

Peter J. Smith

Email: [peter.j.smith@asburyseminary.edu](mailto:peter.j.smith@asburyseminary.edu), Phone: 765-606-0164

# On the Hagiopolite as a Liturgical Influence:

Concerning the Influence of the Holy Places upon the Liturgy of  
Jerusalem

# On the Hagiopolite as a Liturgical Influence:

Concerning the Influence of the Holy Places upon the Liturgy of  
Jerusalem

By: Bauer Prize Applicant  
CH702: Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers

## Introduction

At the beginning of the fourth century, Jerusalem was no longer a holy city but, rather, a diminutive Roman colony. The Roman response to two Jewish revolts had reduced Jerusalem to rubble. Hadrian rebuilt it in order to house a garrison and adorned it with the usual Roman forum and a temple to Venus, giving it the name Aelia Capitolina. Ecclesiastically, it was under the authority of the metropolitan see of Caesarea Maritima. Bishops in the third and early fourth centuries, even the church historian Eusebius of Caesarea, referred to the city as Aelia instead of Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup> It was only after the rise of Constantine and his endorsement of Jerusalem as the location of the events of Christ that the city reentered the sphere of prominence within the life of the Church.

The attention of Constantine, and his mother Helena, on Jerusalem and its surrounds invigorated interest in the places where Jesus walked. The magnificent Church of the Holy Sepulchre was constructed in this period, as well as smaller basilicas on the Mount of Olives and at the site of the Nativity in Bethlehem. As a priest in Jerusalem, and later as bishop, Cyril of Jerusalem witnessed these developments firsthand. Through the benefactions of the imperial family, God was lifting up the city in which the salvation of humanity had been revealed. The question that arises, then, is whether living in Jerusalem and worshipping in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre affected how Cyril understood the meaning and efficaciousness of the liturgy. It

---

<sup>1</sup> For consistency, I refer to the city as Jerusalem.

is hoped that through a comparison of liturgies from the third and fourth centuries an answer will be revealed.<sup>2</sup> Additionally, I will look at the rhetoric that he used to transport his listeners beyond the extravagant monuments to the situation of the historical events of salvation and the way he incorporates this inspired vision into the stational liturgy that developed in fourth century Jerusalem.

For the purposes of this study, the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus (hereafter, generally referred to as *AT*) will act as a liturgical foundation. I will also refer to Justin Martyr's *Apology* as a witness to early sacramental experience. The *Mystagogical Catecheses* of Cyril (*MC*), as well as the *Procatechesis* (*Pro*) and *Catechetical Lectures* (*Cats*), will be the primary sources for the liturgical developments in Jerusalem.<sup>3</sup> To supplement the writings of Cyril, the account of the pilgrim Egeria concerning her extended stay in Jerusalem is invaluable.<sup>4</sup> Egeria was a nun from Spain or Gaul who journeyed through the eastern Mediterranean. John Wilkinson notes that the work of Anton Baumstark and Père Devos narrowed the window of her travels to 382-386, with Devos positing an exact year of 384 for her departure from Jerusalem, based on the dates she gives for her closing trek and the liturgical calendar for the above window of time. Wilkinson also notes that Egeria's description of the Imbomon station seems to imply that there was only an open-air structure present, and not the church that Jerome references. This would set the latest possible date for departure to be c.390.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The original version of this paper included a comparative analysis between Cyril's *Mystagogical Catecheses* and Theodore of Mopsuestia's *Commentary on Baptism and the Eucharist*.

<sup>3</sup> See discussion below as to whether *MC* can be attributed to Cyril.

<sup>4</sup> John Wilkinson trans., *Egeria's Travels*, (London: SPCK, 1971).

<sup>5</sup> Wilkinson, *Travels*, 49-53.

