

*Why the Anaphora of Addai and Mari Matters*

Steven J. Pankey

Mapping Ritual Structures

August 5, 2013

It seems fair to say that on July 20, 2001<sup>1</sup>, as Pope John Paul II put his signature to the *Guidelines for Admission to the Eucharist Between the Chaldean Church and the Assyrian Church of the East*, the field of liturgics changed forever. While Roman Catholic Reporter, John Allen, would disagree, calling *Guidelines*, “an obscure Assyrian liturgical agreement,”<sup>2</sup> and while it is true that “few [Roman Catholics] have ever heard of the Church of the East or of the Chaldean Catholics, and still fewer of the anaphora of Addai and Mari,”<sup>3</sup> the decision to allow Chaldean Catholics to receive the Eucharist, celebrated by a priest of the Church of the East, according to the form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, i.e. without a proper Institution Narrative, is, as Robert Taft wrote, “the most remarkable Catholic magisterial document since Vatican II.”<sup>4</sup> What follows is an overview of the significance of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, a study of its structural development and the quest for its original form, the state of the question around its lack of an Institution Narrative, and why the July 20, 2001 document, *Guidelines*, matters not only to Chaldeans and Assyrians in diaspora<sup>5</sup>, but should matter to the average Episcopalian as well.

### *The Significance of Addai and Mari*

The first study of Addai and Mari was undertaken by I. Rahmani in 1899<sup>6</sup> and the ensuing century-plus of research has led to more questions than answers. As Emmanuel Cutrone wrote at the height of the Cold War in 1973, “Like Russia, the East Syrian anaphora of the

---

<sup>1</sup> There is some ambiguity in the dating of this document, as noted by Taft in “Mass Without the Consecration?” p. 483, “The text, entitled ‘Guidelines for Admission to the Eucharist Between the Chaldean Church and the Assyrian Church of the East,’ was promulgated on 26 October 2001, but bears the date of its approval, 20 July 2001.”

<sup>2</sup> Quoted in Russo. “The Validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari.” (Kindle Location 672-673).

<sup>3</sup> Russo. “The Validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari (Kindle Location 673-674).

<sup>4</sup> Taft. “Mass Without the Consecration?” 483.

<sup>5</sup> For more on the plight of these Christians, see Russo. “The Validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari.” Kindle Location 639ff.

<sup>6</sup> Jammo. “The Anaphora of the Apostles.” 5.

apostles Addai and Mari qualifies as both mystery and enigma. The research done on the many mysteries of this third-century Easy Syrian anaphora usually clarifies all too sharply the many enigmas that still remain.”<sup>7</sup> The crux of the problem with Addai and Mari is that it is not just an archaic document which we can study and know, but rather Addai and Mari continues to be a living, breathing liturgy, still in use in the Church of the East. Cutrone makes this point, “Unlike other anaphoras which share its antiquity... Addai and Mari is not a prototype academic exercise of a typical Eucharistic prayer. This anaphora was, and continues to be, an actual prayer of a worshipping community.”<sup>8</sup> Thirty years later, Mar Jammo echoes,

While the early known formularies of the eucharistic prayer, the *Didache*, the paleoanaphora of the *Apostolic Constitutions* VII, 25 and the anaphora of the *Apostolic Tradition* 4, are but historic literary monuments of Christian euchology, A&M continued to be the vital liturgical expression of a living Church, a Church that kept adding to its ancient and venerated anaphora successive strata to update it with the theological and liturgical developments of the Church universal.”<sup>9</sup>

Still, for all the variation Addai and Mari has taken on over the years, Muksuris reminds us that “of unique interest and importance regarding this ancient liturgy is that it is basically still a Semitic liturgy, the only one of its kind. The anaphora of Addai and Mari differs significantly in thought and structure, not to mention theologically as well, from other Hellenized anaphoras...”<sup>10</sup>

Perhaps the most valuable work on Addai and Mari was undertaken by William Macomber, who in 1966, published the results of his searching through ancient libraries, catacombs, and church basements in “The Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of the Apostles

---

<sup>7</sup> Cutrone. “Anaphora of the apostles.” 624.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Jammo. “The Anaphora of the Apostles.” 18.

<sup>10</sup> Muksuris. “A Brief Overview.” 59-60.

Addai and Mari.” As he notes in the article, his discovery of a *hudra*<sup>11</sup> manuscript in the library of the Church of Mar Esa’ya in Mosul, Iraq was a “prize.”<sup>12</sup> Macomber dated the Mar Esa’ya text to the tenth or eleventh century “about five centuries older than what has been up to now regarded as the oldest witness to the Anaphora of the Apostles.”<sup>13</sup> The significance of the Mar Esa’ya text on the debate over Addai and Mari cannot be overstated, and a more detailed analysis will follow below. Worth note here, however, are two quotes from Macomber’s later writing on Addai and Mari that are based on his deep knowledge of the Mar Esa’ya text. The first comes from his 1977 article, “A History of the Chaldean Mass,” and betrays his sympathies to the significance of Addai and Mari:

Of all the liturgies of Christendom one of the most interesting to study is the one called Chaldean. It was, in fact, the first one to crystallize, acquiring substantially its present form already at the beginning of the seventh century. It is a very archaic rite, therefore, and one that is relatively free from outside influences, especially those derived from the Hellenistic culture of the Roman Empire. Indeed, no other rite was able to develop in such a degree of isolation from Hellenism, and hence no other can exemplify so well for us today Christian liturgy expressed in a non-Hellenic culture.<sup>14</sup>

Second, is a quote selected by A. Gelston as the defining opening word for his 1992 book and critical version of Addai and Mari entitled, *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari*:

The original form of the *Anaphora of the Apostles* has been the object of great speculation, and justly so. It is clearly one of the most ancient eucharistic prayers still in use today; it was, or at least became, the principal anaphora of those Syraic-using churches that were last influenced by the Hellenistic culture of the Roman Empire; and it can be considered a representative expression of the Judeo-Christianity of the early centuries of the Christian era. The time and place of its first composition are shrouded in the mists of time.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Muksuris, in his “A Brief Overview” gives definitions of the Syrian terms used throughout the study of Addai and Mari. A *hudra* is “a Nestorian services book.” 62.

<sup>12</sup> Macomber. “The Oldest Known Text.” 340.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* 344.

<sup>14</sup> Macomber. “History of the Chaldean Mass.” 107.

<sup>15</sup> Quoted in Gelston. *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari*. vi.

Within that quote are two points upon which we must spend some time. First, is the question of the date and place of composition for Addai and Mari. Two years prior to Macomber's discovery of the Mar Esa'ya text, Bayard Jones offered a strongly worded caution to those who would seek to place too much historical value upon Addai and Mari:

Finally, there is one of these endeavors to unearth liturgical source-material from a neglected corner which has taken a distinctively wrong turning, in the last twenty years especially, and one capable of bringing highly deleterious, if not disastrous effects upon the whole study of liturgical origins, by a pollution of its very sources. Of late, a Liturgy has been widely hailed as a probable subapostolic original of the second century, which it is the contention of this book can be demonstrated to have actually been a degenerative form of the seventh century.

The obscure, 'back-water', and now nearly extinct Church of the East-Syrians or Nestorians has in common use the Anaphora under the name of *Addai and Mari*, which in many respects has a curiously deceptive analogy to the Anaphora of Hippolytus which is employed in like manner by the Abyssinians. Like the text in the *Apostolic Tradition*, it is very brief and very simple in style; and more than that, it has a spurious air of being even more 'primitive' than Hippolytus, by being particularly vague and indeterminate in its explicit expressions. This last, as it happens, has proved insidiously attractive to the prevailing school of English liturgiologists, who are largely dominated by 'Western' preconceptions, and therefore show themselves to be unconsciously resentful of what they consider a too great definiteness in the characteristic *Epiclesis* of most 'Eastern' liturgies, and consequently have been all too willing to seize upon any seeming evidence that such traits were not original.<sup>16</sup>

Jones, however, seems to have not gained much traction in the debate, especially following the discovery of Mar Esa'ya as dating the origin of Addai and Mari has coalesced around a very early date. Macomber himself, while very clear about the significance of Addai and Mari in the quote above, remains rather conservative in his dating of the text as "the first [anaphora] to crystallize, acquiring substantially its present form already at the beginning of the seventh century."<sup>17</sup> By 1981, Allan Bouley was willing to place Addai and Mari four centuries earlier, "The earliest form of Addai and Mari probably existed in writing in the third century

---

<sup>16</sup> Jones. "The Quest for the Origins of the Christian Liturgies." 19-20.

