

The Creed and the Development of the Liturgical Year in the Early Church

Wolfram Kinzig*

This paper examines the question of how faith develops into orthodoxy, and considers the role of the liturgy in that process. I will argue that the development of a *confession of faith*, the *symbolum fidei*, is central to this process. The creed becomes normative after 381 in its neo-Nicene form. Measures such as imperial laws make this Neo-Nicene faith incumbent upon all inhabitants of the empire; aberrations of that faith are banned. But what impact did these measures have in reality? Above all, how was the prescribed stipulation to a particular formulation of the faith enforced in practice, and what consequences did that have for the religious life of believers?

I would like to propose that it is no historical coincidence that the religious feasts of Christmas/Epiphany, Easter with Lent, the *Triduum sacrum* and Easter Octave, and Ascension and Pentecost (the latter sometimes accompanied by its own Octave) were introduced almost at the same time. Rather, the implementation of these celebrations is a mechanism consciously utilized by the ecclesial authorities to enforce the normative definition of the Christian faith and was thus instrumental in the formation of a *Corpus Christianum*.

To establish this thesis I will proceed in three steps: In the first and shortest section I would like to call to mind certain stages in the aforementioned path towards a normative form of the Christian faith. Thereafter I will take a look at the development of the liturgies of the most important dominical feasts in the late-fourth century. I will show that, from the 380s onwards, a simultaneous process of liturgization can be observed in various locations that were actually quite distant from each other. In the third and concluding portion I will ask whether the establishment of the creed and the implementation of a uniform Christian calendar might be interconnected, to which end I will consider some potentially relevant ecclesial pronouncements.

* For help in translating this paper into English I am indebted to Dr. Christopher Hays (Oxford).

I.

To begin, I should briefly summarize how the textually and theologically flexible *regulae fidei* of the first three centuries developed into fixed formulae that came to define orthodoxy.¹

The trinitarian theological controversies, which arose concomitantly with the Constantinian turn of the fourth century, catalyzed this process. It became clear that the terminology developed in the theological discussions of the first three centuries could not adequately sustain conversation with Neoplatonic philosophy, nor did it suffice in the *intra muros* efforts to explicate the specifics of the Christian conception of God. These communicative breakdowns occurred because the theological terminology developed in first three centuries was insufficiently refined, and, therefore, was vulnerable to misunderstanding. These disputes were to be settled in Nicaea in 325 where the Council issued a formal agreement in written form, which was signed by the bishops (N).

This procedure of developing a fixed dogmatic definition in order to settle doctrinal differences proved *à la longue* to be astonishingly successful. Now, the Nicene creed may not have initially been established specifically as an institutionalized synodal law (*horos*, canon), but rather as a personal confession in order to emphasize the conveners' individual liability for the process. The "faith of Nicaea", however, which resulted from this process, came to be the standard against which later generations measured the Christian doctrine of the triune God. Nonetheless, that does not signify that it had been established as a *formula* for all times. For had it been so considered, then it would have been impossible to settle the trinitarian disputes in Constantinople in 381. As is well known, this was only achieved, because it was agreed to draw up another creed (C) in order to adequately express the "faith of Nicaea."²

In subsequent years, the Creed of Constantinople became the normative creed in the eastern portion of the Roman Empire. Thus the rule of faith had coagulated into an established dogmatic text.³ This process of coagulation, through which the rule of faith mutated into a *formula* of faith, was expedited by a series of factors.

The Church leaders felt that they must be united on the central question of Christendom's identity. The Christian doctrine of God had to be synthesized with sufficient delicacy to intellectually secure both the unity of God and human salvation. This could only be achieved by formulating a highly-complex set of terminology that allowed for minimal flexibility.

The synods were central to implementing this consensus, a process which involved the marginalization, indeed, the anathematization, of non-majority

1 Cf. also W. Kinzig, review of H. Förster, *Die Anfänge von Weihnachten und Epiphania*, in: ThLZ 134 (2009), 708–711.

2 Cf. below ft. 6.

3 On this process, cf. G. Riedl, *Hermeneutische Grundstrukturen frühchristlicher Bekenntnisbildung*, TBT 123, Berlin 2004, 18–20, and the literature cited therein.

theological perspectives. Although in itself not a new institution, the synod came to be considered an apposite means of addressing dogmatic differences and enforcing the recently-reached consensus. They of course were not immediately and universally successful, though the Neo-Nicene teaching, as articulated by the Creed of Constantinople, did triumph in the end.

Furthermore, throughout the fourth century the emperors had a vital interest in settling the trinitarian controversy, since, from their perspective, a quarrelling Church could only endanger the welfare of the empire. So they placed considerable pressure on the episcopate, with varying degrees of success. For our purposes, Theodosius the Great's edict *Cunctos populos* in February of 380 is of considerable importance, because that edict prescribed a particular form of Christian doctrine, namely, the trinitarian doctrine endorsed by the patriarchs of Rome and Alexandria. This document describes the necessity of believing in (*credamus*) "the one godhead of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, of equal majesty and pious triunity", on the grounds that this faith alone conforms to apostolic teaching and evangelical doctrine.⁴ I am not primarily interested here in the precise description of the trinitarian faith in this edict, which is not transmitted uniformly and poses philological problems,⁵ but rather in its prescription that the trinitarian teaching described therein must be "believed."

This reference to "belief" is found increasingly often in imperial laws during this period. As emerges from the rescript *Nullus haereticis* (Cod. Theod. 16.5,6), which was issued during the proceedings at Constantinople, the "faith" prescribed actually refers to the creed of Nicaea, and, correspondingly, the creed of Constantinople was understood as an explication of the Nicene Creed.⁶ In other words, proper doctrine is thereafter fixed by a

4 Cod.Theod. 16.1,2 (P. Krüger / Th. Mommsen (eds.), *Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis et leges novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes*, vol. 1/2, Berlin 1904, 833): *Cunctos populos, quos clementiae nostrae regit temperamentum, in tali volumus religione versari, quam divinum Petrum apostolum tradidisse Romanis religio usque ad nunc ab ipso insinuata declarat quamque pontificem Damasum sequi claret et Petrum Alexandriae episcopum virum apostolicae sanctitatis, hoc est, ut secundum apostolicam disciplinam evangelicamque doctrinam patris et filii et spiritus sancti unam deitatem sub parili maiestate et sub pia trinitate credamus. Hanc legem sequentes Christianorum catholicorum nomen iubemus amplecti, reliquos vero dementes vesanosque iudicantes haeretici dogmatis infamiam sustinere nec conciliabula eorum ecclesiarum nomen accipere, divina primum vindicta, post etiam motus nostri, quem ex caelesti arbitrio sumpserimus, ultione plectendos.* – Cf. especially K.L. Noethlichs, *Die gesetzgeberischen Maßnahmen der christlichen Kaiser des 4. Jahrhunderts gegen Häretiker, Heiden und Juden*, Diss. Cologne 1971, 129–132. 208–212; K.L. Noethlichs, *Heidenverfolgung*, in: RAC 13 (1986), 1160–1163.

5 The *Codex Iustinianus* (1.1,1), the *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita* (9.7,3), as well as a further manuscript read *sub pari maiestate*. – The collocation of *pious* with *trinitas* is not elsewhere attested. Sozomen, in his paraphrase of the text (7.4,6), writes: *ισοτιμον τριάδα θεϊαν*.

6 Cf. the first canon of Constantinople (381) as all as the Synodal Tome of Constantinople (382) with Thdt., h.e. 5.9,10–12. See also P. Gemeinhardt, *Die Filioque-Kontroverse zwischen Ost- und Westkirche im Frühmittelalter*, AKG 82, Berlin 2002, 41f. In the first session of the Council of Rimini (359) one already finds recourse to Nicea as the normative creed, which should not be changed; cf. below ft. 56.

specific text, viz., the Creed of Constantinople, and the faith defined thereby is binding for the entire population of the empire. This situation became even more acute under Justinian in the sixth century, insofar as the pertinent texts mentioned under the title *De summa trinitate et de fide catholica et ut nemo de ea publice contendere audeat* were moved to the head of the Justinian Code.⁷ This legal compilation notwithstanding, Justinian felt called upon on many other occasions to drum Nicene orthodoxy, as he understood it, in his subjects' heads.⁸

In the West the situation was somewhat more complicated, since the so-called Roman Creed (R), in all of its varieties up to the fully-developed Apostles' Creed (T), existed alongside and partially preceded C,⁹ owing not least of all to the delayed reception of C in that part of the world.¹⁰ More conspicuously, the differences between C and R or T appear not to have mattered very much. In practice, the catechetical standard always remained the Roman Creed with its derivations. Though N, and subsequently C, were certainly operative as crucial theological benchmarks,¹¹ they were nonetheless considered unfit for the unique situation of the West with its strong missional emphasis.

This raises the question of how new legal prescriptions were communicated across the expanse of that society. One could scarcely expect a peasant in Galilee or a craftsman in Gaza to stay up-to-date on the most recent legal developments. Put differently: How was the new-found orthodoxy "implemented" among the populace?

II.

Before we set ourselves to answering this question, in a second section I would like to take a look at the development of the liturgical year. For this purpose it would be helpful to gather together the earliest witnesses to the dominical feasts of Christmas, Epiphany, Ascension, and Pentecost, as well as the evidence regarding the historicizing re-organization of the earlier feast

7 Cf. Cod. Iust. 1.1,1–4.

8 On this point, cf. *ibid.*, 1.1,5–8. See also Riedl, 2004, 23–25.

9 On the origin of the Roman creed, cf. M. Vinzent, *Die Entstehung des "Römischen Glaubensbekenntnisses"*, in: W. Kinzig / C. Marksches / M. Vinzent, *Tauffragen und Bekenntnis. Studien zur sogenannten "Traditio Apostolica", zu den "Interrogationes de fide" und zum "Römischen Glaubensbekenntnis"*, AKG 74, Berlin 1999, 185–409; W. Kinzig / M. Vinzent, *Recent Research on the Origin of the Creed*, in: JThS 50 (1999), 535–559; M. Vinzent, *Der Ursprung des Apostolikums im Urteil der kritischen Forschung*, FKDG 89, Göttingen 2006. On the development of the Roman Creed to the Apostles Creed, see especially L.H. Westra, *The Apostles' Creed. Origin, History, and some Early Commentaries*, *Instrumenta patristica et mediaevalia* 43, Turnhout, 2002. See further Riedl, 2004, 25–31. 91–93. 236–238. 283. 323–326 (with noteworthy textual doublets).

10 So also Gemeinhardt, 2002, 44f.

11 Cf. Gemeinhardt, 2002, 49–56; see further W. Kinzig, *The Creed in the Liturgy. Prayer or Hymn?*, in: A. Gerhards / C. Leonhard (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Liturgy and Worship. New Insights into its History and Interaction*, *Jewish and Christian Perspectives* 15, Leiden 2007, 229–246.

of Easter (see Appendix). When we look over this list, we notice a startling fact: The liturgical year with its associated observance of the primary Christian feasts celebrating the stages of Jesus' earthly life did not come into existence until the late-fourth century. Subsequently, this form of the Christian calendar spread astonishingly quickly throughout nearly the entire ancient Church and has left its mark on Christianity up to the present day.¹²

I cannot trace the particulars of this complex process in detail here; I must instead limit myself to sketching the broad contours of these events. I begin with the Christmas celebration, the origins of which, as is well known, are shrouded in darkness, as are those of the eastern celebration of Epiphany on January 6th. I personally adhere, in spite of the recent objections of Hans Förster,¹³ to the *religionsgeschichtliche* hypothesis according to which the feast originally arose in Rome as a celebration of the winter solstice imbued with Christian content. Thus it was seen in parallel, if not in conscious competition, with the local festival in honour of *Sol invictus*.¹⁴ There is some evidence to suggest that there had already been a dispute at the Council of Nicaea over the date of the celebration of the birth of Christ, but that the Council itself had retained the 6th of January as the sole date.¹⁵ At any rate, it appears that the Christmas feast was a merely local Roman festival for several decades. But in the years following the 380s it seems to have spread explosively through the Roman Empire. We are able to trace the individual steps of this expansion in some detail.