These sources are analyzed and interpreted through the categories of liturgical structure and theological narrative.<sup>6</sup> Liturgical structure is the procession from one ritual act to another; therefore, any distinctions within parallel actions or units will be of particular interest. Theological narrative refers to the imagery used to describe what is accomplished in a particular symbolic action. It also refers to the terms that illustrate the connection between the symbolic action or sacramental element and the salvific reality which it represents. It is through these narratives that the mysteries of the sacraments are explained.

An important term has been used that demands at least a brief discussion: mystagogical lectures. What is mystagogy? It stems from the Greek word *mueō* which means “to teach a doctrine.” In the case of the sacraments, it carries the further connotation “to initiate into the mysteries.”<sup>7</sup> Enrico Mazza posits that the appearance of so many mystagogical homilies and commentaries is a result of the mid-fourth century Council of Laodicea which mandated that “they who are to be baptized must learn the faith by heart and recite it to the bishop or the presbyters.”<sup>8</sup> The “faith” mentioned in the canon likely refers to the Creed, but it soon became the prompt for a full explanation of the Creed and the liturgy. Mazza refutes the claim that mystagogy is “light theology” for those being introduced to the mysteries of baptism and the Eucharist. He asserts that in the hands of such Fathers as Ambrose, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Cyril of Jerusalem the mystagogical homily ought to be understood as providing a proper “theology of the liturgy.”<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Day, *Baptismal Liturgy*, 1-10.

<sup>7</sup> Enrico Mazza, *Mystagogy: A Theology of Liturgy in the Patristic Age* (New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1989), 1.

<sup>8</sup> Mazza, *Mystagogy*, x. For full text of the Canon see “Synod of Laodicea,” *New Advent: Fathers*, copyright 2009, accessed March 11, 2013, <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3806.htm>.

<sup>9</sup> Mazza, *Mystagogy*, 6.

## Cyril and Jerusalem

A century after the life of Christ, Jerusalem of old—the Holy City of the Jews—no longer existed. It had been destroyed in the Roman response to the Jewish revolt of AD 70. The emperor Hadrian rebuilt the city in Roman fashion in 130-132. The new city of Aelia Capitolina was smaller than its predecessor but its western boundary protruded further out than that of first-century Jerusalem. In fact, local Christian tradition maintained that Hadrian's temple to Venus had been constructed over the tomb of Christ. After the revolt of Bar-Kokhba, Hadrian banished all Jews from Jerusalem and they were allowed no closer than the city of Jericho. Consequently, the small Christian community that remained in the city was entirely Gentile. After Constantine ascended to the imperial throne, he initiated a program to cleanse Jerusalem of its pagan pollutants. Therefore, the temple of Venus and all its foundation was excavated and removed from the city. As a consequence of these excavations, the tomb of Christ and the rock of Golgotha were found. It remains uncertain whether Constantine had planned to replace Hadrian's temple with a Christian church but these two sites became central to the construction of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Cyril's context as one of the faithful, a priest, and then bishop must be situated within these developments.

Cyril himself was born in c.320, only a few years before the Council of Nicaea. There are some scholars who claim that Cyril was brought from Caesarea or Alexandria to be bishop of Jerusalem but this is improbable for at least two reasons. Evidence shows that he was ordained as a priest in Jerusalem and it is unlikely that Acacius, the Arian Metropolitan of Caesarea, would have allowed an Alexandrian to be made bishop of Jerusalem.<sup>10</sup> Cyril lived almost all of

---

<sup>10</sup> Edward Yarnold, *Cyril of Jerusalem* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 3.

his life in the ecclesiastical peace of Constantine and, likewise, spent almost his entire clerical career in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. His episcopacy, however, was filled with controversy as he was exiled by Acacius from 357-359 and quickly exiled again from 360-361. Under the emperor Valens, he was again banished from 365 until Valens' death in 378. Cyril died a decade later, c.387, having spent nearly half of his tenure as bishop in exile. It is generally agreed that Cyril wrote *Pro* and *Cats* at the beginning of his episcopacy in 350. If *MC* is the product of Cyril's hand, then it would have been written between the Council of Constantinople and his death, 382-387.

