This article proposes a new definition of the Patriarchal lectionaries of Constantinople. First, the manuscript contains the text titled “Taxis kai Akolouthia” between the synaxarion and menologion parts as noted by J. Lowden and R.S. Nelson. Second, its menologion part adopts the following encaenia (dedication of church/ monastery): 21 Sep. “Hyperagia Theotokos en te Petra”; 31 Oct. “Egkainia tou eukteriou tes hyperagias Theotokou tou en to Patriarcheio”; 4 Nov. “Hyperagia Theotokos en tois Kyrrou”; 5 Nov. “Egkainia tou Theodorou en tois Sphorakiou”; 1 Dec. “Egkainia tou naou tou Palatiou”; 18 Dec. “Egkainia ton Chalkoprateion”; 1 May. “Egkainia tes Neas Basilikes Ekklesias” (21 Sep. and 4 Nov. without the word encaenia). These churches have been under the control of the Patriarchate at that time, and some manuscripts of the Patriarchal lectionaries would have been used in these churches.

The author has surveyed approximately 400 lectionary manuscripts and found entries of encaenia for specific churches or monasteries, except Hagia Sophia in Constantinople and Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem, in 70 manuscripts. These new materials will be efficacious for research on the scriptoria and patrons in eleventh-century Constantinople.

Furthermore, this article hypothesizes that the dense illustration cycle of the prodigal son in the richly-illustrated Patriarchal lectionary, Venice IE gr.2, is, together with that in the Vatopedi lectionary, Sacristy Cod.3, the Patriarchal claim against the Roman Church after the Great Schism.

With the studies of J. Lowden¹ and R.S. Nelson², the research on Patriarchal lectionaries in eleventh-century Constantinople has entered a new phase. In this article³, in which I will propose a new criterion for the Patriarchal character, by taking Lowden’s and Nelson’s studies as my starting point for discussion, I do not provide an overview of the research history. The definition of the Patriarchal lectionaries is, according to Nelson, “manuscripts made for the use of the patriarch of Constantinople in Hagia Sophia.”⁴ I submit a slightly modified definition: the Patriarchal lectionaries are manuscripts made for the use of the Patriarch of Constantinople and other assistant clergies in Hagia Sophia and other churches under the control of the Patriarchate. This modification explains that several manuscripts were produced in a short period of time in the second half of the eleventh century⁵, which we will discuss later.

Two evaluation criteria for Patriarchal lectionaries have been maintained: the double pericopes for the fourth Sunday in the Lukan section with the short instruction mentioning a church synod⁶, and the text of the Patriarchal

---

³ The draft was delivered on 26 February, 2020, at the series of lectures “ο κόσμος των εικονογραφημένων βυζαντινών χειρογράφων” (Department of History and Archaeology of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki/ Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies), at the Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies (Monastery of Vlatadon) in Thessaloniki. A special gratitude I give to Professor A.G. Semoglou who gave me the opportunity for the lecture, and to Professor Ch. Mavropoulou-Tsioumi, my former supervisor.
⁴ Nelson, 89.
⁵ Nelson notes that “the patriarchal lectionary appears to be a phenomenon of the eleventh century and somewhat later.” Nelson, 108.
manual titled “Τάξις καὶ ἀκολουθία” (“Order and Office”) before 1 September, the beginning of the menologion. I think that only the latter is effective, because two typical Patriarchal manuscripts, Paris.gr. 286 and Venice, Istituto Ellenico gr. 2, do not adopt the former.

Furthermore, Nelson added sixteen “diagnostic calendar entries” in the menologion for the patriarchal character:

- 25 Sept. Litany of the Kampȯs, referring to a procession to the Hebdomon, outside the city walls, where the patriarch read the lection
- 26 Oct. St. Demetrios and commemoration of great earthquake
- 31 Oct. Dedication of an oratory of Theotokos in patriarchate
- 1 Dec. Dedication of a naos in Palace
- 18 Dec. Dedication of Chalkoprateia
- 22 Dec. Opening of Hagia Sophia
- 23 Dec. Dedication of Hagia Sophia
- 1 May. Dedication of Imperial Nea Basilica in Palace
- 11 May. Birthday of Constantinople, normally referred to as “the city”
- 5 Jun. Litany of the Kampȯs
- 16 Jul. A lengthy text about the 4th and 5th Ecumenical Church Councils with instructions about its celebration in Hagia Sophia
- 31 Jul. Adoration of the Holy Cross
- 16 Aug. Deposition of the Mandylion
- 31 Aug. Deposition of the Virgin’s girdle at the Chalkoprateia

Among them, I believe, the entries for 31 October, 1 December, 18 December, and 1 May are valid, while the other ten can be found in many non-Patriarchal manuscripts. The manuscripts with the instructions of the rites performed on 25 Sept., 22 and 23 Dec., 11 May, 5 Jun., 16 Jul., and 16 Aug. can be Constantinopolitan, but they are not necessarily Patriarchal. The rites on 26 Oct. and 31 Aug. are found almost in all lectionaries, even in local products. However, it is important that Nelson noted the dedication (encaenia/ ἐγκαίνια) of particular churches, though he missed some other churches.

