

SUMMARIUM

ARTICULI

	PAG.
W. F. Macomber S.J., The Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari	335-371
R.-J. Loenertz O.P., Les Querini, comtes d'Astypalée et seigneurs d'Amorgos, 1413-1446-1537	372-393
O. Meinardus, A Commentary on the XIV th Vision of Daniel according to the Coptic Version	394-449
M. Ruffini, L'opera della Chiesa ortodossa romana nella creazione della lingua letteraria nazionale (seguito) . .	450-477
J. T. Clemons, A Checklist of Syriac manuscripts in the United States and Canada (continued)	478-522

COMMENTARII BREVIORES

R. Murray S.J., A special sense of <i>šlōtā</i> as absolution or readmission to ecclesiastical communion	523-527
J. Gill S.J., The Canonists and the Council of Constance .	528-535
J. M. Hanssens S.J., L'édition critique des Canons d'Hippolyte	536-544

RECENSIONES

Theologica et patristica

A. Rousseau, Irénée de Lyon: Contre les Hérésies, IV . .	545-546
K. Sarkissian, The Council of Chalcedon and the Armenian Church	546-548
G. Weiss, Studien zum Leben, zu den Schriften und zur theologie des Patriarchen Anastasius I. von Antiochien (559-598).	548
E. Trapp, Manuel II. Palaiologos: Dialoge mit einem « Perser »	548-549

The Oldest Known Text
of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai
and Mari

Anton Baumstark, in his *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* ⁽¹⁾, indicates only thirteen manuscripts anterior to the seventeenth century that contain the Anaphora of the Apostles: *Séert* 38 (13th cent.), *Mosul* 36 (1331/2), *Diarbekir* 48 (15th), *Séert* 50 (1461), *Berlin* 38 (Sachau 167-1496), *Vatican Syriac* 66 (1529), *Séert* 37 (16th), *Urmia* 95 (16th), *Mardin* 19 (before 1573/4), *British Museum Oriental* 4060 (16th), *British Museum Additional* 7181 (1570), *Notre-Dame des Semences* 53 (1577/8) and *Mosul* 40 (1599/1600). The ravages of time have not been kind. The three manuscripts of *Séert* and *Urmia* 95 have apparently been destroyed, and it has been presumed that *Diarbekir* 48 and *Mardin* 19 suffered a similar fate ⁽²⁾. As for *Mosul* 36, closer inspection of

⁽¹⁾ Bonn, 1922, pp. 199 n. 1 and 200 nn. 5 and 9.

⁽²⁾ Cf. J. VOSTÉ, *Notes sur les manuscrits syriaques de Diarbekir et autres localités d'Orient*, in *Le Muséon* 50 (1937), 345-51, and, by the same, *Manuscrits Syro-Chaldéens récemment acquis par la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, in *Angelicum* 6 (1929), 36. As regards the Library of Oroomiah College, it seems that it was not destroyed by fire, as Vosté suggests, but it and the other Christian libraries of the area were plundered by bandits. Some of the MSS. were then sold to booksellers, but most, it is said, were used for making paper, of which there is supposed to have been a great shortage after the First World War. At any rate, *Urmia* 43 (*History of Mari Maryam* - 1813 A.D.) and a small fragment of *Urmia* 1 (New Testament - 1613 A.D.) have been given to the Speer Library of Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N.J., which also has most of what is very probably *Urmia* 180 (*Gannaṭ Bussāmē* - supposed to be 9/10th cent., but rather 14/15th); the new shelf marks are, respectively: Cabinet C, nrs. 40, 50 and 28. It is said that other MSS. of the Urmia area have made their way to Kerala in India. The MSS. of *Séert*, on

the manuscript reveals that the leaf on which the date reported by Scher (1) is found is a later addition copied by a certain Mar Giwargis, bishop, to replace the missing final leaf of the Anaphora of Nestorius. Whereas most of the manuscript is written in a thirteenth century hand, the Anaphora of the Apostles is in a later hand of the fifteenth or sixteenth century. Even in the case of *Vatican Syriac 66*, the date given by Baumstark refers only to the first part of the manuscript; the Anaphora of the Apostles, therefore, must be somewhat later, although it must still be of the mid sixteenth century (2). Hence, until recently, it seemed that only two manuscripts of about 1500 and four others of the sixteenth century were available to us for establishing critically the text of this anaphora.

Researches, however, into the libraries of Europe and the Middle East have permitted me to increase this list of manuscripts quite substantially in both number and quality. Thus, at the British Museum, I discovered that *Brit. Mus. Or. 5750*,

the contrary, with the exception of 24 that were sold to the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris before the war (nrs. 1, 2, 7-14, 17, 19, 24, 29, 85, 91, 98, 101, 104, 110, 128-30 and 134 of the catalogue of A. SCHER, *Catalogue des manuscrits syriaques et arabes conservés dans la bibliothèque épiscopale de Séert*, Mosul, 1905) and a funeral ritual (nr. 58) now in the Library of the Chaldean Patriarchate in Baghdad, have completely disappeared.

Just as I was finishing this article, however, I chanced to come across what must be a copy of *Urmia 95*. It is now in the possession of Professor W. D. McHardy, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford University. It was copied at Urmia in 1908, apparently for a member of the Anglican Mission who was a student of the liturgy (A. J. Maclean?). In the colophon it states that it was copied from "an old MS." of the Library of the American Missionaries. Its readings are comparable to those of MSS. which I have dated as of the 15th or 16th century (*Chald. Patr. 36* and *Berlin 39*).

(1) A. SCHER, *Notice sur les manuscrits syriaques conservés dans la Bibliothèque du Patriarcat chaldéen de Mossoul*, in *Revue des Bibliothèques* 17 (1907), 237-8. The date, 1643 of the Greeks, is found on p. 127 of the manuscript.

(2) Cf. J. S. ASSEMANUS, *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codicum manuscriptorum catalogus. Partis primae tomus secundus complectens codices chaldaicos sive syriacos*, Rome, 1758/Paris, 1926, p. 370, where he notes that certain parts of the codex are later additions, written in what appears to be the hand of Joseph, Bishop of the Indies, who copied *Vatican Syriac 45* in 1556 (*ibid.*, p. 304).

a Nestorian service book of the kind known as the *hudrâ*, contains the Anaphora of the Apostles among the ceremonies of the vigil of Easter. Although the manuscript is undated, its script resembles that of *Brit. Mus. Add. 7177*, dated 1484 A.D. (1). There is another *hudrâ* manuscript with this anaphora at the Vatican Library, *Borgia Syriac 150*, whose script I would estimate to be of the sixteenth century (2). Furthermore, in the catalogue of Omont of the manuscripts of the Public Library of Rouen, there is mention of a Nestorian priests' ritual, *Rouen Oriental 21*, copied in a hand characteristic of the sixteenth century, or of the years immediately preceding or following it (3). Finally, the second part of *Cambridge Additional 2046* turns out to be of at least the fifteenth century and, judging by its archaic readings, would seem to be the oldest known surviving missal (4). To these should

(1) MS. nr. 33 in *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum orientalium qui in Museo Britannico asservantur. Pars prima codices syriacos et carshunicos amplectens* (edited by F. ROSEN and J. FORSHALL), London, 1838, p. 55. A page of this MS. is reproduced in W. H. P. HATCH, *An Album of Dated Syriac Manuscripts*, Boston, 1946, plate CLXXVIII. The manuscript checklist at the British Museum estimates the date of *Or. 5750* as the eighteenth century, which may explain why it has failed to receive the attention that it deserves. This MS. is incomplete, beginning with the rite of baptism, celebrated among the offices of Great Saturday. There can be very little doubt that the missing first half is identical with *Hyeurnat Syriac 4*, kept in the Library of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., which is written in the same hand, has the same number of lines per page and the same unusual number of leaves per gathering (12), and ends with the nocturn of Great Saturday.

(2) Msgr. SCHER, *Notice sur les manuscrits syriaques du Musée Borgia, aujourd'hui à la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, in *Journal Asiatique*, sér. 10, vol. XIII (1909), 281, estimates the script to be of the 15th century, but to me it seems a hand transitional between the style characteristic of Mosul MSS. of the 16th century and that of Alqoshi MSS. of the 17th.

(3) MS. nr. 1495 in H. OMONT, *Manuscrits de la bibliothèque de la Ville de Rouen*, in *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Départements*, vol. I, Paris, 1886, p. 444.

(4) In the catalogue (W. WRIGHT and S. A. COOK, *A Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, vol. II, Cambridge, 1901, p. 1179), this section is described as copied in a "later Nestorian" hand. My estimate of the 15th century, however, is confirmed by the archaic readings of this MS., which are more numerous than those found in the other rituals of the 15th century. I am deeply indebted to the Rev. Douglas Webb, Vicar of Wil-

be added *Berlin Oriental Quarto 804*, which Baumstark erroneously reports as being dated 1785 A.D. A more careful reading of Sachau's catalogue reveals that it is only the last leaf that is of this date; the rest, including the Anaphora of the Apostles, is ascribed to the sixteenth or seventeenth century (1).

The finds in the Middle East were of even greater significance. At Mardin and Diarbekir I discovered that substantial numbers of the manuscripts have survived, even though the losses have been tragically high. In particular, I was able to identify the two priests' rituals, *Diarbekir 48* and *Mardin 19*. The former may be confidently assigned to the fifteenth century, following Scher's estimate (2); the latter is most probably of the same century (3). *Mardin 20*, another priests' ritual, has also been preserved, and I chanced to find its date, August 22, 1877 of the Greeks, i.e. 1566 A.D. (4). Moreover, *Mardin 22*, a *ḥudrâ* of the Fast only, dated 1287 A.D., contains the Anaphora of the Apostles, together with the rites of penance and baptism (5).

burton, near Cambridge, for having pointed out to me this important MS. He has also established the correct sequence of its leaves, which have been bound in disorder (ff. 132, 135, 105-8, 136, 133, 109-10, for the Ordinary of the Liturgy and the Anaphora of the Apostles).