First, we have a Christmas sermon from Gregory of Nazianzus (or. 38), which apparently was delivered in Constantinople in the year 380. This sermon appears to set out the reasons for the introduction of the festival, if indeed we agree with the old thesis of Hermann Usener, which has been recently resumed in a modified form by Hans Förster, that Gregory's speech

-
- 12 Recent surveys in K. Hoheisel / H. Brakmann, *Jahr (kultisches)*, in: RAC 16 (1994), 1083–1118 (1109–1112); A.J. Chupungco (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, vol. 5. *Liturgical Time and Space*, Collegeville 2000; J.F. Baldovin, *The Empire Baptized*, in: G. Wainwright / K.B. Westerfield Tucker (eds.), *The Oxford History of Christian Worship*, Oxford 2006, 77–130 (112–120); B.D. Spinks, *The Growth of Liturgy and the Church Year*, in: A. Casiday / F.W. Norris (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vol. 2. *Constantine to c. 600*, Cambridge 2007, 601–617, which nonetheless does not address the questions attended to here. See also Hoheisel / Brakmann, 1994, 1113–1115.
- 13 H. Förster, *Die Feier der Geburt Christi in der Alten Kirche. Beiträge zur Erforschung der Anfänge des Epiphanie- und des Weihnachtsfests*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 4, Tübingen 2000; *ibid.*, *Die Anfänge von Weihnachten und Epiphanias*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 46, Tübingen 2007.
- 14 For details, cf. Kinzig, 2009.
- 15 As much is indicated by Ananias of Shirak (7th cent.), who draws on a letter of Macarius of Jerusalem. Cf. A. Terian, *Macarius of Jerusalem – Letter to the Armenians, A.D. 335. Introduction, text, translation and commentary*, AVANT Series, Crestwood 2008, 63–68. 82–87. See also the commentary, 121–125.

has to be considered the first Christmas sermon for the eastern capital and that it can be reliably dated to that year.¹⁶

In addition, there exists a homily on the celebration of Christmas by John Chrysostom, dating to either 386, 387, or 388, which proceeds along similar lines. It seems specifically to establish the feast for that sector of the Nicene community of Antioch which adhered to Bishop Flavian.¹⁷ In this sermon the orator goes to considerable rhetorical lengths to justify the date of the new holiday. He mentions, *inter alia*, that the festival originated in the West and that the date of the Augustan census, the 25th of December, could also be determined from Roman archives. This holiday, he says, has already spread from Thrace until Gades (Cadiz).¹⁸ These remarks are all the more astonishing since, at that time, the relations between Flavian and Rome were taut because of the continuing Antiochene schism.¹⁹ We will return to this matter later.

We can also discern from one of Jerome's Christmas sermons that after 386 he himself initiated the celebration of Christmas in Bethlehem.²⁰ In the course of this sermon, Jerome claims that "the entire world" already stood against the aberrant opinion of "this province" in celebrating the birth of Christ, an assertion which is incorrect, since at that time Christmas was celebrated neither in Armenia nor in Egypt.²¹

-
- 16 Cf. H. Usener, *Das Weihnachtsfest*, Bonn 21911 (31969), 260–273 (who nonetheless dates the homily to the year 379); Förster, 2007, 182–198.
- 17 With Kelly (J.N.D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth. The Story of John Chrysostom. Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*, London 1995, 70) I would argue that when Chrysostom remarks, in his Christmas homily, that the feast day "has been manifest and known among us for less than ten years" (nativ. 1; PG 49.351: Καίτοι γε οὐπω δέκατόν ἐστιν ἔτος, ἐξ οὗ δῆλη και γνώριμος ἡμῖν αὕτη ἡ ἡμέρα γαγένηται), he does not refer to the introduction of the Christmas feast in Antioch (as is often thought); rather I think this phrase indicates Chrysostom's personal knowledge of the feast occurring on that date. It seems indubitable to me that this homily serves to justify the introduction of the feast in Chrysostom's own context.
- 18 Nativ. 1 (PG 49.351f.): Καθάπερ γάρ τὰ γενναῖα και εὐγενῆ τῶν φυτῶν (και γάρ ἐκεῖνα ὁμοῦ τε εἰς τὴν γῆν κατατίθεται και πρὸς ὕψος εὐθὺς ἀνατρέχει μέγα και τῷ καρπῷ βριθεταί), οὕτω και αὕτη παρὰ μὲν τοῖς τὴν ἐσπέραν οἰκοῦσιν ἀνωθεν γνωριζομένη, πρὸς ἡμᾶς δὲ κοιμισθεῖσα νῦν, και οὐ πρὸ πολλῶν ἐτῶν, ἀθρόον οὕτως ἀνέδραμε και τοσοῦτον ἤνεγκε τὸν καρπὸν, ὅσωνπερ ἐστί νῦν ὄραν, τῶν περιβόλων ἡμῖν πεπληρωμένων και τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀπάσης στενοχωρουμένης τῷ πλήθει τῶν συνδραμόντων. [...] Και πολὺς περὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης πανταχοῦ γίνεται λόγος, τῶν μὲν αἰτιωμένων, ὅτι νέα τίς ἐστί και πρόσφατος και νῦν εἰσενήνεκται, τῶν δὲ ἀπολογουμένων, ὅτι παλαιὰ και ἀρχαία ἐστί, τῶν προφητῶν ἤδη προειπόντων περὶ τῆς γεννήσεως αὐτοῦ, και ἀνωθεν τοῖς ἀπὸ Θράκης μέχρι Γαδεῖρων οἰκοῦσι κατάδηλος και ἐπίσημος γέγονε. Ibid., 2 (353): Και τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τοῖς δημοσίᾳ κειμένοις κώδιξιν ἐπὶ τῆς Ρώμης ἔξεστιν ἐντυχόντα και τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἀπογραφῆς μαθόντα, ἀκριβῶς εἶδέναι τὸν βουλόμενον. See also Förster, 2000, 62, incl. ft. 34; 2007, 179.
- 19 Cf. F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche (IV^e-V^e siècle)*, Paris 1905, 245–292; R. Devreesse, *Le patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Église jusqu'à la conquête arabe*, Études Palestiniennes et Orientales, Paris 1945, 36–38; Kelly, 1995, 14, 117.
- 20 *Homilia de nativitate domini* (CChr.SL 78.524–529). On the dating of the sermon (between 401 and 410?), cf. Förster, 2000, 156, incl. ft. 34; Förster, 2007, 133, incl. ft. 316.
- 21 *Non sunt nostra quae loquimur, maiorum sententia est: uniuersus mundus contra huius provinciae opinionem loquitur* (CChr.SL 78.527,120–122). See also Förster, 2007, 134, ft. 322. – On the si-

Even if we might assume the use of rhetorical hyperbole to establish these three authors' positions, the discernable facts still indicate that the Roman Christmas festival spread quickly in the late-fourth century, even in the East. But why did this change occur only at that point in history? I will resume this question below.

The previously adduced witnesses also make clear that this triumphal introduction of Christmas collided with the celebration of Epiphany. This conflict occurred above all in the eastern half of the empire. Nonetheless, the contents of the feast of Epiphany, which was probably older than Christmas, were never clearly defined. On Epiphany, depending on the time and the region, Christians variously celebrated the birth of Christ, the arrival of the Magi, the miracle at the wedding in Cana, the baptism of Jesus, and the Transfiguration of Christ.

By the second half of the fourth century, however, the observance of Epiphany was already well-established in Jerusalem, where it commemorated Jesus' birth.²² In the immediate vicinity, in Bethlehem, there stood the Church of the Nativity, which Constantine had built. At that church, people venerated the spot where Jesus had been born. It is not by chance that Jerome chose to settle in Bethlehem in 388 CE and there to establish his famous monastery. From his writings and from the approximately contemporaneous travel report of Egeria we receive a vivid picture of the numerous pilgrimages to significant sites in the life of Jesus.

Thus we might infer that it was in Palestine that the feast of Epiphany on January 6th first arose as a celebration of the birth of Jesus, possibly transforming an older celebration.²³ Political factors may have exercised some influence on this process, for the bishop of the Holy City, ever since the time of Constantine, had a massive interest in making his own status commensurate with that of the great patriarchs. The fact that the birth grotto of Jesus was located near Jerusalem could very well indicate that the perhaps older celebration of the Baptism of Jesus was given a new meaning. Not insignificantly, the bishop of Jerusalem came to play an instrumental role in the construction of churches on the sites of Jesus' Birth, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension.²⁴

Open competition thus arose between the feasts of Christmas and Epiphany, and in the end Christmas was victorious in most provinces of the empire.

tuation in North Africa, cf. H.R. Drobner, *Augustinus von Hippo. Predigten zum Weihnachtsfest (Sermones 184–196). Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, Patrologia 11, Frankfurt 2003, 33–40.

22 This is also true for Syria. Cf. U. Possekel, *Thomas von Edessa über das Epiphaniiefest. Erste Anmerkungen zu einer unveröffentlichten Handschrift*, in: W. Kinzig / J. Schmidt / U. Volp (eds.), *Liturgie und Ritual in der Alten Kirche. Patristische Beiträge zum Studium der gottesdienstlichen Quellen der Alten Kirche*, Studien der Patristischen Arbeitsgemeinschaft 11, Leuven 2011, 153–176.

23 Cf. Förster, 2007, 306.

24 Cf. Eus., v.C. 3.30–32; Thdt., h.e. 1.16f.

Jerusalem and Egypt held out the longest,²⁵ and some regions outside the empire, such as Armenia, did not adopt the Roman tradition at all.²⁶

This development also had repercussions in the West, to which Epiphany migrated in turn. Again, this process was met with resistance. For example, in his fourth *Sermon on Epiphany*, Augustine reproached the Donatists for not observing this celebration and therefore maintaining “no community with the Church of the East, where that star once appeared.”²⁷ Similarly, Philastrius of Brescia disputed with heretics who claimed that one must only celebrate Christmas.²⁸ Ultimately these pockets of resistance were overcome, possibly owing to the fact that, at least in the Roman tradition, the festal content was reduced to the veneration of the Magi.²⁹

Let us move forward in the Church year. Throughout the empire the feast of Easter was extended by the observance of the *Quadragesima*, the forty-day period of fasting prior to Easter, and the *Quinquagesima*, the fifty-day period of celebration after Easter. The forty-day period of fasting, however, was not literally observed everywhere, since the fast-days were calculated in various ways.³⁰ Nearly everywhere there is also evidence for an intensified historicizing commemoration of the suffering of Jesus during Holy Week, frequently beginning on Palm Sunday and then especially emphasized on the days between Maundy Thursday and Easter Sunday. Particularly in the West the days from Good Friday until Easter Sunday came to be referred to as the *Triduum sacrum*.³¹

25 The first clear evidence of the observance of Christmas in Egypt is the Christmas homily of Paulus of Emesa, delivered in the presence of the patriarch Cyril; cf., 172. On the complex situation in Palestine, where both festal traditions may have co-existed simultaneously, cf. Förster, 2000, 146–165; *ibid.*, 2007, 129–147. Cf. also Thomas of Edessa (6th cent.), in a text discussing the feast of Epiphany, expressly designates Christmas as a feast commemorating the birth of Christ, and resists critics who object that the Christmas feast arose from the celebration of the “Victory of the Sun.” Text in G. Diettrich, *Bericht über neuentdeckte handschriftliche Urkunden zur Geschichte des Gottesdienstes in der nestorianischen Kirche*, in: NGWG. PH (1909), 200f. See further Förster, 2007, 10.

26 But cf. Förster, 2007, 148–152, who reckons there to have been an occasional observance of the Roman tradition.

27 Serm. 202.2 (PL 38.1033f.): *Merito istum diem nunquam nobiscum haeretici Donatistae celebrare voluerunt, quia nec unitatem amant nec orientali ecclesiae, ubi apparuit illa stella, communicant. Nos autem manifestationem domini et salvatoris nostri Iesu Christi, qua primitias gentium delibavit, in unitate gentium celebremus.*

28 Cf. haer. 140.1,1–4 (CChr.SL 9.304): *Sunt quidam dubitantes heretici de die Epifaniorum domini saluatoris, qui celebratur octauo Idus Ianuarias, dicentes solum natalem debere eos celebrare domini VIII Kalendas Ianuarias, non tamen diem Epifaniorum.*

29 Already in the Epiphany sermons of Leo the Great is this considered the exclusive content of the feast (serm. 31–38). This is not, however, the case for the West as a whole; cf. below the survey of Mommsen, 1959 (I am grateful to Dr. Nils Arne Pedersen, Aarhus for this observation).