<sup>17</sup> Macomber. "A History of the Chaldean Mass." 107.

which indicated that Eucharistic formularies were being produced before the far-ranging developments of anaphoral structures in the fourth century.”<sup>18</sup> In 1992, Gelston places it slightly earlier, “Several factors are suggestive of a date around the beginning of the third century. If this is correct, the Anaphora of Addai and Mari is almost certainly the oldest extant anaphora within the Syrian tradition, and very probably the traditional Anaphora of Edessa. Its importance for the history of the development of the Christian Eucharistic Prayer can hardly be exaggerated.”<sup>19</sup> Finally, a year later, Spinks is even willing to posit that Addai and Mari could have existed in the second century, “Most scholars, taking [Addai and Mari’s] semitic character more seriously, have dated it variously between the second and fourth centuries, and regard it as an important witness in understanding the growth and development of the early eucharistic prayer.”<sup>20</sup>

No matter the specific date of its composition, it is clear that the Anaphora of Addai and Mari is a significant text in liturgical history, and that the questions surrounding its original form and structure, specifically as they relate to the inclusion of an Institution Narrative, are worthy of our time.

### *Theories of Structural Development in Addai and Mari*

One of the key problems with any study of Addai and Mari is the source issue. As noted above, scholars generally tend to agree that Addai and Mari has been in use in some written form since at least the early fourth century, however, according to Macomber, the earliest known extant manuscript can be dated no earlier than the tenth or eleventh century. It does not take a liturgical historical scholar to know that the Church underwent dramatic changes in the intervening six centuries. As a result of this rather significant source problem, several theories on

---

<sup>18</sup> Bouley. *From Freedom to Formula*. 241-242.

<sup>19</sup> Gelston. *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari*. 28.

<sup>20</sup> Spinks. “The Quest for the ‘Original Form.’” 2.

the origins and development of Addai and Mari have been posited and continue to claim scholarly adherents. Three theories have strong footholds in the literature: A Common Core Theory, Developmental Theory, and Jewish Table Blessing Theory (Birkat Ha-Mazon). Two others are worth a short discussion: Eulogien/Eucharistein (as it relates to Birkat Ha-Mazon) and Walter Ray's Chiastic Theory. The Common Core Theory leads to a much deeper discussion of whether or not Addai and Mari included an Institution Narrative in its original form. Therefore, we will save it for last.

#### *Developmental Theory*

The theory that Addai and Mari developed as an independent anaphora, that is to say separate from the Maronite Anaphora of Peter III (also called the Maronite Sharar) is relatively new on the scene. It seems to be the favored opinion of practitioners of Addai and Mari in the East like Dr. Thomas Mannoorampampil, a member of the Advisory Committee for the Saint Ephrem Ecumenical Research Institute (SEERI) living in Kerala<sup>21</sup> and Mar Sarhad Jammo, Chaldean Prelate of the Eparchy of Saint Peter the Apostle. Dr. Mannoorampampil believes that by tracing the text backward, one could find the original form: "The actual text of the *anaphora* of AM is the result of a long process of development in which the original structure of the anaphora was subjected at different times, to additions and modifications. With the help of the available manuscripts and ancient commentaries we can trace out the development of AM from its earliest stratum."<sup>22</sup> With a brief glance to some of the historical scholarship from the likes of Dix and Ligier, Mannoorampampil ultimately concludes that "The second, third and

---

<sup>21</sup> SEERI.org/committee.html Accessed July 31, 2013.

<sup>22</sup> Mannoorampampil. "The Anaphora of Addai and Mari." 100.

[the] earliest form of the fourth g'hantha<sup>23</sup> together with its undeveloped form of the epiclesis seems to be the earliest stratum of AM."<sup>24</sup> Mar Jammo, writing three years later, is also a proponent of the development of Addai and Mari, however he argues that the search for a hypothetical Urtext misses the point:

While all other Churches in East and West composed through the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, new anaphoras reflecting contemporary developments in theology and liturgy, the Church of the East had only one original and commonly used anaphora to cope with these developments: the anaphora of A&M. That is why I suggest that scholarly research on this topic should aim not at the reconstruction of a phantom original text of this Eucharistic prayer, different from the one we possess [in Mar Es'aya], but at the discovery of *different strata* of liturgical development within the very text itself.<sup>25</sup>

For Jammo, the text of Addai and Mari itself shows the development of liturgical practices through the first three centuries of the Church of the East. Reflecting upon the work of single source theorists like Gelston and Macomber, Jammo points out that

This kind of approach does not pay sufficient attention to the fact that the anaphora of A&M is a formulary that accompanied the development and growth of the Church of Mesopotamia. That Church, though it maintained a mutually recognized communion with the "Western Fathers" – clearly until the Synod of Mar Dadysho' (A.D. 424) -, remained somehow distant from them because of its existence in a different empire and culture. To the best of our knowledge, A&M was the only anaphora in general and continuous use by that Church of the East from time immemorial until the time of Mar Isaac the Catholicos and his synod of A.D. 410.<sup>26</sup>

Both Mannoorampampil and Jammo, when searching for the a starting place for the development of Addai and Mari, be it to its written form in the fourth century as Jammo suggests or its final stratum of the 10<sup>th</sup> century as Mannoorampampil argues, look to Ligier and his theory that Eucharist finds its home in the Jewish Table Blessing called Birkat Ha-Mazon.

---

<sup>23</sup> Muksuris defines "g'hantha" as "inclinations... an intercessory prayer said in a low voice." From "A Brief Overview." 62.

<sup>24</sup> Mannoorampampil. "The Anaphora of Addai and Mari." 101.

<sup>25</sup> Jammo. "The Anaphora of the Apostles." 11. (emphasis original)

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

*Birkat Ha-Mazon Theory*

It is worth noting that in the same paragraph that he recalls Ligier's work, Dr.

Mannoorampampil, refers back to another of his own works with a strong, yet simple sentence, "The whole anaphora [of Addai and Mari] was considered consecratory."<sup>27</sup> This fact seems to be far from coincidental. Ligier, a professor to Mar Jammo, recommended to that those who were searching for the origins of the Eucharistic prayer, "to clear the passage from the Supper to the eucharistic prayer of the Canon, one must certainly begin from the Birkat Ha-Mazon, and solely from it. But on two conditions: *most of all we must consider this prayer in its entirety*, then, we have to consider the Birkat Ha-Mazon in its paschal context."<sup>28</sup> The structure of the Jewish Table Blessing, called the Birkat Ha-Mazon is fleshed out by Jammo in a quote from the Babylonian Talmud:

Our Teachers taught: the order of the blessing of food is the following: the first blessing is the one that is for "the One who nourishes", the second one the blessing for the land, the third is "for the One who will build Jerusalem.

Our Teachers taught: From where it results that the blessing for the food is contained in the Law? From where it says: "When you have eaten your fill, you shall bless" (Deut. 8, 10).<sup>29</sup>

At the end of his research, Jammo concludes by reiterating the opinion of his teacher:

Based on the comparison and analysis presented, I think it is valid to conclude the original euchological structure of A&M follows basically the pattern of the Birkat Ha-Mazon in its Passover environment. This basic original structure of A&M could be considered as a first stratum in the *Formgeschichte* of its final text in the manuscripts, close in style, content, and therefore in date of composition, to the eucharist of the *Didache 10*, with one advantage for A&M: the paragraph invoking peace for the Church and conversion for the world brings the Mesopotamian eucharist closer to the Jewish Passover meal, and consequently closer to the Last Supper of Jesus with his disciples."<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Mannoorampampil. "The Anaphora of Addai and Mari." 101.

<sup>28</sup> Quoted in Jammo. "The Anaphora of the Apostles." 12.

