

OFFERING THANKS

J. BOSCO M. PETERS

OFFERING THANKS



by

J. Bosco M. Peters

Auckland Consortium for Theological Education

OFFERING THANKS

ANAPHORAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE EARLY CHURCH

WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE

TO

THE ANTIOCHENE

AND

ALEXANDRIAN

rites

A Research Essay

submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the Degree of
Bachelor of Theology with honours

by

J. Bosco M. Peters

1990

CONTENTS

PREFACE	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. FORMS OF JEWISH PRAYERS AT THE TIME OF JESUS	5
<i>Berakah</i>	7
<i>Birkat ha-mazon</i>	9
Synagogue Liturgy	10
<i>Shema Israel</i>	10
<i>Tephilla</i>	11
II. THE NEW TESTAMENT	16
1 Corinthians 11:23-26	17
The Synoptics	20
III. ANAPHORAE FROM 80 TO 250 C.E.	26
<i>Didache</i>	27
Justin Martyr	28
<i>Addai and Mari</i> and the <i>Sharar</i>	29
Hippolytus' <i>Apostolic Tradition</i>	32
IV. ANTIOCHENE ANAPHORAE	40
Structure	41
Sanctus	43
Institution Narrative	43
Anamnesis	45
Epiclesis	45
V. ALEXANDRIAN ANAPHORAE	49
Structure	49
Sanctus	51
Epiclesis	52
Anamnesis	53
VI. CONCLUSION	57
TEXTS	61
<i>Birkat ha-mazon</i>	61
Passover	62
Passover <i>Haggadah</i>	63
Synagogue Liturgy	63
<i>Attah konanta</i>	67
<i>Didache</i>	67
<i>Addai and Mari</i>	69
<i>Apostolic Tradition</i>	70
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	72

PREFACE

Research into the early history of the Eucharistic Prayer or anaphora occurs at the exciting interface of the studies of History, Scripture and Liturgy. My own interest in anaphoral development stems from the recent production of new Eucharistic Prayers both in New Zealand and overseas.

At the moment there are thirteen Eucharistic Prayers in English authorised for use in the Anglican Church in New Zealand (some admittedly with only slight variations). If one adds those in Maori and other languages used in this Province the number is even higher. Twenty five years ago, however, the scene was quite different. Only one Eucharistic Prayer and its translations was then authorised. This pattern is repeated in many churches. The prodigious writing of Eucharistic Prayers in recent history can only be compared with the creative period of the Early Church.

It has also been to the Early Church, and particularly the Antiochene and Alexandrian rites, that modern writers of Eucharistic Prayers have turned for inspiration. Furthermore, understanding aspects of Eucharistic Prayer construction is becoming more important with growing Liturgical freedom. Two of the thirteen Eucharistic Prayers already mentioned are frameworks in which only the Institution Narrative, anamnesis and epiclesis are

fixed. These allow the participants at a Eucharist to produce their own Eucharistic Prayer.

The academic exercise of attempting to reconstruct the links between the prayers used by Jesus at the Last Supper and the Antiochene and Alexandrian anaphorae of the fourth and fifth centuries is in itself of value. That there may be modern parallels and applications has made this research doubly exciting.

I wish to express my thanks to the lecturers and library staff of St. John's and Trinity Colleges and in particular my supervisor, the Rev. Janet Crawford. I have appreciated the enthusiasm and encouragement of many students here. My thanks to Joan Edmundson for her proof-reading and especially to my spouse Helen who in her reading of the many drafts nearly knows this text by heart.

Bosco Peters

The College of St John the Evangelist

Auckland

Feast of St Ignatius of Antioch

17 October 1990

INTRODUCTION

From the beginning, Christians appear to have met together for meals in which they experienced their risen Lord in their midst.¹ The sharing of meals was a feature of the Jesus they remembered, and after his death and resurrection Christians focused in particular on his Last Supper with his disciples in which Jesus had prayed and shared with them broken bread and a cup of wine, as was common in any festal meal. But in the stories of Jesus that were orally transmitted, it was also told that in this gesture at his last meal, Jesus not only interpreted his own death but also instructed them that when they repeated these actions they were from now on to have a new purpose. This was to be a special means for his continued presence with them, for their participation in what he had done for them, and for their remembrance of him.

Since at least the seventeenth century scholars have been involved in an attempt to find the prayer which Jesus was supposed to have used with the bread and the cup at that Last Supper. Surprisingly, perhaps, they tended to ignore the *Birkat ha-mazon* (בִּרְכַּת הַמִּזוֹן), the Jewish meal prayer, which in 1945 Dom Gregory Dix prophesied would eventually prove to be the fortress which the critics would be unable to capture.²

This emerges as another one of Dix's inspired guesses

which he did not seriously pursue. Louis Bouyer and Louis Ligier,³ however, following Dix's suggestion, independently came to the conclusion that not only is the *Birkat ha-mazon* probably the prayer form that Jesus used at the Last Supper, but that it underlies the development of the Christian anaphora.⁴

The first chapter will trace what is known of the Jewish meal prayer at the time of Jesus, as well as some liturgical forms of the Synagogue that may have influenced later anaphorae. The second chapter looks at the development and transmission of the Last Supper accounts in the New Testament period. The third chapter examines the earliest Christian anaphoral texts for Jewish influences.

After the third century, a plethora of anaphoral texts are available to us. The bewildering variety, however, can be classified on the basis of structure and recurrent phrases into "rites" designated according to their origins. Having found similarities between early anaphorae and the *Birkat ha-mazon*⁵ this study compares and contrasts two great families of anaphorae. The fourth chapter focuses on the anaphoral family centered on Antioch. The fifth chapter similarly examines those anaphorae centered on Alexandria. This study concludes that in West Syria and Egypt, as elsewhere in the fourth and fifth centuries, a period of intense creativity resulted in "classic" styles of Christian anaphorae,

developed from the *Birkat ha-mazon*, and complete with features such as the Sanctus and intercessions which appear to have originated in the Synagogue. The Jewish strophic form of prayer with intervening doxologies was transformed into a single united prayer concluding in a doxology, but even in this final form the Jewish opening dialogue, and the key progression of praise and thanksgiving, anamnesis, supplication, and concluding "Amen", can still be recognised.

NOTES

1. E.g. Luke 24:30-35; Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7, 11; 27:35; 1 Corinthians 11:20-34.
2. Rephrased from Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1945), p.217.
3. Louis Bouyer, *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968). Louis Ligier, "From the Last Supper to the Eucharist," in *The New Liturgy*, ed. L.C. Sheppard (London: Darton Longman & Todd, 1970), pp.113-150. Louis Ligier, "The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer: From the Last Supper to the Eucharist," *Studia Liturgica*, Vol.9 (1973), pp.161-185.
4. As this study will more particularly focus on the Eucharistic Prayer in Antioch and Alexandria, it will be referred to it by its Eastern term the "anaphora" (the offering).
5. That the resemblance should be structural and in the form of key words and phrases is suggested by the phenomenology of Religion. While on the one hand Jewish prayers (and especially their structure and style) would have provided the soil from which the liturgy of the Christian Eucharist grew, on the other, converts have a tendency, especially in a faith's early generations, to distance themselves from their first religious alliance. Hence, one would not expect the indiscriminate importation of whole Jewish texts into the Christian liturgy.

The explanation that Jewish elements in the Christian anaphora are secondary elements, added in later stages of anaphoral construction, can be given little credence because of the church's anti-Semitism from the end of the patristic period, especially evidenced in Syrian authors where the Jewish influence in the liturgy is most prevalent.

A collection of John Chrysostom's anti-Semitic texts was made by A. Lukyn Williams in *Adversus Judaeos. A Bird's Eye view of Christian Apologiae until the Renaissance*, Cambridge, 1935. (Cited in L. Bouyer. *Eucharist* p.17.)

CHAPTER I

FORMS OF JEWISH PRAYERS AT THE TIME OF JESUS

This chapter must of necessity begin with several caveats, not least of which is that it can no longer be seen to be a simple thing to agree on a definition of "Judaism" before 200 C.E.¹ Moreover, the indeterminate boundaries between "Christian" and "Jewish" in this early period have led scholars such as Vermes to place the New Testament as part of "the literary legacy of first-century Judaism".² Concomitant with this observation is the necessary abandonment of earlier views of the immutability of Jewish liturgy at the time of Jesus. Inevitably certain prayer patterns and expressions were widespread and there is general agreement that fixed prayers began to develop before the destruction of the Temple.³ However, spontaneous prayer continued after 70 C.E. (*m. Ber.* 4:4 and *m. 'Abot* 2:13),⁴ and early Christian anaphorae could have been perceived within this whole context. A final warning needs to be made against conceiving of the Judaism out of which Christianity emerged as either uniformly monochromatic or anachronistically able to be separated into Hellenistic and Palestinian provenances.⁵

Our knowledge of the Jewish background of the anaphora comes primarily from the Mishnah and from medieval copies of the Jewish meal prayer, the *Birkat ha-mazon*. While the ninth century *Seder Rab' Amran Gaon*⁶ is the earliest

document to give us this text, the critical analysis of the *Birkat ha-mazon* by Louis Finkelstein⁷ concludes that the tenth century *Seder Rab' Saadia Gaon* (text pp.61-62) is nearer the early Palestinian version. Although the Mishnah is a second century document, most scholars agree that it provides us with information from New Testament times.⁸ Similarly, although no text of the *Seder* antedates the ninth century, we must remember that until the discoveries at Qumran we had no manuscript of the Tanak prior to this date, and furthermore, most authors of antiquity are only available in manuscripts dating from this period.⁹ While there is no certainty that the Jewish prayers recorded in the *Seder* were fixed in the first century, most would agree that we do here have access to their style and structure.¹⁰

While previously scholars sought in the mystery religions of the Roman empire for roots of the Christian Eucharist, only this century have they taken the Jewish heritage more seriously. Results of these studies, exciting though they be, must continue to be received with some critical caution precisely because of the limitations imposed by the present dependence on documents from later periods.

Not only is the conservatism of Jewish liturgy manifested by similarities between the *Seder* and the Jewish prayers used today,¹¹ but reform of Jewish liturgy after the beginning of Christianity tended to differentiate the two communities rather than assimilate forms of Christian

origin.¹² Thus our procedure is determined by the presupposition that Christian texts may preserve Jewish features but that any influence in the opposite direction is far less likely. In this chapter there will be an examination of some Jewish prayer forms with particular attention to their structure. Hence when in Chapter three analysis of Christian anaphorae shows similarities between Christian and Jewish texts, the evidence weighs towards their Jewish origin.

Having indicated something of the methodology to be followed, and its strengths and weaknesses, it is now possible to proceed to examining the particular prayer forms which may have played a part in anaphoral evolution.

Berakah (בִּרְכָּה)

pl. *berakoth*. (בִּרְכוֹת)

Unique to post-exilic Judaism among the prayer categories established during the Tannaitic age¹³ and known to the church, was the *berakah*.¹⁴ The name of this prayer form, which praises God for his acts or gifts, derives from the Hebrew for "knee", and is difficult to translate. In the 1957 analysis of Jean-Paul Audet, the Greek verbs εὐλογεω, ἑξομολογεω and εὐχαριστεω are all taken to be equivalent to the Hebrew *barak* (בָּרַךְ).¹⁵ His work built on that of Dr. Frank Gavin,¹⁶ and intensified scholarly acceptance of the anaphora's origin in the *berakah*

literary genre. In 1975, however, Thomas J. Talley sounded a warning note¹⁷ rejecting especially the third identification, of *barak* with $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega$, which bears directly on our topic.

In the Mishnah, the first tractate is devoted to *berakoth*. Short *berakoth* are quoted in their entirety while the longer ones, assumed to be known, are merely indicated by their first words.

In the third century C.E., the Amoraim¹⁸ regulated the form of the *berakah* which had become traditional. It must begin with "blessed" (בָּרֹךְ), and name God and God's kingdom. The invocation that all *berakoth* normally began with, "Blessed are you, Lord our God, King of the Universe" ($\text{אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ אֱתָהּ אַתָּה הַמֶּלֶךְ הַקָּדוֹשׁ הַיָּחִיד הַנֶּאֱמָר בְּרַךְ אַתָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ$), became the standard. It was then usually followed by a Scriptural reference proclaiming God's sovereignty over the present (e.g. "... Creator of the fruit of the tree" *m. Ber* 6:1). The invocation could also continue with a relative clause (e.g. "who has not made me a slave").¹⁹ Throughout the day, a hundred of such *berakoth* constantly united the devout Jew with the God of Israel and consecrated all things for the *Shekinah* (cf. 1 Timothy 4:3-4).

If the clause or phrase which forms the motive for the praise is lengthened, a brief (and more primitive) *berakah* (commencing with *baruch* בָּרֹךְ) concludes it. This concluding *berakah* is called the *chatimah* (חֲתִימָה) or

"seal". Hence, when a sequence of *berakoth* follow one another, only the first begins with *baruch*, and the series concludes with a *chatimah* (also starting with *baruch*).²⁰ The meal prayer, *Birkat ha-mazon*, which has been central to modern anaphoral source criticism, serves to illustrate this.

Birkat ha-mazon

Text p.61-62.

