

VERITATEM INQUIRERE



PONTIFICIA UNIVERSITÀ  
DELLA SANTA CROCE  
**Roma**



UNIWERSYTET  
MIKOŁAJA KOPERNIKA  
**Toruń**

«**VERITATEM INQUIRERE**»  
Liturgiae Fontes et Studia

*Doctorum Collegium*

- ALZATI Cesare (Italia)
- AROCENA Félix (Spagna)
- BAROFFIO Giacomo (Italia)
- BRZEZIŃSKI Daniel (Polonia)
- DAL COVOLO Enrico (Italia)
- GIRAUDO Cesare (Italia)
- GŁUSIUK Anna Aleksandra (Polonia)
- GUTIERREZ José Luis (Italia)
- IADANZA Mario (Italia)
- MEDEIROS Damásio (Brasile)
- NAVONI Marco (Italia)
- POTOCZNY Mateusz Rafał (Polonia)
- ROSZAK Piotr (Polonia)
- SALVARANI Renata (Italia)
- SEGUI I TROBAT Gabriel (Spagna)
- SODI Manlio (Italia - **direttore scientifico**: manliosodi@gmail.com)
- SUSKI Andrzej (Polonia)
- TONIOLO Alessandro (Italia)
- TRAPANI Valeria (Italia)
- TUREK Waldemar (Polonia)
- ZACCARIA Giovanni (Italia - **direttore editoriale**: g.zaccaria@pusc.it)
- ŻADŁO Andrzej (Polonia)

Daniel Eusterman

THE CONSECRATION  
OF HOLY MYRON

A Study of the Byzantine Prayer (*Barb.gr.336*)  
for a Roman Liturgical Theology

EDUSC 2024

© Copyright 2024 – Edizioni Santa Croce s.r.l.  
Via Sabotino 2/A – 00195 Roma  
Tel. + 39 06 45493637  
*info@edusc.it – www.edizionisantacroce.it*

ISBN 979-12-5482-232-6

## ABBREVIATIONS

- AAS *Acta Apostolicae Sedis: Commentarium Officiale*. Vatican City State: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1909ff.
- BAR = *Barberini Euchologion (Vatican Barb. gr. 336)*  
PARENTI, S. and E. VELKOVSKA. *L'Eucologio Barberini gr. 336: Seconda edizione riveduta, con traduzione in lingua italiana*. BELS 80. Edited by A. PISTOIA and A.M. TRIACCA. Rome: CLV-EL, 2000.
- BAS The Byzantine Divine Liturgy of St. Basil the Great (Greek)
- BELS *Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" Subsidia*
- BES = *Bessarion Euchologion (Grottaferrata Γ.β.Ι)*  
ARRANZ, M. "Les sacrements de l'ancien Euchologe constantinopolitain (1): Étude préliminaire des sources." *OCP* 48 (1982) 290.
- CCC *The Catechism of the Catholic Church, Second Edition*. Vatican City State: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2000.
- CCEC = *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*  
*Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*. Washington D.C.: Canon Law Society of America, 1992.
- CCEO *Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium* (cf. CCEC)
- CCSL *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*
- CHR The Byzantine Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom (Greek)
- CLV-EL Centro Liturgico Vincenziano – Edizioni Liturgiche
- COI = *Coislin 213*  
ARRANZ, M. "Les sacrements de l'ancien Euchologe constantinopolitain (1): Étude préliminaire des sources." *OCP* 48 (1982) 309.

ABBREVIATIONS

- CSEL *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*
- DACL *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1925.
- EBE = *Athens 662 Euchologion*  
 ARRANZ, M. "Les sacrements de l'ancien Euchologe constantinopolitain (1): Étude préliminaire des sources." *OCP* 48 (1982) 316.
- ESV *The Holy Bible: English Standard Version* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Bibles, 2016).
- JAS The Byzantine Divine Liturgy of St. James (Greek)
- JLW *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*
- m.t. my translation
- OCA *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*
- OCP *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*
- PG *Patrologia Graeca*
- POR *Codex Porphyrii (Porfirii-Leningrad 226)*  
 ARRANZ, M. "Les sacrements de l'ancien Euchologe constantinopolitain (1): Étude préliminaire des sources." *OCP* 48 (1982) 300.
- SEV *Sevastianov 474 (R. Staats-Bibl., Φ. 270)*  
 ARRANZ, M. "Les sacrements de l'ancien Euchologe constantinopolitain (1): Étude préliminaire des sources." *OCP* 48 (1982) 303.
- SIN *Sinaiticus 959*  
 ARRANZ, M. "Les sacrements de l'ancien Euchologe constantinopolitain (1): Étude préliminaire des sources." *OCP* 48 (1982) 305.
- ST THOMAS AQUINAS. *Summa Theologica*. Translated by FATHERS OF THE ENGLISH DOMINICAN PROVINCE. Westminster: Christian Classics, 1981.

## INTRODUCTION

Holy myron, or sacred chrism, as it is called in the Roman tradition, is a captivating and evocative sacramental in the Church, used in several key moments of the liturgical and spiritual lives of Christians in both the East and the West. The moving images of oil shining on the crown of the head of a newly baptized baby and the intense fragrance which exudes from the hands of a newly ordained priest capture the senses in a way unlike any other ritual or sacramental. Yet, while the human and religious attraction to this sacred material appears to be universal, the theology, practice, and vision surrounding the consecrated oil among the different Churches and traditions varies intensely.

In the East, the holy myron holds an extremely elevated place in the theological tradition of the Greek Byzantines, used primarily for the incorporation of new members into the Church. In the West, the sacred chrism is also highly regarded, kept under lock and key, and it plays a wider range of roles in the liturgical life of the Church: it is not only the essential matter for Confirmation, but it is also used within “explanatory rites” for the sake of a liturgical teaching moment. In both traditions, the consecration of this aromatic oil has been reserved to the bishop alone (now Patriarchs alone in the East) and is one of the key elements for the dedication of a church and its altar. While the Roman preparation of the sacred chrism traditionally entails a simple mixture of olive oil and fragrant balsam, the Byzantine tradition has developed a complex process of cutting, soaking, cooking, and mixing 57 different ingredients in the form of a liturgy that spans the length of Holy Week up to its consecration on Holy Thursday.<sup>1</sup>

Theologically, sacred chrism is also at the center of debates in sacramental and liturgical theology since scholars have sought to determine the ancient foundations of today’s post-baptismal anointing when there is little to no concrete evidence of such consecratory anointings in the New Testament and the earliest Apostolic practice. As such a captivating reality, chrism is a clear source of rich spiritual and theological fruits in the life of any Christian; yet, there is much that is left unknown and unrecognized by both the faithful and theologians alike. However, that is not to say that it has not been studied nor developed. Rather, as this work demonstrates, many different scholarly works of liturgical and historical studies engage sacred chrism and holy myron within the scope of research, since it has

<sup>1</sup> M. ARRANZ, “Les sacrements de l’ancien Euchologe constantinopolitain (10): La consécration du saint myron,” *OCP* (1989), 324.

such an essential role from the earliest centuries. Yet, in the East and West, this consecratory oil is rarely the primary object of theological study, especially as it is found within its own proper celebratory setting. As will be introduced in the following sections, this study seeks to uncover some of the expectant riches contained within the treasure of the Church's liturgical patrimony.

## 1. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this project is twofold. At the first level, the more immediate goal is to discover and present the Byzantine theological vision of the holy myron by means of examining the rituals encompassing its consecration and its use in anointing. This study, accomplished from a Western, Roman perspective, approaches the treasures of the Byzantine liturgical tradition for the sake of bearing fruits for a broader, remote goal. This remote goal is to widen and strengthen the liturgical-theological vision surrounding the Sacrament of Confirmation and the rites for Christian Initiation. The ancient adage *legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi* ("the law of the prayer establishes the law of belief")<sup>2</sup> is often used as the condensed form of explanation for liturgical theology.<sup>3</sup> If the prayer of the Church within the liturgy is the source and *locus* for theology itself to be possible at all,<sup>4</sup> then the liturgical celebration, the *lex orandi*, of the Church is best studied in a manner wider than a single liturgical tradition. Rather, when the lens of study is widened in liturgical theology, the depth of vision into the mysteries at hand can become more vibrant.

