

## John II of Jerusalem's Homily on the Encaenia of St. Sion and Its Calendrical Background

### 1. Introduction

The homily of John II of Jerusalem (387–417)<sup>1</sup> on the Encaenia of St. Sion<sup>2</sup> is one of the most important witnesses related—directly or indirectly—to the liturgical institutions of Jerusalem among those preserved in Armenian only. It must be considered at the same level as, say, the Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem witnessing the middle-fifth-century Jerusalem rite<sup>3</sup> and the *Vita* of Cyril of Jerusalem (350–386) substantiating the veneration of this saint as the creator of the Jerusalem rite despite the fact that he was consecrated bishop by Arians<sup>4</sup>. The homily of Cyril's successor on the Jerusalem See, John II delivered at the day of the encaenia of the Sion basilica, 15 September 394, is the unique source on the liturgy specific to this holy place which is “the mother of the Churches” in the most literal sense<sup>5</sup>.

This source, however, is the least known among those relevant to the liturgy of Jerusalem, which are preserved in Armenian. The main reason is rather some obscurity of the text itself than a relatively recent date of its discovery. The first and the only publication of the Armenian original (with a Latin translation) was produced by Michel van Esbroeck (1934–2003) in 1973<sup>6</sup>. Then, in 1984, the same author published his French translation, sometimes correcting his previous Latin one, together with a study of this work within the context of John II's activity and Church politics as a whole, but still without a properly liturgical study<sup>7</sup>. Nevertheless, even after this, no liturgical scholar addressed this text, except the unique point of its possible relation to the Jewish feast Yom Kippur, already noticed by van Esbroeck<sup>8</sup>. Indeed, the homily has little to do with the Christian liturgies of the Byzantine realm. This is not only obvious but rather striking. It is, however, not less striking that the liturgy and the liturgical space described by John II continue the tradition of the sevenfold partition of Sion's liturgical space traceable from the pre-Christian epoch through the first Christian centuries. The potential interest of the homily as a liturgical source goes far beyond its possible relation to Yom Kippur.

<sup>1</sup> The main bibliography on John II is provided by Michael M. Kohlbacher, “Vom Enkel des Origenes zum Vater der Chalcedongegner. Einleitungsfragen zum Lehrbekenntnis des Johannes von Jerusalem (CPG 3621)”, in: *Origeniana Septima. Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des 4. Jahrhunderts*, eds. W. A. Bienert and U. Kühneweg (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 137; Leuven: University Press, 1999), 655–672.

<sup>2</sup> S. below, section 5.4, some reservations to this definition of the occasion at which the homily was delivered. Below I will use the spelling “Sion” instead of “Zion” when referring to the Christian/Byzantine realities.

<sup>3</sup> Charles Renoux, “Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121”, 1–2, in: PO 35.1 (1969); 36.2 (1971). Also relevant is his publication of the documents of a later period: Ch. Renoux, “Le lectionnaire de Jérusalem en Arménie. Le *časoc*”, 1–3, in: PO 44.4 (1989); 48.2 (1999); 49.5 (2004).

<sup>4</sup> Ernest Bihain, “Une Vie arménienne de saint Cyrille de Jérusalem”, *Le Muséon* 76 (1963), 319–348.

<sup>5</sup> For Sion as “the Mother of Churches” (an appellation known, at least, from the late fourth century), s. Franz Diekamp, *Hippolytos von Theben. Texte und Untersuchungen* (Münster i. W.: Aschendorff'schen Buchhandlung, 1898), 99–100; Stéphane Verhelst, *La liturgie de Jérusalem à l'époque byzantine. Genèse et structures de l'année liturgique* (unpublished PhD Thesis; Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1999), [271–272] (no pagination in the manuscript).

<sup>6</sup> M. van Esbroeck, “Une homélie sur l'Église attribuée à Jean de Jérusalem”, *Le Muséon* 86 (1973), 283–304, the Armenian text on pp. 289–304. Previously, in 1966, P. Ananian published a distorted epitome of this homily under the name of certain John the Chorbishop dated by him to the 8<sup>th</sup> cent.: Պ. Անանյան, “Յովհաննէս Խորեպիսկոպոսի երկու ճառեր”, *Բազմալէզ* 124 (1966) [P. Ananian, “Two Sermons of John the Chorbishop”, *Polyhistory* 124 (1966)], 18–28, here 23–28; a detailed comparison with the original recension is provided by van Esbroeck, “Une homélie...”, 287–288. Only two manuscripts of the full homily are presently known, but the later one (Matenadaran 2136) is a 18<sup>th</sup>-cent. copy of the earlier one (Matenadaran 993, AD 1456). A detailed description of the latter is provided by Michel van Esbroeck and Ugo Zanetti [“Le manuscrit Erévan 993. Inventaire des pièces”, *RÉA* 12 (1977), 123–167, 479–491].

<sup>7</sup> M. van Esbroeck, “Jean II de Jérusalem et les cultes de S. Étienne, de la Sainte-Sion et de la Croix”, *AB* 102 (1984), 99–134, here 107–124, translation on pp. 115–124. Below I quote the sermon of John II within the text according to the page numbers of van Esbroeck's 1973 edition and his French 1984 translation (txt/tr.).

<sup>8</sup> Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra elaborated on these observations by van Esbroeck: D. Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity* (WUNT 163; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 299–300. Cf. also a mention by Michael A. Fraser, “Constantine and Encaenia”, *Studia Patristica* 29 (1997), 25–28, here 27–28.

The purpose of the present study is a liturgical analysis of the homily against its early Christian and Jewish pre-Christian background<sup>9</sup>.

## 2. The Structure of the Homily: an Overview

The homily on the Encaenia of St. Sion is addressed to Porphyry, the future bishop of Gaza (395–420) but then the *staurophylax* in Jerusalem<sup>10</sup>. Michel van Esbroeck managed to identify Porphyry whose name is distorted in Armenian (*P'op'or*) as the addressee and to date the homily to the year 394 (whereas previously the dedication of the Sion basilica was datable only to the interval between the enthronisation of John in 387 and the death of Emperor Theodosius the Great in 395)<sup>11</sup>.

The homily is clearly subdivided into two parts, where Part One (§§ 1-23) enumerates the main topics which will be covered with the rest of the homily (§§ 24-97). It serves as an overture for the following. Part Two (§§ 24-97) is, in turn, subdivided into eight smaller parts (van Esbroeck has preferred slightly different subdivision: seven smaller parts within Part Two and, then, Part Three, §§ 85-97). The topics enumerated in Part One will become leitmotifs going through the whole Part Two.

The text is extremely dense, saturated with about 300 scriptural allusions (according to van Esbroeck's count<sup>12</sup>) per about 100 sentences ( $\approx$  paragraphs in van Esbroeck's edition). Such a density of allusions leaves a feeling of centonisation. Among the main scriptural authorities the author quotes *4 Ezra* which is, in his eyes, certainly not uncanonical<sup>13</sup>. The imagery of *4 Ezra*, especially the chalice (4 Ez 14), becomes one of the key components of the symbolical language of the homilist.

The leitmotifs dealt with in Part One are the following: (1) the heavenly palaces-tabernacles remotely reflected in the present earthly sanctuary (§§ 1-4); (2) the heavenly paradise where the saints are shining like the fixed stars, whereas the prophetic hymns follow the right path like the moving planets (§§ 5-6); (3) an intoxication with the Holy Spirit from above, with purification of the lips and illumination (§§ 7-10); (4) obstacles to the true revelation, mostly sevenfold, such as either disciples of seven pagan sages [Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, Homer (a current in Armenian distorted form of the name Hermes, *sc.* Trismegistus), Asclepius, Hippocrates, and Galen] or the seven locks of Samson's head woven into the web by Delilah (Judges 16:13-14) (§§ 11-13); (5) the difference between the wisdom of the world and the true wisdom from God (quoting, beside the Bible, Gregory of Nazianzus) (§§ 14-16); (6) the Ark of the Covenant and the Propitiatory, once more in the context of the intoxication with the waves of the Holy Spirit, spiritual renovation, and the divine Bridegroom (§§ 17-18), together with (7) the purification of the heart in imitation of Ezra, with clear allusions to different scenes from *4 Ezra* including those with the chalice and (re)writing of the holy books (4 Ez 14); this description represents Ezra as a new Moses and, thus, alludes to the idea of a New Testament (§§ 19-21)<sup>14</sup>; (8) Moses receiving the Holy Spirit among the

---

<sup>9</sup> Michel van Esbroeck was also the person who introduced me to his friend Karen Yuzbashian in 1983 in St. Petersburg, thus paving my own way to Karen when I started my studies in Armenian Christianity several years later. Since then, their names became for me interconnected. I am sure that Karen would be glad to see Michel mentioned in a paper dedicated to his memory.

<sup>10</sup> Jeff Childers demonstrated that the Greek text of the *Vita Porphyrii* is earlier than the lost Syriac original of the extant Georgian version: J. Childers, "The Life of Porphyry: Clarifying the Relationship of the Greek and Georgian Versions through the Study of New Testament Citations", in: *Transmission and Reception: New Testament Text-Critical and Exegetical Studies*, eds. J. Childers and D. C. Parker (Texts and Studies 3.4; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2006), 154-178 (with previous bibliography on Porphyry).

<sup>11</sup> van Esbroeck, "Jean II de Jérusalem...", 107-111. Stéphane Verhelst expresses some doubts concerning 395 as the *terminus ante quem* and considers 415 (discovering of the relics of St. Stephan) to be the only certain date for this *terminus*: S. Verhelst, *Les traditions judéo-chrétiennes dans la liturgie de Jérusalem : spécialement la Liturgie de saint Jacques Frère de Dieu* (Textes et études liturgiques, 18; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 200-203.

<sup>12</sup> van Esbroeck, "Jean II de Jérusalem...", 114.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. van Esbroeck, "Jean II de Jérusalem...", 134.

<sup>14</sup> This passage is so important for understanding the homily that needs to be quoted in full: "Avançons-nous parmi les éléments [հ ւսւսն ; *I would translate* letters (of the alphabet), *cf.* litteras in van Esbroeck's *Latin tr. and գրեւ զսւսնսն shortly below*] dans les prairies des pasteurs divins, broutant les fleurs aux livres (մատենիցն) divins [cf. 4 Ez 9:24], en imitant Esdras, lequel par le moyen des larmes de repentir (a été) spiritualisé [հոգիացեալ ; *I would translate simply* animé ("*animated*") implying that the Greek verb was here ἐμψύχομαι, *cf.* NBHL 114a] par un jeûne de sept jours, mangeant les fleurs des champs dans la vision des troupes angéliques [4 Ez 9: 26-27], en pleurant Jérusalem et Israël [4 Ez 10:20], ce pourquoi il reçu l'ordre de tracer les caractères [գրել զսւսնսն] et d'accueillir le livre qui conserve l'écrit [4 Ez 14:24-26], et l'ayant bu [...unde iubet scribere litteras, a

gathering of the seventy two elders and explaining with the holy words the mystery of the Propitiatory in the divine house of the Bridegroom (§§ 22-23).

This eightfold subdivision of Part One seems to me rather easily distinguishable and clearly symmetrical to the eightfold subdivision of Part Two (s. below, section 6, for the details).

Part Two is called by the editor “the homily on the Propitiatory”, whereas it is rather a homily on the liturgical structure of the Sion basilica. But, indeed, in each part of the description the homilist mentions “Holy Propitiatory” (քաւարան = ἱλαστήριον / כפורת).

Below I avoid a discussion of one of the most striking liturgical peculiarity of the homily: the material object called “propitiatory”. I argued elsewhere<sup>15</sup> that it was a chalice made from a semiprecious stone (theoretically representing the sapphire from the visions of Ezekiel), whose liturgical usage was abrogated shortly after John II but which continued to be an important holy object preserved in the Sion church before 614. The same object or, at least, its equivalent (copy?) will appear in the Constantinopolitan replica of the Sion church, the church of the Apostles, where it will be seen in the ninth century by Constantine-Cyril, the brother of Methodius and a future Apostle of the Slavs. Another replica of this chalice was produced in Aksum, also (similarly to Constantinople) within a large program of *Translatio Hierosolymi*. The transformation of the propitiatory into a chalice is one of the liturgical trends within the Second Temple Judaism provoked by disappearance of the Ark of the Covenant.

Part Two of John’s homily is subdivided into eight sections according to the eight “circles” (or “orders”, or “orbits”, “spheres” etc.). It is difficult to decide how to translate here the Armenian word պարունակ. Michel van Esbroeck thought that it is the same word that the one used in 4 Ez 7:77-99<sup>16</sup>, given that 4 Ezra is one of the main scriptural sources of the homily. Unfortunately, we have no corresponding Armenian word in 4 Ezra, because the Armenian recension of 4 Ezra in the relevant part deviates from the original (lost) Greek recension<sup>17</sup>. The Latin text distinguishes between the term *via* (“way”) in 7:80-87 and *ordo* (“order”) in 7:88-99, thus revealing that the lost Greek original of the extant versions has had here two different words, too, whereas the Syriac version has everywhere the same word ܠܘܝܐܪܥ (“way”). Therefore, I would be rather sceptical toward van Esbroeck’s guess that պարունակ in our text corresponds to the Greek original term behind Latin *ordo* in 4 Ez 7:88-99<sup>18</sup>. Instead, I would

---

libro servante-inventionem accipere, et potatus...; ուստի հրամայէ գրել զտառսն ի զիւանապահ մատենին ընդանենալ և աղբերացեալ... (il a été envoyé comblé des dons de Dieu [4 Ez 14:38-40]) (§§ 20-21; p. 291-292/116-117). Thus, the two main symbols of 4 Ez 14, the chalice and the book, are amalgamated.