At the time of Jesus there was a customary ritual hand-washing before Jewish meals (similar to that with which Jews also began their day). Participants individually drank their first cup of wine repeating the *berakah*, "Blessed are you, O Lord, our God, King of the Universe, Creator of the fruit of the vine." (*m. Ber 6:1*). The meal then began with the one presiding breaking bread and sharing it with the *berakah* "... Who brings forth bread from the earth." (*m. Ber 6:1*).²¹ The dinner followed with its cups, courses, and other *berakoth*. The Passover followed this pattern but with particular foods, special prayers and the dialogue of the *haggadah* (הגדה). On the eve of holy days, towards the end of the meal, there would be the lighting of the lamp and the incense, each with its *berakah* (*m. Ber 8:5, 6; 6:6*), and a second general hand-washing.²² Meals concluded with the one presiding, generally the male head of the household, inviting all to share in his thanksgiving with a cup of wine mixed with water using words such as "Let us bless

our God"²³ to which all responded, "Blessed is the Lord our God, God of Israel, God of the Hosts, who sits upon the Cherubim, for the food we have eaten." (*m. Ber* 7:3). He would then chant the *Birkat ha-mazon* (text p.61-62).

A structural analysis of the pericopes of the *Birkat ha-mazon* which, as previously argued, was used at the time of Jesus, gives a tripartite scheme²⁴ of praise of God for the gifts of creation, thanksgiving in anamnesis of God's saving works, and an epicletic supplication for the fulfillment of God's promises. At the appropriate points, this prayer could include narrative or supplicatory embolisms on the feasts of *Hanukkah*, *Purim*, and Passover.

Synagogue Liturgy

The *berakoth* prayer genre, as would be expected, also plays a central role in the Synagogue liturgy (text pp.63-66). Within these prayers can also be found the *kedushah* (קְדֻשָּׁה cf. Isaiah 6:3). The similarity of this to the Christian Sanctus found in many anaphorae has, in spite of the complexity of the history of the Sanctus, encouraged scholars to look also to the Synagogue for clues to the development of the anaphora.

Shema Israel (שְׁמָא יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה יְהוָה)

This is a credal prayer, a combination of three scriptural passages (Deuteronomy 6:4-9; 11:13-21; Numbers 15:37-41, see *m. Ber* 2:2). It was recited every morning

and evening surrounded by *berakoth*, the first of which, *Yozer* (יֹזֵר), included the *Kedushah*.²⁵

Tephilla (תְּפִלָּה)²⁶

Text pp.65-66.

In the Synagogue prayers, after the Shema, and the *berakah* which follows it, comes the *Tephilla*, the prayer (as its name indicates). Composed of eighteen pericopes, it was usually said standing, with some genuflections.

Although basically a prayer of supplication, the *Tephilla*, because of its recurrent *chatimah*, is usually regarded as a series of *berakoth*. The first pericope begins with the "*baruch* ..." formula, and each petition culminates in a *chatimah*.²⁷ Before the third *berakah* of the *Tephilla*, the *Kedushah* again occurs.²⁸

The prayer forms outlined above have been seen by most scholars to contribute to anaphoral development. The influential Audet attempted to relate the anaphora's structure to a single idealised *berakah* concluded by a *chatimah*, a pattern probably unknown at this early stage. Louis Bouyer and Louis Ligier pointed, rather more perceptively, to the overall structure of the *Birkat ha-mazon*. Bouyer included an argument in which he wished to combine this meal prayer with the Synagogue prayers (and hence picking up the Sanctus in the process!)²⁹ More penetrating has been the work of Ligier, who works from the institution narrative, and that of Thomas J. Tally,

who builds from the structure of the *Birkat ha-mazon* outlined above.³⁰

In the next chapter the New Testament period will be investigated in an attempt to see where continuity may be perceived with the Jewish roots, as well as those points at which innovations can be discerned.

NOTES

1. See J. Neusner, "Judaism after Moore: a Programmatic Statement," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 31 (1980), pp.141-156.

2. G. Vermes, "Jewish Studies and New Testament Interpretation," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 31 (1980), p.13.

3. See J. Heinemann, *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns*, Studia Judaica: Forschungen zur Wissenschaft des Judentums, Band 9 (Berlin and New York, 1977), p.15; J. Heinemann and J. J. Petuchowski, eds., *Literature of the Synagogue* (New York: Behrman, 1975), p. 1; R. Le Déaut, et al., *The Spirituality of Judaism*, trans. P. Barrett, Religious Experience Series 11. (St. Neinrad, IN: Abbey Press, 1977).

4. The abbreviation "m." refers to tractates in the Mishnah.

5. See M. Smith, "Palestinian Judaism in the First Century," *Israel: Its Role in Civilization*, ed. M. Davis (New York: Harper, 1956), pp. 67-81; G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Black eds., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, 175 B.C.-A.D. 135* (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1973); Salo W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952).

6. Louis Bouyer uses the edition by David Hedegard, *Seder R. Amram Gaon, Part I, Hebrew Text with critical Apparatus, translation with Notes and Introduction* (Lund, 1951). "Gaon" is the title of the heads of the academies of Sura and Pumbedita from the end of the sixth century C.E. to the middle of the eleventh century C.E. (This period is called the "Gaonic" age.)

7. Louis Finkelstein, "The Birkat Ha-Mazon," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 19 (1928-29).

8. Dalman, Jeremias, Dix, Daube and Billerbeck claim the Mishnah provides us with information from New Testament times. Segal, however, sees much as deriving from the situation after the destruction of the Temple (70 C.E.). The Mishnah's recording of the views of Hillel and Shammai indicates at least part of its traditions date to the late first century B.C.E.

9. The Carolingian and its contemporaneous first Byzantine renaissances in the late eighth and early ninth centuries were largely responsible for the copying and preservation of texts of the classics, both Christian and otherwise.

10. L. Ligier, "The origins of the Eucharistic Prayer: From the Last Supper to the Eucharist," and "From the Last Supper to the Eucharist," in *The New Liturgy*; T. J. Talley, "The Eucharistic Prayer of the Ancient Church According to Recent Research: Results and Reflections," *Studia Liturgica* 11 (1976), pp.138-158.

11. Even before prayer formulas were written down Semitic oral tradition tended to emphasise underlying structure and key expressions. See Eduard Nielsen, *Oral Tradition* (London, 1954), especially pp.18 ff. Not until the invention of the printing press were copyists concerned with preventing variants which respected this structure and the key expressions.

12. This has especially been studied in relation to Jewish lectionary reform. See R. G. Finch, *The Synagogue Lectionary and the New Testament* (London, 1939).

13. The "Tannaitic" period covers the time from the school of Hillel (end of the first century B.C.E.) to the compilation of the Mishnah (end of the second century C.E.). The Jewish sages of this period are called "Tannaim".

14. For some of these categories see for example Philippians 4:4; Colossians 4:2; 1 Thessalonians 5:16. Paul would have learnt them from Rabban Gamaliel.

15. Audet's paper was delivered at the International Congress on the Four Gospels at Oxford, 1957. It is published as "Literary Forms and Contents of a Normal Eucharistia in the First Century," in *Studia Evangelica* and *Revue Biblique* 65 (1958), pp.371-399.

16. Gavin's third lecture at S.P.C.K. House, London, in 1927. It was published in his *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments* (London, 1928), pp.59-114.

17. Talley's paper was delivered at the meeting of the Societas Liturgica in Trier, Germany, 26 August 1975. This paper was published in *Studia Liturgica* Vol. 11 (1976), pp.138-158. It was further developed by him in *Worship* Vol. 50, No. 2, March 1976, pp. 115-137.

18. The "Amoraim" were Jewish scholars during the period from the completion of the Mishnah (c. 200 C.E.) to the completion of the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds (the end of the fourth and fifth centuries respectively).

19. This use of the third person form is seen by Joseph Heineman in his significant work *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns*, as an indication of the history of the *berakah* structure. It originated, during the biblical period, as praise of God in the third person (cf. Luke 1:68; Ephesians 1:3; 1 Peter 1:3). As the *berakah* form grew in popularity, such praises gained *chatimah*, and finally older forms gained the "*baruch* ..." formula at the beginning (but kept their original third person continuation). This indicates a profound structural difference between a "benediction" (*berakoth*) and a "thanksgiving" (תְּהִלָּה, *todah*).

20. Audet's analysis concentrated on individual and contrived *berakah*, and failed to take notice of the relationship between *berakoth* expounded above.

21. Those who came after this were not to participate.

22. This description is indebted to David Hedegard, *Seder R. Amram Gaon, Part I, Hebrew Text with critical Apparatus, translation with Notes and Introduction* (Lund, 1951), pp.145-146.

23. The invitation varies with the number present, e.g. for one hundred he says "Let us bless the Lord our God".

24. This tripartite scheme is contrasted by many scholars with the bipartite *todah* structure, wherein thanksgiving is followed by intercession.

25. Some Jewish commentators regard the angelic *Kedusha* to be the heavenly equivalent to the earthly recitation of the *Shema*.

26. *Tephilla* means "the prayer". Also known as *Shemone Esre* (שְׁמוֹנֵה עָשָׂר, "the eighteen", actually today nineteen) or *Amidah* (אֲמִידָה, "standing prayers").

The *Tephilla* comes to us in a Jerusalemite and a Babylonian recension (the latter given in the *Seder Amram Gaon*), however verbal differences are not important as emphasised in footnote 11 above.

27. The eighteen pericopes are reduced to seven on Sabbaths and holy days. While the first three petitions of the Christian "Lord's Prayer" show similarity to the *Kaddish* ($\text{וְיִתְּן$; text pp.63), the rest can be seen to summarise the *Tephilla*. Furthermore, Matthew's version of seven stiches can be seen to emulate the structure of the seven blessings used on Sabbaths and holy days.

28. As well as before the third *berakah* of the *Shemone Esre*, and in the *Yozer*, a *Kedushah* may also have occurred after the reading of the Prophets (*Kedushah* of *Sidrah*, קְדוּשָׁה). The Tannaim saw the *Kedushah* of *Yozer*, however, to be traditional and make no reference to the other two. Furthermore, some believe the *Kedushah* of *Sidrah* to have been recited only on weekdays by students and their teachers of the law, and so the least likely origin of the Sanctus.

29. See L. Bouyer, *Eucharist* pp.88-90, where he argues that the three pericopes of the *Birkat ha-mazon* (which he calls D, E and F) focus respectively on creation, redemption, and supplication of the eschatological fulfillment. Bouyer then sees these three concerns as being taken up by the first *berakah* (A) of the Synagogue, *Yozer*, then (B), *Ahabah* (אָהָבָה), and (C) the *Tephilla* (texts pp.63-66). ABC then parallels DEF. Bouyer sees the anaphora originating in the meal prayer DEF. Most would agree with him in this. But after the Christians no longer attended the Synagogue, he would have them fuse ABC with DEF of the meal prayer. The *Shema* was replaced by the eucharistic meal, forming a new schema AD-BE-CF. This ingenious reconstruction of "what might have happened" tends in the enthusiastic hands of Bouyer to undergo a transformation, by an alchemy not unknown in liturgiology, to become "what actually happened".

Ligier, however, in "The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer" (p.170), sees E as paralleling the *Hodah* (הוֹדָה) rather than the *Ahabah*.

Furthermore, Heinemann's analysis is that in Jewish liturgy the tripartite motifs are Creation-Revelation (i.e. the giving of the Torah)-Redemption. These form the beginning, critical turning point and final destination of humanity (see Heinemann p.33). Christians would see in Jesus the critical turning point but otherwise the parallel stands. This pattern is perceived by Talley in anaphorae.

30. L. Ligier, "The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer: From the Last Supper to the Eucharist" and "From the Last Supper to the Eucharist," in *The New Liturgy*; T. J. Talley, "The Eucharistic Prayer of the Ancient Church According to Recent Research: Results and Reflections".

CHAPTER II

THE NEW TESTAMENT

Sacred meals are a part of many religions. However in Judaism, as indicated in the previous chapter, every meal was sacred, and prayer formed an integral part of each. This chapter traces the development from the meals that Jesus had with his disciples, and especially the last, to the sacred meal of the Christians, the Eucharist, as it was known towards the end of the New Testament period. This chapter must also begin with a warning, that from the scant New Testament information available one cannot argue that every community held identical beliefs or practices. Nor is it necessary to understand every community as having gone through similar stages of development.¹

It is clear that meals were significant in Jesus' ministry.² The many stories of Jesus eating and drinking in a variety of situations stand alongside the gospel tradition of his parabolic teaching as being typical of his ministry. This general statement, however, cannot be pressed to provide historical details. When Jesus' last meal is examined, for example, New Testament scholars are divided over the question of whether it was a Passover meal or not.³ The Synoptics regard the last meal as having been the Passover meal while the Fourth Gospel has Jesus' death occurring while the Passover lambs are being slaughtered.⁴ While not denying the Paschal context

within which his last meal occurred, ultimately it does not matter whether it was the Passover or not as even Dix concedes.⁵ Jesus is not presented as selecting any distinctively Paschal features (the unleavened bread,⁶ the lamb, the bitter herbs) with which to "do this in memory of me" (ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΤΕ Εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν), but only the bread and cup common to all festal meals.

1 Corinthians 11:23-26

It needs first be noted that in all our accounts of Jesus' Last Supper (Matthew 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:15-20; 1 Corinthians 11:23-25) the actual prayer of Jesus is not recorded, merely that he gave thanks.⁷ The words "This is my body which is for you" and "This cup is the new covenant in my blood" (ΤΟΥΤΟ ΜΟΥ ἔστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν and ΤΟΥΤΟ ΤΟ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ ᾧ καινὴ διαθήκη ἔστιν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι) or their variants, which occur almost universally in the Christian anaphorae, occur in these accounts after Jesus' prayer either as words of interpretation or as words of administration.

