

Durham E-Theses

*The anaphorae of the liturgy of Sts. Addai and Mari
and the Byzantine liturgy of St. Basil the great: a
comparative study*

Stylios Muksuris

How to cite:

Muksuris, Stylios (1999) The anaphorae of the liturgy of Sts. Addai and Mari and the Byzantine liturgy of St. Basil the great: a comparative study. Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/4604/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

**The Anaphorae of the Liturgy of Sts. Addai and Mari and the
Byzantine Liturgy of St. Basil the Great: A Comparative Study**

by
Stylios Muksuris

Submitted in Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Letters

University of Durham
Department of Theology
1999



The Anaphorae of the Liturgy of Sts. Addai and Mari and the Byzantine Liturgy of St. Basil the Great: A Comparative Study

by
Stylios Muksuris

While all eucharistic anaphoras derive their primary significance from the Christ-event and Last Supper, each one also reflects and expresses a particular liturgical tradition within Christianity. Two important liturgies from antiquity that share several common similarities are the Anaphora of Sts. Addai and Mari and the Byzantine Anaphora of St. Basil the Great.

A detailed analysis of the historical and linguistic idiosyncrasies of the two anaphoras shows that Addai and Mari is clearly the more ancient eucharistic prayer, a product of an East Syrian environment with distinctive semitic elements, that has led scholars to claim possible apostolic antiquity. On the other hand, Byzantine-Basil belongs to a larger family of anaphoras attributed to the Cappadocian Father himself or to some redactor(s) within his liturgical tradition, and primarily reflects hellenistic ideas.

St. Basil's journeys to Egypt and Syria seem to be responsible for the production of a Coptic version of Basil, which shares some common elements with Addai and Mari. Also, the two 'hellenized' East Syrian liturgies of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius (including the Maronite anaphora *Sharar*), which are very similar to the content of Addai and Mari, may be partially credited for identifying points of contact between the East Syrian and Byzantine prayers.

The purpose of this thesis is to analytically examine the eucharistic prayers of Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil by breaking down both anaphoras into their constitutive sections (through textual juxtaposition) in order to determine and affirm their mutual influence. The methods used are verbal and structural comparison, historical contextualization, and theological comparison. Where applicable, sections from other related anaphoras are also compared against the two main texts. The study concludes that despite Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil's individual uniqueness in style and content, both nonetheless are representative of the original Christian eucharistic tradition and have seemingly influenced each other's development throughout history.

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Chapter One: A Brief Overview of the Structure and Theology of the Liturgy of the Apostles Addai and Mari	10
Chapter Two: The Liturgical Tradition of the Byzantine Anaphora of St. Basil the Great	35
Chapter Three: A Working Methodology	86
Chapter Four: The Opening Dialogue and the Preface	91
Chapter Five: The <i>Presanctus</i> and <i>Sanctus</i>	108
Chapter Six: The <i>Postsanctus</i>	122
Chapter Seven: The Institution Narrative – Anamnesis	138
Chapter Eight: The Epiklesis	172
Chapter Nine: The Intercessions	200
Chapter Ten: The Doxology	244
Conclusion	258
Bibliography	266

© Copyright 1999 by Stylianos Muksuris

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without their prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Introduction

“Eucharistic celebration is the sublime expression of the Christian Faith.”¹ With these words, Thomas Elavanal prefaces his comprehensive study of the East Syrian Anaphora of Addai and Mari, acknowledging liturgical worship as the mouthpiece through which the Church celebrates its origin in Jesus Christ and the identity that it has received from its Lord. Indeed, the paschal mystery of Jesus Christ rests at the very core of every liturgical celebration, and it is precisely this experience of, and participation in, the divine *oikonomia* within the context of liturgy, that constitutes the *kerygma* of the Church from age to age.

An analytical study of ancient eucharistic prayers often proves them to be authentic expressions of the faith and theology possessed by the early Christians. Since no two expressions are ever exactly alike, this logically explains then the number and diversity of various Christian anaphoras. Clearly, the primary focus in all liturgies is the Christ-event and the Last Supper, the common denominators underlying all anaphoras. Certain necessary elements appear in every liturgy (a praising of God’s Name, a reference to the Last Supper, an invocation over the Gifts and the people, *et al.*), but each eucharistic prayer preserves its uniqueness by typically adhering to its own stylistic approach, content, and emphasis. Certainly this diversity does not invalidate the expression of faith professed by the individual liturgical tradition. On the contrary, writes Elavanal, “Since all the liturgies have at their centre the same Christ-event and are based on apostolic and patristic teachings, they are all equally valid sources of Christian faith.”² The very same argument may be applied to the varying Resurrection accounts from the

¹ T. Elavanal, The Memorial Celebration: A Theological Study of the Anaphora of the Apostles Mar Addai and Mari (Kerala, 1989), p. 1.

four gospels. The Church does not deny that Christ rose from the dead because of varying biblical stories. Rather, it views this diversity as an even more convincing witness to the same critical event within Christianity which is expressed by a variety of perspectives.³ “Each liturgy, as the representative of its theology, ecclesiology and spirituality, contributes to the common patrimony of the Church.”⁴

Throughout the Church’s long history, several liturgical traditions from different parts of the world have given expression to the Christian Faith. Whereas some of these liturgies have fallen into disuse, others have been preserved to the present day but usually in a revised form, reflecting elements from their original version as well as matter from other anaphoras. Two important liturgical traditions still in use today, true representatives of both the Semitic and Hellenistic worlds, are respectively, the East Syrian anaphora of the Holy Apostles Sts. Addai and Mari and the Byzantine anaphora of St. Basil the Great.

Over the span of the last century and a half, the liturgy of Addai and Mari, used today by the Chaldeans and Nestorians and still the official liturgy of Syro-Malabar Christians, has been gaining popularity and attention from liturgical scholars who generally regard it as “one of the earliest, and perhaps the very earliest, of the many formularies of the Christian sacrifice.”⁵ In contrast to other more ‘hellenized’ liturgies from the East, it follows a unique Jewish theological background and remains quite Semitic in its structure and phraseology. “The outstanding mark of East Syrian liturgy is

² Ibid.

³ Incidentally, the Passion, Death, and Resurrection accounts are among the few events in the life of Christ included in each of the four gospels, an indication certainly of their pertinence for the Christian Faith and, in truth, an indication of their actual occurrence.

⁴ Elavanal, p. 1.

⁵ J. Mason Neale, General Introduction to a History of the Holy Eastern Church (London, 1850), p. 319.

that it developed mainly on the Jewish theological background, least influenced by other liturgical groups and theological trends.”⁶

Edessa in modern-day southeastern Turkey, one of the first Jewish Christian centers where Addai and Mari probably had its origin and early development, was an affluent cosmopolitan merchant center, thoroughly familiar with both Eastern and Western cultures, and an important city of the early Roman and later Byzantine Empires. Despite, however, Edessa’s renowned plurality, its geographical seclusion from the West and its mainly Syriac-speaking population account for Addai and Mari’s liturgical exclusivity as a unique Christian anaphora immersed within a predominantly semitic background.⁷

Two other important East Syrian liturgies, Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia, together with the strikingly similar Maronite anaphora known as *Sharar*, share several liturgical elements with Addai and Mari. However, the first two anaphoras’ composition in Greek and their use of distinctly Byzantine material, explain their inclination toward the West. Although one may initially assume that the liturgies of Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil cannot possibly have any common threads - the environments in which they developed are plainly disparate! – the similarities between them are overwhelmingly numerous. In fact, the anaphoras of Nestorius and Theodore can partially be credited for ‘linking’ their fellow East Syrian anaphora with the Byzantine liturgical tradition that has seemingly influenced them.

⁶ Elavanal, p. 3.

⁷ Syriac is a branch of Aramaic. See Edip Aydin, “A Bird’s Eye View of the Syriac Language and Literature”, in *Gouden Hoorn* 5/1 (summer 1997), *passim*.

The Byzantine anaphora of St. Basil is a member of a larger family of anaphoras attributed to the Cappadocian Father himself or to some redactor(s) within his liturgical tradition. The two major Basilian families are E-BAS and Ω-BAS, the latter group being the one to which the Byzantine anaphora belongs. St. Basil's extensive travels to Palestine, Syria, and especially Mesopotamia suggest that he did come into contact with the East Syrian liturgical traditions preserved in eucharistic prayers such as Addai and Mari.

It is unreasonable to assume that the manner of liturgical influence between Basil and Addai and Mari was in only one direction. The influence was undoubtedly mutual and quite possibly of equal magnitude. In many cases, it was often indirect, occurring through the 'hellenized' East Syrian liturgies of Nestorius and Theodore. Edessa's conservative and seemingly undisturbed liturgical stance – steeped in a predominantly Jewish background – coupled with Byzantium's extensive political and missionary outreach campaign and fast-developing patristic trinitarian theology, christology, and pneumatology, brought both liturgies to a meeting point by raising interests on both sides about the other's tradition. The gradual effect of each liturgical tradition on the other, however extensive or minimal, was anything but unexpected.

The challenges of conducting a comparative study such as this one are several. The oldest extant text of Addai and Mari, belonging to the Church of *Mar Esa'ya* in Mosul, dates back to about the tenth or eleventh century. The manuscript is obviously a recension of much earlier versions, many of which are purported to predate the Ecumenical Council of Nicaea (325 AD) and even go as far back as the second or third century. In addition, the elaborate liturgical reforms undertaken by the seventh century

Nestorian Patriarch Isho'yab III (649-659) also influenced the phraseology and structure of Addai and Mari. As a result, a significant challenge facing liturgiologists today is trying to reproduce the original text of this ancient anaphora, filtering out the 'foreign' material, much of which has infiltrated into Addai and Mari from 'Western' traditions. Unless the entire anaphora - or portions of it anyway - is carefully researched and rewritten to reflect, as close as possible, an original prototype, any comparative task between it and another liturgy simply becomes an exercise in comparing texts at a certain phase in their history.

The same challenge may be quite realistically evident with the Basilian liturgy. Scholars have identified two major versions of St. Basil's liturgy: a Greek version and a Coptic (Egyptian) version. Byzantine-Basil has been traced, as already mentioned, to a single source known as Ω -BAS, believed in turn to be a redaction of an even earlier form, identified as Ur-Basil. This last hypothetical grouping, assumed to be the actual Basilian prototype, seems to be reflected more closely by the Egyptian versions of Basil rather than the Ω -BAS group. As a result, the Byzantine version of Basil, contained in the ninth century *Codex Barberini* seems to reflect a later period of development and thus almost requires to be checked against the backdrop of Coptic-Basil before it is compared with Addai and Mari.

The existence, however, of other anaphoras related to Addai and Mari and St. Basil is perceived as an advantage in the task of comparative study. Often the other anaphoras have either retained original material or surrendered it by accepting newer structural or theological elements. Also, the influence of one anaphora upon the other can be ascertained indirectly, through comparison with their related anaphoras. For example,

while Addai and Mari's consecratory Epiklesis borrows the concept of 'blessing and hallowing' the Holy Gifts from the Byzantino-Cyrrilline tradition, Basil's uncharacteristic use of the ancient consecratory verb 'come' can clearly be traced to the biblical and eschatological prayer of *Maranatha* (1 Cor 16.22; Rev 22.20), included in the more ancient Addai and Mari.

The purpose of this thesis is to carefully analyze the eucharistic prayer (anaphora) of the East Syrian liturgy of Addai and Mari and the Byzantine liturgy of St. Basil, by breaking down the anaphora into its constitutive sections in order to determine and affirm their mutual influence. Chapters One and Two will provide an extensive overview of the respective liturgical traditions, including authorship, liturgical context, the texts themselves, and a brief examination of the structural and theological highlights of the two anaphoras. Chapter Three will deal exclusively with the methodological approach to be used in conducting this study. Finally, Chapters Four through Ten will encompass the structural and theological comparison of the following constitutive parts of the anaphoras: (1) Opening Dialogue and Preface; (2) *Presanctus* and *Sanctus*; (3) *Postsanctus*; (4) Institution Narrative - Anamnesis; (5) Epiklesis; (6) Intercessions; and (7) Doxology. The 'Conclusion' will address the universal importance of the Eucharist for the Church and its fundamental meaning in the light of the research that will follow in the pages ahead.

Chapter One

A Brief Overview of the Structure and Theology of the Liturgy of the Apostles Addai and Mari

Introduction

The Liturgy of Saints Addai and Mari, alternatively called the Liturgy of the Apostles Addai and Mari, or simply the Liturgy of the Apostles, is a Nestorian liturgy, peculiar to the ancient see of Edessa, in East Syria. Twentieth century liturgical scholarship has enthusiastically assigned much value to this ancient text, claiming it to be one of the earliest Christian anaphoras still in existence today. J. Mason Neale states about the Liturgy of Addai and Mari that it is “one of the earliest, and perhaps the very earliest, of the many formularies of the Christian sacrifice.”¹ Although such a claim of ‘absolute antiquity’ may – and has already – run the risk of major scholarly criticism,² Addai and Mari’s inherent historical value is evident due to three important facts: (1) it is clearly a liturgy of semitic origin, with very little or practically no known adulteration by Greek or other sources; (2) Addai and Mari, so far as can be ascertained, makes exclusive use of Syriac biblical texts when scriptural citations are included in the liturgy; and (3) the body of the eucharistic prayer is addressed not only to the Father, but in part *to the Son*, a further sign of Addai and Mari’s “antiquity, and not an exceptional peculiarity.”³

¹ J. Mason Neale, General Introduction to a History of the Holy Eastern Church (London, 1850), p. 319.

² Most scholars agree that the versions of Addai and Mari currently available (six manuscripts, two from the 1500s and four from the 1600s) are revised texts and, most likely, revisions of revisions made of the original text, which is believed to have been re-elaborated itself by Isho'yab III (649-59) in the seventh century. In 1966, William F. Macomber published a list of earlier manuscripts, with a critical edition of Addai and Mari, based on the text from a *hudra* (a major Syriac service book), belonging to the Church of *Mar Esa'ya* in Mosul, dated about the tenth-eleventh century. This text is still regarded as the earliest form of the anaphora of Addai and Mari in existence. For further references regarding these reforms, see Enrico Mazza, The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer (Collegeville, MN, 1995), p. 338, footnote 20. Also, Bryan D. Spinks, Worship: Prayers from the East (Washington, DC, 1993), p. 10.

³ Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (London, 1945), p. 180. The purely semitic character of Addai and Mari is further substantiated by various other liturgists, including an enlightening essay by Edward C. Ratcliff, “The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: A Suggestion”, Journal of Theological Studies 30 (1929) 23-32; and an excellent study by Stephen B. Wilson, “The Anaphora of the Apostles

Of unique interest and importance regarding this ancient liturgy is that it is basically still a semitic liturgy, the only one of its kind. The anaphora of Addai and Mari differs significantly in thought and structure, not to mention theologically as well, from other hellenized anaphoras, such as Greek Basil (G-BAS), Chrysostom (CHR), and James (JAS), which developed and spread to the hellenistic world north and west of Syria, as a result of St. Paul's missionary journeys. Commenting on Addai and Mari's archaic value, Gregory Dix states:

Its special importance lies in this – that any agreement of ideas with these hellenistic prayers which may be found to underlie the marked peculiarities of SS. Addai and Mari helps to carry back the eucharistic tradition of the church as a whole behind the divergence of Greek and Western christianity [*sic.*] generally from that oriental world to which the original Galilean apostles had belonged.⁴

In this chapter, I plan to briefly examine the structure and theology of the anaphora of the Liturgy of Addai and Mari, paying particular attention to those elements which scholars believe give this particular liturgy its uniqueness and antiquity. Prior to this examination, however, it is necessary to identify Addai and Mari within the greater context of Eastern liturgies, as well as to clarify certain important Syriac liturgical terms used when speaking about the structure of its anaphora.

The Historical and Liturgical Context

Historically, Syria was a region consisting of various different peoples and cultures. Gregory Dix describes this heterogeneity by describing the area as a “mosaic of different races, cultures, religions and languages, which no political framework has ever held together for long.”⁵ Even Hellenism's spread through the conquests of Alexander the Great in the third century BC failed to bring cultural uniformity under the Star of

Addai and Mari” in Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers, ed. Paul F. Bradshaw (Collegeville, 1997), pp. 19-37.

⁴ Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, p. 178.

Vergina, as it had done in much of the ancient world. Many Syrians preserved their Semitic language and traditions, which usually resulted in political conflict with those hellenized sections of the population. From the period c. 250-150 BC, the Seleucid kings of Antioch made possibly the strongest attempt to unify all of Syria by introducing the Greek language and culture everywhere in their domain. Needless to say, in such a diverse and cosmopolitan region as Syria, the attempt toward universal unification failed. Consequently, as Dix notes, Syria became “an older underlying patchwork of races, languages, traditions and religions, with a recent and different patchwork of hellenism and the surviving native cultures superimposed upon it.”⁶ Thus, during the first few centuries of Christianity, a Syrian man may have belonged to the indigenous population of his country (which may have meant he derived his ethnicity from as many as a half-dozen strains), but may have also been as hellenized and westernized in speech and mind as any citizen of Athens or Alexandria or Rome. His next-door neighbor, on the other hand, might also be a native Syrian, but may also have been as oriental in language and thought as his forefathers hundreds of years before. This diversity in Syria’s cultural and linguistic background played a major role in the liturgical development of the time. As Stephen B. Wilson comments, “Syrian Christianity would tend to reflect these wider cultural differences and would thus be marked by a pluriformity of belief and practice.”⁷ Consequently, three main branches of Christianity developed in Syria: (1) West Syrian,

⁵ Ibid. p. 173.

⁶ Ibid. p. 174.

⁷ Wilson, “The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari”, p. 19.

centered in Antioch; (2) South Syrian, centered in Jerusalem; and (3) East Syrian, focused in Edessa.⁸

Traditionally, liturgiologists identify five major families of early Christian liturgy: (1) the Jerusalem-Antiochian rites, adopted throughout the East; (2) the Alexandrian rite, used in Egypt and neighboring countries; (3) the Roman rite, particular to Rome and later to other parts of Western Europe; (4) the Gallican-Mozarabic rites, common in France and Spain and the rest of Western Europe; (5) and the Persian-Syriac rites.⁹ The Liturgy of Addai and Mari clearly falls into the family of Persian-Syriac rites.

The Liturgy of the Apostles Addai and Mari is essentially the official Nestorian liturgy of the East Syrian see of Edessa. The only other two Nestorian liturgies are those attributed to Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia,¹⁰ which, unlike Addai and Mari, are translations from the Greek.

⁸ Dix identifies a fourth rite, which he terms North-West Syrian, common in the regions immediately outside of Antioch. This rite apparently adopted the Liturgy of James but with one important difference. The text of the eucharistic prayer of James was not used. Instead, seventy alternative prayers were said, composed at all periods from the fourth-fifth centuries until the fifteenth. See Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, pp. 175, 176-77.

⁹ See "Introductory Notice to Early Liturgies", in Ante-Nicene Fathers: Lactantius, Venantius, Asterius, Victorinus, Dionysius, Apostolic Teaching and Constitutions, 2 Clement Early Liturgies. Volume 7. Eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson (Peabody, MA), pp. 529-36. Incidentally, the Clementine liturgy is an anaphora which does not belong to any of the aforementioned families. It forms part of Book Eight of the Apostolic Constitutions.

Modern liturgical scholarship has shown that even though the liturgies in each family possess their own particular characteristics and were used, as their family name indicates, in that region of the world, most major liturgies still influenced the composition of other liturgies belonging to other families. As is usually the case, scholars attempt to date liturgies in order to determine the level of influence between two texts. In most cases, however, two texts appear to be recensions of a much earlier anaphora, which is reworked by redactors to come up with the current text. A case in point are the liturgies attributed to St. Basil the Great. Scholars generally agree that there are two versions of Basil's liturgy: a Greek version and a Coptic (Egyptian) version. The three Greek versions, known as Byz-BAS, Arm-BAS, and Syr-BAS, are traced to a single source called Ω -BAS, believed to be Basil's redaction of an even earlier form, identified as Ur-BAS. The sole Coptic version, called E-BAS, is a separate redaction of Ur-BAS, modified independently from Ω -BAS. Also, while Ω -BAS may seemingly belong to the Jerusalem-Antiochian family, E-BAS belongs to the Alexandrian family. For an excellent study of the Basilian liturgical origins, see D. Richard Stuckwisch, "The Basilian Anaphoras" in Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers, ed. Paul F. Bradshaw (Collegeville, MN), pp. 109-30.

¹⁰ Nestorius was a student of Theodore, and his teachings were condemned by the Third Ecumenical Council at Ephesus (431 AD). In 436 Bishop Hiba (Ibas), who possessed Nestorian sympathies, established

Important Liturgical Terms

Before proceeding to a proper discussion of Addai and Mari's structure, it would be helpful to identify a number of Syriac liturgical terms, which are used in its study.

A *cushapa* is a private intercessory prayer offered by the celebrant. This form is comparable to the private devotional prayers common within the Byzantine or Western liturgical traditions. The celebrant offers the *cushapa* as a means of preparation for the reception of Holy Communion or as his own personal expression of piety or repentance.

The *gehanta*, which means 'inclination', is an intercessory prayer said in a low voice. This resembles the mystical, or silent, prayers, spoken by the celebrant but not heard by the people.¹¹

The *qanona* is the audible conclusion to the *gehanta*. Within the Byzantine tradition, this is known as the *ἐκφώνησις* (the 'exclamation'), which is intoned loudly upon the completion of the mystical prayer, and is meant to be heard by everyone.

The *kuddasha* (cf. Heb. *Qeduššah*, the rabbinical term for the synagogue prayer) the which means 'sanctification', 'hallowing', or 'consecration', is used as a title of the whole eucharistic liturgy and of the anaphora itself. The very use of this term for the liturgical anaphora identifies the primary function of the liturgy as consecratory, be it the consecration of the people of God or the Gifts offered to God to be sanctified.

the famous school at Edessa as a center of Nestorianism under the leadership of Narsai the great teacher. Toward the end of the fifth century the Monophysites overtook Edessa, thus forcing the followers of Theodore to relocate to Nisibis in Persia. This relative geographical isolation from the West forced the East Syrian Church to develop its own form of Christian liturgy and theology, which it later spread in the form of missionary efforts as far east as China, India, and Tibet. For a succinct historical overview, see Wilson, "The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari", pp. 19-20.

¹¹ The *gehanta* may very well indicate the later addition of such silent prayers, which are foreign to the very earliest liturgical traditions. As Dix hypothesized, the earliest Christian anaphoras found the bishop alone reciting out loud the one eucharistic prayer, which contained the meaning of the rite. Any additional "private prayers" are later additions which reflect the evolving manners in which the Eucharist is understood and celebrated, e.g. the "mystical" presence of Christ in the Eucharist, the "fearful, unbloody sacrifice" (*ἡ φρικодέστατος, ἀναιμακτος θυσία*), spoken by Cyril of Jerusalem (348 AD), etc.

The *hudra* is a Nestorian service book. Bryan Spinks identifies a particular *hudra* from the Church of *Mar Esa'ya* in Mosul,¹² containing (1) the proper of the liturgy; and (2) the offices for Sundays, feasts of the Lord, and the principal saints' days.

The *Sharar*, which means 'confirm' or 'strengthen', is the opening of a prayer in the pre-anaphora of the Third Anaphora of St. Peter. For the sake of brevity, this liturgy is also called *Sharar*, a Maronite liturgy common in the areas of Jordan, Israel, and Lebanon.

The Structure of Addai and Mari

The following text is a working English translation of the anaphora of Addai and Mari, taken from the oldest Syriac text available, *Mar Esa'ya*.¹³ The proposed division into different sections will facilitate the discussion of the liturgy's structure.

SECTION A

Priest: Peace be with you.

People: And with you and your spirit.

Deacon: Give peace to one another in the love of Christ.

People: For all the *Catholikoi*.

Deacon: Let us give thanks and intercede.

Priest: The grace of our Lord, etc.

People: Amen.

Priest: Lift up your minds. (*lit.* May your minds be above.)

People: Towards you, O God.

Priest: The oblation is offered to God the Lord of all.

People: It is fit and right.

Deacon: Peace be with us.

SECTION B

Priest recites quietly:

Worthy of praise from every mouth, and thanksgiving from every tongue, is the adorable and glorious Name of the Father and the Son and of the Holy Spirit, who created the world by his grace and its inhabitants in his compassion, and redeemed mankind in his mercy, and has effected [*lit. made*] great grace towards mortals.

SECTION C

Your majesty, O Lord, a thousand thousand heavenly beings worship and myriad myriads of angels, hosts of spiritual beings, ministers (of) fire and of spirit, with cherubim and holy seraphim, glorify your Name

Qanona. Crying out and glorifying . . .

¹² See Bryan D. Spinks, *Worship: Prayers from the East*, pp. 2-3.

¹³ *Ibid.* pp. 3-6. See also note 2 of this chapter.

People: Holy, holy, holy . . . [*Sanctus*]

SECTION D

Priest recites quietly:

And with these heavenly powers we give thanks to you, O Lord, even we, your lowly, weak and miserable servants, because you have effected in us a great grace which cannot be repaid, in that you put on our humanity so as to quicken us by your divinity. And you lifted up our poor estate, and righted our fall. And you raised up our mortality. And you forgave our debts. You justified our sinfulness and you enlightened our understanding. And you, our Lord and our God, vanquished our enemies and made triumphant the lowliness of our weak nature through the abounding compassion of your grace.

Qanona. And for all . . .

People: Amen.

Deacon: In your minds . . .

SECTION E

Priest recites quietly:

You, O Lord, in your unspeakable mercies make a gracious remembrance for all the upright and just fathers who have been pleasing before you in the commemoration of the body and blood of your Christ which we offer to you upon the pure and holy altar as you have taught us. And grant us your tranquility and your peace all the days of the world.

Repeat.

People: Amen.

SECTION F

That all the inhabitants of the earth may know that you alone are God, the true Father, and you have sent our Lord Jesus Christ, your Son and your beloved, and he, our Lord and our God, taught us in his life-giving gospel all the purity and holiness of the prophets, apostles, martyrs and confessors and bishops and priests and deacons, and of all the children of the holy catholic church, who have been marked with the mark of holy baptism.

SECTION G

And we also, O Lord, - *three times* - your lowly, weak and miserable servants, who are gathered together and stand before you at this time have received by tradition of the example which is from you, rejoicing, and glorifying, and magnifying, and commemorating and praising, and performing this great and dread mystery of the passion and death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ.

SECTION H

May he come, O Lord, your Holy Spirit and rest upon this oblation (of)

And the deacon says: Be in silence:

of your servants, and bless and hallow it, that it may be to us, O Lord, for the pardon of debts and the forgiveness of sins, and a great hope of resurrection from the dead and a new life in the kingdom of heaven with all who have been pleasing before you.

SECTION I

And for all your marvelous economy towards us we give you thanks and praise you without ceasing in your Church redeemed by the precious blood of your Christ, with open mouths and with uncovered faces.

*Qanona.*¹⁴ Lifting up praise and honor and confession and worship to your living and life-giving Name now and ever and world without end.

People: Amen.

¹⁴ The final *qanona* is taken from Dix's translation of the *Mar Esa'ya* text. See Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, p. 180.

As already stated, a common denominator agreed upon by liturgical scholars studying Addai and Mari is the liturgy's obvious semitic style and language. The first and clearest evidence of this Oriental style within the anaphora is the widespread use of parallelism. As Wilson notes, "One of the effects of this literary device is to allow for unity and progression within a text in a manner that is quite different from that created by means of linear progression."¹⁵ Whereas a linear style renders a logical, thematic, or narrative progression from one point to another, parallelism produces a 'musical effect' by allowing the text to 'move' between a theme's variations. "Accordingly, when parallelism is employed within an anaphora, it emphasizes the poetic quality of the prayer."¹⁶

Wilson also maintains that an added feature which distinguishes Addai and Mari is its 'economy of expression', or minimal use of modifiers and details when chronicling events of salvation history or describing God. This is especially evident when comparing Addai and Mari to the much longer Maronite text of *Sharar*. For example, when Addai and Mari addresses God, it does so in the simplest manner: 'Lord.' On the contrary, *Sharar* lists together a number of descriptive epithets, such as "Lord, God of Abraham, savior of Isaac, strength of Israel." This extensive use of description does account for *Sharar*'s lengthier text, albeit in part. As Wilson points out, Addai and Mari's "economy of expression . . . allows the central elements within a text to remain prominent by not obscuring them with secondary or tertiary considerations."¹⁷

¹⁵ Wilson, p. 27.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid. pp.27, 28.

One notices that in Addai and Mari, there are different modes of addressing God, significant differences that have complicated the task of dating parts of the text.¹⁸ In Section B above, God is referred to in the third person, with the trinitarian phrase “the adorable and glorious Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.” By contrast, in Section C, either the Father or the Godhead God is addressed directly in the vocative case (‘O Lord’). In the first *gehanta*, Section D, ‘O Lord’ refers this time to Christ, because of the phrase ‘you put on our humanity.’ In the second *gehanta*, as Wilson notes (but Spinks’ English rendition fails to express), the referent once again becomes the Father but quickly oscillates to the Son, thanks to the phrase ‘as you taught us.’¹⁹

The First *Gehanta*

As stated earlier, Addai and Mari oscillates between the Father and the Son when addressing this part of the eucharistic prayer to God.²⁰ In this first *gehanta*, Addai and Mari addresses God in the third person singular while *Sharar*, on the other hand, addresses this prayer in the second person singular and then consistently throughout, most likely to the Son. Other minor textual differences exist between both texts, but they are so insignificant that one often wonders which text maintains the better reading.

¹⁸ Indeed, the very tedious task of attempting to make sense of the various forms of address within the same eucharistic prayer must be reserved for another time and is outside of the scope of this study. However, suffice it to say that one of two solutions is possible: (1) AM, like *Sharar*, may have had a consistent form of address at some time; and (2) AM may have become the product of various redactions throughout its history. Which elements of the prayer can be considered original remains a challenging topic for debate. As Wilson states, the acceptance of either of the two perspectives can only be founded on logic rather than textual evidence, because of the limitation (or, in many cases, lack thereof) of the latter.

¹⁹ Spinks’ translation of the AM (Addai and Mari) *Mar Esa’ya* text reads: “. . . and he, our Lord and our God, taught us in his life-giving gospel . . .”. Wilson ascribes to the translation “as you taught us”, in which case it appears that the referent becomes the Son once again. For Spinks, the Father is still being addressed, so no oscillation to an alternative referent has taken place.

²⁰ It should be noted that among the ancient liturgies in which the anaphora is addressed to the Son, aside from *Sharar*, are: the Egyptian *Liturgy of St. Gregory* and another Egyptian prayer published by Hyvernat; the Syrian Monophysite *Second Liturgy of St. Peter*; three Ethiopic liturgies, part of the eucharistic prayer of Syriac *St. James*, as well as sixty or seventy lesser Syriac liturgies. See Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 180.

The *Presanctus* and *Sanctus*

An important area of discussion within the anaphoras of both Addai and Mari and *Sharar* is the *Sanctus* and its surrounding material. The most convincing proof of the antiquity of this material lies in the fact that the *Sanctus* exists in *both* eucharistic prayers, but with minimal variation. Arguments denying the originality of the *Sanctus* and *Presanctus* may be summarized in the following two points: (1) the introductory phrase (Section C, ‘Your majesty, O Lord . . .’) appears to lack any connection with the material that precedes it; and (2) this material seems to interrupt, or break, the sequence of expression between the first *gehanta*, which focuses upon the description of the gift of God’s grace in creation, and the second *gehanta*, which describes God’s redemption in Jesus Christ. Counter arguments against the above two stances make a case by widening the meaning of the word ‘inhabitants’, found in the first *gehanta* of Section B, to include both earthly *and* heavenly dwellers. This definition would then allow the *Sanctus* to flow more smoothly out of the *Presanctus* and would not render a choppy sequence of thought.²¹

One can hypothetically say that since the *Sanctus* and its adjacent material exist in both Addai and Mari and *Sharar*, the material itself can be dated as quite old. However, the discontinuity and choppy sequence of thought within both anaphoras still necessitates further discussion and argumentation on the originality of the *Sanctus*. As Wilson writes: “Put simply, the *Sanctus* is unquestionably an early part of the prayer but the antiquity of this material does not preclude the possibility that it is an addition to a preexisting text.”²²

²¹ Incidentally, in the third *gehanta* (Section F), the text clearly reverts back to the ‘conventional’ meaning of ‘inhabitants’ as human beings.

²² Wilson, p. 30.

Gregory Dix, following the 'established tradition' of Edward C. Ratcliff,²³ denies any sense of continuity between the *Sanctus* and its Preface with the material preceding and following it. Consequently, he believes the *Sanctus* is an interpolation.²⁴ This traditional view, however, is slowly being challenged by modern scholarship.

The Second *Gehanta*

In the second *gehanta*, alternatively called the *Postsanctus*, one clearly finds the closest parallels between Addai and Mari and *Sharar*. This common ground means that both anaphoras can trace their origin to a common source. However, alongside these similarities are also differences, but Ratcliff claims that it is *Sharar* which probably has preserved the more accurate core material. Twenty-eight common Syriac words are shared by both liturgies (45 purely Syriac terms in Addai and Mari, 31 in *Sharar*).

Besides minor differences such as the inclusion of conjunctions and synonyms in one prayer and not in the other, four significant discrepancies do exist between the Maronite rite and the rite of Edessa. First, the phrase 'And with these heavenly powers' (Section D) clearly attempts to connect the *Sanctus* with the current *gehanta*. In *Sharar*, the connection between earthly and heavenly praise is made by an abrupt, awkward statement "Let us also, Lord . . . Holy, Holy, Holy." Wilson believes that "because the arrangement of *Sharar* is somewhat clumsy, it is possible that a redactor of AM [Addai and Mari] has smoothed out the earlier version for a more fluent reading."²⁵ A second point of contention between both anaphoras is found in Addai and Mari's use of the phrase 'your lowly, weak and miserable servants' (Section G), whereas *Sharar* uses the

²³ See The Study of Liturgy. Eds. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, Edward Yarnold, and Paul Bradshaw (New York, 1978), p. 218; also, see Edward C. Ratcliff, "The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: A Suggestion" in Journal of Theological Studies 30 (1929) 23-32.

²⁴ Dix, p. 180.

more compact ‘sinful servants.’ Interestingly, the liturgies of both Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia also share Addai and Mari’s expression, thus giving credence to the belief that the expression is particular to Eastern Syria and Edessa.²⁶ A third difference is Addai and Mari’s use of the paraphrase ‘our Lord and our God’ (Section F) from John 20.28, which recounts Thomas’ confession of the visible and tangible resurrected Christ. The insertion of this paraphrase makes sense, since the preceding statement refers to enlightenment and knowing God. The fourth and final difference is the addition, in Addai and Mari, of the word ‘lowliness’ and the clause ‘through the abounding compassion of you grace’ (Section D).

The Third *Gehanta*

It is in the third *gehanta* where Addai and Mari and *Sharar* begin to differ considerably. The opening of the *gehanta* in both anaphoras is similar, but it appears that a redactor of the former expanded *Sharar*’s earlier ‘great mercy’ to read ‘in your unspeakable mercies.’²⁷ (Section E) Also, Addai and Mari appears to have added ‘pleasing before you’, in order to coincide with ‘all the upright and just fathers.’

After *Sharar* adds the Johannine quote of 6.55,²⁸ the two texts do not share any further similarities until the Epiklesis. Immediately following John 6.55, an Institution Narrative is addressed to Christ. This is an important point, because certain scholars claim that *Sharar* in fact preserved the original location (and possibly wording) of the

²⁵ Wilson, p. 31. Indeed, it may very well be the case also that both liturgies shared this awkwardness, but the literary revision reached Addai and Mari before *Sharar*. Wilson, at least, insinuates this view.

²⁶ Whatever position one takes, the whole idea of a people immersed in sin and sinfulness seemingly reflects a strong Judaic influence upon the text. This should come as no surprise, since Addai and Mari uses ancient Syriac, a derivative of Aramaic, as its language. *Ebionism* (Heb. *ebion* = poor, lowly) was a category into which those christological heresies emphasizing Christ’s humanity (e.g. Arianism, Nestorianism, etc.) were placed. *Ebionic* qualities, such as lowliness, sinfulness, and weakness, were understood as referring only to humans and not to God.

²⁷ Wilson, p. 31.

Institution Narrative that is oddly missing from Addai and Mari.²⁹ One argument against this missing Narrative is that the current text of Addai and Mari never did contain one, and it is highly unlikely that if one did exist it was dropped, especially with the insistence of later authors and redactors to include an Institution Narrative in their texts. A second argument favoring Addai and Mari's present form "is that its current structure has a certain structural and theological flow to it."³⁰ In other words, the inclusion of a full Institution Narrative would interrupt the natural flow of theological thought and structural uniformity within the text. As Dix convincingly proposes,

Addai and Mari has no explicit institution narrative, but it has an equivalent to it in this brief allusion to what happened at the last supper [*sic.*]. The important point to notice is that structurally it plays precisely that pivotal part in the whole prayer which the extended narrative plays in other prayers. It states the *authority* for performing the eucharist and justifies the petition for communion which is about to follow.³¹

Thus, the inclusion of a simple allusion to the Institution Narrative fulfills the task of linking the liturgical act with the 'bloodless sacrifice' of the Upper Room, while allowing the text to maintain its structural and theological fluency. In later liturgical development, the Narrative no longer remains valued for its allusive character, but as a necessary element in the consecratory Epiklesis, especially after the fourth century and specifically, in the churches of the West.

The Anamnesis

Without a doubt, this next section of Addai and Mari is clearly the most problematic in terms of structure. The major difficulty is derived from the fact that the

²⁸ "For My flesh is food indeed, and My blood is drink indeed" (NKJV translation).

²⁹ The absence of the Institution Narrative from any primitive eucharistic prayer, or as Enrico Mazza calls it, from any "paleoanaphora", is strange since the Narrative gives the liturgy its direct connection to Christ's command to "do this in remembrance of me." The Narrative identifies the eucharistic celebration with the Last Supper, which is itself a re-formation and redefinition of a popular Jewish religious meal. Early liturgical authors, on the whole, included the Institution Narrative or, at least, some reference to the events of the Upper Room, in order to preserve this historical continuity within their respective anaphora.

³⁰ Wilson, p. 32.

Anamnesis does not possess a verb. The analysis is further complicated because there are no literary parallels with the Maronite *Sharar* text. These two deficiencies in Addai and Mari have thus attracted much attention to this particular section of the liturgy.

The majority of scholars define the material of Section G as a 'full', independent Anamnesis that can stand on its own. Textual proof of this claim includes "use of the terms 'tradition' and 'commemorating,' as well as the mention of Christ's saving work."³² However, many scholars, such as Bernard Botte,³³ require an accompanying Institution Narrative in order to qualify the anaphora as 'full.' Botte does not hesitate in calling himself a conservative,³⁴ requiring an Institution Narrative and an Epiklesis in an anaphora in order to conform to the "majority [practice] of the Church." Wilson, however, counters this argument by stating: "Because we have certain presuppositions about what an element is and ought to entail, we then assume that if an item which is constitutive of the classification is not present, then it has 'dropped out.' It may be that we need to revise the category."³⁵

The absence of a verb in the Anamnesis section of Addai and Mari can be addressed in one of three ways: (1) the verb may still be sought in the sentence as it now stands; (2) the assumption can be made that the text was revised and the verb has consequently dropped out; or (3) the verb may be present outside the sentence.³⁶

The Epiklesis

³¹ Dix, p. 181.

³² Wilson, p. 33.

³³ See Bernard Botte, "L'anaphore chaldéenne des apôtres", in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 15 (1949) 259-76. Botte maintains: "Une anaphore qui comporterait une action de grâces et un récit de l'institution serait parfaitement logique. Une autre qui se composerait d'une action de grâces et d'une épiclese le serait également, tout en n'étant pas conformé à la tradition de la majeure partie de l'Église" (p. 270).

³⁴ Ibid. p. 270: "On m'accusera peut-être d'être un affreux conservateur; mais j'aime mieux cela que perdre mon bon sens."

³⁵ Wilson, p. 33.

In the Epiklesis (Section H), the similarities between Addai and Mari and *Sharar* reappear. Addai and Mari adds the phrase ‘bless and hallow it’, thus signifying the Holy Spirit’s involvement in the liturgy as consecratory. Since *Theodore of Mopsuestia* and *Nestorius*’ anaphoras also include the same wording, it may very well be that the phrase is, in fact, an interpolation in order to bring Addai and Mari into conformity with the other two East Syrian rites.

Supporters of Addai and Mari’s antiquity must also deal with the role of the Holy Spirit in the ‘event’ of consecration. A unique feature of some paleoanaphoras (like Addai and Mari) is the attribution of the ‘consecratory act’ to the Second Person of the Holy Trinity (in which Christ is besought to send down the Holy Spirit to consecrate the Holy Gifts), even though Addai and Mari oscillates back and forth between the Father and the Son as the referent of the prayer’s address. Dix does not disqualify the possibility that the inclusion of the Holy Spirit in the Epiklesis may have possibly been a later interpolation by redactors to bring Addai and Mari in conformity with Greek fourth century developments.³⁷ However, he also does not feel comfortable calling Addai and Mari’s Epiklesis an epiklesis at all, since no consecration of the elements is actually taking place. Instead, the prayer asks God to bestow upon the worshiping community the *benefits of communion*,³⁸ that is, “the pardon of debts and the forgiveness of sins, and a great hope of resurrection from the dead and a new life in the kingdom of heaven with all who have been pleasing before you.” Edward Ratcliff also holds this position, adding though that the Epiklesis in Addai and Mari “is of the same type as that in *Ap. Trad.*, not

³⁶ For more explicit information, see Wilson, pp. 33-34.

³⁷ The Church convened at the Second Ecumenical Synod in Constantinople (381 AD) to defeat the teachings of Eunomius, the leader of Arianism’s radical wing, who taught against the divinity of the Holy

a consecratory epiklesis but rather a prayer for the fruits of communion,”³⁹ suggesting that the Epiklesis was originally a communion devotion, only later incorporated into the anaphora itself. This ‘devotional’ Epiklesis may indicate that the form in Addai and Mari is a more ancient form from later variations, which tend to be consecratory toward the elements of the bread and wine. Botte comes close to this position also. “He stresses that the epiclesis is archaic in type and Semitic in style, but agrees that it is a secondary element that has been introduced clumsily into a prayer whose unity it breaks.”⁴⁰

Bryan Spinks offers further possible evidence that the Epiklesis in Addai and Mari is in truth ancient. An Epiklesis like Addai and Mari which asks for the Spirit ‘to come’, rather than ‘to be sent’, indicates an earlier date.⁴¹ In fact, the ‘come’ terminology possesses eschatological undertones (“Maranatha! Lord, come!”),⁴² and is thus probably in line with early Judaeo-Christian devotions.

The Doxology

The final portion of the prayer is clearly doxological in character and thus imitates the two preceding *qanonas*. The reason for the Doxology is God’s redemption ‘by the precious blood of your Christ’ (Section I). The term ‘economy’ in this final *qanona* has a

Spirit. Eunomianism was attacked fiercely by St. Gregory of Nyssa (*Contra Eunomium*) and condemned by the aforementioned synod.

³⁸ Dix, p. 183.

³⁹ The Study of Liturgy, p. 219.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ As has previously been stated, the orthodox doctrine of the co-equality between the Holy Spirit and the Father and Son was officially formulated by the Church in the latter half of the fourth century. Many orthodox authors of liturgy were already familiar with St. Basil’s trinitarian formula “Glory to the Father with (*μετά*) the Son together with (*σύν*) the Holy Spirit, as well as the more conventional “Glory to the Father through (*διά*) the Son and in (*έν*) the Holy Spirit.” They were also familiar with Basil’s reference to John 15.26, in which the Holy Spirit is sent by the Son but proceeds from the Father. This familiarity most certainly influenced their inclusion of the ‘send-sent’ terminology in their Epiklesis.

It is also interesting to note that whereas the Antiochian Epiklesis uses the terminology ‘make’ (*ποίησον*) for the elements, the Basilian Epiklesis (Egyptian-Basil and Byzantine-Basil) uses the term ‘show’ or ‘reveal’ (*ἀναδείξαι*).

⁴² Cf. Rev 22.20; 1 Cor 16.22.

much more obvious christological orientation, as compared to the previous smaller doxologies. Also, the term ‘Church’ is used in this Doxology, compared to the pronoun ‘us’ used in the previous *qanona* (Section E), although the ‘us’ is believed to be a later addition from other manuscripts.⁴³

In Section I, Addai and Mari uses the pronoun ‘we’, whereas *Sharar* includes the phrase ‘we your sinful servants.’ *Sharar* uses the same wording in its second *gehanta*, whereas Addai and Mari, in its own second *gehanta*, utilizes “we . . . your lowly, weak and miserable servants.” Other differences are relatively minor in this final section of the anaphora and can thus be overlooked.

Dix mentions that the Doxology is another attempt to redirect the prayer back to the Father, by inserting the words ‘your Christ.’ However, this concluding Doxology is nothing but the glorification of ‘the Name’ of God, clearly a semitic feature. Within the *qanona*, ‘the Name’ being glorified is the ‘the Name’ of Jesus, and so the interpolation ‘your Christ’ is not out of place. As Dix states: “The doxology here is not an ascription of praise to the Three Persons of the Trinity – nothing so theological! It is simply a ‘glorifying of the Name’ in the old jewish [*sic.*] fashion, and a remarkably beautiful one.”⁴⁴

A final important element of the concluding *qanona* is the supposition that the ‘missing verb’ of the anaphora mentioned earlier happens to be the expression ‘give

⁴³ Wilson, pp. 35-36.

⁴⁴ Dix, pp. 185-86. Dix compares this ‘glorifying of the Name’ with the Jewish prayer known as ‘Half-Kaddish’, used to close the separate portions of the ancient worship in the synagogue: “Magnified and hallowed be His great Name in the world which He created according to His will. May He establish His Kingdom in your lifetime and in your days, and in the lifetime of all the house of Israel speedily and in a near time. May His great Name be blessed for ever and to all eternity.” In the anaphora of Addai and Mari, the world *has been* re-created in the precious Blood of Christ and the Kingdom *has been* established. Thus, the Eucharist itself is the realization of the ancient Jewish eschatological expectation.

thanks' (Section I). In his comparative essay, Jean Magne⁴⁵ obviously ascribes to the third theory of the 'missing verb' mystery (see page 24). In other words, the verb, whatever it may be, is likely to be found outside of the Anamnesis section.

The Theology of Addai and Mari

Although an exhaustive review of Addai and Mari's implied theological concepts can be a tedious endeavor, taking up much time and leading to many unanswered questions, specifically regarding the liturgy's origin and dating, I shall at this point limit myself to three important aspects of this ancient anaphora's theology: (1) the eschatological concept of the Presence (*Shekinah*); (2) the theology of the Holy Spirit in the Epiklesis; and (3) the use of 'Economy', 'Church', and the 'Name' in the Doxology.

The Eschatological Concept of the Presence (*Shekinah*)

In Addai and Mari, part of the Anamnesis reads: "And we also, O Lord, . . . who are gathered together and stand before you at this time" (Section G). This powerful image of standing before God in the liturgy has an eschatological dimension of standing before the Presence of the Almighty Judge, who has gathered before Himself all the nations and peoples of the world at the Second Coming (cf. Mt 25.31-46). Hippolytus of Rome also conveys this very same image of the Presence, except that in his *Apostolic Tradition*, he places this reference *before* its Institution Narrative. In Addai and Mari, the reference goes after its version of the Institution Narrative which, as already noted, is an allusion: "we . . . have received by tradition of the example which is from you" (Section G).

Dix states: "Behind all this section of *Addai and Mari* lies the New Testament idea of the eucharist as an anticipation of the second coming and last judgment" for, as he

⁴⁵ Jean Magne, "L'anaphore nestorienne dite d'Adée et Mari et l'anaphore maronite dite de Pierre III. Étude comparative", in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 53 (1987) 145-47.

continues, “in scriptural language to ‘stand before’ God has often the sense of ‘to appear for judgment.’”⁴⁶ Standing in the presence of God, that is, before His judgment seat at the consummation of time, is clearly reflected in Jewish liturgical literature. In the *Abodah* prayer of the *Shemoneh Esreh*, the text reads: “In your love accept soon the sacrifices and prayers of Israel with good will . . . and may our eyes see your return to Zion.”⁴⁷ Two requests are made here: an acceptance of the sacrifice and the coming of God’s Presence, or *Shekinah*, as an expression of hope. Addai and Mari, deeply rooted within a highly semitic linguistic and cultural milieu, identified with such concepts and thus incorporated them into the anaphora.⁴⁸ To re-echo Dix’s position, the Eucharist itself is the realization of the ancient Jewish expectation, since Christ *has already come* (the Eucharist) and the Kingdom *has already been established* (the Church) through His resurrection. In the Eucharist the Lord makes His Presence (*Shekinah*) felt, and so the faithful who partake of Him in the elements of the bread and wine stand before Him and become one with Him.

To what degree, however, is Christ present in the eucharistic elements? W.O.E. Oesterley attempts to provide some clarity to this question by showing how the simple and primitive form of Epiclesis is related to the Jewish idea of *Shekinah*, or Presence.⁴⁹ A word in itself, especially one spoken by God or in God’s holy name, was deemed honorable and sacred, since it was endowed with divine power from on high. This infusion of divine grace was made possible through the uttering of a blessing, filled with

⁴⁶ Dix, p. 181.

⁴⁷ Thomas Elavanal, *The Memorial Celebration: A Theological Study of the Anaphora of the Apostles Mar Addai and Mari* (Kerala, India) 1988, p. 156.

⁴⁸ Early Christians strongly believed that the Second Coming (*Parousia* = *Appearance*) was not too far at hand. Many were convinced that the end of the world was to occur within their own lifetime. The eschatological prayer Maranatha – “Lord, come!” (Rev. 22.20) was constantly on the lips of Christians, who believed that they were living before the Presence, the imminence of the *Parousia*, and affirmed this at the Sunday eucharistic celebration.

⁴⁹ Ibid. p. 157.

God's very *Shekinah*. Some scholars believe that this idea can be thought of as the antecedent of our current understanding of sacramental presence.

The divine Name, within Jewish understanding, was also thought to have an inherent potency to effect the blessing, since God's name, like all names, was an extension of the individual. All this makes much more sense when one stops to realize the numberless restrictions dictated by Mosaic Law regarding speaking God's all-powerful name in vain or using one's words in conversation haphazardly. The word was sacred, and nowhere indeed does this appear more true than in the liturgical anaphora. As Elavanal writes: "Name, is a Jewish designation to denote the power of God. So, to call on the Name of God to repose on an object or person is an epicletic prayer of blessing, and it can be considered as an antecedent of the eucharistic epiclesis."⁵⁰

The Theology of the Holy Spirit in the Epiklesis

An interesting inclusion in the anaphora of Addai and Mari is the role of the Holy Spirit in the Epiklesis. While at first such a reference to the Third Person of the Trinity may seem to challenge the antiquity of this East Syrian anaphora,⁵¹ it seems to make more sense when one discerns what *kind of consecration* is taking place. Elavanal holds the position that the Epiklesis is not, in the strict sense, a consecratory prayer, since it does not pray for a mystical or metaphysical change of the bread and wine. Quite the

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Like most liturgical scholars, Dix also claims that during the first three centuries of Christianity, there is no proof that the Holy Spirit was in fact invoked to effect any consecration, whether of the elements or the people. The consecration, during this period, was invariably ascribed *to the Son* and not to the Spirit. After the fourth century, especially when the Second Ecumenical Synod of Constantinople (381 AD) established the orthodox doctrine of the Third Person of the Trinity, then does one see an overwhelming inclusion of the Spirit in effecting the consecration (see notes 37 and 41 of this chapter).

Interestingly, Dix mentions that there is one Syrian piece of evidence from the third century that the Holy Spirit does, in fact, play some part in the consecration of the elements of bread and wine. The text is the Syrian *Didascalia*, which states that "the eucharist through the Spirit is accepted and sanctified" (Dix, p. 278).

contrary, the Spirit is invoked to help effect the fruits of communion in those faithful who partake of the Eucharist.

So, this epiklesis is a prayer, not for the consecration of bread and wine but for the consecration or sanctification of the communicants through the reception of the Eucharist. It is a supplication for the fruitful communion whereby the present celebration may have its eschatological fulfilment, when the community may join the heavenly group in an eternal hymn of praise to God.⁵²

Elavanal continues that in all the earliest forms of Epiklesis, “the accent was not on the conversion of the elements but on the effects of communion.”⁵³ This work of the Spirit on the communicants was considered to be the most sublime wonder He effected in the eucharistic celebration.

In post-fourth century Eastern anaphoras, it is clear that the *Person* of the Holy Spirit is effecting the change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. An attractive position has been taken by certain scholars that it is still God (or rather His *Shekinah* – Presence) that is participating in the Epiklesis, and not the Spirit specifically who is active, even though ‘Holy Spirit’ is mentioned within the text.

To understand this position, one needs to examine the semitic use of the terms ‘spirit’ and ‘holy spirit’ within Scripture. What exactly is the meaning of ‘your Holy Spirit’ (Section H) in a prayer which oscillates between the Father and the Son? In Jewish literature, ‘holy spirit’ is frequently associated with the Presence (*Shekinah*). Although there are certain limitations one must be aware of between ‘presence of God’ and ‘spirit of God’, Jewish literature identifies the spirit not as a *hypostasis*, but as a *force*, an *energy*, to use St. Gregory Palamas’ characteristic description. Dix observes that “it is clear that in the Old Testament ‘the spirit of the Lord’ which brings superhuman strength, wisdom, insight, etc., is not intended to represent a personal agent, but a force – in the

⁵² Elavanal, p. 172.

older stories, often almost a physical force.”⁵⁴ The ‘spirit of the Lord’ refers to God’s presence as energizing or activating (especially in terms of prophesying),⁵⁵ while ‘the holy spirit’, equally impersonal, seems to make reference to God’s presence ‘resting’ on a thing or person, such as ‘the cloud’ of the *Shekinah* resting upon the Mercy Seat. One sees this also in Psalm 51 (50 LXX), in which “do not cast me away from Your presence” is equated with “do not take Your Holy Spirit from me.” Both the Mishnah and Talmud, in narrating a story about the gathering of the seventy scribes to Jamnia for the purpose of translating the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek, mention that “a mysterious voice was heard saying, ‘There is here a man who is worthy that the holy spirit [‘the presence’, *Talmud*] should rest upon him, but that his generation is not worthy.’”⁵⁶ Thus, *ruh-hakodesh* (‘holy spirit’) and *Shekinah* (‘Presence’) are used interchangeably.

Consequently, it may very well be the case that ‘your Holy Spirit’, mentioned in the Epiklesis of Addai and Mari, is in fact a reference to ‘the presence’ of Christ. In such a context, coupled with Elavanal’s stance of the Epiklesis as not an actual consecratory petition for the elements but a request for the hallowing of the faithful participants within the Eucharist,⁵⁷ the antiquity of Addai and Mari can, at least on this ground, be safe. As a matter of fact, many early epikleses were thought to be derived from personal devotional prayers for communion.⁵⁸

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Dix, p. 184.

⁵⁵ See Luke 4.18 and OT parallel reference Is 61.1). See also Judges 3.10, 6.34, 14.6; 1 Samuel 10.6, 16.13, 16.14; 1 Kings 18.12; 2 Kings 2.16; Isaiah 11.2; Ezekiel 11.5; etc.

⁵⁶ Dix, p. 184.

⁵⁷ A minor observation, but perhaps not without merit: in the Western Syrian and Jerusalem epicleses, the verb is in the *imperative mood* (e.g. *ποιήσον* and *ἀπόστειλον*), denoting a particular request for an action by God. In Addai and Mari, the English translation places the verb in the *optative mood* (“*May he come, O Lord, your Holy Spirit and rest . . .*”), denoting not a direct command but a wish or desire.

⁵⁸ Various Eastern devotional prayers, such as those found in the “Service of Preparation for Holy Communion”, beseech God to bestow upon the communicants the spiritual benefits of the Eucharist (e.g. forgiveness of sins, life eternal, the betrothal of the future life and kingdom, etc.). Such private prayers,

The Use of 'Economy', 'Church', and the 'Name' in the Doxology

The anaphoras of Addai and Mari and *Sharar* make use of three early Christian terms which provide further proof of their antiquity: (1) 'Economy'; (2) 'Church'; and (3) 'the Name.' The first two concepts can be better understood if one turns his attention to the Anamnesis (Section G) and the second *gehanta* (Section D) of Addai and Mari.

The term 'economy' in *Sharar* corresponds to 'this great and dread mystery of the passion and death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ' (Section G). The linkage between the terms 'economy' and 'mystery'⁵⁹ is reminiscent of Ephesians 1.9-10, synonymous first century expressions used to elaborate upon Christ's saving work.

The term 'Church', used in the final Doxology of Addai and Mari (Section I), corresponds to *Sharar's* 'those who have been sealed with the seal of holy baptism' (end of the second *gehanta*) and, more specifically, those "who gathered and stand before you." The first image in the Maronite text reflects a sacramental (and perhaps individualistic) understanding of the Church. In other words, the Church is comprised of those *individuals* who have committed to Christ sacramentally, each by choosing to be "sealed with the seal of holy baptism", the outward expression and proof of their membership in Christ. On the other hand, the second image from *Sharar* presents an eschatological and more collective view of the Church. Numerous scholars have affirmed that the act of "standing" before God implies an image of the future judgment before the

may be said to have an epiletic character about them, unconventionally speaking, and are certainly conducive to the needs of the laity to pray to God, as the celebrant clergyman does, for a particular consecration to be effected.

⁵⁹ The mystery (*μυστήριον* = 'I hide' or 'I conceal from view') of God's plan of salvation, a plan concealed from the knowledge and eyes of even the angels, is a plan by which God seeks to unite, under His own law, the house of his elect people Israel (*οἰκονομία* = 'the law of the house'). This unity is achieved through the entry of God's Son into the world.

throne of God, in which all peoples will be gathered before Him.⁶⁰ Indeed, although each person shall be judged individually, nonetheless the people stand as a collective unit before the throne of God.

Addai and Mari's reference to 'open mouths' and 'uncovered faces' is perhaps a reminder that those who have received baptism and sacramental membership in the Church, and who are cognizant of God's great spiritual benefits in their lives, may openly and without shame proclaim God's glory to the rest of the world without the fear of rebuke or chastisement from others. Also, these two expressions offer a fascinating conclusion to a liturgy otherwise preoccupied with the angelic world, by raising a redeemed mankind, characterized as 'lowly, weak, and miserable', to a level of unrestricted doxology before God, 'with open mouths and with uncovered faces.'

The reference to the Name in the Doxology (Section I) closes the anaphora of Addai and Mari. This *qanona* is obviously quite different from later doxological proclamations, since the former does not make any particular reference to the Trinity.⁶¹ Following its highly semitic style, the *qanona* is simply a glorifying of the Name of Christ Jesus.⁶²

Conclusion

It has been the intent of this chapter to provide a general overview of the contextual background, structure, and theology of the ancient East Syrian liturgy Addai and Mari. In this attempt, I have attempted to concentrate mainly on those elements that can provide clearer proof of the anaphora's antiquity. While this particular anaphora has

⁶⁰ See Matthew 25.31-46, the Parable read on Judgment (or Meatfare) Sunday in the Orthodox Church.

⁶¹ Perhaps there was never a need to do so! It seems that the full trinitarian *ἐκφωνήσεις* were phrased in order to affirm the equality of all three Persons of the Trinity. It is in the fourth century, especially upon the

certainly been proven not to be exempt from revision and manipulation over the centuries, its highly semitic flavor in both language and mindset, coupled with the majority of the eucharistic prayer being addressed to the Son, provides convincing evidence that the original anaphora was anything but a later liturgy.

At the same time though, even the most exhaustive study of Addai and Mari or, for that matter, any primitive or later anaphora, will yield as many pertinent questions at the end as it intended to answer in the beginning. Such an expected result proves a fundamental truth in the study of all liturgy: that essentially, liturgy is a living and evolving organism, one to which man gives birth and over the ages modifies in order to better assist him in his personal and communal response to the revelation of God in his life and the life of the Church.

completion of the first two Ecumenical Councils, that doxological statements involving all three Persons begin to be interpolated, both in earlier and later anaphoral texts.

⁶² See note 44 of this chapter.

Chapter Two The Liturgical Tradition of the Byzantine Anaphora of St. Basil the Great

Introduction

Within modern liturgical scholarship there is little, if no, doubt that the Liturgy of St. Basil the Great (hereafter, BAS) is paradigmatic of all liturgies that gained prominence among Eastern Orthodox churches. Even in the more eucharistic churches of the West, BAS still remains one of the foremost influential models for modern developments in the composition of eucharistic prayers. Historically, as D. Richard Stuckwisch observes, “the Anaphora of St. Basil the Great [BAS] is a key to some of the many anaphoral changes and developments that took place among Christians in the fourth century.”¹

It is very important to remember that the Basilian liturgical tradition does not include only one liturgy. Most Orthodox Christians, especially the Greek Orthodox, have the tendency to associate St. Basil with what they believe to be the only liturgy he composed: the Byzantine liturgy that dominated the capital city of Constantinople up until the twelfth century.² When referring to BAS, it is more appropriate to speak of several anaphoras, which fall under two major groupings.³ Each Basilian liturgy is obviously related to each other in some way, but in some places there exist radical textual differences. Identifying similarities and differences between the different versions of

¹ D. Richard Stuckwisch, “The Basilian Anaphoras”, in Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers, ed. Paul F. Bradshaw (Collegeville, MN), p. 109. BAS could hardly be considered an ‘archetypical’ example of an early Christian anaphora in all places for two main reasons: (1) such uniformity was simply non-existent; and (2) several elements within the prayer were clearly later embolisms that reflected a later theological period and place of origin (e.g. trinitarian affirmations of God, moment of consecration, etc.).

² The Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom. Trans. Faculty of Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology (Brookline, MA, 1985), p. xviii.

BAS can aid in understanding how anaphoras within and without a particular developed in the fourth century.

A Historical Context for the Development of the Basilian Tradition

Since the tradition of BAS encompasses several anaphoras that developed in different parts of the Christian world, it befits our study to briefly examine the historical, ecclesiastical, and linguistic contexts and shifts within areas that may have influenced the composition, transmission, and survival of the various Basilian anaphoras. The first place of interest is undoubtedly the Holy City – Jerusalem.

Jerusalem

As the birthplace of Christianity and the site of the first eucharistic celebrations, Jerusalem is of obvious importance to any Christian anaphora. In the Acts of the Apostles and the epistles of St. Paul, one senses the presence of “a substantial conservative Jewish element, suspicious of, and at times almost hostile to a Gentile mission.”⁴ In 70 AD Jerusalem was captured by a Roman army under Titus and the Temple destroyed. In 135 AD, the city was sacked following the Bar-Cochba revolt and the Jews were dispersed. On these two separate occasions, it appears the Christians found an opportunity to distance themselves from the Jews by vacating the Holy Land. In addition, the line of Hebrew-born bishops came to an abrupt end,⁵ as the new bishops now began to bear Gentile names and preside over a Greek-speaking church. In addition, the church in

³ For now, only the two major parent groups and their respective anaphoras are listed: (1) Ω-BAS (Syrian-BAS; Armenian-BAS; Byzantine-BAS); and (2) E-BAS (ESahidic-BAS; E-Bohairic-BAS; EGreek-BAS). The significance of each group and anaphora will be discussed a little later in this chapter.

⁴ John R.K. Fenwick, The Anaphora of St. Basil and St. James: An Investigation into their Common Origin (Rome, 1992), p. 3.

⁵ Eusebius, in his *Historia Ecclesiasticae* (IV.5-6), names fifteen bishops before the destruction of Jerusalem under Hadrian, repeatedly indicating their Hebrew origin. After the city of Aelia is built, Eusebius mentions that the church in it was composed of Gentiles and identifies its first bishop as Marcus, clearly not a Jewish name.

Jerusalem remained under the administrative jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Caesarea. It was not until the Fourth Ecumenical Council convened in Chalcedon on 451 AD that Bishop Juvenal of Jerusalem, after twenty-five long years of struggle,⁶ finally established Jerusalem as an independent patriarchate of its own, behind Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, which received autocephalous status before the Holy City. Unfortunately, there is no way of truly knowing what direct effect these changes had on the Church's liturgical tradition.⁷

The presence of a Greek-dominated Church in Jerusalem is supported by the Western nun and pilgrim Egeria,⁸ during her journey to the Holy Land in the early 380s, where she was exposed to a variety of Eastern liturgical services and celebrations. Liturgical worship was conducted in Greek, but Egeria specifically mentions that a simultaneous translation was made into the Syriac vernacular, meaning that speakers of the Syriac language made up a sizeable part of the congregation.

Egeria also mentions a widespread interest in, and liturgical use of, the Holy Places. The precedent for this emphasis was set half a century earlier by the Empress Helen, mother of Constantine the Great, who discovered the Holy Cross and had erected various Christian shrines honoring Christ's life and passion, one of which is Christianity's holiest temple: the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. Unsurprisingly, the

⁶ Dix, p. 174. Dix makes the interesting observation that essentially, history has repeated itself. In other words, the struggle and victory of the Holy City over Syria for autonomy is simply a 'christian [sic.] chapter' to the long story of the wars of Israel with Syria (see Book of Kings) and the Maccabean revolt against the Hellenized Seleucid kings.

⁷ A helpful summary and overview of liturgical life in Jerusalem may be found in J.F. Baldwin, Liturgy in Ancient Jerusalem (Nottingham, 1989).

⁸ For a good English translation of Egeria's itinerary in the Holy City, see J. Wilkinson, Egeria's Travels: Newly Translated with Supporting Documents and Notes (London, 1971). See also P. Bradshaw, Two Ways of Praying: Introducing Liturgical Spirituality (Nashville, 1995), esp. pp. 14-16.

anaphora of St. James (JAS), Jerusalem's primary liturgy, makes reference to these holy sites.

A third notable feature of Jerusalem that Egeria records is its fame as a pilgrim center. After the widespread persecutions against the Church subsided in the beginning of the fourth century, greater numbers of people journeyed from all over the Christian world, East and West, to pay homage to the earthly setting of God's economy for the salvation of the world. In addition, Church leaders and laity often visited Jerusalem for synodal and other meetings. Well before Egeria's travels, large numbers of bishops, some from Egypt, had gathered for the local Council of Tyre and the dedication of the buildings commemorating Golgotha in 335.

St. Basil, who visited Constantinople, Athens, Egypt, and Jerusalem between the years 348 and 356,⁹ was surely exposed to and influenced by the native liturgies of these areas. For this reason do liturgical scholars affirm the existence of many liturgies attributed to the Eastern father, rather than a single one. In 638, the Holy City fell to the Arabs under the Caliph Omar but did not surrender its renown as a cosmopolitan and pilgrim center.