30 On the associated challenges, see, e.g. M.E. Johnson, *Preparation for Pascha? Lent in Christian Antiquity*, in: P.F. Bradshaw / L.A. Hoffman (eds.), *Passover and Easter. The Symbolic Structuring of Sacred Seasons*, Two Liturgical Traditions 6, Notre Dame 1999, 36–54.

31 See the evidence cited in the appendix.

The liturgical elevation of the Easter Octave was not established everywhere, but wherever it was introduced, that decision was made in the decades after 380. The details of this process in Jerusalem are most apparent in Cyril's *Mystagogical Catecheses* and Egeria's *Itinerary*.³² As regards Antioch, mention could be made of the *Baptismal Catecheses* of Chrysostom, which date approximately to the year 390, as well as to the only slightly-later Easter sermons of the homilist Asterius.³³ Also in Milan and probably in Hippo, the newly-baptized were catechized after Easter.³⁴

Presently, Holy Week and Easter Octave came to the attention of secular legislators who reacted by pronouncing them public holidays.³⁵ From the year 400 onward, circus games were prohibited during Holy Week, Christmas, and Epiphany.³⁶ Finally, in the year 425 a law was issued proscribing games and prescribing the attendance of Christian worship on Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, and Pentecost.³⁷

It is remarkable to note that in the years following 380, the celebration of the Ascension was divorced from the feast of Pentecost, which concluded the *Quinquagesima*.³⁸ The events recalled on Pentecost no longer referred to the Ascension. "From the end of the fourth century, the events of Acts 2 (i.e. the descent of the Spirit on the fiftieth day) became increasingly the main theme"³⁹ of the feast. This results in some surprising parallels to the feast of Christmas: In Palestine the feast of Ascension was only introduced after some delay, while in Egypt it was not introduced at all. The account of Egeria

32 On this, cf. e.g. H. Auf der Maur, *Die Osterfeier in der alten Kirche*, edited by R. Meßner and W.G. Schöpf, *Liturgica Oenipontana* 2, Münster 2003, 136–155.

33 Cf. G. Kretschmar, *Die Geschichte des Taufgottesdienstes in der alten Kirche*, in: K.F. Müller / W. Blankenburg, *Leiturgia. Handbuch des Evangelischen Gottesdienstes*. 5. *Der Taufgottesdienst*, Kassel 1970, 170–172; W. Kinzig, *In Search of Asterius. Studies on the Authorship of the Homilies on the Psalms*, FKDG 47, Göttingen 1990, 162–164; Auf der Maur, 2003, 174–188.

34 Cf. e.g. Ambrosius, *De sacramentis and De mysteriis*. On Augustine cf. H.R. Drobner, *Augustinus von Hippo – Predigten zum österlichen Triduum* (Sermones 218–229/D). *Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, *Patrologia* 16, Frankfurt 2006, 59f. Further H. Auf der Maur, *Feiern im Rhythmus der Zeit*. 1. *Herrenfeste in Woche und Jahr*, GDK 5, Regensburg 1983, 80; Drobner, 1996, 44f.; A. Fürst, *Die Liturgie der Alten Kirche. Geschichte und Theologie*, Münster 2008, 121f.

35 Cf. *Cod. Theod.* 2.8,19,3 (389, in the West; Th. Mommsen / P.M. Meyer (eds.), *Codex Theodosianus*, vol. 1/2. *Textus cum apparatu*, Berlin 1905, 87f.). *Sacros quoque paschae dies, qui septeno vel praecedunt numero vel sequuntur, in eadem observatione numeramus, nec non et dies solis, qui repetito in se calculo revolvuntur*. Similarly, 2.8,21 (392, in the East).

36 *Cod. Theod.* 2.8,24 (400. [405]).

37 *Cod. Theod.* 15.5,5 (425).

38 See the evidence cited in the appendix; see also R. Cabié, *La Pentecôte. L'évolution de la Cinqantaine pascalle au cours des cinq premiers siècles*, *Bibliothèque de Liturgie*, Paris 1965, 189: "C'est donc probablement, à quelques années près, au cours de l'avant-dernière décennie du IV^e siècle que l'on a commencé à solenniser le quarantième jour après Pâques. Les témoignages que nous avons recueillis ne présentent pas cet usage comme une innovation, mais les documents antérieurs sont tous muets à ce sujet et cela nous semble une preuve suffisante de son institution récente."

39 Auf der Maur, 1983, 81 with citations.

does indicate that in Jerusalem the fortieth day after Easter was celebrated in some way, but one cannot yet speak of an actual celebration of the Ascension. Observance of Ascension in Jerusalem is first apparent in the *Armenian Lectionary*.⁴⁰ For Egypt, there is no relevant evidence at all; instead the Egyptians seem to have persisted until at least the middle of the fifth century in considering the entire *Quinquagesima* to be a period of joyous post-Easter celebration with no particular liturgical emphasis on the fortieth or fiftieth day.⁴¹

Whereas even in pre-Constantinian times baptism was not exclusively practised at Easter, in the fourth century the other dominical feasts clearly came to include baptismal ceremonies, not least of all as a result of the massive increase of the number of catechumens.⁴² From a letter of Pope Siricius (*seddit* 384–399), we know that that pope looked on this development with some skepticism, particularly as it threatened to encroach upon the feasts of the apostles and the martyrs. In his letter to the Spanish bishop Himerius of Tarragona, which is frequently called the oldest decretal, Siricius instructs Himerius to limit the baptisms to Easter and Pentecost, since this was how things were done “among us and in all the Churches” (*apud nos et apud omnes ecclesias*), a statement which patently did not reflect the historical reality of the wider empire.⁴³

Thus we observe throughout the Roman Empire the development of a widespread and thorough-going trend towards unifying the celebration of the dominical feasts of the liturgical year. These dominical feasts primarily focused on the stages of the Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

The reorganisation of the feasts in the Church year formed part of a broader process of standardizing Christian ritual. It has been established for some time that from the end of the fourth century onward the charismatic and improvisational elements, which had hitherto characterized Eucharistic services, were progressively marginalized. Prayers were increasingly written down and approved by ecclesial authorities.⁴⁴ In addition, in 397 a North Af-

40 Cf. Auf der Maur, 2003, 161f.

41 Cf. Cabié, 1965, 61–76.

42 On the question of the dates for baptism, cf. in particular Kretschmar, 1970, 137–140, 268–271; P.F. Bradshaw, “*Diem baptismo sollempniorem*”. *Initiation and Easter in Christian Antiquity*, in: E. Carr / S. Parenti / A.-A. Thiermeyer / E. Velkovska (eds.), *EULOGEMA. Studies in Honor of Robert Taft*, *StAns* 110 / *Analecta Liturgica* 17, Rome 1993, 41–51.

43 Ep. 1.3 (PL 13.1134A–B): *Sequitur deinde baptizandorum, prout unicuique libitum fuerit, improbabilis et emendanda confusio, quae a nostris consacerdotibus, quod commoti dicimus, non ratione auctoritatis alicuius, sed sola temeritate praesumitur, ut passim ac libere natalitii Christi seu apparitionis, necnon et apostolorum seu martyrum festiuitatibus innumerae, ut asseris, plebes baptismi mysterium consequantur, cum hoc sibi privilegium et apud nos et apud omnes ecclesias dominicum specialiter cum pentecoste sua pascha defendat.*

44 Standard works on this topic are M. Vos, *À la recherche de normes pour les textes liturgiques de la messe (V–VII^e siècle)*, in: *RHE* 69 (1974), 5–37; P. De Clerck, *Improvisation et livres liturgiques: leçons d’une histoire*, in: *ComLi* 60 (1978), 115–118; A. Bouley, *From Freedom to Formula. The Evolution of the Eucharistic Prayer from Oral Improvisation to Written Texts*, SCA 21, Washington

rican council decided that in prayer one should not oscillate between addressing the Father and the Son, and that before the altar one's prayers should always be directed to the Father.⁴⁵ Soon thereafter, the first liturgical *libelli* and sacramentaries were compiled.⁴⁶ Simultaneously, in the East the great Byzantine liturgies emerged as fixed rites: the *Anaphora of Basil* and the *Anaphora of Chrysostom*.⁴⁷

Bishops also stressed that ecclesial customs and ceremonies were to be observed with the utmost diligence. Thus in 416 Pope Innocent I (*sedit* 402–417) emphasized in a letter to Decentius of Gubbio that the priests must preserve unchanged the ecclesial institutions (*instituta ecclesiastica*) handed down from the apostles; alterations in the sequences and the rites were not permissible, since they led to confusion.⁴⁸ Subsequently, this text became legally binding owing to its inclusion in various collections of canon law.⁴⁹

1981, 159–215; E.J. Kilmartin, *Early African Legislation Concerning Liturgical Prayer*, in: EL 99 (1985), 105–127; T. Elich, *Using Liturgical Texts in the Middle Ages*, in: G. Austin (ed.), *Fountain of Life. In Memory of Niels K. Rasmussen, O.P.*, Washington, D.C. 1991, 69–83. On improvisation in the first three centuries, cf. R.P.C. Hanson, *The Liberty of the Bishop to Improvise Prayer in the Eucharist*, in: VigChr 15 (1961), 173–176; also in *Studies in Christian Antiquity*, Edinburgh 1985, 113–116; L. Bouyer, *L'improvisation liturgique dans l'Église ancienne*, in: MD 111 (1972), 7–19; De Clerck, 1978, 111–115; Bouley, 1981, 89–158; E. Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century*, Collegeville 1998, 36f.; P.F. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, Oxford 2004, 147–152; M. Klöckener, *Das eucharistische Hochgebet in der nordafrikanischen Liturgie der christlichen Spätantike*, in: A. Gerhards / H. Brakmann / M. Klöckener (eds.), *Præx Eucharistica*, vol. 3. *Studia. Pars Prima. Ecclesia antiqua et occidentalis*, SpicFri 42, Fribourg 2005, 73–84.

- 45 *Breviarium Hipponense* (= 3rd Council of Carthage, 397, can. 23 = Council of Hippo, 393, can. 21 [23]; CChr.SL 149.39,124f.): *Ut nemo in precibus uel patrem pro filio uel filium pro patre nominet; et cum altari adssistitur semper ad patrem dirigatur oratio. Et quicumque sibi preces aliunde describit, non eis utatur nisi prius eas cum instructoribus fratribus contulerit*. Repeatedly in *Collectio Hispana* (CChr.SL 149.333,149f.); *Beatus of Liebana / Etherius of Osma*, adv. Elipandum 2.56. This is evident to a certain degree at the Council of Carthage 525 (CChr. SL 149.264,412); Ferrand., breu. can. 219. Cf. Klöckener, 2005, 73–75.
- 46 On this process, cf. De Clerck, 1978, 118f.; C. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy. An Introduction to the Sources*, Washington 1986, 34–37; Palazzo, 1998, 36f.
- 47 Cf. R.F. Taft, *St. John Chrysostom and the Byzantine Anaphora that Bears His Name*, in: P.F. Bradshaw (ed.), *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*, Collegeville 1997, 195–226; D.R. Stuckwisch, *The Basilian Anaphoras*, in: P.F. Bradshaw (ed.), *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*, Collegeville 1997, 109–130. Further Bouley, 1981, 217–245.
- 48 Ep. 25.1 (R. Cabié, *La lettre du pape Innocent I^{er} à Décentius de Gubbio. Texte critique, traduction et commentaire*, BRHE 58, Louvain 1973, 2–11. 18): *Si instituta ecclesiastica, ut sunt a beatis apostolis tradita, integra vellent servare domini sacerdotes, nulla diversitas, nulla varietas in ipsis ordinibus ac consecrationibus haberetur. Sed dum unusquisque non quod traditum est, sed quod sibi visum fuerit, hoc existimat esse tenendum, inde diversa in diversis locis vel ecclesiis aut teneri aut celebrari videntur; ac fit scandalum populis, qui dum nesciunt traditiones antiquas humana praesumptione corruptas, putant sibi aut ecclesias non convenire aut ab apostolis vel apostolicis ipsis contrarietatem inductam*. Cf. also Vos, 1974, 11f.; Bouley, 1981, 183f.; M.F. Connell, *Church and Worship in Fifth-Century Rome. The Letter of Innocent I to Decentius of Gubbio. Text with Introduction, Translation and Notes*, Joint Liturgical Studies 52, Cambridge 2002, 18f.
- 49 Cf. Cabié, 1973, 12–16.

