The revelation dialogue between a certain "John" and the risen Lord, introduced and translated here as "2 Apocryphal Apocalypse of John" (2 Apocr. Apoc. John; CANT 332), is relatively unknown in modern scholarship—and yet the few scholars who have worked with it directly have done so using a potentially confusing variety of titles, including the "Apocalypse of St. John Chrysostom," the "Chrysostomic Apocalypse," and the "Questions of John the Theologian." Noting its apparent relationship to 1 Apocryphal Apocalypse of John, François Nau called it "Une Deuxième Apocalypse Apocryphe Grecque de Saint Jean," a convention adopted also by Jean-Daniel Kaestli and continued here. That said, the text—unlike other Johannine apocalypses—is indeed associated with the patriarch of Constantinople, not John the Theologian, though it is possible that the attribution to John Chrysostom is a secondary development. Nevertheless, the choice of Chrysostom for interlocutor is quite appropriate as the dialogue focuses upon interpretation of the Byzantine Liturgy, the development of which is closely associated with Chrysostom.

Contents
The text begins rather abruptly with John (usually identified explicitly as "John Chrysostom") approaching the Lord and asking a series of questions. In contrast to other revelatory dialogues, which situate the interlocutors at a particular time and place (typically Mount Tabor or the Mount of Olives in the forty days between Jesus' resurrection and ascension), 2 Apocr. Apoc. John offers no such context. Instead, John immediately launches into a series of questions. Most questions are introduced with the phrase "Tell me, Lord"; most answers are introduced with "Listen, just John." John's first questions concern sin (chap. 1), proper ritual observance of Sunday (2:1-3), and fasting (2:4-19), but the central portion of the text consists of a series of questions and answers on the significance of the liturgy (chaps. 3-5). In these chapters, John questions the Lord about the meaning of the various elements of the liturgical setting and paraphernalia (the altar, the bêma, the ambo, the paten, etc.) and about the meaning of the various segments of the Mass, with an apparent focus on the elements that would have been most prominent to a lay participant (the hymns, the readings, the recitation of the Creed, and the kiss of peace). The interpretations offered are at once typological (associating the earthly liturgy with its cosmic, heavenly counterpart) and historical (associating the liturgy with the events of Jesus' life on earth). The text continues with a question about baptism, the answer to which has more to do with haircuts (6:1-6), and a final question on love (6:7-11).
2 Apocryphal Apocalypse of John

Manuscripts and Versions

2 Apocr. Apoc. John first appeared in a critical edition by Russian scholar Nikolai Krasnoseltsev in 1898. He found the text in a manuscript housed at the library of St. Andrew's Skete on Mount Athos (Skêtê Hagiou Andreou, 96, fols. 78r–81v, 16th cent.). Likely the manuscript perished in the fire of 1958 that destroyed much of the Skete's holdings. Krasnoseltsev mentions finding a shorter recension of the text in the Metochion of the Holy Sepulchre (in Istanbul), but does not provide a shelf number; we have thus far been unable to identify the manuscript to which he refers.1 Krasnoseltsev's work has gone largely unnoticed in subsequent scholarship, which relies upon an edition and French translation of the text made by François Nau in 1914.2 Nau based his text on Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 947 (fols. 276v–280v), copied in Cyprus between 1523 and 1574. Three more manuscripts are known but have yet to be evaluated:

Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. II.106 (coll. 1169), fols. 222v–225v (16th cent.)
Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. III.12 (coll. 1267), fols. 412–413v (1467)
Zaborda, Monë tou hagiou Nikanoros, gr. 127, fols. 186v–189 (17th cent.)

Another manuscript containing the text has been identified among the trove discovered in 1975 at Saint Catherine's Monastery. According to Paul Géhin and Stig Frøyshov (in their review and supplementation of Damianos et al.'s inventory3 of the new discovery), MG 69 is the first page of 2 Apocr. Apoc. John, with more of the text appearing in MG 66.4 It is unclear from the brief descriptions currently available whether MG 66 and 69 represent the entire text or only fragments. Given their very early date (8th/9th cent.) relative to the likely date of the text's composition (also 8th/9th cent., see below), these fragments, once published, will no doubt be extraordinarily valuable in establishing the earliest version of the text.

The two edited recensions are clearly the "same" text, inasmuch as they share the same scenario (John questions the risen Lord), the same structure (a brief introduction followed by questions and answers without narrative context), the same formal elements (the questions are mostly introduced with "Tell me, Lord," the answers with "Listen, Just John"), and the same basic content. That said, the two differ substantially in every single line. The wording is generally quite different; even the passages that correspond most closely never have more than a few phrases in common. A more substantive difference between the two recensions is their various identifications of the "John" in question. While the Skêtê Hagiou Andreou manuscript is explicit throughout in naming the questioner as John Chrysostom, the Paris manuscript attributes the text to John Chrysostom in the incipit but begins the text with "John the Theologian approached our Lord Jesus Christ," and thereafter refers to him simply as John, save for one instance (3:1) where the manuscript reads "Iôannês ho xristôs" (i.e., the common abbreviation for

2. Nau, "Une deuxiême apocalypse."
“John Chrysostom”). Other differences between the two recensions include the Paris manuscript's much lengthier discussion of fasting (2:7–19) and the role played by angels in the liturgy (3:5–9). The Athos manuscript, on the other hand, has a section explaining the significance of the kiss of peace (4:13–14) that is absent in the Paris manuscript.

Thus, although the two manuscripts are clearly pulling from the same tradition, they seem to be independent of one another. It is difficult to say which represents a more "original" version, but it is more helpful to think of 2 Apocr. Apoc. John, like other Johannine apocalypses, as a "fluid text" for which the basic structure and content is established, but is open to rewriting, adaptations, additions, and subtractions.

**Literary Context**

In 2 Apocr. Apoc. John two broadly defined genres, apocalypses and dialogues, intersect. By title alone, the text associates itself with apocalyptic literature, but 2 Apocr. Apoc. John does not fit easily within standard definitions of "apocalypse." In the well-known 1979 issue of *Semeia* ("Apocalypse: Morphology of a Genre"), John J. Collins and others attempt to establish consistency and clarity in the use of the category; examining a set corpus of Jewish and Christian apocalypses, Collins lands on the following definition: "Apocalypse is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world." In her brief discussion of 2 Apocr. Apoc. John, Adela Yarbro Collins concludes that, while it "shows traces of apocalyptic eschatology and the interest in the heavenly world typical of apocalypses," it "should not be categorized as an apocalypse because it lacks the characteristic of mediated, heavenly revelation." Working only with the recension edited by Nau (and thus taking John the Theologian, not John Chrysostom, as the interlocutor), Yarbro Collins notes that there is no "hint that Christ is in the role of heavenly mediator . . . nor is there any indication that the setting is after his resurrection." When the interlocutor is John Chrysostom, however, it is of course self-evident that the setting is post-resurrection.

