

# The “Missing” Oblation and the Problem of Sacrifice in Early Antiochene Anaphoras: A Reconsideration of John Fenwick and Stefano Parenti\*

Matthew S. C. Olver

*Nashotah House Theological Seminary; matthewscolver@gmail.com*

## ■ Abstract

There is a wrinkle in the story of common features in West Syrian anaphoras, which John Fenwick called “the Missing Oblation.” In this article, I argue that the importance of the “missing oblation” highlighted by Fenwick, Robert Taft, Stefano Parenti and others needs to be balanced against the verbs of oblation that are present. The emphasis on the missing oblation, combined with the tendency to summarize the Antiochene structure with little reference to the importance of these verbs, results in an inaccurate and unbalanced sense of the degree to which the anaphora expresses the belief that the action of offering bread and wine is constitutive of the eucharistic action. This should lead to a caution with the unhelpful heuristic about the spiritualization of sacrifice in contemporary scholarship and the underemphasis of the belief in the materiality of the eucharistic sacrifice in writers such as John Chrysostom and earlier anaphoras.

\* I wish to thank the three anonymous *HTR* readers of an earlier version of this article, each of whom provided very helpful comments and suggestions. I also wish to express gratitude to my colleague, Paul Wheatley, for his generous assistance with the Syriac and Coptic in this article and to Andy Golla for his assistance in the preparation of the manuscript. I alone, of course, remain responsible for the final version.

HTR 117:3 (2024) 475–505



## ■ Keywords

Antiochene anaphoras, West Syrian anaphoras, Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles, Anaphora of St. James, eucharistic sacrifice, John Chrysostom

## ■ Introduction

The structure of the West Syrian or Antiochene anaphoras is “often considered by modern liturgical reformers as *the* classic anaphoral structure” and is the form that ends up dominating among Eastern Christians via the Byzantine version of the Anaphora of St. Basil (ByzBASIL) and the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom (CHR).<sup>1</sup> More than eighty anaphoras fit this structure, most of them stemming from the patriarchate of Antioch, sometimes referred to as Syrian Antioch.<sup>2</sup> The Anaphora of St. James (JAMES) was the liturgy of Jerusalem, and so we might have expected an anaphora from this time and region to be composed in Greek. However, many of these were composed in, or at least translated into, Syriac, such as the Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles (ATA)<sup>3</sup> and the Testamentum Domini.<sup>4</sup> While both Apostolic Tradition and Apostolic Constitutions (ApCon) are Church Order documents, they fit within the broad West Syrian framework, as do the following: Egyptian Anaphora of St. Basil (extant in both Bohairic and Sahidic Coptic)<sup>5</sup> the Anaphora

<sup>1</sup> Paul F. Bradshaw and Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2012) 327 (italics in original). See also John Baldovin, “Eucharistic Prayer,” in *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship* (ed. Paul F. Bradshaw; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002) 195–97, at 195 (hereafter *DLW*). See also Bryan D. Spinks, “Berakah, Anaphoral Theory and Luther,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 3.3 (1989) 267–80, at 267; Frank C. Senn, “Towards a Different Anaphoral Structure,” *Worship* 58.4 (1984) 346–58.

<sup>2</sup> *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed* (ed. R. C. D. Jasper et al.; 4th edition; Collegeville: Liturgical Press Academic, 2019) 154 (hereafter *PEER*).

<sup>3</sup> *PEER*, 15864; *Prex eucharistica: textus e variis liturgiis antiquioribus selecti* (ed. Anton Hänggi and Irmgard Pahl; Spicilegium Friburgense 12; Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1968) 265–68 (hereafter *PE*); *Anaphorae Syriacae: quotquot in codicibus adhuc repertae sunt, cura Pontificii Instituti Studiorum Orientalium editae et latine versae* (vol. I–II; Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1939) I.2, 231–63 (hereafter *AS*); Sebastian P. Brock, “The Syriac Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles: An English Translation,” in *Thysia aineseōs: mélanges liturgiques offerts à la mémoire de l’archevêque Georges Wagner (1930–1993)* (ed. J. Getcha and André Lossky; Analecta Sergiana 2; Paris: Presses Saint-Serge, 2005) 65–75.

<sup>4</sup> *PEER* (3rd ed., 1987), 138–41; *PE*, 219–22. Hans-Jürgen Feulner lists 83 (“Zu den Editionen orientalischer Anaphoren,” in *Crossroads of Cultures: Studies in Liturgy and Patristics in Honor of Gabriele Winkler* [ed. Robert F. Taft, Feulner Hans-Jürgen, and Elena Velkovska; Orientalia Christiana Analecta 260; Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2000] 252–81).

<sup>5</sup> *PEER*, 115–23; *PE*, 347–57. See the received version still in use in the Coptic Church in Bohairic; *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio* (ed. Eusèbe Renaudot; 2 vols.; 2nd, corrected ed; Frankfurt: Joseph Bauer, 1847) II.13–18 [Latin translation of the Bohairic]; *Un témoin archaïque de la liturgie copte de saint Basile* (ed. Jean Doresse, Emmanuel Lanne, and Bernard Capelle; Bibliothèque de Muséon 47; Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1960) [Sahidic, with Latin translation]; Anne McGowan, “The Basilian Anaphoras: Rethinking the Question,” in *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West: Essays in Liturgical and Theological Analysis* (ed. Maxwell E. Johnson; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2010) 219–62 and Gabriele Winkler, *Die Basilius-Anaphora: Edition der beiden armenischen*

of Gregory Nazianzus;<sup>6</sup> the two principal Byzantine anaphoras, ByzBASIL (which is an expansion of the Egyptian recension of EgBASIL)<sup>7</sup> and CHR;<sup>8</sup> as well as the Armenian Anaphora of St. Athanasius (ArmATHANASIUS).<sup>9</sup> The logic of the West Syrian/Antiochene structure has been praised by contemporary liturgical scholars for its trinitarian shape, which is nearly always as follows: it begins with an address to the Father<sup>10</sup> that culminates in praise for the Son and his institution of the Eucharist, followed by an anamnestic offering of the gifts, after which the Spirit is asked specifically to act upon the offered gifts in the first of many petitions.<sup>11</sup> In comparison with other widely-used anaphoras such as the Roman Canon Missae and the East Syrian Liturgy of the Apostles Addai and Mari, eastern anaphoras have also been commended by modern liturgists for the considerable place they give to explicit verbal praise and thanksgiving and for their emphasis on creation in the opening section.

There is an important wrinkle in the story of widespread common features among the West Syrian anaphoras, an enigma first noted by Kenneth Stevenson and later named by John Fenwick, in a 1989 booklet, “the Missing Oblation.”<sup>12</sup> There, he took up a thesis that has since garnered rather wide support—namely, that ATA, CHR, and ApCon “are all independent derivatives of a single prayer”—and concluded that this

---

*Redaktionen und der relevanten Fragmente* (AO 2; AA 2; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2005).

<sup>6</sup> PE, 358–73; Renaudot, *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio*, 1:92–104.

<sup>7</sup> PEER, 171–81; PE, 230–43; *Liturgies, Eastern and Western; Being the Texts, Original or Translated, of the Principal Liturgies of the Church* (ed. F. E. Brightman; vol. 1: Eastern Liturgies; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896) 309–44 (hereafter LEW); John R. K. Fenwick, *The Anaphoras of St. Basil and St. James: An Investigation into Their Common Origin* (OCA 240; Rome: Pontificum Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1992).

<sup>8</sup> PEER, 164–71; PE, 223–29; LEW, 309–99 (Barberini text), 470–81 (modern version); Robert F. Taft, “The Authenticity of the Chrysostom Anaphora Revisited, Determining Authorship of Liturgical Texts by Computer,” *OCP* 56 (1990) 5–51; Juan Mateos, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Vol. I, The Liturgy of the Word* (ed. Steven Hawkes-Teeple; Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 2016); volumes II, IV, V and VI were published as OCA 200 (1975), 238 (1991), 261 (2000), and 281 (2008). For the most recent comprehensive study of CHR, see Stefano Parenti, *L’anafora di Crisostomo* (Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 2020).

<sup>9</sup> PEER, 178–91; Hans-Jürgen Feulner, “The Armenian Anaphora of St. Athanasius,” in *Issues in Eucharistic Praying*, 189–218; Winkler, *Die Basilus-Anaphora*; Gabriele Winkler, “On the Formation of the Armenian Anaphora: Completely Revised and Updated Overview,” *Studi Sull’ Oriente Cristiano* 11.2 (2007) 97–130; Hans-Jürgen Feulner, *Die Armenische Athanasius-Anaphora: Kritische Edition, Übersetzung und liturgievergleichender Kommentar*, AO 1 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2001).

<sup>10</sup> The evidence in West Syrian-style anaphoras, however, is not uniform. Most of the Syrian Orthodox anaphoras, as well as Coptic Gregory, however, are addressed to the Son. See Nicholas Newman, *The Liturgy of Saint Gregory the Theologian: Critical Text with Translation and Commentary* (Belleville, IL: Saint Dominic’s Media Inc., 2019).

<sup>11</sup> See Baldovin, “Eucharistic Prayers,” *DLW*, 195. I have elsewhere addressed some matters related to oblation and epiclesis in Matthew S. C. Olver, “Offering for Change: The Logic of Consecration That Unites Early Christian Anaphoras,” *Worship* 96 (July 2022) 204–21 and I draw from it at points in this article.

<sup>12</sup> Three years earlier, Kenneth Stevenson described this phenomenon in Kenneth Stevenson, *Eucharist and Offering* (New York: Pueblo Pub. Co., 1986) 64.

proto-anaphora (what Robert Taft calls “the Greek Urtext”) “lack[ed] any oblation or offering of the eucharistic elements to God.”<sup>13</sup> Bryan Spinks also finds this proposal “to be the most plausible,” though he posits that there may also have been “a Syriac Urtext.” But until any of these texts surface, “this must remain speculation.”<sup>14</sup>

In this article, I intend to explore the idea a “missing” oblation from a number of vantage points. To explore the presence and use of sacrificial language in early Christian anaphoras is to run into the larger question of what constitutes sacrifice, offering, oblation, and so forth, and what (if anything) distinguishes each from the other in the early Christian texts themselves. In light of this challenge, I begin with a look at some of the serious deficiencies in the way contemporary scholarship (both liturgists and beyond) tends to talk about the application of sacrificial terms to the Eucharist in early Christian texts. I next turn to a brief discussion of the Antiochene or West Syrian anaphoras, whose structure is the basis by which ATA is said to be missing a verb of offering. Part III looks in some detail at seven anaphoras from the epiclesis through the intercessions: ATA, the Greek and Syriac versions of JAMES, CHR, Greek and Egyptian BASIL, and ApCon. In Part IV, I probe a number of aspects of the claims of Taft and Fenwick, as well as a provocative further contribution to this line of inquiry by Stefano Parenti.<sup>15</sup>

## ■ Modern Interpretations of Eucharistic Sacrifice

A common argument is that earlier Christians interpreted sacrifice in a spiritual sense, by which the interpreters usually mean a sense that is non-material. In other words, a “spiritual” sacrifice is verbal and an orientation of the heart as opposed to an approach where sacrifice necessarily includes the material offering of bread and wine. But what is really the impetus for making such a distinction? Is this based in the texts themselves?