<sup>15</sup> Mostly in the articles: B. M. Лурье, “Из Иерусалима в Аксум через Храм Соломона: архаичные предания о Сионе и Ковчеге Завета в составе *Кебра Негест* и их трансляция через Константинополь”, *Христианский Восток* 2 (8) (2000) [B. Lourié, “From Jerusalem to Aksum through the Temple of Solomon: Archaic Traditions about Sion and the Ark of Covenant in the *Kebra Nægäst* and Their Translation via Constantinople”, *Christian Orient* 2 (8) (2000)], 137-207; B. M. Лурье, “Чаша Соломона и скиния на Сионе. Часть 1. Надпись на Чаше Соломона: текст и контекст” [B. Lourié, “The Chalice of Solomon and the Tabernacle on Sion. Part 1: The Inscription on the Chalice of Solomon: Text and Context”], *Byzantinorossica* 3 (2005), 8-74. Now the Inscription on the Chalice of Solomon is found also in two Latin manuscripts (by Sergejus Temčinas who prepares their publication); a publication of the second Greek manuscript found in the 1990s by Reiner Stichel is still in preparation. I am grateful to Sergejus Temčinas for sharing with me this information. The first Greek manuscript was published in 1967 by Ihor Ševčenko.

<sup>16</sup> van Esbroeck, “Jean II de Jérusalem...”, 117.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. M. E. Stone, *The Armenian Version of IV Ezra* (University of Pennsylvania Armenian Texts and Studies, 1; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979). The Armenian text contains only the part dealing with the seven “ways” (ճանապարհ).

<sup>18</sup> Anyway, van Esbroeck himself acknowledged, dealing with the eight “circles” of the Sion church, that “[c]es cercles n’ont rien à voir avec les précédents: ils représentent simplement le niveau cosmologique des cieux...”; van Esbroeck, “Jean II de Jérusalem...”, 117, n. 74. He calls “les précédents” the “circles” first mentioned in § 24 and then implied in the introductory passage to Part Two, §§ 24-26. This passage, however, enumerates different symbols of the heavenly Temple from the Old Testament whose total number is twenty one (= trice seven): “heaven of heavens”, heavenly Jerusalem, the Paradise of Eden, the Ark of Shem and Noah, the tabernacle of Moses, “the house of God”, the burning bush, the ladder of Jacob and the rock that Jacob anointed, the Mount Sinai, the temple of Solomon, the lampstand with seven lamps, the lampstand covered with (golden) shields (1 Kgs 10:16), the temple of Ezekiel, the heavenly door, the upper room that God enters, the church of the holy righteous, the sanctuary, the synagogue and camp divine, and, finally, “the present tabernacle” (p. 292/117). I see no specific correspondence between this passage and 4 Ez 7.

agree with Stéphane Verhelst who sees behind this Armenian word the Greek term σφαῖρα (“sphere”) taken in its cosmological meaning<sup>19</sup>.

M. van Esbroeck recognised an analogy between these “spheres” and the sevenfold structure of the heavens known from the *Ascensio Isaiae* and other early Christian and Jewish texts<sup>20</sup>. The eighth “sphere” of the homilist does not disrupt this sevenfold scheme but is established as superior to its sevenfold whole.

### 3. The Cosmology and Liturgical Space and Time

The cosmology implied in the homily agrees perfectly with Verhelst’s understanding of each *պարունակ* as a heavenly sphere and its projection on the liturgical space of an earthly sanctuary. Each of the eight subdivisions of the Sion temple is described by the homilist as having the same Propitiatory as their common *raison d’être*. It is most natural to understand the implied *cosmological* spatial structure as eight concentric spheres having the Propitiatory as their common centre.

This geometrically simple and clear cosmology does not result, however, in an equally clear understanding of the structure of the liturgical space within the Sion basilica. The number of possible ways of mapping of a given structure of the heavens onto the earthly liturgical space is theoretically (from a topological point of view) unlimited.

In fact, we know nothing certain about the internal structure of the Sion basilica<sup>21</sup>—completely destroyed in 614 by the Persians and then replaced in the seventh century by the new one. This fact, nevertheless, will not prevent us from making some conclusions concerning the liturgical calendar implied by the homilist, given that the mapping of a heavenly structure onto a structure of the liturgical space is always suggesting some structure of the liturgical calendar. The heaven as such is not only a spatial structure but also a structure of time; thus, its mapping is always a spatio-temporal procedure affecting, therefore, both liturgical space and liturgical calendar.

The calendar implied by John II has been already discussed by Michel van Esbroeck and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. The former put forward a hypothesis that the homily delivered on 15 September (this date is known as the commemoration day of the dedication of the Sion basilica according to many available sources) was dedicated as well to the Jewish feast of the Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur) which could have been falling, this year, on 15 September<sup>22</sup>. Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra supported this hypothesis in

---

<sup>19</sup> S. Verhelst, “Pesiqta de-Rav Kahana, chapitre 1, et la liturgie chrétienne”, *Liber Annuus* 47 (1997), 129-138, here 137, fn. 36.

<sup>20</sup> S. a review of these texts in Adela Yarbro Collins, “The Seven Heavens in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses”, in: *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*, eds. by John J. Collins and Michael Fishbane (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1995), 59-93.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. a balanced discussion of the available data and interpretations by Edwin K. Broadhead, *Jewish Ways of Following Jesus. Redrawing the Religious Map of Antiquity* (WUNT 266; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 317-323. Michel van Esbroeck shared the hypothesis that the main structure within the church was octagonal, but he did not propose any specific hypothesis concerning the relation of this octagonal structure to the plan of the basilica (van Esbroeck, “Jean II de Jérusalem...”, 114). Referring to this van Esbroeck’s view, Bargil Pixner went further identifying the octagonal structure with the Theodosian memorial church (ca 382) which he called “vestibule church” according to its relation to an adjacent building (both are visible on the Roman Pudentiana mosaic, ca 400); Pixner identified the latter as the historical church of apostles and discerned both from the “larger” Sion basilica build in 394 and visible on the Madaba map [B. Pixner, “Church of the Apostles found on Mount Zion?”, *Biblical Archaeological Review* 16.3 (1990), 16-35, 60; cf. criticisms *apud* Broadhead]. Pixner’s hypothesis is incompatible with van Esbroeck’s conclusion that the homily of John II is delivered on the occasion of the encaenia of the “larger” Sion church and certainly not the Theodosian octagon (erected when the bishop of Jerusalem still was Cyril). Pixner himself did not comment on his disagreement with van Esbroeck [even in his later publication: B. Pixner, *Paths of the Messiah and Sites of the Early Church from Galilee to Jerusalem: Jesus and Jewish Christianity in Light of Archaeological Discoveries*, ed. by R. Riesner (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2010), 348-351 (original German edition 1991)] to whom he refers approvingly. Finally, Verhelst (*La liturgie de Jérusalem...*, [271-272], esp. fn. 1286) put forward an interesting hypothesis that the octagonal church on the Pudentiana mosaic is that of Bethlehem (whose excavations proved it to be octagonal), and the whole image is a (known otherwise) symbolical representation of Golgotha and Bethlehem together as two adjacent buildings.

<sup>22</sup> van Esbroeck, “Jean II de Jérusalem...”, 111-112. In 386, the year of the famous anti-Jewish homilies of John Chrysostom, the Julian date of Yom Kippur (10 Tishri) was 18 September; thus, according to van Esbroeck, it is possible that the actual Jewish calendar—whose exact form is unknown to us due to its possibly irregular way of intercalating—would have had a near date, 15 September, for 10 Tishri in 394. One can notice that, according to a more recent study based on some new documental data, John Chrysostom’s homilies imply a Jewish calendar where

general but added a little correction: according to the calendar-computation program by Nachum Dershowitz and Edward Reingold, the Julian date of the eve of Yom Kippur in 394 fell on 20 September, the last day of the eight-day feast of the Encaenia of the Anastasis church (13 September)<sup>23</sup>. This result is not too far from van Esbroeck's initial guess, because the Encaenia day of the Sion basilica is the third day of the same liturgical cycle opened with the dedication of the Anastasis on 13 September.

Both Michel van Esbroeck and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra were thinking about some contact point(s) between the calendar of John II and the contemporaneous rabbinic Jewish calendar. In fact, there was only one such point they dealt with: both of them focused their attention on the Propitiatory as the only feature clearly referring to some Jewish calendrical tradition.

My approach will be different. I consider the whole structure of the homily (especially of its Part Two) as calendrical and based on a Jewish calendrical pattern.

#### 4. Zion/Sion: a Sevenfold Liturgical Space

A sevenfold (or eightfold which is derived from sevenfold) partition of both liturgical and cosmological spaces would require some kind of sevenfold/eightfold partition of the calendar. The liturgical time is the third domain, after the cosmological and liturgical spaces, which is connected with the two others via the bijective mapping. Thus, one has to expect a sevenfold/eightfold structure for either the whole or a part of the liturgical year implied in the homily by John II.

A sevenfold partition of the Christian Sion church is traceable from the very beginning, long before 394. Three Christian authors of the fourth century mention Emperor Hadrian's visit of Mt Sion *ca* AD 132 reporting that he saw there seven Christian synagogues, and one of these synagogues was preserved until the time of Constantine the Great. One of these witnesses is the anonymous pelerine from Bordeaux, *ca* 333, who saw this last synagogue himself<sup>24</sup>.

A sevenfold structure of the Christian Sion sanctuary is implied in the third-century homily by certain (hardly real) Barsabas of Jerusalem preserved in Georgian only and first edited by Michel van Esbroeck; its dating to the early third century looks the most plausible<sup>25</sup>.

There are, moreover, another group of the sevenfold sanctuaries referring to Zion/Sion, albeit indirectly. This group presents the heavenly shrine and/or its principal earthly (even if sometimes imaginary) counterpart as having a sevenfold partition. Zion/Sion is concerned as far as it is *the* (only or principal) earthly sanctuary. One of the most known examples is presently the Qumranic *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (2<sup>nd</sup> cent. BC)—describing an angelic liturgy but clearly taking into account the rite of an earthly shrine—but there is a number of others. Elsewhere I have enumerated some examples<sup>26</sup>. One

---

10 Tishri fell on 9-10 September (from sunset to sunset) of 387: Wendy Pradels, Rudolf Brändle, Martin Heimgartner, "The Sequence and Dating of the Series of John Chrysostom's Eight Discourses *Adversus Iudaeos*", *ZAC* 6 (2002), 90-116.

<sup>23</sup> Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact of Yom Kippur...*, 299-300.

<sup>24</sup> Two other witnesses are Epiphanius of Salamis (*De mensibus et ponderibus*, 14) and Optatus of Mileve (*De schismate Donatistarum* III, 2). See an edition and analysis of all these three witnesses by F.-M. Abel in: Hugues Vincent, F.-M. Abel, *Jérusalem. Recherches de topographie, d'archéologie et d'histoire*. Tome II. *Jérusalem nouvelle*. Fasc. III. *La Sainte-Sion et les sanctuaires de second ordre* (Paris: Gabalda, 1922), 472-474.

<sup>25</sup> M. van Esbroeck, "Barsabée de Jérusalem, *Sur le Christ et les églises*. Introduction, édition du texte géorgien et traduction française", in: PO 41.3 (1982). Cf. B. Lourié, "Barsabas of Jerusalem, *On Christ and the Churches. Its Genre and Liturgical Contents*", *Philosophical-Theological Review* (Tbilisi; forthcoming; with full bibliography).

<sup>26</sup> B. Lourié, "Calendrical Implications in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*", *Revue biblique* 115 (2008), 245-265, here the excursus, 256-260. Among the examples are: (1) "the seven (not the unique!) clouds of the glory" accompanying the camp of Israel, according to several targums; Rafael Vicent, *La fiesta judía de las Cabañas (Sukkot). Interpretaciones midrásicas en la Biblia y en el judaísmo antiguo* (Estella: Editorial Verbo Divino, 1995), 196-203, demonstrated that the relevant tradition is not simply exegetical but also liturgical; (2) a Coptic magical incantation to Archangel Michael mentioning "the seven basins of the Church of the firstborn that is in the heaven" published by Angelus Kropp, *Der Lobpreis des Erzengels Michael (vormals P. Heidelberg Inv. Nr. 1686)* (Brussels: Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1966), 22/23 (German tr./txt), cf. my analysis in Lourié, *Calendrical...*, 259-260. Cf. also a cosmological and (indirectly but explicitly) liturgical parallel to "the seven clouds of the glory" in the opening midrash of the *Pesiqta de-Rav Kahana* (1:1) studied by Stéphane Verhelst, "Pesiqta de-Rav Kahana...", where the divine *Shekhina* draws back from the earth farer and farer seven times with each of seven human generations: this corresponds to the structure of seven concentric heavens and, therefore, to some kind of sevenfold heavenly sanctuary.

can add the monolithic church of the *Makarinoi* (“the Blessed Ones”) having seven altars (ἑπταστήρια)<sup>27</sup>. Such liturgical rearrangements were accompanied with a diffusion of the liturgical rites specific to different feasts, including the yearly rites of the Day of Atonement. This is why we see, e.g., in the *Epistles to the Hebrews*, the paschal sacrifice of Jesus treated as the sacrifice of both Pentecost (Covenant) and Day of Atonement<sup>28</sup>.