There has been substantial scholarly debate concerning the authorship of *MC*. The debate is split into two camps: those who attribute them to Cyril and those who attribute them to John, his successor. Juliette Day, through a comparative liturgical study, argues that *MC* ought to be seen as evidencing liturgical developments in the later years of John's episcopacy.<sup>11</sup> Edward Yarnold argues through literary analysis that the language and style of *MC* strongly suggest that they are the product of Cyril's baptismal instruction.<sup>12</sup> Adding to the pro-Cyrrillian arguments of Yarnold and Alexis Doval is the recent work of Abraham Terian and Donna Hawk-Reinhard. Hawk-Reinhard posits that the extant texts of *MC* evidence a "sequential redaction" of Cyril's original text by John as he continued to use it in his own catechetical lectures.<sup>13</sup> In light of this recent research, it seems best to affirm the traditional attribution of the *Mystagogical*

---

<sup>11</sup> Day, *Liturgy*, 138-140.

<sup>12</sup> Yarnold, 'The Authorship of the Mystagogical Catecheses Attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem,' *Heythrop Journal*, 19 (1978): 143-161.

<sup>13</sup> Donna Hawk-Reinhard, "Transmission Implications Regarding the Authorship of Cyril of Jerusalem's *Mystagogical Catecheses*," in *The Use of Textual Criticism for the Interpretation of Patristic Texts*, eds. Kenneth B. Steinhauser and Scott Dermer (Lewiston, NY: Edward Mellen Press, 2013), page 60.

*Catecheses* to Cyril. The following discussions, however, will sometimes refer generically to the liturgy and theology of *MC*.

## A Liturgical Inheritance

One of the earliest descriptions we have of the experience and understanding of the sacraments comes from Justin Martyr's *Apology*. He writes, concerning baptism, of the "washing for the remission of sins and unto regeneration." He also witnesses to the use of an Institution Narrative and of an epiclesis upon the bread and wine. An understanding that the bread and wine undergo a "transformation" into the body and blood of Christ is already present.<sup>14</sup> The liturgy of *AT* shows considerable, detailed development in the subsequent century. The baptismal rite begins with the neophyte's renunciation of Satan followed by an anointing with exorcised oil to rid him of "all evil spirits." There is a three-fold immersion in conjunction with an interrogation of the neophyte's acceptance of the Old Roman Creed. She is then urged to "please God and to live properly."<sup>15</sup> The liturgy of the Eucharist begins with a sharing of peace and a thanksgiving. This is followed by a prayer and the chanting of several "alleluia" psalms. Interspersed among the psalms is the offering and partaking of the cup and the bread. The text does seem to imply a "giving thanks" for the bread.<sup>16</sup> Farther down in the text Hippolytus writes that having "[blessed] the cup in the name of God, you received, as it

---

<sup>14</sup> Justin, "Apology," in *Documents of the Christian Church*, ed. Henry Bettenson and Chris Maunder (Oxford: Oxford Press, 2011), 70-71.

<sup>15</sup> Hippolytus, *On the Apostolic Tradition*, trans. Alistair Stewart-Sykes (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's, 2001), 111-113.

<sup>16</sup> Hippolytus, *Tradition*, 133-134.

were, the antitype of the blood [and body] of Christ.”<sup>17</sup> This word, antitype, is key since it is also used by *MC* in its language concerning the nature of the sacramental elements.

BDAG gives two definitions for *antitypos*, one adjectival and one substantive. The substantive is there defined as a “copy” or “representation,” citing a Platonic origin in which the things of this world are the representation of heavenly originals. 2 Clement 14.3-5 offers us an insight into Hippolytus’ use of the word.

[T]he Church which is spiritual was made manifest in the flesh of Christ...this flesh is the antitype of the spirit. Consequently, no one who has corrupted the antitype will share in the reality...Guard the flesh so that you may share in the reality...This flesh is able to share in so great a life and immortality, because the Holy Spirit cleaves to it.<sup>18</sup>

It therefore seems appropriate to say that, after the invocation, the bread and the wine participate in—have a “share in the reality” of—the body and the blood of Christ.

