

# THE ANAPHORA OF THE APOSTLES: IMPLICATIONS OF THE MAR EŠA‘YA TEXT

EMMANUEL J. CUTRONE

Quincy College, Illinois

Like Russia, the East Syrian anaphora of the apostles Addai and Mari qualifies as both mystery and enigma. The research done on the many mysteries of this third-century East Syrian anaphora usually clarifies all too sharply the many enigmas that still remain.<sup>1</sup> Unlike other anaphoras which share its antiquity—Hippolytus, *Apostolic Constitutions* 8, Serapion, or the earlier witness of Justin—Addai and Mari is not a prototype academic exercise of a typical Eucharistic prayer.<sup>2</sup> This anaphora was, and continues to be, an actual prayer of a worshiping community. Bouyer feels that “everything leads us to believe that this prayer is the most ancient christian eucharistic com-

<sup>1</sup> Here is a listing of the major studies done on the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari: Bernard Botte, “L’Anaphore chaldéenne des apôtres,” *Orientalia christiana periodica* 15 (1949) 259-76; B. Botte, “L’Epiclèse dans les liturgies syriennes orientales,” *Sacris erudiri* 6 (1954) 48-72; B. Botte, “Problème de l’anaphore syrienne des apôtres Addai et Mari,” *L’Orient syrien* 10 (1965) 89-106; Louis Bouyer, *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer*, tr. Charles Quinn (Notre Dame, Ind., 1966) pp. 146-57; Hieronymus Engberding, “Zum anaphorischen Fürbittgebet des ostsyrischen Liturgie Addaj und Mar(j),” *Oriens christianus* 41 (1957) 102-24; S. H. Jammo, “Gabriel Qatraya et son commentaire sur la liturgie chaldéenne,” *Orientalia christiana periodica* 32 (1966) 39-52; William F. Macomber, “The Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari,” *ibid.* 32 (1966) 335-71; William E. Pitt, “The Anamnesis and Institution Narrative in the Liturgy of Apostolic Constitutions Book VIII,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 7 (1958) 1-7; W. E. Pitt, “The Origin of the Anaphora of the Liturgy of St. Basil,” *ibid.* 12 (1961) 1-13; Alphonse Raes, “Le récit de l’institution eucharistique dans l’anaphore chaldéenne et malabare des apôtres,” *Orientalia christiana periodica* 10 (1944) 216-26; A. Raes, “The Enigma of the Chaldean and Malabar Anaphora of the Apostles,” in Jacob Vellian (ed.), *The Malabar Church (Orientalia christiana analecta* 186; Rome, 1970) pp. 1-8; E. C. Ratcliff, “The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1929) 23-32; E. C. Ratcliff, “The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 1 (1950) 29-36, 125-34; Douglas Webb, “Variations dans les versions manuscrites de la liturgie nestorienne d’Addai et de Mari,” *Sacris erudiri* 18 (1967-68) 478-523; D. Webb, “La liturgie nestorienne des apôtres Addai et Mari dans la tradition manuscrite,” in B. Botte et al., *Eucharisties d’orient et d’occident* 2 (*Lex orandi* 47; Paris, 1970) pp. 25-50. Also of related interest is Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., “The Formation and Influence of the Antiochene Liturgy,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 15 (1961) 24-44.

<sup>2</sup> For Hippolytus cf. Bernard Botte, *La tradition apostolique de saint Hippolyte (Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen* 39; Münster, 1963) p. xiv. For *Apostolic Constitution* 8 cf. L. Bouyer, *Eucharist*, pp. 250-51. For Serapion cf. B. Capelle, “L’Anaphore de Serapion, essai d’exégèse,” *Muséon* 59 (1946) 438.

position to which we can have access today.”<sup>3</sup> This can only mean that the anaphora of the apostles Addai and Mari is crucial in establishing the evolution of the Eucharistic prayer from the apostolic Church to its classical forms.

The purpose of this article is not to add one more puzzling theory to a growing body of literature. It is rather to bring to public attention recent manuscript finds and the implications these have for the traditional interpretation of this anaphora. In other words, this is not an attempt to dissolve any of the enigmas, but merely to clarify the state of the question.

In the East Syrian Church (also called the Nestorian, Malabar, or Chaldean Church) there are three anaphoras of some antiquity which today are still in use: the anaphora of the apostles Addai and Mari, the anaphora of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and the anaphora of Nestorius. A careful analysis of two of these, Theodore and Nestorius, shows that they have considerable Hellenistic elements present. Internal evidence strongly suggests that these two anaphoras are really adaptations of Greek anaphoras.<sup>4</sup> In the manuscript introductions provided by Joseph de Kelaita, translated by Paul and Mookken, there is a statement that both anaphoras were translated from Greek into Syriac by Mar Ava Catholicos (540–52) on the occasion of his visit to the Roman Empire.<sup>5</sup>

On the other hand, Addai and Mari gives little evidence of Hellenistic influence. It was written in Syriac in a simple and apparently primitive style. Further, this anaphora bears remarkable similarities to the one found in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus of Rome, which at least indicates its antiquity, if not some literary dependence.<sup>6</sup> Of the three East Syrian anaphoras, the anaphora of Addai and Mari gives testimony, at least, to the Eucharistic practice of the early East Syrian tradition.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Bouyer, *Eucharist*, p. 147.

<sup>4</sup> B. Botte, “Problème de l’anaphore syrienne des apôtres Addai et Mari,” *L’Orient syrien* 10 (1965) 84; also E. C. Ratcliff, “The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1929) 24.

<sup>5</sup> *The Liturgy of the Holy Apostles Addai and Mari together with the Liturgies of Mar Theodorus and Mar Nestorius and the Order of Baptism*, printed and published by K. A. Paul and George Mookken (1967) pp. 68, 85.