(1) MS. nr. 39 in E. SACHAU, *Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlich-Bibliothek zu Berlin*. Vol. XXIII: *Verzeichniss der syrischen Handschriften*, part I, Berlin, 1899, p. 150. After submitting this article, I visited the Stiftung Preussischer Kultur Besitz, Depot der Staatsbibliothek, Tübingen, where many of the Berlin MSS. are now located. By their kindness I was able to discover the Anaphora of the Apostles in *Sachau 354* (nr. 47 in the catalogue, supposed to be 17th century but rather 15th or 16th).

(2) *Notice sur les manuscrits syriaques et arabes conservés à l'archevêché chaldéen de Diarbekir*, in *Journal Asiatique*, sér. 10, vol. X (1907), 352-3.

(3) The only indication of date in the MS. itself is provided by a note dated 1885 of the Greeks, i.e. 1573/4 A.D. Cf. A. SCHER, *Notice sur les manuscrits syriaques et arabes conservés dans la bibliothèque de l'évêché chaldéen de Mardin*, in *Revue des Bibliothèques* 18 (1908), II.

(4) No date is given by SCHER, *ibid.*, pp. 11-2.

(5) SCHER, *ibid.*, p. 12, mentions the fact that this MS. contains the anaphora, but Baumstark seems to have overlooked it. Scher also speaks of "the service of the washing of feet" as being contained in the office of Holy (i.e. Great) Saturday, but this is a mistake for "the service of the washing of the altar (i.e. altar linens)", found on f. 311v.

In going through the manuscripts of Middle Eastern libraries, I have discovered that in no case were all of the manuscripts included in the published catalogue. Even though most of the manuscripts that were neglected were of little or no value, there have been some pleasant surprises. Thus, at Mardin, I found a priests' ritual dated 1896 of the Greeks, i.e. 1584/5 A.D. Likewise, in the library of the Chaldean Patriarchate, now transferred from Mosul to Baghdad, I found a fragment of a *ḥudrâ* of the fifteenth century, *Chald. Patr. 333* (1), that contains our anaphora, together with a sixteenth or seventeenth century priests' ritual, *Chald. Patr. 209*. Even greater good fortune awaited me at Diarbekir, where I found another *ḥudrâ* of the Fast, appreciably older than *Mardin 22*.

Finally, there were the libraries that have either never been catalogued, or whose catalogues have never been published. In general, the manuscripts of such libraries were of less value, but there were striking exceptions. In the library of the Chaldean cathedral at Alqosh in Iraq, for example, I found a priests' ritual, *Alqosh 70*, which is dated 1564 A.D. In Baghdad, in the private collection of the late Msgr. Suleyman Saigh, now in the possession of his nephew, Mr. Najib Saigh, there is a *ḥudrâ*, probably of the sixteenth century, which contains a fragment of our ana-

(1) This fragment is taken from a larger fragment now at the Selly Oak Colleges Library, Birmingham, where it bears the shelf mark *Mingana Syriac 512*. A. MINGANA, in his *Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts... of the Woodbrooke Settlement, Selly Oak, Birmingham*, vol. I: *Syriac Manuscripts*, Cambridge, 1933, c. 940, gives its date as "about A.D. 1390". To me, however, the script seems too close to the hand characteristic of MSS. from Mosul in the 16th century. On the other hand, it has more archaic readings than *Brit. Mus. Or. 5750*.

It should be noted with regard to the MSS. of the Chaldean Patriarchate that only 116 are listed in Scher's catalogue (cf. *supra*, n. 3). Since its publication, a few MSS. have disappeared, a few were left in Mosul when the Patriarchate was transferred to Baghdad and over two hundred new ones have been added. A new catalogue prepared by His Excellency Msgr. Raphael Bidawid, now Chaldean Bishop of Beirut, was destroyed by a tragic fire shortly before it was to be sent to the publisher. By the kindness of His Beatitude Paul II Cheikho, I have been allowed to study and take copious notes on the MSS. of the collection, at great personal inconvenience to himself.

phora. The prize, however, of all the finds that I was privileged to make was another *ḥudrā* manuscript in the library of the Church of Mar Eša'ya in Mosul, considerably older than *Mardin 22* or the *ḥudrā* of Diarbekir.

The precise dating of the *ḥudrā*'s of Mar Eša'ya and Diarbekir is rendered difficult by the fact that there is no reproduction available of a dated sample of the so-called "Nestorian" cursive writing earlier than 1243 A.D. (1). Indeed, I have only been able to discover two lines of dated writing (colophon of *Brit. Mus. Add. 17,923*, probably 1074 A.D.) (2) between 615 A.D. (colophon of *Brit. Mus. Add. 14,471*) (3) and 1186 A.D. (colophon of *Chald. Patr. 12*) (4). The Diarbekir *ḥudrā*, however, must be at least a century older than *Mardin 22* (1287 A.D.) and hence should be assigned to the twelfth century, with the possibility of a slightly earlier date not entirely excluded. The form of the letters seems more archaic than in *Mardin 22*, the ink seems more characteristic of twelfth century manuscripts, and the form of the offices is likewise more archaic than in the *Mardin* manuscript — the 'ōnyātā d-ramšā, d-lelyā and d-rāzē lack šurrāyē d-šurtā (5), that are found in *Mardin 22* and in thirteenth century additions to the Mar Eša'ya *ḥudrā*.

(1) The only published samples of "Nestorian" cursive script that I have found are the following: the frontispiece of Rosen and Forshall's *Catalogus* (cf. *supra*, n. 5); F. SACHAU, *op. cit.*, plate VII; E. TISSERANT, *Specimina codicum orientalium*, Bonn, 1914, pp. 34-5; W. H. P. HATCH, *op. cit.*, plates CLXXIII, CLXXV-CLXXVIII, CLXXX-CLXXXIII; N. V. PIGULEVSKAYA, *Katalog sirijskikh rukopisej Leningrada (Palestinskij Sbornik 6 (69))*, Moscow/Leningrad, 1960 (in Russian), plates 3 and 8, facing pp. 88 and 134, respectively; J. ASSFALG, *Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, vol. V: *Syrische Handschriften*, Wiesbaden, 1963, plates V and VI. The sample dated 1243 A.D. is found in Pigulevskaya, plate 3, facing p. 88.

(2) F. 172^v. This is MS. nr. 246 in W. WRIGHT, *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired since the Year 1838*, vol. I, London, 1872, pp. 182-8.

(3) *Ibid.*, nr. 77, pp. 53-4.

(4) P. 187 of the codex.

(5) For the significance of these and similar terms technical to the Chaldean liturgy, cf. the excellent glossary in J. MATEOS, *Lelya-Šapra. Essai d'interprétation des matines chaldéennes (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 155)*, Rome, 1959, pp. 485-502. In the present case, cf. "'ōnīā", pp. 492-3, and "šurtā", p. 499.

The original part of this latter manuscript is still older by at least a century and should be assigned to the tenth or eleventh century. An earlier date seems unlikely, since it is written on paper, and there are no dated examples of Syriac manuscripts on paper older than 932 A.D., nor Arabic manuscripts older than 866 A.D. (1). On the other hand, the structure of the offices is distinctly more archaic than in the Diarbekir *ḥudrā* — there is no noonday office ('eddānā) given for the ferias of the Fast, nor are there *ḥpākātā* in the Sunday offices. There is some resemblance between the script of this manuscript and that of *Diarbekir 22*, which Scher has assigned to the fourteenth century (2), but this dating is surely in error. The earlier dating is corroborated by a marginal note in the Mar Eša'ya *ḥudrā* (3), written in a hand that resembles the two lines of *Brit. Mus. Add. 17,923* (1074 A.D.), mentioned above.

Thus, our list of manuscript witnesses to the Anaphora of the Apostles anterior to the seventeenth century can be revised as follows (4):

1. Mar Eša'ya <i>ḥudrā</i>	10/11th.
2. Diarbekir <i>ḥudrā</i>	12th.
3. <i>Mardin 22</i> (<i>ḥudrā</i>)	1287.
4. <i>Cambr. Add. 2046-B</i> (missal)	15th.
5. <i>Diarbekir 48</i> (ritual)	15th.
6. <i>Mardin 19</i> (ritual)	15th.
7. <i>Chald. Patr. 333</i> (<i>ḥudrā</i>)	15th.
8. <i>Brit. Mus. Or. 5750</i> (<i>ḥudrā</i>)	15th.
9. <i>Berlin 38</i> (Sachau 167 — ritual)	1496.

(1) Cf. HATCH, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-7.

(2) *Notice sur les manuscrits syriaques... de Diarbekir (supra, n. 10)*, pp. 339-40.

(3) P. 320.

(4) MINGANA, in his *Catalogue*, vol. II: *Christian Arabic Manuscripts and Additional Syriac Manuscripts*, Cambridge, 1936, pp. 174-7, attributes *Mingana Syriac 611* to the mid sixteenth century, following a Latin note written at the beginning of the codex in the 17th or 18th century. However, since the lectionary and most of the ritual are translations from the Latin, I consider it highly improbable that this MS. would have been copied before the Synod of Diamper of 1599 and less probable that it would have been before the middle of the 17th century.

10. Chald. Patr. 36 (bishops' ritual)	15/16th.
11. Berlin 47 (Sachau 354 — <i>hudrā</i>)	15/16th.
12. Rouen Or. 21 (ritual)	16th.
13. Saigh <i>hudrā</i> (fragment)	16th.
14. Brit. Mus. Or. 4060 (ritual — fragment)	16th.
15. Vat. Borgia Syr. 150 (<i>hudrā</i>)	16th.
16. Vat. Syr. 66 (bishops' ritual)	16th.
17. Alqosh 70 (ritual)	1564.
18. Mardin 20 (ritual — fragment)	1566.
19. Brit. Mus. Add. 7181 (ritual — lacuna) ⁽¹⁾	1570.
20. N.-D. des Sem. 92 (ritual) ⁽²⁾	1578.
21. Mardin ritual	1584/5.
22. Chald. Patr. 40 (ritual) ⁽³⁾	1600.
23. Chald. Patr. 209 (ritual — lacuna)	16/17th.
24. Berlin 39 (Or. 4° 804 — Ritual)	16/17th.

