

CHAPTER VIII

THE DIALOGUE AFTER THE ENTRANCE OF THE GIFTS

After the final incensation of the gifts on the altar, the priest, putting aside the censer and letting his phelonion fall free,¹ bows his head and says to the deacon standing on his right:

- I. a. *Priest*: Remember me, brother and concelebrant.
b. *Deacon*: May the Lord God remember your priesthood in his kingdom.
- II. a. Pray for me, holy master.
b. *Priest*: May the Holy Spirit come down upon you, and the power of the Most High overshadow you.
c. *Deacon*: May the same Holy Spirit concelebrate with us all the days of our life.
- III. a. Remember me, holy master.
b. *Priest*: May the Lord God remember you in his kingdom, always, now and forever and unto ages of ages.
Deacon: Amen.²

¹ The common rubric "χαλίσσαι τὸ φερόνιον," found in several sources, refers to the fact that the primitive, cone-shaped phelonion was not cut away in front, but hung to the ground evenly all around. Hence the celebrant had to gather it up in front in order to free his hands for ritual gestures. For this purpose sometimes buttons were provided across the front at breast-level, to which loops in the front hem were buttoned to hold it up, thus providing this freedom of movement when necessary (cf. plates 96 and 101 in tome I of *Drevnosti russijskago gosudarstva*, Moscow, in the reign of Nicholas I, n. d.).

² Cf. LEW, pp. 376-380. For convenience in referring to the text, we follow the divisions given by RAES, *Dialogue*, pp. 40-41. Note that the Greek and Slavic texts of II, b-c use the future indicative, following literally the gospel text of Luke 1:35. But the meaning in the dialogue is optative, like *fora* in the blessing following the anaphora in BAS and CHR.

To date, the only serious study of this dialogue is a brief article by A. Raes, S. J.³ Using this pioneer study as a starting point, we hope to complete and — where necessary — modify somewhat Raes' conclusions on the basis of recent literature and of our own studies in the MS tradition.⁴

Parallel Formulae in Other Liturgies

A similar request of the celebrant for the prayers of his fellow ministers is common to several liturgies, both Eastern and Western. The Roman *orate fratres* is but one of many formulae formerly used in the West: "Pray, brethren, that my sacrifice and yours may be pleasing to God the Father almighty."⁵ Other Western texts no longer in use show even more clearly the similarity of this ritual in both traditions. For example *The Prayer-Book of Charles the Bald*, written about 870, contains under the rubric: *Quid orandum sit ad missam pro sacerdote, quando petit pro se orare*, our verse of Luke 1:35, but in the subjunctive: *Spiritus Sanctus superveniat in te et virtus altissimi obumbret te*, followed by Psalm 19:4-5: *Memor sit omnis sacrificii tui et holocaustum tuum pingue fiat. Tribuat tibi secundum cor tuum et omne consilium tuum confirmet*, to which then another brief prayer is added.⁶

In the Jacobite liturgy, right after the *lavabo* and before the

³ RAES, *Dialogue*, pp. 38-51. A more recent article is that of N. DESNOV, *Nedoumennyj vopros iz žina liturgii svjatago Ioanna Zlatousta, Bogoslovskie Trudy IV*, Moscow, 1968, pp. 181-189. Although Desnov comes to the right conclusion concerning the confusion in roles in part II of the *textus receptus*, his article is greatly limited by the sources he had at his disposal — he does not cite RAES and uses only the edited sources of CHR — and by a naive approach to the sources. He cites the thoroughly discredited text of Pseudo-Proclus regarding the authenticity of the Byzantine liturgies, (p. 183), considers Pseudo-Sophronius' commentary an 8th century source (p. 183), and misunderstands that certain elements are not contained in the early euchology MSS of CHR not because they had not yet entered the liturgy, but because of the nature of the euchology as a book for the priest and the characteristics of the ancient recension of CHR (pp. 183-184).

⁴ JACON, *Formulaire*, has been especially helpful in providing new material to complete RAES' study. We are also grateful to Gabriele Winkler for correcting certain errors concerning the evolution of the dialogue text in an earlier draft of this chapter.

⁵ The response "*Suscipiat...*" is a later addition according to JURSMANN, *Missivum Sollemnia II*, pp. 86-87.

⁶ *Ibid.*, II pp. 82 ff. For other Latin sources that employ this text, cf. *ibid.*, II, pp. 37 n. 37 and 88 n. 41; RAES, *Dialogue*, pp. 49-50.

pax, the priest says: "My brethren and my masters, pray for me that my sacrifice be accepted."⁷ In the East-Syrian tradition the ritual is more fully developed. There the rite takes on a special importance because the Nestorian tradition had a primitive form of concelebration in which only one priest read the eucharistic prayer.⁸ In the early church, this was done by the bishop surrounded by his presbyterium. The East-Syrian custom, however, was for the archdeacon to select just before the anaphora one of the presbyters, by turn, for this service.⁹ If there were a large number of presbyters, one's turn would occur rarely, and it is understandable that the chosen presbyter, covered with confusion by the great honor conferred on him, would be most effusive in his reverence, expression of unworthiness, and request for the prayers of his concelebrants as he approached the altar.¹⁰ So it is not surprising that the Nestorian liturgy has a highly evolved rite of departure from the bema and *accessus ad altare*, with numerous preparatory formulae, among which is a lengthy dialogue between the chosen priest and his concelebrants:

Priest: Bless, o my Lord. My brethren, pray for me that this offering be accomplished at my hands.

Concelebrants: God the Lord of all strengthen you to fulfill his will and receive your offering and be well pleased with your

⁷ LEW, p. 83, 2-3.

⁸ Cf. RAES, *Dialogue*, pp. 39-40 and *La concelebration eucharistique dans les rites orientaux*, LMD, 35, 1953, pp. 25-27; JAMMO, *Messe chaldéenne*, pp. 173 ff, 200 ff; W. F. MACOMBER, *Concelebration in the East Syrian Rite*, in J. VRIELAN, ed., *The Malabar Church* (= OCA 186), Rome, 1970, pp. 17-22.

⁹ Cf. the following sources (cited by RAES, *Dialogue*, p. 39, n. 3): The Synod of Seleucia-Ctesiphon in 410 (J. CHABOT, *Synodicon Orientale*, Paris, 1902, p. 268); the Synod of 585 under the Catholicos Iso'yahb I (*ibid.*, p. 414); and canon 11 of the same Catholicos' reply to James, bishop of Darai: "He who is to consecrate is not designated for this office ahead of time, but only at the moment when the bishop and priests receive the *pax* from the altar and exchange it among themselves does the archdeacon designate the one who should consecrate..." (*ibid.*, p. 430).

¹⁰ This emotion would be all the more real because no one knew beforehand who was to be chosen (cf. the previous note). NARSAI speaks in very strong terms of the greatness of this honor: "The priest who is selected to be celebrating this sacrifice, bears in himself the image of the Lord in that hour [of His passion]... Hear, O priest, whither you have been advanced by reason of your order. Stand in awe of your Lord, and honour your order as it is fitting. See, you have been exalted above cherubim, above seraphim... be without blemish and without blame as it is commanded you. In this fashion the priest stands in that hour, nor can aught compare with the greatness to which he is advanced," (*Hom. 17*, ed. CONNOLLY, *Narsai*, p. 4).

sacrifice for us and for yourself and for the four corners of the world by the grace of his compassion forever, amen.

Then the priest repeats the prayer that preceded the dialogue, and continues:

Priest: Bless, o my Lord. Pray for me, my brethren and my beloved, that I be accounted worthy to offer before Our Lord Christ this sacrifice living and holy for myself and for all the body of the holy church by the grace of his compassion forever, amen.

And the concelebrants respond, and the priest repeats the prayer once again.¹¹

The *accessus* rites of these liturgies have in common the notion of preparation for the coming sacrifice, its acceptance by God, the confusion of the priest at his unworthiness and inability to accomplish unaided such a sacred ministry, and the consequent need of divine help.