<sup>6</sup> Both Dix and Bouyer find, in different ways, a relation between Hippolytus and Addai and Mari: Bouyer, *Eucharist*, pp. 158–82; Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (2nd ed.; London, 1945) pp. 186–87.

<sup>7</sup> Ratcliff, “The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1929) 25. One cannot but wonder why Vagaggini insists on the anaphora of Theodore as representative of the East Syrian tradition. Perhaps, as he in-

Because of the unique character of this anaphora and its peculiar characteristics,<sup>8</sup> there has not been agreement on the meaning and significance of this early Eucharistic testimony. The celebrated article by E. C. Ratcliff in 1929<sup>9</sup> brought to public attention the importance of this early Eucharistic prayer and also spurred interest in, as well as controversy about, the anaphora of Addai and Mari. That scholarly interest reached a highpoint in 1965 when Bernard Botte wrote what was then considered the last word on this ancient anaphora.<sup>10</sup> Subsequently, however, William Macomber has discovered a series of manuscripts.<sup>11</sup> This amazing discovery sheds new light on the East Syrian liturgy and reopens many of the conclusions previously reached by even the best authorities.

For the sake of dealing conveniently with the research done on Addai and Mari, the opinions of scholars have been divided into two categories: (1) The structure of this anaphora as we have it today is an accurate account of the original form of this prayer. (2) The prayer as we know it today is the result of radical eliminations and restructurings, so that it has lost its original integrity. This original integrity can be recaptured by rearranging the prayers and supplying those elements which have been eliminated. While each scholar has his own emphasis and interpretation, it is felt that the two categories adequately represent the main thrust of their positions. This article will briefly outline these two categories and then test them against the important recent find of Macomber, the Mar Eša'ya text of the anaphora of the apostles Addai and Mari.

#### THEORIES OF ORIGIN

##### *Integrity of the Prayer*

Through a linguistic analysis E. C. Ratcliff tries to show that the anaphora of Addai and Mari has gone through a number of revisions and additions. The Sanctus, the intercessions, and the epiclesis have been

---

dicates, Addai and Mari is too complex to fit into his development; cf. Cipriano Vagaggini, *The Canon of the Mass and Liturgical Reform*, tr. Peter Coughlan (New York, 1966) p. 59.

<sup>8</sup> The best manuscripts of this anaphora contain no words of institution. The style of the epiclesis is not an invocation of the Holy Spirit to transform the gifts, but to become active in the community. This is paralleled only in the epiclesis given by Hippolytus. Finally, the arrangement of the various prayers of this anaphora is unlike any other. All of these points will be considered below.

<sup>9</sup> Ratcliff, "Addai and Mari" (n. 1 above).

<sup>10</sup> Botte, "Problème de l'anaphore" (n. 1 above).

<sup>11</sup> William F. Macomber, "The Oldest Known Text . . ." (n. 1 above).

added to the original prayer.<sup>12</sup> If this is true, the prayer has only these elements: an address of praise to the Creator and Redeemer, thanksgiving for what has been done for man, the following of Christ's example, and a commemoration of His death and resurrection. In short, the prayer is reduced to two basic elements: praise and memorial. Ratcliff feels that these two elements constituted the original form of Addai and Mari.<sup>13</sup> This Eucharistic prayer is not an oblation, but a commemoration of Christ's death and resurrection which takes place not in word only but also in act, through an imitation of the Supper-act of Christ. The prayer is said over the bread and wine, which are then consumed by the assembly.<sup>14</sup> For the most part Gregory Dix accepts Ratcliff's thesis.<sup>15</sup>

In a highly technical article H. Engberding analyzes the petition prayers of this anaphora.<sup>16</sup> Through a comparison with the Maronite anaphora of Peter, Engberding concludes that the intercessions constitute part of the earliest form of this prayer. He sees a doublet of petitions resulting from a borrowing of the intercessory prayers of the anaphora of Theodore.<sup>17</sup> Those prayers, which contain references to the memorial, are really part of the petitions adopted from the intercessory prayers of the anaphora of Theodore.<sup>18</sup> For Engberding, the original prayer structure is simply praise and petition. The petition for the living and the dead is followed by the final petition for the Holy Spirit—the epiclesis. Engberding calls this a revolutionary way of understanding the function of this early Eucharistic prayer.<sup>19</sup> The implications of this position are that the epiclesis need not be viewed as a later addition, as Ratcliff states, nor is it necessary to propose the mysterious disappearance of the words of institution, as Botte does. The original structure of the prayer was simply praise and petition. Later, petition prayers were inserted before that special peti-

<sup>12</sup> Ratcliff, "Addai and Mari," p. 29.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 30.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, pp. 180–87.

<sup>16</sup> Hieronymus Engberding, "Zum anaphorischen Fürbittgebet . . ." (n. 1 above).

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 112.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 119.

<sup>19</sup> "Unsere Anaphora wird dadurch erneut zu einem Vertreter ganz eigenständiger Liturgiegestaltung. Während die meisten Liturgien des christlichen Ostens das Fürbittgebet erst hinter der Epiklese bringen, treffen wir hier eine Art, welche eine gewisse Verwandtschaft mit der ägyptischen Markusliturgie aufweist, bei welcher ja das Fürbittgebet aus dem Gebet der Darbringung herausfließt, das sich seinerseits unmittelbar an das grosse Dankgebet anschliesst" (*ibid.*, p. 105).

tion prayer now called the epiclesis.<sup>20</sup>

In two articles W. Pitt proposes a different evolution of this prayer.<sup>21</sup> He contends that the anaphora of the fourth century was merely a hymn of praise concluding with the Sanctus. This conclusion is reached by a literal reading of the fifth Mystagogical Catechesis of Cyril of Jerusalem. Cyril is at great pains to describe each phrase of the anaphora. He dedicates paragraph 4 to "lift up your hearts" and paragraph 5 to "let us give thanks to the Lord." But then he merely states that mention is made of creation, and then the Sanctus is said, followed by an invocation of the Spirit. Pitt argues that if the anaphora contained more than this, certainly Cyril would have included it. Pitt contends that not only was the Sanctus a later addition, but also the anamnesis and the epiclesis. This means that according to this view the earliest Eucharistic prayer was simply a hymn of praise.<sup>22</sup>