## Sacramental Rites and Theology in the *Mystagogical Catecheses*

In this section, discussion will focus on the rites of baptism and the Eucharist themselves. Unless particularly relevant, other aspects of the anaphoras will not receive comment. In *MC*, the pre-immersion ritual consists of renouncing Satan, affirming faith in the Trinity, and receiving a final exorcism via bodily anointing. The neophyte faces west, which represents the darkness, when she renounces Satan and then turns to face east, representing the light, for her affirmation of faith. The oil for the exorcism is said to have been itself

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 157-158.

<sup>18</sup> Clement of Rome, “2 Clement,” in *The Apostolic Fathers* (Chicago: Moody Publishers, 2009), 69-70.

exorcized by the invocation of God and prayer. Note that *AT* uses similar language. By this anointing she is said to have become a “sharer in Jesus Christ.”<sup>19</sup> After entering the baptismal font, she is interrogated as to her trinitarian faith and is immersed in the water three times. The meaning of this immersion, however, is not identified with the proclamation of the Trinity. Rather, its significance is attributed to the imitation of Christ’s three days in the tomb. *MC* does not deny the washing of sins or regeneration in the Spirit but emphasis is placed on “sharing in the baptism of his death” as the prerequisite for resurrection life.<sup>20</sup> Afterward, an anointing with chrism on the neophyte’s forehead, ears, nose, and chest symbolizes the anointing of the Spirit. She is exhorted to “preserve this anointing” by “making progress in good works.”<sup>21</sup> In *MC* 4, the meaning of Christ’s body and blood is explained. Since Christ himself said “This is my body” and “This is my blood,” not “This resembles my body,” the Faithful ought to be confident that they are “receiving a share in Christ’s body and blood.” In this way, the words of the Apostle Peter are fulfilled as they bear Christ “throughout their limbs.”<sup>22</sup> Furthermore, recalling the epiclesis, “whatever the Holy Spirit touches is made holy and transformed.” The Holy Spirit is believed to substantially “make” or “change” the bread and the wine into the body and the blood of Christ.<sup>23</sup> In unparalleled language, *MC* refers to the Eucharist itself as a “sacrifice of propitiation.”<sup>24</sup>

It seems pertinent, at this time, to discuss the distinctively sacramental language found in *MC*. In general, Cyril differentiates between two phases: the historical and the sacramental.

---

<sup>19</sup> Yarnold, *Cyril*, 170-174.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 174-175.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 176-178.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 179.

<sup>23</sup> John F. Baldovin, *Liturgy in Ancient Jerusalem* (Nottingham, UK: Grove Books, 1989), 29.

<sup>24</sup> Yarnold, *Cyril*, 183.

Symbol (*symbolon*) and antitype (*antitypos*) refer to the historical phase. They both refer to the action or object involved in the sacramental ritual, but it is symbolic in the sense that they have “meaning and explanatory power.”<sup>25</sup> The Old Testament types also have explanatory power and set the precedent for the contemporary rite. *MC* utilizes an abundance of sacramental language: imitation (*mimesis*), likeness/image (*mimēma*), image (*eikōn*), in reality/in truth (*en alētheia*, *alēthos*), really (*ontōs*), share/participation (*koinōnia*), and likeness (*homoioōma*). Appropriately, much of this vocabulary is founded upon a Pauline baptismal passage (Romans 6:3-8) and a Pauline Eucharistic passage (1 Corinthians 10:16). According to Mazza, the fundamental criteria in Cyril’s sacramentality are those “actions that imitate what happened to Christ.”<sup>26</sup> One quintessential example of this can be found in *MC* 2, which reads, “Christ was really crucified and really buried and literally rose again, and all of this he did for our sake, so that by sharing his sufferings in imitation, we might gain salvation in truth.”<sup>27</sup> We find, then, that the ritual action or object corresponds to the historical event and its salvific efficacy. Divine activity is consequently granted in conjunction with the imitative action taken in faith.

