

Durham E-Theses

With angels and archangels the background, form and function of the sanctus in the eucharistic prayer

Spinks, Bryan D.

How to cite:

Spinks, Bryan D. (1988) *With angels and archangels the background, form and function of the sanctus in the eucharistic prayer*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/6639/>

Use policy

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

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

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

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

ABSTRACT

WITH ANGELS AND ARCHANGELS. THE BACKGROUND, FORM AND FUNCTION
OF THE SANCTUS IN THE EUCHARISTIC PRAYER.

The origin of the sanctus as a constituent element in the eucharistic prayer is one of the unsolved mysteries of Christian liturgy. In a Prolegomena, certain specific older theories are rejected. The use of the qedussah in Judaism, from its biblical setting to its use in Jewish liturgy and mysticism is examined, and the continuity of these usages in Christian non-eucharistic contexts is illustrated.

From this wider background, the study examines the setting and function of the sanctus in the anaphoras of East and West to the seventh century, showing that the earliest attestations and the most logical use of the sanctus both originate in Syria and Palestine. In the peculiar Egyptian anaphoral family, it is used within intercessions, and at Rome it appears to be a late fourth century addition, which was never given a logical setting in the canon missae.

Possible origins are the Jewish Synagogue berakot , the Jewish mystical tradition, or some biblically-minded celebrants. But these possible origins are better accounted for when a variety of models for early eucharistic prayers is accepted, rather than the single model of the Birkat ha-mazon.

The development of the sanctus in later Eastern and Western traditions is examined, noting the proliferation of angelological speculation in West Syria, the innovatory uses of Luther and Cranmer, and the interesting nineteenth century Reformed usage. In modern anaphoral composition it appears to be a sine qua non.

Finally, the sanctus is examined in a wider theological context, defending a variety of logical doxological usages, with more than one position in the anaphora, and possibly wider variations of the biblical/liturgical form.

WITH ANGELS AND ARCHANGELS.

THE BACKGROUND, FORM AND FUNCTION OF THE SANCTUS

IN THE EUCHARISTIC PRAYER

by

BRYAN D. SPINKS, B.A., M.TH., B.D., F.R.HIST.S.

Submitted to the University of Durham
in part requirement for the degree of Doctor of Divinity

1988

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.

No quotation from it should be published without

his prior written consent and information derived

from it should be acknowledged.



25 OCT 1989

WITH ANGELS AND ARCHANGELS.

THE BACKGROUND, FORM AND FUNCTION OF THE SANCTUS
IN THE EUCHARISTIC PRAYER.

CONTENTS

Abbreviations	v
Preface	vi
<u>Prolegomena</u>	
The Mystery of the Sanctus, or Hunting the Liturgical Woozle.	1
<u>PART ONE</u>	
<u>Chapter 1.</u> The Old Testament Foundations: The Visions of Isaiah and Ezekiel.	18
1. The Vision of Isaiah	19
2. The Vision of Ezekiel	33
<u>Chapter 2.</u> The Worship of Heaven and the Qeduššah in Judaism.	49
1. Qumran and the Angelic Liturgy.	50
2. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha	55
3. Merkavah Mysticism and the Hekhalot Literature.	72
4. The Synagogue Berakot.	80
5. Conclusions	93
<u>Chapter 3.</u> The Sanctus in Some Early Christian Documents.	101
1. The New Testament	102
2. 1 Clement 34:6	107
3. Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis	110
4. Tertullian	111
5. The Ascension of Isaiah	112
6. Aphrahat's Demonstration XIV	114
7. Apostolic Constitutions VII.35	115
8. The History of John the Son of Zebedee	119
Appendix	123
<u>PART TWO</u>	
<u>Chapter 4.</u> The Context and Function of the Sanctus in the Anaphora: The Evidence of the Classical Rites to the Seventh Century.	129
1. The East: The Syro-Byzantine and East Syrian Traditions.	130
2. The East: Egypt.	175
3. The West: Rome and Milan	191
4. The West: Spain and Gaul	201
5. Overview	209
<u>Chapter 5.</u> The Forms of the Anaphoral Sanctus, and the Benedictus.	223
1. The Forms of the Sanctus in the Earliest Attestations	224
2. The Sanctus in the Later Attestations	226
3. The Benedictus	230

<u>Chapter 6.</u>	The Possible Origins of the Anaphoral Sanctus.	234
	1. Recent Ideas on Anaphoral Evolution	235
	2. Some Possible Origins of the Sanctus	252
 <u>PART THREE</u>		
<u>Chapter 7.</u>	Developments in East and West Prior to the Reformation.	267
	1. The Jacobite and Maronite Anaphoras	268
	2. The Armenian Anaphoras	284
	3. The Ethiopic Anaphoras	291
	4. Some Western Developments	301
<u>Chapter 8.</u>	The Reformers and the Sanctus.	312
	1. Lutheran Precursors	313
	2. Luther's Treatment of the Sanctus	315
	3. The Lutheran Kirchenordnungen	318
	4. The Reformed Rites	325
	5. The Church of England	328
	6. Overview	331
<u>Chapter 9.</u>	Recovery and Repositioning: Protestant and Anglican Liturgies 1662-1960.	337
	1. Lutheranism	338
	2. The Reformed Tradition	342
	3. Anglicanism	363
	4. Methodism	370
	5. Overview	372
<u>Chapter 10.</u>	The Sanctus in Some Contemporary Eucharistic Prayers.	379
	1. The Roman Catholic Rite	380
	2. The Anglican Communion	387
	3. The Reformed Tradition	402
	4. The Lutheran Tradition	411
	5. Methodist	414
	6. Ecumenical Prayers	415
<u>Chapter 11.</u>	The Anaphoral Sanctus in Review	422
	1. A Logical Doxological Function	426
	2. The Problem of the Angels	428
	3. The Problem of Creation	432
	4. Trinitarian Thanksgiving and the Sanctus	437
	5. Justification/Sanctification and the sanctus	439
	Appendix	444
 <u>Bibliography</u>		 448

<u>Chapter 6.</u>	The Possible Origins of the Anaphoral Sanctus.	234
	1. Recent Ideas on Anaphoral Evolution	235
	2. Some Possible Origins of the Sanctus	252
 <u>PART THREE</u>		
<u>Chapter 7.</u>	Developments in East and West Prior to the Reformation.	267
	1. The Jacobite and Maronite Anaphoras	268
	2. The Armenian Anaphoras	284
	3. The Ethiopic Anaphoras	291
	4. Some Western Developments	301
<u>Chapter 8.</u>	The Reformers and the Sanctus.	312
	1. Lutheran Precursors	313
	2. Luther's Treatment of the Sanctus	315
	3. The Lutheran Kirchenordnungen	318
	4. The Reformed Rites	325
	5. The Church of England	328
	6. Overview	331
<u>Chapter 9.</u>	Recovery and Repositioning: Protestant and Anglican Liturgies 1662-1960.	337
	1. Lutheranism	338
	2. The Reformed Tradition	342
	3. Anglicanism	363
	4. Methodism	370
	5. Overview	372
<u>Chapter 10.</u>	The Sanctus in Some Contemporary Eucharistic Prayers.	379
	1. The Roman Catholic Rite	380
	2. The Anglican Communion	387
	3. The Reformed Tradition	402
	4. The Lutheran Tradition	411
	5. Methodist	414
	6. Ecumenical Prayers	415
<u>Chapter 11.</u>	The Anaphoral Sanctus in Review	422
	1. A Logical Doxological Function	426
	2. The Problem of the Angels	428
	3. The Problem of Creation	432
	4. Trinitarian Thanksgiving and the Sanctus	437
	5. Justification/Sanctification and the sanctus	439
	Appendix	444
 <u>Bibliography</u>		 448

Rev. Bryan Douglas Spinks, B.A., M.Th., B.D., F.R.Hist.S.

The following Thesis is to be presented for the degree of D.D.:

With Angels and Archangels. The Background, Form and Function
of the sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer.

In addition the following published work is submitted:

Short Studies

Addai and Mari- The Anaphora of the Apostles: A Text for Students.
Grove Liturgical Study 24, Bramcote, Notts. 1980. (BDS translated
the texts, not simply 'edited' them.

Luther's Liturgical Criteria and His Reform of the Canon of the Mass.
Grove Liturgical Study 30, Bramcote Notts, 1982.

Published Articles

Luther's Taufbüchlein, Liturgical Review 5:2(1975) 17-20; 6:1 (1976)
13-21.

The Supply of Prayer for Ships: A Forgotten Puritan Liturgy, Journal
of United Reformed Church History Society, 1:5(1975) 139-48.

The Consecratory Epiklesis in the Anaphora of St. James, Studia Liturgica
11(1976), 19-38.

The Original Form of the Anaphora of the Apostles: A Suggestion in
the light of Maronite Sharar, Ephemerides Liturgicae 91(1977), 146-
61.

Christian Worship or Cultural Incantations ?, Studia Liturgica 12(1977)
1-19.

Luther's Other Major Liturgical Reforms: 1. The Divine Office and the
German and 'Latin Litany Corrected', Liturgical Review 7:1
(1977) 35-44.

Luther's Other Major Liturgical Reforms: 2. The Ordination of Ministers
of the Word, Liturgical Review 9:1 (1979), 20-32.

The Jewish Liturgical Sources for the Sanctus, Heythrop Journal 21
(1980) 168-79.

A Note on the Anaphora Outlined in Narsai's Homily XXXII, Journal
Of Theological Studies NS 31(1980) 82-93.

Luther's Other Major Liturgical Reforms: 3. The Traubüchlein,
Liturgical Review 10:1 (1980) 33-8.

The Cleansed Leper's Thankoffering before the Lord: Edward Craddock
Ratcliff and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora, in

Edited by Bryan D. Spinks, The Sacrifice of Praise. Studies on the
Themes of Thanksgiving and Redemption in the Central Prayers of
the Eucharistic and Baptismal Liturgies. Bibliotheca 'Ephemerides
Liturgicae' Subsidia 19, Edizioni Liturgiche, Rome 1981,
159-78.

Symbolism and the Sacraments, in ed. K.W. Stevenson, Symbolism and the
Liturgy, Grove Liturgical Study 26, Bramcote Notts 1981,
24-33.

The Marriage Service in the Church of England: Some Liturgical
Considerations, Liturgical Review 11:2(1981) 90-112.

The Anaphora for India: Some Theological Objections to an attempt at
Inculturation, Ephemerides Liturgicae 95(1981) 529-49.

- Sacerdoce et offrande dans les 'Koushape' des anaphores syriennes orientales, La Maison-Dieu 154 (1983) 107-26.
 = Priesthood and Offering in the kussape of the East Syrian Anaphoras, Studia Liturgica 15(1982/3) 104-17.
- A Complete Anaphora ? A Note on Strasbourg Gr.254, Heythrop Journal 25(1984) 54-55.
- Addai and Mari and the Institution Narrative: The tantalising evidence of Gabriel Qatraya, Ephemerides Liturgicae 98(1984) 60-7.
- Eucharistic Offering in the East Syrian Anaphoras, Orientalia Christiana Periodica 50(1984) 347-71.
- Beware the Liturgical Horses ! An English Interjection on Anaphoral Evolution, Worship 59(1985) 211-19.
- Vivid Signs of the Gift of the Spirit ? The Lima Text on Baptism and Some Recent English Language Baptismal Liturgies, Worship 60 (1986) 232-46.
- The Liturgical Origins and Theology of Calvin's Genevan Marriage Rite, Ecclesia Orans 3(1986) 195-210.
- A Seventeenth Century Reformed Liturgy of Penance and Reconciliation, Scottish Journal of Theology 41(1988) PROOFS
- Practical application of Liturgical Scholarship
- Liturgical Stocktaking, Theology 90(1987) 33-8.
- Revising the Advent-Christmas-Epiphany Cycle in the Church of England, Gratias Agamus (Jubilee Volume, Studia Liturgica 17(1987) 166-175.

Manuscript

- The Jerusalem Liturgy of the Catecheses Mystagogicae: Syrian or Egyptian ? To appear in the Proceedings of the 1983 Patristic Conference, volume 2. (Only volume 1 has appeared to date, but Miss Elizabeth Livingstone advises that it will be in volume 2)

ABBREVIATIONS

v

APOT	Charles, R.H.,(ed.). <u>The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English</u> . 2 Vols. (Clarendon, Oxford 1913)
AS	Anaphorae Syriacae (Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, Rome 1939 -)
ATR	Anglican Theological Review.
AV	Authorized Version
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CD	Church Dogmatics, ET. T & T Clark,Edinburgh.
CQ	Church Quarterly.
EL	Ephemerides Liturgicae
ETL	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses
ET	Expository Times
Gesenius-Kautzch	<u>Hebrew Grammar</u> (ET Clarendon Press,Oxford 1898)
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HBS	Henry Bradshaw Society
HJ	Heythrop Journal
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
IDB	<u>International Dictionary of the Bible</u>
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JEH	Journal of Ecclesiastical History
JLW	Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JSJ	Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
LEW	Brightman, F.E., <u>Liturgies Eastern and Western</u> (Clarendon Press,Oxford 1896)
LR	Liturgical Review (Liturgical Studies)
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Massoretic Text
MGWJ	Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums
Mu	Le Muséon
Nov.T.	Novum Testamentum
ns	new series
NTS	New Testament Studies
OC	Oriens Christianus
OCA	Orientalia Christiana Analecta
OCP	Orientalia Christiana Periodica
Or.Syr.	L'Orient Syrien
OTP	Charlesworth, J.H.,(ed.) <u>The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</u> 2 vols. (DLT,London 1983,1986)
PE	Hänggi,A, Pahl,I.,(eds.) <u>Præx Eucharistia</u> (Spicilegium Friburgense 12, Editions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse, Fribourg 1968)
PEER	Jasper,R.D.C, Cuming G.J., (eds.) <u>Prayers of the Eucharist, Early and Reformed</u> (OUP.New York 1980 ²)

PG	Patrologia Graeca, J.P.Migne.
PWHS	Proceedings of the Wesleyan Historical Society
QL	Questions Liturgiques
REJ	Revue des Études Juives
RSR	Recherches de Science Religieuse
RSV	Revised Standard Version
SE	Sacris Erudiri
SL	Studia Liturgica
SP	Studia Patristica
TDNT	<u>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</u> (eds.) Kittel, G., Friedrich, J. (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids 1964-74)
THAT	<u>Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament</u> , (ed.) E. Jenni and C. Westermann, 2 vols (Zurich/Munich 1971-6)
TL	Tijdschrift voor Liturgie
TRIA	Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy
TS	Theological Studies
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
VC	Vigiliae Christianae
VT	Vetus Testamentum
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZNTW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

PREFACE

As a former undergraduate and graduate liturgy pupil of Arthur Hubert Couratin, it was perhaps inevitable that sooner or later I should become fascinated by what Gregory Dix called 'a sort of liturgical cuckoo' ¹ - the anaphoral sanctus. The sanctus had from time to time preoccupied Arthur Couratin's friend and mentor, Edward Ratcliff, and Couratin in turn caught the same fascination. As he led pupils through the text of the Apostolic Tradition, he would raise the questions about its ending which Ratcliff had set out in his famous article in the Journal of Ecclesiastical History - though rarely mentioning his own support of 'the Master' in the same journal. I am indebted to Arthur Couratin not only for imparting a technique in assessing liturgical texts, but also for imbuing me with the 'sanctus fascination'. However, my later liturgical studies under Geoffrey Cuming and Ronald Jasper, and in Syriac with Sebastian Brock, have been indispensable in equipping me with an independent perspective for investigating its function, and conjecturing on its origin. I have found it necessary therefore to place the investigation in a context far broader than Couratin would think necessary.

The study presented here crosses disciplines other than 'pure liturgiology', and I would like to express my thanks to the Revs. Professor John Rogerson and Dr. Anthony Gelston, Dr. G. I. Davies, Dr. Stefan Reif, and the Rev. Dr. William Horbury for their assistance with the material in Part 1. I must also express gratitude to Professor Sir Harold Bailey for translating the Armenian texts, and the Rev. Professor J. M. Plumley for help with the Coptic; to Professor H. Glahn for information on the Danish rite; to the Revs. Professor J. M. Barkley, Dr. Bruno Bürki, Dr. Howard Hageman and Dr. Horace Allen Jr., for help in locating texts of the Scottish, Irish, French, German and American Reformed rites. My thanks to the Rev. Professor Ronald

Feuerhahn for his ever willing assistance with Lutheran texts; and to my colleague at Churchill College, Dr.Andrea Cervi, who kindly translated one of the Strasbourg Reformation texts.

Liturgy is a wide subject, and it is impossible to work in isolation from other friends and colleagues working in related fields, and their advice is crucial. In this respect I am happy to record my thanks to my friends the Revs.Dr.Geoffrey Cuming and Dr.Kenneth Stevenson for their comments on the earlier drafts of this work. The views expressed and the judgments made, however, are my own, as is the responsibility for any errors. If the latter are not revealed by other colleagues now, they will no doubt one day be pointed out to me before the divine throne by the seraphim though I hope that, like Arthur Couratin, they will soften the sharp tutorial with that inevitable glass of sherry !

Lastly I must thank my wife and family who have had to live with 'the sanctus' for nearly eight years, and who on its final conclusion will sing Te Deum laudamus ! This work is dedicated to them, and to all those who have joined with me in divine worship in the Chapel at Churchill College Cambridge.

PROLEGOMENA

THE MYSTERY OF THE SANCTUS, OR HUNTING THE LITURGICAL

WOOZLE

For Christians of many traditions the sanctus, or trisagion,¹ is a familiar feature in the eucharistic prayer. It finds a place in almost every classical anaphora, and in modern liturgical revision it has generally been regarded as a necessary constituent part of the eucharistic prayer. Its ultimate written source is not a mystery; it is adapted from the song of the seraphim of Isaiah 6:3, which, in a different form, and on the lips of four living creatures (from Ezekiel), reoccurs in Revelation 4:8. From the viewpoint of the history of Christian liturgy, however, its occurrence within the eucharistic prayer remains something of an enigma. In an essay entitled 'The Thanksgiving', A.H.Couratin concluded thus:

When the Sanctus was introduced into Eucharistic Prayers, there was no one particular point at which it was introduced. And indeed, one of the principal puzzles facing the liturgist is to determine why it was ever introduced at all. 2

Why indeed did this biblical song come to be inserted within a prayer in which the church follows the example and command of Jesus at the Last Supper ? There is no suggestion in the Gospels that Jesus uttered the sanctus at this meal and enjoined its recitation, and there appears to be no evidence to suggest that it was ever a recognised constituent of Jewish meal berakot. While in practically all post-fourth century classical anaphoras, East and West, the sanctus occurs at some point in the first part of the prayer, it is noticeably absent from some significant early texts, namely, the Apostolic Tradition attributed to Hippolytus, and Testamentum Domini, from the anaphora of Epiphanius, and, according to M.A.Smith, an anaphora alluded to in Narsai's Homily XVII.³ It is absent from the Didache , which in some recent studies has been regarded as vital for understanding the transition from the Jewish meal berakot to the Christian eucharistic prayer.⁴ It is found in Addai and Mari and Maronite Sharar, but although the majority of scholars agree on



an early dating for the underlying anaphora, a formidable number have regarded the sanctus here as a later insertion.⁵ Justin Martyr makes no mention of it in his description of the eucharist; and although it does occur in Revelation and in 1 Clement 34, there is no cogent proof that the context is eucharistic worship.⁶ The liturgist is left with the questions of when, where and why was this biblical song included within the eucharistic prayer ?

The essay of A.H.Couratin referred to above was the first chapter in a planned book, The Shape of the eucharistic prayer. Illness prevented the completion of the work. However, the second essay, entitled " The Sanctus ", was written in draft form.⁷ At the beginning of this draft Couratin drew attention to three theories which had been offered as solutions to the sanctus puzzle, which may be elaborated slightly as follows:

1. It originated in Egypt, and was part of the eucharistic prayer there by the third century; from there it spread throughout christendom.
2. It originally formed the climax of all, or almost all, eucharistic prayers, and it was later added to, or displaced, or even removed, in accordance with later liturgical fashion.
3. By far the most usual explanation has been that it was interpolated into the eucharistic prayer, either at Antioch or Jerusalem, probably in the fourth century, and its source was the geduššot of the Jewish Synagogue berakot. It later spread throughout christendom.

The alternative title to these prolegomena is 'Hunting the Liturgical Woozle', a reference to one of the adventures of A.A.Milne's character, Pooh Bear.⁸ On one occasion Pooh drew Piglet's attention to some tracks in the snow which led round a spinney, and he decided

that they must have been made by a creature called a woozle. Bravely Pooh and Piglet set out and followed the trail, only to discover that some more tracks had suddenly appeared. Pooh interpreted this as evidence that the woozle had been joined by another woozle. Later, as the pair continued, two more tracks appeared; now it seemed to Pooh that they were on the trail of woozles, and even a wizzle. Just as the tracks were becoming even more mysterious and confusing, a voice called to the two hunters - it was Christopher Robin who was in a big oak tree above them. He wanted to know why Pooh and Piglet had been walking round and round the spinney, pausing every so often to examine their own tracks. Pooh paused, and after examining his paws, and the tracks of the woozle (and noticing how Piglet's trotters fitted the tracks of the wizzle), exclaimed, ' I have been Foolish and Deluded and I am a Bear of No Brain at All'.

Pooh Bear's solution to the initial puzzle of the tracks - the woozle - was mistaken. Had he paused and reflected, and had he not held a preconceived idea of woozles, he might have realised that there was a less fanciful explanation of the evidence. He further compounded his mistake by failing to realise that he was walking in a circle, adding more of his own tracks to the original set, with Piglet adding his, with the result that the mystery deepened in their minds.

In some respects the quest for solutions to the problems surrounding the sanctus in the eucharistic prayer has not been unlike the hunt for the woozle; it has at times been conducted in the 'Foolish and Deluded' manner of Pooh. This is not to deny that there are problems surrounding the sanctus, both in its origin and function. However, the problems have been made more complex by liturgists moving in circles, either creating false trails, or confusing the original marks with their own theories and preconceptions. Part of

the reason seems to have been that few liturgists have placed the sanctus and its anaphoral context as the proper object of their study. Instead, peripheral evidence has been stretched beyond a reasonable interpretation, or certain a priori views about the origin of the eucharistic prayer have been made the pivotal point of the investigation. The first two theories identified by Couratin are in my view prime examples of the woozle hunt.

1. The Egyptian Theory

Referring to this hypothesis, Geoffrey Cuming rightly observed that whoever first proposed this theory, in England it certainly owes its authority to the writings of Gregory Dix.⁹ It has also been espoused by Georg Kretschmar.¹⁰

In The Shape of the Liturgy, in discussing the anaphora in Serapion's euchology, Dix explained that with regard to the preface, the use of the sanctus at Alexandria can be traced in the writings of Origen c.230 CE. Pointing to verbal similarities between the preface of Serapion and that of Greek St.Mark, Dix concluded:

The simplest explanation of these various facts is that the use of the preface and sanctus in the eucharistic prayer began in the Alexandrian church at some time before A.D. 230, and from there spread first to other Egyptian churches, and ultimately all over christendom. 11

In support of such a conclusion, Dix cited two references to an article he had written in Theology in 1938.¹² On examination of this article, the case rests entirely upon two references in Origen's De Principiis, both of which are concerned with an interpretation of the two seraphim of Isaiah which Origen had learnt from his Hebrew teacher. ~~The same interpretation is also given in his Homily~~ on Isaiah.¹³ In the first passage, De Principiis, i,3,4, Origen links the two seraphim with the two living creatures of Habakkuk (LXX) 3:2.

Dix suggested that the exegesis which Origen had learnt from his Hebrew teacher, namely, that the two seraphim are the Son and the Holy Spirit, is echoed in Serapion's sanctus where the celestial creatures are described as τιμιώτατα , and he noted that in the anaphora of St. Mark they are described as τιμιώτατα ζῶα , reverend living creatures, echoing Habakkuk. He inferred from this that Origen was alluding to the Egyptian anaphoral sanctus.

Kretschmar approached the evidence from a study of trinitarian origins, finding an Egyptian view which can be traced to Origen and Methodius where Christ and the Holy Spirit were conceived of as two supreme heavenly powers standing before God's throne (= seraphim), and a Syrian view where God, Christ and the Holy Spirit were ranged side by side as heavenly witnesses. In the middle of the third century the sanctus was taken up in the Alexandrine eucharistic prayer as a reference to Christ and the Holy Spirit as intermediaries who open up the free access to God for the congregation .¹⁴ The immediate context was to counter Sabellianism. However, with the rise of Arianism, Origen's exegesis was abandoned. Syria received the anaphoral sanctus from Egypt in the fourth century, and here it was addressed to Christ, and later to God the creator. Towards the end of the fourth century the Antiochene school of Diodore adopted the trinitarian interpretation of Alexandria. Kretschmar, in seeking the roots of trinitarian doctrine traces the view of Origen back to the Ascension of Isaiah, and to Philo. While this similarity in Origen, the Ascension of Isaiah and Philo is correct, his estimation of the liturgical evidence relies upon Dix's essay and book, both of which are initially referred to in the footnotes.

Although these observations are interesting and suggestive, there is little justification for drawing the conclusion which Dix

and Kretschmar wished to draw, namely that Origen is our earliest witness to the anaphoral sanctus, and in the prayer, the seraphim were understood to be Christ and the Holy Spirit. The first passage in De Principiis, i.3,4, does not actually quote the sanctus, and in the second, iv. 3,14, the sanctus which is quoted is that of the biblical text of Isaiah 6:3, and not its adapted anaphoral form. Origen links Isaiah 6:3 with Col.1:16, which are also found together in Serapion and the Coptic fragment in the Coptic Ostrica. However, in the other fragments of the Alexandrine anaphora, and in St.Mark itself, it is Eph.1:21 which is linked with the sanctus, and not Col.1:16. Since in Serapion Col.1:16 comes as a clumsy repetition of Eph.1:21, it may have been inserted into the anaphora by Serapion himself, or whoever was responsible for that prayer.¹⁵ Contrary to Dix's conclusion, it would seem that the evidence he presented should be assessed as follows. Origen was concerned with the exegesis of biblical texts, and his exegesis led him to link Isaiah 6:3, Habakkuk 3:2 and Col.1:16. He was not expounding a liturgical text. The sanctus in Serapion and in St.Mark both show some slight acquaintance with an exegesis which linked these passages, but is by no means the same. Ζῶα for example does not occur in Serapion, and pace Dix, in St.Mark they are not identified with the seraphim.¹⁶ If Origen was acquainted with an anaphoral tradition which included the sanctus, the passages from De Principiis do not demonstrate this.

In 1938 Dix had cautiously written:

... it begins to look as though Serapion represents, for all its anti-Arian editing, a traditional Egyptian arrangement of the introduction to the Sanctus, which was also in the mind of Origen when he wrote this passage about the Sanctus before A.D. 225. 17

What this statement actually means is that it had begun to look like this to Dix, and he admitted that the evidence was 'delicate'.¹⁸

Yet, by the time he came to write The Shape of the Liturgy, his 1938 'tracks' now came to be assured facts of scholarship. Dix followed his own false tracks, and was later joined by Kretschmar in a journey round the liturgical spinney.¹⁹

2. The Climax Theory

Strangely enough the first prints of this theory can also be traced to Gregory Dix. In The Shape of the Liturgy he suggested that the Egyptian anaphora might have originally consisted of a preface (thanksgiving) terminating with the sanctus.²⁰ However, the development of this idea to a theory that nearly all early orthodox eucharistic prayers may have terminated with the sanctus is associated with the name of Edward Ratcliff.

Ratcliff's theory was set out in a paper entitled 'The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora'²¹ which was concerned with the Verona text of Apostolic Tradition. Comparing the Verona text with the evidence of Justin Martyr and Irenaeus on the eucharistic prayer Ratcliff believed that several things pointed to a later rearrangement of the anaphora. By omitting the epiklesis, Ratcliff joined two paragraphs, both of which were concerned with the idea of divine worship. But,

there is a want of climax, touching bathos, in the use of the common doxology as the ending of the solemn eucharistic prayer which, alone of all prayers, is introduced by 'Sursum corda', 'habemus ad Dominum'.²²

On the basis of the Old Latin and Vulgate usage, Ratcliff propounded that the Verona's adstare coram te et tibi ministrare was a translation, not of ἐστάναι ἐνώπιον σου καὶ ἱερατεύειν σοι, but of παρεστάναι ἐνώπιον σου καὶ λειτουργεῖν σοι. In Theodotion's version of Daniel 7:10 these verbs are found juxtaposed

in connection with worship from the heavenly host. Ratcliff submitted that the transposed clauses of Daniel 7:10 were combined with Isaiah 6:3, and the sanctus constituted the conclusion, not merely of the paragraph itself, but of the whole anaphora. Privately he expressed an opinion of what the missing ending might have been.²³ This erudite study of the anaphora of Apostolic Tradition ended:

Here this article reaches its limit. If its contention be sound, it raises a number of questions, most of them depending upon the primary question, Why, if the pattern of the ancient anaphora ever conformed with the reconstruction proposed here, was the pattern abandoned? The surviving literature, and not least the historic liturgies, either supply the answers or offer evidence which suggests them. A consideration of the questions and answers, however, must be reserved for a future article. 24

The argument was taken a little further in 'A Note on the Anaphoras described in the Liturgical Homilies of Narsai'.²⁵ Here Ratcliff argued that the anaphora outlined by Narsai in Homily XXXII witnessed to an earlier pattern of the anaphora which concluded with the sanctus, and at the same time implying that the sanctus may have had a consecratory function. Although he never wrote the promised article considering the questions and answers, it was his private opinion that all the early anaphoras had ended with the sanctus.²⁶

Support for this theory was forthcoming from A.H.Couratin, G.A.Michell, and W.Pitt.²⁷ Couratin asked whether there was any evidence which would indicate that the terminating sanctus was sung by the celebrant alone, and the people simply responded with 'Amen'? He appealed to tone XVIII for ferial use in the Graduale Romanum; this is the only sanctus chant which continues the melody of the preface. Couratin noted that the first hosanna of benedictus repeats the notes of Sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth and the benedictus repeats the notes of Pleni sunt cæli. He suggested that the notes of the

second hosanna recalled the ekphonesis and the response which concluded the canon missae. Couratin reasoned that, given Ratcliff's argument, the canon missae may originally have ended:

sine fine dicentes Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus Dominus Deus
Sabaoth. Pleni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua per omnia
saecula saeculorum.

R. Amen. 28

He alleged some support from Tertullian which he interpreted as mentioning the sanctus with the doxology; from Apostolic Constitutions VIII, and from Egypt. For the latter he suggested that the concluding doxology echoes Rev. 4:8, to which it was originally attached in the anaphora.

G.A.Michell, inspired by Ratcliff's hypothesis, turned his attention to the report given by Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia to Cyprian regarding a certain prophetess who apparently celebrated the eucharist, and in particular, to the meaning of invocatione and sacramento solitae praedicationis. On the basis of trinitarian references in Theodore of Mopsuestia and Ephraem, and the invocation of names in Gnostic prayers, he urged that invocatione should be understood as invoking the divine names, and that sacramento solitae praedicationis referred to the sanctus. Appealing also to Origen and Ambrose, he wrote:

This cumulative evidence leads to the conclusion that, in Firmilian's view, the second constituent of an orthodox anaphora ought to be the Sanctus, regarded as a proclamation of the holiness and omnipotence of God. 29

Michell also suggested that in the Byzantine anaphora of Basil, the section as far as the sanctus with its invocation of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit, represents the ancient eucharistic prayer of Caesarea. It was upon this conclusion that W.E.Pitt argued that the present Byzantine anaphora of Basil had been extended from its

original form by adding material (from St. James) after the sanctus; preface and sanctus represent the earliest stratum.

An examination of these successive studies serves to show that we have in this theory a most elaborate version of a wozzle hunt.

(a) Ratcliff's study of the anaphora of the Apostolic Tradition raised some important and legitimate questions about the prayer, not least, the question of the reliability of the Verona text. Ratcliff's style of argument was impressive and ingenious, and psychologically the reader is left bedazzled and exhausted. But underneath this, the argument relating to the sanctus rested upon far too many conjectures. We do not know what the underlying Greek was, but the reading ἔσταναι ἐνώπιον σου καὶ λειτουργεῖν σοι of Apostolic Constitutions VIII seems preferable to that suggested by Ratcliff. The Old Latin rendering of the LXX and the New Testament is not necessarily a reliable guide for reconstructing the Greek of a liturgical text.³⁰ But even if Ratcliff's conjectures about the Greek are correct, and even if it echoes the vocabulary found in Theodotion's rendering of Daniel 7:10, there is, logically, no compelling reason for concluding that it led into the sanctus. The fact remains that there is no sanctus in Hippolytus, and it is unlikely that a fourth century reviser would have entirely omitted an existing sanctus at a time when it seems to have been becoming a universal feature in anaphoral composition.

I have already elsewhere questioned the legitimacy of Ratcliff's interpretation of Narsai's Homily XXXII.³¹ Ratcliff misused the homiletic material, and his interpretation was based on four unwarranted assumptions. It is quite possible to interpret the anaphora outlined in the homily in a manner which is consistent with the other two anaphoras described by Narsai, and which avoids the

conclusion of drastic liturgical revolutions at Edessa and Nisibis during the latter part of the fifth century.³²

As far as the supporting articles are concerned, they presuppose the existence of this woozle, and without it they have little rationale. However, even the arguments advanced in these studies serve to confuse the tracks of the sanctus even further.

(b) Couratin's arguments regarding the melody could be reversed; there would be more likelihood of a congregation joining in a sanctus which continued the familiar melody of the preface than in a sanctus with a different melody. Furthermore, the ekphonesis and Amen of the conclusion of the canon missae is only similar to the melody of the second hosanna, and is certainly not identical. The passage in Tertullian is not generally thought to refer to the sanctus, and the interpretation of Apostolic Constitutions VIII and the Egyptian doxology are simply speculations.

(c) Michell's interpretation of invocatione and sacramento solitae praedictionis is extremely forced. E.Dekkers is probably correct in seeing invocatio and praedicatio as being synonyms for the eucharistic prayer as a whole.³³

(d) Both Michell and Pitt put far too much weight upon the text of Byzantine Basil. The cumulative work of Engberding, Capelle, Bobrinskoy and Fenwick on the various versions of Basil indicate that the trinitarian preface of the Byzantine version represents a sophisticated reworking, and hardly preserves a primitive text.³⁴

There are, therefore, no genuine tracks of the sanctus at all in these studies; the only tracks are the self-made circular tracks of Ratcliff and his fellow woozle hunters, who in their hunt for the woozle created one or two wizzles for good measure.

The third theory mentioned by Couratin - the Jewish Synagogue geduššot - is still one of the most favoured sources. Proper consideration of this particular source must be postponed until later in this study. I shall attempt to argue that it may be one of several possible explanations, but does not itself provide a complete answer, and has often been invoked in conjunction with preconceived ideas on the origin of the anaphora.

This study is an attempt to follow the proven tracks of the sanctus, and theories of origin are only discussed after the texts and contexts have themselves been examined. The method adopted is as follows:

Part 1 is concerned with the context of the biblical trisagion, and an examination of its liturgical and quasi-liturgical usage within Judaism, and testing early Christian references for continuity or innovative understanding and use. The widest possible Jewish background is considered in order to provide the widest possible context for approaching subsequent Christian anaphoral usage.

Part 2 considers the earlier anaphoral usage, paying particular attention to the context and function. Since this is not primarily a literary but a historical and theological investigation, I have regarded it as necessary to introduce the various anaphoras with a discussion on their background. The material is surveyed as far as the seventh century, and then the possible origins of the anaphoral sanctus are examined in the light of anaphoral development, internal evidence, and the observations which emerge from Part 1.

Part 3 surveys the development of the anaphoral sanctus from the seventh century to the present, and concludes with a theological reflection on the form and function of the sanctus in future anaphoral composition.

NOTES - PROLEGOMENA

1. In this study trisagion is used in reference to the biblical text of Isaiah 6:3, together with 'thrice-holy'. It does not refer to the christian liturgical Trisagion, 'Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal' and its variants found in the Eastern eucharistic and other rites. The Jewish liturgical use of the trisagion is referred to as gedussah ; sanctus, unless the context shows otherwise, is used to refer to the anaphoral sanctus.
2. Bryan D.Spinks (ed.), The Sacrifice of Praise, Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae Subsidia 19 (Rome 1981) , 19-61, 61.
3. M.A.Smith, 'The Anaphora of Apostolic Tradition re-considered', SP 10 (1970), 426-30.
4. L.Bouyer, Eucharist tr.C.U.Quinn (Indiana 1968), 115-19; W.Rordorf, 'Les Prières Eucharistiques de la Didachè', in Eucharisties d' Orient et d'Occident I (Paris 1970), 65-82; Thomas J.Talley, 'The Eucharistic Prayer of the Ancient Church According to Recent Research: Results and Reflections', SL 11(1976), 138-58. L.Finkelstein had drawn attention to this some years before: 'The Birkat Ha-mazon', JQR ns 19(1928), 211-62.
5. E.C.Ratcliff, 'The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: A Suggestion', JTS 30(1928-29), 23-32; G.Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (London 1945), 181; B.Botte, 'L'Anaphore Chaldéenne des Apôtres', OCP 15(1949), 259-76; 'Problèmes de l'Anaphore syrienne des Apôtres Addai and Mari ', Or.Syr. 10 (1965), 86-106; L.Bouyer, Eucharist, 146-58; L.Ligier, 'From the Last Supper to the Eucharist', in L.Sheppard (ed.), The New Liturgy, (London 1970), 113-50, 132.
6. See particularly, W.C.van Unnik, ' 1 Clement 34 and the Sanctus', VC 5 (1951), 204-48.
7. The type-script essay is in the possession of Rev.Dr.D.H.Tripp to whom I am grateful for access.
8. A.A.Milne, Winnie-The-Pooh (London 1926), 32ff.
9. G.J.Cuming, 'The Anaphora of St.Mark: A Study in development', M 95(1982), 115-29, 123.
10. G.Kretschmar, Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie (Tübingen 1956).
11. G.Dix, op.cit., 165.
12. G.Dix, 'Primitive Consecration Prayers', Theology 37(1938), 261-83.
13. PG xiii.221.

14. G.Kretschmar, op.cit., 180, 182.
15. B.Botte, 'L'Eucologe de Sérapion est-il authentique ? ', OC 48 (1964), 50-57.
16. See chapter 4.
17. art.cit., 274.
18. ibid., 277.
19. This criticism of Kretschmar is in respect of his assessment of Origen and the early Egyptian tradition, and not of his account of the development of trinitarian doctrine.
20. The Shape of the Liturgy, 165, 221, 225-27.
21. JEH 1 (1950), 29-36; 125-34. Reprinted in Liturgical Studies (London 1976), 18-40.
22. JEH 1, 126.
23. Bryan D.Spinks, 'The Cleansed Leper's Thankoffering Before the Lord: Edward Craddock Ratcliff and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora', in The Sacrifice of Praise, 161-178, 166.
24. art.cit., 134.
25. In J.N.Birdsall and R.W.Thompson (eds.) Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey (Freiburg and New York 1963), 235-49; Liturgical Studies, 66-79.
26. The Sacrifice of Praise, 167
27. A.H.Couratin, 'The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora: A note on the Roman Sanctus', JEH 2(1951), 19-23; G.A.Michell, 'Firmilian and Eucharistic Consecration', JTS ns 5(1954), 215-220; W.E.Pitt, 'The Origin of the Anaphora of St.Basil', JEH 12(1961), 1-13.
28. Couratin, art.cit., 21.
29. Michell, art.cit., 217-8.
30. R.J.Ledogar, Acknowledgment: Praise Verbs in the Early Greek Anaphora (Rome 1968). Generally it seems that the compilers of liturgies used a large amount of freedom in rendering words from one language to another.
31. Bryan D.Spinks, ' A Note on the Anaphora outlined in Narsai's Homily XXXII', JTS ns 31(1980), 82-93.
32. ibid., 93.
33. E.Dekkers, 'Van profetie tot canon', TL 25(1946), 8-25.

34. H.Engberding, Das eucharistische Hochgebet der Basileiosliturgie (Münster 1931); B.Capelle, 'Les liturgies"basiliennes" et S.Basile', in J.Doresse and E.Lanne, Un témoin archaïque de la liturgie copte de S.Basile (Louvain 1960); B.Bobrinskoy, 'Liturgie et ecclésiologie trinitaire de Saint Basile', Verbum Caro 23(1969), 1-32; J.R.K.Fenwick, 'An Investigation into the Common Origin of the Anaphoras of the Liturgies of St.Basil and St.James', Ph.D. Thesis, London University, 1985. (To be published in OCA).

PART ONE

CHAPTER 1

THE OLD TESTAMENT FOUNDATIONS: THE VISIONS OF ISAIAH AND EZEKIEL

1. THE VISION OF ISAIAH

A. The Divine Council of Yahweh

The ultimate source of the sanctus, in so far as it is the earliest document in which it is recorded, is the book of the prophet Isaiah, whose prophecies are generally dated c.742-700 BCE. Here it is usually referred to as the trisagion. It occurs on the lips of creatures called seraphim, in a vision in which the prophet sees Yahweh on his throne. However, this vision must be seen in the wider context of the Old Testament conception of a Divine Council attending Yahweh.

In an important article entitled 'The Council of Yahweh', H. Wheeler Robinson drew attention to the fact that when Jeremiah asked

Who hath stood in the council of Yahweh
that he should perceive and know his word ? (Jer.22:18),

the word for council, sôd, is not a figurative or poetic expression, but reflects a real belief in a divine assembly presided over by Yahweh.¹ There is a large amount of evidence in the Old Testament for the heavenly assembly or council, presided over by Yahweh, and composed of divine attendants, heralds and administrators.² While the Old Testament itself contains no uniform or systematic account of these celestial beings, the different books yield what must have been a commonly believed, albeit diverse, angelology.

In Psalm 82:1 we read:

God stationed himself in the divine assembly ('^adat^lEI)
In the midst of the gods ('^elohîm) he has judged.

This psalm pictures a courtroom scene in which God, as head of the council, has indicted some beings called '^elohîm for violating

the law. Although some commentators have suggested that 'ēlohîm here means deified kings, or patron angels of the nations, it almost certainly reflects the idea of Yahweh calling the gods of the nations to a heavenly assize.³ According to the study of E.T.Mullen, the council motif is common to both Mesopotamian and Canaanite culture, though the influence on Hebrew literature seems to have come from the latter where El assembles with a divine pantheon.⁴ Likewise therefore, Psalm 89:6-9a:

Let the heavens praise thy wonders, Yahweh,
thy faithfulness in the assembly of the holy ones (q^ehal
q^edôšîm). For who in the skies can be compared with Yahweh?
Who among the sons of gods (b^ene 'ēlohîm) is like Yahweh?
A God ('El) feared in the council of the holy ones (sôd
q^edôšîm) great and terrible above all that are round about him?
Yahweh, God of Hosts, who is mighty as you, Yah?

The same idea is expressed in Psalm 29.

Various words are used for the divine assembly: mô^ced, (compare the Ugaritic m^d) (Isaiah 14:13)⁵; ʿadat 'El (Ps.82:1); q^ehal and sôd q^edôšîm (Ps.89); sôd Yahweh or 'elo^ah (Jer.23:18; Job 15:8)⁶ and, probably,⁷ dôr (Amos 8:14; Ps.73:15).

In the Canaanite literature the assembly is made up of El and the lesser gods. In Israel, although the celestial beings can be termed gods (Ps.82:1;8:5), other terms are also used: b^ene 'ēlîm (sons of gods); bn 'ilm is the regular term for members of the pantheon in the Ugaritic texts, and recurs in a Canaanite magical plaque from Arslan Tash, dating from the eighth or seventh century BCE⁸); q^edôšîm (holy ones); sābā (host); ʿabādîm (servants) and m^esar^etîm (ministers).⁹ To this perhaps may be added gibbôrîm (mighty ones, Isaiah 13:3; Joel 3:11). The term mal'ākîm, from the root l^k, to send, also occurs. In some instances it is well known that the mal'āk Yahweh is a personification of a theophany, a

special self-manifestation of God (e.g. Gen.31:11-13;Ex.3:2-6).

However, in certain places in the Old Testament mal'āk describes celestial beings who belong to the divine council (e.g. Ps.91:11; 2 Sam.14:17,20). These different names, some of which describe the function of these divine beings, are probably to be regarded as synonyms rather than as different types of celestial being.

Together with the stars and celestial bodies (Deut.4:19; Job 38:7), they were believed to make up a numberless celestial entourage.

In the account of the vision of the prophet Micaiah ben Imlah (1 Kings 22:19), the heavenly host stood either side of Yahweh, and asked their advice:

Who will entice Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead ?
And one said one thing, and another said another.

At last a ruāh (spirit) came forward offering advice and volunteering for the task, advice which Yahweh accepted. Clearly a major function of the divine council - who in this context are called spirits - was to advise Yahweh. Thus, in Job 1, the b^ene 'ēlīm assemble, and Satan too is in attendance, and puts a proposition to Yahweh - which Yahweh accepts. Gen.1:26, 'Let us make man in our own image, after our likeness', presumably represents God addressing the assembly, and according to Job 38:7, the assembly shouted for joy at the creation. True prophets were those who were privileged to stand in ¹⁰ the council of Yahweh and hear the divine decision (Jer.23:21-22 ; Is.6:1-9; 1 Kings 22:19) - something which Job had not done (Job 15:8). Before Isaiah was admitted a ritual cleansing was necessary; after being cleansed Joshua the High Priest was given the right of access ' among those who are standing here' (Zech.3:7).

These celestial beings had other functions also. In the vision

of Micaiah ben Imlah, the 'spirit' actually went forth to do the will of Yahweh, and 'servants' and 'ministers' describe something of the relationship and position of these beings vis à vis Yahweh. In Joshua 5:14 the captain of the host of Yahweh, with sword in hand, speaks with Joshua. T.H.Gaster summarises their function in the patriarchal and monarchic narratives as to convey the mandates of God to men, to harbinger special events, to protect the faithful, and to serve as instruments of divine displeasure against sinners.¹¹ However, one further important function which the Old Testament attests is that of worship of Yahweh. This in Psalm 29:1-2,9, the b^ene ʾēlīm give glory and worship to Yahweh, and this includes the cry 'kābôd'. Psalm 103:19-22 commands the mal'akim to bless Yahweh, and Psalm 148:1-2 commands the sābā to praise him. This function is also affirmed in the prayer of Ezra (Neh.(:6):

You are Yahweh, you alone.
 You have made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth and all that is on it, the seas and all that is in them; and you preserve all of them; and the host of heaven (s^e bā haššamayim) worships you.

It is against this wider Old Testament background that the vision of Isaiah must be seen.

B. The Context of Isaiah 6:3

Chapter 6 of Isaiah marks the beginning of the so-called memoir of the prophet Isaiah which extends as far as 8:18.¹² This section of the book is introduced with an account of the prophet's call, 6:1-13, which falls into three parts: 1. A Theophany. 2. An act of cleansing. 3. The Commissioning. The actual theophany, including the vision of the seraphim and their antiphonal cry of praise, is

recorded in 6:1-3.

In the year that King Uzziah died I saw Yahweh sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up; and his skirts (šûlîm)¹³ filled the temple. Above him stood the seraphim; each had six wings: with two he covered his face, and with two he covered his feet, and with two he flew. And one called to another and said:

Holy, Holy, Holy is Yahweh of Hosts;
The whole earth is full of his glory.

The Peshitta version faithfully translates the Hebrew,¹⁴ but the LXX connects ' high and lifted up ' with 'throne', translates šûlîm with δόξης , and 'above him' (mimma^{al}) with ἐν ἡλῶ αὐτοῦ .

The theophany is recorded as having taken place in the year in which King Uzziah (Azariah) died, 742¹⁵ or 736/5 BCE.¹⁶ The details given in 1:1 are not absolutely reliable, and thus it cannot be certain whether or not the vision took place before the death of Uzziah. The vision took place almost certainly in the Jerusalem temple,¹⁷ and it is possible that its context was some specific liturgical celebration.

Edwin Kingsbury has drawn attention to the similarities between the vision of Isaiah and that of Micaiah ben Imlah in 1 Kings 22:19-23.¹⁸ Kingsbury lists five particular elements in the latter:

- (1) Yahweh was King, seated upon a throne.
- (2) Some heavenly creatures (all the host of heaven) surrounded Yahweh.
- (3) Micaiah 'saw' Yahweh.
- (4) The oracle was merely the relaying of what Micaiah had seen and heard.
- (5) According to Kingsbury, there is reason to believe that the scene at the 'threshing floor' (v.10) connects this experience with some agricultural feast, at 'the turn of the year'.

Turning to the vision of Isaiah, Kingsbury appealed to the studies of Morgenstern and Mowinkel¹⁹ to argue that the orientation of the temple in Jerusalem was such that the morning sun at the autumnal equinox shone between the two cosmic pillars, Jachin and Boaz, through the doors of the temple into the holy of holies. This made possible the representation of the epiphany of Yahweh in the smoke and incense as the 'skirts ' or train of Yahweh. Kingsbury therefore places the occasion of Isaiah's vision, and that of Micaiah's, on the day of the enthronement of Yahweh, the New Year Festival. He finds similar elements to Micaiah's vision in that of Isaiah:

- (1) Yahweh is King, sitting on a throne.
- (2) Some heavenly creatures surrounded Yahweh.
- (3) Isaiah saw Yahweh.
- (4) Isaiah heard Yahweh's word.
- (5) The vision was during the enthronement festival.

Other commentators have also connected the theophany of Isaiah with the New Year Festival, when Yahweh ascended his throne in order to judge his people.²⁰

The New Year Festival and enthronement ceremonies of the Near East have provided a fascinating framework for interpreting the psalms and other Old Testament cultic material.²¹ However, the Old Testament itself remains silent on the details and framework of such a festival. As D.J.A.Clines points out, there was no fixed Near Eastern pattern from which the gaps in our knowledge about the Israelite religion can be filled out, and rituals cannot, in any case, simply be reconstructed from the myths with which they were associated.²² Furthermore, although Israel shared

a common cultural background with Canaanite religion, it would seem that Israel reinterpreted and demythologised many of her neighbours' beliefs and practices. The danger of Kingsbury's analysis is that of explaining what we know something about (Isaiah's vision) by something we know nothing about (The New Year Festival). We cannot be certain of such a specific liturgical context for the vision.

As far as the vision of Yahweh is concerned, no attempt is made to specify the form of the enthroned deity. His transcendence is emphasised (on a throne, high and lifted up, and the skirts or hem of his garment are so enormous that the temple, or holy of holies, is filled), and Kaiser rightly observes that the picture Isaiah paints is an indirect one of a powerful figure who transcends all earthly dimensions.²³

C. Seraphim

In the vision the trisagion is chanted by the seraphim who stood above Yahweh (LXX: $\kappa\upsilon\kappa\lambda\omega\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, around him), each of which is described as having six wings. The Hebrew expression ' one ... to another ' may imply that there were two seraphim only, but verse 6 might be taken to imply that there were several such creatures visible.²⁴ With two pairs of their wings the creatures reverently concealed their faces and 'feet', which is a euphemism for the genitals. Kaiser comments:

Even the heavenly beings, who day and night surround their God and serve him, are similar to men in that they cannot and may not look upon the face of God. The sight of him would be fatal for them as well. Their covering of their private parts expresses the immensely ancient experience of a connection between sex and the feeling of guilt. 25

With a third pair of wings the creatures flew. They also, apparently, had hands (v.6).

The reference in Isaiah is the only reference in the Old Testament to seraphim as heavenly beings, but we may presume that the prophet's contemporaries knew something about the form of the creatures of this name. That this is no longer the case today is confirmed by the fact that, although many suggestions have been made regarding their identity and origin, none has won universal acceptance. Gesenius, for example, connected the word šārāp with the Arabic šarufa, 'to be noble', and interpreted it as meaning a heavenly prince, or noble.²⁶ The majority of commentators, however, identify it with the root šrp, 'to burn'²⁷, and it is possible that as glowing beings of light, they are connected with the flashing lightning associated with some Old Testament theophanies. Jacob, with the support of Isaiah 14:29 and 30:6, where it is a matter of a flying šārāp (serpent), considers a solar or at least an astral origin for these beings.²⁸ Kaiser, adding Numbers 21:6 and Deut.8:15 to the above passages, suggests that the seraphim must be thought of as naked winged serpents with human faces and hands, as well as six wings.²⁹ Karen Joines has cogently argued that they should be regarded as the Israelites' version of the Egyptian symbol of the winged uraeus, which also were given human attributes - hands, feet and faces.³⁰ The association of the throne of the pharaoh with winged serpents is demonstrated archaeologically by the recovered throne of the 14th century BCE pharaoh Tut-Ankh-Amun.³¹ Each arm of the throne, which is overlaid with sheet gold and richly adorned with polychrome faience, glass, and stone inlay, is formed by two wings of a four-winged

uraeus rising vertically from the two back corners of the seat.

Joines also cites evidence to show that the winged uraeus was known in Palestine.³² Accepting this identification, J.de Savignac has argued that knowledge of the Egyptian uraeus influenced the translators of the LXX and hence mimma^lal was rendered κῦκλω αὐτοῦ.³³ Kaiser presumes that they took their name śārāp from their painful, burning bite.³⁴

Whatever the precise origin of the seraphim, the difficulty lies in explaining why they should have featured in Isaiah's vision. If the vision was inspired by the temple liturgy, or the interior of the temple, we might have expected cherubim, which decorated the temple and which were associated with the Ark in the holy of holies, representing the creatures who surrounded Yahweh.³⁵ R.E.Clements points out:

The furnishings of the temple were full of cosmic symbolism, as was in effect true also for the temple as a whole. The very conception of such a building was founded on the belief that a correspondence existed between the earthly and the heavenly worlds. Yahweh's house in Jerusalem was intended to be a copy, or symbol, of the cosmic 'house' where he had his abode. 36

Elsewhere, however, Clements suggests that the uraeus serpent form (seraphim) would have been familiar in Israel in the relief-work adorning thrones.³⁷ Possibly, however, the glowing coals of the altar of incense (with which a seraph seems to be associated in v.6), or the bronze serpent (2 Kings 18:4) played some part in the formation of the vision. The fact that a function of a seraph in the vision was to use a coal from the altar as a cleansing fire and symbol of atonement might suggest the former.³⁸ J.de Savignac suggests identification with the latter, called Nehushatan, which was destroyed by Hezekiah.³⁹ The latter

identification would perhaps explain why no further references to seraphim occur in the Old Testament books. It would seem, however, that seraphim could be understood as a distinct type of celestial being. Possibly reflecting the personnel of Royal Courts, the seraphim were envisaged as particular attendants or royal guards who were thought to flank the throne of God.

D. Thrice-holy ?

The first notable action of the seraphim which Isaiah records was the recitation of the trisagion. If the context was a liturgical celebration, then the trisagion may well have been part of a hymn which was regularly chanted in the temple liturgy, and it may have been chanted antiphonally as by the seraphim.⁴⁰ Engnell, who describes it as 'a burden verse, a cultic formula quoted directly from the ritual of the temple in Jerusalem',⁴¹ cites as an analogy the Egyptian formula applied to pharaoh:

Pure, Pure is the King of the South and the North;
Th y Purity is the purity of Horus, Seth, Thot, and Sopdu. 42

This analogy is not a particularly strong one, but even if the vision of Isaiah was not itself inspired directly by a liturgical event in the Jerusalem temple, the trisagion could certainly be a cultic liturgical formula. Kaiser observes that the refrain in Psalm 99: 3, 5 and 9 seems to be almost in concentrated form in the trisagion.⁴³

The twofold occurrence of 'pure' in Engnell's analagous formula raises the question of whether or not the trisagion of Isaiah is genuine, or whether it represents a later expansion. Engnell himself noted that the editor of Biblia Hebraica suggested that originally there was only one 'holy' - a remark which Engnell regarded as not

very creditable, and he argued for the genuineness of the three-fold 'holy'.⁴⁴ More recently, N.Walker, noting that in MT a dividing line, the paseq, is found after the first qādōš, drawing attention to some peculiarity in the text, and that in 1QIs^a (ASOR 1950 Plate 5 Line 24) there is a two-fold qādōš, which the corrector of the text has passed over, suggests that there were originally two readings of this verse, one with one qādōš, and another with two, meaning 'exceeding holy'.⁴⁵ A later scribe, represented by MT, has attempted to preserve both readings, and placed them together with a paseq.

Summing up, one may say that there is a strong presumption that the 'Thrice-Holy' of Isa.vi.3 was in origin, a conflate reading, signifying, ' HOLY, EXCEEDING HOLY '. 46

The originality of the thrice-holy has been reasserted by B.M.Leiser, who in reply to Walker, pointed out that a paseq does not necessarily signify a peculiarity (indeed, Gesenius-Kautzsch mentions that one use of paseq is as a divider between identical words ⁴⁷), and that in view of the corrector's inconsistency, the absence of a correction in 1QIs^a is not evidence for a reading more ancient than that of MT.⁴⁸ A triple repetition is not unknown - Jer.7:4, Ezek.21:32 - and in Isaiah 6:3 it is appropriate:

The ancient rabbinical interpretation fits the verse quite well: The first seraph called, 'Holy ! ' 'Holy !' was the reply. And then in a gigantic chorus, 'Holy is the Lord of Hosts'. Or perhaps the paseq is utilized to introduce a praise and a subsequent diminuendo in the reading, giving the impression that the enormous chamber resounded with the cry, 'Holy ! (Holy, Holy) is the Lord of Hosts'. 49

Kaiser is surely correct to reject the suggestion that the three-fold repetition is derived from magic and even associated with an apotropaic seraph cult.⁵⁰ The three-fold repetition serves to emphasise the otherness and transcendence of God.

E. Yahweh Sabaoth

The formula Yhwh S^ebā'ōt occurs 267 times in the Old Testament,⁵¹ and although it has been suggested that the form yhwh^ᵚe^ᵚlōhē^ᵚ s^ebā'ōt was the original, and that s^ebā'ōt stands in genitival or construct relation to e^ᵚlōhē^ᵚ, it seems more likely that the longer form is a later expansion,⁵² though this does not rule out the possibility that an ellipse was intended from the beginning.⁵³ The question arises, however, as to what yhwh s^ebā'ōt actually means? While some scholars have argued that proper names of persons are not used in the construct state in Hebrew, and that s^ebā'ōt should be understood in apposition to yhwh, J.A.Emerton has argued from inscriptions at Kuntillet 'Ajrud that it is quite possible to understand yhwh s^ebā'ōt as 'Yahweh of Hosts'.⁵⁴ The problem remains of precisely what 'hosts' means.

Sābā seems to be basically a military term, and possibly a tribal detachment. Certainly in 1 Sam.17:45, 'armies' refers to the host of Israelite armies of which Yahweh is Lord.⁵⁵ However, it has also been argued that 'hosts' refers to the stars and astral beings, and/or angels and ministering spirits.⁵⁶ According to Patrick Miller's study of the term, it includes both these connotations, and that its origin is to be understood against the background of the gods and the heavenly council of the ancient Canaanite pantheon. In the El-Baal-Anat cycle, there was an assembly of gods, a celestial council. El was the theoretical head; there was Baal, Anat, Atirat, Attart, Yamm and Mot, and of less significance, Sāpās and Kotar-wa-hassis.⁵⁷ It included also the sons of El. Yamm's messengers appear as warriors, flaming and with swords, and Miller sees here some

connection with the cherubim of Genesis 3:24, and also with the seraphim. In other words, s^ebā'ōt is another name for the divine council of Yahweh, and the divine council with its heavenly troops join with the armies of Israel. According to Miller, however, originally s^ebā'ōt referred to the nonhuman participants.⁵⁸

Against Miller's explanation is the fact that when s^ebā'ōt, absent from the Pentateuch, Joshua and Judges, does appear (in the Books of Samuel and Kings) it is in connection with the Ark and the armies of Israel, and referred to Yahweh as the God who made himself known in war. Von Rad urges that it had different meanings for different groups,⁵⁹ and thus while its early usage may have been in terms of Israel's armies, it is understandable that s^ebā'ōt came to be applied to heavenly armies also.⁶⁰ According to the analysis of Tryggve Mettinger, there is a clear connection between the Sabaoth title and the temple theology and Zion tradition.⁶¹ The Sabaoth title was the pre-eminent term employed in the Jerusalem tradition for the God who dwelt in the temple, and was indeed the key-word in the classical Jerusalemite theology of the Presence.⁶² The title came to stand for the concept of God as king enthroned upon the cherubim throne in the temple. At the time of the Exile, it was no longer an appropriate term, and was replaced by the Šem (Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic historical work) and kabōd (Ezekiel and P) theologies.⁶³

The LXX renders the phrase sometimes by transliteration (Is.6:3;37:16), and also by κύριος (ὁ θεός ὁ) παντοκράτωρ (2 Sam.5:10; Amos 5:15,16) and κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων (2 Sam.6:2).⁶⁴

F. Kabod, 'Glory'

The second part of the seraphim's cry praises Yahweh for his kābôd, his honour and glory, which fills the whole earth. Kabôd carries the meaning of weightiness, honour and prestige, and suggests that which makes God impressive to man, the force of God's self-manifestation.⁶⁵ Creation itself reveals his glory (Ps.19) and his mighty theophanies amidst thunder and lightning confront man with his glory (Ps.97:1ff; Exodus 19:16). Indeed, the Priestly writer associates the cloud with glory, whereas in Ezekiel it takes a more concrete form - it leaves like a chariot. But there is another dimension to Yahweh's glory. In Isaiah, and Psalm 72:19;57:5,11, it can be something hoped for, and in Deutero-Isaiah the glory of God which will be revealed amounts to Yahweh's salvation for his people. According to Psalm 24, Yahweh of Hosts is the King of Glory. In the trisagion the various manifestations of his kābôd fill the whole earth. Thus there is a balance between the Holy transcendent God, who is immanent in the world in his glory.

G. Summary

The first occurrence of the sanctus, therefore, is as an acclamation of praise on the lips of the winged serpent-like creatures called seraphim, which succinctly proclaims the transcendent holiness of Yahweh of Hosts, who is immanent in the world through his glory.

The Holy God, the Lord over all powers and forces which form and control this world, possesses the power to make his will prevail in this world. 66

The chant may well have been a regular part of the temple liturgy, pre-dating the eighth century BCE context in the Book of Isaiah in which it is recorded.

2. THE VISIONS OF EZEKIEL

The visions of the divine Throne-Chariot of Ezekiel 1 and 10 are important for the present enquiry for a number of reasons. The trisagion itself does not of course occur here. Nevertheless, the Book of Ezekiel records two lengthy visions of the divine Throne-Chariot in which the kābōd of Yahweh is revealed to the prophet. Like the vision of Isaiah, some of the material of the visions seems to have been inspired by the interior of the Jerusalem temple. Furthermore, the visions mention more celestial beings, which together with other images from these visions reappear in the later development of the Jewish geduṣṣah and the Christian sanctus.

A. The Text

There are well known textual difficulties with the Book of Ezekiel, with regard both to the differences between MT and LXX, and also to the material which can be attributed to the prophet Ezekiel, and that which may be regarded as later editorial work.⁶⁷ With regard to the two visions in question, most commentators accept that the theophany in chapter 10 is out of context,⁶⁸ and is merely an elaboration based on the theophany of chapter 1. However, since these chapters have subsequently affected each other, commentators differ widely on what they regard as original and as editorial in chapter 1. For example, J.Herrmann argued that 1:6-26 is a subsequent expansion, deriving from Ezekiel himself, of the original text of the vision contained only in vv.4-5,27-28.⁶⁹ Hölischer excised vv.5-27, and 28a β, seeing the whole description of the

Throne-Chariot as a subsequent addition alien to Ezekiel's own account of his call in chapter 2.⁷⁰ According to Bertholet it was a later addition, but one that was made by Ezekiel; chapter 2:3 - 3:10 would represent the Palestinian call, and chapter 1 the Babylonian call.⁷¹ Most recently, Zimmerli suggests that vv.7-11a, and 15-21 are additions, whereas Eichrodt regards only vv.14-21 as borrowed from chapter 10; quite different again are the suggestions of John Wevers.⁷² There is also the problem of the inconsistent use of feminine and masculine suffixes, though Eichrodt warns that it is not safe to reconstruct the 'original' verses on the basis of feminine suffixes in chapter 1 describing hayyôṭ, and the masculine suffixes in chapter 10 describing cherubim. As the chapters have affected one another, and as the texts have Aramaisms, the distinction between suffixes ceases to be rigid.⁷³

B. First vision: Hayyôṭ and ʾŌphannîm

Chapter 1 purports to describe the vision in which the prophet received his call. The theophany begins with the traditional elements of a great cloud with flashing fire. From the flames appeared four hayyôṭ (LXX: ζῴα), having human form. Hayyāh used in the singular usually signifies ' a dangerous animal, untamed, living free, and usually large '.⁷⁴ The plural occurrence in Ezekiel 1 is perhaps to be regarded as a general designation for living creatures, deliberately left vague, but allowing for a general resemblance to human form. Verses 6-14 give a fuller description of these living creatures, describing attributes of other mammals and birds.

The hayyôṭ resemble the seraphim of Isaiah in that they have wings, one pair of which covered the body (v.11), and they had hands (v.8); and they were associated with burning coals of fire. But the similarities end here. The hayyôṭ had four wings, not six, and they had four faces - of a man, a lion, an ox and an eagle. The order of the description in vv.6-12 which moves on from the faces and wings to the feet and the hands in vv.6-8 whereas vv.10-12 in fact describes only the details of the faces and wings, is acknowledged by Eichrodt to be strange.⁷⁵ However, he rejects Zimmerli's suggestions that the details in vv.7-11a are to be set aside as a subsequent elaboration, suggesting instead that v.6 conveys a general impression, v.7 the upright stance of the feet, and v.8 the hands - emphasising the human features - and in vv.10-12 the characteristics of the faces and wings derived from the animal realm are described.⁷⁶

Verses 15-21, which most commentators regard as a later interpolation into the vision, describe four ʾôphannîm (wheels), which were associated with the living creatures. When the living creatures moved, the ʾôphannîm moved beside them; when the living creatures arose from the ground, the ʾôphannîm arose together with them, for the spirit of the living creatures was in the ʾôphannîm (vv.19-20).

It may be that the inspiration of the vision was a four wheeled chariot.⁷⁷ Zimmerli suggests that each wheel was conceived as a disc, marked with concentric circles or decreasing in thickness from the centre outwards, in such a way that it was hollowed out to form concentric rings. The wheels were full of eyes, which were possibly bosses, a form of decoration or strengthening.⁷⁸

Verses 22-28 describe a vault (rāqī^a) about the heads of the living creatures. Under the vault their wings were spread out, touching one another. Above the vault, or platform, was a throne, and seated on the throne was a form in human likeness, presumably Yahweh. The reference to the fire and rainbow (vv.27-28) Zimmerli suggests, giving just outlines and impressions of colour, is to be understood against the background of ancient Near Eastern imagery;⁷⁹ he cites the coloured ceramics of the god Asshur from Qal'at Serqat (the period of Tukulti-Ninurta II, 890-884 BCE). The whole is described^{as} like the appearance of the glory of Yahweh.

In its present form, the vision and call of Ezekiel extends to 3:15, where he came to the exiles at Tel-abib. In MT and LXX 3:12 reads:

Then the spirit took me up, and I heard behind me the voice as of a great earthquake, (saying) Blessed is the glory of Yahweh from his place.

This text reappears in the later Jewish liturgical development of the gedussah, though in modern translations the text is usually emended, reading b^erūm for bārūk:

Then the spirit lifted me up, and as the glory of Yahweh arose from its place, I heard behind me the sound of a great earthquake. (RSV)

C. Second vision: Galgal and Cherubim

Whereas the vision of chapter 1 is of the glory of Yahweh by the river Chebar in Babylon, those described in chapters 8-11, while seen by the prophet in Babylon, are of the temple in Jerusalem, and chapter 10 seems to have been introduced to show that the glory of Yahweh was still at this stage associated with the temple. According to 10:20-21, it was an identical vision to that recorded in

chapter 1; in 11:22-25 the glory of Yahweh left the city of Jerusalem.

Although it is clear that chapter 10 is a duplicate of chapter 1, it provides more specific definitions than the latter, and is modelled more directly on the iconography of the Jerusalem temple. The living creatures are expressly called cherubim, and in the description of the four faces, that of an ox is replaced with that of a cherub. Furthermore, in vv.2,6 and 13 of MT the wheels are identified as galgal, although the precise significance of this identification remains obscure. Zimmerli suggests that they are wheels under the ark of the covenant, or of the incense brazier set before the ark.⁸⁰ However, the identification of the living creatures with the cherubim suggests that the redactor of chapter 10 was attempting to combine the ark sanctuary of the temple with the throne of Yahweh of chapter 1. Eichrodt comments:

As the ark, itself adorned by cherubim, was regarded as a throne for Yahweh, it already provides a movable throne of God. 81

The speculations about the wheels in chapter 10, which seem to have influenced chapter 1 (vv.15-21), perhaps represent a bold attempt to interpret chapter 1 in terms compatible with a vision modelled directly on the temple interior. But even if this is the case, the vision is not simply a psychedelic description of the temple interior.

The holy of holies of Solomon's temple, with the cherubim of olive wood and gold, and their wings covering the poles of the ark of the covenant, is described in 1 Kings 6:19-28;8:1-9. However the form and significance of these latter objects are not uniform throughout the biblical material. Menahem Haran draws attention to two trends of scholarly thought regarding the significance of the

ark:

(a) It was a chest, a container of objects of great holiness.

(b) The ark was the seat of Yahweh, an empty throne.⁸²

However, regarding the second view, R.E.Clements notes that the position of the ark in the temple, located lengthwise, is incompatible with its use as a throne, unless we are prepared to accept that Yahweh was thought not to face the congregation in the temple, but to be seated sideways on it.⁸³ According to Haran, there were in fact two quite separate objects which have been brought together by P: there is the ark, and, quite separate, the kappōret, or throne, supported by the wings of the cherubim. Deut. refers to the ark, but not in association with the kappōret and cherubim, and this is also the case for references to the ark in the Former Prophets. In Ezekiel, however, it is the throne which is described, and there is no reference to the ark. Both Haran and Zimmerli see the throne-chariot of Ezekiel as reflecting a time after the loss of the actual ark.⁸⁴ It is only P who links them together, and in the description of Solomon's temple it is clear that the ark and its poles are separate from the kappōret and cherubim. The ark may have been, therefore, a chest, and the footstool of Yahweh. The wings of the cherubim carried the platform on which Yahweh was seated. However, M.Metzger has argued that the cherubim were not part of the throne, but protectors of the shrine and the ark, while the ark itself should not be regarded as the 'empty throne' of Yahweh, but as a portable support for his invisible throne, like the 'boxes' in actual Egyptian examples.⁸⁵

The identity of the creatures designated cherubim is only slightly less mysterious than that of Isaiah's seraphim. According to Dhorme,

they were Babylonian intercessory deities;⁸⁶ Kapelrud traces them to Sumerian door-divinities;⁸⁷ W.F.Albright suggested that they were winged sphinxes of Syria and Palestine, as represented at Byblus, Hamath and Megiddo, c.1200-800 BCE, a view shared by Metzger;⁸⁸ and De Vaux suggested winged sphinxes from Egypt.⁸⁹ More probable may be the case presented by R.H.Pfeiffer, who, citing three Assyrian texts where kuribi are mentioned,⁹⁰ concluded:

It appears from these texts that the kuribi belonged to the class of the Lamassa and Lahmu without being identical with either. Like the winged bull and lion colossi, it was represented both in classical form and placed at the door of the temple, and in miniature replicas manufactured by the dozen. ... The root kuribi and, ultimately, of cherubim, seems to be the Assyrian karabu (to bless): these blessing or protecting spirits were akin to the guardian angels. 91

It is probably better to speak of Assyrian parallels rather than identity and origin. In the Old Testament the cherubim have various functions, or, rather, appear in a variety of contexts. In Genesis 3 (J) and in Ezekiel 28:13-14, we encounter a cherub in 'Eden, the garden of God', implying that in some sense they were in the service of Yahweh. These creatures adorned the walls of the temple, and Yahweh can be said to ride (drive ⁹²) or be enthroned upon them (Ps.18:10-11; 80:1-2). But whatever their Mesopotamian or other origin, Haran correctly observes that ' out of all this pre-Israelite heritage the image of the cherubim succeeded in becoming the centre of the sacral-cultic symbolism of the First Temple in Jerusalem'.⁹³

While the cherubim and kappōret of the holy of holies seem to have influenced chapter 10 of Ezekiel, and may have played some conscious part in the form of the vision contained in

chapter 1, there are distinctive elements in the latter which are significantly different from the earthly counterpart. The cherubim described by P and in 1 Kings each had two wings, whereas Ezekiel's hayyôṭ had four. Ezekiel's creatures also had four faces. Neither do the cherubim, kappōret and ark of 1 Kings give any suggestion of 'wheels', although 1 Chronicles 28:18 does refer to the 'golden chariot of the cherubim that spread their wings and covered the ark of the covenant of Yahweh'. There is something to be said for Bertholet's suggestion that the description of the Throne-Chariot had in mind the mobile stands of the temple (1 Kings 7:27-39) as a model.⁹⁴ These objects, which Gray suggests were for purification of worshippers and for the cleansing of the altar and court after bloody sacrifices, had four bronze wheels with axles, hubs and spokes, and panels portraying lions, oxen, and cherubim, and may have provided the raw materials for the prophet's vision.⁹⁵ Zimmerli argues that even though no Throne-Chariot actually stood in the temple, the Israelite throne conception could readily be enlarged upon without difficulty into becoming a mobile throne, and the elaboration took place amongst the school of Ezekiel.⁹⁶

Mettinger has argued that both in chapter 1 and 10, God's throne is a central motif, showing a continuity with the concept of the enthroned king of the Zion-Sabaoth theology.⁹⁷ However, the throne is no longer occupied by yhw h s^ebā'ôṭ, but God's kābôd.⁹⁸ The most likely explanation for this fact is the supposition that God's abandonment of his city to an enemy had made the designation unusable; kābôd, however, turned out to be a reasonable designation for the God who both leaves and returns to the city.⁹⁹

D. Daniel 7:9-10

The vision of the judgment scene in Daniel 7 with the 'Ancient of Days' (ʿattîq yômin) seems to draw upon Ugaritic mythology, where El, 'Father of Years' sits enthroned surrounded by the gods of the Ugaritic pantheon.¹⁰⁰ However, the vision also echoes the vision of Ezekiel, and the concept of the divine council which Isaiah and Ezekiel presuppose. The throne of the Ancient of Days had flames of fire, and wheels (galgillîm) which were burning fire. Furthermore, he is surrounded by innumerable beings:

A thousand thousands (ʿelep ʿalēpîm; LXX χίλιαι χιλιάδες) served him,
and ten thousand times ten thousand (wēribbō ribwān; LXX μύριαι μυριάδες) stood (yēqûmûn; LXX παρειστήκεισαν) before him. 101

The (heavenly) court then sat in judgment.

E. Summary

While allowing for elaboration by the redactor of the book of Ezekiel, it is perhaps best to accept the prophet's vision for what it purports to be, and not to seek an exact counterpart in the temple. The holy of holies was but a model, attempting to depict in poor human fashion a heavenly reality. What both Ezekiel and Isaiah claim is to have a small glimpse of the heavenly reality, and they describe visions using terminology from other Old Testament theophanies, and they use images from the earthly models. For Isaiah, winged seraphim cry out and praise the holiness of Yahweh of Hosts, whose glory fills the earth; for Ezekiel that glory is experienced in a vision of fire, winged creatures and the mysterious wheels of

a Throne-Chariot. The concepts underlying these visions were apparently still common currency at the time of the compilation of the Book of Daniel. These three visions provided the material for the descriptions and assertions in later Judaism concerning the appearance of God in heaven, and the worship offered to him by the celestial beings. While not exclusively limited to the trisagion, or geduṣṣah, this particular acclamation of praise was considered in some circles to be an important element in the angelic repertoire. The extension of the biblical ideas can be traced in the Qumran literature, the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, the yōrdē merkāvāh or Hekhalot literature, and in the evolving berakot of the Synagogue.

NOTES - CHAPTER 1

1. H.Wheeler Robinson, 'The Council of Yahweh', JTS 45(1944),151-157; Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament (Oxford 1946), 166-170.
2. G.E.Wright, The Old Testament Against its Environment, (London 1950), 32-33.
3. Ibid.,31-32.
4. E.T.Mullen, The Assembly of the Gods, (Chico 1980).
5. For the Ugaritic terms see Mullen, op.cit., 117ff.
6. F.M.Cross, 'The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah', JNES 12 (1953), 274-277; 'Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs', HTR 55 (1962), 225-259; R.E.Brown, 'Pre-Christian Semitic Concept of Mystery', CBQ 20 (1958), 417-443; J.A.Wilson, 'The Assembly of a Phoenician City', JNES 4(1945), 245. Cf.also Patrick D.Miller, The Divine Warrior in Early Israel (Cambridge Mass. 1973).
7. F.J.Neuberg, 'An unrecognised Meaning of Hebrew DÔR ', JNES(1950), 215-217; P.Ackroyd, 'The Meaning of Hebrew Dôr Considered', JSS 13(1968), 5-8.
8. T.H.Gaster, IDB 1, 131.
9. W.G.Heidt, Angelology of the Old Testament,(Minnesota 1949),7-14; G.E.Wright, op.cit., 33.
10. For the vocabulary regarding 'standing' in this context, see Mullen, 231.
11. T.H.Gaster, op.cit.,129.
12. Ivan Engnell, The Call of Isaiah,(Uppsala 1949); R.E.Clements, Isaiah 1-39, (London 1980); Otto Kaiser, Isaiah 1-12 (London 1983²).
13. G.B.Gray, Isaiah 1-25 (Edinburgh 1912), 102-3; Kaiser,op.cit., following the observations of G.R.Driver, 'Isaiah 6:1 His train filled the temple', in ed.H.Goedicke, Near Eastern Studies in Honor of W.F.Albright (Baltimore and London 1971) that the garments of gods and rulers did not have flowing trains, translates as ' the hem of his garment'.
14. Engnell, op.cit.
15. J.Bright, A History of Israel (London 1960¹); Bernhard W. Anderson, The Living World of the Old Testament (London 1978³).
16. O.Kaiser, Isaiah 1-12 (London 1972¹), 3 footnote b.
17. G.Fohrer suggested that it was simply a vision of the temple. Clements, op.cit., 73.

18. Edwin C.Kingsbury, 'The Prophets and the Council of Yahweh', JBL 83(1964), 279-286.
19. Julian Morgenstern, 'The Gates of Righteousness', HUCA 6(1929), 1-37; S.Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship (Oxford 1982) 118-130.
20. O.Kaiser, op.cit.¹, 74,76; J.Bright, Isaiah 1, Peake's Commentary on the Bible (London 1962); I.Engnell, op.cit.
21. S.Mowinckel, op.cit.; S.H.Hooke, Myth, Ritual and Kingship (New York and Oxford 1958); A.R.Johnson, Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel (Cardiff 1967); J.H.Eaton, Kingship and Psalms (London 1976); Festal Drama in Deutero-Isaiah (London 1979); Vision in Worship (London 1981); R.E.Clements, God and Temple (Oxford 1965), 69-70.
22. D.J.A.Clines, IDB, Supplementary Volume (Nashville 1976), 625ff. See also H.J.Kraus, Worship in Israel (Oxford 1966); M.Noth, 'God, King, and Nation in the Old Testament', in The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies(Edinburgh 1966).
23. O.Kaiser, op.cit.², 124-125.
24. G.B.Gray, op.cit., 105, 107-8.
25. O.Kaiser, op.cit.¹, 76.
26. F.H.W.Gesenius, Lexicon Manuale Hebraicum et Chaldaicum (Lipsiae 1885), 970.
27. So Kaiser, op.cit.¹, 76, note c; E.Jacob, Theology of the Old Testament (London 1958), 69; I.Engnell, op.cit., 33.
28. Jacob, op.cit.
29. Kaiser, op.cit.¹, 76.
30. Karen R.Joines, 'Winged Serpents in Isaiah's Inaugural Vision', JBL 86(1966), 410-415.
31. Ibid., 413.
32. Ibid., 413-4.
33. J.de Savignac, 'Les "Seraphim"', VT 22(1972), 320-325.
34. Kaiser, op.cit.², 125.
35. 1 Kings 6:24; Exodus 25:20.
36. R.E.Clements, God and Temple, 65.
37. R.E.Clements, Isaiah 1-39, 74

38. Walter Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1 (chapter 1-24) (Philadelphia 1979) suggests in a similar manner to that which may have been used by the priests at the temple over against worshippers who made their confession of sin. 99.
39. art.cit., 322. He also suggests a connection between the Uraeus and Anat (Antit, Beth Shan) and Anath, the consort of Yaho at Elephantine.
40. Kaiser, op.cit.¹, 76; Bright, Isaiah 1, 494; Clements, 74.
41. Engnell, op.cit., 35.
42. Ibid., 36.
43. Kaiser, op.cit.², 126.
44. Engnell, op.cit., 36.
45. N.Walker, 'The Origin of the 'Thrice Holy'', NTS 5(1958/9), 132-3.
46. Ibid., 133.
47. Gesenius-Kautzch, Hebrew Grammar (Oxford 1898), 59-60, note 2.
48. B.M.Leiser, 'The Trisagion of Isaiah's Vision ', NTS 6 (1959/60), 261-3.
49. Ibid., 263.
50. So apparently O.Keel; Kaiser, op.cit.², 126, note 45.
51. G.Von Rad, Old Testament Theology vol 1 (Edinburgh 1962), 19. E.Jacob, op.cit., 54, counts 279.
52. Ibid; Patrick D.Miller, The Divine Warrior in Early Israel, 152-3.
53. J.A.Emerton, 'New Light on Israelite Religion: The Implications of the Inscriptions from Kuntillet 'Ajrud', ZAW 94(1982), 2-20, 4.
54. Ibid., 3-9.
55. Miller, op. cit., 154; Jacob, op.cit., 54-55; J.Gray, 1 and 2 Kings (London 1964¹), 402.
56. Von Rad, op.cit., 18; Jacob, op.cit.; Miller, op.cit., 155; F.M. Cross, 'Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs', HTR 55(1962), 225-59, 256.
57. Miller, op.cit., 10.
58. Ibid., 154. According to Miller, ywhw is a causative imperfect of 'to be'. He follows W.F.Albright, 'Review of L'epithete divine Jahve Šēbā'ōt: Étude philologique, historique, et exégétique', JBL 67(1948). 377-81, and F.M.Cross, art.cit., and

Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic (Cambridge, Mass., 1973), and links yhwh with a longer name, el du yahwe, El who creates. He suggests that yhweh s^ebā'ōt meant 'He who creates the divine armies'.

59. op.cit., 19.
60. Clements, Isaiah 1-39, 32.
61. Tryggve N.D. Mettinger, The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies. (Lund 1982), 13-15.
62. Ibid., 15.
63. Ibid., passim.
64. Cf. E. Tov, The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch, (Missoula 1976), 31, note 20. Theodotion used κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων and Aquila, .. στρατιῶν . Symmachus used both terms. Ibid., note 21.
65. Jacob, op.cit., 79ff; Kittel, TDNT 2, 238ff.
66. Kaiser, op.cit.¹, 78.
67. Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, 3, 75ff; W. Eichrodt, Ezekiel (London 1970), see the discussion of the translation, passim.
68. e.g. Zimmerli, 231ff; Eichrodt, 115ff; John W. Wevers, Ezekiel (London 1969), 73ff; J. Muilenburg, Ezekiel in Peake, 574; D.M.G. Stalker, Ezekiel (London 1968) 94-5.
69. J. Herrmann, Ezechielstudien (Leipzig 1908).
70. G. Hölscher, Hesekiel, der Dichter and das Buch, BZAW 39 (Giessen 1924).
71. A. Bertholet and K. Gallig, Hesekiel HAT 13 (Tübingen 1936)
72. Zimmerli, 105; Eichrodt, 49-59; Wevers, 40-47.
73. Eichrodt, 55.
74. Zimmerli, 120.
75. Eichrodt, 55.
76. Ibid.
77. Zimmerli, 128, but see also Bertholet's suggestion below.
78. Zimmerli, 129.
79. Zimmerli, 122.
80. Zimmerli, 251.

81. Eichrodt, 116.
82. Menahem Haran, 'The Ark and the Cherubim: Their Symbolic Significance in Biblical Ritual', Israel Exploration Journal 9(1959), 30-38; 89-94; Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel (London 1978), 246-59.
83. R.E.Clements, God and Temple, 30
84. Haran, op.cit., 34; Zimmerli, 128.
85. M.Metzger, Königsthron und Gottesthron. Thronformen und Throndarstellungen in Ägypten und im Vorderen Orient im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend vor Christus und deren Bedeutung für das Verstandnis über den Thron im Alten Testament. (Kevelaer 1985). I am grateful for a copy of the review of this book by Dr.G.I.Davies, who drew my attention to it.
86. E.Dhome, 'Le nom des cherubins', Recueil Édouard Dhorme(Paris 1951) 671-83.
87. A.S.Kapelrud, 'The Gates of Hell and the Guardian Angels of Paradise', Journal of the American Oriental Society 70 (1950) 151-56.
88. W.F.Albright, 'What were the Cherubim ?', The Biblical Archaeologist 1 (1938), 1-3; Metzger, op.cit.
89. R.de Vaux, 'Les cherubins et l'arche d'alliance. Les sphinx gardiens et les trônes divins dans l'ancien Orient ', Mélanges de l' Université Saint Joseph (Beyrouth 1961), 93-124.
90. R.H.Pfeiffer, 'Cherubim', JBL 41(1922), 249-50. For example, " A Lahmu and a Kuribi of brilliant Sariru I set up side by side (of the gate)". See also O.Keel, The Symbolism of the Biblical World (London 1978), 167ff.
91. Pfeiffer, art.cit., 250
92. Mettinger, op.cit., 34. According to Metzger, op.cit., yōšēb hakkērûbîm was originally a title of Baal, with no connection with the ark.
93. Haran, op.cit., 38.
94. op.cit.
95. Gray, 1 and 2 Kings, 180.
96. Zimmerli, op.cit.
97. Mettinger, op.cit., 104.
98. Ibid., 105

99. Ibid., 115.
100. E.W.Heaton, Daniel (London 1956), 178-80; J.A.Emerton, 'The Origen of the Son of Man Imagery', JTS NS 11(1958), 225-42. N.Porteous, Daniel (London 1965), 95ff; E.T.Mullen, op.cit., 159-61.
101. For a discussion on the cultic significance of 'standing before', see Mullen, op.cit., 231, and THAT 2, cols.330-31.

CHAPTER 2

THE WORSHIP OF HEAVEN AND THE
QEDUŠŠAH^{yy} IN JUDAISM

1. QUMRAN AND THE ANGELIC LITURGY

Millar Burrows has stressed that a basic element in the theology of the Dead Sea Sect was the conviction of the absolute sovereignty of God, and that he would manifest his glory.¹ In the Manual of Discipline (1QS) the idea of a cosmic struggle between light and darkness is represented by the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness. The struggle of the sectarians against their enemies is simply the earthly manifestation of the struggle between the Spirits of Light and the Spirits of Darkness - an angelic struggle. M.Mansoor elaborates on this parallel heavenly/earthly struggle:

With God in heaven, under the leadership of the prince of light (1QM 13:10) are all the hosts of angels, who gladly and willingly serve God, who sing His praises, who compose His retinue, and fight his battles. To the prince of light God has apportioned the righteous. He had His angels enlighten the hearts of the elect, lead them to righteousness, truth and purity. Angels lead them to repentance and strengthen them in the doing of what is good. The righteous are taken up into their ranks at some time. Everything that is good and pure has its origin in the realm of the prince of light. However, over and against him stands the angel of darkness. Angels are classed in two main groups - good and evil - whose respective functions are strongly linked with the fundamental dualistic teachings of the Sect. The Almighty is surrounded by his angels, and the Sect looks forward to praising Him ultimately in their company. The angels participate in the eschatological event. The members of the Community have fellowship with the good angels. This fellowship involves participation in the heavenly songs of praise for the Almighty. 2

This fellowship which Mansoor refers to must be seen in the context not simply of the eschatological war, but in the origin of the Sect in its opposition to the Jerusalem cult. The Sect believed that the Jerusalem temple and its priesthood were defiled, and saw itself as the true Israel, and its priests as the true priesthood. Its organization derives directly from that of

the priests organized for temple duty. It had its own calendar, and its liturgies and sectarian rules replaced the material sacrifices of the defiled Jerusalem temple.³ Table fellowship was important to the community, and special regulations regarding meals are found in 1QS 6:2-8 and 1QSa 2:11-22. Some scholars have followed K.G.Kuhn in classing these as special cultic meals,⁴ whereas others have seen the regulations as purely to secure the due observance of the pious custom of asking God's blessing on the good things he provides before they are taken.⁵ There were detailed regulations ensuring the purity of those taking part, and the meals were eaten in strict conformity with the hierarchical order of the community. Furthermore, an Aramaic fragment from Qumran is said to describe the sacred meal in the heavenly temple, a meal in which the sons of Zadok were to take part.⁶ Matthew Black infers that the community's sacral meals were understood as being an anticipation of the perfected ritual of the heavenly temple.⁷ Even if this inference concerning the meal is an overstatement of the evidence, the community certainly did regard itself as the true Israel and as being the true temple.⁸ A.R.C.Leane explains this cultic theology thus:

If the whole sect represents the Temple, the laity represent the sanctuary and the priests of the sect the holy of holies. Furthermore, the priests believed themselves to serve among the angels; and this fellowship with the heavenly company helped to explain the divine character of the knowledge of cosmos and calendar which they held and which ruled their practice, a practice shared with the angels. The association of angels with priests arises from the conviction that the priests are like the angels of the presence in serving 'before God'. 9

B.Gärtner points out that the phrase 'before the face of God' in the temple meant 'in the presence of God and his hosts', for the throne of God was surrounded by heavenly beings.¹⁰

The precise significance of angelic beings and their place in the theology of the Sect is complicated first by the fact that the Sect apparently used some of the books of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, and secondly because more material is to be published by Professor John Strugnell which is expected to show that their interest in heavenly angelic liturgies and hymns was greater than has previously been thought.¹¹ The community was concerned to stress that God and his angels dwelt in their midst, and, therefore, the community stood in the midst of God and his angels. Thus 1QS 11:7ff:

God has given them to His chosen ones as an everlasting possession, and has caused them to inherit the lot of the Holy Ones. He has joined their assembly to the Sons of Heaven to be a Council of the Community, a foundation of the Building of Holiness, an eternal Plantation throughout all ages to come. 12

And 1QH 3:19-22 :

I thank thee, O Lord, for thou hast redeemed my soul from the Pit, and from the Hell of Abaddon. Thou hast raised me up to everlasting height. ... Thou hast cleansed a perverse spirit of great sin that it may stand with the host of the Holy Ones, and that it may enter into community with the congregation of the Sons of Heaven.