Further confirming evidence is offered from the anaphora of Basil.<sup>23</sup> Pitt says that textual evidence indicates that this anaphora of Basil ended with the Sanctus.<sup>24</sup> Likewise, with the anaphora of the apostles, Pitt claims that the opening hymn of thanksgiving was the original prayer. The other parts of this anaphora are later additions. Thus he builds up an early pattern for the Eucharist found in Jerusalem, Antioch, and East Syria. The prayer was simply a hymn of praise followed by the Sanctus.<sup>25</sup>

Apparently in the course of time the community felt a need to add an additional prayer as preparation for Communion. This prayer took the form of an invocation of the Holy Spirit which developed into the epiclesis.<sup>26</sup> Eventually another type of pre-Communion prayer was

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 120.

<sup>21</sup> W. E. Pitt, "The Anamnesis and Institution Narrative in the Liturgy of Apostolic Constitutions Book VIII," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 7 (1958) 1-7; also "The Origin of the Anaphora of the Liturgy of St. Basil," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 12 (1961) 3.

<sup>22</sup> F. L. Cross, *St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Lectures on the Christian Sacraments* (London, 1951) pp. 73-74; Pitt, "The Origin of the Anaphora of the Liturgy of St. Basil," p. 3.

<sup>23</sup> Pitt uses the anaphora of the Byzantine liturgy of the ninth century; cf. F. Brightman, *Liturgies: Eastern and Western* 1 (London, 1896) 309-44.

<sup>24</sup> "In Basil, then, the epiclesis marks the place where the prayer originally ended, but it is most unlikely to be the original ending of the prayer"; it ended with the Sanctus (Pitt, "The Origin . . .," p. 2).

<sup>25</sup> A. Couratin has indicated that there is evidence in the Roman anaphora that it ended with an amen at the end of the Sanctus. His proof is from the melody lines in the Gregorian chant, and while the argument seems to be correct, it does not seem to be more than supporting evidence for the theory; cf. Arthur H. Couratin, "The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora: A Note on the Roman Sanctus," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 2 (1951) 20-21.

<sup>26</sup> Pitt, "The Origin . . .," p. 2. For a treatment of the primacy of the epiclesis found in Addai and Mari, cf. B. Botte, "L'Épiclèse dans les liturgies syriennes orientales," *Sacris erudiri* 6 (1954) 48-72.

introduced. This took the character of a memorial type of prayer or an anamnesis. Through a memorial of the Last Supper and the death and resurrection of Christ, the community entered the divine presence once again sharing the saving event and offering the likeness of His body and blood.<sup>27</sup>

Later developments in Jerusalem witnessed by Egeria indicate a desire to be very literal in the memorial.<sup>28</sup> This resulted in the reciting of the very words Christ used. The anamnesis of Addai and Mari, however, is satisfied merely with a reference to the "tradition which comes from you" and a "commemoration of the passion, death, and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ." What developed in the anaphora of Basil into the words of institution is the same concern which is found in the anamnesis of Addai and Mari.<sup>29</sup> Thus Ratcliff, Dix, and Pitt contend that the *verba Christi* never were present in the anaphora of the apostles. There is instead a subtle reference to the Supper itself.

Last of all in this evolution was the introduction of petitions. The witness of Narsai clearly indicates that by his death (503) the petitions had developed even beyond what is found in Addai and Mari.<sup>30</sup>

According to these theories, then, the anaphora as we now have it is the result of gradual additions and amplifications of an essentially very simple prayer. Ratcliff, Dix, and Pitt see the original anaphora as a hymn of praise. This hymn concluded with the Sanctus. The epiclesis was later introduced as a pre-Communion prayer. Influenced by the process of historicization evidenced in Jerusalem, the anamnesis found its way into the anaphora and last of all the intercessions were introduced. It is this gradual growth which gives this anaphora its unusual structure. Engberding sees the original prayer composed of two elements: praise and petition. Later additions to the petition prayer expand the prayer and highlight the epiclesis.

### *Modification of the Prayer*

A second theory about the development of the anaphora of the apostles is proposed mainly by Bernard Botte and Louis Bouyer.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Pitt, "The Origin . . .," pp. 10-11.

<sup>28</sup> In much of Egeria's writings there is portrayed a historical concern to re-enact in place and time exactly what Christ did. This is seen vividly in the Good Friday ceremony where the bishop goes to Golgotha and extends his hands in the form of the cross. Cf. *Etherie, Journal de voyage*, Intro. and tr. Hélène Pétré (*Sources chrétiennes* 21; Paris, 1948) pp. 233-39.

<sup>29</sup> Pitt, "The Origin . . .," pp. 10-11.

<sup>30</sup> Richard H. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai (Text and Studies* 1; Cambridge, Eng., 1909) homily 17 A pp. 18-19.

<sup>31</sup> Botte first developed this theory in "L'Anaphore chaldéenne des apôtres," *Orientalia*

Basically, this position holds that the anaphora of Addai and Mari has been subjected to corruption and rearrangement. Various historical events have caused some modification. Botte and Bouyer contend that the original structure of this anaphora was thanksgiving, intercessions, *verba Christi*, anamnesis, epiclesis. If this is the case, not only does this prayer correspond to the classic structure of all other anaphoras, but it also explains why the words of institution are not present in the manuscripts.