Egypt

Scholars generally agree that the availability of historical details and information regarding the beginnings of Christianity in early Egypt is at best sparse.¹⁰ C.W. Griggs echoes an earlier theory about the existence of a possibly Gnostic version of Christianity in Egypt by writing: ". . . it is clear that much of Egypt for a long time

⁹ Fenwick, p. 19.

¹⁰ Ibid. p. 5.

continued to have a sizable portion of its Christian population following what later came to be defined as heretical doctrines and practices.”¹¹

Since Basil travelled to Egypt, as has already been established, it is important to establish a link between Egypt and Palestine. C.H. Roberts offers the supposition that Christianity reached Egypt from Palestine in a form strongly influenced by Judaism and was allied closely to Judaism for the first two centuries.¹² After the conquests of Trajan around 130 AD, the link with Judaism was gradually severed and an independent Egyptian version of Christianity was born. Following this break, a strong Coptic element (especially the written language) in the Church began to spread, thus producing a substantial amount of Christian literature. However, the conquests of Alexander the Great and his hellenization of the Mediterranean and North Africa several hundred years before rendered a predominantly Greek hierarchy outnumbered by a non-Greek populace. “In Egypt too,” writes Fenwick, “the indigenous liturgy (that of St. Mark) was very probably formed originally in Greek and subsequently translated into the vernacular.”¹³

The Coptic language existed in a number of dialects, of which the two major were: (1) Bohairic, in Lower (north) Egypt; and (2) Sahidic, in Upper (south) Egypt.¹⁴ Fenwick quotes the Coptic historian Atiyah as saying that “Bohairic is the earlier of the two since Lower Egypt would be most open to Greek and Christian influence.”¹⁵ Whatever the relationship between the two dialects might be, it was Bohairic that was

¹¹ C.W. Griggs, *Early Christian Egypt from Its Origins to 451 C.E.* (Leiden, 1990), p. 83.

¹² C.H. Roberts, *Manuscripts, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (Oxford, 1979), p. 49. Roberts makes a convincing point in doubting the strength of Egyptian Gnosticism in the second and third centuries, claiming instead the Egyptian Church’s strong Judaic background inherited from Palestine.

¹³ Fenwick, p. 6.

¹⁴ See note 3 of this chapter. These dialects were used to produce two versions of the Basilian anaphora: EB-BAS and ES-BAS. Whether they are Basil’s own work, or recensions, is unclear and improbable.

¹⁵ Fenwick, p. 6. Coptic, as the Ancient Egyptian language rooted in the externally influenced Bohairic dialect, derives from the Greek alphabet.

adopted in the eleventh century as the official liturgical language of the Coptic Church, apart from the Greek Melkites following the Fourth Ecumenical Council at Chalcedon in 451. The eventual extinction of Sahidic explains the small number of Sahidic manuscripts of the Liturgy of St. Basil.

In 640 the Arab invasion of Egypt helped free the indigenous Coptic Church from the pressures placed upon it by the Greek Melkites. This bright period of prosperity for the Copts though was short-lived. After 705, when Arabic was made the official language of the state, the Coptic language slowly began to die out. In the seventeenth century, Coptic was unknown as a living language, although it has survived to the present day as a liturgical language.

Antioch

As an early recipient of the infant Christian Faith, Antioch was a paradigmatic mixture of Hellenistic and Semitic culture.¹⁶ Ecclesiastically speaking, the dominant influence in Antioch until the fifth century and after was Greek, both in language and hierarchy. Shepherd affirms that the Hellenic influence upon the liturgy was not felt in Syria alone, but as far away as Constantinople. It is truly surprising that very little is known of Antioch's own native liturgy, despite St. John Chrysostom's homiletic tradition in the 380s, in which the Antiochene presbyter did make subtle references to the liturgy in his homilies. In its place, Antioch adopted the Jerusalem Liturgy of St. James somewhere around 397 and 431, making this the 'patriarchal rite' of the region.¹⁷

¹⁶ Dix, p. 173ff.

¹⁷ Ibid. p. 176. Dix identifies four important liturgical divisions in Syria which are worth noting: (1) the old so-called 'patriarchal rite' of the Church of Antioch (Syr-JAS?); (2) the other early West Syrian traditions which seem to have adopted the Liturgy of St. James, with the exception of seventy different eucharistic rites used apart from James; (3) the East Syrian tradition, centered in Edessa (Addai and Mari, *Sharar*, Nestorius, and Theodore of Mopsuestia); and (4) the South Syrian tradition of Jerusalem (Gr-JAS).

The Liturgy of St. James became caught up in what Fenwick calls the 'Melkite/Monophysite, Greek/Syriac split'¹⁸ that divided the churches of the Antiochian Patriarchate after Chalcedon. The Monophysite communities were reorganized by Jacob Baradeus, who ensured the survival of the Jacobite Church named after him. This resulted in the continued use of JAS among the Syriac-speaking natives after Byzantine influence among the Melkites led to its replacement by Byz-BAS and finally, the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom (CHR).

Suffering several earthquakes and the Persian invasions in the first part of the sixth century, Antioch finally succumbed to the Arabs in 638. The Jacobite communities later made further alterations in the liturgy, thanks to the efforts of another Jacob of Edessa (633-708).

Cappadocia

Cappadocia is first mentioned as a Roman province inhabited by Christian 'pilgrims of the Dispersion' in 1 Peter 1.1, where it is listed along with Pontus, Galatia, Asia, and Bithynia. Fenwick believes the first Christian communities in that region had been formed by Jews of the Diaspora.¹⁹

Presumably Cappadocia's most famous personality before the age of the Cappadocian Fathers was St. Gregory the Wonderworker (213-270 AD), known in the East as Thaumaturgos.²⁰ Gregory spent five years (c. 233-238) in Caesarea (Palestine), and was catechized by the great Origen. He was later consecrated bishop of Neocaesarea (Pontus) and later received the honorary title (by the Cappadocian Fathers) of 'apostle

¹⁸ Fenwick, p. 7. This 'split', as Fenwick calls it, seems oversimplified. For example, Patriarch Severus of Antioch (512-518), was both Greek and monophysite. Any truly accurate parallelism does not occur until well after the Arab conquest.

¹⁹ Ibid. p. 8.

and founder' of the Church in Cappadocia.²¹ In honoring Gregory, Basil himself reports that, when Gregory arrived to his see, there were only seventeen Christians in Pontus; by the time he died, there were only seventeen pagans, a powerful testimony to the catechism and conversion of the flock to the Christian Faith. Fenwick believes that "the direction of Christian influence into Cappadocia is likely to have come predominantly from Antioch and Syria."²²

By the time of St. Basil (4th century), the Christian Church in Cappadocia, fluent in the Greek language vis-à-vis her liturgical and social life, had established relatively strong Christian roots. By the end of the fourth century, the Cappadocians of Asia Minor were ready to extend their influence upon the neighboring Armenian Church.

Armenia

Without a doubt, the Armenian Church's greatest historical feature was her connection with Cappadocia.²³ Fenwick implies that perhaps Gregory the Illuminator's²⁴ single-handed conversion of Armenia is a bit exaggerated, although he does not hesitate to acknowledge Gregory as a central figure in the process. The link to Cappadocia is established in the consecration of Gregory by Bishop Leontius of Caesarea. In 374 the Armenian Church abolished its dependence on Caesarea for the ordination and appointment of their Catholicos. Nonetheless, a reasonable amount of contact and influence prevailed between both provinces.

²⁰ *Θαυματουργός*. See Stephen Neill, *History of Christian Missions* (Harmondsworth, 1971) and also, D.R. Stuckwisch, "The Basilian Anaphoras", pp. 120-22.

²¹ Stuckwisch, p. 122.

²² Fenwick, p. 8.

²³ *Ibid.* p. 9.

²⁴ His official title in Greek is: *Ὁ ἐν Ἀγίοις Πατὴρ ἡμῶν Γρηγόριος ὁ ἱερομάρτυρ, φωτιστὴς τῆς Μεγάλης Ἀρμενίας*: 'Our Father among the Saints Gregory the priest-martyr, Illuminator of Greater Armenia.'

Because of war with Persia, the Church in Armenia was not represented at the Council of Chalcedon and later repudiated its decrees, thus espousing the monophysite doctrine of the other non-Chalcedonian churches. In the fifth century, Armenia lost its independent statehood and has been subject to successive occupations and influences ever since.

St. Basil and His Liturgical Tradition

Born to Christian parents in Caesarea in the province of Cappadocia in the year 329 or 330 AD, St. Basil travelled to Constantinople, Athens, and Egypt before returning to his native homeland. Upon his return, he was baptized a Christian and entered the ascetic way of life. He was ordained a presbyter in 362 and was later elevated to Bishop of Caesarea in the autumn of 370, a position he held for over eight years until his death on January 1, 379.

During his lifetime Basil authored several different writings (162 genuine works), the majority of which were composed during the latter part of his life as a bishop. The genuine works are classified as dogmatic, ascetic, and educational writings, homilies, letters, and liturgy. Along with St. Gregory the Theologian²⁵ and St. John Chrysostom, “Basil of Caesarea has been a major formative figure in the life and theology of much of Eastern Christianity.”²⁶ Basil’s work has been translated into Syriac, Latin, Armenian,

²⁵ St. Gregory is also referred to as *Nazianzus* by most Western scholars, but this title is both misleading and incorrect. The East has always known him as the *Theologian*, to distinguish him from his own biological father, Bishop Gregory of Nazianzus. Although the former was born in Nazianzus of Cappadocia, his first episcopal commission was the small Cappadocian village of Sasima. Episcopal titles in the East reflect the see of the hierarch, and not his birthplace, as appears to be the misconception by the West in this case.

²⁶ Fenwick, p. 19.

Coptic, Arabic, Georgian, and Slavonic, from the original Greek, each translation boasting of at least one or more liturgies attributed to the Cappadocian father.²⁷

Given the strong evidence that a specific liturgy was associated with Basil, is there evidence that the saint himself had any particular liturgical interest? Although it is apparent that there are sporadic liturgical references throughout his letters, there is very little material on the Eucharist. One source finds Basil reporting that Christians like himself received Communion on Sunday, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday and some perhaps daily.²⁸ However, Basil mentions not a word about his eucharistic prayer.

In St. Gregory's *Funeral Oration* 34.2 for his friend Basil, one finds the clearest evidence of Basil's liturgical interests. Fenwick records the following passage:

... his boldness towards the governors . . . the decisions of disputes . . . his support of the needy . . . the support of the poor; the entertainment of strangers; the care of maidens; legislation written and unwritten for the monastic life; *the ordering of prayers* (εὐχῶν διατάξεις); adornments of the sanctuary, and other ways in which the true man of God, working for his good, would benefit the people . . .²⁹

This expression, εὐχῶν διατάξεις, conveys possibly Basil's composition of new prayers, his re-ordering of already existing prayers, and his instructions on prayer. Does this expression, however, allow the possibility of a late fourth century bishop modifying an existing eucharistic prayer or even composing a new one? While scholars disagree on

²⁷ For an exhaustive account of St. Basil's life and literary achievements, see: Paul J. Fedwick, "A Chronology of the Life and Works of Basil of Caesarea" (v. 1, pp. 3-19), in Basil of Caesarea: Christian Humanist, Ascetic, two volumes. Ed. idem. (Toronto, 1981). See also Johannes Quasten, Patrology. Volume Three. (Westminster, MD), pp. 204-36, esp. 226-28.

²⁸ Although the fourth century was a period of significant liturgical growth and expansion (the development of monasticism, the canonization of the New Testament, and the official beginning of the weekday eucharistic celebration), it still seems quite early for the Eucharist to have been celebrated daily in every church throughout the world. Rather, Christians who did not participate in a daily celebration of the liturgy continued an ancient practice as old as the first century; namely, taking a portion of the consecrated Host, tintured in the Blood, from the Sunday Eucharist and receiving independently at home during the week. This manner of communion, later coupled with the significance of the Wednesday and Friday fast and the evolution of extended periods of fasting such as Great Lent and Christmas Lent, helped influence the development of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, one of three important Constantinopolitan liturgies attributed to St. Gregory the Dialogos, Pope of Rome. See Dix, p. 105.

whether or not Basil was creative in composing his own eucharistic prayer from scratch, there is a general consensus that the Cappadocian father did contribute somehow to the production of a liturgical text bearing his name. In his *De Spiritu Sancto* (373), St. Basil writes:

Which of the saints has left us in writing the words of the invocation at the showing forth of the bread of the Eucharist and of the cup of blessing? For in these things we are not restricted to what the apostle or the gospel have recorded, but, both before and after, we say other things, of great significance for the sacrament, receiving them from unwritten teaching.³⁰

Indeed, Basil knew that no precise wording had been left behind by the Apostles who received the eucharistic tradition firsthand from Christ himself. He also discovered, throughout the course of his journey to Greece and Egypt, that the eucharistic prayer differed from place to place. Therefore, it would appear likely, based upon this strong supposition, that he in turn felt the same liberty “at the very least to amplify the type of anaphora used by his predecessors and perhaps to compose his own, so long as he adhered to the pattern inherited from unwritten tradition.”³¹

According to Fenwick, identifying the person of St. Basil with a liturgy bearing his name can be based on external evidence from the fifth and sixth centuries. The major witnesses are as follows: (1) Leontius of Byzantium (c. 540-545) reports that the Constantinopolitan Church was celebrating the ‘Liturgy of St. Basil’ at the time of Theodore of Mopsuestia (c. 425-430), no more than 50 years after the Cappadocian father’s death; (2) a letter attributed to a certain Peter the Deacon (c. 520) includes a quotation from a liturgy bearing the name of Basil; (3) a reference is made to the Liturgy of St. Basil in the canons of the Penthekte, or Fifth-Sixth Council in Constantinople (‘in

²⁹ Fenwick, p. 20. See also Gregory Nazianzen, “The Panegyric on St. Basil”, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Volume 7. Eds. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Peabody, 1994), pp. 406-07.

³⁰ St. Basil the Great, *On the Holy Spirit* 27.66 (=Anderson translation, p. 99).

Trullo') in 692,³² and (4) a reference in the *Codex Barberini 336* of the ninth century, the oldest extant text of Byz-BAS, where Basil's name is ascribed before the prayer of the Proskomide in the liturgy now attributed to him.

The Extant Basilian Anaphoras

Before undertaking an examination of the liturgical text of Byz-BAS and proceeding to understand its structure and theology, it is important to place this anaphora within the proper context of the other Basilian anaphoras. Stuckwisch identifies four geographical locations associated with the liturgies created or modified by the Cappadocian father: Egypt, Syria, Armenia, and most prominently, 'Byzantium.' These locations are further grouped into two general subdivisions: (1) E-BAS (comprising ES-BAS, EB-BAS, and EG-BAS); and (2) Ω-BAS (made up of Syr-BAS, Arm-BAS, and Byz-BAS).³³

³¹ Fenwick, p. 22.

³² This council of bishops sat in the domed room of the Emperor Justinian's palace in Constantinople and passed a set of disciplinary canons to complete the work of the Fifth (553) and Sixth (681) Ecumenical Councils. The Orthodox took a solid position against the Armenian Church for not using water to dilute the wine in the Eucharist, claiming that the water mixed with wine symbolized the perfect union of Christ's two natures. The Armenians, following the monophysite doctrine, rejected the use of water, claiming it to be a symbol of imperfection and human frailty, a christological heresy for them and an abomination. Canon 32 condemned the other extreme of sects which used only water and not wine (*ὕδρω παραστάται*), and appealed to the practice of the Byzantine Church and, indeed, the ecumenical Church: "and throughout the whole Church, in which the spiritual luminaries shone forth, the same God-given custom holds . . . For even James, the brother of Christ our God according to the flesh, who first occupied the throne of the Church of Jerusalem, and Basil, the archbishop of Caesarea, whose fame has gone out throughout the world, in handing on in writing to us the sacramental form, in the divine liturgy require the sacred cup to be given in water and wine" (Fenwick, pp. 23-24).

³³ Stuckwisch, pp. 110-12. The Basilian liturgical tradition, scholars agree, is not confined to one anaphora. In other words, there actually exist a variety of eucharistic prayers attributed to the Cappadocian father, some of which are purported to be his own original compositions, others thought to be his own substantial recensions of earlier or synchronal liturgies, and still others to be posthumous editions of other redactors following the specific geographical Basilian tradition. Modern scholarship divides these liturgies into two major families, each family believed to be a derivative of a much larger archetype, conveniently called Ur-BAS. The two categories are: (1) E-BAS (the Egyptian Basilian family), consisting of ES-BAS (Egyptian Sahidic), EB-BAS (Egyptian Bohairic), and EG-BAS (Egyptian Greek), and believed to be the best preserver of the original form; and (2) the Ω-BAS family, consisting of Syr-BAS (Syrian Basil), Arm-BAS (Armenian Basil), and Byz-BAS (Byzantine-Basil). The subcategory Byz-BAS, belonging to the Ω-BAS family, is the Divine Liturgy the Greek Orthodox churches today celebrate ten times a year.

Scholars following Fenwick generally agree that the Basilian liturgical tradition is not confined to one anaphora. In other words, there exist a variety of eucharistic prayers attributed to the Cappadocian hierarch, some of which are purported to be his own original compositions, others thought to be his own substantial recensions of earlier or synchronal liturgies, and still others believed to be posthumous editions of other redactors following the specific geographical Basilian tradition. However, the two sub-families of liturgies, given their striking similarities (as well as differences), appear to be derivatives of a much earlier archetype, conveniently called Ur-BAS. This ancient 'common denominator' which underlies all the forms of Basil, seems to be represented best by the E-BAS family, to which this study now turns.

Egyptian-Basil (E-BAS)

Of all four manuscript traditions E-BAS clearly presents the shortest version of St. Basil's anaphora. As previously mentioned above, the three linguistic forms of this family are: (a) the Sahidic version; (b) the Bohairic version; and (c) the Greek-Egyptian version.

(a) The Sahidic (ES-BAS) version of Basil's Egyptian anaphora was prominent in Upper Egypt. This translation, discovered by Jean Doresse and Emmanuel Lanne in Cairo in 1960 (the text is currently housed at the University of Louvain), is perhaps the most noteworthy witness to E-BAS in existence, preserved on four small sheets of parchment. The manuscript allegedly dates from the seventh century AD, meaning that it is the earliest existing liturgical text of BAS covering such a substantial portion of the text. Unfortunately, ES-BAS does not begin until the end of the *Postsanctus*, omitting the first

third of the anaphora; namely, the Preface, *Presanctus*, and *Sanctus*.³⁴ The extant portion of the eucharistic prayer though is impressively complete. In addition, small fragments from ES-BAS still existing in other places are capable of preserving the anaphora's integrity.³⁵

ES-BAS also does not contain material found in EB-BAS and EG-BAS, further evidence that the former preserves perhaps an earlier redaction of the original text. A crucial difference is that ES-BAS lacks a specific request for the consecration of the bread and wine elements into the Body and Blood of Christ.³⁶ It also does not call to remembrance any saint other than the Theotokos.³⁷

The importance of ES-BAS lies in its age and brevity. Fenwick incidentally notes that it has become one of the chief sources of inspiration of *Eucharistic Prayer IV* of the Revised Roman Rite and *A Common Eucharistic Prayer*, the product of an inter-ecclesial committee of American Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Presbyterians and Methodists. Moreover in the East, it is often treated as *the* Alexandrian version of the anaphora of Basil, displacing both EG-Basil and EB-Basil. To substantiate these claims, L. Mitchell writes:

Compared with other Eastern anaphoras the Alexandrian Anaphora of St. Basil of Caesarea is the soul of brevity. Its development is logical and effective, following what

³⁴ The structure will be examined later in this chapter.

³⁵ Fenwick, pp. 49-50. Indeed, such evidence affirms a sense of continuity and connection between ES-BAS and its sister versions of E-BAS.

³⁶ A popular but perhaps misleading supposition among liturgical scholars, such as Dix, is the older a eucharistic prayer is, the lower its chances of including an actual prayer of consecration for the elements. One will recall from the first chapter on Addai and Mari that a specific Epiklesis for the transformation of the Gifts in that particular anaphora is absent. An *εύχαριστία* rather beseeching God for the benefits of communion is emphasized, as in the ancient anaphoral prayer of Hippolytus of Rome (see Dix, pp. 157-58). It is quite plausible then that the ancient Eucharist, reflected in both ES-BAS, Addai and Mari, and Hippolytus, was a eucharistic celebration in every sense of the word: an expression of thanksgiving to God by His people affirmed in the offering and partaking of the one Bread and one Cup.

³⁷ It was after the fourth century that a formal canon of saints was developed in the Church. Until this time, the only saints ever remembered in liturgical gatherings were the Virgin Mary and, on occasion, St. John the Baptist.

we think of as the order of the Creed. Its theology is kerygmatic as it proclaims the Gospel in the form of a *berakah*, a thanksgiving to God for his saving acts in Christ, and through the Spirit.³⁸

A. Couratin likewise adds:

The complete simplicity of the prayer supports the notion that it represents an older tradition of thanksgivings, to which the thanksgivings of Apostolic Tradition and Addai and Mari belong, a tradition which was elaborated towards the end of the fourth century into such Prayers as Apostolic Constitutions and Byzantine Basil.³⁹

(b) The Bohairic (EB-BAS) tradition thrived in Lower Egypt and today exists in thirty-three manuscripts and four published versions.

(c) The Greek (EG-BAS) version today survives in only a handful of manuscripts, the earliest of which dates from as early as the sixteenth century.⁴⁰

The Ω-BAS Family

(a) The Syrian Basil (Syr-BAS) version is preserved in four manuscript sources, two of which have been published. It is also found in three other collections of liturgical texts. Its characteristic feature is a series of extensive interpolations.

(b) The existence of an Armenian Basil (Arm-BAS) recension comes as no surprise, given the fact that the Armenian Church made significant contacts with Cappadocia in the third and fourth centuries, as previously stated. The liturgy in this case is preserved under the name of St. Gregory the Illuminator, the founder and patron of the Church in Armenia. However, many Armenian manuscripts do include an anaphora under Basil's name, which is really a simplified form of Byz-BAS.

Armenian-Basil survives in three manuscripts and is attested by a fifth-century reference in the writings of Faustus of Byzantium, who in describing the prayer of an

³⁸ L. Mitchell, "The Alexandrian Anaphora of St. Basil of Caesarea: Ancient Source of 'A Common Eucharistic Prayer'", in Anglican Theological Review (ATR) 58/2 (1976) 205.

³⁹ A. Couratin, "The Thanksgiving: An Essay", in The Sacrifice of Praise. Ed. Bryan D. Spinks. (Rome, 1981), p. 44.

⁴⁰ For a dependable text, see: Prex Eucharistica. Eds. A. Hänggi and I. Pahl. (Fribourg, 1968), pp. 348-57.

Armenian priest in the fourth century, cites parts of the *Postsanctus* and Epiklesis of the ancient Armenian version of Basil. Since Arm-BAS lacks certain words and phrases common to both Syr-BAS and Byz-BAS, it has been judged “textually inferior to the other two members of the Ω group.”⁴¹

(c) Byzantine-Basil (Byz-BAS) clearly boasts the largest number of textual witnesses than any other group, inclusive of both the E-BAS and Ω -BAS families. There are over two hundred Greek manuscripts, in addition to approximately one hundred and fifty texts composed in Slavonic, Syriac, Arabic, Georgian, and Armenian. Comparing all these texts together reveals only minor textual variations. While there is excellent congruity between the Greek MSS and the dependent Slavonic, Syriac, Arabic, and Georgian translations, the Armenian text differs from the Greek by way of added material.

The oldest existing textual source of the Byzantine liturgy of St. Basil is the eighth century *Codex Barberini* 336.⁴² Basil’s anaphora was clearly Constantinople’s chief Sunday and festal liturgy until the twelfth century, while the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, much briefer and less rhetorical than Basil’s, was probably celebrated during the week. In time, Chrysostom’s liturgy superceded and replaced Basil’s as the chief Sunday and weekday eucharistic liturgy. Today the celebration of Basil amongst the Eastern Orthodox churches following the typikon of the Great Church of Christ is limited to only ten times per year: January 1 (St. Basil’s Day), the five Sundays of Great Lent, Holy Thursday, Holy Saturday, and the forefeasts of Christmas and Epiphany.

⁴¹ Fenwick, p. 55.

⁴² This ancient document, composed in an uncial Greek script, is today located in the Vatican Library. The codex, a complete euchology, also includes, in order, the other two Byzantine anaphoras: the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom and the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. F.E. Brightman used the *Barberini* MS from

A Structural Comparison of the E-BAS and Ω-BAS Families

The fundamental structure of Basil's liturgy, in all its forms, is essentially the same. Below is an outline of this structure.

1. Opening Dialogue ("Lift up your hearts . . .")
2. Preface (adoration of the Holy Trinity)
3. *Presanctus* (references to angelic worship, leading to *Sanctus*)
4. *Sanctus* ("Holy, holy, holy . . .")
5. *Postsanctus* (confession of Trinity's divine economy of salvation, perhaps the most important distinctive feature in BAS)
6. Institution Narrative
7. Anamnesis (remembrance of Christ, with parallels to second article of Creed)
8. Offering of sacrifice
9. Epiklesis (invocation of Holy Spirit to 'consecrate' both people and offering)
10. Intercessions for Church and world (stemming from Epiklesis)
11. Doxology of the Holy Trinity

It is important to note that several of the constitutive parts of the structure differ considerably in content from one version of Basil's liturgy to the next. However, this eleven-point shape still renders BAS as 'paradigmatic' for its own liturgical family, although not so for any 'universal' anaphora. That being the case, it is now time to draw some important similarities and differences between the two main Basilian families: E-BAS and Ω-BAS.

Many similarities exist between E-BAS and Ω-BAS in regards to language and imagery, to such an extent that the possibility of an interdependence between them seems inevitable. As Stuckwisch observes, "The question really has never been whether or not the anaphoras are related to each other, but only what is the nature and direction of their relationship."⁴³

Two major differences between E-BAS and Ω-BAS are: (1) the latter includes a substantial expansion of the text in terms of scriptural language and allusions, compared

the ninth century, while Hänggi and Pahl basically reproduced Brightman's text in *Præx Eucharistica*. See F.E. Brightman, *Liturgies East and West* (Oxford, 1896), pp. 309-44.

⁴³ Stuckwisch, p. 113.

to a far more simplistic and literary approach in the former; and (2) Ω -Basil is replete with numerous theological statements and expressions regarding the Persons of the Trinity, compared to E-Basil's less descriptive and more direct style. Do these observations possibly suggest then that the liturgies belonging to the Egyptian tradition predate those of Ω -BAS?⁴⁴ The next section will address this question by providing a brief overview of major scholarly contributions on the Basilian liturgies.

A Review of Basilian Scholarship⁴⁵

The study of the Liturgy of St. Basil was for centuries misdirected by what has come to be known as the pseudo-tradition of Proklos, Bishop of Constantinople from 434-446 AD.⁴⁶ To this hierarch was credited a treatise in which the author explained that the earliest apostolic liturgies were very long but were deliberately condensed in later centuries in order to retain the participation of less fervent generations of Christians. Thus as an example, the Liturgy of St. James, being the work of the Lord's brother, was of considerable length, but Chrysostom and Basil both chose to shorten its length when they composed their own anaphoras.⁴⁷ This also implied that the shorter version of E-BAS was a later redaction of the much longer and 'original' Ω -BAS. Since this testimony came after the death of the Cappadocian father, it was taken as a given fact. Within this

⁴⁴ Fenwick identifies the efforts of H. Engberding and A. Baumstark to formulate a codified system of laws governing liturgical development. In brief these laws are: (1) liturgical development in general proceeds from simplicity to increasing enrichment; (2) secondary abbreviations may occur in which primitive elements may be lost while newer ones are retained; (3) the older a text is, the less it is influenced by the Bible (literal quotations from Scripture usually - but not always - denote a later modification of the text); (4) the more recent a text, the more symmetrical it is (e.g. the Institution Narrative); and (5) the more recent a text, the more likely it is to show revisions geared to improving consonance and style. See Fenwick, p. 61. Like any other law, these 'liturgical laws' are founded upon the consistency of historical precedent. In other words, if a particular trend is observed to occur consistently over time, then it is considered law.

⁴⁵ In this section, the different positions taken by scholars (from D.H. Engberding to A. Houssiau *only*) on the originality of the Basilian anaphoras, as well as the relationship between the Greek and Egyptian versions, are also noted in D.R. Stuckwisch, "The Basilian Anaphoras", pp. 114-19.

⁴⁶ See Stuckwisch, *idem.* p. 114.

⁴⁷ Fenwick, p. xxiii.

century, however, through the careful work of F.J. Leroy (1962),⁴⁸ Proklos' claims were proven to be the work of a sixteenth century forger named Constantin Palaocappa.

Well before Leroy's exposure of the forgery of Proklos, a substantial breakthrough in Basilian scholarship was realized in the exhaustive work of Dom Hieronymus Engberding⁴⁹ in the year 1931. Engberding identified and compared well over four hundred manuscripts of Basil. Based upon this examination of so many texts, Engberding concluded that the liturgies are divided into four geographical families, as previously mentioned. He further claims that while the three liturgical traditions, Byz-BAS, Arm-BAS, and Syr-BAS can be traced to a common source that Fenwick calls Ω -BAS (an expansion of the original anaphora called Ur-BAS), the other E-BAS tradition is a separate Egyptian redaction of Ur-Basil, with no connection whatsoever to the person of Basil himself.

The year 1960 welcomed the discoveries and work on the Sahidic version of Basil by Doresse and Lanne,⁵⁰ as well as an important essay written by Bernard Cappelle.⁵¹ In this essay, Cappelle argues that Basil himself was the redactor of the liturgy now bearing his name. He arrives at this interesting conclusion by comparing the writings and expressions from non-liturgical works of the Cappadocian father with the Byz-BAS text. Cappelle also identifies a connection between Basil and ES-BAS, claiming that the Sahidic text was the text Basil used to compose his own edition of Byz-BAS, something Engberding did not see.

⁴⁸ See Stuckwisch, pp. 114-19.

⁴⁹ H. Engberding, Das eucharistisches Hochgebet der Basileiosliturgie. Textgeschichtliche Untersuchungen und kritische Ausgabe. Theologie der christlichen Ostens 1 (Münster, 1931).

⁵⁰ See Stuckwisch, pp. 114-19.

⁵¹ Ibid.

Another scholar, J.M. Hannsens,⁵² likewise opposes Engberding by maintaining that Basil himself was responsible only for E-BAS, while one of his successors on the throne of Caesarea authored the longer and more complex Byz-BAS. This argument legitimizes the inclusion of Basil's name in the Egyptian manuscript. Louis Bouyer slightly modified Hannsens' position by saying that not only was E-BAS Basil's original work, but so also was Byz-BAS (Cappelle's stance). Bouyer also offers that Basil himself introduced E-BAS to the Egyptian Church, thus providing a second reasoning for why the saint's name is included in the manuscripts.

Although Cappelle's work concludes just before the Institution Narrative, Boris Bobrinskoy,⁵³ picks up the examination of the Basilian anaphora following the Narrative, including the Epiklesis and the intercessory petitions. Using an analysis of theological ideas and images within the liturgical phraseology (as will be seen later in this study), Bobrinskoy further substantiates the relationship between the liturgy and its namesake.

Shortly before Doresse and Lanne's work appeared in public, Alphonse Raes⁵⁴ concluded in his own study of the Basilian anaphora that the saint authored both E-BAS and Byz-BAS. After however reviewing the Sahidic version, Raes assumes a radically different and unique position. He rejects the existence of an original Greek version, including a hypothetical Greek retroversion published by Doresse and Lanne along with ES-BAS. Raes holds that ES-BAS is really an 'Egyptian' liturgy and not a 'Basilian' anaphora *per se*. In other words, the liturgy originated in Egypt (from which Coptic elements were later removed), and was not a Greek original with Egyptian additions. Thus, Byz-BAS became a redaction of the more original Egyptian-Basil.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Boris Bobrinskoy, "Liturgie et ecclésiologie trinitaire de S. Basile" in Verbum Caro 23 (1969) 1-32.

Todd Johnson⁵⁵ defends Raes' position by advocating a separate Egyptian provenance for E-Bas, versus an Antiochene-Cappadocian origin. To build his case, Johnson makes three *a priori* assumptions that he feels reflect scholars' approach to the Basilian anaphoras: (1) Basil himself is in some manner connected not only to Byz-BAS but also to E-BAS, although the saint's connection to the Egyptian prayer lacks historical proof; (2) BAS originated as a single anaphora, which was important to Egypt and later modified with added Egyptian elements, although Johnson feels the core of ES-BAS is a collection of Egyptian material; and (3) all anaphoras are homogeneous. Johnson proves this last point by indicating that Doresse and Lanne use the *Apostolic Tradition* in producing their Greek version of E-BAS. Johnson concludes that an Egyptian prayer was joined to a 'second prayer', probably also of Egyptian origin, to form E-BAS. Only after this liturgy came together did Basil expand it to produce Ω-BAS.

In 1961, W.E. Pitt⁵⁶ wrote an article on the origins of the Basilian anaphora, but produced a work deficient in freshly published material, such as Engberding's Hochgebet and the Sahidic text of Basil by Doresse and Lanne. As a result, the relationship between E-BAS and Ω-BAS is overlooked in his essay. However, Pitt does provide some valuable information. He observes that the anaphora used in third century Caesarea consisted of an invocation of the Trinity ending in the *Sanctus*, and that this early form of Eucharistic Prayer is preserved in the first section of BAS. The following section focuses upon the Epiklesis and Intercessions, seen as additions to, but not constitutive parts of, the Eucharistic Prayer itself. Is the remainder of Basil's anaphora then an original composition, or is it borrowed from another Church? To answer this mystery, Pitt makes

⁵⁴ See Stuckwisch, pp. 114-19.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

two arguments: (1) BAS was influenced by the Antiochian liturgical tradition that also drew from the East Syrian anaphora of Addai and Mari (a substantial claim for this thesis); and (2) BAS also borrowed material from JAS - specifically the Institution Narrative, Anamnesis, and Epiklesis, which resulted in the differences between BAS and the East Syrian liturgical tradition.

Albert Houssiau⁵⁷ takes the position that E-BAS dates back to a period before St. Basil himself and the theological controversies of the fourth century, possibly originating in Cappadocia or northern Syria. The Egyptian version sees the celebration of the Eucharist as a means of sanctification, in which God's holiness is given to the faithful through the Holy Spirit.

In his doctoral dissertation The Anaphoras of St. Basil and St. James,⁵⁸ John Fenwick supports Engberding's identification of the four Basilian geographical areas, as well as their association with the E-BAS and Ω -BAS families. He also adds that Ur-BAS, preserved best in ES-BAS, provides the liturgical foundation for both the Ω -BAS group and JAS.

In his work, Fenwick points out deficiencies in Engberding's approach, citing first of all that Engberding did not have access to the Sahidic-Basil text in his time. He further focuses upon the structure of the anaphora, going beyond Engberding's mere verbal analysis of the texts. Also, Fenwick extends his investigation over the whole anaphora, including those sections that Engberding omitted: the Institution Narrative, the Anamnesis, and the Epiklesis. Finally, Fenwick studies the Intercessions, which provide a

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ John Fenwick, The Anaphoras of St. Basil and St. James: An Investigation into Their Common Origin (Rome, 1992).

key to understanding the relationship between Byz-BAS, Syr-BAS, and Arm-BAS. While Syr-BAS reflects the initial ordering of Ω -BAS, which in turn kept the sequence of Ur-BAS, Arm-BAS and Byz-BAS come from later redactions of Ω -BAS.

Another important position taken by Fenwick is that St. Basil was in some way influential in all four geographical areas where the liturgy bearing his name thrived. Even before becoming the Bishop of Caesarea, Basil made a great impact upon the Cappadocian liturgy, thus resulting in the shorter E-BAS. Then, in his early years as a hierarch, Basil inserted additional material into this same structure, producing an early form of Ω -BAS, preserved in Syr-BAS. Further redactions produced the remaining Arm-BAS and Byz-BAS forms.

The Text of Byzantine-BAS

The English translation of Byz-BAS which follows is taken from the liturgical text entitled The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Among the Saints Basil the Great,⁵⁹ published by the faculty of Hellenic College and Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology. It is a fairly accurate and acceptable English version of the original ninth century *Barberini* text, although certain modifications and additions were necessary in the translation, and most especially in the Intercessions (specifically, in the petitions for the Emperor). The headings for each section have been inserted according to the discretion of the author.

⁵⁹ The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Among the Saints Basil the Great. Ed. N.M. Vaporis. Trans. Faculty of Hellenic College and Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology (Brookline, MA, 1988). The comparative chapters that follow will make ample use of this translation, but I have also been very careful to modify the text whenever it seemed to deviate from the basic *Barberini* configuration, which is the version of Byz-BAS under examination in this study. In certain instances, I have revised the translation of Holy Cross – wherever the language appeared inaccurate or misleading – as well as include the intercessory petitions for the Emperor, left out by Holy Cross' more 'contemporary' rendition. Otherwise, the Holy Cross translation above has not been tampered with and is presented here in its untouched form for the sole purpose of introducing the anaphora of Byz-BAS without entering into much analytical detail.

The Opening Dialogue and the *Sursum Corda* ("Lift up your hearts")

Priest: Let us stand well. Let us stand in awe. Let us be attentive, that we may present the holy offering in peace.

People: Mercy and peace, a sacrifice of praise.

Priest: The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God and Father, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with all of you.

People: And with your spirit.

Priest: Let us lift up our hearts.

People: We lift them up to the Lord.

Priest: Let us give thanks to the Lord

People: It is proper and right.

The Preface

Priest (silently): O YOU WHO ARE, Master, Lord, God, worshipful Father almighty, it is truly just and right to the majesty of Your holiness to praise You, to hymn You, to bless You, to worship You, to give thanks to You, to glorify You, the only true God, and to offer to You this our spiritual worship with a contrite heart and a humble spirit. For you have given us to know Your truth. Who is worthy to praise Your mighty acts? Or to make known all Your praises? Or tell of all Your wonderful deeds at all times? Master of all things, Lord of heaven and earth, and of every creature visible and invisible, You are seated upon the throne of glory and behold the depths. You are without beginning, invisible, incomprehensible, beyond words, unchangeable. You are the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the great God and Savior of our hope, the image of Your goodness, the true seal of revealing in Himself You, the Father. He is the living Word, the true God, eternal wisdom, life, sanctification, power, and the true light. Through Him the Holy Spirit was manifested, the spirit of truth, the gift of sonship, the pledge of our future inheritance, the first fruits of eternal blessings, the life-giving power, the source of sanctification through whom every rational and spiritual creature is made capable of worshipping You and giving You eternal glorification, for all things are subject to You.

The *Presanctus*

(cont. 'd) For You are praised by the angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, authorities, powers, and the many-eyed Cherubim. Round about You stand the Seraphim, one with six wings and the other with six wings; with two they cover their faces; with two they cover their feet; with two they fly, crying out to one another with unceasing voices and ever-resounding praises:

The *Sanctus*

Priest (aloud): Singing the victory hymn, proclaiming, crying out, and saying:

People: Holy, holy, holy, Lord Sabaoth, heaven and earth are filled with Your glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is He who comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna to God in the highest.

The *Postsanctus*

Priest (silently): Together with these blessed powers, loving Master, we sinners also cry out and say: Truly You are holy and most holy, and there are no bounds to the majesty of Your holiness. You are holy in all Your works, for with righteousness and true judgment You have ordered all things for us. For having made man by taking dust from the earth, and having honored him with Your own image, O God, You placed him in a garden of delight, promising him eternal life and the enjoyment of everlasting blessings in the observance of Your commandments. But when he disobeyed You, the true God who had created him, and was led astray by the deception of the serpent becoming subject to death through his own transgressions, You, O God, in Your righteous judgment expelled him

from paradise into this world, returning him to the earth from which he was taken, yet providing for him the salvation of regeneration in Your Christ. For You did not forever reject Your creature whom You made, O Good One, nor did You forget the work of Your hands, but because of Your tender compassion, You visited him in various ways: You sent forth prophets; You performed mighty works by Your saints who in every generation have pleased You. You spoke to us by the mouth of Your servants the prophets, announcing to us the salvation which was to come; You gave us the law to help us; You appointed angels as guardians. And when the fullness of time had come, You spoke to us through Your Son Himself, through whom You created the ages. He, being the splendor of Your glory and the image of Your being, upholding all things by the word of His power, thought it not robbery to be equal with You, God and Father. But, being God before all ages, He appeared on earth and lived with humankind. Becoming incarnate from a holy Virgin, He emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, conforming to the body of our lowliness, that He might change us in the likeness of the image of His glory. For, since through man sin came into the world and through sin death, it pleased Your only-begotten Son, who is in Your bosom, God and Father, born of a woman, the holy Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary; born under the law, to condemn sin in His flesh, so that those who died in Adam may be brought to life in Him, Your Christ. He lived in this world, and gave us precepts of salvation. Releasing us from the delusions of idolatry, He guided us to the sure knowledge of You, the true God and Father. He acquired us for Himself as His chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation. Having cleansed us by water and sanctified us with the Holy Spirit, He gave Himself as ransom to death in which we were held captive, sold under sin. Descending into Hades through the cross, that He might fill all things with Himself, He loosed the bonds of death. He rose on the third day, having opened a path for salvation to the resurrection from the dead, since it was not possible that the Author of life would be dominated by corruption. So He became the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep, the first-born of the dead, that He might be Himself the first in all things. Ascending into heaven, He sat at the right hand of Your majesty on high and He will come to render to each according to his works.

The Institution Narrative

(cont. 'd) As memorials of His saving passion, He has left us these gifts which we have set forth before You according to His commands. For when He was about to go forth to His voluntary, ever-memorable, and life-giving death, on the night on which He was delivered up for the life of the world, He took bread in His holy and pure hands, and presenting it to You, God and Father, and offering thanks, blessing, sanctifying, and breaking it:

Priest (aloud): He gave it to His holy disciples and apostles saying: Take, eat; this is My body which is broken for you for the forgiveness of sins.

People: Amen.

Priest (silently): Likewise, He took the cup of the fruit of the vine, and having mingled it, offering thanks, blessing, and sanctifying it:

(aloud) He gave it to His holy disciples and apostles saying: Drink of this all of you. This is My blood of the new Covenant, shed for you and for many, for the forgiveness of sins.

People: Amen.

The Anamnesis

Priest (silently): Do this in remembrance of Me. For as often as you eat this Bread and drink this Cup, you proclaim My death, and you confess My resurrection. Therefore, Master, we also, remembering His saving passion and life-giving cross, His three-day burial and resurrection from the dead, His ascension into heaven, and enthronement at Your right hand, God and Father, and His glorious and awesome second coming.

The Offering of the Sacrifice

(*aloud*) Offering to You these gifts from Your own gifts in all and for all.

People: We praise You, we bless You, we give thanks to You, and we pray to You, Lord our God.

The Epiklesis

Priest (*silently*): Therefore, most holy Master, we also, Your sinful and unworthy servants, whom You have made worthy to serve at Your holy altar, not because of our own righteousness (for we have not done anything good upon the earth), but because of Your mercy and compassion, which You have so richly poured upon us, we dare to approach Your holy altar, and bring forth the antitypes of the holy Body and Blood of Your Christ. We ask You and beseech You, O Holy of Holies, that by the favor of Your goodness, Your All-holy Spirit may come upon us and upon the gifts here laid forth, to bless, sanctify, and show,

This bread to be the precious Body of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ. (Amen.)

Deacon: Amen.

Priest: And this cup to be the precious Blood of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ. (Amen.)

Deacon: Amen.

Priest: Shed for the life and salvation of the world. (Amen.)

Deacon: Amen. Amen. Amen.

[Benefits of Communion]

Priest: And unite us all to one another who become partakers of the one Bread and the Cup in the communion of the one Holy Spirit. Grant that none of us may partake of the holy Body and Blood of Your Christ to judgment or condemnation; but, that we may find mercy and grace with all the saints who through the ages have pleased You: forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, teachers, and for every righteous spirit made perfect in faith.

The Intercessions

(*aloud*) Especially for our most holy, pure, blessed, and glorious Lady, the Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary.

[People: All of creation rejoices in you, O full of grace: the assembly of angels and the human race. You are a sanctified temple and a spiritual paradise, the glory from whom God was incarnate and became a child - our God, existing before all ages. He made your womb a throne, and your body more spacious than the heavens. All of creation rejoices in you, O full of grace. Glory to you.]

[The Diptychs of the dead are read here by the Deacon while the Priest silently prays.]

Priest (*silently*): For Saint John the prophet, forerunner, and baptist; for the holy, glorious, and most-honorable apostles; for Saint(s) (*Names*), whose memory we commemorate today; and for all Your saints, through whose supplications, O God, visit us. Remember also all who have fallen asleep in the hope of the resurrection to eternal life [*here the priest commemorates the names of the deceased*], and grant them rest, our God, where the light of Your countenance shines. Again, we pray to You, be mindful of Your holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, which is from one end of the inhabited earth to the other. Grant peace to her which You have obtained with the precious blood of Your Christ. Strengthen also this holy house to the end of the ages. Remember, Lord, those who have brought You these gifts, and for whom and through whom and the intentions for which they were offered. Remember, Lord, those who bear fruit and do good works in

Your holy churches, and those who remember the poor. Reward them with Your rich and heavenly gifts. Grant them in return for earthly things, heavenly gifts; for temporal, eternal; for corruptible, incorruptible. Remember, Lord, those who are in the deserts, on mountains, in caverns, and in the chambers of the earth. Remember, Lord, those living in chastity and godliness, in asceticism and holiness of life. Remember, Lord, the most pious and faithful Emperor, whom You have made worthy to rule upon the earth; crown him with the weapon of truth, with the weapon of good will; overshadow his head in the day of war; empower his arm; raise his right arm; preserve his kingdom; make all the barbarian nations who desire wars to surrender to him; grant him help and everlasting peace; speak to his heart good things concerning Your Church and all Your people, that through the faithful conduct of his duties we may live a peaceful life in all piety and purity. Remember, Lord, every power and authority and our brothers in the palace and the entire army. Remember, Lord, this country and all those in public service whom you have allowed to govern on earth. Grant them profound and lasting peace. Speak to their hearts good things concerning Your Church and all Your people that through the faithful conduct of their duties we may live a peaceful life in all piety and purity. Sustain the good in their goodness; make the wicked good through Your goodness. Remember, Lord, the people here standing and those who are absent with good cause. Have mercy on them and on us according to the multitude of Your mercy. Fill their treasuries with every good thing; preserve their marriages in peace and harmony; nurture the infants; instruct the youth; strengthen the aged; give courage to the faint-hearted; reunite those separated; bring back those in error and unite them to Your holy, catholic, and apostolic Church. Free those who are held captive by unclean spirits; sail with those who sail; travel with those who travel; defend the widows; protect the orphans; liberate the captives; heal the sick. Remember, Lord, those who are in mines, in exile, in harsh labor, and those in every kind of affliction, necessity, or distress; those who entreat Your loving kindness; those who love us and those who hate us; those who have asked us to pray for them, unworthy though we may be. Remember, Lord our God, all Your people, and pour out Your rich mercy upon them, granting them their petitions for salvation. Remember, O God, all those whom we have not remembered through ignorance, forgetfulness, or because of their multitude, since You know the name and age of each, even from their mother's womb. For You, Lord, are the helper of the helpless, the hope of the hopeless, the savior of the afflicted, the haven of the voyager, and the physician of the sick. Be all things to all, You who know each person, his requests, his household, and his need. Deliver this flock, O Lord, and every city and town, from famine, plague, earthquake, flood, fire, sword, invasion of foreign enemies, and civil war.

[The Diptychs of the living are read here.]

(aloud) Among the first remember, O Lord, our father and Bishop (*Name*) [our Archbishop (*Name*) and our Metropolitan/Bishop (*Name*)]. Grant that he [they] may serve Your holy churches in peace. Keep him [them] safe, honorable, and healthy for many years, rightly discerning the word of Your truth.

(silently) Remember, Lord, all Orthodox bishops who rightly teach the word of Your truth. Remember, Lord, my unworthiness according to the multitude of Your mercies; forgive my every transgression, both voluntary and involuntary. Do not take away the grace of Your Holy Spirit from these gifts presented because of my sins. Remember, Lord, the presbyters, the diaconate in Christ, and every order of the clergy, and do not confound any of us who stand about Your holy altar. Visit us with Your goodness, Lord; manifest Yourself to us through Your rich compassion. Grant us seasonable weather and fruitful seasons; send gentle showers upon the earth so that it may bear fruit; bless the crown of the year of Your goodness. Prevent schism in the Church; pacify the raging of the heathen. Quickly stop the uprisings of heresies by the power of Your Holy Spirit. Receive us all into Your kingdom. Declare us to be sons and daughters of the light and of the day. Grant us Your peace and love, Lord our God, for You have given all things to us.

The Doxology

(*aloud*) And grant that with one voice and one heart we may glorify and praise Your most honored and majestic name, of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, now and forever and to the ages of ages.

People: Amen.

A Brief Examination of the Structure

Prior to commencing the overview of Byzantine-Basil's structure, two very significant observations must be made about this particular anaphora, which is further reflected within the larger Ω -BAS family. When compared to seemingly older anaphoras such as Addai and Mari or *Sharar*, the content of Byz-BAS is clearly more theological; that is, the liturgical text makes extensive use of well-developed trinitarian formulas and expressions not found in older liturgies. In fact, much of St. Basil's theological witness regarding the Person of the Holy Spirit can be identified within the anaphoras bearing his name.

A second point is that Byz-BAS presents a longer anaphora with a more extensive record of salvation history in the *Postsanctus* and far more detailed Intercessions than the East Syrian liturgies. Byzantine-Basil's length and detail suggest a later dating in comparison to the simpler and more succinct Addai and Mari.⁶⁰ In fact, the absence of an Epiklesis prayer of consecration in Addai and Mari but its inclusion in Basil raises the philosophical question of the nature of the anaphora. Is an anaphora simply the worshiping community's expression of thanksgiving to God, culminating in the reception of the Holy Eucharist, or must some type of consecration of the elements occur to likewise consecrate and transform the worshiping community and instill in it the true spirit of thanksgiving? This difference in emphasis, moving from a community-focused liturgy to a sacrament-focused one (even though the Eucharist is celebrated in both

⁶⁰ See Engberding's Hochgebet and also footnote 44 of this chapter.

settings), will be addressed further in the following section and in the next chapter of this thesis.

The Opening Dialogue and Preface

“There is a growing consensus that in the Preface is to be found the ancient core of the Christian anaphora”,⁶¹ writes Fenwick. This supposition essentially suggests that the Prefaces of liturgies such as St. John Chrysostom, the Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles, Addai and Mari, and Mark possess a basic structure of praise or thanksgiving for creation and redemption, concluding with a doxology which sometimes may have taken the form of the *Sanctus*. At the very least, the shorter, more succinct text of E-BAS possibly also falls into this category of a ‘mini-anaphora’, with its Epiklesis and Intercessions being later additions.

In the Opening Dialogue, as is common in all anaphoras, the major intent is to offer thanksgiving and glorification to God for His creation and mighty works. The praise, in this case, is seen as a sacrifice in and of itself (“Mercy and peace, a sacrifice of praise”), alongside the actual eucharistic sacrifice.⁶² The invitation to join in the Church’s prayer of thanksgiving (“Let us give thanks . . .”) leads into the Preface.

The Preface immediately establishes the addressee of the prayer as God the Father (“O YOU WHO ARE, Master, Lord, God, worshipful Father almighty. . .”).⁶³ Unlike

⁶¹ Fenwick, p. 76.

⁶² Once again, is this ‘sacrifice of praise’ the *only* sacrifice offered to God in the more ancient liturgies which scholars have labeled ‘mini-anaphoras’? Since a prayer of consecration was missing in the more ancient liturgical forms, did this imply that the eucharistic elements were not viewed as the *antitypes* (to use one of Basil’s expressions) which was to become the mystically sacrificed Body and Blood of the Lord?

⁶³ Interestingly, the expression in Greek reads ‘Ο ὢν, a Classical Greek participle of the linking verb ‘to be’ (present tense), which translates literally into English as ‘He who is.’ However, I have used license in rendering the participle as ‘O YOU WHO ARE’, so that the translation will reflect the vocative form of the original. Interestingly, this participial expression finds an equivalent in Jeremiah 1.6 (“Ὠ Δέσποτα Κύριε”

Addai and Mari, the prayer remains consistent in its address to the Father, thus limiting the possibility of a confusing oscillation between the Persons of the Trinity. However, the Preface also has a rich trinitarian character by making three individual but detailed references to the Three Persons, who are tied together by virtue of their activity in the history of salvation. Regarding the Father, for example, He is the Creator and initiator of life, who is without beginning (*ἀναρχος*), invisible (*ἀόρατος*), incomprehensible (*ἀκατάληπτος*), beyond words (*ἀπερίγραπτος*), and unchangeable (*ἀναλλοίωτος*). These apophatic expressions were common to the East in Basil's day, as the Church attempted to preserve the orthodoxy of her doctrinal tradition by defining God by what He was not.

God the Son is seen as 'the image of Your [Father's] goodness', the true revelation of God the Father. The imagery drawn from the theological Gospel of St. John is plentiful, especially where Christ says to the disciple Philip: "He who has seen Me has seen the Father" (Jn 14.9). Christ is also the perfect human embodiment of God's 'wisdom, life, sanctification, power, and the true light', qualities the Father has always expressed and conveyed to His people in history.

God the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father but is sent into the world by the Son, a theological formula⁶⁴ St. Basil feels obliged to include in His anaphora, as a

LXX; the Vulgate reads: "A,a,a Domine Deus!"). The apophatic nature of the expression could very well have inspired Basil to allude to it during the composition of his anaphora.

This expression is also reminiscent of Moses' encounter with Yahweh in Exodus 3.13-15, where God reveals His Name as "I am who am" (YHWH). In the Eastern Orthodox tradition, the aforementioned three Greek letters are always placed upon the halo behind Christ's head, to indicate that as the Son of God, Christ is also "true God of true God", the same God revealed to Moses at the Burning Bush. Its omission in the English translation may have been deliberate to draw attention to God the Father as being the recipient of the prayer.

⁶⁴ The actual formula Basil espoused in *Περί Ἁγίου Πνεύματος* was: "Glory to the Father *with* (σύν) the Son and *with* (σύν) the Holy Spirit." The Cappadocian Father did not, however, exclude the more traditional doxology used in Greek-speaking churches: "Glory to the Father *through* (διὰ) the Son and *in* (έν) the Holy Spirit." Whereas the former doxology seemed more appropriate in characterizing the *Immanent Trinity* as the recipient of adoration, the latter doxology is fitting for the *Economic Trinity*, who has effected works of salvation within the history of humankind.

defender of the Holy Spirit in His famous work *De Spiritu Sancto – On the Holy Spirit*. For Basil, the Holy Spirit is He who empowers the faithful worshiper to offer proper adoration and glorification of God.

The *Presanctus* and *Sanctus*

The position of the *Sanctus* in the anaphora, along with the introductory material attached to it, has confounded liturgical scholars for centuries. One reason for this is that the *Sanctus* is seen as an interruption between the prayer of thanksgiving offered in the Preface and that prayer's continuation in the *Postsanctus*.⁶⁵ The verbal transition to the *Sanctus* by way of its introduction at the end of the *Presanctus* is abrupt, sometimes even incoherent. In most cases, scholars have made the seemingly logical supposition that the introduction to the *Sanctus* has been composed in a manner attempting to validate the placement of the *Sanctus* in the midst of the thanksgiving prayer. This abrupt transition, along with the careful wording of the *Presanctus* material, is also obvious in Byz-BAS:

(End of Preface) Through Him the Holy Spirit was manifested, the spirit of truth, the gift of sonship, the pledge of our future inheritance, the first fruits of eternal blessings, the life-giving power, the source of sanctification through whom every rational and spiritual creature is made capable of worshipping You and giving You eternal glorification, for all things are subject to You.

The *Presanctus*

(cont. 'd) For You are praised by the angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, authorities, powers, and the many-eyed Cherubim. Round about You stand the Seraphim, one with six wings and other with six wings; with two they cover their faces; with two they cover their feet; with two they fly, crying out to one another with unceasing voices and ever-resounding praises: . . .

⁶⁵ The redactor of Byz-BAS has obviously manipulated the text even at the beginning of the *Postsanctus* to make it flow more smoothly out of the *Sanctus*: "Holy, holy, holy, Lord Sabaoth, heaven and earth are filled with Your glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is He who comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna to God in the highest."

The text continues: "Together with these blessed powers, loving Master, we sinners also cry out and say: Truly You are holy and most holy, and there are no bounds to the majesty of Your holiness. You are holy in all Your works, for with righteousness and true judgment You have ordered all things for us." God's holiness is identified in the expression of the angelic choirs who praise Him in the *Sanctus*. As can be seen, the *Postsanctus* ties the *Sanctus* with the text that follows by highlighting God's holiness.

The phrase 'for all things are subject to You' introduces the reference to the orders of angels, which naturally leads into the *Sanctus*. The angels of God are chosen by the redactor of the text to represent that part of creation that is subject before God. In truth, any other created being or animal or plant or inanimate object could have been inserted, but the preceding phrase "every rational and spiritual creature is made capable of worshipping You . . ." limits the range to either humans (embodied creatures) or angels (bodiless creatures). The redactor of course has chosen the angels.

If the *Presanctus* and *Sanctus* material were removed, the text would read as follows:

(End of Preface) You are the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the great God and Savior of our hope, the image of Your goodness, the true seal of revealing in Himself You, the Father. He is the living Word, the true God, eternal wisdom, life, sanctification, power, and the true light. Through Him the Holy Spirit was manifested, the spirit of truth, the gift of sonship, the pledge of our future inheritance, the first fruits of eternal blessings, the life-giving power, the source of sanctification through whom every rational and spiritual creature is made capable of worshipping You and giving You eternal glorification, for all things are subject to You. *(Presanctus and Sanctus removed)*

(Postsanctus, with preliminary Sanctus material omitted) You have ordered all things for us. For having made man by taking dust from the earth, and having honored him with Your own image, O God, You placed him in a garden of delight, promising him eternal life and the enjoyment of everlasting blessings in the observance of Your commandments

Even with the *Sanctus* material removed from the *Postsanctus*, the transition between the two texts still seems somewhat disjointed, but unlike the *Sanctus* material, it does not appear that the text was manipulated to produce coherence. A possible explanation for this may be that the Preface and *Postsanctus* were composed separately of each other with no attempt at coherence. The congruity between these two anaphoral sections may have been created by the introduction of the *Sanctus* material, but this remains an assumption. A. Couratin, feeding upon Ratcliff's unsubstantiated but highly influential musings on the reasons for the introduction of the *Sanctus* in the anaphora, makes a

daring claim when he writes: "When the Sanctus was introduced into the Eucharistic Prayers, there was no one particular point at which it was introduced. And indeed, one of the principal problems facing the liturgist is to determine why it was introduced at all."⁶⁶

The *Sanctus* material then is today viewed as an essential element in Eastern anaphoras, but how essential it really is in maintaining a sense of cohesion and unity within the liturgical text cannot be readily agreed upon by everyone.

The *Postsanctus*

In his *Postsanctus*, St. Basil offers a magnificent and lofty recounting of the entire history of salvation, including man's creation, man's fall through disobedience, and God's involvement in redeeming the world through various revelations to His people and finally through His own Incarnation. L. Mitchell compares this 'economical' *Postsanctus*, which focuses almost entirely on man's redemption, with the more 'theological' Preface, rooted in the nature of God and the relationship of all three Persons to each other.

Whereas the origins of the *Postsanctus* are uncertain, most ancient texts such as Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* and Addai and Mari all possess a section comparable to the *Postsanctus* that offers thanksgiving for God's creation and His redeeming economy, albeit in a far more succinct and simplistic manner.⁶⁷

The *Postsanctus* begins with the small transitional section containing *Sanctus* material ("You are holy and most holy . . ."). It then continues with a brief narration of the creation story, including man's disobedience and fall from God's grace, as well as the consequences of this disobedience, that is, death. The prayer then makes ample mention

⁶⁶ Couratin, p. 61.

⁶⁷ Once again, this verbal thanksgiving was believed to be the core of the eucharistic celebration. Often the *Sanctus*, if one happened to exist in a particular liturgy, concluded this thanksgiving. See Fenwick, p. 76.

of prophets and angels and saints whom God sent into the world to prepare the way for God's own advent in the flesh.

When speaking of Christ's Incarnation, Basil theologizes about what the Son of God's entry into the world truly means: "He emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, conforming to the body of our lowliness that He might change us in the likeness of the image of His glory." Man's redemption involves God assuming man's image in order to transform him into God's image.

Christ then offers the world His teaching ministry, in which He not only reveals to the people the love of the God of the Old Testament, but also exposes the danger of participating in hypocrisy and the dark works of evil ('the delusions of idolatry'). The Son of God then claims the Christians as "His chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation" (cf. 1 Pt 2.9), through the sacramental reference to holy baptism and chrismation ("Having cleansed us by water and sanctified us with the Holy Spirit"). To fulfill His divine plan, Christ then proceeds to the ultimate sacrifice upon the Cross, after which the 'Author of life' descends into the bowels of Hades and renders Satan powerless by destroying his authority over spiritual corruption and death. Following His resurrection, Christ, as the 'first fruits' and 'first born' of the dead (cf. 1 Cor 15.20), ascends to the Father, only to come again in glory for the judgment of the world.

Christ's ascent into heaven makes possible the descent of God the Holy Spirit into the world, to continue the work of salvation within the Church until the Second Coming.⁶⁸ An important part of the Spirit's salvific work involves the Church's constant

⁶⁸ Christ Himself says: "It is to your advantage that I go away; for if I do not go away, the Helper [Holy Spirit] will not come to you; but if I depart, I will send him to You" (Jn 16.7).

celebration of the Holy Eucharist. Consequently, this understanding allows for a smooth progression into the next section of the anaphora of Byz-BAS: the Institution Narrative.

The Institution Narrative

The origins of the Institution Narrative and the reasons for its inclusion in the anaphora are unclear, to say the least. Certain scholars feel that together with the Anamnesis that follows, it constituted a Christian embolism that was inserted in the *Birkat ha-mazon*, or thanksgiving, pattern of the eucharistic prayer. This position is further propagated by the belief that “the Institution Narrative is a consequence of the transference of the emphasis in the Eucharist to the gifts and away from thanksgiving, and this would seem to have much to commend it.”⁶⁹

From a purely textual perspective, the Institution Narrative is one of the most complex sections of the anaphora. This is so because not only has each anaphora influenced the other, thus making it difficult to locate an exact point of origin for the Institution Narrative, but the Narrative itself has been influenced by the four New Testament accounts, which themselves show considerable divergences. In addition, no liturgical form follows perfectly a single biblical account to the exclusion of all others. Such differences among Narratives leads to the question of how the Institution Narrative developed in the liturgical life of the Church. One theory is put forth by Paul Cagin in his comparative study of seventy-six anaphoras, listed by Fenwick in his dissertation:

- 1) The development of the biblical accounts, themselves the result of handing down the tradition in the life of the apostolic Church.
- 2) The combination of the Scriptural accounts to produce harmonized forms.
- 3) The addition of non-Scriptural material.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Fenwick, p. 132.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

A striking feature of the Basilian Narrative is the introductory formula “As memorials of His saving passion, He has left us these gifts. . . .” This introduction was apparently reworked by the redactor to provide a chronological link between Christ’s Ascension and the sacramental work of the Holy Spirit within the Church. As Fenwick notes: “The link formula creates a very clever continuity of thought between the *Postsanctus* and the Institution Narrative: The saving acts are completed, Christ has returned to the Father, but he has left us this. . . .”⁷¹

Within the Narrative, the prayer is still addressed to the Father, but all references are made to the Son as the initiator of the Eucharist and, specifically, the eucharistic shape: “He *took* bread . . . and *offering thanks, blessing, sanctifying, and breaking* it, He gave it. . . .”⁷² In the Eastern Tradition, the Words of Institution are customarily intoned, followed each time by the ‘Amen’ response of the people.⁷³

The Anamnesis

Like so many other sections in the eucharistic prayer, the origins of the Anamnesis also remain obscure. It is a deliberate response to the words that end the Institution Narrative, the so-called ‘Command to Repeat.’ Linguistically, this interchange is most interesting. The majority of the anaphora, as has been seen, is addressed to God the Father by the Church. Midway through this address though, Christ abruptly becomes the principal speaker during the Institution Narrative, suggesting that the Narrative and its preceding material were later interpolations in the anaphora. And then, as a response to

⁷¹ Ibid. p. 134.

⁷² Gregory Dix identifies a fundamental ‘four-action shape’ to the Eucharist, common in all anaphoras: (1) taking of bread/cup; (2) blessing/thanksgiving over bread/cup; (3) breaking of bread; and (4) giving of bread/cup. See *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 48.

⁷³ With regards to a ‘moment of consecration’, the Eastern Church views the Epiklesis, or descent of the Holy Spirit, as that moment, while the Roman Church looks to the actual Words of Institution. The exact

this 'Command to [Remember and] Repeat', the Church once again assumes its speaking role by consenting to repeat this eucharistic act by virtue of her remembrance of Christ's saving work. The *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν/μνησθέντες* link is a significant feature in this part of the prayer: Christ's command to 'do this in remembrance of me' is met with the people's 'remembering his saving passion. . . .'

Three features can be identified in the Anamnesis: (1) a transition which recalls the Institution Narrative; (2) an enumeration of the 'mysteries', or saving works of Christ; and (3) a prayer of offering which, for practical purposes, should typically fall under the section of the Epiklesis.

The Anamnesis begins⁷⁴ with the injunction to 'do this in remembrance of Me.' It is apparent that this form borrows material directly from 1 Corinthians 11.26: "For as often you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till He comes", compared to: "For as often as you eat this Bread and drink this Cup, you proclaim My death, and you confess My resurrection." Interestingly, Byz-BAS omits the phrase 'until I come' ('ἄχρις οὗ ἂν ἔλθω'), whereas the E-BAS and Ω-BAS anaphoras do not, possibly because Byz-Basil's redactor thought the transition between 'confessing' and the next part of the Anamnesis would be much smoother with its removal.

The 'mysteries' of Christ's saving works are enumerated as follows: (1) the Passion; (2) the Crucifixion; (3) the Burial; (4) the Resurrection; (5) the Ascension; (6)

origin of such a concept is unclear, although it is found in various Church Fathers, such as Ambrose and, after them, Sarapion and even Athanasios. See Dix, p. 168.