*MC* begins its baptismal rite with a renunciation of Satan and an anointing that enduringly repels the arrows of Satan. In her anointing with exorcized oil, the neophyte has already been granted a “share” in Christ. Furthermore, baptism grants a share in the sufferings of Christ and, in the Eucharist, the faithful receive a share in the body and blood of Christ.<sup>28</sup> *MC* is adamant that baptism is an imitation of Christ’s burial in the tomb. What motivation could

---

<sup>25</sup> Mazza, 155-56.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 156-64.

<sup>27</sup> Yarnold, *Cyril*, 174.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 173, 175, 179.

there be for such a shift in baptismal theology from a concentration on washing and regeneration to *MC*'s concentration on sharing Christ's sufferings? During every Sabbath service and on every feast day, the bishop would proclaim the liturgy of the Eucharist from the Anastasis, the monument over the tomb. The rock of Golgotha bore the scar of Christ's death, confirming the power of his sufferings. At the conclusion of *Cat 13*, Cyril states that Golgotha, the crack in the rock, the tomb and the stone that was rolled away all testify to the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ, but Golgotha is "preeminent."<sup>29</sup> In *Pro*, Cyril uses many images for baptism, but not the imitation of Christ's burial, and in *Cat 3*, he focuses on the element of new birth. *Cat 3.12*, then, is crucial for evaluating the strength of the narrational connection between *Cats* and *MC*. This section states that "when you have...been buried in the waters, as he was buried in the rock, you will be raised again 'to walk in newness of life.'" In *MC 2.4*, the neophyte is led to the baptismal pool "just as Christ was taken from the cross to the tomb *which stands before you*."<sup>30</sup> At some point, then, the path from the exorcism to the baptism begins to reflect the innumerable processions from cross to tomb. It is not the empty tomb of the resurrection that receives prominence but, rather, the twin rocks of Christ's suffering and death. It is what Christ suffered that purchases our salvation and we must therefore share in Christ's death if we are to have a share in Christ at all. The proximate and tangible nature of the holy places, the sites of salvific events, becomes the stimulus for the distinct development of the liturgy in Jerusalem.

---

<sup>29</sup> Yarnold, *Cyril*, 149-163.

<sup>30</sup> Emphasis added.

## Theological Rhetoric and Stational Liturgy

### *Jerusalem and Two Bishops from Palestine*

At this point, I wish to take a step back and reorient the discussion around the evolution of Jerusalem and its place in the Christian narrative of the fourth century. My discussion will concentrate on Eusebius of Caesarea and Cyril of Jerusalem. Eusebius is famous for his treatises on ecclesiastical history. Prior to this work, he had written an anthology of sorts on all of the biblical sites in Palestine. It should not be surprising, then, that he revered Jerusalem for its historical associations with God's revelation of salvation but he felt that it lacked theological significance thereafter. Indeed, for Eusebius, one of the sins of the Jews was that they had continued to venerate the city as the locus of God's presence on earth. He viewed the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans as evidence of this. Christians, he asserted, ought to have their focus on the heavenly Jerusalem where Christ, the eternal Logos, now rules.<sup>31</sup> In fact, Christians met God in his Word, the Logos. The places where divine activity occurred are prompts to reflect on the sacred history revealed in the Word, and Christians are therein brought into the presence of the immortal Logos.<sup>32</sup> For Cyril, on the other hand, such places had become holy ground (*e.g.*, the ground around the burning bush), and he understood Jerusalem itself as the "scene and instrument of divine activity," both past and present.<sup>33</sup> Witnesses of Jesus' saving actions cry out "even today" in the tomb, the Rock of Golgotha, the

---

<sup>31</sup> Walker, *Holy Places*, 40.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 43.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 46-47.

stone that was rolled away, the garden where he prayed, and the cave from which he called out Lazarus.