Again, 1QH 11 - man has been purified of sin,

That he may stand before thee
with the everlasting host
and with (thy) spirits (of holiness),
...
who among all thy creatures
is able to recount (Thy wonders)?
May thy Name be praised
by the mouth of all men !
May they bless thee for ever
in accordance with (their understanding)
and proclaim thee with the voice of praise
in the company of (the Sons of Heaven) !

In 1QSB the priestly leader is said to be 'like an angel of the Presence in the holy dwelling, to serve the glory of the God of hosts (for ever. And thou) shalt be a faithful servant in the

temple of the kingdom, sharing the lot of the angels of the Presence, and in the council of the community (with the holy ones) for ever, and for all eternity, for all thy commandments are (sure) ..¹³
 - though these particular blessings may be for the end-time.

The union of the sectarians with the angelic host implies that the community join in the praises given to God by these holy ones:

For the multitude of the Holy Ones (is with thee) in heaven, and the host of the Angels is in thy holy abode, praising thy Name (1QM 12).

Indeed, praising the Name as an important angelic function is also implied in 4Q Dīb Hām:

Give thanks ...
 (Bless) His holy Name unceasingly
 ... all the angels of the holy firmament
 ... (above) the heavens.

Of specific importance are the two fragments published by Strugnell in 1960 under the title ' The Angelic Liturgy'.¹⁴ In the first fragment, the seven 'sovereign Princes' are the seven chief angels, and they bless the holy ones, both celestial and earthly, and it is possible that this was thought to coincide with the Sabbath offering. Strugnell writes:

Of great significance for the study of postbiblical liturgies is the manner in which the motive of the angelic cult in the Heavenly Temple is, to say the least, meditated upon in the context of the Essene Sabbath liturgy. This is no angelic liturgy, no visionary work where a seer hears the praise of the angels, but a Maskil's composition for an earthly liturgy in which the presence of the angels is in a sense invoked and in which - an idea to which there are parallels in Christian and Jewish literature after the Epistle to the Hebrews - the Heavenly Temple is portrayed on the model of the earthly one and in some way its service is considered the pattern of what is being done below. 15

The second fragment is a description of the activity of the heavenly entourage of the Divine Throne-Chariot of Ezekiel 1, which

on palaeographical grounds Strugnell dated between 75-50 BCE.

... the (ministers) of the Glorious Face in the abode of (the gods) of knowledge fall down before Him, (and the Cherubim utter blessings. And as they rise up, there is a divine small voice ... and loud praise; (there is) a divine (small) voice as they fold their wings.

The Cherubim bless the image of the Throne-Chariot above the firmament, and they praise the (majesty) of the fiery firmament beneath the seat of His glory. And between the turning wheels, Angels of Holiness come and go, as it were a fiery vision of most holy spirits; and about them (flow) seeming rivulets of fire, like gleaming bronze, a radiance of many gorgeous colours, of marvellous pigments magnificently mingled.

The spirits of the Living God move perpetually with the glory of the wonderful Chariot. The small voice of blessing accompanies the tumult as they depart, and on the path of their return they worship the Holy One. Ascending, they rise marvellously; settling, they (stay) still. The sound of joyful praise is silenced and there is a small voice of blessing in all the camp of God. And a voice of praise (resounds) from the midst of all their divisions in (worship of) ... and each one in his place, all their numbered ones sing hymns of praise.

There is no geduṣṣah here, but the speculation on Ezekiel seems to echo the Targum of Jonathan (1 Kings 19:20 - they who bless silently) and Isaiah. The angelic beings utter blessings, praise, sing hymns of praise, all presupposing a wider background of the divine council.

The Qumran community is, therefore, a 'holy congregation', which is in fellowship with God and his angels, and is privileged to serve before the face of God; its praises join those of the heavenly host in adoration of the Name (1 QH 3). The question of whether the geduṣṣah was used in the Qumran liturgies has been raised by Moshe Weinfeld.¹⁶ Weinfeld has argued that the opening sentence of the so-called 'Hymn to the Creator', 11Q Psa Col.24 lines 9-15, gdwl wqdwš yhw qdwš qdwsym ldwr wdw (Great and Holy is the Lord, the holiest of the holy ones for every generation)¹⁷ contains the basic elements of the Synagogue bērākāh Qeduṣṣat ha-shem, the

third berakah of the Amidah to which geduṣṣah is attached. Finding similar (Weinfeld maintains that they are identical) motifs in the hymn to those of the alphabetic acrostic hymns incorporated in the yoser or berakah of the Synagogue Morning Service,¹⁸ Weinfeld argues that the basic formulations of the geduṣṣah liturgy are attested at Qumran. While Weinfeld's observations are extremely suggestive, it must be said that rather a great deal of weight is placed on linguistic echoes rather than on definite parallels, and it remains a fact that geduṣṣah itself is not yet attested in the Qumran liturgical literature.

2. THE OLD TESTAMENT PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

Any discussion of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha is beset with critical problems. Those engaged in the study of this diverse literature seem far from agreement as to what constitutes Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, and, in addition, there seems to be little certainty on the question of dates, provenance, original language, and whether a work may be classified as 'Jewish', ' Jewish-Christian' or 'Christian'.¹⁹ In this particular section the list compiled by J.H.Charlesworth has been followed, which is based on the following criteria:

First, the work must be at least partially, and preferably totally, Jewish or Jewish-Christian. Second, it should date from the period 200 BC to AD 200. Third, it should claim to be inspired. Fourth, it should be related in form or content to the Old Testament. Fifth, it ideally is attributed to an Old Testament figure, who often claims to be the speaker or author. 20

With the exception of the Ladder of Jacob, references have been limited to those works listed in Charlesworth's 'primary' list,

though the Ascension of Isaiah, which in its present form is a Christian work,²¹ has been deliberately omitted from this section.

Commenting upon his criteria for defining Pseudepigrapha, J.H.Charlesworth writes:

It is important to note that the documents collected according to these criteria are predominantly apocalyptic, or related to this genre, and some are expansions of Old Testament narratives. 22

Apocalyptic literature is generally described as dealing with eschatology and the cataclysmic intervention of God in history, and the unveiling of the secrets of future history. However, Christopher Rowland has pointed out that an equally important emphasis in apocalyptic literature is the revelation of things as they actually are in the heavenly world.²³ In certain parts of apocalyptic, it is not so much the description of the last stages of the historical process which is to the fore, but a mystical insight into another world and the perception of its secrets. Such elements point to apocalyptic being not merely a movement which was concerned primarily with the future of the world, but with the world above, its secrets and its glory.²⁴

Within many of these apocalyptic books of the Pseudepigrapha, we find descriptions of heavenly ascensions and relatively detailed accounts in which the host of heaven, and finally God, are seen by the apocalypstist. According to Mary Dean-Otting, the origin of such ascensions are the Old Testament figures of Enoch, Moses and Elijah, who 'ascended' rather than died.²⁵ Sometimes the ascension is simply to heaven and the heaven of heavens (Ethiopic Enoch), but in many there are several heavens - five (3 Baruch), seven (Test.Levi, Slavonic Enoch) or ten (Slavonic Enoch). These visions,

which in many ways represent the beginnings of merkāvāh mysticism, seem to have their basis in the biblical visions of 1 Kings 22:19ff, Isaiah 6:3ff, Ezekiel 1,3:22-24, and 10, and Daniel 7:9-10, and are, therefore, not unconnected with the ideas of the 'Angelic Liturgy' of Qumran. Ithamar Gruenwald points out that, taken together, these biblical verses display the following characteristics:

- a) God is sitting on a throne.
- b) He has the appearance of a man, and particularly that of an old white-haired man (Ezekiel, Daniel).
- c) God is sitting in a palace (1 Kings, Isaiah, Daniel).
- d) Fire occupies an important position in the vision (Ezekiel, Daniel, and under the altar in Isaiah).
- e) God is accompanied by angels who minister to him (1 Kings, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel).
- f) The angels render hymns (Isaiah and Ezekiel). ²⁶

It is the latter feature which is of interest, since in addition to testifying to the belief that certain angels had the function of praising God, several of the Pseudepigrapha record the words of the angelic liturgies.

A. The Prayer of Manassah

Although some authorities place this in the Apocrypha, Charlesworth argues that it most properly belongs to the Pseudepigrapha. In this prayer we read (v.15):

For all the host of heaven sings thy praise,
and thy glory is for ever and ever. Amen.

This is simply the reassertion of the idea found in some of the Psalms that the host of heaven worships God, though now demythologising

has almost certainly taken place. The host of heaven refers to angels rather than to the 'gods' of the old pantheon.

B. The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs

The Testament preserves the testaments reputed to have been left by the sons of Jacob. While in an edition of 1953 M.de Jonge suggested that they were written near the end of the second century CE and were composed by a Christian, and still is of the opinion that the final work is from a Christian redactor,²⁷ other scholars, while admitting that some passages are clearly Christian, have concluded that as a whole the testaments are pre-Christian, and that many of them were composed in a Semitic language.²⁸ In Test.Lev.3, which is preserved in different recensions, seven heavens are described, and in the seventh, the 'highest heaven', dwells the Holy One or Great Glory. However, in the fourth heaven,

There with him are thrones and authorities; there praises to God are offered eternally. 29

C. The Books of Adam and Eve

According to Charlesworth, there is wide agreement that the original text dates from the first century CE, and was composed in a Semitic language; M.D.Johnson suggests that this was Hebrew.³⁰ There are several references to angelic liturgy.

In Vita Adae et Evae 33:2, it is mentioned that at a particular time angels must ascend to worship God. In Apocalypsis Mosis 22:3, Adam and Eve, hearing Michael the Archangel blowing his trumpet and calling the angels to hear the judgment of Adam, saw God appearing in paradise,

mounted on the chariot of his cherubim with the angels proceeding before him and singing hymns of praises, all the plants of paradise, both of your father's lot and mine, broke out into flowers. 31

In 27:5, after the judgment of Adam,

Then the angels fell down on the ground and worshipped the Lord saying, "Thou art just, O Lord, and thou judgest righteous judgement. 32

Further chants are also given:

And I beheld golden censers, between your father and the chariot, and all the angels with censers and frankincense came in haste to the incense-offering and blew upon it and the smoke of the incense veiled the firmaments. And the angels fell down and worshipped God, crying aloud and saying, "Jael, Holy One, have pardon, for he is Thy image, and the work of Thy holy hands" (33:5) . 33

And all angels blew their trumpets and cried: "Blessed art thou, O Lord, for thou hast had pity on Thy creature".
(AE 46:3-47:1) 34

And finally, in the Apocalypse Mosis, 43:4-5:

Even thus spake the angel, and ascended into heaven, glorifying (God) and saying: 'Alleluia'.

(Holy, holy, holy is the Lord, in the glory of God the Father, for to Him it is meet to give glory, honour and worship, with the eternal life-giving spirit now and always and for ever. Amen.)

(Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts. To whom be glory and power for ever and for ever. Amen.)

(Then the archangel Jael glorified God, saying, Holy, holy, holy Lord, heaven and earth are full of thy glory). 35

The editor of the edition in R.H.Charles, L.S.A.Wells, comments on the latter:

Doxologies are later Christian additions. The first paragraph occurs in C, the second in Arm, the third in Slav. 36

M.D.Johnson in his more recent edition simply notes that a number of manuscripts all have the trisagion as an ending.³⁷ The doxologies themselves may be additions to the text, but it is not necessarily clear from the form of the geduṣṣah that it is Christian rather than Jewish. It might be the case that a geduṣṣah added in some Jewish circles was christianized by Christian redactors. There can, however, be no certainty one way or the other.

D. The Testament of Adam

S.E.Robinson dates this work to the middle or late third century CE.

It is regarded as being a Jewish work which has been heavily christianised in its middle section which deals with prophecy.³⁸

In the first section, the Horarium, Adam informs the reader:

The fourth hour is the "holy, holy, holy " praise of the seraphim. And so I used to hear, before I sinned, the sound of their wings in Paradise when the seraphim would beat them to the sound of their triple praise. But after I transgressed against the law, I no longer heard that sound.

Here we have the simple affirmation that in Paradise one can hear the trisagion, but if a person is not 'a heavenly man', then he no longer can hear this seraphic chant.

In the third section, the Hierarchy, we have in a passage which has obviously been christianised, information about the orders of angels. There are angels, archangels, archons, authorities, powers and dominions; and,

thrones, seraphim and cherubim stand before the majesty of our Lord Jesus the Messiah and serve the throne of his magnificence, glorifying him hourly with their "holy, holy, holy ".

E. The Testament of Job

This is dated variously from the first century BCE (Torry) to the first century CE (Philonenko and Kee), but is regarded as a Jewish work. In 48:1-4, one of Job's daughters 'chanted verses in the angelic language, and ascribed a hymn to God in accord with the hymnic style of angels (κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἀγγέλων ὕμνολογῶν).⁹ As she chanted the hymn, she permitted 'the Spirit' to be inscribed on her garment.³⁹ In 49 another daughter adopted the language of the archons and praised God for the creation of the heights; another daughter spoke the language of the cherubim (50:2).

F. The Testament of Abraham

This book, which recounts the archangel Michael's attempt to

gain the soul of Abraham, and which is extant in numerous languages, is in the view of Charlesworth a Jewish composition of the first century CE, although the actual date and original language are debatable.⁴⁰ The Greek recensions, reprinted from the edition of M.R.James, have been published with a translation by M.E.Stone.⁴¹

In recension B, chapter 3, Abraham and Michael were approaching a city, and as they did so, they found a big tree with three hundred branches.

And they heard a voice singing from the branches, 'Holy (are you) because you bore the pretext concerning the things for which you were sent'. And Abraham heard the voice and he hid the mystery in his heart saying to himself, 'What is the mystery which I heard ?' 42

However, recension A has a completely different reading:

As they (Abraham and the Archistrategos) went from the field toward his house, by that path there stood a cypress tree and at God's command the tree cried out in a human voice and said, 'Holy,holy,holy is the Lord God who summons him to those who love him ! ' And Abraham concealed the mystery, for he thought that the Archistrategos had not heard the tree's voice. 43

There is nothing to suggest that this reading in recension A has been the deliberate work of a Christian redactor, and it seems to present us with a variant of the gedussah. It should be noted that in this apocalypse, the chant, which is a 'mystery', is heard on earth from the tree . One further piece of information is given in recension B chapter 4 - at sunset all the angels worship God.

G. The Apocalypse of Abraham

This work is a haggadic midrash on Genesis 15:9-17, and does contain a 'Christian' interpolation in chapter 29. Charlesworth suggests that the work, extant only in Old Slavonic, probably dates from 80-100 CE, and was written in a Semitic language;⁴⁴ Rubinkiewicz thinks that it was written in Hebrew, after 70 CE and before the

middle of the second century CE.⁴⁵

The apocalypse itself covers chapters 9-32. In chapter 10 Jaoel, by means of the ineffable Name, raises Abraham from lying on the earth. He announces himself as 'the one who hath been given to restrain, according to the commandments, the threatening attack of the living creatures of the Cherubim against one another, and teach those who carry Him the song of the seventh hour of the might of man'. In chapter 17 Abraham is taught this eternal song:

Eternal One, Mighty One, Holy El, God autocrat
 self-originate, incorruptible, immaculate,
 unbegotten, spotless, immortal,
 self-perfected, self-devised,
 without mother, without father, ungenerated,
 exalted, fiery,
 just, lover of men, benevolent, compassionate, bountiful,
 jealous over me, patient one, most merciful.
 Eli, eternal, mighty one, holy, Sabaoth,
 most glorious El, El, El, El, Iaoel,
 you are he my soul has loved, my protector.
 Eternal, fiery, shining,
 light-giving, thunder-voiced, lightening-visioned, many-eyed,
 receiving the petitions of those who honor you
 and turning away from the petitions of those who restrain you
 by the restraint of their provocations,
 redeemer of those who dwell in the midst of the wicked ones,
 of those who are dispersed among the just of the world,
 in the corruptible age.
 Showing forth the age of the just,
 you make the light shine
 before the morning light upon your creation
 from your face
 to spend the day on the earth,
 and in your heavenly dwelling place
 (there is) an inexhaustible light of an invincible dawning
 from the light of your face.
 Accept my prayer and delight in it,
 and (accept) also the sacrifice which you yourself made
 to yourself through me as I searched for you.
 Receive me favourably,
 teach me, show me, and make known to your servant
 what you have promised me.

This strange esoteric song is followed in chapter 18 by the vision on the seventh firmament of the throne of God. Fire was under the throne, and round about it were the 'all-seeing ones, reciting the song'.

Whether the song refers to that which was taught to Abraham, or to the gedussah⁴⁵ is not clear. Under the throne were four fiery living creatures who were singing. Each had four faces - of a lion, a man, an ox and an eagle. Each had six wings; two wings covered their faces, two their feet and two were spread out for flying straight forward. Behind the living creatures Abraham saw a chariot with fiery wheels, and each wheel was full of eyes.

Gruenwald stresses that this apocalypse has many features which recur in the Hekhalot literature of merkāvāh mysticism, particularly the elaboration in chapter 18 of Ezekiel 1 with details from Isaiah 6:2, which is a merkāvāh vision.⁴⁶ However, he notes that the hymnological elements of the celestial song are unlike those of the later Hekhalot hymns, and in form and context it is more like a liturgical hymn or sapiential psalm which recites the grace of God and his benevolence.

H. The Testament of Isaac

This work is extant in Ethiopic and Arabic, but the major version is in Coptic. According to Box, it is to be dated 400 CE, and might be Christian or Jewish;⁴⁷ W.F.Stinespring suggests a second century date, and assigns the work to either Coptic Christians, or Egyptian Jews.⁴⁸ It appears to be dependent upon the Testament of Abraham, and there are certainly passages which are from a Christian redactor, but it may well be originally a Jewish work. In this Testament, Isaac who is at the point of death, converses with angels, and ascends to heaven under the guidance of the angel of Abraham. In 6:1-6 we are told:

After this the angel took me to heaven and I saw Abraham. So I prostrated myself before him and he received me graciously, he and all the godly ones. Then they all

came together and did me honor because of my father. Then they took me by the hand and led me to the curtain before the throne of the Father. So I prostrated myself before him, and worshipped him with my father and all the saints, while we uttered praises and cried aloud, saying, "Most holy, most holy, most holy is the Lord Sabaoth ! Heaven and earth are filled with your sanctified (holy ⁴⁹) glory ".

Exactly the same chant appears later in 6:24. The form of this qedussah - heaven and earth, and 'holy' glory - may suggest influence from the Christian liturgy, but not necessarily so.⁵⁰ However, we can do no more than observe the occurrence of the qedussah.

I. 4 Baruch

S.E.Robinson gives this work an upper limit of 136 CE, and believes it to have a Palestinian provenance; the ending has been christianised.⁵¹ In 9:2-6 Jeremiah offered up a sacrifice, and he prayed a prayer saying:

Holy, holy, holy, incense of the living trees, true light that enlightens me until I am taken up to you, for your mercy I plead, for the sweet voice of the two seraphim I plead, for another fragrant odour of incense. And may Michael, the archangel of righteousness who opens the gates for the righteous, be (the object of) my attention until he leads the righteous in. I implore you, Almighty Lord of all creation, unbegotten and incomprehensible, in whom all judgment was hidden before these things existed.

This prayer, which is concerned with intercession rather than simply praise, and which accompanied a sacrifice, begins with the thrice-holy of the trisagion, but nothing else. Nevertheless, the hint is made that the trisagion will be sung if the voice of the two seraphim is granted to Jeremiah.

J. The Ladder of Jacob

This work is placed by Charlesworth in a secondary list of Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, although he notes that the date, provenance and original language have not been researched.

The Jewish character and similarities to the Apocalypse of Abraham, the Odes of Solomon, the Gospel of Thomas, and the Epistle of Barnabas raise the possibility that it is not a medieval composition by Slavs, but rather a pseudepigraphon from the second century AD. ... A Palestinian provenance might be reflected in the emphasis on the land. 52

H.G.Lunt suggests that it is a Jewish story composed in Jewish-Greek, for a Palestinian audience.⁵³ It is preserved in two recensions in Old Slavonic, and the last two chapters, which are not found in the oldest manuscripts, are Christian additions. Chapter 2, as published by M.R.James, contains the following ascent to heaven:

And while the Voice of God was yet in mine ears, I said: How dreadful is this place ! This is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven. And I set up the stone that was under my head for a pillar, and poured oil on the top of it, and I called the name of that place the house of God (a line gone: Rec.2 suggests the supplement: And I prayed to God and said) :

Lord God of Abraham and Isaac my father, and of all those whose ways are right before thee, thou that sittest mighty upon the Cherubim and upon the throne of the majesty, of fire and full of eyes, as I saw in my dream; that holds the Cherubim with four faces, that bears the Seraphim full of eyes, that bears the whole world under his arm, and is borne of none. Thou hast spread out upon the clouds of the heaven the heaven that flieth (resteth ?) under thee, that under it thou mayest move the sun and hide it in the night lest it be held for God: thou hast ordained the way of the moon and the stars, and her thou makest to wax and wane, but for the stars, thou hast commanded them to pass over, lest these also should be supposed gods. Before the face of thy majesty the six-winged Seraphim fear, and hide their feet and their face with their wings, and with the others they fly, and sing ... (two lines gone: no help from Rec.2 which omits this invocation) Highest, with twelve faces, many-named, fiery, lightning-formed, holy one ! Holy, holy, holy, Jao, Jaova, Jaol, Sabakdos, Chadob, Sabaoth, Omlelech, Elaber, Ame (?) S'me barech, eternal king, strong, mighty, very great, long-suffering, Blessed One, that fillest heaven and earth and the sea and the abyss and all aeons with thy glory. Hear my song wherewith I have praised thee, and grant me my petition for which I pray to thee, and show me the interpretation of my dream. For thou art strong and mighty and glorious, a holy God, the Lord of me and of my fathers. 54

It is unfortunate that two lines of the invocation, or song of the Seraphim are missing: the context suggests that the trisagion followed. While the rest of the invocation displays something of a magic formula with a series of names for God, it is nevertheless an expansion of gedussah. Jacob recites this song or invocation, though it actually belongs to the seraphim.

K. Ethiopic Enoch and the Parables of Enoch

(1 Enoch)

A distinction has been made between 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-end, and the Parables of Enoch 37-71 simply for reference purposes. Although 1 Enoch is generally regarded as a Jewish work, J.T. Milik, on the strength of the absence of fragments from Qumran, has argued that the Parables are to be regarded as Christian additions.⁵⁵ However, Milik's arguments relating to the Parables have been rejected by Fitzmyer, Knibb and Mearns,⁵⁶ and according to Charlesworth the overwhelming consensus is that Ethiopic Enoch 37-71 is Jewish.⁵⁷ In a special study of the Parables David W. Suter writes:

Examination of the heavenly ascent and the oath traditions in the Parables of Enoch leads to the conclusion that the work is Jewish rather than Christian in origin and that it belongs to an early stage of the Merkavah tradition. 58

The link with the Merkāvāh tradition is also emphasised by

C. Rowland and I. Gruenwald.⁵⁹ As to the date of the Parables,

Suter writes:

On the basis of the typological examination of the ouranology and angelology of the Parables, its likely use by Matthew, and the examination of its relation to the events of the first centuries B.C. and A.D., it appears that the work was composed sometime between the last quarter of the first century B.C. and the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. While the midst of the first century A.D. seems to be the most likely time of composition, that judgment does not carry a high degree of probability. 60

In 1 Enoch 36:4, the seer says that the Lord of Glory works wonders, and shows the greatness of his work to angels, spirits and men, so that they might praise and bless him, and in 1 Enoch 104:6 the righteous are promised that they will become companions of the host of heaven - an idea similar to that of Qumran. The same idea is found in the Parables, 1 Enoch 39:6-7. In 39:11ff, the seer says of the Lord of Spirits,

Blessed is he, and may he be blessed, from the beginning and forever more. There is no such thing as non-existence (lit: ceasing) before him. (Even) before the world was created, he knows what is forever and what will be from generation to generation. Those who do not slumber but stand before your glory, will bless you. They shall bless, praise, and extol (you) saying, ' Holy,Holy,Holy, Lord of the Spirits; the spirits fill the earth'.

And at that place (under his wings) my eyes saw others who stood before him sleepless (and) blessed(him) saying,

Blessed are you and blessed is the name of the Lord of the Spirits forever and ever.

And my face was changed on account of the fact that I could not withstand the sight.

Thus, the seer hears the qedussah chanted by 'those who sleep not', though it is not the biblical text which is recited. The Parables continue:

And after that I saw a hundred thousand times a hundred thousand, ten million times ten million, I saw an innumerable and uncountable (multitude) who stand before the glory of the Lord of the Spirits. (40:1)

The seer saw four presences - archangels - who bless, praise, pray and supplicate. In 47:1-2, at the coming of the Son of Man in judgment, the prayers of the righteous, together with their blood, shall ascend where the holy ones, with one voice, supplicate, pray, praise, give thanks, bless, and will pray to God for them. We thus have the concept of a mingling of earthly and heavenly worship and supplication. In 1 Enoch 61, an angel reveals to Enoch that the Elect One will be placed on the throne,

And he will summon all the forces of the heavens, and all the holy ones above, and the forces of the Lord - the cherubim, seraphim, ophanim, all the angels of governance, the Elect One, and the other forces on earth (and) over the water. On that day, they shall lift up in one voice, blessing, glorifying, and extolling in the spirit of faith, in the spirit of wisdom and patience, in the spirit of mercy, in the spirit of justice and peace, and in the spirit of generosity. They shall all say in one voice, ' Blessed (is he) and may the name of the Lord of the Spirits be blessed forever and evermore'.

All those who do not sleep in heaven above shall bless him; all the holy ones who are in heaven shall bless him; all the elect ones who dwell in the garden of life (shall bless him); every spirit of light that is capable of blessing, glorifying, extolling, and sanctifying your blessed name (shall bless him); and all flesh shall glorify and bless your name with an exceedingly limitless power forever and ever.

Here we have an eschatological picture of the End, when the righteous and the celestial beings - including cherubim, seraphim and ophanim (the latter having become a separate class of angelic beings - cf.1 Enoch 71:7) - together praise God in heaven. The geduṣṣah in the Parables, we may note, is a song of heaven, and not earth.

L. Slavonic Enoch (2 Enoch)

Although Daniélou regarded Slavonic Enoch as a Jewish-Christian work, the consensus opinion seems to be that, although it may have Christian interpolations, and although the relationship between the two recensions presents problems, the work may be regarded as a Jewish work.⁶¹

In its present form Slavonic Enoch records the ascent of Enoch, carried on the wings of two men (angelic beings) through ten heavens, though the original seems to have referred only to seven heavens; certainly only seven are given a full description. The third heaven contained both Paradise and a terrible place of torture. In Paradise Enoch is told:

And there are three hundred angels, very bright, who look after Paradise; and with never-ceasing voice and pleasant singing they worship the Lord every day and hour. (2 Enoch 8:8 Recension A)

Recension B, which is generally shorter, reads:

And the angels guarding Paradise are very splendid. With never-ceasing voice and pleasant singing they worship God throughout the whole day.

The fourth heaven is depicted as being a particularly musical place :

In 15:1 (Recension A only), corresponding with dawn,

... the solar elements, called phoenixes and khalkedras, burst into song. That is why every bird flaps its wings, rejoicing at the giver of light. And they burst into song at the Lord's command.

According to Odeberg, verse 2, 'The Giver of Light Comes to give His brightness to the whole world', is to be taken as the chant which was sung.⁶² Later in the fourth heaven, the seer records:

In the middle of the heaven I saw armed troops, worshipping the Lord with tympani and pipes and unceasing voices, and pleasant voices and pleasant and unceasing and various songs, which it is impossible to describe. And every mind would be quite astonished, so marvellous and wonderful is the singing of these angels. And I was delighted, listening to them. (17:1)

Recension B is shorter:

In the middle of the heaven I saw armed troops, worshipping God with tympani and pipes and unceasing voices.

It will be recalled that it was in the fourth heaven, in Test. Levi, that thrones and dominions offer hymns always.

In the fifth heaven Enoch encountered Grigori (Greek: watchers) who were rebellious angels, and their song, with one voice, went up before the Lord piteously and touchingly (18:9). In the sixth heaven were seven bands of angels who organise singing and glorious praise. In their midst were six (seven in Recension B) Phoenixes, Cherubim and six-winged ones who,

having but one voice and singing in unison. And their song is not to be reported; and the Lord is delighted by his footstool. (19:6)

Recension B reads:

having but one voice and singing in themselves. Their song is not to be reported; the Lord is delighted by his footstool.

In the seventh heaven Enoch encountered more celestial beings, arranged in hierarchies. Recension B 20:3 - 21:1 reads:

And all the heavenly armies assembled, according to rank, advancing and doing obeisance to the Lord. And then they withdrew and went to their places in joy and merriement, in immeasurable light, but gloriously serving him by night, nor departing by day, standing in front of the face of the Lord, carrying out his will - with all the army of cherubim around his throne, never departing, and the six-winged ones covering his throne, singing in front of the face of the Lord.

Recension A has a much more complicated celestial hierarchy with specific angelic classes arranged in steps according to their rank, which would bow down to the Lord, and would again go to their places in joy and felicity, 'singing songs in the boundless light with small and tender voices, gloriously serving him'.

However, Recension A goes on to quote the geduṣṣah:

cherubim and seraphim standing all around his throne, six-winged and many-eyed; they cover his entire throne, singing with gentle voice in front of the face of the Lord.

Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord Lord Sabaoth,
Heaven and earth are full of his glory.

If Recension A is an expansion of Recension B, it would seem that the redactor has felt it necessary to elaborate on the heavenly songs by giving the geduṣṣah, which is attributed to cherubim and seraphim. Since it is generally agreed that any Christian additions are to be found in A rather than B, it might be the case that this geduṣṣah, which is close to the eucharistic

sanctus, has been inserted under the influence of Christian liturgical usage. There can be no certainty to the matter.

Enoch, it should be noted, is anointed and becomes like one of the glorious ones, and was invited to stand before the Lord's face to eternity (22:6). We may presume that he thus joined in the songs of the heavenly host.

M. Summary

On account of the many uncertainties which surround the diverse literature referred to as Old Testament Pseudepigrapha which clearly emanated from diverse groups with diverse interests, it is impossible to make any firm conclusions. Some of the apocalypses in this material record the ascent of an Old Testament seer (Enoch, Abraham, Job) to the highest heaven, and during the ascension the seer learns some of the secrets of heaven, including information about the celestial entourage. Some of the celestial beings are involved in the worship of God at certain times, and some offer unceasing worship, which the seer overhears, even if it is in angelic language (Test.Job). The fact that some of the chants are actually recorded suggests that knowledge of them was part of the privileged revelation of the secrets of heaven. While the chants vary, the geduṣṣah is often included, and while some instances may be the work of Christian redactors (Apoc.Mosis; Test.Isaac; 2 Enoch), others occur in works which scholars regard as emanating from Jewish groups. The form of the geduṣṣah varies, illustrating that the biblical text was not sacrosanct. In one instance the geduṣṣah is heard on earth (Test.Abraham), and it can be used

as a prayer by man to God (4 Baruch); otherwise, it is a heavenly chant. Odeberg's comment on 2 Enoch holds true for the other chants: ' There is no reference to an interdependence or interrelation between the Celestial Chant and the Service performed by the congregation on earth'.⁶³ However, it is legitimate to suggest that in some Jewish circles the geduṣṣah and other chants were regarded as secrets of the heavenly world which angels and righteous men sing now, and which they would sing together in heaven in the age to come.

3. MERKAVAH MYSTICISM AND THE HEKHALOT LITERATURE

In discussing the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, reference has already been made to the Merkāvāh tradition. Deriving its name from the Hebrew term Ma'aseh Merkāvāh (the work of the Chariot) which in rabbinic writings describes one of the two branches of the esoteric teachings of ancient Judaism (the other being Ma'aseh Bereshit, the work of Creation), it has been the subject of important studies by G.Scholem, I.Gruenwald, and P.Schafer.⁶⁴ The literature of the mature period of this movement, the Hekhalot (Divine Palaces) literature, is preserved in the following books:

Reṽuyot Yehezkel
 Hekhalot Zutreti
 Hekhalot Rabbati
 Merkāvāh Rabbah
 Ma'aseh Merkāvāh
 Sefer Hekhalot (3 Enoch or Hebrew Enoch)
 Masekhet Hekhalot

In addition there are chapters on physiognomics, and chiromancy, and some Hekhalot fragments. 65

According to Gruenwald, the three main subjects dealt with are: 1) heavenly ascension; 2) the revelation of cosmology, and other secrets; and 3) the special method of studying and memorizing the Torah.⁶⁶ Central to the tradition, however, was the study of God's glory and celestial throne, with considerable speculation on the visions of Ezekiel 1 and 3. Lawrence Hoffman writes:

The group emerged out of the Hellenistic milieu of the second century C.E., if not earlier. Basing their theology on the cosmology positing seven heavens (and perhaps eight), they conceptualized God as seated on His throne of glory (or merkavah) and surrounded by angels constantly praising Him. Worship's purpose was to praise God similarly, and to escape the fetters of worldly habitation in order to break through the barriers of the various heavens and see God in His splendor. This psychic journey occasioned considerable danger, particularly at each entry into a new heaven, and would-be travelers were outfitted with secret lore (gnosis), and proper incantations that would prove effective in protecting one from madness or even death at such moments of crisis. 67

It would, however, be quite wrong to identify the Merkāvāh movement solely with the Hekhalot literature. Hoffman points out:

In fact we have no record whatever of merkavah organizations, calls, meetings, leaders, social structure - nothing that a student of human organizations would point to as illustrating the development of a group. We have instead legends about rabbis, some well known, like Yochanan ben Zakkai and Akiba; a literature detailing visions of people who attained the mystical vision; and prayers galore illustrative of merkavah values and merkavah style. So we should speak not of the merkavah "group" but of a merkavah "tendency" to which many a rabbi may well have leaned at one time or another. 68

It seems fairly clear that the Angelic Liturgy of Qumran, where there is speculation on the merkāvāh (throne-chariot), and the heavenly ascents noted in the Pseudepigrapha, are expressions of this movement or "tendency",⁶⁹ and witness to its wide diffusion, and a date earlier than that suggested by Hoffman. The visions

of the Book of Daniel seem to be connected in part with this speculation, and the Targum of Ezekiel, where there is already some considerable elaboration of the biblical text, may itself be the work of this movement.⁷⁰ In Ecclesiasticus 49:8, the Greek version simply records the fact that Ezekiel saw a vision of glory 'which God showed to him on a chariot of cherubim'; the Hebrew text, in place of ὁ ἄρματος χερουβίμ reads z^enê Merkāvāh : 'Ezekiel saw a vision and spoke about the various qualities of the chariot'.

The rabbinic references to this movement are scanty. ^hMisnah Hagigah ii,1 says:

It is forbidden to discourse ... on the creation of the world in the presence of two, and on the Merkāvāh in the presence of one unless he is wise and able to understand of himself.

It was secret knowledge, not general knowledge. While the Book of Ezekiel suggests a Babylonian origin, and while it was certainly developed in Babylonian Jewry,⁷¹ it was equally a Palestinian movement, as witnessed by the story of Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai (ca. 1-80 CE) and his disciples Rabbi El'azar ben 'Arakah, recorded in Tosefta Hagigah 2:1, Jerusalem Hagigah 77a, Babylonian Hagigah 14b and the Mekilta of R.Simon ben Yohai.⁷²

The importance of this tradition for this study of the sanctus is its revelations concerning the divine songs of the heavens which the angelic choirs sing to God, and the liturgical hymns which were revealed, and, we may presume, were sung in certain circles of this diffuse movement.⁷³ Scholem writes:

On the one hand, the hymns are addressed to the throne and to Him who sits upon it, and are described as celestial songs of praise sung by 'the Holy Living Creatures' (Hayyôt ha-qōdeš) who, in Ezekiel 1:5ff, are the bearers of the throne. On the other hand, these same hymns are the ones the mystic is instructed to recite before and during his ecstatic ascent to heaven (which, in a very curious and so far unexplained change of phraseology, is always referred to in this text as a descent unto the Merkavah). The hymns describe, in a plethora of solemn phrases, the spirit of

majesty and solemnity that permeates the heavenly realm, 'the Palaces of Silence' in which God's Shekhinah dwells, and express, too, the ideas of the writers about the many different angelic hosts and their part in the celestial liturgy. 74

According to Scholem, many of these hymns originated in Palestine, certainly not later than the third century CE, and probably earlier. Quite a number of these hymns include geduṣṣot.

In Reṯuyot Yehezkel, the geduṣṣah is sung by angels in the second heaven and these angels are renewed everyday, and they recite their hymns from sunrise to sunset. In the Sefer ha-Razim, before the angels sing the geduṣṣah, they immerse in streams of purity, and wrap themselves up in garments of white fire. In Hekhalot Rabbati, which is the major Hekhalot tractate, Rabbi Ishmael is told:

Between firmament and firmament is hung water; between water and water, fire; between fire and fire, water; between water and water, fire and hail and water. Fire burneth more fiercely and there is a wall of fire on either side of the throne and seraphim standing before Him and saying, 'Holy, holy, holy is Yahweh of Hosts' and beasts uttering praise, 'Blessed be the glory of Yahweh from His (dwelling) place'. And the firmament saith, 'The Lord reigneth He is apparelled with majesty'. And the seas and the rivers utter praise and say, 'To Him who divided the Red Sea into parts' etc. 75

In chapter 11 Rabbi Ishmael gives a detailed description of the worship and ministry of the angelic host. Regarding the holy beasts, in language which echoes the Qumran fragment, Ishmael reveals:

But among the holy beasts there is none that precedeth or delayeth because their height is one and their breadth is one and their clothing is one and their strength is one and the crowns of their heads are one and their splendour is one. And the creatures are arranged at the four feet of the throne, one over against the other: one wheel over against another, one ophan over against another, one beast over against another, one cherub over against another and one melody over against another. And they open their mouths in song, in thanksgiving, in fear, in fright, in terror, in trembling, in shaking, in shivering, in cleanliness and in holiness and in a still, small voice, as it is said, 'and after the tumult (sic) a still small voice.'

And they lift up the Merkavah with a sound of songs, with praise

and with laud. Then do the holy hallow, the pure applaud, the messengers exalt, the wheels rejoice, the cherubim praise, the beasts bless, the seraphim give utterance, the troops magnify, the angels make music and they are divided into three groups of a thousand thousands and myriad of myriads. One group saith, 'Holy,holy,holy', and kneeleth and falleth prostrate; and the second group saith, 'Holy,holy,holy' and kneeleth and falleth prostrate; and the third group saith, 'Holy,holy,holy is Yahweh of Hosts, the whole earth is full of His glory', and it kneeleth and falleth prostrate. And the beasts from under the throne of glory answer after them and say, 'Blessed be the glory of the Lord from His (dwelling) place'.

Similarly, in Ma'aseh Merkāvāh, a short text published by Scholem, we are informed:

In the seventh palace stand a hundred thousand thousand myriad chariots of fire and two thousand thousand myriad flames mingling among them.

In the first palace the chariots of fire say ' Holy,holy,holy, Yahweh of Hosts, all the earth is full of Thy glory'. And their flames of fire separating and gathering in the second palace and saying ' Holy,holy,holy, is Yahweh of Hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory'. In the second palace the chariots of fire say, 'Blessed be the glory of Yahweh in His place ' and also their flames of fire separating and gathering in the third palace, and saying 'Blessed be the glory of Yahweh from His place'. 76

And,

Rabbi Ishmael said, 'When Rabbi Nehuniah ben Haqanah my master told me the secret of the chambers of the chariot and also of the Law, I will not forget one of these chambers. I saw the king of the world sitting on a lofty and exalted throne, and all the chambers of His holy name and his might were sanctifying His name in praise according to their function, as it is said (in Scripture), And they call one to another and say 'Holy,holy,holy, is Yahweh of Hosts, the whole earth is full of His glory'. 77

In Sefer Hekhalot, known as 3 Enoch or Hebrew Enoch, we encounter the mystical tradition as it had developed in the sixth and seventh centuries CE. From the literary point of view the book is affiliated to the Enoch tradition. The first part describes Enoch's translation to heaven and his transformation into Metatron, or a Synthronos - one who is seated alongside God. Chapter 13 describes Metatron's crown, and then in chapter 14 we encounter a highly complex angelology.

Odeberg divides the angelological sections into two main parts:

(a) 17-22, 25-28:6, and (b) the remaining parts, including qedussah.⁷⁸

Amongst the angelic classes are the eight galgillim (now quite distinct from Ophanim), the prince Hayyiel and the four hayyot, four cherubim with their prince Cherubiel; prince Ophaniel over the ophanim; prince Seraphiel over the four seraphim; Radueriel is above them (scribes) and the Throne of Glory, with watchers and the Holy Ones. Another very complex angelological hierarchy is listed in chapter 18.

In chapter 1, which describes Rabbi Ishmael's ascent to the seventh heaven, we are told:

After one hour (had passed) the Holy One, blessed be He, opened to me the gates of Shekina, the gates of Peace, the gates of Wisdom, the gates of Strength, the gates of Power, the gates of Speech, the gates of Song, the gates of Qedussah, the gates of Chant. And he enlightened my eyes and my heart by words of psalm, song, praise, exaltation, thanksgiving, extolment, glorification, hymn, and eulogy. And as I opened my mouth, uttering a song before the Holy One, blessed be He, the Holy Hayyot beneath and above the Throne of Glory answered and said: 'Holy' and 'Blessed be the Glory of Yahweh from His place ! ' (i.e. they chanted the qedussah). 1:11-12.

In chapter 20:2 reference is made to psalms, songs of praise and songs of rejoicing, and in chapter 19:7 the galgillim, cherubim, hayyot and seraphim are reported as saying one to another the fifth verse of Psalm 68. In chapter 46:4 the song uttered by the heavenly bodies is Psalm 8:4, and in chapter 2:4 on the occasion of Rabbi Ishmael's admission to the merkavah the angels sing Psalm 144:15. However, the most important song is the qedussah. As well as chapter 1:12, it is reported to be sung by the hayyot in 20:2. In chapter 39 we are told:

When the ministering angels utter the qedussah then all the explicit names that are graven with a flaming style on the Throne of Glory fly off like eagles, with sixteen wings. And

they surround and compass the Holy One, blessed be He, on the four sides of the place of His Shekina.

And the angels of the host, and the flaming Servants, and the mighty Ophanim, and the cherubim of the Shekina, and the Holy hayyot, and the seraphim and the Er'ellim, and the Taphsarim and the troops of consuming fire, and the fiery armies, and the flaming hosts, and the holy princes, adorned with crowns, clad in kingly majesty, wrapped in glory, girt with loftiness, fall upon their faces three times, saying: 'Blessed be the name of His glorious kingdom for ever and ever'.

According to chapter 40, if the holy beings do not sing in the right order, they are destroyed. In chapter 48(B) myriads of powers

give glory unto them (the 72 names of God) and they answer and cry before them: Holy,holy,holy. And they roll (convoy) them through every heaven as mighty and honoured princes. And when they bring them all back to the place of the Throne of Glory, then all the Hayyot by the Merkavah open their mouth in praise of His glorious name, saying: 'Blessed be the name of His glorious kingdom for ever and ever'.

The qeduṣṣah, according to Hebrew Enoch, is chanted by special hosts of angels, the hayyot, the great Prince, the heavenly bodies, and by the Seer.

Although this is a later merkāvāh text, Sefer Hekhalot amply illustrates the importance of the qeduṣṣah in the mystical tradition. Its importance is attested by the fact that many of the merkāvāh chants include the qeduṣṣah or terminate with it. Thus, in Hekhalot Rabbati, Rabbi Ishmael asks: ' What are those songs which he recites who would behold the vision of the Merkāvāh, who dwells in peace and would ascend in peace ?'. The text gives a variety of hymns heard by Ishmael and learnt by him. The 'principal songs' are found in chapters 2-4. In chapter 2 the following are given:

The beginning of praise and the commencement of song
The beginning of jubilation and the commencement of exultation
Do the princes sing who serve each day
the Lord God of Israel and the throne of His glory,(singing):
Sing,sing for joy, supernal dwelling !
Shout,shout for joy, precious vessel !
Made marvellously and a marvel.
Surely thou shalt gladden the King who sitteth upon thee,

(With joy) as the joy of the bridegroom in his bridechamber.
 Let him rejoice, and let all the seed of Jacob be glad.
 (Thus said I) when I came to take refuge under the shadow
 of thy wings
 In the joy of my heart which rejoiced in thee.
 (For thy converse((my heart)) is with the converse of thy King
 And with thy Maker thou dost hold discourse.)
 (As it is said, 'Holy,holy,holy is Yahweh of Hosts')
 From the praise and song of each day,
 From the jubilation and exultation of each hour,
 And from the utterance which proceedeth out of the mouth of the
 holy ones
 And from the melody which wellet up out of the mouth of the
 servants
 Mountains of fire and hills of flame
 Are piled up and hidden and poured out each day
 As it is said, ' Holy,holy,holy is Yahweh of Hosts'.

In Ma^āseh Merkāvāh we find a berakah which includes geduṣṣah:⁷⁹

Blessed art thou Yahweh my God and my maker great and terrible,
 Life of the worlds, powerful over all the Chariot.
 Who is like thee, powerful in the height ?
 Prosper me in all my limbs
 And I shall meditate at the gates of wisdom and examine the ways
 of perception
 And watch at the chambers of the Law and meditate on the hidden
 things of blessedness;
 And may they be treasures to me, for wisdom is before Thee,
 And protect me from all angry (spirits) who attend, so that
 they may become friends to me before Thy presence,
 And I shall know Thy holiness is for ever,
 And I shall bless Thy holy name for ever
 And I shall sanctify Thy holy and great name
 And the great Seal shall be on all the limbs of my body
 as it is written, and I shall cry ' Holy,holy,holy is Yahweh
 of Hosts, the whole earth is full of His glory'.
 Blessed art thou, Yahweh, Life of the Worlds. 80

The merkāvāh tradition, therefore, as it blossomed in this particular
 literature, witnesses to the importance of the geduṣṣah amongst
 this 'tendency'. The chant came to be included in hymns, whether
 appropriate to the context or not, and the occurrence of geduṣṣah
 within a berakah suggests that it may well have occurred as a
 regular feature in the personal berakot of some adherents to this
 widely diffuse movement.

4. THE SYNAGOGUE BERAKOT

The Synagogue liturgy provides for a Morning (Shaharit), Afternoon (Minha) and Evening (' Arvit) service daily, plus an additional (Musaf) service on Sabbaths and festivals.⁸¹ The qeduṣṣah occurs in three places within the Synagogue liturgy: in the Yoser, the first berakah before the shema in the Morning Service (qeduṣṣah d^e yoser); in the third berakah (Qeduṣṣat ha-shem) of the Amidah (qeduṣṣah d^e amidah); and at the end of the service, originating in the Bet Midras after the readings and exposition (qeduṣṣah d^e sidra). A great deal of discussion has taken place concerning which of these was the first to make its appearance in the public liturgy, and at what date.⁸²

It was not until the Gaonic period (c.600-1100 CE) that a more or less fixed wording of the Synagogue prayers came to be determined, and were written down; until the close of the Talmud, the principle that found acceptance was ' They who write down prayers are as they who burn the Torah'.⁸³ The first prayer book known to us is that of Amran Gaon (d.871) who composed an order (Seder) for use in Spain; roughly a century later, Saadiah Gaon (d.942) issued a prayer book.⁸⁴ Although the texts of these two collections are by no means identical, they are both identified as belonging to the 'Babylonian' ritual. There was also another distinct ritual, the 'Palestinian ' ritual. However, this latter sank into oblivion with the eclipse of Palestinian Jewry at the time of the Crusades, and the Babylonian rite ultimately predominated.⁸⁵ In Egypt the Palestinian rite seems to have been preserved in many of the liturgical fragments of the Cairo Genizah. Although certain more

recent developed rites - the Italian, Ashkenazic and Roumanian - show the influence of the 'Palestinian' ritual, the predominant influence on all modern rites is undoubtedly 'Babylonian'.⁸⁶

The scholarly investigation of the origins and development of the Synagogue prayers has tended to concentrate on the historical and philological issues, and the reconstruction of their 'original' form.⁸⁷ Generally the 'Palestinian' rite has tended to be regarded as older, and hence more 'original' than the texts representing the 'Babylonian' rite. Furthermore, shorter texts of the same prayer tended to be regarded as the earlier versions. In recent years, however, another approach, the form-critical method, has been pioneered by Arthur Spanier and Joseph Heinemann.⁸⁸ This method has been concerned with the development and employment of diverse liturgical forms and patterns in the actual setting of the Synagogue. Heinemann maintained that the liturgy was long circulated in oral form, and thus there was no single Urtext, but different oral versions. Heinemann writes:

The Jewish prayers were originally the creations of the common people. The characteristic idioms and forms of prayer, and indeed the statutory prayers of the synagogue themselves, were not in the first place products of the deliberations of the Rabbis in their academies, but were rather the spontaneous, on-the-spot improvisations of the people who gathered on various occasions to pray in the synagogue. Since the occasions and places of worship were numerous, it was only natural that they should give rise to an abundance of prayers, displaying a wide variety of forms, styles, and patterns. Thus, the first stage in the development of the liturgy was characterized by diversity and variety - and the task of the Rabbis was to systematize and to impose order on this multiplicity of forms, patterns and structures. This task they undertook after the fact; only after the numerous prayers had come into being and were familiar to the masses did the Sages decide that the time had come to establish some measure of uniformity and standardization. Only then did they proceed carefully to inspect the existing forms and patterns, to disqualify some while accepting others, to decide which prayers were to be statutory on which occasions, and by which prayers a man "fulfilled his obligation".⁸⁹

Thus, in the Tannaitic and Amoraic periods, there were a variety of alternative texts which were used in worship. In addition, it has become clear from the form-critical method that not only is it questionable to regard the Palestinian texts as more original, but also, a text which comes down in the Babylonian sources may be of Palestinian origin.

It has long been recognised that the geduṣṣot of the Synagogue berakot with their accompanying angelology were due to the influence of the merkāvāh tradition,⁹⁰ but there has been little agreement concerning the exact extent of this influence, and the date at which it took place. Heinemann notes:

Only once in the Tannaitic sources (and this only toward the end of the period) do we find any mention of the Qeduṣṣah, viz., the description of the sanctification of God by the ministering angels on high, which has its roots in the theophanies of the prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel. Its core is the recitation of two verses from the Biblical accounts of these theophanies - Isaiah 6:3 ("Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory"), and Ezekiel 3:12 ("Blessed be the glory of the Lord from His place"). Scholars are in disagreement as to whether this solitary Tannaitic passage (Tosafṭa Berakot, I, 9) refers to the Qeduṣṣah in the amidah, or in the Yoser (the first benediction before the recitation of the Sema). But there is reason to believe that both forms of the Qeduṣṣah came into being during, or even before, the Mishnaic period, the only question being to what extent either had been accepted as an integral part of the statutory worship in all places during this period. 91

The form-critical approach, together with more recent studies on the Cairo Genizah fragments has meant that the views of earlier scholars on the age of the geduṣṣot need some modification.

A. Qeduṣṣah d' Yoser

In Seder Amran Gaon (SAG), the daily Yoser is as follows:

XX. And the *sheliach sabbur* begins and says:
Blessed be thou, JHWH, our God, king of the universe, who formest light and createst darkness, who makest peace and createst all things: Who in

mercy givest light to the earth and to them that dwell thereon and in his goodness reneweth the creation every day continually. How manifold are thy works, JHWH. In wisdom hast thou made them all, the earth is full of thy possessions. King who alone wast exalted from aforetime, praised, glorified and exalted from days of old. Everlasting God, in thine abundant mercies have mercy upon us, Lord of our strength, Rock of our stronghold, Shield of our salvation, thou stronghold of ours. The blessed God, great in knowledge, prepared and formed the rays of the sun: it was a boon he produced as a glory to his name. He set the luminaries round about his strength. The chiefs of his hosts are holy beings, they extol the Almighty, continually declare the glory of God and his holiness. Be thou blessed, JHWH, our God, in the heavens above and on the earth beneath. Be thou blessed, our Rock, our King and our Redeemer, Creator of holy beings, praised be thy name for ever, our King, Creator of ministering spirits, and all of his ministering spirits stand in the height of the universe, and with awe proclaim aloud in unison the words of the living God and everlasting King. All of them are beloved, all of them are pure, all of them are mighty, all of them in dread do the will of their master, all of them open their mouths in holiness and purity and praise and glorify and sanctify the name of the great King, the mighty and dreaded One, holy is He. They all take upon themselves the yoke of the kingdom of heaven, one from the other, and give leave one to another to hallow their Creator: in tranquil joy of spirit, with pure speech and with holy melody they all respond in unison in fear, and say with awe: HOLY, HOLY, HOLY IS JHWH OF HOSTS: THE WHOLE EARTH IS FULL OF HIS GLORY. And the Ophanim and the holy Chayoth with a noise of great rushing, upraising themselves towards them praise and say: BLESSED BE THE GLORY OF JHWH FROM HIS PLACE. To the blessed God they offer pleasant melodies, to the King, the living and ever-enduring God they utter hymns and make their praises heard, for he alone performeth mighty deeds and maketh new things, the Lord of battles, he soweth righteousness, causeth salvation to spring forth, createth remedies, is revered in praises, the Lord of wonders who in his goodness reneweth the creation every day continually, as it is said: [Give thanks] to him that maketh great lights for his grace endureth for ever. Blessed be thou, JHWH, Creator of the luminaries. 92

The text of the Sabbath Yosher is longer:

XXII. Blessed art thou, O YHWH our God, King of the universe, who formest light and createst darkness, who makest peace and createst all things. All shall thank thee, and all shall praise

thee; all shall say: There is none holy like YHWH. All shall extol thee for ever, thou Maker of all things, O God who openest every day the doors of the gates of sunrise, and breakest through the windows of the firmament, bringing forth the sun from his place.

and the moon from her dwelling, so giving light to the whole world and to its inhabitants whom thou createst with an abundant measure of love, and so giving light to the earth and to them that dwell thereon, in love. There is none to be compared unto thee, neither is there any besides thee; [nay,] none but thee; and who is like unto thee? There is none to be compared unto thee, O YHWH, in this world, neither is there any besides thee, O our King, for the life of the world to come; none but thee, O our Redeemer, for the days of the Messiah; and who is like unto thee, O our Saviour, for the resurrection of the dead?

God, the Lord over all works, blessed is he, and lever to be blessed by the mouth of everything that hath breath. His greatness and his goodness fill the earth; knowledge and understanding surround him; he is exalted over the holy Hayyot, and is adorned in glory above the [celestial] Chariot; purity and rectitude are before his throne, mercy and lovingkindness before the throne of his glory. Good are the luminaries [which] our God hath created; he formed them with knowledge, with understanding and with discernment; he gave them might and power to become rulers in the midst of the world. They

are full of splendour, and they radiate brightness; beautiful in their splendour throughout all the world. They rejoice in their going forth, and they are glad in their returning; they perform with awe the desire of their Creator. Glory and honour they render unto his name, joyful shouting and rejoicing at the remembrance of his kingdom. He called unto the sun, and it sparkled with light; he looked, and ordained the figure of the moon. Every host on high rendereth praise unto him; the Serafim together with the holy Ofannim [ascribe unto him] glory and greatness.

To the God who rested from all [his] works, and on the seventh day exalted himself, and sat upon the throne of his glory; [who] wrapped himself [in] glory for the day of rest, and called the Sabbath day a delight. This is the praise of the seventh day, that God rested thereon from all his work, when the seventh day [itself] offered praise and said, *A Psalm, A Song for the Sabbath day*. Therefore may they glorify God, all his creatures; may they render praise, honour and greatness to the God who giveth rest to his people Israel on the holy Sabbath day. Thy name, O YHWH our God, shall be hallowed; thy remembrance shall be glorified, O our King, for all the praise of the work of thy hands; and the luminaries which thou hast made shall glorify thee for ever.

Thou art blessed, O YHWH our God, in the heavens above and on the earth beneath; blessed art thou, O our Rock, our King and our Redeemer, Creator of holy beings. Praised be

thy name for ever, O our King, Maker of ministering spirits; and whose ministering spirits etc.

[And they recite] 'Holy, holy, holy'; [and further] 'And the Ofanim', 'To the blessed God'; [and] 'With abounding love'. And they recite the *Shema*; [and], 'True and firm', as far as 'who hast redeemed Israel'. 93

The date of the Yoser berakah has itself been disputed. Some scholars believed that it formed part of the temple liturgy as it is outlined in Tractate Tamid. After the sacrifice a prayer service followed which included the shema and the decalogue. Four benedictions are mentioned, and three are named. The first is simply called a berakah, and Bab.T.Berakot 11b witnesses to the fact that from an early date it was uncertain whether this referred to Ahabah or Yoser. Kohler believed that the Yoser would be out of place in the temple since when the morning sacrifice was offered at a later hour, the reference to light would be superfluous.⁹⁴ Heinemann argues that all three berakot of the shema are old, not because of some presumed origin in the temple liturgy, but because they originated as a single unit in the popular prayer of the Synagogue and from the popular worship entered the morning service of the temple priests. Since the temple service was before sunrise, Yoser was never adopted.⁹⁵

Louis Finkelstein, whose liturgical views have been popularized in the English-speaking world by C.W.Dugmore,⁹⁶ believed that the original form of the Yoser originated in the temple, and was shorter than the form used in the Synagogue.⁹⁷ Indeed, Zunz fixed the 'original' form of this berakah at 45 words.⁹⁸ The Palestinian Genizah fragments published by Jacob Mann provided shorter texts

of the Yoser, and did not include geduṣṣah, which led Mann to state that 'for Talmudic times there is no cogent proof for the existence of a Kedusha in Yoser'.⁹⁹ However, the explanation for this latter seems to be that it was for private recitation. In Seder Saadia Gaon (SSG), an ordinance, also found in one manuscript of SAG, notes that the individual recital of the Yoser must be without geduṣṣah, since it is only possible to recite geduṣṣah when ten men are present.¹⁰⁰ Furthermore, the recent research of Ezra Fleischer now indicates that Mann's observation is inaccurate. Fleischer has examined some of the Piyyutim, especially those found in the Cairo Genizah.¹⁰¹ The early Piyyutim were composed to create a parallel with the text of the prayer. Fleischer concludes that the Piyyutim associated Yoser and geduṣṣah, and this would not have been possible unless the latter had been included in the Yoser. The Piyyutim indicate that geduṣṣah was used on Sabbaths and Holidays, but not semi-holidays and weekdays. Only in some Palestinian Jewish communities was geduṣṣah not recited, and this was atypical.

Heinemann comments on Fleischer's work:

It stands to reason, then, that the Qeduṣṣah d' Yoser, too, is of Palestinian origin and is probably quite ancient, although it never became part of the daily order of prayer there. Since there is no longer any doubt that the Qeduṣṣah originated among the mystical circles of the yorde markabah (those who "descend to the Chariot "), it is not difficult to explain its restricted use in the Palestinian rite. The Talmudic Sages, it would seem, did not favor the infiltration of mystical elements into the public statutory liturgy, not so much out of opposition to the mystical doctrines themselves, but out of their conviction that such esoteric matters should not be popularized. ¹⁰²

In the texts of SAG, the Sabbath Yoser has three main insertions: " All shall thank thee "; "God the Lord", and " To the God who rested ". The second of these seems to be the work of the later merkāvāh tradition,¹⁰³ and it was probably this type of expansion

leading up to geduṣṣah which was resisted in Palestinian circles, rather than geduṣṣah itself.

When we turn to examine the context, we may note that Yoser with geduṣṣah praises Yahweh as Creator. It builds up through the luminaries and the heavens above, and mentions the holy beings and ministering spirits who "with awe proclaim aloud in unison the words of the living God and everlasting King". They "open their mouths in holiness and purity " and "praise and glorify and sanctify the name of the great King". It is these 'ministering spirits ' who recite the geduṣṣah, while it is the ôphanîm and hayyôt who respond with Ezekiel 3:12. The words "upraising themselves towards them " is in some texts rendered "towards the seraphim", thus equating "ministering spirits" with the seraphim who sing geduṣṣah in Isaiah 6:3. The prayer suggests that the geduṣṣah is similar to the shema in that it is a taking upon themselves the yoke of the kingdom. The geduṣṣah and other melodies are offered or lifted up to God. There is no verbal suggestion that Israel sings the geduṣṣah.

A fragment of a Yoser from the Cairo Genizah published by Schechter uses phraseology from Daniel 7:10:

Creator of ministering spirits, tens of thousands stand
before him, myriads upon myriads surround his throne,
all are beloved, all are pure... 104

Heinemann traces the development of the phrases 'thousand upon thousand and myriad upon myriad' as found in a thanksgiving prayer for rain attributed to Rabbi Ezekiel.¹⁰⁵ His view is that in this particular prayer it was first applied to raindrops, and only later to angels, and he cites this Genizah fragment in a footnote.¹⁰⁶ However, using Heinemann's own methods, it would be logical to

see this Yoser, not as a development of phraseology originally applied to raindrops, but another variant Yoser, using phraseology associated with angels as found in Daniel 7:10, and appropriate to the context.

B. Qeduššah de ʿamidah

This occurs with the third berakah of the ʿamidah, Qeduššat ha-shem. The nucleus of this qeduššah is Isaiah 6:3, Ezekiel 3:12 and Psalm 146:10, and to these scriptural verses various additions have been made. It is first mentioned in connection with R. Judah b. Ilai in the middle of the second century CE. According to Finkelstein, the Qeduššat ha-shem was composed c.10-60 CE, and was not connected with qeduššah.¹⁰⁷ He suggests that the form of the daily ʿamidah had been fixed by R. Gamaliel, whereas in Babylon the prayer remained in a fluid state, and it was in Babylon that the qeduššah made its entrance. It was natural to add qeduššah to Qeduššat ha-shem, since they are both dealing with the holiness of God. In Babylon the mystics were not satisfied with merely adding the qeduššah, but changed the form of the Qeduššat ha-shem. Its introduction, so Finkelstein suggested, was connected with the persecution after the Bar Kokba rebellion, when the shema was forbidden. The shema and qeduššah were inserted in Qeduššat ha-shem. A.I. Schechter, it may be noted, in his study of Seder Hibbur Berakot tended towards the view that all qeduššot derive from the Babylonian Geonim.¹⁰⁸

Other Jewish scholars have expressed rather different views on the antiquity of the use of this particular liturgical use of the qeduššah. Marmorstein, for example, believed it to be a post-Talmudic

composition.¹⁰⁹ On the other hand, Kohler believed that it was introduced shortly after qeduṣṣah d^e Yoser, and under the influence of the Essenes. It was subsequently altered in some rites to allow private recitation without the angelic song, but the qeduṣṣah, so he argued, is the core of the berakah.¹¹⁰

Finkelstein's views concerning the development of qeduṣṣah d^e amidah and Qeduṣṣat ha-shem centered on the opening words of the latter. In SAC it reads:

From generation to generation give homage to God, for he alone is high and holy, and they praise our God, ...

In SSG it reads:

You are holy and your Name is holy, and holy beings each day offer you their praise.

Clearly, both these versions refer back to the qeduṣṣah. However, in the Palestinian rite the berakah consists of seven words, which Finkelstein regarded as the Urtext:

You are holy, and your Name inspires awe, and there is no other God than you.

Here there is no reference to heavenly beings, and the berakah shows less connection with the qeduṣṣah, and can stand alone without it.

SAG forbids the recital of qeduṣṣah unless ten people are present; Palestinian usage demanded at least seven.¹¹¹ Thus, the Palestinian version may well represent a version for private recitation; furthermore, as has been noted above, different versions do not necessarily mean later developments, but may have existed side by side. Fleischer's study, referred to above, suggests that in fact qeduṣṣah d^e amidah was recited in Palestinian communities in the Morning prayers and holidays, and also in the Musaf for Rosh Hashana, and all the services for the Day of Atonement.¹¹²

The form of the geduṣṣah d^e ʿamidah varies. In SAG, for all occasions, the following text is given:

Unto thee shall the multitudes above with the gatherings below give a crown, all with one accord shall thrice repeat the holy praises unto thee, according to what is said through thy prophet: *and one cried unto another and said: HOLY, HOLY, HOLY IS JHWH OF HOSTS, THE WHOLE EARTH IS FULL OF HIS GLORY.* Then with noise of great rushing, mighty and strong, they make their voices heard, and upraising themselves towards them, they say: BLESSED. BLESSED BE THE GLORY OF JHWH FROM HIS PLACE.

From thy place shine forth, our King, and reign over us, for we wait upon thee. When wilt thou reign? Reign in Zion, speedily, even in our days and in our lives do thou dwell [there]. Mayest thou be magnified and sanctified in the midst of Jerusalem thy city throughout all generations and to all eternity. And let our eyes behold thy kingdom, according to the word that was spoken in the songs of thy might by David, thy righteous anointed:

JHWH shall reign for ever, thy God, Zion, unto all generations. Hallelujah.

113

The Palestinian rite has:

We will sanctify Thy Name in the world even as they sanctify it in the highest heavens, as it is written in the hand of Thy prophets ...

In some rites (e.g. used at Musaf in the Ashkenazic rite):

We will sanctify and revere Thee with the harmonious utterance of the assembly of the heavenly seraphim who repeat twice a holy praise unto Thee; for thus it is written in the hand of the prophets: And one cried unto the other and said, Holy, holy ...

Schechter is quite correct in drawing attention to the 'crown' in SAG as a hall-mark of the merkāvāh tradition, though this does not necessarily mean that it is post-Talmudic.¹¹⁴ Undoubtedly, however, it was in the Babylonian communities that the expansion of the mystical elements in some geduṣṣot d^e ʿamidah took place.

The angelology of geduṣṣah d^e ʿamidah is very restrained: holy beings. The occurrence of holy seraphim in some versions would appear to make explicit the 'they' who 'sanctify (Thy Name)' in the highest heaven. In contrast to the geduṣṣah d^e Yoser where

the song belongs to the holy beings, in this qeduṣṣah Israel joins in and makes geduṣṣah its own song with the angelic beings.

C. Qeduṣṣah de sidra

The context of this qeduṣṣah has been analysed by Liebreich.¹¹⁵

It consists of:

- a) Qeduṣṣah (Isaiah 6:3), Ezekiel 3:12,15:18, with the Targum Onkelos of Isaiah 6:3.
- b) The initial biblical verses: Isaiah 59:20-21 and Psalm 22:4 suggesting the theme of repentance and redemption.
- c) Scripture verses which link the qeduṣṣah with the berakah.
- d) The berakah (ubā l^esiyyôn)
- e) A concluding passage from scripture - Psalm 30:13, and in some texts also Psalm 19:15.

The text in SAG is as follows:

And the *sheliach sabbur* says Kaddish to "high above", and the *sheliach sabbur* begins:

Blessed are they that dwell in thy house, they will be still praising thee. Selah.

And the congregation repeats the whole "Blessed" as we have written above to *My mouth shall speak the praise of JHWH*.

And a redeemer shall come to Zion and to them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith JHWH. And as for me, this is my covenant with them, saith JHWH; my spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith JHWH, from henceforth and for ever. But thou art holy, thou that dwellest amid the praises of Israel. And one cried unto another, and said: *Holy, holy, holy is JHWH of hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory*. And they receive sanction the one from the other, and say: Holy in heaven on high, the place of his Divine Presence, holy upon the earth, the work of his might, holy for ever and to all eternity is JHWH of hosts, the whole earth is full of the radiance of his glory. And then a wind lifted me up, and I heard behind me the voice of a great rushing [saying]: *Blessed be the glory of JHWH from his place*. Then a wind lifted me up, and I heard behind me the voice of a great rushing, of those who uttered praises, and said: Blessed be the glory of JHWH from the region of his Divine Presence. JHWH shall reign for ever and ever. The kingdom of JHWH [endureth] for ever and to all eternity. JHWH, the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Israel, our fathers, keep this for ever as the inward thought in the heart of thy people, and direct their heart unto thee. And he, being merciful, forgiveth iniquity and destroyeth not: yea, many a time he turneth his anger away, and doth not stir up all his wrath. For thou, JHWH, art good

and forgiving, and abounding in mercy unto all them that call upon thee. Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy Torah is truth. Thou wilt show faithfulness to Jacob, and mercy to Abraham, as thou hast sworn unto our fathers from days of old. Blessed be JHWH, day by day he beareth our burden, even the God who is our salvation and our help. Selah. JHWH of hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our stronghold. Selah. JHWH of hosts, happy is the man who trusteth in thee. Save, JHWH, may the King answer us on the day when we call. Blessed be our God, who hath created us for his glory, and hath separated us from them that go astray, and hath given us the Torah of truth, planted everlasting life in our midst. May he open our heart unto his Torah and place his fear within our hearts, that we may do his will and serve him with a perfect heart, that we may not labour in vain, nor bring forth for confusion. May it thus be thy will, JHWH, our God and God of our fathers, that we may keep thy statutes in this world, and be worthy to live and to inherit the life of the world to come. So that my glory may sing praise to thee, and not be silent: JHWH, my God, I will give thanks unto thee for ever. 116

The qeduṣṣah was recited after the conclusion of the reading of the prophets, and was of Bet Midraṣ origin rather than the Synagogue (though of course they were closely connected). Of significance is the fact that in qeduṣṣah d^esidra, no angelic beings are mentioned, though clearly the seraphim are intended by the biblical quotation. Also of interest is the apparent doublet; the biblical text of Isaiah 6:3 is followed by the Aramaic Targum version, which explains the holiness of Yahweh as in heaven as well as on earth.

D. Review

It has been noted that Jewish scholars are divided on the question of which Synagogue qeduṣṣah was the earliest, and the date of its appearance in the liturgy. Isthmar Elbogen argued that qeduṣṣah d^e sidra was the earliest, while, as we have seen, Finkelstein argued for qeduṣṣah d^e ḥamidah. The weight of scholarship has been in favour of qeduṣṣah d^e yoser.¹¹⁷ However, the more recent form-critical approach to Jewish liturgy should caution against the idea that from the texts which have come down to us it is possible to reconstruct an Urtext or adequately demonstrate that one was

derived from another. Fleischer has shown that geduṣṣah was used in Palestine in the Yoser and ʿamidah at an early date, and Tosafta Berakot I, 9 demonstrates that a geduṣṣah was already customary toward the end of the Tannaitic period at the very latest. In the light of the Pseudepigrapha and Hekhalot literature, it is quite probable that some groups of Jews used geduṣṣah in their Synagogue prayer in the first century CE.

The context of the geduṣṣot is also of some significance. In Yoser it is the song of the heavenly beings, and there is no suggestion that Israel takes part. However, the whole berakah is one of praise of God as creator, performer of mighty deeds, and of wonders. In the ʿamidah its immediate context is again of praise (of the Name), though in this case it is the people of Israel who sing geduṣṣah. This berakah is followed by others of an intercessory nature. Qeduṣṣah d'e sidra takes the form of a song of praise, and combines the biblical text with the Targum version.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this diverse literature which emanates from very different Jewish groups between the first century BCE and the sixth century CE (Qumran - 3 Enoch) we find the following tendencies:

- a) The idea that redeemed men will become (like) angels.
- b) Certain privileged men are taken to heaven, and witness the angelic chants, including geduṣṣah.
- c) Certain groups who have this knowledge can use geduṣṣah in hymns and prayers; eventually through the culminative influence of these groups geduṣṣah became part of the

Statutory Synagogue prayers, and Israel itself (qeduṣṣah^{vv} d'e amidah) can take part in the song of the seraphim.

- d) In the apocalypses, the angelology is complex, while in the Hekhalot hymns and Synagogue berakot, the angelology which accompanies qeduṣṣah^{vv} is somewhat more restrained.
- e) In the Hekhalot literature and the Synagogue berakot the biblical text of Isaiah 6:3 (and Ezekiel 3:12) is reproduced without change. An exception is qeduṣṣah^{vv} d'e sidra where the Targum version appears with the biblical texts. In the Pseudepigrapha, however, even excluding the possible Christian interpolations, there are examples of considerable adaptation of the biblical text.

NOTES - CHAPTER 2

1. Millar Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, (New York 1958), 278ff.
2. Menahem Mansoor, The Thanksgiving Hymns, (Leiden 1961), 79.
3. S.Talmon, 'The Emergence of institutionalized Prayer in Israel in the Light of the Qumran Literature', in ed.M.Delcor, Qumran: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu (Paris 1978), 265-84.
4. K.G.Kuhn, 'The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran', in ed.K.Stendahl, The Scrolls and the New Testament, (London 1958), 65-93; M.Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins (London 1961), 102ff; B.Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament, (Cambridge 1965), 10-11.
5. E.F.Sutcliffe, 'Sacred Meals at Qumran', HJ 1(1960),48-65; A.R.C. Leaney, The Rite of Qumran and Its Meaning, (London 1966),182ff.
6. B.Gärtner, op.cit.
7. M.Black, op.cit., 108ff.
8. B.Gärtner, op.cit.
9. A.R.C.Leaney, op.cit., 95.
10. B.Gärtner, op.cit., 92.
11. Ithamar Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism, (Leiden 1980), 41.
12. Texts: G.Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (London 1975²).
13. Cf. Malachi 2:7. "For the lips of a priest should guard knowledge, and man should seek instruction from his mouth, for he is the messenger (angel) of the Lord of hosts." (RSV)
14. J.Strugnell, 'The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran - 4Q Šîrôt Ôlat HaŠšabbat', in Congress Volume, Oxford 1959 VT Supplement 7 (Leiden 1960), 318-45.
15. Ibid., 320.
16. Moshe Weinfeld, 'Traces of Kedushat Yozer and Pesukey De-Zimra in the Qumran Literature and in Ben-Sira', Tarbiz 45 (1975-76), 13-26.
17. ET in J.A.Sanders, The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll, (New York 1967) 131.
18. For the gedussah in the Synagogue berakot, see below.

19. Even these categories are not necessarily particularly helpful. See, Samuel Sandmel, The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity: Certainties and Uncertainties, (London 1969), chapter 2: "Palestinian Judaism"; Martin Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period, 2 vols, (Philadelphia 1974); J. Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity, (London 1964); Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture (London 1973); The Origins of Latin Christianity (London 1977).
20. James H. Charlesworth, The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research. With a Supplement, (Chico 1981), 21.
21. Ibid., 125; Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity, 12-14.
22. Ibid., 21.
23. C.C. Rowland, 'The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature', JSJ 10 (1979), 137-154; 138.
24. Ibid.
25. Mary Dean-Otting, Heavenly Journeys. A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature (Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York 1984), 5-6.
26. Gruenwald, op.cit., 31.
27. M. de Jonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their text, composition and origin, (Assen 1953); Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation (Leiden 1975); 'Once More: Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', Nov.T. 5(1962), 311-319.
28. Charlesworth, op.cit., 211-220, esp. 213.
29. Unless otherwise noted, quotations are from J.H. Charlesworth (ed), The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, 2 vols (London 1983 and 1986); OTP 1, 789.
30. OTP 2, 252.
31. R.H. Charles, APOT 2, 147.
32. Ibid., 148.
33. Ibid., 149.
34. Ibid., 150.
35. Ibid., 154.
36. Ibid.
37. OTP 2, 295, note 43c.
38. OTP 1, 989ff.

39. R.A. Kraft, The Testament of Job (Missoula, Montana 1974), 82-3.
40. Charlesworth, op.cit., 70.
41. Michael E.Stone, The Testament of Abraham. The Greek Recensions, (Montana 1972).
42. Ibid., 63.
43. Ibid., 7.
44. Charlesworth, op.cit., 68-9.
45. OTP 1, 682-3.
46. Gruenwald, op. cit., 55-7.
47. G.H.Box, The Testament of Abraham (London 1927), 57-75.
48. OTP 1, 904.
49. So the translation in Box, op.cit.
50. See chapter 5 on the forms of the Christian anaphoral sanctus.
51. OTP 2, 414.
52. Charlesworth, op.cit., 130-1.
53. OTP 2, 404.
54. M.R.James, The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament,(London 1920) 97-8.
55. J.T.Milik, 'Problèmes de la littérature hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qumrân', HTR 64(1971), 333-78; The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4 (Oxford 1976).
56. Joseph A.Fitzmyer, 'Implications of the New Enoch Literature from Qumran', TS 38(1977), 332-45; M.A.Knibb, 'The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review', NTS 25 (1978-9), 345-59; Christopher L.Mearns, 'The Parables of Enoch - Origin and Date', ET 89(1978), 118-9; 'Dating the Similitudes of Enoch', NTS 25 (1978-9), 360-69. See also H.Odeberg, 3 Enoch, revised by J.Greenfield (New York 1973), p.xvii.
57. J.H.Charlesworth, 'The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen and Paris on the Books of Enoch', NTS 25 (1979), 315-23.
58. David W Suter, Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch, SBL Dissertation Series 47 (Missoula 1979), 23.
59. Rowland, art.cit; Gruenwald, op.cit.

60. Suter, *op.cit.*, 32.
61. Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity, 16; J.Greenfield in Odeberg, *op.cit.*; Charlesworth, *op.cit.*, 104.
62. Odeberg, *op.cit.*, 57.
63. Ibid.
64. G.Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition, (New York 1965²); I Gruenwald, *op.cit.*; P.Schafer, Synopse zur Hekhalot Literatur (Tübingen 1982). Cf also C.Rowland, The Open Heaven.
65. Scholem, 5-7; Gruenwald, 127- 234.
66. Gruenwald, vii.
67. Lawrence A.Hoffman, The Canonization of the Synagogue Service, (Indiana 1979), 60.
68. Ibid., 61.
69. Dean-Otting, Heavenly Journeys, 25, points out an important difference between the ascents in the Pseudepigrapha and those in later developed Hekhalot literature; the ascents of the Pseudepigrapha take the one ascending by surprise, while the Merkāvāh ascent in the latter literature comes about as a result of theurgic practices.
70. Samson H.Levey, 'The Targum of Ezekiel', HUCA 46 (1975), 139-158. Levey, 143, suggests it reflects the situation in Palestine immediately following the catastrophe of 70 CE. See also, Samson H.Levey, The Targum of Ezekiel (Edinburgh 1987).
71. J.Neusner, A History of the Jews in Babylonia. 1. The Parthian Period (Leiden 1969).
72. J.Neusner, A Life of Rabban Yohanan Ben Zakkai ca.1-80 CE (Leiden 1962), 97-8; E.E.Urbach, 'The Traditions about the Merkabah Mysticism in the Tannaitic Period', in Studies in Mysticism and Religion presented to Gershom G.Scholem on his Seventieth Birthday (Jerusalem 1967), 7ff; C.Rowland, *op.cit.*, 228ff.
73. Leon Cornet, 'Sanctus et Merkaba', QL 59(1978), 2 -37; Bryan D.Spinks, 'The Jewish Liturgical Sources for the Sanctus', HJ 21(1980), 168-179.
74. Scholem, *op.cit.*, 20-1.
75. I am indebted to Professor Morton Smith for kindly allowing me to use his translation of Hekhalot Rabbati.
76. Scholem, *op.cit.*, 106.

77. Ibid., 107.
78. H.Odeberg, 3 Enoch, revised by J.Greenfield.
79. For details of berakot, see J.Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud (Berlin and New York, 1977), 77ff.
80. Scholem, op.cit., 110; cf. 116-7.
81. For a full discussion, I.Elbogen, Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlicher Entwicklung (Frankfurt 1931); A.Z.Idelsohn, Jewish Liturgy and Its Development (New York 1960).
82. Conveniently summarized by Eric Werner, 'The Doxology in Synagogue and Church', HUCA 19 (1945-6), reprinted in Jakob J.Petuchowski (ed.), Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy (New York 1970), 318-70.
83. Shabbath 115b.
84. Lawrence Hoffman, op.cit., 1-9; David Hedegard, Seder R.Amran Gaon Part 1 (Lund 1951); Tryggve Kronholm, Seder R.Amran Gaon Part II The Order of Sabbath Prayer (Lund 1974).
85. J.Heinemann, 30.
86. Ibid., 7-8.
87. Richard S.Sarason, 'On the Use of Method in the Modern Study of Jewish Liturgy', in ed. W.S.Green, Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice (Missoula 1978), 97-172.
88. Heinemann, op.cit. For Spanier see Petuchowski, op.cit. xi.
89. Heinemann, 37.
90. P.Bloch, 'Die Yordei Merkavah, die Mystiker der Gaonzeit, und ihr Einfluss auf die Liturgie', MGWJ 37(1893), 22ff.
91. Heinemann, 24.
92. Hedegard, 46-49.
93. Kronholm, 74-80.
94. K.Kohler, 'The Origins and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions with a translation of the corresponding Essene Prayers in the Apostolic Constitutions', HUCA 1 (1924), 387-425; The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church (New York 1929).
95. Heinemann, 126, 129, 230.
96. C.W.Dugmore, The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office, (Oxford 1944; London 1964).

97. L.Finkelstein, 'La Kedouscha et les Bénédictiones du Schema', REJ 93 (1932), 1-26.
98. L.Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden(Frankfurt 1892), 382.
99. J.Mann, 'Geniza Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service', HUCA 2 (1925), 269-338, reprinted in Petuchowski, 400.
100. Hedegard, 49, notes.
101. E.Fleischer, 'The Diffusion of the Qedushot of the 'Amidah and the Yozer in the Palestinian Ritual', Tarbiz 38(1968-9), 255-84.
102. Heinemann, 232.
103. Kronholm, 76, note 8.
104. S.Schechter, in the David Kaufman Memorial Volume, ed. M.Brann and F.Rosenthal (Breslau 1900) Hebrew Section, 52.
105. Heinemann, 60.
106. Ibid., 62 note 35.
107. L.Finkelstein, 'The Development of the 'Amidah', JQR ns 16 (1925/6), 1-43; 127-70; reprinted in Petuchowski, 109, 119ff.
108. A.I.Schechter, Studies in Jewish Liturgy (Philadelphia 1930), 64-70.
109. A Marmorstein, 'L'age de la Kedouscha de l'Amidah', REJ 97(1934) 35-49.
110. Kohler, 'The Origins and Composition', Petuchowski 62-3.
111. Hedegard, 49.
112. Fleischer, art.cit., 261-6.
113. Hedegard, 114-5.
114. A.I.Schechter, op.cit., 68.
115. L.J.Liebreich, 'An Analysis of U-Ba Le-Ziyyon', HUCA 21 (1948), 176-209.
116. Hedegard, 130-2.
117. Werner, art.cit.

CHAPTER 3

THE SANCTUS IN SOME EARLY
CHRISTIAN DOCUMENTS



Christianity inherited the trisagion in the Jewish scriptures which it regarded as canonical, and the later fathers commented fully on it in the context of their commentaries on the Book of Isaiah.¹ Various Christian groups also conserved, copied and edited many of the non-canonical Pseudepigrapha. But this chapter is not concerned directly with either of these (other than to note the possible interpolation of the sanctus in some of the Pseudepigrapha); rather, its purpose is to consider a number of early references to the sanctus in order to illustrate the continuity with the ideas and uses of the geduṣṣot which we have examined in Judaism.

1. THE NEW TESTAMENT

In continuity with Judaism, Christianity inherited the concepts of angelic beings, God enthroned in heaven, and at least in some circles, the idea that the redeemed would be like angels (Luke 20:36. cf. Mark 12:25). Within the New Testament two particular references invite scrutiny.

A. John 12:41

Although the text itself is not quoted, Isaiah 6:3 is directly referred to in the Fourth Gospel. In explaining why the Jews refused to believe in Jesus despite the many signs he had performed, the evangelist refers to Isaiah 53:1 and 6:10. He then adds:

Isaiah said this because he saw his glory and spoke of him.

Here the evangelist interprets ' I saw the Lord' as referring to Jesus. B.Lindars notes that in the Targum this statement is rendered as ' I saw the Lord's glory', and R.E.Brown compares this

with John 1:14, where the glory of the Lord is revealed in the incarnation.² The Fourth Gospel thus gives the trisagion a christological application.

B. Revelation 4:8

Whereas the first three chapters of Revelation are concerned with letters to the seven churches, in chapter 4 a door in heaven opens, and the seer is told:

Come up hither, and I will show you the things which must come to pass hereafter (4:1).

The seer is spiritually translated to heaven, and remains there until the close of chapter 9.³ As in the Enoch literature, the seer hears many celestial songs - 4:8, 11:9-10, 12-13; 7:10, 12 - as well as acclamations and prayers later - 11:15, 17-18; 15:4; 19:1, 7-8. The very first chant that he hears is a variant of Isaiah 6:3, sung by four living creatures (τέσσερα ζῶα)::

Rev.4:8

Ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος
Κύριος ὁ θεὸς Παντοκράτωρ
ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ
ὁ ἐρχόμενος.

LXX Isaiah 6:3

Ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος
Κύριος σαβαωθ
πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ γῆ
τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.

The fact that the seer is in the presence of 24 elders and the living creatures has suggested to many scholars that we have here an early Christian liturgical tradition, which may have its roots in Jewish worship.⁴ P.Prigent could conclude his analysis of chapter 4:

La liturgie céleste d'Apoc.4 n'est pas une pure invention de visionnaire. Elle reprend, pour les adapter au genre littéraire du livre, les grands moments d'une liturgie réelle dont les sources sont juives et qui prépare à son tour la voie à une élaboration liturgique plus structurée et insérée dans un ensemble plus vaste. 4 a

The occurrence of a sanctus in Rev.4:8 is explained by a number of studies as a Christian adaptation of Jewish liturgical usage, particularly of qeduṣṣah d'e yoser; to quote Lucette Mowry, in chapters 4 and 5 'we have material which bridges the gap between Jewish Synagogue worship and later Christian worship'.⁵ A.Cabaniss goes even further, and suggests that Revelation reflects a Christian liturgy with a structure of scripture, homily, prayer and eucharist, though his method is to argue backwards from later liturgical practice. The implication here is that we have in Rev.4:8 an embryonic anaphoral sanctus.⁶

Although the majority of commentators have noted that the seer's description draws upon the imagery of Isaiah, Ezekiel and Daniel, it has been left to Gruenwald and Rowland to develop the insights of R.H.Charles and see Revelation 4 a reflection not so much of an earthly liturgy (Jewish-Christian or Christian), but Jewish mystical tendencies of the type found in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.⁷ Gruenwald remarks:

The Merkavah vision in Revelation IV is an interesting example of how Jewish Merkavah material was recast in the new Christian environment. 8

Rowland draws attention to the references in the New Testament to the open heaven - the baptism of Jesus, and passages such as Luke 9:29, 10:18; John 12:31; Matt.17:2 - which reflect the

common-place ideas of Jewish apocalyptic.⁹ In 2 Cor.12:2-4 Paul refers to a Christian who was snatched up to the third heaven, and to paradise. Rowland is surely correct in his suggestion that we are dealing here with two parts of the same experience (third heaven, then paradise) rather than with parallel accounts.¹⁰ As regards Rev.4, Rowland , who dates the work in the sixties CE, asserts that it 'shows no evidence whatsoever of Christian influence, and, treated in isolation, it is quite clear that it is entirely Jewish in its inspiration'.¹¹ Thus, while in Revelation we may well have early Christian hymns, the visions of chapter 4 and 5 seem to have their roots in merkāvāh rather than in the Synagogue liturgy.

The seer sees the throne of Yahweh, which is surrounded by 24 thrones with 24 elders and the four living creatures, each with six wings. The vision of the throne has been inspired by Ezekiel 1, though there are obvious omissions; there is no mention of the wheels of the chariot, and the living creatures are not bearers of the throne. The 24 elders have been variously identified as glorified men, a college of angels (originally star gods), representatives of the 24 priestly orders, and angelic representation of the faithful.¹² The living creatures are akin to the hayyōt of Ezekiel, but each one has been identified with one of the four faces of the creatures of Ezekiel 1:10ff.¹³ However, imagery from Isaiah 6 has also been used for the four living creatures; they have the six wings of the seraphim, and sing (λέγοντες , which in such a context implies singing or chanting) the song of the seraphim, or rather, an adaptation of it.

R.H.Charles suggested that the seer has followed the LXX rendering of $\text{ś}^{\text{e}}\text{bā}^{\text{t}}\text{ōt}$ with Παντοκράτωρ and he has inserted κύριος ὁ θεός from Ezekiel;¹⁴ in fact Amos 5:15-16 renders Yhwh $\text{ś}^{\text{e}}\text{bā}^{\text{t}}\text{ōt}$ by κύριος ὁ θεός ὁ Παντοκράτωρ . In place of Isaiah's text ' The whole earth is full of his glory', the text here describes the pantokrator in the terms of Rev.1:4,8 as Lord of past,present and future.¹⁵ Noting the grammatical irregularity, Martin McNamara states:

...it is clear that in the divine Name we are in the presence of a designation whose individual terms are left throughout undeclined. We appear to be here in the presence of a traditional designation for God. 16

McNamara examines and rules out Hellenistic and Septuagintal influence, but notes parallel ideas in the late work, The Alphabet of Rabbi Akiba, in explanation of the divine Name of Exodus 3:14.¹⁷ However, more fruitful are the Targumim, where there are precedents for taking the divine Name to imply God's creative activity in the first and a future creation.¹⁸ Targum Pseudo-Jonathan paraphrases Deut.32:39 thus:

I am He who is and who was and I am He who will be

giving an Aramaic tripartite form of the divine Name, of which, McNamara suggests, Rev.4:8b seems to be a servile rendering into Greek.¹⁹ The Fragment Targum and Neofiti Deut.32:3 says:

It is not possible for any of the angels on high to recall the glorious Name until they say Holy, Holy,Holy, three times.

It may be that Revelation is dependent upon these paraphrases, or they may all be dependent upon the same early tradition which, McNamara suggests, may have been liturgical.²⁰

Rev.4:8 is supplemented later by the song of the 24 elders, which has as its theme the glory of God in his works (vv.10-11). Whereas in chapter 4 the situation in heaven is described before the advent of Christ, chapter 5 speaks of the consummation of the triumph of the cross, and is accompanied by 'new songs'. Later in 5:11 it is the living creatures, elders, myriads upon myriads and thousands upon thousands of angels who say:

Worthy is the Lamb, the Lamb that was slain, to receive power and wealth, wisdom and might, honour and glory and praise.

All creatures in heaven, on earth, under the earth, and in the sea were crying:

Praise and honour, glory and might, to him who sits on the throne and to the Lamb for ever and ever.

Thus, although there are probably liturgical echoes in the vision of chapters 4 and 5, the sanctus of Rev.4:8 seems to be a variant geduṣṣah comparable to those encountered in the Pseudepigrapha. Whether or not one accepts Rowland's view of the Jewishness of chapter 4, it would seem that the context of Rev.4:8 is more akin to the geduṣṣot of the Pseudepigrapha and merkāvāh texts than to the setting it was given in the Synagogue liturgy.