In stricter terms, the specific purpose of this study is to discover and present the Byzantine theological vision of holy myron as it flows from the *lex orandi* of the liturgy. The remote goal of this study, then, is that the broader vision gained by the study would supplement the Western theological understanding of Confirmation and Initiation, thus promoting a mutual enrichment to better express the fuller *lex orandi* and *lex credendi* of the Universal Church.

<sup>2</sup> Often summarized as *lex orandi est lex credendi*.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. R. TAFT, "The Epiclesis Question in the Light of the Orthodox and Catholic Lex Orandi Traditions," in *New Perspectives on Historical Theology: Essays in Memory of John Meyendorff*, (ed) B. NASSIF (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1996), 210; D.W. FAGERBERG, "Why We Need Alexander Schmemmann," in *Communio* 48 (2021) 838-843.

<sup>4</sup> "The formula *lex orandi est lex credendi* means nothing else than that theology is possible only within the Church, i.e., as a fruit of this new life in Christ, granted in the sacramental *leitourgia*, as a witness to the eschatological fullness of the Church, as in other terms, a participation in this *leitourgia*" (A. SCHMEMMANN, "Theology and Liturgical Tradition," in *Liturgy and Tradition*, (ed) T. FISCH (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1990), 18; as cited in D.W. FAGERBERG, "Why We Need Alexander Schmemmann," 839-840).



## 2. METHODOLOGY

The methodology by which these purposes are fulfilled is twofold. First, the *mis en place*, i.e., setting up and preparing for the research by situating the study, as much as is possible, within the celebratory context of the liturgy. Second, completing the liturgical theology of the holy myron in that celebratory context by means of the proper extant sources.

The first aspect of the methodology, setting everything in place, situates the liturgical texts in their *celebratory setting*. The setting is a complex reality, made up of the traditions and practices of the ancient Byzantine liturgy, the particular liturgy for the rites incorporating holy myron, and the timing of the celebrations within the year. The doorway used to access this celebratory setting is the eighth-century *Barberini Euchologion*, the most ancient, extant *Euchologion* of the Byzantine Rite.<sup>5</sup> Though the liturgy of the Byzantine Rite varied in the ancient Church by Patriarchate,<sup>6</sup> and while the current practices vary even more widely,<sup>7</sup> the rituals in this ancient *Euchologion* are the foundation and source for the vast majority of Byzantine liturgies for holy myron today.<sup>8</sup> The liturgies which involve the holy myron in this complex liturgical setting are represented most explicitly by the celebration of the *consecration* of the holy myron and *its use* in the post-baptismal anointing for Christian Initiation. These two liturgies are not only united in their liturgical purpose, i.e., consecrated oil for anointing, but they are also united in their liturgical timing: Holy Week. The consecration of the holy myron occurs within the Divine Liturgy on Holy Thursday and then it reaches its purpose in the post-baptismal anointing, or Chrismation, at the Easter Vigil on Holy Saturday. Such a context makes up the

<sup>5</sup> Chapter One presents the *Barberini Euchologion* in full and argues for its selection in this study.

The terminology around the different “Rites” and “Churches” is particularly complex and important to understand for this presentation. The *Barberini* is a witness to the practice of the Greek Byzantine Rite with its roots in the Cathedral liturgy of Constantinople, before the Great Schism of the eleventh century. Thus, to claim that this study regards “the East” and “the West” is a drastic oversimplification since the Churches of Christianity are much more varied and complex.

<sup>6</sup> The liturgical practices, or *ordines*, varied based on the different Patriarchal cities within the Byzantine Empire. In the early centuries of the Byzantine Church, Jerusalem’s Byzantine tradition looked different than that of Constantinople. In time, most distinct Churches within Byzantium adopted the liturgy of the capitol, Constantinople. Therefore, when this study claims that the *Barberini Euchologion* represents the “Byzantine Rite” or the “Byzantine theological vision,” it does not mean it in the strictest sense. Rather, such a description is simplifying the language according to the eventual transformation and unification of practice around the Constantinopolitan *ordo*, both as regards the Eucharistic celebrations as well as the consecration of holy myron. In the strictest sense, this study is studying (1) the Constantinopolitan *ordo* of the (2) wider, ancient Byzantine Rite for (3) the consecration and use of holy myron (4) as evidenced by the *Barberini Euchologion*.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Chapter One, Section 1.2. “Ancient Authority or Constantinopolitan Practice?”

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Chapter One, Section 1.2.1. “The Seventeenth-Century Venetian Branch.”

celebratory setting of the holy myron and makes the liturgical theology of holy myron, the second aspect of the methodology, possible.

This second aspect of the project's methodology is made up of a two-fold analysis of the ritual and the prayer. First, the examination focuses narrowly and looks deeply at the *structure* of the ritual and how its form and placement within the Divine Liturgy reveals how the celebration itself presents the holy myron. This is completed by means of an exhaustive comparison of the prayer's form to other similar prayers. In this way, the attributes of the myron ritual and prayer which seem peculiar when viewed in isolation can be "normalized" within the context of like prayers. Again, this approach seeks to examine the liturgical celebration within its proper setting, avoiding the imposition of later patterns and structures in theological and liturgical development. This structural framing of the rite then contextualizes the second part of the theological analysis which studies the *content* of the prayer and its theological vision of the holy myron. As the final step of the study, this last examination shows that the liturgical text itself is not the true "object of study." Rather, the work of each step leading up to the theological examination of the content attempts to 'en-flesh' the prayer and its voice within the celebratory setting. Though the manuscript containing the *Barberini Euchologion* is indeed a text which can be studied, the real source for theology is the liturgy *qua* celebrated. Thus, the content of the prayer, the gestures, and the liturgical timing all present the holy myron in an embodied theological vision rather than as an object to be studied.<sup>9</sup>

This immediately demonstrates one of the limitations of this particular form of methodology. Though there is a demonstrable benefit to studying an ancient *Euchologion*,<sup>10</sup> the *Barberini Euchologion* is a type of prayer book which does not contain all of the details of the celebration such as antiphons, scriptural readings, or hymns which would serve to further situate the holy myron within its celebratory setting. Yet, for this project, that does not present a major issue, as the rites for the consecration of myron and for Christian Initiation contain a sufficient supply of indicators to uncover the core of the liturgy's vision of the myron. However, the nature of studying any ancient liturgy is that it can never be *perfectly* reconstructed, so there will always be

<sup>9</sup> This language intentionally echoes the presentation of David Fagerberg and Alexander Schmemmann who both fight to defend the art of "liturgical theology," especially as compared to the easy-to-mistake "theology of the liturgy." For example, Fagerberg describes the distinction between them: "Object or source—that is the decision. [...] Liturgical theology discovers, while theology of the liturgy produces. The former encounters *theologia* in the *leitourgia* of the Church-in-motion, while the latter imports concepts exterior to the cult. The former is subject to the Church's inspired and operative tradition, while the latter subjects liturgy to hypotheses of the day. The former can produce liturgical mysticism, while the latter produces more bibliography. The former is liturgical dogmatics, while the latter is philosophy of religion focused on ritual studies" (D.W. FAGERBERG, "Why We Need Alexander Schmemmann," 853-854).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Chapter One, Section 1. "Why an Ancient Euchologion?"

some form of incompleteness regarding the material which allows access to the true source for study, i.e., the actual liturgical celebration.