The Meaning of the Dialogue in the Byzantine Liturgy

In the liturgy of Chrysostom, most of these elements are found expressed in the prayer of *accessus*,¹² but the dialogue limits itself to the theme of divine assistance. And in accord with Byzantine eucharistic theology as expressed in the prayers of the liturgy, this power is attributed to the Holy Spirit.¹³ As we shall see when we study the evolution of the text of the dialogue, the primitive kernel is precisely this prayer for the descent of the Spirit from Lk 1: 35, a theme which John Damascene links to the eucharist:

Whatever God does, he does by the power of the Holy Spirit, and now too [in the eucharist] things that surpass nature and cannot be understood except by faith are done by the power of the Holy Spirit. "How can this be, said the holy Virgin, for I know not man." The archangel Gabriel replies, "The

¹¹ LEW, pp. 272-273.

¹² Cf. below, chapter X.

¹³ RAES, *Dialogue*, pp. 40-42; MATROS, *L'action du Saint-Esprit*, pp. 193-208. Cf. also the anxiety expressed in the anaphora of BAS: "... Do not because of my sins withhold the grace of the Holy Spirit from the offered gifts" (LEW, p. 336, 19-22) — an anxiety sometimes incorporated into the text of the dialogue, so that the priest prays not only for the Spirit to descend but also to "remain with us and concelebrate with us all the days of our life" (*Paris Gr.* 2509, GOAR², p. 81).

Holy Spirit will come down upon you and the power of the Most High overshadow you.¹³ You also ask now how bread becomes the body of Christ and wine and water his blood. And I say to you that the Holy Spirit comes again, and accomplishes what is inconceivable and incomprehensible.¹⁴

At least in this text the patristic foundation for the use of Lk 1:35 in our dialogue is quite explicit.

But what does astonish us is that in our dialogue *these words are addressed to the deacon by the priest!* Petrus Arcudius (1563-1633) in his *De concordia* long ago pointed out this aberration in the *textus receptus*. After citing the same passage from *De fide orthodoxa* (which he mistakenly refers to as chapter 14), he goes on:

Ob eam causam Presbyter celebrans simul cum Diacono ... dicit ad Diaconum, ora pro me Diacone, qui respondens ait, Spiritus Sanctus superveniet ... Sic enim legendum est in liturgia, ut verum, et legitimum sensum habeat ... Quod autem ita fit corrigendum, et legendum, manifeste constat ex liturgia Iacobi, ubi eadem verba cacteri dicunt ad sacerdotem.¹⁵

Goar, too, argues against the text as found in the printed editions, though neither he nor Arcudius offers conclusive arguments from a thorough study of the MS tradition.¹⁶ Such a study does support their objections, however, as we hope to show.

¹³ *De fide orthodoxa* 4, 13, PG 94, 1141.

¹⁴ *De concordia ecclesiae occidentalis et orientalis in septem sacramentorum administratione*, Paris, 1626, III, 36, p. 270. (The dialogue in JAS from which Arcudius argues has the roles in their proper order. Cf. MERCIER, p. 190, 11 ff.)

¹⁵ GOAR², p. 113 n. 113. The references given in this edition of Goar are to the pages as numbered in the first edition, Paris, 1647. We give in brackets the proper pages in the 2d edition (Venice, 1730). As RAES points out (*Dialogue*, p. 43 n. 2) Goar's arguments are not the best. He refers to *Venetia recentiora*, fol. 92 lines 9 [p. 75], *MS Regium*, fol. 106 lines 40 [p. 92], *Cryptof.* and *Codex Pyromalus*. But the "*Venetia recentiora*" follow the *textus receptus*, and fol. 106 [p. 92] contains the edition of Erasmus, which omits the dialogue entirely. Goar probably meant to refer to *Paris Gr. 2509* (15th c.) [p. 81], which gives parts II-III of the dialogue with the roles properly distributed. For *Pyromalus* and *Cryptof.* [= *Codex Falascae*] cf. below, pp. 291-2 and notes 44-45. BAS of *Codex Pyromalus* gives the dialogue in its most primitive form.

The Evolution of the Text of the Dialogue in the MS Tradition

1. Part I

The first part of the dialogue can be dispensed with quickly. Raes rightly points out that it is a later addition with no support in the MS tradition.¹⁷ It is not found in the MS of any Greek, Slavic or Oriental euchology, diataxis, or archieratikon with one single exception, the 18th century codex *Ethnike bibl.* 779.¹⁸ It is not in the *editio princeps* of 1526 nor the Venetian editions of 1558 or 1562.¹⁹ As far as we know it first appears in the Venetian edition of 1571, and even today it is not part of the text of the dialogue in the Slavic *Činovnik*.²⁰

Raes' theory on the origin of this part of the dialogue seems plausible. He believes it is just a repetition of what the deacon says to the priest as he enters the sanctuary at the Great Entrance: "May the Lord God remember your priesthood in his kingdom, always, now and forever, and unto ages of ages." To which the priest replies: "May the Lord God remember your diaconate in his kingdom, always..."²¹ Or perhaps one might consider it a response to this prayer. In the diataxeis of *Ethnike bibl.* 662, *Moscow Synod.* 381, and Philothens, the deacon says to the priest as he enters: "Remember me, Lord, a sinner", to which the priest answers: "May the Lord God remember you in his kingdom."²² Thus, the priest, having prayed for the deacon, asks his prayer in turn, as in the *textus receptus*, part I:

Priest: Pray for me, brother and concelebrant.

Deacon: May the Lord God remember your priesthood in his kingdom.

At any rate, the MSS show that this was not a part of the original dialogue, and we think it belongs to the greetings exchanged at the entrance by the ministers with the people, as well as among themselves, from which the commemorations at the Great Entrance evolved.

¹⁷ *Dialogue*, p. 41.

¹⁸ TREMPERAS, p. 85 (z in the apparatus).

¹⁹ RAES, *Dialogue*, p. 41.

²⁰ *Činovnik*, Moscow, 1879, ff. 36v-37r, and Warsaw, 1944, f. 10r-v; cf. RAES, *Dialogue*, p. 41.

²¹ RAES, *loc. cit.*

²² Ed. TREMPERAS, pp. 9-10; KRASNOSEL'CEV, *Materialy*, p. 25.

One final remark on the text of part I. Raes has drawn attention to the application of the epithet "concelebrant (σουλαιτουργός)" to the deacon.²² Though none of the early MSS of the dialogue gives this title to the deacon, the term is common enough in Greek theological literature and goes back at least to the Council of Neocaesaria (AD 315).²³ Pseudo-Denys also explains that the earthly hierarchy "concelebrates" with the celestial.²⁴ In the liturgy itself, the Constantinopolitan prayer of the introit refers to the concelebrating angels (σουλαιτουργοῦντες) who enter with the clergy.²⁵ Since Byzantine typology often presents the angels vested as deacons, and the commentators describe the deacons as performing the angelic ministry, it should not surprise us to see the term "concelebrant" applied to the deacon, as well as to bishops, presbyters, the celestial hierarchy and even the Holy Spirit. All participants in the liturgy concelebrate, each according to his rank.

2. Parts II-III

a) *The Old Recension of the Dialogue in Constantinople and Italy:*

In the earliest sources, part II, a-b, is seen to be the primitive element of our dialogue. BAS in the 10th century version of Johannisberg has the following rubric at the transfer of gifts:

Interea deportantur & proponuntur munera à presbyteris, & post lunctionem manuum, petit [episcopus] ministros pro se orare, & respondent.

*Spiritus sanctus superueniat in te, & uirtus altissimi obumbret te & comministret tibi.*²⁶

The rubric in the contemporaneous *Codex Pyromalus* of BAS is almost exactly the same:

²² *Dialogue*, pp. 41, 46-48.