2. 1 CLEMENT 34:6

Since the publication of an article in 1951 by W.C. van Unnik entitled '1 Clement 34 and the Sanctus', the older claim that 1 Clement 34:6-7 witnessed to a (eucharistic) liturgical sanctus at Rome c.96 CE has generally been abandoned.²¹ Van Unnik lists the previous literature and

there is little point in repeating it here. While 1 Clement does discuss the eucharist in chapters 40-42, and recent studies have regarded chapters 59-61 as reflecting the content of early eucharistic prayers,²² van Unnik's analysis of chapter 34 has made it extremely difficult to regard the sanctus in verse 6 as a liturgical allusion. He criticised the view, represented for example by Lightfoot, that in chapter 34 the ministrations on earth are the copy and counterpart of the angelic ministrations in heaven.²³ The Greek text of the relevant passage is as follows:

λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· Μύριαι μυριάδες παρειστήκεισαν αὐτῷ, καὶ χίλια χιλιάδες ἐλειτουργοῦν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐκεκραγον· Ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος κύριος σαβαωθ, πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν, ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ ἐπὶ το αὐτο συναχθέντες τῇ συνειδήσει, ὥς ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος βοήσωμεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκτενῶς εἰς το μετόχους ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι τῶν μεγάλων καὶ ἐνδόξων ἐπαγγελιῶν αὐτοῦ.

Van Unnik argued that the context of chapter 34 is eschatological, and is concerned with judgement. In a painstaking analysis of verses 4-8, van Unnik sees a gap between verses 6 and 7:

vs 6 gives the reason for and contents of the will of God in vs.5; vs 7 describes a meeting of the church which serves the will of God amongst the afflictions and dangers of this world, longing for the end. Therefore it is impossible to see a direct parallelism between the two. Consequently this passage does not speak of the heavenly "Sanctus" which is imitated on earth. 24

Van Unnik renders the passage thus:

For the Scripture says: "Ten thousand times ten thousand stood before Him and thousand times thousand ministered unto Him, and they shouted: 'Holy, holy, holy (is) the Lord Sabaoth, full is the whole creation of His glory'." Therefore (noticing this unity in multitude), we too in concord brought together to one place by compliance to the Lord's will (and not by fear for the judgment),

let us as from one mouth cry (for help in our dangerous situation) unto Him with fervour in order that we may become (after the judgment) sharers in His great and glorious promises. 25

Van Unnik's contention has been endorsed by Donald A.Hagner's study of Clement's use of scripture.²⁶ He notes that the passage in question begins 'For the Scripture says', indicating that Clement is quoting from scripture, not liturgy. Hagner observes:

The first part of this quotation agrees exactly with Dn 7:10, according to Theodotion, except for the transposition of clauses, Clement beginning with *μύριαι* rather than *χίλιναι*. Clement has *ἐλεειτούργουν* in the *χίλιναι* clause with Theodotion against the " Old Greek" or "LXX". The words *μυριάδες μυριάδων καὶ χιλιάδες χιλιάδων* found in Rev 5:1 (alluding to Dn 7:10) reveal the sequence *μύριαι-χίλιναι* found in Clement. This indicates no direct connection, but suggests either that this order was in current use, or that the order could be altered freely. The second half of Clement's quotation agrees exactly with Is.6:3 as found in the LXX except for the substitution of *ἡ πύλις* for *ἡ γῆ* (A,B and *ℵ*). B differs from A and *ℵ* in the further slight variant *ἐνεκράγεν* for *ἐνεκράγον*. Clement has either combined the texts himself, or borrowed the combination from some other source. 27

Whether *ἡ πύλις* is Clement's own paraphrase, a slip of the memory, or suggested by Rev.4 is an open question.

If, then, this is not a liturgical quotation, why did Clement put these two quotations together ? R.M.Grant suggested that Clement used a florilegium.²⁸ But two other factors ought to be kept in mind.

a) When van Unnik wrote in 1951, he made use of C.W.Dugmore's presentation of Jewish liturgy, which followed Finkelstein, and regarded the Jewish *geduššot* as post-Christian additions. We have drawn attention to the evidence presented by Fleischer

which makes this view unlikely, and we have noted the fragment published by Schechter which is a Yoser which combines Dan.7:10 with Isaiah 6:3. Perhaps a common combination of these texts in liturgical use may have influenced Clement's choice of scripture quotations at this point.

b) In a paper entitled 'Hellenistic-Jewish Rhetoric in Aphrahat' read at the 1980 Symposium Syriacum, Robert Murray drew attention to the similarity between the themes of 1 Clement and Aphrahat's Demonstration XIV.²⁹ Murray suggests that while the Demonstration is much longer and later, both may reflect a common Hellenistic topos, which has a hint of mysticism parallel to the Hekhalot mysticism. While this suggestion is certainly speculative, the possibility cannot be ruled out that the choice of these two scripture quotations by Clement is the result of the widespread diffusion of Jewish mysticism.

3. PASSIO SANCTARUM PERPETUAE ET FELICITATIS

This passio is generally dated c.200 CE, and is not only an account of the trial and sufferings of the African martyrs, but it is also an apocalypse in its own right, reminiscent of the Book of Revelation and the Shepherd of Hermas.³⁰ It is mainly concerned with the imprisonment, trial and martyrdom of a young matron, Vibia Perpetua. The narrative includes visions of Perpetua and one of her fellow-prisoners, Saturus. It is possible that they were influenced by the Montanists.³¹

The visions of Perpetua reflect a variety of apocalyptic images, reminiscent of the Hekhalot literature, 1 Enoch, the Shepherd of Hermas and the Ascension of Isaiah.³² In the vision

of Saturus,³³ there is an account of the ascent of the martyrs to heaven, in three stages. They leave the world and enter a sphere of light; the second stage is the garden of paradise; and the third is the heavenly city. At the entrance to God's divinity there stood four angels, and later there is a reference to elders, suggesting an allusion to Revelation. The martyrs entered heaven:

et introivimus, et audivimus vocem unitam dicentem ὁ ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος, ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος, sine cessatione.

'With one voice' finds parallels in 2 Enoch and geduṣṣah d^e yoser, and sine cessatione finds parallels in Qumran's Angelic liturgy and 2 Enoch. While the passio is in Latin, the sanctus is in Greek, which chapter 13 perhaps implies is the language of paradise. The literary genre of the passio, and its context suggest a geduṣṣah of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha type, or an allusion to Rev.4:8, and it witnesses to the continued belief passed on from certain circles that those who ascend to heaven would hear the ceaseless chanting of the geduṣṣah. The person addressed, however, appears to be Christ.³⁴

4. TERTULLIAN

It has been suggested that Tertullian is a witness to the early use of a liturgical sanctus, with reference to his work De Oratione.³⁵ In De Oratione 3, speaking of the Name of God, 'Father', Tertullian writes:

Yet when is the name of God not holy and hallowed (even) of itself, seeing he hallows others from within himself, and those angels that stand around cease not to say to him, Holy, holy, holy (Cui illa angelorum assistentia non cessat dicere: sanctus, sanctus, sanctus) ? Consequently therefore we also, angels-designate if such our merits are found to be, already here are learning(to use) that heavenly address to God and that service of the glory that is to be. 36

This passage is suggestive of a liturgical sanctus, but there is no reason to conclude that it definitely is such an allusion. The context is a discussion of the Lord's Prayer, and particularly the hallowing of the Name. What Tertullian seems to be arguing is that by virtue of the Lord's Prayer, Christians have the privilege of hallowing God's Name, just as the angels who surround God hallow him, not with the Lord's Prayer, but their own appointed chant, the thrice-holy. However, there is certainly a hint that (cf. Qumran, Pseudepigraphas) Christians will become like angels, and then will participate in the heavenly geduṣṣah.

5. THE ASCENSION OF ISAIAH

This is a composite work, made up of three separate sections: the martyrdom of Isaiah (1-5), the Testament of Hezekiah (3:13-4:18), and the Vision of Isaiah (6-11). It would seem that the first is a Jewish work dating from the second century BCE, while the other two are Christian compositions dated circa the end of the second century CE.³⁷ A Palestinian provenance is probable.³⁸

The third section, the Vision of Isaiah, is classed by Gruenwald as a Christian merkāvāh vision.³⁹ The vision begins when King Hezekiah and all the people of his court together with Isaiah heard ' a door which had opened and the voice of the Holy Spirit'. Gruenwald notes that from the date given, it seems that the writer did not intend to identify it with the vision described in Isaiah 6. In fact the trisagion of the seraphim is not actually quoted in the vision, though it is alluded to.

Isaiah fell into a trance, and an angel came to show him a vision. The prophet ascended above the firmament, through six

heavens, and finally into the seventh heaven. In the first five heavens there is a throne, with angels on the right and angels on the left. Those on the right had greater glory than those on the left, and they all praised with one voice. Those on the left also gave praise after them, but with an inferior voice, and a different praise (7:14-15).

Each succeeding heaven was greater in glory than the heaven below it, and the praise of each was different. In the sixth heaven there was no throne, nor angels on the left (8:1ff). Power was given to the prophet and he joined with the angels:

And there they all named the primal Father, and His Beloved, the Christ and the Holy Spirit, all with one voice. (8:17-18)

This seems to be a reference to the seraphim, or at least to the trisagion, interpreted as praise of Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

Later, in the seventh heaven, Isaiah saw all the righteous in heaven, like angels. He also saw 'The Lord' (= Christ) and the angel of the Holy Spirit.

And I saw how my Lord and the angel of the Spirit worshipped, and they both together praised God. And thereupon all the righteous drew near and worshipped and all the angels praised. (9:40-42).

Later (11:32) having witnessed the descent of Christ to the incarnation, and his ascension again after the crucifixion, he sees Christ sitting at the right hand of God, and the angel of the Holy Spirit sitting on the left hand.

Even though the trisagion is not quoted, the work is clearly inspired by the vision of Isaiah 6, and it indicates that, as in Revelation chapters 4 and 5, there were certain Christian circles which inherited and developed the ideas of the early merkāvāh tendency of Judaism.

6. APHRAHAT'S DEMONSTRATION XIV

The echo of mysticism found in the Passio of Perpetua and the Ascension of Isaiah is found also in Aphrahat's Demonstration XIV. Aphrahat, the 'Persian Sage', was probably born c.260-275 CE, and died in the persecution of King Sapor the Great c.345 CE. In Demonstration XIV Aphrahat includes what Robert Murray calls a wisdom passage about creation.⁴⁰ It begins as a pastiche reminiscent of Job 28 and Baruch 3:39ff. Aphrahat includes a consideration of the wise man, whose wisdom allows him a vision of heaven (whether it is himself or someone else is not clear).

His reason is rapt with visions,
 his heart is taken captive by his experiences.
 He is shown that which he knew not;
 he gazes into that place and is tested;
 his reason is amazed at all that he sees.
 The Watchers hasten to serve Him
 and the seraphim cry 'Holy' to his glory,
 flying with their swift wings,
 white and resplendent their garments,
 veiling their faces from his splendour,
 rushing swifter than the wind.
 There is set the throne of the kingdom
 and the Judge is ready in the place of judgment;
 seats are arranged for the righteous
 who will judge evil doers on the day of judgment.

It may well be that Aphrahat's spirituality produced this passage quite independently of Jewish mysticism. However, Syrian Christianity - certainly East Syrian - is well-known to have been under considerable influence from the strong Jewish communities of Adiabene.⁴¹ Aphrahat himself attacks certain forms of Judaism, but J. Neusner has shown that at the same time the sage was influenced by the surrounding Judaism.⁴² There is some reason, therefore, for seeing this passage with its

reference to gedussah as evidence for the continuing influence upon Christian writers of the Jewish mystical tradition.

7. APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS VII.35

The Apostolic Constituitions (AC) is regarded as the work of an Arian or semi-Arian compiler - possibly a bishop - in the region of Antioch c.360 CE.⁴³ However, it is a composite work. Books 1-6 are an expansion of the Didascalia; 7:1-32 are a reworking of the Didache, and much of Book 8 is a rewriting of the Apostolic Tradition. There is also material in Books 7 and 8 which so far has eluded liturgical scholars in the tracing of the original sources.⁴⁴

K.Kohler seems to have been the first to draw attention to the similarity between six prayers (AC 7:33-38) and seven berakot of the Sabbath Amidah of the Synagogue, and he suggested that the former represented Essene prayers which had been taken over by Christians.⁴⁵ W.Bousset, unaware of Kohler's work, also argued that these prayers had a Jewish origin; they were Hellenistic Jewish prayers which had been interpolated by Christians.⁴⁶ E.R.Goodenough developed Bousset's insights, linking the prayers to the type of Judaism represented by Philo.⁴⁷ Although dissenting from the idea of a specific 'Philo Judaism', Louis Bouyer has argued that these prayers were originally Hellenistic Jewish Synagogal prayers which originated in Alexandrian Judaism.⁴⁸ The more recent detailed analysis of these prayers by David Fiensy reaches the following conclusions:⁴⁹ The prayers are indeed Jewish Hellenistic Synagogal prayers, which the compiler of AC has expanded; the source was probably oral, though perhaps it was

written down before the compiler of AC appropriated it. The characteristics of the prayers lead to the conclusion that they date from 150-300 CE, and the provenance was Syria.⁵⁰

Fiensy does not seem to consider the possibility that these prayers could be Jewish-Christian Synagogal prayers. It seems strange that the compiler should have borrowed one Jewish source amongst other Christian documents, parts of which clearly indicate the Jewish cradle of Christianity. Although following Fiensy's analysis here, we allow the possibility that these prayers originated from Jewish-Christian circles.

The third prayer of AC 7:33-38 seems to echo the Qedušsat ha-shem in theme, and it contains the sanctus.

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 1 (1) Great are you, O Lord, Almighty One, and great is your strength,
and of your understanding there is no numbering! | Ps 146:5 LXX |
| 2 O Creator, Savior, Rich One in favors,
Long-sufferer, and Supplier of mercy,
<i>Who do not withdraw from the salvation of your creatures!</i> | |
| 3 For by nature you are good;
yet you spare those who are sinning, summoning them to repentance,
for your warning is merciful! | |
| 4 For how should we have withstood,
having swift judgment demanded of us?
We who, when being treated patiently, with difficulty refuse our weakness? | |
| 5 (2) The heavens proclaimed your might;
and earth, (though) being shaken, (proclaimed) your firmness,
being hung upon nothing! | Ps 18:2 LXX
Job 26:7 |
| 6 (The) sea, surging with waves,
and shepherding a herd of countless living creatures,
has been shackled with sand,
has shuddered at your will,
and compels all to cry out: | |
| 7 <i>How magnified are your works, O Lord!
You made everything with Wisdom;
the earth was filled with your creating!</i> | Ps 103:24 LXX
3:16 |
| 8 (3) And an army of angels breaking forth,
and intellectual spirits say to Phelmuni,*
<i>There is one Holy One!</i> | Dan 8:13
[Theodotion] |
| 9 And holy seraphim, together with the six-winged cherubim, singing to you the
triumphal song, with never-silent voices cry out, | |
| 10 <i>Holy, holy, holy, Lord Sabaoth,^b
the heaven and the earth are full of your glory!</i> | Isa 6:3 |
| 11 And the other throngs of the hosts, archangels, thrones, dominions, sovereignties,
authorities, powers, crying out, say, | Col 1:16
12:14, 27 |
| 12 Blessed be the glory of the Lord from its place! | |
| 13 (4) But Israel, your earthly assembly out of (the) gentiles, ^c | |

- competing with the heavenly powers by night and by day,
 14 with heart filled to the brim and with a willing spirit sings, 2Mac 1:3
 15 *The chariot of God is ten thousands multiplied by thousands of thriving ones: Ps 67:18 LXX*
the Lord is among them in Sinai, in the holy place!
- 16 (5) Heaven knows the one who raised it as a vault upon nothing,
 like a stone cube, Job 38:38 LXX
 17 and united earth and water with each other,
 and poured out air for keeping animals,
 18 and plaited together with this fire^d for warmth and encouragement in darkness.
 19 The chorus of stars amazes, Ps 146:4 LXX
 pointing out the one who numbered (them),
 and showing the one who named (them).
- 20 Living creatures (point to) the one who gave (them) life;
 trees (point to) the one who produced (them);
 21 as all things, having been made by your word, suggest the might of your power.
- 22 (6) Wherefore also all men ought, from their very breasts,
 to send up to you through Christ^e the hymn on behalf of all,
 by reason of you who hold power over all things.
- 23 (7) For you are the Kind One in good deeds,
 and One fond of giving with compassions,
 the only All-Mighty one!
 For when you desire, to be able is present with you.
- 24 For your eternal power even cools flames, Dan 3
 and muzzles lions, and tames sea monsters, Dan 6; Jonah 2
 and raises those who are sick, and overturns powers,
 and overthrows an army of enemies and a people numbered for its arrogance.
- 25 (8) You are the one in heaven, the one upon earth,
 the one in the sea,
 the one in the farthest boundaries, bounded by nothing.
 For of your greatness there is no boundary. Ps 144:3 LXX
- 26 For this oracle is not ours, Master, but your servant's, saying,
And you shall know in your heart that your God is (the) Lord,
God in heaven above, and upon earth beneath,
and there is no other beside him! Deut 4:39
- 27 (9) For there is no god beside you alone, there is no Holy one beside you;
 28 Lord God of knowledge,^f Isa 45:5
 God of holy ones, 1Sam 2:3
 Holy one above all holy ones.
 For those who have been made holy are under your hands.
- 29 (You are) honored and exalted exceedingly:
 invisible by nature,^g 1Tim 1:17
 30 unsearchable in judgments, Rom 11:33
 whose life is in want of nothing.
 31 Unchangeable and unceasing is (your) continuance.
 Untiring is (your) activity.
-
- 32 Unlimited is (your) greatness.
 Unfailing is (your) beauty.
 33 Unapproachable is (your) dwelling-place. 1Tim 6:16
 Unremovable is (your) resting-place.
 34 Without beginning is (your) knowledge.
 Unchangeable is (your) truth.
 35 Unmediated is (your) work.
 Unplotted against is (your) strength.
 36 Without successor is (your) monarchy.
 Unending is (your) kingdom.
 37 Without adversary is (your) might.
 Great in number is (your) army.
- 38 (10) For you are the Father of Wisdom, 3:16
 the Creator, as cause, of the creative workmanship through a Mediator;
 39 the Supplier of foresight;
 the Giver of laws;
 the Fulfiller of needs;
 40 the Punisher of the ungodly,
 and the Rewarder of the righteous;
 41 the God and Father of the Christ,^h
and the Lord of those who are pious toward him;
 42 whose promise is not deceptive,
 (whose) judgment is without bribery.
 43 (whose) knowledge is never faithless,
 (whose) religion is never-ending,
 (whose) thanksgiving is everlasting;
 44 through whom also the worship worthy of you is owed by every
 reasonable and holy nature!ⁱ

In AC 7:35, therefore, we have a prayer in a series which is thought to derive from Greek-speaking Judaism, or perhaps a Jewish-Christian congregation; it is a non-eucharistic prayer, and it contains the sanctus.

According to Fiensy, paragraphs 1,2,5,7 (first part), most of 9 and 10, are mainly the work of the compiler. On the other hand paragraphs 3 and 4, where the holiness of God is its theme, and where the sanctus occurs, belong to the original source; 'Apart from some interpolations in this section, very little of the vocabulary is typical of the compiler'.⁵¹

The context of the sanctus is that of the created order declaring the greatness of God. Various angelic beings are mentioned— an army of angels and intellectual spirits, and the seraphim who with the six-winged cherubim, cry out together the sanctus. Other groups call out Ezekiel 3:12 – archangels, thrones, dominions, sovereignties, authorities and powers. Israel sings Ps.68:17, about the chariot of God.

The quotation from Dan 8:13 is probably from the compiler because it is from Theodotion's version.⁵² Likewise the expression 'singing to you the triumphal song' Fiensy suggests is a replacement for another expression, because the words almost never appear anywhere but in the compiler's material in AC.⁵³ Whereas Bousset and Goodenough argued that 'thrones, dominions, sovereignties and authorities' might reflect a common Jewish angelology which is also found in Col.1:16, Fiensy is prepared to accept that the compiler has himself inserted the reference from Col.1:16. On the other hand, Fiensy accepts that the form of the sanctus, which, as will be seen, became standard in several anaphoras, is

thoroughly Jewish.⁵⁴ Eric Werner has pointed out the Jewish precedents for uniting 'Heaven' and 'earth' in Isaiah 6:3. The Targum of Isaiah in qeduṣṣah d'e sidra mentions heaven and earth; furthermore, Werner quotes a midrashic passage where Isaiah 6:3 is linked with Jeremiah 23:24.⁵⁵ However, if this was originally a Jewish prayer, there is the possibility that the compiler replaced the biblical text with this emendation, which he also has in his anaphora in Book 8. At the very least, however, we have in this prayer evidence that, as in the Synagogue, and in the Hekhalot literature, some groups of Christians, at an earlier date than AC, had prayers within which the sanctus could be inserted. The use of Ezekiel 3:12 suggests that the Synagogue pattern was indeed the parent model.

8. THE HISTORY OF JOHN THE SON OF ZEBEDEE

Dated by W.Wright c.mid fourth century, this Syriac document (though probably originally in Greek)⁵⁶ contains two accounts of baptism where reference is made to the sanctus.

a) The baptism of Tyrannus, the Procurator of Ephesus.

And the holy man besought the procurator to command and let fine scented oil come, seventy pints. And he commanded, and it came, and a vat was filled with it. And the holy man drew nigh and kneeled down, and looked up to heaven, and cried out in the midst of the theatre: 'Holy is the Father and the Son and the Spirit of holiness for ever. Amen'. And the whole assembly answered, 'Amen'. Then John made the sign of the Cross over the oil, and said with a loud voice: 'Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Spirit of holiness for ever. Amen'. And again the third time he said: 'Holy is the Father and the Son and the Spirit of holiness. Amen'. And straightway fire blazed forth over the oil, and the oil did not take fire, for two angels had their wings spread over the oil and were crying, ' Holy, holy, holy, Lord Almighty' (qaddiṣ qaddiṣ qaddiṣ māryā hiltānā)

And the people, when they saw these things, were afraid with a great fear, and fell on their faces, and were worshipping

to the East. And when the oil was consecrated, then the holy man drew near to the water, and signed it, and said: 'In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Spirit of holiness, for ever. Amen'. And the whole people cried 'Amen'. And straightway these two angels came and hovered over the water, and were crying, 'Holy, holy, holy, Father and Son and Spirit of holiness', after him. And St. John cried after them, 'Amen'.

b) The baptism of the priests of Artemis.

(After St. John had prayed over the oil and water)

And in that hour fire blazed forth over the oil, and the wings of the angels were spread forth over the oil; and the whole assemblage was crying out, men and women and children, ' Holy, holy, holy, Lord Almighty, of whose glories heaven and earth are full' (qaddiṣ qaddiṣ qaddiṣ māryā hiltānā da-mlēn smayā w-ḏar'a tesbēhātēh). And straightway the vision was taken away.

According to Ratcliff, we have here two baptismal narratives ' which witness to the consecration being effected by the utterance of the sanctus'.⁵⁷ We have elsewhere argued that Ratcliff's interpretation is open to objections.⁵⁸ In the account of the baptism of Tyrannus, the sanctus follows the naming of the Trinity, but in both citations it is sung by two angels, not the congregation. The implication seems to be that when in the baptismal rite the Trinity was named, there was believed to be a heavenly counterpart, namely the sanctus sung by the angels. This would seem to be regarded as ratification in heaven of the earthly consecration affected by the recitation of the name of the Trinity. It is not necessarily implied that the sanctus formed part of the earthly rite.

In the second account, the baptism of the priests of Artemis, the reference to 'vision' again raises the question of whether the sanctus was actually part of the rite, or whether it was simply believed to be the heavenly counterpart to an invocation of the Trinity. It may be that at the consecration of the water and oil, the earthly rite was transfigured, and it appeared that the whole

assemblage was joining the chant of the angels and was crying out ' Holy, holy, holy, Lord Almighty, of whose glories heaven and earth are full'.

When the sanctus does occur in baptismal liturgies, it is almost certainly a borrowing from the eucharistic anaphoras.⁵⁹ Rather than witnessing to a Syrian baptismal rite which contained the sanctus, it would seem that these accounts perpetuate the tendency to allude to the sanctus as the worship of heaven, which the righteous might hear in a vision. The sanctus here is associated with the heavenly liturgy; the accounts also witness to the fact that the sanctus could still be paraphrased.

SUMMARY

In these Christian texts which are dated c.80 CE - c.360 CE, we can discern the following:

1. The idea that Christians are like, or will be like angels, and will therefore be able to hear the trisagion - Revelation, Tertullian, Ascension of Isaiah.
2. A discussion of Isaiah 6:3 as a scriptural text, but with possible Jewish liturgical overtones , and possibly (Murray) mystical overtones.
3. The influence of merkāvāh - Revelation, the Passio, Aphrahat, and the Ascension of Isaiah.
4. The influence of Jewish Synagogal usage - AC 7.

Thus the various Jewish uses and associations of the trisagion discussed in the previous chapter persisted in Christianity, and can all be deemed candidates in the discussion on the origin of the anaphoral sanctus. In addition, as regards the addressee

of the sanctus, we find:

(a) God the Father - Revelation, Clement, AC 7:35.

(b) Christ - John 12:41, the Passio.

(c) The Trinity - the History of John the son of Zebedee.

APPENDIX

LUKE 2:14

In an essay entitled 'Sanktus und Gloria', David Flusser argued at length that the song sung by the heavenly host (στρατιᾶς οὐρανίου) in Luke 2:14 is in fact a diminished Greek paraphrase of the Aramaic Targum on Isaiah 6:3.⁶⁰

The majority of modern commentators regard the text of Luke 2:14 as a two-fold acclamation of praise; it is a proclamation of the results of the birth of Jesus rather than a hymn of praise directly addressed to God.⁶¹

Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἐν
ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας.

As is well known, some manuscripts read εὐδοκία instead of εὐδοκίας and Syr.sin. adds καὶ before ἀνθρώποις, giving a three-fold division. Flusser adopted the three-fold division. Arguing from 1 Clement 34:7, Ig.Eph.4:2 and Rev.4:8, and the expression μία φωνή, he concluded that early Christians were familiar with the trisagion as a familiar liturgical acclamation. He suggested that δόξα was a translation of qaddis, and εὐδοκία means God's forgiveness. Luke, he postulates, has handed on a diminished form of an originally Aramaic geduṣṣah:

Holy in the highest heaven in his glory
Holy on earth in his peace
Holy are the sons of men of his benevolence.

In the course of transmission, the thrice-holy or δόξα has dropped out, and the hymn has been misunderstood.

Flusser's case is beset with difficulties. Too much weight

is placed upon vague linguistic echoes, and speculation. The internal and external evidence favours εὐδοκίας rather than εὐδοκία ;⁶² and while αἰνούντων ... καὶ λεγόντων may recall the introduction of a geduṣṣah, there is no rule which says that other hymns cannot have the same introduction. Furthermore, the geduṣṣah is generally chanted by the celestial beings in heaven (though see Test.Ab.) whereas this chant is sung by them on earth. For Luke the song is sung precisely because 'Today in the city of David a deliverer has been born to you - the Messiah, the Lord'. Something so important warrants a new song to mark the occasion, not the geduṣṣah which was chanted in heaven day and night without ceasing. Flusser's reconstruction is ingenious, but probably represents an imaginative mind rather than the recovery of a diminished geduṣṣah.

NOTES - CHAPTER 3

1. For a discussion, see L.Chavoutier, 'Un Libellus Pseudo-Ambrosien sur le Saint-Esprit', SE 11(1960), 136-191, 154ff; G.Kretschmar, Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie.
2. B.Lindars, The Gospel of John, New Century Bible (London 1972), 439; R.E.Brown, The Gospel According to John (i-xiii) Anchor Bible (New York 1966), 487.
3. R.H.Charles, The Revelation of St.John Vol.1 (Edinburgh 1920), 109.
4. O.A.Piper, 'The Apocalypse of John and the Liturgy of the Ancient Church', Church History 20(1950), 10-22; Lucetta Mowry, 'Revelation 4-5 and Early Christian Liturgical Usage', JBL 71(1952), 75-84; Ralph P.Martin, Worship in the Early Church (Edinburgh 1965), 45; Ferdinand Hahn, The Worship of the Early Church (Philadelphia 1973), 101. It is evident that liturgical allusions are to be found throughout Revelation. J.Comblin, 'La liturgie de la Nouvelle Jérusalem', ETL 29(1953), 5-40.
- 4a. P.Prigent, Apocalypse et liturgie (Neuchatel, 1948), 68.
5. L.Mowry, art.cit., 84.
6. A.Cabaniss, ' A Note on the Liturgy of the Apocalypse', Interpretation 7 (1953), 78-86.
7. R.H.Charles, op.cit., passim; Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism; Rowland, The Open Heaven.
8. Gruenwald, 62.
9. Rowland, 351ff.
10. Ibid., 379-386.
11. Rowland, 'The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature', 145.
12. Charles, 129ff; Gruenwald, 64-66.
13. Charles lists other differences, 119-120.
14. Ibid., 127.
15. G.B.Caird, The Revelation of St.John the Divine (London 1966), 100.
16. Martin McNamara, The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch (Rome 1966), 100.
17. Ibid., 102-105.
18. Ibid., 106-109.
19. Ibid., 110-112.
20. Ibid., 112.

21. W.C.van Unnik, '1 Clement and the Sanctus'.
22. Georges Blond, 'Clement of Rome', in The Eucharist of the Early Christians ed.W.Rordorf (New York 1978), 24-47; Allan Bouley, From Freedom to Formula (Washington 1981).
23. J.B.Lightfoot, The Apostolic Fathers I; Van Unnik, 207-8.
24. Van Unnik, 245.
25. Ibid., 244.
26. Donald A.Hagner,The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome (Leiden 1973).
27. Ibid.,62-63.
28. R.M.Grant, and H.H.Graham, First and Second Clement (New York 1965),
29. R.Murray, 'Hellenistic-Jewish Rhetoric in Aphrahat', Symposium Syriacus 1980(OCA 221, Rome 1983) 79-85.
30. Text in Herbert Musurillo, The Acts of the Christian Martyrs (Oxford 1972) 106-131.
31. W.H.C.Frend, Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church (Oxford 1955), 293ff.
32. J.Daniélou, The Origins of Latin Christianity, 59ff; Rowland, op.cit., 396-402.
33. Chapters 11-12.
34. A.Gerhards, 'Le Phénomène du Sanctus adressé au Christ' in Le Christ dans la Liturgie, (Rome 1981), 65-83, 70.
35. E.C.Ratcliff, 'The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora', 131.
36. ET in E.Evans, Tertullian's Tract on Prayer (London 1953).
37. J.H.Charlesworth,The Pseudepigrapha, 125-130; text, OTP 2,156-176.
38. Charlesworth, op.cit.,126
39. Gruenwald, 57.
40. R.Murray, art.cit.
41. R.Murray, Symbols of Church and Kingdom (London 1975),4ff.
42. J.Neusner, Aphrahat and Judaism. The Christian-Jewish Argument in Fourth Century Iran, (Leiden 1971).
43. G.J.Cuming, 'The Early Eucharistic Liturgies in Recent Research', in ed.Bryan D.Spinks, The Sacrifice of Praise, 65-69,69; D. Hagedorn, Der Hiobkommentar des Arianers Julian (Berlin 1973).

44. M.Metzger, 'The Didascalia and the Constitutiones Apostolorum', in The Eucharist of the Early Christians, 194-219.
45. Originally in a short article in MGWJ 37(1893); the fuller discussion was 'The Essene Version of the Seven Benedictions as Preserved in the VII Book of the Apostolic Constituions', HUCA 1 (1924), 410-425.
46. W.Bousset, 'Eine jüdische Gebetssammlung im siebenten Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen', Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen(Berlin 1916).
47. E.R.Goodenough, By Light,Light (New Haven 1935).
48. L.Bouyer, Eucharist, 119-135, 252.
49. D.A.Fiency, ' A Redactional Examination of Prayers Alleged to be Jewish in the Constitutiones Apostolorum', Ph.D. Thesis, Duke University 1980, published as Prayers Alleged to be Jewish (Chico 1985).
50. Op.cit.,215-228.
51. Ibid.,177.
52. Ibid.
53. Ibid.
54. Ibid.,178.
55. Eric Werner, 'The Doxology in Synagogue and Church',HUCA 19 (1945 -46),276-328.
56. W.Wright,Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles(London 1871); Cf R.H.Connolly, 'The Original Language of the Syriac Acts of John', JTS 8(1906-7), 249-261.
57. E.C.Ratcliff, 'A Note on the Anaphora Described in the Liturgical Homilies of Narsai', 245-247.
58. Bryan D.Spinks, ' A Note on the Anaphora outlined in Narsai's Homily XXXII'.
59. S.P.Brock, 'Studies in the Early History of the Syrian Orthodox Baptismal Liturgy', JTS ns 23(1972), 16-64.
60. D.Flusser, 'Sanktus und Gloria' in ed.O.Betz et al, Abraham unser Vater Festschrift Otto Michael (Leiden 1963), 129-152.
61. I.Howard Marshall, The Gospel of Luke (Exeter 1978), 111.
62. B.Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (New York and London 1971); G.Schrenk, TDNT II, 747-750.

PART TWO

CHAPTER 4

THE CONTEXT AND FUNCTION OF THE SANCTUS IN THE ANAPHORA: THE EVIDENCE OF THE CLASSICAL RITES TO THE SEVENTH CENTURY

1. THE EAST: THE SYRO-BYZANTINE AND EAST SYRIAN TRADITIONS

A. A Third Century witness from East Syria ?

It is generally accepted that the anaphora which underlies the East Syrian anaphora of Addai and Mari, and its 'twin', the Maronite anaphora called Sharar,¹ is a very early composition, reflecting the Jewish-Christian communities of Syria, with parts dating back to the third century, and possibly earlier.² However, although the sanctus is found in both versions of this anaphora, it has almost unanimously been regarded as a later interpolation. It is the contention of this section that there is no logical reason for regarding the sanctus here as an intrusion, and that it belongs with the earliest material of this anaphora.

The view that the sanctus in Addai and Mari is an interpolation seems to have originated with E.C.Ratcliff in his reconstruction of the 'original form' which was published in 1929. Concerning the sanctus Ratcliff wrote:

The clauses that introduce this have no connexion with what precedes them. They have no relevance except to the Sanctus; and the whole passage coming in between an address of praise to the Creator and Redeemer and a thanksgiving for salvation and grace is out of place. As in the Roman Rite so in the East-Syrian the Sanctus is an intrusion. 3

Ratcliff's later opinion, echoed by W.E.Pitt, was that in fact Addai and Mari had always contained the sanctus, but as the termination of the anaphora.⁴ Nevertheless, the view that the sanctus in its present position represents an intrusion was subsequently endorsed by Gregory Dix, Bernard Botte and Louis Bouyer.⁵ In 1966 W.F.Macomber

published the Mar Esa'ya text of Addai and Mari, the manuscript of which he dated 10/11th century, and which is regarded as our earliest witness to the text.⁶ Although the sanctus is contained in this text, Macomber at that time endorsed Ratcliff's view.⁷ Such a view has been repeated more recently by J.M. Sanchez Caro, H.A.J. Wegman, and Jean Magne.⁸

Ratcliff's arguments for regarding the sanctus as an interpolation rested on two premises:

1. The clauses introducing the sanctus appear to have no connection with what precedes them.
2. Coming between an address of praise to the creator and a thanksgiving for salvation and grace is 'out of place'.

On the basis of these two opinions, Ratcliff classed the East Syrian sanctus with the Roman sanctus, as an intrusion.

It is difficult to understand by what criteria Ratcliff arrived at the liturgical law that if it is to be authentic, a sanctus must connect with what precedes it, or why a sanctus is 'out of place' between praise of the Creator and thanksgiving for salvation. It is these assumptions which are questionable.

To begin with, what does an interpolated sanctus look like? We are fortunate in having one example of a sanctus which textually and contextually is an intrusion which is out of place. The anaphora of the Apostolic Tradition is without a sanctus, as is its expanded form in Testamentum Domini. However, both these anaphoras are used in the Ethiopic Church, and have had a sanctus added. The interpolations here, therefore, offer at least some idea of what an interpolated sanctus might look like.

Ap.Trad.

(Dialogue and short thanksgiving)

You sent him from heaven into the Virgin's womb; and, conceived in the womb, he was made flesh and was manifested as your Son, being born of the Holy Spirit and the virgin. Fulfilling your will and gaining for you a holy people, he stretched out his hands when he should suffer, that he might release from suffering those who have believed in you.

Ethiopic Apostles(Dialogue and short thanksgiving)
(Intercessions)

And for these and for them all, rest their souls and be propitious unto them, thou who sentest thy Son from heaven into the bosom of the virgin. He was carried in the womb, was made flesh and his birth was revealed of the Holy Spirit. Unto thee, before whom stand thousand thousands and myriad myriads and the holy angels and archangels and thine honourable creatures that have six wings, the seraphim and cherubim with two of their wings they cover their face, with two of their wings they cover their feet, and with two wings they fly from end to ends of the world. Continually as they hallow thee and praise, with all them that hallow thee and praise thee, receive our hallowing also which we utter unto thee:

Holy, holy, holy,

Holy, holy, holy,

Truly the heavens and earth are full of the holiness of thy Glory in our Lord and our God and our Saviour Jesus Christ thine holy Son. He came and was born of the virgin, that he might fulfil thy will and make a people for you. He stretched out his hands to the passion, suffering to save the sufferers who trust in thee. 9

There are good grounds for concluding that the sanctus here is an interpolation:

1. On textual grounds, since the earlier forms of the anaphora have no sanctus.

2. On contextual grounds. The sanctus in the Ethiopic version, which is based on the Egyptian form of the sanctus, certainly has no connection with what precedes it. It begins abruptly within a

passage which rehearses the incarnation in the past tense, introducing a statement concerning praise offered by the celestial host in the present tense. There is no connection either in terms of a transitional clause, or in the general sense of the passage.

When the sanctus in the anaphora of Addai and Mari is examined in the light of this example, it is difficult to find grounds for Ratcliff's assertions.

1. There is no textual evidence to support his argument. The sanctus is found in all the manuscripts, and is common to both Addai and Mari and Sharar. It is generally accepted by scholars that the material common to both these anaphoras represents the earliest strata. The sanctus therefore has as much claim to antiquity as any other part of the common material. If any of the common material can be given a third century date, then the same can be claimed for the section which contains the sanctus.
2. Contextually Ratcliff's claim does not hold. The anaphora praises the name of God who created the world(s) and its inhabitants; Sharar gives Glory to the Name who created the worlds and its inhabitants - both using phraseology which is thoroughly biblical.¹⁰

Addai and Mari

Worthy of praise from every mouth, and thanksgiving from every tongue is the adorable Name of the Father and the Son and of the Holy Spirit, who created the world by his grace and its inhabitants in his compassion, and redeemed mankind in his mercy, and has effected great grace towards mortals. Your majesty, O Lord, a thousand thousand heavenly beings worship and myriad myriads of angels, hosts of spiritual beings, ministers (of) fire and of spirit, with cherubim and holy seraphim,

Sharar

Glory to you, the adorable and glorious Name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, who created the worlds by your grace and its inhabitants in your mercy; and has effected redemption for mortals by your grace.

Your majesty, O Lord, a thousand thousand heavenly angels worship and myriad myriads of hosts of ministers of fire and of spirit glorify in fear. With the cherubim and seraphim,

glorify your Name, Crying out
and glorifying

who from one to another bless
and sanctify and cry out and say
May we also, O Lord, through your
grace and your compassion be made
worthy to say with them

God is creator of heaven and earth, the heavenly world and the lower earthly world (perhaps a variant reading of Sharax, 'their inhabitants' is to be preferred). In heaven the Name is worshipped without ceasing, and the sanctus, far from being 'out of place', is a quite logical inclusion, since it is the praise which the inhabitants of the heavenly world continually offer to God. This is wholly in accord with the ideas found in early Christian literature - Revelation, 1 Clement, and the ournanology of the Ascension of Isaiah. In Addai and Mari the sanctus remains the song of heaven, the celestial glory, to which is then added the thanksgiving of mortals, and coheres with the overall concept of offering in the anaphora.¹¹ It is interesting to note that in Ma'aseh

Merkāvāh the following passage occurs:

And thy Name is mighty in heaven and earth
Exalted (Thy) might in heaven and earth
Blessed in heaven and blessed in earth
Honoured in heaven and honoured in earth
Merciful in heaven and merciful in earth
Holy in heaven and Holy in earth
May remembrance of Thy Name be active (?) for ever. 12

This passage reflects the concept of the hallowing of God's name in heaven and earth - precisely the same concept which seems to underlie the opening praise and thanksgiving of Addai and Mari. Jacob Vellian has pointed out the strange similarity between the Synagogue yoser with its geduššah and the berakah which follows it, Ahabah, and Addai and Mari.¹³ Talley also points to yoser with its geduššah as a possible inspiration, though he

suggests that the whole of the opening section as far as sanctus may have been added to an earlier strata of thanksgiving (for redemption) and intercession, the addition being due to Jewish influence.¹⁴

In Sharar the thought is slightly different in that 'Glory' is offered to the Name, and the sanctus is made part of the praise of the congregation; here, like the seers in the Pseudepigraphal literature who ascend to heaven and join the heavenly praise, the Christian congregation are permitted on earth to join in the heavenly chant, as well as making their own thanksgiving for redemption.

Although it is not impossible that the address to the Name of God, revealed as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, is original to the anaphora (though not the explicit reference to the Trinity)¹⁵ most commentators accept that the anaphora was originally addressed throughout to Christ, who has been given the Name (kurios = Yahweh = Creator =God) and is a hymn to Christ as God.¹⁶ In this anaphora, therefore, the sanctus is addressed to Christ, or the God who is both creator and who became incarnate.¹⁷ Such an address we have already observed as early as St. John's Gospel.

The introduction to the sanctus is a combination of Daniel 7:10 with Isaiah 6:2 - a combination already encountered in a yoser fragment and in 1 Clement 34. The angelology is not particularly complex:

Addai and Mari

Heavenly beings
angels
spiritual beings
ministers of fire and spirit
cherubim
holy seraphim

Sharar

heavenly angels
ministers of fire and spirit
cherubim
seraphim

Addai and Mari has a slightly more elaborate angelology than

Sharar, though it is impossible to be dogmatic about which is 'more original'. Four groups are found in AC 7:35 - host of angels, intellectual spirits, holy seraphim and six-winged cherubim. The geduṣṣah d^e yoser mentions holy beings and ministering spirits. The idea of fear in Sharar is found in geduṣṣah d^e yoser; glorifying is found in the Apocalypse of Moses; 'crying out and saying' in the Testaments of Abraham and Isaac; 'bless' and 'glorify' are found in 1 Enoch 61. All of this is not incompatible with a third century date, and in a more recent article, W.F. Macomber also accepts that the sanctus is original to the common underlying anaphora.¹⁸ Thus, against Ratcliff and many other scholars, our suggestion is that in Addai and Mari we have evidence of the sanctus as part of the anaphora in East Syria in the third century.

B. The anaphoral tradition of Jerusalem

The anaphora traditionally associated with Jerusalem is that of St. James, which has come down to us in a variety of versions, though the principal ones are the Greek and Syriac. Since it was used by chalcedonians and monophysites, we may assume that there was a common tradition by the fifth century. However, the Mystagogical Catecheses attributed to Cyril deal in part with the anaphora, and thus witness to the Jerusalem anaphora, or some parts of it, in the fourth century. According to Massey Shepherd, a sermon of Eusebius of Caesarea delivered sometime between the years 314 and 319 CE at the opening of the new cathedral at Tyre, also witnesses to the Jerusalem anaphora.¹⁹

Eusebius

Shepherd calls attention to the paragraph preceding the final bidding of Eusebius' sermon which has marked affinities with the 'Preface' and Anamnesis-oblation of the anaphora of St. James, and indeed, some passages of Cyril. The textual affinity of Eusebius' words with the 'Preface' of James may be exhibited as follows (underlining the verbal agreements):

Such is the great temple which the Word, the great Creator of the universe, hath builded throughout the whole world beneath the sun, having fashioned upon earth that intelligible image of those things that lie beyond the vaults of heaven; so that by the whole creation and by the rational, living beings upon earth, His Father is honoured and revered. But the region above the heavens and the models there of the things on earth, and the Jerusalem above, as it is called, and the heavenly Mount Sion, and the supramundane city of the living God, in which the myriad choirs of angels and assembly of the firstborn written in heaven, honour their Maker and sovereign Ruler of the universe with praises (θεολογίας) unutterable and inconceivable to us - such as no mortal can worthily hymn,...

Although the sanctus as such is not quoted, it is clearly alluded to, and when compared with the evidence of Cyril and the anaphora of St. James, there is indeed a reasonable probability that Eusebius is here an independent witness to the anaphora used in the area under the jurisdiction of Caesarea, and therefore of Jerusalem, though this cannot be taken as certain. What it would witness to is a eucharistic prayer which began with praise of God by the whole creation, particularly in heaven by choirs of angels and the saints who praise God with 'praises', presumably the sanctus.

The Mystagogical Catecheses

The Mystagogical Catecheses (MC) attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem (c.348) deal in part with the anaphora. In recent years

Cyril's authorship of these particular homilies has been questioned, and it has been suggested that they are really the work of his successor, John (387-417).²⁰ Recently E.Yarnold has suggested that Cyril was the author, but they represent the older Cyril rather than the younger Cyril of the other catecheses.²¹ However, whether Cyril, older Cyril or John, the MC have been accepted as an important witness to the ancient anaphora of Jerusalem. This view was challenged by G.J.Cuming in an article in 1974, where it was argued that Cyril bears witness to an anaphora of the Egyptian type.²² In a communication read at the Oxford Patristic Conference 1983, the present writer argued against Cuming's interpretation of the evidence, and while accepting that there are curious differences between MC and the anaphora of St.James, urged that Cyril is nevertheless a witness to the Jerusalem rite which is a quite distinct Syrian rite.²³

The anaphora is the subject of MC 5. It is important to bear in mind that the material is catechetical, and does not yield the accuracy demanded by modern liturgical scholarship. Where Cyril agrees with the anaphora of St.James we may check his accuracy, but where he disagrees it is difficult to know whether he knew a different text, or is simply relying on memory, or the licence of a preacher and orator. The order of the anaphora he describes included an opening dialogue, praise of God by mentioning creation, sanctus, epiklesis and intercession for the living and the dead. There is no mention of thanksgiving for redemption, an institution narrative or anamnesis-oblation. It is possible that Cyril passed over these. However, E.Cutrone has argued that had these elements been present, Cyril's concern for eikon-mimesis - the identification

of the believer with Christ - would have induced him to make a great deal of such material. His silence suggests its absence.²⁴ Indeed, in his recent Ph.D. thesis, John Fenwick has argued very strongly that at the time of Cyril such features were not part of the Jerusalem anaphora, and their appearance in the anaphora of St. James is the result of a reworking of the Jerusalemite material with the anaphora attributed to St. Basil in one of its earlier recensions.²⁵ What is significant for this study is that MC does know of the existence of the sanctus.

The sanctus which MC alludes to occurs early in the anaphora, seemingly as part of an oratio theologica:

After this we make mention of heaven, and earth, and sea; of the sun and moon; of the stars and all the creation, rational and irrational, visible and invisible; of Angels, Archangels, Powers (δυνάμειων) Dominions (κυριοτήτων) Principalities (ἀρχῶν) Authorities (ἐξουσιῶν), Thrones (θρόνων); of the Cherubim with many faces; in effect repeating that call of David's, "Magnify the Lord with me".

We make mention also of the Seraphim, whom Isaiah by the Holy Spirit beheld encircling the throne of God, and with two of their wings they cover the face, with two the feet, and with two flying, and saying Holy, holy, holy Lord of Sabaoth (κύριος σαβαώθ). For this reason we rehearse this hymn of praise, handed down to us from the seraphim that we might join in hymns with the hosts of the world above.

Allowing for the homiletic nature of the passage, it is valuable in a number of ways for establishing the probable context and rationale of the anaphoral sanctus at Jerusalem in the fourth century.

(a) MC does not mention 'thanksgiving', but simply lists the various items mentioned in the prayer. It seems that rather than thanking God for creation, it was a prayer about the creation itself; the mention of creation seems to be regarded as praising God, and

mention of the celestial creation logically leads to the sanctus. The thought is slightly different from that encountered in Addai and Mari. Here the existence of the creation, visible and invisible, is itself a form of praise, and leads to the verbal praise of the seraphim (cf.Neh.9:6).

(b) While MC makes it clear that the congregation recites the sanctus (that we might join in), grammatically it remains the chant of the seraphim. Whether the congregation joined in with the single recitation, or whether a congregational recitation followed, is a matter for conjecture.

(c) The quotation from Ps.34:3 is woven into the anaphoral material as part of the catechetical style. There are no grounds for endorsing Kretchmar's suggestion that it actually formed part of the introduction to the Jerusalem sanctus.²⁶

(d) In comparison with Addai and Mari and the Jewish Synagogue geduṣṣot, the angelic hierarchy is complex, and seems more deliberately thought out. Four classes from Col 1:16 - suggested by creation, rational and irrational - have been introduced; Powers (δυνάμεων) has been introduced from Ephesians 1:21, and the angelic classes have been increased to nine. However, there is no attempt to reproduce the scriptural order. Whether Cyril was quoting from memory, or was quoting them in a deliberate, ascending order, is unclear.

(e) G.Dix and G.J.Cuming pointed to the archaic features of the sanctus passage - covering the face (of God) rather than 'faces' of the seraphim, and κύριος σαβαώθ - as Egyptian features.²⁷ It more probably simply reflects use of the LXX.

(f) We are fortunate in that Cyril actually explains how he understood the function of the anaphoral sanctus:

(i) It is rehearsed 'that we may join in hymns with the hosts of the world above'.

(ii) Cyril immediately adds: 'Then having sanctified ourselves with these spiritual hymns, we beseech God, the Lord of all, to send forth his Holy Spirit'. This seems to suggest that the recitation of the sanctus was a means of 'sanctifying' the congregation. Perhaps it is putting too much weight on this homiletic material, but it may imply that the singing of the sanctus was necessary for the actual supplicatory part of the anaphora; the congregation made a 'spiritual ascent' and, having sanctified themselves, standing before God like the seraphim, they then asked for a true communion and the descent of the Spirit, and favours for the living and dead. The reference to spiritual hymns (plural) may mean that some other chant (benedictus ?) was already part of the Jerusalem sanctus, but Cyril does not quote any other chant than the sanctus at this point.

The anaphora of St. James

Although this anaphora exists in Greek, Syriac, Armenian, Georgian, Old Slavonic and Ethiopic, the first two of these are the primary versions.²⁸ The terminus ad quem for the creation of this anaphora is the monophysite split, and the Syriac translation was probably made relatively soon after 451 CE.²⁹ A version of the mid sixth century may be recovered from commentators on the Syrian rite.³⁰

In comparison with MC 5, the anaphora of St. James presents us with a rather expanded structure of the anaphora:

Dialogue
 Eucharistia and sanctus
 Thanksgiving for redemption
 Institution narrative
 Anamnesis-oblation
 Epiklesis
 Intercessions
 Doxology

Thus, in comparison with MC 5, a block of material now appears between the sanctus and epiklesis. Furthermore, it has long been recognised that there is some dependence between St. James and the anaphora of St. Basil, though the direction of the dependence was disputed.³¹ John Fenwick's recent thesis has demonstrated that St. James appears to be a conflation of the Cyrilline Jerusalem anaphora with an earlier version of St. Basil, giving the Jerusalem anaphora a similar structure to the Cappadocian anaphora of Basil.³² Since, however, the Jerusalem anaphora already contained a eucharistia for creation with sanctus, this particular part has not been subjected to so many additions from the Cappadocian anaphora.³³

1. The Greek Version

Ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀξιόν ἐστι καὶ δίκαιον, πρέπον τε καὶ ἐποφειλόμενον σὲ αἰνεῖν, σὲ ὑμεῖν, σὲ εὐλογεῖν, σὲ προσκυνεῖν, σὲ δοξολογεῖν, σοὶ εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ πάσης κτίσεως ὁρατῆς τε καὶ ἀοράτου δημιουργῷ, τῷ θησαυρῷ τῶν/αιωνίων ἀγαθῶν, τῇ πηγῇ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τῆς ἀθανασίας, τῷ πάντων θεῷ καὶ δεσπότῃ, ὃν ὕμνουσιν οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ οἱ οὐρανοὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτῶν, ἡλιός τε καὶ σελήνη καὶ πᾶς ὁ τῶν ἄστρον χορὸς, γῆ, θάλασσα καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἡ ἐπουράνιος, πανήγυρις ἐκλεκτῶν, ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς, πνεύματα δικαίων καὶ προφητῶν, ψυχαὶ μαρτύρων καὶ ἀποστόλων, ἄγγελοι, ἀρχάγγελοι,

θρόνοι, κυριότητες, ἀρχαί τε καὶ ἐξουσίαι καὶ
 δυνάμεις φοβεραί, χερουβὶμ τὰ πολυόμματα καὶ τὰ
 ἑξαπτέρυγα σεραφίμ, ἃ ταῖς μέν δυοὶ πτέρυξι
 κατακαλύπτει τὰ πρόσωπα ἐαυτῶν, ταῖς δὲ δυοὶ
 τοὺς πόδας καὶ ταῖς δυοῖν ἐπτάμενα, κερραγεν
 ἕτερον πρὸς τὸ ἕτερον ἀκαταπαύστοις στόμασιν,
 αἰσιγῆτοις θεολογίας, τὸν ἐπινίκιον ὕμνον τῆς
 μεγαλοπρεποῦς σου δόξης λαμπρᾷ τῇ φωνῇ ᾄδοντα,
 βοῶντα, δοξολογοῦντα, κερραγόντα καὶ λέγοντα

After an initial build up of praise verbs (remarkably similar to
 the Gloria in excelsis³⁴) directed to the creator of all creation,
 the prayer continues speaking of creation itself 'hymning God ',
 leading up to the celestial host and the seraphim. In this respect
 to divide the sanctus as a separate unit beginning with 'angels',
 is artificial since there is a logical progression from the heaven
 of heavens and all their powers to the sun and moon, the spirits
 of righteous men, angels and archangels. Bouyer aptly comments:

This first part, which mentions the Father only, is unified
 by a summary of the whole creation, which is invited to join
 unanimously in the hymn of the Seraphim. All creation is,
 as it were, summed up in the heavenly Jerusalem, the festal
 assembly, the Church of the first-born whose names are
 written in heaven (...), the spirits of the righteous and
 the prophets, to whom are joined the souls of the martyrs and
 the prophets. 35

It is almost as though this oratio theologica has deliberately been
 constructed around the recitation of the sanctus. Could this
 possibly reflect the eschatology of the Jerusalemite Church,
 regarding itself as part of the new Jerusalem, and already part
 of heaven ?

Fenwick notes that in comparison with Cyril, some inversion has
 taken place, though this is perhaps to place too much weight on MC
 reproducing a correct textual sequence.³⁶ It is significant that

the sermon of Eusebius gives some support to elements in James which are not actually mentioned by Cyril.

This whole oratio theologica has been constructed from biblical quotations - 2 Thess 1:3, Col 1:16, Rev.7:17, Psalm 148:3-4, Neh.9:6, Hebrews 12:22-23, Ephesians 1:21, Ezekiel 10:12, Rev.4:8 as well as Isaiah 6:2-3. The celestial classes mentioned are exactly the same as those mentioned by Cyril, though those from Col 1:16 are arranged in their biblical order. The cherubim with many faces have become the cherubim with many eyes, and Powers are 'fearful'. In comparison with Cyril (and the LXX) certain changes have been made in the immediate context of the sanctus: the face (of God) has become 'their faces', and the hymning of the seraphim is now described in more elaborate style - with unwearying mouths and never-silent doxologies (variant reading: theologies), singing, shouting out, glorifying, crying out and saying. The sanctus itself is described as 'the victory hymn of your magnificent glory'.

The post-sanctus, as is characteristic of the Syro-Byzantine family, continues with a linguistic pick-up from the thrice holy of the sanctus. This whole section of the anaphora, according to the study of Fenwick, derives from St.Basil.

2. The Syriac Text

In comparison with the Greek text, it is clear that the Syriac is a translation, and in this particular section, for example, the Syriac translator has had to invent adjectival forms e.g. six-fold of wings. A number of points can be noted:

- (a) The list of the creation which glorify the creator is slightly shorter than the Greek, and Hebrews 12:22-23 is followed immediately

by the angelic hierarchy.

(b) The angelic hierarchy of Col 1:16 has a different order: Principalities, authorities, thrones and dominions. Principalities, risanwata, represents a direct translation, the Peshitta using arcaws. Whereas the Greek has 'fearful powers', the Syriac has 'powers that are above the world'. The Syriac adds 'heavenly armies' from Rev 19:14, making ten classes of angelic beings.

(c) In the Greek the seraphim cry one to another, in the Syriac they fly one to another.

(d) The vocal activity of the seraphim appears to be slightly different: glorifying (msbhnn) crying out (mz'qin) calling (q'in) and saying, though although the words may thus be translated in English, it may be that the Syriac translator believed he was fairly representing the Greek.

Thus, if the sermon of Eusebius is a trustworthy witness to the Jerusalem anaphora, it would appear that from at least the beginning of the fourth century that anaphora opened with a statement of the creation hymning God, and leading into the sanctus. The context of the sanctus is different from that of Addai and Mari, though both are connected with the creation. At Jerusalem, it would seem, the sanctus was addressed to God the creator, though Cyril in the Catecheses shows knowledge that it was connected with the Son (Cat.14.27) , and the tenth century commentator on the Syriac anaphora of St.James, Moses Bar Kephah, knew of three interpretations of the sanctus, including that it was addressed to

Christ who Isaiah had seen sitting on the throne.³⁷

C. Cappadocia

Asterios Sophistes

Asterios Sophistes was born in Cappadocia, and lived in Antioch and Syria. His Easter Homilies which are dated c.335-341 CE have been edited by M.Richard.³⁸ According to the study of these homilies by Hans Jorg Auf der Maur, Asterios is one of our earliest witnesses to the liturgical use of the sanctus.³⁹

In Homily XVI 13-15, Asterios proceeds from commenting upon Ps.8:3a to the entry into Jerusalem, and the cry 'Hosanna to the Son of David. Blessed be he who comes in the name of the Lord' (Matt.21:9). Asterios applies Ps.8:3a to those newly baptised at the Easter Vigil. The newly enlightened who once defiled their mouth with immodest songs, now praise God in the Holy Spirit and sing the hymn of praise 'never heard before'. Auf der Maur considers the possible meanings of 'hymn of praise' and rules out psalms, the creed or the Lord's Prayer. Gregory of Nyssa in De Baptismo used similar terms:

Cleave to the mystical people, and learn secret words. Utter with us those things which even the six-winged seraphim, with initiated Christians, say in hymns of praise. 40

John Chrysostom gives supporting evidence. In Homily 18 on 2 Cor.3, Chrysostom emphasises the active role of the people in the mysteries:

Yet why should you be amazed if, with the priest, the whole people cries out, since the whole people, in fellowship with the cherubim and the powers on high, lifts up these holy hymns. 41

In both these instances the holy hymn seems to be the sanctus, in which the people of the 'baptised' may join with the priest and the seraphim.

In Homily XV.16, which is also a homily for early morning on Easter Day, there is a further reference to the sanctus. Here Asterios dwells on the glorification and exaltation of Jesus. The ascension and enthronement of Jesus he regards as the fulfilment of the prophetic word in Ps.8:2b:

Therefore, since the seraphim and the six-winged ones, all the rational spirits who celebrate the liturgy together with them, behold the body of Christ, radiating over them, they praise and glorify Christ for the sake of the astounding miracle, not because of the human nature in itself but for the sake of him who bears it- and they sing - holy, holy, holy, Lord Sabaoth. Others cry out: Blessed be the glory of the Lord from this place - that is, from this adored body. 42

A further parallel is found in Homily XXIX on Ps.18, though this is not an Easter psalm:

Yet who are these, angels, archangels, the cherubim and the seraphim? The cherubim proclaim the glory of God; for the prophet Ezekiel hears them say 'Blessed be the glory of the Lord from this place'.

The heavens proclaim the glory of God (Ps 18:2a). The seraphim proclaim the glory; for Isaiah hears them cry out 'Holy, holy, holy, Lord Sabaoth. Heaven and earth are full of his glory'.

The heavens proclaim the glory of God (Ps 18:2a). For the evangelist Luke heard them and said: 'And there was with the angel a great multitude of the heavenly host, who praised God and said: Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, among men of goodwill (Luke 2:13-14). 43

From this survey, Auf der Maur concluded that the sanctus, which is cited by Asterios in conjunction with Ezekiel 3:12 as in the Synagogue gedussot first entered the Easter anaphora from the morning prayers used at the Easter Vigil (cf.AC 7) , and then became a regular feature of the anaphora.⁴⁴ He suggests that the tradition in Cappadocia represented by Asterios probably

goes back to the third century. As apparently with Addai and Mari, the sanctus mentioned by Asterios was addressed to Christ.

The anaphora of St.Basil

The name of St.Basil the Great has been attached, at least from the fifth century, and quite possibly before that date, to the text of a eucharistic liturgy. Although it exists in several versions - Byzantine Greek, Armenian, Syriac, Alexandrine Greek, Coptic (Sahidic and Boharic) and Ethiopic - it is reasonably clear that we have two basic texts:

1. The short text which is represented by the Coptic and Alexandrine Greek.
2. The longer text represented by the Byzantine Greek.

For many years the relationship between the two texts was surrounded by confusion on account of an assertion attributed to Proclus, Bishop of Constantinople (434-446) that Basil had shortened a longer liturgy. However, it is now clear that this assertion and its attribution are untrustworthy, and the shorter version represents an earlier version than the longer text. In a study in 1931, H.Engberding demonstrated by a comparative study of the various texts of Basil that the Egyptian text is actually 'pre-Basiline'.⁴⁵ St.Basil, so Engberding suggested, was responsible for re-writing the anaphora to produce the longer text. This view found further support in the publication in 1960 of a Coptic fragment.⁴⁶ In an appendix B.Capelle argued that the Byzantine version had been reworked by St.Basil himself, at least from the opening dialogue as far as the sanctus. A similar

assessment was also made by Bobrinsky.⁴⁷ This assessment has now been expanded considerably by John Fenwick, who has subjected the whole of the anaphora (Engberding, for example, did not include the intercessions) to a very thorough analysis, tracing the expansions in the various versions. Fenwick suggests that an Ur-text (Ur-Basil, underlying all other versions) of a Cappadocian anaphora was expanded at various times by Basil himself, and this accounts for the reason why all the versions are called after the saint. Whereas the redactor of St.James worked by conflation, St.Basil worked by expansion, using scripture and theological enrichment.⁴⁸

1.The shorter Egyptian text

The text is extant in three forms: In Coptic, lacking the first third of the anaphora; in Coptic, with additions to the first text; and in Greek, with further additions. There is also a fragment from Deir Bala'izah which assists with the opening oratio theologica.⁴⁹ The Greek text is as follows:

Ἄξιον καὶ δόκαιον, ἄξιον καὶ δόκαιον, ἀληθῶς ἄξιόν ἐστιν καὶ δόκαιον.

Ὁ ὦν δέσποτα κύριε, ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἀληθείας, ὁ ὑπάρχων πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, καὶ βασιλεύων εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας·

ὁ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ τὰ ταπεινὰ ἐφορῶν. Ὁ ποιήσας οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν

θάλασσαν, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς. Ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου δὲ καὶ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐποίησας τὰ τε ὄρατα καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα.

Ὁ καθημένο·ς ἐπὶ θρόνου τῆς ἀγίας δόξης τῆς βασιλείας σου· ὁ παρὰ πάσης ἀγίας δυνάμεως προσκυνούμενος.

Ῥε παραστήκουσιν ἄγγελοι καὶ ἀρχάγγελοι, ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐξουσαί, θρόνοι, κυριότητες καὶ δυνάμεις.

Οἱ παρῶστανται κύκλῳ σου, τὰ πολυόμματα Χερουβὶμ,
καὶ τὰ ἑξαπτέρυγα Σεραφὶμ, διὰ παντός ὑμνοῦντα καὶ
βοῶντα καὶ λέγοντα.

The opening address, or evocation, is a celebration of God.⁵⁰ It calls upon God the Father, describing his eternal existence and everlasting sovereignty. A.Houssiau comments:

It thus calls on the eternal God, the creator, and the Father of Jesus Christ; there is no sign here of Trinitarian consideration. 51

The prayer describes God as the one who made all things, visible and invisible, and who sits on the throne of glory. This reference to the throne room leads to the adoration given by the celestial beings who stand before and around the throne.

The opening description of God, ' Master, Lord, God of truth ... and regard what is low' has no parallel in the longer Byzantine text, but some parts are attested in a Sahidic fragment, showing that it certainly belongs to the Egyptian recension of Basil. Fenwick, noting the biblical base - Jer.1:6, Psalm 30:6, 54:20 and 112:6 - suggested that Basil himself added this, and later discarded it in later revisions of the anaphora.⁵² However, this may be an Egyptian addition, and Basil was certainly not the only anaphoral writer/expander who was able to quote from scripture ! In the subsequent section of the anaphora material is used from Neh.9:6 as well as the angelic orders of Col 1:16 and Ephesians 1:21. The following points can be noted:

(a) Standing beside God (ὧς παρὰστῆκουσιν) are the seven celestial orders - angels, archangels, principalities, authorities, thrones, dominions and powers - in the same order as in Syriac James. 'Standing beside' may be an Egyptian stylistic feature.⁵³

- (b) Standing around God are the cherubim with many eyes and the seraphim with six wings.
- (c) In the Coptic version the sanctus is described as 'the hymn of glory'.
- (d) The Coptic gives the activity of the seraphim as 'ever singing' and 'saying', while the Greek has 'hymning', 'shouting out' and 'saying'.

As in the Jerusalem anaphora, the sanctus appears to be addressed to the Father and creator, though the opening words of this anaphora are equally applicable to the Son. Could Basil or the Egyptian Church have reworded the Cappadocian tradition which Asterios seems to have known so that the anaphora was addressed to the Father rather than to the Son ?

2. The longer Byzantine text

St. Basil was born in Caesarea in Cappadocia c.329. He was already an influential figure when he visited Egypt c.356, and Bouyer has made the plausible suggestion that it was during this period that communities in Egypt borrowed and used the anaphora which Basil was accustomed to. After his return to Cappadocia, even before he was made bishop, he may have been in a position to influence and rewrite the anaphora of Caesarea.⁵⁴

According to Capelle the opening thanksgiving to the sanctus has been expanded by Basil, and the studies of Bobrinskoy and Fenwick support this. Some of the material found in the Egyptian recension is absent, but the whole opening section has been enriched theologically, and a great deal more scriptural quotation

and allusion has been added - from Psalm 50:17, Rom.12:1, Heb.10:26, Psalm 105:2, 25:7, Matt.11:25, Col.1:16, Wisdom 7:26, 1 John 5:20, John 1:9, 14:17, Rom.8:15. It has been given a trinitarian structure. God is praised, and 'this our reasonable service' is offered.⁵⁵ The reference to the throne of glory no longer leads immediately to the sanctus, but the prayer proceeds to mention the Son, who is the Logos, and the Holy Spirit. The third person of the Trinity now provides the transition to the sanctus:

...by whose enabling the whole reasonable and intelligent creation does you service and renders you unending praise and glory; for all things are your servants. For angels ...

The result is that now the sanctus is addressed to the Trinity rather than to the Father and creator as in the shorter text, and the amplification has resulted in rather an abrupt transition to the sanctus. Having simply the longer text before our eyes, it would easily be possible to conclude that the sanctus is an intrusion, and therefore a later addition. The shorter text gives the sanctus a more logical context. Fenwick is hesitant on this point, though we see no reason to regard the sanctus in the shorter text as an intrusion.⁵⁶

Capelle notes that in comparison with the Egyptian text, an 'inversion' of the angelic orders has taken place (now in the same order as in Greek James) and finds the same order in Basil's works, concluding that the saint himself made the rearrangement.⁵⁷

One may therefore conjecture that the Ur-text known to Basil in the first decades of the fourth century contained the sanctus in praise of the creator , and this is still evident in Egyptian Basil; after further reworking of the text, the longer version gives us a trinitarian setting for a sanctus which is

introduced very abruptly, looking more like an interpolation. If this is correct, the versions of Basil witness to the very opposite of one of Ratcliff's premises; abruptness may be the result of reworking by a redactor, upsetting an earlier contextually logical sanctus.

The Egyptian anaphora of St. Gregory of Nazianzen

The Egyptian anaphora attributed to St. Gregory Nazianzen (329/30-390) is found in both Greek and Coptic recensions. There are also Armenian and Syriac anaphoras attributed to Gregory, but apart from the attribution, they have little in common with each other, or with the Egyptian anaphora.

It was the view of Baumstark that the Egyptian anaphora was the ancient anaphora of Nazianzen which Gregory had himself expanded, and which was later taken to Egypt, possibly by Syrian monks.⁵⁸ However, a characteristic of this anaphora is that it is addressed throughout to the Son.⁵⁹ Jungmann, in his classic study The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer, 1925, argued that it was a monophysite product dating from the sixth century.⁶⁰ Hammerschmidt, in his edition of the Coptic (Boharic) text in 1957 suggested that it dated from between the last years of the fourth century, and the early part of the fifth century,⁶¹ though he accepted that it had been 'Egyptianised'. Recently the Greek text has been examined by Jose Manuel Sanchez Caro and Albert Gerhards. Sanchez Caro considered the I-thou style of the post-sanctus, comparing it with the homilies and poems of St. Gregory, and concluded that this section could well have been written by the saint, reflecting his anti-Arian stance.⁶² Gerhards has taken this further and

suggests that the anti-Arian Cappadocian anaphora has been expanded, quite probably by Proclus of Constantinople, in an anti-Nestorian stance, and has then been subsequently Egyptianised.⁶³ The text as far as the sanctus is given here in English:

It is meet and right, meet and right. It is indeed meet and right to praise you, to bless you, to worship you, to glorify you, the only true God, lover of mankind, ineffable, invisible, infinite, without beginning, eternal, without time, immeasurable, immutable, incomprehensible, maker of all things, deliverer of all. Who forgives all our iniquities and heals all our infirmities, who redeems our life from corruption and crowns us with mercy and loving kindness. Angels praise you, archangels adore you, principalities hymn you, dominions hail you, authorities proclaim your glory, and thrones raise acclamation to you. Around you stand thousands of thousands, and ten thousand times ten thousand offer you service. The invisible powers celebrate you, the visible adore you, all doing your will, O Master.

Deacon: You who are sitting, stand up.

O great I am, Lord God, very Lord of very God, who has shown to us the light of the Father, who hast vouchsafed to us true knowledge of the Holy Spirit: who has displayed to us this great mystery of life, who has instituted for men the choirs of incorporeal beings and has committed to us who are on earth the seraphic hymn: receive, together with those of the invisible choir, even our voices. Unite us with the celestial powers. May we also speak with them, having cast aside all unseemly thoughts, and may we cry aloud those things which they proclaim with voices that are never silent, and may we with unceasing mouths hymn your greatness.

Deacon: Look to the East.

For the seraphim stand around you, each having six wings, and with two they cover their faces, and with two they cover their feet, and with two they fly, and they cry aloud, one to the other, the victory hymn of our salvation, with glorious voices, clear voices, celebrating, singing, shouting, glorifying, crying aloud and saying:

Deacon: Let us attend.

(Sanctus and benedictus)

Holy, holy, are you, O Lord, and all holy

Gerhards points out that the oratio theologica consists of two sections which have been joined together:⁶⁴

1. The opening praise, consisting of,
 - a) Dialogue
 - b) Verbal praise to God
 - c) Theological statements
2. The praise of the angels.

The apophatic adjectives, the so-called negative theology, have parallels in Gregory's writings, but they may also represent the common stock of a particular theological epoch.⁶⁵ As the text now stands, however, this whole section of praise leading to the sanctus seems to have been expanded, and Egyptian elements have been wedded with Syrian elements, as is indicated by the deacon's interruptions. Gerhards points out that the Syrian understanding of the sanctus seems to have been amalgamated with an Egyptian understanding:

Für die Gregoriosanaphora läßt sich daraus der Zusammenhang mit ägyptischen Anaphora-Strukturen folgern; diese finden hier jedoch eine individuelle Ausprägung aufgrund der unterschiedlichen Interpretation des Sanctus in Syrien und Ägypten: Die syrische Liturgie interpretiert es unter Betonung des eschatologischen Charakters stärker als Lobgesang der Engel, die ägyptische dagegen stellt die paränetische Verbindung von Engel-und Menschenchor in den Vordergrund. Die Gregoriosanaphora betont deher in der „ägyptischen“ Sanctus-Einleitung die in Syrien ungewöhnliche „Gleichzeitigkeit“ von Engel-und Menschengesang, wo diese in der bodenständigen Markusliturgie als selbstverständlich vorausgesetzt wird. 66

The introductory praise leads to an angelological list, but each class of angelic being has a particular liturgical activity:

Angels praise you
 Archangels adore you
 Principalities hymn you
 Dominions lift their voices to you
 Authorities proclaim your glory
 Thrones raise acclamations to you
 Thousand thousands stand before you
 Myriad myriads offer you service
 The invisible beings hymn you
 The visible things worship you
 All things do your will.

After this, within a statement that the Father and the Spirit are made known through the Son, petition is made that the voice of the Church may be joined with the voice of the seraphim. This may not necessarily be an Egyptianising, since such petitions are found in some late Syriac anaphoras.⁶⁷ However, it does reflect the Egyptian pattern as found in Serapion, of praise, petition, sanctus. Gerhards suggests that the liturgical understanding on which the anaphora is based has the imprint of the platonic mimesis idea, namely that the earthly liturgy is merely a copy of the heavenly liturgy;⁶⁸ however, such an idea finds echoes in the bible itself. We may note that when mention is made of the seraphim, the material in this anaphora is reminiscent of that found in St. James.

It is extremely difficult to estimate what, if anything, in this section of the anaphora goes back to fourth century Cappadocia. However, against the very popular thesis of Jungmann, both Sanchez Caro and Gerhards have shown that Gregory in his writings against the Arians made the equation of Christ=God, and Gerhards cites the Didache, the Apocryphal Acts of Thomas and John, Addai and Mari, Testamentum Domini and Armenian Gregory to show that contrary to Jungmann's view, early eucharistic prayers in some places were addressed to Christ.⁶⁹ It may be that this Egyptian anaphora witnesses to an earlier Cappadocian custom, seemingly attested to by Asterios Sophistes, of the anaphoral sanctus being addressed to Christ.

D. Antioch

Little is known of the Antiochene anaphora before the fourth

century. Massey Shepherd has suggested that the anaphora of Hippolytus might have derived from Antioch,⁷⁰ and Robert Grant has suggested that passages on the works of God in creation and providence developed by Theophilus of Antioch in Ad Autolycum i.6-7 (probably written before 180 CE) might echo a eucharistic preface.⁷¹ However, it is only in the fourth century that firm, datable material comes to light with the writings of St. John Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia, and the anaphoras of Apostolic Constitutions VIII, of John Chrysostom, and possibly, of the Apostles.

St. John Chrysostom

In an appendix to Liturgies Eastern and Western, F.E. Brightman collected together from Chrysostom's writings what appear to be definite references to the liturgy of Antioch 370-398.⁷² An even more searching analysis has been made by Frans Van de Paverd.⁷³ Thus for evidence of initial praise of God, Van de Paverd cites passages from In Mt Hom.25/26,3, In ep.II ad Cor. Hom.2,5, In ep.I ad Cor. Hom.24,1, and for the sanctus, In ep.ad Ephes. Hom.14,4, In illud: vidi Dominum 6,2-3,4, De baptismo Christi 4,1, In Mt. Hom.19,3, De ss.Martyribus 2 and In illud: vidi Dominum 1,1 and 3.⁷⁴ Such a selection is extremely convincing, though it presupposes a certain structure and content in the anaphora of Antioch.

Theodore of Mopsuestia

Although probably reworked for use at Mopsuestia, Theodore's Homilies 15 and 16 on the eucharist were probably preached at Antioch before 392, and are therefore a useful witness to the usage of Antioch. It would seem from Homily 16 that the sanctus

came near the beginning of the anaphora, after praising the greatness of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Theodore is useful, not so much for the form of the sanctus as for its rationale. The congregation sing in a loud voice 'as if we were also singing that which the invisible natures sing: Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Sabaoth, the whole heaven and earth are full of his praises'.⁷⁵ Theodore saw it as a revelation of the Trinity in three persons, revealed by the thrice holy. He continues:

It is necessary, therefore, that the priest also should, after having mentioned in this service the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, say: 'Praise and adoration are offered by all the creatures to Divine nature'. He makes mention also of the seraphim, as they are found in the Divine Book singing the praise which all of us who are present sing loudly in the Divine song which all of us recite, along with the invisible hosts, in order to serve God. We ought to think of them and to offer a thanksgiving that is equal to theirs. Indeed, the Economy of our Lord granted us to become immortal and incorruptible, and to serve God with the invisible hosts 'when we are caught up in the clouds to meet our Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord', according to the saying of the Apostle. Nor are the words of our Lord false, who says that the children of God 'are like the angels of God, because they are the children of the resurrection'. 76

Theodore, it would seem, saw the eucharist as the offering which is equal to the praise offered by the heavenly host (cf. Addai and Mari). He adds:

we make use of the words of the invisible hosts, in order to make manifest the greatness of the grace which has been so unexpectedly outpoured upon us. We do not cast away the awe from our mind, but on account of the greatness of the things that are now taking place, we keep it throughout the service equally, and we bow our heads both before and after we recite loudly the sanctus, and make manifest this fear in a congruous way. 77

Did Theodore also know of eucharistic prayers without the sanctus ? The Syrian theologian, Cyrus of Edessa, in his Explanation of the Pasch, quotes a prayer which he presents as

an example of the type of prayer used by Jesus at the Last Supper. It is a thanksgiving for redemption beginning, ' Worthy of all glory and of all thanksgiving and praise is the glorious nature of your exalted divinity', extending to an institution narrative.⁷⁸

A very similar prayer is also quoted by Narsai, though in Narsai it is attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia. W.F.Macomber accepts this attribution, and argues that the version quoted by Narsai is probably nearer the original text.⁷⁹ He suggests that the prayer probably occurred in Theodore's commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew which is no longer extant.⁸⁰ Macomber comments:

It may be more important, however, to note the absence of the Sanctus in both versions, which is a strongly presumptive indication that it was also lacking in the original. Theodore, of course, was well acquainted with the Sanctus, as is clear from his Catechetical Homilies. Apparently, therefore, he did not consider the Sanctus to be a necessary element in an anaphora. One may note the absence of any reference to creation such as usually found in Antiochene anaphoras of the classic form. 81

The prayer is without doubt full of the Logos-anthropos christology of Theodore. Since the Apostolic Tradition, its expansion in Testamentum Domini and the anaphora of Epiphanius witness to the use of eucharistic prayers without the sanctus, there is no reason why Theodore should not have been acquainted with such anaphoras.

However, too much should not be read from this prayer and this latter observation. The form in Narsai, which Macomber suggests is the more original, does not include the institution narrative; neither version contains an epiklesis or intercessions. The prayer may therefore simply reflect Theodore's attempt to recreate the type of prayer which he imagined Jesus would have used at the Last Supper. It may be that Cyrus, or a redactor, added an institution

narrative to the prayer in its earlier form in Narsai. But whatever the origin of this prayer, it is nevertheless certain that Theodore in his Catechetical Homilies knew an anaphora of the classical Syro-Byzantine shape, and it included the sanctus.

Both Chrysostom and Theodore witness to an Antiochene anaphora which began with praise to God the Holy Trinity, in which the heavenly host and the sanctus are mentioned.

The anaphoras of St. John Chrysostom and the Apostles

In his study Der ursprung der Chrysostomusliturgie, Georg Wagner subjected the text of the anaphora of St. John Chrysostom to a careful comparison with Chrysostom's writings, and concluded that 'Goldenmouth' could be the author of the Greek anaphora which bears his name.⁸² Few scholars, however, have been entirely convinced that the saint authored this anaphora. Geoffrey Cuming has pointed out that the presence of an identical phrase in a liturgy and in the writings of a Father may indeed be explained as evidence of common authorship; but it may be that the Father is quoting from a liturgy, or both may be drawing from a common source.⁸³ Thus, the apophatic adjectives which appear in the anaphora of St. John Chrysostom could reflect the Anomoean controversy, to which Chrysostom devoted several sermons, but they could reflect the common stock of theological phrases in vogue at that time.⁸⁴ But although it is unlikely that Chrysostom authored the anaphora which bears his name, it is certainly possible that this anaphora has been developed from the liturgy of Antioch which Chrysostom brought with him to Constantinople in 398.

In an article in 1937 H. Engberding drew attention to the

similarities between the Greek anaphora of St. John Chrysostom and a Syriac anaphora entitled the Apostles or Twelve Apostles.⁸⁵ He suggested that perhaps the Syriac might preserve an earlier version of the anaphora. This suggestion was pursued by A. Raes and G. Khouri-Sarkis, both of whom concluded that the Syriac preserved an earlier version of an anaphora which had been expanded in the Greek recension.⁸⁶ The relationship between these two anaphoras is undeniable, but it may be an oversimplification to regard the Syriac version as being nearer to the older use of Antioch. One of the problems with the vast number of Syriac anaphoras of the Syro-Byzantine family is that many of them are abbreviations or conflation of texts, and their authors made additions and alterations of their own which may appear 'primitive', but which are certainly not original ! The Syriac of the Twelve Apostles, in the opinion of S. P. Brock, points to the translation being made in the sixth or seventh centuries,⁸⁷ and this is also the view of G. Wagner.⁸⁸ Twelve Apostles might, therefore, simply be a conflation; however, it might also reflect an earlier Greek text which was also the ancestor of the present Greek anaphora of St. John Chrysostom, the common ancestor being the, or an, anaphora of Antioch.

1. Greek St. John Chrysostom

It is fitting and right to hymn you, to give you thanks, to worship you in all places of your dominion. For you are God, ineffable, inconceivable, invisible, incomprehensible, existing always and in the same way, you and your only-begotten Son and your Holy Spirit. You brought us out of not-being to being; and when we had fallen, you raised us up again; and did not cease to do everything until you had brought us up to heaven, and granted us the kingdom that is to come. For all these things we give thanks to you and to your

only-begotten Son and to your Holy Spirit, for all that we know and do not know, your seen and unseen benefits that have come upon us. We give you thanks also for this ministry; vouchsafe to receive it from our hands, even though thousands of archangels and ten thousands of angels stand before you, cherubim and seraphim, with six wings and many eyes, flying on high singing the victory hymn (ἐπινίκιον ὕμνον)

The sanctus here is woven into the opening praise of the anaphora, and is presented as being a sacrifice of praise offered in heaven; after a thanksgiving for the creation and redemption of the worshippers, thanks is given for 'this service' (τῆς λειτουργίας ταύτης) and God is asked to receive the eucharistic action as well as the praise of the heavenly host (cf. Theodore of Mopsuestia and Addai and Mari). The thought behind this is close to that expressed by St. John Chrysostom himself in Homily 25 on Matthew:

Wherefore, as you know, the Priest also enjoins to give thanks for the world, for the former things, for the things that are now, for what hath been done to us before, for what shall befall us hereafter, when that Sacrifice is set forth.

For this is the thing both to free us from earth, and to remove us into heaven, and to make us Angels instead of men.

Wagner cites parallels to the negative epithets in De incomprehensibili contra Ananoeos 3,1: ⁸⁹

... Καλῶμεν τοίνυν αὐτὸν τὸν ἀνέκφραστον
τὸν ἀπερινόητον θεόν, τὸν ἀόρατον, τὸν
ἀκαταληπτον, τὸν νικῶντα γλώττης δύναμιν
ἀνθρωπίνης ...

A similar vocabulary is found in Ad eos qui scandalizati 2. ⁹⁰

The angelology is more akin to Addai and Mari than to Jerusalem or Cappadocia - something which might be expected in view of the fact that both originate from a similar geographical area. ⁹¹

Chrysostom simply mentions thousands of angels, myriads of archangels, cherubim and seraphim. In the earliest manuscript they simply sing the triumphal hymn. The transition to the post-sanctus is reminiscent also of Addai and Mari, 'With these powers (hosts) ... we also cry and say'. The thrice-holy pick up is given a trinitarian application.

2. Syriac Apostles

The sanctus pericope in this anaphora is even shorter, and seems less contextually connected with the opening praise than the Greek anaphora. This led G.J.Cuming to postulate that the Apostles was originally an anaphora which lacked a sanctus, and one was later inserted.⁹² This however seems to overlook the thought-pattern of the opening of the anaphora, which is different from Greek Chrysostom. The thought seems to be:

It is our duty to praise and glorify you,

for (gyr) 1. You brought us out of not-being into being
(creation and redemption of mankind).. because
of this we give thanks to you ...

for (gyr) 2. Around you stand the cherubim ... glorifying
with never-silent mouths and voices ...

This may be paraphrased: 'we praise you because you have created and redeemed us, and because you are worshipped in heaven by the heavenly host'. Admittedly this is different from Chrysostom, but it is not out of context.⁹³ Nevertheless, if this is a conflation of a Greek text, the different context of the sanctus might be purely accidental, as a result of conflation and omission. In the angelology the cherubim have four faces

(Ezekiel and Revelation), and the heavenly armies (cf.Syriac James) have been added. The vocal activity is identical to that of Syriac James.

If these two anaphoras witness to Antioch, they are not early enough to indicate whether the sanctus was ever addressed to the Son. In the two texts we have, the praise of God has been given a trinitarian setting (cf.Addai and Mari), though the sanctus itself is addressed to the creating and redeeming God.

The anaphora of Apostolic Constitutions VIII

The composite character of the AC has already been noted.⁹⁴ It is generally dated c.360, in the region of Antioch. Chapter 8 contains a eucharistic liturgy with a lengthy anaphora, which is in part a vast expansion of that found in Apostolic Tradition, borrows material from the Jewish Synagogal prayers of AC 7, and, it is assumed, from current Antiochene anaphoral usage. Bouley comments:

There is no reason to assume, however, that the order and structure of the anaphora were the result of his own initiative. These were known to him because they were characteristic of the public liturgy with which he was familiar, and indeed, at least on occasion his own prayer was perhaps actually used in the liturgy. 95

If this view is correct, it has a significant implication for the sanctus. While the compiler has used the anaphora of the Apostolic Tradition, he has inserted a great deal of extra material, including a sanctus. This suggests that c.360 the compiler did not regard the Apostolic Tradition anaphora as entirely adequate, and was aware that an Antiochene anaphora at that time would normally include the sanctus. The compiler was a collector of sources, who found it difficult to discriminate;

he tended to amalgamate and duplicate. In respect of the sanctus, therefore, we might expect a composite form which is a result of amalgamating material. However, the compiler was also an Arian, or had semi-Arian sympathies, and therefore is concerned with God the creator and Father as distinct from the Son. If the anaphora of Antioch was ever addressed to the Son, including its sanctus, it is unlikely to be reflected in this compilation. Thus, although it pre-dates the evidence of St. John Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia, it may not be regarded simply as a local variant of the anaphora of Antioch c.360.

The anaphora opens with the familiar 'Grace' of the Syro-Byzantine family, and proceeds to praise God the creator. Creation is rehearsed in descending chronological order; first the Son was brought into existence, and through him were made the heavenly powers, cherubim and seraphim, the beings of Col.1:16 in reverse order, with archangels and angels. This might suggest the appearance of the sanctus, but the descending order seems to be part of the compiler's elaborate rehearsal of creation - perhaps suggested to him by the angelology of the sanctus - but it is unlikely that the compiler has omitted an 'original' sanctus at this point. Metzger observes:

The inspiration behind the description is both biblical and hellenistic; the description of the universe is based on biblical cosmology, but some parts of it draw on Stoic physics and physiology. 96

The rehearsal of creation continues, and then transfers to the Old Covenant salvation history, from Adam as far as Joshua and the Canaanites. Then as W.H. Bates pointed out, 'the Sanctus seems to have been placed abruptly between the sections of the

prayer which describe the work of God in Christ in the Old Testament, and the work of God in Christ in the New'.⁹⁷ In fact, the compiler passes from the old Joshua to the new Joshua, but without doubt the sanctus is an intrusion, having no logical context.

You declared Joshua to be leader, you destroyed through him the seven nations of Canaanites, you parted Jordan, you dried up the rivers of Etham, you laid walls low without machines or human hands.

For all things glory be to you, almighty Lord. You are worshipped by every bodiless and holy order, by the Paraclete, and above all by your holy child Jesus the Christ, our Lord and God, your angel and the chief general of your power, and eternal and unending high priest, by unnumbered armies of angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, powers, virtues, eternal armies. The Cherubim and the six-winged Seraphim with two wings covering their feet, with two their heads, and with two flying, together with thousands of thousands of archangels and myriads of myriads of angels say unceasingly, never resting their voices: All the people say: Holy, holy, holy (is the) Lord of Sabaoth; heaven and earth are full of his glory; blessed (is he) for ever. Amen.

The bishop continues: Truly are you holy and all-holy, most high and exalted above all for ever.

Holy also is your only-begotten Son, our Lord and God Jesus the Christ, who ministered to you, his God and Father, in all things, in the varieties of creation, and in appropriate forethought.

It is interesting to speculate whether the sentence ' Glory be to you for all things, Almighty Lord' is a concluding doxology to the rehearsal of Old Testament salvation history, or the opening of the sanctus pericope, reintroducing the notion of praise. Short doxologies are found in Didache 9 and 10, Testamentum Domini and Syriac Apostles. On the other hand, it is slightly reminiscent of the opening of Sharar, and it is tempting to ask whether or not this is the opening of a eucharistic prayer (that of Antioch ?) which the compiler has inserted or joined to other material ? If the passages which subordinate the Paraclete and

the Son are removed, and the first set of angelic classes (since angels and archangels are duplicated), we have something not altogether unlike Addai and Mari, or more particularly, Sharar. It would certainly be in keeping with the compiler's method to amalgamate angelologies, and subordinate the Son. It might just be possible, therefore, that this section preserves something of the opening of the anaphora of Antioch of the early fourth century. However, whether or not this suggestion has any substance, in this anaphora the transition from salvation history to the sanctus is contextually abrupt.

The context of the sanctus is rather different from that so far encountered. It is not linked with the worship of the creation as in James, but is more akin to the heavenly sacrifice of praise in Greek Chrysostom. However, the compiler has given it a christological function in line with his own theology. Worship is offered to God by all bodiless and holy orders, including the Paraclete and ,above all, Jesus 'your angel and the chief general of your power'. Only then comes the heavenly host, similar to Greek James, but with 'eternal armies ' (cf.Syriac James, 'heavenly armies'), and after mention of cherubim and seraphim, reference to angels and archangels in terms of Dan 7:10. It might therefore suggest that the compiler has combined a Jerusalemite or Cappadocian angelology with a simpler Antiochene one. After the sanctus and Romans 1:25 (see chapter 5), the prayer proceeds in the usual Syro-Byzantine manner, with a trinitarian (though qualified) application of the thrice holy.

