



BRILL

Vigiliae Christianae 62 (2008) 467-504

Vigiliae
Christianae
www.brill.nl/vc

The Anaphora and the Thanksgiving Prayer from the Barcelona Papyrus: An Underestimated Testimony to the Anaphoral History in the Fourth Century

Michael Zheltov

*Moscow Spiritual Academy, 141300,
Moskovskaya obl., Sergiev Posad, Lavra, Russia
orofos@gmail.com*

Abstract

New critical text edition (with translation and a commentary) of the oldest extant manuscript containing a complete set of prayers, P.Monts.Roca inv. 154b-157b. This text is of prime importance for liturgical studies, especially of anaphoral development.

Keywords

Anaphora, Egypt, Eucharist, liturgical studies, papyri, thanksgiving prayer

A 4th-century papyrus codex, P.Monts.Roca inv.128-178,¹ now in the library of the Abbey of Montserrat but originally in the possession of Ramón Roca-Puig, is yet to receive the scholarly attention it merits. The

¹ The manuscript comes either from Dishna (see Robinson J.M. *The Pachomian Monastic Library at the Chester Beatty Library and the Bibliothèque Bodmer*, in: *Manuscripts of the Middle East*. Vol. 5 (1990-1991). P. 26-40) or from Thebaïd (see Tovar S.T., Worp K.A. *To the Origins of Greek Stenography: P.Monts.Roca I*. Barcelona, 2006. (Orientalia Montserratensia; 1) P. 15-211). A small piece of this codex is now a part of the Duke papyri collection (P.Duk.inv. 798, formerly P.Rob.inv. L 1; J.M. Robinson is incorrect in calling this piece "P. Duke inv. L 1" (Robinson. *Op. cit.*). See a short description and an image of the latter piece in the Internet: <http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/records/798.html>). My confidence in its dating is based not only on data from J. van Haelst's catalogue (van Haelst J. *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens*. (Paris, 1976). P. 288) and R. Roca-Puig's book (Roca-Puig R. *Anàfora de Barcelona i altres pregàries: Missa del segle IV*. (Barcelona, 1994; 1996²; 1999³)), but also on consultations with the leading papyrologists, including Bärbel Kramer and Paul Schubert, whom I thank gratefully. I would also

manuscript contains a few Latin texts as well as some Christian liturgical prayers in Greek,² and a long Greek word-list.³ The liturgical prayers fully occupy seven of its folia (154b-157b).⁴ These prayers comprise a complete anaphora; a thanksgiving prayer after Communion; two prayers for the sick; and an acrostic baptismal (?) hymn. This papyrus is in fact the oldest manuscript known to contain Christian liturgical prayers conserved in their integrity—while, for example, the famous Strasbourg papyrus, P. Straßb. inv. 254, dates from the 4-5th centuries⁵ and has many lacunae in its text,—giving our codex seminal importance for liturgical scholarship.

Surprisingly, these prayers are seldom cited in current scholarly literature. The main publications concerning them are those of Roca-Puig himself, to whom the academic community is indebted for the edition of the manuscript.⁶ Very important contributions to the study of the anaphora of the Barcelona papyrus have been made by Sebastià Janeras⁷ and

like to thank my colleagues Heinzgerd Brakmann and Sebastià Janeras for their important suggestions and improvements for this article, and Robert Taft, Vassa Larin and Vitaly Permiakov—for their help with improving the English text of it.

² See: Robinson. *Op. cit.* P. 34, nr. 34.

³ See the full list of the texts preserved in the codex in: Tovar, Worp. *Op. cit.* 17 (this book is an edition of the Greek word-list from this codex).

⁴ van Haelst. *Op. cit.* Nr. 864. See additional bibliography in: Treu K. *Christliche Papyri XIV*, in: *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete*. Bd. 35 (1989). S. 107-116 (here: S. 109); idem. *Christliche Papyri XVI*, in: *ibid.* Bd. 37 (1991). S. 93-96 (here: S. 96); Römer C. *Christliche Texte I*, in: *ibid.* Bd. 43 (1997). S. 107-145 (here: S. 123-124).

⁵ van Haelst. *Op. cit.* Nr. 998.

⁶ After his first report on the papyrus (Roca-Puig R. *Sui Papiri di Barcellona*, in: *Aegyptus: Rivista italiana di egittologia e di papirologia*. Vol. 46 (1966). P. 91-92) Roca-Puig dedicated a series of articles and brochures to its anaphora: idem. *La "Redempció" a l'Anàfora de Barcelona: Papir de Barcelona, Inv. n° 154b*. (Barcelona, 1982); idem. *La "Creació" a l'Anàfora de Barcelona: Papyri Barcinonenses*, in: *Contribució a la historia de l'Església Catalana (per J. Bonet i Baltà)*. (Montserrat, 1983: Biblioteca Abat Oliba; 27). P. 1-18; idem. *La "Litúrgia angèlica" a l'Anàfora de Barcelona: Papir de Barcelona, Inv. n° 154b*. (Barcelona, 1983); idem. *"Transició" i "Ofrena" a l'Anàfora de Barcelona: Papir de Barcelona, Inv. n° 154b-155a*. (Barcelona, 1984); idem. *L'epiclesi primera a l'Anàfora de Barcelona: Papir de Barcelona, Inv. n° 155a, lin. 2-7*. (Barcelona, 1987)) and thanksgiving prayer (idem. *Oració després de la Comunió: P. Barc. Inv. n. 155b, lin. 1-18*. (Barcelona, 1990)) and finally prepared an edition of the whole manuscript (idem. *Anàfora de Barcelona...*).

⁷ Janeras S. *L'original grec del fragment copte de Lovaina Núm. 27 en l'Anaphora di Barcelona*, in: *Miscel·lània Litúrgica Catalana* Vol. 3 (1984). P. 13-25; cf.: Devos P. *Un témoin copte de la plus ancienne anaphore en grec*, in: *Analecta Bollandiana*. T. 104 (1986). P. 126.

then by Kurt Treu and Johannes Diethart,⁸ who proved that two other 6th-century fragments, the now lost Coptic parchment⁹ Louvain. 27 (Janeras) and the Greek papyrus¹⁰ PVindob. G 41043 (Treu, Diethart), contain parts of the same anaphora. The prayers for the sick from P.Monts. Roca inv. 155b-156b were studied by Wolfgang Luppe¹¹ and Cornelia Römer, Robert Daniel and Klaas Worp;¹² and the acrostic hymn from P.Monts.Roca inv. 157a-157b by Andrey Vinogradov, who supposed the hymn to be baptismal.¹³ The anaphora and thanksgiving prayer from P.Monts.Roca inv. 154b-155b were studied by me in an article published in 2002.¹⁴ Nevertheless, despite the plain fact that this papyrus, probably connected in some way with the Pachomian monastic community, is the oldest liturgical manuscript containing a full anaphora, its important testimony is almost completely neglected by modern liturgical scholars. It does not play a significant role even in the most notable recent reconstructions of the anaphoral history,¹⁵ receiving at best brief mention.

⁸ Diethart J., Treu K. *Griechische literarische Papyri christlichen Inhaltes, 2: Textband*. (Wien, 1993: Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek in Wien; 17). S. 68-69.

⁹ Edition: Lefort L. Th. *Coptica Lovaniensia*, in: *Le Muséon*. Vol. 53 (1940). P. 22-24.

¹⁰ Edition: Diethart J., Treu K. *Op. cit.* It should be noted that J. Hammerstaedt offered a new reconstruction of the papyrus (Hammerstaedt J. *Griechische Anaphorenfragmente aus Ägypten und Nubien* (Opladen, 1999: Papyrologica Coloniensia; 28). S. 156-160).

¹¹ Luppe W. *Christliche Weihung von Öl: Zum Papyrus Barc. 156a/b*, in: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*. Bd. 95 (1993). S. 70.

¹² Römer C.E., Daniel R.W., Worp K.A. *Das Gebet zur Handauflegung bei Kranken in P. Barc 155, 19-156, 5 und P. Kellis I 88*, in: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*. Bd. 119 (1997). S. 128-131.

¹³ Виноградов А. Ю. *Три крещальных гимна с алфавитным акростихом*, in: *Вестник древней истории*. Nr. 3 (2005). С. 91-114.

¹⁴ Желтов М.С. *Греческая литургия IV в. в папирусе Barcelon. Papyr. 154b-157b*, in: *Богословский Сборник*. Nr. 9 (2002). С. 240-256.

¹⁵ See, for example: Taft R.F. *The Interpolation of the Sanctus into the Anaphora: When and Where? A Review of the Dossier*, in: *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*. Vol. 57 (1991). P. 281-308 and Vol. 58 (1992). P. 83-121 (reprinted, with some important notes added, in 1995 in *Variorum Collected Studies Series*); idem. *From Logos to Spirit: On the Early History of the Epiclesis*, in: A. Heinz, H. Rennings (hrsg.) *Gratias Agamus: Studien zum eucharistischen Hochgebet (Für Balthasar Fischer)*. (Freiburg et al., 1992). S. 489-502; Winkler G. *Zur Erforschung orientalischer Anaphoren in liturgievergleichender Sicht I: Anmerkungen zur Oratio post Sanctus und Anamnese bis Epiklese*, in: *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*. Vol. 63 (1997). P. 363-420; eadem. *Zur Erforschung orientalischer Anaphoren in liturgievergleichender Sicht II: Das Formelgut der Oratio post Sanctus und Anamnese sowie Interzessionen und die Taufbekenntnisse*, in: R.F. Taft, G. Winkler, (eds.) *Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton*

Analysis of these prayers is hampered by errors in Roca-Puig's edition of the papyrus. Erroneous readings in the prayers for the sick were already corrected by the scholars mentioned above; my preliminary reading of the anaphora and thanksgiving prayer appeared in an extensive review of Roca-Puig's book in the journal *Khristiansky Vostok*¹⁶ together with Vinogradov's reading of the acrostic hymn. In the present article I offer my reconstruction of text of the anaphora and the thanksgiving prayer, taking into account the former's two other fragments, Louvain. Copt. 27 and P.Vindob. G 41043. Finally, I discuss briefly whether their evidence might shift current scholarly presuppositions about the 4th-century anaphoral history.