²³ *Canon 14*, referring to churchbishops concelebrating with the bishops (Mansi 2, 542-3).

²⁴ *De eccl. hier.* 1, PG 3, 124.

²⁵ *LKW*, p. 312, 21-22 (BAS). The same idea is found in the preparatory prayer before the liturgy in codex *Patmos 719* (13th c.) (Dmitrievskii, II, pp. 170-171) and in *Codex Palascae* (Munsterov, *K materialom*, p. 10). The prayer is omitted in Goar's edition of this codex, probably because it precedes the title of CHR (cf. Goar², p. 85).

²⁶ Cochlearius, *Speculum*, p. 124.

... after the washing of the hands, the bishop asks the ministers (ἀετοσπυρίδες) to pray for him. And they answer: May the Holy Spirit come down upon you ...²⁸

Both these sources are witnesses to the 10th century patriarchal liturgy of Constantinople, and present the dialogue in its most primitive form extant in the rite of the Great Church.

In Italo-Greek sources we find the first indication of our formula in codex *Grottaferrata Gb IV* from the second half of the 10th century (BAS and CHR, ff. 7r, 21r). However in this MS, our earliest witness to the formula under discussion,²⁹ the prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit is presented not as a dialogue, but as a prayer said by the priest:

And after the gifts have been placed [on the altar], the priest turns to the right and prays, saying: May the Holy Spirit come down upon me, and the power of the Most High overshadow me and concelebrate with me, the Lord God, the King of glory.

And he turns to the left and says: May the same most Holy Spirit come down upon me and the Power of the Most High overshadow me and concelebrate with me.³⁰

We shall discuss later the reasons for the non-dialogic form of the prayer in this MS. The important thing to note now is that this text proves the antiquity of the phrase "May the Holy Spirit concelebrate with you (me, us)" and its original connection with the preceding Lukan verse.³¹ This is confirmed by the Constantinopolitan *Codex Pyromalus* and version of Johannisberg already cited. The only difference is that *Grottaferrata Gb IV* repeats the whole formula, with the variant incipit Ἀὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα.

Two other early Italo-Greek codices, *Grottaferrata Zd II* (AD 1090) f. 64v, and *Gb XV* (11th century) f. 3v, seem to agree with *Gb IV*. But since all the MSS give are the incipits of II.b-c, it is impossible to tell whether the text is the same as that of *Gb IV* or has already evolved toward the *textus receptus* in which the verse of Lk 1:35 is separated from the petition that the Holy Spirit concelebrate with the priest.

²⁸ GOAR², p. 155.

²⁹ And not the later 11-12th c. *Grott. Gb II* as RIES thought. Cf. JACOB, *Formulaire*, p. 180; RANS, *Dialogue*, p. 45.

³⁰ CHR, f. 21r. BAS (f. 7r) gives the same text except for some slight verbal variants in the rubrics and the absence of the phrase "Lord God the King of glory".

³¹ JACOB, *Formulaire*, pp. 180-181.

The pristine recension of the dialogue probably comprised a request by the senior celebrant for the prayers of the other ministers (II,a), but not necessarily expressed in the text as a fixed formula (cf. *Codex Pyromachus*, the version of Johannishurg, codex *British Museum Add. 34060*). In reply, the concelebrating ministers answered in the words of the angel to Mary in Lk 1:35 (II,b). Later, to the Lukan text was added the clause "et comministret tibi" first seen in codex *Grottaferrata Gb IV* and in the version of Johannisberg. A further — or perhaps parallel — development, possibly of Italo-Greek origin, was for the main celebrant then to repeat over his concelebrants the same prayer with the variant incipit Αὐτό τὲ πνεῦμα . This is how we would interpret the original form of the text as it has come down to us in *Grottaferrata Gb IV*. The reason the latter codex has abandoned the dialogue form is that it describes a liturgy without concelebrating presbyters, but the rubrics instructing the priest to turn to the right and to the left betray the fact that it was once a dialogue with the concelebrants ranged along both sides of the altar.²²

One later source of the primitive recension of CHR, *Paris Gr. 321*, an early 14th century MS apparently of Oriental origin, preserves the text of the dialogue in its pristine form, i. e. the single petition from Lk 1:35, unrepeated and without the interpolation for the Holy Spirit to concelebrate:

Deacon: Bless, holy angels ($\epsilonὐλογεῖτε ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι$).

Priest: May the Holy Spirit come down upon us and the power of the Most High overshadow us always, now and forever and unto ages of ages.²³

As in *Grottaferrata Gb IV*, the dialogue has been accommodated to a liturgy without concelebrating presbyters, a phenomenon also observable in the 15th century diataxis in *Leningrad Gr. 423* and *Sabas Gr. 305*, in which the Lukan petition is said over the gifts.²⁴ This may explain its simplicity, i. e. the absence of the petition

²² *Loc. cit.* Jacob discovered remnants of the same type of rite in codex *Messina Gr. 160*, an 11th c. MS closely related to *Grott. Gb IV* (*ibid.*, pp. 184 ff, 191). See also below, p. 298.

²³ JACOB, *Formulaire*, p. 252. Also the 16th c. codex *Grottaferrata Gb XIX* (f. 9r) has only II,a-b in the dialogue. Codex *Messina Gr. 160* has "Bless, saints" and the incipit of II,b (*ibid.*, p. 191).

²⁴ КЛАСНОУЛ'ЦЕВ, *Materials*, p. 90. Cf. also the Slavic MS *Petersburg Academy 566* (15th c.) in which the priest says Lk 1:35 while covering the gifts with the act after the Great Entrance (МУРКОВ, *K materialam*, p. 89).

for the Holy Spirit to concelebrate and of part III. But it is equally possible — and we shall see this confirmed in the new redaction of the dialogue — that the interpolation for the concelebration of the Spirit had never won a permanent place in the old redaction.

As for the diaconal injunction "Bless holy angels," Jacob remarks that it seems to be a transformation of the original injunction "dans le sens de la liturgie céleste."³⁵ Perhaps the deacons are addressing the angels whose concelebration was requested in the prayer of the introit. At any rate in Byzantine typology of the celestial liturgy both priests and deacons are depicted as angels.³⁶

b) *The New Recensions of the Dialogue:*

These older usages soon give way before two newer, expanded forms of the dialogue, which appear from the 12th century on in all families of the MS tradition: Constantinopolitan, Otrantian, Calabrian and Sicilian, Oriental, as well as in the monastic diataxeis, and in the Georgian and Slavic versions.

(i) *The New Constantinopolitan Recension:*

The new recension of the dialogue first appears in Constantinople, in the version of Leo Tuscan. It is characterized by the absence of any petition for the Holy Spirit to concelebrate, and by the addition of part III.

Et depositis sanctis panibus super sacram mensam in crucis figuram, expanso desuper peplo et astantibus in circuitu sacerdotibus, dicit archypresbyter: Orate pro me, sacerdotes sancti.

Qui respondent: Spiritus sanctus superueniat in te et uirtus altissimi obumbret tibi.

Et rursus illi dicunt ad eum: Memento nostri, domine.

Et ipse respondet: Memor sit nostri dominus deus in regno suo.

Tunc secedunt et stantes pro ianuis cancellorum a dextris et a sinistris, unusquisque dicit orationes mysteriorum in silentio intrinsecus ad sanctam mensam.³⁷

³⁵ *Formulaire*, p. 252.

³⁶ Cf. for example MILLET, *Monuments de l'Atos*, plates 218, 2; 219, 3; 256, 2; 257, 3; 261, 1-2; 262, 1-2; ȘTEFANESCU, *Illustration des liturgies*, plates XXIX, 1-2; XXX, 1-2.

³⁷ JACOB, *Toscan*, p. 150.