It is worthy of note that the older *hudrā* manuscripts contained, for the most part, the three anaphoras in use in the Chaldean Church, plus baptism and, quite frequently, other rites as well. Of the manuscripts listed above, however, only the Mar Ešā'ya *hudrā* now preserves all three anaphoras: the Anaphora of Theodore of Mopsuestia is contained in the services for Christmas, where it is followed by the rite of fraction; that of Nestorius is in the services for Epiphany; and that of the Apostles is part of the services at Easter vespers, where it is preceded by the rite of baptism. The Diarbekir *hudrā* and *Mardin 22*, on the other hand, are actually only the second volumes of three volume collections, and hence they lack the services for Christmas and Epiphany, since they cover the period from the Entrance to the Fast up to the end of Easter week inclusive. Nonetheless, they do contain the Anaphora of Nestorius for the Liturgy on the

⁽¹⁾ MS. nr. 37 in the catalogue of Rosen and Forshall, pp. 58-60.

⁽²⁾ This is the number given by J. VOSTÉ, *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque Syro-Chaldéenne du Couvent de Notre-Dame des Semences près d'Alqoš (Iraq)*, Rome/Paris, 1929, p. 37 (reprinted from *Angelicum* 5 1928); it had formerly been numbered 53 by A. SCHER, *Notice sur les manuscrits syriaques conservés dans la bibliothèque du couvent des Chaldéens de Notre-Dame-des-Semences*, in *Journal Asiatique*, sér. 10, vol. VII (1906), 499. Baumstark's dating should be corrected to 1578 A.D.

⁽³⁾ Again, Baumstark's dating can be corrected to 1600 A.D.

Thursday of the Pasch (together with the rite of fraction, in the case of the Diarbekir *hudrā*), and they add the rites of the washing of the altar (linens) and absolution before that of baptism on Great Saturday. *Chald. Patr. 333* is limited to the Anaphora of the Apostles and these latter rites, since it only contains the services for Great Saturday and Easter vespers ⁽¹⁾. *Brit. Mus. Or. 5750*, for its part, begins only with the rite of baptism itself, which is followed by absolution and the Anaphora of the Apostles ⁽²⁾. *Berlin Sachau 354* (15-16th cent.) ⁽³⁾ retains only the rites of baptism and absolution, plus the Anaphora of the Apostles, all of which are also in *Berlin Oriental Quarto 1160* (1686 A.D.) ⁽⁴⁾, in addition to the Anaphora of Nestorius. The Saigh *hudrā*, because of its fragmentary state, has lost the Anaphoras of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius and the rite of baptism, retaining only the rite of absolution, part of the rite of oaths and the Anaphora of the Apostles. Finally, *Vatican Borgia 150* has lost the Anaphora of Theodore of Mopsuestia, but retains those of Nestorius and the Apostles, together with the rites of the washing of the altar (linens), baptism and absolution.

Hence, for a critical edition of the Chaldean anaphoras, account will have to be taken of *hudrā* manuscripts as well as missals and rituals. To the manuscripts I have indicated, others should be added that lack the Anaphora of the Apostles, but contain the others. In particular, *Vatican Syriac 83* (1538 A.D.) has both of them, as has *Harvard Syriac 12* (17/18th cent.) ⁽⁵⁾ of the Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., which is known to have likewise the rite of fraction and may

⁽¹⁾ Unfortunately, *Mingana 512*, from which *Chald. Patr. 333* was taken gives only the period from Thursday of the Pasch to Pentecost and hence lacks the other two anaphoras.

⁽²⁾ I have been unable to find out whether *Hyvernat Syriac 4*, the first part of this *hudrā*, contains the other two anaphoras. 35 leaves at the beginning of the codex were replaced in the 16th or 17th century, and others are missing.

⁽³⁾ MS. nr. 47 in Sachau's catalogue.

⁽⁴⁾ MS. nr. 29 in the catalogue of Assfalg.

⁽⁵⁾ Cf. J. T. CLEMONS, *A Checklist of Syriac Manuscripts in the United States and Canada*, in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 32 (1966), 234, nr. 15.

possibly contain the Anaphora of the Apostles and some of the other rites as well. None of the other *hudrā* manuscripts listed by Baumstark⁽¹⁾ that have survived, however, have the texts of the anaphoras. In particular, *Chald. Patr.* 45, supposed to be of the fourteenth century⁽²⁾, is in reality of the sixteenth or seventeenth century, when the practice of including the anaphoras in the *hudrā* was dying out⁽³⁾.

Since the Mar Ešā'ya *hudrā* is about five centuries older than what has been up to now regarded as the oldest witness to the Anaphora of the Apostles, I have judged it worthwhile to edit its text just as it stands in the manuscript. In addition, I have collated this text fully with that of the Diarbekir *hudrā* and *Mardin 22*, since these two manuscripts are so much older than the others and since they are so inaccessible. To facilitate comparison, I have also collated the text with what may be called the *textus receptus* of the Anaphora of the Apostles as represented by the Nestorian and Anglican editions⁽⁴⁾. Finally, I have compared the Mar Ešā'ya text with a number of older and more recent witnesses, which in many points confirm the readings of this venerable *hudrā* against the *textus receptus*.

Certain broad characteristics of our oldest witness should be pointed out. The most striking is the complete lack of the

⁽¹⁾ *Geschichte*, p. 198 n. 9. I have been unable as yet to check *Jerusalem Patriarchate Syriac 3*.

⁽²⁾ Cf. the catalogue of SCHER, p. 239. It is possible that whoever put the labels on the manuscripts of the Patriarchal Library may have made an erroneous identification and that the one described by Scher may have disappeared. However, *Mosul 28*, one of the MSS. left behind, is also described by Scher as of the 14th century, yet appears to me as being rather of the 16th or 17th. It should be noted that the MSS. labeled "Mosul" have been left there, whereas those labeled "Chald. Patr." have been transferred to Baghdad.

⁽³⁾ Since this article went to press, I have found the anaphoras of Theodore and Nestorius in three 15th or 16th cent. *gazzā* MSS. now at Mardin, as well as the ordinary of the Liturgy with the Anaphora of Nestorius in Syriac and Arabic in *Diabekir 57* (1240 A.D.). Most of the surviving Diarbekir MSS. of value are now at Mardin. Unfortunately, *Diabekir 55* and *56* (contemporary with *57*), which must contain the Anaphora of Theodore, are still missing.

⁽⁴⁾ J. E. Y. de KELAITA, *The Liturgy of the Church of the East*, Mosul, 1928, pp. 21-35, and *Liturgia Sanctorum Apostolorum Adaei et Maris*, Urmia, 1890, pp. 11-20.

kuššāpē, the private prayers of the celebrant that precede, in general, each *ghāntā*. E. C. Ratcliff, the first to have analysed this anaphora in detail, assumed that these were later additions⁽¹⁾, and his opinion is now confirmed by the Mar Ešā'ya *hudrā*. This is true of all the *kuššāpē*, including the *kuššāpā* of intercession, concerning which Dom Botte has expressed some doubt as to whether it may not have been in the original text of the anaphora⁽²⁾. On the other hand, although the *kuššāpē* are found in the twelfth century Diarbekir *hudrā*, *Diarbekir 57* (1240 A.D.) and the fifteenth century *Chald. Patr.* 333, they are absent from *Mardin 22* (1287 A.D.), the fifteenth century *Brit. Mus. Or.* 5750 and the sixteenth century Saigh *hudra* and *Vatican Borgia Syriac 150*. Now it is scarcely credible that the Chaldean Liturgy would have been celebrated anywhere in the sixteenth century without *kuššāpē*. Hence, one cannot conclude immediately from the absence of the *kuššāpē* in a *hudra* text that these prayers were not said at the time and place in which the manuscript was copied.

A closer examination and consideration of our newly discovered witnesses, however, together with other evidence that I have found, allows us to draw the conclusion, with reasonable probability, that the *kuššāpē* were not yet a universally recognized part of the Liturgy even as late as the thirteenth century. For the negative evidence of *Brit. Mus. Or.* 5750 and *Vat. Borgia Syr.*

⁽¹⁾ *The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: A Suggestion*, in *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1928-9), 26.

⁽²⁾ B. BOTTE, *Problèmes de l'anaphore syrienne des Apôtres Addaï et Mari*, in *L'Orient Syrien* 10 (1965), 94-8. It might be pointed out that Botte's translation of the *ghāntā* of intercession, p. 92, §§ VI and VII, is based on a defective text, apparently the translation of RENAUDOT (*Liturgiarum orientalium collectio*, 2nd edit., vol. II, Frankfurt-a.-M./London, 1847, p. 586). It should be corrected thus: "...Et lui-même, notre Seigneur et Dieu, est venu et nous a enseigné par son Évangile vivifiant toute la pureté et sainteté VII. des prophètes...". Moreover, the Chaldeans have not modified the text here, as Botte suggests on p. 94, changing "pureté et sainteté" to "vivifiante espérance", but in this point, at least, maintain the reading of the ancient manuscripts in their recent editions, with which the Anglican edition of Urmia is here in agreement. The older Chaldean editions, on the contrary, had suppressed or lost "vivifiante espérance" (more accurately translated "Évangile vivifiant").

150, at least, may be discounted; for, whereas the Mar Eša'ya and Diarbekir *ḥudrā's*, *Mardin 22* and *Chald. Patr. 333* all indicate all of the prayers to be said by celebrant and people, at least by their *incipit*, these more recent *ḥudrā's* limit themselves essentially to the *ghānāṭā* and *qānōnē* to be recited or chanted by the celebrant (the situation of the Saigh *ḥudrā* is unclear since too little of it has been preserved). *Mardin 22*, therefore, which does give all of the prayers with comparatively complete texts, must either have been copied from an older *ḥudrā* that lacked the *kuššāpē* or must have been copied at a time and place (either the Monastery of Mar Awgen near Nisibis or the Church of St. George of Gazarta) ⁽¹⁾ in which the *kuššāpē* were not yet recognized as belonging to the Anaphora of the Apostles.