Our earliest account comes from Paul, about thirty years after the event (1 Corinthians 11:23-26).⁸ Furthermore, many elements within the Pauline account provide a *prima facie* case for regarding it as closer to the original event rather than those presented in the Synoptics. The separation of the bread and cup by the meal accord more to the normal Jewish pattern as has been outlined in the

previous chapter, the repetition of "do this in memory of me" (vv.24 and 25) would have been "absolutely necessary at that point on that one occasion, and absolutely superfluous on any other."⁹ The independence of the bread and cup sayings,¹⁰ and the assumption of taking, eating and drinking rather than their being enjoined, all confirm the antiquity of Paul's narrative the source of which was possibly Peter in Jerusalem.¹¹

Whatever else may be disputed, most now agree that Jesus' thanksgiving would have been in the tradition of the *Birkat ha-mazon*, the Jewish meal prayer, which was outlined in the previous chapter.¹² Account has to be taken of Jesus' special way of praying as recorded in the Gospels. He would often "lift his eyes to heaven"¹³ and he addressed God solely as "Father".¹⁴ The records of Jesus praying, moreover, rather than using the passive *berakah* formula, always have him following the active form found in some Psalms: "I bless you"¹⁵ and "I thank you".¹⁶ Furthermore, the flexibility of Jewish prayers at this period has already been noted. Moreover, the *Birkat ha-mazon* pattern already contained the possibility of modification by inserting a narrative or institution embolism¹⁷ within its second paragraph, or a supplicatory or epicletic one in its third. Hence the possibility that Jesus adapted the *Birkat ha-mazon* structure at his last meal need not surprise us.

At this last meal, Jesus took the actions he knew his

disciples would continue, and gave them a new significance.¹⁸ The Passover context of the Last Supper and of his own death and resurrection introduces Passover concepts into the new Christian meal. Remembering, confessing and proclaiming are combined with looking forward to the consummation of God's Kingdom.¹⁹ Jesus' fourfold action with the bread described in each Last Supper account: taking, blessing, breaking and distributing (reflected also in Matthew 14:34; 15:36; Mark 6:41; 8:6; Luke 9:16; John 6:11) and its threefold equivalent at the end of the meal with the cup, were later conflated by the early Church. The shorter prayer over the bread was absorbed by the *Birkat ha-mazon* over the cup forming another step towards the classic Christian anaphora. This development is traced in the next chapter.

While access to the events underlying New Testament accounts of the Last Supper may be difficult, it is somewhat easier to ascertain the thoughts and practices of the community within which a particular New Testament document arose. Hence from the first epistle to the Corinthians, we can attempt an outline of the Eucharistic rite described by Paul:²⁰

- * all assemble
- * customary Jewish blessing over the bread
- * fraction
- * communion of bread

* meal contributed by assembly

* thanksgiving²¹ over the "cup of blessing"²² (possibly before, or during the assembly in which there was psalmody, teaching and prophecy)²³

* receiving the cup

In Paul's conclusion to his account, "as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (v.26), he provides a clue to the thanksgiving used at Corinth over the "cup of blessing". For "proclaim" (*καταγγελλω*) implies a verbal proclamation²⁴ which, in the Jewish tradition, is provided by the *Birkat ha-mazon*. That the narrative of Jesus' Last Supper is not yet included in the recitation of God's mighty acts in the Corinthian thanksgiving can be argued from the manner in which Paul approaches it in his letter.²⁵

The Synoptics

By the time of the Markan and Matthean accounts (Mark 14:22-25; Matthew 26:26-29), the bread and cup have been joined together, in their communities, within the course of the meal. The interpretive words have become words of administration, and the cup-saying appears to have been assimilated to the bread-saying resulting in precise parallelism. Possibly we are here moving from a Jewish to a more Gentile milieu. There is a shift towards emphasising the body and the blood.²⁶ Possibly a more

primitive element has been preserved by Mark and Matthew in that Jesus "blessed" (εὐλογησας) the bread and "gave thanks" (εὐχαριστήσας) over the cup.

According to G. B. Caird, "The Lucan account of the Last Supper is a scholar's paradise and a beginner's nightmare."²⁷ A shorter recension includes a cup (22:15-18) before the bread (22:19a) but not the second cup which is found in the longer versions (22:19b-20).²⁸ If the longer reading is followed, then "likewise" (ὡσαυτως) may be interpreted to mean that the bread and cup formed a separate rite after the meal.²⁹ Already within the New Testament, then, it may be reasonable to see a movement from the Dominical sevenfold action to the fourfold action ubiquitous in all classical rites.

Whether this occurred in fact during the New Testament period or not, at some stage before the writings of Justin Martyr (c. 150), Christians in celebrating the Eucharist had separated Jesus' actions with bread and cup from the meal. As an integral part of this process, and bearing directly on our anaphoral history, the brief, simple blessing over the bread appears to have been assimilated into the longer thanksgiving over the cup. The structure of this *Birkat ha-mazon*, as was seen in the previous chapter, was eminently suited to include a Christian thanksgiving and proclamation because of the possibility of narrative and epicletic embolisms. Although we can maintain that the structure of these

early anaphorae was based on the *Birkat ha-mazon*, their content can only be guessed at.³⁰ It appears unlikely, however, that an account of the Last Supper was to be found as a regular component of the anaphora at this early stage.

This study attempts to produce a coherent series of links between the thanksgivings prayed in the Upper Room before Jesus' death and the anaphorae as described in some of the earliest Eucharistic liturgies. It is to some of these that we shall now turn our attention.

NOTES

1. James Dunn in *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1977) identifies four early "denominations": Jewish, Hellenistic, Catholic and Apocalyptic. Furthermore, different locations developed along different lines.

2. E.g. Matthew 9:10-13; 12:1-8; 14:13-21; 15:32-39; 22:1-14; Luke 5:29-32; 14:1-24; John 2:1-12; 6. The disciples also experienced the presence of the Risen Christ in the context of a meal, e.g. Luke 24:30f, John 21:4-14.

3. That it was a *Chaburah*: W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (Oxford, 1925), pp.157ff.; Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, pp.30ff.; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament I* (S.C.M. London, 1952), pp.57f., 144ff.

That it was a *Pesach* (Passover meal): E. L. Mascall, *Corpus Christi* (London: Longmans, 1953), p.50; A. J. B. Higgins, *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament*, Studies in Biblical Theology, N^o 6 (S.C.M. London 1952), pp.13ff; Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1966), Ch. 1. For discussion on *Kiddush* see Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p.55n., and p.88; also Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, pp.26-29.

4. Matthew's "hymn" (26:30) and possibly Luke's first cup (22:17) belong to the Passover ritual.

5. see Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p.50 footnote 2.

6. The use of unleavened bread in the West is a ninth century development. Armenians abandoned leavened bread in the seventh century, Maronites in the twelfth in their union with Rome. See Reginald Maxwell Wooley, *The Bread of the Eucharist* (London: Mowbray, 1913) p.20, 44.

7. Mark and Matthew preserve that Jesus "blesses" the bread and "gives thanks" over the cup (see p.21)

8. If the Markan account, in which the bread and cup follow one another without interruption, is preferred as being closer to the original event, rather than the Pauline, where they are separated by the meal, then the argument as it is being developed would have to be modified and one would need to look to *Joseph and Asenath* (P. Batiffol, *Studia Patristica*, Fascicule I, 2, 1889-1890), Essene meals (*Josephus' Wars II*, 139-43), or Qumran where the priest first blesses both the bread and the wine before any partake. See k. G. Kuhn, "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran," *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl (SCM 1958), pp.65-72; also G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Penguin 1962), pp.81, 121.

In *Joseph and Asenath* (see Genesis 41:45), Joseph contrasts himself with Asenath. He blesses the living God, eats the blessed bread of life and drinks the cup of immortality. Joseph prays that God may renew Asenath with his Holy Spirit that she may eat God's bread of life and drink his cup of blessing, and be counted among his chosen people. This resemblance to the Christian Eucharist is of little scholarly help as there is no agreement whether this is a pre-Christian document or not. See Marc Philonenko, "Joseph and Asenath," in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1972), Vol. 10 p.223.

9. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p.69.

The Jewish practice was continued in the early church practice of inserting a common meal between the two parts of Jesus' action, but there was a tendency to draw the two parts together.

10. For the cup see Jeremiah 31:31-34 and Exodus 24:4-8, the Pauline phrasing also appreciates the Jewish rejection of drinking blood.

11. See Galatians 1:18. The presence of a Cephas faction in Corinth (1 Corinthians 1:12) would encourage Paul's accurate repetition of this Petrine tradition. The correlative verbs παραδίδωμι and παραλαμβάνω apply to the receiving and delivering traditions, hence Paul's "I

received from the Lord what I also delivered to you" most reasonably refers to an apostolic tradition going back to the Lord rather than a vision. Cf. 1 Corinthians 15:1-5.

12. See Louis Ligier, "The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer: From the Last Supper to the Eucharist" in *Studia Liturgica* and "From the Last Supper to the Eucharist," in *The New Liturgy*.

13. Matthew 14:19; Mark 6:41; Luke 9:16; John 11:41.

14. Except Mark 15:34 (=Matthew 27:46) where he was quoting Psalm 22:1.

15. Matthew 11:25; Luke 10:21.

16. John 11:41.

17. An "embolism" is an insertion into a prayer.

18. "Do this" could not have been an instruction to repeat the actions of breaking and distributing bread and sharing wine, as devout Jews already did the former at every meal, and the latter on festal or community occasions. (Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p.55f.; Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, p.126.)

19. These were all elements in the Passover celebration.

20. From 1 Corinthians 11:33-34, we glean two Pauline "rules": all must wait until all are assembled before the meal, and social eating and drinking is to be done at home.

21. Probably including thanksgiving for the death of the Lord.

22. The "cup of blessing" is the third of the four cups of *Pesach*. See Joseph Jungman, *The Early Liturgy* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1959), p.32. It is also used at the conclusion of a meal with three or more men present. See Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, p.110, and Roger Beckwith, *Daily and Weekly Worship: Jewish to Christian*, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 1 (Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1987), p.17-18.

23. Some scholars find evidence of this pattern of "Ministry of the Word" after "Ministry of the Sacrament", for example in the structure of the first letter to the Corinthians.

24. See Gerhard Kittel, ed. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964), I, pp.70-73.

25. Had the Institution Narrative been a regular feature of the celebration of the Lord's Supper in Corinth, Paul would have more likely referred to that rather than repeat that what he had "received from the Lord" he also "delivered" to them. See also discussion on the place of the Institution Narrative in early anaphorae in Louis Ligier, "From the Last Supper to the Eucharist," in *The New Liturgy*, and "The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer," in *Studia Liturgica* 9.

26. This was later possibly further developed in John 6.

27. G. B. Caird, *Saint Luke* (Penguin 1963), p.237.

28. As the cup-bread order is found also in 1 Corinthians 10:16 and in the *Didache*, some scholars have postulated that this represented a primitive order which soon disappeared. As D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (1956), pp.330f. argues that "the cup of blessing" is the third of four cups at the Passover, Luke's first cup can be the first of these (as described in the last chapter). This, however, would not normally have been passed around.

29. Howard Marshall sees Luke's use of "likewise" (ὡσαύτως) as "reflecting the later practice of placing both bread and cup after the church meal". See I. Howard Marshall *The Gospel of Luke* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978), p.805. See also Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, pp.122, 154.

This interpretation surprisingly does not appear in many standard commentaries to Luke, but is regularly cited by liturgical scholars, e.g. C. P. M. Jones, "The New Testament" in Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, Edward Yarnold, eds., *The Study of Liturgy* (SPCK, 1978), p.164.

30. However Acts 4:24-30 may record the type of prayer that Luke was accustomed to hear, while many would see in Revelation 4:8,11; 5:9,13,14 a reflection of such an early anaphora. It is of interest to note that the Sanctus in Revelation is closer to that of later liturgies than it is to the Septuagint of Isaiah 6:3.

CHAPTER III

ANAPHORAE FROM 80 TO 250 C.E.

From towards the end of the New Testament period to the middle of the third century, texts of anaphorae are so sparse as to warrant extreme caution in any attempt at developmental analysis. Remembering that each presider had the right to construct his own anaphora,¹ all we have from this period is the *Didache*, Justin Martyr's *First Apology*, *Addai and Mari*, the *Apostolic Tradition*, and possibly the Strasbourg Papyrus. To this may be added information gleaned from Clement of Rome (fl. c. 96), Tertullian (c. 160 to c. 225) and Cyprian (d. 258), as well as other prayers such as in the Martyrdom of Polycarp and the New Testament apocrypha.² All in all, however, we have just a minute sampling from nearly two centuries and from diverse locations within a geographically widespread religious tradition.

With these limitations in mind, this study follows the emerging common understanding of modern scholarship of the anaphora's development from the *Birkat ha-mazon*.³ Before proceeding to some of our earliest texts, it needs to be stressed that the date of a text need not necessarily date the prayer it records. As worship tends to be particularly conservative, texts often preserve a prayer which originated at an earlier period.

Didache

Text pp.67-69.

The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles or *Didache* was discovered towards the end of last century, and, although some dispute continues, it is now generally held to be of late first century Syrian origin. It is the oldest known example of a "Church Order"⁴ and it was adapted and incorporated into Book VII of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. Chapters 9, 10 and 14 preserve prayers which bear on this study. Chapter 14 indisputably refers to the Eucharist, and, although it is debated, the growing consensus is that Chapters 9 and 10 do so as well.⁵

Chapter 9 has a thanksgiving with the cup followed by a thanksgiving with the broken bread, then comes Chapter 10 with its longer thanksgiving after the meal. That the cup is blessed before the bread in Chapter 9, need hardly confirm the non-Eucharistic nature of these texts as the order may preserve the traditional succession in a Jewish meal (blessing over the first cup, blessing over the broken bread, blessing over the cup after the meal).⁶ Here we appear to have a Eucharist still accompanied by the *agapé* meal with an anaphora which reveals its dependence on the Jewish meal prayer.