<sup>29</sup> Quoted in Jammo. "The Anaphora of the Apostles." 12.

<sup>30</sup> Jammo. "The Anaphora of the Apostles." 17.

The tripartite structure of the Birkat Ha-Mazon has been the primary area of study for liturgists interested in how Jesus may have modified the traditional blessing over the bread as his disciples gathered in the upper room the night before his crucifixion. Even a somewhat skeptical Bryan Spinks thinks there is some credibility to the argument, “Can we be so certain... that Jesus the Jew, who was also Jesus the innovator, at the Last Supper where he transformed the traditional Passover, recited the usual *birkat ha-mazon*? Perhaps he did, because religions people seem to be at their most conservative in matters of worship.”<sup>31</sup> Elsewhere, Spinks argues, along with Jammo that Addai and Mari is not the result of a shared source with the Sharar, but that the steps from a basic Birkat Ha-Mazon structure to the written form of both anaphoras was probably less intentionally developed and more the result of local custom.

Writing on the Jewish *barakoth*, Joseph Heinemann emphasized: “We must not try to determine by philological methods the ‘original’ text of any prayer without first determining whether or not such an ‘original’ text ever existed. For we are dealing with materials which originated as part of an oral tradition and hence by their very nature were not phrased in any fixed uniform formulation – which at a later stage came to be ‘revised’ and expanded – but rather were improvised on the spot; and, subsequently, ‘re-improvised’ and reworded in many different formulations in an equally spontaneous fashion.”

Early eucharistic prayers may have followed some outline, but they were the free composition of the bishop or president. If the Anaphora of the Apostles is early, and if we are to take its semitic background seriously, it may be that we have two developed, or ‘re-improvised’ and reworded versions of a once oral tradition. It is perhaps more accurate to speak of a common tradition rather than an ‘original text.’”<sup>32</sup>

Thomas Talley is much less reserved in his opinion:

“The structure of [Addai and Mari] itself is compellingly suggestive of *Birkat Ha-Mazon* and *Didache 10*. It is a tripartite structure consisting of three ‘prayers of inclination,’ or *ghantha*, each preceded by a silent prayer (*kushapa*) and followed by a ‘canon’ (*qanona*) which functions as a doxology. By fairly general agreement, the silent prayers represent later additions to the text, but at that point general agreement has failed and fails still.”<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Spinks. “Beware the Liturgical Horses!” 213.

<sup>32</sup> Spinks. “The Quest for the ‘Original Form.’” 16.

<sup>33</sup> Talley. “From Berakah to Eucharistia.” 131.

As is Terrance Klein:

“If the *birkat ha-mazon* is the fundamental structures of the Christian anaphora, then a presumably complete anaphora is to be found in chapter 10 of the *Didache*. As William Crockett notes, it contains the combined themes of blessing/thanksgiving and then moves on to supplication for the Church (replacing supplication for Jerusalem in the Jewish form). For that matter chapter 9 of the *Didache* can also be taken to be describing a Eucharist rather than just an agape meal. The same is true of the anaphora Addai and Mari which Louis Bouyer considered to be the most ancient Eucharistic composition now known.”<sup>34</sup>

Thomas Elevantal deals with the Semitic nature and tripartite structure of Addai and Mari, especially as it relates to the Birkat Ha-Mazon. Elevantal’s interest, like that of many of the other scholars of Addai and Mari is two-fold: “primarily on account of the unique characteristic of its Judeo-Christian origin and Semitic background; secondly because East Syrian liturgy has developed without being much influenced by other theological trends.”<sup>35</sup> To his second point, the isolation of the East Syrian Church, especially from the political wrangling of Rome and the philosophical and theological arguments of the Hellenists, Elevantal credits the clear connection between Addai and Mari and the Birkat Ha-mazon:

Many of the prayers and phrases in this anaphora are taken from Jewish texts with renewed meaning without much change in their structural pattern and expressions. A structural comparison makes clear that the Jewish prayers of benedictions recited during the context of meal and Synagogue service contributed much of their material for the formation of this anaphora. In its form and content this early eucharistic prayer is the continuation of berakah – the Jewish benediction – only that it is filled with the new meaning of redemption in Christ.<sup>36</sup>

Dealing more specifically with the tripartite structure, he writes that “This threefold structure of praise, thanksgiving, and supplication have (sic) been recast within the outline of salvation

---

<sup>34</sup> Klein. “Institution Narratives at the Crossroads.” 411.

<sup>35</sup> Elevantal. “Some of the Characteristics.” 27.

<sup>36</sup> Elevantal. 28.

history and the anaphora has been remodeled in a trinitarian (sic) structure.”<sup>37</sup> He expands on this assertion:

The first part of this anaphora includes prayers principally directed to the Father and consists mainly of the glorification of God. The second section is a thanksgiving prayer to Christ and includes the commemoration and celebration of the Paschal Mystery of Christ. It leads to a confession of the presence and work of the Spirit in the Church and in the Eucharist...

If we consider the tripartite structure of this eucharistic prayer in time sequence, we can notice past, present and future aspects in celebration. The first part of the anaphora is centered mainly on the abundant graces of God manifested in creation and redemption. The second part is the celebration of the Paschal Mystery. The third part is orientated towards the future. Thus we have the following general structure:

Praise	Thanksgiving	Supplication
Father	Son	Spirit
Past	Present	Future” <sup>38</sup>

It must be noted here that scholars who argue that the Birkat Ha-Mazon was not only the source of Jesus’ blessing over the bread with his disciples but also provided the basic structure for early forms of the Eucharistic prayers, do not seem to be saying that the table blessing offered by Jesus was repeated verbatim by the early Church. Spinks quotes Allan Bouley on this point:

In the Emmaus story perhaps we have some indication that Jesus, especially at meals with his disciples, changed the content of the usual prayers of blessing and made them characteristically his own. Within the evolving structure of the table berakoth and faithful to their principal movement of praise and thanksgiving, he probably prayed freely, using his own words to express new content and meaning.<sup>39</sup>

Similarly, the disciples took the pattern of Birkat Ha-Mazon, with which they also were very familiar, utilized it in the form used for the Passover Feast, the meal which they shared with Jesus on the night before he died, and recast it into language consistent with what they believed happened in the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, the ushering in of the eschatological age,

---

<sup>37</sup> Elevation. 31.

<sup>38</sup> Elevation. “Some of the Characteristics.” 31.

<sup>39</sup> Quoted in Spinks. “Beware the Liturgical Horses!” 214.

which, turning again to Mannooramparampil, is evidenced in the third movement of Addai and Mari:

Most of the scholars agree that AM in its original form was compiled according to the pattern of Jewish *Birkat Ha Mazon* in its paschal form, in which the first part is a praise for creation, the second a thanksgiving for the preservation and redemption, and the third primarily a supplication that the creative and redemptive acts of God in the past, which are commemorated in the first part of the third berakah, may be continued and renewed today and be fulfilled in the coming of the Messiah and in the fulfillment of the kingdom of God.<sup>40</sup>

The final argument for the Birkat Ha-Mazon theory of the origins of Addai and Mari comes in the debate over whether or not an Institution Narrative existed within the original text. Louis Ligier, the seminal author behind this theory, argues that the Institution Narrative entered the already extant Eucharistic Prayers based on the Birkat Ha-Mazon as a result of the typical use of embolisms within the Table Blessings. Terrance Klein summarizes Ligier's work:

Louis Ligier in a series of articles has suggested that the institution narrative entered the Christian anaphora as a type of historical embolism. In the Judaic precedents that Ligier studied, those dealing with the feasts of Kippur, Hanukkah and Purim, embolisms functioned as short prayers which could, on these feasts, be added to the *birkat ha-mazon* to connect the anamnesis more closely with the historical event being celebrated in the feast. Ligier noted that the Jewish anamnesis of Kippur introduced an institution narrative as an embolism. The function of the narrative was to recall the historical event which was being anamnetically celebrated. Its function was very similar to the prefaces of contemporary Roman canons which are used through the liturgical cycle. The embolism focused the prayer and kept it from being vague about the historical salvation already granted.<sup>41</sup>

He also goes on to look at the anamnetic character of the text itself:

The anaphora of Addai and Mari is thought to be of East-Syrian origin, a region known for its rural flavor and its long retention in Christian circles of Jewish characteristics... Giraud notes that Addai and Mari is sufficiently anamnetic to contain an embolism. The anaphora almost seems to swell to a point where the institution narrative could be inserted (as it is in *Sharar*), but then the text moves on as though there is no need to explicate the details of the "commemorating." "And we also. Lord, (thrice) your lowly,

---

<sup>40</sup> Mannooramparampil. "The Anaphora of Addai and Mari." 98.