These sevenfold sanctuaries, in turn, imply a sevenfold liturgical calendar, that is, a calendar where either the whole liturgical year or its especially important part has, too, a sevenfold partition. Normally, this sevenfold structure is something more specific than a simple presence of the seven-day weekly cycle throughout the year. Thus, in the Qumranic *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* we see a 364-day liturgical year subdivided into four 13-week quarters. In *4 Ezra*, we have also a sevenfold liturgical cycle but covering only 33 days from the foundation of the Second Temple on 1.II (cf. 1 Esd 5:55) to the Pentecost falling on 4.III. A similar sevenfold period is implied in *2 Baruch*, but covering 31 days from the date of the postponed (second) Passover 14.II (cf. 2 Chr 30:15) to the Pentecost falling on 15.III. The two latter calendars are *a priori* interesting for us, because both of the corresponding apocalypses are referring to Zion<sup>29</sup>. A four-week pre-Pentecostal cycle based on the motives of *4 Ezra* is preserved in the *Liturgy of the Seventh Sabbath* of the Beta Israel (Falasha), where the implied day of the Pentecost is 4.III (the same as in *4 Ezra* and some other Second Temple Jewish liturgical sources). The *Liturgy of the Seventh Sabbath* is a liturgical text actually used by the Beta Israel, where the yearly cycle of seven pentecontad periods is preserved. However, the modern Beta Israel do not pay attention to the most of its original liturgical features which are recoverable from the text itself which, to my opinion, originated from some branch of the Second Temple Judaism<sup>30</sup>.

The various kinds of sevenfold liturgical space and time form the proper liturgical context where John II was preaching. Thus, his Yom Kippur is hardly the Yom Kippur of the rabbinic liturgical tradition. There is no wonder, therefore, that, for him, a rite involving the use of the propitiatory seems not to be performed only once a year.

## 5. The Liturgical Calendar of John II

### 5.1. An Overview

One can easily notice that each of the eight major topics of the eight subdivisions of Part Two has some correspondences in the Jerusalem calendrical traditions. Some of them are not specific to the fourth-century and later Jerusalem rite, some others are either specific or, at least, originated from the Jerusalem liturgy, even if subsequently having found their way to Constantinople and beyond. All of them are, moreover, historically related to the pentecontad calendar, as it will be seen from a more detailed review below.

The Table 1 includes the main topics of the eight subdivisions (“spheres”) of Part Two together with their calendrical parallels.

Table 1.

Sphere (§§)	Main Topics	Calendrical Correspondence	Date in the Jerusalem calendar (the commemorations accepted in non-Jerusalem calendars are marked with *)
-------------	-------------	----------------------------	---

<sup>27</sup> From a brief account on the *Makarinoi* preserved in Greek and Georgian; J. Rougé, *Expositio totius mundi et gentium. Introduction, texte critique, traduction, notes et commentaries* (SC 124; Paris: Cerf, 1966), 346-357 (critical edition of the Greek text with a French translation and reprint of the 1928 Z. Avalichivili’s French translation of the Georgian version). Cf. a short study of the liturgical space of the temple of the *Makarinoi* in B. M. Лурье, “Три Иерусалима Лалибелы. Интерпретация комплекса церквей Лалибелы в свете данных его Жумуя” [B. Lourié, “Three Jerusalems of Lalibela. An interpretation of the church complex at Lalibela in the light of the data of the *Life of Lalibāla*], *Warszawskie Studia Teologiczne* 13 (2000) (= *Miscellanea Aethiopica Reverendissimo Domino Stanislao Kur septuagenario professori illustrissimo, viro amplissimo ac doctissimo oblata*), 117-140, here 136-137.

<sup>28</sup> See Lourié, “Calendrical Implications...”, with further bibliography.

<sup>29</sup> S. on them B. Lourié, “The Calendar Implied in *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra*: Two Modifications of the One Scheme”, in: *Interpreting 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. International Studies*. Eds. G. Boccaccini and J. M. Zurawski (Library of Second Temple Studies, 87; London etc.: Bloomsbury, 2014), 124-137.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. B. Lourié, “A 364-Day Calendar Encapsulated in the *Liturgy of the Seventh Sabbath* of the Betā ʿĒsraʾel of Ethiopia”, in: *Studies in Ethiopian Languages, Literature, and History, Presented to Getatchew Haile by his Friends and Colleagues*. Ed. Adam C. McCollum (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz) (forthcoming).



I (27-33)	Angelic hosts, fire, heavens, heavenly tabernacles, Holy Spirit.	Pentecost.	*50 <sup>th</sup> day after the Easter.
II (34-40)	Church, her earthly leaders, apostles Peter, Paul, and John, prophets Ezekiel and Ezra.	Feast of the Apostles.	*50 <sup>th</sup> day after the Pentecost.
III (41-55)	Paradise, Tree of Life, Fall, True Vine, Christ...	Invention of the Chalice of the Last Supper.	3 July.
IV (56-61)	Ark of Shem and Noah.	Ark of the Covenant in Kiryat Yearim.	2 July.
V (62-65)	Abraham and Isaac, ointment of the stone (in Bethel) by Isaac.	Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.	21 August (in some documents in Georgian Isaac and Jacob are commemorated on the next day, 22 August).
VI (66-72)	Sinai, Moses, Tabernacle, fast.	Moses.	*4 September.
VII (73-84)	Temple of Solomon, the seven pillars of the Wisdom, the Chalice <sup>31</sup> of the Wisdom.	Encaenia of Martyrium and Anastasis.	*13 September.
VIII (85-97)	Holy of Holies, bridal upper room.	Encaenia of the Sion basilica, formerly the Olivet discourse.	*15 September.

Wheat is the nature of the feasts mentioned in the table above? We will discuss the data available on the corresponding Jerusalem celebrations according to the order of the “spheres” in John’s homily.

All the descriptions of these spheres contain, in one or other way, Temple or Tabernacle(s) symbolism, which is in conformity with the predominance of the Tabernacles motive in the festivity of 15 September (s. below, section 5.4). Nevertheless, each sphere contains recognisable liturgical symbols of its own.

## 5.2. Spheres from I to VII

**Sphere I.** The themes of the angelic hierarchies<sup>32</sup> and the structure of the heavens are not necessarily related to the Pentecost, but the context of different appearances of fire is more specific to the Sinai revelation or its repetition in the Sion upper chamber. There is, moreover, a direct reference to the Sinai revelation of the heavenly Tabernacle to Moses now repeated for Porphyry: “Or donc, ô (Porphyre), beauté de l’éther céleste, qui a adapté<sup>33</sup> les tabernacles célestes à la terre (որ զերկնային խորանն յերկրի զարդարեցեր)...” (§ 30, p. 293/118).

The Christian Pentecost is basically the homonymous Jewish feast (also called the feast of the Weeks) whose exact date was varying according to the different manners of counting the fiftieth day after the Passover/Easter. These details are not important for us now.

What is more important is the fact that its (alleged) Julian date has been often taken as 15 May (presuming 27 March as the “true” Julian date for the Easter<sup>34</sup>), the day of an important Christian feast in

<sup>31</sup> Not “chalices”, as van Esbroeck translates; s. below, section 5.2 (sphere VII), fn. 50.

<sup>32</sup> It is hardly accidental that the enumerated species of angels are seven: cherubim, seraphim, thrones, principalities, powers, dominions, and “les anges rassemblés par la lumière divine dans l’air igné” (§ 27, p. 293/117-118). On the seven angelic orders within the Sinai imagery, s., among others, Judith H. Newman, “Priestly Prophets at Qumran: Summoning Sinai through the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*”, in: *The Significance of Sinai. Traditions about Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity*. Eds. George J. Brooke, Hindy Najman and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (Themes in Biblical Narrative, 12; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 29-72, here 49-53.

<sup>33</sup> Michel van Esbroeck’s earlier Latin translation “qui... ornavisti” seems to me more exact.

<sup>34</sup> The most common presumption; cf. Alden A. Mosshammer, *The Easter Computus and the Origins of the Christian Era* (The Oxford early Christian studies series; Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008), 48-49 (25 March as the date of

the Early Christian Jerusalem going back to the date of the Pentecost 15.III according to the *Book of Jubilees*, the *Temple Scroll*, and the most of the known Second Temple Jewish 364-day calendars<sup>35</sup>. John's homily, nevertheless, has no particular features related to 15 May but is perfectly fitting with the (movable) Pentecost.

**Sphere II.** The sphere is dedicated to the heavenly Jerusalem where "...nous soyons Pierre, Paul, Jean, Ézéchiél, Esdras [պէտրոսանալ պաւղոսանալ յովհաննանալ եզէկիանալ եզրանալ, *lit. Petriniser, Pauliniser, Johanniser, Ezechieliser, Esdraiser*] dans la vertu, afin de devenir dignes du Verbe indicible (անճառ Բանին) par la médiation de ce saint Propitiatoire (§ 40, p. 295/119 and n. 83). Michel van Esbroeck noticed that these five figures residing in the Paradise are presented in a fresco of the church of Timotesubani (Շիմոթոյեշբանի) in Georgia (1205–1215), and the same iconographic programme could be hypothetically recovered from the fragments preserved in some other churches of the Byzantine commonwealth<sup>36</sup>. The three first figures from the five are the most prominent apostles, one of them, moreover, being the person who described this heavenly Jerusalem (Rev 21, quoted with mentioning his name in § 35 together with Paul's "city of the living God", Heb 12:22, p. 294/118). Ezekiel and Ezra are the Old Testament prophets whose visions are especially important for John: Ezra is the main precursor of the apostles being the principal link between them and Moses (s. above, fn. 14), whereas Ezekiel is important for both his vision of the eschatological Temple (mentioned in § 25, s. above, fn. 18) and the whole mystical tradition derived from his visions. Anyway, the second sphere is dedicated to the first three among the apostles, even though together with their predecessors in eschatological visions Ezekiel and Ezra (and, let us add, with a mention of Gregory of Nazianzus: § 37, p. 294/119; for John, he is his direct predecessor in the theological revelation about the Holy Trinity<sup>37</sup> and, therefore, the final link of the chain expanded from the prophets and the apostles to Porphyry and John himself).

The second Pentecost is known as the New Wine festival from the second-century BC *Temple Scroll*. This feast is preserved in some Christian traditions (as the feast of the Apostles in the Eastern Syrian rite and the extinguished Western Syrian rite of Tikrit<sup>38</sup>, the so-called *Vardavar* (Վարդավառ) in the Armenian rite<sup>39</sup> and formerly *Vardoba* (վարձօձ), then *At'enagenoba* (ատենացեմօձ) "St.

---

the Passion Friday, at least, in the Roman Church from the earliest time and in Cappadocia). 27 March + 49 days = 15 May.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Walter D. Ray, Christmas in May? The Early Jerusalem Commemoration of the Birth of Christ", in: *A View from a Bridge: in Honour of Annie Jaubert (1912–1980). II*. Eds. by Madeleine Petit et al. (forthcoming); cf. Verhelst, *La liturgie de Jérusalem...*, [77-78].

<sup>36</sup> van Esbroeck, "Jean II de Jérusalem...", 109 and 119, n. 84; he refers to Ekaterina Leonidovna Privalova's monograph: E. Л. Привалова, *Роспись Тимотеубани – La peinture murale de Timotesoubani* (Tbilisi: Мецниереба, 1980).

<sup>37</sup> On the role of Gregory the Theologian in the homily, s. van Esbroeck, "Jean II de Jérusalem...", 110.

<sup>38</sup> A. Baumstark, *Festbrevier und Kirchenjahr der syrischen Jakobiten. Eine liturgiegeschichtliche Verarbeitung auf Grund hslischer Studien in Jerusalem und Damaskus, der syrischen Hsskataloge von Berlin, Cambridge, London, Oxford, Paris und Rom und des unierten Mossuler Festbrevierdruckes* (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, III.3-5; Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1910 [reprint: Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2012]), 265-266.

<sup>39</sup> On the pre-sixth-century Jerusalem roots of the Armenian *Vardavar*, s. Charles Renoux, "La fête de la Transfiguration et le rite arménien", in: Mens concordet voci. *Pour Mgr A. G. Martimort à l'occasion de ses 40 années d'enseignement et des 20 ans de la Constitution "Sacrosanctum Concilium"* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1983), 652-662. I have elsewhere supposed that the etymology of this word is not from *vard* "rose", as Armenian hagiographical legends claim, but from its homonym having the meaning "magical word", "word of preaching" (cf. Armenian ecclesiastical title "vardapet"), with the second component *var* taken in its habitual meaning "burning, inflaming, on fire"; thus, the term refers to the initial point of apostles' preaching, the scene of the Pentecost in the Zion upper room: В. М. Лурье, "Три типа раннехристианского календаря и одно разночтение в тексте *Epistula Apostolorum*" [B. Lourié, "Three Types of the Early Christian Calendars and One Variant Reading in the Text of the *Epistula Apostolorum*"], in: *Традиции и наследие Христианского Востока. Материалы международной конференции*. Под ред. Д. Е. Афиногенова и А. В. Муравьева [*Traditions and the Legacy of the Christian Orient. Materials of the International Conference*. Eds. D. E. Afinogenov and A. V. Muraviev] (Moscow: Индрик, 1996), 256-320, here 315. Recently Étienne Nodet argued for the hypothesis that the scene described in Acts (s. esp. 2:13) implies the second Pentecost (the New Wine festival) and not the first one: É. Nodet, "On Jesus' Last Supper", *Biblica* 91 (2010), 348-369, here 365-367.