The evidence from Antioch - which is generally later than for Jerusalem and Cappadocia - confirms that praise and thanksgiving led to the sanctus. The evidence suggests that praise was offered to Father, Son and Spirit, and the sanctus was regarded as a

sacrifice of praise offered in heaven, to which the church added its eucharistic action. The peculiar nature of the anaphora of AC 8 does not allow us to use this as direct evidence of the anaphora of Antioch, though it confirms that at that time, c.360, the sanctus was an accepted part of the anaphora in this area also. It is possible that the pericope which introduces the sanctus in this anaphora might preserve something of the oratio theologica and sanctus of the Antiochene anaphora before c.360.

E. The later East Syrian tradition

Although theologians such as Ephraim and Aphrahat shed some light on the eucharistic liturgy in East Syria, they do not provide any evidence on the anaphoral sanctus. As we have seen, Aphrahat alludes to the sanctus in a passage which Murray suggests echoes the Jewish mystical tradition;⁹⁸ Ephraim mentions the sanctus, though not in a eucharistic context, but interestingly, he understands it as being addressed to Christ.⁹⁹ Cyrillonas, writing c.396 knows of the sanctus in a eucharistic context, and also seems to understand that it was addressed to Christ.¹⁰⁰ For other information we must rely on Narsai's liturgical homilies, and the two other East Syrian anaphoras, Theodore the Interpreter and Nestorius.

The origin of the anaphoras attributed to Theodore and Nestorius is uncertain, though it is highly unlikely that they were composed by either Theodore or Nestorius. Writing c.531, Leontius of Byzantium accused Theodore of having no respect for the anaphora of the Apostles (Twelve Apostles ?) or that of St.Basil,

but compiled his own.¹⁰¹ Some of the manuscript headings of these two anaphoras describe them as translations made from the Greek by Mar Abbas and Mar Thomas, suggesting an early sixth century date for the Syriac. Certainly both seem dependent upon a Greek text. However, this information from the manuscripts is late, and its accuracy is called in question by the fact that Narsai's Homily XVII seems to presuppose the existence of an anaphora or anaphoras of the type represented by Theodore and Nestorius.¹⁰² Narsai was professor at Edessa from 437-457, and then at Nisibis until his death c.502. In the liturgical homilies Narsai in fact seems to be commenting on an anaphoral tradition in general rather than one particular anaphora, and seems to switch with ease between parts of Nestorius and parts of Theodore. However, unless the homilies have been interpolated, they suggest that versions of Theodore and Nestorius were in existence in the fifth century.

Narsai

In Homily XVII Narsai explains that the priest, after the anaphoral dialogue, recounts the glory of the incomprehensible Divinity, which is the cause of intelligible and sensible beings, the Creator who is revealed as a Trinity in three hypostases, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. He continues:

The priest adds: 'All the watchers are standing in fear to praise the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. The angels too offer worship to that Majesty, and the army-leaders (of heaven) send up praise continually: the cherubim applaud, the seraphim sanctify with their sanctifications, and the authorities and dominations with their praises: all at once cry and say one to another'.

And the people answer: 'Holy Lord' that dwelleth in light. 'Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord' the people answer, 'of whose glories the heavens and all the earth are full'. 103

Narsai continues with an explanation of the thrice-holy; there is one Lord, but known as Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

Homily XXI is a baptismal homily, and describes the baptismal eucharist. Much less information is given here about the opening of the eucharistic prayer, though the anaphora did contain the sanctus:

He imitates the spiritual beings by his words while he is making supplication; and holily he teaches the people to cry 'Holy'. The utterance of sanctification of the heavenly beings he recites to men, that they may be crying: 'Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord.' 104

In this homily Narsai turns to Isaiah 6:4ff to explain the function of the sanctus. The coal which touched Isaiah's lips was in fact the mystery of the body and blood of Christ. The priest fulfils the role of the seraph, bringing the body and blood of Christ to the sinner.

In the homily on the Church and the Priesthood there is only a brief reference to the anaphora, and a mention of a thrice-holy. It was this reference in Homily XXXII that Ratlciff argued witnessed to an anaphora ending with the sanctus. In fact Narsai is either returning to the sanctus as Connolly suggested, or is referring to the thrice-holy at the commixture.¹⁰⁵

Allowing for the homiletic nature of the material, it would seem that at the time of Narsai, the East Syrian anaphoral tradition gave praise to God the creator, revealed as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and it led into the sanctus which could also be understood as a proof-text of the Trinity.

The anaphora of Nestorius

As has been pointed out by B. Botte, Bayard Jones, G. Wagner, and

myself, Nestorius is a skilful conflation of both Byzantine Basil and Greek Chrysostom (or earlier versions of these) and Addai and Mari.¹⁰⁶ The opening ghanta praises God in terms very similar to Greek Chrysostom, though the theologising tendency of the latter is heightened. The compiler has adapted the reference in Greek Chrysostom to 'this ministry' to form an independent lead in to the sanctus:

We worship thee for all thy graces which thou hast wrought toward us, those we know and those we know not, those that are open and those which are hidden, and we give thanks for this service and we beseech thee to accept it at our hands. For who is sufficient to utter the wonders of thy power, or to show forth all thy praises ? For neither could all living creatures uniting in one mouth and tongue be sufficient to tell of thy greatness O my Lord. For before thy Trinity my Lord stand a thousand thousand and myriad myriads of angels and archangels, who all with one accord fly and hover and cease not, and continually with a loud voice without ceasing sound forth praise, and sing hallelujahs, crying one to another and saying:

It is noticeable that only angels and archangels are mentioned, showing that a simple angelology is not necessarily a sign of antiquity. However, it seems to confirm that in the area of Antioch, and in East Syria (Addai and Mari) Dan.7:10 formed part of the sanctus Formelgut . The post-sanctus picks up in characteristic Syro-Byzantine manner. It explicitly states that God has made his worshippers on earth worthy to become like those who glorify him in heaven - thus making explicit the thought implied in Addai and Mari. The sanctus is thus part of the praise offered on earth to God for his magnificence and glorious nature and deeds. As such we have argued that it is part of the offering sequence which underlies Nestorius:¹⁰⁷

Offering of praise

Offering of the commemoration of our salvation (eucharist)

Pleading the sacrifice in the intercessions

Petition for the Spirit to make the oblation life-giving
to those who receive it.

The anaphora of Theodore

Georg Wagner believes that this is an East Syrian adaptation of the anaphora of Antioch which Theodore of Mopsuestia commented upon in his homilies.¹⁰⁸ However, that anaphora was of the Syro-Byzantine shape, not the East Syrian; the anaphora of Theodore also tends to be dependent upon Addai and Mari. It may be, therefore, that this anaphora is a compilation based upon Theodore's catechetical homilies with material from Addai and Mari, and even Nestorius. It certainly reflects Theodore of Mopsuestia's rationale for the sanctus. The anaphora explicitly says that the sanctus is offered as praise by the angelic beings, using the characteristic East Syrian verb for the offering of verbal praise, slq.¹⁰⁹

For before thee, O God the Father of Truth, and before thy only-begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, and before the Holy Spirit, stand a thousand thousand and myriad myriads of holy angels; these for the joy of their lives, in the constancy of their wills, hallow thy great and holy name in constant praise. And thou hast, my Lord, in thy grace, made even the feeble race of mortal men worthy to lift up glory and honour, with all the companies of those on high, to thy Almighty Sovereignty, even with those who at all times before the majesty of Thy holiness lift up their voice to glorify thy glorious Trinity which in three persons co-equal and undivided is confessed, crying and praising without ceasing, calling one to another and saying, ...

This even more explicit linking of the earthly praise of the church with the celestial worship may well have been suggested to a compiler by the catechetical homilies of Theodore:

The right praises of God consist in professing that all praises and all glorifications are due to Him, inasmuch as adoration and service are due to Him from all of us;... He asserts that praises and glorifications are offered at all times, and before all other (beings), to this eternal and divine nature, by all the visible creatures and by the invisible hosts ... He makes mention also of the seraphim, as they are found in the Divine Book singing praise which all of us who are present sing loudly in the Divine song which we recite, along with the invisible hosts, in order to serve God. We ought to think of them and to offer a thanksgiving that is equal to theirs. 110

The sanctus here is very much part of the sacrifice of praise which is offered to God in conjunction with the oblation.¹¹¹

Thus, in East Syria we find theological elaboration which centres praise on the Trinity; the sanctus explicitly becomes part of the church's oblation of praise, and bread and wine, and the angelology introducing it is severely reduced.

F. Summary

In the Syro-Byzantine and East Syrian traditions, we have argued that with the anaphoras of Addai and Mari and Sharar the sanctus is a logical part of the anaphora, and with other common material in these two anaphoras, could be given a third century date; Eusebius may give us an early fourth century attestation for Jerusalem, and Asterios in the first part of the fourth century for Cappadocia. For Antioch, AC gives us a mid-fourth century date. In these areas the sanctus occurs in the first part of the anaphora, as part of the oratio theologica. Beyond this there are a number of differences.

In Addai and Mari/Sharar it occurs as the praise of the heavenly hosts to the Name (Christ, or Name revealed as Father, Son and Holy Spirit) who is creator and redeemer. From the evidence of Asterios the anaphora in Cappadocia may also have

addressed the sanctus to Christ, and this is possibly confirmed by the anaphora of Gregory which is addressed to the Son. The Jerusalem tradition addressed the Father as creator, and this too is the case in Egyptian Basil, and AC 8; in Byzantine Basil, Greek Chrysostom and Syriac Apostles a trinitarian application becomes more obvious, and this is made explicit in the later West Syrian tradition.

The Jerusalem tradition stands apart in that it is a hymn of creation to the creator, rather than of the church to God making mention of the angelic praise. In Basil the sanctus is introduced in the praise of God by mention of the throne room (the logical link being broken in Byzantine Basil); in Addai and Mari/Sharar it is the praise of heaven to which is added the thanksgiving of mortals; in Greek Chrysostom the eucharist is offered along with the sanctus. Although it is a chant of the congregation, contextually it remains the song of heaven in Addai and Mari, Eusebius and James, AC 8, Greek Chrysostom, Syriac Apostles, Egyptian and Byzantine Basil, and Nestorius. Sharar, Cyril, Theodore, John Chrysostom, Narsai and the anaphora of Theodore, and Gregory, all make explicit that it becomes also the chant of the church. As far as angelology is concerned, Jerusalem and Cappadocia (together with the compiler of AC 8) have a complex angelology, using mainly Col.1:16, adding from Ephesians 1:21, with angels, archangels, cherubim and seraphim. East Syria and Antioch have a simpler angelology, ignoring Col 1:16, but using Dan 7:10.

In so far as there is any comparison with the use of the geduṣṣah in Judaism, the Hekhalot hymns and geduṣṣah d^e yoser are

the nearest, in that they praise the Name of God the creator who is worshipped in heaven. The similarity is, however, minimal.

2. THE EAST: EGYPT

The anaphoras of Egyptian Basil and St. Gregory of Nazianzen witness to the Syro-Byzantine (or Cappadocian) influence in Egypt. However, the Greek anaphora of St. Mark, its Coptic recension (St. Cyril), together with various Greek and Coptic fragments, and the anaphora in the collection attributed to Serapion of Thmuis, witness to a quite distinct indigenous Egyptian anaphoral pattern. In this pattern characteristics include intercessions before the sanctus, an epiklesis after the institution narrative, and the use of 1 Cor. 11:26 in the anamnesis (καταγγέλλετε). Some of these distinct features may themselves be later developments to an earlier quite distinct anaphoral pattern. The fragments include the Strasbourg Papyrus Gr. 254 (4th-5th century), the Deir Bala'izah papyrus (6th/7th century), a Coptic wooden tablet of the 8th century, the Manchester Papyrus (6th century), the Louvain Coptic papyrus (no longer extant) and the Barcelona anaphora. The fragments suggest that this distinct pattern was found in Upper and Lower Egypt, and therefore to refer to the pattern as Alexandrine in an exclusive sense is inaccurate.

A. The Strasbourg Papyrus

In his magisterial study, 'L'Anaphore Alexandrine de Saint Marc', R-G. Coquin carefully examined the Greek and Coptic recensions, tracing their growth by comparing them with earlier fragments.¹¹²

However, the gradual evolution presupposed by Coquin has in recent years been called into question by a number of scholars working quite independently.

Coquin assumed, as did the original editors, that the Strasbourg Papyrus Gr.254 was a fragment of an earlier version of St.Mark.¹¹³ However, in 1974 E.Kilmartin described the fragment as a 'eucharistia', strongly hinting that the papyrus was a complete prayer.¹¹⁴ More recently W.H.Bates, H.A.J.Wegman and G.J.Cuming have argued persuasively that Strasbourg is a complete eucharistic prayer, representing the earliest Egyptian pattern, which subsequently underwent considerable metamorphose in its evolution to the pattern of St.Mark.¹¹⁵ Important in these studies is the analogy with the structure of the Jewish berakot, and the significance of the short doxology of the papyrus. Although this interpretation is not the only possible one,¹¹⁶ their view is gaining considerable acceptance.¹¹⁷ If, therefore, Strasbourg is a complete early Egyptian anaphora, it gives us an anaphora with the following structure:

1. Thanksgiving, or blessing for creation.
2. Oblation - Malachi 1:11
3. Intercessions

These themes are brought to a conclusion by the short doxology,
 δι' οὗ σοι δοξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

This pattern, which Cuming would date to the third century, would be significantly different ~~from~~ that of Apostolic Tradition, Addai and Mari, and the Jerusalem pattern attested by Cyril. It also has significant implications regarding the sanctus. Contrary

to Dix and Kretschmar, it would indicate that far from originating in Egypt, the sanctus there represents a later development, sometime in the fourth century. A consideration of the sanctus as it appears in St.Mark and the various fragments, and Serapion, may shed some light on this development.

B. St.Mark and St.Cyril - Alexandria

There are four manuscripts of the medieval Greek St.Mark: a roll at the University of Messina (12th century); Vat.Gr.1970 (12th century) and 2281 (13th century) and the Pegas manuscript of the 16th century. The text used here is that of Vat.Gr.1970. There are many medieval manuscripts of the Coptic recension which is named after St.Cyril. Here we have used Hunt Ms.403 and the printed edition of Tuki.

As with Greek and Syriac James, so with this anaphora the two versions have influenced each other, and thus it is not always easy to identify the 'original' reading. On the whole the Coptic version is probably to be preferred. The Greek text shows considerable assimilation to the texts of Greek St.James and Byzantine Basil.

Greek Mark

For you are the One who is above all Principalities and Authorities and Powers and Dominions and every name that is named not only in this Age but in that which is to come.

Beside you stand thousands and thousands and myriads of myriads of armies of holy angels and archangels.

Beside you stand your two most honourable living creatures, the many eyed cherubim and the six winged seraphim who with two wings

Coptic Cyril

For you are God, who is above all Principalities and all Authorities and all Powers and all Dominions and every name that is named not only in this Age but in that which is to come.

For you are He beside whom stands the commanders of thousands of thousands and the commanders of myriads of myriads of the angels and holy archangels who serve you.

For you are He beside whom stand your two most honourable living creatures, those to whom belong six wings and many eyes, the seraphim and the

cover their faces, and with two their feet and with two they fly, and cry out one to another with unwearying mouths and never silent theologies the triumphant and thrice-holy hymn singing, shouting out, glorifying crying out and saying to the glory of your great majesty:

(sanctus)

For at all times all things sanctify you. But with all those who sanctify you, receive, Lord God, also our sanctification as with them we hymn and say:

The People: (sanctus)

cherubim. With two wings they cover their faces because of your Godhead which cannot be seen and is inconceivable. With two they cover their feet, flying with the other two.

For at all times all things sanctify you. But with all those who sanctify you, receive also our sanctification as we sing to you saying:

The People: (sanctus)

('their faces because of your Godhead' is omitted from Tuki, whose text is defective at this point)

Unlike the Syro-Byzantine and East Syrian anaphoras, the sanctus here is not part of the opening oratio theologica. St. Mark/St. Cyril gives the following pattern:

1. Thanksgiving for creation and redemption
2. Oblation
3. Intercession
4. Sanctus
5. Epiklesis
6. Institution narrative
7. Anamnesis
8. Epiklesis
9. Doxology

Since each of these items is generally dove-tailed into the next, such an outline obscures the fact that although textually the sanctus remains a hymn of praise, contextually it occurs within intercessions, and serves as a transition to further intercession, namely the first epiklesis. In fact, in comparison with the Strasbourg Papyrus, the theme of redemption has been added to 1., and 4-8 are simply an extension of 3., the intercessions. We shall return to this observation below.

The Greek version of the sanctus pericope has a long duplication,

and the words underlined are identical with Greek James, which is probably the source of the duplication. In addition there are slight differences between the two versions. The Coptic has 'commanders' of angels and archangels who 'serve you'. The Greek version describes the cherubim as having many eyes, and the seraphim as six-winged, whereas the Coptic has an inversion and describes both cherubim and seraphim as many eyed and six-winged - though according to Professor M.Plumley, this could be just an accident of Bohairic grammar.¹¹⁸ The Coptic repeats $\Sigma\upsilon \gamma\alpha\rho \epsilon\iota$ of the opening Ephesians quotation, whereas the Greek has $\sigma\omicron\iota \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$. The Coptic version explains why the faces of the seraphim were covered. The common form of the sanctus pericope which they represent has the following characteristics:

1. It is introduced by Ephesians 1:21

2. Beside God stand:

(a) (Dan.7:10) armies of angels and archangels (Coptic: Commanders).

(b) The two most honourable living creatures, the cherubim (Greek)

(c) The seraphim (Greek)

or, (b) The two most honourable living creatures, the seraphim and cherubim (Coptic).

The term ' two most honourable living creatures ' needs some explanation. It is taken from the LXX version of Hab.3:2. The LXX version differs considerably from the Massoretic text. (There also exists a Greek translation of the text called the Barbarini version.) Whereas Hab.3:2 in the Hebrew reads:

O Lord I have heard your report and your work, O Lord, I fear.
In the midst of the years renew it; in the midst of the years
make it known; (RSV)

the LXX reads:

O Lord I have heard your report and was afraid; and I saw your work and was amazed. In the midst of two living creatures (ἐν μέσῳ δύο ζώων) you shall be acknowledged.

The explanation for this difference would seem to be that 'two living creatures' is a corruption of sanim hayyhu into s^ene hayym.¹¹⁹

Rudolph suggests that it may have arisen through the influence of Exodus 25:22, and that in connection with Isaiah 1:3, it may have given rise to the tradition of the ox and ass at the crib.¹²⁰

The same Greek term, ζῶα, is also used in the LXX to render the hayyôt of Ezekiel.

The term is used as part of the Egyptian sanctus, though in Serapion we find 'the two most honourable seraphim'. As has been noted, Gregory Dix speculated that behind this term we have an early Alexandrine theology as represented by Origen, where two honourable creatures = seraphim = the Son and the Holy Spirit. According to Dix this is the meaning in Serapion, though in St. Mark, although the term has been retained, the identification has been given up.¹²¹

While undoubtedly the reference to honourable creatures suggests that Alexandria associated Hab. 3:2 with Isaiah 6:3. there is little justification for seeing the theology of Origen behind it. Clement of Alexandria could say of the Christian gnostic:

He is inseparable from the commandment and from hope, and is ever giving thanks to God, like the living creatures figuratively spoken of by Isaiah, ...¹²²

Similarly Athanasius identifies the honourable living creatures with the seraphim.¹²³ However, neither give the slightest hint that there is any connection between the seraphim and the Son and

Holy Spirit. They simply link Hab.3:2 with the seraphim of Isaiah, which is the natural interpretation of the reference in Serapion. At a later date Cyril of Alexandria in his commentary on Habakkuk identifies the two living creatures with the cherubim.¹²⁴ It could well be that this dual identification amongst influential Egyptian theologians could account for the vague reference in St.Mark. The Coptic version could, grammatically, identify the two living creatures as both seraphim and cherubim. This dual identification is born out by a text attributed spuriously to St.John Chrysostom, entitled 'The Four Living Creatures'. According to this work, the four living creatures of Ezekiel are the two seraphim and two cherubim.¹²⁵ All one may conclude is that in Egyptian theology Hab.3:2 was associated with Isaiah 6:3, and in the liturgy of Alexandria and of Thmuis Hab.3:2 is used in the sanctus pericope alongside Ephesians 1:21, Dan.7:10 and Isaiah 6:3.

3. The sanctus is specifically made into the song of the church on earth.

4. The sanctus is part of the intercessions. It has been assumed by many scholars, including Coquin, that the intercessions at the beginning of the anaphora of St.Mark are a later interpolation, and that originally the sanctus followed a thanksgiving for creation and redemption, giving an oratio theologica not unlike, for example, Addai and Mari. The Strasbourg Papyrus at least confirms that the intercessions were placed after the reference to oblation at an early date, giving us the thought sequence:

we offer ... And we pray and beseech you for ...¹²⁶

Contextually the sanctus of St.Mark is within the intercessions,

and is used for a spring-board to continue the intercessions, namely the first epiklesis. Whereas the Syro-Byzantine anaphora continues after the sanctus with a pick up on the word 'holy', in St. Mark it is the word 'full' which is the pick up word:

Full in truth are heaven and earth of your glory through our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ: fill, O God, this sacrifice also with a blessing from you through the descent of your Holy Spirit.

This Egyptian peculiarity is also found in an inscription which according to Baumstark preserves part of an old Egyptian eucharistic prayer, though the title theotokos is clearly a much later addition: 127

Master, Lord God of Abraham (?) who shines brightly, having no part in darkness, where dwells the fulness of your godhead, to whom armies above, archangels and angels, minister and unceasingly honour you, singing with a thrice holy voice and saying: Holy, holy, holy are you Lord, heaven and earth are full of your glory ... for they are full of your greatness, all compassionate Lord, for being invisible in the heavens, in the richness of your powers, you condescended to live among mortals, made flesh from the Virgin theotokos, Mary.

This inscription preserves the literary link, though unlike the Egyptian anaphora, there is no intercessory link.

B. Serapion and Thmuis

Although Bernard Botte questioned the authorship of the collection of prayers attributed to Serapion, G.J. Cuming rightly warns that it is premature to speak of 'Pseudo-Serapion'.¹²⁸ Serapion was bishop of Thmuis in the Nile delta, c.340-360, and a friend of St. Athanasius. The anaphora in this collection of prayers has a structural similarity to St. Mark, though it has some characteristics which are Syro-Byzantine. It opens with a hymn of praise to the Father as the creator God, and gives praise for the Son. There is no reference to oblation or Malachi 1:11 at

this point as in Strasbourg and St.Mark, but the opening praise passes to intercession:

We pray you: Make us living men ...

It prays for the Holy Spirit, and (cf.Cyril of Jerusalem):

May the Lord Jesus speak in us, and Holy Spirit, and hymn you through us.

For you are above all Principalities and Authorities and Powers and Dominions and every name that is named, not only in this Age, but in that which is to come.

Beside you stand thousands of thousands and myriads of myriads of angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities and authorities. Beside you stand the two most honourable seraphim with six wings, which cover the face with two wings, and the feet with two, and fly with two; and they cry 'holy'. With them receive also our cry of 'Holy', as we say: 'Holy, holy, holy, Lord Sabaoth; heaven and earth are full of your glory'. Full in heaven, full also is earth of your excellent glory, Lord of Powers. Fill also this sacrifice with your power and your partaking; for to you have we offered this living sacrifice, this bloodless offering.

As with St.Mark, the sanctus pericope opens with Ephesians 1:21, and then Dan.7:10. However, there then comes the angelology of Col.1:16, more familiar in the Syro-Byzantine family. The biblical order is preserved, as in Greek James, AC 8 and Byzantine Basil, though since 'Powers' occurs in the Ephesians quotation, Serapion does not need to add it to the Colossians quotation. Serapion does not mention the cherubim, but the 'two most honourable seraphim' illustrate the linking of Hab.3:2 with Isaiah 6:3. This link, together with the strange request, ' May the Lord Jesus Christ speak in us, and Holy Spirit, and hymn you through us', might suggest to the speculative mind the theology of Origen regarding the equation of seraphim with the Son and Spirit. However, the text does not actually make this equation, and is perfectly consistent with the understanding found in Clement and Athanasius, that the two living creatures were the seraphim. The thought of

the Thmuis anaphora seems to be:

Christ and the Holy Spirit speak in us, so that we, like the living creatures (seraphim) who stand beside you, may praise you with the sanctus.

Serapion, like Cyril of Jerusalem, keeps the LXX reading of 'face'. The text suggests that it was the priest rather than the congregation who recited the sanctus. Like St. Mark, the post-sanctus continues the intercession with an epiklesis. The verbal pick up is on the word 'full', but also the word 'sabaoth' is brought into play. Lord Sabaoth in the sanctus is rendered in the post sanctus in terms of the LXX of 2 Sam.6:2, Lord of Powers, and God is asked to fill the sacrifice with his power (τῆς σῆς δυνάμεως).

C. The Fragments

1. Deir Bala'izah Papyrus

This text confirms that the pattern of St. Mark was also known in Upper Egypt. The fragment preserves a rem^{ant} of the intercessions, which is followed by Ephesians 1:21, a fragmentary sanctus pericope, and an epiklesis which uses part of the Didache. The reference to seraphim or cherubim is missing, but whatever they were, they 'stand in a circle'. The sanctus is recited by the priest:

Everything at all times hallows you, but with all that hallows you, receive also our hallowing, as we say to you: Holy, holy, holy, Lord Sabaoth, Heaven and earth are full of your glory. Fill us also with your glory from you and vouchsafe to send down your Holy Spirit upon these creatures (and) make the bread the body of our (Lord and) Saviour Jesus Christ, and the cup the blood ... of our Lord and ... And as this bread was scattered on (the mountains) and hills and fields ...

After the Didache material, with the petition ' so gather the catholic church', the fragment leads into the institution narrative.

2. The Manchester Papyrus and the British Museum Tablet

The Greek and Coptic fragments are textually very similar, preserving a post sanctus/epiklesis as far as the second epiklesis. The transition from sanctus to epiklesis to institution narrative is extremely brief:

Full in truth are heaven and earth of your glory through our Lord (and) Saviour Jesus Christ: fill, O God, this sacrifice also with your blessing through your Holy Spirit. For our Lord and Saviour and King of all, Jesus Christ, in the night ...

3. The Louvain Coptic Papyrus and the Barcelona anaphora

The Louvain text preserved a post sanctus epiklesis and institution narrative; the post sanctus picked up on the word 'glory', made a reference to Christ, and offered the bread and wine. However, the sections of the anaphora of the Barcelona papyrus which have so far been published appear to be the Greek version of the same or similar anaphora.¹²⁹ After a thanksgiving to God as creator, the sanctus is introduced in a manner different from that so far encountered in the Egyptian texts:

ᾠαλιον καὶ ὀλκαιον ... αἰνεῖν ... εὐχαριστεῖν ...
 ... ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα
 ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι
 τὰ πάντα, οὐρανοὺς γῆν θάλασσαν
 καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς,
 διὰ ἡγαπημένου σου παιδὸς
 ὁ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν,

δι' οὗ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς
 ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς
 ἀπὸ ἀγνοίας εἰς ἐπιγνώσιν
 δόξης δόξατος αὐτοῦ
 ἀπὸ φθορᾶς θανάτου εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν
 εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ ἄρματος χερουβιν
 καὶ σεραφιν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ
 ὧ παριστάσιν χίλιαι χιλιάδες
 καὶ μύριαι μυριάδες ἀγγέλων,
 ἀρχαγγέλων, θρόνων καὶ κυριοτήτων,
 ὕμνουσιν καὶ δοξολογοῦσιν·
 μεθ' ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς ὕμνουσιντες λέγοντες·
 ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος Κύριος σαβαωθ·
 πλήρης ὁ οὐρανός (καὶ ἡ γῆ)
 τῆς δόξης σου·
 ἐν ἣ ἐδόξασας ἡμᾶς
 δια τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου
 καὶ πρωτοτόκου πάσης κτίσεως
 ὁ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν·
 ὁ καθήμενος ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης σου
 ἐν τοῖς οὐράνοις·
 ὃς ἔρχεται κρῖναι
 ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς·
 δι' οὗ
 προσφέρομεν κτίσματα σοῦ ταῦτα·
 ἄρτον τε καὶ ποτήριον ...

Here we do not find the hitherto invariable use of Eph.1:21, but an allusion to 1 Chronicles 28:18 and Ecclesiasticus 49:8, to the Chariot of the cherubim (merkāvāh influence ?), the seraphim in front, and Dan.7:10 is applied to angels, archangels, thrones and dominions. The pick up is on the word 'glory'. However, in the Coptic version of the Louvain Papyrus, after the note of offering, an intercessory note is introduced by an epiklesis. With these two fragments, therefore, we have evidence of a rather different Egyptian pattern, where the sanctus is within a thanksgiving addressed to God the Father.

D. Summary and Analogous literature

With the exception of the Louvain and Barcelona fragments

we find in the peculiarly Egyptian anaphoral pattern a distinctive sanctus pericope which has the following characteristics:

(1) If the Strasbourg Papyrus is a complete anaphora representative of the old Egyptian indigenous anaphora, then we must conclude that the sanctus, together with its epiklesis, as well as an institution narrative, anamnesis and epiklesis is a later development.

(2) When the sanctus was introduced into the anaphora, it was added after the intercessions, and was introduced with Eph.1:21, and generally included reference to Dan 7:10, Hab.3:2 and Isaiah 6:3. Col 1:16, utilised by some Syro-Byzantine anaphoras, is found only in Serapion (and part in the Barcelona fragment), coming in Serapion as an unnecessary repetition. Serapion, who seems to have been influenced in places by Syro-Byzantine usage, may have been influenced by that anaphoral tradition at this point.¹³⁰

(3) The sanctus is the song of the Christian assembly (cf. Sharar, Cyril of Jerusalem, and the anaphoras of Theodore and Gregory) even though in the early texts it was recited by the priest.

(It is possible that the anaphora of Gregory has been expanded before the recitation of the sanctus to accord with Egyptian custom). Despite the use of Ephesians 1:21, it was addressed to the Father.

(4) In the anaphoral texts which have survived, although textually the sanctus is a hymn of praise, contextually it occurs within the intercessions, and is used as a spring-board to further intercession, namely an epiklesis. The epiklesis is wedded to the sanctus with a carefully constructed verbal link; we

have in fact a sanctus-epiklesis unit.

The most puzzling question is that of the possible source of this unit. The development from Strasbourg Papyrus to the textus receptus of St. Mark could easily be explained by borrowing from the Syro-Byzantine pattern, and more particularly, from Egyptian Basil or Apostolic Tradition - the latter also being influential in Egypt.¹³¹ However, the sanctus-epiklesis unit, with its introduction from Ephesians 1:21 has no convincing parallel in the Syro-Byzantine tradition, and nor could Apostolic Tradition have been an inspiration since it has no sanctus. The textual evidence suggests that this unit was an indigenous literary development which was firmly established by the time of Serapion's anaphora in the mid-fourth century.

Louis Bouyer, in looking for Jewish parallels pointed to the geduṣṣah d' 'amidah, since this geduṣṣah occurs in a series of berakot which include intercessory material.¹³² However, this geduṣṣah is not preceded by intercession, and there are no convincing verbal parallels.

There is, however, some similarity to be found in Jewish and Gnostic ideas associated with the power of the divine name, and expressed in the Egyptian Greek magical papyri. E.E. Urbach observes:

The power manifested in sorcery and also the means employed in connection with it are called $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$. The name of the God of Israel, as the God of power and might, is extensively used in magical papyri and invocations. ¹³³

Both Irenaeus and Origen witness to the fact that Sabaoth was regarded by some Gnostic groups as a name employed in incantations,¹³⁴ and Scholem has drawn attention to the importance of 'the name

of the Dynamis' or ' Great Power ', which was interchangeable with 'The Great Glory' in some of the Hekhalot literature. ¹³⁵ In the Gnostic work from Nag Hammadi, On the Origin of the World, we learn concerning Sabaoth, son of Yaldabaoth, that:

Moreover when Sabaoth received light, he received a great authority against all of the powers of Chaos. Since that day, he has been called 'the lord of the powers'. ¹³⁶

In The Discourse of the Eighth and Ninth (heavens) we find a prayer:

O my father, I call upon you who rule over the kingdom of power ...
.. Lord, grant us a wisdom from your power that reaches us,
... ¹³⁷

In a Greek and Coptic exorcism spell amongst the Greek magical papyri, which date from the third century CE, we find the following petition:

Hail, God of Abraham; hail, God of Isaac; hail, God of Jacob; Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Son of the Father, who is above the Seven, who is within the Seven. Bring Iao Sabaoth; may your power issue forth from him, NN, until you drive away the unclean daimon Satan, who is in him. ¹³⁸

In Kropp's collection of magical papyri, we find something reminiscent of the epiklesis connected to the sanctus, though here simply connected with the names of God, and especially Sabaoth:

That you vouchsafe today
To leave (whatsoever) place where you are
And come down upon the cup of water
which stands before me.
May you fill it for me with light like that of the sun and moon,
seven times greater.
.....
Yea, come ! For (I adjure) you by the great true name of the Father,
whose name is Aio, Sabaoth (...) .. ¹³⁹

In another text, which is obviously Christian, the sanctus is actually used:

Holy, holy, holy, Lord Sabaoth
 Heaven and earth are (full) of your glory.
 We praise you,
 We praise all your holy ones, Iao.
 We praise you, Holy One of Sabaoth
 First of heaven and earth.
 We praise thee, Adonai, Eloï, Pantokrator,
 First among the cherubim and seraphim.

...
 I summon thee, Gabriel
 By the two great seraphim,
 Each of whom has six wings,
 With two of which they cover the face,
 With two of which they cover the feet,
 While with two they fly,
 One after the other,
 While they call out and say:
 Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts
 Heaven and earth are full (of your glory)
 ...
 In thy holy majesty
 That you come to me. 140

In the Prayer of Jacob, a Jewish magical text from Egypt
 which Charlesworth dates between the first and fourth centuries CE,
 but which he notes has much in common with second century Egyptian
 Greek papyri, we find the following:

Hear me,
 You the God of the Powers
 the God of angels and archangels,
 King ...
 You who sit upon the mountain of holy Sinaïos;
 You who sit upon the sea,
 You who sit upon the serpent gods,
 the God who sits upon the sun, Iao,
 you who sit upon ...
 you who sit upon the ...Abriel, Louel
 ... the resting place of the cherubim for ever and ever.
 God Abaoth, Abrathioalt, Sabaoth, Adonai, astra
 the Lord of all (things).
 I summon you.
 ...
 He who has the secret name Sabaoth
 God of gods: amen, amen.
 ... Fill me with wisdom. 141

There is in the magical texts, a connection between Sabaoth/Power,
 and wisdom and blessing. 142

It is not being suggested that any of these are genuine

parallels, and even less the source of the sanctus-epiklesis unit in the Egyptian anaphora. However, there is a marked similarity in function. In the Egyptian anaphora the sanctus - the name of Lord Sabaoth - is recited, and then he is asked to fill the bread and wine with power (Serapion) or his blessing (St. Mark). All we can do is to observe the fact that whereas in the Syro-Byzantine and East Syrian anaphoras the sanctus is used in a manner akin to that of the Jewish gedussah de yoser, of praise of God's majesty, in the Egyptian anaphora it has similarities with the ideas regarding the divine Name and especially Sabaoth which were current in Jewish and Gnostic groups in the second to the fourth centuries. It was regarded as an acclamation which could be used for petition, and its function in Egypt as represented by Serapion and St. Mark is quite unlike that of Syria, or for that matter, its use in the West.

3. THE WEST: ROME AND MILAN

The Roman canon missae, which eventually became the sole eucharistic prayer of the Western Catholic Church, and which still survives as Eucharistic Prayer 1 of the Missal of Pope Paul VI, presents itself as something of an enigma.¹⁴³ Its origin, development and final shaping remain intractable questions, as also its relationship with other regional uses in Italy, and with the Gallican rite. Much of it can be paralleled in the fourth century writings of St. Ambrose;¹⁴⁴ its Cyprianic theology of sacrifice together with its Old Latin institution narrative and its vocabulary point to North African influence.¹⁴⁵ Many scholars

have suggested the long pontificate of Pope Damasus (366-384) as the probable time when the early Latin canon was redacted in its essentials, the final redaction being in the pontificate of Gregory the Great (590-604).

In contrast to the Eastern anaphoras which are fixed compositions, the Roman canon missae has three variable parts:

- a) The praefatio or Proper Preface. The Verona Sacramentary has 267 proper prefaces for different occasions, and there are 54 in the older Gelasian.
- b) The Communicantes, which may have an insertion.
- c) The Hanc igitur which also varies according to the occasion.

The first of these variables, the preface, introduces the sanctus.

In general the Roman prefaces introduce the sanctus in four ways:

- (1) The so-called 'praefatio communis' or 'Cottidiana':

Per quem maiestatem tuam laudant angeli, adorant dominationes, tremunt potestates, caeli caelorumque virtutes ac beata seraphim socia exultatione concelebrant. Cum quibus et nostras voces ut admitti iubeas deprecamur supplici confessione dicentes, Sanctus ... 146

- (2) The most common variant is that which begins Et ideo:

Et ideo cum angelis et archangelis, cum thronis et dominationibus, cumque omni militia caelestis exercitus, hymnum gloriae tuae canimus sine fine dicentes, sanctus ... 147

Slight variants of this form include Propterea cum angelis,¹⁴⁸

Unde cum angelis¹⁴⁹, and cum angelis.¹⁵⁰

- (3) Quapropter (unde) profusis gaudiis totus in orbe terrarum mundis exultat. Sed et supernae virtutes atque angelicae potestates hymnum gloriae tuae concinunt sine fine dicentes, sanctus ... 151

- (4) Quem (quam) laudant angeli angeli atque archangeli, cherubim quoque ac seraphim, qui non cessant clamare quotidie una voce dicentes, sanctus ... 152

Slight variants of this form include per quem laudant and per quem te laudant.¹⁵³

These forms occur in the prefaces of the Verona (but not 4.), Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries.¹⁵⁴ However, the great problem is the question of the antiquity of the anaphoral sanctus in the Roman canon.

(1) While scholars accepted that the Apostolic Tradition attributed to Hippolytus represented the Roman canon in the early third century, then it could be assumed that the variable prefaces and the sanctus together with a great deal of other material in the canon missae represent later developments. More recent assessments of the Apostolic Tradition caution against accepting this anaphora as some infallible paradigm. Its Roman provenance has been questioned, but, even if it is a Roman anaphora, it should not necessarily be thought to be representative of the anaphora of all the ecclesial groups in Rome.¹⁵⁵ Furthermore, it purports to be an anaphora which a bishop might use at his ordination, and not a general Sunday anaphora.¹⁵⁶ It has been suggested by Bouley that the proper prefaces are a survival of the time when the celebrant was free to compose the whole anaphora, and should not be regarded as particularly late.¹⁵⁷

(2) It is nevertheless significant that Ambrose in De Sacramentis gives no hint of the sanctus, and Jerome, Ambrosiaster, Gaudentius of Brescia and Augustine, while commenting upon Isaiah 6:3, give no indication that it had a liturgical context.¹⁵⁸

(3) The Roman canon makes little attempt to connect the sanctus with what follows. The paragraph immediately after the sanctus begins

Te igitur, clementissime Pater, per Iesum Christum
filium tuum ...

It is difficult to see what igitur refers to. B. Botte and C. Mohrmann suggested that it represented nothing stronger than the Greek $\delta\epsilon$ and made no attempt to give it any representation in their French translation.¹⁵⁹ However, it does have some sense if it refers back to the preface. E. C. Ratcliff and G. G. Willis have argued that if the sanctus with its introduction is regarded as an intrusion, then te igitur will be seen to carry on the thought of the preface.¹⁶⁰ The thought is, whatever the variable preface, 'It is meet and right to give you thanks through Christ. Therefore through Christ we ask you to accept our thanksgiving'. Thus, the sanctus with its introduction breaks the flow and logic of the Roman canon, suggesting that it could well be an intrusion.

(4) Such a supposition seems to find confirmation in the so-called Mai fragments. These two fragments, published by Cardinal Mai in 1828 present us with two portions of early Italian prayers which correspond structurally with the beginning of the canon missae (praise - commendation of the oblations).¹⁶¹ These are Arian fragments, and demonstrate the existence of written prefaces in North Italy at the beginning of the fourth century. The second, longer formula, after giving thanks and praise to the Father for the gift of the Son and for redemption through him, includes two phrases reminiscent of the Roman te igitur and supplices te, but there is no trace of the sanctus. Indeed, the ending, 'though Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom we ask and beseech', seems to deliberately exclude the sanctus, which the canon missae introduces 'through Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom angels praise ...'. Many of the prefaces given in

the Sacramentaries simply end with 'per' or 'per Christum Dominum'. It is not clear, therefore, whether this abbreviation led originally in all cases into the sanctus, or whether, like the Mai fragments, there was no sanctus.

(5) According to the Liber Pontificalis, the sanctus was introduced as early as Xystus I:

Hic constituit ut intra actionem, sacerdos incipiens, populo hymnum decantare: Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth et cetera. 162

Most commentators are of the opinion that this is most unlikely, and see it as evidence for the sixth century when the Liber Pontificalis was written, rather than for the second century. However, Gamber made the suggestion that this might really be applicable to Xystus III, which would not be implausible.¹⁶³ More importance is attached to the reference to the sanctus in the Libellus on the Holy Spirit attributed to Ambrose. In a thorough discussion of this text, Lucien Chavoutier drew attention to the following statement:

Unde etiam tractum est per omnes fere orientales ecclesias et nonnullas occidentales, ut in oblationibus sacrificiorum, quae Deo Patri offerentur, una cum sacerdote voce populus utatur, id est: Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus Sabaoth, plena est omnis terra maiestate eius. 164

Chavoutier dates the document c.400 CE, and North Italy as its provenance. He suggested that this passage should be interpreted as affirming that by c.400 all the Eastern churches had the sanctus as part of the anaphora but only certain Western churches used it. He further surmises that the Western churches which were in the process of adopting the sanctus as part of the anaphora were those of North Italy and Rome, on the grounds that the writer knows the Old Latin translation of $\delta\delta\xi\alpha$ by maiestas

rather than gloria, and the Old Latin was localised in North Italy.¹⁶⁵

Couratin questioned whether this is what the text actually implies. What the text seems to say is that almost everywhere in the East, and in a number of places in the West, the people join in reciting the sanctus with the celebrant. This may well mean that the almost universal custom (by c.400) in the East of the sanctus being a congregational chant was also becoming the custom in the West. The Libellus may therefore simply witness to the sanctus in the West being recited by the priest alone. Couratin suggested that Canon 3 of the Council of Vaison, 529, would simply be a further stage of development. Once the congregation joined in the sanctus, it was then to be recited in early masses, weekdays in Lent and masses for the dead.¹⁶⁶ The Libellus, then, would not rule out the sanctus being part of the anaphora well before c.400, but said only by the priest and not the congregation.

(6) An earlier date for the sanctus than the sixth century attestation of the Liber Pontificalis has been suggested by P-M. Gy.¹⁶⁷ If certain of the prefaces of the Verona and Gelasian Sacramentaries which presuppose the sanctus can be attributed to St. Gelasius and St. Leo, then clearly the sanctus was an established element in the canon when they wrote. Gy bases his case on the work of A.P. Lang.¹⁶⁸ He concludes:

On peut donc supposer que le sanctus est entré dans le canon romain avant S. Léon. Mais son adoption ne doit pas être beaucoup plus ancienne puisque dans le premier tiers du siècle l'Eglise d'Afrique, dont les liens avec le Siège Apostolique sont si étroits, l'ignore encore complètement.¹⁶⁹

The conclusion to the common preface, so Gy concludes, is probably

contemporary with the insertion of the sanctus into the Roman canon, making its appearance towards the end of the fourth century.

In summary, therefore, it would seem from internal and external evidence that the sanctus in the Roman canon represents a later addition, and the studies of Chavoutier and Gy point to the end of the fourth century or early fifth century for its introduction. Although the preface could be altered to introduce it, the post sanctus te igitur seems to have been left unmodified. There is no literary link as in the Syro-Byzantine and Egyptian anaphoras, nor is there a logical development of thought as in Addai and Mari. It may well be that the sanctus was inserted because it was by that time a universal feature in the East. It might be the case that in some places and on some occasions the sanctus formed part of the anaphora at an earlier date, and gradually became a regular feature of the anaphora at every celebration, but such a conjecture cannot be proven. If the sanctus at Rome was borrowed from the East, is there an Eastern model ? According to Gy, we must look to Jerusalem and to Greek Chrysostom.¹⁷⁰ The result of the Roman adoption of the sanctus results in an anaphoral structure of praise -sanctus -oblation/intercession. The preface and sanctus are akin to the oratio theologica and sanctus of the Syro-Byzantine and East Syrian rites, but the canon does not continue the element of praise after the sanctus.

The angelology of the common preface raises one or two interesting points:

- (a) Archangels and cherubim are absent.
- (b) There is a problem over the meaning of caeli caelorumque virtutes.

On the grounds that caeli caelorumque is not an angelic class,

Capelle suggested that caeli belonged with potestates, and caelorumque with virtutes.¹⁷¹ Some missals have punctuated the Latin 'Potestates, caeli, caelorumque virtutes'. M-F. Lacan drew attention to the term caeli in the Vulgate, and concluded that the term designated all the heavenly armies.¹⁷² However, as Gy observes, in St. James we find the expression οἱ οὐρανοὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτῶν which seems to be repeated here in the Roman common preface.¹⁷³

(c) Each group is given a particular function of praise, in a manner found in St. Gregory.

In the other forms we meet a very restrained angelology, never reaching the complicated systematic hierarchy of St. James or AC 8. The Quam laudant angeli form is close to Greek Chrysostom; omni militia caelestis exercitus echoes ἀνάρητοι στρατιαὶ and στρατιῶν αἰωνίων of AC 8. Archangels make their appearance only in forms 2 and 4. Dan.7:10 does not feature at all.

There is also a variety in the agents who sing the sanctus. In 1. after the Egyptian manner, petition is made for the voices of the congregation to be admitted with those of the heavenly host, ' beseeching you, confessing you, and saying'. In 2. it is also the congregation who sing (canimus) the hymn without end to God's glory. However, in 3 and 4 it is the celestial beings who sing the sanctus: 'concinunt sine fine dicentes' and 'non cessant clamare quotidie una voce dicentes' - phraseology which recalls the Passio of Perpetua, and Tertullian. If the Libellus of Pseudo-Ambrose does only witness to the sanctus becoming a congregational chant rather than just the priest's (so Couratin),

it would be tempting to see the common preface and 2. as representing an accommodation to a later practice, the earlier practice being represented by 3. and 4. This however may be placing too much weight on what may be simply Roman variety, and furthermore, 4. is not found in the Verona Sacramentary.

In a recent article Jean Magne, concerned to show that many early hymns and prayers were addressed to Christ as God, including the anaphoral sanctus in some cases, has suggested that the form quem laudant together with cui merito, a Gallican introduction to the sanctus, indicate that the sanctus was addressed to Christ.¹⁷⁴ However, since the quem laudant form is not found in the early Roman prefaces, but in the Gelasian book, it may well be that this form was imported into Roman use from a tradition where the anaphora of parts of it were addressed to Christ. Gy points out that those prefaces which may be attributed to St. Leo place the sanctus in a trinitarian setting, after the manner of Greek Chrysostom.¹⁷⁵ Indeed, if the Roman sanctus is a later fourth century addition, it was inserted at a time when anaphoras seemed to be concerned with a trinitarian context.¹⁷⁶

The rite of Milan as witnessed by St. Ambrose had much in common with the Roman rite, though it also had its own distinctive elements.¹⁷⁷ In the rite which developed, as witnessed by the Sacramentary of Bergamo (10th Century) the canon is practically that of the Roman canon, though the book contains 203 prefaces.¹⁷⁸ A.A.King divides the prefaces into five groups:¹⁷⁹

(1) In the form of collects, and ending with a doxology per dominum nostrum.

- (2) Narratives normally relating lives of saints.
- (3) Oratorical prefaces, exhibiting high-flown rhetoric, resembling the Gallican and Mozarabic rites.
- (4) Antithetical prefaces, where two subjects are opposed to each other in a series of antitheses, as heaven and hell.
- (5) Prefaces with parallels between persons, such as Eve and Mary.

Tradition ascribes the authorship of the early Milanese prefaces to Eusebius, bishop of Milan (451-65), and this has been corroborated in the study of Paredi.¹⁸⁰ Eusebius was a Greek from Syria, and Gregory Dix suggested that he may have been responsible for the Western preface and sanctus.¹⁸¹ This would seem rather a later date than seems probable for the Roman preface, and it is probable that the sanctus was in use before Eusebius' episcopate.¹⁸² Syrian influence might, however, account for the expansion at Milan of the common preface:

Per quem maiestatem tuam laudant angeli, VENERANTUR
ARCHANGELI, THRONI, dominationes virtutes, PRINCIPATUS ET
potestates adorant, QUEM CHERUBIM et seraphim socia
exultatione concelebrant ...

It increases the classes of celestial beings to nine, as in some of the Eastern rites, though not in the same sequence so as to suggest a specific source. In addition to the four introductions encountered in the Roman rite - though the quem laudant form is made explicitly trinitarian in some cases with the addition 'quem una tecum omnipotens ... ' - we find a few variants:

Aligeri nobiscum ter sanctum hymnum honorifice proclamemus
dicentes ..

Cui venienti obviam ecclesiae in choro innumerabilium
virginum hymnum divinis laudibus decantant dicentes ...

As in the Roman canon, there is no pick up after the sanctus, the

te igitur following. There is an exception in the rite for Holy Saturday, where a vere sanctus is provided, showing again Gallican and Mozarabic influence on the rite of Milan. Although, therefore, there are slight variations, the function of the sanctus, with its lack of logic within the overall anaphora, is identical to that of Rome.

4. THE WEST : SPAIN AND GAUL

There is an undoubted link between the two non-Roman Western rites - the Spanish Visigothic or Mozarabic rite , and the Gallican (and Celtic) rite. In respect to the eucharistic prayer, they seem little more than variations of a single rite, often with the same technical terms, phrases and formulas. It has been argued that the Mozarabic rite is derived from the Gallican, though the view at present seems to favour the Spanish rite as being the primary source.¹⁸³

The Spanish rite

Though the Spanish rite may be the source of the Gallican, its own origins are uncertain. It has been argued that it was derived from the Roman rite, and Coebergh has shown that material from the Verona Sacramentary has been used in the Mozarabic rite.¹⁸⁴ There is, however, also evidence of North African derivation.¹⁸⁵ It may be that the indigenous rite which ultimately developed stemmed from both Roman and North African sources.

No evidence exists for written eucharistic texts in Spain before the fifth century.¹⁸⁶ However, Ferotin believed that some of the texts in the Liber Mozarabicus Sacramentorum went back to 400 CE, on the grounds that the feasts of certain saints such as

Jerome, Augustine and Martin appear in some rare manuscripts and are described as 'new comers'.¹⁸⁷ A number of *inlatios* (corresponding to the Roman prefaces) reflect the circumstances of the fifth and sixth centuries, and there are no feasts in honour of important sixth and seventh century Spanish bishops.¹⁸⁸ Ferotin concluded that many of the texts were gathered together and revised during the sixth and seventh centuries, this process of revision being associated with the great sees of Toledo and Braga.¹⁸⁹ However, although Ferotin is probably correct to regard the collection as containing some quite early texts, it is almost impossible to identify which ones they might be. Neither would it be easy to identify revisions of earlier texts. A further complication is the fact that at certain stages of its history, the rite has been quite deliberately 'Syrianised'.

In the Liber Mozarabicus Sacramentorum and the Liber Ordinum¹⁹⁰ the eucharistic prayer consists of a series of variable prayers introduced by a fixed dialogue, and surrounding a *sanctus* and a fixed institution narrative. The use of the *sanctus* in the eucharistic prayer in Spain seems to be first attested in the Expositio fidei catholicae of pseudo-Athanasius, probably dating from the middle of the fifth century.¹⁹¹

By far the majority of the *inlatios* conclude with what appears to be a standard conventional introduction to the *sanctus*. The most common begins cui merito or cui merito omnes Angeli.¹⁹² The full formula tends to have slight variants:

Cui merito omnes Angeli et Archangeli, Throni, Dominationes,
non cessant clamare atquo ita dicere. 193

cui merito omnes Angeli et Archangeli non cessant clamare
quotidie, una voce dicentes. 194

cui merito etiam omnes Angeli clamare non cessant,
ita dicentes 195

Sometimes the introduction is preceded by, for example, per ipsum
or presta per eum.¹⁹⁶ Another standard introduction is

quem conlaudant (cf. Roman rite) which again has variations:

quem conlaudant Angeli et Archangeli, una voce ita
dicentes 197

quem conlaudant omnes Angeli atque Archangeli: ita
dicentes 198

Alongside these there are other forms of introduction,¹⁹⁹ including
some which have their own elaborate form. Thus for Pentecost,
carefully linked with the theme of flames:

O ignis exurendo fecundans, fecundando multiplicans !
Hunc igitur omnipotentem esse Deum omnes intellectualium
creaturarum vivificationem fatentur. Cuius etiam Cherubim
et Seraphim, feruentes copiosius igne, speciali eius vocabulo
sanctitatis divine magnificantes aequalitatem atque
omnipotentiam Trinitatis, requiem non habentes, sed tali
numquam officio lassescentes, celestium exercitum præcinentibus
choris, peremni iubilatione decantant, adorant atque
magnificant, ita dicentes 200

Again, the third Sunday of the year (Advent):

Presta, unita equalis et indisa Trinitas, Deus noster: quem
celorum multiplex et ineffabilis numerus, quem omnium
Angelorum et Archangelorum millia, eum Senioribus et
Virtutibus, cum Thronis et Dominationibus laudare non
cessant. In cuius preconio quadriga illa senarum reigio
suffulta alarum, intrinsecus et extrinsecus minutatim oculis
luminata, cum Cherubim ymnum cantici novi concinunt,
laudantes atque ita dicentes 201

Here we have examples of that elaborate style which Edmund Bishop
contrasted with the sobriety of the Roman rite.²⁰² What is of
interest in these two examples is that although they are elaborate,
they are not consciously concerned with enumerating a celestial
hierarchy as in the angelology of some of the Eastern prayers
we have surveyed. However, later West Syrian (Jacobite and
Maronite) anaphoras display a similar tendency, and so perhaps

these inlatios are examples of later Syrian influence.

Jean Magne has suggested that the form cui merito, found also in Gallican usage, refers back to Christ, in the formula per Christum Dominum nostrum which precedes the sanctus introduction.²⁰³ Was, therefore, the sanctus in the Spanish rite also was once addressed to Christ ? It is interesting that the opening dialogue in the Spanish rite includes the priest's exhortation, 'Deo ac Domino nostro Jesu Christo Filio Dei, qui est in coelis, dignas laudes dignasque gratias referamus' to which the people reply 'Dignum et justum est'. Ferotin believed that the exhortation was originally addressed to the Father, but this address to Christ could be a sign of antiquity, though, equally, it could be Syrian influence.²⁰⁴

In summary, therefore, the introduction to the sanctus in the Spanish rite is usually short, with a very brief angelology - though the inlatios themselves may be very long. Certain terms occur regularly - sine cessatione, non cessant clamare, ita dicentes. The main conclusion which can be drawn, however, is that when these inlatios were edited, the sanctus and benedictus were regular chants in the rite. The majority of post-sanctus prayers begin with 'Vere sanctus, vere benedictus', indicating that sanctus and benedictus were by this time wedded together.²⁰⁵ The sanctus was an accepted invariable in the eucharistic prayer, and the inlatios wend their way towards it, even if it has little contextual logic. The Vere sanctus pick up echoes the Syro-Byzantine use, and perhaps reflects Eastern influence. If the Libellus of Pseudo-Ambrose is to be interpreted as Chavoutier suggests, then perhaps Spain was one of the Western areas which adopted the sanctus before Rome. It

is possible to conjecture that in some cases the eucharistic prayer, or parts of it including the sanctus, might have been addressed to Christ, but firm evidence is lacking.

The Te Deum

The Te Deum which is regarded as a canticle of Morning Prayer, and which contains the sanctus, was subjected to a detailed study by Paul Cagin.²⁰⁶ Cagin noted that parts of the Te Deum occur in a Spanish inlatio, as well as in a Gallican contestatio (the Gallican name for the preface).²⁰⁷ There is also material found in the Spanish fraction, and the form of the sanctus also corresponds to the Spanish form.²⁰⁸ Cagin suggested, therefore, that the Te Deum was originally an inlatio used at Easter. This was also the verdict of E.Kahler.²⁰⁹ Kahler sees the first part of the Te Deum as an inlatio connected with the mass of the Easter Vigil, and the christological part has parallels with Mozarabic and Gallican post-sanctus prayers. He concludes that the Te Deum in its original form ended with psalm 27:9, and is the core of a mass for the Easter Vigil which has been worked up into artistic form by the hand of a master.

Te Deum laudamus, te Dominum confitemur.
 Te aeternum Patrem omnis terra veneratur
 Tibi omnes Angeli: tibi caeli et universae potestates:
 Tibi Cherubim et Seraphim incessabili voce proclamant:
 Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth.
 Pleni sunt caeli et terra majestatis gloriae tuae
 Te gloriosus Apostolorum chorus
 Te Prophetarum laudabilis numerus
 Te Martyrum candidatus laudat exercitus.
 Te per orbem terrarum, sancta confitetur ecclesia.
 ...

Jean Magne, in the article already noted, takes the text from the Antiphonary of Bangor, which prefaces te Deum with 'Laudate, pueri, Dominum, Laudate Nomen Domini', and by excising references to the

Father, and appealing to Gnostic literature, claims that the Te Deum was originally addressed to Christ who is Sabaoth.²¹⁰

The use of Gnostic material to interpret a reworked Mozarabic inlatio is not particularly convincing.

The Gallican rite: The Masses of Mone

In general there are four theories of the origin of the Gallican rite:

(a) The older theory was that it was the rite brought to Lyon from Ephesus by St. Photinus and St. Irenaeus.²¹¹

(b) It was the rite of Ephesus, adopted by the East Syrian Church, and derived from East Syria.²¹²

(c) It was imported to Gaul from West Syria in the fifth or sixth centuries.²¹³

(d) It was basically Roman, with influence from the Mozarabic and Milanese rites, and later, the East.²¹⁴

Of these, the latter is probably the strongest, and is supported by the internal evidence.

One of the problems of assessing the Gallican rite is that the evidence which survives witnesses to an increasing Romanization, which resulted in its total replacement by the latter.²¹⁵ There are the masses of Mone, c.650 CE; the Missale Gothicum of the seventh century; the Missale Gallicum vetus and Missale Francorum, though these are of the eighth century, and there are some fragments. There is also the Expositio Missae Gallicanae, wrongly attributed to St. Germanus of Paris. All these are relatively late, though we may reasonably assume that the masses of Mone give us an insight to late sixth and early seventh century Gallican usage. The use of the sanctus is attested by Caesarius of Arles and the Council of

Vaison in the sixth century.²¹⁶

In the Gallican anaphora we find the same structure as the Spanish rite, viz., three fixed points around which are arranged variable prayers. The opening prayer is the contestatio, corresponding to the inlatio and praefatio.

In the masses of Mone there are seven mass formularies, 'purely Gallican in character, without any discernible traces of Roman influence'.²¹⁷ The seventh is for the feast of St. Germanus of Auxerre, but the first six seem to be a selection for Sunday use. Each of the Sunday formulas has two contestatios, and the sixth has an additional two. Thus there are fifteen contestatios. Of these, eight have the incipit indicating the following introduction to the sanctus:

cui merito omnes angeli non cessant clamare dicentes.
which is almost identical to the most common form in the Spanish prayers. Three have the slight variant, Merito tibi. This standard introduction indicates that the sanctus was by this time a sine qua non of the anaphora. This is further illustrated by the two contestatios which are concerned with the histories and legends of saints - Elias and St. Germanus. After a lengthy account of Elias' ascent to heaven in a fiery chariot, where he joins the angels who praise the King seated on his throne, the sanctus is simply introduced with 'Merito'. Likewise it is St. Germanus' merits and the angelic praise which again introduce the conventional cui merito.

In some of these contestatios, a further contextual introduction has been created. Thus in the first mass, the first contestatio mentions that through Christ all things in heaven sing the song

of God's melody, and asks:

quaesumus ut iubeas nunc nos audire canentes et tibi
sint placitae laudes cum dicimus istas. cui ...

and the second prefaces cui merito with:

unde tibi merito, rerum deus, una triades, vocibus angelicis
haec carmine sancta resultat.

Four of the contestatios introduce the sanctus in a more integrated context, but the introduction is brief. The second of mass 2 has:

Ipsam igitur omnes angeli cum multiplici turba sanctorum
incessabili voce conlaudant dicentes: sanctus ...

Equally brief is the lead in of the first contestatio of mass

6:

ante cuius conspectu omnes angeli non cessant clamare
dicentes:

Mass 4, and the alternative in mass 5 have long contestatios. The first of these exalts God who is above every virtue and power, who heaven and earth, angels and archangels, thrones and dominions, cherubim and seraphim proclaim with incessant voices; the second of these places the stars, sea, earth and depths (inferno) with the cherubim and seraphim.

Most of the masses have a post-sanctus. Some of these pick up on both the sanctus and benedictus as in the Spanish rite, or even just on the benedictus. Some, however, have no verbal link at all (e.g. mass 3).

The conclusion to be drawn from the masses of Mone is similar to that for that of the Spanish rite. Normally the sanctus was introduced with a fixed formula; it could be given a context in the contestatio, but a context was not necessary. The sanctus was simply a necessary and expected part of the anaphora, but not essential to the thought expressed in the contestatio; it was simply

a convention to conclude the contestatio with it. There seems to have been no great concern to include an elaborate angelology. Where this occurs, it is exceptional.

5. OVERVIEW

This survey of the classical anaphoras to the seventh century began by questioning the premises upon which Ratcliff regarded the sanctus in Addai and Mari as an interpolation, and we argued that it could have a third century dating. By the early fourth century it may have already have been part of the Jerusalem anaphora, and it was certainly so by the time of Cyril's Mystagogical Catecheses. It appears to have been in use in Cappadocia in the early fourth century, and by the mid-fourth century it is attested at Antioch and in Egypt. If the Strasbourg Papyrus is representative of the Egyptian anaphora in the third century, then there the sanctus is a later development between the third century and c.360 when Serapion wrote his anaphora. In the West the indications are that the sanctus was a later development, with Rome being one of the last churches to adopt it, sometime in the late fourth or early fifth century. The surviving Mozarabic and Gallican evidence confirms that at the time the inlatios and contestatios were written or edited, the sanctus was a sine qua non.

There is some evidence to show that in some areas the sanctus, and other parts of the anaphora, was addressed to Christ as God, or at least, that God and Christ were interchangeable terms; thus Addai and Mari, Cappadocia and possibly some Spanish inlatios. In Jerusalem, later Cappadocia, and Egypt, the sanctus

was addressed to God the Father. In the anaphoras of the late fourth century and after, it was common for the sanctus to have a trinitarian application or setting.

In the Syro-Byzantine and East Syrian families, the sanctus is set firmly within the context of praise offered to God. However, beyond this common denominator, there are many differences of emphasis. Jerusalem has a quite distinctive use, in that the sanctus is part of the hymn of creation itself. In other anaphoras in this family it is the praise of the angelic host, to which the church joins its praise, and/or in which the church on earth joins. It is offered to God the creator and Redeemer (Addai and Mari), God seated on his throne (Egyptian Basil) and God in his Divine Being (Greek Chrysostom). It became a convention to continue the anaphora by picking up on the word 'Holy', and this convention was copied also by the later East Syrian rites.

In Egypt , in the type of anaphora represented by St. Mark and Serapion, the sanctus has an entirely different function. Textually it remains an acclamation of praise; contextually it is within the intercessions and is linked with the first epiklesis; it is used, therefore, as a spring-board for intercession. The link between 'Lord Sabaoth' and 'Fill with your power' or 'blessing' is analagous to the use of sabaoth and the sanctus in some Greek and Coptic magical papyri.

In the West the sanctus seems to have been a late-comer, borrowed from Eastern usage. It is used as a climax to the preface which praises God for some work of Christ, or the life and work of a saint, and takes on the role of a formal conclusion to the preface. There is little indication that the sanctus is integral

to the thought of the preface. In Rome (and Milan) there was no attempt to give the sanctus a verbal link with what followed.

The angelology of the Eastern rites tends to reflect certain geographical links. Edessa and Antioch made use of Dan 7:10 and cherubim, as well as Isaiah 6:3; Cappadocia and Jerusalem used Col 1:16, 'powers' from Ephesians 1:21, as well as archangels, angels and cherubim. In Egypt we find Ephesians 1:21 used as a standard introduction, together with Dan 7:10, Hab.3:2 and Isaiah 6:3. The fragments of Louvain and Barcelona , however, give a different tradition where Ecclesiasticus 49:8 was used. A complex angelology is not a sign of later expansion. Cyril of Jerusalem knows a complex angelology, whereas the later Western angelologies and East Syrian anaphoras have a simple, non-hierarchical angelology.

In the Syro-Byzantine family the sanctus is the song of the angels, even though the congregation sang it, whereas in Egypt it is quite explicitly the song of the church. In the West both are found.

From this survey perhaps the firm^e_{st} conclusion which may be drawn is that the sanctus is most integrated in the anaphoras of the Syro-Byzantine and East Syrian families, and it is in those areas that it has its earliest attestations. This may not be insignificant in relation to the problem of the origin of the anaphoral sanctus.

NOTES - CHAPTER 4

1. The name sharar is derived from the first word of the first pro-anaphoral prayer, 'Confirming'.
2. Bryan D.Spinks, Addai and Mari- The Anaphora of the Apostles: A Text for Students, Grove Liturgical Study 24 (Bramcote 1981),3; see 33 for full bibliography.
3. E.C.Ratcliff, 'The Original form of the Anaphora', 29.
4. Bryan D.Spinks, 'The Cleansed Leper's Thankoffering'; W.E.Pitt, 'The Origin of the Liturgy of St.Basil'.
5. G.Dix, 'Primitive Consecration Prayers', 271; The Shape of the Liturgy, 180; B.Botte, 'L'Anaphore Chaldéenne des Apôtres', 264; 'Problemes de l'Anaphore', 93; L.Bouyer, Eucharist, 154.
6. W.F.Macomber, 'The Oldest known text of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari', OCP 32(1966), 335-371.
7. Ibid., 347-8.
8. J.M.Sanchez Caro, 'La anafora de Addai y Mari y la anafora meronita Sarrar: intento de reconstruccion de la fuente primitiva comun', OCP 43(1977),41-69; H.A.J.Wegman, 'Pleidoor voor een Tekst de Anaphora van de Apostelen Addai en Mari', Bijdragen 40(1979), 15-43; Jean Magne, 'L'anaphore nestorienne dite d'Addée et Mari et l'anaphore maronite dite de Pierre III' OCP 53(1987),107-59.
9. Texts: Hippolytus in PEER; Ethiopic Apostles, LEW
10. Tongue, Name - Phil 2:11; Worthy of praise - Rev.4:11,5:12; Name - Psalms 7:17, 9:2, 29:2, Phil 2:9-10, Rom 15:9; Glory - Psalm 19:1; Luke 2:14, Rev.4:11; created the world - Gen 1:1, Rev 4:11.
11. See Bryan D.Spinks, 'Eucharistic Offering in the East Syrian Anaphoras', OCP 50(1984), 347-371.
12. G.Scholem, Major Trends, 104.
13. J.Vellian, 'The Anaphoral Structure of Addai and Mari Compared to the Berakoth Preceding the Shema in the Synagogue Morning Service', Mu 85(1972), 201-223.
14. T.J.Talley, 'The Eucharistic Prayer: Tradition and Development', in (ed.) Kenneth W.Stevenson, Liturgy Reshaped (London 1982), 48-64.
15. Bryan D.Spinks, Addai and Mari, 24-5.
16. Cf. Pliny, Epist.10,96,7: 'Carmen Christo quasi deo dicere'.
17. It is important not to judge such texts by later trinitarian theology.

18. W.F.Macomber, 'The Ancient Form of the Anaphora of the Apostles', in East of Byzantium. Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period, Dumbarton Oaks (Washington 1982) 109-123.
19. Massey H.Shepherd, 'Eusebius and the Liturgy of Saint James', in Yearbook of Liturgical Studies 4(1963), 109-123.
20. W.J.Swaans, 'A propos des "Catéchèses Mystagogiques" attribuées à S.Cyrille de Jérusalem', Mu 55(1942), 1-43; F.L.Cross, St.Cyril of Jerusalem's Lectures on the Christian Sacraments (London 1966) xxxvi-~~xxxix~~.
21. E.Yarnold, 'The Authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem', HJ 19(1978), 143-161.
22. G.J.Cuming, 'Egyptian Elements in the Jerusalem Liturgy', JTS ns 25 (1974), 117-124.
23. 'The Jerusalem Liturgy of the Catecheses Mystagogicae: Syrian or Egyptian ?'.
24. E.C.Cutrone, 'Cyril's Mystagogical Catecheses and the evolution of the Jerusalem Anaphora', OCP 44(1978), 52-64; Bryan D.Spinks, ' The Consecratory Epiklesis in the Anaphora of St.James', SL 11(1976), 19-38.
25. J.R.K.Fenwick, thesis cited; also, Fourth Century Anaphoral Construction Techniques, Grove Liturgical Study 45 (Bramcote 1986).
26. G.Kretschmar, 'Die frühe Geschichte der Jerusalemer Liturgie', in Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie 2(1956), 22-46.
27. G.Dix, The Shape, 197; Cuming, art.cit.
28. The texts used here are Vat.gr.2282 in PE, and BM.293 Add. 14.499 in AS.
29. Cf. O.Heiming, AS II.2, 125; A.Tarby, La Prière Eucharistique de L'Église de Jérusalem (Paris, 1972), 33.
30. R.H.Connolly and H.W.Codrington, Two Commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy (London 1913) .
31. E.g. W.E.Pitt, art.cit.; H.Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy (Leiden 1979), 116; G.Dix, The Shape, 204; G.A.Michell, 'Firmillian and Eucharistic Consecration', 218.
32. Thesis cit., and op.cit.
33. Thesis, 137-138.
34. R.J.Ledogar, Acknowledgement: Praise-Verbs in the Early Greek Anaphoras, 22ff.

35. Eucharist, 270-1.
36. Thesis, 132.
37. In Connolly and Codrington, op.cit., 48-50.
38. M.Richard, Asterii Sopistae Commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt accedunt aliquot homiliae anonymae (Oslo 1956).
39. H-J. Auf der Maur, Die Osterhomilien des Asterios Sophistes als Quelle für die Geschichte der Osterfeier (Trier 1967).
40. Ibid., 79; PG 46.421c.
41. Ibid., 80; PG 61.527.
42. Ibid., 84; Richard, 115.
43. Ibid., 85; Richard 233.
44. Ibid., 187ff.
45. H.Engberding, Das eucharistische Hochgebet der Basileiosliturgie: Textgeschichtlich Untersuchungen und kritische Ausgabe (Münster 1931).
46. J.Doresse and E.Lanne, Un témoin archaïque de la liturgie copte de s.Basile (Louvain 1960).
47. B.Bobrinskoy, 'Liturgie et Ecclésiologie Trinitaire de saint Basile', in Eucharisties d'Orient et d'Occident II (Paris 1970), 197-240.
48. Op.cit.
49. P.E.Kahle, Bala'izah, Coptic Texts from Deir el Bala'izah in Upper Egypt (London 1954), vol.1, 404, no.28.
50. B.Capelle, in J.Doresse and E.Lanne, op.cit., 50; J.M.Sanchez Caro, Eucharistia E Historia de la Salvacion (Madrid 1983), 267.
51. A.Houssiau, 'The Alexandrine Anaphora of St.Basil', in The New Liturgy, 228-243, 230.
52. Fenwick, Thesis cited, 115.
53. See below.
54. Fenwick, op.cit., 31.
55. On this point see Kenneth W.Stevenson, Eucharist and Offering, (New York 1986)
56. Fenwick, Thesis, 130, 138.
57. B.Capelle, in Doresse and Lanne, op.cit., 56.
58. A.Baumstark, 'Die Chrysostomosliturgie und die syrische Liturgie des Nestorios', in Chrysostomika (Rome 1908), 846-848; Bouyer, op.cit., 341.

59. For a brief description see S. De Beaurecueil, 'La prière eucharistique dans la liturgie égyptienne de Saint Grégoire', Les Cahiers Coptes 7-8 (1954), 6-10.
60. J.Jungmann, The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer² (London 1965), 227.
61. E.Hammerschmidt, Die koptische Gregoriosanaphora(Berlin 1957), 179.
62. J.M.Sanchez Caro, op.cit., 310ff.
63. A.Gerhards, Die griechische Gregoriosanaphora (Münster 1984).
64. Ibid., 52.
65. Ibid., 114-121.
66. Ibid., 171; cf Hammerschmidt, op.cit.,177.
67. see chapter 7.
68. Op.cit., 60.
69. Ibid., 176-210.
70. Massey H.Shepherd, 'The Formation and Influence of the Antiochene Liturgy', in Dumbarton Oaks Papers 15(1961), 25-44.
71. Robert M.Grant, 'The Early Antiochene Anaphora', ATR 30 (1946), 91-4.
72. LEW, 470-81.
73. F.Van de Pavard, Zur Geschichte der Messliturgie in Antiocheia und Konstantinopel gegen ende des vierten Jahrhunderts, OCA 187, Rome 1970).
74. Ibid., 266-87.
75. ed. A.Mingana, Woodbrook Studies Vol.VI (Cambridge 1933), 100.
76. Ibid., 101.
77. Ibid., 102
78. ed. W.F.Macomber, Six Explanations of the Liturgical Feasts by Cyrus of Edessa (CSCO, 355 and 356) (Louvain 1974), Tomes 155,156.
79. W.F.Macomber, 'An Anaphoral Prayer composed by Theodore of Mopsuestia', Parole de l'orient 6-7 (1975-6) (Melanges offerts au R.P.Francois Graffin sj), 341-47.

80. Ibid.
81. Ibid., 342.
82. Georg Wagner, Der ursprung der Chrysostomusliturgie, LQF 59, (Münster 1973).
83. G.J.Cuming, 'Pseudonymity and Authenticity, with special reference to the Liturgy of St.John Chrysostom', Studia Patristica 15 (Berlin 1984), 532-38, 535.
84. Ibid., 536.
85. H.Engberding, 'Die syrische Anaphora der zwölf Apostel und ihre Paralleltexzte', OC 12(1937), 213-47.
86. A.Raes, 'L'Authenticité de la Liturgie byzantine de S.Jean Chrysostome', OCP 24(1958), 5-16; G.Khoury-Sarkis, 'L'Origine syrienne de l'anaphore byzantine de saint Jean Chrysostome', Or-Syr 7(1962), 3-68.
87. In a private communication.
88. Op.cit.
89. Ibid.,76.
90. Ibid.
91. W.F.Macomber, 'A Theory on the Origins of the Syrian, Maronite and Chaldean Rites', OCP 39(1973), 235-42.
92. G.J.Cuming, Review article in Eastern Churches Review 7(1975), 95-7.
93. My opinion is supported by Professor Brock, private communication.
94. Chapter 3.
95. A.Bouley, From Freedom to Formula, 232.
96. Marcel Metzger, 'The Didascalia and the Constitutiones Apostolorum', in The Eucharist of the Early Christians, ed. W.Rordorf (New York 1978), 208.
97. W.H.Bates, 'The Composition of the Anaphora of Apostolic Constitutions VIII', Studia Patristica 13 (Berlin 1975), 343-55; 345.
98. Chapter 3.
99. E.Beck, Des Heiligen Ephraem des syrers Hymnen de Nativitate (Epiphania), CSCO 187, Syri 83 (Louvain 1959).
100. Premiere homelie sur la Paque du Seigneur, ed.Bickell, ZDMG 27(1878), 569-75.

101. PG 86.1386c.
102. Bryan D.Spinks, 'Eucharistic Offering in the East Syrian Anaphoras', OCF 50(1984), 347-71; 355-6.
103. R.H.Connolly, The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai, Texts and Studies 8 (Cambridge 1909), 12-13.
104. Ibid., 57.
105. Bryan D.spinks, art.cit., JTS (see Prolegomena)
106. Bryan D.Spinks, 'Eucharistic Offering in the East Syrian Anaphoras', 356, and notes 30 and 31.
107. Ibid., 357-362. K.W.Stevenson, Eucharist and Offering expresses the opinion that it is too subtle; in private conversation he accepts that my argument is probably correct.
108. G.Wagner, op.cit., 51-63.
109. Bryan D.Spinks, art.cit.
110. Mingana, 101.
111. Spinks, art.cit., 365.
112. R-G.Coquin, 'L'anaphore alexandrine de saint Marc', Mu 82(1969), 307-56.
113. M.Andrieu and P.Collomp, 'Fragments sur papyrus de l'anaphore de saint Marc', Revue des sciences religieuses 8 (1928), 489-515.
114. E.Kilmartin, 'Sacrificium Laudis: Content and Function of Early Eucharistic Prayers', TS 35(1974), 268-87.
115. W.H.Bates, 'Thanksgiving and Intercession in the Liturgy of St.Mark', in Bryan D.Spinks (ed), The Sacrifice of Praise, 107-19; H.A.J.Wegman, 'Une anaphore incomplète ?', in R.Van Den Broek and M.J.Vermaseren (eds), Studies in Gnostic and Hellenistic Religions, (Leiden 1981), 432-50; 'Généalogie hypothétique de la prière eucharistique', QL 61(1980), 263-78; G.J.Cuming, 'The Anaphora of St.Mark: A Study in Development', Mu 95(1982), 115-29 (read as a master theme at the Oxford Patristic Conference, 1979).
116. Bryan D.Spinks, 'A Complete Anaphora ?' A Note on Strasbourg Gr.254', HJ 25(1984), 51-59. It is possible that the papyrus preserves the first of two or even more prayer units. If the other elements found in later St.Mark were in use, we might have a two-unit anaphora with a structure as follows:
 1. Praise-oblation.
Intercession.
Doxology.
 2. Praise (sanctus)
Intercession (Epiklesis)

Oblation (Institution narrative and anamnesis)
 Intercession (Epiklesis)
 Doxology.

117. See T.J.Talley, 'The Eucharistic Prayer: Tradition and Development'; E.Mazza, 'Una Anafora Incompleta ? Il Papiro Strasbourg Gr.254', EL 99(1985), 425-36).
118. My thanks to Professor Martin Plumley for kindly expressing his opinion on the matter in a private communication.
119. My thanks to Dr.Anthony Gelston of Durham University for his guidance on this question.
120. W.Rudolph, Micha-Nahum-Habakuk-Zephanja kommenter zum Alten Testament (Gutersloh 1975), 233;242-43.
121. Dix, art.cit. See Prolegomena.
122. Clement, Stromateis 7:12.
123. Athanasius, In illus, omnia mihi tradita sunt, PG 25.220
124. Cyril of Alexandria, Commentariis in Habacuc Prophetum, PG 71.900.
125. I am grateful to Professor Plumley for drawing my attention to this fragment, which he dates ninth century CE. The work itself is more difficult to date.
126. Cuming,art.cit., 119; Bates,art.cit.,115-6.
127. A.Baumstark, 'Zwei nicht erkaante Bruchstücke frühchristlich-griechischer Liturgie Ägyptens', JLW 1(1921), 132-4.
128. B.Botte, 'L'eucologe de Sérapion est-il authentique ?', OC 48(1964), 50-57; G.J.Cuming, 'Thmuis Revisited: another look at the prayers of bishop Sarapion', TS 41(1980), 568-75.
129. S.Janeras, 'L'Original grec del fragment copte de Lovaina Num.27 en l'Anafora di Barcelona', in Miscellania Liturgica Catalana III (1984), 13-25. I am grateful to Geoffrey Cuming for drawing my attention to the text, and providing me with a transcript from the published paper.
130. B.D.Spinks, ' A Complete Anaphora ?'; A.H.Couratin, 'The Sanctus' (unpublished essay) 14.
131. For the latter, see The Egyptian Church Order
132. Bouyer,op.cit., 218.
133. E.E.Urbach, The Sages - Their Concepts and Beliefs (Jerusalem 1975), 98. cf.124.
134. Irenaeus. Contra Haer. ii.35.3; Origen,Philocalia 17; Contra Celsus Bk.1, chapters 24 and 25.

135. Scholem, *op.cit.*, 67-8.
136. ed. J.M.Robinson (Leiden 1977), 165.
137. *Ibid.*, 294.
138. ed. Hans Dieter Betz, The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, vol.1 (Chicago 1985) 62.
139. Cited in E.R.Goodenough, Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period, vol.2. (New York 1953), 172; A.Kropp, Demotische und Koptische Texte (3 vols, Brussels 1930-31) vol.2, 50.
140. *Ibid.*, 176; Kropp, vol.1, 63-78.
141. OTP 2, 715ff.
142. See F.T.Fallon, The Enthronement of Sabaoth(Leiden 1978).
143. J.A.Jungmann, The Mass of the Roman Rite, 2 vols (New York 1955); T.Klauser, A Short History of the Western Liturgy (Oxford 1979²); B.Botte, Le Canon de la messe romaine (Louvain 1935); Ralph A.Keifer, 'The Unity of the Roman Canon: An Examination of its unique structure', SL 11(1976), 39-58.
144. De Sacramentis Bk. 4.
145. E.C.Ratcliff and A.H.Couratin, 'The Early Roman canon missae', JEH 20(1969), 211-24; E.C.Ratcliff, 'The Institution Narrative of the Roman canon missae: its beginnings and early background', Studia Patristica 2 (1957), 64-82; C.Mohrmann, Liturgical Latin. Its origin and character (Washington 1957); 'Les origines de la liturgie chrétienne à Rome', VC 3(1949), 47-106;163-83.
146. e.g. Gelasian 564.
147. e.g. Veronese 111
148. e.g. Gelasian 176
149. e.g. Veronese 239
150. e.g. Gelasian 728
151. e.g. Veronese 1245.
152. e.g. Gelasian 549.
153. e.g. Gelasian 179.
154. These are tabulated in P.Cagin, Te Deum ou Illatio (Oxford and Rome 1906).
155. J.M.Hanssens, La Liturgie d'Hippolyte, OCA 155 (Rome 1965); George La Piana, 'The Roman Church at the end of the Second Century', HTR 18(1925), 201-77.

156. See the essays in G.J.Cuming, Essays on Hippolytus, Grove Liturgical Study 15 (Bramcote 1978); G.J.Cuming, Hippolytus: A Text for Students, Grove Liturgical Study 8 (Bramcote 1976).
157. Bouley, op.cit., 206-7.
158. L.Chavoutier, 'Un Libellus Pseudo-Ambrosien sur le Saint-Esprit'.
159. B.Botte and C.Mohrmann, 'L'Ordinaire de la messe (Paris and Louvain 1953), 75.
160. E.C.Ratcliff, 'Christian Worship and Liturgy' in (ed) K.E.Kirk, The Study of Theology (London 1939), 443; G.G.Willis, Essays in Early Roman Liturgy (London 1964), 124.
161. PE, 422; PEER, 116.
162. ed. L.Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis (3 vols. Paris 1955-7), vol.1, 128.
163. K.Gamber, Missa Romensis (Regensburg 1970), 65.
164. Chavoutier, art.cit., 149.
165. Ibid., 180-91.
166. Unpublished paper, 'Sanctus', 47.
167. P-M. Gy, 'Le Sanctus Romain et les Anaphores Orientales', in Mélanges Liturgiques Bernard Botte, 167-74.
168. A.P.Lang, Leo der Grosse und die Texte des Altgelasianums Steyle 1957); 'Leo der Grosse und die Dreifaltigkeitspräfation', SE 9 (1957), 116-62.
169. Gy, art.cit., 169-70.
170. Ibid., 171.
171. B.Capelle, 'Problèmes textuels de la préface romaine. II.Caeli caelorumque virtutes', RSR 40(1951-52), 145-50.
172. M-F.Lacan, 'Caeli caelorumque virtutes', RSR 51(1963), 240-46.
173. Art.cit., 172.
174. Jean Magne, 'Carmina Christo I. Le 'Sanctus' de la Messe Latine', EL 100 (1986), 3-27; 12-15.
175. Gy, art.cit., 173-4.
176. See above in relation to the Syro-Byzantine and later East Syrian rites.
177. De Sacramentis
178. P.Cagin, op.cit., 481ff.

179. A.A.King, Liturgies of the Primatial Sees (London 1957), 428-9.
180. A.Paredi, I Prefazi ambrosiani (Milan 1937).
181. Dix, The Shape, 541.
182. See the article by Gy, and Chavoutier's arguments.
183. E.Bishop, 'Spanish Symptons', in Liturgica Historica (oxford 1918), 165-202; G.Mercati, 'More Spanish Symptons', in ibid., 203-10; A.Bouley, op.cit., 169-80. Cf. W.C.Bishop, The Mozarabic and Ambrosian Rites (Lonodn 1924).
184. C.Coebergh, ' Sacramentaire leonien et liturgie mozarabe', in Miscellanea Liturgica in honorem Cuniberti Mohlberg. vol 2 (Rome 1949), 295-304.
185. A.Allgeier, 'Das afrikanische Element im altspanischen Psalter', Spanische Forschungen 2 (1930), 196-228; J.Pinell, De liturgiis occidentalibus (manuscript 2 vols.Rome 1967) vol.1, 69.
186. See the discussion in Bouley, op.cit.
187. M.Ferotin, Le Liber Mozarabicus Sacramentorum (Paris 1912),xiv.
188. King, op.cit., 480.
189. Ferotin, op.cit., xv.
190. M.Ferotin, Le Liber Ordinum (Paris 1904).
191. Pseudo-Athanasii de Trinitate libri X-XII (ed.M.Simonetti, Bologne 1956).
192. Lib.Moz.Sac. e.g. cols.44,59,164,174,177,184,189,205,207,
193. col. 66
194. col. 154.
195. col 160
196. cols 197,202.
197. cols 24, 545.
198. col. 172.
199. See Cagin, op.cit.
200. col. 341; ET in E.Bishop, 'The Genius of the Roman Rite', in op.cit., 5.
201. col. 17.
202. E.Bishop, op.cit., 15;19.

203. Magne, art.cit., 11-12.
204. See A.A.King, op.cit., 603.
205. See chapter 5.
206. Op.cit.
207. Ibid., 9 for text.
208. Ibid., 488ff.
209. E.Kahler, Studien zum Te Deum (Göttingen 1956).
210. Jean Magne, 'Carmina Christo: II. Le "Te Deum"', EL 100(1986), 113ff.
211. P.Le Brun, Explication littérale, historique et dogmatique des prières et des cérémonies de la messe, 4 vols (Paris 1716-26), vol.2, 233; J.M.Neale and G.H.Forbes, Ancient Liturgies of the Gallican Church (Burntisland 1855), v.
212. L.Duchesne, Christian Worship (London 1904), 90-95.
213. Bouyer, op.cit., 305-18.
214. E.Griffe, 'Aux origines de la liturgie gallicane' in Bulletin de Literature Ecclesiastique 1 (1955), 17-43; John A.Frendo, The "Post Secreta" of the "Missale Gothicum" and the Eucharistic Theology of the Gallican Anaphora (Malta 1977).
215. Bouley, op.cit., 181ff.
216. Both cited by Chavoutier, art.cit., 165-6.
217. Bouley, op.cit., 187. For the text, L.C.Mohlberg, Missale Gallicanum vetus (Rome 1958), 74-91.

CHAPTER 5

THE FORMS OF THE ANAPHORAL SANCTUS, AND
THE BENEDICTUS

In the geduṣṣot it is generally the biblical text of Isaiah 6:3 which is reproduced without change or addition. This is true of the hekhalot literature, and the geduṣṣah d'e yoser and geduṣṣah d' amidah. However, the Targum version is used in geduṣṣah d'e sidra, and the Pseudepigrapha also yield some variant forms. Furthermore, Ezekiel 3:12 also is often linked with the Jewish geduṣṣah, and a variant form of this occurs in 1 Enoch.

In considering the context and function of the anaphoral sanctus, only indirectly has the actual form of the sanctus been given or mentioned. There is good reason: many manuscripts give only the opening words - 'Holy, holy, holy' - the rest of the formula being assumed. Where the full formula is given, it often reflects elaboration, and its antiquity is difficult to establish. However, before the problem of the origin of the anaphoral sanctus can be discussed, the form it takes or has taken in various traditions needs to be outlined.

1. THE FORMS OF THE SANCTUS IN THE EARLIEST ATTESTATIONS

In the eucharistic evidence which has been considered in the previous chapter, the earliest form quoted would seem to be that found in Asterios. In Homily XV only the first line of the sanctus is given, representing the LXX version, though Ezekiel 3:12 is linked with it. In Homily XXIX the form is:

Ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος κύριος σαβαώθ·
πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ

In comparison with the biblical text, 'heaven and' has been added, and 'whole' has been omitted. This expansion and omission is the hall-mark of nearly all forms of the anaphoral sanctus in subsequent early documents. Ezekiel 3:12 is also found quoted in association with the sanctus in Asterios. Such a link is also found in AC 7, and its continued association with Isaiah 6:3 by some groups may be suggested by a sermon of John Chrysostom:

I mounted to the heavens and gave you as proof the chorus of angels as they sang: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will among men". Again, you heard the seraphim as they shuddered and cried out in astonishment: "Holy, holy, holy, the Lord God of hosts, all the earth is filled with his glory". And I also gave you the cherubim who exclaimed: "Blessed be his glory in his dwelling". 1

The link between the two chants was still known when Dionysius the Areopagite was writing.²

Cyril of Jerusalem gives only the first line, and there is no change here from the LXX. His mention of 'hymns' in the plural might imply that some other chant was associated with Isaiah 6:3 - perhaps Ezekiel 3:12, or even the benedictus - but the fact remains that he does not actually quote any other chant. In Serapion we have:

Ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἄγιος κύριος σαβαώθ
πλήρης ὁ οὐρανός καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης σου.

Here in the second line 'his' has been changed to 'your', addressing the sanctus directly to God. There is no suggestion that either Ezekiel 3:12 or any other chant was attached to the sanctus here. In AC 8 the form is as in Asterios, to which has been appended Romans 1:25:

εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν.

The benedictus also occurs in this rite, but after the anaphora

before the communion.