<sup>41</sup> Klein. "Institution Narratives at the Crossroads." 412.

weak, and miserable servants, who have gathered and stand before you, (and) have received through tradition the form which is from you, rejoicing, glorifying, exalting, commemorating, and celebrating this great mystery of the passion, death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ."<sup>42</sup>

As we will see below, the state of the question as it relates to the original nature of the Institution Narrative in Addai and Mari is still a very open one. Whether or not one subscribes to the Birkat Ha-Mazon theory of development will, in many respects, depend upon whether one believes that an Institution Narrative has been a part of the Eucharistic Prayers of the Church from time immemorial. There is, however, a secondary argument against Birkat Ha-Mazon as the basis of Addai and Mari which is the result of a matter of linguistic development in the Jewish Diaspora.

#### *Eulogein/Eucharistein Theory*

While time and space will not allow a full study of Eulogein/Eucharistein theory, it should be noted that Robert J. Ledogar argues against the close connection between Birkat Ha-Mazon and early Eucharistic prayers; preferring instead that the origins of the Eucharist be based in praise and thanksgiving rather than blessing. His thesis states that,

When one offers praise on account of something God has done for him, we understand the praise offered to be an act of thanksgiving. Thanksgiving is a specific kind of praise. If praise is essentially public, then the act of thanksgiving is a public acknowledgement of gratitude. The Christian celebration which Paul called the Lord's supper has been known, at least since the second century, as the eucharist, the thanksgiving.<sup>43</sup>

Ledogar goes on to point out that the Birkat Ha-Mazon were not fixed until the Amorean Rabbis of the third century. While giving credence to Birkat Ha-Mazon theorists like Audet for their pointing out several consistencies between ancient Eucharistic practices and the Birkat Ha-

---

<sup>42</sup> Klein. "Institution Narratives at the Crossroads." 415-416.

<sup>43</sup> Ledogar. "The Eucharistic Prayer." 581.

Mazon, he insists that while anaphoras like Addai and Mari followed that form, it was not because they necessarily had to:

It is quite right to insist — and for this we can only be grateful to Audet — that the essential element in the body of our canon is the verbal recall of the basic events in salvation history (including that of creation). It is quite right to appreciate the cultic forms assumed by this concept of praise in Judaism and early Christianity. But it is important to realize that Christians today can make public acknowledgment of a eucharistic faith that is essentially one with that of the apostles without necessarily having to do so according to a Jewish literary form. A truly contemporary eucharistic prayer might safely break away from the *berakah*. It could not cease to be an acknowledgment of gratitude.<sup>44</sup>

He goes on to take a deeper look at the vocabulary of praise and thanksgiving in the primitive Church. Looking at how the Greek word for “to be thankful”, *eucharistein*, took on Hebraic meanings like “to bless”, “to glorify”, and “to confess”, Ledogar notes that it did so because the Semitic languages lacked a specific word for gratitude. As the lingua franca of the Jewish Diaspora shifted from Aramaic to Greek, the Semitic languages began to develop words to more closely translate “gratitude.” Therefore, Ledogar suggests:

It is reasonable to suppose, though it cannot be proved, that by the time of Jesus the Greek-speaking Jews of the diaspora regularly used the word *eucharistein* instead of the more hebraic *eulogein* when they said the blessing over the bread at meals. This makes very good sense, since the natural motive for the words of praise spoken over one’s food is gratitude. The Hebrew-speaking Jews ‘blessed’ God for their bread simply because they did not have a specific word for thanks, and the more conservative Palestinian Jews preferred to retain the notion of blessing contained in the Greek word *eulogein*.<sup>45</sup>

He couples this linguistic understanding with a high view of oblation as he ultimately argues that:

The eucharistic prayer is an acknowledgement of gratitude offered to God in the context of a meal. This gratitude is primarily for man’s deliverance from sin and death achieved by Jesus in his paschal mystery. But the context of this gratitude is itself one of gratitude for the elements of the thanksgiving meal. We first offer bread and wine in thanksgiving

---

<sup>44</sup> Ledogar. “The Eucharistic Prayer.” 586.

<sup>45</sup> Ledogar. “The Eucharistic Prayer.” 587.

to acknowledge that the very elements used to celebrate our salvation are themselves gifts of God.<sup>46</sup>

### *Chiastic Theory*

While Chiastic Theory does not seem to carry much weight in the literature, it seems worth mentioning as it derives its basis from the Semitic nature of the Anaphora of the Apostles, which we have seen is overwhelmingly agreed upon. Walter Ray first posited this theory while a doctoral student at The University of Notre Dame in 1993.<sup>47</sup> Ray's basic argument is that since 1929, when E.C. Ratcliff suggested that Addai and Mari's original structure was "a continuous form", scholars have accepted this thesis without reservation.<sup>48</sup> In fact, Ray suggests, since 1929 attempts to reconstruct an original form of Addai and Mari have usually been working toward cutting away that material that seems "disjointed" or "interrupts the sequence of development."<sup>49</sup> Contrary to Ratcliff's commonly accepted assumption, then, Ray attempts to show that Addai and Mari did not develop as a linear prayer, but instead is chiastic in structure, "that is, the prayer is built on a series of parallel pairs surrounding a central focus to produce the following structure: A B C X C' B' A', in which A A', B B', and C C' are parallel pairs and X is the central focus."<sup>50</sup> After laying out the full text of his own version of the original stratum<sup>51</sup>, Ray lays out the chiasms simply:

A	Praise and thanksgiving for God's work of grace
A'	Praise and thanksgiving for the "great and wonderful dispensation towards us"
B	fathers, eucharist
B'	children, baptism
C	God "taught us," "pure and holy"
C'	Christ "taught us," "purity and holiness"

<sup>46</sup> Ledogar. "The Eucharistic Prayer." 592.

<sup>47</sup> N. \* in Ray. "The Chiastic Structure." 187.

<sup>48</sup> Quoted in Ray. "The Chiastic Structure." 187.

<sup>49</sup> Ray. "The Chiastic Structure." 187.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>51</sup> For the full text, see Ray. "The Chiastic Structure." 188-190.

X The central focus: a petition for peace and safety in this world for “us,” and... eternal life for “all the inhabitants of the earth.”<sup>52</sup>

Ray bases his argument for a chiastic structure on three points. First, he notes the prevalence of chiasms in the New Testament, pointing the reader to a 1942 text on the subject by Nils Lund as well as a more up-to-date article by John Breck.<sup>53</sup> Secondly, Ray gives a nod to Addai and Mari scholar, B. Botte, “who says that the anaphora’s ‘style is characterized by a parallelism which is properly Semitic.’”<sup>54</sup> Finally and somewhat circularly, Ray concludes that the original structure of Addai and Mari must have been chiastic because of the ease with which an original form can be found when looking through a chiastic lens, while also giving a nod to the state of the question on Addai and Mari’s Institution Narrative:

The advantage the kind of structural analysis we have engaged in is that we can begin to approach the problem of the original form of the anaphora without theological presuppositions. With a minimum of text manipulation we have been able to reconstruct a chiastic structure for the prayer which must be close to the original form... We still have not completely ruled out the original presence of an institution narrative, although we can say that it is not essential for the structure of the anaphora; the inclusion of an institution narrative would probably complicate the structural reconstruction unnecessarily.<sup>55</sup>

#### *Common Core Theory*

Following Macomber’s discovery of the Mar Es’aya text in Mosul and his subsequent publication in 1966, most scholars tended to offer precedence to his list of extant manuscripts and his critical version of the text above all others. In 1992, A. Gelston took it upon himself to update that material in a book entitled *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari*. The goals of this work were several: to combine the words of Macomber, Webb, and Spinks into one complete list of extant MSS, to develop a better “critical hand-text of the anaphora”, and “the critical

---

<sup>52</sup> Ray. “The Chiastic Structure.” 190.