Constantine, for his part, wished to create a new cultic center for the newly endorsed state religion. Furthermore, he endeavored to be seen as the supreme guardian and benefactor of the Church, and Eusebius placed himself in position to be Constantine's advocate. With the discovery of the sepulchre and the construction of the Great Church, both received their opportunity. In Eusebius' oration upon the completion of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, he artistically associated the divine, risen Christ with the victorious emperor. As "Christ rose from the tomb, Constantine resurrected Jerusalem to its former glory."<sup>34</sup> The orientation of the Holy Sepulchre, according to Eusebius, led from the rear doors of the Martyrium, through the inner courtyard, to the Anastasis. Three times he referred to the space as a testimony and a monument to the resurrection but only once did he refer to the "spot which witnessed the Savior's sufferings."<sup>35</sup> This aligns with his theological emphasis on resurrection and life in the immortal Logos. In a letter to Macarius, Cyril's episcopal predecessor, Constantine wrote of "the monument of his most holy Passion." He could have been referencing either the Rock of Golgotha or the cave-tomb, but from the apparent design of the complex it seems as though his emphasis at least was on the tomb. When Cyril speaks of the monuments of the Holy Sepulchre, he often refers to two rocks: Golgotha and the stone that covered the cave. The tomb is regularly mentioned in light of the resurrection, but it is most often associated with

---

<sup>34</sup> Dayna S. Kalleres, "Cultivating True Sight at the Center of the World: Cyril of Jerusalem and the Lenten Catechumenate," *Church History* 74, no. 3 (September 2005): 439.

<sup>35</sup> Eusebius, "Life of Constantine", in Philip Schaff ed., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, vol. 1, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Pub., 1994) 3.29-40.

Christ's burial. This, in turn, coincides with his theological emphasis on the sacrifice of Christ as the prerequisite for sharing in the life of God.

Cyril frequently invites his listeners, whether they be catechumens, neophytes, or the faithful, to see past the imperial ornamentations to the original condition (in the time of Jesus) of these witnesses to God's saving activity. Through the rhetoric of his homilies and catecheses, he not only incites reflection upon salvific events, but he places the believer in the event itself. Georgia Frank, in her book *Memory of the Eyes*, speaks of this period's "impulse to render the unseen visible."<sup>36</sup> In *Cat 13* and *Cat 14*, Cyril repeatedly transports the initiates from the Martyrium to the courtyard between Golgotha and the tomb. To illicit this engagement from his audience, Cyril employs a rhetorical technique known as *ekphrasis*. Dayna Kalleres notes that orators and authors would utilize "abundant visual as well as other sensual detail [in order to] vivify the composition."<sup>37</sup> Cyril himself tells his catechumens that "while others can only hear, we can see and touch. ...The Lord was crucified: you have been given the testimonies. You can see the place of Golgotha."<sup>38</sup> Beyond catechesis, Cyril puts these listening eyes to work in the stations of the weekly offices and especially during the Easter season, from Lent to Pentecost.

### *Daily Office and Stational Worship in Jerusalem*

As a result of the Constantinian settlement, Christians were enabled to take their worship into the public forum as never before. Christians also received greater freedom to pilgrimage sacred places and holy men/women. It is in this atmosphere that the stational liturgy

---

<sup>36</sup> Georgia Frank, *The Memory of the Eyes: Pilgrims to Living Saints in Christian Late Antiquity*, (Berkeley, CA: Univ. of Cal. Press, 2000), 17.

<sup>37</sup> Kalleres, "True Sight," 443.