The Encaenia in the Gospel Lectionaries

The majority of the number of the lectionary manuscripts is ready-made for use in any church or monastery, rather than made for a specific church or monastery. In such manuscripts, the chapter of the lection for various commemorations and feasts (ἐυαγγέλια ἀναγινωσκόμενα εἰς διαφόρους μνήμας καὶ παννυχίδας) is placed at the end of the manuscript; at its beginning, it says “for dedication of church (εἰς ἐγκαίνια ναοῦ), see 22 Dec., or 29 Jun.” On 22 Dec., they celebrate the opening of Hagia Sophia (Ἁγιασμός τῆς Μεγάλης Ἑκκλησίας) with the reading of Jn. 10:22-30, which includes the phrase of “and now the Dedication feast was taking place at Jerusalem (Ἐγένετο τότε τὰ ἐγκαίνια ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις).” On 29 Jun., the feast for St. Peter and St. Paul, the lection of Mt. 16:13-19 is read; Christ declares there that “it is upon this rock that I will build my church (ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν),” suitable text for the dedication of church. In many manuscripts, at the end of Mt. 16:18 of the feast on

---

(6) Οὕτως μὲν ἀναγινώσκεται καὶ τελεῖται εἰς τὰς ἔξω ἐκκλησίας· εἰς δὲ τὴν μεγάλην ἐκκλησίαν· τὸ ταῦτα λέγον ἐφώνει οὐ λέγεται· ἀλλὰ τὸ εἰς ὕπομονήν προστίθεται ταῦτα· ἀρχὴ τῆς συνόδου. C. R. Gregory, Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes, vol.1, Leipzig, 1900, 355; Nelson, 91 et al.

(7) Lowden, 28-31 with English translation. See Appendix in this article.

(8) For the menologion (immovable feasts) of the Patriarchal lectionary, see T. Masuda, “Establishment of the Patriarchal Menologion in the Eleventh- and Twelfth- Century Constantinople” (introduction in Japanese, list of the calendar in English), Waseda Institute for Advanced Study Research Bulletin, 5 (2013), 117-33. Note that the selections of the saints are slightly different between Paris.gr. 286 and Venice, gr. 2, as described in the article. https://waseda.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=repository_uri&item_id=27267&file_id=162&file_no=1

(9) Nelson, 94.
29 Jun., the note “the end of the dedication (τέλος τῶν ἐγκαινίων)” is written for the practical use.

Some dedications are mentioned even in the ready-made manuscripts. On 13 Sep., they commemorate the proskynesis of the Holy Wood and St. Kornelios the Centurion; quite a number of manuscripts add the dedication of the Anastasis church in Jerusalem (ἐγκαίνια τῆς ἁγίας Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀναστάσεως). The continuous celebration of Hagia Sophia is held on 22 and 23 Dec., the opening (ἀνοίξια, Jn. 10:22-30) and the dedication (ἐγκαίνια, Mt 16:13-19). Many manuscripts adopt the feasts, and their inclusion does not provide the characteristics of the manuscript.

Other proper names of the famous churches of the Virgin also appear on the calendar of the lectionaries. The celebration of the deposition of the Virgin’s maphorion is held on 2 Jul. in her church in Blachernai (καταθέσια τῆς τιμίας ἐσθήτος τοῦ μαφορίου τῆς ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου ἐν τοῖς Βλαχέρναις). The deposition of the Virgin’s girdle in the church of Chalkoprateia (καταθέσια τῆς ζώνης τῆς ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου ἐν τοῖς Χαλκοπρατείοις [καὶ ἐγκαίνια]) is commemorated on 31 Aug. Most manuscripts adopt these feasts, though many of them omit the phrase “and dedication (καὶ ἐγκαίνια)” on 31 Aug. Except for four entries mentioned above, the dedication and other references to specific churches offer information about the origin of the manuscript. I have surveyed approximately 400 lectionary manuscripts to collect the entry of dedication (ἐγκαίνια); it is obvious that the Patriarchal lectionaries have notable features of the encaenia.

Dedications of the Specific Churches

The concrete criteria for the Patriarchal lectionary are, in addition to the text of Τάξις καὶ Ακολουθία before the immovable feasts, the dedications and references of the following churches:

- 21 Sep. Hyperagia Theotokos en te Petra
- 31 Oct. Egkainia tou eukteriou tes hyperagias Theotokou tou en to Patriarcheio
- 4 Nov. Hyperagia Theotokos en tois Kyrou
- 5 Nov. Egkainia tou Theodorou en tois Sphorakiou
- 1 Dec. Egkainia tou naou tou Palatiou
- 18 Dec. Egkainia ton Chalkoprateion
- 1 May. Egkainia tes Neas Basilikes Ekklesias

On the day of the dedication of the Chapel of Theotokos in the Patriarchate (31 Oct.), the celebration of the

---

10 Cambridge University Library, Dd.8.23 (no.2) and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct.T inf.2.7 (no.4) are studied by Lowden (32-33, Table 4). Nelson (111) has missed that Vatopedi 7 (no.6) is Patriarchal, which is from the second half of the eleventh century, not the first half of the twelfth century. Most probably, the Kiev Lectionary, Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine, Φ.301 (KDA), 23 λ, with the text of Τάξις καὶ Ακολουθία (see infra, n. 55) is Patriarchal, which I could not access. As well, I have no access to Moscow, State Historical Museum, gr. 225. The manuscripts, Athos, Vatopedi 7, Munich, Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek gr.621, and Paris, gr.294, are published here for the first time as Patriarchal and related lectionaries. On the Munich manuscript, see F. Berger, Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München, vol. 9, Wiesbaden 2014, 172-77 (11th century, miniatures 13/14th century). https://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/0007/bsb00078284/images/index.html?id=00078284&groesser=&flip=eayaeqwgyztssdaseayyztts&no=4&seite=1, accessed 9 May, 2020.