The Sanctus seems to be an early addition, but it does not disturb the first prayer of thanksgiving into which it is inserted.<sup>32</sup> According to Botte, the epiclesis of Addai and Mari belonged to the original composition.<sup>33</sup> The memorial or anamnesis is also of the original, but historical conditions have caused a rearranging of these prayers so that the epiclesis is inserted into the middle of the anamnesis.<sup>34</sup>

This theory further proposes that the words of institution should be supplied because they were undoubtedly part of the original anaphora. Botte claims that an anamnesis makes no sense unless it follows the words of institution. In every known instance of an anamnesis it always serves as a complement to the words of institution. It is unthinkable, then, to have an anamnesis unless there is also an institution narrative. Because of the authenticity of the anamnesis, along with some textual analysis, Botte concludes to the presence of the words of institution in the original anaphora.<sup>35</sup> Bouyer attempts to reconstruct the missing institution account by inserting the one found in the anaphoras of Nestorius and Theodore. He finds such a reconstruction possible because of the close parallel in the anamnesis of these two anaphoras with the one present in the anaphora of the apostles.<sup>36</sup>

Further, there is evidence from Gabriel Qatraya in the seventh century that the words of institution were in the liturgy. When he comments on the liturgy, he says that we give thanks like Christ by reciting the words "This is my body. . ."<sup>37</sup> It is not altogether clear, how-

---

*christiana periodica* 15 (1949) 259-76, and again in "Problème de l'anaphore syrienne des apôtres Addai et Mari," *L'Orient syrien* 10 (1965) 89-106. Bouyer's treatment is found in *Eucharist*, pp. 146-57. Formerly Alphonse Raes also defended this position, but in the light of the Mar Eša 'ya text he has since rejected this theory. He first deals with this subject in "Le récit de l'institution . . ." (n. 1 above).

<sup>32</sup> Botte, "Problème de l'anaphore," p. 93.

<sup>33</sup> In this he differs from Ratcliffe. As will be indicated below, the textual evidence of Mar Eša 'ya does not bear out Botte's argument on this point; *ibid.*, pp. 98-99.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 98-100.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 100-106. Raes places the words after the Sanctus in his article "Le récit . . .," pp. 224-26.

<sup>36</sup> Bouyer, *Eucharist*, pp. 149-50.

<sup>37</sup> S. H. Jammo, *art. cit.* (n. 1 above) p. 43.

ever, that Qatraya is speaking of the anaphora of the apostles. It should be kept in mind that the anaphoras of Theodore and Nestorius were also in use at this time, and both have institution accounts.

How, then, is it possible that the words of institution have disappeared from this anaphora if they were originally present? Botte suggests that the words of institution were recited by heart, as was the case in the Gallican and Mozarabic rites.<sup>38</sup> Raes cites evidence that they could have been removed for dogmatic reasons.<sup>39</sup> A recently discovered text of Ibn al-Tayyib (+1043) states that Catholicos Išo 'Yahb (+658) rewrote the text of Addai and Mari.<sup>40</sup> A reason why this was done could possibly be to conform Eucharistic practice to Nestorian theology.<sup>41</sup>

The second theory, then, states that the chaotic and heretical circumstances of the East Syrian Church led to the additions, subtractions, and reordering of the prayers. Its original form, however, parallels the classic structure of the other East Syrian anaphoras.

#### THE MAR EŠĀ'YA TEXT

The attempt has been made to outline, in a rather sketchy fashion, the two basically different theories of the origin and development of the anaphora of the apostles Addai and Mari. While this treatment is brief, nonetheless it has been complete without giving all of the arguments.

All the scholars mentioned thus far, Ratcliff through Bouyer, used as the *textus receptus* the Urmi text, published from a sixteenth-century manuscript.<sup>42</sup> Commenting on the reliability of the Urmi text, Botte concludes his treatment with these words: "short of a sensational discovery, we will always be in doubt."<sup>43</sup> Even though it does not remove all doubt, a sensational discovery has been made by William Macomber.

<sup>38</sup> Botte, "Problème de l'anaphore," p. 103.

<sup>39</sup> Raes, "Le récit . . .," pp. 225-26.

<sup>40</sup> Jammo, *art. cit.*, p. 52.

<sup>41</sup> To this author it seems altogether contrary to the course of liturgical development to suppose that something as central as the words of institution could be removed by a theological conviction or by one person. While new prayers find their way into the liturgy with relative ease, there is hardly any evidence that a traditional prayer can be removed without the utmost difficulty. Cf. Baumstark's laws of organic development in his *Comparative Liturgy*, rev. B. Botte, tr. F. L. Cross (Westminster, Md., 1958) p. 23.

<sup>42</sup> An English translation has been made available by Brightman. It is a translation of the Anglican work *Liturgia sanctorum apostolorum Addai et Mari cui accedunt duae aliae . . . necnon ordo baptismi*. This is the first part of the book called *Takhsa* published in 1890. As stated above, this is from a sixteenth-century manuscript. Cf. Brightman, *Liturgies* 1, 246-305.

<sup>43</sup> Botte, "Problème de l'anaphore," p. 106.



In a recent tour of the Near East he found a number of manuscripts of an older text of the anaphora of the apostles. The oldest of these was found in the church of Mar Eša'ya in Mosul.<sup>44</sup> Macomber dates this text in the tenth or eleventh century, making it at least five hundred years older than the Urmi text.<sup>45</sup>

To my knowledge, only one monograph has been published which seeks to investigate the implications of this new edition of the anaphora of Addai and Mari. This rather short work concentrates on only one sentence of the anaphora.<sup>46</sup>

Below is an English translation taken from the Latin version provided by Macomber. The paragraph divisions are my own. There follows a chart which compares paragraph for paragraph the Urmi text with the Mar Eša'ya. The paragraph division of the Urmi text is taken from Botte<sup>47</sup> and an English translation of this Urmi text may be found in Bouyer's *Eucharist*.<sup>48</sup>

## A

Priest: We give thanks, O Lord, for the abundant wealth of your grace toward us, because, even though we are lowly sinners, out of your great kindness you have made us worthy to celebrate the holy mysteries of the body and blood of your Christ. Now we seek your help to strengthen our souls that we might celebrate your gift to use in perfect charity and true faith.