<sup>38</sup> Yarnold, 154-55.

developed in Roman urban centers. In his seminal work on the subject, John Baldovin writes that stational liturgies “gave living and active expression to the faith life of Christians...Stational worship was essentially public in nature, assuring the populace that they indeed lived in a religious cosmos.”<sup>39</sup> Stational liturgies were also local and contextual in nature. In the case of Jerusalem, its foundation was in the proximity of numerous sites pertaining to the life of Christ and in Cyril’s promotion of the sacramental and devotional efficacy of such places. There were four main stations in the first embodiment of Jerusalem’s stational liturgy, and three of those stations had Constantinian origins: the Holy Sepulchre, of course, with its main sanctuary (the Martyrium), the Anastasis, and Golgotha.<sup>40</sup> A basilica was constructed in Bethlehem around the cave attributed to be the birthplace of Jesus Christ. A third basilica was built on the Mount of Olives, named Eleona, over the place where Jesus gave his apocalyptic discourse in Matthew 24-26:2. A final station was the house-church at Sion which was the locus of the pre-Constantinian church in Jerusalem. Tradition maintained that it was the site of the apostles’ headquarters after Jesus’ resurrection and of the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost.

We can see that Cyril infused even the regular worship of the community with the immanence of divine activity at these most holy places. The pilgrim Egeria made note of the ways in which the daily office of *Lucernare* was a focus of this practice. The usual place for worship was the Holy Sepulchre. The service began at the Anastasis and seems to have had a preliminary conclusion with the bishop blessing the catechumens and then the faithful. Then,

---

<sup>39</sup> John F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy*, (Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1987), 261.

<sup>40</sup> Baldovin, *Stational Liturgy*, 46-53.

“singing hymns, they took the bishop from the Anastasis to the Cross.”<sup>41</sup> At the Cross, he would say a prayer and a blessing over the catechumens and the faithful, just as before. Cyril’s understanding of this bipartite site seems to have led him to amend the service in order to include the tomb and the cross. At this point, they were then dismissed. The stations were so integral to the liturgical system of Jerusalem that on Wednesday and Friday, the traditional days of fasting, *Lucernare* was held at Sion. This would seem to have been a nod to the original locus of Christian worship in the city.

The number of stations in Jerusalem increased during Cyril’s episcopacy.<sup>42</sup> By the time Egeria arrived, Sion had been rebuilt in order to accommodate the increase in worshippers. The Lazarium was built over the cave where Jesus called Lazarus out of the tomb. The Imbomon, though not a church, was believed to be the location of the Ascension and could accommodate a large crowd. There was also a small church at the garden of Gethsemane, at the bottom of the Mount of Olives.

For the faithful of Jerusalem, the ordeal of Holy Week (Great Week) began on the Saturday before Palm Sunday.<sup>43</sup> They processed out to the Lazarium, about two miles, for a service in which was read the passage in the Gospel of John where a woman anoints his feet in preparation for his death. On Thursday of Great Week there was a service wherein communion was taken twice, once in the Martyrium and once in the chapel Behind the Cross. This was the only time in the year when the Eucharist was partaken at this location.<sup>44</sup> The people were

---

<sup>41</sup> Wilkinson, 124.

<sup>42</sup> Baldovin, *Stational Liturgy*, 50-53.

<sup>43</sup> Yarnold, *Cyril*, 44-49. cf *Egeria*, 29-43.

<sup>44</sup> Wilkinson, 134-35.

alerted at this time that a “great effort” was ahead of them. The vigil began at midnight in the Eleona, though many arrived early. The service was composed of appropriate gospel readings and psalms. They then moved on to the Imbomon where there was a short service and on down to “the place where he prayed” and the garden of Gethsemane. By the time they reached the city gates the first light of dawn was appearing. Those who did not make the trek to the Mount joined the procession as they eventually arrived at Golgotha, standing before the Cross while Cyril read the accounts of Jesus’ Passion. From the second hour of the day until noon, there was a service of psalms wherein the Wood of the Cross was brought out for the people to venerate (kiss) and from which to receive a divine blessing. From noon to three in the afternoon, there were readings from the Old Testament, the Epistles, and the Gospels. Egeria records that people were moved to weeping and great mourning because of Christ’s sufferings for them.<sup>45</sup> Finally, they moved into the Martyrium for an extended *Lucernare* service. On Easter Sunday, a vigil was kept in which the initiates received baptism. The “usual” Easter service was held and after the dismissal in the Martyrium the people processed to the Anastasis where the resurrection Gospel was read and the faithful were finally given a respite until the Second Sunday of Easter.