III.

The first portion of our study established that in the fourth century the Christian creed was initially summarized in a number of texts, the exact formulation of which was still hotly contested. After 381 these texts coagulated into a few *formulae* (C and R, or alternatively T), the wording of which was no longer to be changed so that the faith could thereby be enforced throughout the empire.

In the second section I attempted to show that from approximately 380 the earlier liturgical diversity in the Roman Empire was compressed into a standardised sequence of dominical feasts, which were considered to be the liturgical core of the Church year and were given a narrative structure. This development occurred in the context of a broader trend towards the standardisation of the liturgy, which likewise came to pass since the turn from the fourth to the fifth centuries.

The question at hand, then, is whether there exists any connection between these two findings (and thus between the establishment of orthodoxy by means of credal texts), and the introduction of a full-fledged Church calendar.

In fact there are both catechetical and liturgical indications of such a connection. First, the community of Christians was instructed in a liturgical context on the dogmatic consensus formulated in the creed. In the wake of the development of baptismal rites during the principal feasts of the Church, from the mid-fourth century onward, there arose the rites of *traditio symboli* and *redditio symboli*, that is, the solemn handing over of the creed to the baptismal candidates (*traditio symboli*) and the subsequent recitation of that creed by the candidates (*redditio symboli*).⁵⁰ As I indicated above, these rites were accompanied by special catecheses, which expounded upon repentance, baptism, and, of course, the creed; we first witness these rites in Jerusalem in the relatively early catecheses of Cyril, probably delivered during the Lenten period of 348.⁵¹ They were followed by baptismal catecheses in Greek and Syriac from the pen of various authors. The West followed suit somewhat later with the *Expositio symboli*, thus establishing a literary genre specifically dedicated to the interpretation of the creed. It is certainly no coincidence that the first extant examples of this genre (Ambrose and Rufinus) were written, once again, at the turn of the fourth and fifth centuries.⁵²

In this respect it is especially significant that these rites were carried out at least to a certain extent in the presence of the entire congregation, and that the concomitant catecheses were also addressed to the entire congregation.⁵³ This means that in the baptismal services the tenets of the faith were annu-

50 Cf. J.N.D. Kelly, *Altchristliche Glaubensbekenntnisse. Geschichte und Theologie*, Göttingen 1972, 36–46.

51 Cf. G. Röwekamp, *Cyrill von Jerusalem*, in: ³LACL (2002), 178–180, 179.

52 Cf. also the overview in the appendix.

53 Cf. Kretschmar, 1970, 157, 240.

ally recapitulated and expounded anew. As part of the standard repertoire of these expositions the baptismal candidates were exhorted to memorize the creed (which, given the rite of the *redditio symboli*, was inevitable anyway) and by no means to forget it,⁵⁴ and they were also admonished not to change its

54 Ambr., symb. 2.9–12 (CSEL 73.3f.): *Sancti ergo apostoli in unum convenientes breviarium fidei fecerunt, ut breviter fidei totius seriem comprahendamus. Brevitas necessaria est, ut semper memoria et recordatione teneatur. Ibid., 9.1–15 (CSEL 73.11): Illud sane monitos vos volo esse, quoniam symbolum non debet scribi, quia reddere illud habetis. Sed nemo scribat! Qua ratione? Sic accepimus, ut non debeat scribi. Sed quid? Teneri. Sed dicis mihi: Quomodo potest teneri, si non scribitur? – Magis potest teneri, si non scribatur. Qua ratione? Accipite! Quod enim scribis, securus quasi relegas, non cottidiana meditatione incipis recensere. Quod autem non scribis, time<n>s, ne amittas, cottidie incipis recensere. Magnum autem tutamentum est: Nascuntur stupores animi et corporis, temptatio adversarii, qui numquam quiescit, tremor aliqui corporis, infirmitas stomachi: Symbolum recense et scrutare intra te ipsum! Maxime recense intra te! Quare? Ne consuetudinem facias, et cum solus fortius recenseres, ubi sunt fideles, incipias inter catechumenos vel haereticos recensere. Ruf., symb. 2.32–36 (CChr.SL 20.135): Idcirco denique haec non scribi cartulis aut membranis, sed retineri cordibus tradiderunt, ut certum esset neminem haec ex lectione, quae interdum peruenire etiam ad infideles solet, sed ex apostolorum traditione didicisse. Aug., serm. 58.13 (PL 38.399): Cum autem tenueritis, ut non obliviscamini, quotidie dicite; quando surgitis, quando vos ad somnum collocatis, reddite symbolum vestrum, reddite domino, commemorate vos ipsos, non pigeat repetere. Bona est enim repetitio, ne subrepat oblivio. Ne dicatis: Dixi heri, dixi hodie, quotidie dico, teneo illud bene. Commemora fidem tuam, inspicere te; sit tanquam speculum tibi symbolum tuum. Ibi te vide, si credis omnia, quae te credere confiteris, et gaude quotidie in fide tua. Serm. 212.2 (PL 38.1060): Nec ut eadem verba symboli teneatis, ullo modo debetis scribere, sed audiendo perdiscere; nec cum didiceritis, scribere, sed memoria semper tenere atque recolere. Serm. 214.1 (PL 38.1065f.): Et ea quidem, quae breviter accepturi estis, mandanda memoriae et ore proferenda, non nova vel inaudita sunt vobis. [...] Haec sunt quae fideliter retenturi estis, et memoriter reddituri. Serm. 214.1 (PL 38.1072): Accepistis ergo et reddidistis, quod animo et corde semper retinere debetis, quod in stratis vestris dicatis, quod in plateis cogitetis et quod intra cibos non obliviscamini, in quo etiam dormientes corpore corde vigiletis. Symb. 1.1f. (CChr.SL 46.185,1–17): [1] Accipite regulam fidei, quod symbolum dicitur. Et cum acceperitis, in corde scribite, et cotidie dicite apud vos: antequam dormiatis, antequam procedatis, uestro symbolo uos munit. Symbolum nemo scribit ut legi possit, sed ad recensendum, ne forte deleat obliuio quod tradidit diligentia, sit uobis codex uestra memoria. quod audituri estis, hoc credituri, et quod credideritis, hoc etiam lingua reddituri. Ait enim apostolus: Corde creditur ad iustitiam, ore autem confessio fit ad salutem [Rom 10:10]. Hoc est enim symbolum, quod recensuri estis et reddituri. Ista uerba quae audistis, per diuinas scripturas sparsa sunt, sed inde collecta et ad unum redacta, ne tardorum hominum memoria laboraret, ut omnis homo possit dicere, possit tenere quod credit. Numquid enim modo solummodo audistis quia deus omnipotens est? Sed incipitis eum habere patrem, quando nati fueritis per ecclesiam matrem. [2] Inde ergo iam accepistis, meditati estis, et meditati tenuistis, ut dicatis: Credo in deum patrem omnipotentem. Nicet. R., *Competentibus ad baptismum instructionis libelli* frg. 4 (Burn 8.6–12): De fide enim sicut in eodem symbolo continetur, pleniter ad fidem quisque atque ad baptisma peruenire desiderans instruendus est pariter et docendus, ut breuitatem symboli in corde memoriter teneat, quod cotidie dicat apud semet ipsum, antequam dormiat, cum de somno resurrexit, quod omnibus horis in mente habeat. Cf. also *ibid.*, 5.13f. Petr. Chrys., serm. 57.16 (CChr.SL 24.323f.): Haec fides, hoc sacramentum non est committendum chartis, non scribendum litteris, quia chartae et litterae magis cauta quam gratiam proloquuntur. Ubi uero dei gratia, donatio diuina consistit, ad pactum fides, altitudo cordis sufficit ad secretum, ut hoc salutis symbolum, hoc uitae pactum, diuinus arbiter noscat, testis falsus ignoret. Similarly, serm. 56.3,5; 58.2; 59.1,18; 60.18; 61.2,15; 62.3. Further Leo. M., Tr. 98 as well as the *Missale Gallicanum Vetus*, where, in analogy to the three persons of the Trinity, a triple recitation is required: *Simbulum istud, dilectissimi, non atramento depingetur, sed humanis cordibus insertum memoria retinetur. [R] Credo. [I]terato uobis repetimus, quo facilius eum tenere possitis. [R] Credo. [I] Credo in Deum Patrem. Et quia lex nostre fidei in trinitate consistit,**

wording. Thus Rufinus warns not to add even a single word to the creed, the Roman version of which was unsoiled by heresy and therefore authoritative.⁵⁵ Ambrose, too, maintains that the wording of the creed was irrevocably fixed. In addition, he appeals expressly to the so-called "canonization-formula" of Revelation (Rev 22:18f.)⁵⁶ and also invokes the Petrine (that is, Roman) origin of the creed.⁵⁷ Finally, the legend of the apostolic origin and authorization of the creed, which was systematically spread through the West since the time of Rufinus, served not only to authorize the creed, but also to guard its exact wording.⁵⁸

However, the relation between the creed and liturgy was not only a formal one; the interpretation of the dominical feasts itself was based on the creed. In this context it is interesting to take a closer look at the encyclical letter on baptism which Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem (*sedit* 314–333), sent to the Armenian bishops. It is preserved only in Armenian fragments (cited by Ananias of Shirak, *fl.* seventh century).⁵⁹ In this letter Macarius commends Epiphany, Easter, and Pentecost as occasions for baptism, because the Birth of the Lord was celebrated on Epiphany, the Passion of Christ on Easter, and

tercio repetimus, ut ipse numerus repetitionis cum signo ueniat trinitatis (L.C. Mohlberg [ed.], *Missale Gallicanum vetus* [Cod. Vat. Palat. lat. 493], RED.F 3, Rome 1958, 10.15–20, Nr. 5 [27]). For the East, see e.g. the Council of Laodicea, can. 46 and 47.

- 55 Symb. 3.7–13 (CChr.SL 20.136): *In ecclesia tamen urbis Romae hoc non deprehenditur factum: pro eo arbitror quod neque haeresis ulla illic sumpsit exordium, et mos inibi seruatur antiquus, eos qui gratiam baptismi suscepturi sunt, publice, id est fidelium populo audiente symbolum reddere; et utique adiectionem unius saltim sermonis eorum, qui praecesserunt in fide, non admittit auditus.*
- 56 Cf. W.C. Van Unnik, *De la règle Μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν dans l'histoire du Canon*, in: *VigChr* 3 (1949), 1–36; also in: *Sparsa Collecta. The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik*, vol. 2, NTS. 30, Leiden 1980, 123–156. There is already recourse to the canonization formula at the first session of the Synod of Rimini (359) on the affirmation of the Nicene Creed. Cf. Hilar., *hist.* A 9.1,2 (CSEL 65.95.13–96,1): *Quibus omnibus nec addendum aliquid credimus nec minui posse manifestum est.* Similarly also in the synodal letter to Constantine, *ibid.* A V,1 (CSEL 65.78–85) and in Ath., *syn.* 10; Socr., *h.e.* 2.37.54–74; Soz., *h.e.* 4.18; Thdt., *h.e.* 2.19,1–13. See also D.H. Williams, *Ambrose of Milan and the End of the Nicene-Arian Conflicts*, OPCS, Oxford 1995, 22–24.
- 57 Cf. symb. 7 (CSEL 73.9f.): *Si ergo mercium istarum negotiatores et conlatores pecuniae hanc habent legem, ut, si quis symbolam suam violaverit, inprobus et instabilis habeatur, multo magis cavendum est nobis, ne de maiorum symbolo aliquid detrahatur, cum habeas in libro apocalypsis Iohannis – qui libellus canonizatur et maxime ad fidei proficit fundamentum; ibi enim evidenter 'omnipotentem' dominum nostrum Iesum Christum memoravit [cf. Rev 1:7f.], licet et in aliis locis tamen – ergo in ipso libello: 'Si quis inquit, addiderit aut detraxerit, iudicium sibi sumit et poenam' [cf. Rev 22:18f.]. Si unius apostoli scripturis nihil est detrahendum, nihil addendum, quemadmodum nos symbolum, quod accepimus ab apostolis traditum atque compositum, conmaculabimus? Nihil debemus detraxere, nihil adiungere. Hoc autem est symbolum, quod Romana ecclesia tenet, ubi primus apostolorum Petrus sedit et communem sententiam eo detulit. – Similarly, *Facund.*, ep. 12 (CChr. L 90A,96–100): *Quoniam ergo pactum cum deo fecimus, et sic in uno sanctae Trinitatis nomine baptizati sumus, si quis unum iota, uel unum apicem ex pacto, quod cum Deo in iiti dissoluerit, sine dubio fidem, qua deo credidit, et ipsum Deum cui credidit, perdidisse conuincitur.**
- 58 Cf. on this point Kelly, 1972, 9–14; Vinzent, 2006, 24–30.
- 59 Cf. on this point Förster, 2000, 109–114; *ibid.*, 2007, 148–152.