<sup>53</sup> N. 5. Ray. “The Chiastic Structure.” 187-188.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>55</sup> Ray. “The Chiastic Structure of Addai and Mari.” 193.

examination of the relationship between the Anaphora of Addai and Mari and *Sharar*.”<sup>56</sup>

Contrary to the proponents of Developmental Theory and Birkat Ha-Mazon, Gelston recalls such heavyweights as Engberding, Botte, and Macomber in support of a Common Core theory between Addai and Mari and *Sharar*. In his introduction, Gelston argues for the antiquity of the tradition of Addai and Mari by way of this Common Core Theory, “... the demonstration of the existence of a common core to this anaphora and the Maronite anaphora *Sharar* proves that such a core must antedate the divisions of the fifth century and thus belong to the earlier unified tradition of Syrian eucharistic liturgy.”<sup>57</sup>

Following a full rewrite of the critical text of Addai and Mari, Gelston spends considerable time commenting on the anaphora, noting very clearly his belief that a common core between Addai and Mari and *Sharar* must have existed.

By far the most important liturgical text with which the Anaphora of Addai and Mari must be compared is the Maronite Anaphora of Peter III, generally known as *Sharar*. There are fairly close parallels between the two anaphoras in Sections B-D and H-I and also in two short passages within Sections E-F. Engberding (1932, p. 46) claimed as the result of an examination of the two anaphoras extending over Sections B-D that *Sharar* throughout offered the older and more original version of the common text underlying them both. Botte (1965, p. 98), however, dismissed as an illusion the belief that *Sharar* takes us back to an older and purer form of the intercessions, arguing that since *Sharar* is an adaptation, its evidence, when it diverges from the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, proves nothing about the original structure of the anaphora. Macomber (1971, p. 84) reaffirmed the importance of *Sharar* for the study of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, and claimed that the elements common to the two anaphoras must be very ancient indeed.<sup>58</sup>

Ultimately, Gelston reconstructs what he believes to be a common core for Addai and Mari and the *Sharar* in the Appendix of his text. However, it must be noted that Jammo, a strong proponent of Developmental Theory, is adamant against a common core, writing:

---

<sup>56</sup> Gelston. *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari*. vii.

<sup>57</sup> Gelston. *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari*. 23.

<sup>58</sup> Gelston. *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari*. 66.

[The] Anamnesis aside, every paragraph in A&M has a parallel in Peter III, but not vice-versa, i.e. not every paragraph in Peter III has a parallel in A&M. That should mean that the “Maronite” reviser had the text of A&M, basically as we find it in Mar ‘Eshaya’s Hudhra, in front of him, to be able to produce a parallel to every paragraph in it while redacting Peter III. This very fact eliminates the need for a phantom common core for both. A&M is the Urtext of Peter III.”<sup>59</sup>

### ***The State of the Question – The Institution Narrative in Addai and Mari***

What seems to be of most interest to scholars who deal with the idea of a Common Core between Addai and Mari and *Sharar* is whether or not an Institution Narrative existed in that extinct historical anaphora? It is nearly impossible to read an article on the Anaphora of Addai and Mari without the question of whether or not an Institution Narrative existed in the original form being raised. As Gelston says, “One further question requires consideration... This concerns the absence from the textual tradition of the anaphora of any Institution Narrative, probably the feature of the anaphora that has excited the greatest attention from liturgists.”<sup>60</sup> This question is the source of most of the controversy around the aforementioned *Guidelines* that will be dealt with below.

What should be noted from the outset is the fact that “it remains true that there is no extant MS authority for the inclusion of an Institution Narrative in the text of the anaphora.”<sup>61</sup> Gelston suggests only two options for dealing with an Institution Narrative in Addai and Mari, “The alternative possibilities are therefore that the anaphora originally contained an Institution Narrative which was subsequently lost, or that it never contained one in the first place.”<sup>62</sup>

Gelston is obviously not the first to raise this possibility. As Klein notes:

The role of the institution narrative in the Eucharistic prayers of the ancient Church has long been a focus for what are now considered almost classical questions. Once the issue

---

<sup>59</sup> Jammo. “The Anaphora of the Apostles.” 10.

<sup>60</sup> Gelston. *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari*. 72.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*

of when the liturgical elements of bread and wine become, or change into, the Body and Blood of Christ became a conceivable question, the Eastern and Western divisions of Christendom began to debate whether or not it is the words of institution or the epiclesis which actually effect such a change.<sup>63</sup>

According to Frank Senn, in the West, the focus of the Eucharist settled upon the

#### Institution Narrative:

The West developed this view of the *Verba Christi*, pinpointing the “moment of consecration” at the words of institution. Thomas Aquinas held that the sacrament of the altar is validly celebrated if all else is omitted in the canon of the Mass and only the words of institution are spoken, presupposing that the priest is really intent on doing what Christ wants to have done for the remembrance of himself.<sup>64</sup>

While at the same time, in the East, according to Klein, it was the Spirit’s work at the epiclesis that effected the change:

In the Eastern approach it is characteristic to see the Holy Spirit as the principal *agens* active in the functioning of anaphoras. An early, and very concise, statement of this approach appears in Cyril of Jerusalem’s (A.D. 386) *Catechesis*: ‘Then, having sanctified ourselves with these spiritual hymns, we beseech God, the lover of humanity, to send forth the Holy Spirit upon the (gifts) set before him, that he may make the bread the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ; for everything that the Holy Spirit has touched, has been sanctified and changed’<sup>65</sup>

The key to understanding the depth of the debate around the lack of an Institution Narrative in Addai and Mari is the isolation of the Church of the East relative even to other Syriac speaking Churches post-Nicea. While the Church of the East in many ways shares characteristics of the rest of Eastern Christendom, when it comes to the role of the Institution Narrative, or even more profoundly, the need for it at all in an effective Eucharistic liturgy, the Churches that use Addai and Mari remain at odds with the rest of the tradition. As Klein again notes, “Because of the East’s pneumatological thrust, the search for lost institution narratives has never had the same

---

<sup>63</sup> Klein. “Institution Narrative at the Crossroads.” 407.

<sup>64</sup> Senn. “Towards a Different Anaphoral Structure.” 348.

<sup>65</sup> Klein. “Institution Narratives at the Crossroads.” 409.

theological significance as in the West; although it should be noted that the Eastern prayers also quickly move in the direction of seeing the narrative as an indispensable element of a complete anaphora.”<sup>66</sup>

Turning back to Gelston’s two options, either: an Institution Narrative existed and has been lost or an Institution Narrative never existed in Addai and Mari; a third option, based in Developmental and Birkat Ha-Mazon Theories should be looked at as well, that is, that though the Institution Narrative did not originally exist in Addai and Mari, it is a logical embolism that developed within later stratum. These three choices will be developed below.

#### *An Original Institution Narrative*

As has been mentioned throughout, there is a considerable source issue when it comes to the study of Addai and Mari. Thanks to Bryan Spinks and his treatment of the early-seventh century (615-625AD) commentary of Gabriel Qatraya, we are able to gain some insight into the form of Addai and Mari prior to its abridgement made by Isho-yabh III (ca. 648-658).<sup>67</sup> As Spinks writes, “Since Gabriel Qatraya’s commentary pre-dates the abridgement attributed to Isho-yabh III, any information about an institution narrative which can be shown to have been cited or mentioned in connection with *Addai and Mari* rather than with the anaphoras of *Theodore* or *Nestorius*, would have considerable implications.”<sup>68</sup> Spinks recounts the work done on Qatraya’s commentary by Mar Jammo and Edward Kilmartin, noting that both “are mainly concerned with Qatraya’s ideas about consecration, and it is clear that he regarded both the words of institution and the epiklesis as necessary for consecration.”<sup>69</sup> This is important to note

---

<sup>66</sup> Klein. “Institution Narratives at the Crossroads.” 409-410.