The “spiritualization thesis” often includes a rather sweeping historical view of a slow process of “spiritualization” in Judaism away from material to immaterial concepts of sacrifice.<sup>16</sup> This process, according to the narrative, began in Second Temple Judaism, was adopted by early Christians, but then, in the fourth and fifth centuries, underwent a rather significant change—a reversal—to a more material

<sup>13</sup> John R. K. Fenwick, *The Missing Oblation: The Contents of the Early Antiochene Anaphora*, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 11 (Bramcote: Grove Books, 1989) 5; Robert F. Taft, “Some Structural Problems in the Syriac Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles I,” *Aram* 5.1–2 (1993) 505–20, at 505.

<sup>14</sup> For more on how to understand the relationship between these anaphoras, see Bryan D. Spinks, “Crossing the Christological Divide: The Greek Anaphora of St. John Chrysostom and the Syriac Anaphoras of Twelve Apostles and Nestorius,” in *Syriac Anaphoras (Arabic and English)* (Kaslik: The University of the Holy Spirit, 2021) 175–97, at 178–79.

<sup>15</sup> Stefano Parenti, “Between Anamnesis and Praise: The Origin of Oblation in Syro-Byzantine Anaphoras,” *SL* 50.1 (2020) 86–100.

<sup>16</sup> For a recent discussion of the ways in which sacrifice underwent a significant reconceptualization in post-70 AD Judaism, see Mira Balberg, *Blood for Thought: The Reinvention of Sacrifice in Early Rabbinic Literature* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2017).

notion of sacrifice.<sup>17</sup> Despite Robert Daly's acknowledgment that the common category of "spiritualization" is "so broad in potential meaning that it can hardly be defined in a few words," he nonetheless uses the term repeatedly. A reconsideration of his discussion of sacrifice in *Didache* reveals just how far away from the text the heuristic of "spiritualization" takes him.

For example, in his discussion of the meaning of the term *θυσία* in *Didache* 9, 10, and 14, Daly inexplicably concludes, without providing any evidence, "that the sacrifice of *Did* 14 apparently has primarily the spiritualized meaning of a prayer of praise and thanksgiving recited over the elements of bread and wine."<sup>18</sup> Everett Ferguson gives a similar interpretation of *Didache*, "since the sacrifice is not identified with the material elements."<sup>19</sup> But what neither admits is that the text does not provide a specific explanation in either direction. *Didache* simply assumes the propriety of the term "sacrifice" to be self-evident. Furthermore, neither Daly nor Ferguson give any indication that the sacrificial categories "material" and "spiritual" may be a profound, conceptual imposition on Ancient Near Eastern writers. Andrew McGowan, in contrast, argues that not only can the term "Eucharist" "only artificially be restricted to prayer, or meal, or gathering" in *Didache*, "[i]t is anachronistic to ask whether *θυσία* refers strictly to the food and drink of the meal, as opposed to the Eucharistic prayers accompanying it, or to other elements of the whole. We should assume rather that it refers to all of them together," unless we have evidence to the contrary.<sup>20</sup> McGowan has demonstrated quite clearly that when we look at the concepts of "Eucharist" and "sacrifice" in early Christianity, "there is no Archimedean point on which to stand so that one of these can be taken as a stable entity influencing the other. Rather these are two closely related traditions, or sets of theory and practice, whose developments require description and interpretation rather than mutual deconstruction."<sup>21</sup>

There were two technical terms that underwent significant development in early Christianity and which would have a significant effect on its conceptualization of sacrifice. The first of these is the term "spiritual" (*λογική/rationabilis*), which

<sup>17</sup> See Robert J. Daly, *Christian Sacrifice: The Judaeo-Christian Background before Origen* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1978); Frances M. Young, *The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom* (Patristic Monograph Series 5; Cambridge, MA: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979); Louis Marie Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament: A Sacramental Reinterpretation of Christian Existence* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995) 228–319. For an example of an appreciative response to Daly's approach, see John H. McKenna, "Eucharist and Sacrifice: An Overview," *Worship* 76.5 (September 2002) 386–402, at 387.

<sup>18</sup> Daly, *Christian Sacrifice*, 503.

<sup>19</sup> Everett Ferguson, "Spiritual Sacrifice in Early Christianity and its Environment," in *ANRW*, 20.1.1151–89, at 1167.

<sup>20</sup> Andrew B. McGowan, "Eucharist and Sacrifice: Cultic Tradition and Transformation in Early Christian Ritual Meals," in *Mahl und religiöse Identität im frühen Christentum = Meals and Religious Identity in Early Christianity* (ed. Matthias Klinghardt and Hal Taussig; TANZ 56; Tübingen: Francke, 2012) 1–45, at 7.

<sup>21</sup> McGowan, "Eucharist and Sacrifice," 3.

was explored in detail by the great scholar of ecclesiastical Latin, Christine Mohrmann. In Rom 12:1, the Christian recipients of the letter in Rome are enjoined to “present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship [τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν].” Rom 12:1 is the likely source for a number of terms that became technical terminology in Christians anaphoras: the notion of a “living sacrifice” comes to be expressed with the term “unbloody” beginning with Athenagoras (ca. 130–190 CE), and the term λογικός becomes fixed in both Greek liturgies and in the Roman Canon with *rationabilis*.<sup>22</sup> Mohrmann explains that at least through the time of Ambrose and Ambrosiaster (late fourth century), *rationabilis* shared its definition with its Greek derivative, λογικός, meaning “spiritual” in the sense that the sacrifice has been elevated to the sphere of the divine, but not necessarily to the exclusion of the material. But by the time of Leo the Great (440–461 CE), its meaning has narrowed and “signified merely what was suited to reason or the nature of things.”<sup>23</sup> What is important is that in neither case did the term carry with it a clear distinction between material and non-material. Thus, the writers of the first few centuries are working with a concept where matter has varying degrees of relation to the divine, to religious cult, and thus to sacrifice. This is rightly described with the adjective λογικός/*rationabilis*, not because it is or is not material, but because it has been raised to the level of the divine. In the words of Josef Jungmann, λογική θυσία “is an exact description of the spiritual sacrifice proper to Christianity, a sacrifice lifted high above the realm of [only] matter.”<sup>24</sup>

The other term that underwent a significant development is θυσία. One of McGowan’s important insights is the collapse, in the Septuagint, of various types of Hebrew Bible sacrifices under one Greek terminological category, such that cereal offerings, animal sacrifices, and so on could alike be described by θυσία.<sup>25</sup> Thus, unbeknownst to them, both Jews and early Christians read the Scriptures through a

<sup>22</sup> Joseph Crehan, “Introduction,” in Athenagoras, *Embassy for the Christians, The Resurrection of the Dead* (trans. Joseph Hugh Crehan SJ; New York: Paulist Press, 1956) 3–28, at 24–25. In *Legatio pro Christianis*, Athenagoras explains that, while they do not need to offer sacrifice, Christians nonetheless offer “a bloodless sacrifice, our spiritual worship” (δέον ἀναιμάκτων θυσίαν καὶ τὴν λογικὴν προσάγειν λατρείαν; *Leg.*, 13 (SC 379, 158) (ibid., 44)). The idea of an unbloody sacrifice pre-dates Christianity. One of the earliest uses appears in the literature of Second Temple Judaism in the Testament of Levi, where the angels offer “to the Lord a pleasing odor [ὄσμὴν εὐωδίας], a rational and bloodless oblation [λογικὴν καὶ ἀναιμάκτων προσφορὰν]”; T. Levi 3:4-6; ET = *OTP*, I:789; Greek is taken from *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (ed. R. H. Charles; London: Oxford University Press [1908] Hildesheim, Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1960) 34.

<sup>23</sup> Christine Mohrmann, “Rationabilis-λογικός,” *RIDA* 5 (1950) 225–34; see also Bernard Botte, “Traduction du Canon de la messe,” *LMD* 23 (1950) 37–53.

<sup>24</sup> Josef A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development (Missarum Sollemnia)* (trans. Francis A. Brunner; 2 vols.; New York: Benziger, 1951) 2:189. Interestingly, in ATA, there appears to be a parallel to the use of λογικός in CHR that is quite close to how Jungmann defines the term, namely, as “this divine sacrifice” (ATA;  $\text{ἡ θυσία ἡ ἀληθινή}$  *ledbahāṭā haḏa alāhayātā*; *sacrificium hoc divinum*; AS, I.2:248–49).

<sup>25</sup> McGowan, “Eucharist and Sacrifice,” 5–6.

linguistic prism that had embedded within itself a conceptual transformation about all that is intended by the term “sacrifice.” This simple insight alone reveals the degree to which so many modern discussions of sacrifice make assumptions that the Ancient Near Eastern world would find completely perplexing and unrecognizable. Paul Bradshaw and Maxwell Johnson point out that it is “important to understand that there is no question but that the Eucharist was widely understood theologically as the Church’s sacrifice and, as such, the burden of proof to the contrary has always been (and remains) on those who wish somehow to deny this interpretation and who seek to avoid using sacrificial terminology altogether in their eucharistic practice and theology.”<sup>26</sup>

In addition to McGowan, other leading scholars have shown just how misleading the spiritualization thesis is. Jonathan Klawans, for example, writes, “as I have been arguing all along, it is high time to abandon the term ‘spiritual sacrifice’ altogether” and instead “speak more neutrally of metaphorical uses of sacrifice language—a phenomenon that we can see in Paul, Philo, the rabbis, and even the Last Supper traditions.”<sup>27</sup> In Harold Attridge’s challenging review of Daly’s monograph, he explains that what is infinitely more useful is “to differentiate symbolic interpretations of traditional cult, metaphorical application of cultic terms to non-cultic activity, and the application of cultic terms to non-traditional ritual activity. These three uses of the language of cult and sacrifice operate in the material surveyed, often at the same time, but to describe them all as ‘spiritualization’ is really not very helpful.”<sup>28</sup> McGowan agrees that what is sometimes called “spiritualization” is better described as “the application of sacrificial understandings and interpretations to a wider range of practices than was previously seen as cultic.” This is different, he argues, from the tendency toward the interiorization of sacrifice that some have identified in a figure such as Philo (though even he is not the advocate for spiritualization that many claim).<sup>29</sup> “Practices such as prayer and communal meals were already closely-related to sacrificial rituals, and in these cases to recast the relationships as organic rather than as merely adjacent is a subtle but important one.”<sup>30</sup>

Thus, writes McGowan, “[i]f we relinquish the notion that “sacrifice” must refer to animal offerings, or must have a propitiatory character”—or (I would add) that it must involve death—or “that ‘sacrifice’ is an essential and stable object” and not a complex idea that begins to be applied by Christians and Jews “to a wider range of practices than were previously seen as cultic,” then we can immediately see

<sup>26</sup> Bradshaw and Johnson, *Eucharistic Liturgies*, 131.

<sup>27</sup> Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) 220.

<sup>28</sup> Harold W. Attridge, “Review of Christian Sacrifice: The Judaeo-Christian Background before Origen, by Robert J. Daly,” *JBL* 100.1 (March 1981) 145–47, at 147.

<sup>29</sup> See Andrew B. McGowan, “Philo and the Materialization of Sacrifice,” *SPhilo* 32 (2020) 183–204.

<sup>30</sup> McGowan, “Eucharistic and Sacrifice,” 14–15.

that so many of the objections that a person might raise to calling the Eucharist a sacrifice begin to fade away.<sup>31</sup> Sacrifice was not, in fact, a stable or fixed concept in this period, which makes the distinction between material and non-material a wooden hermeneutic and an anachronistic lens through which to misinterpret early Christians. These insights will be very helpful as we turn to the claims of Fenwick, Taft, and Parenti.