the descent of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost.⁶⁰ Macarius does not appear to recognize Christmas as a holiday yet. Interestingly, Macarius completely fails to mention the Ascension; he does not even include the content of the Ascension in the feast of Pentecost, as was done elsewhere. Instead, Macarius interprets Pentecost purely in pneumatological terms. This early document already clearly reveals the interrelation between the creed and the Christian feasts.⁶¹

This interdependence between the creed and the Church calendar was clearly strengthened in chronological proximity with the Council of Con-

60 Cf. Terian, 2008, 83: "Hence the ordinance of baptism of the holy font and the earnest observance of the three feasts during which those who are dedicated to God desire most eagerly to bring unto baptism those in darkness and to carry out the great form of the salutary mystery, which is carried out on these holy and prominent days. And this (form of mystery) they hasten to carry out with great eagerness in the holy places of Christ; which all Christians, those who fear Christ, must also carry out in the baptismal service on these (days): on the holy Epiphany of the Nativity of the Lord, and <on> the saving Easter of the life-giving passion of Christ, and on Pentecost full of grace – when the Divine descent of the life-giving Spirit overflowed among us."

61 Because of the obscurity of their dates and authorship, here I cite two further works only in passing:

(1) The so-called Canons of (Ps.-)Athanasius twice refer to Easter, Pentecost, and Epiphany as dominical feasts. §16 (ed. W. Riedel / W.E. Crum, *The Canons of Athanasius of Alexandria. The Arabic and Coptic Versions. Edited and Translated with Introduction, Notes and Appendices*, London 1904, 27): "And the poor and orphans shall he know as doth a father, and shall gather them together at the great festival of the Lord, vowing and distributing much alms and giving unto each whereof he hath need. And at the feast of Pentecost he shall refresh all the people, because that on that day the Holy Ghost came down upon the church. And at the feast of the Lord's Epiphany, which was in (the month) *Tûbah*, that is the (feast of) Baptism, they shall rejoice with them." §66 (Riedel / Crum (eds.), 1904, 43): "The bishop shall eat often with the priests in the church, that he may see their behaviour, whether they do eat in quietness and in the fear of God. And he shall stand there and serve them; and if they be weak, he shall wash their feet with his own hands. [...] The bishop shall not fail in all this thrice a year: at the Paschal feast and at the feast of Pentecost and at the feast of Baptism on the eleventh of (the month) *Tûbah*" (italics in original). On the problems of authorship and dating cf. Förster, 2007, 75–78.

(2) *The Apostolic Constitutions* refer in 8.33 to the following days as days of rest for slaves: Sabbath, Sunday, Holy Week, Easter Octave, Ascension, Pentecost (as the descent of the Spirit), Christmas, Epiphany (as the Baptism of Christ), the feasts of the apostles, and the feasts of the martyrs. Observe how the rationales given for the feasts are oriented towards the propositions of the creed: Ἐγὼ Παῦλος καὶ ἐγὼ Πέτρος διατασσόμεθα. Ἐργαζέσθωσαν οἱ δούλοι πέντε ἡμέρας, σάββατον δὲ καὶ κυριακὴν σχολαζέτωσαν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ διὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν τῆς εὐσεβείας· τὸ μὲν γὰρ σάββατον εἰπομεν δημιουργίας λόγον ἔχειν, τὴν δὲ κυριακὴν ἀναστήσεως. Τὴν μεγάλην ἑβδομάδα πᾶσαν καὶ τὴν μετὰ αὐτὴν ἀργεῖτωσαν οἱ δούλοι, ὅτι ἡ μὲν πάθους ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ ἀναστάσεως, καὶ χρεῖα διδασκαλίας, τίς ὁ ἀποθανῶν καὶ ἀναστήσας ἢ τῆς ὁ συγχωρήσας ἢ καὶ ἀναστήσας. Τὴν ἀνάληψιν ἀργεῖτωσαν διὰ τὸ πέρας τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν οἰκονομίας. Τὴν πεντηκοστήν ἀργεῖτωσαν διὰ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος τὴν δωρηθεῖσαν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς Χριστόν. Τὴν τῶν γενεθλίων ἑορτὴν ἀργεῖτωσαν διὰ τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ τὴν ἀπροσδόκητον χάριον δεδόσθαι ἀνθρώποις, γεννηθῆναι τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τοῦ κόσμου. Τὴν τῶν ἐπιφανίων ἑορτὴν ἀργεῖτωσαν διὰ τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ ἀνάδειξιν γεγενῆσθαι τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ θεότητος, μαρτυρησάντος αὐτῷ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι καὶ τοῦ παρακλήτου ἐν εἰδει περιστερᾶς ὑποδείξαντος τοῖς παροῦσιν τὸν μαρτυρηθέντα. Τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀργεῖτωσαν· διδάσκαλοι γὰρ ὑμῶν εἰς

stantinople, and its western counterpart, the Synod of Aquileia (381). The connection between the creed and the liturgy becomes obvious in the festal sermons which were delivered after 381.⁶² John Chrysostom is an especially interesting case in point. In his works we encounter two enumerations of the Christian holidays, which differ from one another. These lists appear in two sermons that probably date to the year 386. The first list occurs in his first *Homily on Pentecost*. Here Chrysostom engages in rhetorical acrobatics in order to clarify why it is incumbent upon the Christians, in contrast with the Jews (cf. Exod 23:17), to celebrate at all times; he uses the three main Christian feasts to justify this perpetual celebration. Epiphany is given because "God appeared on earth and dwelt among men, because God, the only-begotten child of God, was with us." The content of Pascha is the proclamation of the death of the Lord, while we observe Pentecost, "because the Spirit came to us."⁶³ One should note that in each case Chrysostom offers Christological or pneumatological grounding for his argument.

Χριστὸν κατέστησαν καὶ πνεύματος ὑμᾶς ἡξίωσαν ἁγίου. Τὴν ἡμέραν Στεφάνου τοῦ πρωτομάρτυρος ἀργείτωσαν καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων τῶν προσημνάντων Χριστὸν τῆς ἑαυτῶν ζωῆς. (SC 336.240–242).

- 62 In this relation, it is significant that the festal homily is actually developed in its entire baroque splendour only at this juncture; the new liturgical structure demanded a corresponding rhetorical development of the homily. Prior the fourth century, the Paschal homily of Miletus of Sardis and perhaps the sermon of Ps.-Hippolytus on the same occasion are recognizable as festal homilies, while no homilies on the remaining festivals have been preserved. On all this, cf. also M. Sachot, *Homilie*, in: RAC 16 (1994), 160f.; W. Kinzig, *The Greek Christian Writers*, in: S.E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, Leiden 1997, 633–670; A. Stewart-Sykes, *From Prophecy to Preaching. A Search for the Origins of the Christian Homily*, SVigChr 59, Leiden 2001.
- 63 Pent. 1.1 (PG 50.454): Καὶ ἐκείνους μὲν τρεῖς μόνους ἐκέλευσε καιροῦς ἑορτάζειν, ὑμᾶς δὲ αἰεὶ τοῦτο ποιεῖν ἐκέλευσεν· αἰεὶ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἔστιν ἑορτή. Καὶ ἵνα μάθητε ὅτι αἰεὶ ἑορτή, λέγω τῶν ἑορτῶν τὰς ὑποθέσεις καὶ εἰσεσθε, ὅτι καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἑορτή ἔστι. Τοῖνυν παρ' ἡμῖν ἑορτὴ πρώτη τὰ ἐπιφάνια. Τίς οὖν ἡ ὑπόθεσις τῆς ἑορτῆς; Ἐπειδὴ θεὸς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὤφθη καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συνανηστράφη· ἐπειδὴ ὁ θεὸς ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ θεοῦ παῖς μεθ' ἡμῶν ἦν· ἀλλὰ τοῦτο αἰεὶ ἔστιν. Ἰδοὺ γὰρ, φησί, μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος [Mt 28:20]· διὸ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τὰ ἐπιφάνια δυνατὸν τελεῖν. Τοῦ πάσχα ἡ ἑορτὴ τί βούλεται; τίς ἡ ὑπόθεσις αὐτῆς; Τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλομεν τότε· καὶ τοῦτο ἔστι τὸ πάσχα· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοῦτο καιρῷ ὠρισμένῳ ποιοῦμεν. Βουλόμενος γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἀπαλλάξαι ὁ Παῦλος τῆς τῶν καιρῶν ἀνάγκης καὶ δεικνύς ὅτι δυνατὸν αἰεὶ πάσχα ἐπιτελεῖν, Ὡσαύτως γὰρ ἂν ἐσθίητε, φησί, τοῦτον τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο πίνητε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε [1 Cor 11:26]. Ἐπεὶ οὖν αἰεὶ δυνάμεθα τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλειν, αἰεὶ πάσχα δυνάμεθα ἐπιτελεῖν. Βούλεσθε μαθεῖν, ὅτι καὶ αὕτη ἡ σημεῖον ἑορτῆς δύναται καθ' ἑκάστην πληροῦσθαι, μᾶλλον δὲ καθ' ἑκάστην ἔστιν; Ἴδωμεν τίς ἡ ὑπόθεσις τῆς παρουσίας ἑορτῆς καὶ τίνοσ ἐνεκεν αὐτὴν ἀγομεν. Ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἦλθε καθάπερ γὰρ ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἔστι τῶν πιστῶν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ. Πόθεν δῆλον; Ὁ ἀγαπῶν με, φησί, τὰς ἐντολάς μου τηρήσει, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα μου, καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν, ἵνα μένη μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας [John 14:15–17]. Ὡσπερ οὖν ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπε περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, ὅτι Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, καὶ δυνάμεθα αἰεὶ τὰ ἐπιφάνια ἐπιτελεῖν, οὕτω καὶ περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος εἶπεν, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα μεθ' ὑμῶν ἔστι, καὶ δυνάμεθα αἰεὶ πεντηκοστὴν ἐπιτελεῖν.

Surprisingly, Chrysostom mentions neither Christmas nor the Ascension here. I think that the reason lies, as often assumed, in the fact that in precisely the same year the Christmas celebration was inaugurated in the congregation of Flavian,⁶⁴ since the preacher does refer to all five dominical feasts in another festal homily delivered that year. Here Christmas even serves as the source and grounds for all the other holidays.