Although the prayer of Chapter 10 has a tripartite structure divided by doxologies, "glory to you for

evermore" (σοι ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας) just as the *Birkat ha-mazon* has, there are certain differences even structurally. Whereas the *Birkat ha-mazon* follows a structure of Praise-Thanksgiving-Supplication, in the *Didache* the order of the first two pericopes appears to be reversed. If the analyses of Louis Finkelstein and Martin Dibelius are correct,⁷ and this prayer is dependent upon the *Birkat ha-mazon*, then a structural transformation has begun in which creation has become subordinated to redemption, and the creation pericope has become an embolism in a prayer now subordinate to thanksgiving (εὐχαριστω 10:1). The shift from commencing the prayer with praise ("baruch ..."), to beginning it with thanksgiving may be a significant change which could be reflected in the growing prevalence of "Eucharist" as the title for the whole service. This also means that as we now have it, ignoring the doxologies, the prayer has two movements, thanksgiving and supplication.

The flexibility of prayer at this period is clearly announced at the end of Chapter 10 (which has the main text considered here) in the statement, "But permit the prophets to offer thanksgiving (εὐχαριστεῖν) as much as they desire."

Justin Martyr

Justin was born in Samaria and was familiar with practices in Ephesus where for a while he taught. In his

First Apology, written about 150 C.E. in Rome, Chapters 65 to 67 give important information about the early Eucharist. Justin's anaphora is clearly flexible and because of "our remembrance of the suffering which [Jesus Christ] suffered ... [we] give thanks to God, both for creating the world with all things that are in it for the sake of man, and for freeing us from the evil in which we were born" (*Dialogue with Trypho* 41:1).⁸ There is no longer any mention of a meal.⁹

The reasons for the separation of the Eucharist from the *agapé* meal are now unclear and may include the problem of introducing the concept of religious meals to cultures in which this concept was alien, the growing size of the communities, problems of behaviour such as those Paul encountered in Corinth, the suspicion of the authorities and even the imposition of curfews. With the Lord's Supper ritualised to a ceremonial taking of food, it would be natural to move it to the normal time for a service, the morning, where it combined with the tradition of the readings and exposition which had its origin in the Synagogue. This is the situation as described by Justin.

Addai and Mari and the Sharar

Text pp.69-70.

The East Syrian anaphora named after Addai and Mari, the traditional founders of the Church of Edessa, is

available to us in several editions. Moreover, a second and related anaphora, originating in the Syriac-speaking hinterland of the patriarchate of Antioch, the *Sharar*, stands in a familial relationship to that of *Addai and Mari*. The search for an "original" common ancestor, however, ignores the freedom of the presidents in the early church to construct the anaphora.

It seems more likely that there was a particular tradition, including structure and phrases, of which these two are different developments. The dating of this tradition is also problematic. Although our text of *Addai and Mari* originates from about the sixth century, Ratcliff's deletions of certain private prayers of the priest as well as the Sanctus as being later accretions has gained almost universal acceptance.¹⁰ What remains (with the possible exceptions of the intercessions and the epiclesis) may originate in the first half of the third century. The narrative of the institution of the Lord's Supper is absent in *Addai and Mari*, but included in the *Sharar*.¹¹

Spinks follows the structure of Brightman in analysing the present text of *Addai and Mari*:¹²

A. DIALOGUE

CUSHAPA

B. GEHANTA-Praise and Thanksgiving.

C. QANONA--Sanctus with its introduction.

CUSHAPA

D. GEHANTA-Thanksgiving for redemption.

QANONA--Doxology

CUSHAPA

E. GEHANTA-Commemoration of the righteous fathers.

Petition for peace.

F. Petition for all the Church.

G. Commemoration of the mystery of Christ.

H. Epiclesis.

I. QANONA--Doxology.

Louis Ligier, Louis Bouyer, and Thomas Talley¹³ consider the three *gehantas* as similar to the three strophes of *Didache* Chapter 10 and these as continuing the tradition of the tripartite *Birkat ha-mazon* (text of H. Wegman's reconstruction of "primitive" *Addai and Mari*, pp.69-70). This primitive text was later developed by the addition of an institution narrative, anamnesis and epiclesis, and finally (F) the petition for the church.

Jacob Vellian, followed by Bryan Spinks, however, divides the prayer at the doxologies giving a bipartite structure. They draw parallels with the *Yozer* and *Ahabah* of the Synagogue liturgy (pp.63-65). The *Yozer* is paralleled in A-D and also has the Sanctus-*Kedushah*. E, F and I parallel themes of the *Ahabah*. From these reflections Spinks postulates a second century date for this text.¹⁴ This follows the interpretation of Ratcliff who saw in the excised *Addai and Mari* a form of prayer for a situation midway between *agapé* and Eucharist.

In this brief survey of scholarship on *Addai and Mari* and the *Sharar* it has become clear that little can be securely deduced from this text that confirms the theory of anaphoral evolution presented here. Neither is there anything about it, however, that challenges this theory.

Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*

Text pp.70-71.

The *Apostolic Tradition* is ascribed by most scholars to Hippolytus in early third century Rome.¹⁵ This influential Church Order probably provides us with the oldest single anaphora over the united ceremony with both bread and cup. While it is dated in Rome about 215 C.E., the text as we now have it has had an extremely complex history and this contributes to debates whether features within it are authentic or originate from the mid-fourth-century to which textual criticism can trace our present edition. Against this it may be noted that Hippolytus' conservatism is professed in the purpose of his writing which is to "guard that tradition which has remained up to now" (Ch. 1) and hence he may be presenting a Church practice of the second half of the second century. How widespread and typical the anaphoral construction of the *Apostolic Tradition* is has been another source of much debate particularly as there is nothing comparable anywhere for 150 years after this writing. Furthermore, the prayer given is that of a newly ordained bishop concelebrating with his presbytery and may reflect that

special occasion.¹⁶ Certainly the anaphora in the *Apostolic Tradition* had an extensive influence especially in Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt and Ethiopia.¹⁷

The anaphoral text is still not mandatory but forms a model and seems to incorporate phrases of early stylized liturgical formulae.¹⁸ Hippolytus wrote that

the bishop shall give thanks according to what we said above. It is not at all necessary for him to utter the same words as we said above, as though reciting them from memory, when giving thanks to God; but let each pray according to his ability. If indeed anyone has the ability to pray at length and with a solemn prayer, it is good. But if anyone, when he prays, utters a brief prayer, do not prevent him. Only¹⁹ he must pray what is sound and orthodox.

The bipartite anaphoral construction of thanksgiving and supplication is apparent. Creation has only a vestigial acknowledgment in "through whom you made all things".²⁰ Such a Christological transformation of thanksgiving for creation continues the trend already noted in the *Didache* where creation comes after redemption. This shift to a focus on the Pauline and Johannine insight into Christ's function in creating was bound to lead to a stress on redemption at the expense of the theme of creation.²¹ The prayer's major theme of the life of Christ is essentially presented chronologically. Once more acknowledging the danger of anachronistic analysis (and particularly here with the textual problems), there is nonetheless evidence of many embryonic anaphoral features which were developed in the fourth century.²²

The anaphora of the *Apostolic Tradition* may be divided into

1. Introductory dialogue;
2. Praise and Thanks;
3. Institution Narrative;
4. Anamnesis (and an oblation of the elements);
5. Epiclesis;²³
6. Doxology.

Enduring Jewish influence in this anaphora is evident in the introductory dialogue (1), and structurally in the anamnestic thanksgiving passage (2-4) followed by the supplicatory pericope (5) and concluded by an act of praise (6). In this anaphora we have the only evidence prior to the fourth century of a narrative account of the institution of the Lord's Supper and its insertion is reminiscent of the narrative embolisms inserted in the anamnestic *birkat ha-aretz* pericope of the Jewish meal prayer on the feasts of *Hanukkah* and *Purim*.

Christians adapted the Synagogue service into a morning service of the Word. It is clear that at some stage the ritual elements of the Lord's Supper, now severed from the *agapé* meal, combined with this Christian morning service. Justin Martyr witnessed to this.²⁴ One cannot be more precise about dating when this occurred in each region, but it is attractive to postulate that this union of the service of the Word and prayers with the service of the Lord's Supper increased the influence of the

Synagogue tradition on the *Birkat ha-mazon* tradition underlying the anaphora.

If, for example, it is not difficult to recognise the *Tephilla* tradition in Justin's "prayers in common" (1 *Apology* 55), and in the prayers of the faithful of the *Apostolic Tradition* 21, then is it not possible that, in this united liturgy of Word, prayer and Eucharist, the president's "thanksgiving" has taken over the proclamatory function of the *Shema*? If this is the case then the Synagogue may be, as Bouyer and others would have it, the origin of the enigmatic later arrival of the Sanctus in the anaphora. This would not have been through direct influence of the Synagogue at a later stage than seems possible, but rather through the preservation of Synagogue traditions in the Christian service of morning prayer. Such an hypothesis is made even more plausible by the later moving of intercessory material into the anaphora as well.

Finally mention needs be made of the other sources of information for this period. The fragmentary Strasbourg Papyrus Gr.254 may present another complete anaphora with *lacunae* which in its strophic structure reflects the *Birkat ha-mazon*. Its date, completeness and missing material is, however, still subject to much debate.²⁵ Along with the *Didache*, Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian it quotes Malachi 1:11 in relation to the Eucharist, a citation not often found in later writers. This as well

as its brevity and structure suggests a date perhaps as early as 200 C.E. Along with Clement of Rome, Tertullian, Cyprian, and the prayers in the Martyrdom of Polycarp, the Strasbourg Papyrus provides another indication that in this period, this time in Alexandria, the anaphora followed many linguistic and structural features of the *Birkat ha-mazon*.

Anaphorae originally appear to have been strophic, each strophe concluded by a brief doxology (with a longer one at the end). This doxological structure resembles that of the Jewish *chatimah*. Originally, like the meal prayer, anaphorae were tripartite, but the second theme, thanksgiving and *anamnesis* of redemption, soon weakened the first of praise and creation, leading to a dipartite structure of thanksgiving and supplication. Sometime this dipartite structure was also smoothed out resulting in an anaphora which was a continuous prayer with one final doxology. The prayer of *Didache* Chapter 10 presents a tripartite structure with three doxologies; *Addai and Mari* and its twin, the *Sharar*, have two doxologies. Finally in the *Apostolic Tradition* the anaphora with its continuous form concluding in a single doxology, begins to have some of the classical features that would dominate fourth and fifth century anaphoral construction. The institution account has been incorporated into the *anamnesis* and an *epiclesis* of the Holy Spirit has become part of the supplicatory section.

Once more it must be stressed that this hypothetical anaphoral genealogy is only one attractive reconstruction from very limited data of the route from the unrecorded prayer at Jesus' last supper to the fourth century anaphorae some of which will now be examined.

NOTES

1. See Justin's *1 Apology* 67:1 and Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* 9:3-5.

2. It is beyond the scope of this study to investigate the complex issues surrounding the Eucharistic material contained in the New Testament apocrypha. In the apocryphal Acts of Thomas chapters 27, 49, 133, and 158, Eucharists follow Baptism or anointing with oil. In the apocryphal Acts of John chapter 85, the Eucharist occurs in a tomb, while in chapter 109, it follows a Sunday sermon. The prayers in these services reveal no similarities with the *Birkat ha-mazon* tradition which this study is tracing.

3. This "common understanding" is outlined and enthusiastically defended by Thomas J. Talley in "The Literary Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer," *Worship*, Vol.58 No.5 (September 1984), pp.404-420.

4. Church Orders contained doctrinal pronouncements, disciplinary regulations, and forms of worship and were a common genre through into the fourth century.

5. Those who do not think these are Eucharistic: R. H. Connolly, J. Jeremias, A. Baumstark, J. P. Audet and W. Rordorf. Those who do think these Chapters are Eucharistic: T. Talley, P. Prigent, G. Bornkamm, J. Quasten, J. Daniélou, J. de Watteville and L. Bouyer.

6. See Bouyer, *Eucharist*, p.117.

7. Louis Finkelstein, "The birkat ha-mazon," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 19 (1928-29), pp.211-263. Martin Dibelius, "Die Mahl-Gebete der Didache," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 37 (1938), pp.32-41. Cited in Louis Ligier, "The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer," *Studia Liturgica* Vol.9 (1973), p.177 n.33 & 34. See also Thomas J. Talley, "From Berakah to Eucharistia: A Reopening Question," *Worship* Vol.50 No.2 (March 1976), pp.125-127.

8. R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and reformed*, 3d. ed. (New York: Pueblo, 1987), p.27. Hereafter this work will be referred to as *PEER*.

9. The president "sends up praise and glory to the Father of all in the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and gives thanks at some length that we have been deemed worthy of these things from him. When he has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people give their assent by saying *Amen*." 1 *Apology* 65:1. "And as we said before, when we have finished praying, bread and wine and water are brought up, and the president likewise sends up prayers and thanksgivings to the best of his ability, and the people assent, saying the *Amen*." 1 *Apology* 67:1. (From *PEER*, pp.28, 30.)

10. *PEER*, pp.39-40.