And we bring to you praise, glory, thanks and adoration now, etc.

People: Amen.

## B

Priest: Peace be with you.

People: And with you and your spirit.

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

People: For all the Patriarchs.

Deacon: Let us give thanks and let us pray.

Priest: May the grace of our Lord. . . .

People: Amen.

Priest: Let your mind be on things above.

People: They are on you, O God.

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

People: It is right and fitting.

Deacon: Peace be with us.

<sup>44</sup> Macomber, "The Oldest Known Text . . .," p. 340.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 340-41.

<sup>46</sup> A. Raes, "The Enigma . . ." (n. 1 above).

<sup>47</sup> Botte, "Problème de l'anaphore," pp. 91-93.

<sup>48</sup> Bouyer, *Eucharist*, pp. 147-49.

## C

Priest: Worthy of praise by every mouth, and thanks by every tongue is the adorable and glorious name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, who created the world through his grace and its inhabitants through his kindness, and saved men through his mercy and performed great deeds toward mortals. Your majesty, O Lord, the hundreds of thousands of heavenly beings adore, myriads upon myriads of angels, ranks of spiritual beings, ministers of fire and spirit, together with the holy cherubim and holy seraphim glorify your name, crying out and singing:

## D

People: Holy, holy. . . .

## E

Priest: Together with these heavenly armies, O Lord, we your lowly, weak and miserable servants also give you thanks because you have brought about in us a great grace which cannot be repaid. For you have put on our manhood to give us life through your godhood. You elevated us from our lowly state, you rebuilt our ruined nature. You revived our mortality, you forgave our debts, you justified our sinfulness. You illuminated our intelligence and you, our Lord and God, conquered our enemies. And you made the lowliness of our weak nature to triumph through the abundant mercy of your grace. And because of all this. . . .

People: Amen

Deacon: In your minds. . . .

## F

Priest: You, O Lord, through the multitude of your mercies which are countless, kindly be mindful of all the loyal and upright fathers who were pleasing to you, in the commemoration of the body and blood of your Christ which we offer to you on the pure and holy altar as you taught us. And grant to us your peace and tranquility all the ages of this world.

People: Amen.

## G

May all the inhabitants of the earth know you because you alone are the true God and Father. You sent our Lord Jesus Christ, your beloved Son; and he, our Lord and God, taught us through his life-giving good news all the purity and holiness of the prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, priests, deacons and all children of the holy catholic church who have been sealed with the life-giving sign of holy baptism.

## H

[Note: this paragraph has no main verb]

And we also, Lord, your humble, weak and miserable servants, who have congregated and stand before you at this time, who receive through tradition the

content which is from you, rejoicing, glorifying, exalting, commemorating and giving praise, and celebrating this great and tremendous mystery of the passion, death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ.

## I

Deacon: Let there be silence.

Priest: May your Holy Spirit, O Lord, come and rest on this oblation of your servants. May he bless and sanctify it that it might be for us, O Lord, a remission of debts, a pardon of sins, and a great hope of resurrection from the dead and a new life in the kingdom of heaven with all who have been pleasing to you.

## J

And because of all your wonderful, universal dispensation toward us, with open mouths and uncovered faces we thank you, and glorify you without ceasing in your church, redeemed by the precious blood of your Christ.

People: Amen.

## ANALYSIS

*Structure*

The structure of the anaphora of the apostles as it appears both in the Urmi and in the Mar Eša 'ya texts is different from both the West Syrian anaphoras (Basil and James) and the East Syrian ones (Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius). Here are the structures of each:

<i>W. Syrian</i>	<i>E. Syrian</i>	<i>Addai and Mari</i>
Thanksgiving	Thanksgiving	Thanksgiving
Institution	Institution	Intercessions
Anamnesis	Anamnesis	(Anamnesis—perhaps)
Epiclesis	Intercessions	Epiclesis
Intercessions	Epiclesis	Doxology

Ratcliff, Dix, Engberding, and Pitt are satisfied to leave the structure of Addai and Mari as it is. Botte and Bouyer reconstruct the anaphora in such a way that its structure is identical with that of the other two East Syrian anaphoras.<sup>49</sup>

*Thanksgiving*

The anaphora proper begins with a hymn of praise. It consists of three parts (paragraphs C, D, E). The first is praise to God for creation, then comes the Sanctus, and the last part is thanksgiving for the Incarnation and redemption. There is only the slightest difference here between the Urmi and the Mar Eša ya texts. The word "Trinity" is added in the Urmi

<sup>49</sup> Botte, "Problème de l'anaphore," pp. 104-06; Bouyer, *Eucharist*, pp. 154-56.

MAR EŠA'YA (11th or 12th century)	URMI (16th century)	
A. Prayer for celebration	-----	
B. Dialogue	-----	
C. Praise and Thanksgiving	1. Praise and Thanksgiving	THANKS-GIVING
D. Sanctus	2. Sanctus	
E. Thanksgiving for favors	3. Thanksgiving for favors	
-----	4. Petitions for the whole church	INTERCES-SIONS
F. Commemoration of Fathers and ourselves	5. Commemoration of Fathers and ourselves	
-----	6a. Petition for peace and tranquility	
G. Reason for above petition: to acknowledge God and Christ	6b. To all who acknowledge Christ 7. Be mindful of the whole church	
H. Ambiguous phrase which includes reference to the mystery of Christ	8. Commemoration of mystery of Christ	ANAMNESIS
I. Invocation of Holy Spirit	9. Invocation of Holy Spirit	EPICLESIS
J. Doxology	10. Doxology	DOXOLOGY

text before the recital of the Three Persons, and a short phrase before the Sanctus also appears (“and respond one to another, saying . . .”).<sup>50</sup>

To whom is this prayer addressed? The text we now have is definitely addressed to the Trinity. The earliest form, however, seems to be addressed to Christ. The phrase “you have taken on our manhood” is a direct address to the Second Person of the Trinity. Ratcliff also sees in the opening phrase, “worthy of praise from every mouth,” a parallel to Phil 2:9–11, which is a hymn to Christ.<sup>51</sup> In the *Acts of Thomas* there is a

<sup>50</sup> Botte, “Problème de l’anaphore,” p. 30.