Alice Whealey, echoing Yarbro Collins's skepticism, writes, "the latter text is not an apocalypse at all and should not be so called." Instead, describing its contents as a series of questions on "proper ethical and ritual behavior," she dubs 2 Apocr. Apoc. John a "set of canons." For Whealey, in contrast to Yarbro Collins, the problem is not the absence of a mediated revelation, but that the text has "no clear eschatological revelations"—that is, the very element of more typical apocalypses of which Yarbro Collins does at least find traces in 2 Apocr. Apoc. John.

More recently, Jane Baun has sought to broaden the definition of apocalypse with respect to Byzantine literature, arguing that our current definitions and taxonomies obscure from view a particularly influential group of revelatory texts. She writes:

---

Byzantine apocrypha such as the apocalypses of Anastasia and the Theotokos, the group of apocalypses connected with Saint John the Theologian, the Didascalia of our Lord, and the Letter of Our Lord That Fell from the Sky, have been put to one side when “proper” . . . historical apocalypses, such as those of Pseudo-Methodius or Daniel, are discussed. The two kinds have not seemed to fit together. The problem is partly one of terminology. A new taxonomy of the apocalyptic is needed, more precise and inclusive, to help clarify relationships within the genre.

As an initial remedy to this problem, Baun proposes dividing Byzantine apocalyptic texts into two categories: the “historical” apocalypse, which includes texts like the well-known Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius, and the “moral” apocalypse, which includes Apocalypse of Anastasia, Apocalypse of the Theotokos (aka the Apocalypse of the Virgin), and, ultimately, 2 Apocr. Apoc. John. The latter group of texts shares a set of common concerns, which include sexual morality and proper observance of religious responsibilities, particularly the observance of Sunday and of fasts. For example, in the Apocalypse of Anastasia, we find: “Cursed is that house which from the ninth hour of Saturday until the second dawning of the sun engages in work” (cf. 2 Apocr. Apoc. John, 2, 3).

As much as 2 Apocr. Apoc. John is an apocalypse in that the content is revealed by a heavenly mediator, its question-and-answer structure places it in proximity to erotapokriseis. This group of texts range temporally from Pseudo-Aristotle’s Problemeta through the modern period, enjoying particular popularity in Byzantine literary culture. In the Byzantine period, this literary form was used to convey information on a wide range of topics, including medicine, law, philosophy, and theology. Péter Tóth situates 2 Apocr. Apoc. John specifically within a further subgenre of erotapokriseis he calls the non-eschatological apocalyptic revelation dialogue. Tóth describes three texts, in addition to 2 Apocr. Apoc. John, as non-eschatological apocalyptic revelation dialogues: the Revelation on the Lord’s Prayer (BHG 821x–γ), the Didascalia of the Lord (BHG 82a–e), and the Dialogue of Mary and Christ on the Departure of the Soul, a text that is not registered in the BHG, but which Tóth has identified in two manuscripts. Noting the similarity in content with the Byzantine erotapokriseis (noted above), Tóth concludes that “these apocalyptic revelation dialogues appear to be dialogised or ‘apocryphised’ versions of erotapokriseis,” in which question-and-answer dialogues without

12. Also known as the Epistle of Christ from Heaven (CANT 311); see further Calogero A. Miceli’s introduction and translation of the text in MNTA 1:455–63.
13. Baun, Tales, 32.
14. This group has been the object of substantial scholarly work. A useful overview is in Paul J. Alexander, The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985).
15. On erotapokriseis literature, see the scholarship cited in the entry on the Dialogue of the Revealer and John by Philip Tite elsewhere in this volume (p. 360). Krasnosel’tsev, too, examines the text in the context of erotapokriseis literature, which is a popular genre in Slavonic literature; see further, Anissava Mitenova, “Erotapokriseis in Mediaeval Slavonic Literature: Exegesis or Catechesis?”, in On the Fringe of Commentary: Metatextuality in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Cultures (ed. Sydney H. Aufrère, Philip S. Alexander, and Zlatko Pleše with Cyril Jacques Bouloux; OLA 232; Leuven: Peeters, 2014).
17. This text is edited in two recensions by Krasnosel’tsev, Addenda, 90–98.
any narrative frame are—sometimes hastily—placed within one. Evidence of hastiness is found in sections where the speaker (the risen Lord) refers to himself rather awkwardly in the third person (as happens throughout 2 Apocr. Apoc. John).

Among the Byzantine erōtapokrisēs works dealing with theology\textsuperscript{20} are several that share content nearly identical to what we find in 2 Apocr. Apoc. John. Thus, as Töth notes, in the Various Questions and Answers on Priests\textsuperscript{21} we find “What is the church? What is the sanctuary? What is the altar?” just as in 2 Apocr. Apoc. John (3:1–3)—and with answers that sometimes agreeverbatim. These works, published alongside 2 Apocr. Apoc. John by Krasnoseltsev, apparently reuse material from Byzantine liturgical commentaries, presenting the information in clipped question-and-answer format. The liturgical commentaries themselves are also well worth consulting: Germanos of Constantinople’s Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation (De divina liturgia), in particular, shares both content and a theological outlook with 2 Apocr. Apoc. John. The two texts contain significant content in common, including explanations of the “antitypes” of the structure of the church (e.g., the altar, the ambo, etc.), and of the meanings of the various elements of the liturgy (e.g., the Great Entrance, the Trisagion hymn, etc.). Moreover, Germanos’s commentary represents, as Robert Taft has argued, a combination of two strata of interpretation: 1) mystical interpretation (characterized by a typological understanding of the earthly liturgy as an image of the heavenly liturgy), and 2) a more literal, “salvation-history” interpretation (characterized by its understanding of the liturgy as explicitly representing the historical moments of Jesus’ crucifixion and resurrection).\textsuperscript{22} Thus, early in the commentary we find in subsequent sentences: “The church is an earthly heaven in which the super- celestial God dwells and walks about” and “it represents the crucifixion, burial, and resurrection of Christ” (Div. lit. 1).\textsuperscript{23} Precisely this combination is evident in 2 Apocr. Apoc. John, which—very much like Div. lit.—describes the correspondence of the earthly and heavenly liturgy in its interpretation of the Cherubic hymn, the Trisagion, and the Prokeimenon (3:4–5:7), but also describes the liturgy as representing the earthly life, death, and resurrection of Jesus (3:1–3).\textsuperscript{24}

The effort to place these dialogues within an apocryphal narrative context is significant: their writers have taken pains to knit these texts into the narrative worlds of other well-known apocryphal texts. The writer of the Dialogue of Mary and Christ on the Departure of the Soul, which takes place on the Mount of Olives, has placed his/her text within the narrative context of the very popular Dormition traditions. In a similar vein, the writer of 2 Apocr. Apoc. John taps into popular traditions of John as a recipient of revelation and conversation partner of the risen Lord, the latter tradition known particularly in 1 Apocr. Apoc. John. A direct connection is seen in our writer’s

\textsuperscript{20} A brief description with what limited bibliography is available is provided in Töth, “New Wine,” 90 n. 39.