It is also necessary to clarify that such a methodology does not seek to go beyond what it is capable of. In no way does this approach attempt to discover and present the exhaustive and final Byzantine theological vision of holy myron. Instead, limiting itself to the *Barberini Euchologion*, this methodology presents the roots of such a vision in the tradition's earliest extant source. Further, this work does not presume to present any form of doctrinal definitions regarding holy myron, Chrismation, Confirmation, and the rites of Christian Initiation.<sup>11</sup> Any implications the results of this methodology might have in the areas of such *theologia secunda* are for other masters of sacramental or dogmatic theology to ponder on.<sup>12</sup> Finally, this study does not presume to display true expertise in Byzantine theology, history, or liturgy as it is coming from a clear Roman context. Yet, there is a sufficient foundation of study, research, and inquiry among such specialists within the work to perform what it sets out to accomplish.

### 3. STRUCTURE

Therefore, this methodological approach is structured into two main parts. Part One, containing two chapters, is an introduction to the *Barberini Euchologion* with its texts for incorporating the consecration of myron into the Divine Liturgy. Chapter One introduces the *Barberini Euchologion* and its manuscript, the *Vatican Barb. gr. 336*. It defends the ancient *Barberini* as the fitting choice for this study rather than a "current" rite or any another ancient Constantinopolitan source which followed after it. It ends with a presentation of the Greek text, accompanied by an English translation, for incorporating the consecration of myron into the Divine Liturgy.

Chapter Two gives an overview of the scholarship on the *Barberini Euchologion* since its discovery in the seventeenth century, followed by a summary of the handful of scholars who have worked with its rite for the consecration of myron. Among these, Miguel Arranz proves to be the most expert, first, in light of his numerous publications involving the sacramental rituals in several ancient Constantinopolitan *Euchologia* and, second, due to his particular focus on the rite for the consecration of holy myron.

<sup>11</sup> Since there is no dogmatic claim made on the nature of the Sacraments and for the sake of linguistic simplicity, the three terms "Confirmation," "Chrismation," and "post-baptismal anointing" will be used synonymously to describe the same Sacrament. The only exception to this rule, which will be noted when referenced, is in reference to the Roman post-baptismal anointing with sacred chrism which is only an explanatory rite.

<sup>12</sup> Robert Taft describes the difference between liturgical theology, or *theologia prima*, and the systematic and dogmatic formulations which develop posteriorly: "[Theologia prima is] first-level theology, the faith expressed in the life of the Church antecedent to speculative questioning of its implications, prior to its formulation in dogmatic propositions resulting from 'theologia secunda' or second-level theology, systematic reflection on the lived mystery in the Church" (R. TAFT, "The Epiclesis Question," 211).

Part Two, also containing two chapters, presents the particular study and engagement with the liturgy for the consecration of holy myron. Chapter Three considers the contributions of the previous scholars and then builds on them with new research. It recognizes the essential nature of their work and, at the same time, identifies the need for development in their work where the natural limits of their approaches prevented them from progressing. The result is the renewed study of the *structure* of the ritual for consecration which, in comparison with other anaphoral prayers, reveals a more comprehensive depiction of the nature and function of the consecratory rite and prayer. In particular, the consecratory prayer is shown to be the purely epicletic portion of an anaphoral prayer which is a redactional conglomeration of a “*Worthiness Petition*” and two distinct, explicit, and proper consecratory epicleses from the Alexandrian anaphoral tradition. Then, where the prayer lacks a proper anamnestic section, the *ordo* “grafts” it onto the Eucharistic anaphora of the Divine Liturgy.

Chapter Four, filling the foundational framework of the structure study, turns towards the euchological content of the actual prayer of consecration and offers a line-by-line theological commentary. Drawing from the euchological and theological setting which surrounds and precedes the *Barberini Euchologion*, the particular words and images employed by the prayer concretize the Byzantine theological vision of holy myron. The Conclusion of the study then draws this theological vision of the *lex orandi* into a synthesis in two sections. The first section presents the *methodological* conclusions of the research, i.e., how approaching the study of holy myron within its proper liturgical, euchological, and theological setting allows for unique access to understanding its nature. The second section describes the *theological* conclusions of the research. These are not doctrinal definitions of the myron and the Sacraments, but, rather, syntheses of the theology which is contained within and flows from the liturgy itself. Such a presentation not only adds to the greater Christian theological vision of holy myron and sacred chrism, but, even more, it expands that same vision regarding the nature of liturgy, the unity of the mystical rituals in Initiation, i.e., Baptism, Chrismation, and the Eucharist, and, lastly, the powerfully effective changes wrought by the coming and the “touch” of the Holy Spirit for the sake of participation in the Divine Life.

#### 4. PREVALENCE AND UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION

Therefore, such a study is an important addition to this realm of theological inquiry because it uncovers riches of the Church’s embodied belief involving holy myron and Christian Initiation, her *lex orandi*. Yet more, the methodology of this work draws forth the Church’s vision in a way which has not been done up to this point. Where previous scholarship set the beginnings of this research in an indirect manner, the following research and results form an ampler theological vision which can only be accessed by means of a detailed liturgical theology.

## INTRODUCTION

Consequently, by situating the study of myron within its celebrative, euchological, and theological settings, the following research not only presents the holy myron within its proper context for examination, but it also unearths a more comprehensive theological vision of holy myron. Thus, as other systematic and abstract theological approaches to Chrismation and Confirmation can give insights regarding the nature and importance of this Sacrament *from without* the actual celebration, it is only a liturgical theology such as this which mines the depths of the Church's *theologia prima* to learn her theological vision *from within* the liturgy. Then, in tandem with this work, further research in liturgical theology, based on other liturgical celebrations such as that of the *Barberini Euchologion*, can uncover an ever wider theological vision for the Church's celebration of anointing within Christian Initiation.



## PART ONE

### AN INTRODUCTION TO THE RITUAL FOR CONSECRATING HOLY MYRON IN THE *BARBERINI EUCHOLOGION* (*Vatican Barb. gr. 336*)

Part One presents the object of study in two chapters. Chapter One introduces the *Barberini Euchologion* as a liturgical source for theological study. It argues the reasons for selecting this ancient *Euchologion* and then presents its contents regarding the consecration of holy myron. Chapter Two summarizes the most pertinent scholarship and its claims about the rite for the consecration of myron in this particular *Euchologion*. All of this sets the scholarly and celebratory context for the deeper, thorough analysis of this Constantinopolitan ritual in Part Two.





## Chapter I

### THE BARBERINI EUCHOLOGION

The foundational source of this liturgical study is the ancient Greek manuscript called the *Vatican Barb. gr. 336*,<sup>1</sup> referred to from here on as the *Barberini Euchologion*. It is the oldest extant Byzantine *Euchologion*, that is, the book which “provides the Eucharistic formularies, the presidential prayers of the Liturgy of the Hours, the rites for the Sacraments, and a more-or-less full series of blessings and prayers for various needs and situations.”<sup>2</sup> In the setting of the Western Church, it would be most akin to the *Sacramentary* or *Roman Missal*.<sup>3</sup> The title for this liturgical book is taken from the two Greek words εὐχή (“prayer”) and λόγιον (“collection”). Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska published their second critical edition of this particular manuscript in 2000 along with an Italian translation of the text.<sup>4</sup> The manuscript dates from the second half of the eighth century<sup>5</sup> and seems to have been copied by hand in what is today southern Italy;<sup>6</sup> however, it is still undoubtedly a *Euchologion* which demonstrates the li-

<sup>1</sup> For much of its history, the manuscript was also referred to as the *Barberinum S. Marci* as it belonged to the Dominican convent of San Marco in Florence for a portion of its history, cf. A. STRITTMATTER, “The ‘Barberinum S. Marci’ of Jacques Goar: *Barberinianus graecus 336*,” *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 47 (1933) 330-331.