<sup>67</sup> Spinks. “Addai and Mari and the Institution Narrative.” 61-62.

<sup>68</sup> Spinks. “Addai and Mari and the Institution Narrative.” 62-63.

<sup>69</sup> Spinks. “Addai and Mari and the Institution Narrative.” 63.

as by the time Qatraya wrote his commentary, Addai and Mari had become the most regularly used anaphora in the Church of the East. Spinks cautions reading too much into it, however, “The commentary is so general that it could serve for practically any anaphora!”<sup>70</sup> After pouring through some of the minute details of Qatraya’s full commentary, Spinks is left to draw a difficult conclusion, “Our conclusion must be, therefore, that the evidence Qatraya brings to bear on the question of *Addai and Mari* and the institution narrative is tantalizingly suggestive, but remains inconclusive.”<sup>71</sup>

Perhaps the strongest proponent of an original Institution Narrative in Addai and Mari is Botte. Dr. Mannooramparampil, in his article comparing 1986 and 1989 critical texts with those of 1962 and 1968, notes, along with myriad others, that “the present text of AM lacks the IN.”<sup>72</sup> He then goes on to summarize Botte, whose work was based on the earlier texts:

Botte argues that the very presence of anamnesis in the Qurbana is a proof for its [the IN] presence in its original text. One of the characteristics of the typical anamnesis is that it immediately follows the IN and is immediately connected with it by a transitional sentence: ‘And when you are gathered together in my name do what I have done in memory of me.’ Anamnesis is a natural development of this command. An anaphora, which contains anamnesis, should also possess the IN.<sup>73</sup>

Botte based his argument on what appears to be an anamensis occurring between the third and fourth g’hantha.<sup>74</sup> “According to Botte, ‘and we also’ possess all the necessary characteristics of an anamnesis and therefore constitutes an indirect proof for the presence of IN in the original

---

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.* 67.

<sup>72</sup> Mannooramparampil. “The Structure of Addai and Mari.” 29.

<sup>73</sup> Mannooramparampil. “The Structure of Addai and Mari.” 29.

<sup>74</sup> “And we also, my Lord, your weak, frail and miserable servants who are gathered together in your name, and who stand before you at this time and have received by tradition the example which is from you, rejoicing and glorifying, commemorating and celebrating this great, awesome, holy, vivifying and divine mystery of the passion, the death, burial and resurrection of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.” Mannooramparampil. “The Structure of Addai and Mari.” 26.

structure of AM.”<sup>75</sup> This line of reasoning, however, was caught short when Macomber discovered the Mar Es’aya text, ““The discovery of Mar Esaya text has considerably weakened the position of B. Botte. Its ‘and we also’ lacks the phrase ‘in my name’ on which he based the argument to link the anamnesis with the IN. Although its absence may be possibly be (sic) explained that it is a mere textual dislocation, the very evidence nullifies Botte’s reconstructed IN.”<sup>76</sup> The assertion of an original Institution Narrative was dealt further damage by Engberding:

Engberding has convincingly proved that the whole para[graph] ‘and we also’ is of secondary origin and was later added to the preceding part of the of the (sic) fourth g’hantha as a continuation of the intercession leading up to the epiclesis. Therefore it is not anamnesis but an extension of the fourth g’hantha. The nonanamntic character and the comparatively later origin of the prayer ‘and we also’ invalidates the basic argument of Botte that the presence of the anamnesis in AM is an incontestable evidence for the original existence of the words of Institution in it. *Arguing from the same principles of Botte, Engberding and Dix now contend that the words of Institution never belonged to the original stratum of the anaphora.*<sup>77</sup>

#### *Without the Institution Narrative*

With the discovery of the Mar Es’aya text, the pendulum began to swing from a relative certainty that the Institution Narrative had existed from time immemorial to a more balanced view of the lack of uniformity in the tradition. As Gelston looked at the history of Eucharistic Prayers in the introduction to his 1992 text, he noted that variation was the norm, “The wording of the Christian Eucharistic prayer remained far from fixed until at least the beginning of the third century.”<sup>78</sup> Spinks agrees, writing, “In a short paper in *vigiliae Christianae* in 1961, R. P. C. Hanson drew attention to the evidence pointing to the fact that from the middle of the second century, and well into the third, the presider at the eucharist was at liberty to compose his own

---

<sup>75</sup> Mannooramparampil. “The Structure of Addai and Mari.” 29.

<sup>76</sup> Mannooramparampil. “The Structure of Addai and Mari.” 30.

<sup>77</sup> Mannooramparampil. “The Structure of Addai and Mari.” 31. (Emphasis Mine)

<sup>78</sup> Gelston. *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari*. 5.

anaphora if he wished.”<sup>79</sup> Cutrone suggests that the question of the Institution Narrative is all but moot because of the early dating of Addai and Mari, saying, “Perhaps the problem with understanding this prayer is that we ask of it a clarity and a classic structure which does not actually emerge until the latter part of the fourth century.” It seems as though the general comfortableness with variation lends itself to the idea that Addai and Mari never contained an Institution Narrative even though other ancient prayers like the *Didache* and *Sharar* did.

Looking to the *Sharar* and their common core, Gelston notes, “It must first be noted that *Sharar* contains an Institution Narrative within that part of the anaphora in which the two texts diverge sharply... It is questionable whether *Sharar* can be regarded as providing evidence for the hypothetical lost common core at this point.”<sup>80</sup> Muksuris develops this point further:

After *Sharar* adds the Johannine quote of 6.55 [in the third *gehanta*], the two texts do not share any further similarities until the epiclesis. Immediately following John 6.55, an institution narrative is addressed to Christ. This is an important point, because certain scholars claim that *Sharar* in fact preserved the original location (and possibly wording) of the institution narrative that is oddly missing from Addai and Mari. One argument against this missing narrative is that the current text of Addai and Mari never did contain one, and it is highly unlikely that if one did exist it was dropped, especially with the insistence of later authors and redactors to include an institution narrative in their texts. A second argument favoring Addai and Mari’s present form ‘is that its current structure has a certain structural and theological flow to it.’ In other words the inclusion of a full institution narrative would interrupt the natural flow of theological thought and structural uniformity within the text. As Dix convincingly proposes,

*Addai and Mari* has no explicit institution narrative, but it has an equivalent to it in this brief allusion to what happened at the last supper [sic.]. The important point to notice is that structurally it plays precisely that pivotal part in the whole prayer which the extended narrative plays in other prayers. It states the *authority* for performing the eucharist and justifies the petition for communion which is about to follow.<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Spinks. “Beware the Liturgical Horses.” 214-215.

<sup>80</sup> Gelston. *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari*. 73.

<sup>81</sup> Muksuris. “A Brief Overview.” 68.

Scholars tend to suggest that while in the early 4<sup>th</sup> century and forward, liturgical and theological developments lead to changing anaphoras across the Church, practitioners of Addai and Mari tended to remain content. Cutrone notes:

Developments in Jerusalem witnessed by Egeria indicate a desire to be very literal in the memorial. This resulted in the reciting of the very words Christ used. The anamnesis of Addai and Mari, however, is satisfied merely with a reference to the ‘tradition which comes from you’ and a ‘commemoration of the passion, death, and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ.’ What developed in the anaphora of Basil into the words of institution is the same concern which is found in the anamnesis of Addai and Mari. Thus Ratcliff, Dix, and Pitt contend that the *verba Christi* never were present in the anaphora of the apostles. There is instead a subtle reference to the Supper itself.<sup>82</sup>

This contentment with a “subtle reference” is echoed by Muksuris, “... the inclusion of a simple allusion to the institution narrative fulfills the task of linking the liturgical acts with the ‘bloodless sacrifice’ of the Upper Room.”<sup>83</sup>

Finally, it should be noted that the lack of an Institution Narrative in Addai and Mari is corroborated by a sister church of the Church of the East, the Syro-Malabar Church, which uses Addai and Mari, with an Institution Narrative, but places it in a location that is clearly an local adaptation. Returning to Spinks:

This apparent omission in the manuscripts finds confirmation in the Malabar liturgy... The present Malabar use which goes back to the printed missal of 1774 (Roizian), and the version of the rite published by Anotonio De Gouvea in 1606 (Menezian), both contain an institution narrative, but after the anaphora and before the fraction (the two versions differ over the precise location.) An earlier Malabrese manuscript, *Vat. Syr. 66*, attributed to Mar Joseph Saluqa, Metropolitan of India 1556-1569, contains a narrative before the liturgy which the author intended to be recited at the end of the ceremonies of its fraction. Thus the rite of Malabar witnesses to the fact that on its arrival in India, the Anaphora of Addai and Mari contained no institution narrative.<sup>84</sup>

### *Institution Narrative as Embolism*

---

<sup>82</sup> Cutrone. “Anaphora of the apostles.” 629.