<sup>51</sup> Ratcliff, “Addai and Mari,” p. 30.

prayer clearly addressed to Christ which indicates that such a practice was not unknown and is a further indication of the antiquity of this anaphora.<sup>52</sup>

Ratcliff was the first to point out that the Sanctus was not part of the original text.<sup>53</sup> This is clear because as it now stands the Sanctus interrupts the flow between paragraphs C and E.<sup>54</sup> The words at the beginning of paragraph E have been added to give an apparent unity to the text. If paragraph D with the first phrase of E is removed, then paragraph E follows immediately on paragraph C.<sup>55</sup> This means that the primitive anaphora did not have a Sanctus. Apart from the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus there is no other instance of this. It seems that all have accepted Ratcliff's argumentation here, and the Mar Eša'ya text does nothing to disturb this theory.

### *Intercessions*

The real ambiguities with the anaphora of the apostles come in the next three paragraphs—F, G, H. Paragraphs F and G are both intercessory prayers and a variety of interpretations have been offered for paragraph H. The question is, what is the antiquity of these prayers and how do they relate to one another? Of all the opinions investigated, only Engberding maintains that the intercessory prayers have an ancient quality.<sup>56</sup> The others maintain that the intercessory prayers were of more recent origin. It is interesting to note that it is at this point that we find the greatest difference between the Urmi and the Mar Eša'ya texts. The Urmi text contains an intercessory prayer (4) for the whole Church, which does not appear in the older Mar Eša'ya text. This upholds the claim of Engberding that this prayer in Urmi is of more recent origin and was introduced into Addai and Mari under the influence of the anaphora of Theodore.<sup>57</sup>

Paragraphs F and G do find parallels in the Urmi text (5, 6, 7), but a close analysis reveals some rather significant differences between the two. The petitions in the Urmi text are as follows: for the whole Church, a memorial of the Fathers, for peace and tranquility, for all the living.

<sup>52</sup> Ratcliff, *ibid.*, p. 31; also Dix, *Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 180.

<sup>53</sup> The insertion of the Sanctus probably goes back to the sixth or seventh century, either to the liturgical reform of Mar Aba (540-52), who is supposed to have introduced into the Chaldean Church the anaphoras of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius, both of which have the Sanctus in their original form, or to that of Īsō 'Yahb II (648-58), who is said to have revised the anaphora of the Apostles. Cf. Macomber, "The Oldest Known Text . . .," p. 348.

<sup>54</sup> Ratcliff, "Addai and Mari," p. 29.

<sup>55</sup> Botte, "Problème de l'anaphore," p. 93.

<sup>56</sup> Engberding, "Zum anaphorischen Fürbittgebet . . .," pp. 105-6.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 106.

In the Mar Eša 'ya text the petitions have only two simple parts, first for the dead ("be mindful of all the loyal and upright fathers . . .") and secondly for the living ("and grant us your peace and tranquility . . ."). Each of these petitions is followed by a relative clause.

Paragraph G is not a petition for the Church, as it is in the Urmi text, but a petition for all the inhabitants of the earth. The enumeration of the various offices of the Church (the prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, priests, deacons, and all the faithful) is not the object of a direct petition but the result of what happens when we acknowledge Christ. Thus, unlike all other petition prayers we know, Mar Eša 'ya has no direct petition for the various offices of the Church. Could it be that the original petition of this anaphora was the simple petition of paragraph F and that G was a later addition?<sup>58</sup>

This division leads us back to the enigmatic character of the anaphora. Paragraphs G and H present problems with such a facile division. Paragraph G is definitely a continuation of paragraph F. But the text seems to indicate that paragraph G is a later addition. However, it is not until paragraph G that there is a reference to "knowledge" ("May all the inhabitants of the earth know you . . ."), which Bouyer claims to be a Jewish invocation of the Torah.<sup>59</sup> If this is the case, it should have more importance than paragraph F.

There are further problems with the memorial, which should constitute the third prayer if the anaphora is to follow the classic form. Only by firmly establishing an anamnesis in paragraphs G or H, or at least finding in them some anamnestic character, does the third prayer fit into the expected Jewish pattern.<sup>60</sup> As will be demonstrated below, the Mar Eša 'ya text makes it more difficult, rather than easier, to substantiate this crucial fact for the position proposed by Botte and Bouyer.

#### *Anamnesis (?)*

The greatest problem with this anaphora is in identifying paragraph H. This paragraph is composed of an extended sentence which has no main

<sup>58</sup> This is suggested by the amen which appears at the end of paragraph F, which has no parallel in the Urmi text. In his development of the Jewish berakoth's influence on the Christian Eucharist, Bouyer proposes that the early Christian Eucharist was composed of three separate prayers: praise, petition and memorial. It was usual that each of these prayers was followed by amen. Confer *Eucharist*, pp. 91-135. The Mar Eša 'ya text has amens in three places: (1) Praise and thanksgiving (C, D, E); (2) Intercession (F); Anamnesis, Epiclesis, Doxology (H, I, J). Bouyer points out that the Urmi text has the amen after the hymn of praise; now the Mar Eša 'ya provides us with a third amen to further indicate a threefold division of the prayer. This must, however, remain a very tenuous argument, because in later Syrian practice the deacon inserts amens as he wills.