<sup>2</sup> S. PARENTI and E. VELKOVSKA, *L’Eucologio Barberini gr. 336: Seconda edizione riveduta, con traduzione in lingua italiana*, BELS 80, (eds) A. PISTOIA and A.M. TRIACCA (Rome: CLV-EL, 2000), 19 (m.t.).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. R. TAFT, *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 53. For more information on the *Euchologion*, cf. J. GETCHA, *The Euchologion Unveiled: An Explanation of Byzantine Liturgical Practice II* (New York: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2021).

<sup>4</sup> S. PARENTI, *L’Eucologio Barberini* (above). It is useful to contextualize the two editions in light of the critical reviews of André Jacob. For Parenti’s first edition, cf. A. JACOB, “Une édition de l’euchologe Barberini,” *Archivio Storico per la Calabria e la Lucania* 64 (1997) 5-31. For Parenti’s second edition, cf. A. JACOB, “Une seconde édition ‘revue’ de l’euchologe Barberini,” *Archivio Storico per la Calabria e la Lucania* 66 (1999) 175-181.

<sup>5</sup> Scholars generally agree on the general eighth century dating given by Leo Allatius, cf. L. ALLATIUS, *De libris ecclesiasticis Graecorum, Dissertationes duae* (Parisii: Chamois, 1645) 72. Parenti gives further citations for narrowing the date to the second half of that century, cf. S. PARENTI, *L’Eucologio Barberini*, 19.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. A. WILMART, “La bénédiction romaine du lait et du miel dans l’Euchologe Barberini,” *Revue Bénédictine* 45 (1933) 11.

turgical tradition of Constantinople.<sup>7</sup> This chapter presents the *Barberini Euchologion* and the texts for the consecration of myron in three parts. The first part describes the choice to study an ancient manuscript rather than a “current rite.” The second part offers three reasons for the study of the *Barberini Euchologion* in particular, rather than other ancient manuscripts for scholarship. The third part introduces the contents of the *Euchologion*, first examining them in general and then presenting the texts for the consecration of myron in detail.

## 1. WHY AN ANCIENT *EUCHOLOGION*?

The *Barberini Euchologion* is indeed the most ancient extant Byzantine *Euchologion*, but this quality is not enough in itself to merit a singular focus for study. It would be more helpful for today’s practice and understanding to study the “current rite” for the Byzantine consecration of holy myron. This would permit a liturgical theology that could be placed into communication and comparison with the current Roman celebration. However, it is not so simple nor clear to compare the current Roman and the Byzantine Rites for the consecration of chrism and myron. There are two main reasons for intentionally avoiding the study of the “current rite” of the Byzantine Church. First, there is no single authorized ritual for the Byzantine consecration of myron today. Second, among the diverse Byzantine practices, there are two main branches of textual tradition for consecrating myron and choosing between them can be a delicate and somewhat political decision.

### 1.1. A “Current” Byzantine Liturgical Practice?

The modern Byzantine liturgical practices vary enough between the different churches that it is impossible to properly specify any one of them as *the* current practice of the Byzantine Rite. Thus, one cannot easily point

<sup>7</sup> “The liturgical practice recorded in the *Euchologion* is considered to reflect that of Constantinople even though the manuscript does not originate there, thus providing the earliest manuscript evidence of the liturgy of the capital” (M. MOROZOWICH, *Holy Thursday in Jerusalem and Constantinople: The Liturgical Celebrations from the Fourth to the Fourteenth Centuries*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, in publication), 47; I am grateful to Fr. Mark for sharing his pre-published manuscript for this project.). Miguel Arranz believed that while the majority of the content of *Barberini Euchologion* “must be considered as Constantinopolitan, the whole of the content seems rather peripheral in origin” (M. ARRANZ, “Les sacrements de l’ancien *Euchologe* constantinopolitain (10): La consécration du saint myron,” *OCP* (1989), 321). For more information on the dating, provenance, history, paleography, and content of the *Barberini Euchologion*, cf. S. PARENTI, *L’Eucologio Barberini*, 19-34; P. DE MEESTER, “Greek Liturgies,” in *Dictionnaire d’Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, (eds) F. CABROL and H. LECLERCQ (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1925), 1591-1662; A. JACOB, “L’evoluzione dei libri liturgici bizantini in Calabria e in Sicilia dall’VIII al XVI secolo, con particolare riguardo ai riti eucaristici,” in *Calabria bizantina, vita religiosa e strutture amministrative: Atti del primo e secondo incontro di studi bizantini* (Reggio Calabria: Parallelo ‘38, 1974).

to a particular celebration of the Byzantine consecration of myron as the clear choice for study. In fact, it would be more accurate to say that the current practice of the Byzantine Rite is organically varied based on the variety of each Church and their liturgical patrimonies.<sup>8</sup> For example, the Ecumenical Patriarch follows different liturgical books with different histories than the Orthodox Patriarch of Moscow or the Byzantine Catholic Archeparch of Pittsburgh, PA; yet, each of these hierarchs celebrates the Byzantine Rite. Contrarily, outside the Byzantine sphere, in order to point at the “current practice” of the Roman Rite for the consecration of chrism, one need only find the text approved and promulgated by the Roman Pontiff and his Congregations.

With that in mind, it would seem to be easier to choose the “current practice” of the *Catholic* Byzantine Churches and leave aside the issues of diversity and authority resulting from the Catholic-Orthodox schism. This isn’t the case, however. On the one hand, the variety of Catholic liturgies celebrated in the Byzantine Rite do benefit from some degree of unity and regulation not seen in the Orthodox Church. The 14 Catholic Churches who celebrate the Byzantine Rite<sup>9</sup> are subject to the authority of the Roman Pontiff, the 1990 *Code of Canons of Eastern Churches*, and to the Congregation for Eastern Churches.<sup>10</sup> Further, the Congregation for Eastern Churches has historically exercised the authority for the approval or denial of the texts to be used for the celebration of the liturgy:

The special Commission for the Liturgy, instituted in the heart of the Congregation for the Eastern Churches in 1931, and the other Liturgical Commissions in charge of certain works from time to time, elaborated and revised the liturgical texts and arranged for their publication. Currently, all of the liturgical texts which need to be published are, in any case, always placed under the *recognitio* or under the approval of the Congregation for the Eastern Churches (CCEO, can 657), and this important information is published in the annual volume, S.I.C.O. (*Servizio Informazioni Chiese Orientali*) which illustrates the activity of this Dicastery.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>8</sup> “Each Church” connotes the difference between the Orthodox and Catholic Churches on large scale as well as the differences between each of the Particular (*sui iuris*) Churches in either of the greater Orthodox or Catholic Churches.

<sup>9</sup> The Albanian Greek Catholic Church, the Belarusian Greek Catholic Church, the Bulgarian Greek Catholic Church, the Greek Catholic Church of Croatia and Serbia, the Greek Byzantine Catholic Church, the Melkite Greek Catholic Church, the Hungarian Greek Catholic Church, the Italo-Albanian Catholic Church, the Macedonian Greek Catholic Church, the Romanian Greek Catholic Church, the Russian Greek Catholic Church, the Ruthenian Greek Catholic Church, the Slovak Greek Catholic Church, and the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. CATHOLIC CHURCH, *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches* [CCEC] (Washington D.C.: Canon Law Society of America, 1992) 42ff.

<sup>11</sup> “Recognitio e approvazione dei testi liturgici,” (La santa sede), accessed October 15, 2021, [https://www.vatican.va/roman\\_curia/congregations/orientchurch/documents/rc\\_con\\_corient\\_doc\\_20070601\\_liturgical-texts\\_it.html](https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/orientchurch/documents/rc_con_corient_doc_20070601_liturgical-texts_it.html) (m.t). Cf. also the *Code of Canons of Eastern Churches* 657-658.