<sup>83</sup> Muksuris. “A Brief Overview.” 68.

<sup>84</sup>Spinks. “The Quest for the ‘Original Form.’” 6.

Mar Jammo, as a strong proponent of Developmental Theory, is also very clear on his opinion regarding the place of an Institution Narrative in Addai and Mari, “The Eucharistic Institution narrative could not belong to the original text of the Anaphora. This ‘*gemma orientale*’ belonged to the primordial era when euchology of the Church had not yet inserted the Institution Narrative in the text of the Eucharistic Prayer.”<sup>85</sup> As Mannoorampampil attempted to discern the various stratum of Addai and Mari, he suggested that an Institution Narrative was probably a secondary addition:

The second stage has been obtained at the appearance of the present form of the epiclesis and the ‘and we also’ prayer. With the introduction of the Institution Narrative [AM] falls in the same line with the other *anaphoras*. Institution Narrative and epiclesis could be inserted into the anaphora as embolisms parallel to those of Birkat Ha Mazon. On the days of new moon and feasts the third pericope of Birkat Ha Mazon which remains invariable for all days receive cultural and epicletic embolism which is called ‘ya aleh we-yavo’. On the feast days which were introduced after the exile there was inserted into the second Berakah in its context of thanksgiving a narrative embolism which expounded the events connected with its institution. In A.M., because of its narrative and institutional theme, IN can be inserted into the second pericope (third g’hantha) which corresponds to the Birkat Ha Aretz to which is added generally the institutional embolism. In the paschal form of the Birkat Ha Mazon it is proper to place the IN in the third pericope (fourth g’hantha) fulfilling its eschatological aspiration in the return of Christ at the Eucharist.<sup>86</sup>

This idea of Institution Narrative as embolism was introduced by Louis Ligier<sup>87</sup> and was richly developed by Klein, who wrote:

It would seem clear then that the institution narrative functioned in early Christian anaphoras as an embolism, closely uniting the anamnestic prayer with the historical reality it recalled, the Last Supper, which itself acts as a prophetic symbol for the cosmic reality behind it, the paschal mystery. This explains why Christian Eucharistic Prayers ought to have institution narratives, but it doesn't answer the question why some anaphoras, if that is what they are, don't possess such narratives.”<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> Jammo. “The Anaphora of the Apostles.” 6.

<sup>86</sup> Mannoorampampil. “The Anaphora of Addai and Mari.” 101.

<sup>87</sup> See note 41 above.

<sup>88</sup> Klein. “Institution Narratives at the Crossroads.” 413.

He goes on to suggest the theological rationale for the addition of an Institution Narrative

Embolism in ancient anaphoras:

The institution narrative may well be an early instance in which the Christian community, confident that it was united to Christ by his Holy Spirit, seemingly altered its most basic prayer form, in an attempt not to change that which Christ had given, but rather to be faithful to it, guaranteeing that it be passed on to future generations. It would be an early example of fidelity to a tradition: encountering new questions, and seeking out the very roots of that tradition, in order to produce organic growth.<sup>89</sup>

Whether one believes that Addai and Mari has never had, originally had, or at some point developed an Institution Narrative seems to depend first on one's preferred theory of Addai and Mari's original structure. As we will soon see, the Roman Catholic Church, with the publication of *Guidelines* in 2001, took a firm stance on its opinion that Addai and Mari did not originally and need not now contain an Institution Narrative to be an effective Eucharistic Prayer.

The principal issue for the Catholic Church in agreeing to this request, related to the question of the validity of the Eucharist celebrated with the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, one of the three Anaphoras traditionally used by the Assyrian Church of the East. The Anaphora of Addai and Mari is notable because, from time immemorial, it has been used without a recitation of the Institution Narrative. As the Catholic Church considers the words of the Eucharistic Institution a constitutive and therefore indispensable part of the Anaphora or Eucharistic Prayer, a long and careful study was undertaken of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, from a historical, liturgical and theological perspective, at the end of which the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith on January 17th, 2001 concluded that this Anaphora can be considered valid.<sup>90</sup>

### ***Guidelines for Admission to the Eucharist and Why it Matters***

As I stated in the introduction to this paper, it is my contention that the publication of *Guidelines for Admission to the Eucharist* on July 20, 2001 is one of the most important theological and liturgical developments in recent history. The supporting document, entitled *Admission to the Eucharist in Situations of Pastoral Necessity* makes it clear that this agreement is first, and

---

<sup>89</sup> Klein. "Institution Narratives at the Crossroads." 418.

<sup>90</sup> PCPCU. "Guidelines." §3.

foremost, a pastoral response to a Church in Diaspora<sup>91</sup>, “This provision for admission to the Eucharist in situations of pastoral necessity is not to be equated with full Eucharistic communion between the Chaldean Church and the Assyrian Church of the East...”<sup>92</sup> However, the theology underlying the debate over the role of the Institution Narrative in Addai and Mari has an impact not just on the Christians in exile from the Middle East, but its influence could be felt as The Episcopal Church looks to revise its Eucharistic rites in the years to come.

Robert Taft, in his 2003 article, “Mass Without the Consecration?” lays out an argument for the validity of Addai and Mari based in part on the concept of embolism mentioned above. “Although theories on the origins and evolution of the pristine anaphora remain in flux, one point of growing agreement among representative scholars, Catholic and non, is that the Institution Narrative is a later embolism – i.e. interpolation – into the earlier Eucharistic prayer.”<sup>93</sup> He goes on to argue, with great emphasis, “*There is not a single extant pre-Nicene eucharistic prayer that one can prove contained the Words of Institution*, and today many scholars maintain that the most primitive, original eucharistic prayers were short, self-contained benedictions without Institution Narrative or Epiclesis.”<sup>94</sup> He says further that “before the Middle Ages no one tried to identify a ‘moment of consecration’ apart from the anaphoral prayer over the gifts in its entirety.”<sup>95</sup> This growing realization has lead scholars to reevaluate the impact of Thomas Aquinas and the idea that only the Words of Institution were consecratory.<sup>96</sup> Instead of the Western idea that consecration of the elements being somehow related to the words and actions of the presbyter, “the classic Eastern Orthodox teaching [states that] the

---

<sup>91</sup> See Note 5 above.

<sup>92</sup> CDFCOC. *Admission*. §3, Conclusion

<sup>93</sup> Taft. “Mass Without the Consecration?” 490.

<sup>94</sup> Taft. 493. (Emphasis original)

<sup>95</sup> Taft. 500.