<sup>59</sup> Bouyer, *Eucharist*, p. 155.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*

verb, and thus it is very difficult to establish its meaning. Engberding maintains that this paragraph is a later addition taken from the petition prayers of the anaphora of Theodore. He maintains that this prayer is a continuation of the intercessions leading up to the one final petition, the epiclesis. Quite simply, Engberding considers paragraphs F, G, H, and I as petition prayers. Paragraph F is a petition for the dead. Paragraph G is a petition for the living: "May all the inhabitants of the earth know you because. . . ." Paragraph H begins: "And we also. . . ." This paragraph has no main verb because it is an extended sentence from the previous paragraph continuing the petition for the living. The main verb comes from paragraph G: "may all . . . know you." Understood for paragraph H is that very same verb: "and may we also (know you)." Engberding constructs this argument from the Urmi text.<sup>61</sup> There is nothing in the Mar Eṣa 'ya text to contradict this thesis. In fact, such an explanation seems to be the best way to explain the textual evidence. It most easily explains why there is no verb in paragraph H without the necessity of claiming a corrupt text or some absent phrase which was said from memory.

Strongly reacting to Engberding's proposal, Botte and Bouyer maintain that this prayer definitely is an anamnesis. The reference to "this great and tremendous mystery of the passion and death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ" clearly indicates to Botte that this prayer can only be considered as a traditional anamnesis.<sup>62</sup>

Once again the puzzling character of the anaphora of Addai and Mari is evident. The bone of contention with this anaphora has always been, how is it connected with Christ's prayer at the Last Supper? This link can be found textually in two places in the anaphora. In paragraph F there is the phrase "the commemoration of the body and blood of your Christ which we offer on your pure and holy altar as you taught us." Those who maintain the integrity of the text feel that this reference to the body and blood of Christ is sufficient to establish it as a Eucharistic prayer, or, in traditional sacramental terminology, to consecrate the elements.<sup>63</sup> The problem with this, however, is that the phrase is a passing comment found within the petition prayer for the dead and not part of a definite memorial prayer as might be expected. The other instance of a Eucharistic memorial is found in paragraph H: "the mystery of the passion, death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ." By establishing this prayer as an anamnesis, it is not unreasonable to propose that the

<sup>61</sup> Engberding, "Zum anaphorischen Fürbittgebet . . .," pp. 113-20.

<sup>62</sup> Botte, "Problème de l'anaphore," pp. 100-101.

<sup>63</sup> Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 181; also Pitt, "The Origin of the Anaphora . . .," p. 9.

*verba Christi* precede this prayer and thus the consecration of the elements was accompanied by the traditional recitation of the words of institution.

If one is to insist, as Botte and Bouyer do, that the words of institution were part of the original text, they must appear between paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Urmi text, or between paragraphs G and H of the Mar Eša 'ya text. Botte argues, and Bouyer along with him, that the beginning of paragraph 8 does not follow upon the end of paragraph 3 (it must be remembered that they believe paragraphs 4-7, the intercessions, were later additions) but requires a foregoing sentence. The missing passage is none other than the words of institution.<sup>64</sup> The institution accounts found in the anaphoras of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius have a peculiar ending which is not found elsewhere: "do this whenever you are gathered together in memory of me." Such an ending is peculiar to East Syria. Botte notes that paragraph 8 of the Urmi text begins with the phrase "and we also . . . who are gathered together in thy name." Botte insists that the phrase "in thy name" follows on the ending of the institution account "in memory of me," and unless the institution account is supplied the phrase "in thy name" makes little sense.<sup>65</sup> Bouyer totally accepts this argument as the clearest indication of the necessity of the *verba Christi*.<sup>66</sup>

The textual evidence of Mar Eša 'ya greatly weakens, if not totally destroys, this argument. This text does not contain the key phrase "in thy name," which leads Macomber to question the very foundation of Botte's argument.<sup>67</sup> It is on this phrase that the link has been made with the use of the *verba*. Its absence in the Mar Eša 'ya document destroys the link, but perhaps not the other reasons for considering paragraph H as an anamnesis.

Botte further argues that there is no instance where one finds an anamnesis without the words of institution.<sup>68</sup> Bouyer turns the statement around and insists that with every account of institution there always follows an anamnesis.<sup>69</sup> Both arguments come to the same thing: the narration of the institution account is inseparable from an anamnesis. Since it is clear to Botte that this anaphora has always had an anamnesis, the argument stands in favor for the institution account. On the other hand, such an argument seems to be a convenient way to explain away

<sup>64</sup> Botte, "Problème de l'anaphore," pp. 100-101.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 101-2.

<sup>66</sup> Bouyer, *Eucharist*, pp. 150-51.

<sup>67</sup> Macomber, "The Oldest Known Text," p. 367, n. 7.

<sup>68</sup> Botte, "Problème de l'anamnesis," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 5 (1954) 17.

<sup>69</sup> Bouyer, *Eucharist*, p. 156.



the difficulty presented by a clear manuscript tradition which does not have the words of institution.

A. Raes, who previously argued in the same fashion as Botte and Bouyer, has reversed his position after examining the Mar Eša 'ya text. He no longer believes that this prayer ever had the words of institution.<sup>70</sup> He states that this prayer does not contain the usual recounting of the historical events of the life of Jesus and thus has no need of the narrative of the Last Supper—a passing reference suffices here.<sup>71</sup> He concedes that the new textual evidence has eliminated the need to insist on the original presence of the words of institution. But if they were not present, then paragraph H need not be considered an anamnesis. What, then, is it? Raes proposes that it is the beginning of the prayer that follows—the epiclesis.<sup>72</sup> He finds that the opening phrase in the epiclesis of the anaphora of Nestorius is parallel with this paragraph. Raes supplies the phrase “we pray God . . . we beg him” and establishes paragraph H as a bridge to the epiclesis. Raes himself, however, points out two difficulties with this proposal. Such a bridge to the epiclesis should also be present in the Maronite anaphora of Peter; but it is not. Secondly, this still does not explain the absence of the verb.<sup>73</sup>

Paragraph H, then, is a continuing enigma of this anaphora. The one thing that it does seem to clarify is that there is no necessary connection with the words of institution. The absence of the main verb leaves it open to three different interpretations: (1) continuation of the intercessions, (2) an anamnesis, or (3) part of the epiclesis.