Athenagenos Day” in the Georgian rite<sup>40</sup>). In the most of the Christian traditions its movable date became fixed on 29 June in the epoch of Justinian, and the feast itself became limited to the commemoration of Peter and Paul (whereas, in the Byzantine rite, the next day became the Synaxis of the Twelve Apostles; in the Western Syrian rite the feast of 29 June is still dedicated to the Apostles, not specifically to Peter and Paul).

**Sphere III.** This sphere is also the Paradise. Mentioned are the Tree of Life and “the second Adam”, as well as the different righteous who entered the Paradise (in contrast with different evildoers who did not). The most prominent place in his speech the homilist dedicates to Enoch and Elijah—in the line of the Merkabah mysticism, of course: “...tu [*sc.*, Porphyre] as transité l’en-deça comme Hénoc, tu a été transporté sur le char de Dieu [շահատակեցար կառաւք Աստուծոյ] pareil à Élie...” (§ 44, p. 295/120); “...soyons transportés [շահատակեցուր մէք] dans le paradis par le moyen de la vertu et de l’amour comme Hénoc et Élie...” (§ 48, p. 296/120).

The prevailing imagery related to the state of the rightful in the Paradise is, however, quite specific: many times they are compared with trees, and especially the “tree of vine”, clearly in the context of the Fall and the Redemption: Porphyry “...as planté le paradis de Dieu sur cette terre et la vraie vigne (զճշմարիտ զորքն) et a pressé la treille [խաղողն “grapes”. — *B. L.*] divine du Christ en chevauchant l’univers” (§ 43, p. 295/119); “Venez donc, ô enfants du Christ... tranchez les racines de cette chair...” (follows a list of nine sins with their precedents, mostly biblical; §§ 45-48, p. 295-296/120); “...plantons-nous dans la vraie vigne, le Christ...” (what follow are the biblical quotations comparing the rightful with different trees: Pss 91:13; 103:16; 95:12; 1:3; 51:10; Mt 3:10; §§ 49-51, p. 296/120); “...soyons la vigne de Sorek (որթ սորեակս) [Is 5:2], de tous côtés entourée d’une haute haie, ayant planté le vignoble (այգի) digne de Dieu [Is 5:2]. En t’entourant l’esprit de la haie de l’Esprit-Saint, ne laisse pas aux renards l’occasion d’entrer dans ton vignoble (այգի) [Lam 3:15]...” (§§ 52-53, p. 297/120).

The contrast between the evil roots and the good trees<sup>41</sup>, especially the “true” tree of vine, evokes the imagery of the Fall and the Redemption as primarily related to the two trees of vines: the true one which is Christ implanted in the Paradise instead of the previous one, the habitual tree of vine, implanted, also in the Paradise, by Satan. This imagery is known especially by the Syriac and Greek-Slavonic apocalypses of Baruch (2 *Baruch* 36; 3 *Baruch* 4-5). The topic of the Second Temple Jewish feast of New Wine is explicit. In the Christian Jerusalem liturgical calendar one has to recall the feast of the Chalice.

The Invention of the Chalice (of Jesus’ Last Supper) is known only from Georgian documents, always on 3 July<sup>42</sup>. This feast is clearly nothing but the fixed Julian date for the second Pentecost: 15 May (the Julian date for the Pentecost corresponding to the Easter on 27 March) plus 49 days results in 3 July. This date corresponds to the date of the New Wine festival (3.V) in the *Temple Scroll* (this means that it is the date of the second Pentecost according to all 364-day calendars where the date of the first Pentecost is 15.III). Connotations of the New Wine festival are clearly preserved in John’s homily, especially in comparison with its 3 *Maccabees*’s avatar, where the feast is called “Chalice of Salvation” (3 Mac 6:31: κώθωνα σωτήριον)<sup>43</sup>.

<sup>40</sup> Тамил Г. Мгалоблишвили, “Древнейший праздник «Vardoba» – «Athenagenoba»”, *Православный Палестинский сборник* 98 (35) (1998) [Tamila G. Mgaloblishvili, “The Earliest Festival *Vardoba* – *Athenagenoba*”, *The Orthodox Palestinian Periodical* 98 (35) (1998)], 115-121.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. also the final exhortation: “...que nous quitions cette Égypte de la chair, en nous insérant comme une branche dans les cèdres de Dieu, portons des fruits dans les sentiers angéliques, afin de devenir dignes du jardin d’Éden par la médiation de ce saint Propitiatoire” (§§ 54-55, p. 297/121).

<sup>42</sup> On this feast known from different Jerusalem sources but only in Georgian, s. Gérard Garitte, *Le calendrier palestino-géorgien du Sinaiticus 34 (X<sup>e</sup> siècle)* (SH 30; Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1958), 268-269. Garitte’s supposition that this feast could have been established in commemoration of a (hypothetical) reinvention of the Chalice after the Persian invasion of 614 of the Chalice—previously known as preserved in either within the Martyrium or somewhere near the Martyrium—is untenable, because it forms a part of the long liturgical cycle traceable back to the Second Temple Jewish pentecontad calendars. Cf. also Stéphane Verhelst, *Le Lectionnaire de Jérusalem. Ses traditions judéo-chrétiennes et son histoire, suivant l’index des péricopes évangéliques, conclu par le sanctoral du Sin.* Géo. 58 Novus (Spicilegii Friburgensis Subsidia, 26; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2012), 144-145: against Garitte’s hypothesis but supposing that the Chalice was originally deposed at the place of the *statio* of 3 July, some church called “foundation of John”: “...il faut donc supposer que le motif de l’invention du calice remonte à la fondation de l’endroit” (p. 145). I have nothing to add about the place, but the feast itself is perfectly recognisable from the Jewish pentecontad calendars with their feast of New Wine.

<sup>43</sup> B. Lourié, “3 *Maccabees* and Its Liturgical Calendar” (forthcoming).

**Sphere IV.** This description is dedicated to “the Ark (տապան) of Shem and Noah” (§ 56, p. 297/121) and contains clearly liturgical overtones, especially striking in the treatment of the black raven from Gen 8:7 as representing “the volatiles of the holocaust (ողջակիկացն թռչունք)” (§ 57, p. 297/121). In the Jerusalem liturgical calendar this imagery recalls the commemoration of another ark in Kiryat Yearim.

The Ark of the Covenant in Kiryat Yearim was celebrated, according to all evidence, on 2 July<sup>44</sup>, that is, before the feast of the Chalice. The feast of the Ark acquired, in the middle of the fifth century, an additional Marian meaning, when the funeral of the New Ark of the Covenant, Theotokos, started to be celebrated in Gethsemane. This new feast of the Mary’s robe (initially, of her funeral shroud) has been accepted by the rite of Constantinople. Finally, the commemoration of the Chalcedonian Patriarch of Jerusalem Juvenal († 458), whose month and day of the death are unknown, was added to the same Marian feast—evidently, because of his military seizure of the Gethsemane Marian shrine from the hands of the adherents of the anti-Chalcedonian Patriarch of Jerusalem Theodosius in the summer of 452<sup>45</sup>.

The sequence of the two feasts, that of the Ark and that of the Chalice, which is preserved in all other documents than our homily, is certainly original. It roughly corresponds to the Second Temple Jewish calendars where the second Pentecost has been preceded (within a short period of no more than ten days) with a celebration of the Summer Solstice<sup>46</sup>. The central imagery of this celebration has been established on the idea of the chariot of the Sun reconsidered in the line of the *Merkabah* mysticism. Within such imagery the difference between the Ark of Noah and the Ark of the Covenant would have disappeared and so, the difference between the former in our homily and the latter in the Jerusalem calendar does not create a problem. The real difficulty is the consequence of the “spheres” in our homily: the Ark *after* the Chalice and not *vice versa*. I have no explanation for this calendrical deviation.

**Sphere V.** The central imagery here is the *Aqedah* allowing to introduce together Abraham and Isaac and, then, the unction of the stone in Bethel by Isaac (§§ 62-65, p. 298/121-122). These acts are interpreted as “only an image” of the priesthood of Christ that became accessible to us<sup>47</sup> (van Esbroeck notices that John’s exhortation as addressed primarily to the priests<sup>48</sup>) according to the order of Melchizedek. The themes of Abraham and Isaac and the unction joined together have also a precise equivalent in the Jerusalem liturgical calendar.

21 August is clearly the fixed Julian date for the third Pentecost (ancient New Oil festival): 3.V plus 49 days results in 21.VI (providing that the fifth month is the Julian month July containing 31 days).

---

<sup>44</sup> On this feast attested to in the almost totality of the sources representing the Jerusalem liturgy in Armenian and in Georgian, s. Renoux, “Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121”, II, 212/213-214/215 (txt/tr.); Garitte, *Le calendrier...*, 267. I am grateful to Bernard Outtier who attired my attention to the Armenian part of the dossier, which encompasses as well later Armenian homeliaries (ճառքնսոյիք), e.g., Bibl. nationale de France, ms. Arm. 110, n° XLIX (Outtier’s example). Cf. also Verhelst, *Le Lectionnaire...*, 78: Verhelst acknowledges the pre-fourth-century date of the feast but supposes that it originated from some (probably Ebionite) Jewish-Christian polemics against the sacrifices and the temple of the Jews (“...car l’Arche a disparu dans le temple post-exilique”). Judging from the function of the Ark/Golden (Sun’s) Chariot in the calendars of such Second Temple Jewish texts as *3 Baruch* and *Joseph and Aseneth*, where its appearance marks a liturgical celebration of the Summer Solstice (cf. below, fn. 46), we have to consider our Christian feast of the Ark (that during its staying at Kiryat Yearim still remained on its chariot!) as ultimately Jewish (and, consequently, its original polemical connotations as belonging to intra-Jewish polemics of the Second Temple period).

<sup>45</sup> B. Lourié, “L’*Histoire Euthymiaque* : l’œuvre du patriarche Euthymios/Euphemos de Constantinople (490–496, † 515)”, *Warszawskie Studia Teologiczne* 20.2 (2007) [Miscellanea Patristica Reverendissimo Domino Marco Starowieyski septuagenario professori illustrissimo viro amplissimo ac doctissimo oblata], 189-221. This paper is heavily depending on previous studies by M. van Esbroeck but contains some corrections to his reconstruction of the events of the 450s.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. the calendars of *3 Baruch*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham* [both analysed in B. Lourié, “Cosmology and Liturgical Calendar in *3 Baruch* and Their Mesopotamian Background”, in: *H. Gaylord Memorial Volume* (provisional title). Eds. Alexander Kulik and Andrei Orlov (Studia Judaeslavica; Leiden: Brill) (forthcoming)], the *Joseph and Aseneth* [cf. B. Lourié, “The Liturgical Calendar in the *Joseph and Aseneth*”, in: *Men and Women in the Early Christian Centuries*. Eds. Wendy Mayer and Ian J. Elmer (Early Christian Studies, 18; Strathfield, Australia: St Pauls Publications, 2014), 111-134], *3 Maccabees* [cf. Lourié, “*3 Maccabees...*”].

<sup>47</sup> “O prêtres du Christ, soyons les imitateurs du Fils de Dieu par le sacerdoce de Melchisédech” (Ովք քահանայք Քրիստոսի լիցուք նմանողք Որդւոյն Աստուծոյ Մելքիսեդեկեան քահանայութեամբ; § 64, p. 298/121).

<sup>48</sup> van Esbroeck, “Jean II de Jérusalem...”, 121, n. 93.

The symbolism of the number 21 ( $= 7 \times 3$ ) was, in the fourth century, still important for the commemoration of Abraham, as it is witnessed by Gregory of Nazianzus in his sermon on the Pentecost<sup>49</sup>.

The corresponding date of the *Temple Scroll* is 22.VI, because the fifth month in the most of the 364-day calendars (including those of the *Temple Scroll* and the *Jubilees*) contains only 30 and not 31 days. In Christian Jerusalem, however, 22 August was the commemoration of Isaac, whose anointment of the stone in Bethel (a topic related to the New Oil festival) constitutes the principal commemoration of the feast even according to the homily by John II<sup>50</sup>.

It seems that both 21 and 22 August were reflecting, the early Jerusalem Christian liturgy, the same early Christian avatar of the ancient Jewish New Oil festival. Such a “dissociation” of the unique feast resulted from the two conflicting traditions of “translation” between the calendars (in our case, from some 364-day per year Jewish Second Temple calendar to the Julian calendar): an ancient tradition to preserve the ordinal numbers of the days within the roughly identified months and a more sophisticated tradition of preserving the mathematical relations between the dates within the liturgical cycles. We have already seen the same phenomenon in the similar “dissociation” of the second Pentecost into the movable feast and the fixed feast on 3 July (there were no movable feasts within the 364-day calendrical schemes and, therefore, the mathematical relations between the feasts and their fixed dates were equally important).