What of Addai and Mari, which it has been argued, contained the sanctus from perhaps the third century ? The Mar Esa'ya text gives only the incipit, but the text of Theodore in the same manuscript gives the following:

qaddīš qaddīš qaddīš māryā hiltānā
da-mlēn šmayā w'ar'ā men tešbēhāteh

The words underlined are identical to the form found in the fourth century History of John the Son of Zebedee, which may reflect a liturgical sanctus. There is therefore good reason to believe that although the Mar Esa'ya manuscript itself dates from the tenth or eleventh century, the form of the sanctus it gives has changed little, if at all, from the third or fourth century. In the Syriac of this text, however, the first line gives an interpretation of κύριος σαβῶθ ; κύριος is rendered as 'Lord', and σαβῶθ is rendered by an adjective, 'strong', 'powerful'. The second line is introduced as a relative clause. In English it may be rendered as :

Holy, holy, holy, (is the) Powerful Lord ,
of whose glories heaven and earth are full.

2. THE SANCTUS IN THE LATER ATTESTATIONS

As far as the later texts of the sanctus are concerned, each anaphoral family developed its own particular variation. It is useful to consider each of the two lines of the sanctus in turn.

Line 1

In the Greek liturgies of the Syro-Byzantine and Egyptian families the first line is as that of the LXX. An exception is

the sanctus inscription described by Baumstark where we find:

Ἅγιος, ἕγιος, ἕγιος εἰ κύριε

However, as Baumstark observed, this is in any case an adaptation of the anaphoral sanctus.³

The Coptic translation follows the Greek form, but the Ethiopic appears to qualify Lord of Hosts with 'perfect'.⁴ The Syriac anaphoras have the form already encountered in the Mar Esa'ya text, though the Maronite rite - probably reflecting Roman influence - retains Sabaoth, giving 'Holy, holy, holy, Powerful Lord God Sabaoth'; this rite also addresses the whole sanctus in the second person singular rather than in the third person. The Armenian rite adds 'God'. The Roman rite has:

Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth, thus following the Syriac and Armenian in adding 'God', but retaining the Sabaoth as in the Greek tradition. The non-Roman Western rites have the same, though Pseudo-Ambrose gives the literal translation:

Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, Dominus Sabaoth.

Line 2

The second line is far more variable. The 'whole' earth has, as noted already, been dropped, and 'heaven' or 'heavens'⁵ has been added. The Egyptian Greek (and Coptic) anaphoras have the form:

πλήρης ὁ οὐρανός καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς ἁγίας σου δόξης

In comparison with Serapion, δόξης σου has been inverted, and ἁγίας has been added. The Syro-Byzantine Greek anaphoras have the same as Serapion. However, as noted above, Asterios and AC 8 retain the third person, 'his glory', as is the case in most Syriac formulae. In Syriac James as given by Rucker, the form is:

qaddīš qaddīš qaddīš māryā hiltānā hu da-mlēn 'nun
šmayā w'ar'ā men tešbēhāteh.

Other versions add to tešbēhāteh the words w'ygarā d-rabuteh -

and the honour of whose majesty⁷ - giving,

of whose glories and the honour of whose majesty heaven
and earth are full.

The later manuscripts of the East Syrian rite also extend this line:

glories and the nature of his being and of the excellence
of his glorious splendour.

The Armenian has:

Heaven and earth are full of your glory

reflecting Syro-Byzantine Greek usage, though some versions omit

'and earth'.⁶

Translation of the Ethiopic rite has caused confusion. Harden
rendered the line as follows:

Right (or wholly) full are the heaven and the earth of the
holiness of your glory.

Harden noted that the word translated 'right' or 'wholly' is an
addition and seems to be problematical. He suggested that originally
it may have been an abbreviation coming after the sanctus incipit,
meaning 'etc', and later when the sanctus was written in full,
was incorporated into the text.⁷ Hammerschmidt in his magisterial
study of the Ethiopic anaphoras argued that it represented the
Hebrew word 'whole' and that the Ethiopic rite had reintroduced
the word from the biblical text, 'the whole earth'.⁸ In a
subsequent study, however, he conceded that on analogy with usage
elsewhere in the anaphora of the 318 Orthodox Fathers, the word
actually belongs to the first line, qualifying God in the sense
of 'the complete One'.⁹ Indeed, Daoud had already adopted this
view in his English translation:

Holy, holy, holy, perfect Lord of Hosts,
Heaven and earth are full of the holiness of your glory. 10

In all other respects, the Ethiopic version is as the Egyptian rite.

Without parallel is a Coptic fragment of a preface and sanctus published by Crum, which uses the version of Rev.4:8.¹¹

In Western use, the Roman sanctus has:

pleni sunt caeli et terra gloria tuae,

as in the Syro-Byzantine rites; the Mozarabic has an addition:

gloria maiestatis tuae

The Te Deum has 'maiestatis gloriae tuae'. Pseudo-Ambrose gives the biblical text : plena est omnis terra maiestate eius.

In summary, therefore, the first line in some traditions - Syriac and Latin - has been interpreted rather than simply translated or transliterated. In the second line in every tradition 'heaven' has been added. Heaven is mentioned in the Targum version, and Eric Werner quotes a midrashic passage where Isaiah 6:3 is linked with Jeremiah 23:24.¹² Nevertheless, although there may be a Jewish precedent, it is probably more likely that the addition is a deliberate Christian addition made in the interests of Christology. The 'glory' which Isaiah saw, according to John 12:41, was Christ, and both in his pre-existence and after the ascension Christians believed that the glory was in heaven. The change from 'his glory' to 'your glory' seems to be stylistic, addressing it directly to God. In the Syriac traditions further elaboration has taken place. Only in one instance does it seem that a relatively early anaphora made use of Rev.4:8.

3. THE BENEDICTUS

In all later anaphoras in every tradition other than the Egyptian and the Ethiopic, the sanctus is followed by the 'Benedictus qui venit', which is an adaptation of Matthew 21:9. This absence in the Egyptian rite has been seen by many to point beyond any doubt that the use of benedictus was a much later development, and to regard Egypt as preserving the earlier usage. This view is perhaps less certain when the peculiar Egyptian use of the sanctus is taken into account; the sanctus-epiklesis unit hardly allows for anything to follow the sanctus other than petition.¹³

The benedictus would seem to be a Syrian development, but the precise date is impossible to pinpoint. The early evidence poses three questions:

(1) Since Asterios associates Ezekiel 3:12 with Isaiah 6:3 as in Jewish usage, did the benedictus replace an earlier use of Ezekiel 3:12, perhaps for Christological reasons ?

(2) In AC 8 the benedictus is found after the Sancta sanctis, as a pre-communion acclamation; it is also found before the communion in Testamentum Domini, and in the Byzantine rite. Was this its original place from which it was introduced into the anaphora ?

(3) In AC 8 the sanctus is followed by Romans 1:25. Does this represent an interim development from Ezekiel 3:12 to Matthew 21:9 ?

In considering the use of Romans 1:25 in AC 8, few commentators seem to have asked whether this might represent the compiler's Arian sympathies. Since the benedictus is addressed to Christ, it would hardly have fitted the compiler's anaphora which is

clearly addressed to the Father, and where in the sanctus, the Son is deliberately subordinated. Far from representing an interim stage, this may simply be theological substitution, and the opposite of a once universal stage of development. Of more significance perhaps is the fact that Asterios's discussion of the sanctus takes place in Homily XVI in connection with Psalm 8:3b and Matthew 21:9. At Easter Matthew 21:9 would have been an appropriate chant, and one may conjecture that perhaps at Easter it replaced Ezekiel 3:12 - if this latter was ever used with the anaphoral sanctus - or simply became an Easter embolism. That its use was once restricted to festivals is suggested by a rubric in the Mar Esa'ya manuscript.¹⁴ Or it may have been a deliberate Christian counterpart to Ezekiel 3:12, added in the interests of Christology, originating perhaps in those Syrian areas in close contact with Jews. However, the evidence is so meagre that no firm conclusion can be reached.

As an addition to the sanctus it took various forms in the various traditions. In the Greek Syro-Byzantine liturgies we find two forms of the chant. In the Byzantine tradition:

1. ὡσαννα ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.
2. Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου
3. ὡσαννα ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.

In St. Gregory of Nazianzen (Greek and Coptic) we find an addition in line 2:

Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐλθων καὶ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ...

which is also found in the Syriac anaphoras of this family. The change seems to have been made in the interests of Christology (perhaps influenced by Rev.4:8) to identify the coming Christ with Jesus. In the Armenian rite, in line 1, 'Hosanna' is replaced by 'Blessing', and in line 2:

Blessed are you that came and will come in the name of
the Lord.

The East Syrian rite follows the West Syrian form, though in the
Mar Esa'ya text line 3 is rendered:

Hosanna to the Son of David.

In some manuscripts it has been expanded to:

Hosanna in the highest. Hosanna to the Son of David.
Blessed is he who came and comes in the name of the Lord.
Hosanna in the highest.

In the West the benedictus is first mentioned by Caesarius of
Arles in the sixth century, and as part of the Roman rite in the
seventh century. The Roman form is simply the Latin of the Byzantine
Greek form:

Hosanna in excelsis
Benedictus qui venit in nomine domini
Hosanna in excelsis

In line 1 the Mozarabic rite has:

Hosanna to the Son of David.

Although this has similarities with the East Syrian form, it is
probably to be explained as literal use of Matthew 21:9. The vast
majority of Mozarabic and Gallican post-sanctus prayers pick up
from the language of both the sanctus and benedictus - 'Vere
sanctus, vere benedictus, ...', indicating that at the time of
their composition, the benedictus was an invariable part of the
anaphora.

NOTES - CHAPTER 5

1. 'Discourses Against Judaizing Christians', in Paul W.Hawkins, The Fathers of the Church (Washington 1979).Discourse 1.
2. The Heavenly Hierarchy vii.sect.4.
3. A.Baumstark, 'Zwei nicht erkannte Bruchstücke frühchristlich-griechischer Liturgie Ägyptens'.
4. See below, 228-9.
5. The semitic form is plural, and may be rendered by the English singular or plural.
6. See W.E.Scudamore, Notitia Eucharistica (London 1876),533; Bouyer, op.cit.,352.
7. J.M.Harden, The Anaphoras of the Ethiopic Liturgy (London 1928), 50ff.
8. E.Hammerschmidt, Studies in the Ethiopic Anaphoras (Berlin 1961), 106-9.
9. OC 48(1969), 121-4.
10. M.Daoud, The Liturgy of the Ethiopian Church (Addis Ababa 1954), 59.
11. W.E.Crum, Coptic Ostraca (London 1902), 6, No.4.
12. E.Werner, 'The Doxology in Synagogue and Church', in Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, 337.
13. Jean Magne, 'Carmina Christo'II. Le 'sanctus' de la messe Latine', 19, suggested that the Egyptian sanctus was originally addressed to Christ, and the Benedictus, also addressed to Christ, was originally recited after the words in St.Mark: 'with theirs, receive also our sanctification, saying ..', and it has subsequently fallen out. This is quite preposterous.
14. W.F.Macomber, 'The Oldest Known Text ..', 363, note 9.

CHAPTER 6

THE POSSIBLE ORIGINS OF THE ANAPHORAL SANCTUS

1. RECENT IDEAS ON ANAPHORAL EVOLUTION

In the Prolegomena it was necessary to reject at the outset two particular theories concerning the origin of the anaphoral sanctus: the Egyptian theory and the climax theory. A third contender, and the one which is probably the most common - that it was borrowed from the Synagogue liturgy - was deliberately postponed until those gedussot and the actual context of the sanctus in the earlier anaphoras could be surveyed. However, although approaching the problem of origin with a priori views on anaphoral development was rejected, it remains true that sooner or later the question of origin has to be discussed in relation to theories of anaphoral development.

A. From the Birkat ha-mazon

In recent liturgical literature a large body of opinion has regarded the Jewish table prayers called the Birkat ha-mazon (BHM) as being an important element in the evolution of the eucharistic prayer. Beginning with W.O.E.Oesterley and F.Gavin, and given impetus by Gregory Dix and J-P.Audet, the Jewish berakot came under careful scrutiny in the search for links with Christian prayers.¹ Whereas Audet appealed to the berakot as a literary genre, it was Dix who drew particular attention to the berakot of the giddus and of the BHM. Dix did not himself pursue the inquiry, but in passing emphasised the second pericope of the BHM as a possible key to understanding Christian anaphoral development.² This insight has in recent years been developed in different ways by Louis Bouyer and Louis Ligier, and subsequently by Thomas Talley,

Herman Wegman and Jose Sanchez Caro.³ Whether the Last Supper was a Passover meal, an anticipated Passover meal, or haburah the BHM was the traditional grace after meals, and, it is suggested, may well have been the prayer used by Jesus before the distribution of the cup. This grace, which goes back in form to the time of the Book of Jubilees,⁴ consisted at that time of three berakot:

1. Blessing of Him who nourishes

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

Blessed are you, Lord, for you nourish the universe.

2. Blessing for the earth

We will give thanks to you, Lord our God, because you have given us for our inheritance a desirable land, good and wide, the covenant and the Law, life and food. And for all these things we give you thanks and bless your name for ever and beyond.

Blessed are you, Lord our God, for the earth and for food.

3. Blessing for Jerusalem

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

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

The three berakot give three themes - blessing for creation, giving thanks for redemption, and supplication. There is, however, no gedussah, and no logical context for one, and there is no evidence that any Jewish meal prayer contained gedussah.⁵ The inference must be that, if the BHM is the key to the origin of the Christian anaphora, the sanctus is a component which has been added to the earlier structure at a later epoch.

Bouyer has argued that the BHM, which Jesus pronounced at the end of the meal,⁶ can be schematised as DEF (Blessing for creation,

thanksgiving for redemption and supplication). However, quite apart from the brevity of this grace, Bouyer noted that in comparison with the classical anaphora, an institution narrative with anamnesis/oblation, intercessions and the sanctus have been subsequently developed or added. He thus turned to the Synagogue berakot - both of the shema and amidah (all 21 or 22 berakot !). These placed altogether he schematised ABC, corresponding (but not in length of material !) with the DEF sequence of BHM. He suggested that the Christian anaphora may be explained by a gradual synthesis of the two groups of berakot - AD, BE, CF. This happened as the meal disappeared, and the rite of bread and wine became fused with the readings and prayers of the Morning Service. The sanctus of the anaphora was thus borrowed from the Synagogue berakot. Although he offered no dating, he argued (on very different grounds from Dix) that we first see this development in Egypt. Accepting the views of Bousset and Goodenough, he regarded AC 7 as 'Alexandrine' and attempted, mainly on the basis of the absence of the benedictus to see some correlation between the sanctus in AC 7 and its form in the Egyptian anaphoras. AC 8 then represents an Antiochene introduction of this adapted Synagogue gedussah into the Syro-Byzantine anaphora. The ultimate source is the Synagogue, and by implication, gedussah de^lamidah.

Bouyer's arguments are open to serious questions at a number of points. To begin with, it seems unnecessarily complex, and vague, to make the comparisons with Jewish berakot so wide without proper reference to their context and sequence. Furthermore, as has been noted in chapter 3, the most recent views concerning AC 7 place this collection in the orbit of Antioch, not Egypt.

And, as Ligier has observed:

To form an accurate opinion, it is not sufficient to notice the absence or presence of the Benedictus qui venit, or the particular form of that acclamation or the formation of the Pleni sunt. 7

While critical of Bouyer's wide appeal to all the Synagogue berakot, Louis Ligier has followed both Dix and Bouyer in regarding the BHM as the correct starting point. Ligier's main concern was to explain why the institution narrative with anamnesis/oblation came to be included in the eucharistic prayer. His earlier work was concerned with considering the embolisms which were inserted into the Jewish liturgy of Yom Kippur, and in the BHM for Hannukah and Purim, and to establish the antiquity of such embolisms. His conclusion was that these embolisms date back at least to the second century CE, and at that time they could be inserted in either the second or third pericope of the BHM.⁸

Ligier, accepting that Jesus 'consecrated the sacramental cup at the moment of the birkat ha-mazon',⁹ believed that Jesus could have added his own thanksgiving to the Father for his redemptive mission, and that it is easy to see how the Church could choose this pericope of thanksgiving for the eucharistic embolism - the institution narrative. The preponderant influence of the BHM is seen in Didache 10. Louis Finkelstein and Martin Dibelius had already shown the common themes of Didache 10 and the BHM.¹⁰ However, a transference had apparently taken place. Didache 10 commences at once with thanksgiving for redemption, and then returns to give thanks (not bless) for creation. Ligier noted:

The theme of creation is no longer treated for its own sake: it is subordinated to that of the economy and has become part of the eucharistic theme, where it appears as an embolism. Lastly, let us note that the prayer as a whole includes two principal movements, thanksgiving and supplication. 11

In Addai and Mari (minus sanctus !) Ligier believed that the three gehanata recall the three pericopes of the BHM, and Sharar gives us an institution narrative within the third pericope, the supplication, as an embolism. On the other hand, the two primary movements of thanksgiving and supplication are found in the Apostolic Tradition, where the institution narrative has been inserted in the thanksgiving section.

As to the sanctus, it was not part of the BHM, and, it may be presumed, was still not in use when Didache 10 and the Apostolic Tradition were composed; Ligier was content to follow Ratcliff in regarding the sanctus in Addai and Mari (and Sharar) as a later intrusion into the earlier text. However, in explaining the origin of the sanctus in the anaphora, Ligier reverted to the Synagogue explanation:

It is, for example, evident that our Sanctus does not derive from the Jewish meal liturgy, but rather from the liturgy of the Synagogue, from the qedussah of the yotzer, or the tephillah, or even less probably, the qedussah de sidra. 12

Strangely, in the same paper, Ligier suggested that in St. James and St. Basil the sanctus was an original component; in these the first part of the eucharistic prayer testifies to an intention to glorify God which stands in contrast to the thanksgiving orientation formulated by the opening dialogue. Ligier offers no dates for this development other than it took place between the inclusion of an institution narrative and the attainment of the final structural form in the fifth century.¹³

Ligier's own lines of enquiry have been further explored in a cautious and precise manner by the American Episcopalian liturgist, Thomas Talley. In a paper read to the International

Societas Liturgica, and subsequently expanded for publication in Worship 1976, Talley focused upon what he described as that group of berakot 'whose influence on the eucharistic prayer is most frequently urged, the grace after meals, Birkat ha-mazon'.¹⁴ His conclusion was that on the whole it is difficult to take issue with at least the principal thrust of Ligier's analysis that the BHM was the source of inspiration which gave the pattern of the early eucharistic prayer: praise, thanksgiving, supplication.¹⁵ In his analysis Talley first made two preliminary observations:

(1) While J-P. Audet was right to draw attention to Jewish berakot as the source of Christian euchology, particularly the eucharistic prayer, his description of a berakah was artificial, and required careful qualification.¹⁶

(2) Following on from Audet's discussion, Talley pointed out that to regard εὐλογεῖν as synonymous with εὐχαριστεῖν can no longer be sustained.¹⁷ Εὐχαριστεῖν does not occur in the LXX, and when it does appear in later Judaism it is in the most Hellenized of books. When it does occur in Rabbinic and related usage, it is connected with the Hebrew yadah and its cognates rather than with berak.¹⁸ Talley suggests therefore that in the institution narrative of Paul and Luke, the reference to εὐλογεῖν refers to a simple benediction, but εὐχαριστεῖν refers probably to the BHM and particularly to its second pericope which begins nodeh lekah, we give you thanks.¹⁹

Noting the three pericopes of the BHM, each one ending with a chatimah or short benediction formula, and noting the themes

of blessing God, giving thanks for redemption, and supplication,
 Talley moved to consider Didache 10:

Indeed in spite of all the problems of dating, authenticity and the rest, it should not be considered impossible that Didache 10 either is (or wishes to seem to be) a careful adaptation of Birkat ha-mazon to the requirements of the Supper of the Lord become a christian zebach todah, the eucharistic sacrifice. 20

Talley pointed out that the three pericopes of the BHM are found in Didache 10. However, berak disappears to be replaced by Εὐχαριστεῖν ; the chatimot are replaced by doxologies; and the tripartite schema of blessing God, thanksgiving for redemption, and supplication has become bipartite - thanksgiving for redemption and for food, and supplication. This bipartite schema Talley suggests forms the core of the Christian anaphora. Thus in Hippolytus and Epiphanius, although we find one continuous prayer in place of a series of pericopes, they nevertheless give us the scheme of thanksgiving for redemption and supplication:

(1) both devote themselves entirely to thanksgiving down to the institution narrative, giving no place to that pure praise of God as Creator which was the concern of the first pericope of the Jewish grace or of God as he is in himself which Ligier sees as leading into the sanctus in most of the classic oriental anaphoras; and (2) neither of these prayers includes the sanctus. There are, of course, two major differences between these texts and the thanksgiving and supplication of Didache 10: (1) the first two doxologies of Didache are missing, giving a single continuous prayer instead of the three pericopes of the early christian text and of the Jewish grace after meals; and (2) there is now the narrative/anamnesis unit to be considered. 21

Talley agreed with Ligier that the embolism of the BHM may explain the insertion of the narrative of institution.²²

Talley also suggested influence of the BHM upon the anaphora of Addai and Mari:

The structure of the prayer is itself compellingly suggestive of Birkat ha-mazon and Didache 10. It is a tripartite

structure consisting of three 'prayers of inclination' or gehanatha, each preceded by a silent prayer (kushapa) and followed by a "canon" (qanona) which functions as a doxology. 23

Talley saw in the three gehanata a reflection of the three themes of the BHM.

In this particular paper Talley dealt with the sanctus only in passing:

It is quite possible that the Jewish use of kedushah (sanctus) in the Synagogue liturgy influenced the Christian adoption of that hymn, and perhaps at an earlier date than has been supposed, but that usage (from both the Jewish and Christian sides) is too clouded by uncertainty to justify seeking the roots of the anaphora itself in the berakoth and kedushah before shema. 24

Here Talley hinted that the Synagogue might be the source of the anaphoral sanctus, but not the source of its introductory preface of praise. Since however the BHM is the starting point, it follows that the sanctus must represent a later insertion.

In subsequent papers Talley has expanded, qualified and revised some of the earlier suggestions. Thus, he notes a tripartite pattern of eucharistic prayers such as Addai and Mari which became standard at Antioch, and another and possibly earlier pattern in which the first two sections (of the BHM) are elided into a thanksgiving and supplication (Apostolic Tradition).

Talley sees this bipartite structure in the Egyptian Strasbourg Papyrus Gr.254 (regarded as a complete anaphora) and the Roman Canon.²⁵ However, in papers published in 1982 and 1984, Talley hinted that in Addai and Mari it is possible to see a bipartite nucleus beginning after the sanctus (thanksgiving-supplication) to which was added or restored 'the original threefold pattern by the addition, from the daily office, of an opening Praise of the

Creator hymned by the heavenly choirs'.²⁶ Appealing to Auf der Maur's study of the paschal homilies of Asterios, where the sanctus is used at the Easter Vigil, Talley thought it likely that the sanctus entered the eucharistic prayer from the 'Christian Synagogue' rather than directly from the Synagogue in Judaism. However, Talley allows the possibility that Macomber's reconstruction of the 'original text' of Addai and Mari (which contains the sanctus),

may very well present to us the earliest appearance of Sanctus in a christian anaphora, coming as it does out of the strongly Jewish-Christian environment of Aramaic speaking East Syria. There seems no reason why such a tripartite prayer could not belong to the third century and, indeed, to any point in that century. ²⁷

The Dutch liturgist, Herman Wegman, in a paper which he hinted was somewhat premature,²⁸ outlined a hypothetical genealogy of the eucharistic prayer, again starting with the BHM. Wegman traced a link between the BHM through Didache 10, to Strasbourg Papyrus (where Talley sees a structure of Praise-Supplication, Wegman sees Blessing-Giving thanks- Supplication) and Addai and Mari (minus sanctus). The Apostolic Tradition represents a different branch: 'Cette enigme demeure sans solution: on ignore comment Hippolyte en est arrivé à cette structure'.²⁹ However, the sanctus, when and where it appears, is 'une interpolation postérieure'.³⁰ The Spanish liturgist Jose Sanchez Caro builds on the work of Bouyer, Ligier, Talley and Giraudo,³¹ and again emphasises the BHM as the foundation for the eucharistic prayer. The sanctus is a later addition, from the Synagogue geduššah de yoser.³²

The views of these scholars have been described at some length to illustrate an emerging consensus on the Continent and

North America, and to demonstrate that one's theory of anaphoral origins in turn determines the explanation of the sanctus. Where the BHM is regarded a priori as the basic nucleus, it must follow that the sanctus is a secondary addition to an archetypal structure. Where Didache 10, Apostolic Tradition and Strasbourg Papyrus are treated as direct descendants of the BHM, then in the case of Addai and Mari, the sanctus a priori has to be interpreted as a later addition.

If the consensus is correct in identifying the BHM as the single archetypal structure from which all anaphoras ultimately derive, then the sanctus must represent an intrusion. The source appealed to is in most cases the Synagogue (Bouyer, Ligier, Talley 1976, Sanchez Caro), though there is little concern to give a convincing explanation as to how or why this happened. Only Talley suggests a plausible alternative to the claim for direct borrowing, namely, the Christian Office, which had already from an early date adapted the Synagogue geduššah. Our evidence for this, however, is almost entirely confined to AC 7.

B. Alternative views on anaphoral development

Although the BHM theory is widely accepted,³³ there^{are} reasons for questioning its methodology, and its concentration on a single archetypal structure. Recently Paul Bradshaw has observed:

In spite of the transformation which has taken place in New Testament studies in recent years in recognizing the fundamental pluriformity of early Christianity, there has still been a residual tendency in liturgical scholarship to look for the most ancient stratum in those elements which are common to all, or nearly all, later texts, rather than in those which are distinctive of individual traditions, and in particular to seek to trace the evolution of all eucharistic prayers from a single root. Though this frequently runs into difficulties in explaining the diversity of later prayer-texts,

and especially such things as the variation in the position which the narrative of institution occupies, and the existence of some prayers which seemingly have a bipartite structure and others which have a tripartite structure, yet there is not much sign of a willingness to abandon it altogether. 34

There are reasons for questioning the priority given to the BHM.

1. Did Jesus and the early Apostolic Church use the BHM ?

The views outlined above rest on the assumption that at the Last Supper, and in the primitive Church, the BHM was used.

Although this may well have been the case, the assumption is open to question. This particular prayer series is quite properly classed by Heinemann as belonging to the 'Statutory Prayers' of Judaism. The rules for these Statutory prayers were not laid down until the third century CE Rabbis, the Amoreans, but they were merely making standard one type of a hitherto variety of prayer forms.³⁵

According to their rules, every berakah required:

- (a) the mention of the Name of God.
- (b) the mention of his Kingship.
- (c) barukh at the beginning when it was a one-sentence formula; at the end, at least, when longer.
- (d) when several berakot followed one another, only the first begins with barukh.
- (e) when, in a longer berakah, the thought-content departs from that of the first phrase, the final sentence is to bring the thought back to the beginning. 36

However, in another category which he designated 'Private and Non-Statutory Prayer', Heinemann turned to consider the Lord's Prayer and the implications of Jesus' teaching on prayer.

Finally, there is no doubt that the prayer of Jesus in the New Testament (Matthew 6:9ff) displays all the characteristics of the Jewish private prayer: it opens with an epithet which is not preceded by any expression of praise; it addressed God in the second person; its style is simple; it is quite brief, as are its component sentences; it lacks the form of the 'liturgical Berakah'. 37

Heinemann suggested that here, particularly in the teaching of Matthew 6:5-6, Jesus is expressing his approval of the tradition of private prayer which he considers preferable to the Statutory type of prayer of the Synagogue.³⁸ He concluded:

it is clear beyond all shadow of a doubt that these words of Jesus are directed against the prayer of the Synagogue, and against fixed statutory prayer in general. In its place, he prefers a simple prayer conforming to the tradition of popular private prayer. 39

Heinemann lists the following stylistic features of 'Private and Non-Statutory Prayer':

- (a) Frequent use is made of patterns and styles other than 'those forms which the Sages require', among which are B^erakot that do not make mention of the divine name or kingship.
- (b) When 'those forms which the Sages require' do appear, they contain frequent deviations from the normative style.
- (c) In numerous instances, it is uncertain whether or not the 'liturgical B^erakah form' should be used at all, or whether its use is merely a matter of popular custom.
- (d) Even in those benedictions in which use of the 'Liturgical B^erakah form' is required, a great amount of freedom still remains, allowing various themes now to be mentioned together in one benediction, now to be mentioned successively in separate benedictions.
- (e) A large degree of flexibility regarding the order, structure, and number of prayers is characteristic of this entire area. 40

Amongst a list of additional styles which are characteristic of private prayer, Heinemann included the formulae 'I thank you' and 'We give you thanks', which are commonly found at the beginning of a prayer of thanksgiving.⁴¹ Although the New Testament is familiar with prayers which open with barukh,⁴² it is not without significance

that the Gospels record some instances of short prayers beginning with εὐχαριστῶ - the Pharisee in Luke 18:11, told by Jesus and Jesus himself, John 11:41. Allan Bouley, considering the BHM, writes:

The brief blessing over bread was perhaps unspecific enough to be serviceable, but using the unaltered birkat ha-mazon would have confusedly linked Jesus' covenant up with food, land, city and probably the Passover of the former covenant, whereas the meaning of all these was being changed in the very celebration of the supper. 43

Undoubtedly the BHM was an ancient established grace, though the prayer fragment from the Synagogue at Dura-Europos may suggest that some Jewish groups used other forms of meal grace.⁴⁴ It may be the case that Jesus himself either abandoned the BHM or so altered it at the Last Supper, that the early Christian community itself never took it as the single basic archetypal meal prayer. The BHM may be a false starting point.

2. The freedom of the Christian celebrant

In a short paper published 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 president at the eucharist was at liberty to compose his own anaphora if he wished.⁴⁵ This has been subsequently explored in much greater depth by Allan Bouley.⁴⁶ Given the diverse groups which made up the early Christian Churches,⁴⁷ the prayer models upon which different celebrants drew may have varied widely. The recent surveys by James H.Charlesworth suggest a wide variety of prayer forms influenced the composition, themes and structures of Christian prayers.⁴⁸ Such freedom and diversity might better explain the differences between Apostolic Tradition, Addai and Mari, Strasbourg Papyrus and the Gnostic eucharistic prayers.

Even if Jesus and the early Christian leaders used the BHM as the basis for their eucharistic prayer(s), it is quite conceivable that some communities followed other patterns.

3. Ligier's aside remarks and the 'English School'.

Although Louis Ligier has argued strongly for regarding the BHM as the archetype for understanding anaphoral development, in aside comments he raised certain questions about the total evidence before him. He asked:

Does this mean that in the first two centuries our eucharistic prayer was always modelled after the pattern of this Jewish meal prayer ? 49

Then, with reference to the prayers in the Apocryphal Acts:

The structure of these celebrations and the style of these prayers show no apparent contact with the Birkat ha-mazon; and if they still suggest the Didache at all, it is not in virtue of their liturgical structure, but on account of a few theological ideas. 50

Then, turning to the anaphoras of the Twelve Apostles, Greek

Chrysostom, Addai and Mari and the Strasbourg Papyrus, he noted:

In short, these four liturgical documents, whose opening thanksgiving is concluded by a doxology or a ganona, each constitute a complete and closed euchologia which does not demand to be prolonged by anything at all, either a Sanctus or a narrative. 51

Here the inference is that the 'Preface' of these anaphoras serves perfectly well as an anaphora, and could have existed as such in isolation of any other element.

Ligier simply threw out these remarks without further explanation. However, in a short paper Geoffrey Cuming took up these remarks, suggesting that one could add to the list the opening sections of Egyptian Basil and St. James:

Thus these four prayers share, or can credibly be made to share, a common length and structure of the kind Ligier suggests. But why stop at four ? If we detach the opening sections of these four anaphoras why not also of Egyptian Basil and St. James (the latter with support from Cyril of Jerusalem) ? If the Sanctus be regarded as a doxology (and why not ?), Basil would consist of 11 lines, and James in its Syriac version 17 lines, in Greek of 20. ⁵²

Cuming suggested that the argument could be applied also to the first 18 lines of AC 8, and Serapion. It is interesting that Cuming actually suggests that a 'mini' anaphora might terminate with the sanctus, though one wonders whether this was an unconscious use of the views of Ratcliff and W.E.Pitt.⁵³ A danger in Cuming's line of argument is that it tends to ignore other known factors in the development of some anaphoras. AC 8, for example, is a cumbersome piece of work, and its first 18 lines wending towards the sanctus, but then embarking upon salvation history, are better explained as the exuberant work of the compiler than as a fragment of an earlier anaphora.⁵⁴ Much more important, however, is Cuming's observation on Ligier's comments:

Ligier's suggestion implies a certain method of construction. The anaphora will originally have ended with a doxology or the sanctus, and successive sections would then be added on at the end of the prayer, or slotted in at appropriate points. Does this seem a probable, or even possible, method of developing an anaphora ? ⁵⁵

Cuming himself has illustrated how, if Strasbourg Papyrus is a complete anaphora, it was extended by adding large chunks of material onto the end to give us the present structure of St. Mark.⁵⁶

Cuming's suggestions have in turn been tested by another English scholar, John Fenwick, in his thesis on the anaphoras of St. Basil, and their influence on the Jerusalem liturgy of St. James.⁵⁷ As already noted, Fenwick appealed to the study of Cutrone which maintains that Cyril gives an accurate outline

of the Jerusalem anaphora of his day; there was no thanksgiving for redemption (Christological), narrative of institution or anamnesis - all of which would have suited Cyril's purpose.

According to Cutrone, Cyril knew a two-part anaphora:

1. Praise of God in creation, ending with the sanctus.
2. Supplication, consisting of epiklesis and intercessions.

Fenwick has convincingly shown that the anaphora of St.James was derived from this earlier structure by slotting in material from the Egyptian form of Basil.

Fenwick's findings regarding the Jerusalem anaphora are important not only in terms of theories of anaphoral development, but also with regard to the place of the sanctus in this development. At Jerusalem the sanctus was part of the eucharistic prayer before the introduction of an institution narrative and anamnesis, or even a thanksgiving for redemption. Furthermore, as has been argued in chapter 4, the sanctus known to Cyril (and preserved in St.James) is so integrated with the whole opening of the prayer that it is difficult to see how it could not have been part of the Jerusalem anaphora from whenever that form was first used. To regard this section in the same way as Talley has suggested for Addai and Mari - a borrowing from Christian Morning Prayer - would leave us with a nucleus for the Jerusalem anaphora of an epiklesis and intercessions, having analogy with some Gnostic prayers, but certainly not with the BHM.

It is not our purpose here to develop an alternative theory of anaphoral evolution in detail, but rather simply to point out that although the BHM theory is finding widespread acceptance, there is an 'English School', represented by Cuming and Fenwick,

to which can be added the present writer,⁵⁸ and apparently now Paul Bradshaw,⁵⁹ which believes that the evidence may be better explained by assuming a wide variety of different anaphoral structures rather than one single archetype. This may be illustrated thus:

<u>Didache 10</u>	<u>Apostolic Tradition</u>	<u>Strasbourg 254</u>
Thanksgiving for redemption	Thanksgiving for redemption	Praise for Creation
Thanksgiving for creation and food		Offering
Supplication	Supplication	Supplication
<u>Addai and Mari</u>	<u>Cyril of Jerusalem</u>	<u>Egyptian Basil</u>
Praise of the Name Sanctus	Praise of Creation Sanctus	Praise of God Sanctus
Thanksgiving for redemption		Thanksgiving for redemption
Supplication	Supplication	Supplication
<u>Acts of John 85</u>	<u>Acts of John 109</u>	<u>Acts of Thomas 50</u>
Glorifying the Name	Glorifying the Name	Supplication
Thanksgiving for redemption		
<u>Acts of Thomas 133</u>	<u>Acts of Thomas 158</u>	
Supplication	Mention of redemption	
Naming of Father, Son and Holy Spirit (Syriac)	Supplication	

Since 'thanksgiving' and 'supplication' are such basic themes to prayer, there seems little need to appeal so specifically to the BHM. Given the freedom of celebrants, and the diversity of the groups making up early Christianity, the BHM may have been only one model amongst a variety of structures used. From a

diversity there came gradual standardization by amalgamation, addition, and slotting in of blocks of material as Fenwick has demonstrated.⁶⁰ Although this alternative view of anaphoral development will be less satisfying to the systematic and tidy mind, it may in the end provide a better framework for understanding and explaining anaphoral growth.

In turning to consider the possible origins of the anaphoral sanctus, neither of the above approaches is ruled out, though the second approach, in my view, provides a better framework for understanding how the sanctus could be inserted into an anaphora, or even be 'original' to some early anaphoral compositions.

2. SOME POSSIBLE ORIGINS OF THE SANCTUS

1. The Synagogue (Jewish or Christian).

We have seen that although Ligier, Talley and Sanchez Caro have seen no need to appeal to the Synagogue to explain the origin of the anaphora, they have suggested the Synagogue as a possible source for the anaphoral sanctus. However, anticipating in some respects the work of Bouyer, C.P.Price investigated the similarities between certain anaphoras and the Synagogue berakot in an article in 1961.⁶¹ The shema itself, and Gu'ellah, had in his opinion no great influence; however, the other berakot had, particularly upon AC 8 and Serapion. The yoser with geduššah had an influence on the preface and sanctus, and the amidah on the intercessions.⁶² With regard to the anaphoral sanctus,

Price saw no need to appeal to geduṣṣah d^e sidra, and the geduṣṣah d^eamidah has no angelology; he therefore argued:

For it is surely this kedusha in yotzer, rather than that in the Amidah (where there is no explicit reference to the angelic chorus) that has affinities with Christian usage. In yotzer, before Shema, it is splendidly characteristic of morning devotions. The Eucharist was also a morning service by the fourth century, and would have attracted such splendor of expression for the Christian's greeting of the Lord's Day. Moreover, the similarity between the whole complex of motifs in yotzer including the Kedusha and the complex of motifs in these early Christian prefaces leading to the sanctus - creation, light, luminaries, illumination, the praise of angelic hosts - is too striking to be accidental. 63

Price was to conclude that later anaphoras are the fusion of morning prayers rooted in the Synagogue liturgy but not followed exactly, and a eucharistic nucleus of which Hippolytus is an example.⁶⁴

One of the weaknesses of Price's paper is that the parallels he adduced were widely scattered in different anaphoras of different date and provenance, and the themes themselves are common religious imagery. The actual verbal similarity in any one anaphora is minimal. The most convincing parallels are to be found in AC 8, but we know that the redactor has reused themes and phrases from the Synagogue prayers of AC 7. The greatest problem is that yoser blesses God as Creator of the Luminaries (as a morning hymn) and not directly for creation, whereas the Christian anaphoras praise God for his Name, or the Being of God, or his general creating activity, and not specifically for light.

A more interesting case for the influence of the Morning Synagogue berakot on anaphoral formation has been made by Jacob Vellian in relation to Addai and Mari.⁶⁵ Although his comparison requires qualification,⁶⁶ it is as convincing as the comparison of Addai and Mari with the BHM. Yoser is centered on the

commemoration of the luminaries, includes praise of the Name, and qeduṣṣah. The first part of Addai and Mari has the same general focus (though by no means identical) to which is added a general commemoration of the economy of Christ. Ahabah is an anamnesis of God's gifts such as the Torah and the Land; it also contains a petition for peace, and the coming of God's kingdom. The second part of Addai and Mari has a similar content:

In the absence of any reference to food and in the double-unit formation, the Anaphora of Addai and Mari seems to have a closer resemblance to the morning berakoth preceding shema than the berakoth after the meal. 67

It has to be admitted that Vellian's comparison is no more conclusive than Sanchez Caro's comparison with the BHM. In the former there is no parallel to the epiklesis, and in the latter no parallel to the sanctus. But Vellian's comparison is no less convincing, and remains a viable explanation. Given the freedom of the Christian celebrant, and the diversity found in the Church, I still maintain that

There is no logical reason why, in the early second century, when giving thanks, a bishop of a Jewish Christian congregation could not have modelled his Eucharistic Prayer on the developing Synagogue berakoth. 68

Talley, as has been noted, suggested that rather than direct borrowing, the explanation may be that borrowing has taken place from a Christian adaptation of the Synagogue morning berakot. This is an attractive suggestion, but difficult to demonstrate. Apart from AC 7, we have no early Christian adaptations of Synagogue prayers. Furthermore, the compiler of AC has used the material in Book 8 in a manner which suggests that the sanctus was already a recognised part of some anaphoras, and was different from its use

in the Synagogue prayers.⁶⁹ If borrowing has taken place from this source, it was certainly in a very general way rather than a simple appropriation of the qeduššah. Borrowing from this source would also seem to presuppose either the existence in the anaphora of a thanksgiving for creation, or the borrowing and remodelling of the yoser. Yet, as we have suggested, such a borrowing is difficult to apply to the anaphora of Jerusalem, which seems to presuppose the sanctus as an integral part of the opening prayer of praise.

2. Merkavah Mysticism

Another possible origin may have been the very same diffuse tradition which led to the use of the qeduššah in the Synagogue berakot - Merkāvāh Mysticism. Amongst the diverse strands which made up the early Christian Church, Revelation 4 and 5 witness to the fact that Merkāvāh Mysticism was one such strand. How widespread this tendency was and how typical we do not know. Its continued influence is found in the Passio of Perpetua, and in Aphrahat; furthermore, many of the Pseudepigraphal books which show the influence of this movement were preserved and copied by Christian groups. Could it be, therefore, that amongst such groups the sanctus came to play an important part in the eucharistic prayer? Cuming's suggestion of a thanksgiving terminating in sanctus does have a parallel with the Hekhalot hymns which are a product from the same diffuse movement. It is also strange that although the Book of Revelation was late in being accepted in the Syriac-speaking Church, the phraseology of the hymns of Revelation 4 and 5 is echoed in the first gehanta of Addai and Mari. Furthermore, we have noted earlier the parallel of ideas between the second part

of the berakot in Ma'aseh Merkāvāh and the opening praise section of Addai and Mari. In this context it is perhaps no accident that Addai and Mari is the eucharistic prayer from the area of Edessa and Nisibis, which was influenced in a variety of ways by the Jewish region of Adiabene.⁷⁰ It was within these Babylonian Jewish communities that the Merkāvāh tradition was steadily developed. J. Neusner, though acknowledging that the evidence is suggestive rather than uncontested proof, writes:

Nonetheless, this much is certain: in the light of the findings of Scholem and others on the existence of a mystical tradition as evidenced by Hillel and, more immediately in the second century, by Hananiah the nephew of R. Joshua and also possibly by Yosi of Huzal (if the Mishnaic reading is accepted), Jewish mysticism was studied in Babylonian Jewish academies at the time of R. Judah the Prince, and, specifically, speculation on Ezekiel's vision was carried on. That a whole wall in the Dura Synagogue was apparently devoted to the prophet Ezekiel further strengthens my conviction that Babylonian Jewry did cultivate the traditions of its own prophet in indigenous academies. 71

It would have been quite natural, given the realized eschatology of Christianity, to include geduṣṣah in some of their prayers, including some eucharistic prayers. Such an inclination may have been stronger in the East Syrian communities. In Egyptian Basil, which would seem to have a Cappadocian origin, there is a definite reference to the person of God sitting on the throne of Glory, adored by every heavenly power - the very subject-matter of Merkāvāh Mysticism. Perhaps, therefore, the same mystical tradition which gave rise on the one hand to the Synagogue geduṣṣot, and on the other to the Hekhalot hymns, was also the stimulus which led some Christian groups to use a version of Isaiah 6:3 with an angelology in eucharistic prayers.⁷²

3. Imaginative developments from Biblical phraseology ?

All too often liturgists are concerned to find subtle textual sources for constituent parts of the overall structure of the anaphora. Although a case can be made for the Synagogue geduššot and the Merkāvāh tendency as being possible sources or origins of the anaphoral sanctus, it might be possible that the answer may be less sophisticated and more obvious; could it not have been the result of some biblically-minded and enterprising celebrant who simply decided to include it ?

In at least three of the prayers which are regarded as relatively early - Strasbourg Papyrus, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Egyptian Basil - the thanksgiving is concerned with creation. The first of these has, of course, no sanctus. Its opening thanksgiving or blessing, albeit lacunose, has the following:

σε
εὐλογεῖν
καὶ μ(ε)θ' (ἡ)μέραν (σοι τῷ ποιήσαντι τον οὐ)
ρην(ον καὶ) πάντα τὰ ἐν (αὐτῷ, γῆν καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ, θα)
λά(σσας) καὶ (ποτ)αμ(ο)ύς κ(αὶ πάντα τὰ) ἐ(ν αὐ
τοῖς,

The language has in fact been culled from scripture: Genesis 1 suggests the morning and night; the description of God who made heaven and earth, the sea and all that is in them, may have been lifted from Acts 4:24, but also perhaps from Exodus 20:11

Ἐν γὰρ ἑξ ἡμέραις ἐποίησε Κύριος τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς

Or, Psalm 146:6:

Τὸν ποιήσαντα τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς.

To this has been added Genesis 1:26, and possibly a link to Christ via Psalm 104:24 and John 1:9.

A similar number of biblical phrases and words underlie the opening praise of Egyptian Basil (though this may have been influenced by an Egyptian anaphoral tradition)⁷³ and Cyril of Jerusalem, and the later St. James, though these latter two may have been influenced by Psalm 148 where creation itself hymns God. In Basil, and more particularly in Cyril, the sanctus is included as a natural progression of thought. The sanctus is not simply an appendage.

However, instead of the language of creation being culled from a variety of biblical sources - Acts 4:24, Exodus 20:11 or Psalm 146:6 - all the language is found in the opening of Ezra's prayer in Nehemiah 9:6ff, though there it leads into a reference to the worship of the heavenly host:

σὺ εἶ αὐτὸς Κύριος μόνος, σὺ ἐποίησας τὸν
οὐρανὸν καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ
πάντα τὴν στίχον αὐτῶν, τὴν γῆν καὶ πάντα ὅσα
εἰσὶν ἐν αὐτῇ, τὰς θαλάσσας καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν
αὐταῖς· καὶ σὺ ζωοποιεῖς τὰ πάντα, καὶ σοὶ
προσκυνοῦσιν αἱ στρατιαὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν.

Not only does this text provide the basic phraseology used in Strasbourg Papyrus, but it also provides an even better basis for Egyptian Basil where ὁ παρὰ πάσης ἀγέας δυνάμεως προσκυνούμενος echoes the last words of Nehemiah 9:6, and οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ οἱ οὐρανοὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν in St. James finds a perfect parallel in this text rather than in 1 Kings 8:27. Any Christian celebrant with a good knowledge of the Bible and

a little imagination could easily have seen a connection between Nehemiah 9:6 and Col.1:16, and the mention of angelic beings and the worship of the heavenly host would readily suggest Isaiah 6:3. An awareness of Synagogue usage or Merkāvāh would have provided further incentive, if any was needed, but a knowledge of John 12:41 would have sufficed for a creative mind to have acted independently.

Again, in the prayer contained in the Martyrdom of Polycarp, the opening section has the following:

O Lord God Almighty, Father of Thy beloved and blessed child Jesus Christ, through whom we have received our knowledge of Thee, God of Angels and Powers and of all creation (ὁ Θεὸς (ὁ) ἀγγέλων καὶ δυνάμεων καὶ πάσης κτίσεως) and of the whole race of the righteous who live in Thy Presence

Allan Bouley comments that the language of much of this prayer indicates most strongly its relation to early liturgical prayer and to the eucharistic prayer in particular. It may, he suggests, reflect the type of eucharistic prayer extemporized by Polycarp.⁷⁴ Yet any celebrant using similar phraseology had, with the reference to 'God of Angels and Powers ', a ready made cue for the sanctus.

The thought in Addai and Mari is different: the Name is praised, and there is a reference to creation and salvation, and then the adoration of God by the angelic host. In the Gospel of Bartholomew (4:49) we find a prayer reminiscent of Addai and Mari:

O Lord Jesus Christ, the great and glorious Name. All the choirs of the angels praise you, O Master, and I that am unworthy with my lips ... do praise you, O Master.

There is no sanctus, but any prayer with similar phraseology could easily have suggested to an imaginative celebrant the

inclusion of the sanctus. This, however, seems more feasible where a variety of models for the eucharistic prayer is envisaged rather than simply the BHM model.

4. Cumulative reflections.

The three possible origins outlined above apply to either the widely accepted BHM theory, or the more varied approach of what I have identified as the 'English School'. However, as part of that school, it would appear to me that the origin of the sanctus from any of the three suggested possibilities is easier to understand where a variety of models is accepted. At the same time however, it may be that the sanctus in different places originated in a different way; for example, perhaps the East Syrian rite developed it under the influence of Merkāvāh, whereas elsewhere biblical phraseology, or Nehemiah 9:6 was the inspiration. Elsewhere perhaps there was a more conscious reflection of the Synagogue geduśśot, or more precisely, that of the yoser. Although it can only be speculation, a possible difference in origin may account for why in some places the sanctus seems to have been addressed to Christ-as God, reflecting the 'Higher Christology' which came from the Johannine community, where the Son is one with the Father.⁷⁵

As far as place of origin is concerned, in the Egyptian and Roman traditions, the sanctus would seem to be a later addition to the sense of the anaphora, though the Egyptian unique use remains an enigma. Our examples of anaphoras where the sanctus seems to be an integral part of the prayer are Jerusalem, Cappadocia or North Syria, and Edessa. It may have been integral to

the anaphora at Antioch, but our information here is too sparse. The evidence points to the Syrian part of the Church, and those later anaphoras which stem from that area. Once included, it presumably became a popular congregational acclamation, and gradually came to feature in all anaphoras as part of the initial praise of God - even when, as in the case of the Roman canon, it had no logical context. Egypt, however, developed its own unique supplicatory use of the sanctus.

.

NOTES - CHAPTER 6

1. W.O.E.Oesterley, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, (Oxford 1925); F.Gavin, The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments (London 1928); Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy; J-P. Audet, 'Literary Forms and Contents of a Normal Eucharistia in the First Century', TU 18(1959), 643-62.
2. Dix, op.cit., 52ff;215ff.
3. Louis Bouyer, Eucharist; Louis Ligier, 'From the Last Supper to the Eucharist'; 'The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer: From the Last Supper to the Eucharist', SL 9(1973), 176-85; T.J.Talley, 'From Berakah to Eucharistia: A Reopening Question', Worship 50 (1976), 115-37; 'The Eucharistic Prayer of the Ancient Church According to Recent Research: Results and Reflections'; 'The Eucharistic Prayer: Directions for Development', Worship 51 (1977), 316-25; 'The Eucharistic Prayer: Tradition and Development'; 'The Literary Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer', Worship 58 (1984), 404-20; H.A.J.Wegman, 'Généalogie hypothétique de la prière eucharistique'; J.M.Sanchez Caro, Eucharistia E Historia De La Salvacion.
4. See Talley, Worship 50.120-1.
5. Dr.Ithamar Gruenwald informs me that several of the Jewish Hekhalot texts refer to special meals which the mystic preparing for his special experience had to prepare himself, but unfortunately they do not preserve the berakot which would have accompanied them. In view of the general importance of gedussah in this tendency, it is tempting to speculate that it found a place in these meal prayers.
6. Eucharist, 102.
7. Ligier, 'The Origins', 183.
8. Ligier, 'Anaphores orientales et prières juives', Proche-Orient Chrétien 13(1963), 3-20; 'The Origins', 172-4.
9. 'From the Last Supper...', 129.
10. L.Finkelstein, 'The Birkat ha-mazon', JQR 19(1928/9),211-63; M.Dibelius, 'Die Mahl-Gebete der Didache', ZNTW 37(1938),32-41.
11. 'The Origins', 177.
12. Ibid., 168
13. Ibid., 182.
14. Art.cit., 119.
15. Ibid., 135.

16. SL 9, 140-2.
17. Ibid., 148-9.
18. Ibid., 150. Talley appeals to the studies of Henri Cazelles, 'L'Anaphore et l'Ancien Testament', Eucharisties d'Orient et d'Occident I (Paris 1970), 11-21, and Jean Laporte, La Doctrine eucharistique chez Philon d'Alexandrie (Paris 1972).
19. Worship 50, 124.
20. Ibid., 129
21. Ibid., 130.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid., 131.
24. Ibid., 135.
25. Worship 51, 317-8; 'The Eucharistic Prayer: Tradition and Development', 53; 58.
26. 'The Eucharistic Prayer: Tradition and Development', 55; Worship 58, 415.
27. Worship 58, 415.
28. 'Généalogie ..', 263, note 2.
29. Ibid., 275.
30. Ibid., 272.
31. See Talley, Worship 58.
32. Sanchez Caro, op.cit., 51, 126, 129.
33. See Dennis C. Smolarski, Eucharistia. A Study of the Eucharistic Prayer (New York 1982); H. Wegman, Christian Worship in East and West (New York, 1986).
34. Paul F. Bradshaw, 'The Search for the Origins of Christian Liturgy: some methodological Reflections', Gratias Agamus, SL 17 (Jubilee Volume, 1987), 26-34, 31.
35. J. Heinemann, Prayer in the Talmud. Forms and Patterns, Passim.
36. I. Elbogen, Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung, 4ff.
37. Heinemann, 191.
38. Ibid.

39. Ibid., 192. It could, of course, be the Matthean Churches rather than Jesus.
40. Ibid., 178
41. Ibid., 189.
42. E.g. Luke 1:68; Ephesians 1:3.
43. Bouley, op.cit., 79-80.
44. J. Neusner, A History of the Jews in Babylonia, I. The Parthian Period (Leiden 1969²), 161.
45. R.P.C. Hanson, 'The Liberty of the Bishop to Improve Prayer in the Eucharist', VC 15(1961), 173-6.
46. Op.cit.
47. J.D.G. Dunn, Unity and Diversity in the New Testament (London 1981²); G. Theissen, Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity (Philadelphia 1978); The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity (Edinburgh 1982).
48. J.H. Charlesworth, 'Jewish Liturgies, Hymns and Prayers ', in R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg (eds), Early Post-Biblical Judaism and its Modern Interpreters (Philadelphia 1986); 'A Prolegomenon to a New Study of the Jewish Background of the Hymns and Prayers in the New Testament', JJS 33 (1982) 265-85.
49. Ligier, 'The Origins', 178. My underlining.
50. Ibid., 179.
51. Ibid.
52. 'Four Very Early Anaphoras', Worship 58(1984), 168-72.
53. See Prolegomena.
54. See chapter 4 above.
55. Ibid.
56. G.J. Cuming, 'The Anaphora of St. Mark: A Study in Development'.
57. Fenwick, thesis cit., and op.cit.
58. Bryan D. Spinks, 'Beware the Liturgical Horses ! An English Interjection on Anaphoral Evolution', Worship 59(1985), 211-219.
59. See note 34.

60. At the 1987 Oxford Patristic Conference, G.J.Cuming read a paper entitled 'The Shape of the Anaphora', and , quite independently of the views I express here, concludes that some early anaphoras owe nothing to the BHM, and the Bible and Psalms have exerted an influence on the shape of the anaphora.
61. C.P.Price, 'Jewish Morning Prayers and Early Christian Anaphoras', ATR 43(1961), 153-68.
62. Ibid., 155
63. Ibid., 162.
64. Ibid., 168.
65. J.Vellian, art.cit., note 13 chapter 4.
66. Bryan D.Spinks, 'The Original Form of the Anaphora of the Apostles: A Suggestion in the Light of Maronite Sharar.'
67. Vellian, art.cit.,217.
68. Bryan D.Spinks, 'The Original Form, 150.
69. See chapters 4 and 5 above for details.
70. R.Murray, Symbols of Church and Kingdom. A Study in Early Syriac Tradition (Cambridge 1975).
71. J.Neusner, A History of the Jews in Babylonia, I, 170.
72. Though Rev.4:8 seems to have been ignored in favour of Isaiah 6:3.
73. Had Strasbourg Papyrus, or the tradition it represented, influenced Egyptian Basil ?
74. Bouley, op.cit., 106;108.
75. Raymond E.Brown, The Community of the Beloved Disciple (London 1979), 43-8.Cf. 91: 'What the Johannine Christians considered to be a tradition that had come down from Jesus seems to have been accepted by many other Christians as an embraceable variant of the tradition that they had from Jesus'.

PART THREE

CHAPTER 7

DEVELOPMENTS IN EAST AND WEST PRIOR TO
THE REFORMATION

1. THE JACOBITE AND MARONITE ANAPHORAS

The Syriac anaphoras which are in use, or were once used, in the Jacobite and Maronite Churches number over eighty. The most complete list we have is that of A.Raes, who listed eighty.¹ A.Vööbus has subsequently discovered a previously unknown anaphora attributed to Johannan of Qartamin, and there is every possibility that the list will be further extended.² A large number of these anaphoras were published in Latin translation by Renaudot, and critical texts of some are available in the series Anaphorae Syriacae.³ The majority remain unpublished, and some of them are in manuscripts which are not readily accessible to Western scholars. In the survey undertaken here, fifty-four texts have been consulted, using, in addition to the above, Cambridge University Library manuscripts Add 2887 (which contains 39 anaphoras) and Add 2917, together with Hayek's translation of some of the Maronite texts.⁴

One of the greatest problems in any consideration of this vast group of anaphoras is the problem of origin and date. These prayers range from the sixth and seventh centuries to at least the fifteenth century. The attribution of some of them gives us a date terminus post quem, but others are obviously pseudepigraphal, and the date is uncertain. H.Fuchs has attempted a classification of some of the anaphoras, dividing them into six groups, within two broad divisions:

- I. Texts with non-Syrian ascriptions ⁵
- A. Pseudepigraphal anaphoras which are definitely translated from the Greek .

In this group Fuchs placed Timothy of Alexandria, Ignatius (1 and 2),

Gregory of Nazianzen, Cyril of Alexandria, Severus of Antioch, John of Bostra. He dated these sixth, or at the latest, seventh century.⁶

B. Probable translations from the Greek but without external distinguishing marks from the text.⁷

This includes Caelestine of Rome, Eustathius of Antioch, Julius of Rome, Clement of Rome (1 and 2). Dionysius the Areopagate, Twelve Apostles (1 and 2). According to Fuchs, the mention in Eustathius of barbarian hoards points to the seventh century during the Sassanid tyranny, or the beginning of Islam.⁸

C. Late original Syriac texts with pseudepigraphal names.⁹

To this group he assigned John Chrysostom, John the Evangelist, Dioscorus of Alexandria, Xystus, Thomas the Apostle, Mark the Evangelist, Peter 1 (and 2 ?). Fuchs argued that these belong to the second millennium.

II. Texts with Syrian names

A. Belonging to the second millennium.¹⁰

In this group are to be found John Bar Susa (b.1072), Dionysius Bar Salibi (b.1171), Michael the Patriarch (1199), Basil Maphraim of the East (1214), John XIV (1219/20), John of Haran, John Bar Madani (+ 1263), Dioscorus of Jazirit (ordained 1285), Matthew the Pastor, Ignatius Bar Wahib (1333), Ignatius Behnan (1454), Cyril of Hah (14th century), Abraham the Hunter, Basil Abdal Gani, Gregory John, Holy Fathers (= Theodore Bar Wahban) and James the Less. These are mainly twelfth-fifteenth century.

B. Pseudepigraphal texts whose alleged names belong to the first millenium.¹¹

Amongst this group are James of Edessa (+702), Moses Bar Kepha (903),

Marutha of Tagrit (649), James Burdena (578) and Philoxenus of Mabbourg (523).

C. The rest of the anaphoras of the first millennium.¹²

In this group Fuchs placed Lazar Bar Sabh (829. = Philoxenus of Bagdad), Cyriakos of Tagrit (+817) and James of Serug (+517).

Most of the remaining anaphoras could be placed in one or other of Fuchs's categories. The anaphora of St.Basil the Great, for example, has a Greek origin, being based on Byzantine Basil,¹³ and the anaphora of Johannan of Qatamin is dated 1461/2 CE.¹⁴

As Fuchs himself points out,¹⁵ the original inspiration or models for the earlier of these anaphoras were the Greek anaphoras of St.James, and, to a lesser degree, St.Basil and St.John Chrysostom. Certain themes were developed, abbreviated, or omitted by each subsequent author, and as the number of anaphoras grew, so the new anaphoras in turn provided new models for further compositions. The anaphoras are, therefore, the result of a growing number of possible permutations, though many of the authors made their own distinctive contribution. In comparison with the three Greek anaphoras which seem to have been the basic models, and the first of Fuchs's groups which he believed were originally composed in Greek, the many later anaphoras bear witness to a high degree of abbreviation of ideas and themes, though some also represent extensive expansions, such as Eustathius, Patriarch of the 318 Fathers. The recent study by Stevenson also suggests that one characteristic of these anaphoras is to play down the concept of offering in the anamnesis.¹⁶

In addition to being inspirations for the new compositions, the anaphoras of James, Basil and John Chrysostom were translated

into Syriac. James, as noted above above, seems to have been translated at an early date; St. James the Less seems to be a later abbreviation. The Twelve Apostles may represent an earlier form of 'Chrysostom'.¹⁷ Syriac Basil is from the Byzantine form, though the recent study by Fenwick suggests that the intercessions of Syriac Basil are nearer to Egyptian Basil than to the Byzantine forms.¹⁸ The dialogue - praise - sanctus of James has already been fully discussed, as has Twelve Apostles. In Syriac Basil the opening praise section is practically the same as the Byzantine version, until the transition to angelology. At this point we find the following (from Cambridge University Library mss. Add. 2887 and 2917):

The divine beings exalt you in their ranks and the heavenly things hymn your glory in their habitations (2887 only). And Angels and Archangels worship you; Thrones and Dominions praise you. Powers and Heavenly Armies extol (2917: hallow) you. Before you stand the two honourable creatures who surround the holy throne of your glory, having many faces and many eyes and six wings, the seraphim and cherubim (2917: cherubim and seraphim). With two of their wings they cover their faces, so that they do not gaze on the mystery of your divinity which is invisible. And with two their feet lest they are burnt from the flames of your terrible might, of whom all the creation perceivable to the mind and perceptible to the senses drink from the heat of your vehemence, a small portion and feeble flash which is poured out. And with two they fly and call one to another in never-silent mouths and in sonorous voices, doxologies which do not cease, the hymn of victory and of our salvation, crying out, calling and saying ...

In this expansion (or re-write !) we encounter the two honourable creatures associated with the Egyptian tradition (and the hiding from the divinity recalls Coptic Cyril). However, we also encounter some of the characteristics of the development of the sanctus introduction of this large family of anaphoras:

- (1) The separate activity of the celestial beings is described - e.g. Angels and Archangels worship (cf. Greek Gregory of Nazianzen).

(2) Mention is made of avoiding the divine gaze.

(3) There is an interest in flames and fire.

The dependence of the Syriac anaphoras upon the Greek anaphoras of James, Chrysostom and Basil is well illustrated by the anaphoras of Severus of Antioch and Timothy of Alexandria, where the angelology of James is retained, but expanded. Severus has:

What thoughts can we conceive or what virtue of speeches can we attain whereby to glorify you, king of kings and God of all; who, when you had constituted the powers endowed with intellect and made the sensible creation, also made man from what is visible and invisible to attain every excellence and the divine likeness so that nothing out of all things made should not be a partaker of your grace, so that the very dust might become happy in the contemplation of your glory, and might share in the happiness of angels, and through all your works we might marvel and with profound silence honour you. For also both the congregations of angels and the first rank of the archangels, and the pre-eminent ones of the stable thrones and the jurisdiction of the Authorities, the greatness of the Powers, the sublimity of the Dominions, the Spirits of the just, the Church of the First Born which are written in heaven, with the many-eyed cherubim and the six-winged seraphim, endowed with knowledge and trembling before your invisible and incomprehensible Godhead, turning one to the other and absorbed in the invisible and incomprehensible sight, crying out, calling and saying ...

Timothy of Alexandria is considerably longer, having three sections of initial praise, each beginning 'Truly'. The first two sections may be summarized as follows:

- (1) 'Truly it is right and just ...'. (Praise of God who is ineffable, immutable, inexplicable, incomprehensible (cf. Greek Chrysostom) who created the visible and invisible creation .)
- (2) 'Truly Lord it is right that we should glorify and praise you ...'. (for the creation of the earth, and the heavens, the visible and invisible creation .)

The third section leads directly into the sanctus:

Truly Lord it is fitting that we should praise and glorify and exalt you, for you are praised and glorified and

exalted by mouths which are never silent and by ineffable voices, angels, archangels, principalities, authorities, thrones, dominions, powers which are above the world, heavenly armies, spirits of the prophets and the righteous, spirits of the martyrs and apostles, the cherubim with many eyes and six-winged seraphim, and each of these having six wings, and with two wings they cover their face because of your invisible and incomprehensible divinity, with two the feet and with two they fly one to the other singing the triumphant hymn of magnificent praise, calling out and saying ...

Similarly echoes of James are found in some of the shorter

anaphoras. Thus St. Mark:

To you truly becomes all glory, all recognition, all praise, all exultation, all honour, O Creator of all things, God the Father, with your only-begotten Son and your living and Holy Spirit. Lord, in truth, the angels, archangels, principalities, powers, thrones, dominions, incorporeal virtues, the cherubim, the seraphim and all the heavenly ranks bless you, praise you, glorify you and revere you, who in concert intone the hymn of glory, calling out and saying

Echoes are also found in St. John the Evangelist:

It is right and fitting to praise you, O Lord of the heavens and earth.

The supernal powers and the heavens where they stand glorify you and praise you. The fiery ones acclaim you in fear; the cherubim bless you in trembling; the Holy Seraphim praise your majesty with rapid motion of their wings and with the sound of their feet, they fly one to another, crying out, calling and saying ...

The vast number of these anaphoras makes it extremely difficult to systematise them in any accurate manner. For example, where a compiler has produced a short anaphora, the corresponding oratio theologica is also shortened, sometimes to a bare minimum.

In this category are anaphoras such as Thomas the Apostle:

You are, Lord, revered and glorified, in heaven and on earth, with the only begotten Son and Holy Spirit.

Perfect minds and rational orders and the things which are above the world in the Holy of Holies sanctify your Being to your honour: They are the ones who do not cease crying out, calling and saying ...

Xystus:

We thank you, from the heart, the soul and tongue, O Lord,

Father, Son and Holy Spirit, who is one only true God.
Mixed spiritual groups and seraphim; invisible assemblies
and innumerable ranks, your entire faithful people,
Lord, glorify you, and acclaim you by crying out and
saying thrice ...

Abraham the Hunter:

Truly it is right and just to praise the Trinity and exalt
and glorify the secrecy of your majesty. With angels and
archangels we also in sublime voice cry out and say ...

However, it is possible to delineate certain characteristics,
developments, and peculiarities of this large group of anaphoras.

(A) The anaphoras invariably begin with the assertion that praise
and worship are due to God who is creator, Lord of the invisible
and visible creation, of heaven and earth. Thus St. Peter the
Apostle II :

It is truly right and just that we should glorify and exalt
you, maker of all creation above (or heavenly) and
below (or earthly).

Ignatius Bar Wahib has:

Glory befits you and to you is due worship from all the
heavenly ranks and earthly orders, with everything which *Your*
Being created, sentient and insentient.

(B) Following St. James which has ' you are hymned by the heavens
and the heaven of heavens ', several of the anaphoras include
this (Clement II, Gregory John), or elaborate it. Thus Cyril
of Jerusalem has 'the heavens which are the seat of your majesty';
Clement II, 'The heaven of heavens and everything in them'; Moses
Bar Cepha, 'For you, Lord are in the heavens and the heaven of
heavens '.

(C) As in St. James, there is a concern in some anaphoras to
list the physical universe. Clement I:

The sun and moon in their courses venerate, the stars
in their splendour proclaim you; the sound of the thunder
trembles at your command; the movement of the air signifies
your virtue; the water in the clouds knows your will.

Dionysius the Areopagite:

The sea, and air proclaim you; the sun in its course
gives praise to you. The moon in its phases honours you.
The stars in their series declare your providence.

John Bar Madani mentions 'orbs with the luminaries of heaven'.

Gregory John and Marutha of Tagrit show a similar concern.

(D) Again apparently taking Greek St. James as a model, which mentions 'The heavenly Jerusalem, the assembly of the elect, the church of the firstborn written in heaven, the spirits of righteous men and prophets, the souls of martyrs and apostles', we find in some anaphoras ecclesiological lists and concepts forming part of the lead up to the sanctus. Hebrews 12:22 occurs, for example, in Severus, Cyril of Jerusalem, Caelestine of Rome and Cyriacus of Tagrit. Timothy of Alexandria includes the spirits of the prophets and the righteous, spirits of the martyrs and apostles. Cyril of Jerusalem has an interesting list; God is praised

In the mouths of the children of the Church, the movements
of the prophets, the company of the apostles, in the
sufferings of the martyrs, in the witness of the confessors,
in the theology of the teachers, in the godly stations
of the ascetics, in the assemblies of the just, in the
condition and state of the faithful.

Xystus includes 'your entire faithful people'. Marutha of Tagrit includes 'the theatres of martyrs' and 'congregations of anchorites'.

(E) A few of the anaphoras specifically mention the creation of man (cf. Greek John Chrysostom and Gregory of Nazianzen). Severus asserts that God created man 'so that the very dust might become happy in the contemplation of your glory, and might share in the happiness of angels ' - a remarkably modern scientific sentiment.¹⁹ According to the Syriac Gregory of Nazianzen (which is quite different from the Greek anaphora), 'God made all things by his Word, and in his Wisdom fashioned mankind'. John Bostra

also develops this theme; through the Spirit mankind is enabled to see the angels.

(F) The opening praise usually has a trinitarian reference, often specifically mentioning the Father, Son and Spirit. In some anaphoras doctrinal statements are introduced, and specialised theological language. In Timothy of Alexandria God is described with the negative epithets found in Greek Chrysostom. Clement I can qualify the Trinity as 'one nature on high, one substance, who in three persons is adored'. St. John Chrysostom (again quite different from the Greek anaphora) has 'the one majesty of the Trinity, of equal substance, adored in three persons'. In John Bostra we find 'God in the beginning one and who is one nature and one substance, and who is the same immutable, who is known in three hypostases'. The phraseology of some of the anaphoras seems to have been culled from Pseudo-Dionysius; thus in St. Ignatius God is described as being from sublime substance and immaterial, the great Beauty.²⁰ Dioscorus of Jazirit and John Bar Madani also echo this source.

(G) As might be expected in this vast family of anaphoras, the angelology ranges from no mention at all (Ignatius the Maphrain) to repetition of that of James or Basil, to incredible speculative detail and vast numbers of celestial classes. Ignatius the Maphrain has:

We worship and glorify and praise you, splendid Triune God and one substance. We offer to you worship and exaltation. The minds of the second rank of all creation are to you. And in voices according to ability we cry out theologies and we call out the song of the victory of salvation while we say ...

In Julius only the seraphim are mentioned, and Abraham the Hunter,

and St. Peter the Apostle II only mention angels and archangels. Anaphoras such as St. Mark, St. John the Evangelist, Severus, Timothy of Alexandria, Moses Bar Cepha, the Holy Roman Church, and Cyril of Hah, include the classes found in St. James without much enlargement. John of Harran gives an odd order:

To you, king of the world, God the Father, with the Son and Holy Spirit, is rightly due all thanksgiving. All orders and ranks and companies of heaven, angels and archangels, cherubim and seraphim, thrones and dominions, invisible and innumerable who praise and honour (you) without ceasing - though with incorporeal mouths and with ineffable voices - the hymn of victory, glorifying, and crying out and calling and saying ...

Ignatius Bar Wahib outlines an ascending hierarchy, each order serving the order above it:

Angels who are enlightened from your everlasting light, in mediation of Archangels, minister to you. Archangels who are illumined from the effulgence of your Being, in the mediation of Principalities, laud you. Principalities who shine in the radiance of your concealment, in mediation of Authorities, praise you. Authorities who flame from the blaze of your vehemence, blazing in mediation of thrones, adore you. Thrones who from flames of your divinity flame in mediation of Dominions, exalt you. Dominions who from the bright fire of your fortitude, being set on fire in mediation of Powers, praise you; Powers who are from the splendour of your strength, shining in mediation of the cherubim, extol you. The cherubim who from the lightning of your majesty, shining in mediation of the seraphim, bless you. The seraphim who from the holiness of the throne of your glory, being purified are not in mediation, sanctify you.

As already observed in the case of Syriac Basil, there is a tendency to describe the activity or function of the various celestial groups, or to give them further qualifying descriptions. God is lauded in the chants of angels and in the sounds of joy of the archangels (Cyril of Jerusalem); congregations of angels, and stations of archangels, and bands of chief-ones (Clement II); ardent bands of strong cherubim, terrible orders of holy seraphim

(Eustathius of Antioch); thrones who sing, dominions who exalt, powers who extol (Dioscorus of Alexandria I).

There is also a marked tendency towards what may be described as esoteric and ethereal angelology, with an emphasis on the image of fire and on non-matter. This speculation on the nature of angels is already to be found in the writings of Gregory of Nazianzen.²¹ It is explained at great length by Pseudo-Dionysius, particularly the element of fire:

I think, then, the similitude of fire denotes the likeness of the Heavenly Minds to God in the highest degree; ... It is both uncontrollable and invisible, self-subduing all things, and bringing under its own energy anything in which it may happen to be; ... 22

An expression of this thought is found in Syriac John Chrysostom:

For those who praise you are innumerable; infinite powers of light, the yoked cherubim, and seraphim glorifying, thousands and multitudes without number, myriads and companies without calculation. Extending rows of consuming fire. Marvellous powers of burning coal, ordered legions who stand firm; the chariot of the cherubim, the movements of wheels which are infinite; cohorts of archangels, troops of seraphim who by the sound of their wings move the threshold; a glorious sound of many voices which from the midst of the burning coals of fire is audible in its movements; thousand thousands who stand before you and myriad of myriads who glorify your Being; with one clear voice and one loving harmony, with sweet-song and ethereal tongue, they cry out the one to the other and raise their voices in eternal praise, calling and saying ...

In Gregory of Nazianzen we encounter intelligent spirits of immutable fire, and winged flames; Caelesthine includes fervent ardent congregations of flame, flames of fiery ardour, and intellectual spirits. Other images include fiery beings (Dionysius Bar Salibi, John Sabae), armies of fire (James of Sarug I), bands of legions of fire (Gregory of Nazianzen); substances made from fires which do not burn (Clement II) and the chariot of fire (Clement I). Dionysius the Areopagite lists forces of exalted ones from intelligence, radiant ones who are from

the perfect light, and speechless ones who from their silence unceasingly sing words of glory. Peter I gives 'companies of immaterial power'; John Bar Madani, 'simple substances and immaterial carbons from fire'; Philoxenus of Mabbourg II lists orders of fire and spirit, numerous flaming troops, principal substances, supernal orders, honourable and awesome persons of fire.

In Cyril of Jerusalem, Dionysius of Alexandria, Clement I and St. Ignatius, there is a concern to emphasise the sounds made by the heavenly company. Ignatius includes unceasing doxologies, sweet and pleasant ceteras, and unending celebrations. In some anaphoras there is also a stress on the non-fleshly and incorporeal nature of the agents of the praise - Ignatius, Dionysius the Areopagite, Caelestine of Rome, Dioscorus of Alexandria, and James of Serug II.

Two anaphoras, Clement I and St. Basil, mention the two honourable living creatures. In Basil they seem (as in Coptic Cyril) to be identified with the cherubim and seraphim. In Clement, however, they are the living creatures with four faces from Ezekiel.

A number of the anaphoras omit all reference to the cherubim and seraphim, such as Thomas the Apostle, Peter I and II, Dionysius Bar Salibi, John Sabae and Gregory John. Several omit the cherubim, such as Cyril of Jazirat, the Holy Roman Church, and Xystus. Many simply restate the description found in James - cherubim with many eyes, and six-winged seraphim. However, in line with the tendency to elaborate, these two classes of celestial being are also developed in some of the anaphoras.

The cherubim become 'many-eyed and abundantly wise' (Caelestine of Rome), 'with many eyes and swift movement' (Dionysius the Areopagite), 'armies of cherubim' (Clement I)'submissive cherubim' (John Maron), 'ardent bands of strong cherubim' (Eustathius of Antioch), and 'cherubim who bless in fear' (John Baradeus, St.John the Evangelist). Dioscorus of Alexandria I can describe them as 'yoked' (also Syriac Chrysostom), and James Edessa calls them the 'bearing cherubim'. The merkāvāh, the chariot, is also introduced in connection with the cherubim in Gregory of Nazianzen, Clement I, John Chrysostom, Dioscorus of Jazirat, Cyril of Hah and James of Serug. In Dioscorus of Jazirat the cherubim beat their wings.

A similar elaboration takes place with the seraphim. In Gregory of Nazianzen it is the seraphim who have many eyes; they are assiduously glorious' (Caelestine of Rome), 'blessed' (Holy Roman Church), 'formidable' (John Maron). In Severus they are 'endowed with knowledge, and trembling before your invisible and incomprehensible Godhead...' . Dionysius the Areopagite has them with joined wings and many feathers; they flap their wings in Eustathius of Antioch. For Dioscorus of Alexandria I they are from immaterial fire. According to Cyril of Hah, their place is at the footstool of God. They are not burnt up by God's devouring fire (Dionysius the Areopagite, Clement I and Timothy of Alexandria).

Merkāvāh echoes also occur in other ways. The galgal of Ezekiel are found in Clement II, Gregory of Nazianzen, John Chrysostom, James of Serug I and Cyriacus of Tagrit. Indeed, the latter actually describes the 'thrice holy' as 'the mystical

qeduṣṣah'. Although it is possible that this merkavāh element was the result of Jewish hekhalot influence, at this late date it could equally be accounted for by a combination of knowledge of the Pseudepigrapha such as Enoch, and the imagination of the individual authors.

(H) The immediate conclusion of these anaphoras is usually that of Syriac James - crying out, calling and saying. However, the description of the praise which the seraphim or all the heavenly beings recite varies considerably. They shout out psalms of everlasting glory (Gregory of Nazianzen); the hymn of victory occurs in several of these anaphoras; the praise is without ceasing and glorious in harmonic voice (John Bostra); it is 'in pure song which is cleansed from matter, in equal sound' (Dionysius the Areopagite); 'in pure voices' (Apostles II); 'in songs of delicate beauty' (Michael of Antioch); Peter I has:

...unceasingly extol with voices of jubilation and from returning, with effusion of understanding, and fear, and with wisdom, distinct varied sanctifications, voices extolling, calling out, shouting and saying ...

(I) The function of the sanctus also varies in this large family of anaphoras. In so far as James has a dominating influence, it is the hymn of all creation, or the hymn of the angelic hierarchy, or the seraphim. In such anaphoras we have a continuation of the functions found in James, Basil and Greek Chrysostom. However, in a number of anaphoras we find as in Greek Gregory of Nazianzen, a deliberate petition that the sanctus will be, or a statement that it is, also the praise of mankind/the church/the present worshippers. Thus, in

that of the Holy Roman Church we find the following supplication:

Make us worthy to acclaim, through supplication, and to say together with them ...

In Jacob Baradeus there is a blending of our voices with the praise of the heavenly host:

Blend also now our hymns and imperfect glories with the glories of the watchers and angels who unceasingly glorify you: And mix our songs and feeble psalms with virtuous songs of fires and spirits who praise you without intermission. And unite our weak sounds with the clear sounds of the cherubim who fearfully bless you. And mingle our wretched voices of sanctification with the sweet sanctifications of the seraphim who have six wings, who sanctify you thrice ...

Cyril of Hah explicitly unites the praise of the congregation with that of the seraphim:

And with them we also cry out the mystical qedussah and say and glorify ...

The note of unworthiness is expressed in John Bar Susa (John of Antioch) :

It is very becoming and incumbent to worship and glorify you always, yea, to worship you, because you make our feeble, poor worship to be included with that of the orders and armies of heaven, Lord.

The expression 'feeble, poor worship' is reminiscent of the thought in Addai and Mari, though here it occurs before the sanctus. Marutha of Tagrit prays:

And we also, weak and wretched, utter three-fold doxologies to your incomprehensible and infinite and inscrutable Divinity, worshipping and giving thanks and interceding with petitions so that our petitions and supplications may be joined with the doxologies of all the heavenly host.

And John Maron (influence of Sharar ?):

...and we also, Lord, in spite of our weaknesses and our sins, we are admitted by your grace to say with them ...

Here the idea is made explicit that the sanctus is now the praise

of the Church which, through grace, is admitted to join the angelic chorus.

(J) Of the many anaphoras considered in this section, many have their own peculiar features and phrases. In conclusion, attention is drawn to three in particular:

(1). Ignatius Bar Wahib utilises the second line of the sanctus in its opening oratio theologica:

You are the Lord of whom heaven and earth and all that is in them is full of your glory.

(2). Dioscorus of Jazirat includes what appears to be a deliberate echo of Jewish berakah formulae:

Holy creator of creatures: holy are you who bestows wisdom to children. Blessed is your honour from your habitation feared by all things: Blessed is your virtue, whose power is in all things ...

The angelology of the sanctus, together with the Jewish echo is continued in the post-sanctus:

Holy are you, holy are you: Blessed is your honour out of this place: holy are you three and one, who are blessed, sanctified and glorified by cherubim, seraphim and thrones; who are honoured, praised and exalted by virtues, powers and dominions; who are extolled, glorified and celebrated by principalities, archangels and angels.

Here Ezekiel 3:12 is used.

(3). The theme of the sanctus is continued also in the post-sanctus of John Maron:

Holy, holy, holy, are you, Father, Son and Holy Spirit; the voices of the seraphim proclaim, Lord, the holiness of your trinity, and the assemblies of the cherubim bless your hiddenness; the armies of angels praise your marvellous essence. Glory to you who honours the human race through grace, and mingles the voices of the earth with those of heaven.

All too often the vast number of Syriac anaphoras of the Jacobite and Maronite anaphoras are mentioned in passing, and

are simply classed as 'West Syrian' in structure, as though they were a homogeneous group. Although it is true that their basic inspiration seems to have been James, Basil and Greek Chrysostom, they in fact reflect a great diversity. The individual compilers have developed the sanctus in a number of ways, giving a rich diversity within a standard pattern. The 'mystical theology' of Pseudo-Dionysius has made its influence felt on some of the angelologies which in some instances are developed to an incredible length.

2. THE ARMENIAN ANAPHORAS

Although the Armenian tradition traces its Christian origin to the apostles Thaddeus and Bartholomew,²³ the great missionary of Armenia was St. Gregor Partev, or Gregory the Illuminator (c.240-332 CE), and probably by 301 CE Christianity was the prevailing religion in Armenia.²⁴ Gregory was from Caesarea in Cappadocia,²⁵ but the evidence suggests that some areas of Armenia were influenced by Greek-speaking Christianity, and others by Syriac-speaking Christianity. V.K.Sarkissian writes:

Up to the end of the fourth century the Christian worship was conducted in Armenia either in Greek or Syriac, according to the knowledge of the clergy and the area of influence of these two languages and cultures in Armenia. In fact, the expansion of Christianity into Armenia was the result of a twofold activity carried on simultaneously by Syrian missionaries from Edessa and Nisibis (S-W of Armenia) and by Greek missionaries from Cappadocia, namely from Caesarea, Sebastia and Melitene (N-W of Armenia). 26

Only in the fifth century, with the creation of an alphabet, could translations be made into Armenian, and new 'indigenous' compilations be made. Later Armenia was influenced by Byzantium, and later still by the Roman rite.²⁷

The Armenian Church today uses a liturgy with a single anaphora, attributed to St. Athanasius of Alexandria. According to Salaville, the rite is a compilation from the Greek St. James and Greek St. John Chrysostom, while A. A. King describes it as a local modification of St. Basil with Latin interpolations.²⁸ Regarding the anaphora, King is nearer the mark in that Byzantine Basil seems to have been a prime inspiration. However, the background is rather more complex than either Salaville or King imply, since the manuscripts indicate that at one time several anaphoras were in use in various parts of Armenia, representing both Greek and Syriac influence. The following anaphoras are found in translation:

St. John Chrysostom (Byzantine)

St. Basil (Byzantine)

St. James (Syriac)

St. Ignatius (Syriac)

The Roman canon (Latin)

In addition there are four other anaphoras:

St. Gregory the Illuminator.

St. Gregory of Nazianzen

St. Cyril of Alexandria

St. Isaac the Parthian.

Of these, Gregory the Illuminator seems to be a pre-Byzantine version of Basil, and A. Renoux has called it 'la vieille anaphore arménienne de S. Basile'.²⁹ If this really is associated with St. Gregory, it may indeed confirm that the texts of St. Basil do represent the early anaphora of Caesarea. Apart from the name,

Gregory of Nazianzen and Cyril of Alexandria have nothing in common with the Greek and Syriac anaphoras of those names, and together with Isaac (Sahak) seem to represent independent Armenian compilations.

In our consideration of the sanctus in this tradition, we shall consider Gregory the Illuminator, and the four distinct Armenian anaphoras - Athanasius, Gregory, Cyril and Isaac.³⁰ All reflect the Syro-Byzantine anaphoral structures and, as will be seen, seem to have been inspired mainly by St. Basil, though with possible influence from the other anaphoras which are translations.

A. Gregory the Illuminator

Since this seems to be a pre-Byzantine version of St. Basil, then like Basil, the sanctus forms part of the oratio theologica, praising God for his Being. After the mention of God's throne, the transition is made to the heavenly host and their chant. There are some differences between the manuscripts,³¹ though not of any great significance. There are some differences from the pre-Basil Egyptian and Byzantine versions, but often this seems to be mainly a matter of translation, and of no theological significance:³²

...for all things are your servants. To you angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, authorities, powers bow down; around you stand the cherubim, many-eyed, and six-winged seraphim, of which six wings of one and six wings of one, which cover with two wings their faces and with two wings cover their feet, and with two wings having flown, they cry out one to one, companion to companion, restless with the voice always ... (aloud) .. with the triumphant blessings which they sing, and praise, they cry and say ...

The order of the angelic beings is, interestingly, that of Byzantine Basil and Greek James rather than of Egyptian Basil and Syriac James.

B. The other 'indigenous' Armenian anaphoras

The opening praise leading to the sanctus of these four anaphoras is generally inspired by one or more aspects of St. Basil/ St. Gregory the Illuminator. With the exception of Athanasius they show an interest in the divine attributes, which are multiplied, and in the case of Isaac, the post-sanctus anthropological theme of Basil is developed in the pre-sanctus.

In Byzantine Basil, amidst a description of the action of God, we find the following divine attributes: without beginning, invisible, incomprehensible, infinite, unchangeable. In Greek Chrysostom: ineffable, inconceivable, invisible, incomprehensible, existing always. And in AC 8: unbegotten, without beginning, provider of all good things, without beginning, eternal vision, unbegotten hearing, untaught wisdom, first in nature. Whereas the Jacobite and Maronite anaphoras open with praise, and are then concerned with the various types of praise given to God, the Armenian anaphoras open with a list of divine attributes. Isaac has: Lord and Father of Truth, producer of creatures, provider and caretaker of men, fount of goodness, giver of uncorruption, bestower of felicities, vivifier, life-giver, greatly glorious Lord of glory, and of all exaltations above, producer of all, receiver of the total, complete protector of all, and maker of all visible and invisible things. A slightly less lengthy list is found in Cyril and Gregory. There is, therefore, a different emphasis from that of the Jacobite family, which seems to have taken James as its basic inspiration.

The context and function of the sanctus in these anaphoras fall into three categories:

(1) As part of the Oratio theologica

Following the pattern of Gregory the Illuminator, Gregory of Nazianzen uses the sanctus as the heavenly praise of the Being of God. After a list of divine attributes, the heavenly chant is introduced:

Truly worthy in fear, with faith, with holy heart and with glorification to bow down, heavenly God, uncreate, self-existing, ternary power, light unapproached, maker of light and of all creation visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly, and all sea creatures (Lit: fishes). Myriad troops of angels bless you, celestial powers, with spiritual song, cherubim and six-winged seraphim, who terrified in fear of the divinity of your glory, flapping with wings cover you on all sides and always stand with thrice-holy voices of holy speech, they say, call, cry and say (aloud) triumphant blessings saying, calling, crying out and saying ...

(2) As response to the redemption of mankind

In Athanasius the sanctus is recited by redeemed mankind together with the celestial host, as a result of God's salvation. The Father, by his immaterial and fellow creator Word 'removed the hindrance of the curse '. He 'made the Church his own people' and from the Virgin 'as a divine architect, framed a new work, making earth into heaven'. He became man for our salvation and 'granted to us to join the spiritual choirs of the inhabitants of heaven'.

Isaac is a much longer anaphora, and the oratio theologica develops into a rehearsal of creation and the Fall. While the themes have a parallel in the oratio theologica and post-sanctus of Basil and James, Isaac follows the pattern of AC 8 in placing all these before the sanctus. Whereas AC 8 tends to be rather pedestrian in its language, Isaac is more poetic:

Yet another firmament likewise, like some vault in flight, having spread out divinely in the air, and then he called it sky, wherein you commanded the luminaries, sun and moon's course uncertain, to be made straight, measures

of day and night, from them he taught men clearly to know the changes of times and seasons.

After recalling the rejection from the Orchard (Paradise), the prayer continues:

Although to some extent threatening fury, you counselled, being beneficent, yet again by reason of your kindness, you raised him to heavenly and infinite kingship. And now who is capable to say in word your overflow of kindness or to glory your divinity with praises and spiritual songs ? To whom angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, authorities, powers bow down, whom terrified, the cherubim bless, the seraphim murmur, because with terror, with fear, with two wings they cover their faces, afraid by the great power of the splendour of your light, and with two wings in flight with great fear they fill the orderly blessings with calling, they cry out with thoughtful theology and restlessly with voices one to another together with us saying (aloud) triumphant blessings, calling, crying out and saying ...

Once again we have the idea hinted at in Addai and Mari, and found in some of the Syrian anaphoras, that the restoration of mankind allows his participation now in the sanctus. The 'angelic' or eschatological status of the Christian is recognised in the prayer.

(3) In the context of petition to join the angels in this chant

The anaphora of Cyril opens with a long list of ascriptions of God - Beginningless God, uncreate, timeless, infinite, unknowable, unsearchable, greatness, measureless, eternal, permanent, ever-flowing, form without quality, deathless, fount of deathlessness, giver of good, holy Father. The Son and the Holy Spirit are then also given ascriptions. The prayer continues:

To you alone is due the thrice holy of the dominions and it is truly fit to send up in songs of glorification which you alone in the divine kind have wonderfully made heaven and earth and all that is in them, creation visible

and invisible. Because wholly ineffable in word, they glorify your glorified divinity with knowable and unknowable thought. Make worthy, Lord, by your mercy, our unworthiness according to the angel classes of blessing, to sing to you triumphant songs, which, terrified, in the burning irradiant light of your divinity, wing-covered, with fine turns they sing to you songs of holy speech ...

Here, as with Greek Gregory of Nazianzen and some Jacobite anaphoras, petition is made for worthiness to join in the sanctus.