That the latter is the correct explanation is indicated by a ritual copied during the same century and most probably in the same region, *Chald. Patr. 36*, which lacks *kuššāpē* for the Anaphoras of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius ⁽²⁾. This bishops' ritual does indicate *kuššāpē* for the Anaphora of the Apostles, but that part of the codex was added later, as we have seen, in the fifteenth century. The rest of it, however, must be older than the fourteenth century, since a supply leaf added to replace one that is missing is dated 1331/2 A.D. The script indicates the thirteenth century, and this date may with considerable probability be narrowed to the period between 1247 and 1257 A.D. The manuscript shows two unmistakable indications of Latin influence: on the one hand, the text of the final *ghānāṭā* of the Anaphora of Nestorius has been modified to invoke the intercession of "My Lady Mary, the holy Virgin, Mother (*yāldtēh*) of thy Beloved, Our Lord and God Jesus Christ" ⁽³⁾; on the other

⁽¹⁾ According to the colophon, f. 390^r, the MS. was copied by Joseph, the son of Denha, priest and monk of the Monastery of Mar Awgen. Much of the colophon is now lost, and hence it is not sure that the "(Church) of Mar Giwargis of Gazarta" mentioned there does not designate the place of copying, especially since the name of the Bishop of Gazarta follows that of the Patriarch Yahbālāhā. However, on f. 1^r there is a note saying that the MS. belongs to the Church of Mar Giwargis of Gazarta.

⁽²⁾ The *incipit's* of the *kuššāpē* for the Anaphora of Nestorius have been added in the margin, but in the same 15th or 16th century hand that added the Anaphora of the Apostles.

⁽³⁾ P. 119.

hand, the Latin form of baptism has been added after the Chaldean as an alternate ⁽⁴⁾. Since the manuscript formerly belonged to the Church of St. James of Nisibis ⁽⁵⁾, one strongly suspects that it was copied by or for Išo'yahb Bar Malkon, Metropolitan of Nisibis, who sent a Catholic profession of faith to the Pope around 1247 A.D. by the intermediary of the papal legate André de Longjumeau, and who seems to have died before 1257 A.D. ⁽⁶⁾.

From this I think it legitimate to conclude that the *kuššāpē* were not generally introduced into the Chaldean Liturgy before the end of the thirteenth century, even though they were in use somewhat earlier in some places. On the other hand, it is quite conceivable that even at the time of the Mar Eša'ya *ḥudra*, priests may have said some form of private prayer analogous to our present *kuššāpē*, according to their own devotion and without any set formula. One may speculate that perhaps the celebrant would not begin the *ghānāṭā* until the deacon had stopped chanting. With the introduction of more elaborate chants, this pause would tend to lengthen, and it is easy to imagine that the celebrant would want to fill it with appropriate devotional prayer. One indication of the time when such prayers were fixed in written formulae is the attribution of the final *kuššāpē* of the Anaphora of Nestorius and its alternate in *Chald. Patr. 209* (priests' ritual of the 16th cent.) to the Patriarch Elias III Abu Halim (1176-1190), a noted composer of liturgical prayers ⁽⁴⁾.

The *Sanctus*, as might have been expected, is found in the Mar Eša'ya *ḥudra* ⁽⁶⁾, for even though it appears to be an inter-

⁽¹⁾ P. 166.

⁽²⁾ This note of ownership is repeated several times, mostly in the 15th or 16th hand in which the Anaphora of the Apostles is written (e.g. pp. 1 and 40), but once also (p. 264) in an older 13th or 14th century hand.

⁽³⁾ Cf. P. PELLISOT, *Les Mongols et la papauté*, in *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 24 (1924), 225-9.

⁽⁴⁾ Cf. BAUMSTARK, *op. cit.*, pp. 288-9.

⁽⁵⁾ BOTTE, *art. cit.*, p. 91, gives the form of the *Sanctus* in use today. In the Anaphora of Theodore of Mopsuestia, p. 5 of the Mar Eša'ya *ḥudrā*, a similar longer form was to be used only for feasts. On ordinary days, a shorter form was to be used (indicated in *Mardin 22*, f. 328^r, and by Renaudot, p. 584): "Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, Dominus Deus omnipotens, pleni sunt caeli et terra laudibus ejus".

ruption of the original text of the anaphora⁽¹⁾, the insertion probably goes back to the sixth or seventh century, that is, either to the liturgical reform of Mar Aba (540-552), who is supposed to have introduced into the Chaldean Church the Anaphoras of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius⁽²⁾, both of which, must have contained the Sanctus in their original form⁽³⁾, or to that of Īšō'yahb II (647/8 or 650/1 to 657/8), who is said to have revised the Anaphora of the Apostles⁽⁴⁾. Nor should

(1) Cf. RATCLIFF, *art. cit.*, p. 29, and Botte, pp. 93-4. It is true, as Botte notes, p. 90, that the phrase that links the following *ghāntā* to the Sanctus is lacking in the Maronite Anaphora of St. Peter III. At the same time, however, it is also true that the phrases of the preceding *ghāntā* that lead up to the Sanctus are found there with but minor variants.

(2) Cf. BAUMSTARK, pp. 119-20, especially p. 120 n. 3. It may be noted that there was a second tradition with regard to the translation of the Anaphora of Nestorius. According to *Chald. Patr.* 209, pp. 61-2, it was translated into Syriac by Mar Simeon of Edessa, called Bar Ṭabbāhê. According to BAUMSTARK (*Geschichte*, p. 214), this Simeon lived in the second half of the 8th century. However, this dating rests on the identification made by J. S. ASSEMANI, *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana*, vol. III, part 1: *De scriptoribus nestorianis*, Rome, 1725, p. 215 n. 5, between Simeon Bar Ṭabbāhê, author of an ecclesiastical history, and a certain Ibn at-Ṭabbāh of Kaškar, the prefect of the treasury of the first Abbaside Caliph Al-Mansur (754-775). The identification is more than dubious. One gets the impression from the note in *Brit. Mus. Add. 12,154*, f. 153^r (WRIGHT, *Catalogue*, vol. II, pp. 983-4) that Simeon was writing relatively close to the events of the Council of Chalcedon. As for Ibn at-Ṭabbāh, besides the fact that his name is not an accurate translation of Bar Ṭabbāhê and that he came from Kaškar, not Edessa, we have no indication whatsoever that his name was Simeon or that he ever wrote a history (the relative passage that Assemani cites on p. 206 is from Mari, not 'Amr). I would suggest rather that Simeon may perhaps have been in the *entourage* of Mar Aba, together with his fellow Edessenes Thomas and Cyrus (cf. Baumstark, pp. 121-2). It is known that Mar Aba and Thomas collected and translated (or had translated) works of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius, which might explain why Simeon's history contained the letter of Nestorius cited in *Brit. Mus. Add. 12,154*.

(3) That is, although they have been adapted to conform to the general patterns of Chaldean anaphoras, yet their post-Sanctus *ghāntā*'s are of the "vere sanctus" type characteristic of Antiochene anaphoras.

(4) Cf. BAUMSTARK, pp. 199-200.

It is interesting that Cyrus of Edessa, a disciple of Mar Aba and also a professor in his theological school at Seleucia-Ctesiphon, gives,

it cause any surprise that there is no Narration of the Institution of the Eucharist in the Mar Ešā'ya text, as its loss, if indeed it ever did exist in the Anaphora of the Apostles, must go back at least to the abbreviation effected by Īšō'yahb III in the seventh century⁽¹⁾.

A description of the Mar Ešā'ya codex should precede the text itself. It is bound in cloth-covered wooden boards. The paper on which the text is written is hard and thin. Two gatherings are missing at the beginning of the codex, and it is incomplete at the end, although the number of leaves that have been lost is probably not great. There now remain 39 gatherings numbered rather irregularly. In the thirteenth century, the offices

in *The Cause of the Pasch* (written about 550 A.D. and contained in *Notre-Dame des Semences 155*, f. 103^r), an example of a eucharistic prayer uninterrupted by the Sanctus. It is not sure whether Cyrus was writing before or after the reform of Mar Aba, but this prayer may be taken as evidence that Cyrus was familiar with anaphoras that lacked the Sanctus, which, therefore, had not been generally introduced into the anaphoras of the Chaldean rite before the middle of the 6th century.

(1) Michael the Great, Jacobite Patriarch, reports that Īšo'yahb abbreviated the Anaphora of Nestorius (J.-B. CHABOT, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche jacobite d'Antioche (1166-1199)*, vol. IV, Paris, 1910, p. 776, cc. 1:37-2:1/transl. vol. III, Paris, 1905, p. 521), but Baumstark (*op. cit.*, p. 199) suspects that it must really have been the Anaphora of the Apostles that was abbreviated. His suspicion is confirmed by Ibn at-Ṭayyib, *Fiqh an-Našrānīya*, edited by W. HOENERBACH and O. SPIES (CSCO 167, 168), Louvain, 1958, text p. 90:11-2 (transl. p. 93).

On the question whether the Anaphora of the Apostles ever contained a Narration of the Institution, cf. BOTTE, *art. cit.*, pp. 100-4, and *L'Anaphore Chaldéenne des Apôtres*, in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 15 (1949), 269-75; cf. also A. RAES, *Le Récit de l'institution eucharistique dans l'anaphore chaldéenne et malabare des Apôtres*, in *OCP* 10 (1944), 216-26, H. ENGBERDING, *Zum anaphorischen Fürbittgebet des ostsyrischen Liturgie der Apostel Addaj und Mar(j)*, in *Oriens Christianus* 41 (1957), 113-20, and S. JAMMO, *Gabriel Qaṭraya et son commentaire sur la liturgie chaldéenne*, in *OCP* 32 (1966), 52.

It is again interesting that the eucharistic prayer given by Cyrus of Edessa terminates with the Narration of the Institution. However, this evidence is inconclusive; for even though the beginning of the prayer does bear some resemblance to that of the corresponding ghanta of the Anaphora of the Apostles, the rest is quite different, and it is sure, in any case, that Cyrus would have been acquainted with anaphoras other than that of the Apostles.

of the Rogation of the Ninevites and of Pentecost were largely replaced by newer and longer offices. In the first case, two gatherings have been added, and the gatherings that follow, that were originally numbered 7 to 12, have been renumbered 9 to 14. At that point, however, the numberer tired of his task, and the two following gatherings have retained their original numbers 13 and 14. At Pentecost, similarly, a gathering has been added, and we now have two gatherings numbered 23. On the other hand, 30 has been simply omitted from the series by oversight. Most of the gatherings consist of twelve leaves, but the thirteenth century additions have introduced great irregularities. In addition, the final leaf of the fifth gathering (between pp. 70 and 71) has been lost.