⁷⁴ Fenwick includes the line, "Do this in remembrance in Me . . . and you confess My resurrection" as part of the Institution Narrative. He probably does so to show that linguistically these words of Christ cannot be separated from His Words of Institution. For him, the Anamnesis introduces not only a new section within the anaphora, but it also reverts back to the Church as the principal speaker within the prayer. I have used license in including this sentence *under the Anamnesis rather than the Narrative*, specifically to establish the link between the 'Command to [Remember and] Repeat' (*εἰς ἀνάμνησιν*) and the remembrance to repeat (*μνησθέντες*).

the Enthronement at the Father's right hand; and (7) the Second Coming. Each of these events is ushered into being by the event just prior to it, without there ever being an omission of any 'mystery.' And certainly each saving act of Christ is seen as absolutely necessary and part of God's divine economy. One recalls the words of the risen Lord to the disciples traveling to Emmaus: "Ought not the Christ to have suffered these things and [then only] to enter into His glory?" (Lk 24.26). In chronological sequence then would follow the Church's birth and her celebration of the Eucharist, which could only have meaning after Christ fulfilled the divine plan of salvation for the world.

The Epiklesis

Unlike the other sections of the anaphora, the Epiklesis fortunately possesses a clearer point of origin. Edward Ratcliff suggested, and other scholars have agreed, that the Epiklesis may have been "a prayer initially existing apart from the Anaphora as a preparation for reception of the Eucharist and subsequently incorporated into the Anaphora."⁷⁵ This claim is substantiated by proof that early anaphoras, as previously mentioned, did not include a consecration prayer, but rather one expressing thanksgiving and praise. Ratcliff continues, "If in its initial form (it) was a prayer for the sending of the Spirit on the intended communicants, its transformation into a prayer for the Spirit's in-mission into the oblation was inevitable by the turn of the fourth century, if not slightly earlier."⁷⁶ In other words, most scholars agree that the Epiklesis always did exist from the beginning, but the supplication was geared toward the consecration of the worshipers rather than the consecration of the Gifts.

⁷⁵ Edward C. Ratcliff, Liturgical Studies (London, 1976), p. 34.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

Another very significant issue regarding the Epiklesis is the *subject* of the consecration. Which Person of the Trinity is consecrating? While Addai and Mari oscillates between the Father and the Son, it appears that the Father is the chief subject in Byz-BAS. Although this issue will be reexamined in the comparative section of this thesis, suffice it to say for now that it is the Father who is addressed to sanctify and change the elements to the Body and Blood of ‘Your Christ.’

The very first line in the Epiklesis identifies the members of the Church offering the sacrifice as ‘sinful and unworthy servants’, made worthy through God’s mercy and compassion to serve before His holy altar. This expression of piety is probably intensified after the fourth century, when the Church’s understanding of the Eucharist follows the distinctly Cyrilline idea of an ‘awesome, bloodless sacrifice’ (*ἡ φρικτοδέστατος καὶ ἀναίμακτος θυσία*), before which stands the worshiping community in deep silence and respect.

Another interesting feature is St. Basil calls the unconsecrated elements of bread and wine presented before God for consecration as ‘symbols’ (*ἀντίτυπα*) of the Lord’s Body and Blood. This characterization offers an important insight into how the Eastern Church views the eucharistic elements throughout the Liturgy. The elements are simply regular bread and wine when they are brought into the church by the people (first level). At the Service of Oblation, or Preparation of the Gifts (common to the Eastern Tradition), the elements are set aside for the particular purpose of symbolically representing Christ and potentially becoming His Body and Blood. This setting aside of the elements is denoted by the covering of the paten and chalice with special embroidered cloths, accompanied by biblical prayers (level two). In the liturgy, especially during the Great

Entrance where the elements are transferred to the altar table, the Church reenacts, according to one Byzantine interpretation, Christ's very Passion on His way to Golgotha.⁷⁷ During the Epiklesis, which represents the Resurrection, the symbols of Christ become His actual Body and Blood (level three).

In comparison to the other Byzantine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom which also contains an Epiklesis, Byz-BAS – and the other Basilian anaphoras, for that matter – each use the infinitive 'to show' (*ἀναδείξαι*) rather than the imperative 'make' (*ποιήσον*) to introduce the actual consecration. This significant difference may be explained in two possible ways. First, since the Church has 'shown' to God the Father the elements of bread and wine, that He might consecrate them into Christ's Body and Blood, God is asked 'to show forth' these for what they were originally intended to become: the Holy Eucharist. A second, and perhaps weaker, explanation is since the unconsecrated elements of bread and wine are 'imperfect' and 'incomplete' antitypes of Christ within the Liturgy, the consecration 'shows forth' a 'perfect' and 'complete' Christ fully present in the consecrated Gifts. Again, such argumentation is perhaps confusing, unless one can fully comprehend the liturgical *phronema*, or mindset, of the Eastern Church.

⁷⁷ In fact, Westerners find it quite odd that many Orthodox, prompted by local piety, will even kneel before the elements of bread and wine as they are ceremonially transferred toward the altar table, even though Eastern clerics highly discourage this practice. The reasoning for this disapproval is the elements are not yet the Body and Blood of Christ, only the symbolic antitypes. Of course, as Dix notes in Shape of the Liturgy, the idea that the unconsecrated elements represent the unresurrected Christ who becomes resurrected after the invocation of the Holy Spirit complicates matters further, especially from a doctrinal perspective. Is Christ not fully God and fully Man both before and after His resurrection, and what kind of Christ does the Church worship before the Epiklesis and after it? These questions are legitimate and often beg for a reasonable answer.

[The Benefits of Communion]⁷⁸

The first request made in Byz-Bas is for unity of all those who commune the Body and Blood of Christ. Not surprisingly, this first benefit of Holy Communion is universal in nature, spanning every known anaphora. In fact, early anaphoras void of a prayer of consecration petitioned God to maintain the unity of the Church through the reception of the Eucharist, since the Eucharist was that visible sign which affirmed the unity of the Christians and their Church.

The second request asks God to protect the Christians from unworthy reception of Communion, as well as fulfilling St. Paul's injunction in 1 Corinthians 11.29: "For he who eats and drinks in an unworthy manner eats and drinks judgment to himself, not discerning the Lord's body."

Following this second request, the prayer finally asks God to include the faithful communicants amongst certain sainted individuals who have found mercy and grace by pleasing God in their lives. This list of saints then flows into the next section of the anaphora, the Intercessions, which begins with a remembrance of the Church's most prominent saints: the Theotokos and St. John the Baptist.

The Intercessions

The Intercessions comprise the longest section within the whole anaphora of Byz-BAS. Compared to older liturgies, Basil offers intercessory prayers for a variety of persons and needs, an obvious indication that the Church in the fourth century world is now free to worship and assume an influential place within secular society. Older

⁷⁸ I have chosen to include this section separately from the Epiklesis for the sake of convenience, even though Fenwick attaches it to the end of the Epiklesis.

anaphoras belonging to the persecuted Church offered far fewer and limited petitions for 'worldly needs', believing the petition for Christian unity to have been sufficient.

The petitions are offered follow a particular pattern and may be enumerated as follows: petitions (1) for the deceased; (2) for the universal Church; (3) for the particular local church; (4) for those who bring gifts to the Liturgy; (5) for those who serve Christ's churches; (6) for those living ascetically afar off, as in deserts and caves and for those living lives of chastity and holiness; (7) for the Emperor and civil authorities; (8) for the good and evil; (9) for those absent from the Eucharist; (10) for the infants, the youth, and the elderly; (11) for the faint-hearted; (12) for those separated from the Church because of heresy or schism or apostasy; (13) for those possessed by evil spirits; (14) for travellers; (15) for widows, orphans, captives, and the sick; (16) for those in exile and any form of harsh treatment or punishment; (17) for those who love and hate others; (18) for those who have asked others to pray for them; and finally, (19) a general petition for all God's people. This general prayer immediately leads into a request for all those the Christians have failed to remember either through ignorance or forgetfulness.

The next brief section of the Intercessions ("For You, Lord, are the helper of the helpless, ...") sounds almost as if a concluding doxology is about to close the anaphora. However, this is not the case. Instead, the redactor of the text interrupts the fervent Intercessions (the reason remains unclear) to affirm that God truly is all-powerful and can fulfill everything He is asked to do. He immediately continues the Intercessions by petitioning for deliverance from various natural disasters and war.

In the Eastern Church, the Intercessions of Byz-BAS seem to be interrupted here by the vocal pronouncement of the diptychs, that is, the commemoration of the

immediate hierarch(s) who preside(s) over that particular worshipping community. The Intercessions then pick up with petitions offered for all Orthodox bishops, the celebrant himself, and all presbyters and deacons, asking God not to obstruct the transfer of His divine grace because of the unworthiness or inadequacy of the clergy. The Intercessions then continue, rather abruptly and disjointedly, with petitions for temperate weather, prevention of schisms and heresies within the Church, and finally, a prayer for inclusion of all people into God's kingdom, along with the bestowal of God's peace and love upon them.

A few points need to be made about the Intercessions in Byz-Basil. First, the number of requests made far outnumber those of any other anaphora within the Basilian corpus. This variety of supplications signifies that even though the Church now has far more 'worldly' needs to address than ever before, these petitions were probably added into the anaphora at different stages, judging by the section's disjointedness and spontaneity. Second, the Intercessions seem to progress from a higher, outer stratum to a more tangible and lower, inner stratum. In other words, what begins as references to the saints and to the dead in the first part of the Intercessions later moves toward petitions offered for the living, and specifically for civil authorities before those in the Church.

The Doxology

The concluding Doxology appears to have become fixed at an early date, providing closure to the anaphora and reaffirming its intended purpose as a thanksgiving. This part of the anaphora is also addressed to God the Father, but Basil's trinitarian formula is included in it to show once again the perfect unity and equality between all three Persons of the Trinity.

Two points of interest here need to be lifted out for discussion. First, without meaning to sound repetitive, the mention again of all three Persons in the Doxology suggests a later dating. Establishing the equality of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit was not a concern of the universal Church until the fourth century, with the intensifying of the Pneumatomachian controversy. Early anaphoras simply reverberated the concluding biblical doxology after the Lord's Prayer, without any mention of the Trinity: "For Yours is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen" (Mt 6.13).

Second, the Doxology seeks to manifest the union of all Christians, doctrinally and liturgically, by calling all worshipers to be united in one voice and one heart, the heart possessing internally the truthfulness of the Faith and the voice being the outward expression of this vibrant Faith.

Basilian Theology in the Byzantine Anaphora

In order to truly understand the liturgical work of St. Basil and his contributions to the development of his Byzantine anaphora, it will be helpful to place him, along with the other Cappadocian fathers (his brother St. Gregory of Nyssa and his close friend St. Gregory the Theologian), in a line beginning with the great Origen and Gregory Thaumaturgos of Pontos. The connection between the Cappadocians and the latter two names is most significant. Stuckwisch observes, "It should simply be recognized that Basil lived and worked very much within the heritage of Origen, and that he was likewise greatly influenced by the legacy of Gregory Thaumaturgus."⁷⁹

⁷⁹ Stuckwisch, p. 121.

In his famous *Treatise on Prayer*⁸⁰ (composed around 232 AD), Origen embarks on an important discussion of Christian prayer, including an interpretation of the “Our Father.” The treatise, although it speaks of the theology and practice of individual and communal prayer, establishes a unique connection between the form of such prayer and the Eucharist itself. In other words, the ‘shape’ of this daily prayer is clearly ‘eucharistic.’

The eucharistic nature of this daily prayer is evidence as follows:

- (1) Prayer ought to begin with “something having the force of praise,” offered to “God through Christ, who is praised with Him, and by the Holy Spirit, who is hymned with Him” [*Preface*].
- (2) Next must come the thanksgiving to God for His benefits toward all people, including to the one offering the prayer [*Postsanctus*].
- (3) Then must follow a confession of sins and petitions for forgiveness, “first, for healing that [the one praying] may be delivered from the habit that brings him to sin and, second, for forgiveness of the sins that have been committed” [*Precommunion (Epiklesis)*].
- (4) Then, “the request for great and heavenly things, both private and general” [*Intercessions*].
- (5) Finally, “the prayer should be concluded with a doxology of God through Christ in the Holy Spirit”, just the way it began [*Doxology*].⁸¹

Origen also makes the suggestion that not only should a Christian engage in private prayer but also attend “the spot where believers assemble together.” Origen continues: “When a great number of people are assembled genuinely for the glory of Christ, each one’s angel, . . . encamps with that man,” and so, “there is a double Church, one of men and the other of angels.”⁸² This vision of a joint form of worship between humans and angels identifies an interesting link to the *Sanctus*.

St. Basil regarded Gregory Thaumaturgos⁸³ and his catechist Origen as authorities for praying the Doxology in a ‘new’ way. Gregory’s trinitarian confession of

⁸⁰ Origen, “On Prayer”, in *Origen: An Exhortation to Martyrdom, Prayer, First Principles: Book IV* (New York, 1979), pp. 81-170.

⁸¹ *Ibid.* 33.1; p. 169.

⁸² *Ibid.* 31.5; pp. 166-67.

⁸³ Apparently, Gregory brought with him the Palestinian liturgy to Pontos (as well as to nearby Cappadocia), the liturgy taught to him by the Alexandrian Origen.

faith to the people of Pontos won him this fame in all Cappadocia, and certainly later helped to influence Basil in establishing a trinitarian framework for his liturgical compositions.

The Pneumatomachian Controversy

An issue of grave concern for the Church in the fourth century was the controversy surrounding the nature of the Holy Spirit and the Spirit's relationship to the Father and the Son. St. Basil's involvement in the Pneumatomachian controversy was of paramount significance, and one sees the Cappadocian father's stance in his liturgical anaphoras.

His treatise, *On the Holy Spirit*, was written as a response to a liturgical question and as such, has much to offer any study of fourth-century liturgy. Basil was initially charged with altering the traditional doxological formula of "Glory to the Father *through* the Son *in* the Holy Spirit" with his own form "Glory to the Father *with* the Son *together with* the Holy Spirit" implying a submissiveness of both Son and Spirit to the Father. Basil, however, supported both doxologies, depending on the liturgical context. In other words, he considered the first one ('with' – 'with') as more applicable for offering adoration to the Godhead (Immanent Trinity), while the second one ('through' – 'in') was reserved for confessing the salvific acts of God in history (Economic Trinity).

Basil further describes the difference between the two trinitarian types of doxology as Doxology (praise of the Immanent Trinity) and Thanksgiving (praise of the Economic Trinity). This distinction is rather important for a proper understanding of his anaphora. He writes:

Whenever we reflect on the majesty of the nature of the Only-Begotten, we ascribe glory to Him *with* the Father. [*Immanent Trinity*] On the other hand, when we consider the abundant blessings He has given us, and how He has admitted us as co-heirs into God's

household, we acknowledge that this grace works for us *through* Him and *in* Him.
[*Economic Trinity*]⁸⁴

“Therefore,” concludes Basil, “we use both phrases, expressing His unique dignity by one, and His grace to us by the other.”⁸⁵

In another section, the Cappadocian father addresses the sequence of glorification, similar to that appearing in the Preface and *Presanctus*. The sequence moves from God the Father as the “First Cause” of all that exists, to the Son as the Creator, to the Holy Spirit as the Perfector of creation, and finally to the angels as an example of creation at its best. Basil writes that these “ministering spirits exist by the will of the Father, are brought into being by the work of the Son, and are perfected by the presence of the Spirit, since angels are perfected by perseverance in holiness.”⁸⁶ The parallel to the anaphora – and specifically to the *Sanctus* – is established when a little later in his treatise, Basil rhetorically asks: “How can the Seraphim sing, ‘Holy, holy, holy,’ without the Spirit teaching them to constantly raise their voices in praise?”⁸⁷

Stuckwisch suggests that one important discovery which stems from Basil’s treatise is that at some point, some kind of ‘epiklesis’ was understood to be a prayer for the sanctification of the *Sanctus* (as the Church’s sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving), rather than a consecratory prayer over the eucharistic elements. In other words, the sanctifying power of the Spirit in the life of a Christian could transform his form of worship into that of the angels. Stuchwisch observes: “Furthermore, just as the angels are

⁸⁴ St. Basil the Great, *On the Holy Spirit*, 7.16; p. 33.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.* 8.17; p. 36.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* 16.38; p. 62.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*; p. 64.

holy and serve God only by the grace of the Holy Spirit, so must Christians worship 'in' the Spirit, in order to offer rightly their sacrifice."⁸⁸

Following this section on God as Creator, Basil proceeds to a discussion of the Economic Trinity, with a passage that reads like an abbreviated form of the *Postsanctus*.

When we speak of the plan of salvation for men, accomplished in God's goodness by our great God and Savior Jesus Christ, who would deny that it was all made possible through the grace of the Spirit? Whether you wish to examine the Old Testament - the blessings of the patriarchs, the help given through the law, the types, the prophecies, the victories in battle, the miracles performed through righteous men - or everything that happened since the Lord's coming in the flesh, it all comes to pass through the Spirit.⁸⁹

Thus, one can see within the course of the treatise a progression running parallel to the first part of the anaphora: praise of the Immanent Trinity and a thanksgiving confession of the Economic Trinity.

In his treatise, Basil prefers the use of the preposition 'with' (*σύν*) as a safeguard against the Sabellians who confuse the divine Persons and those who divide the divine Persons. However, Basil is willing to comprise by suggesting instead the use of the conjunction 'and', as is typical in the baptismal formula which affirms the equality of all three Persons.

In Byz-BAS one finds a fully-developed confession of the Trinity, with explicit roles assigned to each hypostasis. The Father is addressed as "O YOU WHO ARE, Master, Lord, God, worshipful Father almighty, . . . Lord of heaven and earth, and of every creature visible and invisible", who observes the depths seated upon His throne of glory. The emphasis then falls upon the Son, who is described as "the great God and Savior of our hope, the image of Your goodness . . . the living Word . . . eternal life, sanctification, power, and the true light." The prayer then shifts to the Holy Spirit, who is

⁸⁸ Stuckwisch, p. 124.

⁸⁹ St. Basil, 16.39; p. 65.

revealed by the Son. This final revelation of the Spirit by the Son indicates a gradual revelation of the Persons of the Trinity throughout human history.

The confession of the Holy Spirit in Byz-BAS is every bit as developed as those of the Father and the Son. The anaphora even hints at the role of the Spirit in the sacraments (Baptism and the Eucharist): “life-giving power, the source of *sanctification through whom every rational and spiritual creature is made capable of worshiping You and giving You eternal glorification*” (emphasis mine). However, Stuckwisch firmly suggests that the sanctification mentioned here belonged to an ancient understanding of Epiklesis (predating the idea of a ‘moment of consecration’ for the elements) that culminated in the *Sanctus*, the Church’s primary sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

Boris Bobrinskoy⁹⁰ makes an interesting observation that helps explain the use of the term ‘to show’ (*ἀναδειξαι*) in the Epiklesis. He notes that there exists a reciprocal relationship between the revelation of God (*descending* movement) and the Church’s worship (*ascending* movement). Put simply, the Father is revealed ‘downwardly’, *through* the Son who came into the world and *in* the Spirit *to* the Church. Likewise, Jesus Himself is said ‘to show’ the bread to the Father in the Institution Narrative, and at this time, the anaphora reflects the liturgical action of the priest. This act of worship offered to God by the Church shows an *ascending* movement. In the Epiklesis, the Holy Spirit is asked to show the bread and wine as Christ’s Body and Blood, a *downward* act of revelation from God to the Church.

In regards to the Epiklesis of Byz-BAS, a few significant comments need to be made. The very ancient verb ‘to come’ (*ἐλθεῖν*) is used in the anaphora, an obvious

⁹⁰ See Boris Bobrinskoy, “The Indwelling of the Spirit in Christ: ‘Pneumatic Christology’ in the Cappadocian Fathers”, in *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 28 (1984) 55.

reference to the early Church's eschatological prayer *Maranatha* ("Lord, come!") in 1 Corinthians 16.22 and Revelation 22.20. This verb probably reflects the earlier form of Epiklesis, as found also in the *Didache* and the Apocryphal *Acts of Thomas*. The verb 'to show' (*ἀναδειξαι*), often translated as 'to make', is a revelatory word that explains how the Father is revealed through the Son and in the Spirit. Likewise in the Epiklesis, the Spirit comes to reveal the Son in the elements of bread and wine. Finally, the invocation of the Spirit to descend 'upon us' and 'upon these Gifts'⁹¹ asserts a duality that is equally important, for the purpose indeed of the sanctification of the Gifts is to in turn sanctify the recipients of the Gifts.⁹²

Conclusion

St. Basil's travels to places like Palestine, Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia, allowed him to experience a wealth of different liturgical anaphoras and prayers, as well as to share with these churches his own forms and practices. The existence of two major Basilian families, E-BAS and Ω-BAS, is proof of this exchange. As has been seen, whereas E-BAS by far represents the shorter, more 'liturgical' tradition, Ω-BAS represents the longer, more theological tradition, with far more detailed concepts than the Egyptian corpus. Also, in Byz-BAS, one notes an expansion of the thanksgiving prayer in the *Postsanctus* to include a confession of the Economic Trinity (as compared to the doxological character of the *Presanctus* in reference to the Immanent Trinity).

⁹¹ Could the phrase 'upon these gifts' have been a later addition (possibly 4th century?) in most of the anaphoras deriving from the West Syrian tradition, such as Basil? This presumption may well hold true if one looks at the intent of the early epikleses: to sanctify the people to worship and confess the majesty of God like the holy angels (*Sanctus*). It is interesting that in the *Mystagogical Catecheses* of Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril does not maintain the duality as mentioned above.

⁹² It seems that one of the main ideological reasons for the decline in the frequency of Communion was Cyril of Jerusalem's insistence on the fearful and mysterious nature of the Eucharist. The sanctification of the Gifts alone would seem to suffice (thus the apparent omission in *MC* of "upon us"), whereas the

The christological remembrance, in comparison to earlier anaphoras, has been moved (or added) to the area between the *eucharistia* (Preface, *Presanctus*, and *Sanctus*) and the precommunion prayer (Epiklesis), thus bringing the whole anaphora into a closer connection with the eucharistic sacrifice. This transfer then gives reason for the anaphora not just to culminate in a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, but rather in the eucharistic sacrifice, whose reception also fulfills the call to praise and thanksgiving.

The precommunion prayer in Byz-BAS (Epiklesis) has also “been expanded to include a fuller ‘litany’ of intercessions, thus integrating the traditional prayers of the faithful into the celebration of the sacrament.”⁹³ While Basil was not the first to introduce intercessions into the anaphora, he nonetheless probably normalized a practice that began in the Epiklesis as a precommunion consecration of the faithful.

In closing, Basil’s Byzantine Liturgy is a poetic and highly articulate expression of the same’s theological witness to the Trinity, especially to the Person of the Holy Spirit. A careful reading of Byz-BAS will reveal to the watchful reader or worshiper that Basil’s anaphora is above all else a prayer that expresses what the Church believes. That is to say, the Church prays with the language and content of the Creed received at baptism:

Through this confession I was made a child of God, I, who was His enemy for so long because of my sins. May I pass from this life to the Lord with this confession on my lips. I exhort them to keep the faith inviolate until the day of Christ’s coming: they must not divide the Spirit from the Father and the Son, but must preserve in the profession of faith and in the doxology the teaching they received at their baptism.⁹⁴

sanctification of the people of God could possibly be attained by their mere standing before the *φρικოდέστατος θυσία*, without communing from it!

⁹³ Stuckwisch, p. 130.

⁹⁴ St. Basil, *On the Holy Spirit*, 10.26; p. 47.

Chapter Three A Working Methodology

The purpose of this thesis is to identify common liturgical elements between the ancient Syriac anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari and the Byzantine Liturgy of St. Basil the Great, and to show a pattern of mutual influence between the two eucharistic prayers. Despite Addai and Mari's general renown as the presumably older text, the direction of influence is nonetheless bilateral, given the Cappadocian father's widespread travels to the East¹ and the liturgical traditions bearing his name,² with which the East Syrian prayer shares many strikingly similar elements. For the sake of brevity, the anaphora of Addai and Mari will henceforth be abbreviated AM and the Byzantine Liturgy of Basil as Byz-BAS.

As already indicated in the first two chapters, this comparative study will utilize the following texts: 1) for AM, the English translation by Bryan D. Spinks in his book Worship: Prayers from the East, pp. 3-6, based upon the *hudra* codex of the Church of *Mar Esa'ya* in Mosul, dated around the tenth or eleventh century; and 2) for Byz-BAS, the ninth century *Codex Barberini 336*, as presented in F.E. Brightman's Liturgies Eastern and Western.³ For the English translation of Byzantine-Basil, the English text by

¹ Basil travelled to Constantinople, Athens, Egypt, Jerusalem, and Mesopotamia prior to his elevation to the episcopacy in the autumn of 370. It would seem highly inconceivable for him not to have encountered the existing native liturgical traditions of the places he visited as a presbyter of the Church. In addition, the evidence presented in this thesis suggests that either he or his redactors not only borrowed elements from these oriental liturgies but also influenced them from the Cappadocian father's own liturgical tradition.

² The known Basilian liturgical traditions are: ES-BAS, EB-BAS, and EG-BAS (of the Egyptian Basil family) and Syr-BAS, Arm-BAS, and Byz-BAS (of the Ω -BAS family). See also p. 13, note 9, and p. 46, note 33.

³ F.E. Brightman includes both texts in his Liturgies Eastern and Western. Not only has Brightman provided the entire *Barberini* codex of Byz-BAS in the original Greek (he has two versions: an "Original Text" and a "Modern Text"), but he has also included AM's *cushapa* intercessions in their entirety, which interestingly are missing from the *Mar Esa'ya* liturgy. The *cushapa* prayers in AM, located in between sections A and B, C and D, and D and E (see chapter 1, pp. 15-17), are private devotional prayers of the celebrant said in a kneeling position and in a low voice. Since this thesis follows the Mosul codex, I have omitted them.

the Faculty of Hellenic College and Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, Brookline, Massachusetts, will be used. In many instances, when the Holy Cross text has deviated from *Barberini* in configuration and language, I deemed it necessary to intervene editorially and render an English translation which remains accurate and fair to the ninth century manuscript (especially in regard to the petitions for the Emperor, which Holy Cross has omitted).

One must remember that the form in which these liturgies currently exist has undoubtedly been reached through a series of revisions of a much earlier text or texts, either by the addition or subtraction of textual material. While scholars have diligently attempted to come as close to the original text as possible by careful reconstruction based on verbal and structural comparison with other related texts,⁴ there is still disagreement among them as to which elements constitute the original form. Reciprocated influence between them again appears to have been the reality. Consequently, our study will focus upon common themes and patterns of influence found not only in the earliest of texts but also in later codices of the two anaphoras. To limit ourselves solely to the comparison of material from earlier, or 'more original', texts runs the risk of rendering our examination deficient, since arriving at the ultimate prototype of any eucharistic prayer is highly improbable, if not impossible.

Baumstark's 'Laws' of Liturgical Development

Engberding's monumental work on the Liturgy of St. Basil in his Hochgebet⁵ established the processes of liturgical development, as Engberding demonstrated them in

⁴ AM especially with *Sharar*, and Byz-BAS with Fenwick's Ω -BAS reconstruction.

⁵ See H. Engberding, Das eucharistische Hochgebet der Basileiosliturgie. Textgeschichtliche Untersuchungen und kritische Ausgabe. Theologie der christlichen Ostens 1. (Münster, 1931), pp. XXIII and XXIV.

his comparative study. However, such 'laws' are commonly associated with Anton Baumstark, although Baumstark's own study⁶ relies heavily upon Engberding, whom Baumstark credits and quotes extensively.

Engberding refers to these 'laws' as 'the generally accepted rules of textual criticism', nine criteria he used to identify the various Basilian texts and group them together. The broad 'laws' of liturgical development presented in Engberding's Hochgebet but codified in Baumstark's Liturgie comparé, are included in this study as a supplementary guide to possibly discerning older liturgical material from newer in both AM and Byz-BAS.

1. Liturgical development in general proceeds from simplicity to increasing enrichment.
2. Secondary abbreviations may occur in which primitive elements may be lost while newer ones are retained.
3. The older a text is, the less it is influenced by the Bible. Literal quotations from the Scriptures usually (but not always) denote a later modification of the text.
4. The more recent a text, the more symmetrical it is. (The Institution Narrative is a clear example of the desire to maintain symmetry in an anaphora.)
5. The more recent a text, the more likely it is to show emendations designed to improve euphony and style.

References to these 'laws' will be made throughout the thesis at appropriate points.

The Verbal and Structural Approach

Engberding's comparative study in Hochgebet of the various Basilian liturgies relies almost exclusively on the verbal method, which involves an exact word-for-word assessment of material from the anaphoras juxtaposed in parallel columns, in order to assess their process of development from a shorter to a longer form. Although this verbal method proves effective for the earlier sections of the anaphora (the Preface, *Presanctus*,

⁶ See Anton Baumstark, Comparative Liturgy. Trans. F.L. Cross. (Oxford, 1958), p. 59f.

and *Postsanctus*), his study remains incomplete, in that he did not extend himself to cover the equally important sections of the Institution Narrative, Anamnesis, or Epiklesis.⁷

In his comparative study The Anaphoras of St. Basil and St. James, John Fenwick has adopted the juxtaposition of common material in parallel columns from Engberding's Hochgebet, but he has also gone a step further than Engberding by complementing the verbal approach with a structural method. The structural method essentially seeks to identify the distribution and relocation of material within one anaphora which does not immediately correspond to material in the other, after which a verbal comparison between texts can be made. This was especially proven to be successful with the Intercessions.

In this study between the eucharistic prayers of Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil, the same three methods of comparison will be used: (1) juxtaposition of common material; (2) the verbal method; and (3) the structural approach. Other than perhaps the absence of an Institution Narrative in AM (the comparative juxtaposition of the *Sharar* Institution Narrative in this section may help!) both anaphoras include corresponding sections,⁸ even though the Byz-BAS text is a lot longer and more extensively developed in terms of its theological ideas. According to Baumstark's 'Laws' of Liturgical Development then,⁹ the Byz-BAS anaphora is clearly the more recent text, having passed through extensive revision from a seemingly much simpler and more succinct Ω -BAS and E-BAS text (themselves recensions of a more original Ur-BAS prototype), although

⁷ See John Fenwick, The Anaphoras of St. Basil and St. James, pp. xxiv and 62. Even in the Intercessions, the verbal method proved to be quite limited.

⁸ The Intercessions exist in both anaphoras, but in entirely different places. In AM they occur *before* the Epiklesis; in Byz-BAS, they occur *after* the Epiklesis.

⁹ 'Law' 1: "Liturgical development in general proceeds from simplicity to increasing enrichment." See previous page.

the tenth-eleventh century Mosul codex of AM also went through significant revision and reform.

The Division of the Anaphoras

The comparative study of Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil will be divided into eight sections corresponding to both eucharistic prayers. An individual chapter will be dedicated to each section. The sections are as follows:

1. *Preface*
2. *Presanctus* and *Sanctus*
3. *Postsanctus*
4. Institution Narrative and Anamnesis
5. Epiklesis
6. Intercessions
7. Doxology

Each chapter will begin with the juxtaposition of the appropriate material into two columns. A careful verbal and structural examination of the texts will then follow based on the juxtaposition, in order to establish, wherever possible, the proper historical context and direction of influence between the anaphoras. A concluding section identifying similar or differing theological concepts between both eucharistic prayers will also be included. Once again, it is the intent of this thesis to support a position of mutual influence between two ancient but very different anaphoras: the preeminently semitic liturgy of Addai and Mari and the hellenistic prayer of Basil the Great within the Byzantine tradition.

Chapter Four The Opening Dialogue and the Preface

Addai and Mari (AM) *Opening Dialogue*

Priest: Peace be with you.

People: And with you and your spirit.

Deacon: Give peace to one another in the love of Christ.

People: For all the Catholikoi.

Deacon: Let us give thanks and intercede.

Priest: The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God the Father and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with us all, now and at all times and for ever and ever.

People: Amen.

Priest: Lift up your minds. (*lit.* May your minds be above.)

People: Towards you, O God.

Priest: The oblation is offered to God the Lord of all.

People: It is fit and right.

Deacon: Peace be with us.

The Preface

Priest: Worthy of praise from every mouth, and thanksgiving from every tongue, is the adorable and glorious Name of the Father and the Son and of the Holy Spirit, who created the world by his grace and its inhabitants in his compassion, and redeemed mankind in his mercy, and has effected [*lit. made*] great grace towards mortals.

Byzantine-Basil (Byz-BAS) *Opening Dialogue*

Priest: Let us stand well. Let us stand in awe. Let us be attentive, that we may present the holy offering in peace.

People: Mercy and peace, a sacrifice of praise.

Priest: The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God and Father, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with all of you.

People: And with your spirit.

Priest: Let us lift up our hearts.

People: We lift them up to the Lord.

Priest: Let us give thanks to the Lord.

People: It is proper and right.

The Preface

Priest (silently): O YOU WHO ARE, Master, Lord, God, worshipful Father almighty, it is truly just and right to the majesty of Your holiness to praise You, to hymn You, to bless You, to worship You, to give thanks to You, to glorify You, the only true God, and to offer to You this our spiritual worship with a contrite heart and a humble spirit. For you have given us to know Your truth. Who is worthy to praise Your mighty acts? Or to make known all Your praises? Or tell of all Your wonderful deeds at all times? Master of all things, Lord of heaven and earth, and of every creature visible and invisible, You are seated upon the throne of glory and behold the depths. You are without beginning, invisible, incomprehensible, beyond words, unchangeable. You are the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the great God and Savior of our hope, the image of Your goodness, the true seal of revealing in Himself You, the Father. He is the living Word, the true God, eternal wisdom, life, sanctification, power, and the true light. Through Him the Holy Spirit was manifested, the spirit of

truth, the gift of sonship, the pledge of our future inheritance, the first fruits of eternal blessings, the life-giving power, the source of sanctification through whom every rational and spiritual creature is made capable of worshipping You and giving You eternal glorification, for all things are subject to You.

A Structural Analysis of the Opening Dialogue

The first series of verbal exchanges in both anaphoras constitutes the Opening Dialogue between the celebrant and the worshipers. According to A. Gelston, the oldest text of this dialogue appears in Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*. It reads as follows, in both the original Latin and in the English translation:

Dominus vobiscum.	The Lord be with you.
Et cum spiritu tuo.	And with thy spirit.
Sursum corda.	Lift up your hearts.
Habemus ad Dominum.	We lift them to the Lord.
Gratias agamus Domino.	Let us give thanks to the Lord.
Dignum et iustum est.	It is meet and right.

In this dialogue,¹ two exhortations are made by the celebrant, to which the people offer a response. As can be observed, both AM and Byz-BAS share the basics of this original form, including the structural order, although the language differs slightly.

Within this particular section, the *Mar Esa'ya* hudra of AM includes five lines not found in Basil, just before the benediction "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, etc." It begins with the offering of peace by the celebrant and the reciprocation of the peace by the people.² Byz-BAS provides an exhortation to stand attentively and in reverence

¹ A. Gelston, *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari* (Oxford, 1992), p. 76.

² It appears that Byz-BAS does not omit this section altogether, because the Byzantine liturgical tradition places the peace before the recitation of the Nicene Creed, which oddly separates the giving of the peace with the anaphoral dialogue. Addai and Mari does not interpose any creed between the peace and the beginning of the anaphora with the aforementioned benediction. Consequently, one may draw two possible conclusions: the anaphora of AM, in this section, does not appear disjointed in any manner but allows the prayer a greater sense of fluidity. Second, the absence of a creed in this particular section of AM, capable of elucidating a higher theology, seems to affirm the claim of Addai and Mari's antiquity.

It is noteworthy to mention that indeed, although the Creed was first introduced within a liturgical setting by Peter the Fuller in Antioch in the latter part of the fifth century (473 AD), it appears uncertain when it was actually inserted in Addai and Mari. F.E. Brightman's presentation of the anaphora of Addai

before the awesome sacrifice,³ that in such a pious manner the entire Church may offer the oblation to the Father in peace. The people respond, “a mercy of peace,⁴ a sacrifice of praise” (ἔλεον εἰρήνης, θυσίαν αἰνέσεως).

In AM, the people are commanded to offer the peace to one another, to which they respond, ‘for all the Catholikai’, the patriarchs of the Oriental Orthodox churches.⁵ The deacon then exhorts the faithful to ‘give thanks and intercede’, a seemingly appropriate introduction to the anaphora proper,⁶ which essentially defines the twofold nature of liturgical prayer, namely, doxology and supplication. All anaphoras, including AM and Byz-BAS, share these important prayer elements. Both texts begin to coincide at

and Mari, under the section entitled ‘The Liturgy of the Nestorians’ (from the later 1890 Urmiah Missal of the Archbishop of Canterbury’s Mission), includes a creed which follows the basic outline of the Nicaeo-Constantinopolitan Creed, but is linguistically not the same. This creed appears just prior to a section labeled ‘Preparation for the Anaphora’, which includes prayers of intercession and a long list of diptychs. It is this section which flows right into the anaphora proper (Brightman, pp. 246, 270-81).

³ This language of ‘awesome’ and ‘fearful’ never seemed to be a part of early eucharistic prayers until introduced by Cyril of Jerusalem in the mid-fourth century in his *Catechetical Homilies*, although according to Thomas Elavanal, the concept of ‘sacrifice’ always existed in the liturgical understanding of the Syriac mind. *Qurbana*, or ‘oblation’, is the eucharistic assembly’s proclamation of the sacrificial death of Christ and the faithful’s participation in this one-time sacrifice through the sacramentality of the meal which re-enacts and re-presents the reality of the Lord’s economy. See T. Elavanal, *The Memorial Celebration* (Kerala, India, 1989), pp. 187-212.

⁴ According to Brightman’s dual-column comparison of Chrysostom and Basil (see Brightman, p. 321), the text under Chrysostom renders one possible English translation, which would apply for Basil also: ‘mercy and peace’ (ἔλεος εἰρήνη). Both nouns are in the nominative, implying an analogous meaning. A variable reading, found in the Holy Cross translation, is ‘a mercy of peace’ (ἔλεον εἰρήνης), a possible reworking of the Barberini Codex in order to attain a parallel with the later addition, ‘a sacrifice of praise’ (θυσίαν αἰνέσεως). The faithful request from God a ‘mercy of peace’ in exchange for the ‘sacrifice of praise’ they offer to Him. It is interesting to note that although AM lacks this later response of a ‘sacrifice of praise’, Basil’s anaphora incorporates it.

Several scholars such as Louis Ligier and Geoffrey Cuming believed the Prefaces of several liturgies such as E-BAS, *James*, and *Apostolic Constitutions* to be ‘mini-anaphoras’, suggesting a basic structure of praise and thanksgiving for creation and redemption, concluding with a doxology which in some cases took the form of the *Sanctus*. Did this mean that the only sacrifice offered in such early anaphoras, perhaps even in AM, was that of praise and not the oblation of bread and wine? Does this possibly suggest that a ‘mini-anaphora’ was not a eucharistic celebration *per se*, but rather a prayer service incorporated later into a eucharistic liturgy? Does the absence of an Institution Narrative in AM (even an invocation for the transformation, in the strictest sense, of the gifts of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ) imply that AM was originally such a ‘mini-anaphora’, offering only ‘a sacrifice of praise’?

⁵ T. Elavanal, mentions that by the fifth century, there were five Patriarchates within the Roman Empire (Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem) and two Catholicates outside the Empire: Persia and Armenia. It appears then that this response has a post-fifth century origin. See Elavanal, p. 17.

the benediction, “The grace of our Lord . . .”, the point which most liturgical scholars consider to be the actual beginning of all anaphoras.

Gelston states that the “East Syrian liturgies adopt the Pauline greeting of 2 Cor. 13:14, which Engberding finds to be characteristic of Byzantine liturgies.”⁷ However, Gelston points to two significant distinctions: (1) the replacement of ‘you’ by ‘us’, which essentially turns the greeting into a prayer for the blessing of the entire church assembly (the people’s response also changes from the reciprocal wish for peace to the simple ‘Amen’); and (2) the addition of the Byzantine liturgical conclusion referring to current time and eternity, namely, “now and forever . . .” The appearance then of these two hellenistic elements in the *Mar Esa’ya* prayer book signifies that AM borrowed from the Basilian tradition.

Besides the modification of ‘you’ to ‘us’, mentioned above, the only other major difference between the two anaphoras is the absence in AM of the conjunction ‘and’ between ‘God’ and ‘Father’ (Byz-BAS reads ‘τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρός’). Gelston notes that “both the addition of ‘Father’ and the supply of the verb ‘be’ reflect derivation from the Greek-speaking liturgical tradition rather than an independent adoption of the greeting from the biblical text.”⁸

In regard to the second exchange between the celebrant and the people (beginning with “Let us lift up our hearts”), the Greek liturgical tradition reads, “Ἄνω

⁶ The anaphora proper begins with: “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God the Father, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with all of you.”

⁷ Gelston, p. 76. 2 Corinthians 13.14 reads: “The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all.” Interestingly, the Syriac Bible known as *Peshitta* replaces ‘grace’ with ‘peace’, but this substitution is nowhere to be found in any of the 86 existing MSS of Addai and Mari. However, ‘the Father’ is absent from the *Peshitta* but present in the anaphora. The *Peshitta* and anaphora are in agreement against the Greek New Testament with the expression ‘our Lord’, but when compared to Byz-BAS, AM is in almost perfect agreement.

⁸ *Ibid.* p. 77.

σχωμεν τὰς καρδίας” (“*Let us lift up our hearts*”), while AM says “*Lift up your minds.*”⁹ Hippolytus’ Latin text for this second reciprocation follows the original Greek text. According to Gelston, the Byzantine text is secondary, while Addai and Mari’s use of the imperative ‘be’ (Gelston’s translation: “Let your hearts [*sic.*] be on high”) is apparently an “independent amplification.”¹⁰

The final exchange (Byz-BAS: “Let us give thanks to the Lord”; AM: “The oblation is offered to God the Lord of all”) differs considerably between both texts. Gelston finds this last exhortation in AM to be the most ancient of the three exchanges of the dialogue, particularly because it seems to stem from the Jewish meal *berakoth*, or “benedictions.” The response, “It is fit [proper] and right”, serves as the exordium, or introductory portion, of the *Presanctus* in most liturgies,¹¹ and it appears as a coherent response to its introductory exhortation in both anaphoras. Gelston, however, insists that AM’s retention of the original response seems to imply that a more traditional exhortation was at one time in existence but was later replaced by the current one. This traditional exhortation probably resembled the one in Byz-BAS.

The strange replacement in AM of the traditional “Let us give thanks to the Lord” with “The oblation is offered . . .” should not pose too much confusion, given the

⁹ Two important textual differences: (1) while AM makes use of the imperative mood (giving a command, ‘lift up’), Byz-BAS uses the subjunctive mood (making a suggestion, ‘let us lift up’); and (2) AM includes ‘minds’; Byz-BAS includes ‘hearts.’ Gelston advocates Greek influence as the cause for the usage of ‘minds’ over ‘hearts’ in AM (also the case in *Apostolic Constitutions* 8), although Byz-BAS peculiarly uses ‘hearts’ and not ‘minds.’

Gelston also makes a number of interesting observations when he makes reference to Theodore of Mopsuestia’s *Mystagogical Lecture* 16, regarding this second exchange. Theodore’s exhortation is identical with AM and even shares with it the plural ‘minds’, against the Greek singular ‘mind’, which is substituted by the plural ‘hearts.’ In addition, writes Gelston, “the response is even more noteworthy since it departs from the traditional form, but has every appearance of being a more primitive form from which the actual response in Addai and Mari has been expanded.” See Gelston, p. 78.

¹⁰ Gelston, p. 77.

¹¹ St. John Chrysostom, Byzantine-Basil, and *Apostolic Constitutions* 8. See *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, ed. F.E. Brightman and, respectively, p. 321, line 28; p. 322, line 1; p. 14, line 25.

intended meaning of the Eucharist in the East Syrian tradition. The synonymous Syriac term for the Greek word *anaphora* is *qurbana* (the root *qrb* means to 'offer' or 'present', usually advice or comments).¹² This final exhortation, for all intents and purposes, is essentially informing the congregation that the eucharistic prayer is about to commence. The implications of both aforementioned formulas is that *something specific* is being offered to God, whether it be a monetary Corban, or the holy oblation of bread and wine, or simply praise and thanksgiving.¹³

In summary then of the introductory dialogue before the Preface, it seems that the first and third exchanges in Addai and Mari correspond to the traditional Greek forms, while the second interchange between celebrant and congregation departs significantly from an Antiochene or Byzantine form in favor of its own text. This suggests, therefore, that the second interchange, expanded with the addition of the Old Testament patriarchs,¹⁴ is the earliest of the three forms.

Addai and Mari's Opening Dialogue, on the whole, appears to be a modification of an earlier form, presumed to belong to a liturgy of a Greek community affiliated directly with the liturgical tradition of either Antioch or Constantinople. Gelston observes that the dialogue was probably translated into the Syriac language from the Greek during its oral transmission. The fixed responses by the people and the priest's part, despite local variations,¹⁵ bear witness to their prominent use in several anaphoras. AM's major

¹² The biblical term *Corban* (Heb. *qorbān*) of Mark 7.11, understood as 'a gift to God', is also the basis for the Syriac word *qurbana*.

¹³ Was the earliest notion of *qurbana* one of praise and thanksgiving only, as believed by Ligier and Cuming, or did it also include a material offering of bread and wine? See the argument in note 4 above.

¹⁴ Gelston's modified text includes the interpolation ". . . the God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Israel, the glorious King", after "To thee" or "Towards you."

¹⁵ Dix *et al.* believe unanimously that all eucharistic prayers differed from church to church, precisely because they were not written down but recited extemporaneously by each individual bishop. Although key structural elements were necessary in each prayer, the presence of variations should not come as a surprise.

adjustments to the dialogue generally reflect its “drifting away from its Semitic moorings.”¹⁶ Gelston summarizes the East Syrian anaphora’s major modifications as “the alteration of the opening exchange from a mutual greeting into a prayer for the blessing of all with a congregational *Amen*, and the substitution of the *Qurbana* formula for the ancient one reflecting the language of the Jewish meal blessings.”¹⁷

AM’s inclusion of a diaconal part appears secondary since it interrupts the natural flow of the text between the response of the final exhortation and the exordium of the Preface. No such insertion exists in the Byz-BAS text.

A Structural and Theological Examination of the Preface

John Fenwick points to the interesting observation (shared by Cuming and Ligier above) that “in the Preface is to be found the ancient core of the Christian anaphora.”¹⁸

Fenwick argues:

Certainly, it would seem reasonable to expect the Preface to contain part or all of the original response to the invitation to give thanks expressed in the Dialogue. Invocation of the Holy Spirit and Intercession may have been added later, but the irreducible minimum of the anaphora – the oldest stratum – must have been an expression of thanksgiving, such as the Dialogue invariably requires.¹⁹

Interestingly, this view offers a possible explanation for the peculiar absence of the Institution Narrative in Addai and Mari.

The Preface in AM may be divided into two major sections: (1) the appropriateness of praise to God (“Worthy of praise . . .”); and (2) the fundamental reason for this praise of God in brief statements of God’s creative and redemptive acts (“who created the world . . . and redeemed mankind in his mercy”). The first section is clearly worded so as to appear as a sequel to the Opening Dialogue. In addition, the entire

¹⁶ Gelston, p. 80.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Fenwick, p. 76. See also note 4 of this chapter.

Preface is composed in the third person singular (note the third person possessive pronoun 'he', used three times).²⁰

The Preface of Byz-BAS also begins with a section affirming the appropriateness of praise to God ("it is truly just and right . . . to praise you . . .", etc.). However, the second section departs radically from Addai and Mari in two fundamental ways. First, instead of legitimizing the praise of God because of His acts of creation and redemption within history, the prayer goes into a full theological discourse identifying the Second Person of the Trinity, in His relation to the Father and the Holy Spirit. In fact, mention of God's redemptive acts in Byz-BAS does not occur until the *Postsanctus*. Second, the Basilian text begins with a direct address of God the Father in the second person singular, in contrast to AM, which speaks about God in the third person. The opening vocative, in fact, "O YOU WHO ARE, Master, Lord, God, worshipful Father almighty" ("Ο ὢν, Δέσποτα, Κύριε Θεέ, Πάτερ Παντοκράτωρ, προσκυνητέ"),²¹ allows for the verb following to be in the active voice, whereas the absence of a direct address in AM makes the use of the passive voice more feasible.

An immediate observation between both Prefaces is clearly the longer length and again, the extensive development of theological ideas in Basil. Also, Basil makes significant use of rhetorical questions right in the text²² ("Who is worthy to praise you . . . ?", etc.), whereas AM's approach is completely declarative in nature. One aspect

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ The text shifts to the second person singular in the next section, or *Presanctus*. Addai and Mari is unique in that it shifts persons within the same eucharistic prayer.

²¹ See Chapter Two, note 63, which examines a possible biblical link for this exordium.

²² It appears that the Basilian tradition here is making obvious use of the Hellenistic (and Semitic) tendency to 'philosophize', or ponder contemplatively, the grandeur of God by posing rhetorical questions to the Lord Himself.

common in both Prefaces is that they are essentially continuations of the Opening Dialogue immediately preceding them.

Addai and Mari

At the end of the first line of the Preface, the majority of the eighty-six manuscripts of Addai and Mari add 'and adoration and exultation from all creatures', with slight variations.²³ The existence of such a variety of inserted phrases among MSS suggests that this added material is probably secondary to the original text.

The very next line ". . . is the adorable and glorious Name of the Father and the Son and of the Holy Spirit" offers an interesting combination of Semitic and possibly Byzantine influence.²⁴ Only two MSS include the possessive pronoun 'thy' instead of the article 'the' in the prepositional phrase 'of thy glorious Trinity', thus turning the phrase into a direct address to God. Consequently, this variation is also viewed as a secondary expansion of the original text.

Byzantine-Basil

The opening phrase "Master, Lord, God, worshipful Father Almighty" was believed to have entered the Preface from the Egyptian tradition, from which it possibly originated.²⁵

After the praise verbs *εὐχαριστεῖν* and *δοξάζειν*, Byz-BAS has a number of verses which derive from the Book of Psalms and Paul's Letters to the Romans and

²³ See A. Gelston, p. 56.

²⁴ The praising of the Name of God is clearly a prominent element in Judaic temple, synagogue, or home worship. Its inclusion in AM is certainly deliberate, given the anaphora's Semitic background. The expounding of the Persons of the Trinity may not be exclusively Byzantine, as Christ Himself mentions Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in Matthew 28.19, in the Great Commission. The earliest *Mar Esa'ya* text reads, 'Father and the Son and of the Holy Spirit', rather than 'of the glorious Trinity.'

²⁵ At least this is the opinion of G.A. Michell who, as Fenwick notes, did not take into account the strong possibility that E-BAS influenced the Egyptian anaphora of Gr-Mark. See G.A. Michell, "Firmilian and Eucharistic Consecration", in *Journal of Theological Studies* 5 (1954) 215-20.

Hebrews, which reflect God's greatness. Since none of this material is present in the older E-BAS manuscript, it appears then that the Preface in Byz-BAS is an expansion.

A common element in all four Basilian traditions, which must as a result be considered original, is the inclusion of the phrases 'the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' ('ὁ Πατήρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ') and 'You are seated upon the throne of glory' ('ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης'). Neither phrase finds an equivalent in AM.

The cataphatic clause 'who is . . .' ('ὅς ἐστιν . . .') is common in Basil, appearing in the Preface at the point "who is the great God and Savior of our hope, the image of your goodness, the true seal of revealing in Himself You, the Father." The clause resembles quite closely a passage from the writings of St. Athanasios the Great and perhaps suggests that Basil himself inserted it to affirm his own Orthodoxy and support of the Nicene Synod of 325 AD. Interestingly, the Cappadocian Father also makes extensive use of apophatic terms, but only in describing God the Father.²⁶ The cataphatic language seems to center rather around the Son.²⁷

The clause 'was manifested' ('ἐξεφάνη')²⁸ is yet another characteristic expression of Byz-BAS when referring to the Holy Spirit and His appearance through the Son. Basil attempts to solidify his anti-Arian position by affirming the Son's equality to the Father in manifesting the Spirit to the world.

²⁶ "You are without beginning, invisible, incomprehensible, beyond words, unchangeable" ("ἀναρχε, ἀόρατε, ἀκατάληπτε, ἀπερίγραπτε, ἀναλλοίωτε, . . ."). In identifying God the Father individually, apart from God the Son and God the Holy Spirit, St. Basil cannot help but use the language of apophaticism, which does not define who God *is*, but rather what He *is not* in human terms. After all human means of defining God have been exhausted, God remains a perfect *μυστήριον*, the difference being that He has been purged of every imperfect and human means of understanding Him.

²⁷ "He is the living Word, the true God, eternal wisdom, life, sanctification, power, and the true light." The only cataphatic statement regarding the Father occurs when Basil establishes the relationship between Father and Son: "You are the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." Obviously, Christ does not conceal His filial relationship to the Father, as can be seen throughout the Gospels, when Jesus calls God "My Father." It would seem then that Basil's boldness in his use of cataphatic language depends exclusively upon the Person of the Son, stemming of course from the reality of the Incarnation.

As can be seen, the Preface of Byz-BAS has a distinct trinitarian structure, but this structure is not exclusive to the Preface alone. As will be seen, other sections of the eucharistic prayer have a similar structure, such as the *Postsanctus* (in a far more elaborate style), the Anamnesis, Institution Narrative, Epiklesis (as a whole unit), and finally, the Doxology. This highly dogmatical anaphora, replete with trinitarian formulas and a plethora of cataphatic and apophatic expressions, differs significantly from the far less elaborate and succinct E-BAS tradition. Regarding the Preface, John Fenwick maintains that the earlier E-BAS text has been reworked to produce the Ω-BAS family and, specifically, Byz-BAS. He writes:

To sum up this examination of the texts of E-BAS and Ω-BAS, it may be concluded that, despite the signs of further reworking in E-Basil itself, there is enough correspondence between the versions to support the theory that the 'sobriety' of the shorter form has been enriched and expanded, primarily by the insertion of blocks of biblical material, in order to give it a Trinitarian schema.²⁹

A Theological Comparison of Both Prefaces

The Centrality of Praise and Thanksgiving

“One of the salient characteristics of East Syrian liturgy is its emphasis on the aspect of praise and thanksgiving.”³⁰ This doxological component is immediately introduced in the Preface of both anaphoras and appears to dominate the first half of each eucharistic prayer. However, as T. Elavanal also observes, the elements of praise and thanksgiving permeate the entire prayer in both AM and Byz-BAS, further evidence perhaps that the anaphora’s original purpose was the offering of glorification to God by the worshiping community of the Church, expressed within the material offering of the

²⁸ “Through Him the Holy Spirit was manifested, . . .” (“παρ’ οὗ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐξεφάνη, . . .”).

²⁹ Fenwick, p. 80.

³⁰ Elavanal, p. 73.



bread and wine. This doxological element will be identified in subsequent chapters when appropriate.

All the Institution accounts from the gospels mention that during the Last Supper, the Lord performed a 'blessing' or 'gave thanks' over the bread and the cup of wine. Matthew and Mark speak of an act of blessing (*εὐλόγησας*) over the bread (Mt 26.26; Mk 14.22) and a thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστήσας*) over the cup (Mt 26.27; Mk 14.23). Luke and Paul only refer to a thanksgiving of Christ at the Last Supper (Lk 22.19-20; 1 Cor 11.23-26).

The content of Christ's words at the Institution are unknown, but there is legitimate reason to suspect that He offered the blessing and thanksgiving prayers to His Father in the light of the customary Jewish *berakoth* pronounced over food in which God is praised for His goodness and mercy.³¹

³¹ Thomas Elavanal has taken the position, substantiated by most liturgical scholars today, that "Christian liturgy has its roots in Judaism rather than Hellenism" (Elavanal, p. 40). In fact, it is virtually undeniable that many of the early Christian liturgical prayers, in content but more so in structure, can be paralleled with Jewish prayers and can be considered as adaptations of them. Elavanal further writes that "it cannot be denied that Christian liturgy has borrowed many of its rites, symbols and formularies from Jewish liturgy, so much so that the Christian liturgy is not something entirely newly invented but shaped out of the forms inherited from Judaism" (Elavanal, pp. 41-42).

Without question, the Christian Church's liturgical life stems from the establishment of the Eucharist by Christ who sat with His disciples in the Upper Room at the Last Supper. The context in which this meal was held was the approaching feast of the Jewish Passover. [There is no need here to enter the debate whether Jesus did celebrate an actual Passover meal at the Last Supper (Western Synoptic stance) or not (Eastern Johannine position).]

An important act of Jewish domestic worship on Sabbaths and major feasts was the *Kiddush*, a religious meal which proclaimed the sanctity of the day. If the Last Supper were an actual Passover meal, then the *Kiddush* was most likely the eucharistic celebration's immediate antecedent. The *Kiddush* involved a cup-bread model (paralleled only in Luke), in which a blessing is recited over a cup of wine by the leader (the symbol of joyous celebration), from which everyone partakes. Then follows a blessing hallowing the day, a blessing over the bread (the symbol of God's physical sustenance of humanity), and the family meal. By the time of Christ, families and pious communities met together for such religious celebrations.

Gregory Dix proposes that Christ probably celebrated a religious meal called *Chaburah* (*chaber* = 'friend'), which consisted of "little private groups or informal society of friends banded together for purposes of special devotion and charity . . . only distinguished from hundreds of other similar societies by its unusually close bond and by the exceptionally independent attitude of its leader toward the accepted religious authorities" (Dix, p. 50). Dix goes on to explain that the *Chaburah* was held weekly, usually on the eve of the Sabbath or holy days, although no specific rule governed its frequency. Elavanal also leans toward the *Chaburah* antecedent for the Christian Eucharist, advocating a Johannine chronology (that the

Aside from the *Kiddush* and *Chaburah* religious meals incorporating aspects of praise and thanksgiving, one must also examine more specifically the importance of the *Birkat ha-mazon*, the benedictions themselves, which are recited after Jewish meals. As early as the Book of Samuel (1 Sam 9.13), there exists evidence that people refrained from eating until the blessing was pronounced over the food, as specified by the biblical injunction: "And you shall eat and be full, and you shall bless the Lord your God for the good land he has given you" (Dt 8.10).

The *Birkat ha-mazon* benedictions consist traditionally of three blessings: (1) "Blessed be He who gives food to all" (instituted by Moses); (2) "Blessed are You for the land and for the food" (instituted by Joshua); and (3) "Blessed are You, Lord, who will rebuild Jerusalem" (instituted by King Solomon). The first benediction blesses God who sustains the entire universe and in His mercy gives food to the people. The second blessing is a thanksgiving for the Torah and covenant and thus a thanksgiving memorial of all the important events in the history of salvation. The third *berakah* is a request that God's creative and redemptive action may be renewed again. It is also a prayer of expectation in the coming of the Messiah and the establishment of God's Kingdom. As Elavanal observes, "Anaphoras contain the general themes of praise of God for creation and His provident activity, thanksgiving for redemption and the fulfillment of the promises and supplication for their eschatological fulfilment."³²

Last Supper was neither a Passover meal nor a *Kiddush*. E.O. James, on a more liberal note, states that even if the Last Supper was not a *Kiddush* meal, it became a new *Kiddush* with its own specific nature and significance. See E.O. James, *The Origin of Sacrifice* (London, 1933), p. 204.

³² The *Birkat ha-mazon*, in its tripartite structure, seems to correspond to the Christian anaphoral structure, to a degree. The first part parallels the Preface and *Presanctus* (praise), the second part the *Postsanctus* (thanksgiving), and the third part the Anamnesis, Epiklesis, and Intercessions (supplication). However, Elavanal cautions that "the structural parallelism of praise, thanksgiving, and supplication, seen in these meal berakoth . . . cannot prove that AM [and Byz-BAS, for that matter], is [are] exclusively modeled after *Birkat ha-mazon*" (Elavanal, p. 57). The reason for this stems from the fact that all Jewish prayer forms,

The Preface in Addai and Mari begins with a glorification of God or, more specifically, an explanation of why God ought to be praised (recall that God is not addressed directly in this section). Basil's anaphora addresses God directly and voices the worshipping community's acknowledgement of God's greatness as the grounds for the Church's praise of Him. In AM, the sole justification for the praise of God is simply that God is praiseworthy, as the Psalmist advises: "O give thanks to the Lord, for He is good!" (Ps 117.1).³³ In the Book of Revelation, a similar expression is voiced in the heavenly liturgy by the twenty-four elders, who fall down and worship the one on the throne: "Worthy are You, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power; for You created all things, . . ." (Rev 4.11). The holy angels also offer a similar benediction: "Worthy is the Lamb who was slain, to receive power and riches and wisdom, and strength and honor and glory and blessing!" (Rev 5.12).

The use of the mouth as the instrument of praise is a popular Semitic concept, rooted in Old Testament scripture, and incorporated in the Preface of Addai and Mari ("Worthy of praise from every *mouth*, and thanksgiving from every *tongue*, . . ."), but absent in Byz-BAS. The psalms of praise include this element (see, e.g., Ps 34.1, Ps, 71.8, and Ps. 145.21).

The Praising of the 'Name'

The concept of praising the Name of God is also a peculiar element of the East Syrian liturgies. In fact, the object of praise in the Preface of AM is not God *per se*, but

including *Shema* and *Tefillah* (to be examined later), share these same themes. A. Fortescue also affirms this fact: "It is dangerous to draw up parallel forms with any one Jewish set of prayer and to deduce that that particular set is the prototype of the Christian liturgy, for several reasons, one of the most obvious of which is that the same forms recur continually in the services of the Jews." See A. Fortescue, The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy (London, 1912), p. 75.

³³ Psalm 118.1 (LXX). All subsequent references to the psalms will be from the Masoretic text, and not the Septuagint.

the 'adorable and glorious Name' of God. The praise of the Name also occurs in the *Presanctus*, except this time it is expressed by the heavenly host. The biblical references to the grandeur of the Name are plenteous.³⁴ The Jewish emphasis on the Name of God stemmed from the belief that "in the formal blessings, the release of divine power was effected by the invocation of the Name of God."³⁵ Within the synagogue tradition, solemn prayers and discourses ended with a formula called *Kaddish*,³⁶ a glorification of God's Name in the form of a doxology.

The trinitarian formula in the Preface of AM, in relation to the 'Name', is believed by L. Bouyer to be a later addition,³⁷ possibly even a later Byzantine interpolation. As mentioned previously, the Preface of Byz-BAS also makes reference to the Holy Trinity but does so in a far more extensive and detailed manner.

According to Bouyer, the original use of the 'Name' in AM, prior to the trinitarian addition, was a direct reference to the Person of Christ.³⁸ "This glorification of the name of Jesus may be based on the proclamation of Jesus as Kyrios who was given 'the name which is above every name' and which every tongue should confess (Phil.

³⁴ See 1 Chr 29.13; Neh 9.5; Is 12.3, 26.13; Ps 7.17, 9.2, 18.49, 44.8, 54.6, 61.8, 66.4, 69.30, 72.19, 86.9,12, 92.1, 96.2, 99.3, 100.4, 106.47, 113.1-3, 116.4,13,17, 135.1, 145.1,2, 148.5, 149.3. For miracles performed in God's Name in the New Testament, see the following references: Mt 7.22; Mk 9.38-39, 16.17; Lk 9.49; Acts 4.10. Christ also asks His followers to pray in His Name: Jn 14.13, 15.16, 16.23-24.

³⁵ Elavanal, p. 83. For the Jews, the Name was an extension of God's Person. Thus, to invoke the Name of God in a blessing was the equivalent of God bestowing the blessing Himself, in person. Interestingly, if one follows the hypothesis of Ligier and Cuming, that AM was possibly a 'mini-anaphora' with a basic structure of praise and thanksgiving, could this imply perhaps that the invocation of the Name of God was the actual 'consecration' of the people and the doxology they offered to Him? As will be seen later in this study, "The epiklesis in AM is not, in the strict sense, a consecratory prayer, for it does not pray for a change of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, but that they may become a source of sanctification for those who receive them" (Elavanal, p. 172).

³⁶ Elavanal, p. 83.

³⁷ See L. Bouyer, *Eucharist, Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer*. Trans. C.U. Quinn (Notre Dame, 1963), p. 153.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

2:10-11).³⁹ Elavanal continues: "In the early Christian liturgy the 'Name' probably referred to Christ, as a proclamation of Jesus as Kyrios and as an acknowledgment of faith in Him."⁴⁰

The elements of adoration and praise of God are fundamental to all liturgical worship. The celebration of the Eucharist is distinctly a communal act which offers to God this glorification.⁴¹ Insofar as the Eucharist remains a communal act, it always involves a public acknowledgment of the Christian faith before others. As Elavanal explains, "It is a proclamation or confession of God for it implies a conscious element of affirmation of our faith."⁴² The praise verbs used in the Preface of both AM and BYZANTINE affirm this idea.

Two Syriac verbs which convey this idea of confession through the act of praise and thanksgiving are *tawdita* ("Worthy of praise . . . and thanksgiving") and *maudenan* (" . . . to give thanks to You").⁴³ In the New Testament, the two Greek words used to describe the blessing over the bread and cup at the Last Supper are *εὐλογεῖν* and *εὐχαριστεῖν*, found in Basil. Their Syriac equivalents are, respectively, *barek* and *awdi*.⁴⁴

The Hebrew word *hodah* has the sense of 'to confess.' The Hebrew *hodah* and *todah* and the Greek *εὐχαριστεῖν* and *εὐχαριστία* are rendered equally in Syriac by

³⁹ Elavanal, p. 84. New Testament references that associate the 'Name' with Christ are: Acts 2.21, 3.6, 4.10,12, 8.12; Rom 10.13, 1 Cor 1.2,10, 5.4, 6.11; Eph 5.20; Col 3.17, 2 Tim 1.12. References to baptism being administered in the Name of Jesus are: Acts 2.38, 8.16, 10.48, 19.15; 1 Cor 1.13.

⁴⁰ Elavanal, p. 85.

⁴¹ Jewish custom called for the presence of at least ten persons for the proper glorification of God, to show the communal nature of this confession of God's glory.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ The Hebrew word *berakah* can be translated as *εὐλογία*, 'a blessing or praise.' Neither of these definitions, however, fully expresses the meaning of *berakah*, which derives from *brk-barak*, which etymologically signifies 'a bending of the knee' and, in a wider sense, "an acknowledgment in a spirit of praise of an act or gift of God" (Elavanal, p. 86).

awdi ('to confess/thank') and *tawdita* ('confession/thanksgiving'). Hence, the Syriac terms seem to combine in themselves both elements of 'confession' or 'profession of faith' (from the Hebrew) and 'thankfulness' (from the Greek), thus reflecting the linguistic idiosyncrasies of both traditions.