<sup>96</sup> See Note 64 above.

power of consecration comes from the words of Christ, the divine mandate that guarantees the eucharistic conversion for all time.”<sup>97</sup> This leads Taft to argue that “The *Words of Institution* are always consecratory even when they are not recited, as in the *Anaphora of Addai and Mari*. For they are consecratory not because they are a formula the priest repeats in the eucharistic prayer, but because Jesus’ pronouncing of them at the Last Supper remains efficaciously consecratory for every Eucharist until the end of time.”<sup>98</sup> This is further developed by Russo in his response to the detractors of *Guidelines*:

Monsignor Brunero Gherardini, director of *Divinitas*, a theological journal published by the Vatican press, took a decidedly trenchant tone in his reaction to the matter. “Whosoever presumes to celebrate the Eucharist by silencing or altering the words used by Him [i.e., Christ] at the moment of the institution,” he declared, “does not perform an act of homage to Christ, but rather its opposite.” Paraphrasing the Councils of Trent and Florence, he goes on to clarify that without the dominical words “the sacrament does not exist,” and that “the celebrant consecrates the bread and the wine only with the words used by Christ and in no other way.”... If Gherardini were correct, then the ineluctable conclusion would be that the Church, or at least many parts of it, did not celebrate the Eucharist for the first three hundred years of her existence. To be sure, precious few exemplars of pre-Nicene Eucharistic prayers have come down to us. But of those that have, none contains the dominical words.<sup>99</sup>

It seems clear, then, that whether or not *Addai and Mari* originally contained an Institution Narrative (and it seems that it did not), the efficacy of the anaphora is not in danger. This is handled with great wisdom on the document itself as Section Three lays out the reasons for accepting the *Anaphora of Addai and Mari* and the Church of the East:

In the first place, the *Anaphora of Addai and Mari* is one of the most ancient Anaphoras, dating back to the time of the very early Church; it was composed and used with the clear intention of celebrating the Eucharist in full continuity with the Last Supper and according to the intention of the Church; its validity was never officially contested, neither in the Christian East nor in the Christian West.

---

<sup>97</sup> Taft. 505.

<sup>98</sup> Taft. 506. (Emphasis original)

<sup>99</sup> Russo. “The Validity of the *Anaphora of Addai and Mari*.” (Kindle Locations 732-737, 742-744).

Secondly, the Catholic Church recognises the Assyrian Church of the East as a true particular Church, built upon orthodox faith and apostolic succession. The Assyrian Church of the East has also preserved full Eucharistic faith in the presence of our Lord under the species of bread and wine and in the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. In the Assyrian Church of the East, though not in full communion with the Catholic Church, are thus to be found "true sacraments, and above all, by apostolic succession, the priesthood and the Eucharist" (U.R., n. 15)

Finally, the words of Eucharistic Institution are indeed present in the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, not in a coherent narrative way and ad litteram, but rather in a dispersed euchological way, that is, integrated in successive prayers of thanksgiving, praise and intercession.<sup>100</sup>

It seems safe, then to conclude that as liturgical scholarship and practice have shifted over the last 100 years, even central tenants like, "the dominical words are necessary and consecratory" have come into question. This raises the issue, addressed by Thomas J. Talley, a liturgical structure scholar and a student of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari,<sup>101</sup> on a peculiarity of the 1979 *Book of Common Prayer* around the Institution Narrative:

It must be considered something of an anomaly that the institution narrative, clearly a historical account and, as such, part of our thanksgiving for the work of Christ, should be accompanied, in every prayer in the present prayer book, by rubrics that seem to be meaningless unless the words they accompany are seen as consecratory."<sup>102</sup>

With a foot firmly in the East, Talley lays out a coherent liturgical structure for an efficacious celebration of the Eucharist:

In the Scottish liturgy and the American prayer books, as in the Greek anaphoras discussed earlier, the institution narrative is the climax of the thanksgiving and leads into the memorial oblation. That seal of our thanksgiving, in turn, leads into the supplication for consecration (the invocation, *epiclesis*). Given that structure, any suggestion that the words of our Lord in the institution narrative should be treated as the point of consecration seems inappropriate, to say the least.<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup> PCPCU. "Guidelines." §3.

<sup>101</sup> See Note 33 above.

<sup>102</sup> Talley. "The Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer." 93.

<sup>103</sup> Talley. "The Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer." 94.

Given the dramatic liturgical and theological shift that is codified in the promulgation of *Guidelines for Admission to the Eucharist*, it seems important that future revisions of our own Prayer Book take into account the Eucharistic theology that has been upheld as fully valid, and held at least in the Church of the East through the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, from time immemorial, that “the whole anaphora [is to be] considered consecratory.”<sup>104</sup> It therefore behooves those liturgists responsible for future revisions of The Book of Common Prayer to be intentional about making a movement away from any requiring any special manual acts at the recitation of the Institution Narrative.

---

<sup>104</sup> Mannooramparampil. “The Anaphora of Addai and Mari.” 101.

## Bibliography

- Bouley, Allan. *From Freedom to Formula* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1981).
- Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith and Congregation for the Oriental Churches. *Admission to the Eucharist in Situations of Pastoral Necessity: Provision Between the Chaldean Church and the Assyrian Church of the East*. Accessed July 17, 2013  
[www.vatican.va/roman\\_curia/pontifical\\_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc\\_pc\\_chrstuni\\_doc\\_20011025\\_chiesa-caldea-assira\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_20011025_chiesa-caldea-assira_en.html)
- Cutrone, Emmanuel J. "Anaphora of the apostles: implications of the Mar Eba'Ya text." *Theological Studies*, 34, no. 4 (December 1973): 624-642.
- Elevanal, Thomas. "Some of the Characteristics of the Anaphora of the Apostles Mar Addai and Mar Mari." *Christian Orient*, 8, no. 1 (March 1987): 27-36.
- Gelston, A. *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari* (Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 1992).
- Jammo, Sarhad. "The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari: A Study of Structure and Historical Background." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 68, no. 1 (2002): 5-35.
- Jones, Bayard H. "The Quest for the Origins of the Christian Liturgies." *Anglican Theological Review*, 46, no. 1 (January 1964): 5-21.
- Klein, Terrance W. "Institution Narratives at the Crossroads." *Worship*, 67, no. 5 (September 1993): 407-418.
- Ledogar, Robert J. "The Eucharistic Prayer And the Gifts over Which It Is Spoken." *Worship* 41 no. 10 (December 1967): 578-596.
- Macomber, William F. "A History of the Chaldean Mass." *Worship* 51, no. 2 (March 1977): 107-120.
- Macomber, William F., S.J. "Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 32, (1966): 335-371.
- Mannoorampampil, Thomas. "The Anaphora of Addai and Mari Its Origin, Development and Theology." *Christian Orient*, 20, no. 2 (June 1999): 97-108.
- Mannoorampampil, Thomas. "The Structure of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari in the Syro-Malabar Qurbana." *Christian Orient*, 23, no. 1 (March 2002): 26-35.

- Muksuris, Stylianos. "A Brief Overview of the Structure and Theology of the Liturgy of the Apostles of Addai and Mari." *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, 43, nos. 1-4 (1998): 59-83.
- Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity. *Guidelines for Admission to the Eucharist Between the Chaldean Church and the Assyrian Church of the East*. Accessed July 17, 2013  
[www.vatican.va/roman\\_curia/pontifical\\_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc\\_pc\\_chrstuni\\_doc\\_20011025\\_chiesa-caldea-assira\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_20011025_chiesa-caldea-assira_en.html)
- Ray, Walter D. "The Chiastic Structure of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari." *Studia Liturgica* 23, no. 2 (1993): 187-193.
- Russo, Nicholas V. "The Validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: Critique of the Critiques" Maxwell E. Johnson, ed. *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2010) Kindle Edition.
- Saint Ephrem Ecumenical Research Institute. "Advisory Committee" Accessed July 31, 2013  
<http://www.seeri.org/committee.html>
- Senn, Frank C. "Towards a Different Anaphoral Structure." *Worship*, 58, no. 4 (July 1984): 346-358.
- Spinks, Bryan D. "Addai and Mari and the Institution Narrative: The Tantalising Evidence of Gabriel Qatraya." *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 98 (1984): 60-67.
- Spinks, Bryan D. "Beware the Liturgical Horses! An English Interjection on Anaphoral Evolution." *Worship*, 59, no. 3 (May 1985): 211-219.
- Spinks, Bryan D. "The Quest for the 'Original Form' of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari." *Worship Prayers from the East* (Washington, DC: The Pastoral Press): 1-20.
- Taft, Robert F. "Mass Without the Consecration? The Historic Agreement on the Eucharist Between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East Promulgated 26 October 2001." *Worship*, 77, no. 6 (November 2003): 482-509.
- Talley, Thomas J. "From Berakah to Eucharistia: a Reopening Question." *Worship* 50, no. 2 (March 1976): 115-137.
- Talley, Thomas J. "The Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer." Ruth A. Meyers, ed. *A Prayer Book for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (New York: Church Publishing, 1996): 76-101.