Therefore, there are clear principles established for the proper approval of texts by a central authority. Yet, on the other hand, the Catholic Church has made it clear that the ritual patrimony of the local rites is to be protected and kept accurate by each hierarch.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, in more recent years, the Commission for the Liturgy has allowed for a shift towards the principle of subsidiarity in their role for approving texts:

The task of the Commission was updated: it is no longer that of curating the publications of liturgical books – since today the major part of the Eastern Catholic Churches have their own Liturgical Commissions which realize this work with zeal and competence – in as much as that of watching the right application of the liturgical prescriptions and to deepen questions that are common to different Churches of the same ritual family or, certainly, all of the Eastern Churches.<sup>13</sup>

This change gives more authority to each of the Churches over their unique patrimony. In the reality of practice, however, the approval of texts by Rome normally focuses only on the principle Eucharistic liturgies of the Byzantine Rite: the Divine Liturgies of St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil, and the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. The other, less-frequently celebrated liturgies are generally left to the particular Church's hierarchs and their liturgical commissions.<sup>14</sup> Thus, all of this is to say that even within the Catholic Church, the ritual for the consecration of myron still differs between the different Churches and the Eparchies within them.

Two examples demonstrate the diversity of liturgical practice within the United States. First, in the Archeparchy of Pittsburgh, PA, the myron consecration ritual is a long service which combines chanted vespers, the Divine Liturgy of St. Basil, the consecration of myron, and rite for the washing of the feet. The text for this service was compiled and published at the local level, as is attested to in its introductory section:

In 2005, the Council of Hierarchs published the propers for this service, which had been translated by the Inter-Eparchial Liturgical Commission and set to the traditional *prostopinije* (plainchant) by the Inter-Eparchial Mu-

<sup>12</sup> “The rites of the Eastern Churches, as the patrimony of the entire Church of Christ, in which there is clearly evident the tradition which has come from the Apostles through the Fathers and which affirm the divine unity in diversity of the Catholic faith, are to be religiously preserved and fostered” (CATHOLIC CHURCH, CCEC, 39).

“Hierarchs who preside over Churches *sui iuris* and all other hierarchs are to see most carefully to the faithful protection and accurate observance of their own rite, and not admit changes in it except by reason of its organic progress, keeping in mind, however, mutual goodwill and the unity of Christians” (CATHOLIC CHURCH, CCEC, 40 §1).

<sup>13</sup> CONGREGAZIONE PER LE CHIESE ORIENTALI, *Brochure Centenario* (2017), 30 (m.t.).

<sup>14</sup> This “actual practice” is evident from lists of the approvals and *recognitio* found in the *Servizio Informazioni Chiese Orientali* up to 2013 and was further confirmed in conversations with Byzantine Catholic Priests (a special thanks to Fr. Ron Barusefski of the Byzantine Catholic Eparchy of Passaic for his insights and guidance during our time as neighbors at the Casa Santa Maria in Rome).

sic Commission. In 2007, the Divine Liturgy of our holy father Basil the Great was promulgated by the Council of Hierarchs, using work done by both commissions.

This booklet contains all of those promulgated texts, as well as the provisional texts for the Blessing of Chrism and the Rite of the Washing of Feet, both of which are reserved to bishops in their cathedral churches.

All of the material in this book is © 2007 by the Byzantine Catholic Metropolitan Church sui juris of Pittsburgh, U.S.A. The booklet is published by the Metropolitan Cantor Institute of the Archeparchy of Pittsburgh.<sup>15</sup>

The Inter-Eparchial Liturgical Commission mentioned is made up of a handful of representatives from each eparchy under the Archeparchy of Pittsburgh.<sup>16</sup> They are the local scholars who perform the curation of the publications with “with zeal and competence,” as the Congregation notes.

The second example within the same country is the Melkite Catholic Eparchy of Newton in the United States. Whereas the Ruthenian Archbishop William C. Skurla of the Archeparchy of Pittsburgh follows the ritual described previously for his Metropolitan see, the Melkite Bishop Nicholas J. Samra of the Melkite Catholic Eparchy of Newton, does not consecrate myron himself at all. Instead, regarding the Melkite Catholic practice,

[t]he blessing of Myron or Chrism is not done by local bishops in each eparchy; [r]ather, it is blessed by the Patriarch at least once during his patriarchate, more times if needed. The former patriarch [who is] now retired, Gregory III, blessed [it last,] and we are still using [it] and plenty is available for all [of] the churches.<sup>17</sup>

Thus, the consecration of myron within the Melkite Greek Catholic Church is reserved to the Patriarch alone,<sup>18</sup> thus, Bishop Samra would receive myron for the consecration of the members of his eparchy from the Melkite Patriarchate in Lebanon.<sup>19</sup>

Therefore, trying to narrow the selection for the study of Byzantine consecration of myron in the current rites of the Churches proves to be diffi-

<sup>15</sup> BYZANTINE CATHOLIC METROPOLITAN CHURCH SUI JURIS OF PITTSBURGH, *Great and Holy Thursday: The Vesper-Liturgy of Our Holy Father Basil the Great with the Blessing of Chrism and the Washing of the Feet* (Pittsburgh: Metropolitan Cantor Institute, 2007).

<sup>16</sup> The Archeparch of Pittsburgh is the Metropolitan over the eparchies of Parma, Passaic, and Phoenix.

<sup>17</sup> From a personal email correspondence with Bishop Nicholas J. Samra (February 18, 2022).

<sup>18</sup> The Patriarch mentioned in the quotation, the last to consecrate the myron for the Melkite Greek Catholic Church, is Gregory III Laham, the Emeritus Patriarch of Antioch and All the East, of Alexandria and Jerusalem. The current patriarch, yet to have consecrated myron, is Youssef I Absi, elected in 2017.

<sup>19</sup> This is interesting since the territory of the Eparchy of Newton contains the entire United States. However, since the bishop is neither the Patriarch, nor even the Metropolitan, he does not consecrate myron.

cult. Even narrowing the selection down to only those Catholic Churches in the United States who celebrate the Byzantine Rite proves to be beyond the practical scope of this project, as it would require a personal correspondence with each local Church to learn of their practices and to view their texts for the consecration of myron.<sup>20</sup> Again, this is a sign of the richness of the patrimony and history of each Byzantine Church which should be respected and preserved.<sup>21</sup> Yet, a study seeking integrity cannot select one of these rituals arbitrarily for analysis. Instead, since the practices are numerous, a well-founded choice can still be made based on the common, historical roots of the major forms of liturgy in both the Orthodox and Catholic Churches. In this regard, there are two branches of textual tradition which can be found at the heart of most Byzantine celebrations for the consecration of myron.

### 1.2. *Ancient Authority or Current Constantinopolitan Practice?*

From among the different celebrations reviewed for this project, there are two main branches of the ritual forms for the myron liturgy based on the consecration prayers. The first branch is typified by the ritual celebrated in the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, last used by the Ecumenical Patriarch, Bartholomew I, in April of 2022.<sup>22</sup> The second is typified by the rite as currently celebrated in the Ruthenian Archeparchy of Pittsburgh, as displayed in the previous section.

#### 1.2.1. The Seventeenth-Century Venetian Branch

Explaining the situation in a drastically simplified manner, the ritual celebrated by the Ecumenical Patriarch is the modern-day result of what began as a private redactional initiative starting in the seventeenth century.<sup>23</sup> Yet, due to the authoritative nature of the Ecumenical Patriarchate,

<sup>20</sup> There are five different Byzantine Churches in the United States which have formal hierarchy: the Ruthenian, Ukrainian, Melkite, Romanian, and Slovak Byzantine Churches.

<sup>21</sup> Even if it makes the work of liturgical research impossible in comparison to the normative nature of the Roman Rite.

<sup>22</sup> ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE OF CONSTANTINOPLE, *L'Ufficiatura del Santo Myron: nel modo in cui è celebrata nel Patriarcato Ecumenico*, (trans) P. CHIARANZ (Venezia, 2016).