In Byzantine and Syriac worship then, God is not only the recipient of the Church's gratitude and thanksgiving, but His mighty works in the history of salvation are also confessed by way of praise within the context of public worship. St. Basil's rendering "Who is worthy to praise Your mighty acts?" implies the notion of confessing God's mighty works of creation and salvation (the *mirabilia Dei*), even though the chief verb used is *λαλῆσαι* ('to speak'; 'to utter'). In a certain thanksgiving prayer of AM after communion, the element of praising God's Name is apparent: "With hosanna we will confess thy name for thy grace towards our race" and "It is fitting . . . to confess and worship and praise the fearful name of thy majesty."⁴⁵ In both liturgies, the Name of God is praised not only because God is praiseworthy by nature, but also because of His creation and divine economy toward mankind. The *Postsanctus* of both anaphoras expounds upon the history of salvation, which explains why the confession and praise of God's Name is worthwhile for the Christian worshiper.

⁴⁵ Elavanal, p. 87.

Chapter Five The *Presanctus* and *Sanctus*

Addai and Mari (AM) *The Presanctus*

Priest: Your majesty, O Lord, a thousand thousand heavenly beings worship and myriad myriads of angels, hosts of spiritual beings, ministers (of) fire and of spirit, with cherubim and holy seraphim, glorify your Name:

(*qamona*) Crying out and glorifying and calling to one another and saying:

The Sanctus

People: Holy, holy, holy is the Lord Almighty: the heavens and the earth are full of his glory. (Hosanna in the highest! Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is he who has come and comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest!)

Byzantine-Basil (Byz-BAS) *The Presanctus*

Priest (*cont. 'd*): For You are praised by the angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, authorities, powers, and the many-eyed Cherubim. Round about You stand the Seraphim, one with six wings and the other with six wings; with two they cover their faces; with two they cover their feet; with two they fly, crying out to one another with unceasing voices and ever-resounding praises:

(*aloud*) Singing the victory hymn, proclaiming, crying out, and saying:

The Sanctus

People: Holy, holy, holy, Lord Sabaoth, heaven and earth are filled with Your glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is He who comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna to God in the highest.

The Originality of the *Sanctus*

The *Presanctus* and *Sanctus* within the Christian liturgy need to be examined as a single unit, since the former's purpose is clearly to introduce the latter. Interestingly, the position of the *Presanctus* immediately after the Preface in Addai and Mari challenges the fluidity of the anaphora,¹ thus raising the important question whether the *Sanctus* is original in AM. On the other hand, the Preface in Byz-BAS seems to lead into the *Presanctus* much more coherently, with minimal, if any, incongruity.²

¹ The ancient tenth century *Mar Esa'ya* manuscript of AM reads: "Worthy of praise . . . is the adorable and glorious Name, . . . and has effected great grace toward mortals./Your majesty, O Lord, a thousand thousand heavenly beings worship . . .". The text seemingly makes an awkward jump from the 'general' glorification of the Name of God to the angelic worship of the heavenly host. This unusual transition has suggested to some scholars that the *Sanctus* and its surrounding material are interpolations and thus not original to the eucharistic prayer. Another interesting point raises the question why the *Presanctus*, at least in its most ancient extant form (i.e. the *Mar Esa'ya* document), was not reworked.

² The Basilian text reads: ". . . every rational and spiritual creature is made capable of worshipping You . . . for all things are subject to You./For You are praised by the angels, . . .". The *Presanctus*' general reference to rational (*λογική*) and spiritual (*νοερά*) beings is inclusive of both humans and angels, two orders of creatures subservient to God's authority. Consequently, the exclusive description in the *Presanctus* of the

Scholars generally disagree about the origins of the liturgical use of the *Sanctus* within the eucharistic liturgy. While some consider it as necessarily original to the eucharistic prayers that have it, others argue that the *Sanctus* is an interpolation. A. Couratin summarizes the conflict with these words: "When the *Sanctus* was introduced into the Eucharistic Prayers, there was no one particular point at which it was introduced. And indeed, one of the principal problems facing the liturgist is to determine why it was introduced at all."³

Edward Ratcliff believed that the eucharistic prayer in *Apostolic Tradition* had been greatly reworked in order to bring it in conformity with other later prayers. For Ratcliff, the original text resembled more closely the pattern of Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, consisting of a more extensive thanksgiving for the work of creation and redemption, the absence of an Epiklesis, and the inclusion of a final thanksgiving bringing the earthly worshipers to join the heavenly worship in the singing of the *Sanctus*.⁴ While Ratcliff's radical position found support in A. Couratin, G.A. Michell, and W.E. Pitt,⁵ "it seemed unlikely that the *Sanctus* had once formed the climax of the prayer and then later been omitted from it altogether."⁶

angelic beings and their role in the worship of God flows naturally from the previous section. It does not seem, however, that Byz-BAS reworks Ω -BAS, since both texts are virtually identical in the transition from the Preface to the *Presanctus*. See J. Fenwick, *The Anaphoras*, pp. 72-74 and 88.

³ See A. Couratin, "The Thanksgiving: An Essay," in *The Sacrifice of Praise*. Ed. Bryan D. Spinks. (Rome, 1981), p. 61.

⁴ See Gregory Dix, "The *Sanctus* and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora", in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 1 (1950) 29-36, 125-34. The purpose of the *Sanctus* then, according to Ratcliff, was essentially to conclude the 'sacrifice of praise' by raising the earthly congregation to join the heavenly legions of angelic beings in singing the praises of God.

⁵ See A.H. Couratin, "The *Sanctus* and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora: A Note on the Roman *Sanctus*", in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 2 (1951) 19-23; G.A. Michell, "Firmilian and Eucharistic Consecration", in *Journal of Theological Studies* 5 (1954) 215-20; W.E. Pitt, "The Origins of the Anaphora of St. Basil", in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 12 (1961) 1-13. Pitt argues that the original form of Basil's anaphora only included a Preface and *Sanctus*.

⁶ See Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* (New York, 1992), p. 144.

In his own examination of the *Sanctus*, Bryan Spinks rejects two popular theories of the past century: namely, (1) the ‘Egyptian theory’, strongly supported by Gregory Dix and Georg Kretschmar,⁷ which states that the appearance of the *Sanctus* can be traced to an Alexandrian origin, namely, the writings of Origen and the *Sacramentary of Sarapion* (the earliest liturgical document⁸ where the *Sanctus* was found in a eucharistic prayer); and (2) the ‘climax theory’, developed by Ratcliff, which maintains that the *Sanctus* is the culmination of the eucharistic celebration because it joins both earthly and heavenly beings in the praise of God. As Bradshaw observes, “He [Spinks] pointed out that while in some early eucharistic prayers the *Sanctus* certainly appeared to be a later addition, in others it seemed instead to be an integral part of the original nucleus, which could perhaps best be explained by positing a variety of early models of eucharistic prayer rather than a single archetype.”⁹ Spinks believed that the *Sanctus* could have been derived from a variety of sources: the early Christians may have borrowed it from the synagogue liturgy¹⁰ or from the Jewish mystical tradition or directly from scriptural phraseology without any Jewish intervention. It may even be that the *Sanctus* originated in a different way in different places, which probably accounts for regional differences in its form.¹¹

⁷ See G. Dix, “Primitive Consecration Prayers”, in *Theology* 37 (1938) 261-83; G. Kretschmar, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie* (Tübingen, 1956), pp. 180, 182.

⁸ Maxwell Johnson points out that “the first indisputable references to the use of the *Sanctus* in the eucharistic liturgy – as well as in a non-eucharistic setting – have been discovered by H.-J. auf der Maur in the paschal vigil homilies (c. 337) of Asterios Sophistes of Cappadocia.” See Maxwell E. Johnson, “The Archaic Nature of the *Sanctus*, Institution Narrative, and Epiclesis of the Logos in the Anaphora Ascribed to Sarapion of Thmuis”, in *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*. Ed. Paul F. Bradshaw (Collegeville, MN, 1997), p. 79.

⁹ Bradshaw, p. 157.

¹⁰ Specifically, the *Yotzer Or* benediction with the accompanying *Qeduššah*. Spinks suggests that the first borrowers of the *Sanctus* tradition were third-century Aramaic-speaking East Syrian Christians. See B. Spinks, “The Original Form of the Anaphora of the Apostles: A Suggestion in the Light of Maronite Sharar”, in *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 91 (1977) 146-61.

¹¹ Bryan D. Spinks, *The Sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 1-121.

If Spinks' supposition is correct, that the *Sanctus* is, in fact, 'an integral part of the original nucleus' of certain anaphoras, then the archaic nature of the *Sanctus* cannot easily be denied. In his doctoral dissertation, Maxwell E. Johnson,¹² following the position of Geoffrey Cuming,¹³ attempts to reestablish the traditional fourth-century dating for the *Sanctus* as well as prove that Bishop Sarapion of Thmuis himself served as the *Sanctus*' editor.

Johnson further observes that modern scholarship is seemingly converging on a Syrian (Cappadocian) point of origin for the *Sanctus*, although he fully accepts that the *Sanctus* unit in the purely Egyptian sources is not Syrian at all but uniquely Egyptian. If then the origins of the liturgical use of the *Sanctus* are in fact Syrian, then the possibility of the Egyptians reworking the *Sanctus* (Johnson suggests Sarapion as a chief editor, to be sure) based on Origen's exegesis of the scriptural reference Isaiah 6.2-3 cannot be ruled out. However, differences in Egyptian and Syrian uses of the *Sanctus* may also suggest: (1) the Egyptian and non-Egyptian anaphoral sources represent two independent liturgical traditions; or (2) the liturgical *Sanctus* is of Egyptian origin but the idea of its use in the anaphora was borrowed and adapted by the Syrians. While the Egyptian-Syrian link for the *Sanctus* could possibly suggest an early use in either the E-BAS or Ω -BAS anaphoras, it still appears unlikely that the anaphora was original to any particular Basilian anaphora, since there is clearly no proof of Basil's authorship of the *Sanctus*. At

¹² Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis* OCA 249 (Rome, 1995). Johnson refutes the positions of scholars such as Bernard Botte and Bernard Capelle, who maintained, respectively, that Sarapion's text – especially his Epiklesis – introduces: (1) a theologically motivated innovation foreign to the established Egyptian liturgy; and (2) a Semi-Arian or Pneumatomachian orientation, which in both cases would suggest a later dating for Sarapion's text, at least fifty to a hundred years.

¹³ Geoffrey J. Cuming, "Thmuis revisited: Another Look at the Prayers of Bishop Sarapion", in *Theological Studies* 41 (1980) 568-75.

best, the Cappadocian father borrowed an already established *Sanctus* unit from either Egypt or Syria during his travels.

Early Liturgical Uses of the *Sanctus*

All scholars are in agreement that the origins of the liturgical use of the *Sanctus* (and its accompanying material) in both Judaism and Christianity are obscure. However, one undeniable truth is that the *Sanctus* has a single biblical derivative, namely, Isaiah 6.3, in which the prophet receives a divine vision of the angelic host hovering around the heavenly throne of God and singing His praises.¹⁴ A. Gelston identifies the three liturgical modifications of the biblical text, first observed by A. Baumstark:

- (1) a change from the third person to the second in the final word: 'his glory' becomes 'your glory';
- (2) the insertion of the word 'God' between 'Lord' and 'of hosts' (in the Latin text, not the Byzantine, which retains *Κύριος Σαβαώθ*);
- (3) the change of 'the whole earth' into 'heaven and earth.'¹⁵

Many scholars are in agreement that the recitation of Jewish prayers in the form of 'holy', common in the synagogue service known as *Qeduššah*,¹⁶ is strikingly similar to the Christian Church's early expression of doxological praise through the *Sanctus*. It may thus be that the primary antecedent of the *Sanctus* was found in the *Qeduššah*.

One of the earliest uses of the *Sanctus* by Christians is noted in a reference to 1 Clement 34.6-7: ". . . and they cry out, Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole

¹⁴ The text reads: "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory" (Is 6.3).

¹⁵ Gelston, p. 85. According to Gelston, the three modifications do not all appear in every anaphora. For example, while the *Sanctus* is absent from the eucharistic prayer of Hippolytus, it occurs in Sarapion with only the first and third modifications, while in *Apostolic Constitutions* 8, only the third of these modifications is evident. Interestingly, The *Mar Esa'ya* text of AM only includes the third modification, choosing to follow the biblical text more closely, while Byz-BAS makes use of the first and third. Both anaphoras disregard altogether the second modification.

¹⁶ *Qeduššah* was a form of communal prayer in which faithful Jews proclaimed the holiness of God alongside the heavenly host. This union of the earthly and heavenly realms in the worship of God was a unique experience for Jews, rooted certainly in the biblical visions of Isaiah 6.1-13 and Ezekiel 3.12-13. The *Qeduššah* appears in three main prayers: (1) the *Qeduššah* of early morning service (*Yotzer*); (2) as a

creation is replete with His splendor. And so we too, being dutifully assembled with one accord, should as with one voice, cry out to Him earnestly.”¹⁷ Whereas T. Elavanal claims that the *Sanctus*’ presence in Clement is clear evidence that the *Sanctus* enjoyed liturgical use in Clement’s time, Gelston denies any direct reference to eucharistic worship in Clement’s allusion to Isaiah 6.3.

The absence of the *Sanctus* in the *Apostolic Tradition* raises a challenging argument. Due to this particular anaphora’s ‘perfect’ fluidity, some scholars strongly feel that the *Sanctus* may have been a later addition in all eucharistic prayers also, one which breaks this coherence. The counter-argument to this position, however, seeks to understand “how the *Sanctus* is closely connected with the whole anaphora right from the beginning and how it is in tune with its general tone.”¹⁸

A few differentiating characteristics between the *Sanctus* in AM and other anaphoras must be examined. First, the phrase “Hosanna to the Son of David!” is an element found in AM¹⁹ but absent in Byz-BAS and the Mozarabic liturgies. Another common element in East Syrian anaphoras is: “Blessed is he who has come and comes in the name of the Lord”, compared to Byz-BAS’ rendering: “Blessed is He who comes in the name of the Lord.”²⁰ AM’s parallel to the Book of Revelation, “who is and who was and who is to come” (Rev 1.4), and “behold, he is coming” (1.7). It would seem then that AM’s eschatological orientation is slightly stronger than that of Byz-BAS (without

part of the *Tefillah*, or ‘Eighteen Benedictions’; and (3) at the end of the weekday morning service (*Qeduššah de Sidra*).

¹⁷ Elavanal, p. 96.

¹⁸ Ibid. p. 97.

¹⁹ Didache 10.9 reads: “Hosanna to the *God* of David” (emphasis mine).

²⁰ Byz-BAS is following the Western Syrian version of the *Sanctus*; Chrysostom’s anaphora includes the same rendition. AM finds a slight variation in the liturgy of St. James and the Armenian liturgy, with the words: ‘who is to come’ and ‘who will come.’ However, the expression ‘Son of David’ remains foreign to these two anaphoras.

denying Basil's own immersion in eschatological language), primarily because of Addai and Mari's stronger biblical parallelism in this particular case.

There exists ample textual proof to suggest that the *Sanctus* was original to the earliest liturgical text of Addai and Mari. Elavanal shows the thematic relation of Addai and Mari to the benedictions of the *Shema*.²¹ The *Sanctus*, he maintains, was borrowed quite early from the Jewish synagogue prayers and almost immediately inserted into the early Christian liturgy. He speculates, "It is less probable that the Christian community would have borrowed new elements from the Synagogue service centuries after it had been separated from Judaism. So it is much more probable that the *Sanctus* was original in AM, as an anaphora developed in a Jewish background."²²

A Comparative Study of the *Presanctus* and *Sanctus*

Generally speaking, the *Presanctus*, aside from introducing the *Sanctus*, functions to affirm the heavenly praise of God among the angelic ranks, since He *is* "worthy of praise from every mouth" (Addai and Mari) and *all* things are subject to [Him] (Byz-

²¹ See Elavanal, pp. 46-49. The *Shema* (lit. "to hear"; "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one" (Dt 6.4)) was enclosed in a framework of three benedictions, the first two preceding the *Shema* and the one following it: (1) the *Yotser*, or first benediction, which praises God as the creator of the universe, but especially of the light and darkness. It also includes a praise of God for creating the angels, which leads into the "holy, holy, holy" of Isaiah 6.3); (2) the *Ahabah Rabbah*, or second benediction, which praises God for His great love toward all people through his involvement in history and especially for the enlightenment of the mind to understand God's commandments as given in the Torah; and (3) the *Emet-We-Yatsibh*, or third benediction, which thanks God by recalling the important events in Jewish salvation history. This benediction concludes with a doxology. Elavanal identifies the first section of the anaphora of AM as corresponding to the *Yotser*, leading up to the *Sanctus*. The *Postsanctus* corresponds to the *Ahabah Rabbah* and *Emet-We-Yatsibh*, which focus upon, respectively, the revelation of Christ and His redemption of the world. Pages 48 and 49 of Elavanal offer an amazing textual comparison to prove the originality of this tripartite structure in AM.

²² Ibid. p. 98. Scholars who disagree with the originality of the *Sanctus* in AM are compelled to eliminate the opening part of the *Postsanctus*, "And with these heavenly powers we give thanks to you, O Lord, . . .". Without this phrase the *Sanctus* would appear out of place indeed. However, as Elavanal cautions, the presence of the *Sanctus* should not be understood merely as a 'connecting link' but rather 'in its Jewish theological background', for communal prayer unites not only the earthly community in the praise of God, but quite necessarily the heavenly community to the earthly as well. "The introduction to the *Sanctus* and post-*Sanctus* are so well joined together that the *Sanctus* does not seem to be a mere interpolation but rather the focus of the first part of AM" (Elavanal, p. 100).

BAS), earthly and heavenly, visible and invisible, bodily, and spiritual. However, there are differences between both texts. First, Byz-BAS expands the hymn of praise in Isaiah 6.3 to include other angelic beings, such as angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, authorities, and powers (Col 1.16; Eph 1.20-21). AM, on the other hand, relies exclusively upon the seraphim and cherubim.²³ While the *Presanctus* text of Byz-BAS seems to depend more upon Isaiah 6.1-2,²⁴ the one in AM incorporates material from Daniel 7.9-10.²⁵ Interestingly, both anaphoras either mention (Byz-BAS) or imply (AM) that the praise of God is accomplished in a standing position. This stance is reminiscent of an eschatological reality, pointing to the Second Coming of Christ, in which all people will 'stand in judgment' before the great Judge.

The *qanona* in AM and its corresponding proclamation in Byz-BAS are quite similar, textually speaking. The urgency to verbalize the praise of God by the angelic host is clearly evident in both anaphoras. Addai and Mari inserts the biblical phrase from Isaiah 6.2, 'calling to one another and saying', in the *qanona*, while Byz-BAS includes it as part of the *Presanctus*. Both anaphoras share the expression 'crying out', but in

²³ Cherubim are not mentioned in Isaiah 6.3.

²⁴ Isaiah 6.1-2 reads: "In the year that King Uzziah died I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up; and his train filled the people. Above him stood the seraphim; each had six wings: with two he covered his face, and with two he covered his feet, and with two he flew. And one called to another and said: . . .". The physical description of the seraphim angels in Isaiah's vision clearly appears in Byz-BAS also. However, the Byzantine anaphora slightly differs from its biblical counterpart in that: (1) Basil has revised the original scriptural text to indicate that the seraphim *collectively* cover their faces and feet and fly, rather than focusing simply on the actions of one angel representing the others (as is the case in Isaiah); and (2) Basil's text reflects the eternal nature of angelic praise ("unceasing voices and ever-resounding praises"), since the angels are themselves eternal beings.

²⁵ Daniel 7.9-10 reads: "As I looked thrones were placed and one that that was ancient of days took his seat; his raiment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool; his throne was fiery flames, its wheels were burning fire. A stream of fire issued and came forth from before him; a thousand thousands served him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him; the court sat in judgment, and the books were opened." According to one Orthodox Christian trinitarian interpretation, this "Ancient of Days" is understood to be God the Father, and is often depicted in Orthodox iconography as an enthroned and aged old man adorned in white raiment (often alongside staunch criticism that the Father cannot be depicted in human form since He was never incarnated!). The language of 'majesty', 'myriad myriads', and ministers of 'fire and spirit' clearly find their equivalents in the corresponding biblical reference.

different places. The participle 'singing' is not present in AM as it is in Byz-BAS.²⁶ Finally, Byz-BAS identifies what is being sung and proclaimed: 'the victory hymn.' AM, on the other hand, simply views the *Sanctus* as a 'glorification of God's Name.' This difference is interesting, given that Isaiah certainly does not understand nor mentions his vision to be 'a hymn of victory.' The 'victory hymn' appears to be a later Byzantine interpolation, following the example of other well known 'victory hymns' of the Byzantine era, such as "Τῆ Ἰπερμάχῳ Στρατηγῶ", "Σῶσον, Κύριε, τὸν λαόν σου", etc.

Turning to the *Sanctus text*, Addai and Mari differs from the Peshitta of Isaiah 6.3 mainly only in the change from 'the whole earth' to 'the heavens and earth.' Interestingly, Basil also makes this change from the Septuagint text of Isaiah, to include 'heaven and earth.' B. Spinks' English translation of the Syriac text reads 'Almighty' instead of *Sabaoth* (= Hebrew, 'of hosts'), while Basil retains the biblical expression *Sabaoth*. Also, AM's *Sanctus* appears in the third person singular, while the English translation of the *Sanctus* in Byz-BAS finds the first part in the second person singular, addressing God directly, and the latter part in the third person.²⁷ This direct address in Basil may have been the work of a redactor who possibly sought to maintain the fluidity of the *Presanctus* and *Sanctus* by combining both sections as a single unit of prayer addressed to God.

AM's concluding section of the *Sanctus* corresponds fairly closely to the Old Syriac and Peshitta of Matthew 21.9. 'Hosanna to the Son of David!' corresponds word

²⁶ This omission in AM makes it tempting to assume that singing in general was not such a prominent part of the liturgy of Addai and Mari, and certainly not as common as in the later Byzantine liturgies. However, it is understood today by scholars that the *Sanctus* was not recited but sung in some form.

²⁷ In actuality, the Greek text of the *Sanctus* in Brightman reads 'εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος', an expression in the nominative which could be read in the vocative (according to the rules of ancient Greek and Hellenistic grammar) and thus keep the entire *Sanctus* in the second person. In such a case, however, the *Sanctus* would need to refer to Christ, and this is a point of disagreement among liturgies.

for word with the biblical passage and is unique to Addai and Mari. Both AM and Byz-BAS are almost identical in their repetition of 'Hosanna in the highest!'²⁸ Gelston explains this repetition thus: "This double rendering probably refers to the Incarnation and the Eucharist",²⁹ the two places where 'Hosanna!' is offered by the angelic hosts, both within the scriptural and traditional life of the Church.

A final difference in the English translations of the *Sanctus* texts between Addai and Mari and Basil is AM's 'Blessed is he who *has come and comes*', compared to Byz-BAS' simpler 'Blessed is he who *comes*.' Interestingly, Gelston remarks, the above expression *Benedictus qui venit* (*Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος*) is not found anywhere in the Egyptian liturgies and appears to be a later interpolation reflecting a christological benediction, although it clearly derives from the biblical greeting of the Jews during Christ's entry into Jerusalem in Matthew 21.9 and perhaps *Didache* 10.6. A. Baumstark oddly draws attention to the double interpretation of ὁ ἐρχόμενος as 'who has come and comes' in the *Sanctus* of Addai and Mari,³⁰ but neither he nor Gelston substantiates his position on this double meaning. Byz-BAS, on the other hand, simply reads 'Blessed is he who comes.' It appears then that the English text of Byzantine-Basil, 'he who comes', corresponds more accurately to the Greek ὁ ἐρχόμενος than AM does, although the Syriac rendering may actually have used a verb which possesses this double meaning.

²⁸ AM repeats 'Hosanna in the highest', while Byz-BAS first reads 'Hosanna in the highest', and the second time, 'Hosanna to God in the highest.'

²⁹ Gelston, p. 87.

³⁰ Linguistically speaking, ὁ ἐρχόμενος is a present participle of the middle voice, denoting a *continuous* action, as is common with all verb forms deriving from the present active tense. Hence, ὁ ἐρχόμενος means 'he who is coming' or 'he who comes' (continuously). The implication of an action that has been

The Debate on the *Sanctus*' Originality

Twentieth century liturgical scholarship regarding the originality of the *Sanctus* in early eucharistic prayers is divided. Most scholars who believe the *Sanctus* not to be original to the anaphora but a later interpolation follow the position of Edward C. Ratcliff, who claims the *Sanctus* to be an insertion in AM “on the grounds that the clauses introducing it have no connection with what precedes them, and that ‘the whole passage coming in between an address of praise to the Creator and Redeemer and a thanksgiving for salvation and grace is out of place.’”³¹ Bernard Botte not only accepted this argument, but also added that redemption is already mentioned in the Preface (‘. . . and redeemed mankind in his mercy, . . .’) and picked up again in the *Postsanctus*. Consequently, the *Sanctus* text is an intrusion that splits this singular theme in two. He concludes that the deletion of the first five words of the *Postsanctus* in AM,³² ‘And with these heavenly powers’, combined with the complete excision of the *Presanctus* section, renders a perfectly coherent text.

William Macomber defends the *Sanctus*' original position in AM by first establishing that the *Sanctus* does not, in fact, interrupt the sequence of thought. The ‘inhabitants’ mentioned in the Preface comprise both humans *and angels*,³³ and that the worship of angels is first inferred in the Preface and reaches its climax in the *Sanctus*, “and that this is followed by the thanksgiving of humanity, . . . relating the two

completed in the past is unusual, since this would be rendered by *ὁ ἐλθών*, ‘he who has come’ or ‘he who comes’, the first aorist participle of the verb denoting an action performed once.

³¹ Gelston, p. 87.

³² The removal of this introductory clause from the *Postsanctus* would make AM appear identical to *Sharar*. However, the counterargument seeking to prove the originality of the *Sanctus* maintains that even though the opening of the *Postsanctus* differs between AM and *Sharar*, the *Sanctus* unit is still present in both anaphoras. According to Gelston, this “creates a presumption in favour of its having belonged to the original common core” (Gelston, p. 88).

³³ See note 22 of this chapter and the comments by T. Elavanal.

together.”³⁴ Macomber also points out that the transition from the third to the second person in AM is more sudden if the *Presanctus* and *Sanctus* are removed. In this case, the text would read thus: “[God] . . . has effected [*lit. made*] great grace towards mortals./Your majesty, O Lord, a thousand thousand heavenly beings worship. . . .” The *Presanctus* then allows for a more gradual transition into the *Sanctus* “in that while God is now addressed directly the focus is on the description of the worship of the angels in the third person, leading into the descriptive third-person form of the *Sanctus*.”³⁵ As a result then of the *Sanctus*’ presence in AM, the following reference to the earthly congregation’s worship in the *Postsanctus* flows smoothly out of the *Sanctus*.

Macomber further indicates that even though the first five words of the *Postsanctus* (‘And with these heavenly powers’) are missing from *Sharar*, the *Sanctus* is nonetheless present, including a comparable phrase found in AM, ‘we your sinful servants.’ Gelston comments that “the emphatic repetition of the pronoun ‘we’ in both texts indicates that the contrast between the worship of heaven and that of the earthly congregation belongs to the common core of the two anaphoras.”³⁶

A Final Summary

Both anaphoras of Addai and Mari and Basil claim the *Presanctus* and *Sanctus* sections as integral parts of their liturgical structure. To rephrase the positions of Elavanal and Macomber, the *Presanctus-Sanctus* unit affirms that the sanctification of the Name of God is carried out simultaneously by both the heavenly host of angels and the human worshipers. For most liturgical scholars, this sense of combining earthly and heavenly worship is clearly not a modern concoction, but a deeply embedded belief within the

³⁴ Gelston, p. 87.

³⁵ Ibid. p. 88.

liturgical life of Judaism, borrowed by the infant Christian Church as it began to formulate and expand its own liturgical mode of worship.

A point of contention however among scholars has been the originality of this unit in both AM and the Basilian liturgies. Is the *Sanctus* an interpolation, and has its accompanying material been reworked, so as not to interrupt the sequence of thought in the anaphora? Or is the *Sanctus* an original part of the Syriac and Byzantine prototype, which later produced AM and Byz-BAS? A careful textual examination in AM shows that while the *Sanctus* seems to break the sequence of thought between the Preface and the *Postsanctus* section (especially if the first five words of the *Postsanctus* are excised), ample proof is given that the *Sanctus* actually links both sections together. This is so because of the interpretation of 'inhabitants' in the Preface as meaning both humans and angels, which would validate the reference to the worship of the heavenly host in the *Sanctus*. In addition, the *Sanctus*' absence would mean a very abrupt transition from the Preface to the *Postsanctus* (with or without the removal of the five introductory words).

A further proof of the *Sanctus*' originality in AM and Byz-BAS is its presence in the majority of other extant liturgical anaphoras, even after related anaphoras have been reworked to arrive at their original common core.

Does such an insistence on the prominence of the *Sanctus* in the Christian liturgy perhaps suggest that the main objective of the eucharistic celebration was the 'universal' glorification of God (i.e. heaven and earth), which found its most sublime expression in the Church's offering of bread and wine? It would seem inaccurately presumptuous to claim that the eucharistic offering itself, the Epiklesis, and the communion of the faithful was of secondary importance to the early Church. The Church certainly lived to fulfill the

³⁶ Ibid.

Lord's injunction to 'do this in remembrance of Me.' However, this act of love was fulfilled as its *εὐχαριστία*, as its thanksgiving and glorification of God. Indeed, the *Sanctus* could never eclipse the eucharistic offering in the anaphora, but it does seem to lead the Church in understanding the purpose for its gathering and then to unite both heaven and earth in the mystery of the mystical offering of bread and wine. In this particular sense, the *Sanctus'* value in the anaphora and its primary importance to the approaching eucharistic offering are clear.

Chapter Six The *Postsanctus*

Addai and Mari (AM) *The Postsanctus*

Priest: And with these heavenly powers we give thanks to you, O Lord, even we, your lowly, weak and miserable servants, because you have effected in us a great grace which cannot be repaid, in that you put on our humanity so as to quicken us by your divinity. And you lifted up our poor estate, and righted our fall. And you raised up our mortality. And you forgave our debts. You justified our sinfulness and you enlightened our understanding. And you, our Lord and our God, vanquished our enemies and made triumphant the lowliness of our weak nature through the abounding compassion of your grace.

(qanona) And for all your benefits and graces towards us we offer you glory and honor and thanksgiving and adoration now and at all times and for ever and ever.

People: Amen.

Deacon: Pray in your hearts. Peace be with us.

Byzantine-Basil (Byz-BAS) *The Postsanctus*

Priest (silently): Together with these blessed powers, loving Master, we sinners also cry out and say: Truly You are holy and most holy, and there are no bounds to the majesty of Your holiness. You are holy in all Your works, for with righteousness and true judgment You have ordered all things for us. For having made man by taking dust from the earth, and having honored him with Your own image, O God, You placed him in a garden of delight, promising him eternal life and the enjoyment of everlasting blessings in the observance of Your commandments. But when he disobeyed You, the true God who had created him, and was led astray by the deception of the serpent becoming subject to death through his own transgressions, You, O God, in Your righteous judgment expelled him from paradise into this world, returning him to the earth from which he was taken, yet providing for him the salvation of regeneration in Your Christ. For You did not forever reject Your creature whom You made, O Good One, nor did You forget the work of Your hands, but because of Your tender compassion, You visited him in various ways: You sent forth prophets; You performed mighty works by Your saints who in every generation have pleased You. You spoke to us by the mouth of Your servants the prophets, announcing to us the salvation which was to come; You gave us the law to help us; You appointed angels as guardians. And when the fullness of time had come, You spoke to us through Your Son Himself, through whom You created the ages. He, being the splendor of Your glory and the image of Your being, upholding all things by the word of His power, thought it not robbery to be equal with You, God and Father. But, being God before all ages, He appeared on earth and lived with humankind. Becoming incarnate from a holy Virgin, He emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, conforming to the body of our lowliness, that He might change us in the likeness of the image of His glory. For, since through man sin came into the world and through sin death, it pleased Your only-begotten Son, who is in Your bosom, God and Father, born of a woman, the holy Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary; born under the law, to condemn sin in His

flesh, so that those who died in Adam may be brought to life in Him, Your Christ. He lived in this world, and gave us precepts of salvation. Releasing us from the delusions of idolatry, He guided us to the sure knowledge of You, the true God and Father. He acquired us for Himself as His chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation. Having cleansed us by water and sanctified us with the Holy Spirit, He gave Himself as ransom to death in which we were held captive, sold under sin. Descending into Hades through the cross, that He might fill all things with Himself, He loosed the bonds of death. He rose on the third day, having opened a path for salvation to the resurrection from the dead, since it was not possible that the Author of life would be dominated by corruption. So He became the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep, the first-born of the dead, that He might be Himself the first in all things. Ascending into heaven, He sat at the right hand of Your majesty on high and He will come to render to each according to his works.

Initial Observations

The general purpose of the *Presanctus-Sanctus* unit in the anaphoras of Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil, as discussed in the previous chapter, is to identify and synchronize, if you will, the earthly worship of Christians with that of the heavenly host. In conjunction with T. Elavanal, “It was through the recitation of Qedushah [*sic.*] that the community join [*sic.*] the angels on high in declaring the glory of God.”¹ The section termed the *Postsanctus* essentially seeks to express the reason *why* humans should join the choirs of angels in their praise of God. Put simply, the *Postsanctus* is mankind’s expression of thanksgiving toward God for His involvement in human history and His redemption of man.

In examining the *Postsanctus* section of both liturgies, one is immediately struck by three very obvious differences, each of which will be discussed at length later in this chapter: (1) Byz-BAS (and clearly the Ω -BAS text as well) possesses a much longer and

more fully developed *Postsanctus*, compared to AM's briefer and more succinct text; (2) the thanksgiving in AM does not include an enumeration of salvific events and persons as does the Byzantine liturgy, but rather focuses upon the effects rendered upon humanity through the divine economy; and (3) the *Postsanctus* in AM interestingly ends with a doxology absent in Byz-BAS (similar to the final Doxology at the end of the East Syrian anaphora), possibly suggesting an independent and self-contained 'mini-anaphora.'²

Such a divergence in content then would seem to imply the absence of any mutual influence between both liturgies at this point. However, as will be seen in this particular study of the *Postsanctus*, the variability in content between AM and Byz-BAS only means that the *emphasis* is different but the *intent* is plainly the same: to delineate in human words why man is grateful for the *oikonomia* of the Trinity, whether this is expressed in predominantly theological (AM) or historical (Byz-BAS) terms.

A Structural Comparison of the *Postsanctus* in AM and Byz-BAS

In the *Postsanctus* are to be found some of the most striking parallels between the Syriac liturgy of Addai and Mari and its closest counterpart, the Maronite anaphora of *Sharar*. Gelston notes, "We need not hesitate to reckon the material common to both as constituting a very ancient text."³ With regard to the eighty-six extant manuscripts of AM, one very important observation must be made regarding the *Postsanctus*, namely, that twelve MSS (not our earliest *Mar Esa'ya* version) attach various parts of the following prayer into the *Postsanctus*: "O merciful One and forgiving of sins and shortcomings, forgive me my sins and shortcomings by thy grace in the day of the/thy

¹ See T. Elavanal, p. 101.

² See note 4 in Chapter 4 of this thesis.

³ See Gelston, p. 90.

judgement.”⁴ Gelston identifies this interpolation as secondary and not original to the main core of the prayer for the reasons stated, specifically: (1) its complete omission in most earlier manuscripts (including Mosul); (2) the large variety of selections from it in MSS that do have it; (3) its interruption of the natural sequence between the last line of the *Postsanctus* (‘. . . through the abounding compassion of your grace.’) and the first line of the *Postsanctus* doxology that immediately follows (‘And for all your benefits and graces towards us . . .’); and (4) the interpolation greatly resembles the *cushapa* prayers, whereby the celebrant silently offers personal prayers for forgiveness and worthiness.⁵

L. Mitchell considers the *Postsanctus* unit within the Basilian liturgies and James as chiefly ‘anthropological’ in content, compared to the more ‘theological’ Preface, since its main theme is man and his salvation.⁶ However, J. Fenwick modifies this claim by calling it ‘anthropological and christological’, “for the material leads from the creation and fall of man to the person and work of Christ.”⁷ With regard to the *Postsanctus* in AM, the content seemingly reflects a ‘theology of redemption’ steeped in rich biblical imagery, since the focus is clearly the benefits of salvation. Whichever the characterization, the *Postsanctus* is undoubtedly a thanksgiving for the divine economy of Christ.

⁴ Ibid. p. 59, under Section D, line 30.

⁵ Ibid. Furthermore, it would seem that the purpose of the *Postsanctus* in offering thanksgiving to God through the remembrance of His spiritual benefits (AM) and His involvement in the history of salvation (Byz-BAS) is confused when a penitential prayer is inserted. Neither the *Mar Esa 'ya* text of AM nor Byz-BAS offer direct petitions to God in the *Postsanctus*, but reserve these for the Epiklesis and Intercessions later on. Even grammatically, neither liturgy possesses a single verb in the imperative. From all these convincing perspectives then, one can see the secondary nature of this insertion and regard it as completely foreign to the original anaphoral core, structurally, contextually, and grammatically.

⁶ See L. Mitchell, p. 201.

⁷ See J. Fenwick, p. 106.

The preeminence of giving thanks in the *Postsanctus* becomes obvious in the very first line of both AM and Byz-BAS, which share a striking similarity. Of course, both texts follow the just completed *Sanctus*, and each attempts to draw attention to the significance of a united doxology by all material and immaterial creatures.

AM

And with these heavenly powers we give thanks
to you, O Lord, . . .

Byz-BAS

Together with these blessed powers, loving
Master, we sinners also cry out and say: . . .

Both anaphoras allow for the earthly congregation to join the angels during the glorification of God. Interestingly, the Syriac verb for ‘giving thanks’ is the equivalent of the Greek *εὐχαριστοῦμεν*,⁸ which is precisely how Hippolytus’ *Apostolic Tradition* begins after the Opening Dialogue.⁹ Basil does not use *εὐχαριστοῦμεν*, but *βοῶμεν* (‘cry out’) and *λέγομεν* (‘say’), reiterating the participles of the *Presanctus*, *βοῶντα* and *λέγοντα*. Basil’s intent is seemingly to make the earthly worshiper achieve the same intensity as the angels in proclaiming the *Sanctus*, and to maintain this fervor during the recounting of God’s holiness through His involvement in the salvation history of mankind. Addai and Mari, by contrast, views the *Sanctus* as a divine melody glorifying God - in which humans surely participate - but the *Postsanctus* is apparently the earthly worshiper’s chief expression of glorification.¹⁰

For practical purposes, Gelston divides the *Postsanctus* in AM into three subsections: (1) the introduction of the congregation’s thanksgiving for redemption; (2)

⁸ Gelston, p. 91.

⁹ See Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, pp. 157-58.

¹⁰ It may be said that while the *Sanctus* is the *angelic* means by which the Name of God is glorified, the *Postsanctus* serves as the exclusively *human* expression of doxology. In other words, the angels praise God for *who He is* (‘the theological Trinity’), since they also are spirits and are capable of catching a minimal glimpse of His sublime glory. Human beings, on the other hand, praise God for *what He has accomplished* in human history (‘the economical Trinity’). Thus, each being praises God in reference to what they know about Him. However, such a mutual exclusivity is problematic for sure, since God’s personhood and actions are perfectly intertwined and equally necessary in understanding Him. The Apostle John clarifies

the understanding of redemption from the standpoint of human experience, expressed in a number of contrasts; and (3) the doxology. No similar division is suggested by scholars for Byz-BAS, probably because the Basilian *Postsanctus* maintains the one 'redemption-in-history' theme throughout and does not include a doxology.¹¹

The three self-deprecating adjectives in AM ('lowly, weak and miserable' [servants]) find their equivalent in Byz-BAS with the less dramatic 'sinners.' The same adjectives in AM reappear in the anamnestic section of the anaphora, but they are matched in Maronite *Sharar* only with the word 'sinful.' B. Spinks believes these self-deprecating adjectives to be devotional expressions peculiar to East Syrians,¹² but which probably did not belong to the common core of AM and *Sharar*. Basil's use of the more succinct and less complicated 'sinners' and his immediate transition to God's divine economy as evidence of His holiness both suggest that the focus here is predominantly the person and actions of God. In AM's *Postsanctus*, the abundance of self-deprecating terms draws the worshiper's attention to the reality of fallen man and how man fared as a result of God's redemptive work. In this particularly regard, one may characterize Byz-Basil's approach more 'theological' while Addai and Mari's more 'anthropological.'

this point when he writes in his catholic epistle: "Whoever does not love does not know God, for God is love" (1 Jn 4.7).

¹¹ A division of God's mighty works in history and in the life of Christ could possibly be made, but it would seem that each phase of the divine economy is dependent on the other. Thus, it is probably best that the Basilian *Postsanctus* be treated as a single, interconnected unit.

¹² See Chapter 1, note 26. Could the *Postsanctus* in AM possibly fall into the category of a *cushapa*? If so, would this not legitimize the use of the self-deprecating adjectives (albeit in the plural) as a personal devotional prayer, after which would follow the doxological *qanona*? Gelston's text of AM does not set off the *qanona* from the rest of the prayer (Gelston, p. 61), which seems to suggest that the prayer and doxological conclusion were recited either out loud or silently, but as one complete unit. If this held true, namely, that the *cushapa* and *qanona* were read out loud, it could possibly be explained as the outcome of a liturgical resistance by the East Syrian churches to the standardization policies of sixth century Byzantine Emperor Justinian, who sought unsuccessfully to have all clerics recite the typically silent priestly prayers out loud. The claim is an interesting one nonetheless that would surely require further study.

The extensive theological and trinitarian language in Byz-BAS, in accordance with Baumstark's 'laws', would suggest a later dating for the Basilian *Postsanctus*, whereas the Syriac liturgy's high inclusion of biblical phraseology would suggest an earlier dating. Within Gelston's second subsection of AM, one finds numerous biblical parallels:¹³ the line 'in that you put on our humanity so as to quicken us by your divinity' recalls 2 Corinthians 5.19, John 5.21, and 2 Peter 1.4. The first half of the next line 'And you lifted up our poor estate' is reminiscent of 1 Samuel 2.7. The word 'justified' in the line 'You justified our sinfulness' possesses all the important biblical and Pauline overtones of justification in Christ. Finally, the word 'enlighten' in ' . . . and enlighten our understanding' makes reference to Ephesians 1.18 and seems to possess the patristic meaning of *φωτίζειν*, implying a possible, but not certain, allusion to Holy Baptism.

An interesting observation can be made in Addai and Mari about two separate references to sin, with two different connotations. The concept of sin is rendered by the term 'debts' in the line 'And you forgave our debts', which is the equivalent of the Greek *ὀφείλημα* ('that which is owed'). In the line immediately following, the word used is 'sinfulness': 'You justified our sinfulness and . . .', with the understanding of 'to miss' (Greek, *ἀμαρτία*).¹⁴ The proximity of both references to each other in the text and their difference in meaning raises the question whether the first one ('debts') was part of the original text from the Syriac Peshitta, while the second ('to miss') may have possibly been a later Hellenistic interpolation. Byz-BAS does not refer to 'sin' *per se* in the first

¹³ Gelston, p. 92.

¹⁴ Ibid. Gelston identifies the root word for the Syriac term as describing 'a state of continuous shortcoming.'

part of the *Postsanctus*,¹⁵ but speaks of ‘disobedience’ (*παρακούσαντα σοῦ τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ . . .*; ‘when he disobeyed You, the true God . . .’) as the equivalent to AM’s rendition of sin.

From a structural standpoint, the *qanona* conclusion at the end of AM’s *Postsanctus* finds, needless to say, no correspondence in Byz-BAS. (The significance of the constituents of the *Sanctus* unit possibly serving to form a ‘mini-anaphora’ need not be reintroduced here.) Neither does one exist in the *Postsanctus* of the similar West Syrian rite of St. John Chrysostom (hereafter LJC), but a striking parallel can be drawn between LJC and AM regarding a common phrase they both share.¹⁶

AM

And for all your benefits and graces towards us we offer you glory and honor and thanksgiving and adoration now and at all times and for ever and ever.

LJC

For all these things we thank You and Your only begotten Son and Your Holy Spirit; . . .

Whereas the phraseology in AM leads directly into a doxological conclusion, LJC simply continues the thanksgiving: “[We thank you] for all things that we know and do not know, for blessings seen and unseen that have been bestowed upon us. We also thank You for this liturgy. . . .” It is very interesting, however, that Chrysostom’s continuation of thanksgiving is prefaced, as can be seen, with a trinitarian reference. An immediate

¹⁵ Byz-BAS refers to sin as *ἀμαρτία* in the latter part of the *Sanctus*: “Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ δι’ ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, ἠδὲ δέχθησεν ὁ μονογενὴς σου Υἱός” (“For, since through man sin came into the world and through sin death, it pleased Your only-begotten Son, . . .”).

¹⁶ See *The Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom*. Trans. Faculty of Hellenic College and Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology (Brookline, 1985), p. 20.

question is raised: Why is the Trinity mentioned in LJC if Chrysostom has not yet arrived at a doxological conclusion? Could Chrysostom's anaphora at one time have incorporated a doxology similar to the one in AM, insinuating that LJC's *Postsanctus* was also a 'mini-anaphora'? Could Antioch have possibly followed the East Syrian prototype, but was later remodified within the Byzantine tradition of Basil to not conclude the *Postsanctus* with a doxology but to retain the trinitarian reference? Another possibility may be that three trinitarian references in LJC ('You and Your only-begotten Son and Your Holy Spirit') may have been an insistent attempt by Chrysostom himself (or his redactors) to counter a previously Arian anaphora that was prevalent in Constantinople and Antioch until c. 380-81 AD. Perhaps a more involved study of this issue could offer some viable answers.

A Theological Comparison of the *Postsanctus*

Clearly the theological significance of the earthly worshipers joining the angels in praise and thanksgiving to God cannot be overstressed. All anaphoras with a *Sanctus* incorporate language into the *Postsanctus* section to emphasize this important point, such as 'And with these heavenly powers . . .' (AM) and 'Together . . . we sinners also cry out . . .' (Byz-BAS). This simultaneous worship provides a vision of the Eastern Church's understanding of liturgical worship, namely, that the Divine Liturgy is a historical event with transcending dimensions. In other words, the Church celebrates the Eucharist both within but also without the boundaries of space and time.¹⁷

¹⁷ The Divine Liturgy is obviously celebrated by human beings (clergy and laity) on a local level, within a particular space (the church building) at a particular point in time (Sunday or feast day). In this respect, the liturgy is a historical reality accomplished within limited conditions by and for limited beings. However, the eucharistic celebration is also understood by the Church as a 'mystery' (*μυστήριον*), possessing cosmic, eternal dimensions and celebrated within the realm of unlimitedness by the unlimited God. In other words, every offering of the bread and wine by the Church within time is equivalent to Christ's own offering of Himself to the Father outside of time. More simply, Christ acts *mystically* when the Church acts *in history*.

J.A. Jungmann points out that man's association with the heavenly host is a sign of his redemption, as he assumes the place of the fallen angels in the verbalization of God's praises. He writes: "In ancient Christendom a favourite way of representing the salvation which is ours in Christ was to show that it associates us with the blessed spirits of heaven and that by its means we are able to take the place of the fallen angels."¹⁸ The apocalyptic book of Enoch regards the praise of God as an eschatological privilege of the righteous man, who joins the lot of saints and angels in heaven.¹⁹

In general, the *Postsanctus* in Western anaphoras is joined to the *Sanctus* with words similar to 'You are truly holy . . .', followed by a remembrance of the economy of salvation in history. Byz-BAS includes Old Testament and New Testament dispensations: the creation, the fall, teaching through the prophets, the revelation through Jesus Christ, His voluntary passion and death, His resurrection, His ascension, and the Parousia. As mentioned previously, AM does not include such a lengthy enumeration of historical events but rather concentrates on the 'effects of salvation' (forgiveness, justification, etc.). According to R.J. Ledogar, "The early eucharistic prayers were mainly centred on redemption in Christ and only later did they begin to include the themes of creation and salvation history as object of thanksgiving."²⁰ This position is probably true for two reasons. First, the early Christians were intently awaiting the Parousia of the Lord and the

To rephrase the position then of G. Dix, the Church's eucharistic *anamnesis* is not an emotional remembrance of a historical event, but an actual 're-calling' and 're-presenting' of the historical event that Christ has made eternal. See G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 161.

Thus, as often as the Church on earth offers praise, the choirs of angels in heaven also join in this doxology. This unity then between the earthly and heavenly creatures within the Church is achieved by virtue of the Incarnation, whereby the eternal and limitless God becomes a finite, limited Being within history. Through the divine economy, the limited race of man is finally able to participate in the eternity of God, since God's grace and life now permeates the entire created world. And man participates in this grace (of forgiveness and mystical unity with God) and obtains a foretaste of eternal life through his collective celebration and individual consumption of the Holy Eucharist.

¹⁸ J.A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*. Trans. F.A. Brunner (New York, 1959), p. 378.

¹⁹ Elavanal, p. 102 (Enoch 39.9; 71.11).

blessings to come in the next life. They were not concerned as much with the earthly Church taking its rightful place in history as with the hope of redemption from the fallen world.²¹ Consequently, the enumeration of spiritual benefits as found in the *Postsanctus* of AM appears to preserve the earlier Christian perspective on life. Indeed, with the Constantinian peace and the cessation of Christian persecutions, the Church begins to assume a more active role in the world and, as A. Schmemmann so boldly brings out in his Introduction to Liturgical Theology, struggles to reconcile the 'dualistic conflict.'²²

A second related reason explaining why the early eucharistic prayers focused more on the *benefits of redemption* rather than on the *historical events of redemption* is the Church had not yet established a formal Christology to enumerate the significance of the salvific events in the life of Christ. Elavanal comments: "In this respect, too, the *Postsanctus* prayer bears witness of its antiquity. The variation and shift of emphasis in the contents of eucharistic prayers depend mainly on the stages of development in Christology."²³

The role of the *Postsanctus*, as previously stated, is to recall the economy of salvation in either historical or theological terms. Elavanal writes, "All that Christ has

²⁰ See R.J. Ledogar, Acknowledgement: Praise Verbs in Early Greek Anaphoras (Rome, 1968), pp. 166-67.

²¹ One can readily see the element of dualism during the Church's infancy. Indeed, the systematic and typically violent waves of persecution of Christians only helped to solidify this belief that the Body of Christ was at war with the powers of evil. See especially Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, pp. 141-55, for an interesting and graphic account of early Christian persecutions with the eucharistic celebration as the backdrop. Dix's characteristic lack of abundant footnotes in this particular chapter perhaps makes the reader wonder about the accuracy of his claims, but it would seem that the chapter's intent is to narrate a story of the trials of early Christians in a unique novelistic style.

²² The no longer persecuted Church is still looking toward the Parousia and the redemption of mankind, but the aspirations toward the *eschaton* seem to have become relaxed. The Christian Church's involvement now in the secular world, as the official religious institution of the Empire (established by Emperor Theodosios the Great, 4th century), protected and supported by the Byzantine State, becomes more intensified. History now becomes relevant for the Church, and in fact a theology of sanctification of time and history is developed as well, rooted in the incarnation of Jesus Christ. It is no surprise then that Byzantine-Basil's *Postsanctus* enumerates the historical dispensations of God throughout salvation history

done to procure our salvation is remembered in thanksgiving.”²⁴ In both AM and Byz-BAS, this remembrance of the salvific events in Christ’s life generally leads into the Institution Narrative, which introduces the eucharistic meal and establishes its origin. The Eucharist then, as a collective meal, is the material expression of thanksgiving for the immaterial blessings of the divine economy and salvific events of Christ. It would seem then appropriate that the verbal *anamnesis* of these events, which justify the Church’s reasoning for thanksgiving, should lead eventually into the material expression of the very same thanksgiving in the offering of the Gifts.²⁵ Elavanal explains, “As the liberation from Egypt and the covenant were remembered in the Passover, the institution of the Eucharist at [the] Last Supper, [the] inauguration of the new covenant, is remembered in the eucharistic celebration.”²⁶ Thus, both the Byzantine and East Syrian anaphoras treat the *Postsanctus* as the conclusion of the Church’s verbal praise and the beginning of her ‘material’ worship, so to speak, in the offering of the bread and wine.

Miguel Arranz,²⁷ in examining thirty anaphoras, identified three main groups in each of which the economy of salvation corresponded to a certain biblical nucleus. These three groups are: (1) Galatians 4.4 (“But when the fullness of time had come, *God sent*

and is thus clearly the later of both texts See A. Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*. Trans. Asheleigh E. Moorhouse (Crestwood, 1986).

²³ Elavanal, p. 107.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ The *Postsanctus* in AM very interestingly flows into an intercessory section rather than an Institution Narrative. In fact, as previously discussed in Chapter One, an Institution Narrative is missing in the earliest extant form of AM (*Mar Esa’ya*). T. Elavanal presumptuously attributes this absence in AM to the fact that AM lacks an enumeration of the historical events of redemption, of which the Last Supper is but one also (pp. 107-08). Later texts, such as the Urmiah Missal of the Archbishop of Canterbury’s mission (1890) and the Catholic Chaldean Missal (1901, 1936), include an Institution Narrative in order to make the anaphora conform with the widespread belief that eucharistic prayers cannot afford not to have one. However, there is no manuscript authority for such later insertions. See B. Spinks, *Worship: Prayers from the East*, p. 6. This issue of the ‘missing Institution Narrative’ will be discussed at length in the next chapter.

In any case, the *Postsanctus* does *eventually* introduce the material offering of the bread and wine as the tangible symbols of the Church’s praise and thanksgiving.

²⁶ Elavanal, p. 107.

his Son”), which became prevalent in Jerusalem; (2) John 3.16 (“For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son”), prominent in Antioch and Western Syria; and (3) Hebrews 1.1-3 (a brief overview of the work of the Son in salvation history), common in Alexandria. Arranz also claims that each of the aforementioned biblical texts helped inspire one of the three great Antiochene anaphoras and especially the *Postsanctus*: James (Gal 4.4), John Chrysostom (Jn 3.16), and Basil (Heb 1.1-3). With regard to Byz-Basil specifically, this assumption is quite alluring, given the fact that certain expressions in the Byzantine *Postsanctus* find their scriptural equivalent in Hebrews.²⁸

The formulation of the *Postsanctus* in AM could not have substantially depended upon any one of the above mentioned three scriptural references. All three make reference to the advent of Christ into history, whereas AM lists the spiritual blessings procured by humanity through the implied advent of the Son of God into the world. However, the Incarnation, as a historical event, is not completely ignored in the *Postsanctus* of the Syriac anaphora. Phrases reminiscent of the Incarnation such as ‘gave his only Son’ or ‘sent his Son’ are clearly absent in AM. Instead, the Incarnation is referred to through the expression ‘you put on our humanity so as to quicken us by your

²⁷ Miguel Arranz, “L’économie du Salut: dans la prière Post-Sanctus des anaphores de type antiochéen”, in *La Maison Dieu* 106 (1972) 46-75.

²⁸ For example, ‘God spoke . . . in many and various ways’ (Heb) vs. ‘You visited him in various ways’ (Byz-BAS); ‘but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son’ (Heb) vs. ‘And when the fullness of time had come, You spoke to us through Your Son Himself’ (Byz-BAS); ‘through whom he also created the worlds’ (Heb) vs. ‘through whom You created the ages’ (Byz-BAS); ‘He is the reflection of God’s glory and the exact imprint of God’s very being’ (Heb) vs. ‘He, being the splendor of Your glory and the image of Your being’ (Byz-BAS); ‘he sustains all things by his powerful word’ (Heb) vs. ‘upholding all things by the word of His power’ (Byz-BAS); ‘he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high’ (Heb) vs. ‘Ascending into heaven, He sat at the right hand of Your majesty on high’ (Byz-BAS). Saint Basil, or the redactor of Byz-BAS, clearly used the biblical reference to Hebrews in formulating this part of the *Postsanctus*. The similarities in the phraseology are too identical to posit otherwise.

divinity', an image common in the writing of St. Athanasios the Great: "He, indeed, assumed humanity that we might become God."²⁹

A careful examination of the Addai and Mari text may possibly provide other hidden references to the economy of Christ in history. For example, 'you lifted up our poor estate, and righted our fall' could correspond to Christ's teaching and healing ministry. The line, 'you raised up our mortality. And you forgave our debts', could either be a reference to Christ's resurrection and crucifixion, respectively (an odd sequence!) or to the related themes of resurrection and forgiveness, as presented in the Johannine gospel (cf. Jn 20.1-18, the account of the Resurrection; and Jn 20.23, the resurrected Lord's authorization of the disciples to absolve and retain sins). Finally, 'you justified our sinfulness and you enlightened our understanding' could be linked with the Passion and the Ascension, respectively.

Once again, the accuracy and legitimacy of such a claim leaves much to be desired, as the arguments against this position are overwhelmingly convincing. The phrases of AM's *Postsanctus* are so interdependent that assigning a historical event in the divine economy to any one particular expression is difficult. For example, the Crucifixion could easily be rendered by *both* 'you justified our sinfulness' and 'you forgave our debts.' Second, the odd sequence 'you raised up our mortality. And you forgave our debts' (Resurrection-Crucifixion) could not be rendered as such and thought to correspond to historical events. Finally, the interrelatedness between the lines of the *Postsanctus* in AM suggests a thematic unity (spiritual benefits) much more effectively than a unity of seemingly independent historical events.

²⁹ St. Athanasius, On the Incarnation. Ed. and trans. A Religious of C.S.M.V. (Crestwood, 1989), p. 93.

The lengthier *Postsanctus* in Byz-BAS delineates these events as a series of independent occurrences, each replete with its own 'individual' theology ('Becoming incarnate from a holy Virgin, He emptied Himself': theology of *kenosis*, Incarnation; '... since it was not possible that the Author of life would be dominated by corruption': Resurrection), even though they too are obviously interdependent on each other.

It would stand then that whereas Addai and Mari's *Postsanctus* centers around the spiritual benefits of the divine economy, Byzantine-Basil's emphasis lies on the historical dimensions of Christ's involvement in the salvation of man.

Conclusion

In summary, the *Postsanctus* section of both Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil cannot be understood apart from the *Presanctus-Sanctus* unit which immediately precedes it. The recitation of the Qeduššah prayers in Judaism, uniting earthly and heavenly beings in the glorification of God, seems to have provided the impetus for the inclusion of the *Sanctus* hymn in the Christian liturgy. The role of the *Postsanctus* identifies the reasons *why* humans should join the choirs of angels in the praise of God. It is, once again, 'mankind's expression of thanksgiving toward God for His involvement in human history and His redemption of man.'

Three notable differences between the *Postsanctus* prayers of AM and Byz-BAS are: (1) the Byz-BAS text, dependent on its Ω -BAS parent, provides a longer and more detailed *Postsanctus*, compared to AM's shorter and more concise text; (2) the thanksgiving in the Syriac liturgy does not have an enumeration of salvific events and persons as does the anaphora of the Cappadocian Father, focusing rather upon the effects reaped by believers as a result of the divine economy; and (3) the *Postsanctus* in AM

concludes with a very interesting doxology that is absent in Basil. This doxological statement, similar to the final Doxology at the end of the East Syrian eucharistic prayer, suggests that the first section of Addai and Mari may very well have been a self-contained 'mini-anaphora.' The absence of an Institution Narrative and a 'formal Epiklesis' in the earliest extant manuscripts of AM helps to support this position. On the contrary, neither an Institution Narrative nor an Epiklesis are absent from the Byzantine liturgy or from the earlier E-BAS family of anaphoras.

The more ancient *Postsanctus* content in Addai and Mari clearly satisfies the generally accepted presumption that Addai and Mari is without a doubt chronologically older than the Basilian anaphora. The earliest eucharistic prayers had not yet developed an individual theology of each salvific event in the life of Christ, as in Basil. Instead, the early Christians expressed gratitude to God for the benefits of salvation rendered to mankind through Christ's economy. In addition, a disavowal of human history and the strong anticipation toward the Parousia (i.e. a strong sense of dualism!) made the 'historical Christ' for the early Church important only in that His involvement in history enabled Christians to reap the spiritual benefits of His heavenly kingdom. Finally, a fixed Christology had not yet been formulated in earlier prayers.

The *Postsanctus* in both anaphoras, as the *verbal* offering of thanksgiving to God, leads into the introduction of the elements of bread and wine as the *tangible* thanksgiving of the Church. The introduction of this formal offering of the Gifts is known as the Institution Narrative. It is this section, along with the Anamnesis, that will be examined in the next chapter.

Chapter Seven The Institution Narrative – Anamnesis

Addai and Mari (AM) The Institution Narrative

[absent in *Mar Esa 'ya* text]

The Anamnesis

Priest: And we also, O Lord [*three times*], your lowly, weak and miserable servants, who are gathered together and stand before you at this time have received by tradition of the example which is from you, rejoicing, and glorifying, and magnifying, and commemorating and praising, and performing this great and dread mystery of the passion and death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Byzantine-Basil (Byz-BAS) The Institution Narrative

Priest (*cont. 'd*): As memorials of His saving passion, He has left us these gifts which we have set forth before You according to His commands. For when He was about to go forth to His voluntary, ever-memorable, and life-giving death, on the night on which He was delivered up for the life of the world, He took bread in His holy and pure hands, and presenting it to You, God and Father, and offering thanks, blessing, sanctifying, and breaking it:

(*aloud*) He gave it to His holy disciples and apostles saying: Take, eat; this is My body which is broken for you for the forgiveness of sins.

People: Amen.

Priest (*silently*): Likewise, He took the cup of the fruit of the vine, and having mingled it, offering thanks, blessing, and sanctifying it:

(*aloud*) He gave it to His holy disciples and apostles saying: Drink of this all of you. This is My blood of the new Covenant, shed for you and for many, for the forgiveness of sins.

People: Amen.

The Anamnesis

Priest (*silently*): Do this in remembrance of Me. For as often as you eat this Bread and drink this Cup, you proclaim My death, and you confess My resurrection. Therefore, Master, we also, remembering His saving passion and life-giving cross, His three-day burial and resurrection from the dead, His ascension into heaven, and enthronement at Your right hand, God and Father, and His glorious and awesome second coming.

(The Offering of the Sacrifice)

(*aloud*) Offering to You these gifts from Your own gifts in all and for all,

People: We praise You, we bless You, we give thanks to You, and we pray to You, Lord our God.

Initial Observations on the Institution Narrative

The function of the Institution Narrative in any Christian anaphora is to recall the Lord's words during the Last Supper and to identify the significance of the elements of

bread and wine as Christ's 'bloodless sacrifice.' As mentioned in the previous chapter, this portion of the eucharistic prayer offers thanksgiving to God through a *material* offering, in comparison to the *Postsanctus* unit immediately preceding, which represents the Church's *verbal* confession of God's economy and thanksgiving. Thomas Elavanal observes,

These words of Christ, "This is my body" and "This cup is the new covenant in my blood", not only reveal the intrinsic essence of the bread and wine but they also clearly characterize this "doing" as the beginning of the new covenant. These explanatory words used by Christ while distributing the already consecrated gifts, revealed also the significance of what He had done.¹

I have decided to treat the Narrative of Institution and the Anamnesis as a single unit, precisely because most liturgies acknowledge them as mutually interdependent and liturgical scholars frequently group them together. The Anamnesis remembers the eucharistic act of offering instituted by Christ and reminds the community of faith to 'do this in remembrance of Me.' It connects the Church's present action of liturgical offering with Christ's own liturgical offering of the elements upon the altar of the Upper Room and His own sacrificial offering upon the altar of Golgotha. In another sense, the Anamnesis and Institution Narrative fully authorize and validate the Church's eucharistic sacrifice, since the Church obediently follows the command of her Master to 'do this' in remembrance of Him.

Without a doubt, the most problematical and challenging anaphoral section in any comparative study involving the anaphora of Addai and Mari is the Institution Narrative. While all the Basilian liturgies clearly include an Institution Narrative, the most ancient *Mar Esa'ya* manuscript of AM does not.² At best, a passing reference is made to the

¹ Elavanal, pp. 122-23.

² The earliest evidence of the insertion of an Institution Narrative in a Malabar liturgy is found in the manuscript Vatican Syr. 66, attributed to Mar John Sulaqa, metropolitan of India (1556-1569). The Words

event of the Last Supper with the words, "we . . . have received by tradition of the example which is from you."

The solutions offered to explain the odd absence of the Narrative of Institution in AM may be divided into three categories. The first position is held by older scholars such as Edward Ratcliff and Gregory Dix, that essentially Addai and Mari never contained an Institution Narrative. Ratcliff was apparently influenced by H. Lietzmann's enticing two-type theory,³ preferring to see AM's original form as an *eucharistia* rather than as an anaphora. Similarly, Dix supposes that it was unthinkable for the early Christian community not to understand the meaning of the eucharistic liturgy and the actions that were happening. So there was no need to include a Narrative of Institution during the Sunday eucharistic celebration, with which all faithful Christians were familiar.⁴ As time progressed, it became necessary to explain the origin and meaning of the rite, especially

of Institution are added on a separate page, and a note indicates that the editor intended for them to be recited *after* the rite of fraction. By contrast, the Malabar liturgy belonging to Antonio de Gouvea (1606) places the Institution Narrative just *before* the fraction. In both cases, the Words of Institution are attached not to the eucharistic prayer *per se*, but rather to the act of communion. Elavanal writes: "A very probable opinion is that the liturgical texts in the book of Revelation and the Didache contain a schema of eucharistic celebration in which the Institution Narrative does not form part of the eucharistic prayers but is inserted just before communion" (pp. 123-24). He continues: "Accordingly, the words, 'This is my body' and 'This is my blood' are words of communion and not words of consecration" (p. 124). See also Elavanal, pp. 128-29; W.C. Bishop, "The Primitive Form of Consecration of the Holy Eucharist", in Church Quarterly Review 66 (1908) 385-404.

The Chaldean missal printed in 1767 in Rome adds the Narrative of Institution right before the fraction. The Urmiah missal of 1890 and the present Malabar text contain the Narrative immediately after the *Postsanctus*, an imitation possibly of other East Syrian anaphoras. In this particular case, the introduction of the Narrative forces the Anamnesis to be transferred from its original place immediately following the *Postsanctus* to right after the Narrative. In the Chaldean missal printed in Mosul (1901, 1936), the Words of Institution have been inserted in the middle of the *Postsanctus* prayer.

³ According to Lietzmann, liturgies can be divided into one of two types: (1) an *eucharistia*, whose purpose is solely the verbal glorification and thanksgiving of God; or (2) an anaphora, which focuses upon the material offering of bread and wine, their consecration, and their distribution as Holy Communion. See H. Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper. Trans. Dorothea H.G. Reeve (Leiden, 1979).