11 The Munich manuscript lacks the first two-thirds of the calendar, but it is certain that it is a Patriarchal lectionary due to the text Τάξις καὶ Ακολουθία. It seems likely that the miniatures belong to the sixteenth-century addition. The twelfth-century lectionary Cod. 48 of Benaki Museum, Athens, includes miniatures of the post-Byzantine addition. The eleventh-century illustrated lectionary Paris.Suppl. gr. 297 partly contains post-Byzantine miniatures. The phenomenon of adding illustrations in the post-Byzantine era (probably in the sixteenth century) to Middle-Byzantine lectionary manuscripts is a subject worth considering.


13 Janin, 217.

14 Janin, 193-95; Janin, CPB, 378-79.


16 Janin, 208.

17 Janin, 361-64.
holy head of St. Aberkios, deposited in the chapel, is also executed. The Patriarchal lectionaries commemorate St. Aberkios on 22 Oct. with the orthros and the leitourgia exceptionally for the minor saint.

Note that the references to the Petra and the Kyrou Churches are not the dedication, but just “hyperagia Theotokos”; the former dedication is unknown to us, and the latter is on 5 May. The Patriarchal lectionaries did not adopt their dedications. The two feasts of the Petra and the Kyrou Churches seem to have been the panegyria of the Virgin’s icons executed mainly by the Patriarchate, though neither the typicon of Hagia Sophia nor the Synaxarion of Constantinople adopted them. All the churches were under the control of the Patriarchate or had close connection with it. As the Patriarchal lectionaries are for the churches listed above, as well as for Hagia Sophia, this should explain the fact that several manuscripts had been produced in a short time during the second half of the eleventh century.

Which dedications are embraced in other manuscripts? If a lectionary manuscript adopts a specific singular dedication, we can assume that it has been produced exclusively for the church’s monastery that is the subject of the dedication. The famous manuscript of Sinai.gr. 204, which features full-page miniatures of excellent quality, commemorates the memory of Hosios Petros on 7 Feb., and the dedication of [the church] of Theotokos of our own monastery (τὰ ἐγκαίνια τῆς Θεοτόκου τῆς καθ’ἡμῶν μονῆς) on 10 May. The Sinai Lectionary was ordered by the monastery of Theotokos, which had been founded by the otherwise unknown Hosios Petros. However, approximately 70 of 400 manuscripts I surveyed have characteristic dedications. Here I will present two methods of analysis.

Holy Sepulcher (13 Sep.) and Hagia Sophia (22 and 23 Dec.) are special churches in Eastern Christendom, and many manuscripts celebrate their dedications. Likewise, the deposition of the Virgin’s maphorion in Blachernai (21 Sep.) and at Kyrou (4 Nov.) are rare, and in my impression, these manuscripts, including the Patriarchal lectionaries, are of high quality. If we consider that these two feasts are related to the intention of patrons, the classification as follows is possible: Table 1: mss no. 1-7 are Patriarchal, no. 9-15 can be regarded as belonging to the Petra-Kyrou-Charkoprateia group, no. 16-26 as belonging to the Petra-Kyrou group, no. 27-43 as belonging to the Petra group, no. 44-53 as belonging to the Charkoprateia-Pege group, no. 54-59 as belonging to the Charkoprateia-Pege group, and no. 65-70 as belonging to the Blachernai group.

On the other hand, if we exclude the two feasts of the Virgin at Petra and at Kyrou, the classification will be simpler: Table 2: mss no. 9-15 and 44 are in the Sphorakiou-Charkoprateia group, no. 17-22, 27-29 and 64

---

18 Janin, 223. According to the typicon of the Great Church, the synaxis of Theotokos is held in the Old Petra Church on Wednesday after the Pentecost. J. Mateos, Le typicon de la grande église, vol. 2, Roma 1963, 146. The lectionary Sinai.gr. 288 commemorates Mneme tes Panagias Theotokou en te Palaia Petra on 21 Sep.

19 H. Delehaye, Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae, Brussels 1902, 659-60, note for 5 May; Mateos, vol. 1, Roma 1962, 282. The lectionary Sinai.gr. 293 adopts the dedication of the Kyrou Church on 5 May.


21 Delehaye, Syn CP


23 Weitzmann-Galavaris, 45. The analysis of the lectionaries with specific dedications will be done in my following article.

are in the Nea Ekklesia group, no.45-53 are in the Chalkoprateia- Pege group, no. 16, 41, and 54-59 are in the Chalkoprateia group, no. 42, 43, 62 and 63 are in the Pege group, and no. 65-70 are in the Blachernai group. In both categories, the Blachernai Group is well established. The Blachernai Church may have had a strong independence from the Patriarchate. From here on, it will be the fields for paleographers and codicologists, not for art historians. I will provide some remarks.