\textsuperscript{21} See Krasnoseltsev, Addenda, 73–75 (for Various Questions and Answers on Priests) and passim for other similar texts.


\textsuperscript{24} Cf. also Germanos, Div. lit. 37 and Taft’s discussion in Byzantine Rite, 47–48.
apparent borrowing of the refrain “Listen, Just John” from that text. We agree, then, with Tóth that these texts “form a distinct stage in what seems to be a special Byzantine way of restructuring and transferring knowledge,” by which “information is extracted from longer argumentative texts and restructured as concise series . . . of questions and answers,” later to be “animated” by being rephrased as human questions and divine answers of pseudo-biblical revelation dialogues.25

2 Apocr. Apoc. John is a text in which multiple literary trajectories cross: it is an apocalypse, it is a dialogue, it is an erótapokriseis, and it bears a relationship to liturgical commentaries. Sitting at this intersection, 2 Apocr. Apoc. John is above all a difficult text: it cannot be understood without reference to texts belonging to several different genres.

Relationship to Johannine Apocalyptica

Seven middle Byzantine apocalypses use the question-and-answer format. In addition to 2 Apocr. Apoc. John, this subset includes 1 Apocr. Apoc. John, 3 Apocr. Apoc. John, the Questions of John to Abraham, the Mysteries of John, the Questions of James to John, and the Questions of John (Interrogatio Johannis).26 Notably, all of these texts involve John the disciple (understood as identical with the author of the Fourth Gospel, Revelation, and the Johannine epistles), either as questioner or respondent, though, as noted, there is some variation in the 2 Apocr. Apoc. John tradition about the precise identity of its John.

The Paris manuscript refers to John Chrysostom only twice: once in the incipit, and a second time—only in abbreviated form—in 31. Otherwise, the “John” of this text is just “John”—or rather “Just John,” apparently in imitation of 1 Apocr. Apoc. John (where the interlocutor is John the Theologian, understood to be the disciple of Jesus and author of the fourth Gospel and Revelation). Thus it was easy for Nau to conclude that the brief identification of the Lord’s interlocutor as “John Chrysostom” was the error of a scribe, who confounded the John to whom authorship of the text is attributed in its title and the John within the text. But the recension found in the Skêtê Hagiou Andreou manuscript complicates the picture: there, while the Lord calls his interlocutor “Just John,” the narrator calls him “John Chrysostom” or just “Chrysostom” throughout. John Chrysostom’s association with the Byzantine Liturgy makes it easy to understand how a text such as 2 Apocr. Apoc. John might have been attributed to him. Could this association have led a writer to imagine Chrysostom himself in conversation with the risen Lord about the liturgy—that is, could the writer who first “apocryphized” these liturgical questions and answers by putting them into a dialogue between a known human figure and the Lord have had Chrysostom in mind from the beginning? This is not impossible—and, indeed, the Skêtê Hagiou Andreou manuscript shows that at least one individual (its scribe) found this a plausible scenario. But the relationship of 2 Apocr. Apoc. John with 1 Apocr. Apoc. John, indicated by the borrowed refrain “Listen, Just John,” points towards the identification of this John with John Chrysostom as a secondary—if, in some ways, entirely sensible—element of the text.

Date and Provenance
With only the Paris manuscript available to him, Nau drew multiple conclusions about 2 Apocr. Apoc. John that are likely mistaken. Starting from the Paris manuscript’s provenance on Cyprus, Nau suggests that the island is in fact a reasonable location for the text’s composition. More specifically, he proposes that, along with the Acts of Barnabas, 2 Apocr. Apoc. John may have been composed as part of a flux of literary activity calculated to provide the church in Cyprus with its own texts to bolster claims of apostolicity as it established its independence from the Antiochene patriarchate in the late fifth century.27 Thus Nau proposes a date of composition in the sixth century, claiming, in any case, that the absence of any mention of either iconoclasm or Latin or Arab conquest precludes a date more recent than the mid-eighth century.28 Court follows Nau on both date and location, developing the notion that the problematic Greek of the Paris manuscript reflects the Cypriot dialect of Greek.29 But there is little—if any—evidence to support these notions. While a provenance on Cyprus is not impossible, there is nothing about the content of 2 Apocr. Apoc. John that points to this location specifically. As to the character of the Greek, none of the typical characteristics of the Cypriot dialect are observable in the text. While Court exaggerates only a little in describing the spelling as “unimaginably atrocious,” with common words “spelt in an amazing variety of permutations,” we find nothing that cannot be understood as a result of straightforward, if rampant, itacism (on which, see below).30

On the other hand, there are, as the discussion on literary context above demonstrates, numerous indications that 2 Apocr. Apoc. John is at home within middle Byzantine literary culture. Beyond the broad picture painted above, we would point to two specific pieces of evidence. First is Alice Whealey’s argument for dating 1 Apocr. Apoc. John to the eighth or ninth century: taking issue with Nau’s claim that there is no mention of iconoclasm in either 1 or 2 Apocr. Apoc. John, Whealey points to 1 Apocr. Apoc. John 13, where the Lord reports that at the second coming he will send his angels to earth to collect all the good and precious things, including “the revered and holy images” (13:3).31 We agree that this line may well originate in an anti-iconoclastic setting.32 Given that 2 Apocr. Apoc. John seems to be literally dependent on 1 Apocr. Apoc. John (in its borrowed refrain “Listen, Just John”), our text, too, would have to have been written either during or after the iconoclastic controversy. The second piece of evidence is provided by a comparison of 2 Apocr. Apoc. John with Germanos of Constantinople’s Div. lit. As noted above, the two texts contain significant content in common, as well as two strata of interpretation described by Robert Taft. Taft notes that “this encroachment of a more literal tradition upon an earlier, mystical level of

27. For more on the putative origins of Acts Barn. see the introduction to the text by Glenn E. Snyder in MNTA 1:324.
31. Wheatley, "Apocryphal Apocalypse," 534. Wheatley also argues rather less persuasively that the "strenuous" emphasis on observing the holy Sunday in 2 Apocr. Apoc. John could reflect contact with Muslims.
32. Note, however, that Rick Brannan (in this volume, pp. 383–84) is rather less convinced by Wheatley’s arguments.
Byzantine interpretation, coincided with the beginnings of the struggle against Iconoclasm (726–843).33

The preponderance of this evidence leads us to assign 2 Apoc. Apoc. John to the eighth or ninth century CE (in line with the growing consensus of the admittedly few scholars who have worked with this text).34 This is, of course, a provisional dating, pending study of the newly discovered manuscript from St. Catherine’s Monastery. As to location, there is little specific evidence to go on—though Constantinople, as a center of the development of and reflection on the liturgy, is of course an obvious possibility.