⁴ Scripture includes four Narratives of Institution: (1) Matthew 26.26-28; (2) Mark 14.22-24; (3) Luke 22.19-20; and (4) 1 Corinthians 11.23-26. Could it be that the Institution Narrative had a chiefly didactic role for Catechumens, and for this reason appears in Scripture - which they were allowed to hear and study rather than in the anaphora - which they were not permitted to attend? An opposing view, held by other liturgical scholars, is that the narration of institution took on a fixed form in the early Christian liturgy

“as the Jewish understanding of ‘berakah’ and ‘anamnesis’ faded away, [and] the community felt more the need to relate what the Church is now doing to the institution and command of Christ.”⁵

The second position, held by A. Raes, I.H. Dalmais, B. Botte, and L. Bouyer, claims that AM originally did have an Institution Narrative, but it is no longer found in the manuscript tradition. For Raes and Dalmais,⁶ the Narrative of Institution was recited from memory and not recorded in the text, out of deference to the *disciplina arcani*.⁷ Botte⁸ compares AM with the anaphora of Theodore and posits that the paragraph in AM beginning, “And we also, O Lord [*three times*], your lowly, weak and miserable servants, who are gathered together and stand before you at this time, etc.” is in actuality an Anamnesis marking the point where there once was an Institution Narrative. He also remarks that Theodore’s Narrative ends with, ‘Be doing thus whenever you gather together in my memory.’ Botte finally concludes that the Anamnesis of AM “is the

because of repetitive use and later went on to influence the formation of the biblical accounts of the Lord’s Supper.

⁵ Elavanal, p. 124. The reasoning given for the later insertion of the Institution Narrative, including its characterization as primarily didactic in nature, are unconvincing. The Church always had a need to express the reasons for its celebration of the Eucharist and to proclaim its validity by drawing upon the command of the Savior at the Last Supper. The Words of Institution were always a part of the early liturgy because it stands to reason that the entire community of faith, especially in its infancy, would want to reaffirm their commitment to the Lord’s command and reassure itself that what it was doing each Sunday was significant for them.

⁶ See A. Raes, “Le récit de l’institution eucharistique dans l’anaphore chaldéenne et malabare des apôtres”, in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 10 (1940) 216-26; I.H. Dalmais, *Eastern Liturgies* (New York, 1960), p. 90.

⁷ The desire of early Christians to protect from profanation the sacred words spoken by the mouth of the Lord, similar to the insertion of ‘vowels’ (actually, two vowel points and a simple *shewa*) in the sublime Name of God (YHWH) to render a slightly different pronunciation (YAHWEH) than the sacred Name.

Incidentally, the alteration of the tetragram YHWH, through the insertion of a simple *shewa* and the vowel points O and A (derived from the Hebrew ADONAI, the word uttered in place of the sacred Name in Hebrew scriptures), renders the term YEHOWAH (*var.* YAHWEH in English texts). It is this form of the sacred Name that has led to the confusion of the Name *Jehovah* in English versions of the Bible. See Elavanal, p. 126; J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Ed. and trans. N. Perrin (London, 1966).

⁸ See B. Botte, “L’anaphore chaldéenne des apôtres”, in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 15 (1949) 259-76; *idem.*, “Problèmes de l’anaphore syrienne des apôtres Addai et Mari”, in *L’Orient Syrien* 10 (1965) 89-106. Botte’s position has also found support in L. Bouyer, *Eucharist*. Trans. C.U. Quinn (Notre Dame, 1968), pp. 147-58.

record of an Institution Narrative which has since disappeared, and that this Narrative ended with the words ‘Be doing thus whenever you gather together in my memory,’ or ‘Be doing thus whenever you gather together in my name,’ an East Syrian peculiarity.”⁹ The removal of the Institution Narrative from Addai and Mari, if one did in fact exist, is generally credited to the abridgements made by Catholicos Isho’yab III (648-658).

The third position points to recent comparative studies between Addai and Mari and Maronite *Sharar*, which sought to reconstruct the original anaphoral text underlying both liturgies. William Macomber claimed that *Sharar* at one point did contain an Institution Narrative addressed to the Son.¹⁰ *Sharar* thus seems to have preserved both the form and location of the lost Institution Narrative now missing from AM. Once again, the reforms of Patriarch Isho’yab III were held responsible for the Narrative’s suppression in Addai and Mari.

Unlike Addai and Mari, all the Basilian liturgies have an Institution Narrative, and this is generally introduced and understood in conjunction with the concept of ‘memorial’ or ‘memorials.’¹¹ The material gifts of bread and wine then are regarded by the Church as visible ‘reminders’ and ‘memorials’ of the Lord’s divine economy. In another sense, they comprise the ‘great mystery of piety.’

According to John Fenwick, “Textually, the Institution Narrative is one of the most complex sections of the anaphora.”¹² It is very difficult to ascertain its point of origin

⁹ See B. Spinks, p. 38.

¹⁰ See William F. Macomber, “The Maronite and Chaldean Versions of the Anaphora of the Apostles”, in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 37 (1971) 55-84.

¹¹ E-BAS uses the expression ‘το μέγα τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον’ ([this] great *mystery* of piety’); Syr-BAS uses ‘a *memorial* of his saving passion’; Arm-BAS, ‘en *memorial* de sa solitaire passion’ (‘in *memory* of his voluntary passion’); and Ω-BAS and Byz-BAS alike have ‘ὑπομνήματα τοῦ σωτηρίου αὐτοῦ πάθους’ (‘*reminders* of his salvific passion’). Each Basilian liturgy emphasizes the memorial significance of the Eucharist, which will be discussed later.

¹² See J. Fenwick, p. 132.

within the extant versions of Basil and James, primarily because there is as much influence between the anaphoras as there is from the four scriptural accounts, which among themselves show significant differences.

Paul Cagin, after studying seventy-six anaphoras, arrived at the definitive conclusion that no eucharistic prayer followed a single biblical account to the exclusion of all others.¹³ His conclusions also led him to identify three stages in the development of the Institution Narrative as used in the liturgy:

- (1) The development of the biblical accounts, resulting from the Church's Oral Tradition.
- (2) The combination of scriptural accounts to produce harmonized forms, transmitted in the liturgical and catechetical traditions. Also, the possible amendment of a harmonized form to make it agree more closely with the biblical account or accounts.
- (3) The addition of non-scriptural material.¹⁴

These three stages offer some important insights into understanding that the Institution Narrative essentially evolved into liturgical use and did not necessarily originate as a liturgical form.

A Textual Examination of the Institution Narrative

Having addressed the issue of the absent Institution Narrative in Addai and Mari, a textual examination of the Basilian Institution Narrative in the Byzantine tradition may follow. The discussion may be prefaced with the observation that the Basilian liturgies in the Ω group do share several words and phrases not found in ES-BAS. Consequently, as Fenwick observes, "It is therefore possible to speak of a distinct Ω -BAS version of the Institution Narrative."¹⁵

¹³ Paul Cagin, L'euchologe latine étudiée dans la tradition de ses formules et de ses formulaires. L'eucharistie, canon primitif de la messe ou formulaire essentiel et premier de toutes les liturgies (Paris, 1912), p. 246.

¹⁴ Ibid. p. 248.

¹⁵ Fenwick, p. 135.

The introductory formula for the Institution Narrative is a striking feature shared by all Basilian anaphoras: ‘κατέλιπε δὲ ἡμῖν . . .’¹⁶ This transitional phrase, occurring immediately following the *Postsanctus*’ enumeration of Christ’s salvific events, especially the final reference to the just retribution of all mortals at the Second Coming,¹⁷ seems out of place, interrupting the natural flow of the prayer. According to Fenwick, “The necessity for such a formula to attach the Narrative to a place in the anaphora where it does not fit chronologically strongly suggests that the Narrative is a later addition.”¹⁸ W.E. Pitt¹⁹ argues the same point, namely, that the Narrative was never a part of the original Basilian anaphora but, as Fenwick points out, the Narrative of Institution was already present in the anaphora and was reworked by the redactor to produce Ω-BAS.²⁰ It remains uncertain how long before St. Basil’s time the Institution Narrative was introduced into the Cappadocian anaphora.

Engberding observes that E-BAS’ simple reference to ‘the great mystery’ (‘τὸ μέγα [τῆς εὐσεβείας] μυστήριον’), derived from 1 Timothy 3.16, was expanded by Ω-Basil’s redactor to include the events of the divine economy. Writes Fenwick, “The

¹⁶ E-BAS, Syr-BAS, Arm-BAS, Byz-BAS, and Ω-BAS all share virtually the same wording. The past tense verb ‘κατέλιπε’ literally means, ‘he gave up’ or ‘he abandoned.’ Its liturgical rendering is, ‘he left behind.’ Interestingly, this Greek verb closely resembles its augmented version, rendered by the Aramaic ‘sabachthani’ (‘έγκατέλιπες’, ‘forsaken’ or ‘forgotten’), spoken by Christ in fear and frustration during His agony upon the Cross (Mt 27.46), as well as by the Psalmist (Ps 22.1).

¹⁷ “. . . ὃς καὶ ἥξει, ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ” (“ . . . and He will come to render to each according to His works”). The next phrase, ‘κατέλιπε δὲ ἡμῖν’, makes a rather abrupt transition, reverting back to the event of the Last Supper, which some scholars feel could have been included in the enumeration, but was not.

It would seem that the reason for not including the Narrative in the long list of christological events was to allow the Institution Narrative the independence to introduce the offering of the material gifts of bread and wine, as well as to show that this offering was a means of thanking God for all His involvement in the salvation history of mankind, just commemorated. Fenwick also observes: “The link formula creates a very clever continuity of thought between the Post-Sanctus and the Institution Narrative: The saving acts are completed, Christ has returned to the Father, but he has left us this . . .” (Fenwick, p. 134).

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ W.E. Pitt, “The Origin of the Anaphora of St. Basil”, in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 12 (1961) 1-13.

²⁰ Fenwick, p. 134. Pitt only knew Byz-BAS, well before Fenwick and others identified the Ω-BAS and E-BAS families as distinct groupings for Basil’s eucharistic prayer.

Eucharist is not simply ‘a great mystery’ but ‘a remembrance of the Lord’s saving passion.’”²¹ In the Anamnesis of AM, a significant reference is also made to ‘this great and dread mystery’, with no enumeration of christological events, except for ‘the passion and death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ.’ Could the absence then of a history of salvific events in AM, and the text’s insistence upon using the term ‘mystery’, coupled with the absence of a Narrative of Institution, have anything to do with the hypothesis that Basil (and specifically, E-BAS) may at one time not have had an Institution Narrative also? Was there a possible direction of influence between AM and E-BAS? Certainly, these assumptions are inconclusive, but they do allow for interesting discussion.

The past tense ‘προτεθείκαμεν’ (‘we have placed before’ or ‘we have placed down’), from the third conjugation verb *προτίθημι*, refers back to the noun ‘ὑπομνήματα’, understood to be the gifts of bread and wine already placed down upon the altar table by the celebrant clergy. The first person plural form of the verb specifies (or should specify) an action of the whole worshiping community of the Church, rather than just that of a few concelebrating priests.²² Indeed, although Byzantine liturgical worship did not escape a strong clerical influence, in which the ordained clergy assumed several of the early *liturgias*²³ (functions) of the laity (such as bringing the prosphora

²¹ Ibid.

²² Certain silent prayers in the Byzantine liturgies of Chrysostom and Basil, which are in the first person plural refer only to the clergy, apart from the people (e.g. prayer of fraction, shared by both anaphoras: “. . . καὶ καταξίωσον τῇ κραταιᾷ σου χειρὶ μεταδοῦναι ἡμῖν [τοῦ ἀχράντου σώματός σου καὶ τοῦ τιμίου αἵματος] καὶ δι’ ἡμῶν παντὶ τῷ λαῷ.” My translation: “. . . deign to give to us and through us to all Your people [a share of Your pure Body and Your precious Blood]. The phrase within the brackets is absent in Brightman’s *Barberini* rendition. See Brightman, LEW, p. 341.

²³ G. Dix, *The Shape*, pp. 1ff, 7ff, and 21ff.

offering themselves right up to the altar),²⁴ the anaphora still appears to struggle with keeping the focus of the eucharistic prayer as communal as possible.

The beginning of the Institution Narrative proper in all the versions of Basil is marked by the clause ‘Μέλλων γάρ’ (‘For when He was about . . .’). The expression clearly introduces the context just before the Lord’s Passion, in the Upper Room where the Last Supper was held. The texts then specify the voluntary nature of Christ’s suffering, with the Byzantine liturgy making ample use of adjectives to describe His death.²⁵

Byzantine-Basil then continues with a passage found in the other Basilian liturgies, except E-BAS, and taken from 1 Corinthians 11.23: ‘ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἧ’ (‘on the night in which’), which provides the immediate setting of the Institution Narrative. Byz-BAS then places Christ as the subject of the Passion (‘He surrendered Himself’; ‘παρεδίδου ἑαυτόν’), probably to lay emphasis on the voluntary nature of Christ’s sacrifice. In contrast, it is Syr-BAS that speaks of Christ as ‘betrayed’, possibly to emphasize the assaulting and corrupted nature of fallen man. Byz-BAS becomes slightly

²⁴ Dix makes three distinctions of ‘offering’ as understood during the pre-Nicene period: (1) The communicant ‘brings’ (*προσενεγκεῖν*) the prosphora; (2) the deacon ‘presents’ or ‘brings it up’ (*ἀναφέρειν*) onto the altar; and (3) the bishop ‘offers’ it (*προσφέρειν*). Each order was responsible for a particular function. In time, these distinctions became obscured with the rise of clericalism, where the clergy assumed the responsibilities of the laity and, in many cases, each other’s. In the Orthodox liturgy today, a priest who serves alone may actually find himself making all three forms of offering by himself. See Dix, *The Shape*, pp. 111-12.

Hugh Wybrew remarks that as early as the fourth century, the deacons were responsible for transferring the Gifts to the altar table, after the people deposited them in a special chamber adjacent to the altar, called the *skeuophylakion*. Theodore of Mopsuestia, in his *Mystagogical Catecheses*, gives an account of this transfer. See H. Wybrew, *The Orthodox Liturgy: The Development of the Eucharistic Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite* (Crestwood, 1990), pp. 52-54.

²⁵ E-BAS has a simpler statement: ‘Μέλλων γάρ παραδοῦναι ἑαυτόν εἰς θάνατον’ (‘For when He was about to surrender Himself to death’), compared to Byz-BAS more complex: ‘Μέλλων γάρ ἐξιέναι ἐπὶ τὸν ἐκούσιον καὶ αἰδίμῳ καὶ ζωοποιὸν αὐτοῦ θάνατον’ (‘For when He was about to go forth to His voluntary and ever-memorable and life-giving death’).

repetitive with ‘ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς’ (‘for the life of the world’), again to explain further the meaning of Christ’s death.

The description of Christ’s hands is a distinct feature of most of the Basilian texts. Each anaphora, except the presumably older (and simpler) E-BAS, uses at least three adjectives to describe the hands of Christ in reference to their offering of the Eucharist during the Last Supper. Byz-BAS has: ‘λαβὼν ἄρτον ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀχράντων χειρῶν’ (‘taking bread into [lit. upon] His holy and pure hands’). As Fenwick accurately notes, this descriptive language is part of the non-biblical material Paul Cagin refers to in his theory on the development of the Institution Narrative.²⁶

The participle ‘ἀναδείξας’ introduces a characteristic expression in the Byzantine liturgy of Basil (shared also by Arm-BAS). The anaphora, addressed to the Father, explains how Christ shows forth the gifts of bread and wine to God the Father. The same verb, albeit in a different form (the infinitive), appears later in the actual Epiklesis, asking God ‘to show forth’ the Gifts to be Christ’s Body and Blood through the invocation of the Holy Spirit. As Fenwick puts it, “The Spirit is besought to *show* (ἀναδείξαι) the gifts to be holy of holies; here God is shown them first in the hands of his Son.”²⁷ More will be said about this verb in the next section.

All the Basilian texts contain the expression ‘ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις’ (‘to His holy disciples and apostles’). The disciples are truly ἅγιοι in the biblical sense, in that Christ has set them apart as the first bishops of the Church to

²⁶ Some other material from this section includes: ‘having shown forth’ (ἀναδείξας); ‘having blessed’ (εὐλογήσας); and ‘sanctified’ (ἁγιάσας). These words seemingly address the complex theology of consecration, and would seem to be later additions to the Basilian prototype. Interestingly, although E-BAS lacks any kind of descriptive language for the hands of Christ, it is nonetheless replete with such ‘consecratory’ terms: ‘εὐλογήσας, ἁγιάσας, . . .’ Perhaps these terms were added into Egyptian-Basil later in order to establish conformity between the anaphoras.

²⁷ Fenwick, p. 135.

continue the eucharistic celebration in His physical absence. They are disciples in that they are taught this manner of eucharistic celebration by their Master, and they are apostles because they are sent into the world to propagate the eucharistic ministry to the ends of the earth.

The expression ‘ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες’ (‘from this all of you’), in reference to the bread, has no biblical connection and so is absent from Byz-BAS, although ES-BAS has preserved the phrase, possibly to retain liturgical symmetry with reference to the cup. All the Basil anaphoras use the expression ‘ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες’ when referring to the cup.

The participle ‘κλώμενον’ (‘broken’) is added into the Words of Institution themselves, another typical example of a non-biblical addition to the Narrative of Institution, although there are claims that the word derives from manuscript traditions which lean upon 1 Corinthians 11.24. To be sure, the act of ‘breaking’ bread *is* mentioned in the Narrative of Institution, but only in a peripheral sense, and Christ Himself does not speak of His own body as ‘broken for you.’ In all the Basilian anaphoras, except for E-BAS (which uses the participle ‘διαδιδόμενον’), the expression seemingly was placed into Christ’s mouth to make the connection between the liturgical act of ‘breaking bread’ and Christ’s own ‘broken’ body during His death at Golgotha. As Fenwick writes, “‘διαδιδόμενον’ may reflect an earlier emphasis on ‘sharing out’ rather than on the Lord’s death.”²⁸

Regarding the words over the cup, Byz-BAS includes the phrase from Luke 22.18, ‘ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου’ (‘from the fruit of the vine’), absent in E-BAS and Syr-BAS. However, the presence of the participle ‘κεράσας’ in Byz-BAS seems to have suppressed ‘wine’ and ‘water’, since the contents of the cup have already been

described. On the contrary, ‘wine’ and ‘water’ *are* mentioned in the other anaphoras, since it is apparent that no reference is made to them via the phrase ‘from the fruit of the vine.’

The triplet *εὐχαριστήσας-εὐλογήσας-ἀγιάσας* (‘thanking-blessing-sanctifying’) for the cup is identical to that for the bread, in order to maintain uniformity throughout the Narrative. Also, Byz-BAS follows Scripture by omitting ‘λάβετε’ for the cup. Furthermore, Byz-BAS oddly does not mention the New Covenant, thus departing from its customary practice of inserting biblical material in the anaphora. Finally, the expression borrowed from Matthew 26.28 ‘εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν’ (‘for the forgiveness of sins’) is found in each of the Basil liturgies, after both references to the bread and cup.²⁹

In the very next section, as Fenwick observes, “All four forms [of Basil’s liturgy] end their Institution Narrative with the 1 Cor 11:26 formula recast into the first person.”³⁰ The only two significant differences between the biblical text and Byz-BAS are: (1) Byz-BAS includes the confession of the Lord’s resurrection, which Corinthians leaves out; and (2) Basil omits the eschatological promise, ‘ἄχρις οὗ ἂν ἔλθω’ (‘until I come’), possibly because, as Fenwick believes, “the Redactor felt that its removal made a smoother transition between ὁμολογεῖτε and the Anamnesis with its confessing of the saving events.”³¹

The Theological Significance of the Institution Narrative

The absence of an Institution Narrative in Addai and Mari and the hypothetical insertion of it by much later redactors to conform to the majority of other eucharistic

²⁸ Ibid. p. 136.

²⁹ Matthew’s reference to ‘forgiveness of sins’ is attached to the cup only, and not the bread, perhaps to emphasize the Jewish notion of the expiatory nature of shed blood.

³⁰ Fenwick, p. 137.

prayers, has obviously made this chapter's comparative work difficult, if not practically non-existent. Although the issue of the missing Institution Narrative in AM has been carefully examined in the first part of this chapter, it may be helpful to point out the Narrative's theological significance in Byz-BAS. In this manner, it may be possible to infer the Narrative's importance for AM and to perhaps explain the reasons behind its non-existence or removal.

As already stated, it is quite clear that the Narrative of Institution in Byzantine-Basil is situated toward the end of the *Postsanctus*, which includes a lengthy description of God's *oikonomia* throughout salvation history. The expression, 'κατέλιπε δὲ ἡμῖν ὑπομνήματα τοῦ σωτηρίου αὐτοῦ πάθους ἃ προτεθείκαμεν' clearly ties the offering of the Gifts as the physical expression of thanksgiving for the *mirabilia Dei* with the *oikonomia* itself. Structurally speaking, the removal of the Institution Narrative in Byz-BAS would forcibly require a complete rearrangement of the sections of the anaphora that follow; namely, (1) the obvious removal of the Epiklesis, which contains direct references to the bread and cup; and (2) the rewording of the Intercessions.³² The Institution Narrative then in Basil is necessary, inasmuch as its surrounding material is dependent upon the material offering of the Gifts, which forms a kind of link between the aforementioned sections.

³¹ Ibid.

³² If the Institution Narrative in Byz-BAS were removed and the rest of the anaphora left unadulterated, then the transition between the *Postsanctus* and the Intercessions would seem nonsensical and incoherent. E.g. '... and He will come to render to each according to His works./Especially for our most holy, pure, blessed, and glorious Lady, the Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary [and litany of saints and Intercessions].' The Institution Narrative summarizes not only Christ's 'saving passion', but also the Trinity's constant involvement in the history of mankind's salvation. The offering of the Gifts and the remembrance of the Last Supper give the Church the opportunity to actually relive, through *anamnesis*, the history of salvation and the portion of that history that directly involves the incarnate Lord. In this reenactment of the divine economy, achieved again through the material offering of the Gifts, the Church offers prayers on behalf of all people, before the mystical presence of the living God, fully present in the consecrated Eucharist. The Institution Narrative then in Basil is very important linking material.

Aside from the incongruity of thought that would be created as a result of the removal of the Institution Narrative in Byz-BAS, the anaphora would structurally come to resemble Addai and Mari even more, but would certainly need extensive revision in order to follow AM's laudatory style. In AM's Anamnesis, the passing reference to the Institution Narrative, 'the example which is from you . . . performing this great and dread mystery' has interspersed between it a clause reflecting doxology and praise: 'rejoicing, and glorifying, and magnifying, and commemorating and praising.' No such doxological statement is to be found in Byz-BAS, except at the very end of the anaphora, with the traditional doxology to the Trinity. It thus seems that the Institution Narrative, for the reasons stated above, is a necessary and constitutive part of Byz-BAS.

The Byzantine liturgy of Basil clearly emphasizes the voluntary nature of the Lord's Passion. In fact, three separate references about the *ἐκούσιον πάθος* of Christ are made in this particular section of the anaphora: (1) 'κατὰ τὰς αὐτοῦ ἐντολάς' ('according to His commands'); (2) 'ἐπὶ τὸν ἐκούσιον . . . θάνατον' ('to His voluntary . . . death'); and (3) 'ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδου ἑαυτὸν' ('on the night He surrendered Himself').

The first prepositional phrase refers specifically to Christ's command for the Church to offer the Eucharist to God the Father in *anamnesis* of the Passion and Resurrection. Indeed, it would stand to reason that had Christ not been in control of His future, there would have certainly been no reason for Him to institute the Eucharist, the moment that His physical end would only have remained a mere memory in man's fallen history. However, Christ's death and resurrection fulfills the divine dispensation of the Father, and so the Eucharist is offered by the Church in order to relive the divine

economy of the Son and to make its sanctifying grace effectual for the Church and her flock.

The second reference – ‘ἐκούσιον’ – is attached to the word ‘death’ and is surrounded by other adjectives like ‘ἀοίδιμον’ (‘ever-memorable’; ‘lauded’) and ‘ζωοποιόν’ (‘life-creating’), to show that the Son of God’s choice to die for the sins of man is not only honorable in and of itself, but also possesses the awesome potential to reestablish the once-lost but intimate bond between God and man. Clearly, the imagery is contradictory by worldly standards: Christ’s voluntary death is not only an honorable and respected accomplishment in the eyes of the Father, but also life-producing and rejuvenating for the same human beings who put Him to the death that He willed.

The third and final reference to the Lord’s voluntary passion is interesting because it finds a similar counterpart in Chrysostom, but Byz-CHR openly rewords this section, most probably to emphasize Christ’s ‘ἐκούσιον πάθος.’³³ Byz-CHR reads: ‘On the night when He was betrayed, or rather when He gave Himself up for the life of the world, ...’, while Byz-BAS contains: ‘... on the night on which He surrendered Himself for the life of the world. ...’

The rewording in Chrysostom is most interesting, in that the redactor appears to change His mind right in the text, by giving prominence to the voluntary nature of Christ’s sacrifice. Byz-BAS does not experience this textual contradiction, except in

³³ I have translated Brightman’s rendering of this section of Byz-BAS as ‘surrendered Himself’, instead of keeping Holy Cross’ ‘He was delivered up’, which is open to a variety of interpretations (e.g. Christ *delivered Himself*, Christ was *delivered up by the Father*, or Christ was *delivered up by His enemies*). The first translation also conveys more clearly the voluntary nature of Christ’s submission to His passion.

Fenwick's rendering of Syr-BAS, whose English translation reads: 'on the night when he was betrayed'³⁴

The *Mar Esa 'ya* text of Addai and Mari does not appear to make any allusions to the voluntary nature of the Lord's passion anywhere in the anaphora, and neither do later manuscripts of the anaphora.³⁵ At best, the anaphora only mentions 'this great and dread mystery of the passion and death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ.' It would stand to reason that if the prototype text for Addai and Mari did in fact originate as early as the first century, there could have been no mention of Christ's 'voluntary' passion since the doctrine of the two wills had not yet been formulated by the Church.

The use of the participle 'ἀναδείξας' ('having shown forth') by Basil in the Institution Narrative is a distinct peculiarity of his anaphora. The term reappears soon again during the Epiklesis. In fact, according to Gregory Dix, "*anadeixis* is S. Basil's own word for the 'consecration.'³⁶ It would seem that the term's initial appearance in

³⁴ Fenwick, p. 124.

³⁵ This may be the result of later redactors' choice to avoid addressing the controversial orthodox doctrine of Christ's two wills, which the non-Chalcedonian churches rejected, along with the orthodox doctrine of the two natures of Christ. The Church fully addressed the monothelite doctrine at the Sixth Ecumenical Synod in Constantinople (680-81) and condemned it as heresy. Such a dogmatical division did not seem to alter the wording in the liturgy of Addai and Mari, although Byzantine-BAS (and Chrysostom) both include words and phrases that emphasize Christ's free will at His saving passion. Interestingly, Basil and Chrysostom's liturgical compositions both came before the seventh century, although the monothelite controversy took its start officially from Ephesus in 431, and locally perhaps much earlier. Consequently, the possibility of perhaps a Byzantine redactor adding later material to reflect Christ's voluntary passion cannot be discounted. See Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700). Volume 2. The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* (Chicago, 1974), pp. 62-77.

³⁶ Dix, *Shape*, p. 287. As Fenwick has already observed, it is the Spirit who is besought to 'show forth' the gifts of bread and wine to be the 'holy of holies', but in the Narrative, the Son first 'shows forth' the Gifts to the Father. In *On the Holy Spirit* 27.66, Basil himself uses *ἀνάδειξις* as the very purpose of the Epiklesis.

One way of understanding the liturgical use of the term 'ἀναδείξας' is to see it as the final outcome of a death-resurrection sequence. To achieve this end, Dix oddly reads into an early Byzantine 'theory of consecration' that viewed the bread and wine as pre-consecrated 'ἀντίτυπα' ('antitypes'), in which the Gifts at the Great Entrance are at that moment in the liturgy representative of the suffering Christ who proceeds toward Golgotha. This concept was incidentally introduced to the Nestorians by Narsai of Edessa in the fifth century, who borrowed this concept from Theodore of Mopsuestia. The same notion was also borrowed by the Armenians directly from the Byzantines. St. Nicholas Kabasilas objects to this veneration

the Narrative occurs in order to bring uniformity between it and the Epiklesis, or vice versa.

Basil's infinitive *ἀναδείξαι* ('to show forth') differs rather considerably from Chrysostom's *ποιήσον* ('make'), which presumably does not seem to consider the Gifts at the time of consecration as the 'frail Body of Christ' although, as Dix would agree, the Eastern Church's peculiar pre-consecratory theology is deeply embedded within all Byzantine liturgies. In Chrysostom's liturgy, the Church asks that the bread and wine 'be made' the Body and Blood of the Lord.

In Addai and Mari, as will be seen in the next chapter, the verb is not in the imperative mood, but rather in the optative, radically different from the Byzantine liturgies. The Epiklesis in AM makes the wish that the Holy Spirit *may come down* upon the offering of the Church and sanctify it, rather than to specifically transform the elements at a given moment in time. The language in both aforementioned Byzantine liturgies seems to reflect this 'moment of consecration' theology, whereas in AM it does not, but rather sees the entire anaphora, the doxology of God for *the mirabilia Dei* along

at the Great Entrance, interpreting it as a carryover from the Presanctified Liturgy, in which the Great Entrance is a procession of Christ's very Body and Blood and thus to be adored.

In Dix's estimation, the unconsecrated Gifts become 'figures' of the Body and Blood of Christ and are thus venerated by the faithful. "The modern Eastern presentation of this theory, that the preparation and offertory of the elements makes them in some sense 'figures' of the Body and Blood of Christ, represents a certain 'toning down' of the ideas found in Theodore of Mopsuestia, that the offered bread is as such the dead Body of Christ and entitled to adoration" (Dix, *Shape*, p. 287). Theodore continues that at the consecration, the 'Body' of the Lord is filled with the Holy Spirit and thus resurrected. In sum then, Christ 'shows forth' His frail physical body to God the Father at the Cross (re-presented at the offertory and during the Narrative of Institution), and the Father 'shows forth' to the Church the resurrected, glorified Christ, at the Epiklesis.

Dix's obsession with a 'moment of consecration' seems superfluous and trivial. It appears that his excessive attention to this issue derives from a Cyrilline theology emphasizing the 'awesome sacrificial' elements more than communion. The concept of a particular 'moment in time', in which the eucharistic elements automatically became Christ's Body and Blood, is completely foreign to early Eastern Christianity (The Eastern churches never truly made an issue of it until much later on, when they were obligated to contradict the Catholic West). Indeed, for the Orthodox East, it is the *entire* liturgical action, i.e. the *whole* anaphora, which is crucial, rather than an isolated moment in time.

with the eucharistic offering, as a complete act through which the consecration is effected for the Church.

THE ANAMNESIS

Introductory Observations

Not unlike the other sections of the eucharistic anaphora, the origins of the Anamnesis are also quite obscure. It is, however, a generally accepted fact that the Anamnesis is intricately related to the Narrative of Institution and typically follows it in sequence. Bernard Botte makes the following observation: “L’anamnèse apparaît donc comme solidaire de ce récit, dont elle est le développement. Impossible donc qu’une anaphore ait une anamnèse sans avoir de récit de l’institution.”³⁷ J. Fenwick writes about the Anamnesis: “It is a response to the closing words of the Institution Narrative, the so-called ‘Command to Repeat’, with which it is almost always associated.”³⁸

Right up until the Institution Narrative in the anaphora, the *Postsanctus* prayer of confession and thanksgiving is offered by the Church to God the Father (Byz-BAS) and/or God the Son (AM). Both the *Postsanctus* and Basil’s own Preface to Christ’s Words of Institution oscillate between the first person plural and the third person singular. However, at the very Words of Institution and the subsequent Anamnesis, Christ becomes the principle speaker, addressing Himself to the Church in the form of a command (‘Take, eat’; ‘Drink of this all of you’; ‘Do this in remembrance of Me’). This expected shift to the first person singular naturally initiates a dialogue between Christ and the Church, expecting an answer, with the latter responding to the former’s command to “Do this’ within the Anamnesis (‘Therefore, Master, we also . . .’). The Church’s

³⁷ Bernard Botte, “Problèmes de l’Anamnèse”, in Journal of Ecclesiastical History 15 (1964) 17.

³⁸ Fenwick, p. 156.

response to Christ's injunction is one of positive affirmation and obedience. Fenwick states, "The command to 'do this in remembrance of me' is followed by a statement of what precisely the Church is doing in memory of her Lord."³⁹

Botte draws further attention to three specific features surrounding the Anamnesis, found in all the forms of Basil: (1) a transition which recalls the Institution Narrative; (2) an enumeration of the 'mysteries' of Christ's dispensation; and (3) a prayer of offering.⁴⁰ While the first and third features are hard to discern in Addai and Mari,⁴¹ the second feature is rather evident in the brief phrase 'the passion and death and resurrection.' Nonetheless, the Anamnesis verbalizes the Church's response to Christ's command to 'Do this in remembrance of Me.' While it seems fairly obvious in the majority of anaphoras that 'this' refers to the material Eucharist (the offering of bread and wine), the uniqueness of the AM anaphora and its presumed antiquity raise the question of the true meaning of Eucharist. Is the Eucharist a purely ritual act possessing great meaning and power, or is it first and foremost the Church's collective act of doxology and praise, expressed through the offering of words, melody, and the gifts of bread and wine? Certainly, the issue is one of perspective and interesting to say the least.

A Structural Analysis of the Anamnesis

A striking similarity between Basil and Addai and Mari occurs in the Anamnesis. As previously mentioned, this section of AM is addressed specifically to the Son, evident from the only phrase that alludes to the Institution Narrative, 'we also . . . have received

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Botte, *Problèmes*, *passim*.

⁴¹ The evident absence of an Institution Narrative in AM probably explains the difficulty in locating the first feature, and the obscure nature of the Epiklesis (that is, the possibility that it may at one time have been simply an invocation of the Spirit to sanctify the congregation rather than specifically the eucharistic Gifts) may account for the third. Possible suggestions of where these features may be in AM are: (1) the

by tradition of the example which is from you.’ Interestingly, according to Fenwick’s comparative study of the anaphoras of Basil and James, Syr-BAS seems to be the only Basilian anaphora where the Anamnesis is oddly addressed to the Son, after the preceding material (*Postsanctus* and partially the Institution Narrative) were addressed to the Father. While the tendency to establish a link between AM and Syr-BAS is quite inviting, given that both anamneses are addressed to the Son, the assumption seems baseless, although Fenwick himself writes about the Syr-BAS Anamnesis: “It is addressed to the Son instead of the Father. This is the case also with Sy-Jas [*sic.*] and is clearly a feature of the ‘Syrianisation’ of these rites.”⁴² Byz-BAS remains consistent with the rest of its sections and addresses the prayer to God the Father.

In Syr-BAS, a lengthy embolism made up of mainly biblical verses, which focus upon a plea for forgiveness and deliverance, is present in the Anamnesis. The embolism itself is clearly addressed to the Son, and so the remembrance of Christ’s passion is made by engaging in dialogue *with* Him rather than with the Father *about* Him.

All the liturgies within the Ω-BAS family, when speaking about the saving mysteries in the Anamnesis, share four elements: (1) ‘δέσποτα’; (2) ‘τοῦ (ζωοποιουῦ) σταυροῦ’; (3) ‘τῆς τριημέρου ταφῆς’; and (4) ‘τοῦ Θεοῦ καί.’ While the first and fourth appear to be, in Fenwick’s words, ‘stylistic elaborations not meriting further comment’,⁴³ the referral to the Cross and the Tomb is most interesting, in light of Botte’s discovery of how early creeds, such as those of Ignatius of Antioch, Justin, and Irenaeus, only spoke of Christ’s passion (*παθῶν*). He observes: “La mention de la passion au lieu de la mort

phrase ‘And we also, O Lord, . . .’ as the point of transition into the Institution Narrative; and (2) the expression ‘this offering of thy servants’, which is intertwined with the Epiklesis.

⁴² Fenwick, p. 156. It is unfortunate that Fenwick does not expound upon his statement, nor does he give a brief explanation of what the process of liturgical ‘Syrianization’ involved.

est donc courante en Orient et elle semble le plus commune avant 341.”⁴⁴ Fenwick explains, “Mention of the sufferings of Christ leads on naturally to recalling the cross where those sufferings took place.”⁴⁵ The version of the creed formulated at Nicea in 325 AD includes mention of the Passion and Resurrection, like the earlier creeds do, whereas the completed creed at Constantinople (381 AD) adds mention of the Cross and Christ’s burial, but not His death. Interestingly, E-BAS does not expound upon the saving mysteries of the Cross and Tomb, as does Byz-BAS,⁴⁶ and is thus quite similar to Addai and Mari, in that the latter also limits itself to ‘passion and death.’ This simplicity and succinctness in E-BAS and AM could possibly have formed the basis for Byz-BAS before further material was added to it.

The Anamnesis further continues to expound upon the other saving mysteries following the Crucifixion (in AM, only the Resurrection; in Byz-BAS, the Resurrection, the Ascension, the enthronement at the Father’s right hand, and the Second Coming). A strong argument in support of AM’s antiquity is the Anamnesis’ limiting of the saving mysteries to only Christ’s passion and resurrection, both of which together encompassed the early Church’s fundamental *kerygma*. The addition of the other ‘mysteries’ in Byz-Basil would appear to shift the focus of the Eucharist as something more than simply the commemoration of Christ’s death, although His death and resurrection are certainly at the core of the Christian Faith. Fenwick writes: “The Anamnesis, continues Botte, thus becomes a Christological profession of faith by the enumeration of the saving facts, and

⁴³ Ibid. p. 157.

⁴⁴ Botte, *Problèmes*, p. 15.

⁴⁵ Fenwick, p. 157.

⁴⁶ Fenwick explains this elaboration as follows: “The reason for the elaboration by Ω -BAS is not difficult to postulate and accords with the tendency to increase biblical detail” (Fenwick, p. 157). He also adds that “to jump directly from the cross to the resurrection would be to ignore an important event in the Gospel

by so doing betrays a developing understanding of the Eucharist as not solely a commemoration of the *death* of Christ.”⁴⁷

The final part of the Anamnesis in Byz-BAS, the offering, or oblation, has no apparent counterpart in AM, but also shows a divergence between the various Basilian forms. Byz-BAS’ text reads: ‘Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέροντες, κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα’ (‘Offering to You these gifts from Your own gifts in all and for all, . . .’).⁴⁸ Fenwick proceeds to discuss the differences between the Basilian anaphoras by dividing this section into three categories: (1) the description of the Gifts; (2) the verb; and (3) ‘for all and through all.’

While ES-BAS and EG-BAS both include the descriptive word ‘δώρων’ for the bread and wine in their oblation (perhaps an Egyptianism), Byz-BAS leaves this term out, as does the greater Ω-BAS family. Fenwick observes that in Syr-BAS, a formal oblation

Passion Narratives, and so ‘tomb’ is inserted to make a logical stepping-stone to the resurrection” (ibid.). These additions, Botte argues, are a result of early credal influence.

⁴⁷ Fenwick, p. 157.

⁴⁸ Brightman’s *Barberini* text reads ‘προσφέροντες’ rather than ‘προσφέροντες’, which is in his “Modern Text” (cf. Brightman, LEW, pp. 329 and 405). Brightman retains the participle for both Basil and Chrysostom’s text, and this seems to preserve the proper grammatical flow and coherence of the section, because of the people’s response immediately afterward: ‘σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν, σὲ εὐλογοῦμεν, σοὶ εὐχαριστοῦμεν, Κύριε, καὶ δεόμεθά σου, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν.’ Fenwick agrees: “The form of the Byz-Basil verb seems to have been determined by the introduction of the people’s response”, containing “the main verbs which conclude the action of the Anamnesis, thus causing the προσφέρω verb to be recast into a participle” (Fenwick, p. 160). The dependent clause of the celebrant, ‘Offering to You these gifts from Your own gifts in all and for all . . .’, naturally connects to the independent clause, ‘we praise [hymn] You, we bless You, we give thanks to You, O Lord, and we pray to You, our God.’ Upon making her offering to God then, the Church immediately offers praise and thanksgiving to Him.

A possible reason for placing the verb *προσφέρω* in the active indicative (present in Brightman’s “Modern Text”), rather than as a participle, stems from the fact that the Anamnesis itself, in current practice, is typically read in silence by the priest. Consequently, keeping the verb in the active indicative at the oblation introduces a section independent of the Anamnesis, which gives greater coherence to the text. Furthermore, the people’s response includes a series of verbs also in the active indicative, introducing yet another section independent of the previous oblation. It would seem then that the more original use of a participle between the oblation and the people’s response, as presented by Brightman, presumed a faster transition between the two sections that would render a more coherent meaning.

A second possible reason for the active indicative use of *προσφέρω* may be due to the time when the people’s response became seen as a comment on the prayer rather than as an integral part of it, possessing the main verbs of the sentence. In truth, the people’s response to the overall anaphora is most significant

is missing altogether and rather an offering of thanksgiving is pronounced instead: “. . . et nos miseri peccatores consecuti gratiam tuam gratias agimus tibi de omnibus et pro omnibus.”⁴⁹ Addai and Mari also lacks the term ‘gifts’ in its own Anamnesis and Epiklesis sections, choosing to call the bread and wine either ‘this great and awesome mystery’ (an almost certain Cyrilline addition) or ‘offering’ (a seemingly more ancient description).⁵⁰ Byz-BAS’ generic ‘τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν’ must certainly refer to the ‘gifts’, but the absence of the term may derive from two possible causes: (1) Byz-BAS later makes reference to the Gifts as ‘ἀντίτυπα’ and ‘δῶρα’, choosing to focus more on the status of the elements prior to the consecration and on the manner of the consecration itself; or (2) influence from a Syrian source (Syr-BAS or AM), which seems to center more around praise rather than the consecration of the elements.

Byz-BAS uses both verbs ‘προσφέρω’ and ‘προτίθημι’, the former in the actual act of oblation (‘προσφέροντες’), the latter in the Epiklesis (‘προθέντες’). As previously mentioned, AM does not have a formal act of oblation, even though the elements are simply referred to as ‘offering.’ According to Fenwick, “There is one indication that προτίθημι is a verb which formed part of the Basilian eucharistic vocabulary.”⁵¹ In Byz-BAS’ Epiklesis, the Church is understood ‘as looking back’ (‘προθέντες τὰ ἀντίτυπα’) to the initial oblation (‘προσφέροντες’) in the Anamnesis. Fenwick believes that “the Redactor of Ω-BAS has altered προτίθημι to προσφέρω in the Anamnesis to express a more developed concept of oblation, but betrays his earlier understanding of the action by

and thus a necessary component, which would qualify the participle as the more accurate (and legitimate) reading.

⁴⁹ Fenwick, p. 150. Syr-BAS begins to resemble Byz-BAS with the words ‘de omnibus et pro omnibus.’

⁵⁰ See note 24 of this chapter.

⁵¹ Fenwick, p. 159.

describing it with προθέντες later in the anaphora.”⁵² Kenneth Stevenson postulates that the Church’s ‘looking back’ to the offering in the anaphora, expressed in the past tense by ‘προθέντες’, is an Egyptian characteristic, in which ‘the Church looks back to the offertory and expresses in words the meaning of that. It looks forward to the act of communion and prays for the effects of that.’⁵³ Such retrospective language is absent in AM, possibly because the rubrics for the offertory in the Nestorian liturgy, according to Brightman, seem very simple and an actual offertory prayer is lacking.⁵⁴

The expression ‘for all and through all’, according to A. Raes,⁵⁵ belongs to the people’s response which follows, “being an offering of the gifts in the Byzantine rite and a giving of thanks in the Syrian rites.”⁵⁶ Raes also suggests that the same phrase, along with the response of the people, was an interpolation, citing as evidence how the early texts of *Apostolic Tradition*⁵⁷ and *Apostolic Constitutions* had the Epiklesis follow the Anamnesis immediately, without any extra material in between the two sections. A similar expression referring to doxological praise appears in the *Postsanctus* of AM, thus

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ See K.W. Stevenson, “Anaphoral Offering: Some Observations on Eastern Eucharistic Prayers”, in *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 94 (1980) 226.

⁵⁴ See Brightman, pp. 267-70. The rubrics are rather plain, consisting of a simple practical action with no apparent procession. “The priest goes to put the mysteries on the altar: and when he puts the vessels on the altar, the priest takes the paten and the deacon the chalice.” The priest celebrant then takes up both Gifts and with his hands crossed, taps them together symbolically, singing all the while the ‘anthem of the mysteries.’ He finally places them on the altar table and covers them with a veil. The only section comparable to an offertory prayer in the Nestorian liturgy is to be found during the striking of the chalice and paten together by the priest: “After thy commandment, O our Lord and our God (repeat), these glorious and holy and life-giving and divine mysteries are placed and ordered on the propitiatory altar until the coming of our Lord the second time from heaven: to whom be glory at all times for ever. Amen.” This initial placement on the altar table, however, is not referred to later in AM’s Anamnesis, consequently discrediting the possibility of any Egyptian (or Byzantine) influence, according to Stevenson’s theory.

⁵⁵ See A. Raes, “KATA ΠΑΝΤΑ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΑ ΠΑΝΤΑ: En tout et pour tout”, in *Oriens Christianus* 48 (1964) 216-20.

⁵⁶ Fenwick, p. 161. Fenwick unfortunately does not expound upon his interpretation of Raes. Is he perhaps insinuating that within the Syrian anaphoras, it is solely God’s praise that is returned to Him, while in Basil, it is only the bread and wine?

vindicating Raes position: ‘And for all your benefits and graces towards us we offer you glory and honor and thanksgiving and adoration. . . .’

A Theological Examination of the Anamnesis

The understanding of ‘memorial’ (*anamnesis*), is fundamental to the eucharistic theology of the Church because this very same concept is basic also to ancient Judaic worship, from which the Christian liturgy derives. For example, the annual celebration of Passover (2 Kg 23.21) was the remembrance of the Jewish people’s deliverance from Egypt: “This day shall be for you a memorial day” (Ex 12.14). The weekly *Kiddush*, or Sabbath celebration, was the memorial of God’s goodness manifested in creation and redemption. Memorial (Heb. *le Zikkaron*) was then “a pledge or sign given by God which guarantees the continuity of the goodness and saving actions of God. It was not merely a remembrance or a record of the past but rather a sign of an objective reality made present – the saving deeds of God.”⁵⁸

In order to make this memorial vibrantly real for the worshiping community, symbolic items (unleavened bread, bitter herbs, a cooked lamb) were used in prayer “that helped the participants to re-live or experience the events of their deliverance from Egypt.”⁵⁹ In this sense, the Jews became contemporaries of their forefathers and co-

⁵⁷ The *Apostolic Tradition* reads: “Memores igitur [*anamnesis*]. . . offerimus tibi panem et calicem . . . et petimus ut mittas [Epiklesis]” (Fenwick, p. 161). Obviously, the Epiklesis follows the Anamnesis immediately. ES-BAS likewise places the Epiklesis immediately after the Anamnesis.

⁵⁸ See Elavanal, pp. 118-19. Likewise, the Eucharist is more than just the recollection of a past historical event; instead, it is a sign of God’s very salvation effected through the eucharistic act instituted within history. Elavanal also observes: “Through memorial celebrations they [the Jews] tried to make that history always present. Memory always provided them the link between past and present” (p. 119).

⁵⁹ Elavanal, p. 119. The Eucharist also involves the use of tangible foods (bread, wine, and water), in order to convey this sense of participation in God’s sacramental redemption. However, the early Church did not understand these elements as *symbolic representations* of Christ’s Body and Blood, but as the *actual thing*. Both Western churches adhering to the Roman rite and Eastern churches following the Antiochene and Byzantine rites have sought later in their histories to make this distinction evident by attempting to determine a set ‘moment of consecration.’ See Dix, *Shape*, especially pp. 291-302.

participants in God's act of redemption. Through memorial then, a past event "was not simply a commemorative celebration but a sign of the abiding presence of the salvific deeds of God."⁶⁰

Not only did the memorial allow the worshiping community of faith to experience and participate in God's saving acts, but it also permitted the Israelites to encounter God Himself in their worship. God was believed then to be sacramentally present during the memorial celebration. Elavanal validates this claim by making reference to Old Testament forms of communal worship: "This understanding of cultic presence of God led to the idea of appearing before God and seeing the face of God in worship (Ex 23.17; 34.23)."⁶¹

In summary then, the early Church understood the eucharistic Anamnesis in virtually the same light as memorial within the Jewish liturgy. The Church 're-calls' and 're-presents' an event of the past by transporting it into the present (rather than simply calling it to mind and leaving it in the past, as in the case of Greco-Roman memorials) and making it effectual here and now through the eternal presence of God. M. Thurian writes: "The past event became present or rather each person became a contemporary of the past event."⁶² In a sense then, the Anamnesis unifies the past with the present together as one complete event within history, possessing eternal, eschatological dimensions.

The 'moment of consecration' theology appears to be a pertinent issue in the West only in the wake of the doctrine of transubstantiation and the consequent idea that the purpose of the eucharistic celebration is to produce the presence of Christ rather than communion. The Eastern position offers the counterargument to the Western idea, namely, that the elements become Christ's Body and Blood as a result of the entire liturgical action of the Church and not as an isolated event within the act of offering (i.e. at the Words of Institution uttered by the clergy celebrant). See note 36 above and T. Elavanal, pp. 213-26. C.C. Richardson also observes: "No single phrase consecrated by itself, for consecrating was not a simple but a complex sacred action. It involved the giving of thanks, doing what the Lord had done, making the 'antitype' of His body and blood, offering the bread and the cup, and hallowing the elements. Indeed, the early liturgies are characterized not so much by a moment as a *movement* of consecration" (C.C. Richardson, "The So-Called Epiclesis in Hippolytus", in Harvard Theological Review 40 (1947) 108).

⁶⁰ Elavanal, p. 119.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² M. Thurian, Eucharistic Memorial. Part One. Ed. and trans. J.G. Davies (London, 1966), p. 19.

Not only does the Anamnesis re-present the salvific actions of Christ for those Christians assembled together in the eucharistic celebration, but it also allows those far away from the Church, and even those who are deceased, to have access to them. The eucharistic celebration then becomes a full intercessory prayer for the entire Body of Christ, living and dead. Elavanal states: "A memorial celebration, in liturgical context, means a commemoration for us, and an intercession before God on behalf of us."⁶³

Early Jewish Christians understood the memorial of the Lord's Supper and Passion as the method through which Christ's redemptive works in history were brought fully into the present so the worshiping community could participate in their eternal benefits. However, the early Hellenistic Christians had difficulty grasping this concept and so, for this reason, "St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians, had to explain how the cup of blessing is a participation in the blood of Christ (1 Cor. 10:16)."⁶⁴ He also explains ten verses later that the Eucharist, and the people's participation in it, is truly the Church's proclamation of the death of Christ. Interestingly, Elavanal uses the argument that the first reference to Christ's command to "Do this in remembrance of Me" appears in Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, and that it is absent from Matthew and Mark, a possible indication that the early Christian community held *anamnesis* in such high regard that it seemed unnecessary to include it in the aforementioned biblical narratives.

Given the absence in Addai and Mari of an Institution Narrative, despite theories trying to identify the place where the Institution Narrative may have once been located prior to its removal (had this been the case), it seems that AM's Anamnesis is directly related to the immediately preceding Intercessions, which will be covered in another

⁶³ Elavanal, p. 143.

⁶⁴ Elavanal, p. 121.

chapter of this thesis. In Byzantine-Basil, the Intercessions *follow* the Anamnesis rather than *precede* it. Byz-BAS' Intercessions are not directly dependent upon the Anamnesis,⁶⁵ due to the presence of a Narrative of Institution in Basil, to which the Anamnesis is directly attached.

In Addai and Mari, the Anamnesis is directly linked to the Intercessions, because the apostles and saints that followed Christ's example were the ones responsible for receiving the eucharistic tradition from the Lord and transmitting it to the Church. Elavanal writes: "It [the anamnesis] should be understood in relation to the preceding part of remembrance of the just fathers who were pleasing before God, and the apostles, martyrs and confessors who were all a connecting link in the transmission of this tradition or example to us from Christ."⁶⁶ While the *Postsanctus* establishes the vertical dimension of the liturgical celebration (the heavenly host with the people), the Anamnesis in AM "stresses the horizontal line of continuity of tradition"⁶⁷ (the living with the righteous fathers before them who delivered the liturgical tradition to later generations).

B. Spinks' English translation of 'example' in AM's Anamnesis (accepted also by F. Brightman), is rendered as 'type' by T. Elavanal, who argues that "this 'type' which we have received from Christ is the reality itself."⁶⁸ Elavanal goes on to explain that 'type' here signifies the more common Syriac understanding of 'symbol' or 'mystery.' Byz-BAS makes no such reference in the Anamnesis, but does refer to the gifts as 'antitypes' in the Epiklesis, the symbols of the Lord's Body and Blood that will become His Body and Blood during the consecration. While it seems rather obvious that the use

⁶⁵ The Intercessions for the dead and the living in Byz-BAS flow out of a commemoration of the righteous saints, begun in the Epiklesis prayers. Chapter Nine will cover this section in full.

⁶⁶ Elavanal, p. 138.

⁶⁷ Ibid. p. 139.

of ‘type’ in AM attempts to draw attention to the institution of the Eucharist (given the fact that the Narrative is absent), Byz-BAS’ placement of ‘antitypes’ at the beginning of the Epiklesis seems to fulfill an entirely different purpose; specifically, to make a sharp distinction between the unconsecrated symbols of bread and wine⁶⁹ and the actual consecrated Body and Blood of Christ.

Odo Casel understands the Syriac term *raza* to mean ‘mystery’, which appears in the Anamnesis of AM.⁷⁰ However, ‘mystery’ in AM does not refer to the manner through which the bread and wine are consecrated into the Body and Blood, but more so to the salvific events of Christ remembered through the eucharistic celebration and offering. Elavanal points out: “In Western eucharistic theology, the accent is more on the oblation of Christ as repeated today through the hands of the priest, while in almost all the oriental liturgies it is on the celebration of the mystery of Christ, the economy of our salvation in Christ, . . .”⁷¹

A final observation to be made regarding the Anamnesis in both the Syriac and Byzantine liturgies centers upon the obvious importance of the Resurrection as the

⁶⁸ Ibid. p. 140.

⁶⁹ It does not seem possible that the later fifth century liturgical theology of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Narsai of Edessa regarding the unconsecrated elements – namely, that they are the lifeless Body of Christ awaiting to be resurrected (see note 36 of this chapter) – influenced Basil in the original composition of his anaphora. The use of the term ‘antitypes’ in the Byzantine anaphora is in all likelihood a later (post-Basilian) attempt to give the Gifts an added symbolic meaning. Furthermore, E-BAS, avowedly the earliest available text of Basil’s anaphora (and certainly earlier than the Byzantine rite), leaves ‘antitypes’ out of its Epiklesis, perhaps a further indication that the Basilian tradition did not originally adhere to Mopsuestian symbolisms.

⁷⁰ The term *raza*, claims Elavanal, is synonymous to the Greek *τύπος* and *σύμβολον*, “a sacred action of worship in which the redemptive work of the past is made present in a particular rite” (See O. Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship and Other Writings*. Ed. and trans. I.T. Hale, ed. B. Neunheuser (London, 1962), pp. 109-10). By executing this sacred sign, the community of faith enters into the redemptive actuality. Elavanal’s comment (p. 145), namely that the Syriac term for ‘mystery’ (*raza*) is equivalent to the Greek term for ‘sacrament’ (*μυστήριον*), seems unconvincing, given that most liturgical commentators recognize the ‘awesome’ and ‘mystery’ language as highly influenced by Cyril of Jerusalem. However, the connection to ‘type’ and ‘symbol’ is far more convincing, inasmuch as the use of such terms, even within the Byzantine tradition, can refer specifically to the salvific acts of Christ.

⁷¹ Elavanal, p. 149.

'primary' salvific event of the Lord, which validates all others.⁷² There is virtually no doubt, especially in Eastern Christianity, that the Resurrection has always possessed central importance in the *kerygma* of the Church. According to Elavanal, "Right from the early centuries, the eucharistic celebration was intimately related to the resurrection of Christ. It is because of the stress on the resurrection rather than on the death of Christ that early eucharistic celebration was associated with the day of resurrection."⁷³

It is also quite interesting to note that AM's concise list of saving events (passion-death-resurrection) seems to explain why the early Church only celebrated the Eucharist on Sunday, as well as originally keep a one- or two-day pre-paschal vigil rather than the more traditional forty-day Lenten cycle,⁷⁴ which was instituted after the fourth century. Byz-BAS' inclusion of other 'salvific events' reflects a time when the eschatological immediacy of the 'basic mysteries' presumably yielded to other events in Christ's life (the Nativity, the Transfiguration, the Ascension, etc.), commemorated separately through a eucharistic celebration *during the week*,⁷⁵ if necessary. The existence of such weekday Eucharists during St. Basil's time, aside from Sunday's liturgy, suggested a greater regard and respect for human history by the recently emancipated and no longer persecuted Church, which was seeking to take its rightful place in human society and history. This represented a divergence from the strongly dualistic attitude harbored by the

⁷² Truthfully, the salvific events in the life of Christ cannot be singled out and honored apart from each other. Each significant event in His life was fundamentally necessary for man's salvation, since one event naturally enabled the other to occur (the Passion led to the Crucifixion, the Crucifixion to the Resurrection, etc.). Early confessions of faith, which includes the Anamnesis of AM, offer a simple delineation of the most important and basic 'mysteries' of salvation (passion, death, resurrection), while Byz-BAS expounds upon these 'mysteries', mentioning also the Ascension, the Enthronement at God's right hand, and the Second Coming.

⁷³ Elavanal, p. 147.

⁷⁴ G. Dix, *Shape*, p. 338; see also, A.C. Calivas, *Great Week and Pascha in the Greek Orthodox Church* (Brookline, 1992), pp. 2-5.

⁷⁵ G. Dix, *Shape*, pp. 343-347.

early Church of the first three centuries, whose focus on the 'basic mysteries' assured salvation from the evil ways of a fallen and seemingly incorrigible world. However, LJC and Byz-BAS' emphasis upon the 'glorious and awesome second coming' of Christ in the Anamnesis does not discount the strong eschatological character of the Byzantine rite.

Conclusion

The primary intent of this chapter has been to conduct a comparative examination between the Institution Narrative-Anamnesis units of both Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil. I had decided to join both major sections together, in keeping with common practice among most liturgical scholars, since both are mutually interdependent. The Narrative of Institution, as its name implies, initiates the Church's eucharistic tradition, as well as identifies for the Church the importance of the elements of bread and wine in connection with the Lord's sacrifice. On the other hand, the Anamnesis recalls Christ's eucharistic ('bloodless') offering at the Last Supper and sacrificial ('blood') offering at Golgotha, validates the Church's eucharistic practice through the command to 'do this in remembrance of Me', and makes effectual here and now the grace of redemption through 'memorial', transforming the worshiper into a participant of a past event with eternal, eschatological dimensions.

Given the fact that an Institution Narrative is absent in the oldest *Mar Esa'ya* manuscript of Addai and Mari, the difficulty in carrying on a comparative study for this section is quite obvious. Instead, I proceeded to summarize the various positions taken by older and contemporary liturgical scholars to explain the reason for this unconventional absence (or removal) in AM. Interestingly, even when later redactors decided to insert a Narrative of Institution in the Syriac anaphora, the points of insertion varied, from before

the fraction to right after the *Postsanctus*. Another interesting theory advocated for the placement of the Narrative just before communion, seeing that the Words of Institution may not actually have formed part of the eucharistic prayers but instead were words associated with communion and not consecration.

Given the Institution Narrative's placement in Byz-BAS after the *Postsanctus*, with its lengthy thanksgiving for the *mirabilia Dei*, one can see how the material offering of the Gifts follows immediately after the verbal offering of praise. It therefore seems that the Narrative in Basil is a necessary and constitutive part of the anaphora, inasmuch as its surrounding material is dependent upon the material offering of the Gifts. The absence in AM of a Narrative but the inclusion of an Epiklesis for the Gifts and people is somewhat contradictory, although AM's passing reference to the Eucharist in the phrase 'the example which is from you' is also immersed in language reflecting praise. This verbal-material praise motif, regardless of the order, seems then to be a fundamental link between the two anaphoras.

The Basilian liturgical tradition (except for the presumably more ancient E-BAS text) focuses intently on the voluntary nature of Christ's passion, whereas Addai and Mari does not, possibly because the Basil redactors were in opposition to the monothelite controversy and probably wished to include a certain phraseology that defended the perfect cooperation of Christ's two wills. AM's complete refusal to refer to Christ's voluntary nature in the eucharistic prayer should not be seen as a betrayal to the rest of the non-Chalcedonian churches, but rather as an indication of its antiquity. The lack of any reference to Christ's voluntary suffering in E-BAS may indicate a common original

source shared by both AM and Byz-BAS, before the redactors of both anaphoras began their revisions.

While the origin of the Anamnesis in liturgical anaphoras is obscure, it is generally accepted that it follows the Narrative of Institution to which it directly refers and is a response to the closing words of the Narrative, the so-called 'Command to Repeat', as J. Fenwick explains.

Botte identifies three features common in most anamneses: (1) a transition within the text recalling the Narrative; (2) an enumeration of the 'mysteries' of Christ's dispensation; and (3) a prayer of offering. While Byz-BAS contains all three, AM lacks the first and third, whereas the second feature exists but in a far more succinct form. Furthermore, Syr-BAS is the only Basilian version where the Anamnesis is addressed to the Son about Himself, as in AM, and so the tendency to draw a link between both traditions is inviting. However, the argument based on Fenwick's explanation of 'Syrianisation' remains inconclusive. Byz-BAS remains consistent with the majority of its liturgical family and addresses the anaphora to the Father about the Son.

AM's simpler Anamnesis seems to focus upon the more immediate events following the Last Supper, namely, the Passion, Crucifixion, and Resurrection (based on a very early creed of faith), whereas Byz-BAS adds other post-Resurrection occurrences. These interpolated later events simply reflect the varying Basilian traditions (all versions, including E-BAS, contain the 'extra' events). This addition of post-Resurrection events in all the Basilian anaphoras may be explained in two ways: first, the need to establish uniformity between them; and second, the influence exerted upon local liturgical practices by a recently-emancipated Church which no longer saw history in a dualistic

eye, but rather sought, through its gradual creation of a liturgical calendar, to celebrate the feasts of saints and other salvific events in the earthly life of Christ (the Incarnation, the Transfiguration, etc.).

Another significant observation is that in AM, the Intercessions and commemoration of the righteous fathers and saints *precede* the Anamnesis to which they seem to be related. It is after all, as Elavanal states, the apostles and saints who followed Christ's 'example' by receiving the eucharistic tradition from Him and transmitting it to the Church. On the contrary, the presence of an Institution Narrative immediately *before* the Anamnesis in Byz-BAS (and in other East Syrian anaphoras containing a Narrative) may explain why the Intercessions are placed *after* the Anamnesis in this anaphora.⁷⁶

In conclusion, the Anamnesis has been considered by several liturgical scholars as the crux of the entire eucharistic prayer, given the fact that it links the Church's anaphoral celebration with the example given by Christ at the Last Supper. In a sense, it justifies the eucharistic ethos of the Church. Elavanal perhaps says it best when he writes:

But that which Paul has received from the Lord is not the narration of institution which he received from the early Christian community; what he received from the Lord is the internal connection which lies behind the Eucharist of early Christians and the last Supper during which Jesus instituted the Eucharist. It is this identity of the action of the Church with the action of Christ that is essential for every eucharistic celebration.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ It is not entirely clear whether the placement of the Intercessions in AM *before* the Anamnesis is due to a missing Institution Narrative. Other East Syrian anaphoras which do contain a Narrative of Institution do place the Intercessions immediately *after* the Anamnesis but before the Epiklesis, whereas West Syrian anaphoras and, by extension, the Byzantine liturgies, include the Intercessions *after the Epiklesis*, which follows the Anamnesis. For a helpful comparative chart of the structural order of the West Syrian, East Syrian, and AM anaphoras, see Elavanal, p. 68.

⁷⁷ Elavanal, p. 141.

Chapter Eight The Epiklesis

Addai and Mari (AM) *The Epiklesis*

Priest: May he come, O Lord, your Holy Spirit and rest upon this oblation of your servants, and bless and hallow it,
[*Deacon:* Be in silence.]

(The Benefits of Communion)

Priest (*continues*): that it may be to us, O Lord, for the pardon of debts and the forgiveness of sins, and a great hope of resurrection from the dead and a new life in the kingdom of heaven with all who have been pleasing before you.

Byzantine-Basil (Byz-BAS) *The Epiklesis*

Priest (*silently*): Therefore, most holy Master, we also, Your sinful and unworthy servants, whom You have made worthy to serve at Your holy altar, not because of our own righteousness (for we have not done anything good upon the earth), but because of Your mercy and compassion, which You have so richly poured upon us, we dare to approach Your holy altar, and bring forth the antitypes of the holy Body and Blood of Your Christ. We ask You and beseech You, O Holy of Holies, that by the favor of Your goodness, Your All-holy Spirit may come upon us and upon the gifts here laid forth, to bless, sanctify, and show,

This bread to be the precious Body of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ. (Amen.)
[*Deacon:* Amen.]

Priest: And this cup to be the precious Blood of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ. (Amen.)
[*Deacon:* Amen.]

Priest: Shed for the life and salvation of the world. (Amen.)
[*Deacon:* Amen. Amen. Amen.]

(The Benefits of Communion)

Priest: And unite us all to one another who become partakers of the one Bread and the Cup in the communion of the one Holy Spirit. Grant that none of us may partake of the holy Body and Blood of Your Christ to judgment or condemnation; but, that we may find mercy and grace with all the saints who through the ages have pleased You: forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, teachers, and for every righteous spirit made perfect in faith.

Opening Comments on Liturgical Epiklesis

Most liturgical scholars seem to agree that the Epiklesis is one of the sections of the Christian anaphora whose origins appear slightly clearer than others. Edward Ratcliff had suggested that the Epiklesis may have been at one time “a prayer initially existing

apart from the Anaphora as a preparation for reception of the Eucharist and subsequently incorporated into the Anaphora.”¹ Louis Ligier agrees that the Epiklesis is an addition to the core of the eucharistic prayer, calling it “a supplication, but without the character of a rite.”² The gradual incorporation of the Epiklesis into the anaphora not only retained the already existent supplication for the benefits of communion, but also added a specific request for the transformation of the elements. In John Fenwick’s words, “There seems to be a clear trend in the development of the Epiklesis to an ever more explicit request concerning the elements,”³ which would qualify Ligier’s characterization of a ‘rite.’