The 12-13th century patriarchal rite of the Great Church in *British Museum Add. 34060* is of the same tradition. The patriarch bows to the concelebrating priests and they say: "May the Holy Spirit come down upon you and the power of the Most High overshadow you. Remember us, master." And he responds: "May the Lord God remember us in his kingdom always, now..."³⁸

The same recension of the dialogue is found in the later Greek monastic diataxeis including that of Philotheus,³⁹ in numerous MSS of the Slavonic version,⁴⁰ and in the 13th century MSS of the liturgy of Otranto.⁴¹ Located on the eastern coast of the heel of Italy, the church of Otranto remained in close contact with Constantinople until the Norman invasions, and its liturgical usages — purely local practices apart — are Constantinopolitan by comparison with the usages of Calabria and Sicily.⁴² And thus the Otrantan dialogue is as in Tuscan except for II,a ("Pray for me, brothers") and the addition of γένοιτο at the end, after the customary ending πάντοτε, νῦν...⁴³ This "flat", undoubtedly attracted to the dialogue by the use of the Lukan verse of the Annunciation in part II, is expanded in the Slavonic recension to include the rest of the Virgin's response: "Be it done unto me (us) according to your word" (Lk 1:38b).⁴⁴

³⁸ Folio 512r. The edition of ARABATZOGLOU (*Bibliotheks*, p. 238) is very defective.

³⁹ E. g. *Ethiopic bibl.* 662 (12-13th c.) and Philotheus (14th c.) in TREMPERAS, pp. 9-10; *Moscow Synod* 381 (13-14th c.), *Vat. Gr.* 573 (14-15th c.) in KRASNOSEL'OV, *Materialy*, pp. 25-26, 108-109.

⁴⁰ Cf. for example *Sinai Slav.* 14 (f. 21r) and 15 (f. 29r).

⁴¹ On Otrantan sources see JACOB, *Formulaires*, pp. 341-384.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 341-342.

⁴³ *Ottoboni Gr.* 344, AD 1177, (f. 152r); the 13th c. MSS *Karlsruhe EM 6* (ed. ENGDALH, CHR, p. 20; BAS, p. 60), *Ambros.* 276 (f. 13v), 709 (f. 92r), and 167 (CHR, f. 20r-v; BAS, f. 70r); the 14th century *Sinai Gr.* 966 (CHR, f. 29v; BAS, f. 36r; cf. DMITRIEVSKIJ II, pp. 205-206); the Otrantan version of BAS, 13-14th c., and the Otrantan revision of Tuscan (JACOB, *Otrante*, pp. 69, 93).

⁴⁴ The "flat" is found in *Ottoboni Gr.* 344, *Sinai Gr.* 966, *Ambros Gr.* 167, and the Otrantan version of BAS (cf. the previous note for these sources), as well as in the Slavonic version in the older MSS (cf. *infra*, p. 300). The *Codex Palaeus* (GOAR², p. 88) has the main celebrant respond to the prayer of his concelebrants (= II,b) with: "Amen, amen. Be it done unto me according to your word. And may the Lord God remember all of us in the kingdom of heaven, always..." *Ambros. Gr.* 1090 has: "γένοιτο κύριε τὸ ἔλεός σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς."

(ii) *The New Oriental Recension:*

Similar in structure to the Constantinopolitan dialogue, the recension found from the 12th century on in euchologies of Sicilian or Calabrian provenance,⁴⁵ as well as in two MSS of JAS and in Georgian CHR of codex *Gruz Georg. 5* (13th c.), is characterised by the use of Ps. 33: 4 in place of the senior celebrant's request for prayers (II.a). Here is the text from *Gruz Georg. 5*:

Sacerdos adoratur sanctam mensam et dicit: Magnificate Dominum mecum et exultabo nomen eius in idipsum.

Illi respondent: Spiritus Sanctus superveniet in te et virtus altissimi obumbrabit tibi.

Memento nostri Domine.

*Sacerdos dicit: Recordetur vestri Dominus Deus in regno suo omni tempore, nunc et semper et in saeculi.*⁴⁶

The presence of this variant in JAS and in the 13th century Georgian version of CHR should indicate that it, like so many other "Italo-Greek peculiarities", is of Oriental origin.⁴⁷ Almost all the MSS containing this variant describe a presbyteral concelebration, and the psalm verse is addressed by the senior presbyter to his fellow ministers, who reply as in the Georgian version.

c) *The Origin of Part III:*

Racs raises the question whether the *textus receptus* of part III should in fact be considered not as a part of the dialogue, but rather as the customary formula said by the deacon when he takes leave of the priest, as at the beginning of the liturgy or after the epiclesis.⁴⁸ The formulae are the same, but we agree with Racs in rejecting this theory. These formulae are already found in the diataxeis of *Éthniké bibl. 662* and Philotheus. But the one at the beginning of the liturgy is also part of a dialogue between priest

⁴⁵ Cf. the 12th century MSS of the Reggio-Messina family such as *Vat. Gr. 1811*, AD 1147, (CHR and BAS, ff. 79v, 90v), *Barberini Gr. 316* (ff. 17v-18r) and 329 (BAS, f. 3r), *Grottaferrata Gb II* (CHR and BAS, ff. 11v, 28v), *Oxford Bodleian Auct. E.5.13*, (CHR and BAS, ff. 14v-15r, 25r-v), and, with variants, the 14th c. Calabrian *Codex Falascae* (= *Grott. Gb III*, GOAK², p. 88).

⁴⁶ ТАУСНІСВІЛІ, *Liturgias ibericae*, p. 58.

⁴⁷ DE MEESTER called it an Italo-Greek peculiarity found only in the *Codex Falascae* (*Origines*, p. 333 n. 6). But in addition to the sources of CHR and BAS already mentioned it is also found in two MSS of JAS, *Vat. Gr. 1970* (13th c.) and *Paris Gr. 2509* (15th c.) (MEESTER, p. 190).

⁴⁸ RACS, *Dialogue*, p. 41.

and deacon.⁴⁰ And its use as a separate formula after the epiclesis is a later addition and not consistent even in the printed editions.⁴¹ In the versions of Tuscan and Otranto (BAS) it is found at the beginning of the liturgy but not after the epiclesis.⁴² And in the Georgian version of *Graz Georg. 5* it is only in the Great-Entrance dialogue. At the beginning of the liturgy in this version there is a formula taken from part II:

Benedic, Domine.
Spiritus Sanctus concelebrat nobiscum.⁴³

But the strongest argument against considering part III as originally the dismissal of the deacon is the fact that our whole dialogue, including part III, is traditionally a dialogue between concelebrants, and not between the main celebrant and the deacon, as we hope to show. Besides, the rubric for the leave-taking of the deacon occurs after the dialogue is finished: "Then the deacon says 'Amen' and bowing, takes leave and goes out."⁴⁴

It is better, then to consider the request for the prayers of the priest by his concelebrants (or the deacon) as a natural response to the original element of part II, in which the senior celebrant has been prayed for by them. This is not clear in the *textus receptus* because the roles have been confused.

d) *The Completion of the Text: the Addition of the Petition for the Concelebration of the Spirit:*

The petition for the Holy Spirit to concelebrate with the ministers (II,c) appears to be a refinement of the primitive Italian recension of the dialogue, in which the one petition for the Holy Spirit to descend and concelebrate (version of Johannisherg, *Codex Pyromalus*) came first to be repeated (*Gratt. Gb IV, Zd II, Gb XV*), then later separated into two separate petitions, the first containing only the Lukan text (II,b) as in the new recension, the second the petition for the Holy Spirit to concelebrate with the ministers (II,c).

The evidence is too sparse to permit us to trace this evolution.

⁴⁰ Ed. TREMPERAS, pp. 5-6; 11-12.