11. It is disputed whether *Addai and Mari* never had an Institution Narrative or whether it was removed before the tenth century. See *PEER*, p.40. Also see William Macomber, "The Ancient Form of the Anaphora of the Apostles," *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period*, Dumbarton Oaks Symposium, 1980 (Washington, D.C., 1982), pp.73-88.

12. See Bryan D. Spinks, *Addai and Mari-the Anaphora of the Apostles: A Text for Students*, Grove Liturgical Study No.24 (Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1980), pp.4-5. F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896), pp.283-288. CUSHAPA is a private prayer of the presider said kneeling and in a low voice. GEHANTA is an inclination, a prayer said in a low voice and with inclined head. QANONA is an audible conclusion to a GEHANTA.

13. L. Ligier, "The origins of the Eucharistic Prayer: From the Last Supper to the Eucharist," L. Bouyer *Eucharist* pp.154-155; T. J. Talley, "The Eucharistic Prayer of the Ancient Church According to Recent Research: Results and Reflections."

14. See Bryan D. Spinks, *Addai and Mari*, p.12.

15. It was independently identified in 1910 by E. Schwarz and in 1916 by R. H. Connolly.

16. For example, "giving you thanks because you have held us worthy to stand before you and minister to you" may be a direct reference to this ordination. One wonders too if the thanksgiving for creation may have been abbreviated for the occasion.

17. A version is still used in Ethiopia, and it has been

revised for modern use by the Roman rite (prayer 2), the Church of England (prayer 3), the Anglican Church of Canada (prayer 2) and the *Lutheran Book of Worship* (Minneapolis & Philadelphia, 1978).

18. See Geoffrey Cuming, "The Eucharist," *Essays on Hippolytus*, Grove Liturgical Study No.15 (Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1978), pp.39-51.

19. *Apostolic Tradition* 9:3-5 in Geoffrey J. Cuming *Hippolytus: A Text for Students* Grove Liturgical Study No.8 (Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1976). This Chapter is not found in the Latin recension. This translation is from the Coptic manuscript. The Arabic and Ethiopic editions date from a time when anaphoral texts were becoming fixed and omit "not at all" giving, "It is necessary for him to utter the same words as we said above"! Origen (c. 246) also has the bishop composing the anaphora in *Conversation with Heracleides* (see Geoffrey Cuming *Essays on Hippolytus*, p.41 n.7).

20. Cf. *Apostolic constitutions* Book 8 which is based on the *Apostolic Tradition* and expands these words to an extensive thanksgiving for creation. This has led some to suspect that there was originally such a thanksgiving here which was omitted in the fourth century recension we now have. It is to be noted that both Justin and Irenaeus stated thanksgiving for creation was part of the anaphora.

21. An exception to this trend is provided by the anaphora in *Apostolic Constitutions* Book 8 in which there is a very extensive thanksgiving for the creation through Christ.

22. With the only features missing being the Sanctus and the intercessions.

23. Dix believed the epiclesis was a later insertion. Ratcliff argued (5) and (6) to be additions and postulated that the text culminated in the Sanctus, a position few would now follow. Botte accepts the authenticity of the epiclesis. The epiclesis in the *Apostolic Tradition* is not dissimilar to the one in *Addai and Mari* and does not have the consecratory element found in the *Apostolic Constitutions* Book 8. In the *Apostolic Tradition* we have a basis for the development of the epiclesis (and also the intercessions).

24. 1 *Apology* 66. See *PEER*, pp. 29-30.

25. See Bryan D. Spinks, "A Complete Anaphora? A note on Strasbourg Gr.254," *The Heythrop Journal*, Vol. XXV No.1 (January 1984), pp.51-55.

CHAPTER IV

ANTIOCHENE ANAPHORAE

Although the reigns of both Constantine (d. 337 C.E.) and Theodosius (379-395 C.E.) brought changes to Christian worship including the building of grand basilicas and the elaboration of ritual, there was no radical break with the past. Certainly the liturgy continued to develop and doctrinal controversies began to make a larger impact. But the Jewish background and influence endured. In fact new features of Jewish origin, particularly the Sanctus, appeared as increasingly universal in anaphorae. The period of the fourth and fifth centuries was a time of liturgical creativity in anaphoral composition such as would not be seen again until the twentieth century. Study of this considerable collection of texts would be frustrating were it not for the fact that important centers created patterns which others followed and hence formed families or "rites".

These last two chapters will examine two families of anaphorae, the "Antiochene" and the "Alexandrian".¹ These form the two primary rites in the East.² Concentrating on just two rites will give more opportunity for some detail than an overview of all fourth and fifth century anaphorae would. Furthermore being able to contrast them will be a reminder that there was not just one pattern of a "classical" anaphora, but rather each rite developed its own riches and idiosyncrasies.

Antioch had long acted as the capital of the eastern world, and as such was of great importance also in the church. Its rite, also known as the "West Syrian", was very influential particularly in Constantinople.³ Other centers of this tradition were Jerusalem as well as Caesarea in Cappadocia.

Structure

Five important Antiochene anaphorae are those of the Twelve Apostles, John Chrysostom, Basil, James, and the pseudo-Clementine anaphora of the *Apostolic Constitutions* Book VIII. More information on the content and structure of West Syrian anaphorae during this period can also be discovered from homilies such as those by Cyril, Nestorius, Narsai as well as the diary of Egeria.⁴

The pattern of the Antiochene anaphora appears structurally to have a Sanctus and intercessions inserted into the structure already witnessed in the *Apostolic Tradition*. Either the form of Hippolytus was influential here, or he preserved an earlier Eastern paradigm which was to develop into the Antiochene type.

In outline then these Antiochene anaphorae, by the end of the fourth century, have this pattern:

1. Introductory dialogue;
2. Praise and Thanks (for Creation);
3. Pre-Sanctus;
4. Sanctus;

5. Post-Sanctus: Praise and Thanks for Salvation;
6. Institution Narrative;
7. Anamnesis;
8. Oblation;
9. Epiclesis;
10. Intercessions;
11. Doxology.

Although scholars regularly refer to the Jewish features in, for example, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and these have been central to studies demonstrating the Jewish origins of the anaphora, it is clear that the lengthy, unified Antiochene anaphorae have passed from a primarily Semitic to a particularly Greek form. Because of the nature of Hebrew syntax, Semitic forms prefer chains of shorter prayers connected by a theme to long continuous prayers such as we find in the Antiochene anaphorae.⁵

As well as Greek rhetoric, another important influence was the growing clarity in Trinitarian theology which resulted in anaphorae with a pattern similar to that of the Christian credal formulae. Thanksgiving to the Father is followed by anamnesis of the Son and epiclesis of the Spirit. The fourth century not only defined the relationship of the Father and the Son at Nicaea (325 C.E.) but it also clarified the doctrine of the Holy Spirit at Constantinople (381 C.E.). These two landmarks are not only reflected in anaphorae, but can also be helpful in dating them.

It has been noted that previous to the fourth century the presider had significant liberty in his anaphoral composition. Now, however, with the growing concern for orthodoxy and unity, and with the movement towards a state church in which presbyters were possibly less charismatic or less educated, fixed written texts were produced.

Sanctus

If the credal or proclamatory function of the anaphora is accepted, may not one explanation for the presence of the Sanctus be the comparable recitation in the Synagogue of the *Kedushah* prior to the *Shema*, the Jewish credal proclamation? This need not necessarily postulate some influence from the fourth century Synagogue, which would be highly unlikely, but the Sanctus may have been moved to the Eucharist from the Christian service of morning prayer.⁶ The insertion of the Sanctus contributed to a fourth century tendency to see the Eucharist as a representation of the heavenly liturgy complete with the priest representing Christ and the deacons representing angels.⁷ Imperial court ritual, its incense and processions, also influenced this development.

Institution Narrative

It is debated whether the anaphora commented on by Cyril of Jerusalem (c.315-386) had an Institution Narrative or not. It is the conclusion of Emmanuel Cutrone⁸ that the

anaphora used in Jerusalem at the time of the *Mystagogical Catecheses* Book Five consisted of:

1. Introductory dialogue;
2. Praise for Creation;
3. Sanctus;
4. Epiclesis;
5. Intercessions.

The absence of the Institution Narrative is deduced by an argument from silence which is accepted by John Fenwick but contested by John Baldovin.⁹ John Fenwick also argues by textual analysis, that the oblation was absent in the common original which underlies the *Twelve Apostles*, *St. John Chrysostom* and *The Apostolic Constitutions* Book VIII.¹⁰

Once more our present texts prevent us from arriving at an irrefutable conclusion. What is highlighted, however, is that anaphoral development did not proceed identically throughout the church. Evidence of an institution narrative and oblation in third century Rome, for example, cannot be used to presume their presence in mid fourth century Jerusalem. With the state's growing recognition of the church, however, journeys of important church figures resulted in a wider dissemination of texts and mutual borrowing. There is evidence of a rising tendency to embellish existing anaphorae with material gleaned from others which either made them more Biblical or incorporated more developed doctrine.¹¹

Anamnesis

The insertion of the institution narrative, with its anamnestic command to "do this in memory of me", and the amplification first of the anamnesis and later the epiclesis, all worked towards a transformation of the proclamatory nature of the Jewish meal prayer into an anaphora, a prayer of offering with a ritual foundation. Words such as "he lifted up his eyes to heaven" were added to the institution account so that the priest could ritually enact them. The fourth century tendency to represent and dramatize the Christian mysteries is well attested in the detailed diary of Egeria in Jerusalem. The *Mystagogical Catecheses* of the Antiochene theologian and Biblical exegete, Theodore of Mopsuestia (c. 350-428), encouraged the entrance of the gifts, and the *proskomide*,¹² and taught a typological interpretation of the Eucharistic action. Secondary rites such as the utilitarian preparation of the gifts were now related to Christ being led to the Cross and so on. This fourth century tendency would become determinative of theology and Eucharistic spirituality for centuries. Thanksgiving was being transformed into representation.

Epiclesis

Cyril (*Mystagogical Catecheses* IV.2d; V.7), and with him the anaphora of St. James signal a new function for the epiclesis. Previously the Holy Spirit may have been

called down upon the communicants, but now the Spirit is called down to "change" (*μεταβαλλειν*) and "make" (*ποιειν*) the bread and wine into Christ's body and blood. Here liturgically is the origin of the later Eastern understanding of the transforming effect of the epiclesis on the Eucharistic elements.¹³

This chapter, then, has outlined the final transformation of the Jewish meal prayer into the classical Antiochene or West Syrian anaphora. Theologically sophisticated and in the best tradition of Greek rhetoric, the Antiochene anaphora has a structural logic and an array of images which is unsurpassed. Within its theology, however, were the seeds of its eclipse as the central feature of the Eucharistic celebration. The concentration upon the anamnestic rather than the eucharistic and a typological interpretation of this, as well as the symbolic representation of the heavenly liturgy, step by step would lead to the anaphora being said silently within the sanctuary to which only the ordained had access. Furthermore, the introduction of a consecratory epiclesis, would encourage a shift towards an undue emphasis upon the Eucharistic elements.

NOTES

1. Besides these there are a number of other "rites" including the "East Syrian", "Roman", "Gallican", and "North African". *Addai and Mari* belong to the East Syrian rite outside the imperial boundaries.

2. All Eastern anaphorae have in common that they have no variable parts, unlike the Western predilection for such things as proper prefaces.

3. When in 451 C.E. the church in Antioch split between "Melchites" and "Jacobites", the former showed their allegiance to the emperor by taking over the Constantinopolitan development of the Antiochene rite, while the latter retained a more primitive form of the same rite. It was this latter rite which in the seventeenth century would begin to be used among the Malabar Christians of India.

4. The texts are too long and numerous to be reproduced in this study. The texts and other information on these anaphorae may be found in *PEER*, pp.88-135. Egeria's diary is accessible in *Egeria's Travels* translated by John Wilkinson (London: SPCK, 1971).

5. See Bouyer, *Eucharist* pp.244-250. Hippolytus' anaphora is our first evidence of such a continuous thanksgiving prayer and it is no surprise that Hippolytus' anaphora was not composed in a Semitic language.

6. Note the presence, for example, of the Sanctus in the *Te Deum*. An obvious sign of movement from morning prayer to the Eucharist is the use now in the latter of the *Gloria in excelsis* which was originally a hymn in morning prayer. See also T. J. Talley, "The Literary Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer," *Worship*, Vol. 58 No. 5 (September 1984), pp.404-420.

7. From the *Mystagogical Catecheses* cited by Herman Wegman, *Christian Worship in East and West* (New York: Pueblo, 1985), pp.114-116.

8. E. J. Cutrone, "Cyril's Mystagogical Catecheses and the Evolution of the Jerusalem Anaphora" (1978), cited in John Fenwick, *Fourth Century Anaphoral Construction Techniques*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 45 (Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1986).

9. John F. Baldovin, *Liturgy in Ancient Jerusalem*, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 9 (Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1989), pp.26-27.

10. John R. K. Fenwick, *The Missing Oblation*, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 11 (Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1989).

11. John Fenwick, *Fourth Century Anaphoral Construction Techniques*.

12. The *proskomide* is the preparation of the bread and wine in Eastern churches before the beginning of the Eucharistic service. The priest cuts the bread in pieces with a "lance" and the deacon prepares the wine and water in a chalice. The elements are censed and prayed over.

13. See John H. McKenna, *Eucharist and Holy Spirit* (Great Wakering: Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1975), pp.29-36. Also John F. Baldovin, *Liturgy in Ancient Jerusalem*, p.28.