Thomas Elavanal makes the distinction between a traditional eucharistic Epiklesis, invoking God to grant the fruits of communion to the partakers, and a ‘consecratory Epiklesis’, which ask for a specific change in the elements.⁴ Ratcliff elaborates upon this thought, stating that “if in its initial form [the Epiklesis] was a prayer for the sending of the Spirit on the intended communicants, its transformation into a prayer for the Spirit’s in-mission into the oblation was inevitable by the turn of the fourth century, if not slightly earlier.”⁵ Saint Cyril of Jerusalem’s pioneering phraseology of

¹ E.C. Ratcliff, *Liturgical Studies*, p. 34. The content of the Epiklesis, part of which specifically requests for the fruits of communion to be fulfilled in the lives of the communicants, merits this position, which still finds substantial support today.

² L. Ligier, *Origins*, p. 181f.

³ J. Fenwick, *The Anaphoras*, p. 178.

⁴ T. Elavanal, *The Memorial Celebration*, p. 154.

⁵ Ratcliff, p. 34. Ratcliff does not seem to explain the reason for the addition of a prayer of transformation in the Epiklesis, much less the connection between the two epicletic forms. Gregory Dix, in his lengthy chapter on “The Theology of Consecration” in *The Shape of the Liturgy*, surmises, albeit obscurely, that both the Eastern and Western churches felt a dire need to explain the reason for a specific consecratory petition for the elements, due to an apparent shift in focus. He writes: “Its place [the central position of the ‘primitive nucleus’ of the anaphora, i.e. the ‘thanksgiving series’ of prayers] as what may be called the ‘operative’ part of the prayer has been taken now by something presumed to have a more directly ‘consecratory’ intention, from the ‘second half’ of the prayer. In some churches it is the recital of our Lord’s words – ‘This is My Body’, etc. – which is now taken to identify the Bread and Wine with what He Himself has said that they are, His Body and Blood” (p. 275).

Dix goes on to indicate that this shift in focus may have first occurred as early as the third century (although it seems Hippolytus’ *Apostolic Tradition* petitions God for the fruits of communion only, like

μυστήριον and *φρικοδέστατος θυσία* in direct reference to the elements identified them as imbued with a special power and presence of God (*Shekinah*) worthy of sublime honor and attention. In a sense then, the traditional eucharistic Epiklesis, void of any specific consecratory petition for the transformation of the Gifts, shows them to be the *material means* through which the worshipers received the divine benefits of forgiveness of sins and eternal life. On the contrary, the consecratory Epiklesis views the hallowed Gifts as the *resurrected Christ Himself*, who bestows upon the communicants the spiritual benefits of communion.

Brian Spinks writes, “In its strict etymological sense, ‘epiklesis’ can refer to any invocation addressed to God”,⁶ regardless of what kind of supplication is made. Possibly the earliest known liturgical Epiklesis is the transliteration of the Aramaic *Maranatha* (“O Lord, come!”) of 1 Corinthians 16.22 and its Greek counterpart in Revelation 22.20 (“Ἐρχου, Κύριε Ἰησοῦ!” or “Come, Lord Jesus!”). Spinks and others insist that this simple formula echoes the earliest form of eucharistic invocation, in which the risen Lord is besought by the Church to ‘come’ and manifest His presence.

AM) or even second century (Justin Martyr), alongside the fourth century evidence (Ambrose of Milan, John Chrysostom of Antioch, Sarapion of Egypt, and Gregory of Nyssa in Asia Minor).

This attempt at clarification led to a difference in opinion regarding the exact ‘moment’ when the transformation of the Gifts into the Body and Blood of Christ occurred (during the Words of Institution for the West and upon the invocation of the Spirit in the East). Consequently, the Eastern churches carried (complicated, for Dix) the issue further by regarding the pre-consecrated ‘antitypes’ of the bread and wine as representative of the suffering Christ who has died and who, at the consecration, is resurrected and glorified since the Holy Spirit has fully permeated the sacrificial oblation. See Chapter 7 of this thesis, note 36.

What is the earliest available evidence indicating a ‘moment of consecration’ theology in the East? There is no distinct answer, although a beginning point may be the inclusion of the deacon’s response at the Epiklesis (‘amen’) in post-ninth century texts (Codex *Barberini* does not have this.). This distinct uttering by the deacon seems to conclude the consecratory requests (‘show’, in Basil; ‘make’, in Chrysostom) and would historically correspond anyway to the twelfth-century Western doctrine of transubstantiation (even though the eucharistic controversies were prevalent in the West from as early as the ninth century onward).

⁶ B. Spinks, *Worship Prayers*, p. 90. The term is derived from the Greek verb *ἐπικαλέω, ἐπικαλῶ* (‘I call upon’ or ‘I invoke’).

The significant verb 'come' is generally accepted as characteristic of the earliest forms of Epiklesis, particularly because of its connection with the aforementioned eschatological prayer *Maranatha*. Interestingly, most anaphoras, earlier and later,⁷ include this ancient imperative in their texts.

Another controversial issue regarding the Epiklesis which requires careful attention is the subject of the Epiklesis: is it God the Son or God the Holy Spirit who comes upon the Gifts? Whereas all the Basilian versions clearly petition the Father to send the Holy Spirit, there is considerable disagreement regarding who the subject is in AM's Epiklesis, since the primary addressee throughout the anaphora oscillates between the Father and the Son. Furthermore, this uncertainty has prompted another debate regarding to whom 'your Holy Spirit' specifically refers: to the Person of the Holy Spirit or Christ?⁸

While A. Gelston⁹ seems convinced that the anaphora of AM was primarily addressed to the Father, B. Spinks,¹⁰ along with W. Macomber,¹¹ abide by the position that in its original form, the prayer was directed toward the Son. It would seem that the proponents of this latter position understand 'your Holy Spirit' as meaning not the Third

⁷ A. Gelston draws attention to the common use of 'come' in the Epiklesis of both AM and Byz-BAS, but notes that Hippolytus' third century *Apostolic Tradition* includes a phrase beseeching the Father to 'send' the Holy Spirit upon the oblation so the communicants can receive the benefits of partaking the Eucharist. Whereas AM uses the more ancient 'come' and asks only for the benefits of communion, Byz-BAS makes a plea for the transformation of the Gifts as well as for the fruits of communion. Other anaphoras that contain the verb 'come' are the Maronite anaphora of *Sharar* and the other two East Syrian rites of Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia. See A. Gelston, *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari*, p. 111.

⁸ G. Dix maintains that 'your Holy Spirit' can actually signify the divine Presence, or *Shekinah* (*Shape*, pp. 183-84). Thus, the 'Spirit' and 'Christ' become interchangeable terms. Elsewhere, he writes: "This 'Spirit = Word' terminology is obviously related to the 'Spirit = Presence-of-God' terminology, of which we have found traces in Syria. It is also likely that both are originally connected to pre-Christian Jewish [*sic.*] thought with the idea of the sanctity and 'power' of the Name of God" (Ibid. p. 276).

⁹ Gelston, *passim*.

¹⁰ Spinks, *Worship Prayers*, p. 91.

Person of the Trinity acting *apart* from the Son – it is unfathomable, theologically speaking, how a dichotomy between the Persons of the Trinity can exist! – but rather a perfect synergistic union existing between the Son and the Spirit, phrased in terms of the spirit-filled ‘presence’ of Jesus, and expressed in Galatians 4.6 (“And because you are children, God has sent *the spirit of his Son* into your hearts, . . .”; “ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ...”) and 1 Corinthians 15.45 (“Thus it is written, ‘the first man, Adam, became a living being’; the last Adam [Christ] became a *life-giving spirit*”; “Οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται, ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἰδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν· ὁ δὲ ἔσχατος Ἰδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν”). These two scriptural references regard the resurrected Christ as capable of fulfilling all things, including the Church’s request at the Epiklesis, because the Holy Spirit is not only within Christ but also collaborates with Him (*συνεργεία*) for the fulfillment of the mysteries of grace. Once again, Spinks and Macomber’s acceptance of the Son as the sole addressee of the prayer does not necessarily imply their adherence to the theology of synergy between the Persons of the Trinity.

In conclusion, therefore, the Epiklesis (the transformation of the Gifts and the enabling of the communicants to participate in the fruits of communion) is effected by the *entire* Trinity or, more specifically, by the Holy Spirit, in complete synergy and union with the Father from whom the Spirit proceeds and the Son, who sends the Spirit to His Church, to use St. Basil’s characteristic language.

¹¹ W.F. Macomber, “The Ancient Form of the Anaphora of the Apostles”, in East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period. Ed. N.G. Garsoian, T.F. Mathews, and R.W. Thomson (Washington, DC, 1982), pp. 73-88.

A Structural and Verbal Analysis in the Epiklesis of AM and Byz-BAS

The presence of an Epiklesis in all the Basilian and East Syrian anaphoras affirms not only its necessary importance for the overall structure of the eucharistic celebration, but also points to a possible prototype model from which all the versions seemingly borrowed in order to phrase their own epikleses. Nowhere does this appear more true than in the related anaphoras AM and *Sharar*. Gelston indicates that the Epiklesis comprises “the part of the text where a common core underlies both the Anaphora of Addai and Mari and *Sharar*, and where a comparative analysis makes possible a reasonably probable reconstruction of this common core.”¹² Spinks provides the following textual comparison between AM and *Sharar*:¹³

Addai and Mari

May he come, O Lord, your Holy Spirit and rest upon this oblation of your servants, and bless and hallow it, that it may be to us, O Lord, for the pardon of debts and the forgiveness of sins, and a great hope of resurrection from the dead and a new life in the kingdom of heaven with all who have been pleasing before you.

Sharar

And may he come, O Lord, your living and Holy Spirit, and dwell and rest upon this oblation of your servants. And may it be to those who partake for the pardon of debts and the forgiveness of sins and for a blessed resurrection from the dead and a new life in the kingdom of heaven for ever.

Aside from some minor textual differences, the epikleses of AM and *Sharar* are almost identical.¹⁴ The verb ‘come’ appears in all the Basilian and East Syrian epikleses, making it difficult to deny its ancient liturgical usage. The apocryphal Acts of Thomas also contains a eucharistic Epiklesis, beseeching Christ to ‘come (ἐλθέ) and communicate with us.’ Spinks draws attention to a variant reading in the Luke 11.2

¹² Gelston, p. 109.

¹³ Spinks, *Worship Prayers*, pp. 90-91.

¹⁴ The minor textual differences in the epikleses of AM and *Sharar* are: (1) the addition in *Sharar* of the adjective ‘living’, modifying ‘your living and Holy Spirit’; (2) the addition in *Sharar* of ‘dwell’; (3) the interesting Byzantine phrase ‘bless and hallow it’ in AM, clearly absent in *Sharar*; (4) the phrase ‘may it be to us’ in AM vs. ‘may it be to those who partake’ in *Sharar*; and (5) the addition in AM of the commemorative phrase, ‘with all who have been well pleasing before you.’

version of the Lord's prayer: 'may your Holy Spirit come (*ἐλθέτω*) upon us and cleanse us.'¹⁵

The adjective 'living' in *Sharar*, when referring to the Holy Spirit, is found in only eight manuscripts of AM and is thus believed by Gelston to be a typical expansion in the latter. Although 'living' is absent in Byz-BAS, it is supplanted in the text by the modifier 'All-holy' (*πανάγιον*).¹⁶

The addition in *Sharar* of 'and dwell' is again regarded by Gelston as a secondary expansion in AM, given the fact that it appears in varying positions before and after the phrase 'and rest.' The phraseology of 'resting and dwelling' is quite reminiscent of the rabbinical concept of *Shekinah*, or Presence.¹⁷ Consequently, it would appear that the East Syrian anaphoras borrowed this concept from liturgical Judaism.¹⁸

The diaconal interjection in AM, 'Be in silence (and awe)', is included by Spinks in his translation of *Mar Esa'ya*. However, it is regarded by Gelston as a secondary 'aside' because of its apparent absence in several of the ancient MSS, as well as its insertion in different places, often breaking the logical sequence of the prayer's thought.¹⁹

¹⁵ Spinks, *Worship Prayers*, p. 90. While Spinks discredits this passage's authenticity, since it places such a petition into the mouth of Christ, he still believes it to be a precursor of the liturgical Epiklesis because it asks God to grant to the people their 'daily bread.'

¹⁶ The expression 'τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ πανάγιον' appears in Brightman's *Barberini* text (p. 329), but is absent in his "Modern Text", which simply reads 'τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.' This editorial manipulation in the latter was made perhaps to emphasize the individual Person of the Holy Spirit as the primary agent at the Epiklesis rather than to deal with the more complicated 'spirit of Christ', discussed previously. On the other hand, it would appear that Brightman's rendering could lend support to the position taken by Spinks and others that the anaphora (and specifically the Epiklesis) was originally addressed to the Son.

¹⁷ See Chapter 1 of this thesis, pp. 27-31.

¹⁸ One possible way of understanding the link between the Jewish concept of *Shekinah*, or the indwelling divine Presence, and the eucharistic consecration in AM is to 'follow God's movements', so to speak, from the sanctified elements (upon which the Holy Spirit has descended) and into the worshipers who have partaken of the Body and Blood of Christ in order to receive spiritual benefits. In other words, the eternal, risen Christ, fully present in the hallowed Gifts by the sanctifying grace of the Holy Spirit, likewise becomes fully present within the faithful who have received communion.

¹⁹ Gelston, p. 62.

A significant difference between AM and *Sharar*, in regard to Byz-BAS, is the inclusion in AM of the consecratory terms ‘bless and hallow.’ While the Maronite anaphora limits itself to preserving the seemingly more ancient ‘come’ verb, Byzantine-Basil’s text reads: ‘bless, sanctify, and show.’ Interestingly, all the Basilian MSS employ at least the verbs ‘ἀγιάσαι’ and ‘ἀναδεῖξαι’, except Arm-BAS, which simply has ‘make.’²⁰ The consecratory expression ‘bless and hallow’ is an addition in AM and seems to have originated from the biblical account of creation (cf. Gen 2.3), from which the hellenized anaphoras also borrowed it. Hence, the inclination to associate such an interpolation directly with a Byzantine source must be met with caution. B. Botte argues the position that this consecratory terminology was inserted directly from the Epiklesis of Nestorius,²¹ which in turn derived its consecratory phraseology from either St. Basil or St. James, and St. John Chrysostom.²² The above mentioned words of consecration reflect Cyril of Jerusalem’s fourth century consecratory theology,²³ in which the transformation of the elements and their absolute centrality in the eucharistic celebration receives far greater emphasis than the people’s *eucharistia* through the offering and communion of the Gifts.

²⁰ The text reads: “. . . nous te prions, Seigneur, et sollicitons de ta bienveillance envoie ton Esprit Saint sur nous et sur ce sacrifice qui est placé devant ta divinité et fasse ce pain . . .” (Fenwick, p. 168). The consecratory verbs have been lost in Arm-BAS or possibly never included. It would seem the expression ‘ta divinité’ would alleviate the necessity for including the verbs, but this is only an assumption.

For a detailed examination of Basil’s ‘ἀναδεῖξαι’ term, see Chapter 7 of this thesis, note 36.

²¹ See B. Botte, “L’*épiklèse* dans les liturgies syriennes orientales”, in *Sacris Erudiri* 6 (1954) 48-72 *passim*.

²² Actually, Spinks points out that the Nestorian anaphora, although initially composed in Greek, retains several East Syrian liturgical characteristics while simultaneously borrowing certain Byzantine traits. For example, Nestorius has kept the initial petition of AM to ‘offer before you’ the ‘oblation’, although the prayer requests for the ‘grace’ of the Holy Spirit. Second, the petition in Nestorius to ‘make’ the elements into Christ’s Body and Blood finds two counterparts in Chrysostom: ‘ποίησον’ and ‘μεταβαλόν.’ Finally, the eschatological fruits of communion have been expanded in Nestorius to bring it more in line with the Syro-Byzantine liturgies.

²³ G. Dix, *Shape*, pp. 280-81.

Byz-Basil resembles *Sharar* more than Addai and Mari in its opening petition for the fruits of communion. Basil's rendering, 'And unite us all to one another who become partakers of', matches *Sharar's* 'And may it be to those who partake.' The insinuation here is that not everyone attending the Eucharist will be communing Christ's Body and Blood, although the entire congregation will most likely be making the offering in prayer.²⁴ AM, on the contrary reads: 'that it may be to us', without the qualifying phrase 'who will partake of.' This is a significant point in that it further evidences to Addai and Mari's generally accepted antiquity. The communion of the entire church body, without exception, was understood and accepted as being the only norm within the eucharistic celebration. In making the distinction between AM and *Sharar* on this particular point, Gelston observes: "*Sharar* also reads 'to those who receive it' in place of 'to us', which seems to reflect adaptation to circumstances in which there is no longer a general communion of the whole congregation."²⁵

A final point of divergence between AM and *Sharar* revolves around the commemorative phrase in AM, 'with all who have been pleasing before you', which is entirely absent from the Maronite liturgy, as well as Nestorius. A similar commemoration is made in the latter portion of the epikleses found in Theodore of Mopsuestia, E-BAS, Arm-BAS, Ω-BAS, and Byz-BAS.²⁶ However, it is only in the Arm-BAS and Byz-BAS

²⁴ An unfortunate reality among the Eastern churches has been the gradual decline in the frequency of Holy Communion from as early as the third and fourth century onward. Not every Orthodox Christian present at the eucharistic liturgy today attends in the traditional sense, that is, to participate in the greater oblation of the Church; many seem to attend for personal reasons. This privatization of worship and detachment from the Church's greater purpose of oblation and communion has deeply threatened the Church's eucharistic *ethos*. However, as can be alleged from the Maronite and Syro-Byzantine anaphoras, this reality seems to have originated quite early in the history of the Church. For an understanding of the major factors contributing to this eucharistic 'anomaly', see Dix, *Shape*, especially pp. 12-35, and A. Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, especially pp. 91-147.

²⁵ Gelston, p. 109.

²⁶ Fenwick, pp. 170-71.

versions where one finds a list of those righteous saints who have been pleasing to God.²⁷

A probable reason for the absence in AM of such a commemoration following the Epiklesis is that it is already made in the Intercessions which precede the Epiklesis.²⁸

Unlike the Epiklesis in AM, which immediately proceeds to the actual petition for consecration, the Epiklesis in Byz-BAS begins with a wordy introduction that gradually leads into the actual request for the transformation of the Gifts. The expression in Basil 'your sinful and unworthy servants' is quite similar to AM's 'your lowly, weak, and miserable servants', located in its *Postsanctus* and Anamnesis sections. Interestingly, all the versions of Basil include these self-deprecating adjectives, and it would seem that the Basilian MSS possibly borrowed them from the earliest prototype (Ur-BAS), which originally adopted them from the East Syrian liturgical tradition.²⁹

The Basilian phrase 'διὰ τοῦτο' ('therefore, . . . we also') is a reference specifically to the divine economy of Christ rather than to the congregation's offering of praise.³⁰ The phrase 'your sinful and unworthy servants' in Byz-BAS would seem to allude to the entire Church, clergy and laity,³¹ but the next line 'whom You have made

²⁷ Arm-BAS reads: ' . . . pères, patriarches, prophètes, apôtres, martyrs, prédicateurs, évêques, prêtres, diacres, et tous les défunts qui ont cru vraiment en Christ.' Byz-BAS has: 'προπατόρων, πατέρων, πατριαρχῶν, προφητῶν, ἀποστόλων, κηρύκων, εὐαγγελιστῶν, μαρτύρων, ὁμολογητῶν, διδασκάλων, καὶ παντὸς πνεύματος δικαίου ἐν πίστει τετελειωμένων.'

²⁸ Recall that the structural order in AM is: Thanksgiving – Intercessions – Anamnesis – Epiklesis, whereas in the Syro-Byzantine anaphoras, the order is: Thanksgiving – Institution Narrative – Anamnesis – Epiklesis – Intercessions. Theodore's later insertion of the phrase within its Epiklesis, 'with all those who have been well pleasing to your will', as well its inclusion in AM, appear to be textual expansions made in order to bring these Oriental anaphoras in uniformity with Western liturgies. In AM, the phrase appears to reinforce the purity and holiness of all the righteous already mentioned in the preceding Intercessions. Therefore, from a textual perspective, it would seem that this commemorative phrase is simultaneously a reaffirmation as well as a redundancy.

²⁹ The self-deprecating language is highly semitic in nature and most likely explains its prevalence in AM. See Chapter 1, note 26, of this thesis.

³⁰ Fenwick, p. 181.

³¹ In AM, it is unlikely that the reference includes only the clergy, since there is no qualifying statement following it as in Basil ('οἱ καταξιωθέντες λειτουργεῖν τῷ ἁγίῳ σου θυσιαστηρίῳ'). In addition, the statement in AM 'that it may be to us, O Lord' seems all-inclusive, compared to *Sharar*'s more exclusive 'who will partake of', which possibly intimates the beginnings of eucharistic clericalism.

worthy to serve at Your holy altar' limits it to the ordained clergy only. The line immediately after this one ('not because of our own righteousness . . . we dare to approach Your holy altar'), which is a prayer of confession, appears to refer to the clergy only, and according to L.L. Mitchell, seems to have been a clericalization. Mitchell writes: "It is the clergy, not the body of the faithful, who proclaim their unworthiness here."³² B. Bobrinskoy maintains the same position, noting similar examples in the Prayers of the Faithful after the Gospel and in the offertory and Intercessions. He explains this shift in the prayers from the entire congregation to the clergy as the result of attempts to fight post-Constantinian 'secularization' as well as the gradual disappearance of the *disciplina arcani*.³³ Whatever the case, it appears obvious that this 'clericalization' of the Epiklesis prayer, in conjunction with certain other prayers of the liturgy, was a later expansion of a much earlier tradition that did not make such sharp distinctions between the clergy and laity.

The line 'we dare to approach Your holy altar' ('θαρροῦντες προσεγγίζομεν τῷ ἁγίῳ σου θυσιαστηρίῳ') seems to imply a rubric peculiar only to the clergy and is thus further evidence of the clericalization trend in the prayer of Epiklesis. Basil's 'and bring forth the antitypes' ('καὶ προθέντες τὰ ἀντίτυπα') recalls the action already mentioned in the Institution Narrative, in which the *clergy specifically* have physically placed the gifts of bread and wine upon the altar table.³⁴

³² L.L. Mitchell, *The Alexandrian Anaphora*, p. 202.

³³ B. Bobrinskoy, *Liturgie et ecclésiologie*, pp. 10-11.

³⁴ See the comments regarding the verb 'προτεθείκαμεν' (from which 'προθέντες' derives) in Chapter 7 of this thesis, under the section "A Textual Examination of the Institution Narrative." The first person active verb *προτίθημι* denotes a physical placement of a material object upon a table or flat surface. Although Dix writes that early (1st-2nd century) Christians themselves presumably placed their gifts of bread and wine upon the table within the church home designated as the altar, the practice of the transfer of the Gifts, especially within Byzantine rite churches, gradually became much more ceremonial and symbolic. The construction of large and spacious church buildings, coupled with the creation of an adjacent room in the

The Basilian term ‘antitypes’ (‘ἀντίτυπα’), along with his characteristic triplet ‘bless-sanctify-show’ (‘εὐλογῆσαι-ἀγιάσαι-ἀναδεῖξαι’), have already been discussed in the previous chapter.³⁵

The two verbs ‘we pray/ask’ (‘δεόμεθα’) and ‘we beseech/plead’ (‘παρακαλοῦμεν’) are common to both Byz-BAS, Arm-BAS, and Ω-BAS, but absent in E-BAS and Syr-BAS, which contain ‘we worship you’ (‘προσκυνοῦμέν σε’).³⁶ While these two verbs are associated with the infinitive ‘to come’ (‘ελθεῖν’) in Byz-BAS, they are clearly absent in AM, and the verb is in the optative mood. The verb ‘beseech’ sounds repetitive but seems to imply a greater sense of urgency for the consecration to be fulfilled than the simpler ‘ask.’ A possible reason then for the use of both verbs in Basil may be due to the fact that the Byzantine Christians acknowledged their sinfulness and distance from God more so than did the persecuted Christians of the first few centuries, whose ‘other-worldly’ orientation made them feel closer to the *Parousia* and their Lord.

The vocative ‘Holy of Holies’ (‘ἅγιε ἁγίων’) is found only in Byz-BAS, but Fenwick believes it was removed from the other Basilian versions and replaced by a more specific petition (‘. . . καὶ ἀναδεῖξαι τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον’). Through the use of the vocative as an appositive, the text appears to emphasize for the worshipping community the transcendent nature of God and the sublimity of the awesome mystery about to be enacted. Byzantine-Basil’s unique adjective ‘πανάγιον’ (‘all-holy’) for the Spirit (not found in the other Basil versions) further witnesses to this advanced theological perception of God and the Eucharist.

northern corner of the church or next to the altar (*skeuophylakion*), set aside for the placement of the Gifts before their transfer by the clergy to the altar table, all contributed to a rise in liturgical clericalism. See A. Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, pp. 50-55.

³⁵ See Chapter 7, note 36.

The expression 'that by the favor of Your goodness' ('εὐδοκία τῆς σῆς ἀγαθότητος') is a peculiarity found in all the Basilian texts, which immediately leads into the infinitive 'to come.' This introduction seems to transfer the initiative of consecration more upon the goodness of God than the sinfulness and limitedness of the people, whereas the absence of anything similar in AM appears to lessen the initiative with God, since the prayer immediately requests the 'coming' of the Spirit.

The phrase in Byz-BAS 'upon us and upon the gifts here laid forth' ('ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα') introduces the two-fold Epiklesis, whose purpose is the consecration of the Gifts and the sanctification of the people through the hallowed Gifts. Botte believed that the Addai and Mari Epiklesis and the one in E-BAS (best represented in ES-BAS³⁷) have many similarities.³⁸ However, he also maintained that the original Epiklesis in Basil stopped short at the words 'ἄγιε ἀγίων.' Hence, he did not realize that E-BAS requests for the Spirit to come upon the people as well as the Gifts. As already shown, this double-action Epiklesis was not necessarily the norm in Eastern anaphoras.³⁹ This is a significant difference between AM and Byz-BAS, and it would seem that the issue of the frequency of communion, as discussed in the previous footnote,

³⁶ Syr-BAS also adds 'and supplicate you', to keep it in line with the other Basilian anaphoras.

³⁷ The ES-BAS liturgy had not been published when Botte composed his article.

³⁸ Botte, "L' épiclese", p. 56.

³⁹ Addai and Mari, Sarapion of Egypt, *Apostolic Constitutions*, *Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles*, and *Testamentum Domini*, all ask for the Holy Spirit to descend upon the Gifts only, rather than upon both the Gifts and the people. One possible reason for the absence of the second Epiklesis in these ancient anaphoras is to show that only through participation in the eucharistic elements can one benefit from the fruits of communion. In this sense, the Spirit 'comes upon' the entire Church which communes the Body and Blood of Christ. This is an enticing argument for why the phrase 'upon us' was included in the epikleses of the later Syro-Byzantine liturgies, given the fact that frequent communion especially among the laity gradually began to decline after the fourth century. This inclusion would seem to imply a non-eucharistic consecration of the people (in other words, communing and non-communing worshipers had access to the Holy Spirit!). However, Fenwick's explanation seems the more prevalent one: "Two acts of sanctification are asked for as a result of the Spirit's coming: 1) the sanctification . . . of the gifts; 2) the sanctification . . . of the worshippers' souls and bodies. The second sanctification is itself a result of the Spirit's work on the people in making them worthy to receive" (Fenwick, p. 180). In actuality, this 'second

may possibly explain the divergence between the texts. In addition, if the frequency of communion is an issue at all, then this would further witness, albeit perhaps unnecessarily, to AM's antiquity over Byz-BAS.

The individual consecration of the bread and wine is noted by two separate formulas in Byz-BAS: '[show] this bread to be the precious Body of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ' ('ἀναδειξαι τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον Σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ') and '[show] this cup to be the precious Blood of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ' ('ἀναδειξαι τὸ δὲ ποτήριον τοῦτο αὐτὸ τὸ τίμιον Αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ'). Once again, AM lacks this special distinction of the bread and wine in its Epiklesis, choosing instead to speak about the 'gifts' and to emphasize the spiritual benefits that will be reaped when the faithful partake of them.

The pattern 'Lord-God-Savior' in Byz-BAS is repeated for the cup as well as the bread, probably for the sake of uniformity. This explanation is consistent in Ω-BAS and Arm-BAS and, to an extent, Syr-BAS, with a small degree of textual variation. However, the formula is entirely absent in E-BAS,⁴⁰ which perhaps points to this version's antiquity and quite possibly its relationship with a prototype shared also by AM. However, E-BAS does include the infinitives 'ἀγιάσαι' and 'ἀναδειξαι' but no direct object (it oddly jumps down to the prayer for fruitful communion). This may well have been the result of textual corruption.

Brightman's *Barberini* version of Basil includes the response 'amen' after each formula, but he does not specify if the 'amen' belongs to the celebrant clergy or laity,

Epiklesis' is the conclusion of the epicletic prayer, but whose aim nevertheless is to bestow upon the participants the benefits of communion.

whereas in his “Modern Text”,⁴¹ only his triplet of ‘amens’ is assigned to the deacon. The former seems to imply that it is a response of the clergy, although the *Hieratikon*,⁴² or *Priest’s Service Book*, published for the Church of Greece, as well as the Holy Cross translation,⁴³ both assign the response specifically to the deacon, as in Brightman’s “Modern Text.”⁴⁴

The phrase ‘shed for the life of the world’ (‘τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς’) in Byz-BAS clearly refers to the consecration of the cup. Brightman’s *Barberini* text⁴⁵ places a single ‘amen’ after the phrase, but his “Modern Text”,⁴⁶ as well as the Holy Cross and *Hieratikon* translations,⁴⁷ insert the deacon’s triple ‘amens’, which immediately follow the Chrysostomic ‘changing them by Your Holy Spirit’ (‘μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ’), a redaction possibly done to keep the phrase together with the immediately preceding supplication over the cup, or to perhaps maintain textual consistency between the Byzantine anaphoras of Basil and Chrysostom.

The final section of Byz-Basil’s Epiklesis, the ‘second sanctification’ or prayer for fruitful communion, certainly finds a counterpart in AM, although as mentioned earlier, the former is far more expanded. Fenwick remarks that all the versions of Basil

⁴⁰ For a full comparison between the major Basilian anaphoras, see Fenwick, pp. 168-71.

⁴¹ See Brightman’s two texts of Basil at this point, in *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, pp. 330 and 406.

⁴² *Ἱερατικόν. Αἱ Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου, Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου, καὶ τῶν Προηγιασμένων, μετὰ τῆς τυπικῆς αὐτῶν Διατάξεως καὶ τινῶν ἀπαραιτήτων ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν, Τάξεων, καὶ Εὐχῶν* (Athens, 1995), p. 180.

⁴³ *The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Among the Saints Basil the Great*, p. 30.

⁴⁴ This appears to be an obvious sign of the clericalization plaguing the eucharistic celebration both in the eighth century and in modern times, whereby the lay communicants are reduced to spectators at an event. According to Dix, the ‘amen’ of the laity in the ancient Church, a distinct and necessary *liturgia*, had as much significance as the other priestly *liturgias*. He writes: “The primitive ideal of corporate worship was not the assimilation of the office of the ‘order’ of laity to those of the other orders, but the combination of all the radically distinct ‘liturgies’ of all the orders in a single complete action of the organic Body of Christ” (Dix, *Shape*, p. 129, and especially pp. 128-31)

⁴⁵ Brightman, p. 330.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* p. 406.

⁴⁷ *Hieratikon*, p. 180.

handle this second section quite differently, with the Bohairic and Sahidic versions of E-BAS following closely the wording of Syr-BAS. The Ω-BAS family likewise differ slightly between themselves, but generally agree in reworking the section.

Byz-BAS' major focus in this second Epiklesis clearly appears to be *unity*, witnessed in the expression, 'And unite us all to one another who become partakers of the one Bread and the Cup in the communion of the one Holy Spirit.' On the contrary, AM's Epiklesis seems to emphasize forgiveness and newness of life through the Resurrection. A second consideration in Byz-BAS is worthy reception of Holy Communion, a stipulation absent in AM since its earlier usage understood that all the worshipers were naturally expected to commune. The final commemoration of righteous men and women is part of a request that all the communicants within the Eucharist may find 'mercy and grace' through their sacramental union with God, as did the righteous saints who preceded them in history.

In summary then, the Epiklesis in Byz-BAS attempts to achieve the following general objectives, according to Fenwick: "1) To increase the sense of awe, indebtedness and unworthiness on the part of the worshippers; and 2) To make more explicit the belief that a change occurs in the elements by the operation of the Holy Spirit and that they are indeed the precious Body and Blood of Christ."⁴⁸

A Theological Analysis of the Epiklesis in AM and Byz-BAS

The presence of the Epiklesis in any eucharistic prayer has any one (or a combination) of the following three objectives, as explained by T. Elavanal: (1) to invoke the Holy Spirit to 'come' upon the congregation and the oblation; (2) to transform the elements of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ; and (3) to allow the

participants in the eucharistic celebration to receive the benefits of communion. While the first and third purpose represent most probably the primitive form of eucharistic Epiklesis, found especially in Addai and Mari, the second seems to focus exclusively upon the transformation of the Gifts and is properly called a 'consecratory Epiklesis'⁴⁹ by Elavanal, who writes: "A 'consecratory Epiklesis' was part of liturgical prayers in Jerusalem from the time of Cyril, in the fourth century."⁵⁰

The eucharistic Epiklesis appears to have originated in the liturgical worship of ancient Judaism and follows a similar structural order. Elavanal writes: "In the anamnesis of the 'Mirabilia Dei' the Jewish community expected their eschatological fulfilment, and as a result their praise very often led to supplications."⁵¹ The placement of the Epiklesis toward the end of the eucharistic prayer parallels the Jewish liturgical practice of attaching the *Abodah* prayer at the end of the *Tefillah*.⁵²

According to Elavanal,⁵³ a starting point for the development of the eucharistic Epiklesis seems to have been the appeal for unity, found in the Jewish *Birkat ha-mazon*. This presupposition especially finds clear support in the Byzantine Epiklesis of Basil, more so than in AM, where the unity of the worshipers with one another and with the one Holy Spirit becomes a major objective.

As previously discussed, the common usage by most anaphoras of the verb 'come' in the Epiklesis seems to have been the ancient practice. It clearly derives from

⁴⁸ Fenwick, p. 184.

⁴⁹ T. Elavanal, p. 154.

⁵⁰ Ibid. p. 155.

⁵¹ Ibid. p. 156.

⁵² Elavanal seems to think that this positioning of the Jewish 'epiklesis' at the end of the *Tefillah* most likely explains why in East Syrian anaphoras, the prayers of intercession were added before the Epiklesis, allowing the latter to be the final major section of the anaphora prior to the concluding Doxology. See Elavanal, p. 156.

⁵³ Elavanal, p. 156.

the eschatological invocation directed to the Son, *Maranatha* ('O Lord, come!'). This brief prayer's transference into the eucharistic Epiklesis is explained by Elavanal as being the result of the delay of Christ's Second Coming. He writes: "As a result of the understanding of delayed Parousia and the role and function of the Spirit in the Church, the prayer for an imminent Parousia might have given way to an invocation of the Spirit, with a supplication for the final fulfilment of the kingdom."⁵⁴ This transference, reflective certainly of the early Christians' eschatological mindset, might also help to explain the gradual development of Byzantine liturgical theology in reference to iconography, architecture, and other elements of Eastern worship.⁵⁵

The early Church's eschatological orientation in worship has always been a significant factor in its liturgical theology. Although the incarnation has inaugurated the end times, the Church still expects the return of Christ in glory and expresses this anticipation in the Eucharist, especially in the eucharistic Epiklesis. In a sense then, the divine economy has not only been fulfilled, but it remains at the same time somewhat 'incomplete' because the final act of salvation, the Second Coming, has not yet taken place. The Church then has always been conscious of itself as an eschatological community and expresses this hope of the *eschaton* in the Eucharist.

⁵⁴ Ibid. p. 159.

⁵⁵ For example, Syro-Byzantine churches have traditionally been built facing East, an act symbolizing the Christian community's expectation of Christ's *Parousia*, expressed in the eschatological petition *Maranatha*.

E. Schillebeeckx characterizes Christianity and by extension, its eucharistic worship, as distinctly a religion of *Maranatha*, based upon the two comings of Christ: (1) the Incarnation, or coming in the flesh; and (2) the *Parousia*, or coming in glory. Elavanal develops this theological idea by alluding to the Orthodox Divine Liturgy, insightfully observing that "the liturgical celebrations of the Church are situated between these two epiphanies or comings of Christ" (p. 182), referring specifically to the iconostasis which bears the icon of Christ with His Mother on the left (the 'first coming') and Christ enthroned in glory on the right (the 'second coming'). See also E. Schillebeeckx, Christ: The Sacrament of the Encounter with God (London, 1963), p. 41.

Through the invocation of Christ or the Spirit in the Eucharist, the Church realizes itself to be this eschatological community, since the Spirit is the distinctive gift of the eschatological age.⁵⁶ Only through the outpouring of the Spirit in the Eucharist, upon the Gifts and the communicants, is the Church ushered into the age of the *eschaton*, receiving a foretaste here and now of the 'final act of *economia*.' Finally, the Epiklesis unites both the historical past and the eschatological future through the present reality of the Eucharist. Elavanal writes: "So the Church lives between the Passover and the Parousia of the Lord. In the Eucharist we look backward to the Last Supper at which Christ instituted it and forward to the Parousia and the Messianic meal in the kingdom of God which is anticipated in every Eucharist."⁵⁷

Regarding the eventual shift in focus from the ancient invocation to the Son (*Maranatha*) to the liturgical invocation directed at the Holy Spirit ('may he come, O Lord, your Holy Spirit'), Elavanal makes the point: "Though the institution of Eucharist is not clearly associated with the Spirit, it cannot be comprehended fully apart from the presence and action of the Spirit in the Church"⁵⁸ for, as he continues, "the new and everlasting covenant, ratified in the blood of Christ, was fulfilled only through the gift of the Spirit."⁵⁹ In its liturgical worship, the Church becomes a constant recipient and witness to the descent of the Spirit, who reveals and sets into motion the mystery of salvation through the eucharistic celebration and makes effectual the benefits of communion for all worshipers. Without the energizing force of the Holy Spirit, the Eucharist remains an act of historical remembrance seeking only to stir up emotions within the human heart,

⁵⁶ Elavanal, p. 181.

⁵⁷ Ibid. p. 183.

⁵⁸ Ibid. pp. 159-60.

⁵⁹ Ibid. p. 160.

without affording the worshipers any possibility of contact with the living Christ. "The Church can celebrate the mystery of Christ in the liturgy only in the Spirit, [for] it is the Spirit that mediates the effects of Christ in us."⁶⁰

The Understanding of Offering in the Anaphoras

The concept of the Eucharist as an 'offering' and 'sacrifice' continues to be a point of contention among liturgists, and minimal research has been conducted in the area.⁶¹ The idea of 'offering' appears to be exclusive in Addai and Mari, while Byzantine-Basil (and the hellenized East Syrian anaphoras of Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia) utilizes both concepts of 'offering' and 'sacrifice.' It would seem that the Eucharist as 'offering' generally represents an earlier understanding of the Church's liturgical act, whereas the idea of 'sacrifice' appears immersed in a deeper Cyrilline theology developed in the fourth century.⁶²

In separating AM into a bipartite structure (marked by the two doxologies: one at the end of the *Postsanctus*, and one following the Epiklesis at the end of the prayer), B. Spinks identifies five references to the Eucharist as 'offering', one in the opening dialogue, one in the first doxology concluding the *Postsanctus*, and three in the second part.⁶³

⁶⁰ Ibid. p. 161.

⁶¹ See K.W. Stevenson, "Anaphoral Offering: Some Observations on Eastern Eucharistic Prayers", in *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 94 (1980) 209-28.

⁶² The anaphora of Bishop Sarapion of Thmuis (dated somewhere between 353-360 AD), refers to the eucharistic elements as a 'living sacrifice' and 'sacrifice' numerous times. Gregory Dix, in his evaluation of Sarapion, attempts to build a case that the 'oblation' terminology is far more natural in the anaphora's overall structure than the idea of 'sacrifice.' He credits the 'sacrificial' characterization of the Eucharist to Cyril of Jerusalem ('bloodless sacrifice'), Sarapion's contemporary from whom he most likely borrowed the language. See G. Dix, *Shape*, p. 166.

However, B. Spinks points out that the presumably earlier *Didache* 14 refers to the Eucharist as a 'sacrifice', backed by non-eucharistic scriptural references in Malachi 1.11 and Matthew 5.23.

⁶³ B. Spinks, *Worship*, p. 66.

(1) 'The oblation (*qurbana*) is offered (*metqarab*) to God the Lord of all.' This statement appears in the opening dialogue, but scholars doubt its authenticity. Similar to the non-Nestorian eucharistic introduction 'Let us give thanks to the Lord', which may at one time have been the original wording in the Oriental liturgies, it may have been a later modification.⁶⁴ W.F. Macomber lends support to this position also,⁶⁵ concluding "that it may originally have been the final phrase of a longer declaration of the meaning and intentions of the eucharistic prayer, which in the Nestorian tradition replaced 'Let us give thanks to the Lord.'"⁶⁶ Spinks concludes, "Thus, it is difficult to know whether we have here a very early reference to the eucharist as an oblation, or simply a later doctrinal statement which now heads this ancient anaphora."⁶⁷

(2) 'And for all your aids and graces towards us let us offer (*naseq*) to you glory, and honor, and thanksgiving and worship, now and at all times.' This second reference appears in the first doxology at the end of the *Postsanctus* in AM, which concludes the first part of the anaphora. The verb *slq* ('raise up'; 'offer') is used in reference to praise and thanksgiving, offered up to the Name of God for His creation and redemption of mankind and the world. In the *Sanctus*, worship is offered by angelic beings and in the *Postsanctus*, man joins in this hymn of praise. As Spinks writes, "Thus far the only *qurbana* is one of praise (*naseq*) offered over bread and wine for what the elements call

⁶⁴ See R. Ledogar, Acknowledgment: Praise Verbs in the Early Greek Anaphoras (Rome, 1968) 27; and A. Gelston, "Sacrifice in the Early East Syrian Eucharistic Tradition", in Sacrifice and Redemption. Ed. S.W. Sykes (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 118-25.

⁶⁵ See W.F. Macomber, "Maronite and Chaldean Versions", esp. pp. 58-65.

⁶⁶ Spinks, Worship, p. 66.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* p. 67. In support of the statement's antiquity, Spinks alludes to *Didache* 14, which refers to the Eucharist as 'sacrifice.' Also, the Old Syriac version of Matthew 5.23-24 translates *προσφέρω* by *qrb*, and *δῶρον* by *qurbana*, and Spinks states that this very well may have been given a eucharistic interpretation in the second century, since the self-offering of Christ (His sacrifice) was the perfect offering (cf. Heb 10.5-10), of which the Eucharist was a proclamation.

to mind - the salvific work of God.”⁶⁸ The *Presanctus* of Byz-BAS uses the infinitive ‘προσφέρειν’ (‘to offer toward’) in reference to ‘this our rational worship’ (‘τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην λατρείαν ἡμῶν’), which seemingly encompasses not only the eucharistic anaphora, but the verbal anaphora of praise as well.

(3) ‘[The upright and just fathers] . . . who have been pleasing before you in the commemoration (‘*uhdana*) of the body and blood of your Christ which we offer (*mqarbinan*) you upon this pure and holy altar as you have taught us.’ This section of the Intercessions asks God to remember the hallowed fathers who have served the holy altar, and attempts to associate the righteous dead with the praises of the angels and humans.⁶⁹ The connection with the eucharistic elements is understood as a proclamation (‘*hd* signifies a commemoration that is proclaimed). Hence, the bread and wine are viewed as a proclamation of the Body and Blood of Christ - “a visual and mysterious proclamation of redemption (showing forth the Lord’s death).”⁷⁰ Spinks concludes: “What is offered, therefore, is the performing of a rite which is a mystery, but which is done so in a context of offering up praise.”⁷¹ A comparable expression in the Byzantine liturgies is ‘We offer (*προσφέρομεν*)/Offering (*προσφέροντες*) to You these gifts from Your own gifts, in all and for all.’ ‘Offering’ here makes specific reference to the elements of bread and wine, but as already noted, the same verb in Greek can also have other connotations (offering of praise, worship, etc.).

(4) ‘May he come, O Lord, your Holy Spirit and rest upon this oblation (*qurbana*) of your servants.’ In the Epiklesis, the ‘oblation’ here clearly signifies the offering of

⁶⁸ Spinks, *Worship*, p. 68.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

bread and wine, upon which the Holy Spirit is invoked to come and rest so that the fruits of communion may be secured.

(5) The concluding Doxology in AM, as a summary of the entire eucharistic anaphora, again offers up (*masqinan*) praise and thanksgiving to God. Regarding this particular offering, Spinks observes: “The thought here seems to be that through the blood of Christ, the redeemed can see God face to face, and offer worship.”⁷² Eucharistic participation not only brings the worshiper into full union with the crucified and risen Lord, but it also enables the worshiper in liturgy to stand before God and offer to Him true praise through the mystical indwelling of the Holy Spirit within the Gifts and the individual communicant. Byz-Basil’s Doxology is void of any ‘offering’ terminology, but immediately proceeds to the glorification (‘δοξάζειν’) and praise (‘ἄνυμνεῖν’) of the Name.

In summary then, Addai and Mari acknowledges the eucharistic celebration as mainly an oblation (*qurbana*), and Spinks draws attention to the correlation between the Byzantine liturgical concept of *δῶρα* and the Syriac *qurbana* (see also Mt 5.23-24 and Mk 7.1).⁷³ However, it would seem that *δῶρον* refers specifically to the material offering of the elements,⁷⁴ whereas *qurbana* can signify both material and verbal offerings of praise and thanksgiving for redemption, although the majority of the time the root *qrb* is

⁷² Ibid. p. 69.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ It is not unlikely that any derivation of *δῶρον*, in a liturgical setting, can also refer to non-material ideas or concepts: e.g. ‘δώρησαι ἡμῖν τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων ἡμῶν’ (‘grant (offer) to us the remission of our transgressions’); ‘ἐπὶ τῶν μελλόντων προτίθεσθαι δῶρων’ (‘upon the gifts about to be presented’); etc. The very same may be said about the Opening Dialogue in the Syro-Byzantine rite, regarding the noun *θυσία*: ‘θυσίαν αἰνέσεως’ (‘a sacrifice of praise’). In most cases, ‘sacrifice’ refers to the bloodless sacrifice of the Eucharist, but it can also have other connotations.

used to denote the eucharistic offering and *slq* the verbal offering.⁷⁵ Following the death of Christ, redemption is made accessible to the Church through the example of the Eucharist Christ set for all to follow. This example is the very mystery of redemption and a proclamation of the Lord's Body and Blood, which witnesses to both the Passion and Resurrection. Through the commemorative offering of the Gifts to God in the Epiklesis, the Church offers its highest form of worship toward Him and simultaneously joins the angelic beings, whose highest form of worship is the offering of praise and thanksgiving to their Lord. In this way, heavenly and earthly worship are joined into one sublime experience within the confines of the Christian eucharistic anaphora.

In conclusion, the Eucharist in Addai and Mari may be conceived as an offering up of praise in which the divine economy of the Son of God is relived and re-presented. As Spinks writes, "Included in this offering is the commemoration of the body and blood of Christ, for the bread and wine are themselves, 'as you have taught us,' a proclamation of the divine economy."⁷⁶ Hence the overall offering of the East Syrian anaphora is rational worship, through the 'sub-offerings' of human praise and the gifts of bread and wine. In Byzantine-Basil, the focus is clearly more on the offering of the eucharistic elements, although certain nuances in the anaphora's terminology could render an alternative emphasis other than the Gifts. Nonetheless, the offering of praise in Basil remains secondary to the offering of the supreme bloodless sacrifice upon the holy altar.

⁷⁵ It is not fully proven that the Syriac term *qurbana* was used exclusively for the commemorative offering of the Body and Blood of Christ. The Opening Dialogue in AM uses *qurbana*, to be sure ('the *oblation* is offered to God the Lord of all'), but this very early reference to the offering of the elements in the anaphora seems to conflict with the tone of verbal offering which predominates the first part of the prayer. It appears that the deliberate use of *qurbana* to denote the offering of bread and wine in AM's Opening Dialogue was either a later addition, possibly to bring AM into textual uniformity with Western liturgical rites, or that perhaps the root verbs *qrb* and *slq*, and certainly their definitions, were used interchangeably.

Conclusion

The Epiklesis has doubtlessly proven to be an important constitutive part of the overall eucharistic celebration. Its current place within the Eucharist is validated by St. Basil the Great in the later fourth century, who regarded the epiklesis as effecting the *anadeixis*.

In spite of our lack of concrete liturgical evidence from the first three Christian centuries, much interesting speculation still exists regarding how the Christian Epiklesis originated in the first place, and the process by which it entered the eucharistic prayer. Many scholars believe that at one time, the content of the Epiklesis may have existed apart from the anaphora and was attached to the rite of communion itself, whereby the Church asked God to bestow upon the worshipers the benefits of communion. In time, this supplication was transferred within the confines of the eucharistic prayer, beseeching the Holy Spirit to come upon the Gifts so that the communicants could become the beneficiaries of the spiritual gifts following their reception of the Body and Blood of Christ. Finally, the Epiklesis prayer within the anaphora evolved into the formal request for the Spirit to transform the elements of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, without disregarding the importance of the spiritual benefits through Holy Communion. A good portion of this chapter has sought to validate the claim that, while the liturgy of Addai and Mari seems to present a 'traditional' eucharistic Epiklesis centering mainly upon the fruits of communion, the later anaphora of Byzantine-Basil advocates a predominantly 'consecratory' Epiklesis.

Clearly, each Epiklesis has undergone substantial textual revision and more often than not, each liturgy has exerted its influence upon the other, most often through the

⁷⁶ Spinks, *Worship*, p. 84.

indirect mediation of the other two hellenized East Syrian anaphoras, Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia. Basil's retention of the ancient epicletic verb 'come', naturally found in the older AM, is proof of the Byzantine anaphora's insistence to maintain a connection with the early Christian liturgy. On the contrary, AM's consecratory formula, the biblical phrase 'bless and hallow', reflects a Syro-Byzantine orientation, but apparently entered into the East Syrian prayer via the hellenized anaphora of Nestorius.

Although liturgical scholars seem to differ as to whom the Epiklesis in AM is addressed (in Byz-BAS, the addressee is clearly the Father), it would appear that this debating possibly borders on the danger of dichotomizing the Persons of the Holy Trinity. Of course, how one views the Eucharist has certain ramifications for this argument,⁷⁷ but in general, the consecration of the elements and the bestowal of the benefits of communion to the people are achieved through the willful consent and energy of all Three Persons, regardless of who the recipient of the prayer is.

AM's Epiklesis is mostly closely paralleled by the Epiklesis found in the Maronite anaphora of *Sharar*. Aside from some minor textual variations, the two are almost identical. As mentioned above, the peculiar addition in AM of 'bless and hallow' seems to bring the anaphora to closer conformity with Basil's 'bless, sanctify, and show', and it is this difference that sharply distinguishes the epikleses of AM and *Sharar*.

While AM's Epiklesis immediately proceeds to the request for the coming of the Spirit, Byz-Basil precedes the consecration with a wordy introduction which focuses upon the sinfulness and unworthiness of the clergy and lay people gathered before the

⁷⁷ Viewing the eucharistic anaphora as a 'sacrifice' (Christ sacrificing Himself to God the Father for the sake of mankind) would seem to identify the addressee as the Father. Viewing it as an 'oblation' (people offering the Gifts to Christ by virtue of 'the example which is from you') would identify the recipient of the prayer as the Son.

altar of God. The self-deprecating adjectives 'sinful and unworthy', common to all the Basilian versions, are similar to those in AM's *Postsanctus* and Anamnesis, and it is possible that Basil borrowed them from the East Syrian liturgical tradition.

Byz-BAS' phrase 'upon us and upon the gifts here laid forth' introduces the 'two-fold Epiklesis' which is absent in AM. A possible explanation for this significant difference between the two anaphoras may be linked to the practice of consistent weekly communion in the ancient Church and sporadic, infrequent communion in later Byzantine churches.

The 'second sanctification' or prayer for fruitful communion in Basil is certainly paralleled in AM, although the former has been expanded. Whereas the major themes in Basil's prayer is unity and worthiness to commune (explaining the infrequency of communing the Body and Blood of Christ in Byzantine times), Addai and Mari centers rather on forgiveness and newness of life. Of course, both prayers can only be fulfilled through the actual reception of the eucharistic elements.

Generally speaking, the eucharistic Epiklesis has three objectives: (1) to invoke the Holy Spirit to 'come' upon the people and the oblation; (2) to transform the Gifts into Christ's Body and Blood; and (3) to enable the communicants to receive the fruits of communion. Whereas the first and third objectives represent the oldest form of eucharistic Epiklesis and are predominant in AM, the second, properly called the 'consecratory Epiklesis' is central to Byz-BAS.

The Christian liturgy's eschatological orientation is best exemplified in Addai and Mari, whose 'come' verb fundamentally derives from the ancient prayer *Maranatha*, a reference to Christ's impending *Parousia*. Through the invocation of Christ or the Spirit

in the Eucharist, the Church realizes itself to be the eschatological community, which receives a foretaste of the 'final act of *economia*.' In a sense, the past, which has already been realized within history, and the future, which will be realized in the age to come, come to a meeting point in the present celebration of the Eucharist.

In conclusion, liturgists have had differing opinions on whether to characterize the eucharistic celebration as either an 'offering' or 'sacrifice.' The general tendency, however, seems to be that the language in AM identifies the liturgical celebration as an offering, whereas the liturgical phraseology in Byz-BAS, immersed in fourth century Cyrilline theology, views it more like a 'sacrificial' oblation. Hence, whereas the East Syrian offering is rational worship through the 'sub-offerings' of human praise and the gifts of bread and wine, the focus in the Byzantine liturgy is the offering of the eucharistic elements understood as the sacrificed Lamb of God, who fulfills the great mystery of salvation through His death and resurrection.

Chapter Nine The Intercessions

Addai and Mari (AM) *The Intercessions*

Priest: You, O Lord, in your unspeakable mercies make a gracious remembrance for all the upright and just fathers who have been pleasing before you in the commemoration of the body and blood of your Christ which we offer to you upon the pure and holy altar as you have taught us. And grant us your tranquility and your peace all the days of the world, (*Repeat*)

People: Amen.

Priest (continues): that all the inhabitants of the earth may know that you alone are God, the true Father, and you have sent our Lord Jesus Christ, your Son and your beloved, and he, our Lord and our God, taught us in his life-giving gospel all the purity and holiness of the prophets, apostles, martyrs and confessors and bishops and priests and deacons, and of all the children of the holy catholic church, who have been marked with the mark of holy baptism.

Byzantine-Basil (Byz-BAS) *The Intercessions*

Priest (aloud): Especially for our most holy, pure, blessed, and glorious Lady, the Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary.

[**People:** All of creation rejoices in you, O full of grace: the assembly of angels and the human race. You are a sanctified temple and a spiritual paradise, the glory from whom God was incarnate and became a child - our God, existing before all ages. He made your womb a throne, and your body more spacious than the heavens. All of creation rejoices in you, O full of grace. Glory to you.]

The Diptychs of the dead are read here by the Deacon while the Priest silently prays.

Priest (silently): For Saint John the prophet, forerunner, and baptist; for the holy, glorious, and most-honorable apostles; for Saint(s) (*Names*), whose memory we commemorate today; and for all Your saints, through whose supplications, O God, visit us. Remember also all who have fallen asleep in the hope of the resurrection to eternal life (*here the priest commemorates the names of the deceased*), and grant them rest, our God, where the light of Your countenance shines. Again, we pray to You, be mindful of Your holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, which is from one end of the inhabited earth to the other. Grant peace to her which You have obtained with the precious blood of Your Christ. Strengthen also this holy house to the end of the ages. Remember, Lord, those who have brought You these gifts, and for whom and through whom and the intentions for which they were offered. Remember, Lord, those who bear fruit and do good works in Your holy churches, and those who remember the poor. Reward them with Your rich and heavenly gifts. Grant them in return for earthly things, heavenly gifts; for temporal, eternal; for corruptible, incorruptible. Remember, Lord, those who are in the deserts, on mountains, in caverns, and in the chambers of the earth. Remember, Lord, those living in chastity and godliness, in asceticism and holiness of life. Remember, Lord, the most pious and faithful Emperor, whom You have made worthy to rule upon the earth; crown him with the weapon of truth, with the weapon of good will;

overshadow his head in the day of war; empower his arm; raise his right arm; preserve his kingdom; make all the barbarian nations who desire wars to surrender to him; grant him help and everlasting peace; speak to his heart good things concerning Your Church and all Your people, that through the faithful conduct of their duties we may live a peaceful life in all piety and purity. Remember, Lord, every power and authority and our brothers in the palace and the entire army. [Remember, Lord, this country and all those in public service whom you have allowed to govern on earth. Grant them profound and lasting peace. Speak to their hearts good things concerning Your Church and all Your people, that through the faithful conduct of their duties we may live a peaceful life in all piety and purity.] Sustain the good in their goodness; make the wicked good through Your goodness. Remember, Lord, the people here standing and those who are absent with good cause. Have mercy on them and on us according to the multitude of Your mercy. Fill their treasuries with every good thing; preserve their marriages in peace and harmony; nurture the infants; instruct the youth; strengthen the aged; give courage to the faint-hearted; reunite those separated; bring back those in error and unite them to Your holy, catholic, and apostolic Church. Free those who are held captive by unclean spirits; sail with those who sail; travel with those who travel; defend the widows; protect the orphans; liberate the captives; heal the sick. Remember, Lord, those who are in mines, in exile, in harsh labor, and those in every kind of affliction, necessity, or distress; those who entreat Your loving kindness; those who love us and those who hate us; those who have asked us to pray for them, unworthy though we may be. Remember, Lord our God, all Your people, and pour out Your rich mercy upon them, granting them their petitions for salvation. Remember, O God, all those whom we have not remembered through ignorance, forgetfulness, or because of their multitude, since You know the name and age of each, even from their mother's womb. For You, Lord, are the helper of the helpless, the hope of the hopeless, the savior of the afflicted, the haven of the voyager, and the physician of the sick. Be all things to all, You who know each person, his requests, his household, and his need. Deliver this flock, O Lord, and every city and town, from famine, plague, earthquake, flood, fire, sword, invasion of foreign enemies, and civil war.

Priest (*aloud*): Among the first remember, O Lord, our father and Bishop (*Name*) [our Archbishop (*Name*) and our Metropolitan/Bishop (*Name*)]. Grant that he [they] may serve Your holy churches in peace. Keep him [them] safe, honorable, and healthy for many years, rightly discerning the word of Your truth.

The Diptychs of the Living are read here.

Priest (*continues silently*): Remember, Lord, all Orthodox bishops who rightly teach the word of Your truth. Remember, Lord, my unworthiness according to the multitude of Your mercies; forgive my every transgression, both voluntary and involuntary. Do not take away the grace of Your Holy Spirit from these gifts presented because of my sins. Remember, Lord, the presbyters, the diaconate in Christ, and every order of the clergy, and do not confound any of us who stand about Your holy altar. Visit us with Your goodness, Lord; manifest Yourself to us through Your rich compassion. Grant us seasonable weather and fruitful seasons; send gentle showers upon the earth so that it may bear fruit; bless the crown of the year of Your goodness. Prevent schism in the Church; pacify the raging of the heathen. Quickly stop the uprisings of heresies by the power of Your Holy Spirit. Receive us all into Your kingdom. Declare us to be sons and daughters of the light and of the day. Grant us Your peace and love, Lord our God, for You have given all things to us.

Textual Notes on Byzantine-Basil

The Byzantine hymn “All of creation” (“Ἐπὶ σοὶ χαίρει”) does not appear in Brightman’s *Barberini* version (pp. 330-37), evidently because the latter is a Hieratikon. Its inclusion in Brightman’s “Modern Text” (pp. 406-09) is essentially irrelevant to this study, since the text under examination is the *Barberini Codex*. Nonetheless, I have placed the hymn within brackets only to indicate the point of its eventual insertion into the Byzantine-Basil text.

Italicized words or expressions within parentheses are solely rubrical in purpose and have been added for clarification. Basil’s *Barberini* version, in contrast to

Brightman's more rubrical "Modern Text", does not specifically dictate which portions of the intercessory section are said aloud by the priest and which are offered silently. One may deduce, however, that the majority of the Intercessions (as well as the Epiklesis) were offered silently, since *Barberini* adds the direction 'ἐκφω.' just prior to 'Especially for our most holy, pure, blessed, and glorious Lady.' (Chrysostom's *Barberini* text possesses far more rubrical directions than Basil). For this reason have I distinguished the silent from the non-silent sections above.

Regarding the commemoration of the ecclesiastical and political authorities, I have once again placed Brightman's "Modern Text" in brackets. Despite the 'modern version's' irrelevance for this study, the decision to include it alongside the *Barberini* document is to indicate again the point of the text's eventual recension, in view certainly of the major historical and political changes among the Byzantines after the middle of the fifteenth century.

Introductory Comments on the Intercessions

By far, the anaphoral Intercessions clearly represent the longest and most complex section of the eucharistic prayer of Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil. At first sight, one cannot help but notice that this section attempts to accomplish two distinct but interrelated objectives: (1) each anaphora includes a commemoration of saints and righteous men and women who have pleased God throughout the ages; and (2) each prayer asks God to meet the spiritual and material needs of the worshipers in the Church, 'that we may find grace with all the saints who through the ages have pleased You' (*Epiklesis-Intercessions*, Byz-BAS).

An important issue requiring clarification is the relationship between the Eucharist itself and the need for intercessory prayer. Why are the intercessory supplications to God offered, when the Epiklesis beseeching God for the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Holy Gifts and the congregation was assumed to be the only major petition, the rest of the anaphora being a confession of praise and thanksgiving? How are the Intercessions connected to the eucharistic sacrifice and why were they inserted in such close proximity to the eucharistic oblation in the first place?

A possible answer to these and other similar questions can be obtained through a brief examination of the historical development and origins of the Intercessions in early eucharistic prayers. According to G. Dix, the intercessory prayers offered in the anaphora were transferred there from their original position in the Synaxis. Prior to this transfer however, when the Eucharist and Synaxis were celebrated as two distinct services,¹ it seemed that the Intercessions became lost altogether. Dix explains:

When the eucharist was celebrated apart from the synaxis in the pre-Nicene Church there was a real loss in the absence of any intercessions whatever. There was a natural desire to replace them in some way; and it is quite possible that in some churches the custom arose during the third century of treating the intercessory 'prayers of the faithful', which really formed the close of the synaxis, as a sort of invariable preliminary to the eucharist, even when this latter was celebrated without the rest of the synaxis.²

Consequently, this separation essentially led to the insertion of intercessory petitions at a new point within the Eucharist itself and, since the early rite consisted predominantly of

¹ Originally, the Eucharist and Synaxis were conducted separately and frequently held without the other. Perhaps the earliest detailed non-biblical account of Christian worship, St. Justin's *Apology* (c. 155 AD), speaks about the eucharistic celebration twice, once preceded by the Synaxis and once preceded by the conferral of Holy Baptism. The next earliest witness is Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* (c. 215 AD), which mentions the Eucharist also on two accounts, one time preceded by the consecration of a bishop and the other time preceded by Baptism and Confirmation. No mention of the Synaxis is made in either instance. In the fourth century, both rites were still distinct celebrations, up until the sixth century, when the Eucharist commemorating Christ's Last Supper was celebrated on Holy Thursday apart from the Synaxis, which was itself celebrated earlier at noon together with the Eucharist. Today's Roman missal for Good Friday advocates the celebration of a comparable version of the old Roman Synaxis, followed by the fourth century Syrian rite of the Veneration of the Cross. See Dix, *Shape*, p. 36.

the one eucharistic prayer, it entered the anaphoral prayer itself, “whatever confusion to its primitive shape and purpose this might cause.”³ The rationalization for this appendage derived from the idea that a prayer offered for ‘special intentions’ could legitimately be connected with the act of eucharistic offering. “Even when the two services were celebrated together, there was a natural desire to associate a prayer for the ‘special intentions’ with which the eucharist was being offered as closely as possible with the act of offering, and this would lead to the same result.”⁴

Furthermore, St. Cyril of Jerusalem seems to have originated the idea of the efficacy of prayer offered in the presence of the awesome consecrated sacrifice. The placement of the Intercessions after the consecration in the Jerusalem and West Syrian rites substantiates Cyril’s position.⁵

The gradual fusion of the Synaxis and the Eucharist led to a repetition of these intercessory prayers at two different points in the service: (1) the old ‘prayers for the faithful’, which concluded the Synaxis rite; and (2) the new intercessory developments within the eucharistic prayer. In time, the ‘prayers of the faithful’ were removed completely from many liturgical traditions, such as Rome and Syr-JAS. Within the Byzantine tradition, the ‘prayers of the faithful’ are still intact in virtually every existing

² G. Dix, *Shape*, p. 170.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 170-71.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 171.

⁵ On the contrary, Alexandria and Egypt adopted another notion, namely, that the Intercessions should be offered *before* the consecration of the Gifts. Typically, Alexandrian intercessions were placed at the beginning of the eucharistic prayer, before the *Sanctus*, whereas in Rome, only prayers for the living were inserted at the beginning of the prayer, but after the *Sanctus* (prayers for the dead in the Roman rite were conventionally only offered in special masses for the dead). This fluidity between geographical areas was not uncommon in the early centuries, since, as Dix writes, “each church began to copy others in ‘modernising’ [*sic.*] its liturgy at different moments and under different influences” (Dix, *Shape*, p. 171). A more detailed discussion of the theological connection between intercessory prayer and the ‘awesome sacrifice’ (*ἡ φηρικοδέστατος θυσία*) will follow later in this chapter.

manuscript (Brightman's rendition being no exception).⁶ However, the actual verbalization of these prayers in contemporary Eastern eucharistic celebrations varies.⁷

An examination of the *content* of these intercessory prayers will likewise provide valuable background information. It is generally accepted that the intercessory 'prayers of the faithful' at the Synaxis were general prayers referring to various classes of people, without specifying names: catechumens, communicants, penitents, travellers, etc. The congregation was expected to particularize silently those in whom each had a personal interest during the collect at the end of the petitions. It appears that the only names specified in the Synaxis were those of the Roman emperor and the local bishop. However, while the general nature of these first Intercessions seemed acceptable, the second set of petitions attached to the eucharistic prayer required more personalization. "But while this public intercession 'by categories' sufficed at the synaxis, the eucharist even in pre-Nicene times was felt to require something more personal, as the domestic gathering of the household of God."⁸ This disposition, coupled certainly with the reality

⁶ See Brightman, LEW, pp. 316-17. Brightman's version of the Nestorian liturgy also indicates a fusion of both the Synaxis and Eucharist. See especially pp. 262-67 ("Mass of the Faithful"); p. 267 ("The Offertory" and the dismissal of the Catechumens just prior); pp. 275-81 ("The Diptychs", which precede the eucharistic anaphora); and pp. 285-87 ("The Anaphora", which includes the anaphoral Intercessions). It is very possible that the Byzantine tendency to repeat prayers and prayer sections within rites may be partially responsible for the repetitiveness of the Intercessions within the hellenized East Syrian rites of Nestorius and Theodore Metaphrastes. In the case of Addai and Mari, the redactors may have simply incorporated material from the other two East Syrian traditions.