⁴¹ E. g. *Ieratikon*, Athens, 1957, omits it; *Euchologion*, Athens, 1926, has it, but with no response by the priest, as in the *editio princeps*. But it is found with response in BAS of the 15th c. codex *St. Petersburg Imperial Library 553* (ДАМТРИКОВСКИИ II, p. 501. Cf. note 54 below).

⁴² JACON, *Toscan*, pp. 137, 155; *Otranto*, pp. 61, 75.

⁴³ TARCHNISVILI, *Liturgiae ibericae*, p. 49.

⁴⁴ Cf. for example the diataxis of Philotheus (ed. TREMPERAS, p. 10).

Long before the appearance of petition II,c in its present form (i. e. the petition for the concelebration of the Spirit without the Lukan text) we find in II,b the Lukan text purged of any interpolation (cf. *Paris Gr.* 324, and all sources with the new recension of the dialogue).

On the other hand we have two 15th century Jerusalem sources, the euchology *St. Petersburg Imperial Library Codex Gr.* 558⁵⁴ and the diataxis of *Vat. Gr.* 782 (f. 217v),⁵⁵ that give the old Italo-Greek structure of the dialogue where the Lukan text of II,b still contains the interpolation "and concelebrate with you," but with the Lukan text already eliminated from the second member (II,c). Here is the text of the dialogue from *St. Petersburg 558*. Note that, as in *Grott. Ob IV*, the priest says the whole dialogue himself even though there is a deacon present. Note also that part III of the dialogue is missing in these two sources just as in the primitive recension of the dialogue:

And after the holy gifts have been placed on the altar and covered, bowing to the left with incense he says: May the Holy Spirit come down upon you [singular] and the power of the Most High overshadow you and concelebrate with you [singular].

And in the same way to the right: May the same Holy Spirit concelebrate with us and with you [plural] all the days of our life, always, now and forever.⁵⁶

Though we are ignorant of just how the evolution came about, there was eventually a fusion of the two types. The petition for the Holy Spirit to concelebrate (II,c) was added to the text of the new recension that already contained both the uninterpolated Lukan text (II,b) and part III. The earliest sources in which we find this completed text — preceeding of course from minor variants — are the codices *Paris Gr.* 2509, a diataxis of Greek provenance,⁵⁷ and *Ambros. Gr.* 84 (f. 82), both of the 15th century.

⁵⁴This MS is described by Orlov as a 14-15th century codex that belonged formerly to Archimandrite Anthony, former superior of the Russian mission in Jerusalem (*Liturgija*, p. XII). The text of BAS is edited in *DMITRIEVSKIJ II*, p. 501.

⁵⁵On the origin of this diataxis JACON remarks: "comme elle fait suite dans le ms. à un typikon de Saint-Sabas, il est à peu près certain qu'elle représente les usages hiérosolymitains de l'époque" (*Formulaire*, p. 439 n. 6). The diataxis does not give the full text of the dialogue, but from the *incipit* we presume it corresponds to that of *St. Petersburg 558* which we cite.

⁵⁶*DMITRIEVSKIJ II*, p. 501.

⁵⁷GOAR², p. 81.

But it was only the appearance of the printed editions that fixed the position for the concelebration of the Spirit (II, c) as a member of the dialogue. Except for the two sources just mentioned all MSS in which we have found it are of the 16th century or later.⁵⁸ It is missing, notably, in the diataxis of Philotheus but is found in the *editio princeps* of 1526.

Variants in the Text of the Dialogue

Because the text of the dialogue was not fixed until so late, the sources contain innumerable variants, even in codices of the same tradition or even between the formularies of BAS and CHR in the same euchology.⁵⁹ But the vast majority of these are minor textual variants such as can be observed in the various texts already cited, and do not affect the basic structure of the dialogue. Often the variants are simply the result of a certain liberty already noted in II, a (*Orate pro me, sacerdotes sancti, Orate fratres; εὐχεσθε ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ ἀδελφοί*);⁶⁰ more often they result from the necessity of adapting a text designed for concelebrating presbyters to a dialogue between priest and deacon (*μνησθητί μου, δέσποτα; εὐχαι ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, δέσποτα* or *διάκωνε* in II, a; the singular form throughout, etc.)⁶¹. There is no purpose to be served in listing all these variants. We shall limit our study to a few significant and common textual variants or to changes in the very structure of the dialogue.

In the archieraticon of Gemistos we find:

Bowing his head slightly, the patriarch turns to each side and says: Bless, saints.

And all bowing to him say: May the Holy Spirit come down upon you.

And then they say: Remember us, holy master.

*And the patriarch says: May the same Holy Spirit remember you in his kingdom.*⁶²

⁵⁸ E. g. *Sinai Gr. 1919* (AD 1564), ff. 35r-v, and the MSS in TREMPERLAS, pp. 84-86.

⁵⁹ Cf. for example *Grott. Gb IV*, ff. 7r, 21r; *Sinai Gr. 966*, DMITRIEVSKIĬ II, pp. 205-206; etc.

⁶⁰ Cf. for example JACOB, *Toscan*, p. 150; *Karlsruhe EM 6* (ed. EXODANT, pp. 20, 60; CHR and BAS); *Ottoboni Gr. 344* (f. 152r), *Ambros. Gr. 167* (CHR and BAS, ff. 20r-v; 70r); JACOB, *Otrante* (BAS), p. 69; *Sinai Gr. 966* (DMITRIEVSKIĬ II, pp. 204-205; CHR and BAS), *Grottaferrata Gb XIX* (f. 9r).

⁶¹ Cf. the diataxis *Ethiopic bibl. 662* of Philotheus (TREMPERLAS, pp. 9-10); *Moscow Synod 381* and *Vat. Gr. 573* (KRASNOSELC'EV, *Materialy*, pp. 25, 105); *Sinai Slav. 14* (f. 21r) and *15* (f. 29r); etc.

⁶² DMITRIEVSKIĬ II, p. 311; likewise in HABERT, p. 77, and the pon-

Here we have a curious fusion of parts II,c and III,b that can hardly be a traditional reading. The "kingdom of the Holy Spirit" is certainly an unwonted concept! Perhaps this joining of the *incipit* of II,c (Ἀβρό τὸ πνεύμα) to III,b is a first sign that petition II,c for the Holy Spirit to concelebrate was beginning to exert its pressure on the new Constantinopolitan redaction.

As for the injunction "Bless, saints" we have already noted great liberty in the formula of II,a. In chapter VI we encountered this formula at the Great Entrance. It first appears in the *orate fratres* dialogue in codex *Messina Gr. 160*, which A. Jacob describes as an 11th century MS of the ancient Italian recension of CHR, closely related to *Grottaferrata GB IV*.⁶² But apart from this codex, the archieratikon of Gemistos and dependent texts, and the "Bless, holy angels" of *Paris Gr. 324*, we know of no other Greek source that has it in the dialogue. However, it is very common in the Slavonic version of the liturgy.

In fact a peculiar Slavic redaction of the dialogue is found rather consistently in the codices, including the oldest:

Priest: Bless, saints.

Response: *Ad multos annos*, holy father. May the Holy Spirit come down upon you and overshadow you.

And pray for us, holy father.

Priest: May the Lord God remember you in his kingdom, always, now and forever ...

Response: Be it done unto us according to your word, holy father.⁶⁴

Variants in part III are rare. One later Italo-Greek MS, *Grottaferrata Gb XVIII* (14th c.), has the following (f. 17r):

— Part II, a-b

— Ps. 25: 6-8 ("Lavabo ...")

— Ps. 42: 4 ("Introibo ad altare dei ...")

— Part III, b

tifical rite of *Etbn. bibl. 754* (17th c.), ed. TREMPERAS, p. 84 (in the apparatus).

⁶² *Formulaire*, pp. 184 ff, 191.