In comparison with the longer Jacobite anaphoras, the angelology of these 'indigenous' Armenian anaphoras is very restrained. There is no attempt to elaborate on the functions of the various groups, other than in Isaac where the cherubim 'bless' and the seraphim 'murmur'. Gregory the Illuminator reproduces the list of Byzantine Basil; Isaac has the same categories, though alters the sequence slightly. Gregory of Nazianzen mentions only angels, powers, cherubim and seraphim, and Athanasius, inhabitants of heaven, spiritual choirs, seraphim and cherubim. Cyril mentions only angelic orders and dominions. The themes of God's light (fire) and the fear of the heavenly beings are mentioned, but again on a more restrained note than in the Jacobite anaphoras.

Other than Gregory of Nazianzen, the Armenian anaphoras have the usual Syro-Byzantine post-sanctus link; Gregory introduces the post-sanctus with, 'In the beginning, Creator most blessed and dwelling in holiness ...'.

Summary

In the Armenian anaphoras, in contrast to the Jacobite/Maronite prayers which begin with mention of the Trinity, and elaborate the praise of God, the tendency is to expand the divine attributes of God (the Father). Nevertheless, the sanctus is utilised in

the manner found in those anaphoras - as heavenly praise of God, as our praise, or with a petition that it may be our praise.

3. THE ETHIOPIC ANAPHORAS

The origins of Christianity in Ethiopia are obscure. Rufinus of Aquileia relates that Athanasius consecrated Frumentius and sent him to Ethiopia as a missionary.³³ Certainly the first origins seem to have been Egyptian, and this is reflected in the use of two anaphoras, that of the Apostles, and that of Our Lord Jesus Christ. The first is a version of the Egyptian Sinados or Church Order (Hippolytus), and the second is based on the Testamentum Domini. These may be dated fourth and fifth centuries respectively, at the earliest, and seem to be the 'original' Ethiopian anaphoras. However, other anaphoras came into existence. In his important study of this tradition, E.Hammerschmidt lists a further 18 anaphoras.³⁴ Not all of these anaphoras were in use everywhere in the Ethiopic Church. For example, the shorter St.Cyril which Hammerschmidt lists is found only in one manuscript, and St.Mark, a translation from the Coptic (Cyril), seems to be a very late translation, and its use does not seem to have been widespread.³⁵ There are clear signs of West Syrian influence in some of these prayers, and as in that tradition, we are dealing with obvious pseudonyms.

The 18 additional anaphoras are classed by Hammerschmidt in two groups:

1. Translations

In this group belong St.Basil, St.James, and St.Mark. More tentatively

Hammerschmidt also adds Gregory of Alexandria, Cyril I and II, which he regards as 'very independent' developments of Greek/Coptic counterparts, with the emphasis more on the 'independent' than on developments³⁶ - though even this seems somewhat generous. In addition, Hammerschmidt also suggests that the anaphora of the 318 Orthodox perhaps reflects a Greek origin, at least in the epiklesis, and James of Serug and Dioscorus as having foreign texts as their models.³⁷

2. Anaphoras which are indigenous Ethiopic compositions

In this group belong Athanasius, Epiphanius, Gregory of Armenia, Mary Gregory (and its alternative), John the Evangelist, John Chrysostom, Mary Cyriacos, and Mary, with also the possibility of Gregory (Hosanna), Cyril I and II, the 318 Orthodox and Dioscorus.³⁸ Of these, Athanasius is distinguished on account of its personification of the Sabbath, an Ethiopian feature which , Hammerschmidt suggested, was perhaps borrowed from the Falashas;³⁹ and Mary Gregory is rhymed, which suggests a late date of composition.⁴⁰

Although Hammerschmidt offers this grouping, he does not offer any precise dating; indeed, there seems to be no clear guide for attempting such dating, other than he notes that the anaphora of Mary was in use by the fifteenth century.⁴¹ He also observed that Mary Cyriacos reflects a time when Islam was a threat to the Ethiopian Church.⁴² He urged the need for a great deal of comparison with other Ethiopian literature, including critical texts of the Bible.⁴³

It was from a comparison with other Ethiopian literature that

a somewhat controversial suggestion has been made more recently by Getatchew Haile.⁴⁴ He suggests that in the writings of Emperor Zar'a Ya'Eqob (1434-1468 CE), in particular in MasEhafa bErhan, MasEhafa milad and Ta'ammEra Maryam, we find evidence of religious controversy, particularly over the Trinity. The dissidents composed their own liturgical books, including anaphoras based on what they believed about the Trinity, and the Church may have responded in the same way by composing anaphoras against dissident doctrine.⁴⁵ Haile examines some readings in Vat.Mss.15 and 18 of Mary Cyriacos and the 318 Orthodox, and finds expressed in them the Trinitarian understanding of the dissidents. Abba Giyorgis was approached to compose anaphoras against the dissidents, and Haile suggests that the anaphora of Athanasius was one of his compositions. Until this time, so Haile suggests, only the anaphora of the Apostles and the anaphora of Our Lord Jesus Christ were recognised by the Ethiopic Church. Some of the new compositions of the Church were never accepted, and went into oblivion, such as that of Mary.⁴⁶ Fifteen anaphoras (Hammerschmidt's category 2-), therefore, are seen as creations of the fifteenth century religious controversies. Later, dissidents and Churchmen were brought together against outside threats, and the dissident anaphoras were accepted, and purged of their dissident theology - hence the change in the text of Mary Cyriacos and 318 Orthodox in Vat.Ms.16, which gives the present readings of those anaphoras.

Haile's view seems to overlook the fact that while this may account for some of the indigenous anaphoras, it does not account for the Syro-Byzantine and Greek influence on some of the other

anaphoras, which suggests a date or dates c.7th - 11th centuries CE. However, whether or not the anaphoras which are pure Geez creations are the result of religious dispute, Haile is probably correct in his view that they belong to the second millennium, and quite possibly as late as the fifteenth century CE.

In what is rather an understatement, Bouley observes:

The later Ethiopian anaphoras display a considerable amount of structural vagueness: traditional parts of the anaphora may practically disappear, or the order of parts may be arranged differently from one anaphora to another. 47

'Freedom' is a keynote in the Ethiopic anaphoras. Some show a Syro-Byzantine pattern, others reflect the Egyptian pattern, and still others have a quite independent arrangement. For example, Mary Cyriacos is in part addressed to the Virgin Mary, and has the Nicene Creed within it, and in the 318 Orthodox, the dialogue which normally opens an anaphora occurs within the prayer.

The sanctus occurs - as one would expect - in the anaphoras of Basil, James and Mark; they are translations, and no change of function has taken place.

Of the other anaphoras, it is not absolutely clear whether all contain a sanctus. The reason is that the manuscripts often omit the sanctus, or its diaconal introduction, but this itself does not mean that the sanctus was not inserted at some point when the anaphora was recited. Thus in Harden's version of Our Lord Jesus Christ, there is no sanctus, but in Mercer's text there is. Hammerschmidt suggested that in Harden's manuscript it was omitted as something self-evident, and should come (as in Mercer's and the version of Daoud-Hazen) after the deacon's

introduction 'Answer ye', between 'prepared for Thee a holy people' and 'He stretched forth His hands to the passion',⁴⁸ very similar to that of the Apostles. It should be noted that in the anaphora of Our Lord Jesus Christ, an adaptation of Rev.4:8 occurs in the opening dialogue:

Priest: That which is holy 'for' the holy.

People: Holy,holy,holy, O Lord, God of gods, who wast and art for ever in heaven and earth.

In Dioscorus the sanctus is also missing from the text. In Harden's translation we find:

By the devil was He tempted; by the power of His Godhead
He destroyed the chiefs of darkness.

The deacon saith: Answer ye.

The priest saith: Holy,holy,holy is God in his Trinity.

Though He was King, He showed His humility as s servant. 49

Following Rodwell's translation, where another 'Answer ye' follows the words 'as a servant', Hammerschmidt suggested that the sanctus followed this.⁵⁰ However, since 'Holy,holy,holy, is God in His Trinity' seems to reflect the Syro-Byzantine pick-up from the sanctus, it would seem that a sanctus was inserted between 'Answer ye' and 'Holy,holy,holy is God in His Trinity', as in Daoud-Hazen.⁵¹ Harden suggested that the sanctus was missing from Epiphanius,⁵² but it is in Euringer's translation, and in that of Daoud-Hazen.⁵³ Both Harden and Hammerschmidt agree that it is missing from the 318 Orthodox, but it is present in the text of Daoud-Hazen.⁵⁴

The sanctus in the anaphora of the Apostles has already been considered in another context.⁵⁵ In comparison with the Apostolic Tradition, it is an insertion, and has no proper context. This is also true of Our Lord Jesus Christ; and it has been given no logical context in Dioscorus and the 318 Orthodox.

This is quite remarkable in the latter, since elsewhere in the anaphora there are references to the throne of God and to angels.

Thus:

No one, thinking deeply, can understand his nature, though he ascendeth to heaven and goeth beyond the lords and meeteth with the four living creatures, full of eyes, whose bodies are light, and from whose mouths comes out the likeness of flaming fire; again, though he descendeth down to earth and goeth beyond the sea, the wind and the fire; again, though he goeth out thence to search upon the right hand and the left, setting his thought on high and spreading it abroad. 56

His throne is compassed by fire and his abode is enveloped by water, and round the roof of his house hang drops of water which do not fall. Flashes of light go out from his throne, within it is like blazing fire, in it there is great light like the winter rainbow, round it there is lightning. At the sides of that throne there are four animals as if they carry on their heads the large throne which is like the white snow. Round about that throne there are twenty-four priests; ... 57

Later the anaphora mentions the angels and archangels who prostrate themselves before the Lord, and the seraphim and cherubim who shout and say 'Holy God, holy mighty, holy living, immortal, who yet died for the love of man' - a version of the liturgical trisagion which in the Eastern rites occurs outside the anaphora.

The 318 Orthodox anaphora (as also Epiphanius) makes great use of Ezechiel 1, Revelation and Ethiopic Enoch. However, these almost hekhalot-type passages have not been used to give the sanctus a context. The conclusion would seem to be that when these anaphoras were composed, the sanctus was a congregational chant which came somewhere, but a logical introduction to it was not necessary.

The lack of any set pattern to the Ethiopic anaphoras results in at least three different positions for the sanctus:

1. In the Oratio theologica

As in the majority of Syro-Byzantine anaphoras, the sanctus is used as a response to God for himself, his Being. This is so in John the Evangelist and Mary Cyriacos (addressed to the Trinity), Gregory of Armenia (addressed to God's Name), and St.Cyril I and II, Epiphanius and, without any logical introduction, 318 Orthodox (God the Creator). In Epiphanius, after a lengthy description of creation, in language reminiscent of the books of Enoch and Jubilees (both part of the Ethiopic Old Testament canon), the sanctus is introduced thus:

He alone putteth on the power of the highest heaven and is adorned with glory and honour. The fiery cherubim and the seraphim dressed in light hallow him with ceaseless words and a mouth which does not keep silent and a tongue which does not tire; and all say together with one voice answering: Holy, holy, holy, perfect Lord of hosts, heaven and earth are full of the holiness of your glory.

Deacon: Answer ye

People: Holy, ... 58

2. In the Oratio christologica

This is most obvious in St. John Chrysostom, where after praise of God's essence, his work of mercy in his Son is rehearsed:

He became perfect man without sin and He was manifested as a servant, but He wrought as God. Even as he bare witness be ye preachers of His Gospel.

The deacon saith: Let us attend.

By His Father He was glorified and by His angels adored and by man praised and by Himself was He sanctified, and heaven and earth are full of the holiness of His glory.

The deacon saith: Answer ye.

Never, then, let us cease in our hearts to utter the holiness of His glory, and let us cry, saying:

The people say: Holy, ... 59

In James of Serug the sanctus is again concerned with the Son:

How great is the majesty and the strength and the patience,
which (is) with might, of Thy Son.

The deacon saith: We are attending.

Him thy Beloved the angels worship and the archangels, ten
thousand times ten thousand, and every name that is named;
the hosts of Michael by their tribes, and the hosts of
Gabriel by their companies, the cherubim in their majesty,
and the seraphim in their holiness, and all the hosts
of angels by their rank give praise to God whom the
saints extol with glory.

Let us, too, say together with them ... 60

It is within the christological section of the anaphora that
the sanctus occurs also in Dioscorus and Gregory of Alexandria.

In neither of these is there an angelological introduction.

Hammerschmidt actually states that it is missing from the latter.⁶¹

He is correct that there is not a normal (compared with other
traditions) introduction, but nevertheless it is introduced
by the Ascension:

and he rose on the third day, and ascended in glory to heaven.

The deacon saith: Answer ye.

(People: Holy, ...)

He covered the heaven with his beauty, He filled the earth
with His glory ... 62

The sanctus is intruded into the christological sections of the
Apostles and Our Lord Jesus Christ.

3. In the Oratio anthropologica

This is the position of the sanctus in the anaphora of St. Athanasius.

This is a strange anaphora, and includes a personification of
the Sabbath; since the Book of Jubilees is canonical scripture
in the Ethiopic Church, this is probably the inspiration rather
than the Falashas as Hammerschmidt suggested. The sanctus occurs
in the section dealing with the creation of Man, which mentions
Adam and Eve. After stating that Christian Man has three births
- baptism, the body and blood of Christ, and the remission of sins -

the sanctus is introduced in the following manner:

And let all of us in purity wash our bodies in pure water and be in the likeness of the angels who glorify God with a voice of praise. In their several majesties, ranks, hosts, names and numbers, some encircle and some surround and some glorify - having each six-wings thus they say, Holy, holy, holy, perfect Lord of Hosts, heaven and earth are full of the holiness of your glory.

And we also say, together with them 63

Here we find ideas similar to those expressed in different ways in Addai and Mari, Greek/Coptic Gregory of Nazianzen, and Theodore the Interpreter, that the redeemed community has, through Christ, become angel-like, and can join in with the song of the seraphim. Here the sanctus is sung to God because man has been born again by God's redemption.

The form of the introduction of the sanctus - where there is one - also presents us with a variety. That inserted into the Apostles is modelled loosely upon the Egyptian form, in that it includes the honourable creatures, though they are identified with the cherubim and the seraphim,⁶⁴ and has the sanctus first recited by the priest, and then by the people; and the post-sanctus picks up on 'full of the holiness of your glory'. Also, the benedictus is absent, though it occurs in the Apostles in the epiklesis. Missing, however, is the use of Ephesians 1:21 as an introduction.

Several of the anaphoras reflect the Egyptian practice of the priest reciting the sanctus which grammatically belongs to the heavenly host, and then the people reciting it. Hammerschmidt notes that in Gregory of Armenia an inversion has taken place, with the introduction of the people's sanctus coming first,

though the sanctus itself is never actually recited at that point:⁶⁵

We give you thanks, O Lord; we glorify you and praise you. Blessed is your name and we too bless you ; praised is your name and we too praise you. Majestic are you above the majestic; greatness beyond utterance is in you. Glorious are you and we glorify you, who are above the holy ones and wonderful is your glory. Above myriads of myriads of angels you are sanctified, and above the watchers who sleep not you are glorified; and above the threescore majestic ones who approach unto you; waves of fire flee that they approach not unto you; and at the coals of fire what issue from your mouth they are afraid and are troubled. All together with one voice sanctify and glorify you. So we too your humble servants, with hands outstretched and raised, making the sign of your cross to glorify you and praise you; and the seraphim and the cherubim also that have each six wings.

The deacon says: You who sit (arise)

All together with one voice sanctify you and praise you one to another, each to his fellow, and say, Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Hosts...

The deacon says: Answer ye.

(Sanctus ?)

Our Lord who was hidden in a veil ... 66

Hammerschmidt is probably right when he says 'The text suggests that the "composer" knew both kinds of introductions or at least the combination already existing and used it freely'.⁶⁷

Four of the anaphoras have a very full angelology - John the Evangelist, James of Serug, Gregory of Armenia and Cyril - of the type encountered in the later Syro-Byzantine prayers. It is perhaps significant that John the Evangelist, James of Serug and Cyril all have a typical Syro-Byzantine post-sanctus form. In John the Evangelist we find lofty ones each in his order, angels in rank, watchers in their brightness, cherubim in their majesty, and seraphim in their holiness. In Cyril, seraphim, cherubim, angels according to their hosts, watchers according to their orders, chiefs of the watchers according to their rank, angels of fire and spiritual ones. Of particular note is the mention of the hosts of Michael and of Gabriel in James of Serug.

We have already noted the Egyptian flavour of the anaphora of the Apostles interpolated sanctus; the celestial beings include those of Dan.7:10, holy angels and archangels, and the honourable creatures who are the cherubim and seraphim. On the whole, however, the majority of the anaphoras are marked by a distinct lack of angelology introducing the sanctus. Athanasius mentions angels, majesties, ranks and hosts; John Chrysostom mentions angels; Mary Cyriacos, the many eyed cherubim and the six winged seraphim; Epiphanius, fiery cherubim and seraphim in light. No angelology introduces the sanctus in Our Lord Jesus Christ, Gregory of Alexandria and Dioscorus.

Summary

Although we have noted some Egyptian elements in the Ethiopic anaphoras, on the whole there is no attempt to follow that pattern completely. The sanctus in Ethiopia is not part of the intercessory material, nor does it lead into an epiklesis. Egyptian influence is most apparent in the Apostles. On the whole it is Syro-Byzantine influence which dominates, though there has been very free adaptation. The sanctus is sometimes concerned with God himself, sometimes with the work of the Son, and in Athanasius, for the redemption of man who can become like the angels.

4. SOME WESTERN DEVELOPMENTS

As long as the Gallican and Mozarabic rites persisted, the West continued to have a variety of introductions to the sanctus alongside the four Roman types of introduction. These simply perpetuated the formulae which we have already encountered in those

traditions. Thus in certain of the Spanish inlatio s which can be ascribed to an author:

In cena Domini (St.Eugene of Toledo 646-657)⁶⁸

His igitur tremebundi iudicis, ad hoc tibi, quae tua sunt ingerimus, ut solius misericordie tuae fiducia freti, sacrificiorum tuorum suffragia mereamur, cum caelestibus sine cessatione dicentes: sanctus ...

In this inlatio the sanctus is introduced very abruptly. Likewise the inlatio for the Ascension attributed to Ildephonse of Toledo (657-667), after a rehearsal of salvation history, introduced the sanctus with:⁶⁹

cui merito omnes angeli et archangeli, throni et dominationes, non cessant clamare atque ita dicere: sanctus ...

The 7th century fragment of Bruyne in North France is a little more ambitious in its contestatio. It mentions Rafael, Racuel, Michael, Rumiel, Sultyel and Danaiel(sic), and leads to:

et cum viginti et quattuor senioribus sedentibus in celo et cum quattuor animalibus huna voci coobolancia et dicen dicenciam coninam et dicant: sanctus, ... 70

Here the Book of Revelation has been an inspiration.

During the eighth century the Gallican rite was replaced by the Roman rite, and the Spanish rite was suppressed (other than in Toledo Cathedral) in the eleventh century,⁷¹ thus leaving the West with only the one Roman anaphora with its four introductions to the sanctus. The canon of the mass in the Stowe missal witnesses to the fusion of Gallican and Roman elements, though the Roman predominate. Interestingly, the Stowe sanctus is an example of the fusion or conflation. The introduction in the preface is normative, but the form of the sanctus itself has been expanded:

Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, Dominus Deus sabaoth. Pleni sunt caeli et universa terra gloria tua. Hosanna in excelsis. Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini. Hosanna in excelsis.

Benedictus qui venit de caelis, ut conversaretur in terris,
homo factus est, ut delicta carnis deleret, hostia factus
est, ut per passionem suam vitam aeternam credentibus daret:
per Dominum. Te igitur... 72

F.E. Brightman pointed out that this extended benedictus is really a Gallican post-sanctus which has been added on. Also, universa, perhaps suggested by the biblical version of Isaiah 6:3, has been inserted.⁷³

Although the introduction to the sanctus was standardised in the West by the adoption of the Roman rite, nevertheless, the text of the sanctus was at times expanded. A popular addition of feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary was, instead of 'Blessed is He who comes...', 'Blessed is the Son of Mary who comes ...'.⁷⁴ Another development was the use of Greek texts and their chants, which included the sanctus.⁷⁵

A far more dramatic development in the West was by means of tropes. These were textual and/or musical additions to the plainchant, though the precise definition has been disputed.⁷⁶ Tropes seem to have made their appearance about eighty years after the Gregorian repertoire, in the middle of the ninth century. Four developments associated with tropes can be delineated:

- (1) Melismas - first supplementing the jubilia of the Alleluia, and then the Gradual and Offertory.
- (2) Prosulas - the filling in with words, such as in the Hosanna of the sanctus. (Historically, Hosanna belongs to benedictus, of course)
- (3) Sequences.
- (4) Towards the end of the ninth century, the interpolation or farsing of texts of the Ordinary of the mass - kyries, Gloria, sanctus and Agnus Dei. ⁷⁷

However, according to the definition of Paul Evans, only the fourth category can be termed tropes.⁷⁸

By means of 'interpolation' and 'substitution' tropes⁷⁹, the Ordinary of the mass could be made into propers for each feast. Although at one time it was argued that the development of tropes centered on the monasteries of St.Gall in Switzerland and St.Martial in Southern France, Eugenio Costa stresses that it is impossible to trace the development to a particular school or place: France, Aquitaine, the Rhine region, South Germany, North and South Italy, and later, Scandinavia, constitute the ground where the techniques emerge.⁸⁰

Some sanctus tropes are contained in the collection Analecta Hymnica⁸¹, but as yet there is no critical text or thorough study of the texts. Dr.Gundilla Iversen of Stockholm is editing a text in the series Corpus Troporum, and Dr.Charles Atkinson of Ohio University is, at the time of writing, working on the sanctus melodies for the series Monumenta Monodica Medii Aevi.

The sanctus tropes show a variety of ways of developing the standard text. In some cases they take the form of hymns using the sanctus as a refrain; a few form an introduction to the sanctus text; the majority make additions after each 'Holy', and between 'gloria tua' and 'Hosanna'. Thus:

(a) Sanctus O quam dulciter⁸²

O how sweetly
the voices resound there
when all the Holy Ones
sing the praises of God
saying: sanctus ...

Thus we also praise
the Lord on earth
whom the holy angels
praise in the highest
saying: sanctus ...

You who alone make
 clean from unclean
 cleanse us, as long as we are in the world
 because you alone are: sanctus ...

Sanctus O Lux indeficiens ⁸³

O unfailing light
 Peace and also most High Trinity
 to you the virgin choirs are always
 proclaiming saying:
 Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus
 Domine Deus Sabaoth.

O how precious are we
 the complex heavenly orders
 who aglow with ardour
 proclaim in the highest
 Pleni sunt caeli et terra
 gloria tua: H.i.excelsis

O Blessed God, the most illustrious ranks, rejoicing
 now bless you, who rule the Pole stars
 Benedictus qui venit in nomine P,
 Hosanna in excelsis.

(b) Sanctus Deus omnipotens ⁸⁴

Holy God, Omnipotent Father; Holy and only-begotten
 Son of God.
 Also the Holy Spirit, paraclete, the will of both.
 Glory to the one God, Hosanna to God in
 the highest, let us all say:
 Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus ...

(c) Sanctus Adonai athanatos ⁸⁵

Sanctus, Adonai, immortal, kyrios
 Sanctus, Alpha and Omega, God and Man
 Sanctus, Original Virtue
 Eternal Father
 Deity, Humanity
 Benignity, Sanctity.

Dominus Deus Sabaoth - gloria tua; Hosanna in excelsis.
 O God the Father, who is,
 Send dew on Sion
 which descended from Herman
 Into the pool of Heshbon.

Sanctus Pater cuncta creans ⁸⁶

Sanctus, Father causing all things
 Sanctus, Life-giving Son
 Sanctus, Sanctifying Spirit
 Dominus Deus - gloria tua
 One Divinity
 Of equal glory.

Hosanna in excelsis.
 Of whom are all things
 in heaven and earth
 air and sea.

Benedictus - nomine Domine
 Hear the prayers
 Of your humble people
 Hosanna in excelsis.

Costa noted that the second part of the sanctus was the object of a particular elaboration, analogous to the prosulae ad Regnum of the Gloria:

One first placed the prosulas on the melismas corresponding to (Hosann-) a, or to (ex) cel (sis); then one added the verbo-melodics interpolated between Hosanna and excelsis. The musical composition then established itself a tendency to separate itself from the sanctus, becoming a separate piece, of definite and sealed form. 87

Costa gives the Hosanna for the Trinity as an example: ⁸⁸

1. Hosanna

- | | |
|--|---|
| 2a. Trinitas,
Unitas
Deitas
Superna; | 2b. Maiestas,
Potestas,
Claritas
aeterna. |
| 3a. Lapis, mons,
Petra, fons,
Flumen, pons,
Semita; | 3b. Sol, lumen,
Et numen
Cacumen
Et vita. |
| 4a. Tu sator,
Creator,
Amator,
Redemptor,
Salvator,
Et vitae ianua; | 4b. Tu nitor
Et decor,
Tu candor,
Tu splendor
Et odor,
Quo vivunt mortua. |
| 5a. Tu vertex
Et apex,
Regnum rex,
Legum rex,
Et iudex,
Tu laus angelica; | 5b. Quem laudant,
Adorant,
Cui cantant,
Quem clamant,
Quem amant
Agmina caelica. |

6a. Tu theos,
 Tu heros,
 Dive flos,
 Vive ros,
 Rege nos,
 Salva nos,
 Perduc nos
 Ad thronos
 Superos
 Et vitae gaudia;

6b. Tu Deus,
 Tu pius,
 Tu iustus
 Et verus,
 Tu sanctus
 Et bonus
 Tu rectus
 et summus
 Dominus:
 Tibi sit gloria.

7. In excelsis

It is possible to regard these developments as an intrusion and a digression, though Guilo Cattin denies that they represent a 'malignant growth', but rather, 'the most meaningful response made by the musical and liturgical genius of new peoples in a new era'.⁸⁹ Certainly within the confines of a single fixed canon, the sanctus tropes were in one sense a Western counterpart to the more elaborate material found in some of the Syriac Jacobite and Ethiopic anaphoras. Nevertheless, it also reflects an attitude which regarded the sanctus as simply a chant not necessarily tied to a particular anaphora's logic. The development of tropes coincides with the tendency found in missals to regard the canon as beginning with Te igitur, and isolating the sursum corda, preface, sanctus and benedictus as a pre-anaphoral unit. This in turn would influence the Reformation handling of the sanctus; oddly enough, although the era of tropes was over by the time of the Reformation (the development reached a peak in the thirteenth century, and declined thereafter) some newer forms of sanctus tropes survived in one Reformation tradition to replace the liturgical sanctus itself.⁹⁰

NOTES - CHAPTER 7

1. Alphonse Raes, Anaphorae Syriacae, Vol.I.Fasc.1 (Rome 1939), xxxix - xlii.
2. A.V86bus, 'Discovery of the Anaphora by Johannan of Qartamin', EL 90 (1976), 197-200.
3. E.Renaudot, Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio, Vol.II (reprint, Farnborough 1970).
4. Michael Hayek, Liturgie Maronite. Histoire et textes eucharistiques, (Paris 1964).
5. H.Fuchs, Die Anaphora des monophysitischen Patriarchen Johannan I (Münster in Westf. 1926), xxxii.
6. Ibid., xliii
7. Ibid., xliv
8. Ibid., 1.
9. Ibid., lii
10. Ibid., lxi
11. Ibid., lxvii.
12. Ibid., lxxi.
13. But see J.Fenwick, Thesis cited, for the view that the Syriac represents an intermediate version.
14. Voobus,art.cit.,199.
15. Ibid., xliii ff.
16. K.W.Stevenson, op.cit.
17. See chapter 5.
18. John Fenwick, 'Significance of similarities in the Anaphoral Intercession Sequence in the Coptic Anaphora of St.Basil and other Ancient Liturgies', in Studia Patristica, forthcoming. (Communication read to the Oxford Patristic Conference,1983)
19. The idea that man is the 'stuff' of the universe become conscious is commonplace in modern scientific textbooks. See chapter 11.
20. On Divine Names, 4:7.
21. Oration 28:31;38:9.
22. On the Celestial Hierarchy, 15:2

23. M.Ormanian, The Church of Armenia (London 1955), 3.
24. Ibid., 8; G.Winkler, Das Armenische Initiationsrituale (Rome 1982), 60ff.
25. Ormanian, 8; Winkler, 61.
26. V.K.Sarkissian, A Brief Introduction to Armenian Christian Literature (London 1960),14 note 7.
27. Ibid.; A.Atiya, A History of Eastern Christianity (London 1968), 317; G.Winkler, 'The Political Influence of the Holy See on Armenia and its Liturgy (XI - XIV centuries) in ed.J.Vellian, The Romanization Tendency (Kottayam 1975), 110-125.
28. S.Salaville, Introduction to the Study of Eastern Liturgies, (London 1958),16; A.A.King,The Rites of Eastern Christendom, Vol.2 (Rome 1948), 588.
29. A.Renoux, 'L'Anaphore Arménienne De Saint Gregoire L'Illuminateur', Eucharisties d'Orient et d'Occident II (Paris 1970), 83-108, 84.
30. Texts in: Y.Catergian and P.J.Dashian, Die Liturgies bei den Armenien, Fünfzehn texte und untersuchungen (Wien 1897).
31. Renoux, art.cit.
32. I am indebted to Professor Sir Harold Bailey of Cambridge who has kindly provided a literal translation of Gregory the Illuminator, Isaac, Gregory of Nazianzen and Cyril of Alexandria from Catergian-Dashian. For Athanasius I have used the ET in Brightman.
33. J.M.Harden, The Anaphoras of the Ethiopic Liturgy (London 1928) 1; Rufinus, Hist.Eccl. I.ix.
34. Ernest Hammerschmidt, Studies in the Ethiopic Anaphoras. Three of these - Our Lady by Gregory and its alternative, and shorter Cyril - have not been published.
35. Hammerschmidt, 44.
36. Ibid., 45.
37. Ibid., 46-7.
38. Ibid., 47ff.
39. Ibid., 82.
40. Ibid., 49.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid., 80.
43. Ibid., 165-6.

44. G.Haile, 'Religious Controversies and the Growth of Ethiopic Literature in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries', OC 4th series 65(1981), 102-136.
45. Ibid., 116.
46. Ibid., 129.
47. Bouley, op.cit., 228.
48. Harden, op.cit., 63; Hammerschmidt, 74; Mercer, Journal of the Society of Oriental Research 1 (1917), 27; M.Daoud and H.E.Blatta Marsie Hazen, The Liturgy of the Ethiopian Church , 102.
49. Harden, 114.
50. Hammerschmidt, 94
51. Daoud-Hazen, 296.
52. Harden, 16.
53. S.Euringer, OC 3,1(1926/7), 98-142; Daoud-Hazen, 237.
54. Harden, 16; Hammerschmidt, 56,86; Daoud-Hazen,155.
55. See chapter 4.
56. Daoud-Hazen, 155-6.
57. Ibid., 160.
58. Ibid., 237 (adapted)
59. Harden, 88.
60. Ibid., 117-8.
61. Hammerschmidt, 56.
62. Harden, 110
63. Ibid.,97 (adapted)
64. Harden, 34; Daoud-Hazen,72, omit cherubim and seraphim, and simply qualify 'honourable creatures (beasts)'with'each with six wings'.
65. Hammerschmidt, 90.
66. Harden, 127.
67. Hammerschmidt, 90.
68. Prex Eucharistica, 507-8.
69. Ibid.,509-10.

70. L.C.Mohlberg, Das Fragment de Bruyne, Missale Gallicanum vetus, (Rome 1958), 97.
71. Bouley, op.cit., 177ff.
72. B.MacCarthy, On the Stowe Missal, TRIA 27(1886), 207.
73. In ed.W.K.Lowther Clarke, Liturgy and Worship (London 1932), 338.
74. E.g. The Sarum and York missals.
75. Kenneth Levy, 'The Byzantine Sanctus and its Modal Tradition in East and West', in Annales Musicologiques VI (1958-63), 7-67; M.Hugo, 'La tradition occidentale des melodies byzantines du Sanctus', in ed.F.Tack, Der kultische Gesang der abendlandische Kirche, aus Anlass des 75.Geburtstages von D.Johner (Koln 1950), 40-46.
76. Paul Evans, 'Some Reflections on the Origin of the Trope', in Journal of the American Musicological Society 14(1961), 119-30; Richard L.Crocker, 'The Troping Hypothesis', in Musical Quarterly 52(1966), 183-203.
77. E.Costa, Tropes et séquences dans le cadre de la vie liturgique au moyen-âge, Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae Subsidia 17 (Rome 1979), 7-10.
78. Art.cit., 121.
79. For these terms used by Jacques Chailley, see Guilio Cattin, Music of the Middle Ages I (London 1984), 110ff.
80. Costa, op.cit., 6ff; W.H.Frere, The Winchester Troper (London 1894), viii.
81. Analecta Hymnica Medii aeri, ed C.Blume and H.M.Bannister, Vol.47 (Leipzig 1905) Cited as A.H.
82. A.H. 320
83. A.H. 303
84. New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians (London 1980), 181-2.
85. A.H. 321.
86. Ibid.
87. Costa, op.cit., 53.
88. Ibid
89. Cattin, op.cit., 113.
90. In Denmark and, apparently, Sweden. See below, Chapter 8.

CHAPTER 8

THE REFORMERS AND THE SANCTUS

The treatment of the sanctus by the sixteenth century Reformers must be seen within a twofold context. First, in considering the development of tropes, it was noted that medieval manuscripts regarded the canon as beginning with Te igitur, and the sursum corda, preface, sanctus and benedictus were regarded as a separate preliminary unit.¹ The result was that the sanctus and benedictus could be regarded as congregational and choir items. The Reformers never had reason to question this understanding, and their target was the canon of the mass, and not harmless chants. The sanctus therefore was an item which could either remain because it was of no doctrinal consequence, or it could be replaced by something more useful and fitting.

The second factor is that the foundation rites of the Reformation were the writings and recommendations of Martin Luther, and the rites prepared in Switzerland by Zwingli and Oecolampadius. This is not to deny the individual contributions by Bucer at Strasbourg, Calvin at Geneva, or Cranmer in England. However, they drew upon the experience and precedents set by the earlier Reformers.

1. LUTHERAN PRECURSORS

In his early writings such as the Babylonian Captivity of the Church, 1520, The Misuse of the Mass, 1520 and Receiving Both kinds, 1522, Luther suggested that since the stumbling block in the mass was the canon, and anything which spoke of sacrifice, then priests should simply omit anything which referred to sacrifice.² The entire canon could be omitted and replaced with the words of

institution, or a prayer shorn of any hint of offering. Thus, the sursum corda-preface-sanctus unit could remain intact, though not all proper prefaces were doctrinally acceptable. Much to Luther's annoyance, some German Reformers put his advice into practice.

(A) During Luther's absence from Wittenberg in 1522, Karlstadt acted upon his advice in Ordnung der Stadt Wittenberg. The mass was in Latin still, and permission was given for the introit, kyrie, Gloria, collect, Epistle, Gradual, creed, offertory, preface and sanctus with variable de tempore prefaces.³ After the sanctus the words of institution alone follow, the entire canon being omitted. The isolation of the sanctus from what followed is thus made more pronounced.

(B) Two German vernacular reforms, again anticipating Luther, were composed by Kasper Kantz at Nordlingen, 1522, and Thomas Muntzer at Alstadt, 1524. Kantz gave the sursum corda, common preface and the following sanctus and benedictus:

Heyliger, heyliger, heyliger herre Gott Sabaoth; voll
seind hymmel und erd deiner herlichkeit. Osanna in den
hochsten, gebenedent sen, der da kompt in dem namen des
herren. Gluck und heyl in den hochsten. 4

Muntzer published an outline of his Reformed mass in 1523, retaining sursum corda, preface and sanctus.⁵ In his 1524 text he gave the following preface and sanctus:

Truly it is meet and right and it is salutary that we should
always and everywhere give you thanks, Lord, O holy Father,
almighty, everlasting God. Because you conceived your holy
manhood from the Virgin Mary by the overshadowing of the
Holy Spirit, which she brought forth with chastity intact,
the eternal Light of the world, Jesus Christ our Lord.
Through whom the angels praise your majesty, and the

ruling angels honour you; the angels of power are themselves seized with fear. With them the heavens and the heavenly virtues and the holy seraphim praise you unceasingly with one joyful voice. Grant us, O Lord, that our voice may ring out with theirs, so that we may praise you always in true confession, saying:

Heilger, heilger, heilger herre gott Sabaoth. Himmel und erde seint erfullet mit deinem preise. Ozianna in dem hochsten. Gesegnet sei, der do kumpt im namen des herren. Ozianna in den hochsten. 6

Prefaces were also provided for the Passion, Christmas, Easter and Whitsun. Although Kantz had a prayer of consecration which included the institution narrative, and Muntzer had an introduction to the narrative, in both instances there was no obvious link with the sanctus, and as in Karlstadt's order, it appeared as the tail end of the preface, isolated from what followed.

2. LUTHER'S TREATMENT OF THE SANCTUS

Although Luther had urged priests to make their own reforms, he repudiated those made by Karlstadt and Muntzer, both of whom he regarded as dangerous fanatics. Nevertheless, because others were prepared to make reforms, Luther eventually felt compelled to offer advice himself. This he did in the Formula Missae (FM) 1523, and the Deutsche Messe (DM) 1526.⁷

In FM Luther retained the Latin sursum corda and preface. However, he suggested that the preface should then be followed by the words of institution, preferably intoned, and then the sanctus and benedictus should be sung to accompany the elevation. Luther used the common preface, but since the sanctus was moved, the mention of angels and archangels was deleted.

In DM Luther believed that he was providing a vernacular mass

rather than merely a German translation of the Latin idiom.

Earlier, perhaps with the attempts of Kantz and Muntzer in mind, he had said:

I would gladly have a German mass today. I am also occupied with it. But I would very much like it to have a true German character. For to translate the Latin text and retain the Latin tongue or notes has my sanction, though it does not sound polished or well done. Both the text and notes, accent, melody, and manner of rendering ought to grow out of the true mother tongue and its inflection, otherwise ... it becomes an imitation, in the manner of the apes. 8

In DM the sursum corda and preface disappeared, being replaced by a brief paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer and a brief exhortation. It would seem that Luther regarded these as a German cultural equivalent, or interpretation, of the sursum corda and preface; like other Reformers,⁹ he seemed to regard the sursum corda as an exhortation to the worshippers to lift their hearts and minds to heavenly things, and to give thanks for salvation. This, in the German idiom, could be achieved more effectively by a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer, and a brief exhortation. Then the words of institution were intoned as far as the words relating to the bread, followed by the German sanctus - a new paraphrase based upon Isaiah 6:1-9:

Isaiah 'twas the prophet who did see seated above the Lord in Majesty High on a lofty throne in splendour bright; the train of his robe filled the temple quite. Standing beside him were two seraphim; Six wings, six wings he saw on each of them. With twain they hid in awe their faces clear; With twain they hid their feet in rev'rent fear. And with the other twain they flew about: One to the other loudly raised the shout: Holy is God, the Lord of Sabaoth, Holy is God, the Lord of Sabaoth, Holy is God, the Lord of Sabaoth, Behold his glory filleth all the earth. The angels' cry made beams and lintels shake; The house also was filled with clouds of smoke. 10

According to Y.Brilioth and L.D.Reed, this removal of the sanctus to a place after (or in the middle of) the words of

institution was 'without doubt one of the least successful of Luther's suggestions for reform'.¹¹ However, in contrast to those Reformers who left the sanctus intact because they gave it no thought, Luther seems to have had a clear logic behind his suggestions.

To begin with, since the sanctus was regarded as an anthem or chant prior to the canon, there was no reason why it should have been given a place in a reformed canon. Luther deliberately utilized it as an anthem sung as a conclusion to his new canon. The reason for this new position seems to have been two-fold. It came at the end of the words of institution during the elevation as a joyful response to the proclamation of the gospel, the testament of forgiveness; it was a thanksgiving - the sacrifice of praise which follows the proclamation of justification. But there appears to have been a second reason which is not immediately apparent.

The sanctus is from Isaiah 6, and Luther chose to use this version and its context rather than the context of the heavenly Jerusalem of Revelation 4. Luther seems to have seen a distinct parallel between Isaiah 6 and the eucharist. Isaiah the prophet heard the sanctus sung in honour of the holiness of God. Commenting on these verses, Luther wrote:

The angels were borne aloft like birds, that is, they served God not with their endeavours, but with a confession in which they sing the Trishagion, that is, the thrice holy, whereby they indicate that all holiness in the whole earth must be ascribed to God alone. All the words are grandly put. They shouted. The truest worship of God is a pure and simple confession. God says (Ps.50.23): "He who brings thanksgiving as his sacrifice honours me". The other things we have, such as gifts, intellect, good habits, our best endeavours, let these be concealed. We must glory in the Word alone and confess that we have received these gifts from God, we do not bring them along ... It is necessary that God be hallowed and that I be

defiled, but in that act of hallowing I must know, believe, praise, and confess that God Himself is alone holy, that He gives and does not receive. 12

Luther saw the sanctus as a true sacrifice of praise - something which men could render to God. But there is a deeper significance. Isaiah was overawed by a sense of sin. One of the seraphim cleansed him by putting a burning coal on his lips and saying, 'Behold, this has touched your lips; your guilt is taken away, and your sin forgiven'. Then the prophet was sent out as the servant of God. For Luther, the gospel and the mass were for sinners because both were a declaration of sins forgiven. The bread and wine were the tokens or seals of that promise, and they touch the lips of the communicant as a declaration of forgiveness. After the communion, the Christian is sent out as a servant of God. Thus, the sanctus was a fitting conclusion to the proclamation of the testament of forgiveness, i.e. the words of institution.

Although in DM Luther provided the German sanctus, he suggested other hymns which might be sung at that point in the service. It would be tempting for those who followed the DM to see any suitable hymn as an alternative to the sanctus at this point, and to omit the sanctus altogether.

3. THE LUTHERAN KIRCHENORDNUNGEN

Luther's FM and DM were recommendations, and not mandatory services. Taken with the less detailed recommendations found in his earlier writings such as the Babylonian Captivity and the Misuse of the Mass, three possible treatments of the sanctus stem from Luther:

- (1). Leaving the inherited medieval pattern intact, with sursum corda,

preface and sanctus, in Latin or the vernacular, before a reformed canon.

(2). The pattern of FM, with sursum corda, preface, words of institution and sanctus.

(3). The pattern of DM, using the sanctus simply as a hymn, in Latin, the vernacular, or in paraphrase, either during the institution narrative, or after it; it could, however, be omitted in preference for another suitable hymn.

All these permutations are found in the subsequent Lutheran Church Orders.

The medieval pattern intact

Amongst the Lutheran rites which retained this pattern are

Brunswick 1528,¹³ Pomerania 1535,¹⁴ Osnabruck 1543,¹⁵ Buxtehude 1552,¹⁶ and Saxony 1539.¹⁷ The latter for example allows:

die latinische prefation singen, darauf das latinische sanctus,
nach dem selbigen das vater unser und die verba testamenti
deutsch. 18

The Danish masses of 1528, 1535 and 1539 also allow for the traditional pattern, either in Latin or Danish.¹⁹ The rite prepared by Bucer and Melancthon for Archbishop Hermann von Wied of Cologne also retained the traditional pattern, though in the vernacular. After the sursum corda came the following common preface (proper prefaces were also given) and rubric:

It is verily a thing worthy, right, meet, and wholesome, that we give thanks unto thee always and everywhere, that we praise and magnify thee, Lord, holy Father, Almighty, everlasting God, through Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom thou madest us of nothing unto thine image, and hast appointed all other creatures to our uses; and whereas we, through the sin of Adam sliding from thee, were made thine enemies, and therefore subject to death and eternal damnation, thou of thy infinite mercy and unspeakable love, didst send the same thy Son, the eternal Word, into this world; who

through the cross and death delivered us from sins and the power of the devil, and brought us again into thy favour by his holy Spirit whom he sent to us from thee; and gave his body and blood to be the food of a new and eternal life, that, being more confirmed through the trust of thy mercy and love, we should ever go forward to all that that is thy pleasure by renewing and sanctifying of ourselves; and that we should glorify and exalt thee here and evermore in all our words and deeds, and sing unto thee without end with all thy holy angels and beloved children.

After these things, Sanctus shall be sung; where clerks be, in Latin, but of the people in Douch, one side answering the other, thrice of both parts. As for that this is wont to be added, 'The Lord God of hosts' and Benedictus, it shall be sung communally of the whole congregation, and therefore in Douch. 20

The rubric is interesting in its directions for singing of the thrice holy.

Where the mass was still said or sung in Latin, particularly in towns where there was a choir, the traditional pattern in Latin tended to survive. This was true in Sweden, where alongside the Swedish mass of Olavus Petri, the directions of Laurentius Petri for the Latin High mass assume the sursum corda, preface and sanctus will be sung as in the Roman mass.²¹

The pattern of FM

In FM Luther suggested that it was appropriate to sing the sanctus after the preface and institution narrative, and that it provided a fitting accompaniment to the elevation. The elevation tended to fall into disuse, but a number of the Kirchenordnungen followed Luther's suggestion. Amongst these are the rite of Andreas Dober 1525²², the Prussian rites of 1525 and 1524²³, the Brandenburg-Nurnburg rite of 1533²⁴, the 1543 Pfalz-Neuberg rite²⁵, and, when there was a choir, East Friesland 1535²⁶, Wurttemberg 1536²⁷, and Wittenberg 1533²⁸. Some

of these, such as Dober's mass for Nurnburg, were in German rather than Latin.

The most distinctive rite which followed Luther's 1523 suggestions was the Swedish rite. In the 1531 vernacular mass of Olavus Petri, we find the following outline:

Sursum corda
Preface
Institution
Sanctus
Lord's Prayer
Agnus Dei
Exhortation 29

The provisions of Laurentius Petri allowed for many parts to be said or sung in Latin - presumably choirs had no music for the new vernacular texts for some time.³⁰

Much more Catholic in tone was the Swedish mass of 1576, the 'Red Book' of King John III.³¹ This was an attempt to reach some rapprochement with Rome, since John III's queen was a Catholic. There are three parts to the Liturgy, which are more expansive than comparable sections in other Lutheran orders: The office of preparation, the Offertory, and the Eucharistic Prayer. According to the study of Sigtrygg Serenius, this order drew upon the medieval Swedish mass tradition, the German Lutheran Church orders, and the Church of England's Book of Common Prayer.³² The rite has been variously assessed, from 'unlutheran' to a 'Liturgical masterpiece'.³³

A full eucharistic prayer was provided, with eight proper prefaces, and a reworking of the portion of the Roman canon missae from the Unde et memores to the Nobis quoque. However, even so, the sanctus with its angelic introduction comes after the preface-institution as in FM. Yelveton wrote:

The common introduction is called the Laudes - in four different forms according to the day adopted from the medieval Missal. The Hymnus Trisagion which follows appears in two forms, the only difference between them being that Hosanna in the one is rendered as Salvation (Saliggor oss) in the other. 34

The Communion Office of Charles IX, 1600, was described by Brilioth as bearing 'the stamp of the Reformed tradition'.³⁵

Here we find:

Sursum corda
Institution read
Thanksgiving for redemption
Institution with prayer (with the alternative Gospel narratives)
Sanctus is read or sung, and the people and scholars sing it with the preacher.
Lord's Prayer
Communion

Despite the 'stamp of the Reformed tradition',³⁶ the FM position of the sanctus was retained.

The pattern of DM

In DM the sursum corda and preface disappeared, their place being taken by a vernacular exhortation, and paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer. The sanctus, now a paraphrase, could be sung half way through the singing of the institution, after the words relating to the bread, and the bread could then be distributed. However, this suggestion seems to have been found to be impracticable, and the common custom was to read the narrative through without having a separate distribution of the bread. The sanctus in paraphrase was retained as one of a number of hymns which might follow the institution: Gott sei gelobet, Jesus Christus unser Heiland, and the German Agnus Dei were equally good alternatives. Such was the Wittenberg order of 1533³⁷, Schwabisch-Hall 1543 and Wurttemberg 1553.³⁸ In many Lutheran orders a latitude was allowed with either sursum corda, preface,

sanctus and institution, or exhortation, institution, sanctus or hymn, or an amalgamation. An example of the latter is the Bradenberg-Nurnburg rite of 1533, where the vernacular exhortation and institution narrative are followed by either the Latin or German (paraphrase) sanctus. The 1540 order for Saxony actually provided for two different services for ferials and feasts.³⁹ The ferial usage was according to DM, but without mention of the sanctus; on feasts the minister intones the Latin prefaces, and sanctus, followed by the Lord's Prayer and institution in German. In village churches there was provision for the Lord's Prayer, exhortation, institution and sanctus all in German. Indeed, it would seem that the pattern of DM came to prevail in village areas where there was no choir to sing the traditional chants. However, since DM gave the German sanctus as one chant amongst alternatives, it is hardly surprising that a few Lutheran orders simply make no mention of it. It is not mentioned for ferials in the Saxony order of 1540; it is not mentioned at all in the rite of Hess, 1532⁴⁰ and in Wurttemberg 1559 it appears to be covered by the rubric allowing 'another spiritual hymn' as an alternative to Gott sei gelobet and Jesus Christus unser heiland.⁴¹

An interesting development, or counterpart to Luther's paraphrase is to be found in one or two Lutheran rites, the Danish being the prime example.

In Claus Mortengen's rite of 1528⁴², the sermon is followed by a psalm, and an admonition to say the Lord's Prayer. Then the sanctus in Danish, with musical notation, is given, and then comes the institution narrative. The sursum corda and preface

occur in an appendix as optional. However, a Danish version of a sanctus trope, Tig ware laass (from the sanctus-hosanna trope, Tibi laus ⁴³), is provided after the institution narrative. The sanctus, therefore, occurs twice; once in its liturgical form, and then in a vernacular adaptation of a trope. In the 1535 Malmø mass, a sanctus paraphrase, Hellig er Gud Fader (or another suitable hymn) was sung after the sermon and psalm as the bread and wine were prepared. This paraphrase was a translation of Nicolai Decius' hymn, 'Hyllich is Godt de vader', which was printed in 1531. In its German form it was included in the 1569 rite of Pomerania, placed after the institution narrative.⁴⁴ The Danish version is not mentioned in the 1537 Ordinance, drawn up by Bugenhagen, omitted sursum corda, preface and sanctus from the text, but offered them as optional for festivals. In the 1539 Malmø Handbog of Frands Vormordsen the sanctus in Latin or Danish comes after the sermon and psalm, and is optional; sursum corda and preface are sometimes used. However, although the trope version is not mentioned in these later rites, it was included (though in a slightly different translation⁴⁶) in the Psalmebog of 1528, and in successive Psalmebogen, and thus a dual use of the sanctus could still occur. What is strange is that the sanctus could be used before the institution, but shorn of sursum corda and preface. And just to add to the possible variations, Luther's paraphrase was included in Psalmebogen from 1533 to 1699.⁴⁷ The Tibi laus trope was also in use in Sweden, and was included in the Icelandic rite of 1594.⁴⁸

4. THE REFORMED RITES

The eucharistic liturgies of the Reformed tradition had their origin in the early reforms of three cities - Strasbourg, Basle and Zurich. As H.O.Old has shown, the later eucharistic liturgies which emerged in various Reformed cities took their lead - and often their text - from these early liturgies.⁴⁹

Strasbourg

The first reforms of the mass at Strasbourg were the work of Diobald Schwarz. On February 16th 1524 he celebrated mass in German in St.John's Chapel in the Church of St.Laurance.⁵⁰ Between the years 1524-25, nine or ten printed editions of the German mass appeared in Strasbourg, each differing slightly from the others, but all closely related in form and substance.⁵¹ In Schwarz's first reform, the preface, proper preface, sanctus and benedictus were left intact. The Lavabo with its accompanying prayer followed, which was the custom at Sträsbourg.⁵² Then came a 'Reformed canon' which included praise, intercession and an institution narrative. This sequence is found in successive orders, lettered by Hubert A,A¹,A²,A³,A⁴,B,C¹,C²,C³, D¹, D². In A, Schwarz had given the following preface:

(Short exhortation)

The Lord be with you !

(Here follows the Preface)

Lift up your hearts ! Give thanks to the Lord, our God !
It is indeed our duty, (and is) just, right and salutary,
that we should always and in all places give thanks to
you, O Lord, holy, almighty Father, eternal God, who has
secured our salvation through the Wood of the Cross, so
that Life might come from Him, from whom Death was
dispelled, and so that the Fiend, which, because of the
disobedience of the wood had overcome us all in Adam, might
now be defied through the obedience which was rendered by
the wood of the Cross, through Jesus Christ, our Lord,

through whose majesty and glory the angels and all the heavenly hosts praise you, with whose exultant honour and praise we beseech you also to hear our voices, as in humble confession we say:

Sanctus

Holy, holy, (holy) Lord, God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of your glory; O make us holy in the heights !

(Benedictus)

Praise be to Him who comes in the name of the Lord; O sanctify us in the heights !

(lavetur manus tacite; deinde stans per modum
orantis levatis, si placet, manibus:) 53

This form remained almost without alteration until D¹ in 1525,

when there is both contraction and expansion:

Beloved brothers and sisters, pray all of you to God our Father, that He may send us His Holy Spirit to teach us to offer up God's sacrifice, a broken spirit and a crushed heart; and that we might offer up our bodies to be a living, holy and pleasing sacrifice, which is our reasonable service, so that we also may give thanks and offer praise to God, and so that He may show us His salvation.

The Lord will hear your prayer.

So let us now lift up our hearts to the the Lord and give thanks to Him, our Lord and God; for it is indeed right, fitting and salutary that we should at all times and in all places give thanks and praise, Holy Lord, Almighty Father, eternal God, and that, for the sake of Jesus Christ, our Saviour, for whose sake also the angels and all the heavenly hosts praise and honour you, with whom we join in prayer and supplication, you might hear our voices, as in humble confession we say:

Sanctus

Holy, holy, holy are you, Lord and God of hosts ! Heaven and earth are full of your glory ! Hosanna, help us, Almighty ! Blessed are you, who comes in the name of the Lord, a Son of David ! Hosanna, O help us Almighty, that your kingdom may grow and be strengthened !

(Instead of the canon, the following prayer is used)

Almighty God and Father of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who has promised us, for the sake of your dear Son, our Lord, all that we ask in His name: grant us this. ... 54

Here the preface has been shortened, and fitted to the exhortation,

but the sanctus and benedictus have been expanded almost to a

Mozarabic form ! Liturgy E, dated May 1525 was lost; but by F,

1526, the sanctus had disappeared, and the great Bucerian revisions

never reintroduced it.⁵⁵ Here, therefore, the history of the sanctus

between 1524 and 1526 is one of conservation, expansion and then abolition.

Basle

In 1523 Oecolampdius published Das Testament Jesu Christ.⁵⁶ Strictly speaking this was not so much a suggested reform of the mass as a devotional paraphrase for Maundy Thursday. The service was in German, and the preface and sanctus was followed by the Lord's Prayer and a canon. However, in his Form und Gestalt, 1525, the sursum corda, preface and sanctus entirely disappeared to be replaced by an exhortation and the Lord's Prayer.⁵⁷ Thus the sanctus ceased to be part of the Basle liturgy.

Zurich

Zwingli published his De canone missae epicheiresis in 1523.⁵⁸ The service was in Latin, and the sursum corda with preface were retained, the sanctus being introduced by:

Postquam cum celestibus animis omnipotentem deum ter
sanctum cecinimus, sic tandem precibus adoriamur:

The remainder of the canon (though for Zwingli only the post-sanctus was recognised as the canon) was replaced by four new Latin prayers. However, in the Action oder Bruch des Nachtmals, 1525,⁵⁹ as with Oecolampadius, the sursum corda, preface, sanctus, and new canon were replaced with an exhortation, Lord's Prayer, a prayer of approach, and institution narrative. Again, therefore, the sanctus disappeared from the eucharistic liturgy, and it did not reappear in Bullinger's Agenda of 1532.⁶⁰

Other Reformed rites

The Reformed rites of other cities were generally drawn up under the guidance of Bucer, Oecolampadius or Zwingli, and thus the rites of Berne, Memmingen, Augsburg, Ulm, Constance and

Neuchâtel likewise dispensed with preface and sanctus.⁶¹ Calvin's liturgies of Strasbourg and Geneva were based upon the rites of Basle, Strasbourg and Farel's rite published at Neuchâtel which was used in Geneva,⁶² and likewise had no sanctus. The nearest hint is the so-called 'Reformed sursum corda', found in Farel's exhortation which Calvin utilised:

Therefore, lift up your hearts on high, seeking the heavenly things in heaven, where Jesus Christ is seated at the right hand of the Father and do not fix your eyes on the visible signs which are corrupted through usage. 63

This came at the end of the exhortation, and illustrates once again that the Reformers saw the sursum corda simply as an exhortation to the congregation, which could be achieved better by a fuller exhortation to worthy communion. Calvin seems to have understood the sursum corda in this way.⁶⁴ The sanctus, however, found no place. This remained true of those rites which were either derived from Calvin, or were closely modelled on his Genevan rite - Pollain's Liturgia Sacra, a Lasco's Forma ac Ratio, the Genevan liturgy associated with John Knox and its Puritan adaptations, and the Pfalz liturgy of 1563 and Datheen's adaptation for the Dutch Reformed Church.⁶⁵

5. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

Cranmer's first liturgical reform relating to the eucharist was the 1548 Order of the Communion. This was an English preparation for communion which was inserted within the structure of the Latin mass. Much of the material in this communion preparation was derived from the Consultation of Hermann von Wied, 1543. It will be recalled that this latter rite, prepared by Melancthon and Bucer, retained the traditional pattern of

sursum corda, preface and sanctus.⁶⁶ The first English mass appeared in the Book of Common Prayer of 1549. Here Cranmer followed the pattern of the Latin mass closely, though the canon was entirely rewritten, and transposed into a protestant key.

The old pattern, as in Hermann's order, remained intact, though again it is clear that the sursum corda, ~~preface~~, ~~sanctus~~ and benedictus were regarded as being a unit quite separate from the canon. Cranmer provided a common preface, and proper prefaces for Christmas, Easter, the Ascension, Whitsunday and the feast of the Trinity. There is, however, a common introduction to the sanctus:

Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the holy companie of heaven, we laude and magnify thy glorious name, evermore praisyng thee and saying, ...

As with a number of German rites, Cranmer did not give a literal translation of the sanctus and benedictus:

Holy, holy, holy, Lorde God of Hostes: heauen and earth are full of thy glory; Osianna in the highest. Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lorde: Glory to thee, O Lorde in the highest.

The priest or deacon then addressed the congregation:

Let us praie for the whole state of Christes Church.

The rubric before this refers to the sanctus, and directed:

This the clerkes shall also syng.

Thus sanctus and bendictus were retained as choir chants, though it is not clear whether the people were expected to join in.⁶⁷

The 1549 Prayer Book was short lived, and its place was taken by a new Prayer Book in 1552. This book was far more protestant in character than the previous book. In the Communion service the sequence sursum corda, preface and sanctus

was retained as a liturgical unit, but was now separated from the reformulated prayer corresponding to the canon. The unit now followed the confession, absolution and comfortable words of scripture, and was followed by the devotional prayer "We do not presume" - later to be called the Prayer of Humble Access. Then came a prayer which contained the words of institution. Textual changes also took place. The 'company of heaven' was no longer 'holy', and the benedictus was omitted, though Cranmer's rendering of its second Hosanna was now appended to the sanctus:

Holye,holye,holye, Lorde God of hostes: heaven and y earthe are full of thy glory: glory be to thee, O Lord, most high.

This apparent departure from the pattern found in 1549 has been criticised by a number of scholars in much the same way as Luther's change. W.H.Frere, for example, comparing 1552 with that of 1549 wrote:

In 1552 this fine attempt (1549) at an English canon was broken into three pieces, and redistributed, after undergoing further modifications. ... On one side the Prayer of Humble Access separates it from the Preface and Sanctus, with which it is intimately connected by right; and, on the other side, the whole act of Communion separates it from the Prayer of Oblation and the Lord's Prayer, which also are, when rightly placed, integral parts with it of one whole. 68

However, Cranmer may well have deliberately placed the Humble Access prayer after the sanctus, because like Luther he looked carefully at Isaiah 6:1-9. Colin Buchanan writes:

The Benedictus qui venit was removed from the end of the Sanctus, and the whole biblical order of Isaiah 6 came to light. If we catch the vision of God and sing the angels' song, then if Isaiah is to be believed, we immediately express our own unworthiness. What could be more natural than the location of humble access at this point ? 69

This sequence remained in the subsequent Books of Common Prayer of 1559, 1604, 1625, and the revision of 1662. In the latter the rubric is unclear as to whether the sanctus was to be recited by the congregation, since it is attached to the preface recited by the priest.

6. OVERVIEW

The Reformation and the sanctus angelology

The Reformation treatment of the sanctus resulted in the continuation of restraint on angelology already found in the Roman tradition. Where the Reformation rites retained the medieval texts almost intact - Muntzer and the Swedish 'Red Book' - the angelology remained the same. However, where the medieval pattern was retained, but new texts prepared, there is a definite tendency to simplify the angelology. Thus in the early Strasbourg rites only the angels and the heavenly host were mentioned; Hermann's Consultation is satisfied with 'holy angels'; Cranmer has only angels, archangels and all the (holy) company of heaven. Those Lutheran rites which followed FM dispensed entirely with the angelology, leaving the sanctus as a chant without a heavenly entourage !

The Form of the sanctus

As the form of the Latin sanctus was rendered into the vernaculars, we find variations which are simply stylistic differences. Nevertheless, there is a tendency to interpret certain words. Kantz rendered Hosanna in the benedictus as 'Gluck und heyl', blessing and salvation. He rendered 'Glory' as herlichkeit, but

Muntzer preferred 'preise'. Nurenburg 1525 rendered glory as 'glory und herrlicheyt', and Hosanna as 'Ach mache uns salig' - o save us.⁷⁰ Likewise the variant in the Swedish 'Red Book' renders Hosanna by 'Saliggor oss'. In Strasbourg D¹ it is expanded to a form reminiscent of the Spanish rite and the East Syrian. Cranmer too chose to paraphrase. However, it was Luther who took the bold step and produced a German sanctus, which in effect was a new original liturgical form.

Rationale

It is all too easy to be bedazzled by comparative liturgy, and see the Reformation handling of the sanctus as clumsy and inane. However, while it might be regretted that this venerable part of the eucharistic prayer ceased to have a place in many of the Reformed rites, it would be blindness to miss the positive view found in Luther and Cranmer. Given the 16th century indifference to the sanctus other than as a pre-canon liturgical chant, it is significant that Luther and Cranmer fitted it into a theological context in their reformed rites. They were inspired by its biblical context. For Luther the chant could be relocated at the end of the institution narrative as a fitting conclusion to the testament of forgiveness, and an accompaniment to the elevation. Nothing could be more appropriate, for the elevation of the elements was nothing less than to see the glory of God which fills heaven and earth - God's graciousness, and the sign of justification. Cranmer had a different use, but no less effective. For him the theme of unworthiness which follows Isaiah 6:3 is a useful prelude to the institution narrative: 'We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs from under they table ...'. Both Luther and Cranmer, therefore, actually made new positive theological use of the sanctus.

NOTES - CHAPTER 8

1. Rosamund McKitterick, The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789-895, (London 1977), 142.
2. For the texts, see the American edition of Luther's Works (Philadelphia and St.Louis 1955-),(LW) 36.
3. Text in E.Sehling, Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI Jahrhunderts 5 Bands (Leipzig 1902-13), 1, 697ff.
4. Text in J.Smend, Die Evangelischen Deutschen Messen bis zu Luthers Deutscher Messe (Göttingen 1896; Nieuwkoop 1967), 75.
5. German text in Sehling, 1, 497ff.
6. Smend, 104. The sanctus has been left in German as a comparison with Kantz's rendering.
7. Texts, LW 53. See Bryan D.Spinks, Luther's Liturgical Criteria and His Reform of the Canon of the Mass, Grove Liturgical Study 30 (Bramcote 1982).
8. LW 40, 141.
9. See below on Calvin and Farel.
10. LW 53.
11. Y.Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic (London 1930), 117.
12. LW 16,70.
13. Ed. I.Pahl, Coena Domini I. Die Abendmahlsliturgie der Reformationskirchen im 16/17. Jahrhundert, Spicilegium Friburgense 29 (Freiburg 1983), 55.
14. AE.Richter, Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen 2 vols (Weimar 1846), I, 106.
15. Sehling, VII/I (Tübingen 1955ff), 224.
16. Ibid., 75.
17. Sehling, I,271.
18. Ibid.
19. See below.
20. Text in G.J.Cuming, A History of Anglican Liturgy (London 1969), 353-4.
21. E.E. Yelverton, The Mass in Sweden 1531-1914 HBS 57 (London 1920).

22. Coena Domini I, 69.
23. Richter I, 30; II, 67.
24. Ibid., I, 207.
25. Ibid., II, 28.
26. Sehling VII/I, 379-81.
27. Richter I, 261.
28. Ibid., 224.
29. Yelverton, 38.
30. Ibid.
31. Yelverton, 71; Brilioth, 254ff; Frank C.Senn, 'Liturgia Svecanae Ecclesiae: An Attempt at Eucharistic Restoration during the Swedish Reformation', SL 14(1980-81), 20-36.
32. Sigtrygg Serenius, Liturgia Svecanae ecclesiae catholicae et orthodoxae conformis: En liturgiehistorisk undersökning med särskild hänsyn till struktur och förlagor (Åbo, 1966).
33. Oscar Quensel, Bidrag till svenska liturgiens historia II (Upsala 1893), 122; Yelverton, 73-4.
34. Ibid., 71.
35. Op.cit., 260.
36. Ibid.
37. Richter, I, 224.
38. Coena Domini I , 258.
39. Richter I, 307ff.
40. Ibid., 164.
41. Coena Domini, 256.
42. Danske Messebøger Fra Reformationstiden (København 1959) for the Danish texts referred to in this section.
43. Sigurd Kroon, Tibi Laus. Studier kring den Svenska Psalmen Nr 199. (Lund 1953); Henrik Glahn, Melodistadier Til Den Lutherske Salmesangs Historie Fra 1524 til Ca 1600 (København 1954) 1 Plate 4. I am grateful to Henrik Glahn, former Karlsberg Fellow at Churchill College, Cambridge 1984, for guidance on the Danish material.

44. Coena Domini I, 66.
45. Danske Messeboger, 82.
46. Glahn, op.cit., 114.
47. Danske Messeboger, 82
48. Coena Domini, 174.
49. H.O.Old, The Patristic Roots of Reformed Worship (Zurich 1975).
50. F.Hubert, Die Strassburger liturgischen ordnungen im Zeitalter der Reformation (Göttingen 1900); W.D.Maxwell, An Outline of Christian Worship, (London 1936); René Bornert, La Réforme Protestante du Culte à Strasbourg au XVI^e siècle. 1523-1598 (Leiden 1981).
51. Maxwell, op.cit., 90.
52. Ibid., 94 note 1
53. Text, Hubert op.cit., 64-5. I am indebted to my colleague, Dr. Andrea Cervi, for the translation of this text, and that of 1525.
54. Hubert, op.cit., 85.
55. Bornert, op.cit., 543.
56. Smend, 51ff. The text of the sanctus given by Oecolampadius was: Heylig, heylig, heylig yst Got der almechtig. hymel und erden ist vol deyner glory. Ach Got, hylf uns yn deyner hoch. Geben edeyet sey der, der da kumt yn dem namen des herren Gyb gluck und hey1.
57. ET in Bard Thompson, Liturgies of the Western Church (New York and Cleveland, 1971), 211-15.
58. Coena Domini I, 185-8; ET, PEER, 130ff.
59. Smend, 196ff; ET Bard Thompson, 151ff.
60. Leo Weisz, 'Heinrich Bullinger's Agenda', in Zwingliana 10(1954-8) 1-23.
61. See H.O.Old, passim.
62. Bryan D.Spinks, From the Lord and "The Best Reformed Churches", A Study of the eucharistic liturgy in the English Puritan and Separatist traditions 1550-1633 (Rome 1985), 46ff.
63. ET Thompson, op.cit., 205-7; 219-23; Spinks, ibid., 83-4.
64. Spinks, op.cit., 63.

65. For these eucharistic liturgies, see Spinks, *ibid.*
66. See above, 319-20.
67. I am indebted to Canon Dr. Donald Gray for pointing this out, and the ambiguity in the 1662 text. The 1549 rubric caused Bucer to remark that since clerks are often impatient and sing it before the priest has finished praying, a stricter rubric was necessary. E.C. Whitaker, Martin Bucer and the Book of Common Prayer Alcuin Club Collection 55 (Great Wakering 1974), 48-50.
68. W.H. Frere, Some Principles of Liturgical Reform (London 1911) 188; Cf. Maxwell, An Outline of Christian Worship, 149.
69. C.O. Buchanan, What Did Cranmer Think He was Doing ?, Grove Liturgical Study 7 (Bramcote 1976), 27
70. Smend, 167.

CHAPTER 9

RECOVERY AND REPOSITIONING: PROTESTANT AND ANGLICAN LITURGIES, 1662 - 1960

1. LUTHERANISM

For the most part during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the patterns inherited from the sixteenth century Lutheran rites were perpetuated in German agendas. Thus Coburg 1626 and Gotha 1645 omit the preface and sanctus; Magdeburg 1632, 1653 and 1740 require them on festivals; Mecklenburg 1650, and Brunswick-Luneberg 1619 and 1643 permit the use of them, and Brunswick-Luneberg 1657 appoints them for all Sundays and festivals.¹ However, the inroads of Pietism and Rationalism resulted in less frequent celebrations of the eucharist, and so the use of the sanctus became less frequent even in those areas whose agendas included it. Of interest in this context was the Prussian Agenda 1821, enforced by Frederick Wilhelm III of Prussia, following the union of Lutheran and Reformed Churches in 1817. This Agenda included a preface and sanctus, but in a position where they were used every Sunday even when there was no eucharist. The following order was given: hymn, invocation, versicle, confession of sins, declaration of grace, Gloria Patri (choir), kyrie (choir), Gloria in excelsis, salutation and collect, Epistle, Hallelujah, Gospel, Apostles' Creed, preface, sanctus, general prayer, Lord's Prayer, and benediction. The sermon followed either the creed or the Lord's Prayer.²

Later agendas show the same variations. In Nassau, 1843, after the exhortation, there is a transition to a type of preface and sanctus, before the Lord's Prayer and institution narrative.³ In Baden 1858 there was no sanctus, but in the 1912 revision a preface

and sanctus were introduced and in 1930 the hosanna and benedictus were also added. Bavaria 1856 and 1879 contain a variable preface and sanctus;⁴ Hanover 1911 has the preface and sanctus before the exhortation, Lord's Prayer and institution narrative.⁵ The reintroduction of the sanctus in areas where it had fallen into disuse was stimulated by Wilhelm Löhe's Agenda für Christliche Gemeinden, 1844, in which he promoted a return to 'traditional' Lutheran forms. This Agenda provided the sursum corda, eight prefaces, and sanctus with benedictus. The benedictus allowed two expanded versions:

Blessed is Mary's Son who comes in the Name of the Lord.

Blessed is the Paschal Lamb who comes in the Name of the Lord. 6

Much more recently, the 1955 Agende für evangelisch-lutherische kirche und Gemeinden provided alternative forms; either the 'traditional' Lutheran pattern of sursum corda, preface, sanctus and benedictus, to be followed by the Lord's Prayer and institution narrative, or a eucharistic prayer beginning with sursum corda, and incorporating the words of institution. On the other hand, the Evangelisches Kirchengesangbuch, Brunswick 1960 gives only the former pattern

Outside Germany, Lutheran rites seem to have been less conservative in experimentation. In Sweden the Communion Office of Charles IX was revised in 1811.⁷ Interestingly, this revised rite commenced with an anthem constructed from the sanctus and Te Deum. The anaphoral sanctus retained the Swedish position after the institution narrative, as it did in the 1917 revision with sursum corda, preface, institution narrative, Lord's Prayer

and sanctus.⁸ In 1942, however, this Formula Missae pattern was abandoned, and the sanctus followed the proper preface. The sanctus was in turn followed by a short prayer beginning 'Praise be unto thee, Lord of heaven and earth ...', described by Luther Reed as a prayer of 'humble access',⁹ and then came the words of institution and the Lord's Prayer. In the Norwegian rite of 1685 all Latin was abolished, and no sursum corda or sanctus were included, and the rite presupposed a communion psalm, exhortation, Lord's Prayer, institution narrative and communion.¹⁰ The revision of 1889 restored the sursum corda, preface and sanctus as an alternative to the communion psalm. However, in the 1920 rite the sursum corda-sanctus unit was provided as the only form, giving a sequence of sursum corda, preface, sanctus, exhortation, thanksgiving, Agnus Dei, Lord's Prayer and institution narrative. The form of the sanctus was that of the biblical text of Isaiah 6:3 - 'The whole earth is full of His glory'.¹¹

In the Danish Lutheran rite, the sanctus seems to have fallen into disuse in most places. Luther's German sanctus was omitted from the Danmarks og Norges Kirke-Ritual 1685, and subsequently in the Gradual of Thomas Kingo, 1699. The hymn 'Dig vaere Loff' (Tibi Laus) was still in Kingo's Gradual with its tune, but not as an obligatory part of the liturgy. As a regular part of the Danish eucharistic liturgy, the sanctus was reintroduced into the text in the rite of 1912, though the version used was that of Rev.4:8.¹²

The English speaking Lutheran Churches in the USA have emerged from a complex linguistic background, and the differing

Swedish, German, Norwegian, Danish and Finnish elements have each made some contribution.¹³ The original groups from Europe used of course their own linguistic forms. The first liturgy compiled for Lutherans in the USA was the German liturgy of Henry Muhlenburg, 1748, which had an abbreviated sanctus. After the sursum corda, the pastor said 'Heilig, Heilig, Heilig ist der Herr Zebaoth !', to which the congregation replied 'Alle Lande sind seiner Ehre voll'; in other words, it was the biblical text of Isaiah 6:3 used as a versicle and response.¹⁴ As various Synods amalgamated, and as English became the mother tongue of succeeding generations, so the need was felt for an English liturgy. Many Lutheran groups therefore adopted a version of the 1888 Common Service.¹⁵ With minor differences only, this rite was reproduced, for example, in the Common Service Book of the Lutheran Church 1917/18 (United Lutheran Church of America), Evangelical Lutheran Hymn Book 1912, 1928, The Lutheran Hymnary 1928 (Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Synod, The Hauge's Evangelical Lutheran Synod and the United Norwegian Lutheran Church of America) and Lutheran Hymnal 1941 (Missouri Synod).¹⁶ The Common Service provided for a hymn, sursum corda, preface, proper preface, sanctus and benedictus, possible use of an exhortation, Lord's Prayer and institution narrative. In Service Book and Hymnal 1958, authorised by eight Lutheran bodies, a new development took place. In addition to the pattern of the Common Service, as a first alternative a 'prayer of thanksgiving' followed immediately after sanctus and benedictus, beginning 'Holy art thou, Almighty and Merciful God ... ', and which included the words of institution. The

compilation of this prayer was in the hands of P.Z.Strodach and L.D.Reed.¹⁷ Strodach had already compiled a eucharistic prayer for the Lutheran Churches of India, based upon St.James, St.John Chrysostom, St.Basil, the Gallican and the 1549 Book of Common Prayer rites, and the Swedish rite of 1942 was also influential in this re-introduction of a eucharistic prayer following the sanctus.¹⁸

Thus, in Lutheranism in the nineteenth and first part of the twentieth centuries we find:

- (a) The re-introduction of the sanctus in traditions where it had been omitted (Bavaria, Norway, Denmark).
- (b) A firmly entrenched pattern where sursum corda, preface and sanctus continued to form a unit of praise before the Lord's Prayer and institution narrative.
- (c) Repositioning of the sanctus (Sweden).
- (d) A move to follow the sanctus with some form of eucharistic prayer (Sweden, Germany, America).

2.-THE REFORMED TRADITION

A. Ostervald's rite for Neuchâtel

The earliest of the Reformed rites to re-introduce the sanctus into the euchaistic liturgy was that of Jean Frederic Ostervald prepared for Neuchâtel and published in 1713.¹⁹ Until this time Neuchâtel had used a rite derived from Farel's La Maniere et fasson. Ostervald had a keen interest in the Church of England even though he never himself visited England. Inevitably, therefore, the

liturgy which he introduced was influenced by the Book of Common Prayer.

The eucharistic rite was contained in a separate section on the sacraments, and was a service quite separate from the Morning Service. Its structure was as follows:

- Invocation
- Prayer
- Institution narrative
- Excommunication and exhortation, with preface and sanctus.
- Prayer for the world.
- Lord's Prayer
- Confession
- Absolution
- Consecration
- Communion
- Nunc Dimittis
- Prayer
- Gloria in excelsis
- Exhortation
- Blessing

Bruno Bürki illustrates how this is a careful blending of elements from Calvin (and Farel) and the Church of England rite.²⁰ This is precisely what Ostervald achieves in his exhortation. It will be recalled that the exhortation of Farel and Calvin concluded with the so-called Reformed *sursum corda*, exhorting the congregation to lift their minds to heaven. Ostervald's exhortation, following the institution narrative, and read from the pulpit, concluded with a Reformed *sursum corda*, and then preface, proper preface and the sanctus:

Rendons donc aujourd'huy et sans cesse, à ce Redempteur charitable, aussi bien qu'au Pere et au S.Esprit, nos Benedictions et nos Louanges selon que nous y sommes si justement obligés.

Et pour cet effet, Elevons tous nos coeurs en haut, et rendons graces au Seigneur nôtre Dieu.

Il est juste et raisonnable, et c'est in Devoir très-salutaire qu'en tout tems et en tous lieux, nous te rendions graces, ô Seigneur Dieu, Pere Saint, Dieu Eternel. (Proper preface)

C'est pourquoy avec les Anges, avec les Archanges, et

avec toute l'Armée des Cieux, nous magnifions ton Nom
glorieux, nous chantons une Hymne à ta Gloire, disant:
Saint, Saint, Saint, Seigneur Dieu des Armées. Les
Cieux et la Terre sont remplis de ta Gloire, ô Dieu
Trés-haut ! 21

Proper prefaces were provided for Christmas, Easter, Pentecost (two are provided, the first from the Roman preface for the Holy Spirit, the second from the Anglican rite ²²), and for the September festivals. Bürki notes that there is no indication that the congregation could join in the sanctus. ²³ He also suggests that Ostervald accentuated the fault of the Anglican rite, which had already separated the sanctus from the Prayer of Consecration. ²⁴ But here Bürki seems to have failed to see not only Cranmer's new rationale for the sanctus, but also that Ostervald was using it in a manner faithful to his Calvinist liturgical tradition. He simply extended the echo of the Reformed sursum corda by adding a preface and sanctus, which is a quite logical development of the Farel/Calvin echo. ²⁵

Further editions of Ostervald's liturgy were published in 1731, 1772, 1779 and 1873. ²⁶ Of interest is the fact that in 1853 an English translation was published for use of a French Reformed community in Charleston, South Carolina, USA. ²⁷

B. The work of Eugène Bersier

Eugène Bersier, Anglo-Swiss by birth, spent his entire ministry at L'Église de l'Etoile in Paris. ²⁸ It was a fashionable Church, and Bersier was a fashionable preacher. He was also concerned with liturgical reform, and like Ostervald, was influenced in part by the Anglican rite. His liturgy, Liturgie à l'usage des Églises Réformées was published in 1874. ²⁹ The order for the communion was as follows:

Grace (with the grace repeated as a response)
 Go in peace ...
 The peace
 Exhortation with words of institution
 Gloria in excelsis
 Prayer
 Short prayer
 Sursum corda
 Preface (Proper prefaces for Christmas, Good Friday, Easter
 and Pentecost)
 Sanctus
 Sanctus repeated by the congregation
 Prayer for purity
 Petition for the Holy Spirit
 Institution narrative
 Lord's Prayer
 Communion

The liturgy included a Musical Supplement with settings by his
 sister-in-law; music for the sanctus was provided on pages
 47-48 of this Supplement.

At a later date Bersier accepted an invitation by the General
 Synod of Nantes to prepare a liturgy for consideration for use
 in the Reformed Church of France. This was published in 1888
 as Projet de Révision de la Liturgie des Églises Réformées de
 France, though it was not considered until after his death.³⁰
 The introduction gave a useful history of the French Reformed
 liturgy, and he mentioned that only after the publication of
 his own rite did he become aware of Ostervald's work. However,
 in this Projet Bersier was too wise to promote his own liturgy
 in its entirety, and he made considerable use of the Genevan rites
 of 1743 and 1861. The sanctus was retained, but its position
 was changed from that of 1874, and it was now proposed as an
 alternative to the invitation to communion:

Exhortation with institution narrative
 Exhortation
 Gloria in excelsis
 Eucharistic Prayer (from the 1743 Genevan rite)

Words of institution (consecration)
 Invitation or sursum corda, preface and sanctus
 communion
 Dismissal in peace
 Exhortation
 Prayer
 Nunc Dimittis
 Blessing

Bersier explained the sanctus thus:

It is evident that in this paragraph of invitation one wishes to preserve the expressive idea of the second century, in the prayers of the liturgies East and West, "Lift up your hearts". 31

It is interesting that Bersier seemed to interpret sursum corda-sanctus in a manner consistent with that of Farel and Calvin.

The Projet was unsuccessful, and the 1897 Liturgie des Églises Réformées de France had no sanctus.³²

C. Other Continental Reformed rites

Neither Ostervald nor Bersier seem to have had much influence on other French rites at the time; the rites of Geneva of 1724, 1743, 1861, and 1875 which served for large numbers of French speaking pastors and congregations, reproduced a type of liturgy akin to Calvin's original forms - though with distinct changes in eucharistic theology.³³ However, the Vaud liturgy of 1899 had a eucharistic prayer, the conclusion of which seems to be a deliberate echo of the sanctus:

Seigneur, élève nos coeurs jusqu'a toi et donne-nous de redire avec joie le cantique des rachetés: Gloire à toi, dans les lieux très hauts, Dieu d'amour, Créateur et Pere tout-puissant ! Gloire à toi, ô Christ, Agneau de Dieu qui ôtes le péche du monde ! Gloire à toi, Esprit consolateur, qui demeures toujours avec nous ! Que la terre, ô Dieu, soit remplie de ta gloire ! Amen. 34

However, it was with Richard Paquier and the Église et Liturgie movement that the French Reformed rites (France and Switzerland)

began to be influenced by traditions other than their own.³⁵ Paquier's liturgy of 1931 was inspired by the Apostolic Tradition, AC 8 and Justin Martyr, and included a eucharistic prayer which Paquier divided into four parts - dialogue, preface, sanctus and consecration. The benedictus was reintroduced with the sanctus. A revised edition of this liturgy appeared in 1952. Bürki has examined a number of recent official revisions which show in varying degrees the influence of Paquier. Thus the Genevan liturgy of 1945 provided three traditional Calvinist eucharistic rites, and then a fourth which contained a eucharistic prayer based on 1931. After a lengthy preface giving thanks for creation and redemption through Christ, mention is made of the angelic hosts, and the congregation then sing the sanctus from their Psalter. It reappeared in the 1950 draft liturgy for the Reformed Church of France, and in a Psalter version in the Berne rite of 1955.³⁶

A similar mid-twentieth century revival is also found in some German language Reformed rites - the Baselbieter Kirchenbuch 1949, and the Aargauer Liturgie 1950. The Dutch Reformed rite of 1955 also provided for sursum corda, preface and sanctus before the recital of the institution narrative.

D. The Catholic Apostolic rite, Mercersburg and Presbyterianism

The Catholic Apostolic Church had its origins with Henry Drummond, John Cardale and Edward Irving. Although this new Church came from Reformed roots, it was entirely disowned by the Reformed tradition. Its liturgy, however, was to be extremely influential amongst certain Reformed groups.

In 1826 Henry Drummond, a wealthy banker, began a series of conferences at his home, Albury Park, Surrey. These conferences were concerned with Millenarianism. Edward Irving, a clergyman of the Church of Scotland and Minister of Regent Square Church, London, was a prominent member. In about 1830 in Scotland there were alleged instances of charismatic gifts and speaking in tongues, and Irving's London congregation became a centre of interest. When public worship in Irving's Church was interrupted by tongues, the Church of Scotland removed Irving from his ministry. However, Irving and his congregation continued in temporary accommodation, and through Drummond and Cardale, the Catholic Apostolic Church grew out of this charismatic congregation. Although nicknamed 'Irvingites', Irving himself played little part in its development; in 1843 he fell out with Cardale, and after returning to Scotland, died at the end of that year.

Drummond and Cardale had been recognised as 'Apostles', and instituted a complex hierarchy of ministry. The Catholic Apostolic Church grew in numbers, and progressed from a Reformed congregation with charismatic utterances, to a Church with a very catholic-looking liturgy and a complex ceremonial.³⁷

In its early years, when it was still recognisable as a Reformed schismatic group, the eucharist followed a 19th century Reformed pattern.³⁸ In 1838 an outline 'Order for the Communion Service' was sent from Albury to all the Angels (bishops) of the churches. The eucharist began with the offertory, and had a confession, absolution, the Lord's Prayer; then a commemoration of the Living and the Departed; the thanksgiving over the bread

was followed by the sanctus, the institution narrative, and distribution of the bread; the thanksgiving over the cup was followed by the Gloria in excelsis, institution narrative, and giving the cup. Between 1838 and 1842 the outline of the eucharist and other services were being developed.³⁹ In 1842 a printed liturgy appeared, which was subsequently expanded in various editions until 1880.

The eucharist was a full service of Word and sacrament, compiled from many sources - Anglican, Roman Catholic and Eastern - and included sursum corda, preface and sanctus; in 1847 the benedictus and hosannas were added. What is significant, however, is the shape and content of the anaphoral section. K.W.Stevenson observes:

Whereas revisions of our time all tend in the direction of the unity of the Eucharistic Prayer, the Catholic Apostolic Rite sees a great diversity in this part of the Rite. 40

In fact, the anaphora is made up of ten sections - salutation and sursum corda, preface, sanctus and benedictus, Lord's Prayer, Consecration prayer, prayer of oblation, incense anthem, commemoration of the Living, commemoration of the Departed, and concluding prayer before communion.⁴¹

The liturgiographer and liturgist of the Catholic Apostolic Church was Cardale, and some of the rationale behind this compilation was revealed in his book Readings upon the Liturgy and other Divine Offices of the Church.⁴² Cardale argued that thanksgiving and blessing are quite distinct acts; in thanksgiving God is praised for his mighty acts in the eucharistic prayer (preface-sanctus), but the bread and wine are blessed in the

consecration. Thanksgiving, therefore, terminates with sanctus and benedictus; the Lord's Prayer separates the Thanksgiving from the prayer of consecration. This arrangement was to have an interesting influence upon the loose adaptations of this liturgy made by other Churches in the USA and the United Kingdom.

Cardale explained the function of the sanctus in his Thanksgiving as follows:

Having gone through the several particulars for which thanksgiving are due, we conclude by offering praise, worship, and adoration, unto the name of God; stirring up ourselves to unite, as it were, our voices with those of the heavenly host, that we may together join in that hymn which, in holy Scripture, the seraphim are said to sing, one to another, before the throne of God. 43

The cherubim and seraphim had a 'revealed' meaning as well as being heavenly celestial beings; they represented the ministry of the Church. Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists and Pastors correspond to the cherubim; Angels (bishops) correspond to the seraphim.⁴⁴

The text of the definitive preface was as follows:

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto Thee, O Lord, Father Almighty, Eternal God; who, together with Thine Only-begotten Son and the Holy-Ghost, art ONE GOD AND ONE LORD.

For Thou didst create heaven and earth, and all things that are therein. Thou hast given unto us life and being. By Thy providence are the fruits of the earth preserved and by Thy blessing we, and all things living, are sustained. Thou hast preserved us all our days, and again Thou bringest us into Thy presence, satisfied with Thy mercies, and replenished with Thy goodness.

For all Thy bounties known to us, for all unknown, we give Thee thanks. But chiefly that, when through disobedience we had fallen from Thee, Thou didst not suffer us to depart from Thee for ever; Thou hast ransomed us from eternal death, and given us the joyful hope of everlasting life, through Jesus Christ; who, being very and eternal God, dwelling with Thee before all time in glory and blessedness unspeakable, came down from heaven in perfect love, from perfect Love, and became very Man for our salvation.^a

We bless Thee for His holy Incarnation; for His life on earth; for His precious sufferings and death upon the cross;^b for His resurrection from the dead;^c and for His glorious ascension to Thy right hand.^{d e}

We bless Thee for the giving of the Holy Ghost; for all the sacraments and ordinances of Thy Church;^f and for the most blessed communion of all saints in these holy mysteries.^g We bless Thee for the hope of everlasting life, and of the glory which shall be brought unto us at the coming, and in the kingdom of Thy dear Son.^{h i}

Thee, mighty God, heavenly King, we magnify and praise. We worship and adore Thy glorious Name; the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; joining in the hymn of angels, and archangels, and all the hosts of heaven, the cherubim and seraphim before Thy throne and singing unto Thee,

Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth; heaven and earth are full of the majesty of Thy glory.

Hosanna in the highest.

Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord.

Hosanna in the highest.

Proper prefaces could be inserted at points a-i.

Stevenson suggests that the form of the sanctus here was probably to harmonize with the sanctus of the Te Deum which was sung at the end of the Sunday eucharist. What we have, however, is a very lengthy preface as 'Thanksgiving', which although taking thanksgiving seriously, perpetuates the medieval separation of the preface and sanctus from the business of consecration.

The immediate influence of this liturgy is to be seen in the Provisional Liturgy compiled for use in the German Reformed Church in the USA in 1857. The two leading members of the committee responsible for this liturgy were professors at the seminary in Mercersburg, Pennsylvania: Dr. John William Nevin and Dr. Philip Schaff.⁴⁵ Both held a high doctrine of the Church, ministry and sacraments, and their writings echo in some ways the English Tractarians. In 1854 Schaff visited England, and wrote to his

wife enthusiastically about the Irvingites. Howard Hageman writes:

The letter indicates more than a fleeting impression; something more like a strong current of influence. We can safely assume that Schaff returned to Mercersburg with a copy of the Catholic and(!) Apostolic liturgy in his luggage. 46

Although a great many sources were used in the compilation of the Provisional Liturgy, the influence of the Catholic Apostolic liturgy upon the eucharistic rite is unmistakable. Brenner has aptly remarked:

It is as though Schaff seated himself at an organ with the score of the Catholic Apostolic Liturgy before him and began to improvise. 47

The anaphoral section of the Provisional Liturgy came after an exhortation, confession and absolution. J.M.Maxwell summarizes it as follows:

Salutation
Sursum corda
Gratia agamus
Preface - vere dignum
Thanksgiving: Creation, Preservation, Redemption
Sanctus-benedictus
Words of institution (Fraction and elevation)
Epiklesis
Anamnesis
Intercessions
Lord's Prayer. 48

However, such a summary can miss the conscious or unconscious adoption of Cardale's distinction between Thanksgiving and Blessing, or consecration. The sursum corda of the Provisional Liturgy is followed by a lengthy preface derived mainly from St.James and the Catholic Apostolic Liturgy, ending with:

Thee, mighty God, heavenly King, we magnify and praise.
With patriarchs and prophets, apostles and martyrs; with the holy Church throughout all the world; with the heavenly Jerusalem, the joyful assembly and congregation

of the firstborn on high; with the innumerable company of angels round about Thy throne, the heavens, and all the powers therein; we worship and adore Thy glorious name, joining in the song of the Cherubim and Seraphim, and with united voice, saying:

The sanctus followed with benedictus, being the text of the Catholic Apostolic liturgy. However, this is then followed by the recital of the institution narrative (it is not a continuation of the prayer), and then this is followed by an epikletic prayer. Thus the lengthy thanksgiving and sanctus represents the eucharistic prayer; the recital of the narrative and the separate epikletic prayer represent the consecration. The eucharistic prayer thus terminates with the sanctus and benedictus.