## ■ The Structure of Antiochene Anaphoras

Proper attention to the whole of particular anaphoras, in all their attending complexities, means reading a given anaphora carefully and entirely, consciously aware that scholarly heuristics about anaphoral structural families (such as West Syrian and East Syrian) can just as easily obscure an anaphora's particularities as reveal them. So, in order for the significance of the "disappearing" offering to be understood, it is necessary to be clear about what has been understood as the normative structure of Antiochene anaphoras. The Greek version of JAMES will serve as the representative example in this essay for a number of reasons, but especially because the various versions of JAMES play a major role in the "missing" oblation thesis.<sup>32</sup>

Like nearly all of the Syrian and Byzantine anaphoras, JAMES introduces the opening dialogue with the "Grace" adapted from 2 Cor 13:13.<sup>33</sup> It then moves to an effusive paragraph of praise for creation and the glory that is God's by nature, followed by the pre-*Sanctus*, which ties the praise offered by mortals to that of the myriad of heavenly beings and saints and the *Sanctus* to the song they forever

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 8, 15.

<sup>32</sup> There are a number of versions of JAMES, including both a longer and shorter version of SyJAMES, which Gabriele Winkler has explored recently. She recently overturned the standard position of Alphonse Raes, who was convinced that the short version of SyJAMES (which Winkler abbreviates as syr Jm II) was both a 13th century abbreviation and that it tracked exactly with the longer version of SyJAMES (syr Jm I); see *AS*, II.2:186. After comparing both Syriac versions of JAMES with its Ethiopic and Armenian versions, she concluded that (shorter) syr Jm II was older and was not a later abbreviation and further that longer SyJAMES (syr Jm I) had a great deal of unique linguistic overlap with Greek JAMES. Gabriele Winkler, "A New Study of the Liturgy of James," *OCF* 80 (2014) 23–33, at 26–28; see also Winkler, *Die Jakobus-Liturgie in ihren Überlieferungssträngen. Edition des Cod. arm. 17 von Lyon, Übersetzung und Liturgievergleich*, (AO 4; AA 4; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2013). Also, after a new comparison of the Armenian version of JAMES with all of the other extant versions led her "to the conclusion that this Armenian version seemingly derives from an earlier version than syr Jm I as it also showed that the Armenian redaction often agrees with syr Jm II (and eth Jm)"; Winkler, "A New Study of the Liturgy of James," 29; see Winkler, *Die Jakobus-Liturgie*, 560–69. Even more surprising to her was the "discovery of the dependence of the Armenian version of the Liturgy of James (arm Jm) on the Armenian redaction Anaphora of Basil in its earliest form, namely arm Bas I"; Winkler, "A New Study of the Liturgy of James," 29. The details of her massive study are too complex to deal with throughout this article. Nonetheless, when I look at the particular units of these various anaphoras, I will always note if and how the two recensions of SyJAMES differ from each other.

<sup>33</sup> "The love of God the Father, the grace of our Lord God and Savior Jesus Christ, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all"; *PEER*, 143.



sing. Next, in a move distinctive of the West Syrian prayers, the introduction of the post-*Sanctus* begins with an affirmation of God's holiness that explicitly links the post-*Sanctus* terminologically to the first word of the *Sanctus* itself (such as "holy indeed" in JAMES), after which it continues the praise begun in the preface. These anaphoras move to a recollection of salvation history and conclude with the coming of Jesus for the salvation of the world.<sup>34</sup> The transition to the institution narrative follows naturally upon the summary of Christ's saving actions. Dominic Serra points out that "the supper narrative appears within the anamnestic thanksgiving of all anaphoras belonging to the Antiochene Family," not as a structurally distinct feature.<sup>35</sup> In other words, the summary of God's work of salvation in history culminates with a narrative description of the night that Christ told his disciples to "do this." In JAMES, the people respond "Amen" to the institution narrative and then verbalize a brief anamnestic acclamation ("Your death, Lord, we proclaim and your resurrection we confess"), which introduces and amplifies the common anamnesis-offering-epiclesis triad that follows. It is important to note that summaries of the West Syrian structure fail to mention the verb of oblation just as often as they include it in the summary of the structure: two entries in the same reference work (*The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*) disagree about whether to include the oblation as one of the structural features of West Syrian anaphoras.<sup>36</sup> The same divergence can be seen in other oft-cited works for students.<sup>37</sup>

The transition from oblation to epiclesis in JAMES is lengthy and characterized by an emphasis on the mercy of God: the effectual reception of mercy by means of the sacrament is joined to the epicletic request by couching the Father's mission of the Spirit both on the people and on the gifts (sometimes called a double epiclesis) as itself an act of mercy.<sup>38</sup> The intercessions then follow the epiclesis. In JAMES, the intercessions begin "We offer to you, Master, for. . . ." The intercessions are lengthy and usually begin with the phrase, "remember, Lord" (μνήσθητι). The anaphora concludes, as nearly all West Syrian anaphoras do, with a trinitarian doxology.

<sup>34</sup> PEER, 144.

<sup>35</sup> Dominic E. Serra, "The Roman Canon: The Theological Significance of Its Structure and Syntax," *EO* 20.1 (2003) 99–128, at 103.

<sup>36</sup> See Baldwin, "Eucharistic Prayers," *DLW*, 195, who includes the oblation, while John Klentos, in "Eucharist: Eastern Churches," in *DLW*, 175 does not.

<sup>37</sup> Bradshaw and Johnson, *Eucharistic Liturgies*, 77 and Herman A. J. Wegman, *Christian Worship in East and West: A Study Guide to Liturgical History* (New York: Pueblo Pub. Co, 1985) 127 do not mention the oblation, while these sources do include it: E. J. Yarnold, "The Liturgy of the Faithful in the Fourth and Early Fifth Centuries," in *The Study of Liturgy* (ed. Cheslyn Jones et al., rev. ed., London: New York: SPCK; Oxford University Press, 1992) 230–45, at 235 and Bryan D. Spinks, *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Eucharist from the Early Church to the Present Day* (SCM Studies in Worship and Liturgy Series; London: SCM Press, 2013) 65.

<sup>38</sup> This unified double-epiclesis is also found in EgBASIL and in the following West Syrian-style anaphora: ApCon 8, EgBASIL, CHR, and ByzBASIL; see PEER, 59–60, 121, 169, 178.

## ■ The “Missing Oblation”

There is an important wrinkle in the story of widespread common features among the West Syrian anaphoras, an enigma that John Fenwick called “the Missing Oblation.” Almost all complete Eastern anaphoras contain an explicit oblation of the bread and wine as the conclusion to the anamnesis that follows the institution narrative, such as this in JAMES. A few anaphoras, such as SyJAMES and CHR, contain two distinct verbs of offering, and still more verbs of offering are incorporated within the intercessions (“we offer *for*...”).<sup>39</sup> ATA, which shares much in common with CHR, is particularly noteworthy because there is no expected verb of oblation within the transition from anamnesis to epiclesis,<sup>40</sup> hence, Fenwick’s “missing” oblation.

At this point, it is important to note that to speak of an oblation as “missing” is to assume a normative standard from which a deviation has occurred. ATA is normally dated quite early (usually no later than 350 CE) and as we have already seen, one reason why so many anaphoras have remarkably similar structures, even across wide geographic lines, is that there was so much cross-pollination. Thus, we should take care not to draw conclusions that are too far reaching from the fact that an earlier anaphora had less time to be influenced by other anaphoras and does not contain a feature found in other, later anaphoras.

We should pause here to note that I have described what is present in ATA rather than identify what it lacks according to some Archimedean standard. What sets ATA apart most from other Antiochene anaphoral structures is that its only verb of offering is located within the intercessions: “Therefore we offer you (ܡܩܪܒܝܢܢ *mqarbeynan*; *offerimus*), O Lord Almighty, this divine sacrifice (ܠܗܘܘܐ ܠܗܘܘܐ ܠܗܘܘܐ *ledbahātā haḏa alāhayāṭā*; *sacrificium hoc divinum*) on behalf of all humanity, on behalf of your entire Church.”<sup>41</sup> Robert Taft argues that both ATA and CHR “are but two later, expanded redactions of a no longer extant Greek Urtext,” which he named “the Liturgy of the Apostles.” These “divergences in the presanctus of APSyr/CHR,” he explains, “must be attributed to theological elaborations of the Greek Urtext at the turn of the fourth-fifth centuries.”<sup>42</sup> But the situation is a bit

<sup>39</sup> See Fenwick, *Missing Oblation*, 12; Robert F. Taft, “Understanding the Byzantine Anaphoral Oblation,” in *Rule of Prayer, Rule of Faith: Essays in Honor of Aidan Kavanagh, O.S.B.* (ed. Nathan Mitchell and John F. Baldovin; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996) 32–55.

<sup>40</sup> Fenwick, *Missing Oblation*, 6; Stevenson, *Eucharist and Offering*, 64. Engberding basically argued the following points: ATA is essential for understanding the development of CHR; the preface in ATA, with all its brevity and undeveloped theology, is likely the original form of the Antiochene preface, its Greek version dating to the 4th cent.; and the provenance is Antioch; Hieronymus Engberding, “Die syrische Anaphora der zwölf Apostel und ihre Paralleltex-te,” *OC* 7 (1937) 213–47. The following scholars agreed with Engberding: Alphonse Raes, “L’authenticité de la liturgie byzantine de S. Jean Chrysostome,” *OCP* 24 (1958) 5–16; G. Khouri-Sarkis, “L’origine syrienne de l’anaphore Byzantine de Saint Jean Chrysostom,” *Ostkirchliche Studien* 7 (1962) 3–68. Fenwick, however, concludes that ATA, CHR, and ApCon are likely all independent developments from a common, shared source; Fenwick, *Missing Oblation*, 34.

<sup>41</sup> *AS*, II.2:248–49.

<sup>42</sup> Taft, “Some Structural Problems,” 505.

more complex: after the introduction to the saving events of Christ's life, ATA no longer parallels CHR. Instead, it begins to share a set of features with a single anaphora: JAMES and its Syriac recession, SyJAMES. In their respective discussions, both Fenwick and Taft consider the wider range of anaphoras that are related to each other: not just ATA, CHR, and SyJAMES, but also ByBASIL, EgBASIL, and ApCon. In the next section, a series of tables put all of these anaphoras in parallel in English, divided into discrete sections so that they can be seen most easily alongside the commentary that follows each section. In the discussion that follows each unit, the relevant terms in the original languages will be identified. Since seven anaphoras are being compared, these discussions will be limited to those items most relevant to this inquiry.

## ■ The Anamnesis through the Intercessions in Seven Historic Anaphoras

### A. Table 1: *The Anamnesis*<sup>43</sup>

Each of the seven anaphoras follow the institution narrative with the classic anamnestic structure: an adverbial participle of recollection (such as, “remembering”), followed by a recounting of the central, saving deeds of Christ; and each agree about what constitutes these actions: passion and death (expressed variously with “[life-giving] cross,” “death,” “the tomb,” “saving passion,” and “holy sufferings”), resurrection (often clarified “on the third day”), ascension, seating at the Father's right hand, and second coming (the purpose of which, in four of them, is to bring requisite or reward for earthly actions). In all the anaphoras save for ATA, this list is followed by a first-person plural verb of oblation in the Antiochene anaphoras. Again, Fenwick's “missing oblation.”