I. The Text

In the edition of the Barcelona papyrus by Roca-Puig (hereafter: R.-P.), the critical edition of the Greek text of the anaphora is preceded by a diplomatic edition of the text that transcribes every letter of the papyrus. Despite the fact that a diplomatic version should decipher the manuscript verbatim, in R.-P. diplomatic edition of the anaphora its text is already divided into words. This rash division has unfortunately prejudiced R.-P.'s reading of the papyrus. In fact a few of R.-P.'s crucial conjectures in his critical edition of the prayers can be avoided just by choosing another word-division of the continuous papyrus text. R.-P. substantiates his conjectures by many examples from other liturgical texts, but the clear evidence of the papyrus itself should undoubtedly prevail as the main criterion of its reconstruction.

In order to avoid prejudiced readings of the papyrus, I start by providing new diplomatic versions of the anaphora and thanksgiving prayer from the Barcelona papyrus, using the facsimile edition of the papyrus given at the end of R.-P.'s book.¹⁷

Baumstark (1872-1948): Acts of the International Congress. (Roma, 2001 [2002]: *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*; 265); eadem. *Zur Erforschung orientalischer Anaphoren in liturgievergleichender Sicht III: Der Hinweis auf ‚die Gaben‘ bzw. ‚das Opfer‘ bei der Epiklese*, in: A. Gerhards, K. Richter, (hrsg.) *Das Opfer: Biblischer Anspruch und liturgische Feier.* (Freiburg et al., 2000: *Quaestiones Disputatae*; 186). S. 216-233; Bradshaw P.F. *Eucharistic Origins.* (London et al., 2004) etc.

¹⁶ *Христианский Восток.* Vol. 4. P. 565-586. This volume, fully prepared for publication already in 2002, appeared only in 2005 (2006 is the year of publication indicated).

¹⁷ Roca-Puig. *Anáfora de Barcelona...* P. 127-131.

I. 1. Diplomatic Text of the Anaphora and the Thanksgiving Prayer from the Barcelona Papyrus

[P.Monts.Roca inv. 154b]

ΕΙΣΘΕΟΣΙΗΣΟΥΣΟΚΥΡΙΟΣ·
 ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΑΣΠΕΡΙΑΡΤΟΥΚΑΙΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΥ
 ΑΝΩΤΑΣΚΑΡΔΙΑΣΗΜΩΝΕΥΞΟΜΕΝΙΠΡΟΣ
 ΚΥΡΙΟΝΕΤΙΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΘΗΣΟΜΕΝΑΞΙΟΝΚΑΙΔΙΚΑΙ
 5 ΟΝΑΞΙΟΝΕΣΤΙΝΚΑΙΔΙΚΑΙΟΝΣΕΕΑΙΝΕΙΝΣΕ
 ΕΥΛΟΓΕΙΝΣΕΥΜΝΕΙΝΣΕΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΝΔΕΣΠΟΤΑ
 ΘΕΙΠΑΝΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡΤΟΥΚΥΗΜΩΝΙΥΧΡΥΟΠΙΟΙ
 ΗΣΑΣΤΑΠΑΝΤΑΕΚΤΟΥΜΗΟΝΤΟΣΕΙΣΤΟΕΙΝΑΙ
 ΤΑΠΑΝΤΑΟΥΡΑΝΟΥΣΤΗΝΘΑΛΑΣΣΑΝΚΑΙΠΑΝΤΑΤΑ
 10 ΕΝΑΥΤΟΙΣΔΙΑΤΟΥΗΓΑΠΗΜΕΝΟΥΣΟΥΠΙΑΙΔΟΣΙΥΧΡΥ
 ΤΟΥΚΥΗΜΩΝΔΙΟΥΕΚΑΛΕΣΕΝΗΜΑΣΑΠΙΟΣΚΟΤΟΣ
 ΕΙΣΦΩΣΑΠΟΑΓΝΟΣΙΑΣΕΙΣΕΙΠΓΝΟΣΙΟΝΔΟΞΗΣΟΝΟ
 ΜΑΤΟΣΑΥΤΩΑΠΟΦΘΟΡΑΣΘΑΝΑΤΟΥΕΙΣΑΦΘΑΡ
 ΣΙΑΝΕΙΣΖΩΗΝΑΙΩΝΙΟΝΟΚΑΘΗΜΕΝΟΣΕΙΠΑΡΜΑ
 15 ΤΟΣΧΕΡΟΥΒΙΝΚΑΙΣΑΡΡΑΦΙΝΕΜΙΠΡΟΣΘΕΝΑΥΤΟΥ
 ΩΠΑΡΑΣΤΑΣΙΝΧΕΙΛΙΑΙΣΧΕΙΛΙΑΔΔΩΝΚΑΙΜΥΡΙΑΙ
 ΜΥΡΙΑΔΕΣΑΓΓΕΛΛΩΝΑΡΧΑΓΓΕΛΛΩΝΘΡΟΝΩΝ
 ΚΑΙΚΥΡΙΟΤΗΤΩΝΥΜΝΟΥΝΤΩΝΚΑΙΔΟΞΑΛΟΓΟΥΝ
 ΤΩΝΜΕΘΩΝΚΑΙΥΜΕΙΣΥΜΝΟΥΝΤΕΣΛΕΓΟΝΤΕΣ
 20 ΑΓΙΟΣΑΓΙΟΣΑΓΙΟΣΚΥΡΙΟΣΣΑΒΑΩΦΙΛΗΡΗΣΟΥ
 ΟΟΥΡΑΝΟΣΤΗΣΔΟΞΗΣΟΥΕΝΗΕΛΟΞΑΣΑΣΗΜΑΣΔΙ
 ΑΤΟΥΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΟΥΣΟΥΚΑΙΠΡΩΤΟΤΟΚΟΥΠΙΑΣΗΕΚΤΙ
 ΣΕΩΣΙΥΧΡΥΤΟΥΚΥΗΜΩΝΟΚΑΘΗΜΕΝΟΣΕΝ
 ΔΕΞΙΑΤΗΣΜΕΓΑΛΟΣΥΝΗΣΟΥΕΝΤΟΙΣΟΥΡΑΝΙ
 25 ΟΙΣΩΣΕΡΧΕΤΑΙΚΡΙΝΑΙΖΩΝΤΑΣΚΑΙΝΕΚΡΟΥΣ

[P.Monts.Roca inv. 155a]

ΔΙΟΥΠΙΡΟΣΦΕΡΟΜΕΝΕΚΤΙΣΜΑΤΑΣΟΥΤΑΥΤΑΑΡ
 ΤΟΝΤΕΚΑΙΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝΑΙΤΟΥΜΕΘΑΚΑΙΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΟΥ
 ΜΕΝΣΟΙΟΠΩΣΚΑΤΑΠΕΜΨΗΣΕΠΑΥΤΑΤΟΑΓΙΟΝΣΟΥ
 ΤΟΑΓΙΟΝΣΟΥΚΑΙΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΤΟΝΣΟΥΤΙΝΕΥΜΑΑΞΙΩΝ
 5 ΟΥΝΩΝΕΙΣΤΟΣΩΜΑΤΟΥΠΙΟΗΣΑΙΑΥΤΑΚΑΙΠΙΟΗΣΑΙ
 ΤΟΜΕΝΑΡΤΟΝΣΩΜΑΧΡΥΤΟΔΕΙΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝΑΙΜΑΧΡΥ
 ΤΗΣΚΑΙΝΗΣΔΙΑΘΗΚΗΣΚΑΘΩΣ^{ΚΑΙ}ΑΥΤΩΣΗΝΙΚΑ
 ΕΜΕΛΛΕΝΠΑΡΑΔΙΔΟΝΑΙΛΑΒΩΝΑΡΤΟΝΚΑΙΕΥΧΑΡΙ
 ΣΤΗΣΑΣΚΑΙΕΚΑΛΕΣΕΝΚΑΙΕΔΩΚΕΝΤΟΙΣΜΑΘΗΤΑΙΣ
 10 ΑΥΤΟΥΛΕΓΩΝΛΑΒΕΤΕΦΑΓΕΤΕΤΟΥΤΟΜΟΙΕΣΤΙΝΤΟΣΩΜΑ
 ΚΑΙΟΜΙΩΣΜΕΤΑΤΟΔΕΙΠΙΝΗΣΑΙΛΑΒΩΝΙΠΟΤΗ
 ΡΙΟΝΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΣΑΣΕΔΩΚΕΝΑΥΤΟΙΣΛΕΓΩΝΛΑΒΕΤΕ
 ΠΙΕΤΕΤΟΑΙΜΑΤΟΠΕΡΙΠΟΛΛΩΝΕΚΧΥΟΜΕΝΩΝΕΙΣ
 ΑΦΗΣΙΝΑΜΑΡΤΙΩΝΚΑΙΗΜΕΙΣΤΟΑΥΤΟΠΟΙΟΥΜΕΝ