In all, there now remain 443 leaves, or 886 numbered pages, measuring 272 by 196 mm. The text is written in a single column with from 25 to 28 lines to the page. The only decorations occur in the thirteenth century additions, being limited to simple geometric patterns that are used to separate different sections of the text ⁽¹⁾ and three Maltese crosses in the margins. As is customary, the liturgical days are indicated in the margins throughout, together with occasional corrections, additions and notes that are written in hands that range from the eleventh to about the fourteenth century.

Unfortunately, the codex is not in the best condition. Several leaves of the fifth and sixth gatherings have become stuck together and have often been badly torn as the result of inexpert and unsuccessful attempts to separate them. Elsewhere, there are only a very few leaves that have been torn. In the original part, only one case, pp. 239-40, involves a considerable loss of text, but four leaves of the thirteenth century additions at the end have been torn away, leaving only small fragments. Worse still, the codex has at least twice been subjected to heavy water soaking from the top, and the ink has been washed away more or less entirely from a considerable portion of each leaf, especially those near the beginning of the codex. Moreover, a heavy stain has frequently been left at the edges of the damaged portions

⁽¹⁾ Similar designs are shown in the reproduction of *Syriac MS. nr. 2* of the original collection of the Oriental Institute of Leningrad (1243 A.D.) referred to above, n. 15.

that obscures or renders altogether illegible the underlying text, and sometimes the ink of one page has adhered to the opposite page, making decipherment extremely difficult.

It is worthy of note that the thirteenth century additions have successfully withstood the water damage, at least for the most part. Another curious feature is that the rubrics of the damaged portions of the original sections are, in general, notably more legible than the text written in black ink, which is quite the reverse of what can be observed in the thirteenth century additions and in other manuscripts of later date. I have noted this phenomenon only in the undated *Diarbekir 22*, which is written in a script that is closer to that of the original portion of our manuscript than any I have yet found, and in the remnants of a Jacobite *fanqitho* preserved at the Monastery of Mar Behnam near Mosul, whose script is not unlike that of the *Book of the Himyarites* (932 A.D.) ⁽¹⁾. It would seem that the black ink of paper manuscripts of the tenth and eleventh centuries was, at least in some places, not waterproof.

The result of this water soaking has been that photographs taken with ordinary equipment were unsuccessful in recording the damaged portions of the text. However, I was fortunate in having at my disposition ultra-violet light ⁽²⁾, which rendered substantially legible all but a few areas whose surface has been physically injured. The least legible parts of the text are at the beginning of the codex and include, unfortunately, the final part of the Anaphora of Nestorius. In addition, the offices from the second to the fifth Friday of the Epiphany (pp. 62-97) are to a great extent illegible since so many of the leaves are stuck together. The Anaphora of the Apostles, on the other hand, is almost completely legible under ultra-violet light, and likewise the rite of baptism.

The writing of the scribe is, on the whole, rather negligent and is occasionally difficult to decipher even in the undamaged portions of the text. In particular, *nūn* is often hard to distinguish from *yōd* (and *hēyē*). Hence, it has been necessary at times to resort to parallel texts to interpret what the scribe has written.

⁽¹⁾ Cf. HATCH, *op. cit.*, plate CXVI.

⁽²⁾ Kindly loaned to me by the Rev. Leo Guay, S.J., of Al-Hikma University, Baghdad.

His use of vowel points is relatively sparing, and his pointing is often unusual. Worthy of note is his peculiar spelling of ܠܠܝ and ܠܠܝܐ , which appear in the manuscript as ܠܠܝ and ܠܠܝܐ . Both spellings are clearly intentional because they are repeated throughout the manuscript; in particular, the first is certainly intended for the masculine participle, not the feminine, since it is paired consistently with masculine participles. In this respect, in punctuation (or the lack thereof) and in abbreviations, I adhere to what I have found in the manuscript.

Finally, as regards the contents of the codex, the bulk of it consists in the *ḥudrā* proper, beginning with the end of the office for Christmas lauds and continuing on to the end of the liturgical year (pp. 1-731). The only offices given are those for Sundays, Fridays, feasts and commemorations, plus the ferias of the Fast and Easter week. Besides the other characteristics mentioned above (1), it should be noted that an office of *subbā'ā* (compline) is given for all of these days throughout the year, with the exception of ordinary Fridays during the year and the ferias of Easter week. Indeed, it replaces *lelyā* (the nocturns) on all feasts and commemorations. The Anaphora of Theodore of Mopsuestia is found on pp. 2-10, and it is followed immediately by the rite of fraction, pp. 10-3. The Anaphora of Nestorius is given on pp. 37-49, the rite of baptism on pp. 446-63 and the Anaphora of the Apostles on pp. 463-6. On p. 637, the scribe, Eliya, makes known his name in petitioning the prayers of the readers of the manuscript. At the end, p. 731, he notes: "Here ends, by the help of Our Lord, the *ḥudrā* of the entire year, according as it was ordered by Mar Gabriel and Mar Abraham, the ecumenical doctors who lived in the Upper Monastery". Indeed, it is possible that this precious manuscript was copied at the Upper Monastery itself and was used there, for, on the one hand, the patron saint commemorated on the seventh Friday of the Epiphany is identified with an otherwise unspecified Mar Abraham in the verses *da-lbāktā* of this commemoration (p. 177), and, on the other, it seems likely that the manuscript originally belonged to the Tahra Church of Mosul, which was formerly the

(1) *Supra*, pp. 340 and 341.

church of the Upper Monastery and which is now attached to the parish of Mar Ešā'ya (1).

The *ḥudrā* proper is followed by the so-called *qālê d-'udrānê*, chants of assistance, that normally complete *ḥudrā* and *gazzā* manuscripts, pp. 731-830. It may be noted, in passing, that the numbering of these *qālê* is slightly different from that indicated in the published breviary (2), that there are several *šuhlāpê* not found there, and that the twenty-second *qālā*, pp. 824-5, is without counterpart and so probably represents the missing twenty-second *qālā* of the breviary, concerning which Bedjan, the editor, notes: "In the manuscript tradition (*rušmā*) of the Upper Monastery, there is no ordinary *qālā* (with this number)" (3).

At the end of the manuscript, the thirteenth century copyist has added the following: *lelyā* for the ferias of the whole year in abbreviated form, pp. 831-57; the distichs, called *ḥpākātā*, from the metrical homilies of Narsai that precede both the psalm called *d-qaltā* and the hymn *Tawdî l-Ṭābā* for all the Sundays of the year, pp. 858-74; the office of St. Thomas the Apostle, pp. 874-8; the special antiphons (*yānōnê*) that precede Psalm 100 (99 of the Vulgate) in the office of lauds of certain great feasts and begin with the word *B-rāšīt*, pp. 878-81; and, finally, "an anthem on the Economy... said at the Rogation (of the Ninevites) and the Fast", which is attributed in Warda manuscripts to Sabrišō' Bar Pawlos of Mosul (4), pp. 881-3 (incomplete). The

(1) Cf. J.-M. FIEV, *Mossoul chrétienne*, p. 23.

(2) *Breviarium iuxta ritum Syrorum Orientalium, id est Chaldaeorum*, Paris, 1886-1887/Rome, 1938, pp. 2*-210*.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 193*.

(4) E.g. *Chald. Patr.* 82, pp. 250-3. This Sabrišō' is mentioned in the colophon of *Mosul 13* as being the rector (*yāšōpā*) of the Church of St. Meskenta in Mosul when the MS. was copied (cf. the catalogue of Scher, pp. 232-3). The date is indicated as Saturday August 4, 1500 of the Greeks, or 609 of the Arabs (i.e. of the Hejira). These dates do not agree; the Greek date would indicate 1189 A.D., whereas the Arab date would be 1212 A.D. In the catalogue Scher fails to indicate which date is correct, but in an article, *Étude supplémentaire sur les écrivains syriens orientaux*, in *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 11 (1906), 28 n. 1, he solves the doubt in favour of 1212 A.D., because Yahbāiāhā II, mentioned in the colophon as the Patriarch, reigned from 1191 to 1222. This is confirmed by the fact that August 4th fell on a Saturday in 1212, but not in 1189.

last two leaves of the codex, pp. 883-6, are too fragmentary for their contents to be identified, but the top of p. 885 seems to contain part of an anthem or other hymn on the Prophets.

To explain the symbols used in the text, words that are underlined are written in red ink in the manuscript. Letters given in square brackets [] are those that are completely illegible in the manuscript and have been supplied on the basis of the *textus receptus* and other manuscripts. Letters set off by half brackets below [] were so faint in the manuscript that their reading must be considered doubtful. The Latin translation that accompanies the text is taken from Renaudot (1); it has been modified, where necessary, to agree with the Mar Ešā'ya text and occasionally corrected and improved as well. As I note there, I have departed in the translation from the Mar Ešā'ya text in four instances: two of these represent corrections found in the manuscript in a hand that is contemporaneous with the text and may possibly have been made by the original scribe; one is a correction of an obvious *lapsus calami*; finally, I ignore one correction made by the original scribe, which contradicts the entire manuscript tradition and makes very little sense.

For the apparatus to the text, I have arranged the manuscripts in chronological order and assigned to each a letter in sequence, first majuscule, then minuscule:

A - Diarbekir <i>hudrā</i> (2)	12th	D - Diarbekir 48	15th
B - Mardin 22	1287	E - Mardin 19	15th
C - Cambr. Add. 2046B	15th	F - Chald. Patr. 333	15th

(1) E. RENAUDOT, *Liturgiarum orientalium collectio*, 1st ed., Paris 1716, vol. II, pp. 588-92/2nd ed., Frankfurt-a.-M., 1847, vol. II, pp. 582-6 (the translation, at least of the anaphora, remains unchanged).