Translation
The following translation presents the two recensions of the text in a synopsis. Both recensions are replete with technical, liturgical language—much of which is still in use (though occasionally with slightly different meaning) in the vocabulary of the modern Orthodox liturgy. In the case of Greek terms that are relatively well known (e.g., “bêma” and “ambo”) we have simply transliterated the Greek, rather than providing translations (e.g., “sanctuary” and “pulpit”) that will have misleading associations for many readers of contemporary English. Nau divides the text into numbered paragraphs, and this system is retained in Court’s translation. We have introduced new chapter and verse divisions; at times the verses are further divided into smaller units (e.g., 5:8a, 8b) to aid in presenting both manuscripts in parallel without favoring the structure of one over the other. Nau’s original paragraph numbering is given in parentheses.

A particular difficulty in translating Nau’s text is the fact that, contrary to typical editorial practice, he did not correct for itacism and other spelling variations.35 Instead, he provided a diplomatic edition, preserving the spelling of the manuscript. In lieu of a corrected edition, Nau offers a French translation—an odd choice, inasmuch as this means that he has in fact made determinations about how each word should be corrected, but forces the reader to reconstruct from his French what those corrections are. Ultimately, our translation is based on our own corrections of the manuscript’s spelling; in instances where we disagree with Nau (and Court, who simply reproduces Nau’s text along with an English translation), or when more than one option for correction is possible, we have made note of it.

Finally, because the section of the text dealing with the liturgy (chaps. 3–5) is bewildering without some knowledge of the Byzantine Rite, we have provided cross-references to the Byzantine liturgy of the ninth century (as represented in the famous Barberini manuscript—Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Barb. gr. 336—the oldest extant text of the Byzantine liturgy) and to Germanos’s commentary on the liturgy from Div. lit.36

33. Taft, Byzantine Rite, 47.
34. In addition to Whealey, cf. Baun, Tales, 111; and Zheltov, “Moment of Eucharistic Consecration.”
35. “Itacism” describes the collapse of the originally distinct vowel sounds made by eta, iota, upsilon, and the diphthongs epsilon-iota, omicron-iota, upsilon-iota to a single long e sound; this shift, understandably, resulted in considerable confusion and variation in spelling. Other vowel shifts include the merging of omicron and omega into a long ô and the merging of the alpha-iota diphthong with epsilon.
36. References to the Barberini manuscript are to the edition of Frank E. Brightman, Liturgies East-
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*ern and Western* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1896), 309–44; we will use the abbreviation LEW, citing page and line numbers. References to Germanos's *Div. lit.* are to the edition of Nilo Borgia, printed (with English translation and commentary) by Paul Meyendorff, in *St. Germanus of Constantinople, On the Divine Liturgy* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1999). For a detailed discussion of the liturgy of this period, see Taft, "Liturgy."
ATHOS, SKETE HAGIOU ANDREOU, 96
From our father, now among the saints, John Chrysostom: a word of teaching. having prayed before the Lord and asked about the holy Sunday and the divine liturgy. Lord, bless.

On unforgivable sins

1 Saint John Chrysostom, having approached and seen the Lord, fell before him, saying, “Tell me, Lord, how many sins in the world are unforgivable?”

2 The Savior began to say the sins: “A first sin explains the world: if

(1) 1 John the Theologian\textsuperscript{b} approached our Lord Jesus Christ and said, “Lord, tell me how many sins are there, and what type of sin is unforgivable for human beings?”

(2) 2 If one confesses demons, and denies the Lord, and collabo-

---

a. The manuscript has \textit{diatasei} here, which most properly denotes a process of loosening or breaking apart—often negatively (with the sense of “destroy”) though also positively (with the sense of “solve,” “satisfy,” “relax,” or “reconcile”). While it is surely possible to understand this sentence in isolation as “a first sin destroys the world,” the verb occurs three more times in the text (in chaps. 12, 13, and 14) in a repeated phrase by which John asks the Lord what various elements of the liturgy mean; moreover, the same verb is used throughout the two recensions of the \textit{Revelation on the Lord’s Prayer} (see Introduction) in the imperative, as the apostle Peter repeatedly asks the Lord to explain the meaning of individual lines of the Lord’s Prayer. This usage is also reflected in the use of the related (simplex) noun \textit{lusis} to denote “answer” in multiple Byzantine question-and-answer texts (see, e.g., Krasnoseltsev, \textit{Addenda}, 20). Note, also, that in chaps. 12

PARIS, BNF, GR. 947
From our father, now among the saints, John, archbishop of Constantinople, Chrysostom: a treatise of benefit\textsuperscript{a} to those listening to it. Father, bless.

b. The moniker “Theologian” calls to mind 1 Apocr. \textit{Apoc. John} and other Johannine apocalyptic texts that feature John the disciple (not John Chrysostom).
someone should confess demons and deny Christ, and work together with the devil and do his command, this one will be punished for eternity. A second sin: one having defiled the womb of his mother and daughter, whether his by baptism or by birth. A third sin: whoever does not honor the holy Sunday—if one does not welcome business affairs during the six days [of the week], and he does not honor the day of Sunday, these will depart into eternal punishment."

On the holy Sunday
2 1Chrysostom asked, saying, "Tell me, Lord, about the holy Sunday."

2 The Lord said, "Listen, Just John, about the splendid Sunday. Sunday is the Lord and the Lord is Sunday. The one who honors Sunday, the Lord will honor him before angels and human beings. The one who honors the holy Sunday with his whole household, and from the ninth hour of Saturday leaves his toil and departs for church to give thanks to God and to perform the prayer of the Lord's resurrection—he is redeemed from the sin of the rates with the devil and his demons, will God not judge him for eternity? (3) There is a second sin: If someone defiles the bed of a daughter, or mother, or godmother, or sister, or aunt, or cousin—how does God judge them? Like the Jew in the river of fire. (4) There is a third sin: If one rests from his toil for the six days [of the week], and avoids his grindstone and business affairs until Sunday—how does God judge him? Like Judas the betrayer."

(5) 2 John asked the Lord, saying, "Tell me also about the holy Sunday."

(6) The Lord said, "Listen, Just John: Sunday is the Lord, and the Lord is Sunday. The one who honors the holy Sunday, the Lord honors him before angels and human beings. (7) The one who honors Sunday with his whole household, from the ninth hour on Saturday, leaves his toil and goes to church and gives thanks to God, and likewise goes to the divine liturgy also on the evening of the holy Sunday.