**Sphere VI.** The description of this sphere is dedicated exclusively to the vision of the heavenly Tabernacle by Moses on Sinai. The objects that were subsequently presented in the Tabernacle of Moses are enumerated in great detail.

Moses is commemorated in the Christian Jerusalem calendar on 4 September (in the Constantinopolitan rite as well)<sup>51</sup>. John mentions him in different contexts including the context of fasting (referring to the 40-day Moses’ fast on Sinai, Ex 24:18; § 71, p. 300/122), thus certainly alluding to the Jewish tradition of one-day fasting during the period of Tishri before the Yom Kippur. The normal date of this fast is 3.VII. Dedication of this one-day fast to Gedaliah (2 Kgs 25:25-26 and Jer 41) is a phenomenon of Talmudic times, whereas the fast itself is much earlier (most probably, going back to the Hasmonean epoch<sup>52</sup>).

<sup>49</sup> “I perceive that Enoch, the seventh among our ancestors (Jud 14), was honoured by translation. I perceive also that the twenty-first, Abraham, was given the glory of the Patriarchate, by the addition of a greater mystery. For the Hebdomad thrice repeated brings out this number. And one who is very bold might venture even to come to the New Adam, my God and Lord Jesus Christ, Who is counted the Seventy-seventh from the old Adam who fell under sin, in the backward genealogy according to Luke (3:34)” [*Oration* 41, 4; Claudio Moreschini, Grégoire de Nazianze, *Discours 38-41. Introduction, texte critique et notes* (SC 358; Paris: Cerf, 1990), 320; cf. p. 321, fn. 2 on the calculation of the ordinal number of Abraham from Gen 5:3-30, 10:21-24, and 13:10-27; English tr. by Ch. G. Browne and J. E. Swallow in: *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2nd Series, vol. 7 (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1894; revised and edited for New Advent by Kevin Knight <<http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/310241.htm>>].

<sup>50</sup> The sphere V is the only exception where the propitiatory is not mentioned but, instead, the homilist mentions some “holy unction of the stone”: “...en bénissant le nom du Seigneur par le moyen de la sainte onction de la pierre que voici” (աւրհնելով զանուն Տէառն ի ձեռն տուրբ աւծեալ վիմիս այս, § 65, p. 298/122; I have added the word “sainte” as a rendering of տուրբ that van Esbroeck seems to overlook in the two his translations). This phrase corresponds to the refrain that ends the descriptions of the spheres from I to IV and VII: “...par la médiation de ce saint Propitiatoire” (բարեխաւտութեամբ տուրբ քալարանիս), §§ 33, 40, 55, 61, 84, p. 294/118, 295/119, 297/121, 298/121, 302/124. The description of the sphere VIII mentions the propitiatory in another manner, whereas that of the sphere VI does not mention the propitiatory nor any equivalent at all (one can thus suppose that the original ending of this description is lost). Michel van Esbroeck considered this anointed stone as “l’élément fondateur de l’église” (van Esbroeck, “Jean II de Jérusalem...”, 122, n. 94. I argued elsewhere (in the two articles mentioned above, fn. 15) that the stony chalice-propitiatory was identified with the *Eben Shatya* (“the cornerstone”) that replaced the Ark of the Covenant in the Holy of Holies according to some Second Temple traditions. I think therefore that this “stone” is another name for the same propitiatory, whereas van Esbroeck was right in his understanding of this object as “l’élément fondateur”.

<sup>51</sup> Garitte, *Le calendrier...*, 322. Cf. also the commemoration of the Departure of Moses in the Copto-Ethiopic calendar on 8 Tut / Mäskäräm = 5 September (Julian).

<sup>52</sup> It is prescribed already in the *Megillat Ta’anit* (ca 100 CE) but with the rationale whose exact meaning is now undecipherable: “On the third of Tishri the mention (אֲדָכְרָתָא) was removed [variant reading nullified] from the documents (שְׂטָרָא)”; Vered Noam, “Megillat Taanit – The Scroll of Fasting”, in: *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud*. Vol. 3: *The Literature of the Sages*. Part 1. Eds. Shmuel Safrai et al. (Compendia rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, section 2; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 339-362, here 341 (txt), 343 (tr.), cf. 345, fn. 45: “The precise nature of the event is unclear”. Nevertheless, Vered Noam follows those

John II elaborates on this commemoration of Moses but ignores the proper context of this commemoration in the Jerusalem liturgical tradition—or, better, in a Jerusalem liturgical tradition that could be earlier than his own attempt to expropriate from it the commemoration of Moses but reject the commemorations of Elijah (and Elisha) and that of Yom Kippur on 10 September. This tradition needs to be sketched in a separate excursus (s. below, section 5.3).

**Sphere VII.** The imagery of this sphere is clearly focused on the Temple. The vocabulary is mostly explicit but several terms need a clarification. The sphere as a whole is called “la tour et la maison porteuse du voile [Sir 50:5, *sc.*, the Holy of Holies. — B. L.], l’autel et la colonne des églises” (աշտարակ և տուն արահաւորս սեղան [= θυσιαστήριον] սիւն եկեղեցից; § 72, p. 300/123). The words “tower” (աշտարակ = πύργος) and “pillar” (սիւն = στύλος) are used by John in its Second Temple Jewish and early Christian meaning of “temple”<sup>53</sup>. The Armenian word խառնելի/խառնելիք (singular/plural, derived from the verb խառնել “to mix”, analogous to Greek κρατήρ) could be used in the plural form also for singular “chalice”. Given that the whole passage (as van Esbroeck himself noticed) is a paraphrase of Prov 9:1-2 (the Wisdom calling to her house for her chalice filled with the wine)<sup>54</sup>, I would propose to translate here “chalice” in singular.

The dedication of the church complex of Martyrium and Anastasis built by Constantine took place, in 335, on either September 17 (thus according to the seventh-century *Chronicon Paschale*, which preserves, sometimes, archaic Christian traditions) or, most probably, September 13 (thus according to the whole liturgical tradition, whose witnesses, however, are not earlier than 383 or 384, the date of Egeria’s description<sup>55</sup>). Anyway, to the time of John II, the tradition of the celebration on 13 September has been certainly established. Egeria herself explained the date 13 September as that of the dedication of the Temple of Solomon according to 2 Chr 7:8-10 (cf. 1 Kgs 8:65-66)<sup>56</sup>, but she—or rather her guides—is certainly wrong: the counting of 2 Chr 7:8-10 implies 14 days before 23.VII (excluding this day), which leads to 9.VII as the first day of the festival of Dedication<sup>57</sup>.

Egeria’s witness is important, nevertheless, as that of understanding of the Constantine’s church complex as a New Temple of Solomon. This identification goes back to the epoch of Constantine<sup>58</sup> and is emphasised as well in the relevant part of the homily by John II.

---

previous scholars who, in agreement with the mediaeval Jewish Scholiast, dated this fast to the Hasmonean period. For a different dating (to the second Jewish War against the Romans), s. Solomon Zeitlin, *Megillat Taanit as a Source for Jewish Chronology and History in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Philadelphia: Oxford UP, 1922), 97-100.

<sup>53</sup> Лурье, “Три Иерусалима Лалибелы...”, 164-165, fn. 66. Cf. also “Voici la tour fondée à Thalpiôth avec un millier de boucliers suspendus [Cant 4:4]” (§ 73, p. 300/123).

<sup>54</sup> “Voici la vraie colonne à sept bases sur laquelle les sages s’appuient [Prov 9:1], en réjouissant ceux qui sont appelés avec amour aux coupes [*to correct to* à la coupe. — B. L.] [Prov 9:2]...” (Ահա ճշմարիտ սիւն և շօնախարիսիւք [from կօն “seven” and խարիսիւ = βάρεις] յորում իմաստութիւնքն կանգնին, ուրախ առնելով զսիրով կոչեցեալսն ի խառնելիսն; § 75, p. 300/123). The wording of the Zohrab Bible is different but with the same usage of plural (ի խառնելիս) in the meaning of singular: կանգնեաց սիւնս եւրն “she has set up seven pillars”; խառնեաց ի խառնելիս զգինի իւր “she mixed her wine in the chalice [*lit.* chalices]”.

<sup>55</sup> The date 17 September could not be discarded as easy as Fraser and some other scholars do: “The date given by the *Chronicon Paschale* would appear to be a date given in error for the Egyptian date of 17 Thout, the day on which the Coptic church celebrates the finding of the Cross” (Fraser, “Constantine and Encaenia”, 25). The Copto-Ethiopian calendar provides commemoration of the Encaenia on the right date, 16 Tut = 13 September, whereas the feast of the Cross on 17 Tut is the feast of Exaltation of the Cross on 14 September. The source of the peculiar date provided by the *Chronicon Paschale* remains still unknown. A recent defence of 17 September as the historical date is proposed by Stéphane Verhelst, *La liturgie...*, [178-180]. To him, the existence of the Jupiter Capitolinus feast on 13 September would have prevented the Encaenia on the same day; I would think rather in the opposite direction (s. below). Be that as it may, it does not affect our analysis of John’s homily.

<sup>56</sup> Egeria, *Itinerarium* 48:2: “Et hoc per Scripturas sanctas inuenitur, quod ea dies sit encenarum, qua et sanctus Salomon consummata domo Dei, quam edificauerat, steterit ante altarium Dei et orauerit, sicut scriptum est in libris Paralipomenon”; Pierre Maraval, Égérie, *Journal de Voyage (Itinéraire)* (SC 296; Paris: Cerf, 1982), 316.

<sup>57</sup> Egeria certainly does not have in mind the contemporaneous Jewish Rabbinic lunisolar calendar whose date 9 Tishri would have not coincided each year with the same day of the Julian calendar. She implies that the correspondences between her familiar Julian dates and the biblical ones are fixed.

<sup>58</sup> S. a useful review of the relevant data in Louis van Tongeren, *Exaltation of the Cross: toward the origins of the Feast of the Cross and the meaning of the Cross in the early medieval liturgy* (Liturgia condenda, 11; Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 31-32.

The choice of 13 September (or even 17 September) instead of the “scriptural” date (9 September)<sup>59</sup> has broken all Jewish and Christian calendrical schemes. Probably, it was chosen by Constantine himself due to his specific ideas of absorbing principal Roman cults into Christianity: September 13, or Ides of September was the festal day of Jupiter Capitolinus whose temple or, at least, a statue (viz. a shrine) was erected by Emperor Hadrian on the place of the future Anastasis<sup>60</sup>. Anyway, 13 September becomes the first date of an important—not to say, principal—celebration, that has no historical connexion to any Jewish calendar at all.

As Stéphane Verhelst noticed, it was John II who rearranged the two-day festival of the common Encaenia of both Anastasis and Martyrium in comparison with the previously existing order described by Egeria. Egeria indicated both stations of 13 and 14 September in the Martyrium, whereas already in 393 the first day was celebrated in the Anastasis (and, then, both Armenian and Georgian sources prescribe the same order)<sup>61</sup>. This change was a prerequisite for formation of the future feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross as a separate, whereas (before the seventh cent.) no more than “accompanying” feast (Baumstark’s term *Begleitfest*) of the Encaenia. Being only a *Begleitfest*, the feast of the Cross is not emphasised in John’s homily<sup>62</sup>, whereas it is present behind the scenes, because the direct addressee of the homily is the *staurophylax* Porphyry.

I would consider this step as aiming at “Christianisation” of the earlier non-Christian calendrical initiative of Constantine. The sequence of the Encaenia of the Anastasis on 13 September and a clearly distinct *Begleitfest* in the Martyrium on the next day would have recalled the sequence of 2 Chr 7:8-10 where the dedication of the Temple of Solomon was appointed on the eve of the Yom Kippur—thus, as a *Begleitfest* of the latter. In John’s calendar, the order of the principal feast and its *Begleitfest* became reversed, and their dates shifted. Thus, the resulting “Christianisation” of the calendrical dates was less than perfect.

Nevertheless, for John, the main September date is fifteen that refers to the feast of Tabernacles (Sukkot). Our present knowledge of the Second Temple Jewish calendars is not sufficient for a proper discussion of the Jewish “matrix” of John’s calendrical decision. We only know that the feasts of 10 and 15 Tishri, Yom Kippur and Sukkot, were interfering with each other—in different ways in different particular traditions—both having absorbed as well the topics related to the dedication of the Temple / Tabernacle<sup>63</sup>. At least, we should be sure that there were Jewish calendrical traditions that reached John II through some Christian milieux, where the Tishri/September feasts were culminating on the middle of the month, its fifteenth day.

### 5.3. Excursus: Elijah and Moses as the precursors of the Day of Judgment / Yom Kippur on 10 September.

In the Second Temple period, the number of the preparatory days together with the Day of Atonement itself was either ten or eight. This period was interpreted, moreover, as the multi-day consecration feast of the second

<sup>59</sup> That is, the date presuming the identification of Tishri with September.

<sup>60</sup> As it was first pointed out by Dom Ildephonse Herwegen (the abbot of the Maria Laach) to Anton Baumstark and first published by the latter (in 1927); cf. A. Baumstark, *Liturgie comparée. Principes et Méthodes pour l'étude historique des liturgies chrétiennes*, 3<sup>e</sup> éd. revue par Bernard Botte (Coll. Irénikon; Chevetogne: Éditions de Chevetogne, 1953), 203. Now this is rather a common opinion. Cf. Constantine’s syncretism in Constantinople: Vasiliki Limberis, *Divine Heiress: The Virgin Mary and Making of Christian Constantinople* (London—New York: Routledge, 1994).