- 15 ΕΙΣΤΗΝΣΗΝΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΝΟΣΟΚΙΝΕΑΝΟΥΝΕΡΧΟΝΤΕΣ
ΠΟΙΟΥΝΤΕΣΣΟΥΤΗΝΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΝΤΟΥΑΓΙΟΥΜΥΣΤΗ
ΡΙΟΥΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΥΚΑΙΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣΚΑΙΣΩΤΗΡΟΣΗΜΩΝ
ΙΥΧΡΥΝΑΙΑΞΙΟΥΜΕΝΣΕΔΕΣΠΟΤΑΟΠΩΣΕΥΛΟΓΩΝ
ΕΥΛΟΓΗΣΗΣΚΑΙΑΓΙΩΣΑΓΙΑΣΗΣΤΟΙΣΠΑΣΙΝΕΞΑΥΤΩΝ
20 ΜΕΤΑΛΑΜΒΑΝΟΥΣΙΝΕΙΣΠΙΣΤΙΝΑΔΙΑΚΡΙΤΟΝΕΙΣΜΕΤΟ
ΧΗΝΑΦΘΑΡΣΙΑΝΕΙΣΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑΝΠΙΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣΑΓΙΟΥ
ΕΙΣΚΑΤΑΡΤΙΣΜΟΝΠΙΣΤΕΩΣΚΑΙΑΛΗΘΕΙΑΣΕΙΣΣΥΝΤΕ
ΛΕΙΩΣΙΝΠΙΑΝΤΟΣΘΕΛΗΜΑΤΟΣΣΟΥΝΑΕΤΙΚΑΙΕΝΤΟΥΤΩ
ΔΟΞΑΖΟΜΕΝΤΟΝΠΑΝΕΝΤΙΜΟΝΚΑΙΠΑΝΑΓΙΟΝΟΝΟ
25 ΜΑΣΟΥΔΙΑΤΟΥΑΓΙΑΣΜΕΝΟΥΣΟΥΠΑΙΔΟΣΙΥΧΡΥΤΟΥ
ΚΥΗΜΩΝΔΙΟΥΣΟΙΔΟΞΑΚΡΑΤΟΣΕΙΣΤΟΥΣΑΚΗΡΑΤΟΥΣ
ΑΙΩΝΑΣΤΩΝΑΙΩΝΩΝΑΜΗΝ

[P.Monts.Roca inv. 155b]

- ΕΙΣΘΕΟΣ
ΕΤΙΔΕΟΜΕΘΑΣΟΥΔΕΣΠΟΤΑΘΕΠΑΝΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡΚΑΙ
ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΟΥΜΕΝΣΟΙΕΠΕΙΤΗΜΕΤΑΛΗΜΨΙΤΟΥΑΡΤΟΥ
ΤΗΣΖΩΗΣΚΑΙΤΟΥΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΥΚΑΙΤΟΥΑΓΙΑΣΜΕΝΟΥΚΑΙ
5 ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΟΥΜΕΝΣΟΙΟΠΩΣΑΓΙΑΣΗΣΗΜΑΣΠΑΝΤΑΣ
ΤΟΥΣΜΕΤΕΛΗΦΟΤΟΣΥΠΑΥΤΩΝΠΡΟΣΤΟΜΗΓΕΝΕΣΘΑΙ
ΗΜΙΝΕΙΣΚΡΙΜΑΗΕΙΣΚΑΤΑΚΡΙΜΑΤΟΙΣΜΕΤΑΛΛΑΜ
ΒΑΝΟΥΣΙΝΑΛΛΑΜΑΛΛΟΝΕΙΣΑΓΙΑΝΣΑΡΚΟΣΚΑΙΨΥΧΗΣ
ΕΙΣΑΝΑΙΝΕΩΣΙΝΤΟΥΠΙΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣΗΜΩΝΕΙΣΠΙΣΤΙΝ
10 ΚΑΙΣΩΦΡΟΣΥΝΗΝΕΙΣΪΣΧΥΝΚΑΙΔΥΝΑΜΙΝΕΙΣΑΓΑΠΗΝ
ΚΑΙΦΙΛΛΗΛΙΑΝΕΙΣΣΥΝΤΕΛΕΙΑΝΠΑΝΤΟΣΘΕΛΗΜΑΤΟΣΣΟΥ
ΕΙΣΤΕΛΕΙΟΝΣΟΥΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΝΤΟΚΑΤΑΘΕΟΝΚΤΙΣΘΕΝΤΑ
ΪΝΑΩΜΕΝΤΕΛΕΙΟΙΚΑΙΚΑΘΑΡΟΙΑΜΑΧΥΝΤΟΙΣΕΞΩΣ
ΜΕΝΟΙΑΠΟΠΑΝΤΟΣΑΝΟΜΙΩΝΚΑΙΤΕΛΕΙΟΜΕΝΟΙΕΝ
15 ΠΑΝΤΙΘΕΛΗΜΑΤΙΤΟΥΘΥΚΑΙΠΡΟΣΚΥΗΜΩΝΙΥΧΡΥ
ΔΙΟΥΣΟΙΔΟΞΑΚΡΑΤΟΣΑΙΩΝΟΣΤΙΜΗΜΕΓΑΛΩΣΥΝΗ
ΚΑΙΝΥΝΚΑΙΕΙΣΤΟΥΣΣΥΜΠΑΝΤΑΣΑΙΩΝΑΣΤΩΝ
ΑΙΩΝΩΝΑΜΗΝ ΕΙΣΘΕΟΣ

I. 2. *Conjectural Readings in Roca-Puig's Edition of Text of the Anaphora and the Thanksgiving Prayer*

Before proceeding with my reconstruction of the text of the anaphora and the thanksgiving prayer, I shall discuss the misspellings and mistakes committed by the scribe of the papyrus. They are mostly the customary iota-cisms; many of R.-P.'s corrections of these are fully acceptable—but not all of them.

In line 154b, 2 R.-P. reads ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΑΣ in the title of the anaphora as *Εὐχαριστία*, “Thanksgiving”, which is certainly correct: such an inter-

change of ει and ι, a very common iotacism, is widely represented in the Egyptian papyri.¹⁸

In lines 154b, 3-4 R.-P. reads ΕΥΞΟΜΕΝΙΠΡΟΣ//ΚΥΡΙΟΝ as Ἐχομεν πρὸς Κύριον, “We have [the hearts—*M. Zh.*] to the Lord.” This is quite understandable—Ἐχομεν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον / *Habemus ad Dominum* is indeed a well known liturgical response.¹⁹

In line 154b, 4 R.-P. reads ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΘΗΣΟΜΕΝ as εὐχαριστήσομεν. He is certainly correct in replacing Θ with Τ (the case we have here is a false aspiration),²⁰ but probably incorrect in interpreting this form as a future indicative (or an epic aorist, which is very unlikely). Instead it should be read as a regular aorist subjunctive: εὐχαριστήσομεν—a replacement of ω by ο occurs frequently in the papyri.²¹

In line 154b, 7 R.-P. reads ΘΕΙΠΑΝΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡΤΟΥΚΥΡΗΜΩΝΙΟΥΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ as Θεὲ παντοκράτωρ, <Πάτερ> τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, “O God Pantocrator, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” I do not see any need to interpret the text in this way. The text should be read exactly, as: Θεὲ παντοκράτωρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, “O God Pantocrator of our Lord Jesus Christ.” This is merely a sign of an archaic Christology—such expressions are well known from Sacred Scripture (cf. Eph 1: 17) and from many writings of the pre-Nicaean orthodox Fathers. Note that a similar address to God is found in another Egyptian anaphora, that ascribed to Athanasius:²² Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, “O Lord, God Pantocrator of our Lord Jesus Christ.”²³

In line 154b, 9 R.-P. reads ΟΥΡΑΝΟΥΣΤΗΝΘΑΛΑΣΣΑΝ as οὐρανοῦς, γῆν, θάλασσαν, “the heaven, the earth, the sea.” Although the reading οὐρανοῦς, τὴν θάλασσαν is also not improbable, I agree with R.-P.’s

¹⁸ See: Gignac F. Th. *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Vol. 1: Phonology. (Milano, 1976: Testi e documenti per lo studio dell’antichità; 55). P. 190-191.

¹⁹ Still, there is another way of reading this sequence without turning ΥΞ into Χ, which is not likely phonetically: Ζευξομεν πρὸς Κύριον, “Let’s join [the hearts] together to the Lord.” But this reading seems very unnatural. Here the scribe has perhaps confused Ἐχομεν with some form like Εὐξόμεθα.

²⁰ See: Gignac. *Op. cit.* P. 135-138.

²¹ See: *Ibid.* P. 276-277.

²² Edition: Frensd W.H.C., Muirhead I.A. *The Greek Manuscripts from the Cathedral of Q’asr Ibrim*, in: *Le Muséon*. Vol. 89 (1976). P. 43-49 (here: p. 47-49).

²³ I disagree with J. Hammerstaedt who inserts—just as Roca-Puig did in his edition of the Barcelona papyrus—the expression <ὁ Πατήρ> into the text of the Athanasian anaphora (Hammerstaedt. *Op. cit.* S. 135). There is no *textological* argument for this interpolation.

conjecture, because the expression seems quite natural and also because οὐρανὸς is written without an article—consequently, it is strange to expect an article before a homogeneous part of the sentence (θάλασσαν); but it should be noted that here R.-P. is mistaken already in his diplomatic version of the text (where he reads Γ instead of Τ), and thereby completely neglects to highlight his conjecture.

In line 154b, 11 R.-P. is right in reading ΟΣ as -ους in ΑΠΟΣΚΟΤΟΣ: ἀπὸ σκοτούς, “from darkness.” An interchange of ου and ο occurs in the papyri, though rarely.²⁴

In lines 154b, 12-13 R.-P. corrects the scribe’s misspellings ΕΙΣΕΠΙΓΝΟΣΙΟΝΔΟΞΗΣΟΝΟ//ΜΑΤΟΣΑΥΤΩ, reading this sequence as εἰς ἐπίγνωσι δόξης ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ, “unto knowledge of the glory of His name”, which is certainly correct: a replacement of ου by ω in the papyri is a “frequent interchange, especially in final position”,²⁵ and a replacement of ω by ο also occurs frequently.²⁶ Only an insertion of a vowel after ι is uncommon.