Among the pattern of the dedications of the Patriarchal lectionaries, the Paris.gr. 294, a manuscript of humble quality, is from the twelfth century, and without the text of Taxis kai Akolouthia. Probably, the scribe of Paris.gr. 294 had copied faithfully the Patriarchal calendar, but had judged that the manual of the rites for the Patriarchate, Taxis kai Akolouthia, was unnecessary.

The manuscript of good quality, Duke University, Clark 12, belongs to the Petra- Kyrou group according to Table 1, and the Nea Ekklesia group according to Table 2; it contains the peculiar instruction at the beginning of the menologion (1 Sept.):

+Μηνὶ Σεπτεμβρίω α´ ἁρχὴ τῆς ἰνδίκτου καὶ μνήμη τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἣμων Συμεῶν τοῦ στυλίτου, καὶ τοῦ μεγάλου ἐμπρησμοῦ: Γίνεται δὲ καὶ σύναξις τῆς ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου ἐν τοῖς Χαλκοπρατείοις ὑπὲρ Μιασινῶν: Τάξις γινομένη ἐν τῶ Φόρω εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἰνδίκτου: Δέον γινώσκειν ὅτι μετὰ τὸ ἀνελθεῖν τὸν Πατριάρχην ἐν τῶ Φόρω, μετὰ τῆς λιτῆς, καὶ ρηθεῖν τὰ τρία ἀντίφωνα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀναγνώστων καὶ δοξάσαι, πάντων σιωπῶντων, ἀναφωνῆ ὁ Πατριάρχης, τὰς αἱτήσεις ταύτας: Ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς καταστάσεως καὶ εὐσταθείας τῶν ἁγίων ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν πάντων ἑνώσεως εἴπωμεν: Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ θεοφυλάκτων ἡμῶν βασιλέων, παντὸς τοῦ Παλατίου καὶ τοῦ στρατοπεδίου αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ φιλοχρίστου λαοῦ, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ συντριβῆναι τὸν σατανὰν ἐντάχει ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν, εἴπωμεν Κύριε ἐλέησον: Ὑπὲρ τῶν οἱκουμενικῶν, ἄσιστῶν καὶ ἄφλεκτων διαφυλαθῆναι τῆν πόλιν ἡμῶν καὶ πάσαν πόλιν, εἴπωμεν Κύριε ἐλέησον: Καὶ ἡθʹοὕτως κατασφραγίζει τὸν λαὸν τρίτον, καὶ γίνεται ἡ ἀκολουθία: Καὶ ἐν μεν τῶ Φόρῳ, καὶ εἰς τὴν Μεγάλην Ἐκκλησίαν, ἀναγινώσκεται εὐαγγέλιον:

Though the manuscript is not Patriarchal, we recognize that its patron had a very close connection with the Patriarchate. It is often difficult, analyzing the encaenia, to determine whether we are dealing with the issue of patron or scriptorium. In Tables, there are several manuscripts with colophon from which we can know the date and scribe of the manuscript. For example, Paris.Suppl.gr. 1096 (no.19) in the Petra- Kyrou or Nea Ekklesia group, includes the colophon, which says that the manuscript was made by the hand of Grammatikos Petros of the schole at Chalkoprateia in 1070. The scribe Petros did not adopt the dedication of the Chalkoprateia Church. Did Petros belong to the scriptorium of Chalkoprateia and make the lectionary for the use of Nea Ekklesia?

To take a manuscript with colophon and without the dedications as an example, British Library, Add. 36751 was completed in 1008 by the hand of the monk Theophanes of the Iviron Monastery on Mount Athos. Though there is no entry of the dedication, which means that we have no information about the patron, the selection of the saints in the menologion portion is considerably different from the Patriarchal lectionaries; to cite main differential, Add. 36751 chooses Proklos on 24 Oct. (adding to Arethas); Chrysantos-Dareias on 4 Jan. (instead of 70 Apostles); Ioudas on 14 May (instead of Isedoros); Iakobos Alphaiou on 26 May (instead of Ioudas); Thaddaios on 19 Jun. (instead of Iezekiel and Zosimos). It may have been a calendar specialized for the Iviron Monastery.

The colophon may often confuse us about the origin of manuscripts. British Library, Add. 39602 (no. 10) was produced in 980, in Cappadocia. From the encaenia, the manuscript can be regarded as belonging to the Petra- Kyrou- Sphorakiou- Chalkoprateia group, or to the Sphorakiou- Chalkoprateia group. Why does a manuscript

---

25 I. Spatharakis, Corpus of Dated Illuminated Greek Manuscripts to the Year 1453, Leiden 1981, no.89, 29; Browning (n.14), 172.
26 K. and S. Lake, Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200, vol.2, Boston 1934, no.67, pls.121-23; Spatharakis, Corpus, no.38, 17-18.
27 On the Patriarchal calendar, see Masuda (n.8).
produced in Cappadocia include the dedications and feasts of the capital? Is it merely the case that the Cappadocians scribe had copied a Metropolitan manuscript? This may be an example of *epoche* in the manuscript studies, and we cannot determine, without other evidence, the exact origin of the manuscript.

I treat the manuscripts from eleventh or twelfth century in this article. Y. Sakurai has surveyed the calendar of twelve lectionaries from the Hodegon Monastery in the late Byzantine Constantinople. Twelve calendars do not include specific dedications, and it seems that the intention of the patron is not reflected in the manuscripts. The same is true of the Palaiologina group. The Palaiologan lectionaries are not a reservoir of information about the *encaenia*.