<sup>61</sup> Verhelst, *La liturgie*..., [180], esp. fn. 826.

<sup>62</sup> Cf., however, the Good Thief imagery applied to Porphyry (§ 44, p. 295/120) and referring to the famous episode of Porphyry’s life, his vision of the crucified Christ and his healing from the Good Thief; s. van Ebroeck’s analysis, “Jean II de Jérusalem...”, 109-110. The context is, however, not the sphere VII (Encaenia) but the sphere III (New Wine), that is, implying a contrast between the two trees, that of perdition (vine) and that of salvation (Cross).

<sup>63</sup> Oddly enough, van Goudoever’s 1959 review of the data [Jan van Goudoever, *Biblical Calendars* (Leiden: Brill, 1959), 36-44], even though belonging *de facto* to the pre-Qumranic epoch of scholarship, continues to be the clearest introduction to the relevant calendrical traditions. Of course, more recent studies would add a lot of details; s. esp. Vicent, *La fiesta judía de las Cabañas...* and Håkan Ulfsgård, *The Story of Sukkot. The Setting, Shaping, and Sequel of the Biblical Feast of Tabernacles* (Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese, 34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

temple (eight days in *3 Baruch* but ten days in *4 Baruch* = *Paraleipomena Ieremiae*)<sup>64</sup>. In these cases, Yom Kippur has absorbed the symbolism of Sukkot (that of the heavenly Temple/Tabernacle) and became the final festival of the Tishri period. Thus, *3 Baruch* did certainly not imply any continuation of its final Yom Kippur/heavenly Temple feast.

The eight-day preparatory period required 3.VII as an especially marked day, regardless of the specific interpretation of this day, which was variable according to different traditions (possibly not connected to a fast, as, e.g., in *3 Baruch*).

The appearance of Moses on 4 September in the Jerusalem calendar becomes more understandable in a larger context, where Moses turns out to be accompanied by Elijah. In the Jerusalem calendar, the historical Tishri cycle is represented with the New Year festival properly (1 September)<sup>65</sup>, a commemoration of Elisha (2 September, peculiar to the Jerusalem rite and attested to in Georgian only)<sup>66</sup>, a commemoration of the ascension of Elijah (3 September, also peculiar to Jerusalem and only in Georgian)<sup>67</sup>, Moses (4 September), holy martyr Barypsab(b)a(s)/Baripsab(b)a(s) on 10 September<sup>68</sup>, whose hagiographical dossier is poorly preserved and not sufficiently studied so far<sup>69</sup> but is obviously alluding to the Yom Kippur topics<sup>70</sup>, and, finally, the commemorations of the eight-day cycle of the Encaenia of the Anastasis (13 September), including the third day of this cycle, the Encaenia of the Sion church on 15 September.

The name of Baripsabas seems to be derived from the name of the heavenly High Priest (sometimes, rather a divine than angelic figure) preserved in Ethiopic as Bərsəbaḥel (ብርሰባሐል :). According to the *Liturgy of the Seventh Sabbath* (that I consider to be a Second Temple period Jewish text preserved by the Beta Israel (Falasha) liturgical tradition), he serves within the heavenly sanctuary on Yom Kippur and closely related celebrations<sup>71</sup>. The name Bərsəbaḥel is certainly Aramaic, and its spelling in different Ethiopic sources is rather stable. There is no such Aramaic root as *sbh*, but, in Ethiopic, ስ normally renders Semitic *ś* as well<sup>72</sup>. Thus, the Aramaic form of the name is recoverable as Bar Šubḥa'el (בר שְׁבַחֵאֵל) “Son of the Glory/Praise of God”. It would be reasonable to consider this

<sup>64</sup> Lourié, *Cosmology...* A useful review of biblical data concerning both seven- and nine-day periods before 10.VII and their connexion to the dedication of the Temple is provided by van Goudoever, *Biblical Calendars*, 36-44.

<sup>65</sup> Garitte, *Le calendrier...*, 319.

<sup>66</sup> Garitte, *Le calendrier...*, 320.

<sup>67</sup> Garitte, *Le calendrier...*, 321.

<sup>68</sup> Garitte, *Le calendrier...*, 326-327. No such name in the four volumes of Tal Ilan, *Lexicon of the Jewish Names in Late Antiquity*, Parts I–IV (Texts and studies in ancient Judaism, 91, 148, 126, 141; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002, 2012, 2008, 2011). The name would look not so anomalous, were it spelled \*Βαριξαβ(β)α(ς), that is if the two components of this name were *Barikh* (ברִיךְ) “blessed” and *Saba* (סבא) “elder”, both rather common for Jewish names (two-component names with the first element *Barikh* were common in the Babylonian diaspora only: Ilan, *Lexicon...*, IV, 339-340), even though not attested to when joined together.

<sup>69</sup> Its main elements are preserved in Greek: a late, albeit pre-Metaphrastic long recension of the *Life* in the unique and defective manuscript *Vat. gr. 1589 (BHG 238)*, several synaxarium entries (including that of the *Menologion* of Basil II provided with an illumination presenting his martyrdom), and several 9<sup>th</sup>-cent. hymnographical works. Cf. O. H. Заец, “Варипсав” [O. N. Zaets, “Varipsav”], in *Православная энциклопедия* [*The Orthodox Encyclopaedia*], vol. 6 (Moscow: «Православная энциклопедия», 2003), 574-575 (to my knowledge, this reference entry is the most complete). An important review of several evidences together with the only edition of *BHG 238* is provided by J[oaannes] S[tiltingus] in the *Acta Sanctorum Septembris*, t. III (Antwerp: Bernardus Albertus vander Plassche, 1750), cols. 494-501. Different accounts on the saint are far from being perfectly compatible, which reveals behind them a long and ramified tradition.

<sup>70</sup> Baripsabas has preserved a pumpkin with the blood and the water shed by Jesus on the cross; this blood have been performing healings; he was killed by the robbers who planned to take off the pumpkin but it turned out to be void. The following Byzantine verses introducing the synaxarium notice in the printed Greek *menaia* explain the symbolism: Βαρυσαβᾶς δι' αἷμα θεῖον Δεσπότης / Εἰκεῖον αἷμα, συντριβείς ξύλοις, χέει “Barypsabas, for the divine blood of the Lord, / Sheds his own blood after having been crushed with woods [*sc.*, wooden sticks]” alluding, through a wordplay, to “the wood of cross” also often called “wood (ξύλον)” in Byzantium. Baripsabas imitates Christ in shedding his own blood on the wood. It is a development of the classical Christian imagery of the wooden cross as a wooden Ark of the Covenant with the sacrificial blood poured on it; cf. Stephan Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross was found. From Event to Medieval Legend. With an Appendix of Texts* (Bibliotheca theologiae practicae. Kyrkonveenskapliga studier, 47; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell Int., 1991), 173-178; Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact of Yom Kippur...*, 290-328, but with no reference to Baripsabas. Cf. also Georg Mayer, “Parzival und der Hl. Varipsava. Zur Vorgeschichte der mittelalterlichen Gralsdichtungen”, in: *Slawistische Studien zum V. Internationalen Slawistenkongress in Sofia*. Eds. Maximilian Braun and Erwin Koschmieder. Redaktion Irmgard Mahnken (Opera slavica, 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 319-341.

<sup>71</sup> Lourié, “A 364-Day Calendar Encapsulated in the *Liturgy of the Seventh Sabbath...*”, esp. an excursus dedicated to “Bərsəbaḥel, a Divine Priest”. This figure appears, in Ethiopia, in the Christian tradition as well.

<sup>72</sup> August Dillmann, *Ethiopic Grammar*. Revised by Carl Bezold, transl. with additions James A. Crichton (London: Williams and Norgate, 1907) [repr.: Eugen, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2005], 63-64.



name to be the common source of the names of both Baripsabas and Barsabas (the alleged author of the third-century Jerusalem sermon *On Christ and the Churches* preserved in Georgian). The most important for our purpose is the fact that there is a Second Temple Jewish (and, most probably, Palestinian) tradition where Bərsəbaḥel (Bar Šubḥa'el) serves at Yom Kippur. This fact is quite enough to explain the appearance of Baripsabas on 10 September.

The Synaxarium of Constantinople mentions the custom of *proskynesis* to the Holy Cross in the church of St. Sophia from September 10 to 13, before the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross on September 14<sup>73</sup>. Such a respect to the ordinal number of the day of Yom Kippur, 10, would suggest that this custom goes back to Jerusalem, together with the custom of *proskynesis* to the Holy Cross itself.

All the above reveals liturgical traditions related to both eschatological Judgement (Yom Kippur) and the Transfiguration of Jesus and, therefore, explains the appearance of Moses and Elijah next to each other. The commemoration of the Transfiguration of Christ on 6 August is a relatively early tradition (going back to, at least, the late fourth century) but originated in the Church of Antioch<sup>74</sup> and, therefore, having nothing to do with the early Jerusalem calendar.

Let us begin with Elijah and Moses as an eschatological pair appearing before the Day of Judgment, mentioned explicitly in Malachi (3:22-24; cf. 3:1) and implicitly in the Revelation of John (the “two witnesses” in Rev 11:1-13). This identification of the two witnesses of the Revelation is an early (most probably, authentic for the Apocalypse of John) tradition, unlike the alternative identification of the two as Elijah and Enoch<sup>75</sup>. John II, however, certainly follows the latter: he avoids any mention of Elijah together with Moses but, in the sphere III, elaborates on the pair of Enoch and Elijah (§§ 44 and 48, p. 295-296/120).

The exegetical tradition of eschatological coming of Elijah and Moses is not well preserved, even though its official status in the thirteenth–sixteenth-century Northern Ethiopia would suggest its high reputation, at least, in some part of the late antique Christian world<sup>76</sup>. No wonder, if this part turns out to be Jerusalem. One can add, as an indirect but important witness of the earthly Jerusalem, the heavenly and eschatological Jerusalem as depicted in the mosaic on the triumphal ark of the St. Praxedes basilica in Rome (created under Pope Paschal I, between 817 and 824): there, Christ is flanked, among others, with two symmetrically positioned figures of Moses and Elijah, and the latter is accompanied with the angel of Mal 3:1; such a composition is not sufficiently explainable with a reference to the Transfiguration scene<sup>77</sup>. Another important parallel is the East Syrian (“Nestorian”) liturgical year where an earlier seven-pentecontad structure is still traceable, and the liturgical year still contains 364 days. The main seven periods of the year (called “weeks”) are the following: Lent, Pentecost, followed with the “weeks” of Apostles,

<sup>73</sup> H. Delehay, *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae...* (Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris; Brussels: apud Socios Bollandianos, 1902), col. 34.

<sup>74</sup> S. esp. M. van Esbroeck, “Une homélie géorgienne anonyme sur la Transfiguration”, *OCP* 46 (1980), 418-445.

<sup>75</sup> Now this understanding of Rev 11 is near to become the scholarly consensus. S., first of all, Richard Bauckham, *The Climax of Prophecy. Studies on the Book of Revelation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 273-283 (with previous bibliography). Cf. his review of the alternative tradition whose pre-Christian existence he denies: R. Bauckham, “The Martyrdom of Enoch and Elijah: Jewish or Christian?”, *JBL* 95 (1976), 447-458. According to Bauckham, in the further Christian exegesis of Rev 11, Moses has been replaced with Enoch (although such replacement first occurs in the 2<sup>nd</sup> cent. in Tertullian, *De Anima*, 50). Cf., for the first authoritative scholarly identification of the “two witnesses” as Elijah and Moses, R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the Revelation of St. John...*, vol. 1 (The International Critical Commentary; New York: Ch. Scribner's Sons, 1920), 281-284.

<sup>76</sup> The modern commentators feel uneasy with the relevant patristic references (and, most often, completely avoid them). Cf., e.g., Donatus Haugg, *Die Zwei Zeugen. Eine exegetische Studie über Apok. 11, 1-13* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, XVII, 1; Münster i. W.: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1936), 102-105: the only reference for Moses as one of the two witnesses is from Joachim del Fiore (p. 105). Thus, as an important testimony for this exegetical tradition should be considered the Ethiopian Ge'ez traditional commentary to the *Book of Revelation* (*Tərg'ame Qälāmsis*), which contains a detailed and polemical digression about Moses and not Enoch as one of the “two witnesses”: Roger W. Cowley, *The Traditional Interpretation of the Apocalypse of St John in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications, 33; Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983), 112-115 (tr.; Ge'ez text on the appended microfiche). This commentary is vaguely datable to the 13<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> cent. and localised in the Northern Ethiopia; cf. Miguel Angel García, “Tərg'ame”, in: *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica*, ed. Siegbert Uhlig. Vol. 4: O – X (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), 921-923, here 921. In the later Amharic *Andämta* commentary Moses will be replaced with Enoch. The official status of the identification with Moses in the Northern Ethiopia of the corresponding period would point out, most probably, a non-Severianist tradition of the “Monophysitism”, which preserved a number of archaic Jewish-Christian features; cf. B. Lourié, “Julianism”, in: *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica*, ed. Siegbert Uhlig. Vol. 3: He – N (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007), 308-310.