## Conclusion

In Cyril, we see a shift from Eusebius’ understanding of holy places and his theological vision of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in particular. For Cyril, the places where Christ walked were transformed into instruments of divine activity. They radiated with the nearness

---

<sup>45</sup> Wilkinson, 138.

of God in Jesus Christ. This understanding is also transferred to his understanding of the liturgy, in particular the sacraments of baptism and Eucharist. The sacraments receive their efficacy in that as the faithful, or the baptizand, imitate the actions of Christ, the benefits of the historic action are transferred to them in conjunction with the imitated action of Christ. Similarly, with the aid of Cyril's *ekphrastic* rhetoric, when the Jerusalem worshipper enters the space where Jesus raised Lazarus or where Jesus was born, she becomes a witness to the event itself. It would seem, then, that the Holy City and the tangible presence of Christ's saving actions did indeed affect the way that Cyril understood and, later, developed the liturgy in Jerusalem.

## Bibliography

- Baldovin, John F. *Liturgy in Ancient Jerusalem*. Nottingham, UK: Grove Books, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy*. Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalum, 1987.
- Bradshaw, Paul F. *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*. Oxford: Oxford Press, 2002.
- Clement of Rome. "2 Clement." In *The Apostolic Fathers*, 69-70. Chicago: Moody Publishers, 2009.
- Cummings, Owen F. *Eucharistic Doctors: A Theological History*. New York: Paulist Press, 2005.
- Day, Juliette. *The Baptismal Liturgy of Jerusalem: Fourth- and Fifth-Century Evidence from Palestine, Syria and Egypt*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2007.
- Doval, Alexis J. *Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogue: The Authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2001.
- Hawk-Reinhard, Donna. "Transmission Implications Regarding the Authorship of Cyril of Jerusalem's *Mystagogical Catecheses*." In *The Use of Textual Criticism for the Interpretation of Patristic Texts*, edited by Kenneth B. Steinhauser and Scott Dermer, 37-76. Lewiston, NY: Edward Mellen Press, 2013.
- Hippolytus. *On the Apostolic Tradition*. Trans. Alistair Stewart-Sykes. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's, 2001.
- Johnson, Lawrence J. *Worship in the Early Church: An Anthology of Historical Sources vol. 2*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2009.
- Jones, Cheslyn, Geoffrey Wainwright, Edward Yarnold SJ, and Paul Bradshaw eds. *The Study of Liturgy*. New York: Oxford Press, 1992.
- Justin. "Apology." In *Documents of the Christian Church*, ed. Henry Bettenson and Chris Maunder, 70-71. Oxford: Oxford Press, 2011.
- Kalleres, Dayna S. "Cultivating True Sight at the Center of the World: Cyril of Jerusalem and the Lenten Catechumenate." *Church History* 74, no. 3 (September 2005): 431-459.
- Mazza, Enrico. *Mystagogy: A Theology of Liturgy in the Patristic Age*. New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1989.

New Advent. "Synod of Laodicea." New Advent: Fathers. Copyright 2009. Accessed March 11, 2013. <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3806.htm>.

Riley, Hugh M. *Christian Initiation: A Comparative Study of the Interpretation of the Baptismal Liturgy in the Mystagogical Writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chryostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Ambrose of Milan*. Washington, D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 1974.

Schaff, Philip and Henry Wace eds. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Second Series, vol. 1*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Pub., 1994

Walker, P. W. L. *Holy City Holy Places?: Christian Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Wilkinson, John. *Egeria's Travels*. London: SPCK, 1971.

Yarnold, Edward. "The Authorship of the Mystagogical Catecheses Attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem." *Heythrop Journal*, 19 (1978): 143-161.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Cyril of Jerusalem*. New York: Routledge, 2000.