<sup>23</sup> For nearly four centuries, the most-used Greek liturgical books were printed in Venice and grew in such popularity for the Byzantine liturgical world, including the Ecumenical Patriarchate, that they came to hold a certain standard of "official approval" in the Orthodox Church. However, at its start, these Venetian copies were the results of a private initiative and it was not until the nineteenth century that the Ecumenical Patriarchate formed its own typography (cf. C. KOROLEVSKIJ, "Le Pontifical dans le rite byzantine," *OCP* 10 (1944) 202-215). It was on the basis of the 1638 Venetian copy of the Greek *Euchologion*, along with a handful of other ancient manuscripts including the *Barberini* and the *Bessarion* (*Grottaferrata* Γ.β.1), that Jacques Goar compiled his famous *ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ sive Rituale Graecorum* in 1647. However, the "small number of carefully

the liturgies celebrated there have held an unspoken form of authority for much of the history of the Church.<sup>24</sup> However, the Orthodox Patriarchates of Jerusalem and Athens were not prevented from printing their own texts beginning in the twentieth century even when they differed from the Constantinopolitan books. Therefore, this ritual form rests more on the recent tradition and authority of the Ecumenical Patriarchate rather than on the ancient forms and prayers of the Byzantine Rite as the second branch does.

### 1.2.2. The Ancient Manuscript Branch

The ritual for the consecration of myron as celebrated in the Archeparchy of Pittsburgh shows a uniformity with the ancient manuscript tradition of Constantinople. In such cases, fidelity to the ancient rites may be due to an unbroken tradition from medieval ages or it may be due to a more recent Byzantine *ressourcement*, renewing the liturgy through a deeper formation in the traditions of the liturgical patrimony.<sup>25</sup> In either case,

selected manuscripts" which Goar used were listed in a manner which was "neither exhaustive nor precise" and some pages even show his inaccurate knowledge of their dating (Cf. A. STRITTMATTER, "The Barberinum," 329-367). Many Byzantine Churches took the euchological texts for the majority of their liturgies, including the consecration of myron, from the Goar *Euchologion*. In 1912, the Ecumenical Patriarchate abandoned the ancient Constantinopolitan rituals (based on the *Barberini Euchologion*) for myron which it had been celebrating for centuries, in order to establish a new rite with changes the two central consecration prayers. The first prayer was taken from the Goar *Euchologion* while the second prayer was "mutilated" in part. "That reform seems to have been done by a special commission in which M. Gedeon had a role..." (M. ARRANZ, "La consécration," 330-331, my translation). Though Goar's work was monumental for his time, Arranz agrees that the work of Goar need not be studied nor followed any longer due to the new wave of manuscript studies begun by Aleksei Dmitrievsky (and continued by himself) and due to the difficult nature of identifying the sources Goar used in the seventeenth century (cf. M. ARRANZ, "Les sacrements de l'ancien Euchologe constantinopolitain (1): Étude préliminaire des sources," *OCP* 48 (1982), 334); in fact he calls the Goar *Euchologion* "the ever indispensable but very dangerous edition" (M. ARRANZ, "La consécration," 319-320, footnote 7).

<sup>24</sup> This is evidenced in the controversial liturgical reforms in seventeenth-century Russia by Patriarch Nikon of Moscow. He assumed the authority of the Greek Venetian texts of Constantinople (as well as the accompanying Slavonic texts of Kiev) for the basis of his reform of the Russian texts. This shift was based on the argument that the Constantinopolitan texts were orthodox and the Russian texts had become heterodox through time. Cf. P. MEYENDORFF, *Russia, Ritual, and Reform: The Liturgical Reforms of Nikon in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991). Further, while the Holy Synod of the Greek Church does give "official approval" for certain texts, the value of this gesture is "more akin to the Western *imprimatur* of the Roman Church" (C. KOROLEVSKIJ, "Le Pontifical," 210 (m.t.)).

<sup>25</sup> Of particular note is the work and influence of Alexander Schmemmann, a twentieth-century theologian who was involved in the Liturgical Movement and liturgical renewal in the Byzantine sphere, both Orthodox and Catholic (Cf. *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (1966), *For the Life of the World* (1973), *Of Water and the Spirit* (1974), and *The*

there are Byzantine Churches which celebrate the consecration of myron according to a manner which does not bear marks of the influence of the Venetian nor Goar *Euchologia*.<sup>26</sup> Rather, like the Archeparchy's celebration for myron within the Divine Liturgy of St. Basil, they display the rites of their earliest Constantinopolitan roots in an elegant manner.<sup>27</sup>

Therefore, these two euchological branches present themselves as representatives of two forms of liturgical authority: the ritual of Constantinople bears weight based on the fact that it is celebrated at the Ecumenical Patriarchate, whereas the ancient ritual has its own authority based on the incorporation of the more "authentic" patrimony of the Byzantine Rite. Without an explicit promulgation of the ritual, the question is presented: which form of authority bears the greater weight? This question is incarnate in a final euchological example: the two most recent *Euchologia* of Athens, Greece, the second of which is used by both the Greek Catholic and the Orthodox Churches in Greece.

### 1.2.3. The *Euchologia* of Athens

The 1927 Athens *Euchologion* contains only one rite for the consecration of myron<sup>28</sup> which is based on the ancient Constantinopolitan manuscripts, similar to those of the Pittsburgh Ruthenians. However, the most recent edition of the Athens *Euchologion* gives two possible rites for the consecration of myron. The first option, placed among other significant liturgies (the Epiphany blessing of water, the Palm Sunday blessing of branches, and the rites for Holy Week), is a copy of the version in the 1927 *Euchologion*, i.e., the one based on the ancient manuscripts.<sup>29</sup> The second option, placed in the back of the 2014 *Euchologion* under the section titled "New Addendum" (ΝΕΩΤΕΡΟΝ ΕΠΙΜΕΤΡΟΝ), is called "The Order of Sanctifying the Holy Myron in the Great Church"<sup>30</sup> and provides the seventeenth-century ritual as it is now celebrated at the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople (i.e., the "Great Church"). Thus, in the same ritual book, both textual branches are present as options; the first option rests on the authority of ancient tradition of the manuscripts while the second option explicitly points to the authority of the current practice of the Ecumenical

*Eucharist* (1988), all published by St. Vladimir's Seminary Press; cf. also N. DENYSENKO, "Ressourcement or Aggiornamento? An Assessment of Modern Liturgical Reforms," *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 20 (2018) 186-208.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. footnote 23 of this chapter.

<sup>27</sup> One of the more curious situations which displays these two branches of the Byzantine consecration of myron are the last two *Euchologia* published in Athens.

<sup>28</sup> *ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ ΤΟ ΜΕΓΑ* (Athens: Ἐκδόσεις Παπαδημητρίου, 1927), 115ff.

<sup>29</sup> *ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ ΤΟ ΜΕΓΑ* (Athens: Ἐκδόσεις Παπαδημητρίου, 2014), 347-350.

<sup>30</sup> ΔΙΑΤΑΞΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΚΑΘΑΓΙΑΣΜΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΓΟΥ ΜΥΡΟΥ ΕΝ Τῇ ΜΕΓΑΛῃ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ (ΕΥΧΟΛΟΓΙΟΝ) (2014), 674-682).