<sup>77</sup> Thus according to Mary M. Schaefer, *Women in Pastoral Office. The Story of Santa Prassede, Rome* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013), 69-71; the author quotes (p. 71) Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, book 20, who “...draws on the oracle of Malachi as he delineates the role of the two prophets Moses and Elijah in preparing the Last Judgment (20.25, 27-29)”.

Elijah, Moses, and Dedication of the Churches. The commemorations and their order are the same as in Jerusalem, even though realised within another calendrical scheme.

In Jerusalem, we see Elijah ascended on 3 September. It is worth noting that the Jewish commemorations of 3 Tishri are, too, related to some disappearances, those of either some “mentions” (of the name of God in the documents?) or Gedaliah. This is clearly the main day of the three-day construction in September from 2 to 4, where Elijah became the central figure between Elisha and Moses.

The Synoptic accounts of the Transfiguration are not only representing this event as a revelation of Jesus as the heavenly Tabernacle<sup>78</sup>, but are inscribed into the calendrical cycle of the Tishri feasts<sup>79</sup>. The commemoration of the ascension of Elijah, in the Jerusalem rite, exactly on 3 September, followed with the commemoration of Moses, could hardly be a coincidence.

The internal chronology of the liturgical Transfiguration cycle would have played with numbers six and eight—from, respectively, Mt 17:1//Mk 9:2 (μεθ’ ἡμέρας ἑξ // μετὰ ἡμέρας ἑξ) and Lk 9:28 (Ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τοῦς λόγους τούτους ὥσεί ἡμέραι ὀκτώ). Looking at the Jerusalem calendar, we see that the number eight covers the whole period from 3.VII (Elijah) to 10.VII, whereas the number six is fitting with the space between 4.VII (Moses) and the same date 10.VII. Thus, both intervals are absorbed by the liturgical calendar, and the interval “eight” became identified with the established Jewish tradition of a liturgical cycle from 3.VII to 10.VII.

Both eschatological and Transfiguration contexts make us consider the commemorations of Baripsabas on 10 September and Elijah on 3 September as mutually connected and the commemorations of Elisha on 2 September and Moses on 4 September as flanking the 3 September commemoration of Elijah. All of them form the cycle of Yom Kippur together with the preparatory days thereof and apparently without any distinct commemoration of Sukkot.

John II does not follow this tradition but uses its unique element, the commemoration of Moses in September, which will be accepted later throughout the Byzantine Empire and far beyond, up to Ethiopia, sometimes with a slight shift of date from September 4<sup>80</sup>.

#### 5.4. Sphere VIII: the Day of Judgment (Yom Kippur) as the First Day of the Tabernacles.

The sphere VIII is the bridal upper room of Christ where the propitiatory is established<sup>81</sup>.

Stéphane Verhelst has already pointed out that the festal date 15 September was certainly not a creation of John II but an earlier festal date, whereas formerly without any specific connexion to Sion. According to him, the station in the Sion church on this day is a later phenomenon, and its later

---

<sup>78</sup> As has been first shown by Harald Riesenfeld, *Jésus transfiguré: l’arrière-plan du récit évangélique de la Transfiguration de Notre-Seigneur* (Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, 16; Copenhagen: E. Munksgaard, 1947). For a detailed discussion of this Riesenfeld’s view in the context of patristic exegesis and liturgical calendars (with a bibliography of previous polemics), s. B. Lourié, “Afterlife of the 2 Enoch Calendar: Major Christian Feasts on the Sixth Day”, *Enoch* 33 (2011), 102-107, here 105-107; the analysis is limited, however, to the August tradition of Transfiguration/Tabernacles.

<sup>79</sup> Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, “The Revelation of the Sacral Son of Man. The Genre, History of Religious Context and the Meaning of the Transfiguration”, in: *Auferstehung – Resurrection. The Fourth Durham–Tübingen Research Symposium: Resurrection, Transfiguration and Exaltation in Old Testament, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (Tübingen, 1999)*, eds. Friedrich Avemarie and Hermann Lichtenberger (WUNT I.135; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001; 2004<sup>2</sup>), 247-298.

<sup>80</sup> Apart from the Copto-Ethiopian date September 5, one can mention a recently discovered Jerusalem tradition (in the Georgian calendar *Sin. geo.* 58 *novus*, f. 59-69, late 9<sup>th</sup> or early 10<sup>th</sup> cent.), where the commemoration of Moses is called his “Nativity” (ԹԹԾԾ = γενεθλία, here in the meaning of the day of his death?) and appointed on September 3, whereas the commemorations of Elijah and Elisha on September 3 and 2 are absent: Verhelst, *Le Lectionnaire...*, 231-255, here 241 (quoted text and tr.), 249 (commentary). We do not know how old this tradition is. Formally, it is the most fitting with the calendar implied by John II.

<sup>81</sup> The mention of the propitiatory in § 96, p. 304/125, is somewhat enigmatic: Եւ հաւնապազ լսելի լիցի միշտ յարեգակնացեալ քաւարանիս; van Esbroeck translates: “et que ce Propitiatoire baigné de soleil soit toujours entendu (et quotidianum exauditum sit semper per solem factum PROPITIATORIUM hoc)” providing the references to Rev 21:23 and 22:5 (as an explanation of the solar metaphor; it is difficult to decide what exactly Greek word is rendered with արեգակնացեալ, but the two different van Esbroeck’s translations could grasp the general meaning anyway) and Rom 3:25 (as a—rather unhelpful—explanation of the propitiatory itself, because this verse does not mention propitiatory at all). I would explain this “hearing” the chalice/propitiatory with a reference to its prophetic function attested to explicitly in the first line of the *Inscription on the Chalice of Solomon* (Лурье, “Чаша Соломона...”: “My chalice, my chalice, prophesy...” and indirectly with a late sixth-century pilgrims’ custom to hear human voices from the stone which was preserved in the Sion church as the “cornerstone” mentioned by Jesus but ultimately related to the *Eben Shatya* and the propitiatory (Лурье, “Из Иерусалима в Аксум...”, 195-198).

interpretation as the Encaenia feast is historically false, especially because there was a Sion church before the basilica (re)constructed by John II. Nevertheless, “[I]e 15 septembre 394 commémore éventuellement la restauration de l’église par Jean II, où le calendrier situe une station, désormais à l’ombre de l’Anastasis”; the historical date of the dedication of the pre-394 Sion church remains unknown<sup>82</sup>. I basically agree with this Verhelst’s reasoning but consider it to be somewhat overcomplicated.

There would be nothing strange if the date of the reconstruction of the Sion church in 394 became the date of its (new) dedication, a kind of Christian Hanukkah feast. Moreover, the place of the Sion feast on 15 September in the later Jerusalem calendars, where it is certainly overshadowed with the festivities of 13 and 14 September, is in a sharp contrast with the liturgical contents of John’s Sion homily. In the homily, on the contrary, it is the 15 September festivity that is the culmination of the whole cycle starting from the Pentecost. This means that, for John, this new feast is, in some way, equal to the Easter—in the same manner as we will see in the later Jerusalem documents for the feast of the Encaenia of the Anastasis on 13 September<sup>83</sup>. We are in presence of a historically unsuccessful liturgical innovation attempted by John.

Before proceeding further, we should consider the difference between the spheres VII and VIII, that is, between the Temple of Solomon and the upper room of the divine Bridegroom. The two are hardly distinguishable without taking into account a larger exegetical and liturgical context: both are dealing with the final fate of the blessed ones, and it is difficult to understand whether there is, in the heavenly realm, any difference between the Temple of Solomon and the upper room of Sion. Apparently, some difference does exist: the heavenly bridal chamber clearly implies a much closer attachment to God than any other John’s sphere. But what does it mean liturgically?

Here we see the pattern of a (forced, of course) interpretation of the Day of Atonement as the first day of the eight-day Tabernacles feast—so far not studied liturgically but known, at least, from the third century. The feast called “Tabernacles” (σκηνοπηγία) is subdivided into two parts; the first one is dedicated to the resurrection (traditional topic of the Tabernacles feast) and the final Judgment (traditional topic of the Day of Atonement), the second one to the abode of the rightful with the Lord (which could be, in turn, subdivided into two parts: one millennium on the earth and the eternity in the heavens).

The clearest exposition is preserved in the ninth dialogue of the *Symposium* of Methodius of Olympus (late third cent. or the very beginning of the fourth). Its Christian and possibly Jewish background remains almost unstudied. The “normal” scheme of the Tabernacles in the third- and fourth-century Christian authors was different, whereas assuming two stages as well: the commemoration of wandering in the desert with tents and the final eternal life in the house of God; in this scheme, one pays no specific attention to the Judgment<sup>84</sup>.

Methodius explicitly calls the first day of the feast of the Tabernacles described in Lev 23:40 the day of judgment (*Symposium* IX, 3, the whole paragraph<sup>85</sup>). Then, he continues (*Symposium* IX, 5):

Setting out from here and making my way from the Egypt of this life, I come first to the resurrection, the true construction of the tabernacle (τὴν ἀληθινὴν σκηνοπηγίαν); and there, setting up my tabernacle decorated with the fruit of virtue on the first day of the risen life, which is the Judgment (τῇ πρώτῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς ἀναστάσεως ἡμέρᾳ, τῇ κρίσει), I shall celebrate with Christ the Millennium of Rest, the Seven Days as they are called, the true Sabbath Days. Then, once again, following Jesus, *that has passed into the*

<sup>82</sup> Verhelst, *La liturgie*..., [279]; cf. Verhelst, *Les traditions*..., 200-203.

<sup>83</sup> Its octave is called ღაგობი (= quuthli “Easter”) in the Georgian Lectionary, § 1255; Michael Tarchnischvili, *Le grand Lectionnaire de l’Église de Jérusalem (V<sup>e</sup>–VIII<sup>e</sup> s.)*, II (CSCO 204-205, Iber. 13-14; Louvain: Secrétariat du CSCO, 1960), 47 (txt) / 40 (tr.).

<sup>84</sup> About the mutual connexion between all these authors in their exegesis of the Tabernacles, s. Jean Daniélou, “La fête des Tabernacles dans l’exégèse patristique”, *Studia Patristica* 1 (1957), 262-279; Louis Doutreleau, Didyme l’Aveugle, *Sur Zacharie. Texte inédit d’après un papyrus de Toura*, t. III (SC 85; Paris: Cerf, 1962), 1058-1061 (in footnotes). Cf. also Ann Conway-Jones, *Gregory of Nyssa’s Tabernacle Imagery in Its Jewish and Christian Contexts* (Oxford Early Christian Studies; Oxford: Oxford UP, 2014). At least, Didymus the Blind was aware of Methodius of Olympus but did not follow him in equating the first day of Sukkot with Yom Kippur.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. the following phrases: “When I am judged on that first day of the risen life... And so I shall take what is required on *the first day*, the day, that is, on which I am judged... And this is the fruit that we are to bring to the judgment seat of Christ on the first day of the Feast”. Without this “...we shall have no part, as John says, *in the first resurrection* (Rev 20:6)”; tr. by Herbert Musurillo in St. Methodius, *The Symposium: A Treatise on Chastity* (Ancient Christian Writers, 27; Westminster, MD: Paulist Press, 1958), 135-136; s. text in H. Musurillo, *Méthode d’Olympe, Le Banquet. Introduction et texte critique* (SC 95; Paris: Cerf, 1963), 270, 272.

*heavens* (Heb 4:14), I shall arrive in heaven, just as the Jews after the rest of the Tabernacles came to the Promised Land<sup>86</sup>.

Let us notice the features having liturgical significance. The feast of the Tabernacles is not the wandering in the desert of this world but only the resurrection which was the goal of the whole journey. This resurrection is, in turn, a prerequisite of the Day of Judgment; then, the true Sabbath is the following “millennium of rest”. This scheme, evidently, assumes that the Tabernacles are the major feast among the two, Yom Kippur and Sukkot, and therefore the former should have been absorbed by the latter.

It is difficult to say whether John II has had in mind any millenarian ideas. Anyway, he retained the pattern of two different abodes of the rightful with Christ, from whom only the second one is the final and eternal, whereas the first one belongs to those who took the victory at the final Judgment. This is the *raison d’être* of the Temple of Solomon distinct from the bridal upper room of Christ. And this is why his homily implies to be preserved the ordinal number of the day of the Tabernacles, 15, whereas the ordinal number of the Day of Atonement, 10, shifted to 13.

John II, as it seems, made changes within the framework of the Octave of the Encaenia (since 13 September) established before him<sup>87</sup>. He rearranged its structure creating a new culmination on the third day, 15 September, in an imitation of the *triduum paschale*. The identification of the September festal Octave with the Easter (s. above) survived the liturgical innovations by John II.

### 5.5. Sphere VIII: the Olivet Discourse

Another important liturgical innovation made by John II for 15 September became the translation of the station of this day from the Eleona to Sion. According to Egeria (49, 3), the third day of the eight days of the Encaenia was celebrated at the Mount of Olives. She adds that the commemorations related to this locality are those of the Ascension and the sermon of Christ delivered there<sup>88</sup>.

As I tried to demonstrate elsewhere, the Olivet discourse—at least, in its second part, a series of parables—is a close paraphrase of a Second Temple Jewish apocalypse preserving its calendrical structure: each parable corresponds to a feast from the Midpentecost to the Day of Atonement in their normal order. It is very similar to the liturgical structure behind the homily of John II as described above (s. Table 2). There are no specific intertextual links between the “Synoptic Apocalypse” (a usual term for the apocalypse known from Mt 24-25 and its Synoptic parallels) and the homily of John II, both of them go back to a very similar liturgical traditions or rather to the same tradition of liturgical calendar. Their overlapping domains belong rather to the liturgy than the texts.