**Characteristics of the Patriarchal Calendar**

As described in the Patriarchal calendar, two Patriarchal lectionaries, Paris.gr. 286 and Venice, IE gr. 2, have some differences. The Paris Lectionary seems to keep an earlier version of the calendar, and the Patriarchate has revised the calendar sometime in the second half of the eleventh century; the Venice Lectionary and other manuscripts have adopted the latter. One of the outstanding changes in the Venice version is the addition of Iconophile saints:

7 Sep. Daniel (hegoumenos Thasios)
7 Oct. Niketas Monomachos/ Patrikios
11 Oct. Theophanes the Poet/ Graptos
18 Jul. Theodosia (with the comment: μαρτυρησάς υπό τῶν ἁγίων καὶ σεπτῶν εἰκόνων ἐπὶ τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ Κοπρόνυμου)
17 Aug. Makaritos (with the comment: ἐπὶ τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ Κοπρόνυμος μαρτυρήσαντος)

The noticeable feature of the Patriarchal calendar, common in both manuscripts, is the addition of recent uncanonized nine Patriarchs in the form of memory (*mneme*):

16 Dec. Nikolaos II Chrysoberges (r. 979-91)
5 Feb. Polyeuktos (r. 956-70)
6 Feb. Photios (r. 858-67, 877-86)
12 Apr. Sergios II (*tou apo tes mones tou Manouel*) (r. 1001-1019)
15 May. Nikolaos I Mystikos (*tou en Galakrinais*) (r. 901-07, 912-25)
27 May. Stephanos I (r. 886-93, Venice only)
31 May. Eustathios (r. 1019-25).
18 Jul. Stephanou II of Amasea (r. 925–28)
5 Aug. Euthymios I (r. 907-12, Venice only) Former hegoumenos of Mon. Psamathia

As a result, the Patriarchal lectionaries celebrate the following Patriarchs as a whole (Patriarchs in Italics indicate omissions):

Metrophanes (306-14) 4 Jun.
Paul I Homologetes (337-51) 6 Nov.
Nektarios (381-97) 11 Oct.
John I Chrysostom (398-404) 13 Nov. (see also 27 Jan.)
Arsakios of Tarsos (404-05) 11 Oct.
Sisinnios (426-27) 11 Oct.
Maximianos (431-34) 20 Nov. described as Maximos
Proklos (434-46) 20 Nov.
Phlabianos (446-49) 18 Feb.
Anatolios (449-58) 20 Nov.
Gennadios I (458-71) 20 Nov.
John II of Cappadocia (518-20) 25 Aug.
Epiphaniios (520-35) 25 Aug.
Menas (536-52) 25 Aug.
Eutychios (552-65, 577-82) 6 Apr.
John IV Nesteutes (582-95) 2 Sep.
Kyriakos II (595-606) 30 Oct.
Thomas I (607-10) 22 Feb.
Paul III (688-94) 2 Sep.
Germanos I (715-30) 12 May
……………(Iconoclastic controversy, first period: 730-87)
Paul IV Neos (780-84) 30 Aug.
Tarasios (784-806) 25 Feb.

(Niconclastic controversy, second period: 814-43)
Theodotos I Kassiteras (815–21)
Antonios I (821–36)
Ioannes VII Grammatikos (836–43)
Methodios I (843-47) 14 Jun.
Ignatios (847-58, 867-77) 23 Oct.
Photios (858-67, 877-86) 6 Feb. [mneme]
Stephanos I (886-93) 27 May [mneme], Venetian addition
Antonios II Kauleas (893-901) 12 Feb.
Nikolaos I Mystikos (901-07, 912-25) 15 May [mneme]
Euthymios I (907-12) 5 Aug. [mneme], Venetian addition
Stephanos II (925–28) 18 Jul. [mneme]
Tryphon (928–31)
Theophylaktos (933–56)
Polyeuktos (956-70) 5 Feb. [mneme]
Basileios I Skamandrenos (970–74)
Antonios III (974–79)
Nikolaos II Chrysoberges (979-91) 16 Dec. [mneme]
Sisinnios II (996–99)
Sergios II (1001-19) 12 Apr. [mneme]
Eustathios (1019-25) 31 May [mneme]

We can confirm that, adding the recent important Patriarchs in the form of mneme, the continuity of the Patriarchate after the victory of Orthodoxy is emphasized. Some Patriarchs have been omitted for an uncertain reason.

In the Patriarchal calendar, the following feasts are celebrated both by the orthros and the leitougia, and constitute evidence of an important feast. Of particular note is the emphasis on St. Aberkios.

8 Sep. Birth of the Virgin Mary
14 Sep. Exaltation of the Cross
22 Oct. St. Aberkios
8 Nov. Synaxis of the Archangels
13 Nov. St. John Chrysostom
21 Nov. Presentation of the Virgin to the Temple
25 Dec. Nativity of Christ
6 Jan. Theophany (Baptism of Christ)
25 Jan. St. Gregory the Theologian
2 Feb. Presentation of Christ to the Temple
25 Mar. Annunciation
11 May. Birth of the City (Constantinople), litany instead of orthros
24 Jun. Birth of St. John the Baptist
29 Jun. St. Peter and Paul
6 Aug. Transfiguration of Christ
29 Aug. Beheading of St. John the Baptist

Relationship with the Roman Church

The donation by the Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (r.1042-55) to the Patriarchate enabled the everyday liturgy in Hagia Sophia. This was the main reason why several Patriarchal lectionaries were produced in a short time in the second half of the eleventh century. During the reign of Constantine, the Byzantines experienced another great event: the schism of the Eastern and Western Churches. Is it the case that the decision that Patriarch Michael I Keroularios (r. 1043-59) had made, the excommunication of the Pope, did not influence the sphere of religious art, or at least the richly-illustrated Patriarchal lectionary in Venice?