⁶⁴ Cf. the 12th century *Služebniki* of Antony the Roman and of Varlaam Chytynskij (*Moscow Synod 342-605* and *343-604*, NEVOSTRUCV-GORSKIJ, *Opisanie* III, 1, pp. 2, 6); the six MSS edited by MUKETOV, *K materialam*, pp. 86-89, the earliest of which is the *Petersburg Acad. 518* (12th c.); also *Vat. Slav. 9* (KRASSNOSEL'CEV, *Svedenijsa*, p. 154); *Vat. Slav. 14* (diataxis of Philotheus, *ibid.*, p. 185); various MSS cited by PETROVSKIJ, *Rédaction slave*, pp. 867, 880; ORLOV, *Liturgija*, pp. 143-145 (BAS); and DEKHOV, *Nedoumennyj vopros*, p. 187.

Here the dialogue has been disturbed by the custom common to several Italian MSS of placing the *lavabo* after the dialogue. As for Ps. 42: 4, suffice it to note that one codex, the euchology of the cathedral of Otranto, *Ottoboni Gr 344* (AD 1177), has a rubric (f. 152v) indicating that the dialogue is to be replaced by this psalm verse if the priest is celebrating without concelebrants.⁵⁸

One MS, codex *Ambros. Gr. 276*, has part III of the dialogue take place between the people and the priest (f. 13v); *Grottaferrata Gb II* (f. 11v) has the people say the final "Amen" at the end of the dialogue between the concelebrants.⁵⁹ The 15th century diataxis of codex *Vat. Gr. 573* has the deacon add "*Ad multos annos, master*" at the end of the dialogue when the priest blesses him.⁶⁰ This is just an adoption of the acclamation of the people following the bishop's blessing after the dialogue in the pontifical rite. It is common Byzantine liturgical practice for the people to acclaim the bishop in this manner when he blesses them with the trikerion and dikerion.

The Original Scope of the Dialogue: the Distribution of Roles

One problem with respect to the *textus receptus* — the most important one from the practical point of view — still remains: what caused the confusion in the distribution of roles found in today's rubrics for the dialogue between priest and deacon? Of all the MSS we have studied, only four, all of them late, have the roles distributed as in the *textus receptus* so that the priest prays for the descent of the Spirit on the deacon, rather than vice-versa: *Ambros. Gr. 84* (15th c.) f. 82r; *Sinai Gr. 1919* (AD 1564), f. 34r; *Iviron 878* (AD 1642), f. 31r; and *Ethnike bibl. 779* (18th c.)⁶¹. So there is no basis in the MS tradition for the contemporary practice. Why, then, did the *editio princeps* and other printed editions reverse the proper order in part II? Not in order to alternate the roles in harmony with part I because part I is not found in the early editions.

⁵⁸ JACOB, *Formulaire*, p. 359. This may be the result of Latin influence, but the use of this psalm here at the *accessus ad altare* shows that the scribe had a sense for the *accessus* rite that begins here.

⁵⁹ Cf. МЕРКОВ, *K materialum*, p. 4. In codex *Grot. Gb XIX* (AD 1591) the priest kisses the altar and turns to the people (f. 9r), an obvious Latinism.

⁶⁰ КРАБНОСМЕЛ'ЦЕВ, *Materialy*, p. 109.

⁶¹ THOMPSON, p. 85. The roles are in their proper order in JAS (cf. MERCIER, p. 190, li ff).

Nor is the distribution of roles the only disturbing element in some redactions of the dialogue. In the diataxis of Philotheus, for example, where the roles are in proper order, the priest addresses the deacon with the disconcerting title "Master" (Ἐξά: ἰπὲρ ἐμοῦ, δέσποτα).⁶⁹

We believe that all these unsatisfactory readings are to be explained by the original scope of the dialogue. In most early sources that contain any dialogue at all, it is a dialogue between the bishop or main celebrant and his concelebrants.⁷⁰ These concelebrants were ranged about the altar.⁷¹ The main celebrant bows to the right, then to the left, and asks their prayers.⁷² They in turn respond with the traditional verse of Lk 1: 35.

⁶⁹TREMPERAS, p. 10. Cf. also *Moscow Synod 381* and *Vat. Gr. 573*, KRASNOSEL'CEV, *Materialy*, pp. 25, 108; *Sinai Slav. 15* (f. 29r); etc.

⁷⁰In addition to the MSS cited in the following note, cf. *Constantinopolitan sources*: BAS of *Codex Pyromalus* (GOAN², p. 153) and the version of *Johannisberg* (COCHLAKUR, *Speculum*, p. 124) cited above, pp. 291-2; the version of *Leo Tuscan* (JACOB, *Toscan.*, p. 150) cited above, p. 294; the archieraticon of *Gemistos* (DMITRIEVSKIĬ II, p. 311) cited above, p. 299; *Otranton sources*: JACOB, *Otranto*, p. 69; codices *Ottoboni Gr. 344* (f. 152r), *Sinai Gr. 966* (BAS, DMITRIEVSKIĬ II, p. 206), *Ambros. Gr. 167* (CHR, f. 20r-v; BAS, f. 70r) and 709 (f. 92r); *Reggio-Messina codices*: *Barberini Gr. 316* (ff. 17v-18r) and 329 (BAS, f. 3r). Cf. also the 16th c. codex *Éthn. bibl. 757* (TREMPERAS, pp. 85-86 in the apparatus). Other sources are vague, with rubrics in the plural that could refer to concelebrating presbyters or to the deacons and other ministers: e. g. the Otranton codex *Karlsruhe EM 6* cited in the following note; *Codex Palascae* (cf. note 72); *Graz Georg. 5* (TARCHNISVILI, *Liturgias ibericae*, p. 56) cited above, p. 296. The early Slavic sources almost always give the dialogue as between concelebrants: cf. the 12th century *Stavebniki* of Antony the Roman and of Varlam Chutynskij (= *Moscow Synod 342-605* and *343-604*, NEVOSTRUEV-GORSKIĬ, *Opisanie III*, 1, pp. 2, 6) and of *Vat. Slav 9* (KRASNOSEL'CEV, *Sesdenija*, p. 154); and several other Slavic MSS in Dessov, *Nedoumenyyj vopros*, p. 185-187; MUKETOV, *K Materialam*, pp. 86 ff; and OKLOV, *Liturgija*, pp. 142-145. We have also seen remnants of this usage in the rubrics of other MSS (cf. pp. 292-293, 298).

⁷¹Cf. for example the 13th century Otranton codex *Karlsruhe EM 6* (CHR, ed. EXORDANI, p. 20; cf. BAS, p. 60): "He [the priest] says to the deacon and to the others standing around in a circle (κύκλω): Pray for me, brothers..." See also the 12th century Reggio-Messina rubric cited in the excursus, below, p. 310.

⁷²Cf. *Grottaferrata Gb IV*, the archieraticon of Gemistos, and *Petersburg Imperial Library Codex Gr. 558*, all cited above, pp. 292, 298-299. The *Codex Palascae* (GOAN², p. 88) has this rubric right after the gifts have been covered: "And [the priest] incenses, saying to those on his right and to those on his left: Magnificente..." It is undoubtedly the gifts he was incensing, but perhaps misinterpretations of such a rubric were at the origin of the rubric preceding the dialogue in the reformed Slavic pontifical:

At a liturgy celebrated by one presbyter with the assistance only of a deacon — or even without a deacon — a compromise had to be made. Either the dialogue had to be omitted as ordered by the rubrics of *Ottoboni Gr. 344*; or transformed into a prayer of the priest that the Holy Spirit "descend on me (or us)" as in *Grottaferrata Gb IV* and *Paris Gr. 324*; or on the gifts as in the 15th century diataxis in codices *Sabas 305* and *Leningrad 423*, and the Slavic MS *Petersburg Acad. 566* (15th c.);⁷² or else the deacon or server had to take the part of the concelebrants and reply to the priest's request for prayers.