Table 2.

Feast	Homily by John II	Synoptic Apocalypse (SA)	Principal Witnesses of SA
Midpentecost or Second Passover (14.II)	No	Days of Noah (and Lot?)	Mt 24:37-42 // Lk 17:26-33
Pentecost	Sphere I	Owner of the House and Thief	Mt 24:43-44 // Lk 12:39-40; 1 Thes 5:1-5
Summer Solstice	Sphere IV	No	
New Wine	Sphere II Sphere III	Good and Wicked Slaves	Mt 24:45-51 // Lk 12:41-46; 1 Thes 5:6-8
New Oil	Sphere V	Ten Virgins	Mt 25:1-13; <i>Epist. Apostolorum</i> 43-45
3.VII	Sphere VI	Talents	Mt 25:14-30 (Lk 19:11-27 implies 1.VII)
Yom Kippur	Sphere VII	Judgment: Sheep and Goats	Mt 25:31-46 (cf. Ez 34:17; 1 En 89-90)
Sukkot	Sphere VIII	No	

<sup>86</sup> St. Methodius, *The Symposium*..., 139; Musurillo, *Méthode d’Olympe*..., 280.

<sup>87</sup> First witnessed already by Egeria (49, 1): “Hi ergo dies enceniarum cum uenerint, octo diebus attenduntur” (Maraval, *Égérie, Journal*..., 316).

<sup>88</sup> “Item tertia die in Eleona, id est in ecclesia, quae est in ipso monte, a quo ascendit Dominus in caelis post passionem, intra qua ecclesia est spelunca illa, in qua docebat Dominus apostolos in monte Oliueti” (Maraval, *Égérie, Journal*..., 318).

We can see, in Table 2, that the liturgical scheme behind the homily of John II looks as a still recognisable modification of that of the Synoptic Apocalypse. The two pieces almost unrelated intertextually turn out to be closely related extratextually: they represent the same cultic tradition, that is, different evolutionary stages of the same liturgical calendar.

Not only the unity but even the continuity of the parameters called by Hippolyte Delehaye “liturgical coordinates”<sup>89</sup> is very significant. The liturgical coordinates of time and place are the most invariable parameters of any cult; their stability is much higher than that of the corresponding hagiographical legends (narratives). What shows Table 2 is the fact of the continuity between the early Christian (viz. late Jewish) “Synoptic Apocalypse” and the calendar implied in the homily by John II. This is the continuity of the corresponding systems of liturgical coordinates of time. The coordinates of place are in the same relation of continuity: we can derive from Egeria’s report that the 15 September station was removed from the Eleona to Sion by John II himself. The coordinate of place of the Olivet discourse by Jesus (the Synoptic Apocalypse; the same in the *Apocalypse of Peter*) was precisely the Eleona.

We have to conclude therefore that John II established, in his new Sion basilica, a new feast where the eschatological motives of the Eleona station on 15 September were “grafted” to the liturgical traditions proper to Sion as the “mother of the churches” and the place of the Holy of Holies. The meaning of the eschatological feast of Tabernacles, as distinct from the eschatological Yom Kippur, was originally connected to the station of 15 September (judging from its symbolical date recalling 15 Tishri).

## 6. Part One Compared with Part Two

Eventually we became in position to return to the main motives of Part One. One can see (Table 3) that they are basically the same as those of the description of the eight spheres in Part Two, whereas in some disorder. The calendrical structure known to us from Part Two is still recognisable, even though severely distorted. All this looks as a paraphrase of a liturgical calendar without paying attention to the dates of liturgical commemorations.

Brief commentaries on the eight subdivisions of Part One are provided below.

Table 3.

Sphere (§§)	Main Topics	Calendrical Correspondence	Part One’s Subdivisions
I (27-33)	Angelic hosts, fire, heavens, heavenly tabernacles, Holy Spirit.	Pentecost.	(1) the heavenly palaces-tabernacles remotely reflected in the present earthly sanctuary (§§ 1-4) and (7) (mention of Ezra, s. below)
II (34-40)	Church, her earthly leaders, apostles Peter, Paul, and John, prophets Ezekiel and Ezra.	Feast of the Apostles (second Pentecost)	(2) the heavenly paradise where the saints are shining like the fixed stars, whereas the prophetic hymns follow the right path like the moving planets (§§ 5-6)
III (41-55)	Paradise, Tree of Life, Fall, True Vine, Christ...	Invention of the Chalice of the Last Supper (second Pentecost = New Wine fixed on 3 July)	(3) an intoxication with the Holy Spirit from above, with purification of the lips and illumination (§§ 7-10) and (6) the Ark of the Covenant and the Propitiatory, in the context of the intoxication with the waves of the Holy Spirit, spiritual renovation (“Encaenia”), and the divine Bridegroom (§§ 17-18)
IV (56-61)	Ark of Shem and Noah.	Ark of the Covenant in Kiryat Yearim (Summer Solstice feast fixed on 2 July)	(2) and (6) (s. above)
V (62-65)	Abraham and Isaac, ointment of the stone	Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (third Pentecost)	(4) obstacles to the true revelation, mostly sevenfold, such as either

<sup>89</sup> On this notion, s. H. Delehaye, *Cinq leçons sur la méthode hagiographique* (SH 21; Bruxelles, 1934) and a development of his concept in В. М. Лурье, *Введение в критическую агиографию* [B. Lourié, *An Introduction to the Critical Hagiography*] (St. Petersburg: Axiōma, 2009), 71-151.

	(in Bethel) by Isaac.	= New Oil fixed on 21/22 August)	disciples of seven pagan sages or the seven locks of Samson's head woven into the web by Delilah (Judges 16:13-14) (§§ 11-13) and <b>(5)</b> the difference between the wisdom of the world and the true wisdom from God (quoting, beside the Bible, Gregory of Nazianzus) (§§ 14-16)
VI (66-72)	Sinai, Moses, Tabernacle, fast.	Moses (4 September), preparation fast for Yom Kippur (3-9.VII?)	<b>(7)</b> the purification of the heart in imitation of Ezra, including a 7-day fast (representing Ezra as a new Moses) (§§ 19-21) and <b>(8)</b> Moses receiving the Holy Spirit among the gathering of the seventy two elders and explaining with the holy words the mystery of the Propitiatory in the divine house of the Bridegroom (§§ 22-23)
VII (73-84)	Temple of Solomon, the seven pillars of the Wisdom, the Chalice of the Wisdom.	Encaenia of Martyrium and Anastasis (13 September)	<b>(3)</b> and <b>(6)</b> (s. above)
VIII (85-97)	Holy of Holies, bridal upper room.	Encaenia of the Sion basilica, formerly the Olivet discourse (15 September)	<b>(8)</b> and <b>(6)</b> (s. above)

**Subdivision (1)** corresponds almost perfectly to the description of the sphere I but is limited to the main motive of the latter only.

**Subdivision (2)** corresponds to two spheres, II and IV. The saints are the common motive with the sphere II. The overlapping with the motives of the sphere IV is much more significant, because the cosmological motive is here, unlike the description of the sphere IV, explicit. As it becomes especially clear in *3 Baruch*, the Summer Solstice, being the highest point of the ecliptic (early route of the Sun around the Earth), is the best place for contemplating the construction of the heavens.

The cosmological motives in subdivision (2) present the first instance where an ancient calendrical structure comes out from a later layer of rhetoric.

**Subdivision (3)** corresponds, quite expectedly, to the spheres III (New Wine) and VII (Chalice of the Wisdom).

**Subdivision (4)** together with **subdivision (5)** (I am not insisting on their separation: probably it would be better to consider them as a unique subdivision, thus reducing the total number of subdivisions to seven) do not correspond *directly* to any of the descriptions of the eight spheres. Nevertheless, one can see from Table 3 that their actual place within the sequence of motives roughly corresponds to the sphere V (with a shift by one position); the calendrical meaning of the latter is the New Oil festival that, in turn, corresponds in the Synoptic Apocalypse to the parable of the wise and fool virgins. The main motive of the subdivisions (4) and (5) is an opposition between the false and the true wisdoms, which corresponds exactly to the same motive in the parable of Ten Virgins. Nevertheless, there is no correspondence to the specific numbers of the New Oil parable of the Synoptic Apocalypse, five and ten. Instead, the predominant place is reserved to the number seven which reveals a pentecontad nature of the New Oil festival.

The motive of opposition between the two kinds of wisdom preserved on the place roughly corresponding to the sphere V forms the second instance of recognisability of an ancient calendrical structure behind the rhetoric.



**Subdivision (6)** unites the motives of the Ark of the Covenant<sup>90</sup>, the propitiatory, and—indirectly—the Chalice (through the motive of “intoxication” with the waves of the Holy Spirit)<sup>91</sup>. These motives correspond to the spheres III, IV (presuming that the Ark of the Covenant is, in some way, the same as the Ark of Noah), and VII. The motive of the divine Bridegroom refers to the sphere VIII, whereas the motive of the Encaenia (“let us become newly build...”) to both spheres VII and VIII. Thus, we have, in this subdivision, five the most important motives of the homily amalgamated and condensed.

**Subdivision (7)** (cf. analysis of the text in fn. 14 above) does not mention Moses being focused on the figure of Ezra. In Part Two, Ezra is explicitly mentioned only in the sphere I, in conformity with the liturgical traditions where 4 Ezra was related to the (first) Pentecost (s. above). Nevertheless, the mention of the seven-day fast of Ezra—unlike the forty-day fast of Moses mentioned in the parallel place of the description of the sphere VI—is quite appropriate for the seven preparatory days before the Day of Atonement (from 3.VII to 9.VII).

It is tempting to suppose here the third instance of preserving some traces of an ancient calendrical structure, especially in the light of Daniel Boyarin’s observation that the passage 4 Ez 7:102–8:36 “...is strikingly similar to many [Jewish] penitential prayers [*S<sup>e</sup>lihot*], but particularly to the famous *S<sup>e</sup>liha* for the night of *Yom Kippur*, the refrain of which is, ‘O, look to the covenant, turn not to the (deeds of) the evil inclination’”<sup>92</sup>. Our knowledge of the liturgical traditions pertinent to 4 Ezra is, however, too fragmentary to make us able to go further.

**Subdivision (8)** is centered on Moses (the main character of the sphere VI) but obviously in the context belonging to the sphere VIII. Moses is here clearly a prefiguration of Christ, whereas in the sphere VIII it is Christ that is meant.

We have to conclude that Part One is a rhetorical elaboration on the units of a liturgical calendar very similar to or identical with that of Part Two. It does not deliberately follow, however, any particular scheme of liturgical space and/or structure of heavens. Therefore, from a “cosmological” or liturgical point of view, it is noticeably confused. Nevertheless, it still preserves some traces of, at least, two or even three archaic calendrical features lacking from Part Two.

## 7. Conclusions

Dealing with the Jewish background of John II of Jerusalem one cannot avoid the question whether the liturgy implied by John belonged to the tradition of the official Church or to the tradition of some small hypothetical “Jewish-Christian” faction, as Michel van Esbroeck and some other scholars supposed. Our analysis of the liturgical calendar resulted in no specific “Jewish-Christian” feature.

The liturgical use of the “propitiatory”, however, is something more archaic—even if, in fact, this “propitiatory” served as a chalice for the Eucharist. The hypothesis about a specific “sectarian” Jewish-Christian legacy in John II is therefore not falsified so far. Nevertheless, it is not the only possible hypothesis.

The official Church of Jerusalem shortly before 394—more exactly, until the Second Ecumenical Council in 381—was Arian. The Arians, however, were more conservative than their opponents in preserving Jewish legacy<sup>93</sup>. The Arian “Great Church”, especially in Jerusalem, should be considered as another potential source of archaic Jewish traditions in Christianity<sup>94</sup>.

---

<sup>90</sup> Called տապալանակ, whereas the Ark of Noah is called տապալմ; this usage of the diminutive suffix is normative for Armenian and hardly reflects any difference between the Greek words which were used in the original, κιβωτός in both cases.

<sup>91</sup> “Abreuvés (աղբերացեալք) donc aux flots de l’Esprit-Saint, dansons comme David devant l’arche du Seigneur avec la cithare [cf. 2 Sam 6:14] en criant la puissance des miracles qui se sont produits de nos jours, en exaltant (cette puissance) par des paroles éclatantes, en apportant des dons, soyons renouvelés [լիցուր նորակերսն — *lit.* let us become newly build/constructed, *from* կերսն “building, construction”] par le Propitiatoire et le divin Époux (քաւարանիս և աստուածաբնակ հարսնացելոյս)” (§§ 17-18, p. 291/118).

<sup>92</sup> D. Boyarin, “Penitential Liturgy in 4 Ezra”, *JSJ* 3 (1972), 30-34, here 34.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Rudolf Lorenz, *Arius judaizans? Untersuchungen zur dogmengeschichtlichen Einordnung des Arius* (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, 31; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979).

<sup>94</sup> The author would like to express his deep gratitude to all those whose help contributed to his work (whereas certainly not to his possible errors!), and, among them, especially to Cornelia B. Horn, Bernard Outtier, Stéphane Verhelst, and Nikolai Seleznyov.