(46) Consequently, the year 1025 provides us terminus post quem for the Patriarchal calendar.
(47) See also Lowden, 37-38, Table 6.
(48) Nelson, 96.
I would like to point to one notable feature in the iconographic program of the manuscript. The Venice Lectionary includes 96 narrative miniatures in the initial letters and margins, except for the headpiece with the Deisis (f.4r) and single figures in the initial letters. One pericope is basically visualized by one picture in the manuscript, but the extreme exception is the episode of the prodigal son (ff. 219r-220v: Kyriake pro tes apokreo, Lk. 15:11-32), which is narrated by eleven sequences:

1. Christ in the initial E which corresponds with “Ἐιπεν ὁ κύριος”, designating that the whole parable is narrated by himself (219r);
2. The elder son is faithful to his father, but the younger son runs away from home (219r);
3. The younger son, being hungry, sits alone on the rock (219r);
4. The younger son regrets and weeps, “Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee” (219v);
5. Going back home, the younger son and the father embrace (219v);
6. The father gives the order to the servants to dress the younger son (219v);
7. A servant brings out a fat calf to kill (220r);
8. They began their merry-making (220r);
9. The elder son complains to his father that he has never made a party for the faithful son (220r);
10. The father soothes that all of his property belongs to his elder son (220r);
11. The father reconciles the elder son and the younger son (221r, the episode does not correspond to the Biblical text).

Given the obvious emphasis on the cycle of the prodigal son, what is the intention of the Patriarchate, the patron of the manuscript? The prodigal son who betrays his father is the figure of the Roman Church; the tolerant father, however, always awaits his return. This is, of course, merely a hypothetical interpretation without documental evidence, but another illustrated Gospel lectionary, though not a Patriarchal one, may provide evidence that corroborates my theory: Skevophylakion (Sacristy) cod. 3 in the Vatopedi Monastery on Mount Athos.

The Vatopedi Lectionary shares the emphasis on the cycle of the prodigal son with the Venice Lectionary. The former narrates the story in ten sequences differently from the latter:

1. The initial E includes three persons, the father sitting, the elder son extending his hand to the father, and the younger son turning away from the father (129v);
2. With a fan, the younger son blows the man and woman who hug each other at the dining table (130r);
3. The younger son, now poor, is standing in front of a rich man sitting (130r);
4. The younger son is feeding swine (130r);
5. The father and the younger son are embracing (130v);
6. The younger son is dressing with the help of servants (130v);
7. A servant slaughters a calf (131r);
8. The father and the younger son are on a luxurious banquet table. It shows a person playing lyre, roasted animals, a wine vase, and so on (131r);
9. The elder son complains to his father (131r);
10. Conversation of two old men with white hair and beard; one on the right in red clothes raises his hands, and the other on the left in grey clothes crosses his hands at his chest, a gesture of repentance (131v).

The most interesting image in the Vatopedi Lectionary is Scene 10 of the reconciliation; the reconciliation should be made between the elder son and the father, or between the elder and younger sons, or, as in the Venice

---


\(^{(51)}\) Kadas (1998), 592, fig.540-e.

\(^{(52)}\) Kadas (2008), 112, describes as “συνομιλία πατέρα με πρεσβύτερο υἱό (father’s conversation with the eldest son)”, who overlooks the latter’s representation of white hair and beard.
Lectionary, among the three, the father, the elder son and the younger son. The Vatopedi Lectionary, however, represents two old men, suggesting the Eastern and the Western Churches. It goes without saying that reconciliation must be made by the Western Church’s repentance from the standpoint of Constantinople.

Furthermore, the Vatopedi Lectionary places at the beginning of the manuscript, the headpiece representing the Trinity with the Orthodox interpretation (f.3r) [Fig. 1]. In the center of the square headpiece, the enthroned Ancient of Days is depicted. Around this, eight smaller medallions are arranged; among them, on the top is the Hetoimasia, and below the Ancient of Days, Christ Immanuel, looking up and pointing above with his right hand, is depicted. Placing the Hetoimasia, the symbol of the Holy Spirit, above the Ancient of Days, and Christ Immanuel below the Ancient of Days, the creator of the iconography emphasizes that the Holy Spirit does not appear through the Son, but directly from God the Father. Thus, the Vatopedi Lectionary tries to establish the Orthodox standpoint of anti-filioque after the Great Schism.

The Vatopedi Lectionary includes another half-page headpiece with the Deisis (f.67r, the beginning of the second part of the synaxarion, of Matthew) [Fig. 2]. A comprehensive image of two Vatopedi headpieces can be found in the so-called Meleniko (Melnik) Lectionary at Athens (cod. 2645, f.1r) [Fig. 3]. The Patriarchal Venice Lectionary has many elements in common with them [Fig. 4]. Perhaps from the standpoint of three aspects of Christ (Immanuel, Pantokrator, the Ancient of Days), we should consult the headpieces of the Paris Gospels, Cod.Paris.gr. 74. The iconography of the headpiece in the Byzantine Gospel lectionary is, however, a matter for another paper.