(2) I was able to consult and take notes on the MSS. of Diarbekir and Mardin through the courtesy and help of the Rev. Süleyman Şen, pastor of the Chaldean parishes in these two cities. I wish to acknowledge also the kindness of the staffs of the British Museum, the University Library of Cambridge, the Vatican Library and the Selly Oak Colleges Library for the facilities accorded to me for consulting their MSS. I have already acknowledged my great debt to His Beatitude Paul II Cheikho, the actual Chaldean Patriarch. Similar gratitude should be expressed to Mr. Najib Saigh and the Rev. Qasha Khoshaba of Baghdad for allowing me to examine their MSS., as also to the Very Rev. Ablahad Rabban, Superior General of the Chaldean Monks of St. Hormisdas,

G - Br. Mus. Or. 5750	15th	a - Khoshaba ritual	1664
H - Berlin 38	1496	b - Ming. Syr. 53 (9)	1681
I - Chald. Patr. 36	15/16	c - Diarbekir ritual	1683
J - Berlin 39 (1)	15/16	d - Mosul 41	1685
K - Rouen Or. 21	16th	e - Cambr. Add. 2045	1686
L - Saigh <i>hudrā</i> (2)	16th	f - Vat. Syr. 491	1686
M - Br. Mus. Or. 4060 (3)	16th	g - Cambr. Oo. 1. 15 (10)	1691
N - Vat. Borg. Syr. 150	16th	h - Vat. Syr. 44	1691
O - Vat. Syr. 66	16th	i - Chald. Patr. 38	1697
P - Alqosh 70	1564	j - Berlin 40	17/18
Q - Mardin 20 (4)	1566	k - Vat. Borg. Syr. 36	17/18
R - Br. Mus. Add. 7181 (5)	1570	l - Vat. Syr. 43	1701
S - N.-D. des Sem. 92 (6)	1578	m - Chald. Patr. 170	1706
T - Mardin ritual	1584/5	n - Chald. Patr. 39	1708
U - Chald. Patr. 40	1600	o - Mardin ritual	1715
V - Chald. Patr. 209 (7)	16/17	p - Chald. Patr. 37	1726
W - Vat. Syr. 42	1603	q - Mardin ritual	18th
X - Mardin 18 (8)	1605	r - Mardin ritual	18th
Y - Vat. Syr. 303	1608	s - Mardin 31	1753
Z - Ming. Syr. 611	17th	t - Berlin 42	1756

who allowed me to see the MSS. of Notre-Dame des Semences. Not to be overlooked are the Rev. Ephrem Rassam, former parish priest of Mar Ešā'ya Church, and his successor, the Rev. Faraj Rahho, who allowed me twice to carry their precious *hudrā* to Baghdad for study. Last, but far from least, it is a pleasure to render testimony to the invaluable assistance rendered me by the Rev. Douglas Webb, Vicar of Wilburton, Ely, who provided me with transcripts of *Berlin 38* and *Rouen Or. 21* and permitted me to examine his microfilm copies of these and the other Berlin MSS, besides pointing out to me the important *Cambr. Add. 2046B*.

(1) Having seen this MS. after the article went to press, I must revise my estimate of its date to the 17th cent. It was not possible to include in the apparatus the variants of *Berlin Sachau 354* (15/16) and *Or. 40 1160* (1686).

(2) This MS. lacks the first two *ghānāṭā* and most of the third.

(3) This MS. lacks all but the last part of the fourth *ghānāṭā*.

(4) This MS. lacks the first three *ghānāṭā* and the end of the fourth.

(5) This MS. lacks only the first part of the fourth *ghānāṭā*.

(6) My collation of this MS. is not complete and omits variants of secondary importance.

(7) This MS. lacks the first part of the second *ghānāṭā*.

(8) This MS. lacks most of the second, the beginning of the third and virtually all of the fourth *ghānāṭā*.

(9) The date, as I found it in the MS., was September 24, 1992 (not 1990, as in the catalogue) of the Greeks, i.e. 1681 A.D.

(10) This MS. lacks the first *ghānāṭā*.

u - Cambr. Add. 2046A ⁽¹⁾ 18/19	x - Chald. Patr. 221	1839
v - Chald. Patr. 42	y - Mar Ya'qob 6 ⁽²⁾	1850
w - Berlin 41	z - McHardy codex ⁽³⁾	1908

I give all of the variants to the text, but not to the rubrics, found in the manuscripts of the fifteenth century. With the sixteenth century witnesses, I eliminate obvious scribal errors of no significance. As for the more recent ones, I adduce them whenever they support readings of the older manuscripts, or when there seems some chance that they may preserve a reading from an older tradition, or when their reading seems interesting for some other reason. Beginning with R, most of the subsequent manuscripts fall into one of three well-defined text traditions: the Alqosh tradition, designated *AQ*, consisting of R, S, U, Y, b, c, d, e, i, j, n, p, s, t, u and v; the Chaldean tradition, *CH*, embracing f, g, h, l, m, o, q, r, x and y; and the Malabar tradition, *ML*, represented by only Z and k. These three traditions, indeed, account for all of the manuscripts since the middle of the seventeenth century with the exception of the Khoshaba ritual, which contains elements from the Alqosh tradition and what was shortly to become the Chaldean, and *Berlin 41*, which seems to have been copied from a much older ritual and preserves many archaic readings.

The following table shows the abbreviations used for the printed editions of the Anaphora of the Apostles and the translations that I have been able to consult. It is not an exhaustive list.

Cm - Mosul editions of the Chaldean missal (*Cm*⁰¹ = 1901; *Cm*³⁶ = 1936) ⁽⁴⁾.

⁽¹⁾ This MS. lacks the end of fourth *ghāntā*. The date is my estimate.

⁽²⁾ The MSS. of the Monastery of Mar Ya'qob and of the parish church of Dehok are temporarily being kept at the Convent of the Dominican Fathers in Mosul, by whose kindness I was given the opportunity of examining them.

⁽³⁾ My study of this MS. was so hasty that I may have missed some of its variants.

⁽⁴⁾ *Missale juxta ritum Ecclesiae Syrorum Orientalium, id est Chaldaeorum*, Mosul, 1901, pp. 24-36; and *Missale juxta ritum Ecclesiae Chaldaeorum*, Mosul, 1936, pp. 24-36.

- Cr* - Roman edition of the Chaldean missal ⁽¹⁾.
- Ke* - Nestorian edition of Kelaita, where it differs from the Anglican.
- Mb* - Editions of the Malabar missal (*Mb*²⁹ = 1929; *Mb*⁶⁰ = 1960) ⁽²⁾.
- Mn* - Latin translation of Malabar Liturgy as corrected by de Meneses ⁽³⁾.
- Re* - Latin translation of Renaudot.
- Šr* - Maronite Anaphora of St. Peter III, known as "Šar-rar" ⁽⁴⁾.
- Tr* - *Textus receptus* (= *Ke* and *Ur*, where they agree).
- Ur* - Anglican edition of Urmia.
- Edd* - All of the printed editions (excluding translations), where they agree.

It should be pointed out that the Mar Eša'ya text occasionally agrees with the Maronite Anaphora of St. Peter III against the *textus receptus*. These readings are noted, since they presumably represent the original text of the anaphora.

⁽¹⁾ *Missale Chaldaicum ex decreto Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide editum*, Rome, 1767, pp. 280-6.

⁽²⁾ *Kīlāb Tukkāsē w-Qeryānē...ak Takṣā Kaldāyā d-Mālābār*, Rome, 1844, supplementary pp. 20-7; *Ordo Missae Syro-Chaldaeo-Malabaricae*, Puttenpally, 1912, pp. 24-35; *Sacrum Beatorum Apostolorum, quod est sacrum primum*, Puttenpally, 1912, pp. 46-66; A. Kalapura, *Ordo chaldaicus rituum et lectionum juxta morem Ecclesiae Malabaricae*, Puttenpally, 1929, supplementary pp. 21-9; *Takṣā d-Quddāšē*, Alwaye, 1960, pp. 24-35.

⁽³⁾ J.-B. de GLEN, *La Messe des Anciens Chrestiens dicts de S. Thomas, en l'Euesché d'Angamal, ès Indes Orientales: repurgée des erreurs & blasphemés du Nestorianisme par l'illust. me & Reu. me S. r Don Alexis de Meneses*, Brussels, 1609, pp. 98-104.

⁽⁴⁾ *Missale Chaldaicum juxta ritum Ecclesiae nationis Maronitarum*, Rome, 1594 (or 1592), pp. 220-41 (especially pp. 229-30 and 236-7).

TEXTUS

VERSIO

1. מִיָּד מִמֶּנּוּ הַמְּדַבֵּר מִתְּחִלָּה
 2. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה
 3. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה
 4. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה
 5. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה
 6. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה
 7. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה
 8. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה
 9. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה
 10. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה
 11. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה
 12. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה

P. 463

P. 464

10

1. מִיָּד מִמֶּנּוּ הַמְּדַבֵּר מִתְּחִלָּה AFGJN AQ (exc e) W a w z Tr Cm]
 2. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה B..EHIKOPTV X e CH (exc g) ML Cr Mn Re 2
 3. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה A B H K R t x Mb²⁹ Cm³⁶ Re] plur ceteri ||
 4. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה A, 2-3 J a 2-3 H K P ||
 5. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה A 3 praem a
 6. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה ACEHKNPTV w z ||
 7. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה H 6
 8. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה HN 6
 9. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה E, om BI II
 10. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה BDFIOPRWXZ bcfh..lnptu Mb
 11. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה Tr Cm Mn] ACEHJKTU Y a e CH (exc fghl) v w z Cr Re
 12. מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה מִתְּחִלָּה praem x y Cr Mb

Et accedit sacerdos ad celebrandam Anaphoram Apostolorum (1).
 Gratias agimus, Domine (2), divitiis abundantibus gratiae (3) tuae
 erga nos (4), quia, cum peccatores et humiles simus, propter mul-
 titudinem clementiae tuae fecisti nos dignos celebrandi mysteria
 sancta [corporis et sanguinis (5) Christi tui. Dum petimus auxi-
 lium quod a te est ad corroborandas animas nostras, ut caritate
 perfecta et (6) fide vera celebremus donum tuum erga nos (7).

Canon: Et referamus tibi laudem, gloriam, gratiarum actio-
 nem et adorationem nunc, etc. (8).

[Et respondent: Amen (9).

Et dicit sacerdos: Pax vobiscum.

Et respondent: [Et tecum (10) et cum spiritu tuo.

Et dicit diaconus: Date pacem invicem in caritate Christi.