CHAPTER V

ALEXANDRIAN ANAPHORAE

Alexandria, like Antioch, had traditionally exerted some authority beyond its immediate locality. Upper Egypt and Libya came under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Alexandria, a position ratified by Canon VI of Nicaea (325 C.E.). It is little wonder then that Alexandrian anaphorae should also exercise influence beyond the city.¹

Knowledge of the anaphora at Alexandria is more detailed than elsewhere because of the survival of papyri which lessen the dependency on medieval manuscripts.² The Alexandrian structure also appears more primitive. It continues the Jewish predilection for fusing together strophes rather than producing a uniform prayer with an inherent logic.³

Structure

The liturgy of the patriarchate of Alexandria is that of St. Mark. A Coptic translation of this dates from the early fifth century but earlier stages of its development are reflected in the Strasbourg Papyrus Gr.254, the Deir Balyzeh Papyrus, and the Manchester parchment. The anaphora attributed to the fourth century Serapion of Thmuis, which differs in places from the Alexandrian pattern, still shows enough similarities to be useful in this discussion. Similarly the shorter form of *Basil*

found in Egypt (*Egyptian Basil*) may also be included. Although *Egyptian Basil* apparently originates in Cappadocia or Antioch and preserves the West Syrian structure it manifests Egyptian influences.⁴ It is now often ranked with the *Apostolic Tradition* and *Addai and Mari* as preserving one of the earliest anaphorae.⁵

The main difference between the Alexandrian and Antiochene Eucharistic liturgies is found in the structure of their respective anaphorae. In particular, when the Institution Narrative was inserted in the Antiochene prayer it was placed within the thanksgiving and anamnestic material. In Alexandria it appears to have been placed within the supplicatory material.⁶ What results is a twofold epiclesis, one before and one after the Institution Narrative.⁷

We hence have the following structure:

1. Introductory Dialogue;
2. Praise and Thanks;
3. Intercessions;
4. Pre-Sanctus;
5. Sanctus;
6. Epiclesis;
7. Institution Narrative;⁸
8. Anamnesis;
9. Oblation;⁹
10. Epiclesis;
11. Doxology.

Modern research has tended to suggest that the Alexandrian anaphoral structure from the Sanctus to the final doxology resulted from West Syrian influence on a primitive form such as that found in the Strasbourg Papyrus Gr.254.¹⁰ This earlier form followed a tripartite structure of thanksgiving - offering - intercession concluding with a doxology. It opened with praise of God as Creator through Christ, an oblation of the "reasonable sacrifice and this bloodless service" and concluded with intercessions over "this sacrifice and offering". In this primitive form it is Malachi 1:11,¹¹ rather than any Institution Narrative, which forms an embolism. In fact a Christological section is absent. *St. Mark* develops this early Egyptian pattern by replacing the doxology with the Sanctus and continuing with an anaphoral structure similar to that of West Syria.¹²

Sanctus

The Sanctus appears in Christian anaphorae in two distinct forms, possibly reflecting different ways in which it was introduced into the Eucharistic liturgy. The West Syrian Sanctus is sung by the Cherubim and Seraphim. This reflects the custom of the Synagogue and can be traced back to Isaiah 6:3. *Egyptian Basil*, showing its West Syrian origin, exemplifies this tradition: "around you stand the cherubim with many eyes and the seraphim with six wings, forever singing the hymn of glory and saying: [people:] Holy, holy, holy Lord"

Alternatively, the Egyptian Sanctus occurs in the anaphora as the song of the faithful who sing it following the example of the Cherubim and Seraphim. This form is found in *St. Mark* and *Serapion*: " ... with them we hymn you and say: [*people*:] Holy, holy, holy" (*St. Mark*).

Another Alexandrian characteristic is the absence of a form of the "Blessed is he who comes" which everywhere else follows the Sanctus.

Epiclesis

The proclamation in the Sanctus that heaven and earth are "full" of God's glory provides the cue for the Alexandrian epiclesis before the Institution Narrative. In this first epiclesis the Father is typically asked to "fill ... this sacrifice also with the blessing from you through the descent of your Holy Spirit" (*St. Mark*).¹³ Only after the Institution Narrative does the second epiclesis ask for the transformation of the bread and the wine into Christ's body and blood. This "consecratory epiclesis" is first witnessed in *Egyptian Basil* and so may have originated in West Syria and from there influenced Egypt.¹⁴

In the Deir Balyzeh Papyrus, which provides an Egyptian anaphora possibly dating to the late fourth century, a consecratory epiclesis occurs prior to the Institution Narrative. Here the Father is asked to send the Holy

Spirit to "make the bread the body of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and the cup the blood."¹⁵ No longer is the "full" in the Sanctus the cue to filling the sacrifice, but it is the worshipers whom God is asked to "fill ... also with your glory". Unfortunately we know nothing in this fragment of the content of any second epiclesis or even if there was one after the Institution Narrative.

Serapion follows the simpler Alexandrian form in its first epiclesis, asking for the filling of the sacrifice with "power" (δυναμews) and "participation" (μεταληψεως). When after the Institution Narrative it proceeds to the consecratory epiclesis, the "Word" is called upon rather than the "Spirit". How much *Serapion* can be relied upon to witness to the Alexandrian tradition of the mid fourth century is disputed, with Botte arguing that the text is that of one who wished to diminish the role of the Spirit, while others see the lack of distinction between "Word" and "Spirit" as a genuine archaism.¹⁶

Anamnesis

The Institution Narrative in the Alexandrian family of anaphorae is characteristically introduced by the causative "because" (ὅτι) or "for" (γάρ). This narrative is then enlarged by adding the "Pauline comment" (1 Corinthians 11:26) as a part of Jesus' words: "For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim my death and confess my Resurrection."

Hence, the anamnesis begins with "proclaiming" rather than "remembering" as found in other rites. Furthermore, because the offering has been made earlier in the prayer, the oblation now is in the aorist: "Proclaiming (καταγγελοντες) the death of your Son and confessing his resurrection, we have offered (προεβηκαμεν) before you from your own gifts."

In attempting to reconstruct the development of the Alexandrian anaphora, it appears that just as with *Didache* Chapter 10 and *Addai and Mari*, the earliest anaphorae were tripartite in structure (reflecting the *Birkat ha-mazon*) with anamnestic praise and thanksgiving followed by epicletic intercessions.¹⁷ Such an anaphora is presented in the Strasbourg Papyrus Gr.254. In the previous chapter it was postulated that Antiochene anaphorae were systematic reworkings of such traditional material under elaborate rhetoric and within a framework of an advanced Trinitarian theology. As this Antiochene development came to influence Alexandria, the primitive Alexandrian form was preserved particularly before the Sanctus, hence explaining the location of the intercessions. In fact, in Alexandrian anaphorae, from the Sanctus onwards is epicletic material rather than a continuation of the anamnestic thanksgiving as is found in West Syria.

Finally it appears that the influence of the Antiochene and Alexandrian liturgies upon one another did not just

work in one direction. The Byzantine liturgy of St. Basil and the liturgy of St. James are both reworkings of *Egyptian Basil*.¹⁸ Although *Egyptian Basil* probably originated in West Syria, it evidences Egyptian influences¹⁹ and it is through this, for example, that the "Pauline comment" (1 Corinthians 11:26) is to be found in *Byzantine Basil* and *James*. This mutual borrowing is one reason for caution in locating the origin of specific features during this period.²⁰

NOTES

1. Alexandria and Antioch were also theological rivals. The former, highly influenced by the Platonic tradition, stressed the transcendence of God, the divinity of Christ, the distinction of the persons of the Trinity and the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures. This contrasted with the Aristotelian tendency of Antioch which tended to stress Christ's humanity, an economic Trinity and the historical sense of the Scriptures.

2. Reference has already been made to Strasbourg Gr. 254 in Chapter 3 above.

3. This more primitive tendency is also observable in the Roman rite. The Antiochene genius for creating an anaphora which forms a literary unity is credited by Aimé Puech as being due to the influence of Libanios (314-393), the Antiochian teacher of Basil, of the two Gregorys, and of John Chrysostom. See Bouyer, *Eucharist*, p.246.

4. For texts see *PEER*, pp.52-81.

5. See *PEER*, p.67.

6. This appears to have similarly occurred in the Roman rite where everything after "*Te igitur*" appears to be supplicatory. See also Frank C. Senn, "Toward a Different Anaphoral Structure," *Worship*, Vol. 58 No. 4 (July 1984).

7. Unless one argues that the first epiclesis was inserted along with the Sanctus.

8. Introduced in the Alexandrian rite by $\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$ or $\gamma\alpha\rho$.
9. In the past tense, see following paragraph.
10. See Thomas J. Talley, "The Literary Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer," p.416.
11. "We offer the reasonable sacrifice and this bloodless service, which all the nations offer you, from sunrise to sunset, from south to north, for your name is great among all the nations, and in every place incense is offered to your holy name and a pure sacrifice" (Strasbourg Papyrus Gr.254). Malachi 1:11 is found also in the *Didache*, Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian, but later it is seldom used in relation to the Eucharist.
12. Some differences are the preliminary epiclesis and the lack of a Christological section.
13. See *PEER*, p.64.
14. *Egyptian Basil* lacks a preliminary epiclesis before the Institution Narrative.
15. *PEER*, p.80.
16. See John H. McKenna, *Eucharist and Holy Spirit*, Alcuin Club Collections No. 57 (Great Wakering: Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1975) p.27. See also *PEER*, p.75.
17. This bipartite format has already been noted in relation to Hippolytus (p.33). The combination of bipartite and tripartite patterns in the Christian anaphorae is occasioning research into the euchological form for the maintenance of the covenant relationship which Cesare Giraudo termed the "Old Testament *today*". (See Thomas J. Talley, "The Literary Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer.")
18. The 1932 thesis of Dom Hieronymus Engberding that *Byzantine Basil* is based on *Egyptian Basil* is now universally accepted. This thesis, as well as the origin of *James*, is clearly expounded by John Fenwick in *Fourth Century anaphoral Construction Techniques*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 45.
19. E.g. the "Pauline comment" and the aorist oblation.
20. E.g. did the consecratory epiclesis originate in West Syria or in Egypt?

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The Jewish meal in the first century was hallowed at its beginning by the blessing over the bread (which was then broken and shared), and on festal occasions by the thanksgiving over the wine towards the meal's conclusion. In this latter prayer, the *Birkat ha-mazon*, God was blessed as creator, sustainer, and redeemer, and if there was a particular festival this prayer could reflect that. God's actions were recalled and prayer was offered for Israel. An eschatological element was present in the supplications. Finally, these prayers concluded with another expression of praise. In the *Birkat ha-mazon* the Jewish community reaffirmed in a credal form its heritage and hopes.

Although the prayers of Jesus with the bread and the cup at the Last Supper are not recorded, their very absence argues for the presumption that he followed the normal *Birkat ha-mazon* framework. From the beginning, Christians followed Jesus' command and remembered him with the bread and wine of their normal community meals. Their thanksgiving would now have included all that God had done for them in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus.

The early centuries do not provide many examples of the Christian prayer of thanksgiving with bread and wine

(which later in the East would be called the anaphora). In all early anaphorae, however, this study has traced Jewish influences, both from the *Birkat ha-mazon* as well as later from the Synagogue. This Synagogue influence appears not to have come directly from Judaism, which with growing anti-semitism would be implausible, but through the earlier influence of the Synagogue on Christian morning prayer. It was with this "Synagogue-style" morning prayer that the Lord's Supper came to be combined when the ritual with bread and cup was separated from the ordinary meal.

Certainly there are some anaphorae which appear as more dependent on the mystery religions than on the *Birkat ha-mazon*.¹ This study, however, traced the Jewish influence from the New Testament period to classical anaphorae of the fourth and fifth centuries centering on Antioch and Alexandria. Similar studies could produce comparable conclusions for Rome, Gaul, North Africa or elsewhere. Through choosing two locations, it has become evident that the development of the anaphora did not proceed identically in every area. The anaphora evolved differently in different communities and at different rates. Yet each retained fixed elements from the *Birkat ha-mazon*: the introductory dialogue including the presider's request for permission to pray in the name of the community, "Let us give thanks to the Lord our God," and their assent, "It is right to do so," as well as

praise, thanksgiving and supplication, and the acclamation "Amen" at the end. Furthermore, the movement from the Dominical sevenfold action, which included two prayers separated by the meal, was universally modified to a fourfold action including a single anaphora.

Before the fourth century, limited documents and problems of textual recensions have necessitated cautious conclusions so that texts from different locations and disputed periods have not been forced to conform to a preconceived theory of anaphoral evolution.

From the fourth century our information becomes more abundant. Social changes and theological development encouraged greater formalism and the fixing of texts. The journeys of Christian leaders resulted in mutual borrowing and influence. In the Alexandrian and more particularly the Antiochene anaphorae there were developments which produced a Trinitarian pattern comparable to the creeds. The Jewish strophic structure of prayer, though to some degree retained in Egypt, was abandoned in West Syria for the unified form deriving from Greek rhetoric. The Institution Narrative increasingly appears, as does the Sanctus and the "Blessed is he who comes" Further acclamations were added for the congregation in addition to the traditional concluding "Amen".

During the time when the Antiochene and Alexandrian

anaphorae assumed the shape which they would retain to this present day, the epicletic focus on a transformation in the Eucharistic elements, as well as dramatic influence from imperial court ritual, encouraged the transformation of the anaphora's essence. The meal in which Jesus wished to be remembered had already been condensed to the essential symbolic elements of bread and wine. Now this became a mystical re-enactment and a dramatic representation in which the anaphora was limited to an incantation pronounced within the confines of a screened sanctuary. Here whatever Jewish elements of thanksgiving and proclamation remained were reduced to a shadow of their original intention.