For a celebration is approaching, a feast which is more august and awe-inspiring than all the other feasts and which one can call the capital of all feasts without erring. Which do I mean? The birth of Christ in the flesh. In it the Theophany, the holy Pascha, the Ascension, and Pentecost have their origin and their foundation. For if Christ were not born in the flesh, then he would not have been baptized, which is Theophany; he would not have been crucified, which is the Pascha; and he would not have sent the Spirit, which is Pentecost. Just as many rivers flow from one source, so these feasts have been born for us.⁶⁵

Christmas, Theophany/Epiphany (which remains strictly a celebration of the baptism of Christ), Pascha, Ascension, and Pentecost are named here and justified in christological or pneumatological terms in a way which approximates the creed. (If one be permitted to draw conclusions from the mention of the feast of Ascension here, might this feast also have first been introduced in Antioch in 386?)⁶⁶

If we turn to the West, we come across the above-mentioned Philastrius, who was the bishop of Brescia from the late 370s onward, and, in that capacity, was also a participant in the Synod of Aquileia in 381. Prior to 397 he composed an anti-heretical treatise (*Diversarum haereseon liber*) in which he inveighed against liturgical heresies, among other things. According to Philastrius, the celebration of Epiphany on the 6th of January is in no way to

64 Cf. also Kelly, 1995, 70.

65 Philogon. 3f. (PG 48.752f.): Καὶ γὰρ ἐορτὴ μέλλει προσελαύνειν, ἢ πασῶν τῶν ἐορτῶν σεμνοτάτῃ καὶ φρικωδεστάτῃ, ἣν οὐκ ἂν τις ἀμάρτοι μητρόπολιν πασῶν τῶν ἐορτῶν προσειπῶν. Τίς δὲ ἐστὶν αὐτή; Ἡ κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ Χριστοῦ γέννησις. Ἀπὸ γὰρ ταύτης τὰ θεοφάνια καὶ τὸ πάσχα τὸ ἱερόν καὶ ἡ ἀνάληψις καὶ ἡ πεντηκοστὴ τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἔλαβον. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἐτέχθη κατὰ σάρκα ὁ Χριστός, οὐκ ἂν ἐβαπτίσθη, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὰ θεοφάνια· οὐκ ἂν ἐσταυρώθη, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ πάσχα· οὐκ ἂν τὸ πνεῦμα κατέπεμψεν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἡ πεντηκοστὴ. Ὡστε ἐντεύθεν, ὡσπερ ἀπὸ τινος πηγῆς ποταμοὶ διάφοροι ῥυέντες, αὐταὶ ἐτέχθησαν ἡμῖν αἱ ἐορταί. On translation and comment, cf. W. Mayer / P. Allen, *John Chrysostom, The Early Church Fathers*, London 2000, 184–195. On the designation of the Christmas feast as a μητρόπολις cf. also Chrys., pent. 2.1, where this title is given to the Pentecost feast. On this, Cabié, 1965, 185f.

66 From what is clearly a later date, we also possess the homily *In ascensionem domini* (CPG 4342; PG 50.441–452).

be superseded by the celebration of Christmas on December 25th, as many *haeretici* claim. In this context he asserts:

As is proper, for the sake of our salvation the following four days of the year have been established for the great feasts: first, the day on which he was born; then, the day on which he appeared, that is, twelve days later; thereafter, the day on which he suffered on Pascha; and finally, the day near Pentecost when he ascended into heaven, for this is his victorious consummation. But whoever ignores or overlooks one of these days could also doubt the other days. He does not have the entire truth at his disposal. For different joys from the Lord Christ have thus sprouted for us at the four appointed seasons of each year, that is, when he was born, then, when he appeared, the third time, when he suffered and rose again and was seen, and the fourth time, when he ascended into heaven, such that we can celebrate throughout the year without interruption, rejoicing at all times. Let us adhere to and preserve these [feasts] completely and without abbreviation.⁶⁷

Philastrius, then, also knows of four dominical feasts. Still, what is problematic here is that in this passage he clearly identifies Ascension with Pentecost, whereas he distinguishes the feasts from each other later in his work.⁶⁸ Beside this, two other items stand out: Philastrius insists on the official introduction of the feasts, and he clearly refers to the Christological section of the creed. The feasts appear almost to have been officially established. "By whom?" one might ask, but the text gives no answer. Probably the author is less interested in historical veracity than in lending his exposition the highest authority possible in order to reject "heresies." Philastrius clearly alludes to the relevant passages in the second article of R or C. The liturgical year is modeled upon the stages of the earthly progress of Christ. We should also observe that, just as in R and C, Philastrius' comments on the major feasts make no mention of Jesus' teachings or miracles, which comprise the largest portion of the Gospels.⁶⁹

67 Haer. 140.2–4,9–22 (CChr.SL 9.304): *Per ordinem quippe pro nostra salute et annui dies festiuitatis maioris isti statuti sunt quattuor: primum in quo natus est; deinde in quo apparuit, id est XII dies post; <post> in quo passus est in pascha; in fine uero in quo ascendit in caelum circa pentecosten, uincens est quippe consummatio. Qui ergo unum ignorat praetermittit, potest et de aliis diebus dubitare, non habens plenitudinem ueritatis, quod secundum tempora quattuor cuiusque anni ita nobis diuersa gaudia a Christo domino pullularunt, id est in quo natus est, post in quo apparuit, tertio <in> quo passus est et resurrexit et uisus est, quarto in quo ascendit in caelum, ut haec per annum sine intermissione celebremus generaliter exultantes, atque haec integra inuiolataque custodientes detineamus.*

68 Cf. haer. 149.3,11–17 (CChr.SL 9.312): *Nam per annum quattuor ieiunia in ecclesia celebrantur, in natale primum, deinde in pascha, tertio in ascensione, quarto in pentecosten. Nam in natale saluatoris domini ieiunandum est, deinde in pascha quadragesimae aequae, in ascensione itidem in caelum post pascham die quadragesimo, inde usque ad pentecosten diebus decem aut postea.*

69 This is also the case for a further text, which is possibly to be located in Italy. This document treats a poem of Paulinus of Nola (†431), in which Paulinus gives (among other things)

Finally, one can observe the same rhetorical strategy in a famous passage from a letter by Augustine to Januarius from January of 400 CE. In this epistle he grapples with the problem of defining which customs and ceremonies of the Catholic church are the most important and from whence the justification for their existence is derived (Ep. 54). He argues that the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist were established in the New Testament. Nonetheless, there is a whole array of customs which are not set forth in the Holy Scripture, but which ought to be observed on the grounds of tradition:

As to those other things which we hold on the authority, not of Scripture, but of tradition, and which are observed throughout the whole world, it may be understood that they are held as approved and instituted either by the apostles themselves, or by plenary councils, whose authority in the Church is most useful, e.g. the annual commemoration, by special solemnities, of the Lord's passion, resurrection, and ascension, and of the descent of the Holy Spirit from heaven, and

the grounds for the dominical feasts, in the course of which he names Christmas, Epiphany (here understood as the feast of the three Magi, of the Baptism of Jesus, and of the miracles of Jesus at the wedding at Cana), Easter, and Pentecost (as a feast of the outpouring of the Spirit), without mentioning the Ascension. Cf. *car. m.* 2743–71 (CSEL 30.264f.):

*Sic aequae diuina feruntur munera Christi:
 ut ueneranda dies cunctis, [scil. Christmas] qua uirgine natus
 pro cunctis hominem sumpsit deus, [scil. Epiphany] utque deinde,
 qua puerum stella duce mystica dona ferentes
 subpliciter uidere magi, seu qua magis illum
 Iordanis trepidans lauit tingente Iohanne
 sacramentem cunctas recreandis gentibus undas,
 siue dies eadem magis illo sit sacra signo,
 quo primum deus egit opus, cum flumine uerso
 permutauit aquas praedulcis nectare uini.
 [scil. Easter] quid paschale epulum? nam certe iugiter omni
 pascha die cunctis ecclesia praedicat oris,
 contestans domini mortem cruce, de cruce uitam
 cunctorum; tamen hoc magnae pietatis in omnes
 grande sacramentem praescripto mense quotannis
 lotus ubique pari famulatu mundus adorat,
 aeternum celebrans rediuiuio corpore regem.
 [scil. Pentecost] hoc sollemne dies sequitur (septem numeramus
 hebdomadas, et lux populis festiua recurrit),
 qua sanctus quondam caelo demissus ab alto
 spiritus ignito diuisit lumine linguas,
 unus et ipse deus diuersa per ora cucurrit
 omnigenasque uno sonuit tunc ore loquellas,
 omnibus ignotas tribuens expromere uoces,
 quisque suam ut gentem peregrino agnosceret ore
 externamque suo nesciret in ore loquellam.
 barbarus ipse sibi non notis nota canebat
 uerba, suis aliena loquens; sed in omnibus unum
 uoce deum uaria laudabat spiritus unus.*

whatever else is in like manner observed by the whole Church wherever it has been established.⁷⁰

Here once again appears a sequence of four dominical feasts, namely, Good Friday, Easter Sunday, Ascension, and Pentecost. Christmas and Epiphany are missing, perhaps owing to the fact that Augustine was aware that these feasts were not celebrated *toto terrarum orbe*.⁷¹ In addition, Augustine points out elsewhere that Christmas does not bear a sacramental character, but only calls to mind the fact of the birth of Christ.⁷² In Ep. 54 Augustine goes on to say that the feasts in question either possess apostolic origins or go back to the general councils. This is remarkable, insofar as at the first Ecumenical Council Constantine merely determined the Sunday as the day for celebrating the already much older feast of Easter (Pascha).⁷³ Yet as far as we can ascertain, no provisions were made for Good Friday, Ascension, and Pentecost either at that time or in Constantinople in 381.⁷⁴ Whatever Augustine may have meant by those remarks, they had considerable consequences, since they were taken up into the *Decretum Gratiani* in the High Middle Ages and thus passed into canon law.⁷⁵

Once again we witness the explicit connection between the content of Christian feasts and the creed; the Passion (Good Friday), the Resurrection (Easter Sunday), the Ascension, and the arrival of the Spirit on Pentecost recall the second and third articles of the creed. In Augustine we see, once again, the "isolating, historicizing view" of the Easter events, to use the language with which Hansjörg Auf der Maur described the development of the Easter cycle in the fourth and fifth centuries.⁷⁶ It is my contention that this view of the Easter events is determined by the pursuit of congruity with the creed.

It becomes most apparent from the spread of Christmas that Rome played a significant role in this process. We know that the hegemonic claims of the

70 Ep. 54.1 (CSEL 34/2.159,15–160,3): *Illa autem, quae non scripta sed tradita custodimus, quae quidem toto terrarum orbe seruantur, datur intellegi uel ab ipsis apostolis uel plenariis conciliis, quorum est in ecclesia saluberrima auctoritas, commendata atque statuta retineri, sicuti quod domini passio et resurrectio et ascensio in caelum et aduentus de caelo spiritus sancti anniuersaria sollemnitate celebrantur et si quid aliud tale occurrit, quod seruat ab uniuersa, quacumque se diffundit, ecclesia.* On the passage, cf. M. Klöckener, *Augustins Kriterien zu Einheit und Vielfalt in der Liturgie nach seinen Briefen 54 und 55*, in: LJ 41 (1991), 24–39 (31–33).

71 But cf. also Aug., serm. 202.1 (PL 38.1033): *per uniuersum mundum nota sollemnitas.*

72 Ep. 55.2 (CSEL 34/2.170,7–13): *Hic primum oportet noueris diem natalis domini non in sacramento celebrari, sed tantum in memoriam reuocari, quod natus sit, ac per hoc nihil opus erat, nisi reuolutum diem anni, quo ipsa res facta est, festa deuotione signari. Sacramentum est autem in aliqua celebratione, cum rei gestae commemoratio ita fit, ut aliquid etiam significare intellegatur, quod sancte accipiendum est.*

73 For further discussion of this question cf. W. Huber, *Passa und Ostern. Untersuchungen zur Osterfeier in der alten Kirche*, BZNW 35, Berlin 1969, 64–68.

74 Cf. however above ft. 16.

75 *Decretum Gratiani*, Dist. 12, I. Pars, C. 11.

76 Auf der Maur, 1983, 82; cf. also J. Rexer, *Die Entwicklung des liturgischen Jahres in altkirchlicher Zeit*, in: JBTh 18 (2003), 285, ft. 26.

Roman See grew stronger under the papacies of Damasus (*sedit* 366–384) and Siricius. It is not incidental that Siricius developed a new means of implementing this claim, *viz.*, the decretal.⁷⁷ Still, a number of details about the process of implementing this claim in the East remain unclear in the late-fourth century. In any case, we should not think that the Council of Constantinople was serviceable to this end – on the contrary, if one considers the manner in which the third canon of the Council ranked the patriarchates of Rome and Constantinople and the reactions it triggered in the West.