⁷ Many churches that follow the Byzantine *typikon* simply omit the pronouncement of the 'prayers of the faithful', along with the 'prayers of the catechumens', since many places no longer have an official catechumenate. Some priests offer the petitions and prayers for both classes of people silently, when an opportunity during the Synaxis arises (such as the chanting by the choir of the dismissal hymns or the *Trisagion*). This privatization of prayer, discussed earlier in this thesis, represents, at least for many Westerners, an odd custom which seems to be connected to an early form of 'liturgical elitism' or clericalism.

⁸ Dix, *Shape*, p. 498.

of an intimately smaller congregation surrounding its bishop and clergy, led to the common practice of specific petitions within the eucharistic prayer.⁹

According to the available evidence from North Africa, by 240 AD, it became customary to name the *dead* individually within the eucharistic prayer, although there is no evidence in St. Cyprian's writings to possibly suggest a naming of the *living* members of the particular church. Interestingly, neither does St. Augustine, one hundred and fifty years later, make mention of any specific naming for living persons in the Eucharist, even though his naming of the dead is ambiguous also. His only reference to intercessory prayer is when he mentions the naming of certain martyrs during the anaphoral Intercessions, a practice the African church borrowed from Jerusalem.¹⁰

The Egyptian text of Sarapion advocates a pause for the reading of the names (*ὑποβολή*) of only the dead, a custom believed by most scholars to be a later addition in this anaphora.¹¹ Likewise, Cyril also mentions prayer only for the dead in the Jerusalem

⁹ The earliest recorded instance of specifically naming an individual within the Eucharist is found in the first epistle of St. Cyprian of Carthage. Cyprian describes the awkward case of a deceased bishop who had intentionally violated a canon at a recent local council, which ruled against the inconvenient practice of allowing clergymen to be executors, or guardians, of a deceased person's will or children. In response, Cyprian supports the African synod's ruling that, "there shall be no oblation on his [the deposed bishop's] behalf (at the offertory) nor shall the sacrifice be offered for his repose, for he does not deserve to be *named in the prayer* of bishops who has sought to distract the bishops and ministers from (the service of) the altar" (Dix, *Shape*, p. 498, quotes St. Cyprian, *Epistle I*, 2). This liturgical 'excommunication', Dix immediately stipulates, was probably not applicable to the deceased bishop's diocese, where he was most likely honored in prayer, but among other surrounding churches within Africa who knew about the late bishop's stance.

¹⁰ Dix, *Shape*, pp. 498-99.

¹¹ The reasoning behind this speculation is based upon the immediate structural evidence, namely, that the Intercessions have no connection whatsoever with the preceding or following material. This argument may be applied to other anaphoras also, inasmuch as redactors often attempt to rewrite the prayers in such a way as to retain fluidity between the Intercessions and their encompassing neighboring sections. Generally speaking, the Intercessions seem to be the most foreign of all the sections in the eucharistic prayer for two reasons: (1) their original position in the Synaxis before their duplication (and eventual transference) into the anaphora; and (2) the idea that only one supplicatory prayer, or 'intercession' – that of the consecration of the elements and the people – dominated early eucharistic prayers.

rite, "because of 'the special assistance of their souls for whom prayer is made in the presence of the holy and most awful sacrifice.'"¹²

Regarding prayers for the living, the earliest recorded evidence appears in Spain, at the Council of Elvira in 303 AD, whose Canon 29 prohibits the names of those possessed by an evil spirit "to be recited at the altar with the oblation."¹³ Dix comments: "Canon 28 prohibits an abuse which had grown up by which persons under excommunication – probably those who for social reasons had made some excessive compromise with pagan conventions – were allowed to offer their prosphora and have their names read out with the rest, provided they did not actually make their communion."¹⁴ This evidence suggests nothing more than what seemed to be a roster of names representing all those who attended the particular Eucharist.¹⁵

The earliest Roman references to the anaphoral Intercessions for the living date back to the late fourth and fifth centuries, and offer prayers 'for kings, for the people, and the others.'¹⁶ Other contemporary sources, such as Pope Innocent I, affirm this arrangement in which petitions are offered for the living. However, St. Innocent here designates a restriction, which distinguishes the Roman structure of intercessory prayer from that of the Mozarabic rite churches. For Innocent, intercessions for the living must

¹² Dix, *Shape*, p. 499; and St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures* 23.9.

¹³ Dix, *Shape*, p. 499. In the early Church, the possessed were numbered among the Catechumens and penitents and thus excluded from the eucharistic celebration.

¹⁴ Dix, *Shape*, p. 499.

¹⁵ These offertory prayers *ad nomina* ('at the names') were common in the Spanish church, and were considered to refer to those who 'offered' that particular Eucharist. The Mozarabic rite explicitly offers prayers for the names 'of the (living) offerers and the departed' ('offerentium et pausantium'), a possible pre-Nicene practice, in which "the relatives or representatives of the dead offered in 'the name of' those departed from that church in its peace and communion, a touching illustration of the vividness of belief in the communion of saints and the unity in Christ of all christians [*sic.*] living and dead" (Dix, *Shape*, pp. 499-500). Dix also points out that whereas Cyprian's naming of the dead occurs within the course of the eucharistic prayer, the Spanish naming of the living occurs before the prayer actually begins.

¹⁶ St. Ambrose, *About the Sacraments*, 4.4. The only prelate in Rome mentioned by name was the local bishop, i.e. the pope.

be offered *during the anaphora and not before it*, as was the practice in Spain. “One should name them during the divine mysteries and not in the part of the rite which precedes, so that the mysteries themselves lead up to the prayers to be offered.”¹⁷

In summary then, whereas in Egypt and Jerusalem (and possibly Africa) the names read at the Intercessions appeared to be those of the deceased, in Rome and Spain only the living were commemorated in a typical Eucharist (the dead remembered only in a special funeral mass or requiem prayer).¹⁸ Furthermore, the early Church, in her commemoration of the living and dead at the eucharistic celebration, seemed to make only a *local* remembrance of her faithful. As Dix says, “The ‘Names’ are in fact the ‘parochial intercessions.’”¹⁹

The Byzantine liturgical tradition seemed to expand the Intercessions beyond their local limitations to include the names of all the living and dead in canonical union with the Church. These ‘Diptychs’, as they were called, were two conjoined tablets bearing the names of the living on one side and on the other side, “a list of saints commemorated and of the dead persons recommended officially to the prayers of the Church.”²⁰ Dix observes: “It is first and foremost this *combination* of lists of the living and dead which distinguishes the ‘diptychs’ proper from the various customs of ‘naming.’”²¹

¹⁷ Dix, *Shape*, p. 500. Pope Innocent I’s Roman model would thus read: Offertory – Preface – *Sanctus* – Intercessions – etc. It is interesting to note that the Preface and *Sanctus* were later interpolations to the Roman rite and thus unobserved by St. Innocent. Yet, they are included above to indicate the sequence.

¹⁸ The practice in Rome of commemorating the dead in all masses was introduced in the ninth century from the Gallic Rite (France). See Dix, *Shape*, p. 507.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* p. 502.

²⁰ *Ibid.* In *Barberini*, the Diptychs occur at two places: (1) they are read by the deacon while the priest reads the silent prayer of the Intercessions, beginning, ‘For Saint John the prophet, forerunner, and baptist; . . .’; and (2) the ‘Diptychs of the Living’ are read immediately following the commemoration of the local bishop. Interestingly, *Barberini* does not specify if the first Diptychs read by the deacon are those of the dead, even though the second set are designated for the living. Given each set’s placement in *Barberini*, it would seem logical that the first Diptychs would name the dead while the latter the living.

²¹ *Ibid.*

In the early fifth century, the Diptychs at Constantinople: (1) consisted of a separate list of names for the living and dead; (2) were arranged according to 'ecclesiastical' precedence (*πρεσβεία*), bishops first, then the other orders of the clergy, and finally the laity; and (3) included the whole 'succession-list' of past patriarchs and emperors of Constantinople. In time, this ordering became quite selective and politically motivated, as would be expected following the marriage of Church and State in Byzantium.²² Dix perceptively states: "From this time onwards, and especially down to c. A.D. 600, the diptychs are constantly in question in the East in connection with ecclesiastical politics, and accusations and counter-accusations of heresy."²³

The 'naming' of the dead in the Constantinopolitan and Antiochene rites (390-400 AD) developed out of the Jerusalem model, namely, after the consecration. In all, although the inclusion of names in the intercessory diptychs was originally intended to verify the orthodoxy and prominence of the individual, the practice inevitably became a seemingly controversial act charged with political undertones.²⁴

²² St. John Chrysostom's second and final deposition as Archbishop of Constantinople by a synod (d. 407 AD) triggered a series of posthumous disputes regarding the inclusion of his name in the Diptychs of the Eastern churches. Often the grounds for non-inclusion or removal were heresy, excommunication, or treason against the State. It is clear that Chrysostom was by no means guilty of either three conditions, his only 'offenses' being his staunch and outspoken disapproval of the unethical behavior of the Byzantine Empress Eudoxia and his tireless war against corruption within the Church and Empire. Keeping in mind the imperfections of human nature, it comes as no surprise that the existing interdependence between the Byzantine Church and State caused the removal of many names from the Diptychs of the Church because of political coercion and not for more legitimate reasons.

²³ Dix, *Shape*, p. 502. From the fifth century, it was customary for the four great sees in the East to commemorate each other's reigning patriarch, but more often than not, the inclusion or removal of a bishop's name from Eucharist became a powerful political statement between churches. "But in the interminable disputes and alliances and counter-alliances of patriarchates which went on under theological pretexts in this period . . . the solemn insertion or erasure of names and sees in the diptych of the living was little more than a public register of how the political position stood at the moment" (p. 503). The confusion was equally apparent for the commemoration of the dead.

²⁴ The insinuation made by Gregory Dix is convincing, namely, that the Eastern Diptychs, despite perhaps their initial genuine intention of affirming a person's orthodoxy, gradually and quite inevitably became an exclusive, or elitist, method of eucharistic commemoration. The individual naming of prominent people, living or dead, at the exclusion of common persons on a 'lower' rung of the social ladder – equally in need of God's mercy and grace – would not only seem unfair, but also a betrayal of the early Church's

In other churches throughout the East, commemoration practices at the Intercessions differed. In the Egyptian anaphora of St. Mark, only the parochial dead are remembered, a divergence from the more 'ecumenical' commemorations of the Byzantine church. In the East Syrian tradition, which of course encompasses Addai and Mari, the Diptychs of the living and the dead are read at the offertory (as in the Mozarabic rite), before the Anamnesis and consecration. F.E. Brightman identifies two distinct 'books' of the living and dead,²⁵ the former being much shorter in content than the latter and including only a summary of the categories of people, with the only names mentioned being those of the Nestorian patriarch and local bishop. By contrast, the 'book of the dead' is significantly lengthier and consists of long lists of proper names, which include great saints of the Old and New Testament, along with the succession-list of Nestorian patriarchs of Mesopotamia, and the local righteous admired and respected within a particular diocese or community. Dix makes the perceptive observation that the East Syrian tradition combined two very common trends within its anaphoral Intercessions.

It is clear, I think, that while the East Syrian diptych of the dead represents a genuine survival of the 'naming' of the 'parochial' dead, known and mourned by the congregation, the diptych of the living on the contrary represents an imitation of the formal Greek practice, inserted in the period when it had come to be taken for granted that there ought to be two diptychs.²⁶

Regarding the specific commemoration of saints in the Intercessions, the practice may have originated in Jerusalem and was later adopted in St. Augustine's rite and

commemoration of all those who offered (or for whom was offered) the Eucharist (p. 504). The immediate argument to this position, of course, is that the numbers of communicants in most parish churches have increased dramatically, and so the individual commemoration of all the living and dead is simply impractical. In order to remedy this condition, perhaps a return to smaller parishes is in order, as was the case with the home churches in Apostolic times, which could only accommodate a far smaller congregation, as many as could fit the designated meeting facility in the house. In any case, the issue is truly an important one and possibly strikes at the very heart of the Church's nature and its *liturgia*.

²⁵ Brightman, LEW, pp. 275-81.

subsequently, in Rome, by the innovative Pope Gelasius (492-496 AD).²⁷ In Basil's Liturgy, the intercessions for the saints indicate that they are the first for whom the eucharistic sacrifice is offered. In addition, the Church invites the saints to participate in the Eucharist by offering their own intercessory prayers to God on behalf of the earthly members of the Church.

Similar to the 'international' register of names common in the Jerusalem Diptychs, the church of Rome also included a listing of several foreign names. For example, in Pope Gregory I's writings (c. 595 AD), four out of the sixteen men martyrs mentioned possess non-Roman names (one of them, Ignatius of Antioch, happened to be martyred in Rome and thus included in the list). Among women martyrs, four out of the seven are also of non-Roman extraction.²⁸

In Constantinople, the gradual development of a lengthier canon of saints and the creation of the ecclesiastical calendar of feast days, coupled with the spread of monasticism and the canonization of saints from the monastic ranks, all helped to inspire the Byzantine trend toward the liturgical commemoration of names. Interestingly, however, Byz-BAS seems to preserve a more conservative listing of names in its anaphoral Intercessions,²⁹ in contrast perhaps to other non-eucharistic services (litanies

²⁶ Dix, *Shape*, pp. 505-06.

²⁷ Originally, it would stand to reason that the executed martyrs who belonged to a local church were the only ones commemorated among the 'sainted dead' by that particular community. In time, with the gradual development of a more complex canon of saints spanning various areas of the Christian world, the commemorations became more universal in scope.

It may be interesting to note that in Fenwick's comparison of the various Basilian Intercessions, all the Basil versions include the name of the Virgin Mary, and all include St. John the Baptist (with the exception of E-BAS, which here evidences a more primitive form). Also, with the exception again of E-BAS and this time Byz-BAS, the other three versions (Syr-BAS, Arm-BAS, and Ω -BAS) include the name of the archdeacon and protomartyr Stephen. Finally, all the anaphoras (except E-BAS) conclude the commemoration of the saints with the general 'with all the/Your saints.' See Fenwick, pp. 218-19.

²⁸ Dix, *Shape*, p. 508.

²⁹ Did St. Basil or his redactors perhaps feel awkward to diverge from the more ancient tradition of keeping the commemoration of saints briefer, thus drawing greater attention to the eucharistic celebration or

within Vespers, Matins, *et al.*), in which whole categories of saints are mentioned. Thus, whereas the ancient 'prayers of the faithful' from the Synaxis were lost entirely from the Roman rite by the end of the fifth century, the Byzantine church replaced them by borrowing the Antiochene custom of litanies, which often included within their content a list of saints to be commemorated.

In conclusion, therefore, the general 'prayers of the faithful' from the Synaxis, now defunct in several eucharistic traditions, are restated in a different form under the all-inclusive anaphoral Intercessions, and the addition of the Diptychs satisfies the task of specifically naming individual persons.

A Structural Examination of the Intercessions in Addai and Mari

A structural comparison between the Intercessions of Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil cannot viably be conducted in a line-by-line manner, since the content and focus within each anaphora differs considerably, not to mention Byz-BAS' extreme length and complexity. Consequently, the procedure in this section of the study will involve the examination of whole segments from one anaphora and, where applicable, juxtaposing the corresponding material from the other.

Bryan Spinks' *Mar Esa'ya* text of AM divides the intercessory section into two separate paragraphs (E and F),³⁰ but in the interest of structural study, both sections must be considered as one unit. In AM, the opening lines, 'You, O Lord, . . . make a gracious remembrance . . . upon the pure and holy altar as you have taught us', closely parallel Maronite *Sharar* (the common core can be deduced by simply eliminating material found

sacrifice? A comparison between Byz-BAS and the evidently older E-BAS possibly lends support to this argument. See note 27 above.

³⁰ See B. Spinks, *Worship*, p. 5. A. Gelston structures the Intercessions in a similar manner (Addai and Mari, pp. 50-53).

in only one of the anaphoras). It appears that the anaphora makes a new beginning following the preceding doxology in the *Postsanctus*, which finalizes the previous 'offering of praise', and "there is no immediately obvious connection with what has preceded."³¹

Sharar's consistent address to Christ would explain the absence of 'of your Christ', whereas Gelston's rendering of AM (and Spinks' *Mar Esa 'ya* text) includes the phrase, thus implying an address to the Father. The back-and-forth arguments need not be resurrected again, although Gelston does question the likelihood that the 'memorial of Christ's body and blood would have been made directly to him rather than to the Father in the original core text.'³²

The first line in AM, 'You, O Lord, in your unspeakable mercies make a gracious remembrance . . . ' is essentially offering a supplication to God to remember the clergy, ('for all the upright and just fathers') who have served the Holy Eucharist ('in the commemoration of the body and blood of your Christ').³³

The phrase 'pure and holy altar', as already mentioned, is a Maronite peculiarity that AM has borrowed and thus uses only in this one instance. The offering of the

³¹ Gelston, p. 94. Based upon a comparison between the East Syrian anaphoras and the Gregorian Canon, Engberding postulates that the insertion of 'therefore' within the line 'You, O Lord' (present, in fact, in *Sharar*) would link the first section of praise with the offering of the Gifts. Gelston remarks that the insertion of the word 'igitur' in Gregory "indicates that the offering of the elements is the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving of which God has been said to be worthy" (p. 95). However, Gelston cautiously doubts a similar interpretation in AM, unless it is connected specifically to the reference of the propitiatory altar, peculiar only at the end of *Sharar's Postsanctus*. "In that case," judges Gelston, "the sequence of thought would be a plea that in view of the sacrifice of praise offered at the propitiatory altar, God would remember for good the souls of the departed" (ibid.), reminiscent of the position taken by St. Cyril of Jerusalem in his *Catechetical Lectures on the Mysteries* 5.8-10. This later theology would seem foreign to the earlier AM text and thus, the term 'therefore' is conclusively deemed a secondary expansion in *Sharar*, with AM preserving the more original of the two anaphoras.

³² Gelston, p. 95.

³³ This initial general remembrance of only bishops and presbyters seems to introduce AM's two-tier model of commemoration, including the very general categories of clergy and laity. The lack of any references to

Eucharist occurs upon this 'pure and holy altar', in both AM and *Sharar*, and seems to adhere to the idea that an altar, in biblical times, was the designated place where God met His people and exchanged his blessings for their material *sacrifice*.³⁴

The meaning derived from the phrase 'as you have taught us' is similar to the later expression in the Anamnesis, 'of the example which is from you.' This double inference to the institution of the Eucharist probably serves as a 'reminder' of, or 'substitute' for, the anaphora's missing Institution Narrative. However, the complex issue of to whom the prayer is addressed resurfaces once again.³⁵ The presence of an Institution Narrative in Byz-BAS does not allow for such phraseology, and its consistent address to the Father permits no room for doubt either.

The very next line in both AM and *Sharar* introduces a sharp divergence between the two texts. AM's version, 'And grant us your tranquility and your peace all the days of the world', introduces a new theme by way of a petition for peace for the living, which sharply contrasts from the previous request made toward remembering the dead. *Sharar*, on the other hand, apparently continues its remembrance of the dead at this point, but also oddly inserts a paraphrase of John 6.51 (part of Christ's 'I am the living bread' discourse). This Johannine reference then leads up to the Narrative of Institution, along

emperors or courts, as well as the absence of Diptychs or the particular naming of individuals, may suggest an earlier dating, although Justin Martyr asserted that Christians did pray for the Roman Emperor.

³⁴ The concepts of 'altar' and 'sacrifice' are clearly interrelated. Addai and Mari's adoption of the Maronite 'propitiatory altar', which occurs only once throughout the whole text, seems to clash with the seemingly more ancient idea of offering (*qurbana*), although both ideas appear to have been reconciled in modern usage. Thus, an offering or sacrifice could easily signify either words of praise or the gifts of bread and wine. However, in the ancient understanding of *qurbana*, which implies the entire eucharistic celebration, a 'consecratory' altar was unnecessary. Instead, the Eucharist's identification with the (evening) meal was made clear when the eucharistic bread and wine were placed upon the *dinner* table, the immediate predecessor of the altar table. See Chapter 8 of this thesis, "The Understanding of Offering in the Anaphoras", pp. 20-24.

³⁵ Since both references to the Institution Narrative present the same conflict, namely, the uncertainty of the addressee, there is no need to restate the issue here. For an overview, see Chapter 7 of this thesis,

with some propitiatory language very reminiscent of St. Cyril's theology but quite absent in Addai and Mari.

In its outward form, this line for peace in AM appears almost like a prayer of consecration in itself, with its own intercessory section immediately following, 'that all the inhabitants of the world may know that you . . .',³⁶ which could be likened to the benefits of communion. However, aside from the central request for peace (which could just as easily pass as a 'benefit of communion'), the major 'disqualifier' would most likely be the absence of the traditional invocation of the Spirit to 'come' upon the people and the Gifts, or to 'make' or 'show' the Gifts to be the Body and Blood of Christ.

Addai and Mari's petitions for the living are essentially twofold: (1) a request for worldly peace; and (2) the universal knowledge of God "as revealed in Christ and in the religion he came to teach."³⁷ The 'purity and holiness' taught by Christ in the Gospel is shared by a list of saintly individuals who have apparently attained a special holiness and union with the Lord through His revelation to them and the Church. This second petition in AM, as well as its peripheral material, is very closely paralleled in *Sharar*. In Byz-BAS, this enumeration of saints appears in the Epiklesis section, but they are introduced as those who have 'pleased God through the ages.' In addition, whereas AM indirectly beseeches God that the communicants emulate the saints through the grace of knowledge

"Introductory Observations on the Anamnesis" (pp. 1-6), and partially, "A Structural Analysis of the Anamnesis", pp. 17-20.

³⁶ There appears to be a significant resemblance to Basil's Epiklesis here, even though AM possesses its own distinct Epiklesis. The first evident sign is the (editorial?) insertion of the 'amen' immediately following the request for peace and just prior to the subsequent request for divine knowledge in both renditions of Gelston and Spinks (Brightman's Nestorian text, p. 287, does not have this interpolation). In fact, the eschatological ending, 'all the days of the world', almost sounds like a concluding Doxology, which would typically be followed by the 'amen' anyway. Secondly, the list of hallowed individuals (in AM's Intercessions; in Byz-BAS' Epiklesis) are viewed in both anaphoras as persons exemplifying 'purity and holiness' who have 'through the ages pleased God' and are thus worthy of emulation by the communicants.

³⁷ Gelston, p. 96.

(which leads to a life of purity and holiness), Byz-BAS' entreaty is far more penitential in purpose, imploring God to spare the communicants from His justified chastisement and judgment, and consequently, to grant them mercy and grace like the saints. Both texts are juxtaposed below:

Addai and Mari

... that all the inhabitants of the earth may know that you alone are God, the true Father, and you have sent our Lord Jesus Christ, your Son and your beloved, and he, our Lord and our God, taught us in his life-giving gospel all the purity and holiness of the prophets, apostles, martyrs and confessors and bishops and priests and deacons, and of all the children of the holy catholic church, who have been marked with the mark of holy baptism.

Byzantine-Basil

Grant that none of us may partake of the holy Body and Blood of Your Christ to judgment or condemnation; but, that we may find mercy and grace with all the saints who through the ages have pleased You: forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, teachers, and for every righteous spirit made perfect in faith.

The categories of saints common to both anaphoras are the prophets, apostles, martyrs, and confessors. It is notable that these offices are listed in chronological order, despite Basil's insertion of 'preachers and evangelists' in between the middle two groups (which could readily be included as subcategories of 'apostles').³⁸ The three orders of ministry in AM, listed according to ecclesiastical rank ('bishops and priests and deacons'), is also shared by *Sharar* and seems thus to be a peculiarity of the East Syrian tradition and, quite possibly, earlier liturgies, in which the three orders of the clergy and the distinction between their liturgical responsibilities was quite explicit.³⁹

³⁸ In general, Basil's exceptionally lengthy listing of saints and more detailed breakdown of categories than AM may indicate a later dating for this section. 'Evangelists' and 'preachers' encompass ministries all apostles would typically fulfill, as confessors would certainly be labeled 'teachers' of the Faith, through their theological exposition of Christian doctrine as well as their example of patience and endurance for the sake of Christ.

³⁹ Dix, *Shape*, especially pp. 103-40.

Basil's 'patriarchs, fathers, forefathers' triplet has no counterpart in AM, and seems to be a reference to certain Old Testament personalities, if one follows the chronological arrangement of the categories.

Whereas AM culminates in the mention of all baptized persons ('who have been marked with the mark of holy baptism'), Byz-BAS concludes with 'every righteous spirit made perfect in faith' ('ἐν πίστει τετελειωμένου', alternately denoting 'having died in faith'; cf. also 1 Cor 12.28). In either case, both lines appear to utilize inclusive language ('all the children of the holy catholic church'/'every righteous spirit') and serve as a generic summary of the section. The AM expression 'who have been marked (sealed) with the mark of holy baptism' is also found in *Sharar*, whose peculiar penitential language replaces 'holy' with 'propitiatory' (or 'absolving'), in its reference to 'baptism.' The very citation in AM to the ancient rite of Baptism within the Eucharist suggests a firm link between the two sacraments, when the former was typically celebrated within the context of the latter.

Hellenized anaphoras such as Byz-BAS and *Sharar* seem to differ from Addai and Mari in terms of the *context* in which the Intercessions are offered. Gelston writes: "The essential difference is that in *Sharar* [as in Basil] the context of the list is the offering of the Eucharist in memory of departed Christians, while in Addai and Mari it is part of the commemoration of the revelation of true religion brought by Christ."⁴⁰ Such a difference is significant because it distinguishes the individual theologies of each anaphora: Basil's Cyrilline theology, in which the dead benefit from prayers offered by

⁴⁰ Gelston, p. 97.

the Church before the 'awesome sacrifice',⁴¹ versus AM's own view of the sainted fathers as the recipients and deliverers of the eucharistic tradition.

The Intercessions of Addai and Mari apparently parallel the sixth-century fragment edited by E. Connolly (1925) in three instances. However, the fragment's corresponding material does not necessarily come from its intercessory section but from other sections of the manuscript. This common matter suggests, according to Gelston, that the Intercessions of Addai and Mari "represent an amalgam of traditional material which has been put together in a not very orderly way, in which some of the material is found here in a context different from that in which it originated."⁴²

Consequently then, the line 'for all the upright and just fathers who have been pleasing before you' would be followed by 'prophets, apostles, martyrs and confessors', and 'all the purity and holiness of the' would be attached to 'bishops and priests and deacons, and of all the children of the holy catholic church, who have been marked with the mark of holy baptism.' This neat arrangement seems inviting, since the first list would fall under the general category of the 'upright and just fathers' (not that the three orders of ministry could not), while the clergy and laity would seem to be the more logical pairing in the second part. Furthermore, this rewriting of the Intercessions may also be understood as the commemoration of the dead in the first part ('the upright and just fathers') and the living members in the second part, the Church's two necessary human components.

The expression 'life-giving gospel' would follow 'as you have taught us', and finally, the line 'and he, our Lord and our God, taught us' would appear to be a weak

⁴¹ See note 12 of this chapter.

⁴² Gelston, p. 100.

attempt to bridge ‘and you have sent our Lord Jesus Christ, your Son and your beloved’ with ‘all the purity and holiness, etc.’ In addition to the suggestions offered above, a possible revision of the complete intercessory section appears below:

Priest: You, O Lord, in your unspeakable mercies make a gracious remembrance for all the upright and just fathers who have been pleasing before you, prophets, apostles, martyrs and confessors, and all the purity and holiness of the bishops and priests and deacons, and of all the children of the holy catholic church, who have been marked with the mark of holy baptism, in the commemoration of the body and blood of your Christ which we offer to you upon the pure and holy altar as you have taught us [in his life-giving gospel], that all the inhabitants of the earth may know that you alone are God, the true Father, and you have sent our Lord Jesus Christ, your Son and your beloved, and he, our Lord and God, taught us [in his life-giving gospel]. And grant us your tranquility and your peace all the days of the world.

People: Amen.

Gelston’s suggested placement of ‘in his life-giving gospel’ after the phrase ‘as you have taught us’ seems to disturb the prayer’s address to the Father and thus renders an incoherent meaning. However, its positioning after the introduction of the Son three lines down (‘and he . . . taught us in his life-giving gospel’) seems to give the better reading, although the revised text almost begs for a direct object to follow, which would indicate *what* the Lord exactly taught. The *Mar Esa’ya* text’s inclusion of ‘all the purity and holiness’ apparently answers this question.

In this rearrangement then of the prayer, three distinct intercessions can be noted: (1) an intercession for the departed; (2) an intercession for the living clergy and lay people of the Church; and (3) an intercession for the world, asking for the universal knowledge of God in Christ, and peace. Finally, Gelston remarks that the present text of AM seems to flow more smoothly into the next major section of the anaphora, the Anamnesis, than the reworked text.⁴³

Among the more ancient texts that Addai and Mari’s intercessory section most closely resembles, Sarapion’s *Euchologion* seems to be the closest match, even though

the possibility of verbal links between the two anaphoras is very unlikely. One does notice, however, an allusion in both to John 17.3 ('that they may know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you have sent'), including a brief and general intercession at the end. Another noteworthy detail between the two anaphoras involves AM's more refined use of the words 'remembrance' and 'commemoration.' Sarapion in fact uses the term 'ἀνάμνησις' for the memorial of the departed but not in reference to the eucharistic memorial (its Institution Narrative does not contain the command, 'Do this in remembrance of me.'). AM uses two different terms for its memorial of the dead and the Eucharist, with the Syriac term for the Eucharist corresponding to the Greek 'καταγγέλετε', which connotes a sense of 'proclamation.' The verbs of proclamation and praise are grouped together in AM's Anamnesis section and precede the 'commemoration.' "This seems to indicate," explains Gelston, "that the Anaphora of Addai and Mari makes a conscious distinction between the 'remembrance' of the departed and the eucharistic 'commemoration' of the body and blood of the Lord."⁴⁴ Regarding the similarities between AM and Sarapion, Gelston notes: "They may be felt to breathe the same atmosphere, and in particular to antedate the new propitiatory theology of intercession at the Eucharist propounded somewhat self-consciously by Cyril of Jerusalem."⁴⁴

A few further details in AM need to be examined. The 'good remembrance' recalls the prayer of Nehemiah: "Remember me, O my God, for good" (Neh 13.31; cf. also 13.14, 22). Basil's rendering, 'Remember, Lord, my unworthiness according to the multitude of Your mercies', corresponds more closely to Nehemiah 13.22 ("Remember

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid. p. 101.

this also in my favor, O my God, and spare me according to the greatness of your steadfast love”). However, Basil’s subsequent petition, ‘Do not take away the grace of your Holy Spirit from these gifts’ seems to follow Nehemiah 13.14 (“Remember me, O my God, concerning this, and wipe not out my good deeds that I have done for the house of my God and for his service”). It would appear then that both anaphoras seem to rely heavily on the prophetic prayer, although it is uncertain if there has been a mutual influence between them in this instance.

The preposition ‘in’ in the phrase, ‘in the commemoration of’, seems to imply that the Eucharist is the proper context for the offering of prayers for the dead, although the possibility of a Cyrilline inclination, states Gelston, is not likely. “What is not suggested is any pleading of the sacrifice of either the Cross or the Eucharist as a ground of the intercession for the departed.”⁴⁵ Another solution would be to consider the ‘upright and just fathers’ as a memorial of the clergy who throughout history have offered the Eucharist ‘upon the pure and holy altar.’ The dilemma here would appear in how the line ‘which we offer to you’ is taken. In other words, are the clergy the only ones who make the eucharistic offering, or is it the *entire* Church, clergy *and* laity? Addai and Mari’s generally accepted antiquity would seem to favor a more inclusive connotation, and perhaps ‘upright and just fathers’ could include lay persons also, but this seems improbable.

The antecedent of ‘which’ in ‘which we offer to you upon the pure and holy altar’ implies that the ‘commemoration’ is what is offered rather than the Gifts themselves (which would suggest a more advanced eucharistic theology). In Byz-Basil’s Epiklesis,

⁴⁴ Ibid. p. 101.

⁴⁵ Ibid. p. 102.

what is 'brought forth' are the 'antitypes' of the Lord's Body and Blood, while in Byz-Chrysostom, what is 'offered' is 'this reasonable and bloodless worship' ('τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν'). The latter two Byzantine anaphoras specifically point to an offering of the Gifts, but AM's antiquity does not allow it to imply anything but the simpler eucharistic 'commemoration', "referring to the whole eucharistic action undertaken in fulfillment of the dominical command."⁴⁶

A Structural Examination of the Intercessions in Byzantine-Basil

An immediate observation made in the Intercessions of Byzantine-Basil is their lengthiness. In fact, all the Basil recensions, with the exception of E-BAS, include a longer list of commemorations and petitions. As Fenwick notes, "In general the Ω Group show some slight expansion of the ES-Basil wording, often simply in the form of stylistic embellishment."⁴⁷

The petitions shared by Byz-BAS and the Sahidic version of E-BAS are: (1) the remembrance of 'Your holy, catholic, and apostolic Church'; (2) the remembrance of all orthodox bishops and (3) the Diptychs (local bishop); (4) the remembrance of 'the people'; (5) a petition for favorable weather; (6) a prayer 'for those who have brought You these gifts'; (7) a list of various saints 'who have please You' (included at the conclusion of the Epiklesis section in our study); (8) a commemoration of the Virgin Mary; (9) a commemoration of the dead; (10) a prayer for their repose; and (11) a petition for the reception of all the faithful in the Kingdom of God.

A few comments regarding these petitions are in order. The general prayer for the Church is placed immediately after the commemoration of the dead, and appropriately

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Fenwick, p. 227.

introduces the sequence of petitions for all the living members of the Church, which Basil eventually breaks down into different groups and categories. Addai and Mari's more succinct and all-inclusive 'that all the inhabitants of the earth' is the closest match to Basil's petition for 'Your holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, which is from one end of the inhabited earth to the other.' The increased emphasis in Byzantine times upon the variety of worldly needs (poor, sick, widows, orphans, etc.), coupled with an increase in ministries and 'offices' (monastics, ascetics, etc.), would logically account for the detailed embellishment of the Intercessions.

The prayer for the local church building ('Strengthen also this holy house to the end of the ages') seems to indicate the common Byzantine practice of designating a particular importance and reverence to the physical building ('holy space'), as well as to physical objects of veneration (e.g. relics of saints, icons, incense, etc.). This concept, immersed in the doctrine of the Incarnation (the sanctification of the material world through the Son of God's entrance into it), would appear to disagree with the earlier dualistic idea of 'church' as the 'holy people of God' who have been separated from the fallen world. However, even though Byzantine theology would certainly not deny the latter concept, the fact remains that in St. Basil's day, a special holiness was attached to the actual church building itself, to the point perhaps that 'going to church' signified not so much gathering together with other Christians but rather filling the 'holy space' of the sanctuary.

The commemoration of all orthodox bishops and the local bishop is clearly a remembrance of the spiritual leaders of the Church, who form, in the words of St. Ignatios of Antioch, the 'εἰκόνες Χριστοῦ' ('icons of Christ') for their flock. The phrase

'who rightly discern the word of Your truth' is an obvious indication of the episcopal office's most important ministry. For the early Church, unity in the one true Faith was the primary responsibility of the bishop, who achieved this goal through his role as teacher and guardian of theological truth.

The general petition for 'all Your people' oddly occurs midway through the intercessory section, but seems to summarize the entire preceding block, which offers petitions for various categories of the living laity (from those who offer gifts, to the Emperor, to those in affliction 'who have asked us to pray for them'). The prayer's request is for the general benefits of mercy and salvation, as God sees fit for each individual person and condition. A final supplication is offered for all those people that the celebrant and people have forgotten 'through ignorance, forgetfulness, or because of their multitude', but which God recognizes quite well, since He knows 'each person, his requests, his household, and his need', even from the maternal womb. This final request appears to be a humble expression of human limitedness but simultaneously, seeks to responsibly include in prayer all the inhabitants of the earth, known and unknown.

The prayer 'for those who have brought You these gifts' enjoys prominence as being the first specific petition in the Intercessions, following the generic prayer for the Church. It is clearly a reference to the *prosphora* of bread and wine brought by *certain* people to the eucharistic celebration. The very fact that it appears in the form of a petition strongly implies that during the Byzantine era, not every Christian brought an offering of bread and wine to the eucharistic synaxis, as was apparently the case in the pre-Nicene Church. Furthermore, the addendum 'for whom and through whom and the intentions for which they were offered' implies that the Gifts are offered in return for spiritual benefits

but also for individuals who are not necessarily present at the Eucharist. This understanding may very well represent the antecedent of the later Eastern practice of commemorating the living and the dead, in which the celebrant removes particles from the offering loaves at the preparatory service of *Proskomide*.

The commemoration of the Virgin Mary heads the intercessory section, followed by St. John the Baptist, the saints of the day, and all the saints of the Church. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the intercessions for the saints identify them as being the first for whom the Eucharist is offered, as well as those whose intercessory prayers are offered to God, to visit His people and bestow upon each individual the necessary spiritual and material benefits.

The individual naming of the dead and a prayer for their repose appears immediately after the commemoration of the saints. It concludes the intercessory section regarding the membership of the 'Church Triumphant', before the prayer shifts to requests for the members of the 'Church Militant.' St. Cyril of Jerusalem's belief in the efficacy of prayer for the dead in the presence of the 'awesome sacrifice' has already been discussed previously in this chapter and so seems to have influenced the placement of this petition following the consecration of the Holy Gifts.

The final petition for the reception of all the faithful in the Kingdom of God occurs at the conclusion of the intercessory section and summarizes the intentions previously offered by placing them in one concise request: acceptance in God's Kingdom 'as sons and daughters of the light and of the day.' This phrase is similar to AM's 'that all the inhabitants of the earth may know that you alone are God', since the implication in both prayers is enlightenment by and in the truth, which leads to union with God in His

Kingdom. Spiritual 'peace and love' are certainly fruits of this divine union, which are bestowed upon mankind by God. The last line, 'for You have given all things to us', introduces the concluding Doxology, which seems almost to extend the Intercessions by making a request that God may enable the worshipers to glorify His Name 'with one voice and one heart.' From a structural perspective, the doxological material would indeed make an appropriate and powerful conclusion as the 'last petition', since even in the very offering of glorification to God, the Church asks God Himself for assistance and wisdom to correctly and honorably fulfill this most important and sublime act of worship.

Among the petitions not found in ES-BAS but shared by all the Ω -Basil anaphoras are: (1) the celebrant; (2) those who stand with us; (3) heavenly recompense; (4) widows and orphans; (5) the Emperor; (6) John the Baptist; (7) all the saints; (8) cessation of schism, etc.; and (9) the scattered and wanderers.

The petition for the celebrant occurs later in Byzantine-Basil's Intercessions, and finds a parallel in the 'gracious (good) remembrance' of AM, with its biblical link to the Prophecy of Nehemiah (discussed above). According to Fenwick, the prayer for the celebrant appears very much like it formerly existed outside of the anaphora, probably as a prayer for personal worthiness and was subsequently incorporated into it. The content of the prayer evidently has no connection with the material immediately preceding or following it,⁴⁸ which points to the possibility of its being an interpolation.

The petition for 'the people here standing' before the holy altar of God possesses eschatological significance, in that it is an image of the Second Coming of Christ. The

⁴⁸ In the Byz-BAS text, the redactor intersperses the commemoration of the presiding hierarch(s), which then flows smoothly into a petition for 'all Orthodox bishops' and finally, the prayer for the celebrant. If the commemoration of the archbishop or bishop is eliminated, then the celebrant's prayer for worthiness would follow clumsily after the prayer for protection against 'famine, plague, earthquake,' etc. Likewise,

same concept is reverberated in AM's Anamnesis: 'And we also, O Lord, . . . who are gathered together and stand before you at this time.' It is followed by a related petition for 'those who are absent with good cause.' The implication here is that the physically disabled or severely ill were understandably not capable (and thus excused) of attending the Eucharist, although it would seem that there is a further insinuation warning healthy Christians from deliberately missing the eucharistic celebration.

The petition for heavenly reward is in actuality a set of three couplets (heavenly for earthly, eternal for temporal, and incorruptible for corruptible). These spiritual benefits are asked for a distinct group of persons, namely, those who have made their eucharistic offering in the liturgy, and for 'those who bear fruit and do good works' (a probable reference to the benefactors, as well as the builders and artists, of the church building; from *καλλιεργέω*, 'I beautify with mosaic', etc.). Interestingly, AM petitions God that 'all the inhabitants of the earth' may be the beneficiaries of the knowledge of God. This distinction in Basil possibly implies that at the time of its composition, only certain Christians were offering gifts or performing 'good works' within the liturgical setting.⁴⁹

The petitions for 'widows and orphans' (the seemingly "first entry of a number of more 'domestic' situations for which prayer is made"⁵⁰) and 'the Emperor' find no counterpart in Addai and Mari. The former occurs in Byz-BAS with the couplet 'sail with

the subsequent request for 'seasonable weather' makes an abrupt transition after the celebrant's prayer, which points to the possibility of the former being an interpolation.

⁴⁹ A more contemporary understanding of 'good works' may be approached in the following way. Byzantine Christianity saw the full development of minor orders and functionaries within the Church, such as subdeacons, readers, cantors, and designated choirs. Church sextons were also assigned to care for the cleanliness of the church building. If 'good works' is understood within a liturgical context, then it seems to contain a reference to the above minor orders. Outside of a liturgical context, the reference may be to Christian lay people who are directly involved with the Church's philanthropic or outreach ministries.

⁵⁰ Fenwick, p. 228.

those who sail, travel with those who travel’, and the second occurs in all the Basil recensions except ES-BAS.

Regarding the commemoration of the saints and specifically St. John the Baptist, the seemingly older Sahidic Basil includes only Mary, while the other Basil texts (and most other anaphoras) add John the Baptist and other saints. Addai and Mari makes no such references, which attests certainly to its antiquity, well before the establishment of a canon of saints and an ecclesiastical calendar. The insertion of the expression ‘and for all Your saints’ is an attempt to remedy a possible clutter of individual names.

The prayer for ‘cessation of schism’, like the petition for the worthiness of the celebrant, may also have “originally existed as an independent block of material which had been inserted originally at the end of the list.”⁵¹ Its proximity to the prayer for worthiness attests to this hypothesis, but more so its placement after the prayer for ‘seasonable weather.’⁵² Although AM does not have a specific prayer against schism, this certainly does not imply that the threat of pagan beliefs or heresy was not a prevalent danger when the anaphora was composed. In fact, AM’s ‘that all the inhabitants of the earth may know that you alone are God, the true Father, and you have sent our Lord Jesus Christ, . . .’ is a prayer for enlightenment and, in truth, a trinitarian statement, perhaps aimed at an ancient system of polytheism or Gnosticism.

The final petition for the ‘scattered and wanderers’ encompasses the block, ‘give courage to the faint-hearted; reunite those separated; bring back those in error and unite them to Your holy, catholic, and apostolic Church. Free those who are held captive by

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² In truth, the cluttered arrangement of the petitions in the concluding section of the *Barberini Intercessions* makes it generally difficult to discern which of the petitions have been interpolated into the section and which are original to it.

unclean spirits.’ It would seem that this petition could sensibly be attached to that for the ‘cessation of schism’, but its placement elsewhere in the Intercessions renders it as a separate request altogether.

Another set of eight petitions occurs in Byz-BAS. These prayers are for: (1) ‘the helpless and hopeless’; (2) ‘marriages, children, youths, etc.’; (3) the afflicted; (4) those who sail and travel; (5) ‘those who have asked us to pray for them’; (6) those who bring forth fruits; (7) those in deserts, mountains, and caves; and (8) deliverance from earthquake, etc. One petition not found in Byz-BAS but existing in the other Basil recensions is regarding the Protomartyr Stephen. While Fenwick feels that this latter’s absence is due to a copyist’s error, it is still generally admitted that Byz-BAS seems to limit its enumeration of the saints.⁵³

While individual commentary on each of the aforementioned petitions may be deemed tedious and unnecessary, a few general comments are in order. St. Basil’s general concern for the spiritual welfare of the Christian family, as expressed in his liturgy, is echoed in some of his other writings, namely, his ‘letters of consolation’ (nos. 5, 6, 28, 29, 62, 101, 107, 139, 140, 206, 227, 238, 247, 256, 269, and 300-302),⁵⁴ and in his *Exhortation to Youths as to How They shall Best Profit by the Writings of Pagan Authors (Ad adolescentes)*.⁵⁵ His social outreach efforts toward the poor and oppressed and the destitute within society and specifically within his own see of Cappadocia are reflected in his ‘epistles of recommendation’ (3, 15, 31-37, 72-78, 83-88, 96, 104, 108-112, 137, 142-

⁵³ Fenwick, p. 229.

⁵⁴ See St. Basil the Great, *The Letters* (4 volumes). Ed. R. Deferrari (Cambridge, 1926-39); also, J.P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 32.220-1112.

⁵⁵ See idem., *Aux jeunes gens, sur la manière de tirer profit des lettres helléniques* (established text and translation). Ed. F. Boulenger. Paris, 1952; PG 31.563-590.

144, 177-180, 271, 273-276, 279-281, and 303-319),⁵⁶ in which Basil addressed himself “to high authorities and wealthy persons in order to recommend the poor and oppressed, to intercede for cities and towns, for relatives and friends.”⁵⁷ The petition for those in deserts, mountains, and caves seems to be almost a sure reference to the ascetics of the Church (cf. Heb 11.38). Also, the petition for those who sail and journey seems almost to take into account the imminent dangers of sea and land travel known throughout Asia Minor. Indeed, the rough terrain and harsh climate conditions of the Caesarean countryside probably account for the text’s distinct language in both petitions, but Basil’s widespread acclaim as a staunch supporter of formal cenobitic monasticism and asceticism is also very well documented.⁵⁸

The final petition for protection against ‘famine, plague, earthquake, flood, fire, sword, invasion of foreign enemies, and civil war’ is interestingly also a part of the fervent litany offered in other supplicatory services of the Eastern Church. Asia Minor has historically been regarded as a seismopathic region of the world, and so Basil’s reference to earthquakes is obvious. The petition regarding ‘foreign enemies’ makes a plea for the protection and unity of the Byzantine Empire, while the reference to civil war is probably an attempt to reconcile warring factions within the Empire who are at odds because of doctrinal or political reasons. The deliberate removal from the Diptychs of ‘heretical bishops’, who were likewise not in amiable political standing with the State, attests to this often existing division within the Church.

⁵⁶ Basil, *Letters*; PG 32.220-1112.

⁵⁷ See Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*. Volume 3 (Westminster, MD), p. 222.

⁵⁸ Basil’s major ascetic treatises include: (1) *The Moralia* (*Tà ‘Hθικᾶ*) and (2) *Long and Short Rules*. See *The Ascetic Works of Saint Basil*. Trans. W.K.L. Clarke (London, 1925).

Four petitions present in all the Ω-BAS anaphoras except Arm-BAS are for: (1) presbyters and deacons (placed in Byz-BAS after the commemoration of the local hierarch and immediately after the celebrant's personal prayer for worthiness); (2) every clerical order (in addition to a general request for worthiness for the clergy who 'stand about ['encircle'] Your holy altar'; (3) those who live in virginity and piety (perhaps a reference to Christians who live ascetically but have not been tonsured into a monastic brotherhood); and (4) visitation by God through the intercessions of the saints. A prayer for the departed laity ('καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐκ τάγματος λαϊκῶν'), common toward the end of Syr-BAS and ES-BAS, is absent from Byz-BAS and Arm-BAS, particularly because of the latter two anaphoras' reversal of the living/dead sequence, in which the dead are commemorated much earlier in the prayer. Finally, the prayer for the 'parish flock', expressed by the words 'τὴν ποιμνὴν ταύτην', is found in Byz-BAS but not in Syr-BAS or Arm-BAS.

The remaining three petitions found only in Byz-BAS are: (1) a request for the royal court and the army (an extension of the prayer for the Emperor, expected within the Byzantine political hierarchy); (2) a commemoration of the saint of the day (an indication of a developed ecclesiastical calendar replete with saints' feast days); and (3) a prayer for those 'who love us and those who hate us', attached to 'those who entreat Your loving kindness.'

A Theological Overview of the Intercessions in AM and Byz-BAS

While there seems to be little doubt among scholars that the anaphoral Intercessions were transposed to their current place in the Eucharist from their original position in the Synaxis, their purpose may often differ from liturgy to liturgy. In other

words, the 'commemoration' spoken about in the Intercessions may be either anamnestic (as in AM) or supplicatory (as in Byz-BAS) in scope. Whereas the Intercessions in Addai and Mari predominantly ask the Lord to 'make a gracious remembrance for all the upright and just fathers', bringing them into full participatory communion with the earthly church, Basil's Intercessions, on the contrary, mainly supplicate God - before the holy oblation - to assist the people mentioned by addressing their manifold needs.

Once again, liturgical *anamnesis*, in its strictest sense, implies a 're-presenting' and 're-calling' of a past event or person into the present time and space, to share in the efficacy and power of the present act. The dominical command to "Do this in remembrance of Me" was not intended to mean a historical commemoration intended to temporarily stir up the emotions or heart, but a means of participating in a past event with future (eschatological) benefits within the present rite.

Addai and Mari's commemoration, writes, T. Elavanal, "is not understood as a supplication for them [the fathers] but as a thanksgiving for them and an intercession through them."⁵⁹ The Church not only expresses its gratitude for the exemplary lives led by the holy fathers, but also invites them to share in the offering of praise, doxology, and the Holy Gifts. "We thank God for all that God has done for us through them, and it is together with them that we offer our oblation."⁶⁰ It is clear then that Addai and Mari does not dichotomize between the earthly and heavenly realms, but rather brings about a unification of both time and place through the anamnestic Intercessions.

⁵⁹ Elavanal, p. 209. It is obvious that Elavanal understands *anamnesis* as a 'bringing together of the past and present' when he remarks that the deceased and saintly fathers are also capable of *offering intercessions* for the Church. Through their commemoration, the fathers are projected as fervent intercessors for the Church within the eucharistic gathering, as they also assume their place within the Eucharist and together with the citizens of the earthly Kingdom, offer the oblation to God.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

This does not mean, however, that Addai and Mari's Intercessions do not necessarily petition God for particular requests. The prayers in AM for 'your tranquility and your peace', as well as for divine knowledge, are distinct petitions⁶¹ that are certainly made in the *context* of the eucharistic celebration, whereas in Byzantine-Basil the idea is that the intercessory prayers possess much efficacy since they are offered before the consecrated Holy Gifts, in which the divine presence (*Shekinah*) of the suffering and risen Christ abides. Put simply, the petitions in AM are capable of being secured through the communicant's *participation in the oblation of thanksgiving and holy communion*, whereas the petitions in Byz-BAS seem to be fulfilled by being *offered in the presence of the 'awesome sacrifice.'* Both positions are certainly not without their flaws, and one would again wonder why further petitions – aside from the one main consecratory petition – should be offered during the Eucharist in the first place. The eventual repositioning and transformation of the 'prayers of the faithful' from the Synaxis into the Eucharist, coupled with the development of St. Cyril's eucharistic theology, has created an intercessory section within most eucharistic prayers not without its share of problems.

In his *Catechetical Lecture* 5.8-10, St. Cyril of Jerusalem builds the foundation for his eucharistic theology surrounding the efficacy of prayer before the eucharistic sacrifice.⁶² He embarks upon an exegetical discussion of the healing of the paralytic in Capernaum (Mark 2.1-12) and the raising of Lazarus (Jn 11.1-44).

⁶¹ A striking parallel is found in an epistle of St. Clement, in which following the remembrance of the fathers, a prayer for 'concord and peace' is offered. The text reads as follows: "Grant concord and peace to us as well as to all the inhabitants of the earth, just as Thou didst grant it to our fathers when they piously called upon Thee in faith and truth." See J.A. Kleist, *The Epistle of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch* (Westminster, 1946), p. 46.

⁶² St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures* 5.8-10, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Volume 7. Eds. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Peabody, MA, 1994), p. 31.

In the first instance, Cyril describes how the *fervent faith and commitment of the four friends* who lowered the paralyzed man into the house enabled the latter to be saved from his infirmity. Cyril hazards the guess that the paralytic was not a believer (10.8) and yet the love and efforts of his companions helped to effect his healing.

Likewise, in the account of Lazarus, when the Lord asks where the dead man was laid to rest, the sister Martha's hesitation to answer ("Lord, already there is a stench because he has been dead four days", Jn 11.39) is countered by Christ's attempt to induce more faith in her: "Did I not tell you that if you believed, you would see the glory of God? (Jn 11.40). St. Cyril's point here is that the sisters' faith in the power of God could become effectual for their deceased brother by supplying for him the necessary faith that he understandably lacked. "Have then men by believing, the one on behalf of the other, been able to raise the dead, and shalt not thou, if thou believe sincerely on thine own behalf, be much rather profited?"⁶³ Thus, genuine faith that comes from another individual has the capability of working wonders for the person in need, despite the latter's spiritual disposition.⁶⁴

Cyril builds upon this premise in a later homily, *Catechetical Lecture 23*,⁶⁵ which is a description, in summary form, of the ancient Jerusalem liturgy of St. James for newly-baptized Christians who just attended their first Eucharist during Easter week in 348 AD. In his outline of the liturgy, he includes a section on the Intercessions (23.8-10):

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ It is not certain that St. Cyril is disregarding the importance of individual free will and thus advocating a slant toward predestination. The paralytic's malady, as well as Lazarus' untimely death, were certainly not desirable events. Yet, their faith in God at the time of their fall may have been diminished or simply not allowed to blossom. The supplementary faith, however, expressed by friends and family, allowed the grievous situation for the paralytic and Lazarus to be corrected, thus bringing joy and relief to everyone. Had Cyril been advocating a violation of free will, then the paralytic and Lazarus would have been saved in spite of their adamant refusal to be helped and their desire to remain in their misery.

Then, after the spiritual sacrifice (‘θυσία’), the bloodless service, is completed, over that sacrifice of propitiation we entreat God for the common peace of the Churches, for the welfare of the world; for kings; for soldiers and allies; for the sick; for the afflicted; and, in a word, for all who stand in need of succour we all pray and offer this sacrifice.

Then we commemorate also those who have fallen asleep before us, first Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, that at their prayers and intercessions God would receive our petition. Then on behalf also of the Holy Fathers and Bishops who have fallen asleep before us, and in a word of all who in past years have fallen asleep among us, believing that it will be a very great benefit to the souls, for which the supplication is put up, while that holy and most awful sacrifice is set forth.

And I wish to persuade you by an illustration. For I know that many say, what is a soul profited, which departs from this world either with sins, or without sins, if it be commemorated in the prayer? For if a king were to banish certain who had given him offence, and then those who belong to them should weave a crown and offer it to him on behalf of those under punishment, would he not grant a remission of their penalties? In the same way we, when we offer to Him our supplications for those who have fallen asleep, though they be sinners, weave no crown, but offer up Christ sacrificed for our sins, propitiating our merciful Father for them as well as for ourselves.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lecture* 23.1-23 = *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Volume 7, pp. 153-57.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* 23.8-10. A few comments on this excerpt must be made. First, many scholars have questioned whether a thanksgiving for creation, the Incarnation, and the Passion, a Narrative of Institution, and an Anamnesis clause, ever existed in the ancient Jerusalem rite, since Cyril leaves it out in his *Catechetical Lectures*, jumping from the *Sanctus* to the Epiklesis. Dix defends the position that St. Cyril’s intent is to offer a detailed *summary* of the eucharistic celebration for new Christians who are not too familiar with the rite, rather than a full exegesis of the liturgy. The Institution Narrative, as a didactic element pointing to the origin of the rite and as a constitutive element, was in all probability omitted because it was taken for granted. F.E. Brightman explains: St. Cyril “is only expounding the salient points of the rite, and for the purposes of his exposition the whole passage between the sanctus and the intercession would be a single paragraph with the form of invocation for its essential point” (LEW, p. 469, note 9). Also, Cyril’s characteristic use of ‘εἴτα’ (‘next’) is one of his habitual transitions in the work, pointing to the next major section of the rite rather than to the next detail within the section, which would create confusion. Dix writes: “He [Cyril] is going through the contents of the prayer for the benefit of those who have just attended the eucharist for the first time in their lives, for whom such skipping about would be quite unnecessarily confusing” (Dix, *Shape*, p. 198).

A second interesting point is that St. John Chrysostom also addresses the efficacy of prayer before the eucharistic sacrifice: “Not in vain was this rule ordained by the Apostles, that in the dread Mysteries remembrance should be made of the departed; for they knew that it is a great gain to them, and a great benefit” (see St. John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians* = *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Volume 12. Ed. Philip Schaff (Peabody, MA, 1994), Homily 41, pp. 249-54 *passim.*). It would certainly appear that as a contemporary of St. Cyril, Chrysostom was also influenced by the former’s eucharistic theology, as is also evident in his liturgy, where intercessions for the dead are offered following the consecration of the Holy Gifts.

Finally, in Cyril’s third paragraph quoted above, it almost sounds that God’s justified chastisement toward man is appeased through the awesome sacrifice of His Son. In speaking about the sacrificial oblation, Cyril is not insinuating necessarily that God, like an earthly king, can allow Himself to be coerced through the material gifts of others. Nothing so anthropomorphic! Instead, Cyril is attempting to prove that Christ’s voluntary sacrifice upon the Cross is relived by the Church in the eucharistic offering, and it is before the divine presence of Christ, manifested in the consecrated Gifts, that fervent prayer is offered by all the members of the Church for each other. Since Christ offered Himself voluntarily to the Father, there can be no place for coercion.

For St. Cyril then, the holy oblation offered at the Eucharist is likened to the sacrificed Lord at Golgotha, filled with the divine Presence (*Shekinah*) at the consecration, and before whom the Church offers prayers and supplications for the dead and living. Indeed, the Church's prayer to God is that in the abundance of His mercy and inasmuch as Christ voluntarily died for all of mankind, He will remember the needs of all people and grant them peace and salvation. The powerful account of the thief who confessed Christ and was crucified next to Him demonstrates the efficacy of prayer before the awesome sacrifice of the Son of God within human history. The Eucharist, which transcends the limitations of history, assures the efficacy of the prayer before the holy oblation at all times and in every place.

A second theological point of interest is the reference to the fathers and saints in both anaphoras. In Addai and Mari, the 'upright and just fathers' are invited to join the earthly Church in offering the Eucharist to God. On the contrary, Basil's anaphora recalls the saints (Mary, John the Baptist, *et al.*) to offer their intercessory prayers on behalf of the Church and its members before the 'awesome sacrifice.' Although each liturgy clearly acknowledges the significance of liturgical *anamnesis*, they differ in terms of how they understand the roles of the saintly individuals commemorated in the Intercessions.

This significant difference between AM and Byz-BAS apparently sheds light also upon their ecclesiological and hagiological idiosyncrasies. In Addai and Mari, the language of the anaphoral prayer does not seem to distinguish into two separate categories the saints from the 'children of the holy catholic church.' The 'upright and just fathers' are commemorated together with the living members of the Church who do not necessarily belong to an official diptych of miraculous saints. On the contrary, in

Byzantine-Basil, the dichotomy is far sharper, as Mary, St. John the Baptist, the saints of the day, and all the saints, are remembered as a separate group apart from the dead, who in turn are remembered as a separate group apart from the living.⁶⁷

A number of factors seem to account for this greater dichotomy in Byz-BAS between the saints and ordinary Christians. In the first century Church, Scripture points to the early practice of Christians addressing one another as 'saints', (*ἅγιοι*, from *ἀγι(ά)ζω*, 'I sanctify', 'I dedicate', 'I set aside'; cf. also the Hebrew *qdsh*, meaning 'separated for and by God', which is possibly the derivation of the Greek).⁶⁸ Individuals closest to the Apostles or Jesus Himself, as well as clergy and lay martyrs who suffered and were executed for their Christian faith, were given a special prominence within the Church. With the eventual cessation of the persecutions and the granting of religious freedom to the Church, Christians sought out other ways to holiness, one of which was through the ascetical disciplines of monasticism.⁶⁹ In time, the development of an ecclesiastical

⁶⁷ From a grammatical perspective, note that in Basil's Intercessions, the redactor has come to a full stop in the Basilian text after the commemoration of the saints, to indicate the beginning of a new series of prayers in the Intercessions (cf. Brightman's 'traditional' *Barberini* and 'modern' texts, pp. 331-32 and 406-07). In actuality though, the transitional "Ἐτι σοῦ δεόμεθα" ('Again we pray') between the commemorations of the dead and the living seems to make a more definitive distinction between the two sections. Perhaps the closer connection between the saints and the dead was a more ancient remnant preserved in AM but excised by the redactor of Byz-BAS.

In Addai and Mari, again from a grammatical perspective, the prayer flows in such a way that the saintly fathers, the three orders of clergy, and the laity – indeed, the entire Church in heaven and on earth – are included in the same sweeping thought. In AM's intercessory section, only two requests are made: (1) that God will remember the holy fathers and saints who join the earthly eucharistic community in prayer, in order that the people may reap through the spiritual benefits; and (2) for peace and tranquility to the end of the age. The general intent in AM is that 'all the children of the holy catholic church, who have been marked with the mark of holy baptism', whether alive or dead, whether sainted or not, may share together the spiritual benefits offered by God during their concelebration of the Eucharist.

⁶⁸ See Ioannis D. Stamatakos, *Λεξικὸν Ἀρχαίας Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης = Lexicon of the Ancient Greek Language* (Athens, 1972), p. 18.

⁶⁹ Truly, the influence of a free secular world upon the emancipated Church undoubtedly provided other 'interests' for these later Christians, who in all probability did not feel the immediacy of the Second Coming as intensely as their first century predecessors, whose daily struggle for survival in the fear of persecution instilled within them an 'otherworldly' focus. Religious freedom, on the contrary, also meant that many Christians chose not to fully dedicate themselves to the pursuit of holiness, certainly not to the extent that the ascetics and martyrs did. Yet, does one assume that their own personal pursuit of a life of holiness was less significant in the eyes of God than that of the canonized saints of the Church? Indeed, the

calendar and a canon of martyrs and ascetics meant the Church could now freely mark the anniversary of their earthly deaths by continuing the ancient practice of celebrating the Eucharist over their graves. Such special attention then set these saints apart from the rest of the Church membership, and this distinction appears to be reflected more clearly in Basil's anaphora than Addai and Mari. In fact, based upon the above premise surrounding the Intercessions, it may be deduced that AM's lack of a specific commemoration of saints as well as no particular reference to 'ascetics', would establish the date of the East Syrian anaphora well before the turn of the third century, predating the first Byzantine Christian Emperor Constantine and St. Anthony the Great.

Conclusion

The Intercessions within the eucharistic prayer are clearly the longest and most complicated section of both Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil. While the contents of the anaphoral Intercessions differ from liturgy to liturgy, their purpose is essentially twofold: (1) to include a commemoration of the righteous saints who are invited to participate in the eucharistic offering through their prayers; and (2) to offer supplication for the material and spiritual needs of the worshipers and the Church throughout the world.

The relationship between the Eucharist and actual intercessory prayers has long been a point of dispute among liturgical scholars. Why does the eucharistic prayer require petitions to be offered to God, when the only supplication seemingly made in the anaphora is for the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Holy Gifts and the people? Also, do not the spiritual benefits requested in the Epiklesis fulfill the intercessory requirements

Church was responsible for drawing this 'fine line' between what constituted a saint and what did not, and it would certainly appear that such a decision had to have been most difficult in many cases.

in the eucharistic prayer (AM), without making further supplication for material benefits and gifts (Byz-BAS)? Finally, why are the Intercessions inserted in such close proximity to the actual offering of bread and wine rather than at an earlier point in the prayer (just before the Epiklesis in AM and immediately after the Epiklesis in Byz-BAS)?

By examining the historical roots of the Intercessions, one finds that they originated as the ancient 'prayers for the faithful', which at one time constituted a portion of the Synaxis. In time, when the Synaxis and Eucharist became fused into one whole service, these intercessory prayers were eventually transferred into the anaphoral prayer and, in several liturgical traditions, completely removed from their original position or simply not verbalized during the celebration of the liturgy, in order to avoid repetition.

The original 'prayers of the faithful' were general prayers referring to various classes of people, without specifying names (the only names mentioned were those of the local bishop and Emperor). The congregation was expected to particularize silently those for whom they wished to pray at the collect at the end of the section. In time, a general feeling developed that at the intimate and smaller eucharistic gathering of the 'household of God', prayers would need to become more specific.

This sentiment led to the individual naming of the dead in eucharistic prayers offered in North Africa and Egypt (Sarapion), as well as in Palestine. Such commemorations were originally local in nature. St. Cyril of Jerusalem characteristically speaks about the efficacy of prayer for the dead before the 'awesome sacrifice.' In Jerusalem, the intercessory prayers for the dead are offered after the Epiklesis, which is their standard position also in Byz-BAS and Byz-CHR.

In like manner, the petitions for the living in the eucharistic prayer appear first in Spain in the early fourth century and later in Rome (fourth and fifth centuries). These commemorations, also local in scope, were typically offered before the Epiklesis but always within the context of the anaphora.

The Byzantines borrowed the practice of commemorating the living and the dead in their own development of the Diptychs, which consisted of a separate list of names for the living and dead, arranged according to 'ecclesiastical' and 'political' precedence (patriarchs and emperors first, and lower orders of clergy and secular leaders next, and finally, the common laity). The Diptychs involved an individual commemoration before the eucharistic sacrifice of past patriarchs and emperors of Constantinople, a prestigious honor that was very often immersed in political controversy upon the removal or addition of a name.

The specific commemoration of saints may have originated in Jerusalem and later spread to Rome via St. Augustine of Hippo. In Rome, the practice was to remember local saints and martyrs, whereas in Constantinople, the gradual development of an ecclesiastical calendar and a universal canon of saints saw a more 'international' listing.⁷⁰

In Addai and Mari's *Mar Esa'ya* text, the Intercessions appear before the Epiklesis prayer, but they do not make any apparent reference to a specific listing of living or dead persons, or to a canon of specific saints. Clearly, a memorial is offered for several saints (including mar Addai and mar Mari, 'the converters of this eastern region'⁷¹) and deceased persons, but this remembrance is made outside of the eucharistic

⁷⁰ Also, whereas Rome had several hundred martyrs dating from the pre-Constantinian era, Constantinople could only offer St. Mokios.