NOTES

1. The Acts of John 109 (second century) is still used in the Ethiopian Anaphora of Saint John the Evangelist; the Acts of Thomas 49-50 (third century) is part of a Eucharistic prayer in a seventh century Irish palimpsest (a manuscript later covered by a second text).

TEXTS

Birkat ha-mazon

From the tenth-century manuscript, *Seder* (or *Siddur*) *Rab' Saadia Gaon*, translated by R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming in *Prayers of the Eucharist*, pp.10-11. Text available in *Siddur R. Saadia Gaon* ed. I. Davidson, S. Assaf, B. I. Joel, (Jerusalem, 1941).

Blessing of the one who nourishes

Blessed are you, Lord our God, King of the universe, for you nourish us and the whole world with goodness, grace, kindness, and mercy.

Blessed are you, Lord for you nourish the universe.

Blessing for the land (birkat ha-aretz, בִּרְכַּת הָאֶרֶץ)¹

We will give thanks to you, Lord our God, because you have given us for our inheritance a desirable land, good and wide, the covenant and the law, life and food.

(On the feasts of *Hanukkah* and *Purim*, here follows an embolism.)

And for all these things we give you thanks and bless your name for ever and ever and beyond.

Blessed are you, Lord, for the land and for food.

Blessing for Jerusalem

(*birkat ha-Ierushalayyim*, בִּרְכַּת יְרוּשָׁלַיִם)

Have mercy, Lord our God, on us your people Israel, and your city Jerusalem, on your sanctuary and your dwelling place, on Zion, the habitation of your glory, and the great and holy house Zion, over which your name is invoked. Restore the kingdom of the house of David to its place in our days, and speedily build Jerusalem.

(On the feast of *Passover*, here follows this embolism: *ya'aleh we-yavo*, יָאֵלֶּה וְיָבוֹא):

Our God and God of our fathers, may there arise in your sight, and come, and be present, and be regarded, and be pleasing, and be heard, and be visited, and be remembered, our remembrance and our visitation, and the remembrance of our fathers, and the remembrance of the Messiah, the son of your servant David, and the remembrance of Jerusalem, the city of your holiness, and the remembrance of all your people, the house of Israel: for escape, for prosperity, for grace, and for loving-

kindness and mercy for life and for peace, on this day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Remember us on this day, Lord our God, for prosperity, and visit us on it for blessing, and save us on it for life. And by the word of salvation and mercy spare us, and grant us grace, and have mercy on us, and save us: for our eyes look to you, for you, O God, are a gracious and merciful king.)

Blessed are you, Lord, for you build Jerusalem. Amen.

[*Blessing of the good and beneficent*

Blessed are you, Lord our God, King of the universe, God, our father, our king, our creator, our redeemer, good and beneficent king, who day by day is concerned to benefit us in many ways, and himself will increase us for ever in grace and kindness and spirit and mercy and every good thing.]

According to Finkelstein, the fourth benediction, included above in square brackets, is an early second century addition. (The Mishnah mentions only three, while the Babylonian Talmud knows of the four).

NOTES

1. *Birkat ha-aretz* is technically the title of the *chatimah* which concludes this pericope, but it is now commonly used to refer to the total thanksgiving.

This pericope was flexible at the time of Jesus, and continued to develop in the Gaonic period as is indicated by comparison of the texts of Saadia and Amram. The festal embolisms are another indication of its flexibility.

Passover

The ritual of Passover, as recorded about the end of the second century, had the following structure:

Blessing over the first cup;
Herbs and sauce;
Explanation (*haggadah*) by the head of the house;
First part of the *hallel* ⁷⁷□ (Psalm 113 or 113-114);
The second cup;
Blessing over the (unleavened) bread;
The Passover lamb;
Blessing (*Birkath ha-mazon*) over the third cup
("the cup of blessing");
Second part of the *hallel* (Psalms 114-118 or 115-118);
Praise over the fourth cup. (PEER, p.8.)

Passover Haggadah

From *The Mishnah* translated by Jacob Neusner.

Therefore we are duty-bound to thank, praise, glorify, honour, exalt, extol, and bless him who did for our forefathers and for us all these miracles. He brought us forth from slavery to freedom, anguish to joy, mourning to festival, darkness to great light, subjugation to redemption, so we should say before him, Hallelujah.

PEER, p.11 sees this as being recited "At the elevation of the cup". However this interpretation is not directly derived from our text, and its recitation is not even indicated.

Synagogue Liturgy

Kaddish:

Magnified and sanctified be His great name in the world which He has created according to His will. May He establish His Kingdom during your life and during your days, and during the life of all the house of Israel, even speedily and at a near time, and say Amen.

Let His great name be praised for ever and to all eternity.¹

The *Sheliach sibbur* (שְׁלִיחַ סִבּוּר) chants

Bless the Lord, who is to be blessed.

Blessed be the Lord, who is to be blessed, for ever and ever.

Yozer:

Blessed are you, Lord, our God, King of the universe, who forms light and creates darkness, who makes peace and creates all things: who in mercy gives light to the earth and to them that dwell thereon and in his goodness renews the creation every day continually. How manifold are your works, Lord. In wisdom you have made them all, the earth is full of your possessions. King who alone was exalted from aforetime, praised, glorified and exalted from days of old. Everlasting God, in your abundant mercies have mercy upon us, Lord of our strength, Rock of our stronghold, Shield of our salvation, you stronghold of ours. The blessed God, great in knowledge, prepared and formed the rays of the sun: it was a boon he produced as a glory to his name. He set the luminaries round about his strength. The chiefs of his hosts are holy beings, they exalt the Almighty, continually declare the glory of God and his holiness. Be blessed, Lord, our God, in the heavens above and on the earth beneath. Be blessed, our

Rock, our King and our Redeemer, Creator of holy beings, praised be your name forever, our King, Creator of ministering spirits, and all of his ministering spirits stand in the height of the universe, and with awe proclaim aloud in unison the words of the living God and everlasting King. All of them are beloved, all of them are pure, all of them are mighty, all of them in dread do the will of their master, all of them open their mouths in holiness and purity and praise and glorify and sanctify the name of the great King, the mighty and dreaded One, holy is he. They all take upon themselves the yoke of the kingdom of heaven, one from the other, and give leave one to another to hallow their Creator: in tranquil joy of spirit, with pure speech and with holy melody they all respond in unison in fear, and say with awe

Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory.

And the Ophanim and the holy Chayoth with a noise of great rushing, upraising themselves towards them praise and say:

Blessed be the glory of the Lord from this place.

To the blessed God they offer pleasant melodies, to the King, the living and ever-enduring God they utter hymns and make their praises heard, for he alone performs mighty deeds and makes new things, the Lord of battles, he sows righteousness, causes salvation to spring forth, creates remedies, is revered in praises, the Lord of wonders who in his goodness renews the creation every day continually, as it is said: (Give thanks) to him that makes great lights for his grace endures forever. Blessed are you, Lord, Creator of the luminaries.

Ahabah:

With abounding love you have loved us, Lord, our God, with great and exceeding pity you have pitied us, our Father, our King, for the sake of our fathers who trusted in you, and whom you taught the statutes of life, be gracious also to us. Our Father, merciful Father, have mercy upon us, and put it into our hearts to understand, and to discern, and to hear, and to learn, and to do all the words of instruction in your Torah in love. And enlighten our eyes in your commandments, and let our hearts cleave to your fear, and unite our hearts to love your name because we have been called by your holy, truly great name. Do unto us for the sake of your great and fearful name, soon in love exalt our horn and be our king and save us for the sake of your name, for we have trusted in you, that we be not put to shame, and we trust in your name that we be not abashed nor stumble for ever and ever because you, O God, are our Father, our God, and

let not your mercy abandon us for ever and ever. Let peace come over us from the four corners of the earth and cause us soon to go upright to our land, for you have chosen us from all peoples and tongues and have brought us near to your great name in love. Blessed are you, Lord, who has chosen your people Israel in love.

Here follows the collective recitation of the Shema.

A few passages from the Tephilla will serve to illustrate the nature of this prayer.

O Lord, open my lips,
and my mouth shall declare your praise!

1. (Aboth-אֲבוֹת) Blessed are you, Lord, our God and God of our fathers, God of Abraham, God of Isaac and God of Jacob, the great, the mighty and revered God, the most high God, who bestows lovingkindness, possesses all things and remembers the pious deeds of the fathers, and will bring a redeemer to their children's children for your name's sake, in love, King, Helper, Saviour and Shield. Blessed are you, Lord, the Shield of Abraham.

2. (Geburoth-גְּבוּרוֹת) You are mighty forever, Lord Blessed are you, Lord, who quickens the dead.

(Keter-קֶטֶר) Unto you shall the multitudes above with all the gatherings below give a crown, all with one accord shall thrice repeat the holy praise unto you, according to what is said through the prophet: and one cried unto another and said:

Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory.

Then with noise of great rushing, mighty and strong, they make their voices heard, and upraising themselves towards them, they say:

Blessed, blessed be the glory of the Lord from his place.

From your place shine forth, our King, and reign over us for we wait upon you

3. (Kedushat ha-Shem-קְדוּשַׁת־הַשֵּׁם) From generation to generation give homage to God for he alone is high and holy, and your praise, our God, shall not depart from our mouth for ever, for you are a great and holy king. Blessed are you Lord, holy God.

Then follow the twelve (now thirteen) petitions (all structurally very similar to number 5 included below).

4. (Binah-בִּינָה) for knowledge.

5. (*Teshubah*- תְּשׁוּבָה) *for repentance.* Cause us to return, our Father, unto your Torah, and draw us near, our King, unto your service, and bring us back in perfect repentance before you. Blessed are you, Lord, who delights in repentance.

6. (*Selishah*- שְׁלִישָׁה) *for forgiveness.*

7. (*Ge'ullah*- גְּאֻלָּה) *for redemption.*

8. (*Refnah*- רִפְנוּה) *for healing.*

9. (*Birkat ha-shanim*- בִּרְכַּת הַשָּׁנִים) *for blessing of the year.*

10. (*Kibbus galuyoth*- קִבּוּץ גְּלוּיֹת) *for return of the exiles.*

11. (*Birkat mishpat*- בִּרְכַּת מִשְׁפָּט) *for righteousness.*

12. (*Birkatha-minim*- בִּרְכַּת הַמִּינִים) *against the wicked.* (A very variable prayer against the Christians, especially Jewish Christians. This is a later addition.)

13. (*Birkat saddiqim*- בִּרְכַּת צַדִּיקִים) *for reward of the righteous.*

14. (*Birkat Yerushalem*- בִּרְכַּת יְרוּשָׁלַיִם) *for Jerusalem.* Now praying for Jerusalem's rebuilding, originally this would have focused on the building of Jerusalem and on the divine presence.

15. (*Birkat David*- בִּרְכַּת דָּוִד) *for messianic salvation.*

16. (*Tephilla*- תְּפִלָּה) *for reception of prayer.*

Praise becomes more dominant in the final three pericopes.

17. (*Abodah*- אַבֹּדָה) *to accept Israel and its prayer.*

18. (*Hodah*- הוֹדָה) We give thanks to you, our God and the God of our fathers; you are the Rock of our lives...Blessed are you, Lord, whose name is all-good, and to whom it is fitting to give thanks.

19. (*Birkat kohanim*- בִּרְכַּת כֹּהֲנִים) Grant peace, welfare, blessing, loving-kindness and mercy unto us and unto all Israel, your people, and bless us, our Father, ... Blessed are you, Lord, who blesses your people Israel with peace.²

Morning prayer: *Yozer* (cf. Isaiah 45:7)
Ahabah
Shema
Ge'ullah

NOTES

1. Adapted from Eric Werner, *The Sacred Bridge* (London: Dennis Dobson, 1959), p.6.

2. The *Yozer* and *Ahabah* are adapted from Bouyer, *Eucharist*, pp.62-64, in which Bouyer is quoting from David Hedegard, *Seder R. Amram Gaon, Part I, Hebrew Text with critical Apparatus, translation with Notes and Introduction* (Lund, 1951), pp.46ff. The Tephilla similarly adapts Bouyer's pp.71-77 (Hedegard 83ff., 87ff., 96ff., 114ff.).

Attah konanta (אֲתָּה כּוֹנֵן הָעוֹלָם)

From the rite for the Day of Atonement, a recitation from creation to the fall, a feature prominent in Eastern anaphorae.

You founded the world in the beginning; you established the globe, and made the universe, and moulded the creatures.

When you saw the empty void, the darkness, and the spirit on the face of the deep, you scattered the blackness and aroused the light

He fell away from your word and was expelled from Eden; and you did not destroy him, because he was the workmanship of your hands

(*PEER*, p.12 from *Siddur R. Saadia Gaon*)

Didache

Chapter 9

About the thanksgiving: give thanks thus:

First, about the cup:

We give thanks to you, our Father, for the holy vine of your child¹ David, which you have made known to us through your child Jesus;
 glory to you for evermore.

And about the broken bread:

We give thanks to you, our Father, for the life and knowledge which you made known to us through your child Jesus;
glory to you for evermore.

As this broken bread was scattered over the mountains, and when brought together became one, so let your Church be brought together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom;
for yours are the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for evermore.

But let no one eat or drink of your thanksgiving (εὐχαριστίας) but those who have been baptized in the name of the Lord. For about this also the Lord has said, "Do not give what is holy to the dogs."

Chapter 10

And after you have had your fill, give thanks thus:

We give thanks to you, holy Father, for your holy Name which you have enshrined in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which you made known to us through your child Jesus;
glory to you for evermore.