The influence of the Mercersburg liturgy upon the German Reformed Church and its repercussions with other Reformed groups in America is a story in its own right.⁴⁹ Although members of the Dutch Reformed Churches in America were hostile to the Mercersburg movement, their own provisional liturgy of 1873 contained an alternate eucharistic prayer with the sanctus and benedictus, and this remained in the official liturgy of 1883. However, the major influence of the Mercersburg liturgy, together with its own inspiration, that of the Catholic Apostolic liturgy, was upon the liturgical forms of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, England, Ireland and the USA.

(1) As early as 1857, in Presbyterian Liturgies with Specimens of Forms of Prayer for Public Worship, A. Bonar had referred to the German Reformed liturgy just published in the USA. No sign of any dependence upon this work, or any other current or historic liturgies is discernable in Robert Lee's Order of Public Worship, 1865.

But quite different was the case with the Euchologion of the Church Service Society, 1867. In its introduction to the communion service outlines were given of historic liturgies, and of some 'Modern Services'. Amongst the latter were the Irvingite and the American German Reformed rites. One of the main authors of the Euchologion, George Sprott, later acknowledged that the eucharistic prayer was largely borrowed from the American (German) Reformed Church and that of the Catholic Apostolic Church.⁵⁰ However, in comparison with the sources, a number of changes had been made in the Euchologion. There was no sursum corda, since it was not envisaged that a Scottish Presbyterian congregation would have the compilation in their hands, and would not, in any case, make responses. The prayer entitled 'The Eucharistic Prayer' duly begins 'It is very meet and right ...'. After a very long preface came the sanctus and benedictus, though the Catholic Apostolic/Mercersburg form had been modified:

Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth, heaven and earth are full of Thy glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest.

An asterisk by the first 'Holy' drew attention to a footnote: 'Anciently the people joined aloud in this hymn'. Then came a petition entitled 'The Invocation', which in fact was a Reformed epiklesis and oblation. However, although this section had its own title, it began with the words, 'And we most humbly beseech Thee ...', indicating that the invocation was a continuation of the eucharistic prayer. At the end of the invocation came the Lord's Prayer, and institution narrative, with fraction and administration.

Here, then, was an attempt to reintegrate the various elements of the anaphora (though not the institution narrative) into one continuous prayer. The result is a lengthy thanksgiving for creation, restoration from the Fall, the work of Christ, the Holy Spirit, and the sacraments, followed by the sanctus and benedictus, followed immediately by an epiklesis and anamnesis. The move from sanctus to epiklesis towards the end of the prayer echoes Egyptian usage, but it is, structurally, only a faint echo. The net result is a sanctus towards the end of the prayer, in contrast to a position at the beginning as found in most of the classical rites.

This part of the eucharistic rite remained virtually unchanged in subsequent editions of the Euchologion (the 1884 edition had the sequence anamnesis-epiklesis). Its impact upon the Church of Scotland is to be seen in Prayers for Divine Service, 1923. The thanksgiving section was shortened, and the sanctus-benedictus were followed by anamnesis, epiklesis, commemoration and intercession; this prayer is reproduced with minor amendments in Prayers for Divine Service, 1929. These forms were mainly incorporated in the main eucharistic rite of The Book of Common Order, 1940. The institution was read as a warrant, followed by sursum corda, preface, proper preface, sanctus, benedictus, and a pick up, 'verily holy, verily blessed', continuing with thanksgiving for the incarnation, anamnesis, epiklesis and self-oblation.

The Book of Common Order 1940 was prepared for the united Church of Scotland which came about in 1929. Prior to this, the United Free Church of Scotland had had its own liturgical

compositions, the Book of Common Order, 1923 and 1928. The United Free Church was itself a union in 1900 of the United Presbyterian Church and the Free Church of Scotland. The former had issued a liturgy under the title Presbyterian Forms of Worship 1891, 1892 and 1899; the latter Church had issued A New Directory for the Public Worship of God, 1898. In these rites we find a slightly different treatment of the sanctus.⁵¹

Presbyterian Forms of Worship contained two orders for the eucharist. In each case we have a lengthy eucharistic prayer (no sursum corda) (1891 edition, 43-45, 53-54) which terminates with the sanctus (Book of Common Prayer version), and in the first, with the benedictus also. A hymn follows the uncovering of the elements before the recital of the institution narrative. The first prayer, whether it ends in sanctus or whether the benedictus is also added, allows for congregational participation or response, for the sanctus is 'Doxology 17 ', and Hosanna is 'Sentence 90'. In both these prayers the tendency found in the Catholic Apostolic rite and the Mercersburg liturgy is used as a fait accompli: the eucharistic prayer terminates with the sanctus. While a 'Blessing' follows the first prayer, in the second the communion follows at once.

A New Directory for the Public Worship of God 1898 provided a number of alternative prayers for various parts of the service. Prayer IV is a Thanksgiving and Consecration Prayer at the communion. The prayer ends with a doxology. However, a footnote allows that in place of the doxology, the eucharistic prayer may terminate with ' And now with angels and archangels ... ', and so into the sanctus (Prayer Book version). Prayer V, reminiscent of the

of the format of the Euchologion, has a eucharistic prayer ending : 'Blessing and honour and glory and power for ever and ever. With angels and archangels ...' and so into the sanctus, but it is immediately followed by a brief epiklesis entitled 'The Prayer of Consecration'.

The Book of Common Order 1923 reproduced a shortened version of the Euchologion. The 1928 book contained three short orders for the communion. In the first the sursum corda is followed by the institution narrative with a shortened exhortation. There follows a eucharistic prayer with a shortened introduction to the sanctus (Book of Common Prayer, no benedictus) :

For Thou art from everlasting: Thou alone didst create the heavens and the earth and all that is therein. Thee all the hosts of heaven continually adore, crying aloud and singing unto Thee:

The second order has no sanctus, and the third has a compressed preface, sanctus without introduction, and a prayer adapted from the Book of Common Prayer 'Humble Access' prayer.

In all the denominational books of the Scottish Presbyterians we therefore find the reintroduction of the sanctus. Its use, however, differs. In some prayers it is recited by the minister alone, in others it is assumed the congregation will join in. The most interesting point is the position of the sanctus in the earlier books. It comes either towards the end of the eucharistic prayer (Euchologion), or it actually terminates the eucharistic prayer. Appearing in the United Presbyterian book of 1891, we may assume that terminating the eucharistic prayer with the sanctus was an earlier established tradition amongst some ministers in this Church. J.M.Barkley has offered the following

opinion:

The evidence for the United and Free Churches using the Sanctus as a conclusion to the eucharistic prayer is meagre, but I am inclined to think it was growing, if not absolutely common, practice otherwise it would not have been included in the 1891, 1892, 1899 and 1898 Books. There is also the fact that while men like my father used extempore prayer their prayers were full of Biblical quotations, especially the psalms, and also semi-liturgical language which was derived from Scripture. 52

Behind this may lie two other factors:

- (a) The Catholic Apostolic liturgy, mediated through the Euchologion, which separated 'Thanksgiving' and 'Consecration'.
- (b) The Book of Common Prayer, which would reinforce this duality, where sursum corda, preface and sanctus (thanksgiving) is separated from the Prayer of Consecration by the Humble Access prayer.

(2) The Presbyterian Church of England was strongly connected with the United Presbyterian Church and the Free Church of Scotland. It is of little surprise, therefore, to find the same type of liturgical thinking. In 1894 there appeared the Directory for the Public Worship of God, compiled by a committee of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of England. For the Lord's Supper there was a series of instructions. Instruction 8 was the institution narrative read as a warrant; Instruction 9 was a eucharistic prayer 'which may conclude with this ancient doxology'. There followed the sanctus from the Book of Common Prayer ! In the 1898 Directory for Public Worship there was no reference to the sanctus, but in the 1921 book of the same title two eucharistic prayers were provided, the second of which echoed the Euchologion, but ended:

Yielding ourselves unto Thee, a sacrifice of love,
 we worship and adore Thee. With angels and archangels,
 and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify
 Thy glorious Name; evermore praising Thee, and saying,
 Holy, holy, holy (Book of Common Prayer text).

This was followed by the fraction and narrative of institution.

This pattern was abandoned in the 1948 The Presbyterian Service Book. Three orders were provided for the eucharist. In the first the eucharistic prayer was modelled upon that of the 1940 Book of Common Order, and the third was a conflated eucharistic prayer, with the sanctus at a place near the beginning. The second reproduced the second eucharistic prayer of the 1921 book, but now minus the sanctus ending ! On the otherhand the private compilation by Eric W. Philip, Sacramental and Other Services, 1927, provided three 'thanksgivings', A-C. Thanksgiving B ended with a sanctus:

for whose life and death of love, for whose rising again
 to be the living inspirer of our souls, we magnify and
 bless Thy holy name, evermore praising Thee and saying:
 Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty: glory be to Thee for
 thy great love. Amen.

(3) The Presbyterian Church of Ireland revisions of the Westminster Directory for the Public Worship of God (1825, 1840, 1859, 1868, 1887) make no reference to the sanctus. Both sanctus and benedictus appeared in the 1923 A Book of Public Worship, and its revision in 1931, both showing the influence of the Euchologion which was also in use in Ireland. In both books the sanctus and benedictus come after a lengthy preface (shortened in 1931) and were followed immediately as one continuous prayer by further thanksgiving, a brief reference to the institution narrative (cf. Addai and Mari !), anamnesis and epiklesis. In

the 1942 revision the sanctus came nearer the beginning of the prayer, the preface having been considerably reduced in length. In all cases the text assumed that it would be recited by the minister.⁵³

(4) The Presbyterian Churches in the USA (major reunions took place in 1958 and 1983) have a rather different liturgical background, the Dutch Reformed Church being one major source of influence.⁵⁴ However, in 1906 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the USA issued a Book of Common Worship, revised in 1932 and again in 1946.⁵⁵ In the first two, after the prayer of the veil, comes sursum corda, preface and then sanctus and benedictus in which the people join, followed by anamnesis, self-oblation and epiklesis, and then the institution narrative as a separate element.⁵⁶ The 1946 book produced a eucharistic prayer clearly influenced by the Church of Scotland's Book of Common Order, 1940. The same position for the sanctus and benedictus, at the beginning of a eucharistic prayer, is also found in the Book of Common Order, 1922 of Canada, the United Church of Canada's Book of Common Order, 1932, and Service Book and Ordinal of the Presbyterian Church of South Africa, 1921.

F. Congregationalism

The English Congregational tradition had rejected set forms of liturgy after the Westminster Directory of 1645, though apart from separate consecration of the bread and wine, the eucharist tended to follow the general outline of the Directory.⁵⁷ The sanctus made its re-entry into the Congregational tradition in

the 19th century adaptations of the Prayer Book.⁵⁸ So for example, The Book of Common Prayer Adapted for the use of the Congregational Church, Finchley Common, 1864, reproduced the Church of England eucharistic liturgy with only minor alterations, and included sursum corda, preface, sanctus, Prayer of Humble Access, etc. The same is true of the Free Church Service Book 1867, and The Free Church Prayer Book, 1897. The famous and influential Devotional Services of Dr. John Hunter re-introduced the sanctus in the edition of 1895, and in the definitive edition of 1901. Dr. W. E. Orchard, wearing his Presbyterian Church of England hat, compiled a liturgy c. 1912 for St. Paul's Church, Enfield, which had a Prayer of Thanksgiving (sursum corda, preface and sanctus) followed by a separate Prayer of Consecration.⁵⁹ When nominally a Congregationalist, his Divine Service of 1919 and 1926 both included sanctus and benedictus. In the 1919 edition the Prayer Book sursum corda, preface, proper preface and sanctus occurred after the offertory and collects, and were followed by the Oration fratres, suscipiat Domine and benedictus, and then a eucharistic prayer based on St. John's Gospel and 'Ancient Liturgies'.⁶⁰ In the 1926 edition the Oration fratres and suscipiat Domine were placed before the offertory prayer, thus removing any interruption from the sursum corda through to the prayer of oblation.

Although the Congregational Union had issued a liturgy in 1847, it was not until 1920 that a further liturgy was issued on behalf of the denomination (as against the publications of individuals), and one which contained a eucharistic liturgy. Heavily dependent upon the Prayer Book, it provided the sursum corda, preface and sanctus,

followed by the narrative of institution - 1 Cor.11:23-26.

However, these features disappeared in the Manual for Ministers 1936, a book which gave liturgical expression to the excesses of Liberal Theology. With the Neo-Genevan books of 1948, 1951 and 1959 (revised 1969)⁶¹, showing the influence of the eucharist of the 1940 Book of Common Order as well as that of the United Church of Canada's book 1932, the sanctus reappeared as part of a eucharistic prayer. In the first order of the 1948 book, the sursum corda, preface and sanctus of the Prayer Book were utilised alongside material from the 1940 Scottish Presbyterian rite, resulting in a thanksgiving for creation after the sanctus. The second order utilised the Canadian prayer; the sanctus also appeared in the fourth order. The 1959 book was published on behalf of the denomination, and accepted that preface and sanctus are a legitimate feature of the eucharistic prayer.

A similar recovery of the tradition is evidenced in the American Congregationalist books. The Book of Church Services, Chicago 1922, has a communion order based on that of Hunter, but no sanctus; in A Book of Worship for Free Churches, New York 1948, the communion service includes the Prayer Book invitation, sursum corda and sanctus, and a Prayer of Consecration.⁶²

F. Summary

Apart from the rite of Ostervald which is an eighteenth century work, the sanctus remained excluded from Reformed rites until the nineteenth century. Amongst English-speaking groups the main inspiration was the rite of the Catholic Apostolic Church - though Bersier was also aware of this rite.⁶³ In

Presbyterianism, where the Euchologion was followed, the sanctus was given an angelological setting which included reference to cherubim and seraphim, and Bersier too provided a full angelology. In the main, however, the English-speaking Reformed Churches were content to use the form of the Church of England, limited to angels, archangels and all the company (host) of heaven. Sometimes the Anglican version of the sanctus was used, at other times the Catholic Apostolic version, shorn of 'Sabaoth', but including benedictus. In later books, in imitation of the classical anaphora, the sanctus comes towards the beginning of the eucharistic prayer, after praise of God as creator. In the earlier books, however, it ended a lengthy section of praise for the whole of redemptive history (Euchologion) before a transition to anamnesis and epiklesis, or (e.g. Presbyterian 1891) it functioned as a doxology terminating a eucharistic prayer which is quite separate from 'Consecration'. It is usually assumed that the congregation will join in the sanctus, and settings for this 'doxology' were provided in collections of chants, hymns and doxologies.

3. ANGLICANISM

Although no official revision of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer took place in England before the twentieth century, a number of unofficial and private liturgical revisions and entire re-writings, were attempted in the intervening period. This was particularly true of the eighteenth century.

Already in 1696 Edward Stephens published 'The Liturgy of the Ancients Represented As Near as well may be, In English Form', which was designed for public use.⁶⁴ The book also contained a liturgy for private use. In the first eucharistic liturgy, after the offertory (with sentences) came the Grace, sursum corda, and a preface derived in large measure from the General Thanksgiving⁶⁵, with the sanctus together with the 'worship of the lamb' from the Apocalypse, thus connecting Isaiah 6:3 with Revelation 4:8-11, and 5:12-13:

It is very Meet, Right, and our Bounden Duty, that we should (Adore, Worship, and Glorifie thee, and) at all Times, and in all Places, give (Praise and) Thanks unto thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God, (for all Thy Goodness and Loving-kindness to us, and to all Men: We bless thee for our Creation, Preservation, and all the Blessings of this Life; but above All, for thine inestimable Love in the Redemption of the World by our Lord Jesus Christ; for the means of Grace, and for the hope of Glory. And) therefore with Angels and Arch-angels, and with all the Company of Heaven, we laud and magnifie thy glorious Name, evermore praising thee, and saying, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts, Heaven and Earth are full of thy Glory. Glory be to thee, O Lord most high. Amen.

Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive Glory, and Honour, and Power; for thou hast created all things; and for thy Pleasure they are and were created.

Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive Power, and Riches, and Wisdom and Strength, and Honour and Glory, and Blessing.

For thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us unto God, by thy Blood, out of every Kindred, and Tongue, and People and Nation.

Blessing, Honour, Glory, and Power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the Throne; and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever. 66

Patterned upon 1549, this was followed by the intercessions, and then the consecration, though there was no attempt to link these prayers together into one continuous eucharistic prayer.

The second rite, or 'Office of the Faithful', provided a similar link between the sanctus and Revelation, but the preface

took the form of 'a turgid thanksgiving-series with responses',⁶⁷ leading up to 'Therefore with Angels and Archangels...'.

Stephens published yet a third form, ' A Compleat Form of Liturgy, or Divine Service, According to the Usage of the Most Ancient Christians ' (second edition 1705) which appears to be a definitive revision. An offertory prayer led to the Grace, sursum corda, and a preface covering seven pages, with congregational responses. This extended preface actually developed into a Christological thanksgiving, thus giving the sanctus a new setting:

who, being in the form of God would not appear as God, but abased himself, taking the form of a Servant, made into the likeness of Men, and in appearance found as Man, humbled himself, being made obedient to Death, even the Death of the Cross.

R. For which God hath exalted him, and given him a Name above all Names, that at the Name of Jesus every knee bow, of Coelestial, Terrestrial, and Subterrestrial things, and every Tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

And therefore with Angels and Arch-angels, and all the Holy and Blessed Orders and Hosts of Heaven, We adore, worship and glorifie Thee, and Laud and Magnifie thy Glorious Name, saying: Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts, Heaven and Earth are full of thy Glory: Glory be to Thee, O Lord, Most High.

— Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive Glory and Honour, and Power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy Pleasure they were Created. 68

Early in the eighteenth century two liturgies were published by Arian sympathizers, William Whiston and John Henley. In 1713 Whiston published 'The Liturgy of the Church of England reduc'd nearer to the Primitive Standard, Humbly propos'd to Publick Consideration'.⁶⁹ This liturgy was influenced by AC 8, which Whiston believed to be the primitive apostolic liturgy. In the eucharist the Church Militant prayer was placed after the

'Comfortable Words', but the Prayer Book sursum corda, preface and sanctus, with Humble Access prayer were all reproduced. Much more radical, however, was the eucharist of John Henley, 'The Primitive Liturgy and Eucharist', 1726.⁷⁰ Henley freely drew upon AC. The anaphora was divided into ten parts or paragraphs, each ending with an Amen as the Roman canon missae. The 'preface' covered the first five paragraphs, thanking God for his own Being, as Creator of Christ, the heavenly bodies, the earth, and finally man, leading into the sanctus.⁷¹ The thematic arrangement corresponds with the anaphora of AC 8.

For catholic rather than Arian reasons, we find a similar use of material from the classical rites in the Non-jurors' liturgies of 1718 and 1734.⁷² That of 1718 is more recognisably an enrichment of the Book of Common Prayer. After the offertory came a prayer of approach, the sursum corda, preface, proper preface, and sanctus with benedictus from the 1549 Prayer Book. The post-sanctus was derived from that of St. James, beginning 'Holiness is thy nature and being, O Eternal King; Holy is the only begotten Son ...'. In 1734 the Non-jurors departed further from the Church of England forms, and the anaphora was based directly upon that of St. James and AC 8. The form of the sanctus shows the authority which was accorded AC at this time:

Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of Sabaoth; heaven and earth are full of his glory: Blessed is he for evermore. Amen.

As in Henley's rite, the benedictus occurs later in the service before communion, as in AC.

The eighteenth century also witnessed the emergence of two 'official' Anglican revisions: the 1764 Scottish Communion

Office, and the 1789 rite of the American Episcopal Church.⁷³

Behind the former lies the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1637, and the usage of the more moderate Non-jurors. It had precursors in the 'Wee Bookies' of 1722, 1735, and the recommendations of 1743.⁷⁴

The American rite was based in a small part upon the 1764 Scottish Office, but is a more conservative revision of the English 1662 rite.

The 1764 rite removed the invitation, confession, absolution and comfortable words and Humble Access prayer to a place immediately before communion, thus restoring the sequence sursum corda, preface sanctus, consecration and oblation, after which came the intercessions and Lord's Prayer. The preface-sanctus unit was thus reunited as part of a eucharistic prayer. Although 'Amen' still followed the sanctus, the Prayer of Consecration began 'All glory be to thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that thou of thy tender mercy ...', linking the Prayer of Consecration with the word 'glory' in the Cranmerian sanctus. At this point in the American book, however, the 1662 sequence was retained.

The 1662 pattern and that of 1764 represent the two patterns of handling the sanctus in subsequent Anglican revisions during this period. The '1662' pattern reappeared in the following revisions in the Anglican Communion: America 1789 and 1892; Canada 1918; Ireland 1920, and India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon 1960.⁷⁵ The '1764' pattern was given new impetus mainly through the work of Bishop W.H.Frere. In his influential book Some Principles of Liturgical Reform, 1911, Frere argued that the Prayer of Humble Access isolated the sanctus from the Prayer of Consecration,

resulting in 'a very unsatisfactory pattern'.⁷⁶ Appealing to the Scottish example he suggested a simple rearrangement:

- 1.Comfortable Words
- 2.Prayer of Humble Access
- 3.Sursum corda
- 4.Preface and sanctus
- 5.Consecration Prayer
- 6.Prayer of Oblation
- 7.Lord's Prayer. 77

In the reformulations of a Prayer of Consecration leading to the Deposited Book of 1927/8, the Lower House of Canterbury on 19th February 1914 prescribed:

That the Prayer of Humble Access be removed from its present position and be placed immediately before the Communion of Priest and People; that the Amen at the end of the present Prayer of Consecration be omitted, and that the Prayer of Oblation follow at once (prefaced by the word wherefore), and then the Lord's Prayer. 78

Although not necessarily following these particular directions of the Lower House of Canterbury Convocation, the removal of the Humble Access and the linking of the sanctus verbally to the Prayer of Consecration was adopted in the following Anglican revisions: Church of England 1928, America 1928, Scotland 1929, South Africa 1929⁷⁹, Canada 1959, Korea 1939, West Indies 1959, Madagascar 1945, Swahili, Hong Kong and Macao 1957, Japan 1957/9, India 1960, and Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia.⁸⁰

There is a more specific background to the Ceylon rite 1933/35, South India 1950/54 and India 1960. In 1920 J.C.Winslow and E.C.Ratcliff completed a liturgy for use in India which, they claimed, was more in keeping with Indian culture than the very Western European Book of Common Prayer.⁸¹ The rite which they produced was based upon the Liturgy of St.James, and was authorised for use in 1920. The eucharistic prayer was entitled 'The Anaphora', and commenced with the Grace and sursum

corda, with the Book of Common Prayer preface and provision for a proper preface. The introduction to the sanctus continued thus:

Therefore with martyrs and apostles, and with the great company of thy saints triumphant, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name: and we worship and adore thy Majesty with angels and Archangels, and with all the host of heaven, who ever fly before thy throne, praising thee, and chanting, and saying ...

The post-sanctus picked up thus: 'Holy in truth art thou, O Father Almighty, Eternal King, ...'.

This same inspiration, though slightly more in keeping with the Prayer Book form is found in the Ceylon rite 1933/35.

The liturgy of South India was for a Church which was a union between Anglicans, Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians. It drew on the Book of Common Order of the Church of Scotland, as well as upon the Book of Common Prayer and Methodist rites. The sursum corda was followed by the preface from the Book of Common Order, and the sanctus and benedictus (showing, ultimately, the influence of St. James⁸²), picking up 'Truly holy, truly blessed art thou, O heavenly Father ...'.

Most of the Anglican rites reproduced the Church of England texts, or simply translated them. Some rites added benedictus (Scotland, South India, India, Japan, Canada, Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia, Swahili, Korea, West Indies and Madagascar) and some removed the 'Amen' after the sanctus (Ceylon, Bombay, India, Japan, Canada, Korea, Hong Kong and Macao). It is difficult to evaluate the significance of English translations of vernacular compositions where there are a few differences - e.g. Madagascar ET

has ' in the Name of Jehovah' in the benedictus, and Hong Kong and Macao, 'heaven and earth are full of the glory of the Lord, glory be to the Lord Most High'. The Japanese rite attached a Hosanna to the sanctus.

The sanctus, where the Prayer of Consecration was to follow direct, was normally linked to it with such words as 'All glory be to thee, Almighty God...', 'All glory and thanksgiving...' or 'Blessing and glory and thanksgiving ...' (Canada 1959); the Japanese liturgy, almost certainly unconsciously, followed the idea found in Stephen's liturgy, with the sanctus being followed by a reference to Revelation 4:11:

Unto thee, O God, the Father almighty, be thanksgiving and blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and honour, and power, and might, for ever and ever; for that thou by thy Word didst create all things, and for us men, and for our salvation...

There was, therefore, a strong move in some Provinces to reintegrate the sursum corda -sanctus unit with the Prayer of Consecration; apart from one or two notable exceptions, other provinces seemed content to use the English textual forms, even in translation.

4. METHODISM

John Wesley combined the use of extempore prayer with a high esteem of the Book of Common Prayer. When forced into a position of ordaining a Superintendent and Elders for the USA, Wesley prepared an abridgement of the Book of Common Prayer.⁸³ In the Communion Service, Wesley made minor changes, but the position of the prayers remained unchanged, and thus the 1784 Abridgement followed Cranmer's arrangement.⁸⁴ A second

edition appeared in 1786, and subsequent editions appeared under various titles in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in the Wesleyan Methodist tradition.⁸⁵ However, splits in the Methodist ranks quickly appeared after Wesley's death, and other Methodist groups tended to emphasise free prayer, and despised liturgical forms. In the nineteenth century some of these groups did eventually issue forms of service for the guidance of the minister for occasions such as baptism, communion and weddings.⁸⁶ The Primitive Methodists issued forms in 1860 and c.1890. In the Order of Administration of the Sacraments and other Services, c.1890, the following order for communion was given:

Prayer for the Church
 Scripture passages
 Exhortation
 Confession
 Comfortable Words
 Prayer of Consecration (no narrative of institution)
 Delivery (1662 BCP form)
 Post-communion prayer
 Blessing. 87

The United Methodist Free Churches' Book of Services (between 1875-83)⁸⁸, gave:

Hymn
 Narrative (Matthew, Luke or 1 Cor)
 Collection with scripture sentences
 Address
 Hymn
 Distribution. 89

The Bible Christians produced Service Book in 1903⁹⁰, and the United Methodists produced another liturgy in 1913.⁹¹ In his consideration of these rites, John Bowmer remarked that there was no provision for congregational responses, and so the sursum corda, preface and sanctus found no place in these communion services.⁹² When the full union of the Methodist Church took place

in 1932, a new liturgy, The Book of Offices, was issued in 1936. Two orders for the communion were included, one following the Prayer Book pattern of the Wesleyan Methodist tradition, with sursum corda, preface, proper preface and sanctus in their 1662 position, and a second reflecting more the pattern of the United Methodist Church type of order. In this second order, the Prayer Book sursum corda, preface and sanctus were incorporated in the following pattern:

Sentences
Hymn and offering
Lord's Prayer
ye that do truly
Penitential response (Psalm 51) and two-fold Agnus Dei
Scripture passage
Sursum corda
Preface
Sanctus
Extempore prayer or prayer of oblation
Prayer
Humble Access
Institution narrative
Delivery
Hymn
Gloria in excelsis
Blessing and Grace.

Thus in the 1936 rite, the sursum corda, preface and sanctus are recommended for Methodist usage. However, this unit - as in the Book of Common Prayer - was regarded as a unit complete in itself. This was also true of American Methodism, which tended to follow Wesley's Abridgement.⁹³ There was no attempt at this time to reincorporate it into a eucharistic prayer.

5. OVERVIEW

In the four traditions which we have reviewed in this period in the Reformation Churches, we find a revival of the use of the

sanctus in those traditions and sectors of Churches where it had fallen into disuse. In Lutheranism, Anglicanism and the more recent Reformed rites, there was a move to reconnect it within a eucharistic prayer, simply in imitation of the classical anaphoras, though adapting it to the needs and practice of the particular Church. Only in the Reformed tradition was there a new development - the termination of the eucharistic prayer with the sanctus as a doxology - though a separate Prayer of Consecration might follow.

NOTES -- CHAPTER 9

1. Edward T.Horn, Outlines of Liturgics, (Philadelphia,1890),47-8.
2. L.D.Reed, The Lutheran Liturgy, (Philadelphia 1960²), 152-3.
3. Liturgie bei dem öffentlichen Gottensdienste der evangelische-christlichen kirche in dem Herzogthum Nassau (Wiesbaden 1843).
4. Reed,op.cit; ed.C.Jones, G.Wainwright and E.Yarnold, The Study of Liturgy (London 1978), 254. See also Brilioth,op.cit.,146ff.
5. Die Hannoversche Agende (Bonn 1913).
6. W.Löhe, Agende für christliche Gemeinden des lutherischen Bekenntnisses (Nordlingen, 1844), 26-30,29.
7. Text in E.Yelverton, The Mass in Sweden (HBS 57, London 1920).
8. Ibid.
9. Reed, op.cit., 758.
10. H.Holloway, The Norwegian Rite (London 1934).
11. Ibid.
12. I am indebted to Professor H.Glahn and Rev.Dr.K.Stevenson for information and texts of the Danish rite.
13. Reed, op.cit.,passim. For the various churches and amalgamations see Arthur C.Piepkorn, Profiles in Belief. The Religious Bodies of the United States and Canada Vol.2 (New York 1978).
14. I am grateful to Rev.R.Feuerhahn of the Lutheran Seminary St.Louis for kindly supplying me with the text. See also Reed, op.cit.,168.
15. Edward T.Horn, 'The Lutheran Sources of the Common Service', Lutheran Quarterly 21(1891), 239-68.
16. For other Lutheran groups, see Reed,passim.
17. Reed,op.cit.,211.
18. Reed, 126,756.
19. Text in Bruno Bürki, Cène du Seigneur - eucharistie de l'Église (Fribourg 1985) 2 vols., Vol.A.
20. Ibid., Vol.B.,57ff.
21. Ibid.,A, 18.
22. Ibid.,B,81.

23. Ibid.,82
24. Ibid.,75
25. See my review of Bürki in JTS NS 37(1986),693-7; see also Bryan D.Spinks, From the Lord and"the Best Reformed Churches".
26. So H.Daniel, Codex Liturgiis III.
27. H.Hageman, Pulpit and Table (Richmond 1962),61.
28. Ibid., 70ff
29. Text in Bürki.
30. For a full discussion, Bürki, B, 108ff
31. Projet, 157ff.
32. Text in Bürki.
33. Bürki, B, passim.
34. Ibid., A, 114.
35. Ibid., B, 139ff.
36. See Bürki,A.
37. For a full survey, K.W.Stevenson, 'The Catholic Apostolic Eucharist', University of Southampton Ph.D. 1975; idem, 'The Catholic Apostolic Church - its History and its Eucharist', SL 13(1979), 21-43. I am grateful to Kenneth Stevenson for his assistance with the background to this rite.
38. Stevenson, art.cit.,27.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid.,30.
41. Ibid.,35-9
42. J.Cardale, Readings upon the Liturgy and other Divine Offices of the Church 2 Vols (London 1874/5).
43. Ibid., vol.1, 148.
44. Ibid., 149-50.
45. J.M.Maxwell, Worship and Reformed Theology. The Liturgical Lessons of Mercersburg (Pittsburgh 1976).
46. Hageman, op.cit.,89.
47. Scott F.Brenner, 'Philip Schaff the Liturgist', Christendom 11 (1946), 443-56, 450.

48. J.M.Maxwell, op.cit., 436.
49. See Maxwell for details.
50. George W.Sprott, The Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland (Edinburgh and London 1882),118.
51. I am indebted to Professor J.M.Barkley who not only supplied me with the texts of these rites, but also offered helpful advice on them.
52. Private letter, 9th July 1985.
53. For details of these rites, J.M.Barkley, The Worship of the Reformed Church (London 1966).
54. J.M.Maxwell, op.cit.,336-40.
55. Julius Melton, 'Presbyterian Worship in Twentieth Century America', in ed.John E.Booty,The Divine Drama in History and Liturgy (Allison Park, 1984) 179-99. For the various Presbyterian Churches in the USA, see Piepkorn, op.cit. I am indebted to Rev.Dr.Horace Allan for supplying me with many of the texts.
56. The influence of the Euchologion is discernable. However, the communion service by Herrick Johnson, Forms for Special Occasions, Philadelphia 1909 reflects the Directory, and has no sursum corda or sanctus - suggesting that many congregations did not use these elements in their worship.
57. For full details, Bryan D.Spinks, Freedom or Order ? (Allison Park 1984)
58. Bryan D.Spinks, 'The liturgical Revival amongst nineteenth-century English Congregationalists', SL 15(1982/3),178-87.
59. Bryan D.Spinks, 'A Precursor to Dr.W.E.Orchard's Divine Service ?', Journal of United-Reformed Church-History Society 2:3 (1979), 73-5.
60. Spinks, Freedom or Order ?, 123ff.
61. For this title, ibid., 165ff.
62. The American Congregationalists largely merged with the German Reformed Church to form the United Church of Christ in 1957. See Piepkorn, op.cit.
63. Bouyer, Eucharist, 431-2.
64. Text in W.Jardine Grisbrooke,Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries (London 1958).
65. Itself probably a Puritan eucharistic prayer. G.J.Cuming, 'Two Fragments of a Lost Liturgy', in Studies in Church History vol.3., (Leiden 1966), 247-53.

66. Grisbrooke, 211-2.
67. Ibid., 51.
68. Ibid., 240.
69. Ibid., 247.
70. Ibid., 263.
71. Ibid., 266-7.
72. Ibid., 273ff.
73. Marion J. Hatchett, The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer (New York 1982)
74. Ibid., 26-7.
75. Texts in B. Wigan, The Liturgy in English (Oxford 1962)
76. W. H. Frere, Some Principles of Liturgical Reform (London 1911), 188.
77. Ibid., 191.
78. Quoted in G. J. Cuming, The Godly Order (London 1983) 175.
79. See G. J. Cuming, A History of Anglican Liturgy for influence of Frere on South Africa.
80. Texts in Wigan; C. O. Buchanan, Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958-1968 (Oxford 1968).
81. J. Winslow, E. C. Ratcliff, The Eucharist in India: a plea for a Distinctive Liturgy for the Indian Church (London 1920)
82. See chapter 4 for St. James.--
83. Text in Bard Thompson, Liturgies of the Western Church
84. For details, G. J. Cuming, A History of Anglican Liturgy, 179-82.
85. Wesley F. Swift, 'The Sunday Service of the Methodists', PWHS 29 (1953/4), 12-24; 'The Sunday Service of the Methodists. A Study of Nineteenth-century Liturgy', PWHS 31(1957/8), 112-8.
86. See Elliott Peaston, The Prayer Book Tradition in the Free Churches (London 1964).
87. John C. Bowmer, 'Some Non-Wesleyan Service Books', PWHS 32 (1960/1), 145-52.
88. Ibid.

89. Ibid. This was expanded in later editions.
90. John C. Bowmer, 'The Bible Christian Service Book', PWHS 33 (1961/2), 1-3.
91. John C. Bowmer, 'Some Non-Wesleyan Service Books'.
92. Ibid.
93. Nolan B. Harmon, The Rites and Ritual of Episcopal Methodism (Nasville 1926).

CHAPTER 10

THE SANCTUS IN SOME CONTEMPORARY EUCHARISTIC PRAYERS

Since 1960 most Western Churches have produced a mixture of revised, alternative and experimental eucharistic liturgies, with one or more new eucharistic prayers. Indeed, in the last twenty five years more eucharistic prayers have been composed than in the whole previous history of the Church ! It is an impossible task to undertake an examination of all these prayers, and because of the consensus on the structure and content of the anaphora which has grown out of the Liturgical and Ecumenical movements, an unnecessary one. In this chapter a selection from various traditions has been made simply to see how the sanctus has been utilised. Some new eucharistic prayers have been composed without using the sanctus, and this fact will be considered in the final chapter.

1. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RITE

Dated 20th March 1970, the Congregation for Divine Worship published the new Roman Missal together with an introduction, the Institutio Generalis. Whereas the Missal of Pius V of 1570 had conserved only the single Roman canon missae, and limited the number of proper prefaces,¹ the Missal of Paul VI, while giving a slight revision of the canon, provided three new eucharistic prayers, entitled Eucharistic Prayer II, III, and IV respectively; these new prayers had been published in 1968.² Eucharistic Prayer II was based upon the anaphora of Apostolic Tradition;³ III, according to Bouyer was based upon the Mozarabic and Gallican sources, though Wegman and Mazza feel that its structure is that of the Roman canon, with Antiochene and Alexandrine

influence;⁴ and IV was modelled upon the Coptic version of St.Basil, and, more loosely, West Syrian forms.⁵ A revised text of the Missal (but not affecting the eucharistic prayers) was published in 1975.

In November 1974 the Congregation for Divine Worship published five further eucharistic prayers - two on the theme of reconciliation, and three for use at eucharists with children.⁶ These, together with the four prayers in the Missal were composed in Latin, and National Bishops' Conferences and Synods were responsible for the vernacular translations and adaptations.⁷ Subsequently national synods have been able to compose their own eucharistic prayers in the vernacular.⁸

Although the old Roman canon has retained its unique structure, Eucharistic Prayers II,III and IV have a common structure described as the ingenium romanum:

1. Opening doxology of praise to the Father.
2. Statement of motives for thanksgiving.
3. Sanctus - vere sanctus.
4. Consecratory epiklesis
5. Institution narrative and acclamation
6. Anamnesis or memorial prayer with oblation.
7. Communion epiklesis
8. Intercession
9. Closing doxology.

Aidan Kavanagh has remarked that there is something here for everyone: proper prefaces of the Western tradition (not IV), a post-sanctus epiklesis as in the Egyptian tradition, and an epiklesis and intercession of the West Syrian tradition.⁹ The resulting structure, however, is entirely new and without precedent.

Prayer IV, modelled upon St.Basil, is not designed for use with a proper preface; it is a fixed prayer as in the Eastern

tradition. Whereas the Western prefaces generally have a christological concern, the first part of this prayer is solely 'theological', praising the transcendent God for his Being:

Father in heaven, it is right that we should give you
thanks and glory:
you alone are God, living and true.
Through all eternity you live in unapproachable light.
Source of life and goodness, you have created all things,
to fill your creatures with every blessing
and lead all men to the joyful vision of your light.
Countless hosts of angels stand before you to do your will;
they look upon your splendour
and praise you, night and day.
United with them
and in the name of every creature under heaven,
we too praise your glory as we say: (ICEL text)

The post-sanctus continues with an account of salvation history. Although this prayer echoes Basil, in contrast to the latter's⁹ prolific angelology, here angelology has been kept to a minimum - perhaps as Mazza has suggested, because people are so unreceptive towards angelology or, more simply, because philosophers have rejected any cosmological role for the angels.¹⁰ This pruning of angelology - already encountered in many protestant texts from the Reformation onwards - is a recurring factor in most modern eucharistic prayers.¹¹

Eucharistic Prayers I, II, and III are designed to be used with proper prefaces. Eighty two proper prefaces are provided - fifty one within the Order of the Mass, and the rest appearing in their proper places in the course of the missal. This increase in the number of proper prefaces (though still less than in the Verona Sacramentary !) gives the eucharistic prayer a firm setting within the liturgical calendar, or theme of the mass.

Prayer II was based upon Hippolytus which is noted for its fixed thanksgiving, and absence of the sanctus and intercessions.

In the Latin text of Prayer II the usual preface is based upon that of Hippolytus, but a sanctus has been inserted. Commenting upon this Botte wrote:

One problem was that raised by the Sanctus. This chant is not a primitive feature in the anaphoras. In many of the oldest of them its insertion has been made so clumsily that the juncture with the primitive text is easily seen. But one fact stands out: the Sanctus has been inserted in all liturgies ... So it was necessary to find a point at which the Sanctus could be inserted and after it a way of connecting it with the continuation of the prayer. 12

The second part of this study has attempted to demonstrate that Botte's assumption about the sanctus being everywhere an insertion is entirely incorrect. Of note however is that for the composition of new anaphoras, the sanctus was to be regarded now as a sine qua non. The usual preface of this prayer can be replaced by any other proper preface which is appropriate, though this makes no difference to the modern 'interpolation' of the sanctus into this Hippolytus-based anaphora. Eucharistic Prayer III -whether we accept Bouyer's views or that of Wegman and Mazza about its basis - has, as might be expected, sanctus and benedictus.

In the Latin text of the prefaces we find the transition to the sanctus made with the traditional Roman formulae, particularly Et ideo cum Angelis et Archangelis, Per quem maiestatem, and Quapropter, profusis (paschalibus) gaudiis. However, in addition new shorter angelological sections are provided, and an appendix contains twelve additional formulae which synods may use in translating into the vernacular:

1. Unde et nos cum omnibus Angelis te laudamus,
iucunda celebratione clamantes:

2. Unde et nos tibi gratias agimus
et tuas virtutes cum Angelis praedicamus, dicentes:
3. Unde et nos, Domine, cum Angelis et Sanctis universis
tibi confitemur, in exultatione dicentes:
4. Et ideo, choris angelicis sociati,
te laudamus in gaudio confitentes:
5. Et ideo, cum innumeris Angelis,
una te magnificamus laudis voce, dicentes:
6. Et ideo, cum Angelorum atque Sanctorum turba,
hymnum laudis tibi canimus, sine fine dicentes:
7. Et ideo, cum Sanctis et Angelis universis,
te collaudamus, sine fine dicentes:
8. Et ideo, cum caelorum Virtutibus,
in terris te iugiter celebramus
maiestati tuae sine fine clamantes:
9. Propter quod caelestia tibi atque terrestria
canticum novum concinunt adorando,
et nos cum omni exercitu Angelorum
proclamamus, sine fine dicentes:
10. Quapropter nunc et usque in saeculum,
cum omni militia Angelorum,
devota tibi mente concinimus
clamantes atque dicentes:
11. Sed et angelici chori atque agmina beatorum
hymnum gloriae tuae concinunt, sine fine dicentes:
12. Per quem maiestatem tuam adorat exercitus Angelorum,
ante conspectum tuum in aeternitate laetantium
~~cum quibus et nostras voces ut admitti iubeas, deprecamur,~~
solia exultatione dicentes:

Occasionally a slightly different introduction is found in some of the prefaces (e.g. of Angels, of Saints, Common Preface III).

It is interesting to observe that the English (ICEL) translations of the new proper prefaces discard the old Roman introductions with their angelology in preference for the formulae of the appendix which has a much simplified angelology. On the other hand, the 1970 missal of the Nederlandse Commissie voor Liturgie opted for a more intermediate form. For example,

the preface for the Second Sunday in Advent:

1970 Latin missal

Et ideo cum Angelis et
Archangelis cum thronis et
dominationes cumque omni militia
caelestis exercitus, hymnum
gloriae tuae canimus sine fine
dicentes:

ICEL

And so, with all the choirs
of angels in heaven we proclaim
your glory and join in their
unending hymn of praise:

Dutch 1970

Therefore with all the angels, powers and virtues(machten en krachten)
with all who stand before your throne
we praise and worship you
and full of joy sing to you:

A certain latitude has been allowed, therefore, in translation
and cultural adaptation; the ICEL version of formula 9 is:

Earth unites with heaven to sing the song of creation
as we adore and praise you for ever.

The Dutch Ordo Missae of 1970 was remarkable on account of
the fact that alongside the official eucharistic prayers, it
included twelve other 'indigenous' Dutch prayers compiled by
members of the Nederlandse Commissie voor Liturgie, which included
the priest-poet, Huub Oosterhuis, and the liturgist Herman
Wegman.¹³ Some of the prayers presupposed the use of an
authorised preface and sanctus; others provided new fixed prefaces.
All the new compositions show a reluctance to use angelology as
an introduction to the sanctus. Thus Prayer VIII:

Together with Him and with His Church from the whole world
we want to thank you, and praise you and we sing to you ...

Prayer IX:

In city and country
in humanity and powers
in life and death
you are thought to be present and are spoken of
until this earth is the city of peace,
the new Jerusalem where sorrow is over
and all our misdeeds forgotten.
Then listen now, when we call to you, God,
and keep on saying:

Prayer XV:

We honour you in the Name of your whole church, with
 Mary, most blessed of women, with your disciples, martyrs
 and confessors,
 with all who acknowledge you, we say:

This latter introduction, uniting as it does the church on earth
 with the church triumphant, is reminiscent of the development
 found in some West Syrian anaphoras, though their exuberant
 angelology is not imitated in any sense at all. Prayer XII
 offered a variant version of the sanctus:

Holy, holy, holy, Lord of all Powers
 Heaven and earth are full of your glory
 Come to release us, You the Most High.
 Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.
 Come to release us, You the Most High.

In this instance the Hosanna has been interpreted rather than
 merely translated.

The same tendency to down the angelology is found in the
 eucharistic prayer of the Swiss Synod (particularly variable
 preface 4)¹⁴, the two prayers for reconciliation, and the ICEL
 English Eucharistic Prayer A.¹⁵

The Eucharistic Prayers for use with children reveal a more
 imaginative approach to the sanctus. The first has a long
 preface of three parts, interrupted by parts of the sanctus and
 benedictus as responses by the children:

1. Praise of the creation: Heaven and Earth...Hosanna in the Highest.
2. Thanksgiving for Christ: Blessed is he ...
3. Together with us the whole Church prayers: sanctus and benedictus.

The second is characterised by many inserted responses, including
 Hosanna in the Highest, the sanctus and benedictus, and the
 benedictus on its own. The third prayer has sanctus and benedictus
 in the more traditional position.

Because the vernacular was adopted for the Vatican II reforms, each language speaking area became responsible for translating and adapting the Latin original compositions. For the English speaking world a committee was appointed to standardize English translations, ICEL.¹⁶ This was later broadened to an ecumenical group acting on behalf of all English-speaking churches, ICET.¹⁷ In the resulting text of the sanctus and benedictus the following translation was adopted:

Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might,
 heaven and earth are full of your glory.
 Hosanna in the highest.
 Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.
 Hosanna in the highest.

Two things should be noted here. First, on the grounds that the sense of the LXX version of Isaiah 6:3 does not demand a comma after the third holy, and the address of the sanctus in the eucharistic prayer direct to God (your glory in line 2), the first line becomes a vocative. Because of the difficulty over the meaning of 'Sabaoth', this has been translated as 'God of power and might', suggested in part by 'pantocrator' of Rev.4:8. Secondly, the Hosanna, which seems originally to have been the introduction to the benedictus, has continued to be attached to the sanctus.¹⁸ These versions, therefore, are not only those of the English Roman Catholic texts, but also of many English-speaking churches.

2. THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

Since 1960 a vast number of new liturgies have been compiled for use within the Anglican Communion. Some of these have been

experimental, some alternatives, and some are new definitive texts. Where the English language has been utilized, or English versions have been produced alongside vernacular liturgies, the language has been changed from Authorized Version English to Revised Standard Version English, to Modern English, and for a number of texts, the ICET versions. The majority of the new Anglican eucharistic liturgies have been collected and edited by Colin Buchanan in MAL, FAL and LAL.¹⁹

Overall there has been an almost uniform abandonment of the Cranmerian/1662 utilization of the preface-sanctus-Humble Access-Prayer of Consecration sequence in favour of a unified eucharistic prayer, although in many places the 1662 rite remains in use alongside newer rites.²⁰ In their compilations, the various Provinces of the Anglican Communion have been influenced by a number of factors:

1. The growing ecumenical consensus on eucharistic prayers.²¹
2. Revision in other Churches, especially the CSI and the Roman Catholic Church.
3. The rites of other Anglican Provinces.
4. Earlier rites of each Province.
5. New ideas of the various commissions themselves.

In order to give some coherent unity in Anglicanism, a number of guide documents have been produced. The most important of these have been:

- a) The Lambeth Conference 1958.
- b) The Pan-Anglican Document.
- c) The Second Pan-Anglican Document.²²

Regarding the eucharistic prayer, Lambeth recommended the following:

The events for which thanksgiving is made in the Consecration Prayer are not confined to Calvary but include thanksgiving for all the principal "mighty works of God", especially the resurrection and ascension of our Lord, and his return in glory. 23

Perhaps inspired by the Eastern eucharistic prayers, this recommendation involved what Frere had argued for, namely the reuniting of the sursum corda, preface and sanctus with the rest of the prayer. The Pan-Anglican document of 1965 was vaguer on the content of the eucharistic prayer:

The Service of the Lord's Supper. This should include the placing of the gifts on the Lord's Table and the ancient form of Sursum Corda. The consecration prayer should be in the form of a thanksgiving for creation and for God's mighty acts in Christ and in sending the Holy Spirit. There should be a recital of the words and acts of the Lord at the Last Supper and a prayer for the communicants. The Lord's Prayer makes a fitting ending to this prayer. The Breaking of the Bread follows, and the Communion of clergy and people. 24

The Second Pan-Anglican document was more specific. Article 5, entitled 'The Thanksgiving over bread and wine' said:

The basic elements and progression of this eucharistic are:

- (a) Sursum corda
- (b) The proclamation and recital of the mighty acts of God in creation, redemption, and sanctification.
- (c) The Narrative of the Institution.
- (d) The anamnesis of the work of Christ in Death, Resurrection, and Ascension 'until he come'. It is recognized that this is the most difficult section of the prayer in view of the different doctrinal emphases which are expressed and recognized within the Anglican Communion. The whole concept of anamnesis is, however, so rich in meaning that it should not be impossible to express it in such a way that the needs of everyone are met. Whatever language is adopted should, however, avoid any idea of a propitiatory sacrifice or repetition of Christ's sacrifice. The 'once for all' character of his work must not be obscured.
- (e) The prayer that through the sharing of the bread and wine

and through the power of the Holy Spirit we may be made one with our Lord and so renewed in the Body of Christ.

The whole prayer is rightly set in the context of praise e.g. Sursum corda and sanctus. 25

Surveying the most recent revisions Buchanan wrote:

At first sight there is now a shared concept of what a eucharistic prayer is, and a common structure of that prayer, which enables specific prayers to be set out in parallel columns with a common set of titles to sections down the left-hand margin. The pattern looks like this:

SALUTATION

SURSUM CORDA

PREFACE: Creation

Incarnation of Christ

Death and Resurrection

Sending of the Spirit and

calling into being of the Church.

Introduction to Sanctus.

SANCTUS:

(Benedictus Qui Venit)

POST-SANCTUS: 'Link' (possibly with more salvation history)

Petition for Consecration (first epiclesis)

Narrative of Institution

ACCLAMATIONS

Anamnesis

'Second epiclesis'

Petition for fruitful reception

Doxology

AMEN 26

However, Buchanan goes on to say:

With a little experience of recent Anglican eucharistic rites, it might well look possible to draft a mainstream sample Anglican eucharistic prayer ! In fact it is not so easy. 27

Indeed, the prayers tend to overlap, though certain 'families' are still discernable. In FAL Buchanan identified five distinct types or families.²⁸ Here we shall consider the treatment of the sanctus in the archetypes of those families, and then offer a summary overview of other recent Anglican revision.

The Liturgy for Africa (itself inspired by CSI.)

Conceived in Kampala in April 1961, LfA was drafted there in

April 1963 at a meeting with representatives of the Provinces of South Africa, West Africa, Central Africa, East Africa and Uganda.²⁹ The idea of a unitive liturgy arose in East Africa where the newly formed Province united traditions of 1662 and the 1549/Roman use of Swahili. The Archbishop of Uganda, Dr. Leslie Brown, was responsible for much of the work, submitting it to four members of the Church of England Liturgical Commission for comment. The definitive text was published in 1964.

The eucharistic prayer was entitled 'The Great Thanksgiving' and was drafted in AV language.³⁰ After sursum corda came a lengthy fixed preface based upon the CSI prayer, giving thanks through Christ for

- a) Creation and material things
- b) The Incarnation and Resurrection
- c) The Ascension and Heavenly Intercession
- d) Sending the Holy Spirit and making a Royal priesthood.

This thanksgiving led to the sanctus:

Therefore with angels and archangels, with patriarchs and prophets, apostles and martyrs, and with all the holy company of heaven, we cry aloud with joy, evermore praising thee and saying:

Only the Prayer Book sanctus was included, with the pick up 'All glory to thee, o heavenly Father, ...' .

Thus in LfA we encounter a fixed preface where the sanctus is a joyful hymn in response to God's mighty Acts, particularly in Christ and the Church. There is no proper preface. The angelology of Cranmer is left intact, but representatives of the Church triumphant are added.

Church of England Series 2, 3, and Rite A.

The Alternative Services Book of the Church of England appeared in 1980, and the eucharistic liturgy in modern English - Rite A - provided four eucharistic prayers, as well as a modernized form of 1662. The history behind the four eucharistic prayers is complex, and spans a period of some fifteen years.³¹

By the Prayer Book (Alternative and Other Services) Measure 1965, the Church of England could authorize experimental services without Parliament's ratification. In the Alternative Services First Series the 1662 text with some 1928 features, and many options, was authorized, following Frere's suggestion of reordering the preface, sanctus, prayer of consecration and oblation. However, in the same year the Liturgical Commission also published as a report Alternative Services Second Series, which included a new eucharistic rite (Series 2). Although in AV/RSV language, it was very different from the Prayer Book. The Liturgical Commission explained some of the thinking behind the eucharistic prayer:

We have thought of the Preface and the Prayer of Consecration as two parts of one whole; and we have therefore removed the Prayer of Humble Access from its present position between them ...

In the Preface, or first half of our Consecration we have attempted to produce a Thanksgiving for the Creation of the World, the Redemption of Mankind, and the Sanctification of the People of God, through Christ. In order to mark the seasons of the Church's Year, we have provided short 'proper prefaces' to be inserted in the general thanksgiving. But we hope that we have written something which is of manageable length. 32

Although there was considerable controversy over the anamnesis-oblation in the prayer,³³ the section from sursum corda to

the sanctus of the revised authorized rite of 1967 hardly differed from that proposed in 1965.

The prayer included both a lengthy fixed preface giving thanks for the same themes (though phrased differently) as LfA. However, after thanksgiving for the resurrection, there was provision for the insertion of proper prefaces for Christmas, Passiontide and Easter, and after thanksgiving for the Holy Spirit, a proper preface for use from Ascension to Pentecost. It thus combined a fixed 'Eastern' type preface with the Western use of proper prefaces. The post-sanctus led immediately into a petition for 'consecration', without any literary link. The sanctus was the Prayer Book form, and the benedictus was included, but, possibly influenced by convictions about AC 8, as an optional anthem immediately after the eucharistic prayer.

The prayer was inspired by the ancient anaphora contained in the Apostolic Tradition, and the account of the eucharist and writings of Justin Martyr. This explains partly the lengthy Christological fixed preface before the sanctus. Since however neither of these ancient sources include the sanctus, one had to be inserted and given a context. A former secretary to the Liturgical Commission, G.G. Willis commented:

Perhaps the Commission thought it would be too shocking for words to an English Congregation if it were to behave in a really primitive fashion and excise the Sanctus, ... The Preface seems to be over-elaborate, and the insertions made into it at great festivals are clumsy, and tend to be tautologous, and the transition to the rest of the prayer is exceptionally abrupt. 34

Willis also noted that the sanctus alone, without benedictus - after the Egyptian model - had been adopted.³⁵ However, much of this can be explained by the fact that the Commission at that

time was influenced by the views of two of its members, E.C.Ratcliff and A.H.Couratin, both of whom at that time believed that the original form of Apostolic Tradition had included the sanctus as a terminating doxology.³⁶ Couratin explained the thought to me thus:

In the original draft, since Dialogue 41 (Justin) has no allusion to the sanctus, it was placed between eucharistia and anamnesis, because that is really the only place in which it had hope of being accepted. Ronald Jasper wanted it at the end, and even suggested that it should be sung twice, once after eucharistia and once after anamnesis. But it was pointed out to him that, if he could over the years convince the C of E that it ought to form the doxology of the Eucharistic Prayer, it would be very easy to move the paragraph to the end, and make it run: 'Through him therefore with angels and archangels, with Cherubim and Seraphim, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious name, evermore praising thee and saying: Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth, heaven and earth are full of thy glory, throughout all ages, world without end. Amen'. Meanwhile we introduced references to 'earth' and 'heaven' and 'the whole Church' into the ordinary doxology, to direct men's thoughts heavenward ! 37

Indeed, the prayer ended with a reference to glory 'from the whole company of earth and heaven ', and the sanctus would have been a fitting conclusion to the prayer.

In 1968 the text of Series 2 was the basis for the modern English text which was included in Modern Liturgical Texts, which represented a stage towards the modern English Series 3 report of 1971, and the authorized text of 1973.³⁸ This latter included the ICET texts. Revised as GS 364 and GS 364A, the final definitive text became prayer 1 of the ASB.

The prayer was redrafted for the Series 3 report 1971 and Series 3 1973 - and retained through to its ASB version - had a reminder of the original intention behind Series 2; the prayer did not terminate with the sanctus, but with another doxology

after which the people responded:

Through him, and with him, and in him, in the power
of the Holy Spirit, with all who stand before you in earth
and heaven, we worship you, Father almighty, in songs
of everlasting praise:

Blessing and honour and glory and power be yours for
ever and ever. Amen.

Had the sanctus not already featured earlier in the prayer, it
would have fitted neatly as a response to the doxology.

Although in modern English, and in places rephrased, together
with provision for a proper preface in a single position,
before the introduction to the sanctus the substance of the
prayer remained unchanged in its scope of thanksgiving. From
the 1978 redrafting onwards, benedictus could be used immediately
after the sanctus. The sanctus in this prayer, from its
Series 2 origins to its form as prayer 1 in the ASB, concludes
a lengthy Christological thanksgiving.

The second prayer in the ASB is also descended from Series 2,
and the differences between prayers 1 and 2 are found in the
anamnesis. Prayer 3 was the result of initiatives taken by
R.Beckwith and B.Brindly in November 1978.³⁹ It was based
directly upon the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, but like
the Roman Catholic revision, the Church of England found it
necessary to provide for a proper preface and sanctus with
benedictus. Thus after the barest reference to creation through
the Word, the preface is a rehearsal of Christ's saving deeds.
The sanctus is thus used as a response to the work of Christ.

Prayer 4 was based upon Series 1. Sanctus and benedictus come
after a short preface with proper preface, though the Prayer Book
initial thanksgiving has been expanded to include 'Creator of heaven

and earth, through Jesus Christ our Lord'.

Unlike the Roman prefaces, there is no variety of introduction to the sanctus, but a standard introduction (partly of course because the proper prefaces are insertions, and not complete independent prefaces as in the Roman rite). The angelology is simply that of the Prayer Book - angels, archangels, and the whole company of heaven. An exception to this is for the feast of St. Michael and All Angels, in which the cherubim and seraphim make an appearance.

ECUSA 1977/79.

The ECUSA revised Prayer Book was the culmination of some twenty years of revision. Two rites were provided for the eucharist: rite one in traditional (AV) English, which has two eucharistic prayers, reflecting the American 1928 Prayer Book, each retaining the Prayer Book sursum corda, short preface, proper prefaces (22) and sanctus with benedictus; and rite two in modern English, which provides four eucharistic prayers. Of these, A and B (cf. ASB prayer 4) have a brief preface (mentioning creation), proper prefaces, and a common introduction to the sanctus:

Therefore we praise you, joining our voices with Angels and Archangels and with all the company of heaven, who for ever sing this hymn to proclaim the glory of your Name:

Prayer A has the pick up, 'Holy and gracious Father'; prayer B which is based on Hippolytus, continues ' We give thanks to you, O God, ...'.⁴⁰ Prayer C, the 'Star-trek' prayer, was first published in 1970 for experimental use within the rite for an informal liturgy, and was the work of Captain Howard Galley of the Church

Army.⁴¹ After the sursum corda, it continues as a dialogue between celebrant and congregation, giving thanks to God as creator and redeemer, leading to the sanctus:

God of all power, Ruler of the Universe, you are worthy of glory and praise.

Glory to you for ever and ever.

At your command all things came to be; the vast expanse of interstellar space, galaxies, suns, the planets in their courses, and this fragile earth, our Island home.

By your will they were created and have their being.

From the primal elements you brought forth the human race, and blessed us with memory, reason and skill. You made us the rulers of creation. But we turned against you, and betrayed your trust; and we turned against one another.

Have mercy, Lord, for we are sinners in your sight.

Again and again, you called us to return. Through prophets and sages you revealed your righteous Law. And in the fulness of time you sent your only Son, born of a woman, to fulfill your Law, to open for us the way to freedom and peace.

By his blood, he reconciled us.

By his wounds, we are healed.

And therefore we praise you, joining with the heavenly chorus, with prophets, apostles, martyrs, and with all those in every generation who have looked to you in hope, to proclaim with them your glory, in their unending hymn:

It is interesting that the use of modern cosmological terms coincides here with the omission of any direct angelic (ancient cosmological ?) reference.

Prayer D is 'A Common Eucharistic Prayer' compiled in 1975 by a group of liturgical scholars representing Lutheran, Episcopal, Methodist, Presbyterian and Roman Catholic traditions. It was based directly upon the Latin original of Eucharistic Prayer IV of the Roman Catholic rite, and upon the original underlying anaphora, Coptic St.Basil. The sursum corda, fixed preface and sanctus are, apart from phrasing, that of the Roman prayer. The sanctus thus praises God the creator for his Being.

The American book also provides a further eucharistic order which gives only minimum directions for the celebration. The

eucharistic prayer may be ad hoc or extempore, and may include sanctus and benedictus. If these latter are included, they are introduced with these or similar words:

And so we join the saints and angels in proclaiming your glory, as we sing (say) ...

Thus, apart from the responsorial preface of C, and the fixed preface of D, the American full prayers retain the short preface form of the Prayer Book, with the sanctus close to the beginning of the eucharistic prayer.

Australia

Two eucharistic rites were issued in 1966. Aus 1 was a conservative revision of 1662, with sursum corda, preface and sanctus before the Prayer of Humble Access. Aus 2 was an experimental liturgy in modern English, with a eucharistic prayer which began with sursum corda and included the sanctus. The compilation was influenced by LfA and CSI, but showed independent adaptation. After a lengthy fixed preface (creation through Christ, redemption, resurrection, Holy Spirit), the sanctus was introduced with:

Therefore with the seraphs and all angels and every living creature, with the patriarchs and apostles and the church of the first-born sons, we give honour to your glorious name, and cry aloud with the praise which has no end, saying...

Since this text pre-dated the ICET texts, the sanctus was rendered independently as:

Holy, holy, holy, sovereign Lord of all,
heaven and earth are full of your glory.
Yours is the victory, O God most high. Amen.

There was no post-sanctus link, and the institution narrative followed, introduced with a brief note of unworthiness.

In 1972 a modern language version of Aus 1 was published - Aus1A.

More radical revisions - Aus 3 and 4 - followed. The former was a further revision of Aus 2. The scope of the thanksgiving was very similar to Aus 2, with the addition of 'you provide food for the needs of men'. In the revised introduction to the sanctus, the seraphim and the first-born sons were omitted, the latter becoming 'the whole church in heaven and earth'. The Aus 2 form of sanctus was retained, and the prayer continued with a pick-up on 'victory'. Aus 4 was influenced by Series 3, and contained the ICET sanctus; benedictus could be sung as an anthem.

These rites underwent further revision before incorporation in An Australian Prayer Book, 1978. In this book Aus 1B provides a modern 1662 common rite, with the sequence sursum corda, preface, proper preface, sanctus, Prayer of Humble Access. The Holy Communion Second Order (Aus 5) provides four eucharistic prayers. They follow the themes found in the English Series 2,3 and Rite A , and proper prefaces may be inserted. The ICET sanctus is included, but the benedictus may be sung later as a communion anthem.

Chile

The 1967 rite for Chile was an independent compilation, based upon 1662 and Free Church traditions. In modern Spanish, the sursum corda, and common preface and sanctus (or Chorus form) were included, followed by a form of Humble Access prayer, and then 1 Cor.11:23-26 read as a warrant/consecration. In this sense, there was no eucharistic prayer, unless one takes the sursum corda-sanctus to be the eucharistic prayer.

Overview

Given the vast number of liturgies produced in the Anglican

Communion between 1961 and 1985, with the different family traditions and different influences, it is far more difficult to give a succinct picture than is possible for the period prior to 1960. The following points, however, can be made:

1. The 1662 type prevails, either still as a legal usage alongside modern alternatives (England) or as a real usage (Uganda ⁴²) or in modernised form - Eng A, Aus 1A,B, Chil R 1973. Here the 1552/1662 treatment of the sanctus remains unchanged.

2. Where the eucharistic prayer is unified and contains the sanctus, we find three different treatments.

(a) With a brief statement of praise, provision for a proper preface, and introduction to the sanctus, similar to 1662 - Eng 1, Scot R 1966, Wal 1966, Wal 1, 2, Ire 1, Amer 1-1, Amer 2-2 (A and B).

(b) There is a lengthy fixed preface, covering creation, redemption and the Holy Spirit. e.g. LfA 1964, Aus 2 1966, NZ 1966, Tan 1973/4, Scot 2 1982.

(c) An extended preface with thanksgiving for creation, redemption and the Holy Spirit, with provision for insertions of a proper preface e.g. Eng.2,3,A, EAUL, NUL 1965, Scot 1977.

Although these are three different approaches, the Western flavour prevails: thanksgiving is mainly christological and soteriological. God is praised for creation, but usually 'through Christ' or 'through the Word'. There is little extended praise of God as Father, or for creation. The exceptions are notable: Amer 2-2 (C), 'Star-trek', gives extended mention of creation; Aus 3 (1969) gave thanks for creation and food; Can 4(1) gives thanks for creation, the covenant, Abraham, Moses and the prophets; and

Can 4(4) is an expansion of 'Star-trek', and NZ 1984 1 alternative and 2, deal with creation and Old Testament history. Overall, the sanctus is a hymn of praise for God's actions through Christ and the Holy Spirit.

3. In the introduction to the sanctus, the majority of rites retain (though in modern language) the Prayer Book introduction, mentioning angels, archangels, and the whole company of heaven. In some rites e.g. LfA, EAUL, Amer 2-2(C), there is a tendency to expand the introduction to include groups of the church triumphant - patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs and the saints (CNI, CSI), or the faithful who rest in Him (NZ, Kuch). The special preface for St. Michael's Day in Eng. A has been noted above; the seraphim made an appearance in Aus 2 1966, and the Common Eucharistic Prayer includes an extended angelology. The New Zealand and some of the Canadian prayers have avoided explicit mention of angels; the Canadian Kootenay-Boundary had 'therefore, with all Creation, that which is seen and that which is unseen we praise your name, O Father, saying..'. .

In Nul, CNI and Chile 1967 the introduction was recited by the congregation as well as the celebrant.

4. The form of the sanctus: In the English liturgies we find a modern Prayer Book form and the ICET form. With English translations from a vernacular composition, it is difficult (for the present writer, at least) to be certain. Braz R 1972 had 'Lord God of the Universe' for 'Lord God of Hosts'. Independence was shown in Aus 2 1966 and 3 1969 (quoted earlier). The Canadian Qu'Appelle liturgy rendered the third line as 'The highest glory is yours,

O Lord'. The boldest experiment with the form comes from the New Zealand rite 2 a and b. The first has:

Holy God, Holy and merciful, Holy and just,
glory and goodness come from you.
Glory to you most high and gracious God.

The second has the following sanctus:

Holy, holy, holy,
God of mercy, giver of life;
earth and sea and sky
and all that lives,
declare your presence and your glory.

5. The benedictus is treated in four ways:

- (a) As in the Prayer Book - simply omitted.
- (b) With the sanctus e.g. Wal, Scot.
- (c) Later as a communion anthem (inspired by AC 8)
- (d) b and c as alternatives.

Usually the ICET text is employed. The Qu'Appelle text had:

Blessed is he who comes in your name.
The highest glory is yours.

6. While some eucharistic prayers have a post-sanctus literary link e.g. NZ 2(b), there is a definite move away from this convention in the more recent liturgies.

7. Amer 3-3, taken over by NZ 3, gives a skeleton prayer with rubrics. It envisages some occasions when the eucharistic prayer, ad hoc or extempore, will not feature the sanctus.

3. THE REFORMED TRADITION

England: Presbyterian Church of England, Congregationalism and the United Reformed Church.

By an Act of Parliament 1972 the Presbyterian Church of England

and the Congregational Church in England and Wales⁴³ united to form the United Reformed Church. Prior to this date both churches had been busy revising their liturgies. The Presbyterian Church of England published The Presbyterian Service Book in 1968. It was a mild revision of the 1948 book, and had taken ten years to complete.⁴⁴ It contained three orders for the eucharist, all of them in traditional AV/RSV language. The eucharistic prayer of Order 1 was from the 1948 book, being similar to that of the Church of Scotland Book of Common Order 1940; the second order's prayer did not contain the sanctus, and the third drew upon the 1940 Book of Common Order alternative Order; thus there was nothing new or original here.

Quite the reverse was the case of the 1970 An Order of Public Worship of the Congregational Church.⁴⁵ Starting work in 1964, the compilation was completed by 1967, but due to the publisher's delay, did not appear until 1970. It had been compiled in traditional language, but appeared at a date when most revisions were using modern English. The book therefore had an out-of-date appearance which detracted from its advanced liturgical thinking.

The order contained six eucharistic prayers. All commenced with the sursum corda, and all contained the sanctus (not benedictus); each had a preface and included thanksgiving for creation (except V) and redemption. Prayer III had proper prefaces for Christmas, Easter and Pentecost. However, a fascinating feature of Prayers IV,V and VI was that they all ended with the sanctus. The Notes on the service explained:

In I,II and III, the Sanctus comes in the middle of the prayer - after the thanksgiving and before the prayer that God will transform what we are doing. In IV,V, and VI,

the Sanctus comes at the end of the prayer as its climax, expressing the fact that in Christian worship Christ admits us to share in the eternal worship of heaven. 46

Prayer III may be compared to the 1928 Prayer Book form of eucharistic prayer, with sursum corda, brief preface and sanctus with a post sanctus link, 'All glory be to Thee, ...'. Prayer I and II both had a lengthy fixed preface, that of II deriving from the Statement of Faith of the United Reformed Church scheme of union. The sanctus in these two prayers comes in the middle of the prayer as praise for creation, salvation in Christ, the Holy Spirit and the Church.

In the other three prayers the Congregationalist Worship Committee achieved what the Church of England compilers had half attempted - a eucharistic prayer which reached its climax, not with a doxology, but with the sanctus. It is true that there were Lutheran and Presbyterian precedents, as we have observed, but the Congregationalist prayers were the direct result of two distinct factors:

1. The influence of English liturgical scholarship, following the hypothesis of E.C.Ratcliff concerning Apostolic Tradition.⁴⁷

This is related to the fact that one of the committee, Stuart Gibbons, had studied liturgy at Oxford under A.H.Couratin, who at that time accepted and supported Ratcliff's hypothesis. A hint of this influence was to be seen in a paper which Gibbons read to the Church Order Group, c.1960, entitled The Eucharistic Prayer. Gibbons observed that in Exodus 24, the making of the covenant, half the blood of the sacrifice was thrown on the altar, and half on the congregation; the people were joined to God

by the symbolism of the blood which was a sharing of life. After this the Elders were able to ascend the mountain, and they beheld God, ate and drank. Christ's death, the new covenant, has admitted Christians to eat and drink in the presence of the Holy God. The words of institution contain a promise:

This act of worship, this thank-offering of bread and wine, in this relationship of utter dependence and gratitude, is regarded by God as my body and blood. From you, this is enough, in God's gracious design, to admit you poor, imperfect worshippers, into his sight, to stand in his presence. 48

Gibbons had already pointed out that when Isaiah was admitted to the presence of God, he heard the sanctus; in the Book of Revelation the Church is admitted to God's presence and joins in the sanctus. The inference must be that the sanctus would form a fitting conclusion to the eucharistic prayer.⁴⁹ During the early 1960's Gibbons was himself already using a eucharistic prayer which terminated with the sanctus, and he successfully persuaded the committee that they should adopt this pattern for some of the prayers. Gibbons explained:

It seemed to me that Ratcliff has made a good case for the hypothesis that this was the position in which the sanctus had come into liturgical use, but that as a hypothesis it provided no basis for an argument from history. However, I felt that the theological argument for a final sanctus is weighty if the biblical associations of the sanctus are given due emphasis. Isaiah's reaction to finding himself a spectator of the heavenly worship is that he is not fit to be there, and he has to be cleansed before he can serve. In Revelation 5, the joining of all creation to sing the glory of God follows the celebration of the death of the Lamb whose blood has ransomed men for God. The point that we can only participate in the worship of heaven because Christ has died for us, seems to be given its proper emphasis when the sanctus follows the anamnesis or making present/ effective to us of the sacrifice of Christ. The inclusion of a final sanctus in three out of six prayers suggests that the committee was persuaded of the weight of this argument but equally unwilling to break with tradition. 50

2. Pragmatic. Dr.J.K.Gregory, another member of the Committee, had also experimented with closing the eucharistic prayer with the sanctus. His reason was that in Congregational Praise, the sursum corda, preface (Prayer Book version) and sanctus were provided for minister and people. The people said together the words leading to the sanctus, 'therefore with angels ...'. A problem arose as to when the people should sit; furthermore, not having a set text to follow, a Congregational congregation would have no idea when the minister would conclude the eucharistic prayer. It seemed a good idea to Gregory for the eucharistic prayer to follow the preface, and to conclude the prayer with 'Therefore with angels,etc.', in which the people would join, and from which they would know that the prayer was coming to its conclusion. Gregory therefore, for very different reasons, was happy to support Gibbons.⁵¹

Prayers IV and V, as with I,II and III, included the Prayer Book angelology. Prayer VI, undergoing several revisions of a prayer drafted by Stuart Gibbons, included:

O God, in mercy receive our sacrifice of praise, at the hand of Christ our great High Priest; and unite us by thy Holy Spirit with all thy saints on earth and all the company of heaven to laud and magnify thy glorious name, evermore praising thee, and saying ...

It is somewhat ironical that a liturgical theory of an Anglican scholar of the Catholic wing of that Church should have found its practical application in a tradition widely regarded as hostile to liturgy, and indifferent to liturgical history and theory. Possibly only the freedom and openness which Congregationalism possessed made such a bold experiment at this time possible.

With the formation of the United Reformed Church, it was

decided that a new liturgy was needed for the new Church. A eucharistic rite was published in booklet form in 1974, containing a form in traditional language and one in modern English. The modern rite alone was updated for inclusion in A New Church Praise 1975; the definitive text appeared in A Book of Services 1980.

Three eucharistic prayers, all in modern English were provided in the 1980 book. Prayers II and III were, respectively, the ecumenical prayer of the British Joint Liturgical Group, and a Table Prayer of the Dutch Catholic, Huub Oosterhuis.⁵² Prayer I was the definitive text of the original United Reformed Church composition. Its opening thanksgiving section consisted of a preface thanking God for human life in the world, the love of God, and the giving of the Son, with provision for the insertion (cf. Eng 3 and A) of a General preface for the work of Christ, the Holy Spirit and God's presence, and proper prefaces for Advent, Christmas, Epiphany, Lent, Passiontide, Easter, and the Ascension, all being Christological, and Pentecost which is pneumatic and ecclesial in content. The thanksgiving section concludes thus:

Therefore with all the company of heaven, and with all your people, of all places and times, we proclaim your greatness and sing your praise.

The ICET sanctus and benedictus follow. Thus, direct reference to angelology is avoided, and the sanctus serves as a response of praise to God's work.

Other Reformed rites

In France the eucharistic liturgy of the Taize community

has been an important liturgical catalyst. The community's 1959 rite had a 're-cycled' Roman canon as its eucharistic prayer, with the sanctus following a brief preface and proper preface. The rite was revised in 1972 with traditional eucharistic prayers. The thanksgiving preface of VII is a fixed preface for the creation of the whole universe, mankind, the covenant, and promises revealed through the prophets. However, this Reformed community is not necessarily typical of Continental Reformed liturgy, where the older tradition still makes its presence felt. The French Reformed Church's Liturgie 1963 represents a blending of older Reformed tradition with the insights of modern scholarship.⁵³

It provided:

- (a) Sursum corda - sanctus
- (b) Recitation of the institution
- (c) Resumption of prayer - anamnesis and epiklesis.

The resulting sequence appears like the classical Syro-Byzantine anaphora, but in fact there are two separate prayers surrounding the narrative which is read as a warrant; such a pattern was used in the Mercersburg rite. In the 1982 revision of Liturgie further prayers were added, and in these the narrative was included as part of a single eucharistic prayer. In prayer II the sanctus (and benedictus) is sung, 'with all the angels and archangels', after thanksgiving is made for God's creating activity and care; in IV it comes as a proclamation of God's glory for Christ. The sanctus comes after a preface in the Vaud rite 1963, the Swiss Romande rite 1979⁵⁴, and , for example, the Swiss German Reformed rites of Zurich 1969 and Berne 1983.⁵⁵

After some experimentation a definitive revision of the

Book of Common Order 1940 was published for the Church of

Scotland in 1979.⁵⁶ Three orders of communion were provided.

The eucharistic prayer in order 1 was expanded from that of 1940; the second, using traditional language, had a lengthy thanksgiving (reminiscent of the Euchologion's thanksgiving) leading to the sanctus. The third order is in modern English (Scottish !) and includes thanksgiving for creation of the universe, life by the Spirit, redemption in Christ, and for the gifts of light, strength and love through the Spirit, leading to:

For this, and all your goodness to us, known and unknown,
we give you thanks with the Church Universal, and with
the whole company of heaven we praise you in the angels'
hymn.

The Worshipbook 1970 of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, contained one eucharistic prayer.⁵⁷ The common preface centered on creation with a list (reminiscent of St.James), making Man, giving the commandments and justice in the cry of the prophets. The sanctus was introduced as a response of praise for the work of God:

Great and wonderful are your works, Lord God almighty.
Your ways are just and true. With men of faith from all
times and places, we lift our hearts in joyful praise,
for you alone are holy.

There is no reference to angels, nor to the heavenly Church.

The ICET sanctus and benedictus were provided, but as an alternative the following form could be used:

Holy, holy, holy,
God of power and majesty,
heaven and earth are full of your glory,
O God most high !

The 1984 Supplemental Liturgical Resource 1 provides seven

eucharistic prayers, A-G. A, C, and G have proper prefaces. E is the Common Eucharistic Prayer; D is a version of the Apostolic Tradition and has no sanctus; and F has a variety of prefaces in a similar manner to the Roman Catholic prayers (i.e. not an insertion, but complete alternative prefaces). The use of proper prefaces for seasons means that in A, B if used with a preface, C and F, the sanctus is a Christological praise. Prayer B without preface, and G, centre more upon God as creator and giver of grace.

Unlike the single prayer of the Worshipbook, the angelic beings and members of the Church triumphant re-enter the introduction to the sanctus. Prayer A has:

Therefore with apostles and prophets,
and that great cloud of witnesses
who live for you beyond all time and space,
we lift our hearts in joyful praise:

'Choirs of angels' figure in B and C; prophets, apostles and martyrs in G. An exception is the prefaces of F which conclude, '(Therefore) in all times and places your people proclaim your glory in unending praise'.

The Service of Word and Sacrament I 1969 of the United Church of Christ, USA ⁵⁸ has a lengthy thanksgiving preface in modern English, echoing the eucharistic prayer of the Scottish 1940 book, Apostolic Tradition and the Euchologion, introducing the sanctus and benedictus with:

With patriarchs and prophets, apostles and martyrs,
with your church on earth and with all the company of
heaven, we magnify and praise you, we worship and adore
you, O Lord Most Holy:

Two forms of the sanctus and benedictus were given, but not ICET. Here once again the sanctus ends a thanksgiving for creation, the

life and work of Christ, the sending of the Holy Spirit and the Church.

In these prayers from different Reformed Churches, we find a compromise use of the sanctus (France 1963), and a radical use (English Congregationalism 1970); however, by far the majority reflect ecumenical usage, with the sanctus and benedictus in the first part of a single eucharistic prayer, used as an expression of praise for either God's activity, or his work through and in Christ.

4. THE LUTHERAN TRADITION

A eucharistic prayer was prepared by the German Evangelical Brotherhood of Michael in 1961, which provided a eucharistic prayer (Hochgebet) with sursum corda, proper preface, sanctus and benedictus, followed by the institution narrative, anamnesis and epiklesis with fraction, terminating with 'maranatha'.⁵⁹ This liturgy, together with impetus from the new Roman Catholic forms, resulted in revisions in 1976 and 1977 of the German Lutheran Agende of 1955.⁶⁰ After sursum corda, proper preface, sanctus and benedictus, provision was made for:

- (a) Lord's Prayer and institution narrative
- (b) Eucharistic Prayer with five alternatives (the third was to be used without preface and sanctus)
- (c) Experimental type of eucharistic prayer.

The general preface stands out from most major modern revisions on account of its profuse angelology, being an adaptation of

the old Roman Per quem maiestatem:

Through him the angels praise your majesty, the heavenly hosts adore you, and the powers tremble; together with the blessed Seraphim all the citizens of heaven praise you in brilliant jubilation. Unite our voices with theirs and let us sing praise in endless adoration.

In the USA, The Lutheran Churches produced two new books for worship: The Lutheran Book of Worship, 1978 (LBW) and Lutheran Worship 1982 (LW). LBW was the result of the work of the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship. After the offertory comes the 'Great Thanksgiving' with sursum corda, appropriate preface, sanctus and benedictus. After this the book makes provision for three usages:

1. A full eucharistic prayer after the classical structure.
2. The institution narrative as proclamation.
3. The 1942 Swedish pattern - a short prayer, then the narrative as proclamation.

Instead of the sanctus, Hymn 528 'Isaiah in a vision' - an English version of Luther's paraphrase - may be sung. The Manual which accompanies LBW explains:

Luther's "Isaiah in a vision did of old" (hymn 528) may replace the sanctus on occasion. When it is used, the final phrase of the appointed preface should be modified to introduce the hymn which is not simply the cry of the seraphim but a paraphrase of the account in Isaiah. The Preface should include: 'And so with the church on earth and the hosts of heaven, we praise your name and join in adoring song'. 61

Because of dissension from certain members of the Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod, the latter Church revised the material prepared for LBW to produce LW. There were strong objections to a eucharistic prayer,⁶² on the grounds that this was a departure from the Lutheran formulae and therefore 'unlutheran'. Divine

Service I reproduced the Common Service; Divine Service II provided *sursum corda*, preface, *sanctus* and *benedictus*, a short prayer similar to 3 in LBW, then the Lord's Prayer and institution narrative. Divine Service III claims to follow the DM of 1526, and uses chorales. It provided for an admonition, Lord's Prayer, narrative of institution, and hymn 214, 'Isaiah, Mighty Seer, in Spirit soared'. In LB, therefore, we find a reluctance to depart from the traditional interpretation of Luther's patterns, and the *sanctus* either terminates a preface, or as a hymn, may follow the narrative (as in FM rather than DM !).

In the Swedish alternative rite 1975/6,⁶³ a complete prayer is provided, with three alternative continuations after the *sanctus*. *Sursum corda*, preface, proper preface (ten provided) lead into the *sanctus* and *benedictus* with:

Therefore with all your faithful through all times, and with all the company of heaven, we praise your name and devoutly sing:

Thus this Swedish revision unites the *sanctus* with a full eucharistic prayer. Norway, however, 1979/84 has a similar pattern to LW Divine Service II, where a short prayer after the *sanctus* is followed by the Lord's Prayer and institution.⁶⁴ In the Danish revision a similar pattern is given, and in the 1968 Finnish Evangelical Lutheran rite the same pattern is found, except that the Lord's Prayer follows the narrative of institution.⁶⁵ Thus, within this tradition there is a trend towards using the *sanctus* in a unified eucharistic prayer, but the older Lutheran pattern - and the use of a *sanctus* paraphrase - is still prevalent.

5. METHODIST

English Methodism produced an experimental eucharistic rite in 1968, entitled The Sunday Service. The revisers had before them the Church of England Series 2 rite, and in any case, there was a considerable amount of cross fertilisation of ideas.⁶⁶ The eucharistic prayer, entitled 'The Thanksgiving' was a single prayer, but in traditional and modern English, in parallel columns. Like Series 2, there was a long thanksgiving preface, though without any proper prefaces. A.H.Couratin observed:

It begins by asserting, rightly, not that it is the duty of Christians to give thanks to God, but that it is their duty to give thanks to God through Jesus Christ his Son. The Christian thanksgiving must be centred on the Son, who is Jesus Christ our Lord. It is therefore somewhat surprising to find that in the first thanksgiving, the thanksgiving for creation, no mention at all is made of the Son. 67

Nevertheless, as Couratin went on to observe, the remainder of the thanksgiving was Christological. The congregation joined with 'angels, and archangels and with all the company of heaven'. The modern version of the sanctus and benedictus was:

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts of heaven
your glory fills all heaven and earth.
All glory belongs to you, O Lord most High.
Praise be to him who comes in the name of the Lord.
Praise to our King and Saviour.

This experimental order was revised and the definitive text was incorporated into The Methodist Service Book 1975. The thanksgiving remained practically the same, though now only in modern English. The ICET sanctus and benedictus were used, but the Prayer Book angelology of 1968 was replaced with:

And so with all the company of heaven we join in the unending hymn of praise.

Rather different was 'The Great Thanksgiving' of the United Methodist Church, USA, 1980. Here the thanksgiving was Eastern in flavour, with thanksgiving for creation, the covenant and prophets. Angelology was not explicit:

Therefore, we join the entire company of heaven and all your people now on earth in worshipping and glorifying you:

This prayer, with a variety of others including ones for special occasions (a total of twenty two) appeared in At the Lord's Table, 1981. Of interest in the introduction to the sanctus in 'A Lyrical Prayer':

We join with those who have lived
and those now living in faith -
from sunrise to sunset,
from south to north -
as with one voice
in the song of unending praise.

Again, overall, there is an obvious tendency to avoid angelology.

6. ECUMENICAL PRAYERS

We have already considered the American Consultation of Church-Union prayer (D of ECUSA; F of Presbyterian Supplement, 4 of At the Lord's Table). The Taize eucharistic prayers, and those of the Michael Brotherhood, both ecumenical communities, have also been influential indirectly. Two other prayers of an ecumenical background which should be mentioned are that of the British Joint Liturgical Group (JLG) 1978, and the WCC Lima rite.

The JLG prayer - included in the Book of Services, 1980 of the United Reformed Church - is modelled partly upon the Te Deum, which as has been observed, was itself derived from an inlatio.⁶⁸

A brief thanks for creation shifts to Christological thanksgiving, with mention of the Holy Spirit and Church, with provision for a proper preface to be inserted. Being produced in the UK, it is not surprising that it echoes elements of thanksgiving found in the ASB, and the Methodist, United Reformed and Scottish Churches. The section concludes with the words 'We praise you, for you are God'. The congregation then joins in the words from the Te Deum:

We acclaim you, for you are the Lord. We worship you,
eternal Father; and with the whole company of heaven
we sing in endless praise:

ICET sanctus and optional benedictus follow. This is an interesting use of a scholarly hypothesis, and at least in this particular prayer, is very successful.

The WCC Lima eucharistic prayer, although showing considerable flair in its overall composition (double epiklesis of the Roman type, and responses) has a brief and uninspiring preface. After a brief thanksgiving for creation through the Word, the remainder is entirely Christological. Max Thurian explains:

The great eucharistic prayer begins with a composite preface, which also takes its theme from the BEM document. First of all thanksgiving for creation is focused on the life-giving Word, giving life in particular to the human being who reflects the glory of God. In the fullness of time Christ was given as the way, truth and the life. In the account of Jesus' life, the preface recalls the consecration of the servant by baptism, the last supper of the eucharist, the memorial of the death and resurrection, and the presence of the risen Saviour in the breaking of the bread. Finally, the preface refers to the gift of the royal priesthood to all christians, from among whom God chooses ministers who are charged to feed the Church by Word and sacraments and thereby give it life. 69

The congregation joins in with angels and saints to sing the sanctus.

In conclusion to this selected survey, it becomes clear that in the official eucharistic rites of the major denominations, the sanctus occurs as a sine qua non, generally placed within a unified eucharistic prayer. With only a few notable exceptions, it concludes a thanksgiving preface which is mainly Christological, and in the introduction to the sanctus, there is a marked tendency to play down, and even avoid, reference to celestial Beings.

NOTES - CHAPTER 10

1. Though of course new proper prefaces e.g. St. Joseph the Worker, Immaculate Conception, had been added subsequently.
2. For a discussion, see L. Bouyer, Eucharist, 443ff; ed. L. Sheppard, The New Liturgy, 161ff; John Barry Ryan, The Eucharistic Prayer, A Study in Contemporary Liturgy (New York 1974); E. Mazza, The Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Rite (ET Pueblo, New York 1986).
3. Ibid.
4. Bouyer, The New Liturgy, 203ff; Mazza, op.cit., 123ff.
5. The New Liturgy, 213ff; Mazza, 154ff.
6. Mazza, op.cit., 191ff; 225ff.
7. The prayers for the Children's eucharistic prayers were only given a general outline in Latin, which had to be fleshed out.
8. E.g. The prayer of the Swiss Synod, and the Anaphora for India.
9. Aidan Kavanagh, 'Thoughts on the New Eucharistic Prayers', Worship 43(1969), 2-12, 4.
10. Mazza, op.cit., 163.
11. This question will be considered more fully in the final chapter.
12. The New Liturgy, 197.
13. Ordo Missae (Hilversum 1970), 91.
14. See Mazza, op.cit., 213.
15. Text in News of Liturgy 120(December 1984).
16. International Commission on English in the Liturgy.
17. International Consultation on English Texts.
18. ICET, Prayers we have in Common (London 1975²), 15. W.J. Grisbrooke, 'Series II: The new Communion Service of the Church of England Examined', SL 7(1970), 2-36, makes this point. See chapter 5.
19. Ed. C.O. Buchanan, Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958-1968 (Oxford, 1968); Further Anglican Liturgies 1968-1975 (Bramcote 1975); Latest Anglican Liturgies 1976-1984 (London 1985). The abbreviations used in these volumes for the various Anglican rites have been utilized in this chapter.