In line 154b, 15 R.-P. renders ΣΑΡΡΑΦΙΝ as σεραφιν, “seraphim”. While omitting the doubled P is incontestable,²⁷ there is no need to spell Α as Ε in σεραφιν: the form σεραφιν is also attested in the sources.²⁸

In lines 154b, 16-17 R.-P. corrects a few scribal misspellings in ΧΕΙΛΙΑΙΣΧΕΙΛΙΑΔΩΝΚΑΙΜΥΡΙΑΙ//ΜΥΡΙΑΔΕΣΑΓΓΕΛΛΩΝΑΡΧΑΓΓΕΛΛΩΝ, rendering this sequence as χίλιαι χιλιάδων καὶ μύριαι μυριάδων ἀγγέλων, ἀρχαγγέλων, “thousands of thousands and myriads of myriads of angels, archangels.” Here, indeed, the scribe should have confused a noun (ἀγγέλων) and a participle (ἀγγέλλων), erroneously repeating Λ in ἀγγέλων and ἀρχαγγέλων; he also seems to have misspelled some forms of χιλίας—but which forms? While R.-P.’s conjecture (χίλιαι χιλιάδων) could be correct, it is less reasonable than a conjectural χίλιαι χιλιάδες, which: 1) is purely biblical (see Dan 7: 10); 2) leaves ΜΥΡΙΑΙ//ΜΥΡΙΑΔΕΣ without any conjecture at all; 3) is found in other known Greek anaphoras, including Egyptian ones—for example, in the anaphora of the Liturgy of Mark. So I would suggest χίλιαι χιλιάδες καὶ μύριαι μυριάδες ἀγγέλων, ἀρχαγγέλων, with the same meaning as R.-P.’s.

²⁴ See: Gignac. *Op. cit.* P. 211-214.

²⁵ See: *Ibid.* P. 208.

²⁶ See: *Ibid.* P. 276-277; cf. lines 154b, 4; 155a, 15; 155a, 24 of our papyrus.

²⁷ See: *Ibid.* P. 157.

²⁸ This form is used, for example, in Photius’ “Lexicon”: Φοτίου τοῦ πατριάρχου λέξεων συναγωγή (Cambridge, 1822). Part. 2. P. 500.

In lines 154b, 18-19 R.-P. rightly corrects a mistake in ΔΟΞΑΛΟΓΟΥΝ//ΤΩΝ: δοξολογούντων: the replacement of α by ο is a special feature of the Greek papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods, and the presence of a liquid makes this interchange even more natural.²⁹

In lines 154b, 20-21 R.-P. reads ΠΛΗΡΗΣΟΥ//ΟΟΥΡΑΝΟΣΤΗΣΔΟΞΗΣΟΥ as πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς <καὶ ἡ γῆ> τῆς δόξης σου, “Heaven and earth are full of Your glory.” If we take into consideration the text of the Barcelona papyrus only, this conjecture is unnecessary. The reading πλήρης σου ὁ οὐρανὸς τῆς δόξης σου, “Your heaven is full of Your glory,” is a bit clumsy yet still acceptable, though this reading would attest that the anaphora contains not just a redaction of the biblical text, usual for Christian anaphoras (πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης σου instead of the πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ of Is. 6: 3),³⁰ but also a complete replacement of the biblical ἡ γῆ by ὁ οὐρανὸς and a doubling of σοῦ replacing the biblical αὐτοῦ. But both the Louvain and Vienna fragments of the anaphora, which begin with the second part of the Sanctus hymn, do contain the word γῆ here. The Louvain fragment has it even twice—both in the Greek transcription of the hymn and in its Coptic translation: ΓΗ ΤΗΣ ΔΟΞΗΣ ΟΟΥ. ΤΠΕ ΜΠΚΑΖ ΜΕΖ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΠΠΕΚΟΟΥ ΠΧΟΕΙC, “[Heaven and] earth [are full] of Your glory. Heaven and earth are full of Your glory, O Lord!” The Vienna fragment of the anaphora opens with:]ς κ[αὶ] ἡ γῆ τῆς ἁγί[, “[Heaven] and earth [are full] of [Your] holy [glory]”—hence, R.-P.’s conjecture here should be accepted.³¹

In line 154b, 22 R.-P. reads ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΟΥΣΟΥ as μονογενεὺς σου, correcting the omitted Σ, which is of course just a scribal oversight.

Line 154b, 25 of the papyrus is fairly complete, but both Louvain. Copt. 27 and P.Vindob. G 41043 add after νεκρούς: οὗ τὴν θανάτου ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμεν. I would insert this addition into the critical text of the anaphora because it is supported by two out of three witnesses to the text.

In line 155a, 1 R.-P. reads ΠΡΟΣΦΕΡΟΜΕΝΕΚΤΙΣΜΑΤΑΣΟΥΤΑΥΤΑ as προσφέρομεν κτίσματά σου ταῦτα, “We offer these Your creations,” not commenting at all on his omission of Ε after ΠΡΟΣΦΕΡΟΜΕΝ. This is highly inaccurate: the line could simply be read as is: προσφέρομεν ἐκτίσματά σου ταῦτα, “We offer these Your payments”—and this reading would have necessarily been preferred had the Louvain fragment been

²⁹⁾ See: Gignac. *Op. cit.* P. 287-289.

³⁰⁾ See: Taft R.F. *The Interpolation...* Vol. 57 (1991). P. 284.

³¹⁾ S. Janeras suggests to make just one more conjecture here— see footnote 73.

completely lost. But the Louvain fragment (the Vienna fragment is of no help here) gives $\epsilon\pi\pi\rho\sigma\phi\epsilon\rho\alpha\ \eta\alpha\kappa\ \eta\eta\epsilon\kappa\ \sigma\omega\eta\tau\ \eta\alpha\iota$, “we offer *You* these creations of Yours.” So I suggest interpreting E in this line of the papyrus as a misspelled ΣΕ, which, in turn, would be a misspelled ΣΟΙ. Thus, the correct reading seems to be: $\pi\rho\sigma\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \sigma\omicron\iota\ \kappa\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$, “We offer *You* these *Your* creations.”

In lines 155a, 3-4 R.-P. omits the doubling of ΤΟΑΓΙΟΝΣΟΥ. This is probably correct. But he also reads ΤΟΑΓΙΟΝΣΟΥ as τὸ ἅγιον, “Holy,” which is an unnecessary conjecture. The text should be read as it stands: τὸ ἅγιόν σου, “Your Holy.”

In lines 155a, 4-5 R.-P. reads ΠΙΝΕΥΜΑΑΞΙΩΝ// $\overline{\text{ΟΥΝΩΝ}}$ as Πνεῦμα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, “Spirit from heaven.” I would not easily agree with a hasty reading of ΑΞΙΩΝ// $\overline{\text{ΟΥΝΩΝ}}$ as ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, because it is impossible phonetically to render ἐκ τῶν as ΑΞΙΩΝ. This obscure sequence could be read in other ways, either as ἄξιον, οὐράνιον, “worthy, heavenly,” or as ἐκ Σιών οὐρανίου,³² “from heavenly Sion”: the rendering of ἐκ Σιών as ΑΞΙΩΝ is much more satisfactory phonetically than that of ἐκ τῶν. But R.-P.’s reading here is supported by evidence of the Louvain fragment, whereas the Vienna fragment abruptly comes to an end a few words before: $\epsilon\text{ΡΟΛ}\ \text{Ϟ\text{Π\text{Π\text{Π\text{Η\text{Γ\text{Ε}}}}$, “from heaven.”³³

In line 155a, 5 R.-P. reads ΕΙΣΤΟΣΩΜΑΤΟΥΠΙΟΗΣΑΙΑΥΤΑ as τοῦ ἁγιάσαι αὐτὰ, “in order to sanctify them.” I strongly disagree with this reading, because the text of the papyrus is quite clear here and needs no such guesswork. ΕΙΣΤΟ is in any case not τοῦ but, obviously, εἰς τὸ, and ΣΩΜΑΤΟΥΠΙΟΗΣΑΙ is very likely a slightly misspelled form of the regular Greek verb $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\pi\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ ³⁴ —σωματοποιῆσαι. The transformation of οἰ into ο in different forms of ποιῶ (including ποιῆσαι) is very common in the papyri;³⁵ and in line 154b, 11 of our papyrus we have already seen an example of an interchange between ου and ο (though in an opposite direction)—such interchange seems to rest on interference between Greek and Coptic.³⁶

³² For this variant and for a conjecture to be discussed next (line 155a, 5) I am indebted to Michael Asmus, whom I thank gratefully.

³³ This reading is in itself a conjecture, though—here in ΠΗΓΕ, “heaven,” only Η is easily legible.

³⁴ See, for example: Liddell H.G., Scott R. *A Greek-English Lexicon / Revised by H.S. Jones and others*. (10th ed.: Oxford, 1996). P. 1749-1750; Lampe G.W.H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. (Oxford, 1961). P. 1367-1368.

³⁵ See: Gignac. *Op. cit.* P. 199-200.

³⁶ See: *Ibid.* P. 213-214; on p. 211 Gignac also states that an unaccented ο, which is the case here, is “tending to be represented by ου.”