You, almighty Master, created all things for the sake of your Name, and gave food and drink to humanity for their enjoyment, that they might give you thanks; but to us you have granted spiritual food and drink and eternal life through your child Jesus. Above all we give you thanks because you are mighty;
glory to you for evermore. Amen.

Remember, Lord, your Church, to deliver it from all evil and to perfect it in your love; bring it together from the four winds, now sanctified, into your kingdom which you have prepared for it;
for yours are the power and the glory for evermore.

May grace come, and may this world pass away.

Hosanna to the God of David.

If any is holy, let him come; if any is not, let him repent.
Maranatha. Amen.

But allow the prophets to give thanks (εὐχαριστεῖν) as much as they will.

Chapter 14

On the Lord's day of the Lord [sic.], come together, break bread, and give thanks, having first confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure.

But let none who has a quarrel with his companion join with you until they have been reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be defiled.

For this is that which was spoken by the Lord, "In every place, and at every time, offer me a pure sacrifice; for I am a great king, says the Lord, and my Name is wonderful among the nations."²

(PEER pp.23-24, slightly adapted.)

NOTES

1. Greek: or "servant".

2. Malachi 1:11.

Addai and Mari

First strophe

Worthy of *glory* from every mouth and *thanksgiving* from every tongue is the adorable and glorious *Name* He *created* the world through his grace and its inhabitants through his kindness; he *saved* men through his mercy; and gave great grace to morals ... (seal or doxology).

Second strophe

... Lord, we ... give you thanks because you have given us a great grace which cannot be repaid. For you *put on our human nature to give us life* through your divine nature; you exalted our lowliness; you redressed our fallen state; you revived our mortality; you forgave our debts; you justified our sinfulness; you *enlightened our intelligence*. You, our Lord and our God, conquered our enemies, and *made the lowliness of our weak nature to triumph* through the abundant mercy of your grace ... (seal or doxology).

Third strophe

You, Lord, through your many mercies which cannot be told, be *graciously mindful* of all the pious and righteous fathers who were pleasing in your sight, in the

commemoration of (your) body and blood...which we offer to you on the pure and holy altar, as you taught us. And grant us your tranquillity and your peace for all the days of this age. Amen.

Seal or doxology

And because of all your wonderful *dispensation* toward us, with *open mouths and uncovered faces* let us give you thanks and glorify you without ceasing in your Church, which has been redeemed by (your) precious blood....Amen.

(Reconstruction by H. Wegman, "Pleidooi voor een tekst: de Anaphora van de Apostelen Addai en Mari," *Bijdragen* 40, 1979, pp.14-43. Cited in Herman Wegman, *Christian Worship in East and West*, trans. Gordon W. Lathrop (New York: Pueblo, 1985), p.133. Italicized words "are important for further analysis and take us back to the old Syrian, Jewish-Christian world of faith." (Wegman p.133). Cf. *PEER*, pp.39-44.

Apostolic Tradition

Chapter 4

And when he has been made bishop, all shall offer the kiss of peace, greeting him because he has been made worthy.

Then the deacons shall present the offering to him; and he, laying his hands on it with all the presbytery, shall say, giving thanks:

The Lord be with you.

And all shall say:

And with your spirit.

Up with your hearts.

We have (them) with the Lord.

Let us give thanks to the Lord.

It is fitting and right.

And then he shall continue thus:

We render thanks to you, O God, through your beloved child¹ Jesus Christ, whom in the last times you sent to us as a saviour and redeemer and angel of your will; who is your inseparable Word, through whom you made all things, and in whom you were well pleased. You sent him from heaven into a virgin's womb; and conceived in the womb, he was made flesh and was manifested as your Son, being born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin. Fulfilling your will and gaining for you a holy people, he stretched

out his hands when he should suffer, that he might release from suffering those who have believed in you.

And when he was betrayed to voluntary suffering that he might destroy death, and break the bonds of the devil, and tread down hell, and shine upon the righteous, and fix a term, and manifest the resurrection, he took bread and gave thanks to you, saying, "Take, eat; this is my body, which shall be broken for you." Likewise also the cup, saying, "This is my blood, which is shed for you; when you do this, you make my remembrance."

Remembering therefore his death and resurrection, we offer to you the bread and cup, giving thanks because you have held us worthy to stand before you and minister to you.

And we ask that you would send your Holy Spirit upon the offering of your holy Church; that, gathering her into one, you would grant to all who receive the holy things [to receive]² for the fullness of the Holy Spirit for the strengthening of faith in truth; that we may praise and glorify you through your child³ Jesus Christ; through whom be glory and honour to you, to the Father and the Son, with the Holy Spirit, in your holy Church, both now and to the ages of ages. Amen.

(*PEER*, pp.34-35.)

NOTES

1. Or "servant".

2. Added to make sense of the difficult Latin at this point.

3. Or "servant".

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albright, W. F., and Mann, C. S. *Matthew*. New York: Doubleday, 1984.

Baldovin, John F. *Liturgy in Ancient Jerusalem*. Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 9. Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1989.

Barret, C. K. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: Charles Black, 1968.

Baumstark, Anton. *Comparative Liturgy*. Revised by Bernard Botte. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1958.

Beckwith, Roger T. *Daily and Weekly Worship: Jewish to Christian*. Grove Liturgical Study 49. Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1987.

Bettenson, Henry ed. *Documents of the Christian Church*. Oxford University Press, 1963.

Birnbaum, Philip. *Daily Prayer Book*. New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, 1977.

Bouyer, Louis. *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.

Bradshaw, Paul F. ed. *The Canons of Hippolytus*. Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 2. Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1987.

_____. *Daily Prayer in the Early Church*. Alcuin Club/SPCK, 1981.

_____. *Liturgical Presidency in the Early Church*. Grove Liturgical Study No. 36. Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1983.

Brightman, F. E., and Hammond, C. E. ed. *Liturgies Eastern and Western*. Vol I Eastern Liturgies. Oxford: Clarendon, 1896.

Brock, Sebastian and Vasey, Michael ed. *The Liturgical Portions of the Didascalia*. Grove Liturgical Study No. 29. Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1982.

Buchanan, Colin. ed. *Essays on Eucharistic Sacrifice in the Early Church*. Grove Liturgical Study No. 40. Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1984.

Caird, G. B. *Saint Luke*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1963.

Cuming, Geoffrey. *He Gave Thanks: An Introduction to the Eucharistic Prayer*. Grove Liturgical Study No. 28. Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1981.

_____. *Hippolytus: A Text for Students*. Grove Liturgical Study No. 8. Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1976.

The Definitions of the Catholic Faith and Canons of Discipline of the First Four General Councils of the Universal Church: in Greek and English. Oxford: James Parker, 1863.

Delling, D. Gerhard. *Worship in the New Testament*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1962.

Dix, Dom Gregory. *The Shape of the Liturgy*. London: Dacre Press, 1945.

Duba, Arlo D. "Hints for a Morphology of Eucharistic Praying: A Study of John 13:31-17:26." In *Worship* Vol 57 No.4, July (1983): 365-377.

Dugmore, C. W. *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office*. Westminster: The Faith Press, 1944.

Dunn, James D.G. *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*. London: SCM Press, 1977.

Emminghaus, Johannes H. *The Eucharist: Essence, Form, Celebration*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1988.

Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1987.

Fenton, J. C. *Saint Matthew*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1963.

Fenwick, John R. K. *Fourth Century Anaphoral Construction Techniques*. Grove Liturgical Study No. 45. Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1986.

_____. *The Missing Oblation: The Contents of the Early Antiochene Anaphora*. Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 11. Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1989.

Ferguson, Everett. *Early Christians Speak: Faith and Life in the first three centuries*. Abilene, Texas: ACU Press, 1981.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

Frere, Walter Howard. *The Anaphora or Great Eucharistic Prayer: An eirenical study in Liturgical History*. London: SPCK, 1938.

Geldenhuy, Norval. *The Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1951.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. *The Apostolic Fathers*. London: Independent Press, 1950.

Grisbrooke, W. Jardine. *The Liturgical Portions of the Apostolic Constitutions: A Text for Students*. Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 13-14. Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1990.

Guthrie, Harvey H. *Theology as Thanksgiving: From Israel's Psalms to the Church's Eucharist*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1981.

Hahn, Ferdinand. *The Worship of the Early Church*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973.

Hanson, R. P. C. *Eucharistic offering in the Early Church*. Grove Liturgical Study No. 19. Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1979.

Hennecke, E., ed. *New Testament Apocrypha*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1965.

Higgins, A. J. B. *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 6. London: SCM Press, 1952.

Houssiau, Albert. "The Alexandrine Anaphora of St Basil." In Lancelot Sheppard ed., *The New Liturgy*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970. pp. 228-243.

Jasper, R. C. D., and Cuming, G. J. *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and reformed*. 3rd ed. New York: Pueblo, 1987.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1966.

Jones, Cheslyn; Wainwright, Geoffrey; and Yarnold, Edward ed. *The Study of the Liturgy*. London: SPCK, 1978.

Jungmann, Joseph A. *The Early Liturgy to the time of Gregory the Great*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1959.

Kee, Howard Clark. *The Origins of Christianity- Sources and Documents*. London: SPCK, 1973.

Kraft, Robert, A., and Nickelsburg, George W. E. ed. *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

Kucharek, Caimir. *The Byzantine-Slav Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Its Origin and Evolution*. Allendale, N.J.: Alleluia Press, 1971.

Lane, William L. *The Gospel of Mark*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1974.

Legrand, Hervé-Marie. "The Presidency of the Eucharist According to the Ancient Tradition." In *Worship* Vol.53 No.5, September (1979): 413-438.

Lightfoot, J. B., and Harmer, J. R. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1984.

Ligier, Louis. "From the Last Supper to the Eucharist." In Lancelot Sheppard ed., *The New Liturgy*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970. pp.113-150.

_____. "The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer: From the Last Supper to the Eucharist." In *Studia Liturgica* Vol.9, (1973): 161-185.

Linton, Arthur. *Twenty-Five Consecration Prayers with Notes and Introduction*. London: SPCK, 1944.

Maccoby, Hyam. *Judaism in the First Century*. London: Sheldon Press, 1989.

McKenna, John H. *Eucharist and Holy Spirit: The Eucharistic Epiclesis in 20th Century Theology*. Alcuin Club Collections No.57. Great Wakering: Mayhew McCrimmon, 1975.

Mann, C.S. *Mark*. New York: Doubleday, 1986.

Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Greek New Testament Commentary. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1978.

Martimort, A.G. *The Church at Prayer: The Eucharist*. Shannon: Irish University Press, 1973.

Martin, Ralph. *Worship in the Early Church*. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1964.

Mascall, E. L. *Corpus Christi*. London: Longmans, 1953.

Maxwell, William D. *An Outline of Christian Worship: Its Development and Forms*. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.

Moule, C. F. D. *Worship in the New Testament*. Grove Liturgical Study No. 12/13. Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1983.

Neusner, Jacob. *The Mishnah*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.

Nineham, D. E. *Saint Mark*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1963.

Reumann, John. *The Supper of The Lord*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

Scotland, N. A. D. *Eucharistic Consecration in the First Four Centuries and its implication for Liturgical Reform*. Latimer Studies 31. Oxford: Latimer House, 1989.

Senn, Frank C. "The Lord's Supper, Not the Passover Seder." In *Worship* Vol.60 No.4 July (1986): 362-368.

_____. "Toward a Different Anaphoral Structure." in *Worship* Vol.58 No.4, July (1984): 346-358.

Sheerin, Daniel J. *The Eucharist*. Message of the Fathers of the Church Vol.7. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1986.

Solovey, Meletius Michael. *The Byzantine Divine Liturgy: History and Commentary*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1970.

Spinks, Bryan D. "A Complete Anaphora? A Note on Strasbourg Gr.254." In *The Heythrop Journal* Vol.XXV No.1, January (1984): 51-55.

_____. *Addai and Mari - The Anaphora of the Apostles: A Text for Students*. Grove Liturgical Study No. 24. Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1980.

_____. "Beware Liturgical Horses! An English Interjection on Anaphoral Evolution." In *Worship* Vol.59 No.3 May (1985): 211-219.

_____. "The Jewish Sources for the Sanctus." *The Heythrop Journal*. Vol.XXI No.2 April (1990): 168-179.

Srawley, J. H. *The Early History of the Liturgy*. Cambridge: University Press, 1957.

Stevenson, J. ed. *A New Eusebius*. London: SPCK, 1957.

Talley, Thomas J. "From Berakah to Eucharistia: A Reopening Question." In *Worship* Vol.50 No.2, March (1976): 114-137.

Talley, Thomas J. "The Eucharistic Prayer of the Ancient Church According to Recent Research: Results and Reflections." In *Studia Liturgica* Vol.11 (1976): 138-158.

_____. "The Literary Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer." In *Worship* Vol.58 No.5, September (1984): 404-420.

Warren, F. E. *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church*. London: SPCK, 1897.

Wegman, Herman A. J. *Christian Worship in East and West: A Study Guide to Liturgical History*. New York: Pueblo, 1985.

Werner, Eric. *The Sacred Bridge*. London: Dennis Dobson, 1959.

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

Williams, Rowan. *Eucharistic Sacrifice: The Roots of a Metaphor*. Grove Liturgical Study No.31. Bramcote Notts.: Grove Books, 1982.

Wilson, Marvin R. *Our Father Abraham: Jewish Roots of the Christian Faith*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 1989.

Wybrew, Hugh. *The Orthodox Liturgy: The Development of the Eucharistic Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite*. London: SPCK, 1989.