In particular, it remains unclear why the Roman date of Christmas on December 25th was introduced in Constantinople in precisely the year 380.⁷⁸ Was Theodosius himself responsible, as Förster has also claimed, since he “considered the liturgy to be an important sign of orthodox belief?”⁷⁹ Although this supposition does not appear implausible, there is scant evidence for it in the sources. Förster is also of the opinion that Christmas was already celebrated in the Antiochene congregation of Paulinus from 375 CE, and that imperial pressure had led the congregation of Flavian to follow suit a good ten years later, a process in which the celebration of the holiday in Constantinople under Gregory of Nazianzus had something of a pivotal role.⁸⁰ Still, if it were this imperial effort that actually produced such uniformity in the cult, then why was Christmas only introduced in Jerusalem and Egypt at a much later date?

Perhaps Meletius of Antioch’s rapprochement with Damasus is significant in this context. This reconciliation goes back to a council in the west-Syrian capital in 379, and—as has recently been suggested—should have led to ecclesial communion between the Roman Church and Meletius’ own congregation,⁸¹ even though the West had actually supported Meletius’ rival Paulinus.⁸² As is generally known, the West had just accepted a compromise, according to which the Antiochene schism could have been abolished after the death of both Nicene bishops through the selection of a single successor, but that compromise was torpedoed by the election of Flavian as the succes-

77 Cf. F.R. Gahbauer, *Siricius, Papst*, in: BBKL 10 (1995), 530f.; also online at URL <http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/s/siricius_p.shtml> (08.12.2011) and above page 72.

78 Cf. above page 67.

79 So Förster, 2007, 127, with reference to Cod. Theod. 16.5,12.

80 Förster, 2007, 166–179.

81 On this council, cf. *inter alia* G. Bardy, *Le Concile d’Antioche (379)*, in: *Revue Bénédictine* 45 (1933), 196–213; E. Schwartz, *Über die Sammlung des Cod. Veronensis LX*, in: *ZNW* 35 (1936), 1–23; Devreesse, 1945, 34f.; R. Staats, *Die römische Tradition im Symbol von 381 (NC) und seine Entstehung auf der Synode von Antiochien 379*, in: *VigChr* 44 (1990), 209–221; *Das Glaubensbekenntnis von Nizäa-Konstantinopel. Historische und theologische Grundlagen*, Darmstadt 1999, 165–170, 175–179; L.L. Field Jr., *On the Communion of Damasus and Meletius. Fourth-Century Synodal Formulae in the Codex Veronensis LX. Edited and translated*, STPIMS 145, Toronto 2004.

82 Cf. also, e.g. A.M. Ritter, *Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol. Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des II. Ökumenischen Konzils*, FKDG 15, Göttingen 1965, 59.

sor to Meletius.⁸³ Did the ecclesial community between Rome and Flavian's congregation outlast this election as well?

One would also like to have known further details about the Roman Council of 382. Fragments of its acts may have been preserved in the first three chapters of the *Decretum Gelasianum*.⁸⁴ If this text is authentic, then the Council addressed not only the condemnation of Apollinarianism and the abolition of ecclesial community with Flavian of Antioch, Diodore of Tarsus, and Acacius of Beroea.⁸⁵ Rather, important decisions about the constitution of the Roman church may also have been made, among which we might mention the drawing up of a list of canonical writings of the Bible as well as fundamental statements about the primacy of the See of Peter. It is certainly conceivable that one might also expect to find a liturgical calendar in the context of these organizational endeavours. Perhaps comments like those previously cited from Filastrius and Augustine, according to which the number of the feasts was determined by a synod, should also be seen in this context. The propagation of Christmas as a feast of the incarnation of God would fit with the generally anti-Apollinarian tendency of this Council—yet this remains by necessity speculative, particularly since the authenticity of the texts contained in the *Decretum Gelasianum* is not beyond the pale of doubt.⁸⁶

Be that as it may, the proliferation of the typical Roman feast of Christmas, first in Constantinople and then in Antioch, is evidence for the strong influence of Rome at this time, which warrants renewed investigation.

* * *

The foregoing considerations have made clear that the implementation of the trinitarian creed was achieved less by legislative means (many of which may well have been unknown to the populace) than by preaching and liturgy. On the one hand this occurred in the rehearsal of the tenets of the faith, both by the baptismal candidate himself (if an adult), and also indirectly by the godparents and the members of the congregation who are in attendance (*traditio/redditio symboli*, connected with expositions of the creed or mystagogical catecheses). On the other hand, as I endeavoured to show here, the creed was memorized in the course of the Church year by means of the dominical

83 Cf. Ritter, 1965, 60–68 and above ft. 19.

84 Cf. CPL 1634, 1676. Editions: C.H. Turner, *Latin Lists of the Canonical Books*, 1. *The Roman Council Under Damasus, A.D. 382*, in: *JThS* 1 (1899), 554–560; E. von Dobschütz, *Das Decretum Gelasianum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis*, in *kritischem Text herausgegeben und untersucht*, TU 38, Leipzig 1912.

85 Cf. K.J. Hefele / H. Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles d'après les documents originaux*, 2/1, Paris 1908, 57–63. However, Dobschütz is skeptical (1912, 340–348), dating the entire document to the first half of the sixth century.

86 Cf. Ritter, 1965, 95, ft. 2, which offers older literature on this question.

feasts, through both the celebration of their liturgies and the preaching which formed part of these celebrations.

My results can thus be summarized in eight points:

1. At the Second Ecumenical Council the trinitarian controversies were more or less settled through the formulation of C (in connection with the tome of the synod of Constantinople of 382).
2. On form-critical grounds, but also because of the slow reception of C, the Roman Creed with its derivations had a greater influence than C in the West. Insofar as both creeds substantially agree with one another in the clauses of the second article, which deal with the earthly life of Christ, this competition was tolerated.
3. In the following years the emperors as well as the Church attempted to make the content of C and R normative in order to ensure *a unity in the faith*.
4. Consequently, the creeds came to be understood from that point on as credal *formulae*. Unity in the faith meant that a particular text, i.e. C or R and its offspring, always and at every time comprised the *fides quae creditur*, and that its exact wording was important. The rites of the *traditio* and *redditio symboli* as well as the expositions of the creed reflect this process.
5. Simultaneously, beginning in Rome and Constantinople an attempt was made to map this unified faith onto the church calendar so that it could be experienced by the worshippers in the liturgy and the mass. The goal was *unity in Christian worship*.
6. This goal was achieved above all by homogenizing the number and contents of the principal feasts, which, as dominical feasts, were geared towards the second and third articles of the creed. This process accelerated considerably after the end of the fourth century. It developed most quickly in the patriarchates of Rome, Constantinople, and Antioch, whereas the patriarchates of Jerusalem and Egypt proved especially recalcitrant with regard both to the competition between Christmas and Epiphany and to the separation of the Ascension from Pentecost.
7. This development of the Church year based on the principal christological feasts (Christmas/Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, and Pentecost) served to commemorate and to recapitulate the contents of the creed and consequently contributed to its implementation as dogmatic norm.
8. As a result, less and less room was left within the liturgy for improvisation. Unity in the faith meant that rites and prayers could no longer be left to the devices of the celebrant.

It appears to me that the theological as well as liturgical developments of the late-fourth century had an impact on Church history which was similar to the change of the early Catholic to the old Catholic Church at the end of the second century, since they led to another stage in what Wolf-Dieter Hauschild has called the increased "institutionalization" and "morphologi-

cal differentiation" of Christianity.⁸⁷ The efforts of the late-fourth century led to the formation of an imperial Church which was largely unified not only in its creed but also in its worship. This resulted, on the one hand, in the increased cohesion of Christianity, and indeed ran counter to the phenomenon of political decay. But on the other hand, the threshold of tolerance towards heterodox groups, towards Judaism, and also towards remaining paganism clearly sank.⁸⁸ Therefore this process contributed significantly to the ambiguous legacy of late-antique Christianity.

87 So W.-D. Hauschild, *Lehrbuch der Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, I. Alte Kirche und Mittelalter*, Gütersloh 2007, 61, on the transition from the early to the old Catholic Church.

88 On the intensified proceedings against heretics, parallel to the development depicted here, cf. N. Brox, *Häresie*, in: *RAC* 13 (1986), 281–283. On the intensified marginalization of and discrimination against non-Christians from 391/2, cf. Noethlichs, 1986, 1161. On the intensification of intolerance towards Judaism in the period following Theodosius I, cf. S.R. Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.*, Princeton 2001, 194–202.

Appendix

Earliest evidence for the major dominical feasts

† = Provenance, date or source value uncertain

	<i>Spain</i>	<i>Gaul</i>	<i>Italy</i>
Christmas (25 December)	<p>385 Siricius, ep. 1.2</p> <p>ca. 400 †Prud., cath. 11</p>		<p>before 397 Philastr., haer. 140</p> <p>ca. 400 Paul. Nol., carm. 27.45ff.</p> <p>ca. 400 Max. Taur., serm. 52; 62; 97; 99</p>
Epiphany/Theophany (6 January)	<p>Siricius, ep. 1.2</p> <p>ca. 400 †Prud., cath. 12: Magi and massacre of the innocents</p>	<p>361 Emperor Julian in Vienne acc. to Amm., 21.2,5</p>	<p>before 397 Philastr., haer. 140: Magi, baptism and transfiguration of Christ</p> <p>ca. 400 Paul. Nol., carm. 27.45ff.: Magi, baptism of Christ, Cana miracle</p> <p>ca. 400 Max. Taur., serm. 13a; 13b.1; 45.2; 64.1; 65.1; 100; 101.2: (birth of Christ), baptism of Christ, Cana miracle</p> <p>430/450 Petr. Chrys. (Ravenna), serm. 156–160: Magi, baptism of Christ, Cana miracle</p>

	<i>Rome</i>	<i>North Africa</i>	<i>Asia Minor</i>
Christmas (25 December)	<p>before 336 <i>Chronographer of 354</i> (MGH.AA 9, 71 Mommsen)</p> <p>385 †Siricius, ep. 1.2</p> <p>440/461 Leo. M., serm. 21–30</p>	<p>362/363 †Optat., <i>Christmas sermon</i> CPL 245 (authenticity doubtful)</p> <p>after 395/396 Aug., serm. 184–196</p>	<p>380/381 †Greg.Nyss. (Cappadocia), laud. Bas. (GNO 10/1.109,10–14): Theophany as feast of feasts</p> <p>386 †(Ps.-)Greg.Nyss., nativ.</p> <p>ca. 400 Ast. Am. (Pontus), hom. 4.3,3: Theophany</p>
Epiphany/Theophany (6 January)	<p>385 †Siricius, ep. 1.2</p> <p>440/461 Leo. M., serm. 31–38: Magi</p> <p>after 450? †Apon., in <i>Canticum canticorum commentarius</i> 8.10: <i>apparitio</i> (=birth) of Christ</p>	<p>Aug., serm. 199–204; 373; 375; serm. Étaix 4; serm. Dolbeau 23</p> <p><i>not</i> celebrated by the Donatists: Aug., serm. 202.2 (before 411?)</p> <p>416/418 Oros., hist. 6.20,3: <i>apparitionem sive manifestationem dominici sacramenti</i> (=baptism of Christ?)</p>	<p>372/373 Emperor Valens participates in the celebration of the Epiphany in Caesarea (Cappadocia) (Greg. Naz., or. 43.52)</p> <p>383 Greg.Nyss. (Cappadocia), <i>in diem luminum</i> (feast of lights): baptism of Christ</p> <p>ca. 400 Ast. Am. (Pontus), hom. 4.3,3 (feast of lights): baptism of Christ</p>

<i>Constantinople</i>	<i>Western Syria/Antioch</i>	<i>Palestine/Jerusalem</i>
380 Greg.Naz., or. 38: Theophany	375/400 ConstAp 5.13,1; 7.36,2; 8.33,6 386/388 Chrys., Philogon. (CPG 4319) 3f. 386/388 Chrys., nativ. (CPG 4334): introduction in Antioch (congregation of Flavian) from Rome	401/410 Hier., <i>de nativitate domini</i> (Bethlehem) between 424 and 458 introduction of Christmas in Jerusalem by Juvenal of Jerusalem (cf. Bas. Sel., or. 41 [PG 85.470B]) before 550 †abolition of Christmas (Abr. Eph., annunt. [PO 16.443]; Cosm. Ind., top. 5.10) 561 Justn., <i>epistle to the inhabitants of Jerusalem</i> (see van Esbroeck, 1968, 357): introduction of Christmas
381 Greg.Naz., or. 39	375/400 ConstAp 5.13,2; 8.33,7 (baptism of Jesus) 386? Chrys., pent. (CPG 4343) 1.1 386/388 Chrys., Philogon. (CPG 4319) 4 387/388 Chrys., <i>in Epiphaniam</i> (CPG 4335)	after 325 †Macarius of Jerusalem (in Ananias of Shirak, Terian, 2008, 82–87): birth and baptism of Christ 381/384 Egeria, it. 25f. (including Octave) ca. 550 Cosm. Ind., top. 5.10