R.-P. finds support for his reading³⁷ in some liturgical sources of non-Egyptian provenance,³⁸ but I consider my reading εἰς τὸ σωματοποιῆσαι αὐτὰ, “to represent them materially,” decidedly, preferable, because it does not disturb the clear text of the papyrus itself, and because the term σωματοποιέω is used in connection with the Eucharist precisely in Egyptian Christian writings of the 3rd c.,³⁹ as well as by Pseudo-Macarius and Justin.⁴⁰ Alas, the Louvain fragment, which could lend some support to my reading, is barely legible here. Th. Lefort, its editor, managed to read only the following letters: [.]ΟΥΛΛΒ[.]Δ[.]Μ]ΜΑΠΟΕΙ[Κ]. This Coptic sequence should obviously be interpreted as a qualitative form of ΟΥΟΠ, “sanctify,” plus about 7-8 illegible letters (only Δ in the middle is clearly readable) plus a few other letters that should be parts of some unidentified word or words, plus, probably, the word ΟΕΙΚ, “bread.” I suggest reconstructing the Louvain fragment here as [Τ]ΟΥΛΛΒ[ΟΥ] Δ[ΥΩ ΤΑ] ΜΑΠΟΕΙ[Κ], “for sanctifying them and representing; the bread” etc. Furthermore, despite the fact that in Coptic there is a special word for rendering σωματοποιέω—ΤΑΛΔΟ, which is used mainly in the sense of “to heal”,⁴¹ I remain convinced that the Coptic ΤΟΥΛΛΒΟΥ ΔΥΩ ΤΑΜΔ could well be a translation of the Greek εἰς τὸ σωματοποιῆσαι αὐτὰ, because a Coptic translator might render σωματοποιέω (in the sense “to represent materially”) as ΤΑΜΔ (“to show, to represent”) and then add ΤΟΥΛΛΒ (causative prefix plus qualitative form of “to sanctify”) to explain clearly the notion of Eucharistic transformation contained in εἰς τὸ σωματοποεῖν. When all is said and done, Egyptian writers certainly attest that the term σωματοποιέω was used in a Eucharistic context to denote the transformation of the Holy gifts, and the anaphora considered here (an Egyptian

³⁷ Which seems to be influenced by his erroneous word-division in his diplomatic version of the text.

³⁸ Roca-Puig. *Anàfora de Barcelona i altres pregàries: Missa del segle IV.* (Barcelona, 1994). P. 55.

³⁹ Cf.: Clemens Alexandrinus, *Paedagogus* I. 6. 38 (Marrou H.-I., Harl M. (eds.) *Clément d'Alexandrie, Le Pédagogue. Livre I.* (Paris, 1970: Sources chrétiennes; 70). P. 180); Origenes, *De oratione* 33 (PG 11. Col. 557).

⁴⁰ Cf.: Justinus Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo* 70 (Marcovich M. (ed.) *Iustini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone.* (Berlin; New York, 1997: Patristische Texte und Studien; 47). P. 192); Pseudo-Macarius Magnus, *50 Homiliae spirituales (coll. H)* 4 (PG 34. Col. 481b); idem, *64 Sermones (coll. B)* 49. 7 (PG 34. Col. 896a). It should be noted that the use of this term by Pseudo-Macarius poses again a question of the provenance of at least some parts of the Macarian corpus.

⁴¹ Crum W.E. *A Coptic Dictionary.* (Oxford, 1939). P. 411-412.

one!) is the only possible known liturgical text that might have influenced their use of the term in this very sense.

In lines 155a, 8-9 R.-P. reads ΕΜΕΛΛΕΝΙΑΡΑΔΙΔΟΝΑΙΛΑΒΩΝΑΡΤΟΝ ΚΑΙΕΥΧΑΡΙ//ΣΤΗΣΑΣΚΑΙΕΚΑΛΕΣΕΝΚΑΙΕΔΩΚΕΝ as ἔμελλεν παραδιδόναι ἑαυτὸν, λαβὼν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας, ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν. While the insertion of ἑαυτὸν is quite logical, the omission of καὶ is of course unnecessary. In any case, rendering of ΕΚΑΛΕΣΕΝ as ἔκλασεν and not verbatim as ἐκάλεσεν, “having called,” without any explanation, is unfounded. Of course, R.-P.’s rendering is supported by all variant redactions of the institution narrative,⁴² but here his reading is actually supported not by an external witness, but by the Louvain fragment, which has: ΠΤΕΡΕΦΗΟΥ ΕΥΗΑΠΑΡΑΔΙΔΟΥ ΠΗΟΥ ΔΙΧΙ ΠΠΟΙΚ ΔΙΦΠΙΖΜΟΥ ΕΖΡΑΙ ΕΧΩΙ ΔΙΦΜΟΥ ΕΡΟΥ ΔΙΦΠΩΪ ΔΙΓΑΔΑ, “when He was going to give Himself, took bread, has given thanks upon it, has blessed it, broke, gave,” and R.-P. fails to notice this.

In line 155a, 10 R.-P. reads ΤΟΥΤΟΜΟΙΕΣΤΙΝΤΟΣΩΜΑ as τοῦτό μου ἔστιν τὸ σῶμα, “this is My body.” While he is probably correct in interpreting ΜΟΙ as μου, and both the corresponding New Testament passages (Mt 26: 26, Mk 14: 22, Lk 22: 19, 1 Cor 11: 24) and the Louvain fragment, which gives here ΠΑΩΜΑ, “My body,” support his interpretation, a straightforward reading, τοῦτό μοι ἔστιν τὸ σῶμα, should not have been discounted so easily.

In lines 155a, 12-13 R.-P. reads ΛΑΒΕΤΕ//ΠΙΕΤΕΤΟΑΙΜΑ as λάβετε, πίετε· τοῦτό μου ἔστιν τὸ αἷμα, “Take, drink—this is My blood.” While this reading is generally supported by the Louvain fragment, which has: ΧΙ ΠΤΕΤΠΩ. ΠΑΪ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΠΑΩΜΟΥ, “Take, drink—for (γάρ) this is My blood,” the papyrus still could be read here without a conjecture: λάβετε, πίετε τὸ αἷμα, “take, drink the blood.”

In line 155a, 13 R.-P. is right in inserting N⁴³ and correcting the misspelled O⁴⁴ in ΕΚΧΥΟΜΕΝΩΝ: ἐκχυνόμενον, “shed.” The Louvain fragment abruptly ends shortly after this word.

⁴² However, in patristic literature there are a few examples of the use of ἐκάλεσεν in connection with the σῶμα of Christ and His Church: in reference to the Eucharist, cf. Hesychius, *Comm. brevis in Ps* 77. 24: Τὸ μάννα ὡς ἀχειροποίητον οὐράνιον ἐκάλεσεν, ἐσήμανε δὲ τὸ σῶμα Χριστοῦ (Jagic V. *Supplementum Psalterii Bononiensis. Incerti auctoris explanatio Graeca*. Vienna, 1917), and in a more general sense, cf. Theodoretus, *Interpr. in xiv epistulas s. Pauli*: Χριστὸν ἐνταῦθα τὸ κοινὸν σῶμα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἐκάλεσε (PG. 82. Col. 325).

⁴³ Cf. Gignac. *Op. cit.* P. 117.

⁴⁴ See: *Ibid.* P. 277.

In line 155a, 14 R.-P. rightly corrects H in ΑΦΗΣΙΝ: ἄφεσιν, “remission.”⁴⁵

In lines 155a, 15-16 R.-P. reads ΟΣΟΚΙΝΕΑΝΟΥΝΕΡΧΟΝΤΕΣ//ΠΟΙΟΥΝΤΕΣ ΣΟΥ ΤΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΝ as ὁσάκις ἐὰν συνερχόμενοι ποιῶμεν τὴν ἀνάμνησιν, “each time when we meet together, we shall make the remembrance.” This reading is influenced by the following division into words in R.-P.’s diplomatic version: ΟΣΟΚΙΝ ΕΑΝ ΟΥΝΕΡΧΟΝΤΕΣ ΠΟΙΟΥΝΤΕΣ ΣΟΥ ΤΗΝ ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΝ. But it is doubtful that the scribe has indeed rendered a conjectured ὁσάκις plus συνερχόμενοι ποιῶμεν as ΟΣΟΚΙΝ and ΟΥΝΕΡΧΟΝΤΕΣ//ΠΟΙΟΥΝΤΕΣ respectively. Meanwhile, ΟΥΝΕΡΧΟΝΤΕΣ//ΠΟΙΟΥΝΤΕΣ could be interpreted without any guesswork at all as οὖν ἔρχοντες ποιοῦντες, “when meeting together, making.” Though, this seems to be a construction too complicated for a prayer. In sum, I suggest we read the sequence ΟΥΝΕΡΧΟΝΤΕΣ//ΠΟΙΟΥΝΤΕΣ as συνέρχοντες, ποιοῦντες, supposing that the scribe confused O and Σ, which were written in a similar way. ΟΣΟΚΙΝΕΑΝ, then, could be read as ὡς ἐκεῖνοι ἄν.⁴⁶ We have already seen an example of the replacement of ω by o in lines 154b, 4; 154b, 12 and 155a, 24 of our papyrus, while interchange between οἱ (or υ) and ε (or αἱ) in unaccented syllables occurs in the papyri many times and is probably a result of bilingual interference.⁴⁷ So the reading I suggest is preferable than R.-P.’s (moreover, a pseudo-diacritical mark above O could even be interpreted in the sense of a correction of a misspelled letter). This reading may seem a bit unnatural, especially in comparison with ὁσάκις ἐὰν / ὁσάκις γὰρ ἐὰν in 1 Cor 11: 25-26, the *locus theologicus* for this very place of the anaphora, but, I repeat, substitution of ὁσάκις with ΟΣΟΚΙΝ is unlikely phonetically. Besides, a search query in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* gives no instance of a use of ὁσάκις ἐὰν together with a participle form (NB: here in the papyrus we have συνέρχοντες, ποιοῦντες), while there are a number of instances of the use of ὡς ἐκεῖνοι ἄν with an aorist participle. One of these is found in Athanasius of Alexandria: ὡς ἂν ἐκεῖνοι μωμέντες,⁴⁸ i.e. in a work of an author of the same time and provenance as the Barcelona papyrus.⁴⁹ Finally, I see no reason for omitting ΣΟΥ after ΠΟΙΟΥΝΤΕΣ.

⁴⁵ See: *Ibid.* P. 273-275.

⁴⁶ I gratefully thank Andrej Vinogradov who helped me to establish the most plausible variant for interpreting the ΟΣΟΚΙΝΕΑΝ sequence.

⁴⁷ See: Gignac. *Op. cit.* P. 245.

⁴⁸ Athanasius Magnus, *Orationes tres contra Arianos.* 44 (PG 26. Col. 417).