---

and 14 Paris gr. 947 has dîlé, which—presumably correcting for itacism to déloî—Nau and Court translate with "signifie" and "reveals," respectively. Given that dialuei and déloî are (with itacism) near homophones, it seems plausible that, at some earlier point in the transmission process, one was taken over in error from the other. Taking into account the use of dialuein in the Revelation on the Lord's Prayer and the greater likelihood of the more common verb déloun being mistakenly introduced, dialuein is likely the more original reading.

a. The manuscript has σënteknësas here, or, with itacism corrected, sytënteknëssas. As Baun points out, in the Byzantine period words from this stem refer to baptismal coparents, a point missed by both Nau and Court, who translate with "celle qui est née en même temps (jumelle)" and "twin," respectively. See Baun, Tales, 340 n. 59.
six days of the week, and the Lord blesses him like Abraham."

On fasting

"And he said, "(What if) someone should fast for six days, but not honor Sunday?"

"Listen, Just John: Like a shepherd (who) grazes his sheep throughout the middle stretch of the day, but in the evening does not gather them into the fold, "so too is the one who fasts for six days and does not honor Sunday. And if someone should say 'I love God,' and he does not honor Sunday, then he is a liar."

he is redeemed from the mistakes of the six days (of the week). God blesses him like Abraham, blesses his house and his toils.

(8) "John said, "If someone fasts and prays for six days and does not honor the holy Sunday, what recompense will he receive?"

(9) "Listen, Just John: If someone tends his flock throughout the whole course of the day, but does not shut them in for the night, what good is it? (10) "So too will be the one who fasts and prays but does not honor holy Sunday and the noble confession. Whoever says that he loves the Lord, but does not honor holy Sunday, he is a liar."

Follow-up questions on fasting

(11) "John said, "Tell me also about the fast itself?"

(12) "The fast is great with grace. Many people, through the fast, go above and beyond the heavens, and with the angels they have a portion (of the Eucharist) and fellowship. The fast is great with grace, for you go hungry and the poor man will be sated from your bread. Fruitful is your fast."

(13) "And John [said], "Tell me what the monk—having neither bread, nor wine, nor olive oil—does for you."

(14) "Listen, Just John: the poverty of the monks (is practiced) in

---

a. In the Byzantine period, the Greek meris ("portion" or "share") is frequently used specifically for the Eucharist. See Evangelinus A. Sophocles, Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900), s.v. meris.

b. The manuscript has hypenēa here,
order that each might arrive through the humiliation of his body. Among laypeople (fasting) is observed in order that they might share with all who are poor.\(^8\)

(15) \(^{11}\) What sort of fast does God want?\(^b\)

(16) \(^{12}\) Listen, Just John, to the sort of fast God loves: anoint your face and wash your head, so that you do not appear to people to be fasting. \(^{13}\) Go into your room and close the door, and pray to your Father in secret; and your Father who sees in secret will reward you openly.

\(^{14}\) And on the anniversaries of your saints, do not forget that by their intercession a person is ransomed from wicked death and from error. \(^{15}\) Therefore, when you fast, above all restrain your tongue so as not to say wicked things. When which should be corrected for itacism to \(\textit{hē penia}\) ("poverty"). Court seems to take it otherwise, translating this sentence with "monks expect to come to God through the humiliation of their bodies."

a. This section, too, seems likely to be partly corrupt. The three verses (2:8–10) can perhaps be summarized as follows: in 2:8, it has been established that one purpose of fasting is to provide for the poor; as a follow-up question, John asks what purpose the perpetual poverty of the monk serves, inasmuch as it does not provide for the poor in the way that the layperson's intermittent fasting does; the Lord responds in 2:10 that when monks go without, it is for spiritual purposes involving the humiliation of the body; it is specifically the layperson's abstaining that is meant to help the poor.

b. This sentence is certainly corrupt, reading \(\textit{tou thelē ho theos tian nēsteian}\); Nau suggests emending \(\textit{tou to pōs}\) (an emendation we have followed here), but even that does not solve all the difficulties. Nevertheless, it is fairly clear (also from the answer that follows) that it asks what sort of fast God wants.
your ears do not hear, will your lips speak? will they not slander?

When your eyes have not seen, do not speak. When you have seen, then speak what (your eyes) have seen in truth. (17) And again he says 'a little wine sanctifies'. Look, it is not our abstinence from food that is called 'demon's destruction', but from all evil things.

(18) When you fast, abstain from all things on Wednesday and on Friday, but do not (abstain) at all during the days of the holy Pentecost and of the gloriously triumphant saints, for at the tombs and during the twelve days and contrary to the canons—as has happened—(fasting) is harmful. (19) For the fast is great with grace, and a person is redeemed from fire, and from water, and from wild beasts; from every evil, and from wicked death.

---

a. The manuscript has polēs daimonoi here, the meaning of which is quite obscure. Nau translates tentatively with "la perte du démon," apparently taking polēs to be some form of apōleia ("destruction"). Court seems to follow Nau, translating with "demon's defeat." Having failed to come up with a better proposal than Nau's, we have—likewise tentatively—maintained his translation.

b. I.e., martyrs.

c. I.e., the tombs of martyrs. Another possible translation of the Greek mnēmasin is "on the anniversaries" or "at the memorials"—i.e., of the martyrs' deaths. Whether it is the location or the day referred to here, the sense is the same: do not fast while celebrating the deaths of martyrs.

d. The "twelve days" refers to the period directly preceding Lent. See Baun, Tales, 351 (with further bibliography cited in n. 109).
On the liturgical setting

3 1Chrysostom says, "Tell me, Lord, about the antitypes of the church."

... a

2 [The Lord said, "Listen, Just John: the apse is the crown of the Lord's head,] b The bêma is the Lord's tomb. [The altar table is the Lord's chest.] c The paten is the Lord's eye. The chancel gates are his knees. The presbyter is a pillar. The ambo is the stone rolled away from the door of the tomb, and the layman is not worthy to recline in it, except for clergymen and singers, and the woman is not worthy to come before the bêma."

(20) 3 d And John Chrysostom e said, "Lord, (what are) the antitypes of the church?"