At this point, ATA, SyJAMES and JAMES diverge from the other three anaphoras with the following section:

### B. Table 2: *Unique Unit in ATA, JAMES, and SyJAMES*

One expects a verb of oblation in the first-person plural to follow directly on the anamnesis in Antiochene anaphoras. But it turns out that there are a number of more unexpected features than just a missing oblation in ATA (which instead moves straight to intercession). SyJAMES and JAMES contain the expected verb

<sup>43</sup> ET of ATA = Brock, “Twelve Apostles,” 69; ET of SyJAMES is adapted from Baby Varghese, *The Syriac Version of the Liturgy of St James: A Brief History for Students*, JLS 49 (Cambridge, UK: Grove Books Ltd., 2001) 32–39. The text that he is following, however, does not match the text in *AS*, II.2:149–53 and reproduced in *PE*, 269–75. In particular, the second oblation (just following the people's *Miserere nostri*, *Pater pantocrator*) is not reflected in his translation. The order of the anaphoras in the tables was an attempt to put those anaphoras that had closer relationships next to each other, especially because there are times when ATA, SyJAMES, and JAMES will contain material not found in CHR, SyBASIL, and EgBASIL, and visa-versa.

Table 1: The Anamnesis

ATA	JAMES	SyJAMES	CHR	ByBASIL	EgBASIL	ApCon
<p><i>Priest.</i>  <u>Recalling</u>, therefore,                      O Lord, the saving                      command and all your                      dispensation which took                      place on our behalf –                      the <b>cross</b>,</p> <p>your <u>resurrection</u>  <b>from the dead</b>                      after <b>three days</b>,                      the ascent into heaven                      and the sitting at the right                      hand of the majesty                      of the Father,                      and your glorious <u>Second</u>                      Coming,                      when with glory</p>	<p>We, therefore,  <u>remembering</u></p> <p>his <b>death</b>                      and his <u>resurrection</u>  <b>from the dead</b>                      on the <b>third day</b>                      and his <u>return</u> to                      heaven                      and his session at                      your right hand,                      his God and Father,                      and his glorious                      and awesome                      second coming,                      when</p> <p>he <b>judges</b>                      the <b>living and the</b>  <b>dead</b>,</p> <p>when he <b>will</b>  <b>reward each</b>  <b>according to his</b>  <b>works</b>,</p>	<p><i>Priest.</i>                      Remembering,                      therefore, O Lord                      [addressed to                      Christ and not the                      Father]                      your <b>death</b>                      and your                      resurrection                      on the <b>third day</b>                      from among the                      dead, and your                      ascension into                      heaven                      and your session at                      the right hand                      of God,                      and your terrible                      and glorious second                      coming,                      wherein you are                      about</p> <p>to <b>judge</b>                      the <i>world</i>                      in <i>righteousness</i>                      and reward every                      one according to                      his deeds:</p>	<p><i>Priest, privately:</i>                      We therefore,  <u>remembering</u>                      this saving                      commandment and                      all the things that                      were done for us:                      The <b>cross</b>, the                      tomb,                      the <u>resurrection</u>                      on the <b>third day</b>,                      the <u>ascension</u> into                      heaven,                      the session at the                      right hand,                      the second and                      glorious coming                      again</p>	<p><i>Priest, privately:</i>                      Therefore,                      Master, we also                      remembering</p> <p>his saving <b>passion</b>,                      his life-giving  <b>cross</b>,                      his <i>three-day burial</i>,                      his <u>resurrection</u>  <b>from the dead</b>,</p> <p>his <u>ascension</u> into                      heaven,                      his session at your                      right hand,                      God and Father,                      and his glorious                      and fearful <u>second</u>                      coming</p>	<p>We therefore,  <u>remembering</u></p> <p>his <i>holy sufferings</i>,                      and his <u>resurrection</u>  <b>from the dead</b>,</p> <p>and his <u>ascension</u>                      into heaven,                      and his session at                      the right hand of the                      Father,                      and his glorious and                      fearful coming to us                      (again),</p> <p>and his future  <u>second coming</u>,                      in which                      he comes with                      glory and power                      to <b>judge</b>                      the <b>living and the</b>  <b>dead</b>,</p> <p>and to reward                      each according to                      his works,</p>	<p><u>Remembering</u></p> <p>his <b>passion</b>                      and <b>death</b> and                      resurrection  <b>from the dead</b>,</p> <p>his <u>return</u> to heaven</p> <p>and his future  <u>second coming</u>,                      in which                      he comes with                      glory and power                      to <b>judge</b>                      the <b>living and the</b>  <b>dead</b>,</p> <p>and to reward                      each according to                      his works,</p>

Underline: shared by all (whether identical or similar language), **bold**: shared by some; *italics*: unique to this anaphora [here and in all tables that follow]

Table 2: Unique Unit in ATA, JAMES, and SyJAMES

ATA	JAMES	SyJAMES
<p><i>Therefore, your church and your flock supplicates you, and through you and with you, your Father, saying</i></p>	<p><b>we offer you</b> (<i>present tense</i>) <b>this fearful and bloodless sacrifice, that you would not deal with us according to our sins, nor reward us according to our iniquities, but according to your mildness and love for mankind, blot out our sins, your suppliants.</b></p> <p><b>For your people and your Church</b></p> <p><u>beseech you.</u></p>	<p><b>we offer you</b> (<i>present tense</i>) <b>this fearful and bloodless sacrifice, that you would not deal with us according to our sins, nor reward us according to our iniquities, but according to your mildness and love for mankind, blot out our sins, your suppliants.</b></p> <p><b>For your people and your inheritance</b></p> <p><u>beseech you,</u> <b>and through you</b></p> <p><b>to your Father, saying</b></p>
<p>Have mercy on me. <i>People: Have mercy . . .</i></p> <p><i>Priest:</i> We too, Lord, <i>in gratitude</i> <b>give thanks to you</b></p>	<p><i>People: Have mercy upon us,</i></p> <p><b>Father Almighty.</b></p>	<p><i>People: Have mercy upon us, O God,</i> <b>Father Almighty.</b> <i>Priest:</i> <b>Giving thanks to you and confessing to you,</b></p>

of oblation with the phrase, “this fearful and bloodless sacrifice”<sup>44</sup> followed by a request for pardon and acceptance, then picking up with intercessions for the church, joining up with ATA and SyJAMES. This is followed in all three anaphoras by a request for mercy, plus (in ATA and SyJAMES) a verb of thanksgiving.

At this point, ATA and SyJAMES begin to track with the other four, though with further variations from the expected structure.

C. Table 3: The Oblation

This table in particular allows the reader to see clearly the “oblation” that Fenwick identified as “missing” in ATA when set beside these related anaphoras. The table also shows the further anomaly in JAMES, namely, that the oblation in the previous is that anaphora’s only verb of oblation after the anamnesis and moves directly to the epiclesis. SyJAMES, on the other hand, repeats the verb of offering in the present tense<sup>45</sup> with a structure nearly identical to what is found in CHR, ByBASIL, EgBASIL, and ApCon (plus ATA, minus the verb of oblation). Why JAMES does not reflect the older ATA anaphora while SyJAMES does remains a mystery.

<sup>44</sup> Longer SyJAMES: *es mqarrabinan lek lehadda dabāhātā dhaylātā weddel dmā; Offerimus tibi hoc sacrificium hoc tremendum et incruentum (AS, II.2:148–49).* Shorter SyJAMES: *ܡܠܟܢܢ ܕܡܩܪܪܒܝܢܢ ܠܟ ܠܗܗܕܕܐ ܕܒܐܗܗܐܬܐ ܐܠ ܕܡܢܐܢܝܬܐ ܡܩܪܪܒܝܢܢ ܠܟ; propterea sacrificium incruentum offerimus tibi (AS, II 2:196–97);* JAMES: *προσφερόμεν σοι, δέσποτα, τὴν φοβερὰν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν (PE, 248).*

<sup>45</sup> The offering is only present in the longer recension of SyJAMES: *ܡܠܟܢܢ ܕܡܩܪܪܒܝܢܢ ܠܟ ܠܗ ܕܒܠܗܕܕܐ ܕܒܐܗܗܐܬܐ ܗܕܕܐ ܕܗܝܠܐܬܐ; Offerimus tibi, in omnibus et propter omnia (AS, II.2:148–49).*

Table 3: The Oblation

ATA	JAMES	SyJAMES	CHR	ByBASIL	EgBASIL	ApCon
<p>on behalf</p> <p><i>of all and for all.</i></p> <p><i>People:</i>                      We praise you,                      &lt;we bless you,                      we give thanks                      to you,                      Lord,                      and we ask you,                      our God,                      'be gracious, for                      you are good, and                      have mercy on                      us' &gt;.</p> <p><i>Deacon:</i>                      In stillness and                      awe ...</p>		<p>we offer to you                      (present tense)</p> <p>from that which is                      yours,                      in all and for all.</p> <p><i>People:</i>                      We praise you,                      &lt;we bless you,                      we give thanks                      to you,                      and pray to you,                      our God.&gt;</p>	<p>(aloud) offering                      you                      (present participle)</p> <p>your own from                      your own,                      in all, and for all,</p> <p><i>People:</i>                      we hymn you,                      &lt;we bless you,                      we give thanks                      to you,                      and pray to you,                      our God.&gt;</p>	<p>(aloud) offering                      you                      (present participle)</p> <p>your own from                      your own,                      in all, and for all,</p> <p><i>People:</i>                      we hymn you,                      &lt;we bless you,                      we give thanks                      to you,                      and pray to you,                      our God.&gt;</p>	<p>have set forth                      before                      you (aorist)</p> <p>your own from                      your own gifts,                      this bread and                      cup,                      [the epiclesis                      follows directly;                      see below]</p> <p>-----</p>	<p>We offer you,                      (present tense)                      King and God,                      according to his                      commandment,</p> <p>this bread and                      this cup,</p> <p>giving you thanks                      through him</p>

There are a number of other noteworthy features. First, the tense of the oblation verb varies: SyJAMES and ApCon are in the first-person, plural, present tense (مقارربان *mqarrabinan* and *offerimus* in the longer reception of SyJAMES; προσφέρουμεν in ApCon)<sup>46</sup> while CHR and ByBASIL use the present participle (προσφέροντες; “offering you”).<sup>47</sup> EgBASIL, however, uses the “famous” aorist tense<sup>48</sup> (ἠρῆκω ἐργαῖ γῆ [θ]ἠ ἴμοκ ἀγω ἡ πεκίτο ε[βολ] ἴνετενογκ νε εβολ ἕνεκ.Δωρῶ; *proposuimus tibi et coram te tua de tuis donis*),<sup>49</sup> which would seem to imply that the offering of the gifts had already taken place. We should be careful not to make too much of the verb tenses, at least in CHR, since there, the intercessions later in the anaphora include three petitions that begin with a present tense verb of offering: “we offer you this service for. . .” This would indicate that *when* offering occurs in the anaphora is secondary to the fact that the act of offering is constitutive of the anaphora. Furthermore, the various verb tenses would seem to indicate that it might be wise not to be overly literal about the sequence within the anaphora (A then B then C, etc.). ByBASIL and EgBASIL, on the other hand, do not contain any verbs of offering as part of the intercessions.