### *Epiclesis*

Whether the words of institution were present originally or not, the high point of the Mar Eša 'ya text must be the epiclesis (par. I). The deacon indicates this by calling for silence. The Holy Spirit is called down for the benefit of the community. His power is called upon to sanctify the oblation for the pardon of the faults and remission of the sins of the community, and the hope of resurrection and new life in the kingdom. There is a great deal of similarity between the epiclesis of Addai and Mari and that of Hippolytus.<sup>74</sup> The invocation in Addai and Mari is not so much for the transformation of the gifts as for the good of the community. The epiclesis of these two anaphoras stands in contrast to

<sup>70</sup> Raes states that it was to emphasize the importance of the epiclesis that the Nestorians decided to drop the words of institution in the fifth century: “Le récit . . .,” pp. 224–26.

<sup>71</sup> Raes, “The Enigma . . .,” pp. 6–7.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 4–5.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>74</sup> Botte, “L'Épiclèse dans les liturgies syriennes orientales,” p. 70.

all other epicleses which petition for the change of the elements. Underlying this invocation, Richardson suggests, is the idea that within the Eucharist one encounters the Spirit.<sup>75</sup>

Ratcliff argues that the epiclesis is a later addition to the text. He says that it probably arose as a prayer in preparation for Communion,<sup>76</sup> and also to bring this anaphora more in line with the Greek practice.<sup>77</sup> The anaphoras of Theodore and Nestorius, which were current in East Syria by the fifth century, contain an epiclesis which petitioned for the change of the elements into the body and blood of Christ. This indicates that the epiclesis of Addai and Mari was introduced before the fifth century.<sup>78</sup> Furthermore, Botte has demonstrated that the epiclesis of Addai and Mari is the most ancient one we know.<sup>79</sup>

Botte doubts that the epiclesis is not part of the original anaphora. Considering its Syrian style, he believes that it is as old as the prayers of thanksgiving and the anamnesis. He does admit that the epiclesis is misplaced because of the work of a redactor.<sup>80</sup> He feels that the original arrangement was: thanksgiving, institution account, anamnesis, intercessions, epiclesis.<sup>81</sup> Bouyer, however, argues for the antiquity of this prayer because of its Jewish origins in the berakah of the meal. He does not see it as an interruption of the anamnesis, but as an underpinning to the end of the prayer.<sup>82</sup>

### *Doxology*

The anaphora ends with a prayer of praise and thanksgiving. Botte views this as a continuation of the anamnesis, which was interrupted by the insertion of the epiclesis.<sup>83</sup> Here again the Mar Eša'ya text has weakened the argument presented by Botte. This text makes it less evident than the Urmi that the anamnesis was divided into two parts by the insertion of the epiclesis.<sup>84</sup> Bouyer claims that paragraph J is a doxology, a hymn of praise to conclude the prayer.<sup>85</sup> Whatever its nature, its function is to bring the anaphora to a close.

<sup>75</sup> Cyril C. Richardson, "The Origin of the Epiclesis," *Anglical Theological Review* 28 (1946) 149.

<sup>76</sup> Ratcliff, "The Sanctus . . .," pp. 34-35; also Massey Shepherd, Jr., "The Formation and Influence of the Antiochene Liturgy," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 15 (1961) 34.

<sup>77</sup> Ratcliff, "The Original Form . . .," p. 29.

<sup>78</sup> Richardson, *art. cit.*, pp. 152-53.

<sup>79</sup> Botte, "L'Epiclèse dans les liturgies syriennes orientales," p. 63.

<sup>80</sup> Botte, "Problème de l'anaphore," p. 99.

<sup>81</sup> Botte, "L'Epiclèse," p. 68.

<sup>82</sup> Bouyer, *Eucharist*, pp. 152-53.

<sup>83</sup> Botte, "Problème de l'anaphore," p. 99.

<sup>84</sup> Macomber, "The Oldest Known Text," p. 371, n. 2.

<sup>85</sup> Bouyer, *Eucharist*, pp. 152-53.

## CONCLUSIONS

This anaphora has been investigated in terms of the traditional elements of the classical forms of the anaphora: praise and thanksgiving, intercessions, *verba Christi*, anamnesis, epiclesis. These different elements seem to have their foundation in the Jewish berakoth, which in turn seem to be the foundation for the anaphora of the apostles Addai and Mari. This assumption, however, is not categorically established by the manuscript evidence of Addai and Mari. On the contrary, the ambiguity connected with the anamnesis introduces more doubt than certainty of the Jewish structure of this prayer. Perhaps the problem with understanding this prayer is that we ask of it a clarity and a classic structure which does not actually emerge until the latter part of the fourth century.

In the continuing search to understand this ancient prayer, the Mar Eša'ya text has clarified the following points: (1) the intercessory prayers have a great deal of antiquity, but they probably were not elaborated in great detail; (2) the *verba Christi* were not part of the original prayer; (3) the epiclesis holds a very central place; (4) the present text may be corrupt at paragraph H, or it may be a continuation of paragraph G. In any case, the words of institution were not present here. Still in doubt: the presence of an anamnesis, the affirmation or denial of which determines the manner in which this prayer is to be understood.

The Mar Eša'ya text has clarified much in understanding this anaphora, and it is only painfully obvious that there is still mystery and enigma associated with Addai and Mari.