(21) 2 And the Lord said, "Listen Just John: the apse of the church is the crown of God's head. The bêma is the Lord's tomb. f The altar table is the Lord's chest. g The paten is the stone rolled away from the door of the tomb, and the layman is not worthy to go into it, and the woman is not worthy to enter before the ambo. c

---

a. The manuscript has here Xr, the common abbreviation for "Chrysostom." As this is the only occurrence of the moniker in this text (excepting the title), Nau ("Une deuxième," 217 n. 4) surmises that it is the error of a scribe, who had confounded John the Theologian (presumably the figure originally associated with this work) and John Chrysostom. The presence of John Chrysostom throughout Skêtê Hagiou Andreou 96, however, significantly complicates the question of which John appeared in the earliest versions of this text (see the introduction, p. 404).

b. The Greek here is, as in 2:18 above, mneïma, with itacism corrected: mnêma. Nau translates with "le souvenir du Seigneur," either correcting to mneïa or understanding mnêma with the more abstract sense of "remembrance" as opposed to a physical structure; Court follows, translating with "the remembrance of the Lord." That "tomb" is more likely what was intended here is confirmed by Skêtê Hagiou Andreou 96, which reads taphos (straightforwardly "tomb").

c. The Greek ambôn might be translated as "pulpit," though in the Byzantine church its use was rather more limited—it was essentially a lectern for reading the Gospel or Epistle—than what the contemporary English term "pulpit" might suggest.
On the antitypes of clerical actors and actions

"Chrysostom says, "Tell me, Lord, the reading and the singing—what is it?"

(22) "And John said, "Tell me, Lord, the readers"—who are they, when they come to the ambo singing?"

(23) "Listen, Just John: the presbyter is the first-angel Michael through a cloud, for he processes the holy gifts through the cloud to the altar table and enters, and the lay-person is not worthy to look intently at him from the knees up."

(24) John said, "Tell me, Lord, also about the liturgy, when the priest makes the prayer of the offering and departs to officiate:

(25) "Listen, Just John: the angel of the Lord arrives, guarding the holy gifts."

a. With the term "readers" (anagnostai) our writer seems actually to be referring to the singers (psaltai), who would sing the psalms and hymns from a position below the ambo.

b. The sense of this last clause is not entirely clear. We have taken the manuscript's etranise (correcting for itacism) as the aorist infinitive of entranizein—that is, "to look intently." As for the difficult apo ta gonata tèn anò, we have translated as literally as possible with "from the knees up," surmising that the directive here is for laypeople not to stare directly at the presbyter as he makes the Entrance, but to keep their eyes down while still carefully attending. As Taft notes, at this moment of the liturgy, the laypeople must have "turned in expectation to watch the appearance of the patriarch and his retinue" ("Liturgy," 51).

c. The manuscript reads aperchete here (with itacism corrected, aperchetai), but, as Court notes, the notion that the angel "departs" at this moment makes little sense. This should, rather, be the moment at which the angel arrives (cf. John Chrysostom, Sac. 6.4, cited by Court). It seems likely that our scribe has made an error, perhaps looking back at the aperchetai in the previous sentence; we surmise that the original reading was anerchetai ("return"), as in Skêtê Hagiou Andreou 96 (at 3:11).
On the Entrance

11"Listen, Just John: [whenever] the presbyter speaks the holy Gospel and begins to say the prayer of the Entrance, a then an angel of the Lord returns and harmonizes completely in the throat of the priest until he says, 'Peace to all.'"b

(26) "Lord, tell me also about the hymns (antiphons)—what are they?"
(27) "Listen, Just John: when the Lord entered Hades, he both smashed the bolts of the gates and raised the dead from ages past. Then David rejoiced, and the prophets began to sing these things."

(28) "Tell me about the Entrance."
(29) "When the presbyter lifts up the holy Gospel, the angel goes down into the throat of the priest until he says, 'Go in peace!'"

---

a. The Greek term here (eisodos) refers to the formal "Entrance" of the priest onto the bêma during the liturgy; there are two formal entrances, the "Little Entrance" and the "Great Entrance." The entrance referred to in this passage, associated with the Gospel, seems to be the "Little Entrance," during which the book of the Gospels is brought to the sanctuary (cf. LEW 312, 10–30). The phrase "go in peace" refers to the dismissal of the people (cf. LEW 343, 10–12). The sense of this section seems to be that from the Little Entrance until the dismissal of the people (that is, essentially, from the beginning to the end of the liturgy), the presbyter speaks with the voice of an angel.

b. On the presence of angels at the Eucharist, cf. Germanos, Div. lit. 37. Cf. also John Chrysostom, Sac. 6.4, where he writes that angels stand beside the priest during the liturgy and the whole sanctuary is filled with the powers of heaven. For a brief discussion, see Court, Book of Revelation, 93.
2 Apocryphal Apocalypse of John

On the hymns and readings

4 Chrysostom says, "Tell me, Lord, about the Trisagion and the Epistle, and the Alleluia.""1

2*Listen, Just John: the Trisagion Hymn is angelic. David sings the Prokeimenon with an archangelic voice. The holy Gospel is the Lord's very own voice, and the one not listening to it with his whole soul is cursed."2

Chrysostom says, "Tell me, Lord, about (the Mass of) the Catechumens and (the Mass of) the Faithful, and (30) 4 And John said, "Tell me, Lord, about the Prokeimenon, and the Alleluia, and the Epistle and the Gospel, and (the Mass of) the Catechumens, and the Cherubic Hymn, the Mysteries, and the Kiss, and the Holy Doors, and the Symbol—what does each thing signify?

(31) 2*Listen, Just John: David sings the Prokeimenon: 'Your spirit goes before the holy one.' The apostle Paul is the apostolic (teaching). David sings the Alleluia with an evangelic voice, for a second time, into the holy gifts. The four evangelists teach the holy Gospel; the one not hearing these things with his whole soul is cursed.

---

a. "Trisagion" refers to the Trisagion Hymn (introduced into the liturgy by Proclus, Patriarch of Constantinople in 446 CE) or the Trisagion Prayer. In the Barberini manuscript, the Trisagion Prayer occurs immediately after the Little Entrance (cf. LEW 313, 1–314, 14). In Germanos, Div. lit. 25, the Trisagion Hymn is commented on immediately following the Entrance of the Gospel.

b. The Greek here is apostolos; this refers to the "apostolic" reading, that is, a reading from one of the New Testament epistles. Cf. LEW 314, 22–25 and Germanos, Div. lit. 28.

c. The Alleluia is sung prior to the reading from the Gospel.

d. The "Prokeimenon" refers to a verse or two from the Psalms, sung prior to the reading of the Epistle. Its equivalent in the Latin Eucharist is the "Gradual." Cf. Germanos, Div. lit. 28.

e. This refers to the reading of the Gospel; cf. LEW 314, 22–25 and Germanos, Div. lit. 31–32.

f. The Mass of the Catechumens and the Mass of the Faithful are the two halves of the Byzantine liturgy. The first half is open to both catechumens and the baptized, and includes the Trisagion Hymn and readings from the Epistles and the Gospel; then the catechumens are dismissed, and the Mass of the Faithful, which includes the Eucharist, begins. Cf. LEW 313, 10–316, 7.