There are a few other noteworthy features in this section. SyJAMES, CHR, ByBASIL, and EgBASIL all refer to the bread and wine as “gifts,” whether implicitly (the first three using some version of “your own from your own”) or explicitly in EgBASIL (“your own from your own gifts”). The offering in ApCon, on the other hand, is more literal: “We offer . . . this bread and this cup.” The formula “in all and for all” in ATA, SyJAMES, CHR, and ByBASIL seems to be based on LXX 1 Chr 29:14 (ὄτι σὰ ῥὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐκ τῶν σῶν δεδόκαμέν σοι) and forms an essential part of Parenti’s argument, which we will explore in a later section.<sup>50</sup>

Another feature of ATA, SyJAMES, CHR, and ByBASIL is the insertion of an acclamation by the people, “We praise you,” which then is expanded later into “We praise you, we bless you, we give thanks to you,” with further slight differences in ATA and SyJAMES. ApCon reveals a different version of this that incorporates the later “we give you thanks” into a different verb form, identifying the offering of the bread and wine as an act of thanksgiving: “We offer you, King and God according to his commandment, this bread and this cup, giving you thanks through him. . .”

At this point, CHR, ByBASIL, and ApCon have a transition section not found in the other four anaphoras.

<sup>46</sup> AS, II.2:152–53; *Les constitutions apostoliques III* (ed. Marcel Metzger; Sch, no 336; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1987) 198.

<sup>47</sup> PE, 226, 236.

<sup>48</sup> See Alphonse Raes, “Un nouveau document de la liturgie de S. Basile,” *OCP Periodica* 26 (1960) 401–10.

<sup>49</sup> Doresse, et al., *La liturgie copte de sainte Basile*, 18–20.

<sup>50</sup> Parenti, “Between Anamnesis and Praise,” 92–93.

*D. Table 4: Unique Interjection in CHR, ByBASIL, and ApCon*

ByBASIL and ApCon (quite briefly) both refer to God’s action in making the faithful “worthy” to minister or stand at the altar, to which ByBASIL adds a longer description of our unworthiness and God’s mercy. CHR does not contain any of this material, but then begins to parallel ByBASIL with another verb of oblation: CHR in present-tense (the second of five repetitions of προσφέρωμεν) while ByBASIL uses an aorist participle (προθέντες). In ByBASIL, “the likeness of the holy body and blood of your Christ” is offered, while in CHR it is “this reasonable and bloodless service” (τὴν λογικὴν καὶ ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν).<sup>51</sup> We saw earlier that both JAMES and SyJAMES, in the unique intervening section where another verb of offering is included just after the anamnesis, describe what is offered as “this fearful and bloodless sacrifice” (προσφερόμεν σοι, δέσποτα, τὴν φοβερὰν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν).<sup>52</sup> The closest to this phrase is what we find in CHR, which calls the sacrificial offering “this spiritual and bloodless service” (προσφέροντές σοι τὴν λογικὴν καὶ ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν).<sup>53</sup> JAMES and its Syriac variant is the only West Syrian anaphora to use precisely this phraseology, though all of those terms are found in the *Catecheses mystagogicae* of Cyril of Jerusalem.<sup>54</sup> There are a number of parallels to the slightly different language in CHR, namely, in Sarapion, Ambrose’s *De sacramentis* 4.6.27, The Strasbourg Papyrus, and The Anaphora of St. Mark.<sup>55</sup>

Table 4: Unique Interjection in CHR, ByBASIL, and ApCon

CHR	ByBASIL	ApCon
<p><i>Priest, privately: (present tense) We offer you also this reasonable and bloodless service</i></p>	<p><i>Priest: Therefore, Master all-Holy, we also, our sinful and unworthy servants, who have been held worthy to minister at your altar,</i></p> <p><i>not for our righteousness, for we have done nothing good upon earth, but for your mercies and compassions which you have poured out rightly upon us, with confidence approach your holy altar.</i></p> <p><b>And having set forth (aorist participle)</b></p> <p><i>the likeness of the holy body and blood of your Christ,</i></p>	<p><b>that you have deemed us worthy to stand before you and to serve you as priests</b></p> <p>-----</p>

<sup>51</sup> PEER, 169; PE, 228, 236.

<sup>52</sup> PEER, 145; PE, 248.

<sup>53</sup> PEER, 169; PE, 228.

<sup>54</sup> See PEER, 133-41.

<sup>55</sup> For Strasbourg, Mark, and Sarapion see PE, 116, 102, and 130; for Ambrose, see SCh 25bis, 116.



Table 5: The Epiclesis

<p>ATA</p> <p><i>Priest: Again,</i></p> <p><b>we beseech you, Lord/God Almighty and God of the holy Hosts, as we fall upon our faces before you,</b></p> <p>that you send your <u>Holy Spirit</u> upon these offerings <b>set forth</b></p>	<p>JAMES</p> <p><i>Priest, privately,</i> <b>Have mercy upon us,</b></p> <p><b>O God, the Father Almighty, and</b></p> <p>send down your <u>Holy Spirit</u> <b>upon us, and</b> upon these oblations <b>that are set forth,</b></p> <p><b>he who is the Lord and life-giver, equal to you in throne, consubstantial and co-eternal, who spoke in the law and the prophets, and in your new covenant, who descended in the likeness of a dove upon our Lord Jesus Christ in the Jordan River, who descended upon your holy apostles in the likeness of tongues of fire.</b></p>	<p>CHR</p> <p><b>and we pray and beseech and entreat you,</b></p> <p>send down your <u>Holy Spirit</u> upon these gifts <b>set forth;</b></p>	<p>ByBASIL</p> <p><b>we pray and beseech you,</b></p> <p><i>O holy of holies,</i> <b>in the good pleasure of your bounty,</b></p> <p>that your all-Holy <u>Spirit may come</u> <b>upon us and</b> upon these gifts <b>set forth,</b></p>	<p>EgBASIL</p> <p><i>And we, sinners and unworthy and wretched,</i> <b>pray you, our God,</b></p> <p><i>in adoration that</i> <b>in the good pleasure of your goodness</b></p> <p>your Holy Spirit may descend <b>upon us and</b> upon these gifts <b>that have been set before you,</b></p>	<p>ApCon</p> <p><b>And we beseech you</b></p> <p><i>to look graciously upon these gifts set before you, O God who need nothing, and accept them in honor of your Christ; and to send down your Holy Spirit</i> upon this sacrifice.</p> <p><i>the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus,</i></p>
---	--	---	--	--	--

*E. Table 5: The Epiclesis*

All seven anaphoras have an explicit epiclesis, though there is some variation in the particulars of the epicletic request. Both versions of JAMES (though not the shorter recension of SyJAMES<sup>56</sup>) and both version of BASIL first ask the Spirit to be sent down “upon us” and then on the gifts, a feature sometimes referred to as a double epiclesis.<sup>57</sup> All seven anaphoras request that the Holy Spirit come down upon the bread and wine, referred to as “offerings” or gifts: ATA (قربان qurbānā; *oblationem*), JAMES (δῶρα; *dona*), SyJAMES (قربان qurābānā; *oblationes*), CHR (δῶρα; *dona*), ByBASIL (δῶρα; *dona*), EgBASIL (δῶρον; *dona*), and ApCon (δῶρα)<sup>58</sup>— which all except for ApCon describe as being “set forth” in some fashion. Both JAMES anaphoras then add a long relative clause that describes the Holy Spirit. All of the anaphoras describe in some fashion the affects they hope that the epiclesis will confer upon the bread and wine.

*F. Table 6: The Requested Effects of the Epiclesis on the Gifts*

In each of the anaphoras, the epiclesis is followed by at least two sorts of requests: 1) for its effect on the offered bread and wine, and 2) on those who receive the offered bread and wine. A clear pattern is found in all seven anaphoras in the first of these requests: “that they may” followed by a verb (or two) of action upon “this bread [to be] the body of Christ and this cup [to be] the blood of Christ.” JAMES, SyJAMES, CHR, and EgBASIL all request that the Holy Spirit “make” the bread and wine Christ’s body and blood, while the other three ask that the Spirit “show” this bread to be Christ’s body and blood (*thawwe* in ATA,<sup>59</sup> ἀναδείξει in ByBASIL, and ἀπορήνη in ApCon). CHR alone, after naming the body and blood of Christ respectively, adds the phrase, “changing it by your Holy Spirit.”

<sup>56</sup> See *AS*, II.2:198–99.

<sup>57</sup> This unified double-epiclesis is also found in EgBASIL and in the following West Syrian-style anaphora: ApCon 8, EgBASIL, CHR, and ByzBASIL; see *PEER*, 59–60, 121, 169, 178.

<sup>58</sup> *AS*, I.2: 246–47; *PE*, 250–51 (JAMES); *AS*, II.2:150–51 (Longer SyJAMES); *AS*, II.2:198–99 (Shorter SyJAMES); *PE*, 226–27 (CHR); *PE*, 236–37 (ByBASIL); Doresse, et al., *La liturgie copte de sainte Basile*, 20 (EgBASIL); Metzger, *SCh*, 336, 198 (ApCon).

<sup>59</sup> For more on this, see Sebastian P. Brock, “Invocations to/for the Holy Spirit in Syria Liturgical Texts: Some Comparative Approaches,” in *Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (1872–1948)* (ed. Robert F. Taft and Gabriele Winkler; OCA 265; Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2001) 377–406, at 387–88.

Table 6: Requested Effects of the Epiclesis on the Gifts

ATA	JAMES	SyJAMES	CHR	ByBASIL	EgBASIL	ApCon
<p><i>He raises his voice:</i></p> <p><b>And appoint this bread</b></p> <p><b>the honoured Body of our Lord Jesus Christ,</b></p> <p><b>and this cup</b></p>	<p><i>The Priest raises his voice,</i> So that he may descend upon them, <b>and make this bread</b></p> <p><b>the holy body of Christ (People: Amen)</b></p>	<p><i>The Priest raises his voice,</i> So that he may overshadow them <b>may make this bread</b> <i>the life-giving body, the redeeming body, the heavenly body, the body which frees our souls and bodies,</i> <b>the body of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ,</b> <i>for the remission of sins and eternal life for those who receive (People: Amen).</i> <b>is in this cup,</b> <i>he may make the blood of the new covenant, the redeeming blood, the life-giving blood, the heavenly blood, the blood which frees our souls and bodies,</i> <b>the blood of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ,</b> <i>for the remission of sins and eternal life for those who receive,</i> <b>(People: Amen).</b></p>	<p><b>and make this bread</b></p> <p><b>the precious body of your Christ,</b> <i>changing it by your Holy Spirit, Amen;</i></p> <p><b>and that which is in this cup</b></p> <p><b>the precious blood of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ,</b> <i>changing it by your Holy Spirit, Amen;</i></p>	<p><i>and bless them and sanctify</i></p> <p><b>and show this bread</b></p> <p><b>the precious body of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ.</b> <b>Amen.</b></p> <p><b>And this cup</b></p> <p><b>the precious blood of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ, Amen,</b> <i>which is shed for the life of the world.</i> <b>Amen.</b></p>	<p><b>and may sanctify them and make them holy of holies.</b> <i>[The intercessions follow directly]</i></p>	<p><b>that he may show this bread</b></p> <p><b>body of your Christ,</b></p> <p><b>and this cup</b></p> <p><b>blood of your Christ;</b></p>