This would explain why the priest addresses the deacon as "Master" in Philotheus' diataxis and a few other codices: the deacon is simply receiving a request formerly addressed to the concelebrating ministers. This is confirmed by the fact that in the codex *Ambros. Gr. 709* (f. 92r) the senior presbyter addresses the concelebrating priests as *δεσπότες* in this opening injunction (I.a). At least this seems more plausible than the explanation of Trempelas, who took the epithet as an indication of the high esteem in which the diaconate was formerly held.⁷³ Another explanation might be that these sources are copies of a text in which the roles had already become confused, and the copyist corrected the *roles* but not the *text* of the dialogue, in which the deacon would have addressed the priest as "Master". At any rate, Byzantine practice is for lesser ministers to address presbyters or bishops as *δεσπότες*. We have never seen the title applied to any other order.

One MS of BAS, *Sinai Gr. 1021* (15th c.), compromises in the other direction by preserving the confusion of roles, but changing the text so that the bishop does not pray for the Holy Spirit to descend on the deacon:

Deacon: Pray for me, holy master.

Bishop: May the Lord direct your steps.

Deacon: Remember me, holy master.

Bishop: May the Lord God remember you ...⁷⁴

⁷² "i abie otlast kadil'nice, nekogože kadja" ("and he [the bishop] puts aside the censor, incensing no one"; *Činovník*, Moscow, 1870, f. 36v; Warsaw, 1944 f. 10r). For in one *Služebnik* (Moscow, 1651) the priest incenses the deacon while saying to him "May the Holy Spirit come down upon you..." (Cf. DESNOV, *Nedoumennyj vopros*, p. 187).

⁷³ Cf. above, pp. 292-3, 301.

⁷⁴ TREMPELAS, p. 83.

⁷⁵ DMITRIEVSKIJ II, p. 368.

This text, found also in the dialogue at the beginning of the liturgy,⁷⁶ brings us to our final textual problem: the recension of the dialogue in the Slavic *Činovník*.

The Dialogue in the Slavic *Činovník*

Since the reform of 1666-1667, the text of the dialogue in the Slavic pontifical liturgy is as follows:

The Bishop bows three times. And turning to the right side, he says to the concelebrants: Brothers and concelebrants, archimandrites and priests, pray for me.

And after letting down their phelonia, all answer, saying: May the Holy Spirit come down upon you and the power of the Most High overshadow you.

The Bishop says: May the same Holy Spirit concelebrate with us and you all the days of our life.

The Protodeacon says, and the others: Pray for us, holy master.

Bishop: May the Lord direct your steps.

Again they say: Remember us, holy master.

And the Bishop: May the Lord God remember you ... amen."

Here the bishop's response as in BAS of *Sinai Gr. 1021* is interpolated into the new Constantinopolitan recension of the dialogue. The absence of part I shows that this recension is more conservative than our Greek *textus receptus*. Since this redaction represents the dialogue according to the 17th century reform when the Slavic books were corrected to conform to contemporary Greek usage, at a council attended by the Orthodox patriarchs of the Greek Churches, we can probably take it as representative of the dialogue in the Greek archieratikon at that time.

The Origin of the Dialogue

Although the dialogue is found in JAS, PETER, and even in some Latin sources,⁷⁷ it seems certain that our text is native to

⁷⁶ LEW, p. 362, 8-16; TREMPERAS, pp. 20-21.

⁷⁷ *Dejanija*, f. 53r-v. Cf. *Činovník*, Moscow, 1879, ff. 36v-37r; Warsaw, I. 10r.

⁷⁸ For the Latin sources, see note 6; for JAS see MERCIER, p. 190, (*Vat. Gr. 1970* and *Paris Gr. 2509*); for two MSS of PETER in which the priest recites Lk 1:36 before the anaphora, cf. CODRINGTON, *Peter*, pp. 132, 13 and 135, 36 (= *Vat. Gr. 1970* and *Grott. Gb VII*, both of Italian provenance as regards PETER).

the Byzantine rite. As Raes points out, the dialogue is found only in two MSS of JAS, a liturgy that has been heavily Byzantinized.⁷⁹ And PETER contains little at all that is original.

But we do not agree with Raes that the dialogue is of Italo-Greek origin.⁸⁰ With the exception of *Grottaferrata Ob IV*, our earliest witnesses are Constantinopolitan (BAS of *Codex Pyromalus* and the version of *Johannisberg*). They show that the dialogue was known in the Great Church as early as the 10-11th century when, as Jacob notes, it would be unrealistic to suppose any Italian influence in the liturgy there.⁸¹ Rather, the dialogue appears in Italy and Constantinople at an early date and seems to be part of the common patrimony of the whole Byzantine tradition.⁸²

CONCLUSION

We have seen that the dialogue after the Great Entrance is a native element of the Byzantine liturgy, though it has its parallels in the liturgies of other churches. In its original form and scope it was a dialogue between concelebrants of at least presbyteral rank, and was the first element in the rite of *accessus ad altare* by which the concelebrants prepared themselves spiritually for the coming anaphora.

The primitive Constantinopolitan text comprised a freely formulated request for prayers by the principal celebrant. The response of his concelebrants was at first simply the words of the angel in Lk 1:35, to which the phrase "and concelebrate with you" was later added. A further development that first appears in the old Italo-Greek sources is the repetition of this response with the variant *incipit* Ἀὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα. But Constantinopolitan, Italian, and Oriental sources retained the primitive reading of Lk 1:35 as the sole response in part II after adding part III to the dialogue to form the new recension. Eventually the two trends converge: the repetition of the one response in part II evolves into two distinct elements (II, b-c of the *textus receptus*); part III of the new recension becomes a permanent part of the dialogue; and with the printed editions part I, originally a repetition of or

⁷⁹ RAES, *Dialogue*, p. 48.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

⁸¹ JACOB, *Formulaire*, pp. 179 ff.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 180.

response to the greeting at the entrance becomes attached to the beginning of the dialogue to complete the evolution of the text as it stands today. Eventually the use of the dialogue in non-concelebrated liturgies led to a confusion of roles that still exists in the *textus receptus*, but that has been corrected in the recent Roman editions.⁹³

⁹³ *Služebnik*, 1942, p. 243; *Liturgikon*, 1942, p. 234; *Ierntikon*, 1950, p. 126.

Schema of the Evolution of the Text of the Dialogue

Urtext :

Main celebrant : request for prayers.
Concelebrants : Lk 1 : 35

Primitive Recension

CONSTANTINOPOLITAN :

(BAS of *Codex Pyromalus* and
the version of *Johannisberg*) :

Main celebrant : request for prayers.

Concelebrants : May the Holy Spirit

... (Lk 1 : 35) and *concelebrate* with you.

ITALIAN :

Main celebrant : request for prayers.

Concelebrants : May the Holy Spirit

... (Lk 1 : 35) and *concelebrate* with you.

Main celebrant : May the same

Holy Spirit ... (Lk 1 : 35 with
variant *incipit*) and *concelebrate* with you.

Later Refinements :

evolves into II, a-b-c

Urtext

preserved in
some sources,
e. g. *Paris*
Gr. 324 (?)