20. So in England and Uganda; MAL,47; C.O.Buchanan, Anglican Eucharistic Liturgy 1975-1985 (Grove Liturgical Study 41, Bramcote 1985),10.
21. Worship and the Oneness of Christ's Church: Report of Section IV of the Montreal Conference, SL 2(1963), 243-55.
22. For these documents, see MAL, 31-2;FAL,26-31.
23. See MAL, 14-15.
24. MAL,32.
25. FAL,30
26. Anglican Eucharistic Liturgy 1975-1985, 18.
27. Ibid.
28. FAL, 12-16.
29. MAL,48-56; L.W.Brown, Relevant Liturgy (London 1965)
30. MAL, 65.
31. C.O.Buchanan, Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of England (Grove Booklet on Ministry and Worship 14, Bramcote 1973) and Supplements 14A,1973-4; 14B,1974-6;14C, 1976-8; Latest Liturgical Revision in the Church of England 1978-1984, (Grove Liturgical Study 39, Bramcote 1984).
32. The Church of England Liturgical Commission.Alternative Services .Second Series (London 1965),147.
33. See the articles in Theology 69(1966) and 70(1967). See also the discussion in K.W.Stevenson, Eucharist and Offering, 204ff.
34. G.G.Willis, 1966 and All That (London 1969),13.
35. Ibid. Grisbrooke, art.cit.
36. See Prolegomena.
37. Private letter to the writer, 10.9.1975.
38. See MAL and FAL for details.
39. C.O.Buchanan, Latest Revision in the Church of England 1978-1984, 8-12.
40. H.B.Porter, 'An American Assembly of Anaphoral Prayers', in ed.Bryan D.Spinks, The Sacrifice of Praise, 181-96.
41. Ibid., 90.

42. Kenya also, but it has now produced a new 'indigenous' rite.
News of Liturgy, 154 (October 1987).
43. The Congregational Union of England and Wales had been reconstituted in 1966 to become The Congregational Church in England and Wales.
44. N.Leak, 'Recent Developments in Public Worship and Aids to Devotion - Presbyterian Church of England', LR 3(1973), 26-31.
45. For full details, Bryan D.Spinks, Freedom or Order ?
46. An Order of Public Worship (Oxford 1970),31.
47. See Prolegomena.
48. S.Gibbons, 'The Eucharistic Prayer' (Cyclostyled), 6.
49. Ibid.
50. Letter to the writer 7.6.1974.
51. A private conversation with Dr.Gregory in July 1976.
52. For Oosterhuis, see John Barry Ryan, op.cit.
53. See Bruno Bürki, Cene du Seigneur, A 155ff, and B 164ff. Bürki points out that the chant book, Louange et priere, contains two versions of the sanctus set to music, one by Bach and the other by Bortniansky. Ibid. B 168.
54. Ibid., A, 172, 167.
55. I am grateful to Professor Bürki for drawing my attention to these rites.
56. Duncan Forrester, 'Recent Liturgical Work in Scotland', The Expository Times 91:2 (1979), 39-44.
57. See Julius Melton, 'Presbyterian Worship in Twentieth Century America' in ed.Booty, op.cit. I am indebted to Rev.Dr.H.Allen for kindly supplying me with texts.
58. See note 62,chapter 9.
59. Text in SL 4(1966).
60. O.Jordahn, 'The Ecumenical Significance of the New Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Liturgy', SL 11(1976),101-17; H.C.Schmidt-Lauber, 'The Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Catholic Church Today', ibid.,159-76; J.Bergsma, 'The Eucharistic Prayer in Non-Roman Catholic Churches of the West Today', ibid 177-85.

61. Philip H. Pfatteicher and Carlos R. Messerli, Manual on the Liturgy: Lutheran Book of Worship (Minneapolis 1979), 235.
62. For some details, Bryan D. Spinks, Luther's Liturgical Criteria and His Reform of the Canon of the Mass, 38-40; Report and Recommendations of the Special Hymnal Review Committee, 1978.
63. 1975 according to Baptism and Eucharist, 140; 1976 according to the English translation of Hogmaisa Med Naltvard of the London Church !
64. I am indebted to Rev. Dr. Helge Faehn for details of recent revision. See also Arve Brunvoll, 'Tradition and Renewal: Recent Liturgical Work in the Church of Norway' I., LR 9(1979) 67-71; II LR 10(1980) 23-32.
65. My thanks to Professor Glahn for the Danish text, and Rev. Leo Norja for the Finnish text.
66. Members of each commission/committee knew each other well, and tended to show each other drafts.
67. A. H. Couratin, 'The Methodist Sunday Service', CQ 2(1969), 31-38, 35.
68. See chapter 4.
69. Baptism and Eucharist. Ecumenical Convergence in Celebration, ed. M. Thurian and G. Wainwright (Geneva and Grand Rapids 1983), 244.

CHAPTER 11

THE ANAPHORAL SANCTUS IN REVIEW

This study of the anaphoral sanctus began with its pre-history in Judaism. The cultic chant is cited first in the Book of Isaiah, overheard being sung in honour of Yahweh by the seraphim who attended the throne. We may conjecture that this chant was probably part of the Temple liturgy at that time, and may reflect a combination of a Yahweh Sabaoth Zion cultic theology with the kabod theology which was later to replace it. It may be at least, therefore, as old as Isaiah's vision, 742 or 736/5 BCE. The prophetic concept of being admitted to God's throne room or divine council recurs in later Jewish thought in the apocalyptic literature such as Daniel, and in the eschatological community of Qumran. Righteous men and the elect may be admitted to God's presence with the angelic host. The sanctus, or qeduṣṣah, was one of the chants that seers and the elect might hear, as witnessed in the Pseudepigrapha (even allowing for Christian interpolations). The 'mystical tendency' of the joining of earth and heaven in praise to God was kept alive and developed in various Jewish groups, making its mark on some of the Pseudepigrapha, and hekhalot literature, and by the inclusion of qeduṣṣah in the Synagogue berakot. This same tendency also influenced certain Christian groups, as is witnessed by John 12:41, Revelation 4, and the Passio of Perpetua and Felicity, as well as by the preservation of Pseudepigraphal works. Possibly the usage of the Synagogue, or the strong mystical Judaism of Babylonia influenced Syrian and Palestinian Christians to adopt the sanctus as part of their anaphoras, or, as has been suggested, biblically-minded celebrants drew on Nehemiah 9 in their initial praise of

God, and imaginatively inserted an adaptation of Isaiah 6:3, though no doubt aware of its liturgical use in Judaism. By the third century, and indisputably by the early fourth, it was part of the eucharistic prayer in some Syrian and Palestinian communities. From there - perhaps like the institution narrative - it became a near universal feature, eventually joined with benedictus in all traditions other than the Egyptian, and remained so until the Reformation.

In the sixteenth century Lutheran and Anglican traditions the sanctus was retained, though its context and function was changed; the Reformed tradition, however, jettisoned it. From the nineteenth century onwards it has been recovered in that tradition, and has been given a more traditional setting in the Lutheran and Anglican traditions. It is an almost universal feature in modern eucharistic prayers.

Yet there is a small, but significant number of recent eucharistic prayers which omit the sanctus. Some of these are from small Protestant denominations of a conservative nature who have felt no need to introduce 'traditional' elements into their prayers - such as The Disciples of Christ Handbook for Christian Worship, St. Louis 1970. There has also been the deliberate use of Hippolytus without alteration, as in the Altar edition of LBW. However, there have also been a number of unofficial eucharistic prayers¹ and certain official new compilations, such as the Roman Catholic eucharistic prayer for Australian Aborigines, and the ASB eucharistic prayer for Communion of the Sick, which have not utilized the sanctus.

Taken together these prayers confirm -- if there ever was any doubt - that it is quite possible to compose eucharistic prayers without recourse to the sanctus.

Some of the unofficial prayers were discussed by John Barry Ryan. He made the following observation:

The frequent omission of the Sanctus and references to the saints, thereby leaving unexpressed the idea of an earthly liturgy joining in a heavenly liturgy, accents the community desire to assume responsibility for their worship and their work to bring all men into the Kingdom. 2

These unofficial compositions, although being a very subjective expression of a particular community's thoughts, tend to concentrate on an oratio christologica where, as in Hippolytus, some sudden transition to something which apparently praises God's transcendent Being, is out of context.

Such an observation, however, is applicable to many modern official eucharistic prayers. Very few are concerned with an oratio theologica, and very few, if any, have the approach of Cyril/St. James where the creation itself praises God, leading into the sanctus in a logical manner. A large number have a Christological proper preface which does not actually need the sanctus at all. Their context is such that in many cases the sanctus and its introduction could be removed, and the flow of the prayer (cf. The Roman Canon missae) would be distinctly improved. Furthermore, it has been shown in the previous chapter that there is a distinct tendency to play down angelology, which in many eucharistic prayers is the only item which gives the sanctus any sort of context.

These observations raise a number of fundamental questions

about the anaphoral sanctus today. If the sanctus is to be included in eucharistic prayers, how should it be included ? Is it possible to separate the sanctus from its traditional angelological introduction ? Is there a case for experimenting with its position and form ? It is with these questions that the conclusion of this study is concerned.

1. A LOGICAL DOXOLOGICAL FUNCTION

In certain anaphoras, where the sanctus seems to have been an original element, its function was either as an expression of the praise of the whole cosmos (Cyril/James) or a statement of the fact that God is hymned in heaven by the angelic host (Addai and Mari). However, what is true of these anaphoras, has it would seem, been extended to a generalisation to explain the function of the sanctus wherever it occurs. Peter Brunner, the Lutheran dogmatician, argued:

To be sure, the worship of the angels excels the worship of the church on earth in every respect. But the worship of the angels and the worship of the church are not separated by an iron curtain. Because they have the same center, the Lamb that was slain, they stand in real communication with each other. The church on earth may already join in the praises of the angels and pray God to grant that its voice on earth may unite with the sanctus of the angels in heaven. Where the church assembles in worship around the crucified Christ, present in the Pneuma and in the Lord's Supper, the worship of the church is opened to and orientated to the worship of the angels, just as, conversely, the worship of the church, surrounds it, envelops it, and supports it. 3

And again:

As the congregation sings the hymn of praise in worship, it participates in the 'new' song of the saints of God.

It is particularly the hymn of praise in which the glorifying voice of the church harmonizes 'with angels and archangels and with all the company of heaven'(Preface). 4

J.J.Von Allmen, under the title 'The Participants in the Cult', could write:

In the preface to the Eucharist, the congregation, after declaring what God has done for the world and its salvation, chants the sanctus 'with angels and all the powers of heaven'. In so doing it avows that it is participating in the doxology of the heavenly beings described by the Book of Revelation (Cf.4:8); it draws near to the heavenly Jerusalem where are innumerable angels (Heb.12:22). 5

After noting the secondary dogmatic nature of angels, and arguing that they include 'animal' categories as well as 'anthropological' categories, Von Allmen emphasises that the worship of the Church is joined to the worship of the angels in the heavenly sanctuary, and they are also present in the Church's worship.⁶

As valid a general theology of worship as these statements undoubtedly are, they ignore totally the diversity of usage of the sanctus in the various eucharistic prayers. There is nothing to relate such a theology to in Hippolytus and its derivatives; in the Roman canon missae there is an abrupt transition to the angelic hierarchy, which seems to be an interpolation; in Egypt it interrupts the intercessions, and has little logical context; many West Syrian anaphoras have used it as an excuse to build an oratio angelologica, going beyond the speculations of pseudo-Dionysius; and in many modern compositions, its inclusion seems to have been based upon weight of tradition (cf.Botte's comment, and the Church of England deliberations), or musical considerations rather than on the logic of praise.

Emil Lengeling, in looking at the 'component units' of the

eucharistic prayer, suggested a fourfold classification, from 'Class 1', indispensable, to 'Class 4', parts not necessary at all.⁷ Lengeling placed the sanctus in 'Class 3', parts which may be omitted in principle, but whose presence may be limited. Yet why? Many liturgists would wish to place it in his 'Class 4'; history shows that it is not essential, and least successful where it appears as an abrupt interruption. There seems, therefore, very little justification for including the sanctus unless it is given a logical setting. The brief Prayer Book (1662, Wales) introduction:

It is very meet, right and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God. Therefore with Angels and Archangels ...

representing as it does a truncation of Roman usage (itself an intrusion) is an example of where the sanctus has no logical context. Some general theology about heavenly worship, or the weight of tradition, should not be the excuse for simply inserting the sanctus; it ought to have a logical doxological context.

2. THE PROBLEM OF THE ANGELS

The sanctus in both its biblical settings is a chant of heaven, sung by celestial Beings. With few exceptions in either antiquity (some West Syrian) or modern (Canadian) anaphoras, it is introduced as the song of angelic beings. The 'toning down', common in most modern revisions, seems to reflect the modern Western unease with angelological speculation.

It is of course true that many Christians in the modern West are quite happy to believe in the existence of angels, either because the Church teaches so, or because they are mentioned in the Bible. In a book aimed at a popular readership the American evangelist, Dr. Billy Graham, asserts:

I believe in angels because the Bible says there are angels; and I believe the Bible to be the true Word of God. 8

He further adds:

I also believe in angels because I have sensed their presence in my life on special occasions. 9

On the other hand, without necessarily accepting the full implications of Bultmann's call for demythologising, many would agree that on the question of angels, we are faced with an outdated Weltanschauung,¹⁰ entering Christianity from the religious milieu of late Judaism, and in conflict with a Copernician view of the world, and scientific thought.¹¹ Apart from the studies of Edward Langton and W.G. Heidt,¹² the absence of recent extended treatments¹³ of the subject tends to emphasise the uneasiness of devoting too much attention and thought to these 'essentially marginal figures'.¹⁴ Amongst modern dogmatics, the treatment by Macquarrie, Rahner and Barth of the subject stands out against an otherwise deafening silence.

Macquarrie's discussion is centred on his argument that creation is a hierarchy of beings, and all participate in Being. Although he accepts that as they have been represented, they belong to the mythology and poetry of religion rather than to theology, Macquarrie argues that the doctrine of angels directs our minds to the vastness and richness of the creation, in which there

must be higher orders of beings whose service is joined with ours under God.¹⁵ This approach, in some ways a refined and simplified use of Pseudo-Dionysius' 'Hierarchy' and Aquinas' concern with the existence of spiritual beings, does venture near the 'metaphysical bats' position.¹⁶ Rahner's discussion is concerned to explore certain questions within current Roman Catholic theology. In a theology of the cosmos, if they exist, angels must have a cosmic function, and perhaps may be understood as the organising and unifying regional principles of the material cosmos.¹⁷ Barth's approach is not concerned with angelica natura, but with the officium angelicum, the biblical function of angels. Barth urges that they be viewed as servants in the work of Christ, as witnesses, ambassadors and guardians.¹⁸

It may be wise to make a distinction between on the one hand the possibility of supra-human beings, who are included in the whole creation, described as visible and invisible (invisible from man's view point), who, or which, may in fact be God's 'Laws of the Universe', or expressions of God's care ('guardians of the nations'), or his ambassadors, and who by their very existence are, like all creation, a witness and a living doxology to God, and which may be called by the general biblical name 'angels' or 'The host of heaven', and on the other hand acceptance of the definite existence of certain celestial zoological species (ζῶα) classified as thrones, powers, cherubim and seraphim, and so on.

We have already considered earlier the possible ancient Near Eastern background relating to cherubim and seraphim.¹⁹ As

far as the New Testament use of Thrones, Powers, Dominions etc., is concerned, although scholarship in general is agreed that these represent classes of spiritual beings, exegetes are divided as to whether they represent good or evil forces. Through the influence of Martin Dibelius and Oscar Cullman,²⁰ it has become common to interpret ἐξουσία in Romans 13:1 as referring to human authorities and the spiritual forces that are behind them. These spiritual forces will be defeated by Christ. Such a sinister interpretation is postulated by other scholars.²¹ The recent monograph by Wesley Carr has questioned this trend, and he sees the list in Col.1:15-20 as angelic classes mentioned in order to establish God's awesome power and majesty.²² No doubt this New Testament question is far from settled, but the weight of the Pseudepigrapha and the usage in Christian liturgy would seem to support Carr. Yet, whatever the truth of the exegetical question, it has to be admitted that these beings are simply presumed to exist by the New Testament writers. Possibly, therefore, in order to avoid unnecessary speculation, it might be legitimate to see these angelic beings as referring to God's Laws of the Universe, and possibly - following one interpretation of certain Old Testament references - the wonder and awe of God's Universe represented by stars and planets. They actually serve to witness to God's mysterious and transcendent Being.

It must be admitted that the language of worship is not the same as that of precise dogmatic formulations, or a philosophy of religion; furthermore it is well known that many liberal and radical theologians who question traditional ways of speaking

of God and Christ are happy to use the 'poetic' language of worship.²³ Yet it has to be asked whether the eucharistic prayer is the right place to introduce, or preserve, speculative language, or as many would urge, mythological language in the form of the biblical classes of celestial beings. It may be wise to extend the present trend and omit completely any angelological introduction to the sanctus. As a doxological hymn of praise to God the Creator and Redeemer, it has been revealed to mankind for us to use, either with or without angelic participation ! A legitimate introduction might be as follows:

Joining with the angels (or, 'celestial beings', or 'all creation, seen and unseen') together with the heavenly chorus, with prophets, apostles, martyrs, and Christians in every generation who look to you in hope, we worship you, singing ...

An emphasis on the unity of the earthly and heavenly Church rather than on celestial zoological species has much to commend it, and preserves the transcendent and immanent dimensions of the original biblical setting (and temple cultic setting ?) of the sanctus. If the anaphora is to be concerned with the creation itself praising God, then perhaps:

the entire Universe, with all its Laws, all creation, seen and unseen, hymn you with the song of heaven ...

3. THE PROBLEM OF CREATION

In most of the classical Eastern anaphoras the sanctus occurs as a doxological climax to a praise of God which includes his work as creator (Basil, Addai and Mari, AC 8)

or as the praise of the whole creation itself (Cyril/James).

In modern eucharistic prayers this theme is rarely given extended treatment. The Roman prayer IV echoes Basil; however, the proper prefaces for use with the other anaphoras are either Christological or hagiological, related to the proper of the feast. In the Anglican Communion extended praise of God as Creator is the exception rather than the rule. Only a short reference occurs in the Church of Scotland's Book of Common Order 1979, third order:

It is indeed our duty and delight always and everywhere to give you thanks and praise, Almighty God, eternal and holy Father. In the beginning you brought the Universe into being from nothing. You created life by your Spirit.

The prayer then switches to salvation history. The French Reformed eucharistic prayer II, 1982 manages a little better:

Yes, it is our joy
O God of love and holiness, our Creator and our Father,
to give you thanks always and everywhere.
In your image you made us all;
your universe you put in our care;
your creation you entrust to our hands,
with all its wonders and travail.
You make us partners in your labours
and invite us to share in your rest, through Christ our Lord.

The French prayer is one of the few exceptions. Why the apparent silence ?

It is partly, no doubt, that being Western Churches, the inherited tradition has always been more concerned with redemption and a Christological preface. However, it is strange that although the Eastern anaphoras have been used as inspiration in many new compositions, their theme of creation should have been ignored. It may be that this represents an unconscious retreat in the West in the face of the disastrous Darwinian controversies, and a wish not to disturb the 'uneasy truce' between science and

religion.²⁴ To say too much using biblical language might be mistaken for Creationism; to venture too much into scientific terminology runs the risk of sounding like a textbook, and with swift changes in scientific theory, might run the risk of being tomorrow's discredited theory. There is perhaps some wisdom in the Barthian position that the doctrine of creation is a matter of faith quite unaffected by the changes, chances and controversies of science. However, belief in God as Creator is a fundamental belief:

One God, the Father Almighty, is the Creator of heaven and earth and of all things visible and invisible, while the incarnate Son or Logos, through whom all things were made and in whom they hold together, is the central and creative source of all order and rationality within the created universe. 25

There is reason to believe that the truce between religion and science is less 'uneasy' now than it was some twenty years ago. The discovery of fossil radiation by Arno Penzias and Robert Wilson in 1965 has convinced most scientists that the Steady State theory championed by Hoyle, Bondi and Gold must now be jettisoned.²⁶ The universe had a beginning. Whereas Jacques Monod could argue that our existence, like the whole universe, is the result of pure chance or accident, Arthur Peacocke has pointed out that these words are not synonymous.²⁷ The present position is summarized by Peacocke:

the character of this interplay of chance and law appears now to be of a kind which makes it 'inevitable' both that living structures should emerge and that they should evolve - given the physical and chemical properties of the atomic units (and presumably therefore, of sub-atomic particles) in the Universe we actually have. 28

This 'inevitability', together with admiration for the beauty,

simplicity and complexity of the Universe ²⁹ has provoked some scientists to a sense of mysterium tremendum et fascinosum.

The chemist James Lovelock went as far as to posit a common medium in our atmosphere which preserves life on earth, naming it Gaia after the Greek earth goddess.³⁰ Rather more restrained are the astronomers Henbest and Couper:

The long line of development that's led to our appearance on Earth has required a whole string of 'coincidences', working hand-in-glove. Some are fairly obvious, others fairly abstruse; and they range from the borderlines of philosophy to intricacies of nuclear physics. 31

In the long line of development these writers include the barely perceptible imbalance of matter over anti-matter which led to the Universe of stars, planets and galaxies; the laws of Nature which are favourable to the development of intelligent life; the razor-thin balance of the nuclear force needed to join subatomic particles to form the nuclei of atoms; and the masses of the subatomic particles leading to DNA.

There are far too many 'coincidences' to be mere chance. We must conclude that we are only here because the Universe has certain very specific rules built into it. 32

Henbest and Couper point out that scientists (if they are true to their discipline) cannot invoke God at this point, but prefer what is called the 'anthropic principle'. But they state:

The anthropic principle underlies our interrelation with the Universe - and the only possible alternative, a Universe designed by God for man, makes the same point even more strongly. The Universe is part of every one of us, at many levels. 33

T.F.Torrance has argued that the Christian doctrine of creation allows us to accept the Universe as divine and contingent.³⁴

The combination of unpredictability and lawfulness in nature found

in its capacity spontaneously to generate richer and more open-structured forms of order in the constantly expanding Universe may be regarded as something like the signature of the Creator in the depths of contingent being.³⁵ Interestingly, Torrance anchors this in doxology:

Because the Universe is God's creation, theological science cannot but be deeply interested in the uncovering through natural scientific inquiry of the rational patterns which God has conferred upon it, if only in Christian concern for praise and worship of the Creator by the creation. 36

It is not our purpose to embark upon a discussion of science and creation, but merely to indicate that there are grounds for more confidence and boldness in this area than many new eucharistic prayers seem to acknowledge. In Basil, Addai and Mari and James, the sanctus occurs (so we have urged) logically and naturally as praise of the transcendent God who is also immanent in his world: Heaven and earth - the whole Universe - is full of his glory. The sanctus can and should be utilized with the same context in contemporary eucharistic prayers, as thanksgiving for and with creation. The American 'Star-trek' prayer is a good example of an attempt to use common English scientific terms without surrendering a poetic and prayerful style, and without becoming a particular scientific school of thought. Such a thanksgiving quite logically flows into the sanctus; indeed, according to one interpretation stars and planets can be seen as a twentieth century update of Old Testament angelology. In giving thanks for the Universe, galaxies, planets and life, man who is the stuff of the Universe made conscious, is rendering thanks to God for his own creation

in the imago dei, and for all creation. Moltmann underscores this point admirably:

As God's gifts, all his creatures are fundamentally eucharistic beings also; but the human being is able - and designated - to express the praise of all created things before God. In his own praise he acts as representative for the whole of creation. His thanksgiving, as it were, looses the dumb tongue of nature. It is here that the priestly dimension of his designation is to be found. So when in the 'creation' psalms thanks are offered for the sun and the light, for the heavens and the fertility of the earth, the human being is . . . thanking God, not merely on his own behalf, but also in the name of heaven and earth and all created beings in them. Through human beings the sun and moon also glorify the Creator. Through human beings plants and animals adore the Creator too. That is why in the praise of creation the human being sings the cosmic liturgy, and through him the cosmos sings before its Creator the eternal song of creation. 37

In this context the New Zealand rite, while having very little on creation itself, has an excellent variant form of the sanctus:

Holy, holy, holy, God of mercy, giver of life;
earth and sea and sky and all that lives, declare your
presence and your glory.

4. TRINITARIAN THANKSGIVING AND SANCTUS

Certain of the classical anaphoras mention the Trinity, either indirectly (by addition perhaps in Addai and Mari) or directly.

A few Syro-Byzantine anaphoras give a doctrinal qualification:

Eustathius has 'You are equal in ousia and worshipped in three persons of Father and Son and Holy Spirit'. Clement has 'Father, Son and Holy Spirit, true God, one nature on high, one substance, who in three persons is adored and praised by all things '. Syriac John Chrysostom has 'the one majesty of the Trinity, of equal substance, adored in three persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit'. In this context, the sanctus came later

in the anaphora reinforcing the doctrine, since Isaiah 6:3 was a useful proof text.

In much contemporary theology the doctrine of the Trinity has fallen into oblivion, and also there is a tendency to move towards a unitarianism, or more commonly perhaps, a binitarianism.³⁸

However, some recent studies have been concerned to defend the centrality of a critical rational and strong doctrine of the Trinity.³⁹ David Brown, for example, affirms that there are sufficient grounds for believing the doctrine if it is set in the wider framework of a justified belief in an interventionist God who engages in a particular form of revelatory dialogue with man.⁴⁰ Modern anaphoras do not necessarily reflect the neglect of this doctrine, though apart from a proper preface for the feast, there is a reluctance to mention the Trinity itself. This is probably due to the fact that modern revisers are concerned with the anaphora as a prayer, and not as an extension of Council decrees. However, although no attempt is made to expound the Substantial Trinity, in the Anglican, Methodist and some Reformed traditions, there is a tendency to use a long preface leading up to the sanctus, which is a thanksgiving for the Trinitarian history of God in terms of Theology, Christology and Pneumatology. God is thanked as Father and Creator (briefly !), giving a soteriological understanding of the work of creation. Then follows extended treatment of the work of Christ and the Holy Spirit. The latter is sometimes just mentioned, but in some prayers the work of the Spirit in renewing men and women and bringing about their new solidarity and fellowship - the Holy Spirit

glorifying the risen Lord and through him the Father - is recounted. Yet, as Moltmann has pointed out, there is only one, single, divine Trinity, and one, single divine history of salvation. The triune God can only appear in history as he is in himself, and in no other way.⁴¹ Thus although the new prefaces covering the work of creation, Christology and the work of the Spirit represent a new departure, the Trinitarian history with which they are concerned is simply the 'Economic' side of the immanent Trinity. To conclude such a preface with the sanctus is therefore highly appropriate, even if today Isaiah 6:3 cannot be used as a proof text. It may be, however, that Revelation 4:8 would be a more logical doxology to the Trinitarian history of God - who was, who is and who is to come. Precedents for its use in the anaphora are few - a Coptic fragment, the liturgy of Stephens, the Danish liturgy 1912 - but this should not prevent or discourage its use in the anaphora.

5. JUSTIFICATION/SANCTIFICATION AND THE SANCTUS

Ultimately the eucharistic prayer, at least in its classical forms, and as it is conceived by most scholars and Churches at present - is a doxology glorifying God for the fact of justification and sanctification. At the heart of the prayer is God's saving work pinpointed in the sacrifice on the cross for our redemption, of which the eucharist itself is the anamnesis. By the sacrificial death of Jesus we have been placed on God's side and consecrated to him for ever.

The Church is a holy temple (1 Cor.3:16-17; Eph.2:21);
believers are to present their bodies to God in the

form of living, holy sacrifices (Rom.12:1). In fact, Christ sanctified the whole Church and made it his own by his sacrifice at Calvary, so he could present it as a pure, spotless sacrifice at the end of the age (Eph.5:27). 42

Indeed, in the eucharistic memorial, the Church pleads Christ's sacrifice on the cross, and offers itself in, with and through Christ.⁴³ We are united with Jesus Christ in his vicarious humanity, and participate in his vicarious self-offering to the Father.

It may be argued that justification and sanctification, concepts from the realms of the Jewish law courts and the sanctuary, are complimentary models whose truth should not be pressed into a logical or a chronological relationship.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, the anaphoras tend to move from justification to the idea of sanctification. Salvation from God includes the call to a new life within the community of the discipleship of Jesus, with goals set by him, and achieved through the power of his Spirit. The Syro-Byzantine anaphoras, and many modern anaphoras, include a petition for the communicants within the epiklesis. The Holy Spirit as the paraclete sets people apart for God because of the sacrificial blood of Jesus, shed for the remission of sins. The Church is also prayed for in the anaphoral intercessions, which apart from Egypt and part of the Roman canon, come after the anamnesis (or in East Syria, after the institution narrative) and epiklesis. The thought is to associate the whole Church with the eucharistic feast. Since the eucharist is a foretaste of the heavenly banquet (Luke 13:29), where we eat in the presence of God, it is not surprising that some anaphoras conclude on this

eschatological note. Addai and Mari in particular expresses this:

And because of all your wonderful dispensation towards us, with open mouths and uncovered faces let us give you thanks and glorify you without ceasing in your Church, which has been redeemed by the precious blood of your Christ, offering up praise, honour, thanks and adoration to your holy and life-giving name, now and at all times for ever and ever.

A similar type of eschatological thought is expressed in the

Roman Catholic Eucharistic Prayer for Reconciliation II:

You have gathered us here around the table of your Son, in fellowship with the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, and all the saints.
In that new world where the fullness of your peace will be revealed, gather people of every race, language, and way of life to share in the one eternal banquet with Jesus Christ the Lord.

And in the second prayer of the ASB rite A:

Accept through him this offering of our duty and service; and as we eat and drink these holy gifts in the presence of your divine majesty, fill us with your grace and heavenly blessing; nourish us with the body and blood of your Son, that we may grow into his likeness and, made one by your Spirit, become a living temple to your glory.
Through Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom, and with whom, and in whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honour and glory be yours, almighty Father, from all who stand before you in earth and heaven, now and for ever. Amen.

Here we find the model of justification/sanctification resulting

in the Church being admitted into the presence of God, just as

the cleansing of Joshua the High Priest in the vision of

Zechariah resulted in him being given access 'among those (the celestial host) who are standing here (before God's throne)'.

As Moltmann says,

...according to Christian understanding, the beginning of heavenly bliss is already present - and is also already experienced - in the grace of Christ and in the Church of Christ; and this means that heaven has already been thrown open here. 45

Within this theological context the sanctus provides a fitting conclusion to the whole eucharistic prayer. This suggestion

may seem to be letting Ratcliff's theory of the sanctus in again at the backdoor. It must be stressed, therefore, that there seems not the slightest historical evidence to support Ratcliff's view. As a termination of the eucharistic prayer, it appears first with Luther (though of course there is little in the way of eucharistic prayer), and more obviously in certain Presbyterian rites. In the context suggested here, it appears in some of the eucharistic prayers of the 1970 English Congregationalist liturgy; the anaphora used in the community at West Malling Abbey; and it concludes two of three eucharistic prayers being considered by the Church of England Liturgical Commission in 1987 for possible use in Family Services and Urban Priority congregations.⁴⁶ Its use as a conclusion is suggested not on historical grounds at all, but purely on logical theological and doxological grounds. As Stuart Gibbons, one of the authors of the Congregationalist prayers, argued:

The point that we can only participate in the worship of heaven because Christ died for us, seems to be given its proper emphasis when the sanctus follows the anamnesis or making present/effective to us the sacrifice of Christ.⁴⁷

Used as the terminating doxology, the sanctus then forms the crescendo of praise and expresses the eschatological status of the people of God. The form could be the usual liturgical adaptation of Isaiah 6:3, or Revelation 4:8, or could even be a sanctus 'proper', reminiscent of the tropes. What is important, however, is that the sense of the prayer should dictate the use or non-use of the sanctus, and its position, and musical considerations must come second.

As far as the benedictus is concerned, whether its Hosanna

is to remain attached to the sanctus, or whether the benedictus itself is added to the sanctus, or omitted, should depend on whether it is appropriate to the context.

Although it is quite possible, and in some cases perhaps desirable to compile eucharistic prayers without the sanctus, there is every reason to expect that this ancient chant will continue to be utilized in some form in the eucharistic prayer - not because of tradition, but because it is appropriate. For in Christian theology, the glory of God was revealed in Christ, whose love and grace is revealed in the eucharistic feast. In Christ the space of heaven and the region of the earth are united. In the eucharist the worshipper enters heaven through Christ, and is represented by our true High Priest. Here time and eternity intersect and become one, and this world and that to come elide. The words of the sanctus, whether said quietly, sung to a solemn but simple Gregorian chant, or to an elaborate polyphonic setting, can give the worshipper that glimpse of eternity which Isaiah experienced. Perhaps the last word belongs to Rudolph Otto who reminded the Church of the mysterium tremendum et fascinans - something which is sometimes forgotten in contemporary liturgical formulation:

I have heard the Sanctus Sanctus Sanctus of the cardinals in St. Peter's, the Swiat Swiat Swiat in the Kreml Cathedral, and the Hagios Hagios Hagios of the patriarch in Jerusalem. In whatever language they resound, these most sublime words that have come from human lips always grip one in the depths of the soul, with a mighty shudder, exciting and calling into play the mystery of the otherworldly latent therein. 48

APPENDIXDRAFT RESPONSIVE EUCHARISTIC PRAYER 1987

(Dialogue)

Lord God of justice and mercy,
 we glorify your Name because you care for the world
 and each of us.
 You call us to share your life and you give us your love.
 You are a kind and compassionate Father, always ready to forgive.
 You rejoice in our joy, listen patiently to our troubles,
 and comfort us in distress.

We glorify your Name for evermore

We worship you, Lord, because we see your love revealed
 through your Son Jesus Christ.
 He is your Good news to the world, and through his word
 we are brought salvation.
 He died on the cross to gain forgiveness for us.

Father, you are worthy of all our praise and adoration

At supper the night before he died, he took bread and broke it,
 giving you thanks and praise.
 He gave it to his disciples and said
 'This is my body given for you'.

Jesus, you are our living bread

At the end of supper he took the cup of wine and said,
 'This cup is the New Covenant in my blood.
 Drink it in remembrance of me.'

Jesus, you are the true vine.

God of all holiness, we are gathered together in your Name
 to celebrate the sacrifice Jesus made for us all.
 May your Spirit show (reveal) these gifts of bread and wine
 to be for us his saving body and blood.

Holy Spirit, you are the Power of God, and the Giver of Life

Father, help us to work together for your kingdom, and for that
 day when your justice and mercy will be seen everywhere.
 And as we set before you this commemoration of our salvation,
 we pray that your grace and mercy will unite us with your
 whole Church on earth and in heaven,
 so that with one voice we may worship you and praise your Name

Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of Power and Might.
 Who was, and is, and is to come. Amen.

NOTES - CHAPTER 11

1. E.g. The prayers of Robert Hoey and Thiery Naetens, discussed by John Barry Ryan, op.cit. Alan Gaunt's prayers in New Prayers for Worship, 1972 - the work of a United Reformed Church minister.
2. Ryan, op.cit., 188
3. Peter Brunner, Worship in the Name of Jesus (St.Louis Missouri 1986) 96.
4. Ibid.,210.
5. J.J.Von Allmen, Worship: Its Theology and Practice (London 1965), 205.
6. Ibid.
7. E.J.Lengeling, 'Le problème des nouvelles prières eucharistiques dans la liturgie romaine', QL 53(1972) 51
8. Billy Graham, Angels: God's Secret Agents (London 1976), 25.
9. Ibid. The vicar of a parish to whom I was an assistant curate once claimed to see angels in the lavatory ! Perhaps the proposed book announced by David Rose, Angels at Large (Church Times 30 October 1987) will change the whole matter.
10. R.Bultmann, 'New Testament and Mythology', in Kerygma and Myth ed.H.W.Bartsch and R.H.Fuller (London 1964²) Vol.1., 1-16.
11. Karl Barth, CD 3/3, 413, quoting Strauss, and 414 quoting Lipsius.
12. E.Langton, The Ministries of the Angelic Powers according to the Old Testament and Later Jewish Literature (London 1936); The Angel Teaching of the New Testament (London 1935). W.G.Heidt, Angelology of the Old Testament (Minnesota 1949).
13. There are of course articles dealing with particular passages of the Bible and Intertestamental literature.
14. Barth, CD 3/3 371
15. J.Macquarrie, Principles of Christian Theology (London 1966) 215-8.
16. Barth, CD 3/3 377.
17. Karl Rahner, Theological Investigations 19 (London 1983), 235-74.
18. Barth,ibid.

19. See chapter 1.
20. Martin Dibelius, Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus, (Göttingen 1909); O.Cullman, Christ and Time (London 1962), 191ff.
21. E.g. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament Vol.1 (London 1952); G.Caird, Powers and Principalities (Oxford 1956).
22. A.W.Carr, Angels and Principalities: The Background, Meaning and Development of the Pauline Phrase 'hai archai kai hai exousia' (Cambridge 1981).
23. It is well known that this was true for several of the authors of The Myth of God Incarnate.
24. J.A.Habgood, 'The Uneasy Truce between Science and Religion', in ed.A.R.Vidler, Soundings (Cambridge 1963), 21-41.
25. T.F.Torrance, Divine and Contingent Order (London 1981), 2.
26. N.Henbest and H.Couper, The Restless Universe (London 1982), 190.
27. A.R.Peacocke, Creation and the World of Science (London 1979), 90-1.
28. Ibid., 103.
29. Paul Davies, God and the New Physics (London 1983) 218ff.
30. James Lovelock, Gaia: A New Look at Life on Earth (London 1982)
31. Op.cit., 204.
32. Ibid., 205.
33. Ibid. Cf. H.Montefiore, The Probability of God (London 1985) 166ff.
34. T.F.Torrance, op.cit.
35. Ibid., 73.
36. Ibid., 83.
37. Jurgen Moltmann, God in Creation (London 1985), 71. F.Crick an atheist (and a former Fellow of the College of which I am Chaplain) criticizes organised religion for a lack of awe and wonder at the sheer size of the Universe. Life Itself (New York 1981), 21ff.
38. This according to David Brown (see below) is represented by Lampe's God as Spirit and Moule's The Holy Spirit.
39. David Brown, The Divine Trinity (London 1984); W.Kasper, The God of Jesus Christ (London 1984); Jurgen Moltmann, The Trinity and the Kingdom of God (London 1981).

40. Brown, op.cit., 305.
41. Moltmann, op.cit., 153.
42. P.Toon, Justification and Sanctification (London 1983),40.
43. T.F.Torrance, 'The Paschal Mystery of Christ and the Eucharist',
in Theology in Reconciliation (London 1975).
44. Toon, op.cit.,141-2.
45. J.Moltmann, God and Creation, 169.
46. One by Trevor Lloyd, which does not reflect this theological
pattern, and one by the present writer, reproduced in an
appendix here.
47. See Bryan D.Spinks, Freedom or Order ?, 209.
48. Rudolp Otto, Die Christliche Welt, July 27 1911, 709, cited
in Robert F.Davidson, Rudolph Otto's Interpretation of
Religion (Princeton 1947), 78.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackroyd, P. 'The Meaning of Hebrew DOR Considered', JSS 13(1968), 5-8.
- Albright, W.F. 'What were the Cherubim?', The Biblical Archaeologist, 1(1938) 1-3.
- 'Review of L'epithete divine Jahve $\text{S}^{\text{e}}\text{ba}'\text{ot}$: Etude philologique, historique et exegetique', JBL 67 (1948) 337-81.
- Allgeier, A. 'Das afrikanische Element im altspanischen Psalter', Spanische Forschungen 2 (1930) 196-228.
- Anderson, B.W. The Living World of the Old Testament (DLT, London 1978³)
- Andrieu, M. and Collomp, P. 'Fragments sur papyrus de l'anaphore de saint Marc', Revue des sciences religieuses 8(1928) 489-515.
- Atiya, A. A History of Eastern Christianity (Methuen, London 1968).
- Audet, J-P. 'Literary Forms and Contents of a Normal Eucharistia in the First Century', TU 18(1959) 643-62.
- Auf der Maur, H-J. Die Osterhomilien des Asterios Sophistes als Quelle für die Geschichte der Osterfeier (Paulinus-Verlag, Trier 1967).
- Bates, W.H. 'The Composition of the Anaphora of Apostolic Constitutions VIII', SP 13 (1975) 345-55.
- 'Thanksgiving and Intercession in the Liturgy of St. Mark', in ed. B.D. Spinks, The Sacrifice of Praise, 107-119.
- Barkley, J.M. The Worship of the Reformed Church (Lutterworth Press, London 1966)
- Barth, Karl. Church Dogmatics 3/3 (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh 1960)
- Baumstark, A. 'Die Chrysostomosliturgie und die syrische Liturgie des Nestorios', in Chrysostomika (Pustet, Rome 1908)
- 'Zwei nicht erkaante Bruchstücke frühchristlich-griechischer Liturgie Ägyptens', JLW 1(1921) 132-4.
- Beaurecueil, S de. 'La prière eucharistique dans la liturgie égyptienne de Saint Grégoire', Les Cahiers Coptes 7-8 (1954) 6-10.
- Beck, E. Des Heiligen Ephraem des Syrsers Hymnen de Nativite (Epiphania) (CSCO, Louvain 1959).
- Bergsma, J. 'The Eucharistic Prayer in Non-Roman Catholic Churches of the West Today', SL 11(1976) 177-85.
- Bersier, E. Projet de Révision de La Liturgie des Églises Reformées de France (Fischbacher, Paris 1888)
- Bertholet, A. and Gallig, K. Hesekiel HAT 13 (Mohr, Tübingen 1936)
- Betz, H.D. The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation Vol.1 (University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1985)
- Birdsall, J.N. and Thompson, R.W. (eds.), Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey (Herder, Freiburg 1963)

- Bishop, E. Liturgica Historica (OUP, Oxford 1918)
- Bishop, W.C. The Mozarabic and Ambrosian Rites (Mowbray, London 1924)
- Black, M. The Scrolls and Christian Origins (Nelson, London 1961)
- Bloch, P. 'Die Yordei Merkavah, die Mystiker der Gaonzeit und ihr Einfluss auf die Liturgie', MGWJ 37 (1893)
- Blond, G. 'Clement of Rome' in The Eucharist of the Early Christians ed. W. Rordorf (ET Pueblo New York 1978) 24-47.
- Blume, C. and Bannister, H.M. Analecta Hymnica Medii aeri 47 (Reisland, Leipzig 1905)
- Bobrinskoy, B. 'Liturgie et Ecclésiologie Trinitaire de Saint Basile', in Eucharisties d'Orient et d'Occident II (Cerf, Paris 1970) 197-240.
- Bornert, R. La Réforme Protestante du Culte à Strasbourg au XVI^e Siècle. 1523-1598 (Brill, Leiden 1981).
- Botte, B. Le Canon de la messe romaine (Abbaye du Mont Cesar, Louvain 1935)
- and Mohrmann, C. L'Ordinaire de la messe (Cerf, Paris and Louvain 1953)
- 'L'Anaphore Chaldéenne des Apôtres', OCP 15(1949), 259-76.
- 'Problèmes de l'Anaphore syrienne des Apôtres Addai et Mari', Or.Syr 10(1965) 86-106.
- 'L'Eucologe de Sérapion est-il authentique?', OC 48 (1964) 50-7.
- Bouley, A. From Freedom to Formula (Catholic University of America Press, Washington 1981).
- Bousset, W. Eine jüdische Gebetssammlung im siebten Buch der Apostolischen Konstitutionen. Nachrichten Gesellschaft (Göttingen/Berlin 1916)
- Bouyer, L. Eucharist (ET. Notre Dame University Press, Indiana 1968)
- Bowmer, J.C. 'Some Non-Wesleyan Service Books', PWHS 32(1960/1), 145-52.
- 'The Bible Christian Service Book', PWHS 33 (1961/2), 1-3.
- Box, G.H. The Testament of Abraham (SPCK, London 1927)
- Brann, M and Rosenthal F.(eds.) David Kaufman Memorial Volume (Sches.Verlags-Anstalt v.s.Schottlaender, Breslau 1910).
- Brenner, Scott F. 'Philip Schaft the Liturgist', Christendom 11 (1946) 443-56.
- Bright, J. A History of Israel (SCM London 1960¹)
- Brilioth, Y. Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic (SPCK, London 1930).
- Brock, S.P. 'Studies in the Early History of the Syrian Orthodox Baptismal Liturgy', JTS ns 23(1972) 16-64.
- Brown, David. The Divine Trinity (Duckworth, London 1985)
- Brown, L.W. Relevant Liturgy (SPCK, London 1965)
- Brown, R.E. 'Pre-Christian Semitic Concept of Mystery', CBQ 20 (1958) 417-43.
- Brun, P.Le Explication littéraire, historique et dogmatique des prières et des ceremonies de la messe 4 vols. (Paris 1716-26.
- Brunner, P. Worship in the Name of Jesus (ET. Concordia, St. Louis Missouri 1968)
- Brunvoll, Arve 'Tradition and Renewal: Recent Liturgical Work in the Church of Norway', LR 9(1979) 67-72; 10(1980) 23-32.
- Buchanan, C.O. Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958-1968 (OUP, Oxford 1968).
- Further Anglican Liturgies 1968-1975 (Grove Books, Bramcote, 1975).

- Buchanan, C.O. Latest Anglican Liturgies 1976-1984 (Alcuin Club/ 450
SPCK, London 1985).

Anglican Eucharistic Liturgy 1975-1985 (Grove
Liturgical Study 41, Bramcote 1985)

Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of England
(Grove Booklet on Ministry and Worship 14, Bramcote
1973)

Supplements 14A, 14B, 14C.

Latest Liturgical Revision in the Church of England
(Grove Liturgical Study 39, Bramcote 1984)
Bultmann, R. Theology of the New Testament (SCM, London 1952) Vol. 1.

'New Testament and Mythology' in ed. H.W. Bartsch and
R.H. Fuller, Kerygma and Myth Vol. 1 (SPCK 1964²) 1-16.
Bürki, B. Cène du Seigneur-eucharistie de l'Église Cahiers
Oecuméniques (Editions Universitaires Fribourg Suisse,
Fribourg 1985). 2 Vols.
Burrows, M. More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls (Viking, New York
1958)
- Cabaniss, A. 'A Note on the Liturgy of the Apocalypse', in
Interpretation 7(1953) 78-86.
Cagin, P. Te Deum ou Illatio. (Scriptorium Solismense, Abbaye
de Solesmes, Oxford and Rome 1906).
Caird, G. Powers and Principalities (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1956)
Capelle, B. 'Problèmes textuels de la préface romaine. II. Caeli
caelorumque virtutes', RSR 40(1951-2) 145-50.

'Les liturgies "basiliennes" et S. Basile', in
J. Doresse and E. Lanne, Un témoin archaïque de la
liturgie copte de S. Basile (Publications universitaires
Louvain, Louvain 1960)
Cardale, J. Readings in the Liturgy and Divine Offices of the
Church 2 vols (Thomas Bosworth, London 1874/5)
Carr, A.W. Angels and Principalities: The Background, Meaning
and Development of the Pauline Phrase 'hai archai
kai hai exousiai' (CUP, Cambridge 1981).
Catergian, Y and Dashian, P.J. Die Liturgies bei den Armenien
Fünfzehn texte und untersuchungen (Gerold & co, Wien 1897)
Cattin, G. Music of the Middle Ages I (CUP, London 1984)
Charles, R.H. The Revelation of St. John I (T & T. Clark, Edinburgh 1920)
Charlesworth, J.H., The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research. With a
Supplement (Scholars Press, Chico 1981)

'The SNTS Pseudepigrapha Seminars at Tübingen
and Paris on the Books of Enoch', NTS 25(1979) 315-23.

'Jewish Liturgies, Hymns and Prayers', in R.A. Kraft
G.W.E. Nickelsburg (eds.) Early Post-Biblical Judaism
and its Modern Interpreters (Fortress Press, Philadelphia 1986)

'A Prolegomenon to a New Study of the Jewish
Background of the Hymns and Prayers in the New
Testament', JJS 33(1982) 265-85.
Chavoutier, L. 'Un Libellus Pseudo-Ambrosien sur le saint-esprit',
SE 11(1960) 136-91.
Clements, R.E. Isaiah 1-39 (Marshall, Morgan and Scott, London 1980)

God and Temple (OUP, Oxford 1965)
Coebergh, C. 'Sacramentaire leonien et liturgie mozarabe', in
Miscellanea Liturgica in honorem Cuniberti Mohlberg
(Edizioni Liturgiche, Rome 1949). 295-304.

- Comblin, J. 'La liturgie de la Nouvelle Jérusalem', ETL 29(1953) 5-40.
- Connolly, R.H. 'The Original Language of the Syriac Acts of John',
JTS 8(1906-7) 249-61.
- The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai Texts and Studies 8,
(CUP, Cambridge 1909)
- and Codrington, H.W. Two Commentaries on the Jacobite
Liturgy (Williams and Northgate, London 1913)
- Cornet, L. 'Sanctus et Merkaba', QL 59(1978) 23-37.
- Costa, E. Tropes et Séquences dans le cadre de la vie liturgique
au moyen-âge (CLV, Rome 1979).
- Couratin, A.H. 'The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora: A
Note on the Roman Sanctus', JEH 2(1951) 19-23.
- 'The Methodist Sunday Service', CQ 2(1969) 31-8.
- 'The Sanctus' (unpublished essay, typescript)
- and Tripp, D.H. (eds.) Liturgical Studies (SPCK, London
1976).
- Crick, F. Life Itself (Simon and Schuster, New York 1981)
- Crocker, R.L. 'The Troping Hypothesis', Musical Quarterly 52(1966)
183-203.
- Cross, F.M. 'The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah', JNES 12(1953)
274-77.
- 'Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs', HTR 55(1962)
225-259.
- Canaanite Myths and Hebrew Epic (HUP, Cambridge Mass. 1973)
- Cross, Frank Leslie, St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Lectures on the Christian
Sacraments (SPCK London 1966)
- Cuming, G.J. 'Two Fragments of a Lost Liturgy', in Studies in
Church History 3 (Brill, Leiden 1966) 247-53.
- A History of Anglican Liturgy (Macmillan, London 1969¹)
- 'Egyptian Elements in the Jerusalem Liturgy', JTS ns
25(1974) 117-24.
- Hippolytus: A Text for Students (Grove Liturgical Study 8,
Bramcote 1976)
- (ed.) Essays on Hippolytus (Grove Liturgical Study 15,
Bramcote 1978)
- Review Article in Eastern Churches Review 7(1975) 95-7.
- 'Thmuis Revisited: another look at the prayers of
Bishop Sarapion', TS 41(1980) 568-75.
- 'The Early Eucharistic Liturgies in Recent Research'
in (ed.) B.D. Spinks, The Sacrifice of Praise, 65-9.
- 'The Anaphora of St. Mark: A Study in development',
Mu 95(1982) 115-29.
- The Godly Order (Alcun Club/SPCK London 1983)
- 'Four Very Early Anaphoras', Worship 58(1984), 168-72.
- 'Pseudonymity and Authenticity, with special reference
to the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom', SP 15 (1984)
532-38.
- 'The Shape of the Anaphora', paper read at the Oxford
Patristic Conference, 1987.
- Cullman, O. Christ and Time (ET.SCM, London revised edition 1962)
- Cutrone, E.C. 'Cyril's Mystagogical Catecheses and the evolution
of the Jerusalem Anaphora', OCP 44(1978) 52-64.

- Daniélou, J. The Theology of Jewish Christianity (DLT London 1964)
 ----- Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture (DLT, London 1973)
 ----- The Origins of Latin Christianity (DLT London 1977)
- Danske Messeboger Fra Reformationstiden (J.H.Schultz Forlag, København 1959)
- Daoud, M and Hazen, H.E.B.M. The Liturgy of the Ethiopian Church
 (The Egyptian Church Press, Adis Ababa 1959)
- Davidson, R.F. Rudolph Otto's Interpretation of Religion (Princeton University Press, Princeton 1947)
- Davies, P. God and the New Physics (Dent, London 1983)
- Dean-Otting, M. Heavenly Journeys. A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature (Verlag Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York, 1984)
- Dekkers, E. 'Van profetie tot canon', TL 25(1946) 8-25.
- Dhorme, E. 'Le nom des cherubins', in Recueil Edouard Dhorme
 (Impr.nationale, Paris 1951) 671-83.
- Dibelius, M. Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 1909)
 ----- 'Die Mahl-Gebete der Didache', ZNTW 37(1938) 32-41.
- Dix, G. The Shape of the Liturgy (Dacre, London 1945)
 ----- 'Primitive Consecration Prayers', Theology 37(1938) 261-83.
- Doresse, J. and Lanne, E. Un Témoin archaïque de la liturgie copte de S.Basile (Publications Universitaires, Louvain 1960)
- Driver, G.R. 'Isaiah 6:1. His train filled the Temple', in
 H.Goedicke(ed.) Near Eastern Studies in Honor of W.F. Albright (John Hopkins Press, Baltimore and London 1971).
- Duchesne, L.(ed.) Liber Pontificalis (Bibliothèque des Ecoles
 francaises d'Athenes et de Rome, Paris 1955-7) Vol.1.
 ----- Christian Worship (Christian Knowledge Society, London 1904).
- Dugmore, C.W. The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office
 OUP, Oxford 1944; Faith Press, London 1964)
- Dunn, J.D.G. Unity and Diversity in the New Testament (SCM London 1981²)
-
- Eaton, J.H. Kingship and Psalms (SCM London 1976)
 ----- Festal Drama in Deutero-Isaiah (SPCL London 1979)
 ----- Vision in Worship (SPCK London 1981)
- Elbogen, I. Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlicher
 Entwicklung (J.Kauffmann, Frankfurt 1931)
- Eichrodt, W. Ezekiel (SCM, London 1970)
- Emerton, J.A. 'The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery' JTS ns 11(1958) 225-42.
 ----- 'New Light on Israelite Religion: The Implications of
 the Inscriptions from Kuntillet 'Ajrud', ZAW 94(1982) 2-20.
- Engberding, H. Das eucharistische Hochgebet der Basileiosliturgie
 (Aschendorff, Münster 1931)
 ----- 'Die syrische Anaphora der zwölf Apostel und ihr
 Paralleltex', OC 12(1937) 213-47.
- England- Church of England Liturgical Commission. Alternative Services.
 Second Series (SPCK London 1965)
- Euringer, S. ' Die Äthiopische Anaphora des hl.Epiphanius, Bischofs
 der Insel Cypern', OC 3.1(1926/27) 98-142.

- Evans, E. Tertullian's Tract on Prayer (SPCK, London 1953)
- Evans, Paul. 'Some Reflections on the Origin of the Trope', in Journal of the American Musicological Society 14(1961), 119-130.
- Fallon, F.T. The Enthronement of Sabaoth (Brill, Leiden 1978).
- Fenwick, J.R.K. 'An Investigation into the common origin of the Anaphora of the Liturgies of St. Basil and St. James'. Ph.D. Thesis, London University 1985.
- Fourth Century Anaphoral Construction Techniques (Grove Liturgical Study 45, Bramcote 1986)
- 'Significance of similarities in the anaphoral intercession sequence in the Coptic anaphora of St. Basil and other ancient liturgies', SP forthcoming.
- Ferotin, M. Le Liber Mozarabicus Sacramentorum (Librairie de Firmin-Didot, Paris 1912)
- Le Liber Ordinum (Librairie de Firmin-Didot, Paris 1904)
- Fiensy, D.A. Prayers Alleged to be Jewish. An Examination of the Constitutiones Apostolorum (Brown Judaic Studies 65, Scholars Press Chico 1985)
- Finkelstein, L. 'The Development of the Amidah', JQR ns 16(1925/6), 1-43, 127-70.
- ' The Birkat Ha-Mazon', JQR ns 19(1928/9), 211-62.
- ' La Kedouscha et les Benedictions du Schema', REJ 93(1932), 1-26.
- Fitzmyer, J.A. 'Implications of the New Enoch Literature from Qumran ' TS 38(1977) 332-345.
- Fleischer, E. 'The Diffusion of the Qedushot of the Amidah and the Yozer in the Palestinian Ritual', Tarbiz 38(1968/9) 255-84.
- Flusser, D. 'Sanktus und Gloria ', in O. Betz et al (eds.), Abraham unser Vater, Festschrift Otto Michael (Brill, Leiden 1963) 129-52.
- Forrester, D. 'Recent Liturgical Work in Scotland', The Expository Times 91:2 (1979) 39-44.
- Freund, W.H.C. Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church (OUP, Oxford 1955)
- Frendo, J.A. The "Post Secreta" of the "Missale Gothicum" and the Eucharistic Theology of the Gallican Anaphora (St. Venera, Malta 1977)
- Frere, W.H. The Winchester Troper (HBS 8, London 1894)
- Some Principles of Liturgical Reform (John Murray, London 1911)
- Fuchs, H. Die Anaphora des monophysitischen Patriarchen Jôhannan I (Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen, Münster in Westf. 1926)
- Gamber, K. Missa Romensis (Pustet, Regensburg 1970).
- Gärtner, B. The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament (CUP, Cambridge 1965)
- Gavin, F. The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments (SPCK, London 1928)

- Gerhards, A. 'Le Phénomène du Sanctus adressé au Christ', in Le Christ dans la Liturgie (Conférences St.Serge 1980, CLV,Rome 1981) 65-83.
 ----- Die griechische Gregoriosanaphora (LQF 65, Aschendorff, Münster 1984)
- Gesenius, W. Lexicon Manuale Hebraicum et Chaldaicum (Vogel, Lipsiae 1885)
- Gesenius-Kautzeh, Hebrew Grammer (ET Clarendon Press, Oxford 1898)
- Glahn, H. Melodistadier Til Den Lutherske Salmesangs Historie Fra 1524 til ca 1600 (Rosenkilde og Bagger, København, 1954) 2 vols.
- Goodenough, E.R. By Light, Light (Yale University Press, New Haven and London 1935)
 ----- Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period 2 (Pantheon Books, New York 1953)
- Graham, Billy. Angels: God's Secret Agents (Hodder and Staughton, London 1976)
- Grant, R.M. 'The Early Antiochene Anaphora', ATR 30(1946) 91-4.
 ----- and Graham, H.H. First and Second Clement (
- Gray, G.B. Isaiah 1-25 (T and T Clark, Edinburgh 1912).
- Gray, J. 1 and 2 Kings (SCM, London 1964¹)
- Green, W.S. (ed.) Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice (Scholars Press, Missoula 1978)
- Griffe, E. "Aux origines de la liturgie gallicane" in Bulletin de Literature Ecclésiastique 1(1955) 17-43.
- Grisbrooke, W.J. Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries (Alcuin Club/SPCK, London 1958)
 ----- "Series II: The new Communion Service of the Church of England Examined", SL 7(1970) 2-36.
- Grove - New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians (Macmillan London 1980). Vol.19.
- Gruenwald, I. Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism (Brill, Leiden 1980)
- Gy, P-M. 'La Sanctus Romain et les Anaphores Orientales', in Mélanges Liturgiques offerts au R.P. Dom Bernard Botte (Abbaye du Mont César, Louvain 1972) 167-74.
- Habgood, J.A. 'The Uneasy Truce between Science and Religion', in A.Vidler(ed.), Soundings (CUP, Cambridge 1963) 21-41.
- Hagedorn, D. Der Hiobkommentar des Arianers Julian (De Gruyter, Berlin 1973)
- Hageman, H. Pulpit and Table (John Knox Press, Richmond 1962)
- Hagner, D.A. The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome (Brill, Leiden 1973)
- Hahn, F. The Worship of the Early Church (Fortress Press, Philadelphia 1973)
- Haile, G. 'Religious Controversies and the Growth of Ethiopic Literature in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries', OC 4th series 65(1981) 102-36.
- Hammerschmidt, E. Die Koptische Gregoriosanaphora (Berliner byzantische Arbeiten 8, Berlin 1957)
 ----- Studies in the Ethiopic Anaphoras (Akademie-Verlag, Berlin 1961)
- Hannover - Die Hannoversche Agende. Kleine texte für vorlesungen und ubungen Herausgegeben von Hans Lietzmann 125 (A.Marcus und E.Weber Verlag, Bonn 1913)

- Hanson, R.P.C. 'The Liberty of the Bishop to Improvise Prayer in the Eucharist', VC 15(1961) 173-6.
- Hanssens, J.M. La Liturgie D'Hippolyte (OCA 155, Rome 1965)
- Haran, M. 'The Ark and the Cherubim: Their Symbolic Significance in Biblical Ritual', Israel Exploration Journal 9 (1959) 30-8; 89-94.
- Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel (OUP, London 1978)
- Harden, J.M. The Anaphoras of the Ethiopic Liturgy (SPCK, London 1928)
- Harmon, N.B. The Rites and Ritual of Episcopal Methodism (Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Nashville 1926)
- Hatchett, M.J. The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer (Seabury Press, New York 1982)
- Hayek, M. Liturgie Maronite. Histoire et textes eucharistiques (Maison Mame, Paris 1964)
- Heaton, E.W. Daniel (SCM, London 1956)
- Hedegard, D. Seder R.Amran Gaon Part 1 (Ph.Lindstedts universitets-bokhandel, Lund 1951)
- Heidt, W.G. Angelology of the Old Testament (The Catholic University of America. Studies in Sacred Theology, Minnesota 1949)
- Heinemann, J. Prayer in the Talmud (De Gruyter, Berlin and New York 1977)
- Henbest, N and Couper, H. The Restless Universe (George Philip, London 1982)
- Hengel, M. Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period 2 vols (Fortress Press, Philadelphia 1974)
- Herntrich, V. Ezekielprobleme BZAW 61 (Topelmann, Giessen 1933)
- Herrmann, J. Ezechielstudien (J.C.Hinrichs, Leipzig 1908)
- Hoffman, L.A. The Canonization of the Synagogue Service (University of Notre Dame, Indiana 1979)
- Holloway, H. The Norwegian Rite (Stockwell, London 1934)
- Hölscher, G. Hesekiel, der dichter und das Buch BZAW 39(Topelmann, Giessen 1924)
- Hooke, S.H. Myth, Ritual and Kingship (Clarendon Press, New York and Oxford 1958)
- Horn, E.T. Outlines of Liturgics (Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia 1890)
- 'The Lutheran Sources of the Common Service', Lutheran Quarterly 21(1891) 239-68.
- Houssiau, A. 'The Alexandrine Anaphora of St.Basil', in The New Liturgy, 228-43.
- Hubert, F. Die Strassburger liturgischen ordnungen im Zeitalter der Reformation (Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, Göttingen 1900).
- ICET Prayers We have in Common (SPCK, London 1975²)
- Idelsohn, A.Z. Jewish Liturgy and its Development (Schocken, New York 1960)

- Jacob, E. Theology of the Old Testament (Hodder and Staughton, London 1958)
- James, M.R. The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament (SPCK, London 1920)
- Janeras, S. 'L'Original grec del fragment copte de Louvain Num.27 en l'Anafora di Barcelona', in Miscellania Liturgica Catalana III (1984), 13-25.
- Johnson, A.R. Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel (University of Wales, Cardiff 1967)
- Joines, K.R. 'Winged Serpents in Isaiah's Inaugural Vision', JBL 86 (1976) 410- 15.
- Jones, C. et al., The Study of Liturgy (SPCK, London 1978)
- Jonge, M.de. The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their text, composition and origin (Van Gorcum, Assen 1953)
- Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation (Brill, Leiden 1975)
- 'Once More: Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs' Nov.T. 5(1962) 311-19
- Jordahn, O. 'The Ecumenical Significance of the New Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Liturgy' SL 11(1976) 101-17.
- Jungmann, J.A. The Mass of the Roman Rite 2 vols (Benzinger, New York 1955)
- The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer (Geoffrey Chapman, London 1965²)
-
- Kahle, P.E. Bala'izah Coptic Texts from Deir el Bala'izah in Upper Egypt (OUP, London 1954)
- Kahler, E. Studien zum Te Deum (Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen 1956)
- Kaiser, O. Isaiah 1-12 (SCM, London 1972¹; 1983²)
- Kapelrud, A.S. 'The Gates of Hell and the Guardian Angels of Paradise', Journal of the American Oriental Society 70(1950) 151-6.
- Kasper, W. The God of Jesus Christ (SCM, London 1984)
- Kavanagh, A. ' Thoughts on the New Eucharistic Prayers', Worship 43 (1969), 2-12.
- Keel, O. The Symbolism of the Biblical World (SPCK, London 1978)
- Keifer, R.A. 'The Unity of the Roman Canon: An Examination of its unique structure', SL 11(1976) 39-58.
- Khoury-Sarkis, G. 'L'Origine syrienne de l'anaphore byzantine de saint Jean Chrysostome ', Or.Syr 7(1962) 3-68.
- Kilmartin, E. 'Sacrificium Laudis: Content and Function of Early Eucharistic Prayers', TS 35 (1974) 268-87.
- King, A.A. Liturgies of the Primatial Sees (Longmans,London 1957)
- The Rites of Eastern Christendom 2 vols (Catholic Book Agency, Rome 1948)
- Kingsbury, E.C. 'The Prophets and the Council of Yahweh', JBL 83(1964) 279-86.
- Klauser, T. A Short History of the Western Liturgy (OUP, Oxford 1979²)
- Knibb, M.A. 'The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review', NTS 25(1978-9) 345-59.
- Kohler, K. 'The Origins and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions with a translation of the corresponding Essene Prayers in the Apostolic Constitutions ', HUCA 1 (1924) 387-425.
- The Origins of the Synagogue and the Church (Macmillan, New York 1929)

- Kraft, R.A. The Testament of Job (Scholars Press, Missoula, Montana 1974)
- Kraus, H-J. Worship in Israel (ET Blackwell, Oxford 1966)
- Kretschmar, G. 'Die frühe Geschichte der Jerusalemer Liturgie', in Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie 2(1956) 22-46.
----- Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie
(J.C.B.Mohr, Tübingen 1965)
- Kronholm, T. Seder R. Amran Gaon Part II (C.W.K.Gleerup, Lund 1974)
- Kroon, S. Tibi Laus. Studier Kring den Svenska Psalmen Nr.199
(Lunds universitets Arsskrift, Lund 1953)
- Kropp, A. Demotische und Koptische Texte (Ausgewählte Koptische Zaubertexte. 3 vols Brussels 1930-31)
- Kuhn, K.G. 'The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran', in K.Stendahl (ed.) The Scrolls and the New Testament (SCM, London 1958)
- Lacan, M-F. 'Caeli caelorumque virtutes', RSR 51(1963) 240-46.
- Lang, A.P. Leo der Grosse und die Texte des Altgelasianums
(Pont.Univ.Gregoriana, Steyl 1957)
----- 'Leo der Grosse und die Dreifaltigkeitspräfatation',
SE 9(1957) 116-62.
- Langton, E. The Ministries of the Angelic Powers according to the Old Testament and Later Jewish Literature (J.Clarke, London 1936).
----- The Angel Teaching of the New Testament (J.Clarke, London 1935)
- Leak, N. 'Recent Developments in Public Worship and Aids to Devotion - Presbyterian Church of England', LR 3(1973) 26-31.
- Leaney, A.R.C. The Rite of Qumran and its Meaning (SCM, London 1966)
- Ledogar, J. Acknowledgement: Praise Verbs in the Early Greek Anaphoras (Herder, Rome 1968)
- Leiser, B.M. 'The Trisagion of Isaiah's Vision', NTS 6(1959/60) 261-263.
- Lengeling, E. 'Le problème des nouvelles prières eucharistique dans la liturgie romaine', QL 53(1972) 51.
- Levey, S. 'The Targum of Ezekiel', HUCA 46 (1975), 139-58.
----- The Targum of Ezekiel (T & T Clark, Edinburgh 1987)
- Levy, K. 'The Byzantine Sanctus and its Modal Tradition in East and West', Ann.M. 6(1958-63) 7-67.
- Liebreich, L.J. ' An Analysis of U-Ba' Le-Ziyyon', HUCA 21(1948) 176-209.
- Lietzmann, H. Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of Liturgy (Brill, Leiden 1979)
- Lightfoot, J.B. The Apostolic Fathers (Macmillan, London 1907)
- Ligier, L. ' From the Last Supper to the Eucharist', in The New Liturgy 113-50.
----- ' Anaphores orientales et prières juives', Proche-Orient Chretien 13(1963) 3-20.
----- 'The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer: From the Last Supper to the Eucharist', SL 9(1973) 176-85.
- Lincoln, A.T. Paradise Now and Not Yet (CUP.Cambridge 1981)
- Lohe, W. Agende für Christliche Gemeinden des luthischen Bekenntnisses (Beck, Nordlingen 1844)
- Lovelock, J. Gaia: A New Look at Life on Earth (OUP, London 1982)
- Lowther Clarke, W.K. (ed.) Liturgy and Worship (SPCK, London 1932)
- Luther's Works (Fortress Press, Philadelphia: Concordia, St.Louis 1955-)

- MacCarthy, B. On the Stowe Missal, (TRIA 27 1886)
- Macomber, W.F. 'The Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari', OCP 32(1966) 335-71.
- 'The Ancient Form of the Anaphora of the Apostles' in East of Byzantium, Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period (Dumbarton Oaks, Washington 1982).
- Six Explanations of the Liturgical Feasts by Cyrus of Edessa (CSCO, Louvain 1974) Tomes 155/6.
- 'An Anaphoral Prayer composed by Theodore of Mopsuestia', Parole de l'Orient 6-7(1975/6) (Melanges offerts au R.P. Francois Graffin, sj) 341-7.
- 'A Theory on the Origins of the Syrian, Maronite and Chaldean Rites', OCP 39(1973) 235-42.
- Macquarrie, John. Principles of Christian Theology (SCM, London 1966)
- McNamara, M. The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch (Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome 1966)
- Magne, J. 'L'anaphore nestorienne dite d'Addée et Mari et l'anaphore maronite dite de Pierre III', OCP 53(1987) 107-59.
- 'Carmina Christo I. Le "Sanctus" de la Messe Latine', EL 100(1986) 3-27.
- 'Carmina Christo II. Le "Te Deum"', EL 100(1986) 113-37.
- Mann, J. 'Geniza Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service', HUCA 2(1925) 269-338.
- Mansoor, M. The Thanksgiving Hymns (Brill, Leiden 1961)
- Marmorstein, A. 'L'Âge de la kedouscha de l'Amidah', REJ 97(1934) 176-209.
- Marshall, I.H. The Gospel of Luke (Paternoster Press, Exeter 1978)
- Martin, R.P. Worship in the Early Church (T & T. Clark, Edinburgh 1965)
- Maxwell, J.M. Worship and Reformed Theology. The Liturgical Lesson of Mercersburg (Pickwick Press, Pittsburgh 1976)
- Maxwell, W.D. An Outline of Christian Worship (OUP, London 1936)
- Mazza, E. 'Una Anafora Incompleta? Il Papiro Strassbourg Gr.254', EL 99(1985) 425-36.
- The Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Rite (ET Pueblo, New York 1986)
- Mearns, C.L. 'The Parables of Enoch - Origin and Date', Expository Times 89(1978) 118-9.
- 'Dating the Similitudes of Enoch', NTS 25(1978/9) 360-9.
- Melton, J. 'Presbyterian Worship in Twentieth Century America', in J.E. Booty (ed.), The Divine Drama in History and Liturgy (Pickwick Publications, Allinson Park 1984) 179-99.
- Mettinger, T.N.D. The Dethronement of Sabaoth. Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies. Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 18 (C.W.K. Gleerup, Lund 1982)
- Metzger, B. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (United Bible Society, New York and London 1971)
- Metzger, M. 'The Didascalia and the Constitutiones Apostolorum', in The Eucharist of the Early Christians, ed. W. Rordorf (Pueblo, New York 1978) 194-219.
- Metzger, M. Königsthron und Gottesthron. 2 vols (Verlag Butzon & Bercker, Kevelaer, 1985)
- Michell, G.A. 'Firmilian and Eucharistic Consecration', JTS ns 5 (1954) 215-20.
- Milik, J.T. 'Problèmes de la littérature hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qumrân', HTR 64(1971) 333-78.

- Milik, J.T. The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4 (OUP,Oxford 1976)
- Miller, P.D. The Divine Warrior in Early Israel (Harvard Semitic Monographs 5, HUP, Cambridge,Mass. 1973)
- Milne,A.A. Winnie-The-Pooh (Methuen London 1926)
- Mohlberg,L.C. Missale Gallicanum Vetus (Rome,Herder 1958)
- Mohrmann,C. Liturgical Latin (Catholic University of America Press, Washington 1957)
- 'Les origines de la liturgie chrétienne à Rome', VC 3 (1949) 47-106; 163-83.
- Moltmann,J. God in Creation (SCM, London 1985)
- The Trinity and the Kingdom of God (SCM, London 1981)
- Montefiore, H. The Probability of God (SCM,London 1985)
- Morgenstern, J. 'The Gates of Righteousness', HUCA 6(1926) 1-37.
- Mowinckel, S. The Psalms in Israel's Worship (Blackwell,Oxford 1982)
- Mowrey,L. 'Revelation 4-5 and Early Christian Liturgical Usage', JBL 71(1952) 75-84.
- Mullen, E.T. The Assembly of the Gods (Harvard Semitic Monographs 24, Scholars Press,Chico 1980)
- Murray, R. Symbols of Church and Kingdom (CUP,London 1972)
- 'Hellenistic-Jewish Rhetoric in Aphrahat', Symposium Syriacus 1980 (OCA,221, Rome 1983) 79-85
- Musurillo,H. The Acts of the Christian Martyrs (OUP, Oxford 1972)
- Nassau - Liturgie bei dem öffentlichen Gottensdienste der evangelische-Christlichen Kirche in dem Hergogthum Nassau (Wiesbaden 1843)
- Neale,J.M. and Forbes G.H. Ancient Liturgies of the Gallican Church (Burntisland 1855)
- Neuberg,F.J. 'An unrecognised Meaning of Hebrew $\hat{D}OR$ ', JNES (1950) 215-7.
- Neusner,J. A Life of Rabban Yohanan Ben Zakkai Ca.1-80CE (Brill,Leiden 1962)
- A History of the Jews in Babylonia. I The Parthian Period. (Brill,Leiden 1969²)
- Aphrahat and Judaism. The Christian-Jewish Argument in Fourth Century Iran (Brill,Leiden 1971)
- Noth,M. 'God,King and Nation in the Old Testament' in The Laws in the Pentateuch and other Studies (Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh 1966).
- News of Liturgy - (Bramcote,Notts.) 120(Dec.1984);154 (Oct.1987)
- Odeberg,H. 3 Enoch Revised by J.Greenfield (Ktav,New York 1973)
- Oesterley, W.O.E. The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy (OUP,Oxford 1925)
- Ordo Missae - Dutch Church (N.V.Gooi and Sticht,Hilversum 1970)
- Ormanian, M. The Church of Armenia (Mowbray,London 1955)
- Old,H.O. The Patristic Roots of Reformed Worship (Theologischer Verlag, Zurich 1975)

- Pahl, I (ed.) Coena Domini. Die Abendmahlsliturgie der Reformationskirchen im 16/17. Jahrhundert. Spicilegium Friburgense 29(Universitätsverlag, Freiburg Schweiz 1983)
- Paredi, A. I Prefazi ambrosiani (Societa editrice vita e pensiero, Milan 1937)
- Paverd, F. Van de Zur Geschichte der Messliturgie in Antiochein und Konstantinopel gegen ende des vierten Jahrhunderts (OCA 187, Rome 1970)
- Peacocke, A.R. Creation and the World of Science (OUP, London 1979)
- Peake - Peake's Commentary on the Bible (Nelson, London 1962)
- Peaston, A.E. The Prayer Book Tradition in the Free Churches (J. Clarke, London 1964)
- Peterson, E. The Angels and the Liturgy (DLT, London 1964)
- Petuchowski, J. (ed.) Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy (Ktav, New York 1970)
- Pfatteicher, P.H. and Messerli, C.R., Manual on the Liturgy: Lutheran Book of Worship (Augsberg, Minneapolis 1979)
- Pfeiffer, R.H. 'Cherubim', JBL 41(1922) 249-50.
- Piana, G. La. 'The Roman Church at the end of the Second Century', HTR 18(1925) 201-77.
- Piepkorn, A.C. Profiles in Belief. The Religious Bodies of the United States and Canada Vol.2 (Harper and Row, New York 1978)
- Pinell, J. De liturgiis occidentalibus (mss. 2 vols. Rome 1967)
- Piper, O. 'The Apocalypse of John and the Liturgy of the Ancient Church', Church History 20(1950) 10-22.
- Pitt, W.E. 'The Origin of the Anaphora of St. Basil', JEH 12(1961) 1-13.
- Porteous, N. Daniel (SCM, London 1965)
- Porter, H.B. 'An American Assembly of Anaphoral Prayers', in (ed.) B.D. Spinks, The Sacrifice of Praise, 181-96.
- Price, C.P. 'Jewish Morning Prayers and Early Christian Anaphoras', ATR 43(1961) 153-68.
- Prigent, P. Apocalypse et liturgie (Delachaux et Niestle, Neuchatel 1964).
- Quensel, O. Bidrag till Svenska liturgiens historia II (Lundequistska, Upsala 1893).
- Rad, G. Von. Old Testament Theology 1 and 2. (ET Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh 1962)
- Raes, A. 'L'Authenticite de la Liturgie byzantine de S. Jean Chrysostome', OCP 24(1958) 5-16.
- (ed.) Anaphorae Syriacae (Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, Rome 1939-)
- Rahner, K. Theological Investigations 19 (DLT, London 1983)
- Ratcliff, E.C. 'The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: A Suggestion', JTS 30(1928/9) 23-32.
- 'The Institution Narrative of the Roman Canon Missae: its beginnings and early background', SP 2(1957) 64-82.

- Ratcliff, E.C. 'A Note on the Anaphoras described in the Liturgical Homilies of Narsai', in (ed.) Birdsall and Thompson, Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey, 235-49.
- and A.H.Couratin, 'The Early Roman Canon Missae', JEH 20(1969) 211-24.
- Reed, L.D. The Lutheran Liturgy (Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1960²)
- Renaudot, E. Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio (Gregg International reprint, Farnborough 1970) 2 vols.
- Renoux, A. 'L'Anaphore Arménienne de saint Gregoire l'Illuminatur', Eucharisties d'Orient et d'Occident II (Cerf, Paris 1970) 83-108.
- Richard, M. Asterii Sophistae Commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt accedunt aliquot homiliae anonymae (Symbolae Osloenses, Oslo 1956)
- Richter, A.E. Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen 2 vols (Verlag des Landes-industriecomptoirs, Weimar 1846)
- Robinson, H.Wheeler, 'The Council of Yahweh', JTS 45(1944) 151-7.
- Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament (OUP, Oxford 1946)
- Robinson, J.M. et al, The Nag Hammadi Library in English (Brill, Leiden 1977)
- Rordorf, W. 'Les Prières Eucharistique de la Didache', in Eucharisties d'Orient et d'Occident I (Cerf Paris 1970) 65-82.
- Rowland, C.C. 'The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature', JSJ 10(1979) 137-54.
- The Open Heaven (SPCK, London 1982)
- Rudolph, W. Micha-Nahum-Habakuk-Zephania Kommementen zum Alten Testament (Mohn, Gutersloh 1975)
- Ryan, J.B. The Eucharistic Prayer. A Study in Contemporary Liturgy (Paulist Press, New York 1974)
- Salaville, S. Introduction to the Study of Eastern Liturgies (Sands & Co, London 1938)
- Sánchez Caro, J.M. 'La anafora de Addai y Mari y la anafora meronita Sarrar: intento de reconstrucción de la fuente primitiva comun', OCP 43(1977) 41-69.
- Eucharistia E Historia de la Salvacion (Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, Madrid 1983)
- Sanders, J.A. The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll (Cornell University Press, New York 1967)
- Sandmel, S. The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity: Certainties and Uncertainties (OUP, London 1969)
- Sarason, R.S. 'On the Use of Method in the Modern Study of Jewish Liturgy' in (ed.) W.S.Green, Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice (Scholars Press, Missoula 1978) 97-172.
- Sarkissian, V.K. A Brief Introduction to Armenian Christian Literature (Faith Press, London 1960)
- Savignac, J.de. 'Les "Seraphim"', VT 22(1972) 320-5.
- Schafer, P. Synopse zur Hekhalot Literatur (Mohr, Tübingen 1982)

- Schechter, A.I. Studies in Jewish Liturgy (The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, Philadelphia 1930) 462
- Scholem, G. Jewish Gnosticism, Merkavah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition (Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York 1965²)
- Schmidt-Lauber, H.C. 'The Eucharistic Prayers in the Roman Catholic Church Today', SL 11(1976) 159-76.
- Sehling, E. Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI Jahrhunderts 5 Bands (Reisland, Leipzig 1902-13)
- Senn, F.C. 'Liturgia Svecanae Ecclesiae: An Attempt at Eucharistic Restoration during the Swedish Reformation', SL 14 (1980-81) 20-36.
- Serenius, S. Liturgia Svecanae ecclesiae catholicae et orthodoxae conformis: En liturgiehistorisk undersokning med sarskild hansyn till struktur och forlagor (Acta Academiae Aboensis, Abo Akademi, Abo 1966)
- Sheppard, L. (ed.) The New Liturgy (DLT London 1970)
- Shepherd, M.H. 'Eusebius and the Liturgy of Saint James' in Yearbook of Liturgical Studies 4(1963) 109-23.
- 'The Formation and Influence of the Antiochene Liturgy', in Dumbarton Oaks Papers 15(1961) 25-44.
- Smend, J. Die Evangelischen Deutschen Messen Bis zu Luthers Deutscher Messe (Reprint De Graaf, Nieuwkoop 1967)
- Smith, M.A. 'The Anaphora of Apostolic Tradition re-considered', SP 10 (1970) 426-30.
- Smolarski, D.C. Eucharistia. A Study of the Eucharistic Prayer (Paulist Press, New York 1982)
- Spinks, B.D. (ed.) The Sacrifice of Praise (A.H. Couratin Festschrift) (CLV, Rome 1981)
- 'The Cleansed Leper's Thankoffering Before the Lord: Edward Craddock Ratcliff and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora', in The Sacrifice of Praise, 161-78.
- 'A Note on the Anaphora outlined in Narsai's Homily XXXII', JTS ns 31(1980) 82-93.
- 'The Jewish Liturgical Sources for the Sanctus', HJ 21(1980) 168-79.
- Addai and Mari- The Anaphora of the Apostles: A Text for Students (Grove Liturgical Study 24, Bramcote 1981)
- 'Eucharistic Offering in the East Syrian Anaphoras', OCP 50(1984) 347-71.
- 'The Jerusalem Liturgy of the Catecheses Mystagogicae: Syrian or Egyptian ?', forthcoming in SP
- 'The Consecratory Epiklesis in the Anaphora of St. James', SL 11(1976) 19-38.
- 'A Complete Anaphora ? A Note on Strasbourg Gr. 254', HJ 25(1984) 51-9.
- Luther's Liturgical Criteria and His Reform of the Canon of the Mass (Grove Liturgical Study 30, Bramcote 1982)
- From the Lord and "The Best Reformed Churches". A Study of the eucharistic liturgy in the English Puritan and Separatist Traditions 1550-1633 (CLV, Rome 1985)
- Review of Bruno Bürki, Cène du Seigneur, JTS ns 37(1986) 693-7.
- Freedom or Order ? The Eucharistic Liturgy in the English Congregationalist Tradition 1645-1980. (Pickwick Publications, Allinson Park, 1984)
- 'The Liturgical Revival amongst nineteenth-century English Congregationalists', SL 15(1982/3) 178-87.
- 'A Precursor to Dr. W.E. Orchard's Divine Service ?', Journal of United Reformed Church History Society 2:3 (1979) 73-5.

- Spinks, B.D. 'Beware the Liturgical Horses ! An English Interjection on Anaphoral Evolution, Worship 59(1985) 211-19.
- Sprott, G.W., The Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland (Blackwood, Edinburgh and London 1882)
- Stalker, D.M.G. Ezekiel (SCM, London 1968)
- Stevenson, K.W. 'The Catholic Apostolic Church - its History and its Eucharist', SL 13(1979) 21-43.

The Catholic Apostolic Eucharist. Ph.D. Thesis, Southampton University 1975.

Eucharist and Offering (Pueblo, New York 1986)
- Stone, M.E. The Testament of Abraham. The Greek Recensions. (Scholars Press, Missoula Montana 1972)
- Strugnell, J. 'The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran - 4Q Šîrôt Ôlat Hassabbât', in Congress Volume Oxford 1959 (VT Supplement 7, Brill, Leiden 1960)
- Sutcliffe, E.F. 'Sacred Meals at Qumran', HJ 1(1960) 48-65.
- Suter, D.W. Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch (SBL Dissertation Series 47, Scholars Press, Missoula, 1979)
- Swaans, W.J. 'A propos des "Catéchèses Mystagogiques" attribu à S. Cyrille de Jérusalem', Mu 55(1942) 1-43.
- Swift, W.F. 'The Sunday Service of the Methodists', PWHS 29 (1953/4) 12-24.

'The Sunday Service of the Methodists. A Study of Nineteenth-Century Liturgy', PWHS 31(1957/8) 112-118.
- Talley, T.J. ' The Eucharistic Prayer of the Ancient Church According to Recent Research: Results and Reflections', SL 11(1970) 138-58.

'From Berakah to Eucharistia: A Reopening Question', Worship 50(1976) 115-37.

'The Eucharistic Prayer: Directions for Development', Worship 51(1977) 316-25.

'The Eucharistic Prayer: Tradition and Development', in (ed.) Kenneth W. Stevenson, Liturgy Reshaped (In honour of G.J. Cuming) (SPCK, 1982) 48-64.

'The Literary Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer', Worship 58(1984) 404-20.
- Talmon, S. 'The Emergence of Institutionalized Prayer in Israel in the Light of the Qumran Literature' in (ed.) M. Delcor, Qumran: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu (Duculot, Paris 1978) 265-84.
- Tarby, A. La Prière Eucharistique de L'Église de Jérusalem (Beauchesne, Paris 1972)
- Theissen, G. Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity (Fortress Press, Philadelphia 1978)

The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity (T & T Clark, Edinburgh 1982)
- Thompson, B. Liturgies of the Western Church (The World Publishing Company, New York and Cleveland 1971)
- Thurian, M. and Wainwright, G. Baptism and Eucharist. Ecumenical Convergence in Concelebration (WCC, Geneva; Eerdmans, Grand Rapids 1984)

- Toon, P. Justification and Sanctification (Marshall, Morgan and Scott, London 1983)
- Torrance, T.F. Divine and Contingent Order (OUP, London 1981)
- Theology in Reconciliation (Geoffrey Chapman, London 1975)
- Tov, E. The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch (Scholars Press, Missoula 1976)
-
- Unnik, W.C. Van '1 Clement 34 and the Sanctus', VC 5(1951) 204-48.
- Urbach, E.E. 'The Traditions about the Merkabah Mysticism in the Tannaitic Period', in Studies in Mysticism and Religion Presented to Gershom G. Scholem on Seventieth Birthday (Magnes Press, Jerusalem 1967)
- Urbach, E.E. The Sages - Their Concepts and Beliefs (Magnes Press, Jerusalem 1975)
-
- Vellian, J. 'The Anaphoral Structure of Addai and Mari Compared to the Berakoth Preceding the Shema in the Synagogue Morning Service', Mu 85(1972) 201-23.
- Von Allmen, J.J. Worship: Its Theology and Practice (ET Lutterworth, London 1965)
- Voöbus, A. 'Discovery of the Anaphora by Johannan of Qartamin', EL 90(1976) 197-200.
-
- Wagner, G. Der Ursprung der Chrysostomusliturgie (LQF 59 Aschendorff, Münster 1973)
- Walker, N. 'The Origin of the 'Thrice Holy' ', NTS 5(1958/9) 132-3.
- Wegman, H. 'Pleidoor voor een Tekst de Anaphora van de Apostelen Addai en Mari ', Bijdragen 40(1979) 15-43.
- 'Généalogie hypothétique de la priere eucharistique', QL 61(1980) 263-78.
- 'Une anaphore incomplète ?', in R. Van Den Broek and M.J. Vermaseren (eds.) Studies in Gnostic and Hellenistic Religions (Brill, Leiden 1981) 432-50.
- Christian Worship in East and West (Pueblo, New York 1986)
- Weinfeld, M. 'Traces of Kedushat Yozer and Pesukei De-Zimra in the Qumran Literature and in Ben-Sira', Tarbiz 45(1975/6) 13-26.
- Weisz, L. 'Heinrich Bullingers Agenda', Zwingliana 10(1954-8) 1-23.
- Werner, E. 'The Doxology in Synagogue and Church', HUCA 19(1945/6) reprinted in J. Petuchowski (ed.), Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy, 318-70.
- Wevers, J.W. Ezekiel (Oliphants, London 1969)
- Whitaker, E.C. Martin Bucer and the Book of Common Prayer (Alcuin Club, Mayhew-McCrimmon, Great Woking 1974)
- Wigan, B. The Liturgy in English (OUP, Oxford 1962)
- Willis, G.G. 1966 and All That (Faith Press, London 1969)
- Wilson, J.A. 'The Assembly of a Phoenician City'. JNES 4(1945) 245.

- Winkler, G. Das Armenische Initiationsrituale (OCA 217, Rome 1982)
 ----- 'The Political Influences of the Holy See on
 Armenia and its Liturgy (XI-XIV Centuries) in
 J.Vellian (ed.) The Romanization Tendency (The
 Syrian Churches Series 8, Kottayam 1975) 110-25.
- Winslow, J. and Ratcliff, E.C. The Eucharist in India: a plea for
 a Distinctive Liturgy for the Indian Church
 (Longmans, London 1920)
- Wright, G.E. The Old Testament Against its Environment (SCM, London
 1950)
- Wright, W. The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles (Williams and
 Norgate, London 1871) 2 vols.
- Yarnold, E. 'The Authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses attributed
 to Cyril of Jerusalem', HJ 19(1978) 143-61.
- Yelverton, E.E. The Mass in Sweden 1531-1914 (HBS 57, London 1920)
- Zimmerli, W. Ezekiel 1 (Chapters 1-24) (Fortress Press,
 Philadelphia 1979)
- Zunz, L. Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden (J.Kauffmann,
 Frankfurt 1892)

Addenda

- Bradshaw, P.F. 'The Search for the Origins of Christian
 Liturgy: some methodological Reflections',
Gratias Agamus, SL 17 (Jubilee Volume 1987)
 ----- 26-34.
- Brown, R.E. St. John 1-12 (Anchor Bible, Chapman, London 1971)
 ----- The Community of the Beloved Disciple (Chapman,
 London 1979)
- Caird, G.B. The Revelation of St. John the Divine (A and C
 Black, London 1966)
- Willis, G.G. Essays in Early Roman Liturgy (Alcuin Club,
 SPCK, London 1964)
- Paul F. Bradshaw, 'The Search for the Origins of Christian Liturgy:
 some methodological Reflections', Gratias Agamus,
 SL 17 (Jubilee Volume, 1987), 26-34.

