are about to be brought back to the altar (4), set in order, then removed to the skeuophylakion (3) for consumption by the ministers after the liturgy – at this point, when the communion psalmody is concluded with the singing of the last verse of the psalm (5), the new refrain is appended to the psalmody (6).

The recessional route was probably the reverse of the Great Entrance. But if the exact route is uncertain, the whither and thither are beyond dispute: the recession left the sanctuary via the Holy Doors and down the solea to pause at the ambo for the Opisthambonos, then went out to the skeuophylakion where the ministers said the final prayer of the liturgy, the Skeuophylakion Prayer, and removed their sacred vestments, while the deacons consumed the remaining gifts, then purified and put away the sacred vessels. That is the older ritual at least – and the reason for the name of both Opisthambonos and Skeuophylakion Prayers.

VIII. Conclusion

Though no single extant description is alone detailed enough to provide every aspect of my reconstruction of the Byzantine processions in Hagia Sophia, I believe the sources already cited are best interpreted in this way. In the first place, the two extremities of both processions, the bema and the skeuophylakion, are unmistakeably clear in the sources. The location of bema and skeuophylakion in Hagia Sophia have also been established beyond reasonable cavil. But because

305 Dindorf I, 714 = PG 92:1001BC.

³⁰⁶ On the small credences used to facilitate the distribution of communion, see note 198 above.

some find it impossible to accept the notion that an entrance could have had an outbuilding as one its poles, the obvious meaning of the sources is discounted, and imaginary solutions with no evidential basis must be invented. Against this I can only repeat what I have already said: the fact that sources like codex *Dresden A 104* and the *De cerimoniis* describe the patriarch and emperor moving in and out of the basilica to its outbuildings like the Holy Well or the skeuophylakion, performing their devotions, incensing, venerating the relics, holding receptions, distributing eulogia, makes it hard to see why, *a priori*, one must exclude the notion that the gifts could have been prepared in the skeuophylakion and brought in from there.

I would resume what I have tried to establish as follows:

- 1. The earliest sources place the recitation of the Prothesis Prayer, the first prayer of the Divine Liturgy in the earliest euchologies, in the skeuophylakion.
- 2. Some early sources place the patriarch in the skeuophylakion before the liturgy to offer and incense the gifts, and recite this prayer.
- 3. The bishop's presence in the skeuophylakion before entering church for the opening of the liturgy is corroborated by the fact that originally he conferred minor orders there before the Introit of the liturgy.
- 4. This Introit was once where the liturgy began with the entrance of the clergy into the nave from the narthex. Even after the addition of the Enarxis of three antiphons, litanies, and prayers, the bishop waited in the narthex, entering the nave and processing to the bema only at the Introit.
- 5. Early sources have the gifts brought in from the skeuophylakion to the bema at the Great Entrance.
- 6. Early sources have the gifts returned to the skeuophylakion from the bema after communion.
- 7. In the same sources the last prayer of the liturgy, the Skeuophylakion Prayer, is said in the skeuophylakion at the consummation of the gifts following the service.

On this basis, I have drawn the only conclusion possible: in Hagia Sophia the three processions of the divine liturgy went between the bema and the skeuophylakion. This (to me ineluctable) conclusion has received broad acceptance.

How they went to and fro depends on four other questions:

- 1. Where was the bema?
- 2. Where was the skeuophylakion?
- 3. How did one communicate between them i.e., where were the doors and paths that might have been used?
- 4. What route did the processions in fact take?

The answers to questions 1 and 2 are clear from the confluence of literary and archeological evidence. Imagining another solution not only flies in the face of

this evidence, but finds no support in anything but its proponents' imagination. Except for some confusion concerning the possibility of a second door in the inadequately studied skeuophylakion rotunda of Hagia Sophia, question 3 has also been resolved. The answer I proposed to question 4, what route the processions took, must remain hypothetical in the absence of any direct evidence. The hypothesis, however, is based on the evidence, and not on wishful thinking about how the processions should have been.