⁴⁹ Yet, in the given passage of Athanasius we have the ὡς ἐκεῖνοι ἄν sequence in reversed order; but, for example, in John Chrysostom’s homilies on Paul’s Epistle to the Romans,

Thus it seems that the whole sequence should read ὡς ἐκεῖνοι ἄν συνέρχοντες, ποιούντες σου τὴν ἀνάμνησιν, “like those [*i.e.* the apostles], whenever we meet together, we make the remembrance of You.”

Lines 155a, 19-20 show an obvious omission after ΑΓΙΑΣΗΣ in ΑΓΙΑΣΗΣΤΟΙΣΠΙΑΣΙΝΕΞΑΥΤΩΝ//ΜΕΤΑΛΑΜΒΑΝΟΥΣΙΝ. It seems that the scribe has omitted one or two lines here. R.-P. suggests filling the gap with an expression from the Byzantine anaphora of Basil⁵⁰ and to read ΜΕΤΑΛΑΜΒΑΝΟΥΣΙΝ as an imperfect (μετελαμβάνουσιν): ἀγιάσης πάντας τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου τούτων μετέχοντας, ὥστε γενέσθαι τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐξ αὐτῶν μετελαμβάνουσιν, “You would sanctify all who have taken part from the bread and the cup, so that to all who have received Communion they [the bread and cup] will be...”. I suggest reading ΜΕΤΑΛΑΜΒΑΝΟΥΣΙΝ without any alteration as μεταλαμβάνουσιν, “[those who] communicate.” And while acknowledging an omission here, I would just mark it without filling in the gap, precisely because any conjecture here (and especially one based on a non-Egyptian source) would be a mere fantasy.

In lines 155a, 21-22 R.-P. reads ΜΕΤΟΧΗΝ//ΑΦΘΑΡΣΙΑΝ as μετοχήν ἀφθαρσίας, “communication of incorruption.” While he is probably right in his interpretation, taking into account the fact that the same construction (Acc.+Gen.) is repeated many times in the following enumeration of spiritual gifts (κοινωνίαν Πνεύματος... καταρτισμὸν πίστεως καὶ ἀληθείας... συντελείωσιν... θελήματος),⁵¹ it is also true that ΜΕΤΟΧΗΝ//ΑΦΘΑΡΣΙΑΝ could be read as μετοχήν, ἀφθαρσίαν, “communication [and] incorruption,” and this literal reading should not be passed over without commentary.

In line 155a, 24 R.-P. correctly reads ΔΟΞΑΖΟΜΕΝ as a conjunctive: δοξάζομεν, “[will] glorify” (cf. lines 154b, 4; 154b, 12; 155a, 15; 155a, 24 of our papyrus).

In line 155a, 25 R.-P. reads ΑΓΙΑΣΜΕΝΟΥ as ἡγιασμένου, but I see no need to disturb the clear text of the papyrus, which contains the form ἡγιασμένου not only here, but also in the following prayer of thanksgiv-

for example, we have the following passage: καὶ οὗτοι γοῦν, φησὶν, ὡς ἐκεῖνοι ἄν ἐγένοντο (PG 60. Col. 562).

⁵⁰ Hänggi A., Pahl I. *Præx Eucharistica: Textus e variis Liturgiis antiquioribus selecti*. (Fribourg, 1968: Spicilegium Friburgense; 12). P. 238, 335.

⁵¹ This argument seems to be of greater importance than the citation ἴν ἀφθαρσίας Roca-Puig found in a thanksgiving prayer from the papyrus P.Berol 13918.

ing after Communion, which occupies a part of the folium 155b of the papyrus.

In line 155b, 3 R.-P. rightly corrects iotacisms (cf. line 154b, 2 of our papyrus) in ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΟΥΜΕΝΣΟΙΕΠΙΕΙΤΗΜΕΤΑΛΛΗΜΨΙΤΟΥΑΡΤΟΥ—εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι ἐπὶ τῇ μεταλήμψει, “we offer you thanks for the Communion.”

In line 155b, 4 R.-P. reads ΚΑΙΤΟΥΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΥΚΑΙΤΟΥΑΓΙΑΣΜΕΝΟΥ as καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ, “and of the cup of sanctification.” R.-P. explains his conjecture by a reference to a Milanese papyrus edited by Ghedini.⁵² In his commentaries, R.-P. also offers another conjecture: καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου τοῦ ἁγιασμένου, “and of the sanctified cup,” which he considers an “acceptable sense”. For me, the literal reading of what the papyrus itself contains, καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ ἁγιασμένου, already is an “acceptable sense”: in the anaphora, He who is called ἁγιασμένος is Christ Himself—see my commentary on line 155a, 25 above. This means that Christ “is sanctified” either by God the Father or by Christians—and if the first interpretation, that Christ is eternally sanctified by God the Father, may seem dubious, the second finds its parallel in other Egyptian anaphoras, which depict Christian worship as a “sanctification” of God by the worshippers.⁵³ So the line in question should be read literally: καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ ἁγιασμένου, “and of cup and of [Him, Who is] sanctified [*i.e.* Christ].”

In lines 155b, 5-6 R.-P. is right in correcting three orthographic errors of the scribe: παρακαλοῦμέν σε, “we beseech You”, (papyrus: ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΟΥΜΕΝΣΟΙ; cf. line 155a, 16 of our papyrus) and μετεληφότας ἀπ’ αὐτῶν, “those who have received a part from them [e.g. Holy Gifts—*M. Zh.*]” (papyrus: ΜΕΤΕΛΗΦΟΤΑΣΥΠΙΑΥΤΩΝ).⁵⁴

In line 155b, 8 R.-P. reads ΑΓΙΑΝ as ἁγνεῖαν, “purity,” noting in his commentary that other readings could also be suggested, e.g. ἁγιοσύνη,

⁵² Ghedini G. *Frammenti liturgici in un papiro milanese*, in: *Aegyptus*, 13:2 (1933). P. 667-673.

⁵³ Anaphoras: of the Liturgy of Mark (Cuming G.J. (ed.) *The Liturgy of St. Mark*. (Roma, 1990: *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*; 234). P. 37), from the Euchologion of Sarapion (Johnson M.E. *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Literary, Liturgical and Theological Analysis*. (Roma, 1995: *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*; 249). P. 46), from the papyrus from Dêr-Balyzeh (van Haelst J. *Une nouvelle reconstitution du papyrus liturgique de Dêr-Balizeh*, in: *Ephemerides Theologicae Louvanienses*. Vol. 45 (1969). P. 444-455, here: p. 448).

⁵⁴ See: Gignac. *Op. cit.* P. 256-257.

ύγίαιαν, ύγείαν, ἄδειαν. Of these, I would prefer ύγείαν, “health”, because it is more natural phonetically—to spell ύγείαν as ἀγίαν, not ἀγνείαν; furthermore, a wish that Holy Communion should grant a communicant both bodily and spiritual health is very common in the thanksgiving prayers.

In lines 155b, 9, 11 and 12 R.-P. rightly corrects three orthographic errors of the scribe: ἀνανέωσιν, “renewal” (papyrus: ANAINEΩΣΙΝ),⁵⁵ φιλαλληλίαν, “mutual love” (papyrus: ΦΙΛΛΗΛΙΑΝ),⁵⁶ ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθέντα, “man who is created after God” (papyrus: ΑΝΘΡΩ-ΠΙΟΝΤΟΚΑΤΑΘΕΟΝΚΤΙΣΘΕΝΤΑ).⁵⁷

In line 155b, 13 R.-P. reads ΑΜΑΧΥΝΤΟΙ as ἀναίσχυντοι, “shameless.” I suggest ἀμάχητοι, “invincible,” instead. My reading seems to be more satisfactory phonetically, because it needs no guesswork in replacing μ by ν and α with αι (stressed!), while an interchange of υ and η in the papyri “occurs frequently in all phonetic conditions throughout the Roman and Byzantine periods,”⁵⁸ and insertions of nasals before stops are also “very frequent.”⁵⁹

Finally, in line 155b, 14 R.-P. reads ΑΠΟΠΙΑΝΤΟΣΑΝΟΜΙΩΝΚΑΙΤΕΛΕΙΟΜΕΝΟΙ as ἀπὸ παντὸς <κακοῦ καὶ λελυτρωμένοι ἀπὸ πασῶν> ἀνομιῶν καὶ τέλειοι <καὶ πεπληροφορη>μένοι, “from every evil and freed from all crimes and accomplished and plentiful.” Both conjectures are explained as resembling some biblical verses. I see absolutely no need of either conjecture here, because the genitive plural ἀνομιῶν could be understood as a partitive genitive, and thus the literal text of the papyrus reads literally perfectly well as: ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀνομιῶν καὶ τελειομένοι, “from each of crimes, and being accomplished” etc.

There are also a few minor editorial errors in R.-P.’s edition of both the anaphora and the thanksgiving prayer: in the anaphora διαθήκης is written instead of διαθήκης (155a, 7), in the thanksgiving prayer the concluding Σ of line 155b, 13 is found in the beginning of line 155b, 14; conjectures are indicated only occasionally.

Finally, I should repeat that R.-P. is usually right in correcting minor misspellings and scribal errors, while his main conjectured interpretations

⁵⁵) On an interchange of α and αι in medial position see: *Ibid.* P. 195.

⁵⁶) On the sporadic interchange of α and η see: *Ibid.* P. 286; on simplification and gemination of liquids see: *Ibid.* P. 155-156.

⁵⁷) On omission of final ν before a word beginning with a stop see: *Ibid.* P. 111-112.

⁵⁸) *Ibid.* P. 262; examples for the case we have here are given on p. 264.

⁵⁹) *Ibid.* P. 118-119.

are often unnecessary and could be agreed with only when they are supported by the Louvain or the Vienna fragments. As a result, R.-P.'s edition of the text of the anaphora and thanksgiving prayer is unreliable. Having shown this, I will now present my own reconstruction of the text, based on all its three known manuscripts—P.Monts.Roca inv. 154b-155b, Louvain. Copt. 27 and P.Vindob. G 41043.