As evident in the Vatopedi and Venice Lectionaries, the parable of the prodigal son, in later-eleventh-century Constantinople, is a visual claim of the Orthodox Church against the Roman Church. Although the audience of the manuscripts was quite limited, the two surviving examples of the cycle of the prodigal son suggest that the connotation of the iconography was recognized by the inhabitants of Constantinople.

---


55 We should add here the Paris Gospels, Cod.Paris.gr. 74 (ff.143r-v), which depicts the parable in seven sequences.
Ἀμήν, κάθηται ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ. Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἄσειστον καὶ ἄφλεκτον καὶ ἀναίμακτον. Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων ἡμῶν βασιλέων. Ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς καταστάσεως. Καὶ μετὰ τὰ ἀντίφωνα λέγει ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τὰς προσυνήθεις ἐκτενεῖς δεήσεις οὕτως:

Ἡ κυρίως καὶ ἀληθῶς Θεοτόκος: δ’Εὐλογήσει τὸν στέφανον τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ τῆς χρηστότητός σου [Ps 45:2]: Ἀντίφωνον γ’· Ψαλμὸς ξδʹ

Στίχος β’· Ψαλμὸς β’· περισσὴ δὲ οὐ λέγεται. Ἀντιλαβοῦ μου, Κύριε. Νῦν τὸ τοῦτο αὐτὸ προσκλαίει τὰς προσγειώσεις τῆς προσευχῆς ἐκτελεῖ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς [Ps 2:13]: Δόξα, καὶ νῦν.

Ἀντίφωνον β’· Ψαλμὸς β’· Τὰς κεφαλὰς, ὁ ψάλτης τὸ προκείμενον· Εἶτα εὐλογοῦσι εἰς τὸν θρόνον τοῦ Κυρίου ἡ παρακλήσις [Ps 64:12]. Καὶ λέγοντος τοῦ διακόνου· Ἐν εἰρήνῃ τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν [Ps 45:2]: Καταφυγὴ καὶ δύναμις οἱ ψάλται τὸ αὐτὸ τρισάγιον. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ πληρῶσαι τοῦτο καὶ τὸν λαὸν ἐκφωνεῖ ὁ διάκονος εὐχὴν λέγουσιν ἐν τῷ ἄμβωνι ἔναρξιν τὸ μέγα τρισάγιον τὸς Κυρίου ἡμῶν τοῦ Θεοτόκου: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐκφωνῆσαι τὸν ἀρχιερέα· ἢ τὸν ἱερέα· καὶ εἰρηνεῦσαι ἀυτὸν· οὐ λέγει ὁ διάκονος: ἀλλ’ ἄρχεται· καθ’ἑξῆς:

Γινομένη τῇ α΄ τοῦ σεπτεμβρίου μηνὸς· εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Ἰνδίκτου· ἀπερχομένης τῆς λιτῆς ἐν τῷ Φόρῳ καὶ Καθ’ἑξῆς. Τὰς κεφαλὰς, ὁ ἰσότιμος αὐτῶν· ἤτοι τὸ ἀδιάκονον τῆς καταστάσεως. Ἔναρξιν τὸ μέγα τρισάγιον· τοῦτο ἐφοβοῦτος ῥάθιαστος ὁ λαὸς: ὁ διάκονος εὐχὴν λέγουσιν ἐν τῷ ἄμβωνι ἔναρξιν τὸ μέγα τρισάγιον. Τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ, ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Ναζαρέτ οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος· ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τὸν λαὸν γ’ καὶ λέγει· Σον γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἐλεεῖν καὶ σώζειν, ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν καὶ σοὶ τὴν δόξαν τῆς καταστάσεως. Καὶ ἐν ὁδῷ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς· ἢ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ ἐκεῖνος· ἢ ἄρχεται· καθ’ἑξῆς: μὴ λέγοντος ἐκατομμύριον· ἕναρξιν ὁ διάκονος εὐχὴν λέγουσιν ἐν τῷ θρόνων τοῦ Κυρίου· ἀλλ’ ἄρχεται· καθ’ἑξῆς: Τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ· ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Ναζαρέτ· ἐκτελοῦσαν τὴν ἀρχήν τὴς Ἰνδίκτου· ἀπερχομένης τῆς λιτῆς ἐν τῷ Φόρῳ καὶ Καθ’ἑξῆς: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐκφωνῆσαι τὸν ἀρχιερέα· ἢ τὸν ἱερέα· καὶ εἰρηνεῦσαι ἀυτὸν· οὐ λέγει ὁ διάκονος: ἀλλ’ ἄρχεται· καθ’ἑξῆς: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐκφωνῆσαι τὸν ἀρχιερέα· ἢ τὸν ἱερέα· καὶ εἰρηνεῦσαι ἀυτὸν· οὐ λέγει ὁ διάκονος: ἀλλ’ ἄρχεται· καθ’ἑξῆς: Τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ· ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Ναζαρέτ· ἐκτελοῦσαν τὴν ἀρχήν τὴς Ἰνδίκτου· ἀπερχομένης τῆς λιτῆς ἐν τῷ Φόρῳ καὶ Καθ’ἑξῆς: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐκφωνῆσαι τὸν ἀρχιερέα· ἢ τὸν ἱερέα· καὶ εἰρηνεῦσαι ἀυτὸν· οὐ λέγει ὁ διάκονος: ἀλλ’ ἄρχεται· καθ’ἑξῆς: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐκφωνῆσαι τὸν ἀρχιερέα· ἢ τὸν ἱερέα· καὶ εἰρηνεῦσαι ἀυτὸν· οὐ λέγει ὁ διάκονος: ἀλλ’ ἄρχεται· καθ’ἑξῆς: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐκφωνῆσαι τὸν ἀρχιερέα· ἢ τὸν ἱερέα· καὶ εἰρηνεῦσαι ἀυτὸν· οὐ λέγει ὁ διάκονος: ἀλλ’ ἄρχεται· καθ’ἑξῆς: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐκφωνῆσαι τὸν ἀρχιερέα· ἢ τὸν ἱερέα· καὶ εἰρηνεῦσαι ἀυτὸν· οὐ λέγει ὁ διάκονος: ἀλλ’ ἄρχεται· καθ’ἑξῆς: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐκφωνῆσαι τὸν ἀρχιερέα· ἢ τὸν ἱερέα· καὶ εἰρηνεῦσαι ἀυτὸν· οὐ λέγει ὁ διάκονος: ἀλλ’ ἄρχεται· καθ’ἑξῆς:

The text was mainly edited from Paris.gr. 286 and Venice, IE gr. 2, and referenced other manuscripts as appropriate. Formerly the text was published in: A. Dmitrievskii, Opisanie liturgicheskikh rukopisei, khranitsekhikhia v bibliotekakh pravoslavnogo Vostoka, Kiev 1895, vol.1, 152–54 (rep. in: Mateos, vol.2, 200-03). See also Lowden, 28-31.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athos, Vatopedi</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>1067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athos, Lavra</td>
<td>A92</td>
<td>1055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Auct.T inf.2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, NL 174</td>
<td></td>
<td>1038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, Suppl.gr. 1096</td>
<td></td>
<td>1026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, NL 57</td>
<td></td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, Suppl.gr. 1081</td>
<td>773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinai gr. 221</td>
<td>855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinai.gr. 257</td>
<td></td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL Add. 11840</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, NL 150 (1089)</td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venetia, Ev gr.157</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Aud.T inf.2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, NL 190</td>
<td></td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice, VI gr. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice, III gr. 2</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, gr. 206</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge UL, Dd. 8.23</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, Suppl.gr. 1096</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinai.gr. 221</td>
<td>855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinai.gr. 257</td>
<td>851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL Add. 11840</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, NL 150 (1089)</td>
<td></td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venetia, Evgr. 157</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Aud.T inf.2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, NL 190</td>
<td></td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice, VI gr. 2</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, gr. 206</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Patriarchal Lectionaries of Constantinople: A New Criterion for the Encaenia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location/Institution</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Sep</td>
<td>Egkainia agias Christou tou Thous Nemont Anavatos (without Patriarchal Sphorakiou)</td>
<td>Athos, Vatopedi</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Sep</td>
<td>Hyperegyia Theoukoumenon te Patra</td>
<td>Athos, Dionysiou</td>
<td>82 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Oct</td>
<td>Egkainia to kathariou te patagion Theoukoumenon (without Patriarchal Sphorakiou)</td>
<td>Athens, NL</td>
<td>2513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Nov</td>
<td>Hyperegyia Theoukoumenon te Kyriou</td>
<td>Athens, NL</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Nov</td>
<td>Egkainia ton Theodorou en ton (Sphorakiou)</td>
<td>Athen, NL</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dec</td>
<td>Egkainia ton Nea Boukikon Ekleisis</td>
<td>Athen, NL</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Dec</td>
<td>Egkainia ton Chalkoprateia</td>
<td>Athen, NL</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Dec</td>
<td>Anoixia to Megale Ekklesia</td>
<td>Athen, NL</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Dec</td>
<td>Egkainia ton Megale Ekklesia</td>
<td>Athen, NL</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 May</td>
<td>Egkainia ton Nea Boukikon Ekleisis</td>
<td>Athen, NL</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 May</td>
<td>Kataxenia teis enosis ton N. Boukikon Ekleisis (without Patriarchal Sphorakiou)</td>
<td>Athen, NL</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 May</td>
<td>Egkainia ton Nea Boukikon Ekleisis as te Page</td>
<td>Athen, NL</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 May</td>
<td>Egkainia ton Nea Boukikon Ekleisis as te Page</td>
<td>Athen, NL</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 May</td>
<td>Kataxenia teis enosis ton Hyperegyia Theoukoumenon (without Patriarchal Sphorakiou)</td>
<td>Athen, NL</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- "(L)" means "without egkainia"
- "(R)" means "without egkainia" and "as te Page""
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Fig. 1 Vatopedi Monastery, Sklovychakion Cod. 3, f. 3r

Fig. 2 Vatopedi Monastery, Sklovychakion Cod. 3, f. 67r
Fig. 3 Athens, National Library Cod.2645, f.1r

Fig. 4 Venice, Istituto Ellenico Cod.gr.2, f.4r