(1) This first *ghānāṭā* is entitled *ṣlōṭā da-qām maḏbhā* in B F G N O f Cr. In A, F and all of the rituals and missals, it is preceded by a *kuššāpā*, and this is considered part of the anaphora in A F I P.

(2) Surely the more primitive reading.

(3) Probably to be preferred as the *lectio antiquior*.

(4) Most MSS. (D I J K A Q M L C H) indicate a repeat here. B, which indicates the analogous repeats at the beginning of the third and fourth (but not the second) *ghānāṭā*, omits it.

(5) The reading of the text might be considered *simplicior*.

(6) There is no *waw* visible in the MS., even under ultra-violet light. However, there is space for it, and it is called for by the sense and the entire MS. tradition.

(7) Again, many MSS. (H P A Q M L) indicate a repeat here. According to E, this is the general rule for the beginnings and ends of *ghānāṭā*.

(8) According to most MSS. (A B. .), the priest here signs himself. Y gives, as an alternate for feasts, the corresponding *qānōnā* from the Anaphora of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

(9) G omits this response, and both it and N omit all else up to the second *ghānāṭā*.

(10) Preferable as the *lectio difficilior*. In actual pronunciation, the *waw*, though written in the published texts, tends to disappear.

13 אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ
 15 אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ *
אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ
 20 אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ
 25 אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ
אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ

13 A H I T U Y w z Ke Re] om B F P y, praem a ceteri
 16 אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ om H J a j w 19 אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ D
 20 אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ ceteri 23 אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ add
אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ DE (אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ) T c w, add
 H (אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ) I J K O A Q (exc c
 s u v) W X (deficit post אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ) M L a z CH Edd Mn Re, add
אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ post אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ A..KNPTVW
 a j z Re Šr] add אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ O R S U Y M L b..e CH
 (exc x y) i n (2a manu) Cr Mb Mn, add אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ
 n (1a manu) p s u..y Tr Cm 24 אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ n (2a manu) p s..w
 Cm || אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ A O S] אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ N R b d f..i l m o
 q r Cr Šr, אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ ceteri || אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ plur G T q y
 26 אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ interv O || אֵלֵינוּ אֵלֵינוּ H, om I

Et dicunt. Pro (1) omnibus Catholicis (2).
 Et proclamat diaconus: Gratias agamus et rogemus.
 Et dicit sacerdos: Gratia Domini nostri, etc. (3).
 Et respondent: Amen.
 Et dicit sacerdos: Sursum sint mentes vestrae (4).
 Et respondent: Sunt ad te Deus...
 Et dicit sacerdos: Oblatio Deo omnium domino offertur (4).
 Et respondent: Dignum et justum est.
 Et dicit diaconus: Pax nobiscum (5).
 Et recitat sacerdos submisso: «Dignum est gloria ab omnibus
 oribus, et gratiarum actione ab omnibus linguis, nomen adoran-
 dum et gloriosum Patris (6) et Filii et Spiritus (7) Sancti: qui
 creavit mundum per gratiam suam, et habitatores ejus per cle-
 mentiam suam, et salvavit homines per misericordiam suam, et
 fecit gratiam magnam erga mortales. Majestatem tuam, Domine,

(1) The reading of D E etc., "Et pro..." would seem slightly *difficilior*.

(2) I.e. "(Let us pray) for all of the Patriarchs..." In most rituals, a *kuššāpā* and one or two prayers of incense follow. After the *kuššāpā*, Cr and some Chaldean MSS. add a *ghāntā* addressed to "the Mother of Our Lord Jesus Christ"; it is derived from Šr (p. 234).

(3) According to most MSS. (A B..), the priest here signs the Mysteries.

(4) Several MSS. (E P Y Z) give alternate *qānōnē* for feasts taken from the Anaphora of Theodore.

(5) A, F and most rituals add a *kuššāpā* here. A prayer of incense precedes it in A.

(6) Evidently the more primitive reading.

(7) Perhaps the reading of the text should be preferred as *difficilior*.

אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם מִלְּיָמֵי שָׁמַיִם וְמִלְּיָמֵי אֲרֶצֶת חַיִּים
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם מִלְּיָמֵי שָׁמַיִם וְמִלְּיָמֵי אֲרֶצֶת חַיִּים
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם מִלְּיָמֵי שָׁמַיִם וְמִלְּיָמֵי אֲרֶצֶת חַיִּים
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם מִלְּיָמֵי שָׁמַיִם וְמִלְּיָמֵי אֲרֶצֶת חַיִּים

30

אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם מִלְּיָמֵי שָׁמַיִם וְמִלְּיָמֵי אֲרֶצֶת חַיִּים
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם מִלְּיָמֵי שָׁמַיִם וְמִלְּיָמֵי אֲרֶצֶת חַיִּים
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם מִלְּיָמֵי שָׁמַיִם וְמִלְּיָמֵי אֲרֶצֶת חַיִּים
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם מִלְּיָמֵי שָׁמַיִם וְמִלְּיָמֵי אֲרֶצֶת חַיִּים
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם מִלְּיָמֵי שָׁמַיִם וְמִלְּיָמֵי אֲרֶצֶת חַיִּים
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם מִלְּיָמֵי שָׁמַיִם וְמִלְּיָמֵי אֲרֶצֶת חַיִּים
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם מִלְּיָמֵי שָׁמַיִם וְמִלְּיָמֵי אֲרֶצֶת חַיִּים
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם מִלְּיָמֵי שָׁמַיִם וְמִלְּיָמֵי אֲרֶצֶת חַיִּים

35

27 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם ABFNTCH (exc g q) Cr] add אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם q, praem
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם ceteri || אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם A || אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם usq אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם ceteri] אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם || אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם Sr || אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם חַיִּים חַיִּים חַיִּים
 28 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם add אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם EGN, add אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם ceteri (D praeterea
 add אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם || אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם praem אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם || אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם om C ||
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם] praem אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם EGT V Y e g, om C 28-29 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם usq
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם om per haplogr J 29 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם H K Re] add אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם I P V W a j z, add אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם ceteri, אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם ceteri || אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם ABCFGHKUY e g w Ur Re Sr || אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם ABFGN Sr] add אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם ceteri || אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם ABFGN] om
 Mn Sr, אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם ceteri || אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם om ABFGN, אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם H, אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם K Re, אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם V, אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם C, אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם J 33 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם T 34 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם
 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם 35 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם A 36 אֲדוֹרָאנְתַּיִם om
 O CH Cr

adorant ⁽¹⁾ mille milia supernorum et myrias myriadum ⁽²⁾ an-
 gelorum ⁽³⁾, agmina ⁽⁴⁾ spiritualium, ministri ignis et spiritus ⁽⁵⁾,
 cum ⁽⁶⁾ 「Cherubim et Seraphim sanctis ⁽⁷⁾, 「nomen tuum glori-
 fificant ⁽⁸⁾.

Canon: Clamantes et glorificantes...

Et respondent: Sanctus, Sanctus... (9).

Et recitat sacerdos submisso: Et cum his exercitibus caelesti-
 bus gratias agimus tibi, Domine ⁽¹⁰⁾, nos quoque servi tui humiles,
 infirmi et miseri, quia fecisti in nobis gratiam magnam quae
 rependi non potest. Nempe induisti humanitatem nostram, ut
 nos vivificares per divinitatem tuam: elevasti abjectionem no-
 stram: erexisti ruinam nostram: resuscitasti mortalitatem no-
 stram: dimisisti debita nostra: justificasti peccaminositatem no-
 stram: illuminasti intelligentiam nostram, et devicisti, Domine

(1) Clearly the preferable reading.

(2) It is barely possible that the missing nun is merely illegible.

(3) The lectio simplicior of the text should probably be considered more primitive, especially since complete unanimity is lacking in the other MSS.

(4) The reading "et agmina", found in all other witnesses, seems preferable.

(5) Almost all of the MSS. insert the phrase "nomen tuum glorificans" here, rather than at the end of the ghāntā. Berlin Sachau 354 has it in both places. In the MS. there are points above and below both the dālat and the rēš; presumably, the scribe first wrote them incorrectly, and then, when he did correct them, failed to remove the erroneous points.

(6) Probably to be preferred.

(7) This reading, clearly the more primitive, is confined to hūdā MSS.

(8) If this phrase should be anticipated above (n. 5), then the canon should follow "Seraphim sanctis" immediately, as in the other hūdā MSS. Berlin Sachau 354 alone agrees with the text.

(9) The MS. gives the complete text of this response in the Anaphora of Theodore of Mopsuestia (p. 5): "Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, Dominus Deus omnipotens: pleni sunt caeli et terra laudibus ejus. Et si festa est: Hosanna in excelsis. Benedictus est qui venit et qui venturus est in nomine Domini. Hosanna Filio David". Another kuššāpā follows in A and all rituals.

(10) Cm inserts the Narration of the Institution at this point. I have found this insertion in at least one MS., an unnumbered ritual of Mar Ya'qob of the late 19th century.