I. 3. Critical Text of the Anaphora and Thanksgiving Prayer from the Barcelona Papyrus

In providing the critical text of the anaphora and thanksgiving prayer I am adhering to the following principles. Wordings of the main manuscript witness (i.e. P.Monts.Roca inv. 154b-155b) are kept without any alterations as much as possible; when a conjecture is inevitable, the closest to the literal text of P.Monts.Roca inv. 154b-155b is chosen. Only once I omit a few words from the text of the main manuscript witness and on three occasions I insert a few words into it. These emendations were made only because both the Louvain and Vienna fragments agree together against the main papyrus; all these changes (the omission and insertions) are indicated by the angle brackets: <>, as well as in the apparatus. A lacuna in line 155a, 19 is indicated by the square brackets: []. Abbreviated Divine names are deciphered, but this is indicated by the parentheses: (). For the convenience of comparing the critical text with the diplomatic version, division into lines is kept exactly as is in the main papyrus; the apparatus is given after the anaphora and after the thanksgiving prayer separately. In the apparatus, the original readings of the Barcelona papyrus (B) are given whenever a conjecture is made; the variant readings of the Louvain fragment (L) are given without translation (i.e. in Coptic); the variant readings of the Vienna fragment (V) are given only when they are (at least partly) readable and are not pure conjectures themselves. In order to make the text clear all biblical and patristic references are given below, as footnotes to the English translation.

[P.Monts.Roca inv. 154b]

Εἰς Θεός—Ἰησοῦς ὁ Κύριος
Εὐχαριστία περὶ ἄρτου καὶ ποτηρίου
Ἄνω τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν—Ἐχομεν πρὸς
Κύριον—Ἐτι εὐχαριστήσωμεν—Ἀξίον καὶ δίκαι-

- 5 ον. Ἄξιόν ἐστιν καὶ δίκαιον· σὲ αἰνεῖν, σὲ
 εὐλογεῖν, σὲ ὑμνεῖν, σοὶ εὐχαριστεῖν, Δέσποτα
 Θε(ε)ῖ παντοκράτωρ τοῦ Κ(υρίου) ἡμῶν Ἰ(ησοῦ) Χ(ριστοῦ), ὁ ποι-
 ῆσας τὰ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι,
 τὰ πάντα· οὐρανοῦς, γῆν, θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ
 10 ἐν αὐτοῖς, διὰ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου σου παιδὸς Ἰ(ησοῦ) Χ(ριστοῦ)
 τοῦ Κ(υρίου) ἡμῶν, δι' οὗ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ σκοτότος
 εἰς φῶς, ἀπὸ ἀγνωσίας εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν δόξης ὀνό-
 ματος αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ φθορᾶς θανάτου εἰς ἀφθαρ-
 σίαν, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον· ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ ἄρμα-
 15 τος χερουβὶν καὶ σαραφὶν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ·
 ᾧ παριστάσιν χίλιαι χιλιάδες καὶ μύριαι
 μυριάδες ἀγγέλων, ἀρχαγγέλων, θρόνων
 καὶ κυριοτήτων, ὑμνούντων καὶ δοξολογούν-
 των· μεθ' ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμνοῦντες, λέγοντες,
 20 Ἄγιος, Ἄγιος, Ἄγιος, Κύριος Σαβαώθ· πλήρης <>
 ὁ οὐρανὸς <καὶ ἡ γῆ> τῆς δόξης σου· ἐν ᾧ ἐδόξασας ἡμᾶς δι-
 ἄ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου καὶ πρωτοτόκου πάσης κτί-
 σεως Ἰ(ησοῦ) Χ(ριστοῦ), τοῦ Κ(υρίου) ἡμῶν· ὁ καθήμενος ἐν
 δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης σου ἐν τοῖς οὐρανό-
 25 οῖς· ὃς ἔρχεται κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς <οὗ τὴν θανάτου ἀνάμνησιν
 ποιοῦμεν>

[P.Monts.Roca inv. 155a]

- δι' οὗ προσφερόμεν σοὶ κτίσματά σου ταῦτα, ἄρ-
 τον τε καὶ ποτήριον· αἰτούμεθα καὶ παρακαλου-
 μέν σε ὅπως καταπέμψῃς ἐπ' αὐτὰ τὸ ἅγιόν σου
 καὶ παράκλητόν σου Πνεῦμα ἐκ τῶν
 5 οὐ(ρα)νῶν· εἰς τὸ σωματοποιῆσαι αὐτὰ καὶ ποιῆσαι
 τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα Χρ(ιστοῦ), τὸ δὲ ποτήριον αἷμα Χρ(ιστοῦ),
 τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης· Καθὼς καὶ αὐτός, ἠνίκα
 ἔμελλεν παραδιδόναι <εαυτόν>, λαβὼν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαρι-
 στήσας καὶ ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς
 10 αὐτοῦ λέγων· Λάβετε, φάγετε, τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα.
 Καὶ ὁμοίως, μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λαβὼν ποτή-
 ριον, εὐχαριστήσας, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· Λάβετε,
 πίετε τὸ αἷμα τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς
 ἄφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν· Καὶ ἡμεῖς τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦμεν
 15 εἰς τὴν σὴν ἀνάμνησιν, ὡς ἐκεῖνοι ἄν συνέρχοντες,
 ποιοῦντές σου τὴν ἀνάμνησιν, τοῦ ἁγίου μυστη-
 ρίου διδασκάλου καὶ βασιλέως καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν
 Ἰ(ησοῦ) Χρ(ιστοῦ). Ναί, ἀξιοῦμέν σε, Δέσποτα, ὅπως εὐλογῶν
 εὐλογῆσῃς καὶ ἁγίως ἀγιάσῃς [...] τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐξ αὐτῶν
 20 μεταλαμβάνουσιν εἰς πίστιν ἀδιάκριτον, εἰς μετο-
 χὴν ἀφθαρσίας, εἰς κοινωνίαν Πνεύματος ἁγίου,

- εἰς καταρτισμὸν πίστεως καὶ ἀληθείας, εἰς συντε-
 λείωσιν παντὸς θελήματός σου, ἵνα ἔτι καὶ ἐν τούτῳ
 δοξάζωμεν τὸ πανέντιμον καὶ πανάγιον ὄνο-
 25 μά σου, διὰ τοῦ ἁγιασμένου σου παιδὸς Ἰ(ησοῦ) Χρ(ιστοῦ) τοῦ
 Κ(υρίου) ἡμῶν, δι' οὗ σοὶ δόξα, κράτος εἰς τοὺς ἀκηράτους
 αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· Ἀμήν.

154b

2 Εὐχαριστία] ευχαριστειας B; 3 Ἔχομεν] ευζομεν B; 4 εὐχαριστήσωμεν]
 ευχαρισθησομεν B; 9 γῆν] την B; 11 σκότους] σκοτος B; 12 ἐπίγνωσιν]
 επιγνωσιον B; 13 αὐτοῦ] αυτω B; 15 σαραφὶν] σαρραφιν B; 16 χίλιαι χιλιάδες]
 χειλιαις χειλιαδων B; 17 ἀγγέλων, ἀρχαγγέλων] αγγελων αρχαγγελων B;
 18-19 δοξολογούντων] δοξαλογουντων B; 20 πλήρης] σου add. B; 20-21 πλήρης
 ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης σου] duplic. L; 21 καὶ ἡ γῆ] om. B; 21 τῆς] ἁγίας
 add. V; 21 σου] πικροεις add. L; 22 σου] ου B; 22 σου] πῆμιρε add. L; 22 καὶ] τοῦ
 V; 23 τοῦ Κ(υρίου) ἡμῶν] om. L; 24 σου] om. L; 25 οὗ τὴν θανάτου ἀνάμνησιν
 ποιούμεν] om. B.

155a

1 δι' οὗ] om. L; προσφέρομεν] προσφερωμεν V; 1 σοὶ] ε B; 1 ταῦτα] πεῖ add. L;
 2 τε καὶ] μήπιεῖ L; 2 αἰτούμεθα] δεόμεθα V; 3 καταπέμψης ἐπ' αὐτά] ε. α. κ. V; 3
 τὸ] om. V; 3 τὸ ἅγιόν σου] duplic. B; 4 σου] om. L; 4 ἐκ τῶν] αξιων B; 5
 σωματοποιῆσαι] σωματουποησαι B; 5 εἰς τὸ σωματοποιῆσαι αὐτὰ καὶ
 ποιῆσαι] <Τ>ΟΥΑΔΒ<ΟΥ> Δ<Υ>Ω ΤΑ>ΝΑ- L; 6 Χρ(ιστοῦ)... Χρ(ιστοῦ) πῆπεχ<...
 πῆπε<εχ<... L; 8 ἑαυτόν] om. B; 7 αὐτός] add. L; 8-9 καὶ... καὶ... καὶ...] om. L;
 8-9 εὐχαριστήσας] ΔΑΦΠΡΗΜΟΤ ΕΖΡΑΪ ΕΧΩΙ ΔΙΣΗΟΥ L; 9 ἔκλασεν] εκαλεσεν
 B; 10 λέγων] ΗΑΥ add. L; 10 τοῦτό] ΓΑΡ add. L; 10 μού] μοι B; 10 σώμα]
 ΕΤΟΥΓΑΤΑΔΑ ΔΡΑΥΤῆ add. L; 12 εὐχαριστήσας] ΟΗ ΔΑΦΠΡΗΜΟΤ ΕΖΡΑΪ ΕΧΩΙ
 L; 13 τὸ αἶμα] ΠΑΪ ΓΑΡ ΠΕ ΠΑΣΗΟΥ L; 14 ἄφεςιν] αφησιν B; 15 ὡς ἐκείνοι]
 οσοκινε B; 21 ἀφθαρσίας] αφθαρσιαν B; 24 δοξάζωμεν] δοξαζομεν B.