Table 7: The Request for Fruitful Communion that Follows the Epiiclesis

JAMES and SyJAMES	CHR	ATA	ByBASIL	EgBASIL	ApCon
<p><b>That they may be to all who partake of them</b></p> <p><b>the sanctification of souls and bodies,</b></p> <p><b>the bearing of fruits of good works,</b></p> <p><i>for the confirmation of your holy church which you had founded upon the rock of faith and the gates of hell shall not overcome her against it, delivering her from all heresy and from the stumbling blocks of them that work lawlessness,</i></p> <p><b>even unto the end of the world,</b></p> <p><i>both now and at all times and to the ages of ages.</i></p> <p>&lt;SyJAMES&gt;</p> <p><b>Amen.</b></p>	<p><b>so that they may become to those who partake</b></p> <p><b>for vigilance of soul,</b></p> <p><b>for communion with the Holy Spirit,</b></p> <p><i>for the fullness of the kingdom, for boldness toward you, not for judgment or condemnation.</i></p>	<p><b>so that they may be for all those who partake of them</b></p> <p><i>for life, resurrection and forgiveness of sins, for health of soul and of body,</i></p> <p><i>for illumination of mind, and a defense before the awesome tribunal of your Christ.</i></p> <p><b>And may none perish from your people, O Lord;</b></p> <p><i>rather, make us all, as we serve and minister undisturbed before you all the time of our lives, worthy to enjoy your heavenly, immortal and life-giving Mysteries, by your grace, compassion and love of humanity, now...</i></p> <p><i>People: Amen</i></p>	<p><i>Unite with one another all of us who partake of the one bread and the cup</i></p> <p><b>into fellowship with the one Holy Spirit;</b></p> <p><b>and make none of us to partake of the holy body and blood of your Christ for judgement or for condemnation,</b></p> <p><b>but that we may find mercy and grace with all the saints . . .</b></p>	<p><i>Make us all worthy to partake of your holy things</i></p> <p><b>for sanctification of soul and body,</b></p> <p><b>that we may become one body and one spirit,</b></p> <p><b>and may have a portion with all the saints who have been pleasing to you from eternity.</b></p>	<p>That those who partake <b>of it may be strengthened to piety, obtain forgiveness of sins,</b></p> <p><i>be delivered from the devil and his deceit,</i></p> <p><b>be filled with Holy Spirit,</b></p> <p><i>become worthy of your Christ, and obtain eternal life, after reconciliation with you, almighty Master.</i></p>

*G. Table 7: The Request for Fruitful Communion that Follows the Epiclesis<sup>60</sup>*

The second type of request that follows the epiclesis in all seven anaphoras begins with a purpose clause that directly connects a divine action to “those who receive it” (the eucharistic gifts), that is, a request for the fruit of the reception of the sacrament, such as forgiveness of sins or sanctification (except in EgBASIL), the work of the Holy Spirit (CHR, BASIL, EgBASIL, and ApCon), and ecclesial unity of some sort. It is difficult to make a sharp distinction between these requests and the requests that follow, since the structure seems to imply that the eucharistic action along with the reception of the sacrament are intimately related to the fittingness of making intercession for a whole range of needs.

*H. Table 8: The Intercessions*

All the anaphoras move quite smoothly into more general intercessions. ATA, JAMES, SyJAMES, CHR, and ApCon all begin those intercessions with a verb that connects the oblatinal character of the eucharist with the intercession: in ATA, it begins, “Therefore we offer you (مقربين *mqarbeynan*; *offerimus*), O Lord Almighty, this divine sacrifice (لهداياها الهدى *ledbahātā haḍā alāhayātā*; *sacrificium hoc divinum*). . . .”<sup>61</sup> Neither BASIL nor EgBASIL use any form of a “we offer” verb in the intercessions, but the rest do. SyJAMES repeats the earlier language: “We offer you this *fearful and bloodless sacrifice for . . .*” (emphasis added); ATA and CHR describe the offering with the adjective λογικήν (ATA calls it a sacrifice while CHR refers to it as λατρείαν); JAMES and ApCon move quite simply from verb to request: “we offer for . . .”; ATA (مقربين *mqarbeynan*; *offerimus*), JAMES (προσφέρομεν), and SyJAMES (مقربين *mqarbeynan*; *offerimus*) only use the offering verb once, to begin the intercessions, while CHR and ApCon repeat the verb “we offer” (προσφέρομεν) two additional times in the intercessions.<sup>62</sup>

Now that these anaphoras have been examined in relation to each other in some detail, the matter of Stevenson and Fenwick’s “missing” oblation is clearer. However, as I have intimated, the situation is a bit more complex, which can be seen if we return to the anamnesis-oblation-epiclesis section. As I noted earlier, ATA shares some features with only SyJAMES and JAMES, and only at this point

<sup>60</sup> Two changes have been made in the typical arrangement of the anaphoras in this table in order to make certain relationships clearer for the reader. First, JAMES and SyJAMES have been combined, since they are identical, except for an additional phrase in SyJAMES in <> at the very end. Second, in this section in particular, there are sometimes parallels between only two anaphoras. So that one of those between ATA and CHY could be seen more clearly, ATA was moved from the left side to between CHY and ByBASIL. Also, some items that are on the same rows are not necessarily in parallel; the use of italics is especially important here to indicate when the language is unique to the anaphora in question.

<sup>61</sup> AS, II.2:248–49.

<sup>62</sup> AS, I.2:248–49; PE, 250 (JAMES); AS, II.2, 152–53 (Longer SyJAMES); AS, II.2:198–99 (Shorter SyJAMES); PE, 228 (CHR); Metzger, Sch, 336, 202–04 (ApCon).

Table 8: The Intercession

<p>ATA</p> <p><i>Priest, inclined:</i> Therefore <b>we offer you,</b> <i>O Lord Almighty,</i> <b>this</b> <i>divine</i>  <b>sacrifice</b> <b>on behalf of all</b> <b>humanity,</b> <b>on behalf of your entire</b> <b>Church . . .</b></p>	<p>JAMES</p> <p><i>Priest:</i> Again, <b>we offer to you</b></p>	<p>SyJAMES</p> <p><i>Priest:</i> Again, <b>we offer you</b></p> <p><b>this</b> <i>fearful</i> <i>and bloodless</i> <b>sacrifice</b></p>	<p>CHR</p> <p><b>We offer you</b></p> <p><b>this</b> <i>reasonable</i>  <b>service also</b></p> <p><b>for those who rest in</b> <b>faith . . .</b></p>	<p>ByBASIL and EgBASIL</p> <p><i>There is no parallel to the offering verbs in the intercessions]</i></p>	<p>ApCon</p> <p><b>We offer to you</b></p> <p>also for all those holy people... (recounting of saints) . . .</p> <p><b>And we offer to you</b> for this people . . . (for those present)</p> <p><b>And we offer to you also</b> for a mild climate. . .</p> <p><i>The intercessions in ApCon are introduced either with "we offer" or a version of "we entreat."</i> <i>(PEER, 59-60)</i></p>
--	--	---	--	---	---

in the prayer. In the Table 9 below, units A and C are found in all seven of the anaphoras except for JAMES, while the material in unit B is unique to just ATA, SyJAMES, and JAMES:

*I. Table 9: The Anamnesis-Oblation-Epiclesis Unit in ATA, JAMES, and SyJAMES*

After the anamnesis, SyJAMES and JAMES begin the next unit with a verb of oblation in the expected first-person plural form (προσφέρομεν). Especially noteworthy, given the focus on this study, is that both also frame the offering in terms of sacrifice: “we offer you this fearful and bloodless sacrifice” (SyJAMES: ܠܗܘܕܐ ܕܒܗܗܝܬܐ ܕܗܝܠܐܝܬܐ ܘܘܕܠܐ ܕܡܐ; *lehadda dabāhātā dhaylātā weddel dmā*; *idem sacrificium hoc tremendum et incruentum*; JAMES: προσφέρομεν σοι, δέσποτα, τὴν φοβερὰν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν); in ATA, “this divine sacrifice” (ATA: ܠܕܒܗܗܝܬܐ ܕܗܘܕܐ ܕܒܗܗܝܬܐ; *ledbahātā haḏa alāhayātā*; *sacrificium hoc divinum*).<sup>63</sup> All three anaphoras reflect a different sequence than we see in most other Antiochene anaphoras with the presence of this peculiar sequence: oblation (except in ATA); supplication to the Father; request for mercy (JAMES stop here); giving thanks in all and for all; doxology that begins with “We praise.”

While ATA does not have a parallel verb of oblation, ATA and SyJAMES clearly share a set of source material that appears to be unique to the two of them. JAMES, however, is missing the combination of a verb of oblation and the prepositional phrases “in all and for all” found in all the others (except for the missing verb of oblation in ATA). This seems to suggest that at this point in the anaphora, Greek JAMES (at least as it has come down to us) represents the earliest strata after ATA, into which SyJAMES interjects the oblation in the form found in CHR, ByBASIL, EgBASIL, and ApCon, after which it moves smoothly into the epiclesis (though some include an acclamation by the people). At this point, all of the anaphoras pick up with the oblation that we have come to expect directly after the anamnesis, all save for ATA, who again is “missing” an oblation but retains the materials found in all the others save JAMES. The next table puts together all the possible structural parts that could exist in these anaphoras so that we can see more easily what is shared and how they differ from each other (note that at the end, there is a summary of verbs of oblation for each anaphora).<sup>64</sup>

*J. Table 10: Summary of the Anamnesis-Oblation-Epiclesis Unit*

A temptation that often accompanies a judgment such as Fenwick’s—along with some interpretations of eucharistic sacrifice in early Christian texts—is to treat

<sup>63</sup> AS, II.2:152–53 (Longer SyJAMES); AS, II.2:198–99 (Shorter SyJAMES); PE, 248 (JAMES); AS, I.2:248–49 (ATA).

<sup>64</sup> Taft only lists five parts: 1. *memores*; 2. *offerimus*; 3. *laudamus*; 4; *et/vel gratias agentes*; 5. *et petimus ut mittas/mittere/mitte Spiritum*; Taft, “Some Structural Problems,” 505–06. I have mostly followed Taft’s terminology, but have also expanded his terms in order to better clarify the ways in which the anaphoras overlap and differ from each other.