Patriarch.<sup>31</sup> Though a choice between these two branches would normally require a deeper theological, liturgical, and even political consideration of such types of authority, as well as the examination of the legitimate liturgical reform through the centuries, the choice for this study is fairly clear. Not only do the rites found in the ancient manuscripts appear to flow more from the heart of the Byzantine Rite's liturgical patrimony, but they also have a body of research and scholarship which acts as a treasure trove of insight into the ancient Constantinopolitan and Byzantine practice.<sup>32</sup>

## 2. WHY THE BARBERINI EUCHOLOGION?

To consider the selection of ancient manuscripts bearing Constantinopolitan *Euchologia*, a brief synthesis of historical context is required. One of the results of the conclusion of the iconoclastic controversy in 843 A.D. was the eventual possibility of identifying different groups of manuscripts of the Constantinopolitan liturgical tradition. After the restoration of icon veneration by the Empress Theodora, the Church and her liturgy in Constantinople leaned heavily upon the monastic centers to establish right practice. The gradual Studite reforms introduced the transformations which developed the Byzantine Church, worship, and vision into the rich Cathedral-Monastic synthesis that it is today.<sup>33</sup> Therefore, the ancient manuscripts witnessing to the Constantinopolitan *Euchologia* are separable into two general groups: 'pre-iconoclastic' and 'post-iconoclastic.'<sup>34</sup> The earlier, pre-iconoclastic texts have their roots in the early (and now lost) sources of Constantinople's tradition.<sup>35</sup> The extant results of those sources are the *Barberini Euchologion* (Vatican Barb. gr. 336 – eighth century), the *Codex Porphyrii* (Leningrad 226 – tenth century), the *Sevastianov 474* (gr. 270 – tenth century), and the *Sinaiticus 959* (eleventh century). The *Barberini* and the

<sup>31</sup> In the Greek Byzantine Catholic Church (covering Greece and Turkey), the Catholic Apostolic Exarch celebrates the consecration of myron using the secondary rite from the appendix (from a personal email correspondence with Apostolic Exarch, Bishop Manuel Nin, (May 12, 2019)).

<sup>32</sup> Miguel Arranz published a large collection of articles on the ancient Constantinopolitan *Euchologion* in two series, spanning from 1982-1997. The first series (1982-1989) studies the rites and Sacraments around Christian Initiation (*Les Sacrements de l'ancien Euchologe constantinopolitain*) and concludes with an article on the consecration of myron. The second series (1990-1997) examines the rites and Sacraments surrounding the restoration of persons in the life of the Church, such as confession, readmission, and rites for the dead (*Les Sacrements de la restauration de l'ancien Euchologe constantinopolitain*). The full references for each article are in the bibliography. A fruit of Arranz's work on the ancient Constantinopolitan *Euchologion* was the publication of *L'Eucologio Costantinopolitano agli inizi del secolo XI: Hagiasmatarion & Archieratikon (Rituale & Pontificale)* (Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1996).

<sup>33</sup> Cf. R. TAFT, "The Studite Era," in *The Byzantine Rite*, 52-66.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. R. TAFT, *The Byzantine Rite*, 52-53; M. ARRANZ, "Les sacrements," 322.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. R. TAFT, *The Byzantine Rite*, 52-53.

*Porphyrii* are the clearest examples of pre-iconoclastic *Euchologia*.<sup>36</sup> The three main *Euchologia* from the post-iconoclastic group are the *Bessarion Euchologion* (*Grottaferrata* Γ.β.I – eleventh to twelfth century), the *Coislin 213* (1027 A.D.), and the *Athens 662 Euchologion* (twelfth and fourteenth century). The three post-iconoclastic manuscripts give evidence of a common, unknown source, the same source “from which the [*Barberini Euchologion*] had already drawn from some centuries before.”<sup>37</sup>

As explained by the masterful scholar, Miguel Arranz, the so-called *Ancient Constantinopolitan Euchologion* is not a real physical text nor an actual manuscript from ancient times, but, rather, the synthesis of the Constantinopolitan euchological tradition compiled from these manuscripts.<sup>38</sup> Scholars generally select either the *Barberini Euchologion* or the *Bessarion Euchologion* as the more important for study: the *Barberini* because it is the most ancient,<sup>39</sup> and the *Bessarion* because it appears to best typify the Constantinopolitan liturgy at its zenith.<sup>40</sup> Thus, voices differ on which manuscript best suits the study of the ancient Byzantine Rite, but that argument is not of immediate concern when examining the consecration of myron in particular. In the end, whichever may be the “more Constantinopolitan,” the textual unity between them is impressive, since, “despite the five

<sup>36</sup> The *Sevastianov 474* and the *Sinaiticus 959* can really be considered to be “from the intermediary period” (M. ARRANZ, “Les sacrements,” 322, (m.t.)).

<sup>37</sup> M. ARRANZ, “Les sacrements,” 330 (m.t.).

<sup>38</sup> Arranz uses *Ancient Constantinopolitan Euchologion* to refer not to a particular book of the present nor even of the past, but, rather, to describe the collection of texts and prayer which describe the liturgies celebrated in Constantinople. He argues that there may never have been a full *Euchologion* used in Constantinople like those in use in more recent centuries. The principle manuscripts he uses for his study (the *Barberini Euchologion*, the *Sinaiticus 959*, the *Bessarion Euchologion*, and the *Athens 662 Euchologion*) are witnesses to the tradition or reality he calls the *Constantinopolitan Euchologion*. “In speaking of the ancient *Euchologia* in the title of our series of works, we had this state of affairs clearly in view. We therefore do not have the official *Euchologion*, but only *vade-mecum* type compilations, a bit like the famous ‘*Missale Curiae Romanae*’” (M. ARRANZ, “Les sacrements,” 332 (m.t.)). Arranz argues that even the seven manuscripts he uses for study would likely never have been real liturgical books used by the Patriarch of Constantinople. He and other bishops most likely would have “used either booklets, scrolls, or *kontakia*” (M. ARRANZ, “Les sacrements,” 330), i.e., each liturgy would have had its own easy-to-read text, not like these ancient *Euchologia* which were more likely compilations of those scrolls (cf. M. ARRANZ, “Les sacrements,” 330).

<sup>39</sup> “The miniscule differences convey a strong continuity of tradition in the Constantinopolitan Myron consecration rite. Thus *Barberini 336*, since it is the oldest, will serve as the standard text for comparison with other manuscript evidence considered” (M. MOROZOWICH, *Holy Thursday* (OCA draft), 227).

<sup>40</sup> M. ARRANZ, “Les sacrements,” 288. However, this is a point of historical debate among Byzantine scholars: “Contrary to what was previously believed on the subject, the eleventh century was not the zenith of the cathedral tradition of Constantinople, but rather an age of decadence and abandonment [*sic*]” (S. PARENTI, “The Cathedral Rite of Constantinople: Evolution of a Local Tradition,” *OCP* 77 (2011) 466).

centuries which separate them, we find ourselves before the 'same' book, especially as regards the office of the hours and the sacramental rites."<sup>41</sup>

Nonetheless, their unique characteristics are distinct enough concerning the texts for the consecration of myron, that the *Barberini Euchologion* becomes the clear choice for research, and not just because it is the most ancient among them. Therefore, there are three key reasons the *Barberini* is most suited for this study: first, its closeness to the cathedral liturgy; second, its specificity concerning the myron ritual; and lastly, because this study seeks to be fundamental for continued liturgical theology involving the other subsequent manuscripts which share many elements with the myron texts of the *Barberini Euchologion*.

### 2.1. Close to the Cathedral

As the imperial and orthodox response to iconoclasm increased in influence, another crucial aspect of the monastic reforms is the formulation of diverse *typoi* of liturgical books in Constantinople, "one of the cathedral, called 'ecclesiastical,' and another of 'other churches' and monasteries, called 'hagiopolites.'"<sup>42</sup> Thus, there were not only shifts in the greater ecclesial setting, but also a slow, yet visible, attraction towards the monasteries which had been so crucial for the victory of the orthodox iconodules. The 'post-iconoclastic' manuscripts were therefore created and rooted in the heart of the developments of the Studite Era which resulted in the completion of the "Middle-Byzantine synthesis" in the twelfth century.<sup>43</sup> Though these reforms were relatively minor shifts, they were nonetheless gradual steps away from the Cathedral, both physically and liturgically. This is evidenced first by the necessary formation of the *Typikon*, which regulates the cycles, calendars, and celebrations, as well as by the gradual replacement of the Liturgy of St. Basil with the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom as the principal liturgy in the Byzantine Church.