---

a. That is, the Creed.
b. The manuscript reads katerônta; we have translated Nau's suggested emendation of katerôta, meaning "another time."
the Cherubic Hymn, and how each one is explained."

Then listen, John: the Catechumens are those preparing themselves for baptism. "The Faithful (say) "Pray!" on behalf of the Catechumens, and make their remembrance, just as the Lord said. And the Cherubic Hymn is the petition of the angels and prayer of the Faithful, wherefore it says, 'and so let us lay aside every worldly care, so that we will receive the king of all.'"c

Then let your eye look [neither this way] nor that way, so that you please the king with your audience and do not treat his chair disdainfully. The audience of the altar table—they are angels, for they are joining in this sacred rite and blessing the undefiled body of our Lord Jesus Christ the true God, before whom the angels, in audience, tremble.

When he says, 'Love one another,' whoever has enmity against

\begin{quote}
\textit{a} The Cherubic Hymn, added to the liturgy in the sixth century, is sung at the Great Entrance, during the Mass of the Faithful. Cf. \textit{LEW} 318; Germanos, \textit{Div. lit.} 37.
\textit{b} Note that citation formula "as the Lord said" is here put into the Lord's own mouth. While the Lord refers to himself in the third person throughout, this line is particularly awkward and likely reveals an editorial seam—that is, a preexisting statement has been placed into a direct revelatory discourse without attention to the fact that the person quoted is the person speaking. Notably, Paris gr. 947 does the same. "In remembrance" seems, as Court suggests, to refer to participation in the Eucharist.
\textit{c} These words are indeed found in the Cherubic Hymn.
\textit{d} Greek kathedra, used of the bishop's chair within a church and, metonymically, of the episcopal see.
\textit{e} The phrase "Let us love one another"
\end{quote}

\textit{b} "The Catechumens are the ones (awaiting) baptism. "The Faithful, who are the just ones, say, 'Catechumens, pray!'" Then those who are beyond baptism, the Faithful, make their remembrance, just as the Lord said. "The mystical Hymn of the Cherubic is an angelic hymn, and invokes the power of heaven, wherefore it says, 'and so let us set aside every worldly care, so that we will receive the king of all.'"

Then let your eye be lifted neither this way nor that way from the holy altar—for it is an angelic presence that the priests bless. Therefore the luminaries bow down to your undefiled body and the precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, before whom the angels, in audience, tremble.

When we say, 'Let us love one another,' indeed, whoever is

\begin{quote}
\textit{a} The manuscript seems to be partly corrupt here, particularly with the oddly placed \textit{eipō} (which we have translated as "say," following Nau). Nevertheless, this section seems to refer to the prayer on behalf of the Catechumens prior to their dismissal. The modern Liturgy of St. Chrysostom in fact includes the command "Catechumens, pray to the Lord" (\textit{LEW} 374, 11–12).
\textit{b} The "your" here (Gr. σου) seems quite out of place; doubtless this is a corruption of a reference to the Lord's incorruptible body.
\end{quote}
his brother and does not forgive in that hour is cursed. 11 The one outside hurrying to the doors is not worthy to receive (the Eucharist). 12 The 'I believe' is a confession of baptism; therefore, (someone) says 'One baptism for the forgiveness of sins' and, on account of this, expects resurrection of the dead, along with both judgment and retribution."

On the kiss of peace

13 "And about the church's kiss—how is each thing explained?"

14 "Listen, John: when Judas the traitor said, 'Greetings, Rabbi' and kissed the Lord, and after three days the risen Lord found the eleven disciples and apostles and said, 'Peace be with you; kiss each other and I will gather you together in Galilee,' it was so that every Christian would, with a kiss, love his neighbor.

found to have a contention with his brothers, and will not in that hour give his brother the kiss (of peace), he is cursed to heaven. (34)
11 The one outside that hurried to the doors, this man has cried out to God with no effect. (35) 12 But the holy Symbol of the faith is the noble confession, which the noble fathers have confessed."

Matt 26:49
Mark 14:45 par.
Matt 18:16-18; Mark 16:14; Luke 24:36
Mark 14:28//Matt 26:32

is spoken by the deacon in the liturgy prior to the "kiss of peace." Cf. LEW 320, 24–30.

a. After the kiss of peace, the minister calls out "the doors, the doors," referring to the doors of the sanctuary, which are closed after the Great Entrance (cf. LEW 321, 1–5). Germanos, Div. lit. 41 states that the closing of the doors symbolizes the ultimate separation of those who are worthy and will be admitted into the bridal chamber of Christ from those who are unworthy and will be rejected. This is helpful context for understanding this otherwise difficult section: it seems to refer not to the one who is late for church (that is, physically outside the main doors of the building), but to the one who is spiritually outside the doors.

b. Immediately after calling out "the doors, the doors," the Creed (also referred to in Greek as symbolon, "symbol") is recited (cf. LEW 321, 6; Germanos, Div. lit. 41).
On the offering of the Eucharist

1 "And about the 'Let us stand well, let us stand with fear,' and about the Triumphal Hymn, and the Offering to you what is yours from yours, and about the dodecalogue of prayer, and about the lifting up of the bread—how is each thing explained?"

2 "The 'Let us stand well' (means) 'love God.' The 'Let us stand with fear' (means) 'fear his name.'"

3 "The Triumphal Hymn (is) what the cherubim

419

a. This is a quotation from the liturgy; it is exclaimed by the priest at the beginning of the anaphora, directly after the Creed (cf. LEW 321, 8–9, which lacks "let us stand with fear").

b. This is a quotation from the liturgy; it is exclaimed by the priest at the beginning of the celebration of the Eucharist (cf. LEW 329, 7).

c. In contrast, in Germanos, Div. lit. these lines are interpreted in terms of the events of Christ's death and resurrection: "Thus Christ is crucified, life is buried, the tomb is secured, the stone is sealed. In the company of the angelic powers, the priest approaches, standing no longer as on earth, but attending at the heavenly altar, before the altar of the throne of God, and he contemplates the great, ineffable, and unsearchable mystery of God. He gives thanks, proclaims the resurrection, and confirms the faith in the holy Trinity. The angel wearing white approaches the stone of the tomb and rolls it away with his hand, pointing with his garment and exclaiming with an awed voice through the deacon, who proclaims the resurrection on the third day, raising the veil and saying: 'Let us stand aright'—behold, the first day!—'Let us stand in fear'—behold, the second day!—'Let us offer in peace'—behold, the third day!" (trans. Meyendorff, St. Germanus, 89–91).

d. The Triumphal Hymn ("Holy, holy, holy Lord of the Sabbath, heaven and earth are full of your glory, Hosanna in the highest, blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord, Hosanna in the highest")
shout, and the seraphim sing; and the heavenly powers and the tetramorphic animals singing, shouting, proclaiming and saying, 'Praise the footstool of his feet.'