Table 9: The Anamnesis-Oblation-Epiclesis Unit in ATA, JAMES, and SyJAMES

	ATA	SyJAMES	JAMES
A	<p><u>Recalling</u>, therefore, O Lord, the saving command and all your dispensation which took place on our behalf –</p> <p>the <b>cross</b>,</p> <p>your <u>resurrection</u> <b>from the dead</b> <u>after three days</u>,</p> <p><u>the ascent into heaven</u> and the sitting at the right hand of the majesty of the <b>Father</b>,</p> <p>and your <u>glorious</u> <b>Second Coming</b>, <u>when</u> with glory you are going to <u>judge</u> <b>the living and the dead</b>,</p> <p>and <u>requite everyone</u> <u>according to his deeds</u> <i>with lovingkindness</i>.</p>	<p>We, therefore, <u>remembering</u></p> <p>his <b>death</b></p> <p>and his <u>resurrection</u> <b>from the dead</b> <u>on the third day</u></p> <p><u>and his return to heaven</u> and his session at your right <u>hand</u>,</p> <p>his <b>God and Father</b>, and his <u>glorious and fearful</u> <b>second coming</b>, <u>when</u></p> <p>he <u>judges</u> <b>the living and the dead</b>,</p> <p><u>when he will reward each</u> <u>according to his works</u>.</p>	<p><i>Priest</i>: <u>Remembering</u>, therefore, O Lord [<i>addressed to Christ</i> <i>and not the Father</i>],</p> <p>your <b>death</b></p> <p>and your <u>resurrection</u> <u>on the third day</u> <i>from among the dead</i>, and your ascension into heaven and your session at the right hand of <b>God</b>, and your <b>fearful</b> and <u>glorious</u> <b>second coming</b> <u>wherein</u> you are about to <u>judge</u></p> <p><i>the world in righteousness</i> and <u>reward every one</u> <u>according to his deeds</u>:</p>
B	<p>-----</p> <p>Therefore, your church and your flock supplicates you, and through you and with you, your Father, saying Have mercy on me.</p> <p><i>People</i>: <u>Have mercy . . .</u> <i>Priest</i>: We too, Lord, in gratitude <b>give thanks to you</b></p>	<p><b>we offer you</b> this fearful and bloodless sacrifice, that you would not deal with us according to our sins, nor reward us according to our iniquities, but according to your mildness and love for mankind, blot out our sins, your suppliants. For your people and your inheritance beseech you, and through you to your Father, saying,</p> <p><i>People</i>: <u>Have mercy upon us</u>, O God, Father Almighty. <i>Priest</i>: <b>Giving thanks to you</b> and confessing to you,</p>	<p><b>we offer you</b> this fearful and bloodless sacrifice, that you would not deal with us according to our sins, nor reward us according to our iniquities, but according to your mildness and love for mankind, blot out our sins, your suppliants. For your people and your Church beseech you.</p> <p><i>People</i>: Have mercy upon us, Father Almighty.</p> <p>-----</p>
C	<p>-----</p> <p>on behalf of all and for all.</p> <p><i>People</i>: <b>We praise you,</b> <b>we bless you,</b> <b>we give thanks to you,</b> <b>and pray to you, our God.&gt;</b></p>	<p><b>we offer to you</b> from that which is yours, in all and for all.</p> <p><i>People</i>: <b>We praise you,</b> <b>&lt;we bless you,</b> <b>we give thanks to you,</b> <b>and pray to you, our God.&gt;</b></p>	<p>--</p>
<p><i>Each then continues with the epiclesis</i></p>			



Table 10: Summary of the Anamnesis-Oblation-Epiclesis Unit

	ATA	JAMES	SyJAMES	CHR	ByzBASIL	EgBASIL	ApCon
προτεθαίκαμεν (perfect tense) – intro to inst. narr.	--	--	--	--	yes	--	--
<i>memores</i>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
<i>offerimus</i> (present tense)	--	yes	yes	--			
supplicate the Father to have mercy	yes	yes	yes				
<i>gratias agentes</i>	yes	--	yes				
<i>offerimus</i> (present tense)	--	--	yes	--	--	--	yes
προσφέροντες (participle)	--	--	--	yes	yes	--	--
have set forth (aorist)	--	--	--	--	--	yes	--
“that which is yours”	--	--	yes	yes	yes	yes	--
“in all and for all”	--	--	yes	yes	yes	yes	--
<i>laudamus</i>	yes	--	yes	yes	yes	--	--
<i>gratias agentes</i>	yes	--	yes	yes	yes	--	yes
<i>Offerimus</i> (present tense)	--	--	--	yes	yes	--	--
request for acceptance	--	--	--	--	--	--	yes
epiclesis	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Double epiclesis	--	yes	yes	--	yes	yes	--
“Fruit of communion” as first request after epiclesis	yes	yes	yes	yes	--	--	yes
<i>Offerimus</i> in intercessions (present)	yes	yes	yes	yes (3x)	--	--	yes (3x)
Verbs of offering	1	2	3	5	3	1	4

a verb of oblation between the anamnesis and epiclesis as the offering verb that really “counts,” namely, the indication of whether or not a particular anaphora understands the Eucharist as a sacrifice. But as we have seen, first-person plural verbs of oblation (usually *προσφέροντες*) appear in other places in anaphoras, and not always in the expected link from anamnesis to epiclesis. This overly-narrow focus on a specific location of the oblation within the typical West Syrian structure not only leads to observations that an oblation is “missing” but also a more general narrowing of what allows an interpreter to identify if an anaphora reflects a view of the eucharistic action as sacrificial. While noting the missing oblation, Fenwick and Taft could have strengthened their analysis considerably if they had also explored what to make of the oblation that *is* present: not before the epiclesis, but right after it. An oblation in this location is found in JAMES, SyJAMES, and also in both CHR

and ApCon as a way to introduce the intercessions at least once, and sometimes more than once. Furthermore, CHR and ByzBASIL both contain a second oblation just before the epiclesis: CHR in present-tense (προσφέρομεν) while ByzBASIL again uses an aorist participle (προθέντες). Thus, EgBASIL and ATA each have just one verb of offering, JAMES and ByzBASIL have two, SyJAMES and has three, ApCon has four, and CHR contains five.

To his credit, Stevenson does point out that “[i]t is only at the start of the intercessions that we come across this formula” of offering in ATA. But then the spiritualization thesis rears its head: he claims that the sacrificial language that is present is “a reference to the whole eucharist, along the lines of the ‘living sacrifice’ of the whole congregation, in offering their concerns to God.”<sup>65</sup> But does the anaphora make such a distinction? Stevenson’s presupposition seems to be that for an anaphora to understand the bread and wine as offered in sacrifice, there must be a verb of offering in the anamnesis. Again, this is another reminder that the heuristic of the so-called “families” of anaphoral structure (West Syrian, East Syrian, and so forth) can just as easily obscure by concealing the particulars of this or that “Antiochene” anaphora. As we have seen, several of the influential representatives of this family contain more than one verb of offering. In fact, most contain more than one! Thus, there is a greater emphasis on the sacrificial and oblationary character of the Eucharist in these prayers than an assumption about the structure of the typical Antiochene anaphora might lead one to conclude.

## ■ The Contribution of Stefano Parenti

In a 2020 article, Stefano Parenti makes a proposal about the origin of verbs of oblation in the anamnestic unit of Antiochene anaphoras which builds on the work of three key articles by Robert Taft.<sup>66</sup> By drawing on a range of sources—Theodoret of Cyrus, the Catechesis in Verses of the Monk Hyperichios, Firmus of Caesarea in Cappadocia, the Pseudo-Chrysostom Text: “Sermon I on Penitence,” and some inscriptions from the period—Parenti proposes that the language of offering in Antiochene anaphoras originates in dedicatory formulas “associated with objects, therefore to buildings, to material realities” that began “to circulate in the middle of the fifth century.” Instead of arising from a euchological theology of sacrifice, he suggests, “I would rather be directed to see in the formula τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν an extension to the eucharistic gifts of a dedicatory formula that was becoming increasingly widespread and popular” within the orbit of the church. These formulae seem to be based (as I noted earlier) on LXX 1 Chr 29:14 (ὄτι σὰ τῶν πάντων, καὶ ἐκ τῶν σῶν δεδώκαμέν σοι) and were used in dedicatory language for “objects

<sup>65</sup> Stevenson, *Eucharist and Offering*, 60.

<sup>66</sup> Robert F. Taft, “The Oblation and Hymn of the Chrysostom Anaphora: Its Text and Antecedents,” *BollGrott* 46 (1992) 319–45; Taft, “Reconstructing the Oblation of the Chrysostom Anaphora: An Exercise In Comparative Liturgy,” *OCP* 59 (1993) 387–402; Taft, “Some Structural Problems.”

offered as gifts to the churches.”<sup>67</sup> In other words, he wishes “to discard sacrificial declinations of the formula τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν,” which was the basis of Montminy’s suggestion that this was the original expression of the notion of a eucharistic “sacrificial offering” within early anaphoras.<sup>68</sup> Instead, he follows the approach of René-Georges Coquin in his 1969 study of the Anaphora of St. Mark, where he “posed a simple and immediate question: what does the Greek τὰ σὰ mean? The response was equally straightforward: they are the gifts of bread and wine for the Eucharist taken in their materiality, and previously placed on the altar, as the aorist προεθήκαμεν of the Alexandrian tradition states.”<sup>69</sup> In accepting Coquin’s proposal, Parenti concludes that “simple observation leads us to discard sacrificial declinations of the formula τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν.” This raises, of course, the immediate question: what does Parenti understand to be the distinction between something offered to God and something that is a “sacrificial offering”? This is a question that Parenti does not answer.

The first piece of historical evidence to support his view that there was a development in early Christianity from a more interior or spiritual concept of sacrifice to an understanding that the Eucharist is a material sacrifice is a sermon from Theodoret of Cyrus on Heb 8:4–5. There, Theodoret speaks of Christian priests “keeping memory” of the one sacrifice of Christ, and Parenti suggests that John Chrysostom says the same thing in a sermon on a similar passage. From this, Parenti then concludes that this sermonic evidence, along with ATA’s missing oblation preceding the epiclesis, indicates “that in the ‘mystical liturgy’ the ministers do not offer sacrifice.” In his view, both Theodoret and John Chrysostom have a “typological interpretation,” which he explains in this way: “The Last Supper is the τύπος, the image/model to which the liturgical celebration must conform.”<sup>70</sup>

There are a number of problems with Parenti’s argumentation. The first of these has to do with the interpretation of the evidence of Theodoret and John Chrysostom. The text that Parenti cites from Theodoret actually does not connect the Eucharist to the Last Supper as “the image/model to which the liturgical celebration must conform.”

<sup>67</sup> Parenti, “Between Anamnesis and Praise,” 92–93.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 100; Montminy, “L’offrande sacrificielle,” 395.

<sup>69</sup> Parenti, “Between Anamnesis and Praise,” 99; see René-Georges Coquin, “L’anaphore alexandrine de saint Marc,” *LM* 82 (1969) 307–56, at 342.

<sup>70</sup> Parenti, “Between Anamnesis and Praise,” 91.

Εἰ τοίνυν καὶ ἡ κατὰ νόμον ἱερωσύνητο τέλος ἐδόξατο, καὶ ὁ κατὰ τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ ἀρχιερεὺς τὴν θυσίαν προσήνεγκε, καὶ θυσίας ἐτέρας νενδεεῖς καθέστηκε, τί δήποτε τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης οἱ ἱερεῖς τὴν μυστικὴν λειτουργίαν ἐπιτελοῦσιν; Ἀλλὰ δῆλον τοῖς τὰ θεῖα πεπαιδευμένοις, ὡς οὐκ ἄλλην τιὰ θυσίαν προσφέρομεν, ἀλλὰ τῆς μιᾶς ἐκείνης καὶ σωτηρίου τὴν μνήμην ἐπιτελοῦμεν. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Δεσπότης προσέταξε: Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν νάμνησιν, ἵνα τῇ θεωρίᾳ τῶν τύπων, τῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν γεγενημένων αναμνησκόμεθα παθημάτων, καὶ τὴν περὶ τὸν εὐεργέτην γάπην πυρσεύσωμεν.<sup>71</sup>

Therefore, even if the priesthood according to the Law came to an end and that of the Supreme Pontiff, according to the order of Melchizedek, offered the sacrifice and did it in a way that ensured that no other sacrifices were necessary, why then do the priests of the New Covenant celebrate the mystical liturgy? But it is clear to those instructed in divine things that we do not offer another sacrifice, but that we keep memory of that (sacrifice which is) unique and salvific. This, in fact, is what the same Lord had commanded us: “Do this in memory of me,” so that in the vision of the “images,” we will keep memory of the suffering accomplished for us and that we become inflamed by love for the benefactor.