New Recension

CONSTANTINOPOLITAN :

II, a-b

III, a-b

ORIENTAL :

Ps 22 : 4 in place
of II, a

II, b

III, a-b

LATER CODICES AND EDITIO PRINCEPS

II, a-b-c

III, a-b

TEXTUS RECEPTUS

I, a-b

II, a-b-c

III, a-b

EXCURSUS: THE POSITION OF THE CONCELEBRANTS
DURING THE LITURGY

According to contemporary Byzantine usage, all concelebrating priests stand at the altar all during the eucharistic part of the liturgy following the Great Entrance. The bishop (or bishops) or senior concelebrant alone stands before the altar; the other concelebrants are ranged alongside the altar to the right and left. But this does not seem to have been the ancient custom. According to the rubrics in the version of Leo Tuscan, after the *orate fratres* dialogue the concelebrating priests

*Tunc secedunt et stantes pro ianuis cancellorum a dextris et a sinistris, unusquisque dicit orationes mysteriorum in silentio intuentes ad sanctam mensam.*¹

And a bit later, just after the diaconal admonition "*Stemus honeste ...*" that announces the anaphora, we find this rubric:

*Quo dicto, sacerdos qui solus assistit divine mensę et qui secus illam diaconi contingentes venerabile peplum subleuant ...*²

Hence only one priest stood at the altar; the others who had been standing in the sanctuary "*in circuitu*"³ during the dialogue are said to withdraw and stand to the right and left "*pro ianuis cancellorum*." What does this mean? Can it be possible that during the anaphora the concelebrants stood outside the sanctuary before the chancel, especially since the doors were closed after the kiss of peace?⁴ The rubric that precedes the litany after the entrance is no help. It just says that the priests stand "*in locis suis*."⁵ And the language used by Tuscan in other rubrics throws no light on what he means by "*pro ianuis*."⁶ *Pro* can mean

¹ JACOB, *Toscan*, p. 150. As Jacob has demonstrated, "*orationes mysteriorum*" here means anaphora in the broad sense, i. e. the whole eucharistic formula, including the proskomide prayer (*Concélébration*, p. 253). Cf. above, chapter III, pp. 123 ff.

² JACOB, *Toscan*, p. 153.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 150 (cited in full above, p. 294).

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 152.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 151.

⁶ He always uses other expressions when the meaning is clearly "before the chancel" or "before the chancel entrance." E. g.: at the beginning of the liturgy "... *diaconus egreditur cancellos et stans coram sancto altari dicit ...*" (*ibid.*, p. 137); at the Little Entrance "... *diaconus ... egreditur*

"in", or "on", as well as "before", "in front of", "right opposite to".⁷ But Tuscan was probably translating "πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν" which in this phrase is hard to interpret in any way except "in front of, before".

Perhaps the key to Tuscan's enigmatic rubric is to be found in the shape of the chancel of Hagia Sophia. Justinian's second sanctuary, built after 558, lasted until the sack of Constantinople in 1204. According to Xydis⁸ and Mathew's reconstruction the chancel was "π-shaped",⁹ and Paul the Silentary clearly mentions doors on all three sides.¹⁰ Hence it is possible that the presbyters stood along the north and south sides of the chancel in front of the two smaller doors. But whether Tuscan's "pro ianuis" refers to these doors or to the central or "holy doors", we think he must be using *pro* from the viewpoint of one standing within.

It would seem that the concelebrants were alongside the main celebrant for the *orate fratres* dialogue, then withdrew when he approached the altar for the *accessus* prayer. Other sources support this hypothesis. In the 14th century archieratikon of Gemistos, during the Entrance of the Mysteries the concelebrating bishops stand in double file "on either side of the sanctuary from the holy doors up to the altar".¹⁰ This probably explains the rubric in the 12th century patriarchal diataxis of codex *British Museum Add. 34060*, which has the patriarch leave the altar after covering the gifts and stand near the concelebrants at the holy doors for the dialogue. We cite the MS (f. 513v) because the edition of Arabatzoglou (p. 238) is defective:

And he [the patriarch] leaves [the altar] and stands by the holy doors. The other priests [i. e. bishops] stand with him on the right and on the left, and he bows, praying. At the third short bow of the head the priests pray to him thus: May the Holy Spirit ... [dialogue]

And thus he withdraws to the holy table.

cum sacerdotibus. Quibus stantibus ante altare, dicunt lectores: Venite exultemus domino ..." (p. 141). Then they enter, the priest kisses the altar and stands "*iuxta ianuas cancellorum*" (p. 142). After the gospel the deacon puts the book on the altar "*... exitque cancellos et stans ante sanctum altare pronuntiat: Dicamus omnes [= otkene]*" (p. 147).

⁷ Cf. J. FACCIOLATI et al. *Lexicon totius latininitatis*, Padua, 1871, III, p. 869; LEWIS and SHORT, *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford, 1962, pp. 1447-1448.

⁸ XYDIS, *Chancel: MATHEW, Early Churches*, pp. 97-98.

⁹ *Descriptio S. Sophiae* 717-719, PG 86², 2146-2147.

¹⁰ DIMITRAKIS II, p. 310.

A similar positioning of the concelebrating presbyters is found in the rubrics of the 12th century Reggio-Messina codices *Vatican Gr. 1811* (ff. 79v-80r, BAS 90v), *Grottaferrata Gb II* (f. 11v), and *Oxford Bodleian Auct. B.5.13*. (ff. 14v-15r, BAS 25r-v):

And the priest who is about to approach the holy table to celebrate the holy mysteries bows three times before the altar and greets the priests, deacons, and clerics standing on either side, saying: Magnificate ... [Ps. 22:4]

And all, bowing, respond: May the Holy Spirit come down upon you ... Remember us, master.

Priest: May the Lord God remember you ...

People [sic]: Amen.

And the priest goes before the holy table; the other priests stand back towards the chancel (ὁπισθεν εἰς τὰ διάκονα) and the deacons stand on either side of the holy table ...¹¹

Hence it seems that the concelebrants were lined up by the doors during the dialogue. When it was over, they stepped back and stood along the chancel for the anaphora, probably because the sides of the altar were occupied by the coming and going of the deacons with their *ripidia*, etc.

¹¹ We cite the text of *Grottaferrata Gb II* from MURSTOV, *K materialum*, p. 4. The pertinent section is also in HANSSSEN, *De concelebratione missae*, p. 33.

CHAPTER IX

THE LITANY AFTER THE GREAT ENTRANCE

Today, as soon as the dialogue after the Great Entrance is completed, the deacon takes leave of the priest and goes out as usual via the north door of the iconostasis to his customary place before the royal doors and intones a litany. During the litany the priest says silently the proskomide prayer. When the deacon has finished, the priest concludes the litany with the prayer's epho-nesis. Here is the *textus receptus* of the litany and prayer:

- (1) Πληρώσωμεν τὴν δέησιν ἡμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ.
Οἱ Χοροὶ ἐναλλάξ· Κύριε, ἐλέησον.
- (2) Ὑπὲρ τῶν προτεθέντων τιμίων δώρων, τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.
- (3) Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου Οἴκου τούτου, καὶ τῶν μετὰ πίστεως, εὐλαβείας, καὶ φόβου Θεοῦ εισιόντων ἐν αὐτῷ, τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.
- (4) Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ρυσθῆναι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης θλίψεως, ἐργῆς, κινδύ-νου καὶ ἀνάγκης, τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν.

Εὐχή τῆς Ποροσκομιδῆς, ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἱερέως λεγόμενη μυστικῶς, μετὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς ἁγίας Τραπέζης τῶν θείων δώρων ἀπόθεσιν.

Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ μόνος ἅγιος, ὁ δεχόμενος θυσίαν αἰνέσεως παρὰ τῶν ἐπικαλουμένων σε ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ, πρόσδεξαι καὶ ἡμῶν τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν τὴν δέησιν, καὶ προσάγαγε τῷ ἁγίῳ σου Θυσιαστηρίῳ καὶ ἐκάνωσον ἡμᾶς προσενεγκεῖν σοι δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας πνευματικὰς, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἀγνοημάτων. Καὶ καταξίωσον ἡμᾶς εὐρεῖν χάριν ἐνώπιόν σου, τοῦ γενέσθαι σοι εὐπρόσδεκτον τὴν θυσίαν ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐπισκερνῶσαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτός σου τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα, καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα τὸν λαόν σου.

- (5) Ἀντιλαβοῦ, σῦσον, ἐλέησον, καὶ διαφύλαξον ἡμᾶς, ὁ Θεός, τῇ σῇ χάριτι.
Ὁ Χορός· Κύριε, ἐλέησον.