While these slight shifts are part of the legitimate liturgical reform which progressed from the ninth to the eleventh centuries, each passing century drew the liturgical tradition a bit farther from the origins of the cathedral celebration of the mysteries. Therefore, while the later *Euchologia* are clearly valid options for analysis as regards the consecration of myron, due to the particular connection between this rite and the cathedral, it is preferable to seek the source which draws the evidence closer to the concrete celebrations of the Constantinopolitan cathedral itself.<sup>44</sup> In the end,

<sup>41</sup> M. ARRANZ, "Les sacrements," 299 (m.t.).

<sup>42</sup> S. PARENTI, *The Cathedral Rite*, 465.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. R. TAFT, *The Byzantine Rite*, 61.

<sup>44</sup> It is duly noted that the *Barberini Euchologion* could very well be "less Constantinopolitan" than the later 'post-iconoclastic' *Euchologia* due to its Southern Italian influences (cf. M. ARRANZ, "Les sacrements," 333). Yet, as will be seen in the details of the rubrics for myron, the rites which pertain to the Constantinopolitan cathedral celebrations

since the centuries of reform inch further from the cathedral, the desire for this project is to remain as close as possible to that ecclesiological heart of the celebration of the consecration of myron. Further, as the next section will show, the nearness of the rite for myron in the *Barberini Euchologion* to the cathedral rite is all the more evident given the specific details of the preparation and consecration of the myron.

## 2.2. *Specific Details for Myron*

When comparing the rituals provided for the consecration of myron in the *Barberini Euchologion* and the *Bessarion Euchologion*, there are a few rubrical differences that encourage study of the elder. On the one hand, the rubrics immediately preceding the prayer for consecration of myron in the *Barberini* are ever-so-slightly “fuller,” i.e., they ‘enflesh’ the ritual in its celebrated form through particular details which are lacking in the *Bessarion*. For example, the *Bessarion* begins with a simple phrase, “The prayer for the confecton of myron, which takes place on Great Thursday: When the holy gifts are brought to the divine table...”<sup>45</sup> The equivalent in the *Barberini* reads, “The prayer for making myron, said only by the bishop on Holy Thursday of Holy Week: Having celebrated all of the sacred liturgy in order, when someone brings the holy gifts to the divine table...”<sup>46</sup> Though minimal, the differences show details which appear more ‘concrete’ in the proximity to the liturgy *qua* celebrated.

On the other hand, the rubrics for the materials and processes for the preparation of the myron itself give a more revelatory difference. Only the *Barberini Euchologion* contains these instructions, giving the measurement for each liquid and the size to which the materials ought to be cut. The other manuscripts contain nothing of this preparation.<sup>47</sup> This gives an even stronger sense that the proximity of the ritual for consecration is that much closer to the Constantinopolitan practice, for it still contains the very steps followed in the days prior to the celebration of the liturgy. The more distant in time the liturgy and the manuscripts grew from the cathedral celebrations, the less rooted they appear in the concrete celebratory context.

seem to retain more evidence of closeness to the Cathedral practices for the consecration of myron.

<sup>45</sup> Εὐχή ποιήσει μύρου γινομένη τῆ μεγάλη ε΄· Εἰσαγομένων τῶν ἁγίων δώρων ἐν τῇ θείᾳ τραπέζῃ εἰσάγεται” *Grottaferrata Γ.β.1*, 70 (my translation from the citation of M. ARRANZ, “La consécration,” 324-325).

<sup>46</sup> S. PARENTI, *L’Eucologio Barberini*, 141.1 (m.t.); for explanation of Parenti’s bold numeration cf. footnote 64 of this chapter.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. M. ARRANZ, “La consécration,” 322; M. ARRANZ, *L’eucologio costantinopolitano*, 216-219.

### 2.3. Foundational Nature of the Research

The final reason the *Barberini Euchologion* is most fitting for this study of the consecration of myron is that this project does not intend to be all-encompassing. Rather, the goal is that this research would be of a foundational nature so that the successive developments and their later sources can build upon it. As the following two chapters of the project will demonstrate, the previous scholarship surrounding this ritual and the finer details of the prayer of consecration did not attain, nor attempt to attain, the depth required for a foundational liturgical theology of holy myron. The previous scholars intended to trace the evolution and content of the celebrations through time, narrowing in on other areas of import besides the prayer of consecration in its celebratory context. This project will not concern itself with the gradual developments of the rite; rather, it seeks to narrow in on the direct content of the *Euchologion* as it presents the ritual for consecration and its insertion into the celebration of the Divine Liturgy. Therefore, after having established which is the proper *Euchologion* for this study, it is necessary to survey the manuscript itself regarding its general contents and, with greater attention, the pages presenting the texts for the consecration of myron within the Divine Liturgy.

## 3. CONTENTS OF THE BARBERINI EUCHOLOGION

In order to best situate the ritual for the consecration of myron as presented by the *Barberini Euchologion*, this section will begin with a brief presentation of the contents of the *Euchologion* as a whole. Then it will narrow in on the details of the 10 pages of the manuscript which provide the rubrics and prayers for the consecration of myron.

### 3.1. Contents of the Manuscript as a Whole

The vast majority of the manuscript entitled *Vatican Barb. gr. 336* is comprised of the *Euchologion* and is therefore equivocated with it; however, including the *Euchologion*, there are a total of three different genres of texts in the manuscript. Other than the *Euchologion* (ff. 1-263<sup>48</sup>), the manuscript also contains certain ecclesial texts, i.e., extracts from *Canones* (ff. 266-269) and from the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (ff. 269-279), and a Latin blessing of milk and honey (f. 279<sup>v</sup>). Therefore, the “heterogenous” nature of the contents of the manuscript as a whole, and of its *Euchologion* in particular, shows aspects of the redactional history within. Thus, it is not a letter-by-letter copy of a patriarchal prayer book from the altar of the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>48</sup> According to the more ancient handwritten numeration of the manuscript’s pages (cf. S. PARENTI, *L’Eucologio Barberini*, 25).

<sup>49</sup> As described in footnote 38 of this chapter.

In order to situate the content regarding the consecration of myron, it helps to contextualize the pages describing the myron texts within the collection of prayers and other rites. The *Euchologion* first gives the texts for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy in the three principle Byzantine celebrations and then is followed by the different prayers for the Office and other rituals and sacramental liturgies.<sup>50</sup>

Liturgy of St. Basil  
 Liturgy of St. Chrysostom  
 Liturgy of the Presanctified  
*Vespers*  
 Midnight Hour  
*Lauds*  
*Prime*  
*Sext*  
*Terce-Sext*  
 Rites for Christian Initiation (Holy Saturday)  
 Theophany  
 Prayer Vigil  
*Preparation and Consecration of Myron (Holy Thursday)*  
 Rite of Renunciation and Adhesion (Good Friday)  
 Abjuration of Heretics  
 Dedication of a Church  
 Ordinations  
 Monastic Rites  
 Rites for the Imperial Court  
 Prayers for Various Occasions  
 Nuptial Rites  
 Prayers for Various Occasions  
 Prayers and Rites for the Sick  
 Exorcisms  
 Prayers for Various Occasions  
 Additional Prayers for Holy Week and Pentecost  
 Prayers for Various Occasions  
 Monastic Rites  
 Prayers for the Dead  
 Final Prayers for the Eucharistic Liturgy  
 Diaconal Intercessions

Visualizing the contents in list form discloses two points of notable interest. First, the flow of the content, though it might seem somewhat chaotic, appears to have a rational ordering.<sup>51</sup> The liturgies of most frequent use

<sup>50</sup> It is a tragedy that the eighth fascicule of the manuscript is missing. It contained a large section of the Divine Liturgy of St. Basil (the *Post-Sanctus*, *Anamnesis*, *Epiclesis*, and a large portion of the *Intercessions*). Cf. S. PARENTI, *L'Eucologio Barberini*, 25 and 33.

<sup>51</sup> The current ordering of the fascicules seems to be the result of a rearrangement effected when the manuscript was rebound at some point. The numeration on the pages reveals that there are four missing fascicules which would have been the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> in the original order. Further, the original 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> fascicules, those containing the