While Theodoret does use the term *τύπος* (as does Chrysostom), he connects the response to the Lord’s command to “do this” with a memorial of Christ’s actions on our behalf, namely, his suffering, not the Last Supper.<sup>72</sup> The Eucharist itself is directly related to the Last Supper as a response is related to the command that instigated it. But the typological connection is between the Eucharist and Christ’s saving actions outside the Eucharist. Parenti claims that John Chrysostom’s interpretation is “the same typological perception” as Theodoret’s. Chrysostom makes a nearly identical interpretation in a homily on Heb 9:24–26, but then goes much further than Theodoret:

<sup>71</sup> PG 82, 736BC; r. 31 reads *τύπων*, here corrected according to *Catena Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum* (ed. J. A. Cramer; Oxford, 1844) 581 r. 34; quoted in Parenti, “Between Anamnesis and Praise,” 90.

<sup>72</sup> A further complication is that definitions of terms such as typology, allegory, and symbolic are not self-evident and can vary widely between scholarly authors. For a helpful survey of the wide and conflicting definitions given to these two terms in 20th cent. scholarship (both within and outside theological disciplines), especially on the debate between de Lubac and Daniélou on what term to use when describing patristic exegesis, see Peter Martens, “Revisiting the Allegory/Typology Distinction: The Case of Origen,” *J ECS* 16.3 (2008) 283–317; Martens, “Origen against History?: Reconsidering the Critique of Allegory,” *MT* 28.4 (2012) 635–56. For a survey of typology in Biblical studies, see Tibor Fabiny, “Typology: Pros and Cons in Biblical Hermeneutics and Literary Criticism (from Leonhard Goppelt to Northrop Frye),” *RILCE. Revista de Filología Hispánica* 25.1 (2009) 138–52.

Τί οὖν ; ἡμεῖς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν οὐ προσφέρομεν; Προσφέρομεν μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀνάμεσιν ποιούμενοι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ · καὶ μία ἐστὶν αὐτή, καὶ οὐ πολλαί. Ἐπειδὴ ἅπαξ προσνήκεθη, ὡσπερ ἐκείνη ἡ εἰς τὰ Ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων. Τοῦτο ἐκείνης τύπος ἐστὶ, καὶ αὐτὴ ἐκείνης· τὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἀεὶ προσφέρομεν, οὐ νῦν μὲν ἕτερον πρόβατον, αὐριον δὲ ἕτερον, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τὸ αὐτό · ὥστε μία ἐστὶν ἡ θυσία. Ἐπει τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ, ἐπειδὴ πολλαχοῦ προσφέρεται, καὶ πολλοὶ Χριστοὶ ; ἀλλ' οὐδαμῶς, ἀλλ' εἰς πανταχοῦ ὁ Χριστὸς, καὶ ἐνταῦθα πλήρης ὢν, καὶ ἐκεῖ πλήρης, ἐν σώμα ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐ πολλά σώματα, οὕτω καὶ μία θυσία. Ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἡμῶν ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὁ τὴν θυσίαν τὴν καθαιρούσαν ἡμῶν προσενεγκών. Ἐκείνην προσφέρομεν καὶ νῦν, τὴν τότε προσενεχθεῖσαν, τὴν ἀνάλωτον. Τοῦτο εἰς ἀνάμνησιν γίνεται τοῦ τότε γενομένου · Τοῦτο γὰρ ποιεῖτε, φησὶν, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. Οὐκ ἄλλην θυσίαν, καθάπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τότε, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰεὶ ποιούμεν · μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.<sup>73</sup>

Do we not offer the sacrifice daily? Indeed we do offer it daily, re-presenting his death. How then is it one sacrifice and not many? Since, as that [sacrifice] was once for all carried into the Holy of Holies, this [sacrifice] is a type of [that sacrifice], and this a remembrance of that. We offer the same person, not one sheep one day and tomorrow a different one, but always the same offering. . . . There is one sacrifice and one high priest who offered the sacrifice that cleanses us. Today we offer that which was once offered, a sacrifice that is inexhaustible. This is done as a remembrance of that which was done then, for he said, “Do this in remembrance of me.” We do not offer another sacrifice as the priest offered of old, but we always offer the same sacrifice. Or rather we re-present the sacrifice.<sup>74</sup>

Chrysostom's explanation is richer and broader. Like Theodoret, Chrysostom is clear that we do not offer a sacrifice that is in addition to Christ's. But, Chrysostom adds, Christians do offer something, and that which is offered is rightly called a sacrifice. What Christians offer, he explains, is the offering that was already made, namely, Christ's own self-offering of himself. Robert Louis Wilken thinks it is self-evident that this is an expression of belief in material sacrifice, whereby the action of the Eucharist is joined to and makes present the one sacrifice of Christ and thus has some sort of continuity with Hebrew Bible priests, even though they offered something quite distinct. Both Theodoret and Chrysostom agree that Christian priests do not offer a sacrifice that is *in addition to* Christ's. But since Chrysostom is clear that we can also say that Christian priests do offer a sacrifice, there is no reason to think that Theodoret would not agree with Chrysostom. Thus, the conclusion by Parenti “that in the ‘mystical liturgy’ the ministers do not offer sacrifice” is doubtful, at least if these two witnesses are the basis for the claim.

Another aspect of Parenti's argument concerns the formula τὰ σα ἐκ τῶν σῶν. He argues that we can “discard sacrificial declinations of the formula τὰ σα ἐκ τῶν σῶν” because this is dedicatory and not sacrificial. This too deserves to be questioned. The passage he cites from Firmus of Caesarea in Cappadocia (St. Basil's successor) is remarkable and makes it clear that this formula is definitely attached to the dedication of objects as an act of religious piety. It seems less clear, however,

<sup>73</sup> *Hom. in Heb.* 17.3: PG 63, 129–31.

<sup>74</sup> *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974–2003) 4440; ET is based on Robert Louis Wilken, *The Spirit of Early Christian Thought: Seeking the Face of God* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003) 35, but makes a few adjustments so that the same terms in Theodoret and Chrysostom are translated the same.

that we can definitely conclude, as Parenti does, that “the formula did not sound familiar either to Firmo or to Evandrius” and thus that the “anaphora in use there (BAS?) did not possess an oblation formula inspired by the scriptural passage” and that the “dedicatory formula is independent of liturgical use in the anaphora and precedes it.”<sup>75</sup> Both of these seem like possibilities but not certainties. Even if the anaphora in use at the time did not contain an oblation that was inspired by LXX 1 Chron 29:14, it quite possibly had an oblationary formula. Thus, the fact that the scriptural language has its origin in the anaphora by way of broader dedicatory formulas is less consequential of a discovery than his claim that the oblation is introduced to these anaphoras *because* of the dedication language. The way Parenti presents the data also seems to imply that the sacrificial understanding of the Eucharist may have been an unintended consequence of the introduction of these verbs of offering that originate in dedicatory formulas. Even more so, given the next piece of evidence that he presents (the Pseudo-Chrysostom text: Sermon 1 on Penitence), it is clear that verbs of oblation are present in at least some Greek anaphoras by at least the end of the fourth century. Oddly, this does not seem to strengthen the claim that the origin of verbs of oblation come by way of dedicatory formulas, but instead indicate the presence of such sacrificial language in anaphoras before the fifth century whose origin is elsewhere.

Parenti explains that, “[i]n the end we find ourselves with only two traditions, the Alexandrian (MK) [Anaphora of St. Mark] and the Constantinopolitan (BAS), both using the formula τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν inspired by 1 Chr 29:14.” It is very clear that the Greek τὰ σὰ that is offered is none other than “the gifts of bread and wine for the Eucharist taken in their materiality, and previously placed on the altar, as the aorist προεθήκαμεν of the Alexandrian traditions states.”<sup>76</sup> This clarity is extremely helpful, especially because it takes the linguistic evidence at face value, namely, that the reference of the participle προσφέροντες must include the material offering of bread and wine.

But we must ask nonetheless whether Parenti also engages in the all-too-common misreading of the evidence in favor of the view that material offering in the Eucharist is a latter addition. Parenti is quite clear that he rejects Jean-Paul Montminy’s interpretation that verb of oblation in *Strasbourg*, the earliest evidence of the Alexandrian rite (προσφέρο[μ]εν [τ]ὴν θυ[σ]ίαν τὴν λογικὴν, τὴν ἀναί[μακτ]ον λατρε[ίαν]<sup>77</sup>), is evidence of “the emergence of the anaphora of ‘sacrificial offering.’” In fact, he argues that in Strasbourg (in contrast to MARK and BASIL), where the oblation is early in the prayer (“in the initial thanksgiving” section, like in MARK), “the oblation coincides with the offering of spiritual and bloodless worship, that is, of the Eucharistic Prayer itself,” not the material offering of bread

<sup>75</sup> Parenti, “Between Anamnesis and Praise,” 92–93.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, 99.

<sup>77</sup> *PE*, 116.

and wine.<sup>78</sup> He contrasts this with possibly the next oldest witness, the Anaphora of Barcelona, where the oblation is also early in the prayer (in the post-*Sanctus*). “But,” Parenti claims, “the object is no longer the anaphora but ‘these creatures, the bread and the chalice.’”<sup>79</sup> But is this distinction between the offering of the anaphora and the bread and wine a distinction that is warranted by the texts in question? Thus, I think it is fair to conclude that even if Parenti is correct that the formula τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν has its origins in dedicatory formulas, the evidence he uses does not demonstrate that earlier anaphoras did not express a eucharistic theology that precludes material sacrifice, a fact that is especially clear in his discussion of Theodoret and John Chrysostom.

## ■ Conclusion

This study has afforded a number of key insights. First, the importance of the “missing oblation” that has been highlighted by Fenwick, Taft, Parenti and others needs to be balanced against the oblation that *is* present in ATA. Second, the emphasis on the missing oblation, combined with the tendency to summarize the Antiochene structure with little reference to the importance of verbs of oblation, results in an inaccurate sense of the degree to which the anaphora expresses the belief that the action of offering bread and wine is constitutive of the eucharistic action. Third, Parenti’s invaluable contributions about the linguistic overlap between religious dedicatory formulas and the phrase τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν, found in SyJAMES, CHR, ByzBASIL, and EgBASIL among others and inspired by 1 Chron 29:14 LXX, should be balanced against his tendency to perpetuate the unhelpful heuristic about the spiritualization of sacrifice and his underemphasis of the belief in the materiality of the eucharistic sacrifice in writers such as John Chrysostom and earlier anaphoras. Fifth, future research on the application of sacrificial language to the Eucharist in early Christianity must avoid distinctions such as spiritual versus material and instead attend to the complexity and polyphony of ways that “sacrifice” is applied to Christian ritual actions, as well as in Judaism and Greek religious rituals. Furthermore, we would do well to replace a developmental view of sacrifice from spiritual to material with a view of the development of precision, clarity, and specification as to the ways that sacrifice is a proper adjective for the Christian Eucharist. Finally, we must allow the actual texts of Antiochene anaphoras and the centrality of sacrificial language and verbs of oblation to guide our discussions of these influential eucharistic prayers and allow the parallel patristic evidence to be fully heard.

<sup>78</sup> Parenti, “Between Anamnesis and Praise,” 98–99.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 99. See Michael Zheltov, “The Anaphora and the Thanksgiving Prayer from the Barcelona Papyrus: An Underestimated Testimony to the Anaphoral History in the Fourth Century,” *VC*, 62.5 (2008) 467–504 (484 vv. 1–2; δι’ οὗ προσφερόμεν σοι κτίσματά σου ταῦτα, ἄρτον τε καὶ ποτήριον).