	<i>Eastern Syria</i>	<i>Egypt</i>	<i>Other</i>
Christmas (25 December)	before 540 Thomas of Edessa, <i>on Epiphany</i> (see Possekkel, 2011): birth of Christ	432 Paul. Em., hom. 1 (Christmas sermon) ca. 450? Shenoute of Atripe, <i>Christmas sermon</i> ca. 550 Cosm. Ind., top. 5.9	425 Cod. Theod. 15.5,5
Epiphany/Theophany (6 January)	tt. dom. 1.28,42 before 373 Ephr., <i>nativ.</i> 5.13: birth of Christ Assyrian Church of the East: 410 Synod of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, can. 2 before 540 Thomas of Edessa, <i>on Epiphany</i> (see Possekkel, 2011): baptism of Christ	before 215 Basilidians acc. to Clem., str. 1.146,1: 11 th of Tybi: baptism of Jesus 329 †Ath., ep. pasch. 1 350–400 † <i>Canons of Ps.-Athanasius</i> §§16, 66: baptism of Christ; Cana miracle 374/377 Epiph., pan. 51.30: 11 th of Tybi: birth of Christ, Cana miracle 385/400 Cassian., coll. 10.2: baptism and birth of Christ; 'old custom'	Cyprus: 374/377 Epiph., pan. 51.9,13; 16.1,8; 22.3 425 Cod. Theod. 15.5,5 Ireland: 432/457 Synod under Patrick, can. 19

	<i>Spain</i>	<i>Gaul</i>	<i>Italy</i>
Easter: Quadragesima		381/384 Eger., it. 27.1 (<i>quadragesimae</i>)	395 Ambr., Psal. 40.37 (<i>passio Domini finis est quadragesimae</i>)
Easter: Holy Week		381/384 Eger., it. 30 (<i>septimana paschale</i>)	
Easter: <i>triduum sacrum</i>			ca. 386 † (Ps.) Ambr., <i>epistula extra collationem</i> 13.12f. (Maur., ep. 23.12f.: <i>triduum</i> <i>sacrum</i>)
Easter: Easter Octave		381/384 Eger., it. 39: <i>dies paschales</i>	

	<i>Rome</i>	<i>North Africa</i>	<i>Asia Minor</i>
Easter: Quadragesima	384 Hier., ep. 24.4 (<i>in quadragesima</i>)		
Easter: Holy Week			
Easter: <i>triduum sacrum</i>	416 Innoc., ep. 25.4 (<i>ad Decentium</i>)	ca. 400 Aug., ep. 55.14,24 (<i>sacratissimum triduum</i>) Aug., serm. 218.1: celebration of Good Friday	373/403 Amph., <i>in diem sabbati sancti</i> (celebration of Holy Saturday)
Easter: Easter Octave		ca. 400 Aug., serm. 232.1; 259	

<i>Constantinople</i>	<i>Western Syria/Antioch</i>	<i>Palestine/Jerusalem</i>
	375/400 ConstAp 5.13,3 387 Chrys., Jud. (CPG 4327) 3.4	334/335 Eus., pasch. 4 381/384 Egeria, it. 27.1: <i>eortae</i>
	375/400 ConstAp 5.13,4: τῆς ἀγίας τοῦ πάσχα ἐβδομάδος (time of fasting, no special liturgical celebration); 8.33,3: τὴν μεγάλην ἐβδομάδα 386/398 Chrys., hom. in Gen. (CPG 4409) 30.1: τὴν μεγάλην ἐβδομάδα 396? John Chrysostom, hom. in Ps. 145 (CPG 4415)	381/384 Egeria, it. 30.1: <i>septimana maior</i> ; cf. 30–41
	375/400 ConstAp 8.33,3	348 †Cyr. H., catech. 18.33 (secondary?) 381/384 Egeria, it. 39f.
	388 Chrys., cat. bapt. (CPG 4460–4462, 4467) 388 Chrys., hom. 1–4 in Act. princ. (CPG 4371) 389? Chrys., cat. bapt. (CPG 4468–4472) before 392 Thdr. Mops., hom. cat. 12–14	? †Cyr. H., catech. 18.33 (secondary?) †Cyr. H., catech. 19–23. 381/384 Egeria, it. 46.6

	<i>Eastern Syria</i>	<i>Egypt</i>	<i>Other</i>
Easter: Quadragesima	†Syriac doct. apost., can. 7 ca. 410 East Syria: Marutha of Maipherkat, Letter to Isaac of Seleucia/Ctesiphon	334 Ath., ep. pasch. 6.13 414 Cyr., hom. pasch. 1.6	325 †Council of Nicaea, can. 5 400 (405) Cod. Theod. 2.8,24 Eastern Syria: †Syriac doct. apost., can. 7 ca. 439 Socr., h.e. 5.22: survey of traditions of fasting
Easter: Holy Week		401 Thphl. Al. in Hier., ep. 96.20: <i>hebdomadae maioris</i> 414 Cyr., hom. pasch. 1.6: της εβδομάδος του σωτηριώδους πάθους	400 (405) Cod. Theod. 2.8,24
Easter: Easter Octave			
Easter: baptismal homilies / mystagogical catecheses			

	<i>Spain</i>	<i>Gaul</i>	<i>Italy</i>	<i>Rome</i>
Ascension			380-390 Chromat., serm. 8 before 397 Philastr., haer. 149 (but see below)	444/445 Leo. M., serm. 73f. 5th/6th cent. sacram. Leon.
Pentecost = Ascension			before 397 Philastr., haer. 140	
Pentecost = outpouring of the Holy Spirit			ca. 384, Ambr., apol. Dau. 8.42 ca. 400 Paul. Nol., carm. 27.45ff.	ca. 380 †Ambrosiaster, <i>quaestiones veteris et novi testamenti</i> 95 440/461 Leo. M., serm. 75-77
Pentecost/Ascension: relationship unclear	300/309 †Conc. Illib., can. 43			

	<i>North Africa</i>	<i>Asia Minor</i>	<i>Constantinople</i>	<i>Western Syria/Antioch</i>
Ascension	396/397 Aug., serm. 261–265, 263A, 265A–F; ep. 54.1	ca. 388 †Greg.Nyss. (Cappadocia), ascens.	before 425 (Socr., h.e. 7.26)	375/400 ConstAp 5.20,2; 8.33,4 386/388 Chrys., Philogon. (CPG 4319) 4 386/398 Chrys., ascens. (CPG 4342)
Pentecost = Ascension				
Pentecost = outpouring of the Holy Spirit	397/398 Aug., Faust. 32.12	ca. 388 Greg.Nyss. (Cappadocia), Spir.	379 Greg.Naz., or. 41	375/400 ConstAp 5.20,4. 14 (with Octave); 8.33,5 386? Chrys., pent. 1f. (CPG 4343)
Pentecost/Ascension: relationship unclear			337 Eus., v.C. 4.64 (death of Constantine)	

	<i>Palestine/Jerusalem</i>	<i>Eastern Syria</i>	<i>Egypt</i>	<i>Other</i>
Ascension	381/384 Egeria, it. 43 (unspecific) before 439 Lect. Hieros. arm. 57 Renoux	before 540 Thomas of Edessa, on <i>Epiphany</i> (see Possekel, 2011)	ca. 700 John of Nikiu, chron. 90.30	
Pentecost = Ascension	334/335 †Eus., pasch. 5			
Pentecost = outpouring of the Holy Spirit	after 325 †Macarius of Jerusalem (in Ananias of Shirak, Terian, 2008, 82–87)		350–400 † <i>Canons of Ps.-Athanasius</i> § 16	
Pentecost = Ascension + outpouring of Holy Spirit	381/384 Egeria, it. 43 Hier., Gal. 2.4,10f. (outpouring of Holy Spirit) Hier., Ephes. prol.; in <i>die dominica paschae</i> (Ascension)			
Pentecost/Ascension: relationship unclear	337 Eus., v.C. 4.64 385/400 Cassian., coll. 21.11	† T. Dom. 1.28,42 before 540 Thomas of Edessa, on <i>Epiphany</i> (see Possekel, 2011)		425 Cod. Theod. 15.5,5

Further Lists

Earliest expositions of the creed:

- 348, Jerusalem: Cyr. H., catech. 6–18
- 373/397, Milan: Ambr., symb.
- 381/384, Jerusalem: Egeria, it. 46.2
- 382/386? (Ps.-)Cyr. H., catech. 19–23
- before 392, Antioch: Thdr. Mops., catechetical homilies 1–10
- ca. 400, Dacia: Nicet. R., comp., lib. V: symb.
- ca. 400, North Africa: Aug., serm. 212
- ca. 404, Aquileia: Ruf., symb.
- before 410, North Africa: Aug., serm. 213–215
- after 418, North Africa: Aug., symb.
- before 450, Ravenna: Petr. Chrys., serm. 57–62

Earliest evidence for traditio/redditio symboli:

- 348, Jerusalem: Cyr. H., catech. 18.21
- ca. 360, Rome: Aug., conf. 8.2,5 (concerning Victorinus)
- 373/397, Milan: Ambr., symb.
- 381/384, Jerusalem: Egeria, it. 46.5
- ca. 400 North Africa: Aug., serm. 212–215, 56–59

Earliest lists of dominical feasts:

- ? East Syria, †Syriac doct. apost., can. 6–9: Epiphany (principal feast), Good Friday, Easter Sunday, Pentecost (=Ascension)
- after 325, Palestine: †Macarius of Jerusalem (in Ananias of Shirak; see Terrian, 2008, 82–87): Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost
- 350–400, Egypt: †*Canons of Ps.-Athanasius* §§ 16, 66: Easter, Pentecost, Epiphany
- 375/400, Antioch: ConstAp 5.13–20: Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost; 8.33: slaves should rest during Holy Week, Easter Octave, Ascension, Pentecost, Christmas, Epiphany, and feasts of martyrs
- Pentecost 386/398, Antioch: Chrys., pent. 1.1 (PG 50.454): Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost
- 20 Dec. 386/388, Antioch: Chrys., Philogon. 3–4 (PG 48.752f): Christmas, Theophany, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost
- before 397, North Italy: Philastr., haer. 140: Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension/Pentecost
- 400, North Africa: Aug., ep. 54.1: Easter (passion/resurrection), Ascension, Pentecost
- ca. 400: Paul. Nol., carm. 27.34ff.: Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost
- 425, whole empire: Cod. Theod. 15.5,5: prohibition of circus games and obligation to attend mass on Sundays, Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost

- 5th cent.?, Syria, t. dom. 1.28,42: Easter, Epiphany, Pentecost
- 6th c., Eastern Syria: early Syriac lectionary, see F.C. Burkitt, *The Early Syriac Lectionary System*, PBA 11, London 1923: (Christmas), Epiphany, Lent, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, Pentecost
- before 540, Eastern Syria: Thomas of Edessa, on Epiphany (unedited, cf. Possek, 2011): Christmas, Baptism, Lent, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, Pentecost

Dates for baptism in the fourth and fifth centuries:

- after 325, Palestine: †Macarius of Jerusalem (in Ananias of Shirak; see Terrian, 2008, 82–87): Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost (bestowal of Holy Spirit by laying on of hands)
- 381, Constantinople: Greg.Naz., or. 40.24: Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost
- ca. 385, Spain: Siricius, ep. 1.2: Christmas, Epiphany, feasts of apostles and martyrs (refused by Siricius)
- ca. 385, Rome: Siricius, ep. 1.2: Easter, Pentecost (allegedly *apud nos et apud omnes ecclesias*)
- 425, whole empire: Cod. Theod. 15.5,5: Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost
- 432/457, Ireland: synod under Patrick of Armagh, can. 19: Easter, Pentecost, Epiphany