⁷¹ See F.E. Brightman, LEW, 'The Diptychs' under 'The Liturgy of the Nestorians,' p. 276 and, in general, pp. 275-81.

prayer itself. The simplicity then of the intercessory section in AM seems to prove that it predates these later developments of specific intercessory prayer.

Whereas Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil both understand the concept of liturgical *anamnesis* as the 're-presenting' or 're-calling' of a past event or person to share in the efficacy and power of the present act, their Intercessions seem to achieve a different theological purpose. In the East Syrian anaphora, the intent is chiefly anamnestic, in which the commemoration of the 'upright and just fathers' re-presents them as full participants within the eucharistic celebration, making their own offering of doxology and thanksgiving together with the living members of the Church. In Byz-BAS, the aim is mainly supplicatory, in which the commemoration of the saints secures their presence to petition God – before the holy oblation – to fulfill the manifold spiritual and worldly needs of the people.

This does not mean that the Intercessions of AM do not necessarily petition God for particular requests. The prayers for 'tranquility and peace', as well as for divine knowledge, are distinct petitions for spiritual benefits made *within the context* of the eucharistic offering itself. Why any petitions are offered within the context of the eucharistic prayer in the first place, aside from the traditional prayer of the Epiklesis, is avowedly odd, according to the available evidence of ancient eucharistic texts. Nonetheless, it behooves this study to seek an answer to this question by examining the transference of the 'prayers of the faithful' from the Synaxis into a position either preceding or following the eucharistic prayer.

In regard to the Intercessions of Byz-BAS, it is quite possible that the anaphora was influenced by the theological thought of St. Basil's contemporary, St. Cyril of

Jerusalem, whose views had presumably been shared by other mid-fourth century bishops. Cyril's characteristic understanding of the Eucharist as 'ἡ φοβικωδέστατος καὶ ἀναίμακτος θυσία' ('the most fearsome and unbloody sacrifice') defined the oblation of the consecrated Body and Blood of Christ not simply as the Church's offering to God, but also instilled with the divine presence of the risen Lord, before whom the Church confidently offers prayers for all its faithful. In his *Catechetical Lectures*, Cyril utilizes biblical examples to illustrate how the efficacy of prayer for the dead and helpless, when offered by others before the 'awesome sacrifice', can benefit such persons.

The commemoration of saints is another significant theological difference between the anaphoras. As previously mentioned, in AM the saints are invited to offer the Eucharist together with the earthly members of the Church. In Byz-BAS, the saints are not only the first for whom the sacrifice is offered, but they are also re-called to offer their intercessory prayers on behalf of the Church before the holy oblation. This distinction in the understanding of the role of the righteous saints perhaps indicates their unique positioning within the Intercessions of both anaphoras. Whereas in Addai and Mari the 'upright and just fathers' are listed together with the living members of the Church, who may not necessarily belong to a formal canon of saints, in Byz-BAS the dichotomy between the three categories of the saints, the dead, and the living is far more distinct. Certainly, various historical factors gradually influenced the eucharistic prayer in Byzantine-Basil to make such distinctions, but it seems that the prayer in the liturgy of Addai and Mari remained uncorrupted.

Chapter Ten The Doxology

Addai and Mari (AM) *The Doxology*

Priest: And for all your marvelous economy towards us we give you thanks and praise you without ceasing in your Church redeemed by the precious blood of your Christ, with open mouths and with uncovered faces.

(*qanona*) Lifting up praise and honor and confession and worship to your living and life-giving Name now and ever and world without end.

People: Amen.

Byzantine-Basil (Byz-BAS) *The Doxology*

Priest (aloud): And grant that with one voice and one heart we may glorify and praise Your most honored and majestic name, of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, now and forever and to the ages of ages.

People: Amen.

Opening Comments on the Concluding Doxology

The concluding Doxology, as its name implies, brings the eucharistic prayer to its completion and fulfillment. Structurally speaking, this subsection announces the close of the eucharistic prayer proper and is expectedly placed at the very end of the anaphoral section.¹

¹ Whereas in Addai and Mari the concluding Doxology follows the Epiklesis, in Byzantine-Basil it is located at the end of the Intercessions. Interestingly, modern scholarship claims that each concluding doxological statement fulfills a slightly different function, depending upon its specific position in the liturgy to which it corresponds. For example, in AM, the concluding Doxology summarizes the Church's thanksgiving and praise for the divine economy, effected through the sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross and the reception of communion by the faithful. In Byz-BAS, the Doxology appears like a 'prayer-conclusion' (Fenwick, p. 290) to the immediately preceding section of the Intercessions. In the case with Basil, there is no recapitulation of thanksgiving for the entire divine economy (as in AM) but rather a final petition (in a series of petitions from the preceding major section) for the glorification and praising of the Name, with the characteristic Byzantine trinitarian formula included. R.J. Ledogar does not acknowledge the Doxology in Basil as a doxology proper because it is missing an ascription of glory to God, although it includes a significant reference to the praising of the Name. See R.J. Ledogar, Acknowledgement: Praise Verbs in Early Greek Anaphoras Rome, 1968, p. 45.

Most Byzantine doxologies within the Divine Liturgy and other services seem to be extensions of the prayer they follow. Indeed, it is quite difficult to understand how these doxologies (alternatively labeled *ἐκφωνήσεις*, a rubrical term signifying the audible pronouncement of the Doxology, in comparison to the preceding priestly prayer that was recited by the celebrant to himself) can semantically stand on their own, with no reference to a preceding prayer. Was the Doxology at one time a more constitutive element of the prayer it concluded, so that both were recited audibly by the celebrant? Did later post-fourth century redactors, influenced by a strong sense of mysticism and clericalism, create this rubrical dichotomy between the prayer and its corresponding Doxology?

Therefore, the question, "What constitutes a liturgical doxology?", will always be answered differently when applied to different anaphoras. Is the concluding doxological statement in Byz-BAS a doxology

The eucharistic Doxology, according to J. Fenwick, and R. Ledogar,² became fixed at a very early date, but more important perhaps is the fact that it did so in a number of different forms. One of these forms, a full trinitarian Doxology, seems to be mentioned in a statement attributed to Patriarch Dionysios of Alexandria, included by Fenwick:

In consistency with all these arguments, we also, having of course received a formula and rule from the men of old before us, harmoniously with them, when we end our eucharistic prayer (προσευχᾶριστοῦντες) – and here we are formally instructing you – terminate it: ‘To God the Father, and to the Son our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Holy Spirit, glory and power for ever and ever. Amen.’³

In his comparative study between the major Basilian anaphoras and those of James, Fenwick identifies four doxological forms preserved in these liturgies. However, the exact relationship between them remains unclear.

An immediately observable difference between the doxologies of Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil is the former’s lack of a trinitarian formula, clear evidence of its pre-Nicene antiquity. However, both doxologies focus upon the praising of the Name, an ancient practice deeply rooted within the Semitic liturgy which Basil (or his redactors) apparently felt hesitant to remove.

The expression in AM ‘with open mouths and with uncovered faces’ also finds no counterpart in any of the Basilian recensions and appears to draw on two specific biblical references: namely, 2 Corinthians 3.18⁴ and Isaiah 6.2.⁵ The references are essentially eschatological in nature, the former focusing upon the gradual transformation of man into

because of the praising of the Name or the trinitarian formula? Is the Doxology in AM validated by its praising of the Name or the summarization of the divine economy expressed throughout the entire anaphora? Clearly, each of the aforementioned suggestions are valid for that particular anaphora. However, it does not seem that the common denominator underlying *all* liturgies is that the concluding Doxology terminates the eucharistic prayer and ushers in the final section on the communion of the faithful.

² R.J. Ledogar, p. 47.

³ Fenwick, p. 290. Here, Fenwick is quoting directly from R.P.C. Hanson, “The Liberty of the Bishop to Improvise Prayer in the Eucharist”, in *Vigiliae Christianae* 15 (1961) 173-76.

⁴ The NRSV text reads: “And all of us, with unveiled faces, seeing the glory of the Lord . . . are being transformed.”

God's very image 'from one degree of glory to another' (a familiar phrase from the writings of St. Gregory of Nyssa), and the latter describing the awe felt by the seraphim who cover their faces in the presence of their Creator. The image of 'open mouths' further reflects this expression of deep reverence that the Church feels as it experiences the sublime presence of Christ in the midst of the congregation and anticipates the *Parousia* which will usher in the end of history. Finally, the imagery of 'open mouths and uncovered faces' offers a fascinating conclusion to a liturgy otherwise preoccupied with the angelic world, by raising a redeemed mankind, characterized as 'lowly, weak, and miserable', to a level of unrestricted and open doxology before God.

A Structural Examination of the Doxologies in AM and Byz-BAS

It is generally accepted that the concluding statement of praise and thanksgiving in Addai and Mari is not the only doxology one encounters in the anaphora. Another doxology, worthy of comparison to the final one, appears at the end of the *Postsanctus*. One may remember from Chapter Six of this thesis that if AM is separated into its bipartite structure, this particular doxology after the *Postsanctus* apparently concludes the 'verbal offering' of thanksgiving, prominent in the first part of the anaphora, and introduces the 'material Eucharist', which focuses upon the elements of bread and wine in the second part.

The structure and contents of both doxologies in AM are quite similar, the major difference being the replacement of the first doxology's 'all your benefits and graces' with the final one's 'your marvelous economy', which summarizes Christ's overall work of salvation which the Eucharist re-presents for the Church.

⁵ The NRSV text reads: "Seraphs were in attendance above him [God]; each had six wings: with two they covered their faces. . . ."

AM and Maronite *Sharar* have additional matter peculiar to themselves. In AM, the core word ‘economy’⁶ is prefaced by the adjectives ‘all’ and ‘marvelous’, whereas *Sharar* simply has ‘glorious’ (a variant in two Addai and Mari MSS).⁷ Other additional material between both anaphoras is probably secondary.

The two lines in the concluding Doxology of AM, ‘we give you thanks and praise you without ceasing’ and ‘lifting up praise and honor and confession and worship’, broadly correspond to the *Postsanctus qanona* ‘we offer you glory and honor and thanksgiving and adoration.’ In Byz-BAS, the counterpart is ‘we may glorify and praise.’ A significant point of comparison here is AM’s inclusion of the four objects of doxology, preceded by the two finite verbs ‘we give thanks’ and ‘we praise.’ While the Basilian anaphora retains the verbs ‘δοξάζειν’ and ‘ἀνυμνεῖν’, it does not include the traditional East Syrian enumeration of the objects (it supplants this enumeration with its own characteristic trinitarian formula).

The element of united worship between angelic and human beings highlights not only the *Postsanctus qanona* but also the concluding Doxology. The parallel expressions in both sections (glory/praise – honor/honor – thanksgiving/confession – adoration/worship) were probably inspired, according to Gelston,⁸ from the passage in Revelation 4.8,9, which refers to the heavenly worship of the angelic creatures: “The four

⁶ A. Gelston translates the Syriac term as ‘dispensation’, but B. Spinks prefers the hellenized rendering *οἰκονομία*. It appears the differing translations are a product of personal scholarly preference.

Interestingly though, Gelston appears to prefer ‘economy’, writing that the Syriac term “is used to render the Greek *οἰκονομία*, particularly in its technical sense in relation to Christ’s incarnate life and redeeming work. As such”, he continues, “it is a specially appropriate term to use here with reference back to the enumeration of the passion, death, and resurrection of Christ” (Gelston, *Eucharistic Prayer*, pp. 113-14). However, he justifies his use of ‘dispensation’ by claiming that the doxological summary in AM may also have sought to include the overall divine providence and purpose of the Holy Trinity, certainly with special emphasis upon the redemptive *οἰκονομία* particular only to Christ.

⁷ Gelston, p. 113.

⁸ Ibid. p. 114.

living creatures, each having six wings [an allusion perhaps to Isaiah 6.2 and Ezekiel 1.5,21] . . . give glory and honor and thanks to Him who sits on the throne, who lives forever and ever.” The Doxology’s likely reference to the worship of the angels, when attached to the pronoun ‘we’ (‘we give you thanks and praise you’), seems to imply a collective expression of doxology encompassing both the heavenly and earthly worlds, a concept all too familiar within Addai and Mari.

Sharar’s more succinct Doxology ‘we give you thanks’, together with the addendum ‘we your sinful servants’, parallels the beginning of AM’s *Postsanctus* and “represents a reduced emphasis on praise and thanksgiving, which the whole structure of the doxology suggests is primary to it as to the anaphora as a whole.”⁹

The lines in AM’s final Doxology, ‘in your Church redeemed by the precious blood of your Christ, with open mouths and with uncovered faces’, have no apparent counterpart in the earlier doxology. However, this reference to ‘your Church’ interestingly appears in only one of the Basil anaphoras; namely, E-BAS: ‘Πατήρ ἐν Υἱῷ, Υἱὸς ἐν Πατρὶ, σὺν Ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι, ἐν τῇ ἀγίᾳ καὶ μόνῃ καὶ καθολικῇ σου Ἐκκλησίᾳ’ (‘the Father in the Son, the Son in the Father, with the Holy Spirit, in Your holy and one catholic Church’).¹⁰ It also appears in Hippolytus’ *Apostolic Tradition* (AT): ‘ut te laudemus et glorificemus . . . cum Sancto Spiritu in sancta Ecclesia tua.’¹¹ *Sharar’s* reference to the propitiatory ‘altar’, absent in AM, E-BAS, and AT, appears to be a Maronite peculiarity. Gelston associates the ancient liturgical expression ‘in your

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Fenwick, see comparative charts on pp. 286-89. The adjectives ‘holy’, ‘one’, and ‘catholic’ in E-BAS appear to be another example of Byzantine expansion within a non-Byzantine liturgy. In fact, it is interesting to note that the same three terms are used in the Nicene Creed in the concluding article on the Church. On the contrary, Hippolytus maintains the simpler ‘in your holy Church’, thus preserving a seemingly earlier rendition.

¹¹ Ibid. p. 291.

Church' to the passage in Ephesians 3.21 ("to him be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus to all generations, forever and ever. Amen."), "where it also occurs in a doxological context, and probably represents the original common core."¹²

Addai and Mari's reading of 'redeemed by the precious blood of your Christ' differs in two major respects from *Sharar's* 'redeemed by your innocent blood.' First, the Maronite anaphora substitutes 'innocent' for 'precious' when referring to the blood of Christ, and second, *Sharar's* second person rendering 'your innocent blood' differs from AM's third person 'of your Christ.' This wording maintains the consistency of address within each liturgy (AM is predominantly addressed to the Father; *Sharar* exclusively to the Son). Gelston assumes an allusion here to 1 Peter 1.18-19, to which AM appears to be verbally closer by virtue of the adjective 'precious.'¹³ Interestingly, in Byz-BAS, 'τίμιον' is used only in the Epiklesis, when referring specifically to the 'Body' and 'Blood' of Christ. It could possibly be that Basil here is also drawing upon the Petrine passage, like Addai and Mari. However, it is also true that both eucharistic prayers of AM (for the most part) and Basil are directed to the Father, and the adjective 'precious', in referring to the Body and Blood of Christ, seems to affirm this third person orientation.

Gelston carefully points out that "there is no direct biblical precedent for the description of the Church as redeemed by the blood of Christ."¹⁴ However, in the

¹² Gelston, p. 115. If this is the case, namely, that the original core of the concluding Doxology in most anaphoras is represented in the Ephesians passage, then it is possible that a common thread linking the doxologies of AM and Basil also runs through the E-BAS version, despite the added trinitarian material in the latter ('the Father in the Son, the Son in the Father, with the Holy Spirit').

¹³ Gelston, p. 115. The NRSV translation of 1 Peter 1.18-19 reads as follows: "You know that you were ransomed from the futile ways inherited from your ancestors, not with perishable things like silver or gold, but with the *precious blood* (τιμίῳ αἵματι) of Christ, like that of a lamb without defect or blemish."

¹⁴ Ibid. Instead, Gelston advocates the possibility of a conflation of 1 Peter 1.18-19 and Acts 20.28 ('Keep watch ... to shepherd the church of God that he obtained with the blood of his own Son.')

conflation of the two scriptural passages, AM still appears to preserve the common primitive form more accurately than *Sharar*.

As previously mentioned, the reference to 'your Name' as the object of worship is a common element in Addai and Mari and clearly reflects Judaic influence. Its third and final appearance in the concluding Doxology of AM follows two other occurrences, namely, one in the Preface (which is oddly combined with a trinitarian formula) and the other in the *Presanctus*. The adjectives referring to the Name, 'living and life-giving',¹⁵ are probably expansions to the original core.

The ending 'now and ever and world without end' is comparable to Basil's 'now and forever and to the ages of ages' and seems to be a concluding formula common in virtually all anaphoras. The phrase 'world without end' appears in Sarapion of Thmuis and Hippolytus of Rome (the formula in *Apostolic Tradition* is identical to AM), and seems to preserve the more ancient reading. Both AM and Basil's concluding formula possess an eschatological orientation, namely, that the praise of God may continue ceaselessly in every age within history and beyond the end of time.

In general, writes Gelston, "The overall impression resulting from a comparison of [AM's final Doxology] with the parallel material in *Sharar* is that the text of Addai and Mari is more primitive in both order and content, and that *Sharar* shows signs of rearrangement of some of the material."¹⁶

¹⁵ Gelston includes 'holy' in his translation, but does mention that it is secondary and thus presumably not part of the *Mar Esa'ya* text. However, he does not discount the term primitive in itself, "with its echoes of the Lord's Prayer and the Jewish Kaddish" (Gelston, p. 116).

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

Among the various Basilian doxologies, Fenwick believes that the version in ES-BAS is probably the most ancient.¹⁷ His claim is rather significant, given the close relationship between the concluding Doxology of AM and Hippolytus' AT, which he compares directly with ES-BAS.

ES-BAS

διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, Πατὴρ ἐν Υἱῷ, Υἱὸς ἐν Πατρὶ], σὺν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἀγίᾳ καὶ μόνῃ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὡςπερ ἦν καὶ ἐστίν.

AT

ut te laudemus et glorificemus per puerum tuum Iesum Christum [per quem tibi gloria et honor Patri et Filio], cum Sancto Spiritu in sancta Ecclesia tua et nunc et in saecula saeculorum.¹⁸

If the words within brackets are regarded as a later trinitarian embolism and hypothetically removed, then the parallel between both texts is impressively close and would seem to preserve an ancient Doxology, similar to the one in Addai and Mari. The origins of the trinitarian embolism 'Father in the Son . . .', common in ES-BAS and partially in AT, seems to occur in four doxologies, all of which find their origin in Egypt.¹⁹ Although scriptural points of contact may be cited (Matthew 11 and John 17), it still lacks verbal identity. Fenwick concludes that if the trinitarian embolism (which he remarks is not a 'full-blown' one because of the partial 'σὺν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι') is in fact an 'Egyptianism', then it probably dates from as early as the fourth century and bears some connection to St. Basil's own dogmatic writings.

As already discussed, the concluding statement in the eucharistic prayer of Byz-BAS is not an actual doxology *per se*, but as Fenwick observes, "the final petition of the Intercessions, asking for a single heart and mouth to praise the name of God."²⁰ The

¹⁷ Fenwick, p. 290. Fenwick also proposes that the original Sahidic Doxology was itself replaced by a later Egyptian form, although he is not clear if the earliest version was the Ur-Basil text.

¹⁸ Ibid. p. 291.

¹⁹ A. Raes, *Nouveau*, p. 44.

²⁰ Fenwick, p. 292.

petition just prior to this one also asks, 'Grant us Your peace and love, Lord our God, for You have given all things to us.'

Fenwick provides an interesting theory about the origins of the 'praising of the Name' embolism in Byz-BAS. He believes that the concept of the 'Name' was at some point in time transferred from the introduction to the Lord's Prayer, located later in the liturgy, to the concluding Doxology of the eucharistic prayer.²¹ He bases his argument on the appearance of the phrase 'ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος' ('of/with one mouth') in the introduction of the Lord's Prayer in ES-BAS. Furthermore, the redactor of Byz-BAS had apparently adopted the Syrian Doxology but retained some of his own elements. The absence today of the 'one mouth' expression in the introductory verses to the Lord's Prayer in Syr-BAS and Byz-BAS would validate Fenwick's position, although he himself does not rule out the possibility of independent derivation from Romans 15.6 ("... so that together you may with one voice glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ").

While the trinitarian formula in Byz-BAS is clearly the most developed of all the Basil versions, the members of the Ω family agree in closing the Doxology with the eschatological 'now and forever and to the ages of ages.' AT's identical conclusion seems to qualify Byz-BAS' ending as also ancient, while ES-BAS may have possibly lost the phrase and replaced it by its current ending. Fenwick suggests that this dissimilar ending in ES-BAS may be attributed to the fact that because the early MSS of ES-BAS do not contain congregational responses, the anaphora's peculiar ending was part of the text recited solely by the celebrant. The final four words 'ὡςπερ ἦν καὶ ἐστίν' ('as it was and is/let be'), may have been the response of the congregation that simply was assumed into the celebrant's text.

The Theological Significance of the Doxology in AM and Byz-BAS

Since some theological matter has already been briefly mentioned in the preceding section on the structure of the two doxologies, as well as discussed extensively in previous chapters, it would be redundant to expound upon these ideas again. Hence, only two theological aspects pertinent to the concluding doxologies of Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil will be examined: (1) doxology as a succinct summary of the Church's gratitude for the Lord's sacrifice and Eucharist; and (2) the eschatological and eternal dimension of this eucharistic expression. T. Elavanal affirms these two aspects in his examination of doxology in AM when he writes: "Two elements form the criteria necessary for the doxology: the proclamation of God's praise and the affirmation of His infinity in time."²²

The concluding Doxology, as already stated, is the natural expected ending common to every eucharistic prayer. The early Church's expression of thanksgiving to God within the anaphora and at the end of the eucharistic prayer was plainly borrowed from the Jewish liturgy.²³ Revelation 7.12 is perhaps the best example of a liturgical doxology from the New Testament that may have been used to close a particular eucharistic celebration.²⁴

The placement of the Doxology at the end of the anaphora in Addai and Mari and Basil recaps the Church's celebratory *ethos* and mindset. It reminds the worshipers that

²¹ Ibid. p. 293.

²² T. Elavanal, Memorial Celebration, p. 116.

²³ Jewish benedictions and prayers of blessings in the Old Testament often began with a call to praise God, and they concluded with the congregational 'Amen' or the more complex doxology (e.g. Ps 41.13; 72.19). Elavanal adds, "In Jewish benedictions, particular stress was laid on the closing formula" (Ibid. p. 117).

²⁴ The biblical text reads: "Blessing and glory and wisdom, thanksgiving and honor and power and might, be to our God forever and ever. Amen." G. Dix affirms that early eucharistic prayers were verbalized differently by bishops, but that all the celebrants had to abide by certain structural rules. The Doxology was a necessary element in the overall makeup of the Christian eucharistic prayer.

their offering of praise and thanksgiving, expressed in hymns and prayers, and their offering of the elements of bread and wine, are all a significant part of their worship to God, which is summarized in the act of glorification. In addition, one may even propose that when the Church obediently fulfills its Master's command to 'do this in remembrance of Me', this act of 'humility and servitude' becomes man's own participation in the exaltation of God. The Parable of the Two Sons (Mt 21.28-32) is most applicable here, since the humble fulfillment of the father's will became the crown of glory for the reluctant son who nonetheless acted in the father's favor.

Not unlike the Jewish liturgy, the Christian Doxology that concludes the anaphora reinforces the opening benediction of praise and thanksgiving found in the Preface of both AM and Byz-BAS. This opening and concluding expression of glory to God is most significant in any celebration of the Eucharist, insofar as it presents the liturgy of the Church as a true *eucharistia*, or thanksgiving, from its *enarxis* to its *telos*. God is to be glorified at the inception of any divine work, and He is to be glorified when this labor has been brought to fulfillment.

For the faithful worshiper then, the eucharistic liturgy sets a concrete model to be emulated within the often-called 'liturgy after the Liturgy', whereby the glorification and praise of God becomes the ultimate *skopos* of a Christian's entire life. Thus, the inspiration toward living a genuine life of holiness will not only be limited to the Sunday (or weekday) worship experience, but will hopefully extend its influence consistently throughout the week and permanently throughout life.

A second important theological element in the eucharistic Doxology is its eternal and eschatological dimension. Addai and Mari's 'now and ever and world without end'

and Byz-BAS' 'now and forever and to the ages of ages' carry the glorification of God from the present moment within time until the consummation of time and beyond. The eucharistic liturgy is a unified celebration of earthly and heavenly beings who glorify God ceaselessly for the redemption and sanctification and recreation of human existence through the sacrifice of Christ.²⁵

Quite clearly, the Eucharist occurs in the 'here and now', drawing upon historical events from the past and looking toward the fulfillment of the *Parousia* in the future. In the Eucharist, time becomes a single reality, a single mode of existence, whereby the living Lord has come, is coming, and will come to His Church.²⁶ Since Christ then is forever acting within the life of His Church, within and without time, His followers likewise offer up ceaseless praise to God, which also spans the limits of time and beyond. Since God acts now, the Church glorifies God now; and since God will continue to act forever, so too will the Church offer up its praise and thanksgiving to Him 'to the ages of ages.' God's continuous involvement in man's existence and in his salvation, expressed so fully within the celebration of the Christian Eucharist, is reason enough for man to glorify God 'forever and ever.'

The earthly liturgy mirrors heavenly worship in all its aspects, and the verbalization of the concluding Doxology at the end of the eucharistic prayer reinforces the need for the Church to participate eternally in the angelic offering of praise and

²⁵ With regard to the concluding Doxology in AM, G. Dix summarizes the reason for the Church's gratitude toward God: "In *Addai and Mari*, the world *has been* 're-created' by the precious Blood, and the Kingdom *has been* established; the communicants are within it even in this world and they already bless and magnify 'the living and life-giving Name' of Jesus for evermore in 'new life in the kingdom of heaven with' all the saints, for the great and marvellous [*sic.*] dispensation' of redemption" (Dix, *Shape*, p. 186; emphasis author's).

²⁶ Elavanal's clever iconostatic image of the celebration of the present Eucharist (holy doors), uniting the historical incarnation of Christ (icon of the Virgin with Child) with His future *Parousia* (icon of Christ

thanksgiving. The Church's consent to this eternal doxology, which it experiences within the Eucharist, is summarized by the congregational response 'Amen.'²⁷ Dix writes about this ancient biblical term's relevance for the Christian liturgy:

As the conclusion of the doxology which closed the eucharistic prayer with the proclamation of the revealed majesty of One God in Three Persons, it prolonged and endorsed the tremendous affirmation 'unto all ages of ages' (or as we customarily translate it 'world without end') with an echo of the timeless worship of heaven.²⁸

In closing, the Doxology's prime importance for the eucharistic prayer is quite apparent, both in its ability to prayerfully summarize the Church's expression of gratitude for the Lord's sacrifice and redemption of the created world, as well as to identify the eternal significance of this expression of thanksgiving. Elavanal perhaps puts it best when he writes: "Doxologies can be considered as the highest kind of prayers, for they contain all the elements of praise, confession, thanksgiving and worship of God."²⁹

Conclusion

As already discussed, the concluding Doxology brings the eucharistic prayer to its completion and fulfillment. Both Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil include in their doxologies a praising of the Name, an ancient liturgical element rooted in Judaic worship and a common denominator between the two anaphoras. Although AM lacks Basil's later trinitarian formula, it nonetheless shares a similar version of the eschatological ending 'now and forever and to the ages of ages/and world without end.' In Byz-BAS, the Doxology appears like a 'prayer-conclusion' to the immediately preceding section of the

enthroned in judgment), and based upon E. Schillebeeckx' *Maranatha* characterization' of Christian worship (see Chapter 8, note 55), vivifies how the Eucharist transforms time into a single unifying reality.

²⁷ Dix observes that the early Jewish Christians, cognizant of the Hebrew term's depth of meaning and comfortable with its intended liturgical use within the Jewish liturgy, often avoided translating 'Amen' into the comparable Greek Septuagint rendering *γένοιτο* ('would that it were so') or *ἀληθινῶς* ('truly'; 'what is not false'). For them, the connotation derived from the Lord's own "'Amen I say unto you' the truth of God" remained the best rendition (Dix, *Shape*, p. 130).

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Elavanal, p. 117.

Intercessions (one more request in the long series of petitions), while in AM, the Doxology expressly summarizes the Church's thanksgiving and praise for the divine economy through the Passion, Crucifixion, and Resurrection, and by the reception of Communion by the faithful.

The two doxologies in Addai and Mari (which correspond cleanly to the anaphora's suggested bipartite structure) evidently follow two distinct offerings: (1) the offering of praise and thanksgiving, at the conclusion of the *Postsanctus*; and (2) the offering of the elements of bread and wine, after the Epiklesis. Basil's single Doxology occurs at the end of the prayer, and aside from its 'supplicatory nature', seems to combine the offering of praise and the Holy Gifts as one complete unit.

In conclusion, the doxologies in both anaphoras can be seen as theologically significant, insofar as they summarize the Church's gratitude for the Lord's sacrifice and institution of the Eucharist. In this regard, the Doxology may be thought of as a 'mini-Eucharist' in the strict sense of the word, offering glory and thanks to the Name of God for all the blessings He has bestowed upon His Church.

In addition, liturgical doxology possesses eternal dimensions as well. When the Church offers doxology to the Holy Trinity, heavenly and earthly beings join voices to sing the praises of God. In the Eucharist, time becomes a single reality, whereby the eternal Christ, who has acted in the past and will act in the future, acts in the 'here and now.' Thus, since Christ is forever active in the life of His Church, so too is the Church forever lifting up its voice to glorify Him 'to the ages of ages.'

Conclusion

The celebration of the Eucharist has traditionally held central importance within the life of the Christian Church. Throughout history, various liturgical traditions from all over the world have given expression to Christ's mandate spoken at the Last Supper, to "do this in remembrance of Me."

Since then, churches in both the East and West have expanded Christ's words and Gregory Dix's suggested 'four-action rubric' ('took bread – blessed it – broke it – gave it') to include a series of meaningful prayers and symbolic actions that reflect the human response to the divine initiative. In other words, through his participation in the eucharistic celebration, man gives form (in a sense, his own 'flesh') to the skeletal outline of the first Eucharist as instituted by Christ.

The Eucharist furthermore becomes a 'dialogue' between God and mankind: God expressing His love for man through the consecration and offering of the bread and wine; and man expressing his gratitude toward God for His divine *oikonomia*, re-presented and relived in the eucharistic celebration.

Purpose of the Eucharist: Praise or Consecration?

This comparative study between the East Syrian anaphora of Addai and Mari and the Byzantine eucharistic prayer of St. Basil raises a fundamental yet challenging question for all students of liturgy, encountered already numerous times in this thesis. What is the primary purpose of the eucharistic celebration? Is it the Church's collective praise of God, or is it the consecration of the elements and, through them, the sanctification of the faithful? When compared to each other, as well as against the backdrop of other earlier or contemporary liturgies, both AM and Byz-BAS indicate that

the acts of praise and consecration are equally necessary and mutually dependent on the other. The Church thus presents both a verbal and material offering to God, in which man fulfills his doxological mission through obedience to the dominical command at the Last Supper, to likewise offer the Eucharist and commune from the Holy Gifts.

Modern liturgical discussions on the Eucharist, however, often seem to revolve around the consecration of the elements themselves. Later theological trends (in predominantly the Latin West) focused primarily on a 'moment of consecration' and certainly the 'means' by which this consecration occurred. As a result, the eucharistic celebration has gradually come to lose its fundamental significance as the 'mutual expression of love' between God and man through Christ's own offering of Himself in the Holy Gifts and the faithful's own words of praise and gratitude. Interestingly, in many places today, the celebration is still only referred to as a 'liturgy' or 'service', rather than the 'Eucharist', the collective expression of thanksgiving rendered by the Church to its Lord.

As mentioned, this preoccupation with the consecration of the Gifts has seemingly eclipsed – or at least dimmed – the significance of praise and thanksgiving within the eucharistic celebration. Even though the latter are still an obvious part of the eucharistic prayer, the movement within the prayer, especially in later traditions, is toward the consecration and distribution of Holy Communion. Hence, according to this understanding, the *consecratory Epiclesis itself* hallows the elements, through which the communicants themselves are in turn sanctified. For the primitive Church, it was the *entire rite of the Eucharist* that effected the consecration of the worshipers through their

verbal and sacramental participation in the Eucharist. The difference is quite significant and would merit further comment at this point.

“It was alien to the early eucharistic theology to pin down the consecration to a momentary action or to a particular set of words.”¹ The early Church regarded Christ’s Words of Institution at the Last Supper not as consecratory in nature, but as contextual and authoritative. As explained earlier in this thesis, the Narrative of Institution expresses the divine authorization given to the Church by its Master to fulfill the eucharistic celebration following His death and resurrection. As W.C. Bishop writes, “The words of institution were not recited as of themselves effecting the consecration, but rather as the authority in obedience to which the rite is performed.”²

Rather than regarding an actual ‘moment’ or section of the eucharistic prayer that effected the consecration, the early Church acknowledged that full participation within the eucharistic rite was an act of consecration in itself, both for the ‘holy gifts and the holy people of God.’³ “For the early fathers of the Church,” remarks Elavanal, “the whole eucharistic prayer was an epiclesis and a consecration prayer. Generally they explain the eucharistic prayer as a single consecratory form.”⁴

Identifying a particular ‘moment of consecration’ in the liturgy has customarily been understood as the product of Western Scholasticism seeking a logical explanation for the inexplicable. For the early Church, the eucharistic celebration had several critical ‘*moments* of consecration’, each of them absolutely necessary and interdependent which

¹ T. Elavanal, The Memorial Celebration: A Theological Study of the Anaphora of the Apostles Mar Addai and Mari (Kerala, 1989), p. 216.

² W.C. Bishop, “The Primitive Form of Consecration of the Holy Eucharist”, in Church Quarterly Review 66 (1908) 392.

³ The Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. Trans. Faculty of Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology (Brookline, 1985), p. 28.

⁴ Elavanal, p. 217.

contributed to the sanctification of the clergy and laity. C.C. Richardson best expresses this concept when he writes:

No single phrase consecrated by itself, for consecrating was not a simple but a complex sacred action. It involved the giving of thanks, doing what the Lord had done, making the 'antitype' of His body and blood, offering the bread and the cup, and hallowing the elements. Indeed, the early liturgies are characterized not so much by a moment as a *movement* of consecration.⁵

Hence, consecration becomes a progressive action fulfilled over time and not as the product of a particular formula. As St. Nicholas Cabasilas also points out, the eucharistic consecration is effected not because of the words spoken by the celebrant, but because the faithful fulfill the will of Christ, doing what He commanded.⁶

In this light then, liturgical worship encompasses more than a series of interdependent words and actions: it is clearly the doxological expression of the earthly and heavenly Church toward the Creator and Benefactor of all, through the verbal offering of praise and the material sacrifice of bread and wine. Both acts are products of the Christian community's conscious decision to sacrifice a portion of their time, livelihood, or energy, to honor and thank the Lord for these (and other) gifts of stewardship. And this 'rational worship' (*λογικὴ λατρεία*) is valid by virtue of the obedience manifested by the Church toward Christ, by fulfilling His holy will in the celebration of the Eucharist.

Final Conclusions

This comparative study has certainly identified several structural and theological distinctions between Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil, which reflect two very

⁵ C.C. Richardson, "The So-Called Epiclesis in Hippolytus", in *Harvard Theological Review* 40 (1947) 108.

⁶ See St. Nicholas Cabasilas, *A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy*. Trans. J.M. Hussey and P.A. McNulty (London, 1960), pp. 71-76. He also refers to St. John Chrysostom's position, namely, that Christ's words 'This is My Body' are always effective as is the divine command 'Increase and multiply' (Gen 1.22), so

different background settings altogether. Nonetheless, one must never lose sight of the fact that both texts are equally valuable inasmuch as they are representative of the earliest eucharistic witness from Apostolic times. As already mentioned, both anaphoras fulfill a specific purpose, which is to give human expression to Christ's mandate to offer the Eucharist and by expanding, in ceremonial word and rubric, His Words of Institution. Furthermore, both liturgies offer to the Christian communities that celebrate them a unique opportunity to worship in a manner which reflects the peculiar idiosyncrasies (theologies, traditions, and mindsets) of the people from each region.

Immersed in a predominantly semitic culture and possessing a eucharistic prayer addressed in part to the Son, Addai and Mari's distinctive simplicity and succinctness offer proof of an ancient liturgy where praise and thanksgiving to God are the primary goals. "The whole anaphora is primarily a praise of the Name of God. In response to this praise the Spirit of the Lord is asked to come and bless us through blessing the oblation of the Church."⁷ This implies a personal relationship between two beings (God and man) and the expression of mutual love and reverence between them. Within the context of the Eucharist, this relationship is realized and nurtured by means of a monologue (the eucharistic prayer), to which God responds through the consecration of the Gifts and the people. St. Basil's Byzantine text attempts to retain this same spirit, albeit in a far more enhanced and expanded language than its East Syrian counterpart.

Byzantine-Basil's descriptive phraseology and more complex theological expressions, often marked with philosophical concepts and ideas of a predominantly hellenized world, are products of a post-Nicene era, when the Church began taking a

long as the people cooperate with the divine will and fulfill it. In like manner, the eucharistic consecration itself is effectual when the will of Christ to 'do this in remembrance of Me' is accomplished.

more active role in the secular world and felt the need to combat heresy through the formulation and propagation of Christian doctrine. Implied in Basil's inclusion of extra-ecclesiastical personalities and political authorities, as well as the poor and needy in society, is a respect for the created world and the Church's ardent hope in its transformation and salvation, concepts not so readily visualized in Addai and Mari.

Once again, this by no means suggests that the anaphora of St. Basil has lost its eschatological orientation, nor that Addai and Mari is necessarily exclusive of non-Christians in its prayer for the world. It simply indicates the former liturgy's open embrace of the fallen world Christ came to save by meeting the people's material and spiritual needs together. In the case of Addai and Mari, the Church beseeches God for the enlightenment of those who live in spiritual darkness, beyond the knowledge of Christ, 'that all the inhabitants of the earth may know that you alone are God, the true Father, and you have sent our Lord Jesus Christ.' In other words, whereas the East Syrian rite seeks to transform the world through the bestowal of divine enlightenment and wisdom upon those who do and do not belong to Christ, the Byzantine anaphora sees God's fulfillment of material and spiritual needs together in the lives of all people as an indication of His involvement and continued interest in the affairs of history and the plight of His creation. The emphasis is slightly different, but the concern for the salvation and transformation of God's created world and His people is identical.

Despite the anaphoras' individual peculiarities, both have mutually influenced each other's development throughout history. St. Basil's extensive travels to the East, especially to Palestine, Syria, and Mesopotamia, suggest that he personally came into contact with East Syrian liturgical traditions preserved in such eucharistic prayers as

⁷ Elavanal, p. 219.

Addai and Mari. Furthermore, Basil not only borrowed elements from the Oriental churches, but likewise shared with them concepts and ideas reflected in his own celebration and understanding of the Greek liturgy in Cappadocia. Hence, one form of mutual influence may be characterized as direct.

Byzantine-Basil belongs to a larger family of hellenized anaphoras (labeled Ω -BAS), attributed to the Cappadocian father himself or to a redactor within his liturgical tradition. In addition, there exists the apparently older Coptic family of Basilian anaphoras (known as E-BAS), which share many similarities with the East Syrian prayer of Addai and Mari, as well as with Byz-BAS. Both Greek and Egyptian versions are in turn believed to be recensions of an earlier prototype called Ur-BAS, with the simpler and more succinct E-BAS group being the better preserver of the original. Thus, in comparing AM with Byz-BAS, one often finds the need to consult Egyptian-Basil, which serves almost as a connecting link between the aforementioned two rites and through which each liturgy has also shaped the other.

Another indirect way in which Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil have mutually influenced each other is through the existence of the 'hellenized' East Syrian anaphoras of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius, which share several common elements with the Cappadocian rite. Furthermore, the Maronite liturgy *Sharar*, whose text is strikingly similar to AM and in some aspects with Byz-BAS, provides yet another link between the two eucharistic prayers.

History has shown that despite Edessa's geographical seclusion from the West and its conservative liturgical stance within an overwhelmingly oriental culture, its status as an important cosmopolitan center for both the Roman and Byzantine Empires clearly

facilitated the influx of various other liturgical traditions from the West, one of which was undoubtedly the popular Byzantine prayer of St. Basil. Also, the Byzantine Empire's extensive political outreach campaign, its widespread missionary efforts, and its fast-developing trinitarian theology, christology, and pneumatology was destined inevitably to bring both liturgical worlds together, raising interest on both sides about the other's traditions, in which the flow of influence was inevitable and mutual.

In closing, the Eucharist is the sublime expression of the mutual love that exists between the Creator and His creatures. Although Addai and Mari and Byzantine-Basil reflect two very unique liturgical traditions, they both derive their authority from Christ's own command to nurture this relationship of mutual love, by offering and participating in the eucharistic celebration. This common denominator of the Last Supper, the link between all Christian anaphoras, is founded upon the 'kernel of faith' expressed by each church within its respective liturgical tradition, without which the transcendent reality of eucharistic worship is impossible.⁸

⁸ Ibid. p. 226.

Bibliography

- Alfrink, J., "Biblical Background to the Eucharist as a Sacrificial Meal", in Irish Theological Quarterly 26 (1959) 290-302.
- Ambrose of Milan. *On the Sacraments* = Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Volume 10. Eds. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1994, pp. 317-25.
- Arranz, Miguel, "L'économie du Salut: dans la prière Post-Sanctus des anaphores de type antiochéen", in La Maison Dieu 106 (1972) 46-75.
- Atchley, E.G.C.F. On the Epiklesis of the Eucharistic Liturgy and in the Consecration of the Font. Alcuin Club Collections, volume 31. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935.
- Athanasius the Great. On the Incarnation. Ed. and trans. A Religious of C.S.M.V. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1989.
- Aydin, Edip, "A Bird's Eye View of the Syriac Language and Literature", in Gouden Hoorn 5/1 (summer 1997).
- Basil the Great. Aux jeunes gens, sur la manière de tirer profit des lettres helléniques (established text and translation). Ed. F. Boulenger. Paris: n.p., 1952.
- _____. On the Holy Spirit. Trans. David Anderson. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980.
- _____. The Ascetic Works of Saint Basil. Trans. W.K.L. Clarke. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1925.
- _____. The Letters (4 volumes). Ed. R. Deferrari. Cambridge: Loeb Classical Library, 1926-39.
- Baumstark, Anton. Comparative Liturgy. Trans. F.L. Cross. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Bethune-Baker, J.F. Nestorius and His Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1908.
- Bishop, W.C., "The Primitive Form of Consecration of the Holy Eucharist", in Church Quarterly Review 66 (1908) 385-404.
- Bobrinskoy, Boris, "Liturgie et ecclésiologie trinitaire de S. Basile", in Verbum Caro 23 (1969) 1-32.

- _____, "The Indwelling of the Spirit in Christ: 'Pneumatic Christology' in the Cappadocian Fathers", in St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 28 (1984) 49-65.
- Botte, Bernard, "L'anaphore chaldéenne des Apôtres", in Orientalia Christiana Periodica 15 (1949) 259-76.
- _____, "L'épiklèse dans les liturgies syriennes orientales", in Sacris Erudiri 6 (1954) 48-72.
- _____, "L'Esprit-Saint et l'Église dans la 'Tradition Apostolique' de Saint Hippolyte", in Didascalia 2 (1972) 221-33.
- _____, "Problèmes de l'Anamnèse", in Journal of Ecclesiastical History 15 (1964) 17.
- _____, "Problèmes de l'anaphore syrienne des apôtres Addai et Mari", in L'Orient Syrien 10 (1965) 89-106
- Bouman, C.A., "Variants in the Introduction to the Eucharistic Prayer", in Vigiliae Christianae 4 (1950) 94-115.
- Bouyer, L. Eucharist. Trans. C.U. Quinn. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1968.
- Bradshaw, Paul F., "The Search for the Origins of Christian Liturgy: Some Methodological Reflections", in Studia Liturgica 17 (1987) 26-34.
- _____. The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- _____. Two Ways of Praying: Introducing Liturgical Spirituality. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995.
- Brightman, F.E., "Invocation in the Holy Eucharist", in Theology 9 (1924) 33-40.
- _____. Liturgies Eastern and Western. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896.
- _____, "The Anaphora of Theodore", in Journal of Theological Studies 31 (1930) 160-64.
- Brock, S.P. The Holy Spirit in the Syrian Baptismal Tradition. *The Syrian Churches Series*, volume 9. Poona: Anita Press, 1979.
- Cabasilas, Nicholas. A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy. Trans. J.M. Hussey and P.A. McNulty. London: SPCK, 1960.

- Cagin, Paul. L'euchologue latine étudiée dans la tradition de ses formules et de ses formulaires. L'eucharistie, canon primitif de la messe ou formulaire essentiel et premier de toutes les liturgies. Paris, n.p., 1912.
- Calivas, Alkiviadis C. Great Week and Pascha in the Greek Orthodox Church. Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1992.
- Casel, Odo. The Mystery of Christian Worship and Other Writings. Ed. and trans. I.T. Hale, ed. B. Neunheuser. London: DLT, 1962.
- Collins, M.D., "Eucharistic Proclamation of God's Presence", in Worship 41 (1976) 531-41.
- Congar, Y. Lay People in the Church. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Company, Ltd., 1960.
- Connolly, R.H., "Agape and Eucharist in the Didache", in Downside Review 55 (1937) 477-89.
- _____, "Sixth Century Fragments of an East-Syrian Anaphora", in Oriens Christianus 12-14 (1925) 99-128.
- _____. The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai: Texts and Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.
- _____, "The Work of Menezes on the Malabar Liturgy" (Part One), in Journal of Theological Studies 15 (1913-14) 396-425.
- _____, "The Work of Menezes on the Malabar Liturgy" (Part Two), in Journal of Theological Studies 15 (1913-14) 569-93.
- Coquin, R.G., "L'Anaphore Alexandrine de Saint Marc", in Mus 82 (1969) 307-56.
- Couratin, A.H., "The Sacrifice of Praise", in Theology 58 (1955) 285-91.
- _____, "The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora: A Note on the Roman Sanctus", in Journal of Ecclesiastical History 2 (1951) 19-23.
- _____, "The Thanksgiving: An Essay", in The Sacrifice of Praise. Ed. Bryan D. Spinks. Rome, n.p: 1981, pp. 20-61.
- Cuming, Geoffrey J., "Egyptian Elements in the Jerusalem Liturgy", in Journal of Theological Studies 25 (1974) 117-24.
- _____, "Four Very Early Anaphoras", in Worship 58 (1984) 168-72.

- _____, "The Liturgy of Antioch in the Time of Severus (513-518)", in Time and Community. Ed. J.Neil Alexander. Washington, DC: The Pastoral Press, 1990.
- _____, "Thmuis Revisited: Another Look at the Prayers of Bishop Sarapion", in Theological Studies 41 (1980) 568-75.
- Cutrone, E.J., "The Anaphora of the Apostles: Implications of the Mar Esa'ya Text", in Theological Studies 34 (1973) 623-42.
- Cyprian of Carthage. *Epistles* = Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume 5. Eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1994, pp. 275-409.
- Cyril of Jerusalem. *Catechetical Lectures* = Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Volume 7. Eds. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1994, pp. 1-157.
- Dalmais, I.H. Eastern Liturgies. New York: Hawthorne Books, 1960.
- Daly, R.J. The Origins of the Christine Doctrine of Sacrifice. London: DLT, 1978.
- Divine Liturgy of Our Father Among the Saints Basil the Great, The. Ed. N.M. Vaporis. Trans. Faculty of Hellenic College and Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology. Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1988.
- Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, The. Trans. Faculty of Hellenic College/Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology. Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1985.
- Dix, Gregory, "Primitive Consecration Prayers", in Theology 37 (1938) 261-83.
- _____, "The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora", in Journal of Ecclesiastical History 1 (1950) 29-36, 125-34.
- _____. The Shape of the Liturgy. London: A & C Black (Publishers) Ltd., 1945.
- Documents in Early Christian Thought. Eds. Maurice Wiles and Mark Santer. London: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Documents of the Christian Church. Ed. Henry Bettenson. New York: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Duchesne, L. Christian Worship: Its Origins and Evolution. London: SPCK, 1931.
- Dupont, J., "Ceci est mon corps, Ceci est mon sang", in Nouvelle Revue Théologique 40

(1958) 1025-41.

Elavanal, Thomas. The Memorial Celebration: A Theological Study of the Anaphora of the Apostles Mar Addai and Mari. Kerala, India: M.C.B.S. Publications, 1988.

Engberding, H. Das eucharistisches Hochgebet der Basileiosliturgie. Textgeschichtliche Untersuchungen und kritische Ausgabe. Theologie der christlichen Ostens 1. Münster: Aschendorff, 1931.

Fedwick, Paul J., "A Chronology of the Life and Works of Basil of Caesarea" (v. 1, pp. 3-19), in Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic, two volumes. Ed. idem. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981.

Fenwick, John R.K. Fourth Century Anaphoral Construction Techniques. *Grove Liturgical Study*, volume 45. Bramcote: Grove Books, 1986.

_____. The Anaphoras of St. Basil and St. James: An Investigation into Their Common Origin. Rome: Edizioni Orientalia Christiana, 1992.

_____, "The Significance of Similarities in the Anaphoral Intercession Sequence in the Coptic Anaphora of St. Basil and Other Ancient Liturgies", in Studia Patristica 18/2 (1989) 355-62.

Ferguson, Everett. Early Christians Speak. Austin: Sweet Publishing Company, 1971.

Fortescue, A. The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy. London: Longmans, 1912.

Gain, B. L'Église de Cappadoce au IVe Siècle d'après la Correspondence de Basil de Césarée (330-379). *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, vol. 225. Rome: n.p., 1985.

Galvin, R.J., "Addai and Mari Revisited: The State of the Question", in Ephemerides Liturgicae 87 (1973) 383-414.

Garret, T.S. Worship in the Church of South India. Richmond: Knox Press, 1958.

Gelsinger, M.G.H., "The Epiklesis in the Liturgy of St. Basil", in Eastern Churches Quarterly 10 (1953) 243-48.

Gelston, Anthony, "Sacrifice in the Early East Syrian Eucharistic Tradition", in Sacrifice and Redemption. Ed. S.W. Sykes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, pp. 118-25.

_____. The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Grant, R.M., "The Early Antiochene Anaphora", in Anglican Theological Review 30

(1948) 91-94.

Greer, R. Theodore of Mopsuestia: Exegete and Theologian. London: Faith Press, 1961.

Gregory Nazianzen, "The Panegyric on St. Basil", in Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Volume 7. Eds. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., pp. 395-422.

Griggs, C. W. Early Christian Egypt from Its Origins to 451 CE. Leiden: n.p., 1990.

Hahn, F. The Worship of the Early Church. Ed. and trans. D.E. Green. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973.

Hamerton-Kelly, R.G., "The Temple and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic", in Vetus Testamentum 20 (1970) 1-15.

Hamman, A., "Liturgie, Prière et Famille dans les Trois Premiers Siècles Chrétiens", in Questions Liturgiques 57 (1976) 81-98.

Hanson, R.P.C., "The Liberty of the Bishop to Improvise Prayer in the Eucharist", in Vigiliae Christianae 15 (1961) 173-76.

Heinemann, J., "Birkat ha-zimmum and Havurah – Meals", in Journal of Jewish Studies 13 (1962) 23-29.

_____. Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns. New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1977.

Hoffman, L.A., "Blessings and Their Translation in Jewish Current Liturgies", in Worship 60 (1986) 134-61.

Holy Bible (NRSV with Apocrypha). Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1989.

Hruby, K., "La Notion de 'Berakah' dans la Tradition et son Caractère Anamnetique", in Questions Liturgiques 52 (1971) 155-70.

Ἱερατικόν. Αἱ Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου, Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου, καὶ τῶν Προηγιασμένων, μετὰ τῆς τυπικῆς αὐτῶν Διατάξεως καὶ τινῶν ἀπαραιτήτων ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν, Τάξεων, καὶ Εὐχῶν. Athens: Apostoliki Diakonia, 1995.

"Introductory Notice to Early Liturgies", in Ante-Nicene Fathers: Lactantius, Venantius, Asterius, Victorinus, Dionysius, Apostolic Teaching and Constitutions, 2 Clement Early Liturgies. Volume 7. Eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1994, pp. 529-36.

James, E.O. The Origin of Sacrifice. London, n.p., 1933.

- Jasper, R.C.D. and G.J. Cuming. Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed. London, n.p., 1980.
- Jeremias, J. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. Ed. and trans. N. Perrin. London: SCM, 1966.
- John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians* = Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Volume 12. Ed. Philip Schaff. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1994.
- Johnson, Maxwell E., "The Archaic Nature of the Sanctus, Institution Narrative, and Epiclesis of the Logos in the Anaphora Ascribed to Sarapion of Thmuis", in Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers. Ed. Paul F. Bradshaw. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1997, pp. 73-107.
- _____. The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis OCA 249. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientale, 1995.
- Jones, Bayard H., "The Formation of the Nestorian Liturgy", in Anglican Theological Review 48 (1966) 276-306.
- _____, "The History of the Nestorian Liturgies", in Anglican Theological Review 46 (1964) 157-76.
- _____, "The Sources of the Nestorian Liturgy", in Anglican Theological Review 46 (1964) 414-25.
- Jugie, M., "L'Épiklèse et le Mot Antitype de la Messe de Saint Basil", in Échos d'Orient 9 (1906) 293-98.
- Jungmann, J.A. The Mass of the Roman Rite. Trans. F.A. Brunner. New York: Christian Classics, 1959.
- Jurgens, W.A. The Priesthood. New York: Macmillan Company, 1955.
- Kilmartin, E., "Sacrificium Laudis: Content and Function of Early Eucharistic Prayers", in Theological Studies 35 (1974) 268-87.
- Kleist, J.A. The Epistle of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch. Westminster: n.p., 1946.
- Kretschmar, Georg. Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie. Tübingen: n.p., 1956, pp. 180, 182.
- _____, "La Liturgie Ancienne dans les Recherches Historiques Actuelles", in La Maison Dieu 149 (1982) 57-90.

- Ledogar, R.J. Acknowledgement: Praise Verbs in Early Greek Anaphoras. Rome: Herder, 1968.
- Lietzmann, H. Mass and Lord's Supper. Trans. Dorothea H.G. Reeve. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979.
- L'Huillier, P., "La Theologie de l'Épiklèse", in Verbum Caro 14 (1960) 307-27.
- Ligier, Louis, "Autour du Sacrifice Eucharistique. Anaphores Orientales et Anamnèse Juive de Kippur", in Nouvelle Revue Théologique 92 (1960) 40-55.
- _____, "The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer: From the Last Supper to the Eucharist", in Studia Liturgica 94 (1973) 161-85.
- Lussier, E. The Eucharist: The Bread of Life. New York: Alba House, 1977.
- Macomber, William F., "A History of the Chaldean Mass", in Worship 51 (1977) 107-20.
- _____, "A Theory on the Origins of the Syrian, Maronite and Chaldean Rites", in Orientalia Christiana Periodica 39 (1973) 235-42.
- _____, "The Ancient Form of the Anaphora of the Apostles", in East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period. Ed. N.G. Garsoian, T.F. Mathews, and R.W. Thomson. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1982, pp. 73-88.
- _____, "The Maronite and Chaldean Versions of the Anaphora of the Apostles", in Orientalia Christiana Periodica 37 (1971) 55-84.
- _____, "The Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari", in Orientalia Christiana Periodica 32 (1966) 335-71.
- Magne, Jean, "L'anaphore nestorienne dite d'Adée et Mari et l'anaphore maronite dite de Pierre III. Étude comparative", in Orientalia Christiana Periodica 53 (1987) 145-47.
- Mansell, C.N.R. A Study of the Epiklesis: The Petition for Fruitful Reception and the Benefits of Communion. *Dissertation for the Diploma of Theological Studies*. Bristol: Trinity College, 1982.
- Maraval, P. Égérie: Journal de Voyage. *Sources Chrétiennes*, vol. 296. Paris, n.p., 1982.
- Marston, W., "A Solution to the Enigma of Addai and Mari", in Ephemerides Liturgicae 103 (1989) 79-91.

- Martimort, A.G. Introduction to the Liturgy. New York: Désclée, 1968.
- Mateos, J., "Fruits of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist", in Diakonia 7 (1972) 21-31.
- _____, "L'Action du Saint Esprit dans la Liturgie Dite de Saint Jean Chrysostome", in Le Proche-Orient Chrétien 3 (1959) 193-208.
- Maxfield, T.H.W. The Words of Institution. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933.
- Mercier, B.C., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition Critique du Texte Grec avec Traduction Latine", in Patrologia Orientalis 26/2 (1946) 115-256.
- Moore, S., "Towards a Eucharistic Definition of Sacrifice", in Downside Review 69 (1951) 428-39.
- Mazza, Enrico. The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer. Trans. Ronald E. Lane. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1995.
- Michell, G.A., "Firmilian and Eucharistic Consecration", in Journal of Theological Studies 5 (1954) 215-20.
- Middleton, R.D., "The Eucharistic Prayers of the Didache", in Journal of Theological Studies 36 (1935) 259-67.
- Mitchell, L., "The Alexandrian Anaphora of St. Basil of Caesarea: Ancient Source of 'A Common Eucharistic Prayer'", in Anglican Theological Review (ATR) 58/2 (1976) 194-206.
- Neale, J. Mason. General Introduction to a History of the Holy Eastern Church. London: n.p., 1850.
- Neill, Stephen. History of Christian Missions. Harmondsworth: n.p. 1971.
- Neunheuser, B., "Mystery Presence", in Worship 34 (1960) 120-27.
- O'Doherty, R., "The Eucharistic Prayer: An Examination of Recent Research", in Scottish Journal of Theology 38 (1985) 85-97.
- Origen, "On Prayer", in Origen: An Exhortation to Martyrdom, Prayer, First Principles: Book IV. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.
- Orthodox Study Bible, The. Eds. J. Allen, J.N. Sparks, M. Najim, and T. Stylianopoulos. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1993.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700). Volume 2. The

- Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine. Chicago: n.p., 1974.
- Pitt, W.E., "The Anamnesis and Institution Narrative in the Liturgy of Apostolic Constitutions Book VIII", in Journal of Ecclesiastical History 9 (1958) 1-7.
- _____, "The Origin of the Anaphora of St. Basil", in Journal of Ecclesiastical History 12 (1961) 1-13.
- Powers, J.M. Eucharistic Theology. New York: Seabury Press, 1967.
- Prex Eucharistica: Textus e variis liturgiis antiquioribus selecti. Eds. A. Hänggi and I. Pahl. Fribourg: n.p. 1968.
- Price, C.P., "Jewish Morning Prayers and Early Christian Anaphoras", in Anglican Theological Review 43 (1961) 153-68.
- Quasten, Johannes. Patrology (Volume Three). Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, Inc., 1986.
- Raes, A., "KATA ΠΑΝΤΑ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΑ ΠΑΝΤΑ: En tout et pour tout", in Oriens Christianus 48 (1964) 216-20.
- _____, "L'Authenticité de la Liturgie Byzantine de Saint Basile", in Revue des Études Byzantines 16 (1958) 158-61.
- _____, "Le récit de l'institution eucharistique dans l'anaphore chaldéenne et malabare des apôtres", in Orientalia Christiana Periodica 10 (1940) 216-26.
- _____, "Un Nouveau Document de la Liturgie de S. Basile", in Orientalia Christiana Periodica 26 (1960) 401-11.
- Rahner, K. and A. Haussling. The Celebration of the Eucharist. London: Burns and Oates, 1968.
- Ratcliff, Edward C. Liturgical Studies. London: n.p., 1976.
- _____, "The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: A Suggestion", in Journal of Theological Studies 30 (1929) 23-32.
- _____, "The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora", in Journal of Ecclesiastical History 1 (1950) 29-36, 125-34.
- Reif, S.C., "Jewish Liturgical Research: Past, Present and Future", in Journal of Jewish Studies 34 (1983) 161-70.

- Richardson, C.C., "The Origin of the Epiclesis", in Anglican Theological Review 28 (1946) 148-53.
- _____, "The So-Called Epiclesis in Hippolitus", in Harvard Theological Review 40 (1947) 101-08.
- Richardson, R.D., "The Lord's Prayer as an Early Eucharistia", in Anglican Theological Review 39 (1957) 123-30.
- Riggs, J.W., "From Gracious Table to Sacramental Elements. The Traditions-History of *Didache* 9 and 10", in The Second Century 4 (1984) 83-101.
- Roberts, C.H. Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Robinson, J.A.T., "The Earliest Christian Liturgical Sequence", in Journal of Theological Studies. New Series 4 (1958) 38-41.
- Rodopoulos, P., "Doctrinal Teaching in the Sacramentary of Serapion of Thmuis", in Greek Orthodox Theological Review 9 (1963-1964) 201-14.
- Rordorf, W., "Le Sacrifice Eucharistique", in Théologie et Philosophie 25 (1969) 335-53.
- Rouwhorst, G., "Les Oraisons de la Table dans le Judaïsme et les Célébrations de l'Eucharistie des Chrétiens Syriaques", in Questions Liturgiques 61 (1980) 211-40.
- Rubin, Ze'ev, "The Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Conflict Between the Sees of Caesarea and Jerusalem", in The Jerusalem Cathedra. Ed. Lee I Levine. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1981, pp. 79-105.
- Rudder of the Orthodox Catholic Church, The: The Compilation of the Holy Canons by Saints Nikodemos and Agapios. Trans. D. Cummings. West Brookfield, MA: Orthodox Christian Educational Society, 1957.
- Salaville, S. An Introduction to the Study of Eastern Liturgies. London: n.p., 1938.
- Schillebeeckx, E. Christ: The Sacrament of the Encounter with God. London: Sheed and Ward, 1963.
- Schmemmann, Alexander. Introduction to Liturgical Theology. Trans. Asheleigh E. Moorhouse. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1986.
- _____. Of Water and the Spirit. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974.

Shepherd, M.H., "Eusebius and the Liturgy of St. James", in Yearbook of Liturgical Studies 4 (1963) 109-23.

_____, "The Formation and Influence of the Antiochene Liturgy", in Dumbarton Oaks Papers 15 (1961) 25-44.

Spinks, Bryan D., "Addai and Mari and the Institution Narrative: The Tantalising Evidence of Gabriel Qatraya," in Ephemerides Liturgicae 98 (1984) 60-67.

_____, "Beware the Liturgical Horses! An English Interjection on Anaphoral Evolution", in Worship 59 (1985) 211-19.

_____, "Eucharistic Offering in the East Syrian Anaphoras", in Orientalia Christiana Periodica 50 (1984) 347-71.

_____, "The Consecratory Epiclesis in the Anaphora of St. James", in Studia Liturgica 11 (1976) 19-38.

_____, "The Jerusalem Liturgy of the Catecheses Mystagogicae: Syrian or Egyptian?", in Studia Patristica 18/2 (1989) 391-95.

_____, "The Jewish Sources for the Sanctus", in Heythrop Journal 21 (1980) 168-79.

_____, "The Original Form of the Anaphora of the Apostles: A Suggestion in the Light of Maronite Sharar", in Ephemerides Liturgicae 91 (1977) 146-61.

_____. The Sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, pp. 1-121

_____. Worship: Prayers from the East. Washington, DC: The Pastoral Press, 1993.

Stamatakos, Ioannis D. Λεξικὸν Ἀρχαίας Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης = Lexicon of the Ancient Greek Language. Athens: Phoenix Publishers, 1972.

Stevenson, Kenneth W., "Anaphoral Offering: Some Observations on Eastern Eucharistic Prayers", in Ephemerides Liturgicae 94 (1980) 209-228.

_____. The First Rites: Worship in the Early Church. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1989.

Stuckwisch, D. Richard, "The Basilian Anaphoras", in Essays on Early Eucharistic Prayers. Ed. Paul F. Bradshaw. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1997, pp. 109-30.

- Study of Liturgy, The. Eds. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, Edward Yarnold, and Paul Bradshaw. New York, Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Sullivan, Francis A. The Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia. *Analecta Gregoriana*, volume 82. Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1956.
- Taft, Robert. Beyond East and West: Problems in Liturgical Understanding. Washington, DC: The Pastoral Press, 1984.
- _____, "Liturgy as Theology", in Worship 56 (1982) 113-17.
- _____. The Great Entrance. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, volume 200. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1975.
- _____, "The Spirit of Eastern Worship", in Diakonia 12 (1977) 103-20.
- Talley, T.J., "From Berakah to Eucharistia: A Reopening Question", in Worship 50 (1976) 115-37.
- _____, "The Literary Structure of Eucharistic Prayer", in Worship 58 (1984) 404-20.
- Tarby, A. La Prière Eucharistique de l'Église de Jérusalem. Paris: n.p., 1972.
- Thurian, M. Eucharistic Memorial. Part One. Ed. and trans. J.G. Davies. London: n.p., 1966.
- Vellian, J., "The Anaphora Structure of Addai and Mari Compared to the Berakoth Preceding the Shema in the Synagogue Morning Service Contained in the Seder R. Amram Gaon", in Le Muséon 85 (1972) 201-23.
- Verheul, A., "La prière eucharistique de Addaï et de Mari", in Questions Liturgiques 61 (1980) 19-27.
- Voobus, A., "Regarding the Background of the Liturgical Traditions in the Didache", in Vigiliae Christianae 23 (1969) 81-87.
- Wainwright, Geoffrey. Eucharist and Eschatology. London: Epworth Press, 1971.
- Warren, F.E. The Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church. London: SPCK, 1897.
- Webb, Douglas, "La liturgie nestorienne des apôtres Addai et Mari dans la tradition manuscrite", in Lex Orandi. Eucharisties d'Orient et d'Occident 47 (1970) 25-49.
- _____, "The Anaphora of Theodore the Interpreter", in Ephemerides Liturgicae 104 (1990) 3-22.

- Wilkinson, J. Egeria's Travels: Newly Translated with Supporting Documents and Notes. London: SPCK, 1971.
- Willis, G., "The Verbs of Offering in Early Egyptian Liturgies", in Downside Review (April, 1977) 118-19.
- Wilson, Stephen B., "The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari", in Essays on Early Eucharistic Prayers. Ed. Paul F. Bradshaw. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1997, pp. 19-37.
- Wolfson, Harry A., "The Theology of Cyril of Jerusalem", in Dumbarton Oaks Papers 11 (1957) 3-19.
- Wybrew, H. The Orthodox Liturgy: The Development of the Eucharistic Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1990.
- Yarnold, E., "The Authorship of the Mystagogical Catecheses Attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem", in Heythrop Journal 19 (1978) 143-61.