420 "(As for) the 'Yours from yours': when the Lord went down into Hades, he shattered the bars on Hades and gathered the long dead. Then David rejoiced and the prophets also sang, and, risen, he went to the Father and said, 'Let us offer to you what is yours from yours,' and the prophets answered and said, 'We sing your praise, we bless you, master.'

And whenever the doors of the church open, then, disgraced, the devil stands at the back; holding paper and a reed, he writes as follows, saying, 'You do not know lightning, you do not know thunder, your eye does not know how to look.' And on account of this, a human being does not want to look to what is behind, until his petition has been favored. Look, indeed, the dodecalogue, the Our Father; he calls prayer and consecration and confession."

is sung prior to the offering (cf. LEW 323, 26–324, 3). Germanos agrees that it is the cherubim, seraphim, and the tetramorphic creatures who sing the Triumphant Hymn (Div. lit. 41).

a. "Offering to you what is yours from yours, on behalf of all and for the sake of all" is exclaimed by the priest prior to the distribution of the Eucharist; the people respond "we sing your praises, we bless you, we give thanks to you, Lord" (LEW 329, 7–10).

b. The sense of this sentence is not entirely clear to us (is "the dodecalogue" or "twelve words" really the subject of the verb "calls," as grammar and syntax seem to indicate?), but it may refer to the prayers for the removal of vestments (not found in the Barberini manuscript, but appearing in later versions of the liturgy), which include

 (...)

(38) "(As for) the 'Yours from yours': the Lord went into Hades and he shattered the spirits of wickedness and the gates of Hades, and he raised together the first-formed Adam. Then he said to the spirits, 'Offering to you what is yours from yours, on behalf of all and for the sake of all.' And the angels answered and said 'We sing your praises.'

(39) "And whenever he opens the doors of the church, grasping a reed and writing, and there is †... † therefore lightning did not see, and thunder did not hear, but even the eye itself looks upon me, and on this account a human being does not want to look, especially (as) the elder lifts up the bread, and says 'Holy things to the holy ones,' and then the Holy Spirit descends upon them.

a. This phrase is clearly corrupt. The manuscript reads kai dasemos estin; it is not clear to what dasemos (not a recognizable Greek word) should be corrected. Nau suggests dasekoon, translating with "et qu'il y aura des indolentes." This guess is, of course, conceivable, but it is nevertheless very much a "guess"; failing to arrive at a better suggestion, we have placed the phrase in daggers.

b. The manuscript reads nipsei. Nau and Court—who translate with "purifera" and "consecrate (purify)," respectively—seem to take the verb as a form of nizein ("to wash"). Better is an emendation to hypsoi ("he lifts up"), which itacism could easily render as ipsei. Perhaps the addition of the nu is a result of hiatus-avoidance. In any case, in the liturgy, the priest does indeed lift up the bread prior to saying "holy things to holy ones" (cf. LEW 341, 14–15). On this section of 2 Apocr. Apoc. John, see Zheltov, "Moment of Eucharistic Consecration," 296.
On the Dismissal

(79) “And when he says, ‘Let us go forth in peace,’” then an angel thoroughly rejoices above the entrance, after seeing the blessing. And he blesses all the people. The presbyter sets down the offering. And he offers the divine liturgy. (7b) And after the presbyter takes off his robe, then the angel of the Lord, the one guarding the offering, goes up and offers the divine liturgy in the heavens.

On honoring the priest

(8b) “And those honoring the priest and with faith requesting it of him are cleansed of sin.

On baptism and tonsure

(6) “Chrysostom said, “Tell me, Lord, also about the holy baptism.”

(20) “Listen, Just John: (there is) one baptism for the forgiveness of sins, and on account of this the abbot’s tonsure (is done) thirty times per year, the priest’s twelve times per year, and the layperson’s three times. (This is done) for the sake of recognizing the holy baptism.”

(40) “And when he says, ‘Let us go forth in peace,’ an angel (is) giving the blessing in faith and fear to those present and standing upright in the church, while the presbyter completes the prayer of the holy church and the supplication of those in heaven.

(41) And John said, “The one honoring the priest, what reward does he have?”


---

a. We suspect some corruption here: the two clauses (both introduced with ho-tan in Greek) are difficult to read as part of the same sentence. Comparison with Skêtê Hagiou Andreou 96 suggests that these may have been two separate sentences, each describing what the presbyter does (in the “when” clause), followed with what the angel does (in the “then” clause). Perhaps the sense here is something like “And when he says, ‘let us go forth in peace,’ an angel (is) giving the blessing in faith and fear to those present and standing upright in the church; and when the presbyter completes the prayer of the holy church, an angel makes the supplication for those in heaven.”

twelve repetitions of “Lord, have mercy” (see LEW 399, 6–24), or to the (twelve) petitions of the diaconal litany that precede the Our Father.

a. This is the Dismissal (cf. LEW 343, 10–12).
Chrysostom said, "(What about) the unshorn among the participants?"

"Listen, John: if anyone's hairs should go below their eyes, he is cursed. Likewise the priest giving him communion."

Chrysostom said, "Tell me, Lord, also about the women."

The Lord said, "Her head was sanctified with her husband; unless she cuts the hairs of her head, she is cursed."

On love and peace

7 Chrysostom said, "Tell me, Lord, about love and peace."

8 "Listen, Just John: God is peace, just as the Lord said, 'So that you love one another.' Every good thing strives for joy. The apostle said, 'Love is more sparkling than the sun,' love bears all things, love endures all things, love hopes all things. Love never ends.' 9 And again the holy Gospel says, 'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God.' 10 Then it says, 'The one who loves God and does not love his brother is a liar.' 'No one has ever seen God.' The one who does not love his own form, how will he love the God that made it? Therefore, there is help in our God.

To whom be the glory forever and ever. Amen.

(46) "Listen, Just John: the ones whose hairs go below his eye, he is not worthy of his communion. The priest who gives it to him is cursed."

(47) And John said, "Lord, tell me also about the women."

(48) "Until a woman has been blessed with her husband, if the hairs of her head go below her eye, then she is not worthy to receive. Similarly, indeed, from the time when her head has been sanctified with her husband, if she should cut the hairs off her head, she is cursed."

(49) And John said, "Lord, tell me also about love."

8 "Let us love one another. 'Great is love, patient and kind.' Love is the brilliance of the sun, more sparkling than the sea. 'Love bears all things, hopes all things, endures all things. Love never ends.' (51) Look, God is peace, just as the Gospel says, 'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called children of God.' And again it says, 'Peace be with you, so that you love one another.'"

To him be the glory and power forever. Amen.

a. This phrase does not appear in 1 Cor 13.