50 50
 ܘܠܟ ܘܠܟܐ . ܬܠܝܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܠܡܨܝܗ
 ܕܥܡܪܝܠ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ . ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ
 ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ . ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ
 ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ . ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ
 ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ . ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ
 ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ . ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ
 ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ . ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ
 ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ . ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ
 ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ . ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ
55

ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ . ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ
 ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ . ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ
 ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ . ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ
 ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ . ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ
 ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ . ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ
60

50 50
 ceteri A || ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ
 51 ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ om A G C m 52 ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ || ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ
 C m³⁶ || ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ A E T || ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ om A || ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ
 B D . I K . N Q, ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ A, ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ T, ܩܠܥ
 ܩܠܥ ceteri 53 ܡܫܚܬܐ ܕܡܫܚܬܐ om O C H C r R e
 ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ K, ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ C || ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ om L
 53-55 ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ usq ... ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ subst ܩܠܥ pro
 ܩܠܥ T 56 ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ A L praem B F H
 K T ('ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ') V k w Mb, idem sed *interu* ceteri 56 ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ
 S r] add in marg 2a (?) manu ܩܠܥ] in textu B C D F G H J K O A Q
 (exc R) a C H w z C r Tr C m, praeterea add ܩܠܥ E I M P Q W M L
 Mb, add ܩܠܥ A L T, add ܩܠܥ N 57 ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ om L N r v
 58 ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ om L || ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ A Q (exc R t) W M L g w z Mb Tr C m
 A B C F J K O V a C H (exc g) t C r R e, om D E G H I L M N P Q T ||
 ܩܠܥ add ܩܠܥ G 59 ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ ceteri, praeterea add
 ܩܠܥ D (implicite) I M N P Q || ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ add ܩܠܥ ceteri || ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ
 ܩܠܥ om A B C F H N || ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ Y ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ ceteri
 ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ A, ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ
 60 ceteri || ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ C m || ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ
 ܩܠܥ ܩܠܥ B C F

Ut cognoscant te omnes habitatores (1) terrae: quia tu solus
 es Deus Pater verus; et tu misisti Dominum nostrum Jesum
 Christum, Filium tuum et dilectum tuum; et ipse Dominus noster
 et Deus noster «docuit nos (2) per evangelium suum vivificum
 omnem puritatem et sanctitatem Prophetarum, Apostolorum,
 Martyrum, Confessorum, Episcoporum (3), Sacerdotum, Diaco-
 norum, et omnium filiorum Ecclesiae sanctae Catholicae, qui ob-
 signati sunt signo vivo (4) baptismatis sancti (5).

Et nos quoque, Domine — *tribus vicibus* — «servi tui (6)
 humiles, infirmi et miseri, qui congregati sumus (7) et stamus
 coram te «in tempore hoc (8), accepimus (9) per successionem for-

(1) The MS. has "habitationes", an obvious *lapsus calami*.

(2) The reading of B D. . I etc. is presumably more primitive; the translation, however, would not be affected.

(3) The *lectio simplicior* of the text, supported by A and L, is preferable. The Doctors are likewise absent from an analogous list of saints in the Anaphora of Theodore of Mopsuestia (MS. p. 9), but they do appear in the Anaphora of Nestorius (p. 47), where they precede the Bishops, as in B F etc.

(4) This word has also been written in the margin of the MS. in a hand that is at least coeval with that of the text, and it is found in all MSS. Nonetheless, the fact that it is absent from S r should caution us against hasty conclusions.

(5) B D G have here the rubric "Hārkhā tāpāḥ". V and other witnesses add "al appawh(y)". Chaldeans today usually interpret it as a full prostration, whereas the Orthodox understand it as a striking of the face. Formerly, the Chaldeans, too, seem to have understood the verb in this latter sense, but changed its object from the face to the breast, judging by the rubric of g, "Tāpāḥ 'al ḥadyēh.", i.e. "percutit pectus". That this is the true interpretation seems well confirmed by the unambiguous rubric of C: "Hārkhā tāpēp tārēp 'al paršōpēh.", i.e. "Hic pluries (?) percutit faciem suam". Mb⁶⁰ puts here the Epiclesis and the first part of what follows there. What follows here, on the contrary, appears in Mb⁶⁰ as the Anamnesis after the Narration of Institution.

(6) The meaning of the line over the yōḡ in the MS. is unclear.

(7) The absence of "in nomine tuo" from our two oldest witnesses should make us very hesitant to accept it as primitive. Dom Botte, however, uses this phrase as evidence that the Narration of Institution originally preceded immediately the Anamnesis; cf. *L'Anaphore Chaldéenne des Apôtres*, in OCP 15 (1949), 273-4, and *Problèmes de l'anaphore... des Apôtres*, in *L'Orient Syrien* 10 (1965), 101-2.

(8) The absence of this phrase from so many old witnesses (A B C F H N) indicates that it is not primitive.

(9) The lone support of Y is surely insufficient to justify the absence of the "et" that precedes this word in all other witnesses.

ܡܠ ܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ .
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ .
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ .
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ .
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ .
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ .
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ .
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ .
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ .
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ . ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ .

ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ om I M P Q ML Mb, add ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ V ||
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ AC, trsp ante ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ xy Cr ||
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ om ceteri || ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ Cm || ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ T 62 interv
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ I || ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ BFL || ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ A, idem
 sed add CDGHJKNOa CH (exc x) Cr Mn Re, praeterea add ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ
 post ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ I M P Q R (deficit usq ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ) A Q V W ML x z Mb
 Tr Cm, add ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ E, ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ T w || ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ L N W j o q (Ia manu) r w add ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ
 ceteri 63 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ A B C E F G J L N T a w || add ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ
 post ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ ceteri (om ܡ Ur) 64 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ J a (Ia manu) x Cr ||
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ E P, ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ ceteri || ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ H, ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ C E J K Y a z, praeterea add ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ Š || ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ O 65 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ
 usq ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ om A C D F G I K L N P S U V c h l m Re, om ܡ ceteri ||
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ add ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ B E H J O W Y b i j n p t u v x z Edd, idem et
 praem ܡ J a e 68 ܡ usq ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ om CH Mn (?) || ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ O T CH (exc r x) Cr Re, praeterea add ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ r 69 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ
 ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ A || ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ A . D F H J K N O a CH (exc q) w z Cr
 Mn Re Šr ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ ceteri || ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ A . F H K N O T V a CH
 w z Cr Mn Re, praem ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ G I L M A Q (exc Y u) W ML Mb Tr
 Cm, ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ P, praem ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ Y || ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ add ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ
 w || ܡܠܚܘܕܝܢܢ praem ܡ C E

mam⁽¹⁾ quae a te est, laetantes, glorificantes, exaltantes, com-
 memorantes et laudantes⁽²⁾, et celebrantes mysterium hoc ma-
 gnum et tremendum⁽³⁾ passionis, mortis et resurrectionis⁽⁴⁾
 「Domini nostri⁽⁵⁾ Jesu Christi.

Veniat⁽⁶⁾, Domine, Spiritus tuus Sanctus⁽⁷⁾, et requiescat⁽⁸⁾
 super oblationem hanc — 「Et dicit⁽⁹⁾ diaconus: Quieti estote. . . —
 servorum tuorum⁽¹⁰⁾, et eam benedicat et sanctificet, ut sit nobis,
 Domine, in remissionem debitorum, et veniam peccatorum, spem-
 que magnam resurrectionis a mortuis, et vitam novam in regno
 caelorum, cum omnibus qui placiti fuerunt coram te⁽¹¹⁾. Et prop-

(1) The MS. has here "formae" in virtue of a *dālaṭ* inserted *ra manu*
 above the line between this word and the preceding. I can only speculate
 that the scribe misplaced his correction, which he may possibly have
 intended to put before *qabbeln-an*: "accepimus enim. . .".

(2) This word, which can scarcely be primitive, is found only in
 V and in a different position.

(3) The *lectio simplicior* of the text is evidently preferable. The
 absence of "et tremendum", moreover, from A T w suggests that it,
 too, may not be primitive.

(4) The *lectio simplicior* of the text is preferable here too, especially
 since it has the support of so many MSS.

(5) Again, the reading of the text is clearly more primitive.

(6) The support of J and a, together with Cr (x presumably copies
 Cr), is not enough to justify the absence of the "et" that precedes this
 word in all other MSS. The reading of E and P seems to be due to the
 influence of the Anaphora of Theodore of Mopsuestia, for in a following
 rubric of E (and Y) there is reference to this phrase as: *Tē'itē 'layn Mār(y)*
Rūḥāḳḳ hayyā w-qaddīšā — "Veniat super nos, Domine, Spiritus tuus
 vivus et sanctus" — of which the first two words of the Syriac are found
 only in the Anaphora of Theodore.

(7) Despite the fact that the *lectio simplicior* of the text is suppor-
 ted by the great majority of the MSS., the reading of C E J K Y a z,
 (and Berlin Sachau 354), "vividus et sanctus", since it is also attested by
 Šr, may well be more primitive.

(8) Again, the *lectio simplicior* of the text is found in almost all
 the other witnesses. Nonetheless, the support that Šr gives for the
 reading of H, "inhabit et requiescat", demands explanation.

(9) The scribe evidently began to write "servorum", but then
 decided to insert the acclamation of the deacon, failing to delete the *dālaṭ*.

(10) Renaudot here adds the phrase "quam offerunt", not found
 in any of the MSS. that I have seen.

(11) Mb⁶⁰ puts here the *qānōnā* of the third *ghāntā* as the final dox-
 ology of the anaphora. What follows here, including the *qānōnā*, has
 been appended to the Anamnesis.

70 ܠܟܢ ܗܘܢܐ ܥܝܘܒܐ ܕܝܚܝܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܠܟܢ ܗܘܢܐ ܠܟܢ
 ܕܚܝܝܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ . ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ || ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ P. 466

ܠܟܢ ܗܘܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ

ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ

ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ
 75 ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ

ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ J || ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ || ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ om P
 BI (Ia manu) 71 ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ A || ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ C J
 73 ܕܥܥܗܢܐ ܕܥܥܗܢܐ om F G H L N CH (exc h l) w Cr.

ter universam [dispensationem tuam (1) mirabilem (2) erga nos, gratias agamus tibi et glorificemus te indesinenter in Ecclesia tua redempta sanguine pretioso Christi tui, oribus apertis et faciebus revelatis.

Canon: Referentes... (3).

Et respondent: Amen.

Et absolvunt omnia sicut scriptum est in Anaphora Interpretis, quae [scripta est in dominica (4) prima Annuntiationis.

WILLIAM F. MACOMBER S.J.

(1) Contrary to the opinion of Botte, "Problèmes...", p. 101, the oldest MSS. confirm the reading of Šr, which, therefore, does not represent a modification of the primitive text on the part of the Maronite editor.

(2) The agreement of P and Y with Šr suggests that "gloriosam" may perhaps be the more primitive reading here, even though all other MSS. agree with the reading of the text. In any case, the reading of Tr, "hanc magnam et mirabilem", is clearly not primitive, and hence one cannot argue from it, as Botte does, *art. cit.*, p. 99, to prove that this section represents a continuation of the anamnestic prayer that precedes the Epiclesis. Of course, the new MS. evidence does not positively exclude Botte's theories, but it does show how fragile all reconstructions are likely to be that are not based on a critically established text.

(3) A, B and most rituals indicate that the celebrant signs the Mysteries at this point.

(4) It is possible that the surplus letters in these words may have been deleted and that the deletion is no longer visible.