[P.Monts.Roca inv. 155b]

Εἰς Θεός

- Ἔτι δεόμεθά σου, Δέσποτα Θ(ε)ῖ παντοκράτωρ, καὶ
 εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι ἐπὶ τῇ μεταλήμψει τοῦ ἄρτου
 τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου, καὶ τοῦ ἁγιασμένου· καὶ
 5 παρακαλοῦμέν σε ὅπως ἁγιάσης ἡμᾶς πάντας
 τοὺς μετειληφότες ἀπ' αὐτῶν· πρὸς τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι
 ἡμῖν εἰς κρίμα ἢ εἰς κατάκριμα, τοῖς μεταλαμ-
 βάνουσιν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς ὑγίαν σαρκὸς καὶ ψυχῆς,
 εἰς ἀνανέωσιν τοῦ πνεύματος ἡμῶν, εἰς πίστιν
 10 καὶ σωφροσύνην, εἰς ἰσχὺν καὶ δύναμιν, εἰς ἀγάπην
 καὶ φιλαλληλίαν, εἰς συντέλειαν παντὸς θελήματός σου,

- εἰς τέλειόν σου ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθέντα·
 ἵνα ὦμεν τέλειοι καὶ καθαροὶ, ἀμάχητοι, σεσωσ-
 μένοι ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀνομιῶν καὶ τελειομένοι ἐν
 15 παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ·
 δι' οὗ σοὶ δόξα, κράτος, αἰῶνος τιμὴ, μεγαλωσύνη·
 καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν
 αἰῶνων· Ἀμήν. Εἰς Θεός
- 3 ἐπὶ] ἐπει B; μεταλήμψει] μεταλημψι B; 5 σε] σοι B; 6 μετεκληφόμενος ἀπ'
 αὐτῶν] μετεκληφόμενος ὑπ αὐτῶν B; 8 ὑγείαν] αγίαν B; 9 ἀνανέωσιν] ἀνανεώσιν
 B; 11 φιλαλληλίαν] φιλληλίαν B; 12 τὸν] το B; 13 ἀμάχητοι] ἀμαχυντοὶ B.

I. 4. *English Translation of the Anaphora and the Thanksgiving Prayer from the Barcelona Papyrus*⁶⁰

[Anaphora]

—One God.⁶¹

—Jesus the Lord.

“Thanksgiving for the bread and the cup.”

⁶⁰ In giving textual parallels I am adhering to the following principles. Biblical references are given always when an expression shows some proximity with a biblical phrase (OT citations are always taken from the Septuagint; when I cite deuterocanonical books or when the numbering differs from the Masoretic text, this is explicitly marked by an abbreviation: LXX). Patristic parallels are given from the 1-4th century sources with a special attention paid to texts of Egyptian provenance. Parallels from purely liturgical sources (namely, from Greek Liturgies of Mark, James, Basil, John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzus; from the Euchology of Sarapion; from some Egyptian liturgical papyri—i.e. only from the texts of the eucharistic rites preserved in Greek) are given (with a citation—because most of these have no common numbering) only when a *particular* expression of the anaphora or thanksgiving prayer resembles some *particular* expression in these sources. In other words, obvious parallels in such anaphoral commonplaces as: the Ἄνω τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν and Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον in the initial dialogue of anaphora, the Ἅγιος, Ἅγιος, Ἅγιος... in the Sanctus, the words of Institution, the final “Amen”, are totally omitted. In cases of verbal conformity of expressions an equal sign (=) is used. All parallels except biblical are accompanied by a reference to an edition of the text.

⁶¹ Εἰς Θεός—this acclamation was very popular in the Early Church (see Peterson E. *Εἰς Θεός: Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. (Göttingen, 1926: Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments; 411)).

—Up our hearts.

—We have to the Lord.

—Let us also give thanks.⁶²

—Fitting and right.

It is fitting and right to praise You, to bless You, to hymn You, to give You thanks,⁶³ ο Master, God Pantocrator of our Lord Jesus Christ,⁶⁴ Who created all things from non-existence into being, all: heaven and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them,⁶⁵—through Your beloved child Jesus Christ, our Lord, through

⁶² Or: “*Then*. Let us give thanks”—ἔτι here can be taken as just a rubric. I am grateful for the idea to S. Janeras.

⁶³ σὲ αἰνεῖν, σὲ εὐλογεῖν, σὲ ὑμνεῖν, σοὶ εὐχαριστεῖν—cf. Liturgy of Mark (Byzantine redaction): σὲ αἰνεῖν, σὲ ὑμνεῖν, σὲ εὐλογεῖν, σὲ προσκυνεῖν, σοὶ ἀνθομολογεῖσθαι (Cumming. *Op. cit.* P. 21-22); Liturgy of the Euchology of Sarapion: σὲ... αἰνεῖν, ὑμνεῖν, δοξολογεῖν (Johnson. *Op. cit.* P. 46); Liturgy of Basil (Byzantine redaction): σὲ αἰνεῖν, σὲ ὑμνεῖν, σὲ εὐλογεῖν, σὲ προσκυνεῖν, σοὶ εὐχαριστεῖν, σὲ δοξάζειν (Hänggi A., Pahl I. (eds.) *Prex Eucharistica*. (Fribourg, 1968: Spicilegium Friburgense; 12). P. 230); Liturgy of John Chrysostom: σὲ ὑμνεῖν, σὲ εὐλογεῖν, [modern editions add: σὲ αἰνεῖν,] σοὶ εὐχαριστεῖν, σὲ προσκυνεῖν (*ibid.* P. 224); Liturgy of James (Byzantine redaction): σὲ αἰνεῖν, σὲ ὑμνεῖν, σὲ εὐλογεῖν, σὲ προσκυνεῖν, σὲ δοξολογεῖν, σοὶ εὐχαριστεῖν (B.-Ch. Mercier (ed.) *La liturgie de Saint Jacques*. (Turnhout, 1974: Patrologia Orientalis; 126: 2). P. 198 [84]); Liturgy of Gregory of Nazianz: σε αἰνεῖν, σὲ εὐλογεῖν, σὲ προσκυνεῖν, σὲ δοξάζειν (Gerhards A. *Die griechische Gregoriosanaphora: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Eucharistischen Hochgebets*. (Münster, 1984: Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen; 65). S. 22).

⁶⁴ Θεὸς παντοκράτωρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—cf. Eph 1: 17. Compare this with the initial address in the anaphora of Athanasius: Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Hammerstaedt. *Op. cit.* S. 135-139).

⁶⁵ ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος... οὐρανοῦς, γῆν, θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς—cf. 2 Macc [LXX] 7: 28; ὁ ποιήσας... οὐρανοῦς, γῆν, θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς—cf. Exod 20: 11. Cf. also Liturgy of Basil (Egyptian redaction): ποιήσας οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ πάντα ἐν αὐτοῖς (Hänggi, Pahl. *Op. cit.* P. 348).

Additional parallels: ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι—cf. Philo Judaeus, *Quod Deus sit immutabilis* 119 (Wendland P. (ed.) *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. (Berlin, 1897). Bd. 2. S. 52); idem, *De vita Mosis* 2. 267 (Cohn R. (ed.) *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. (Berlin, 1902). Bd. 4. S. 112); Hermas, *Pastor* Mand. I. 1 (26. 1) (Joly R. (ed.) *Hermas, Le Pasteur*. (Paris, 1958: Sources chrétiennes; 53). P. 144) (cited by name by Athanasius Magnus, *De incarnatione Verbi* 3. 1 (Kannengiesser G. (ed.) *Athanasie d’Alexandrie, Sur l’incarnation du Verbe*. (Paris, 1973: Sources chrétiennes; 199). P. 268) and others); Origenes, *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis*. 32. 16. 188 (PG 14. Col. 784); Athanasius Magnus, *De decretis Nicaenae Synodi* 18. 3 (PG 25b. Col. 448).

Whom You have called us from darkness into light,⁶⁶ from ignorance to knowledge of the glory of His name, from decay of death into incorruption,⁶⁷ into life eternal;⁶⁸

Who sits on the chariot, Cherubim and Seraphim before it,⁶⁹ Who is attended by thousands of thousands and myriads of myriads of angels,⁷⁰ archangels,

In Greek anaphoras the idea of creation *ex nihilo* is also explicitly expressed in the anaphora of the Liturgy of John Chrysostom: Σὺ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς παρήγαγες (Hänggi, Pahl. *Op. cit.* P. 224). Cf. also the unidentified prayer (part of the anaphora? preanaphoral prayer?) from the papyrus from Dêr-Balyzeh: ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων καὶ εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα παραγαγὼν (van Haelst J. *Une nouvelle reconstitution du papyrus liturgique de Dêr-Balîzeh*, in: *Ephemerides Theologicae Louvanienses*. Vol. 45 (1969). P. 444-455, here: p. 447).

⁶⁶ διὰ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου σου παιδὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, δι' οὗ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς, ἀπὸ ἀγνωσίας εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν δόξης ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ = Clemens Romanus, *Epistula ii ad Corinthios* 59. 2 (Jaubert A. (ed.) *Clément de Rome, Épître aux Corinthiens*. (Paris, 1971: Sources chrétiennes; 167). P. 194) (Clement gives αὐτοῦ instead of σου).

Additional parallels: διὰ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου σου παιδὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—cf. Acts 3: 13; 4: 30; Eph 1: 16; *Didache* 9-10 (Niederwimmer K. *Die Didache*. (Göttingen, 1993: Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern; 1) S. 174-175); *Martyrium Polycarpi* 14; 20 (Musurillo H. (ed.) *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*. (Oxford, 1972). P. 15; 20); *Acta Joannis* 11 (Junod E., Kaestli J.-D. (eds.) *Acta Iohannis*. (Turnhout, 1983: Corpus Christianorum—Series apocryphorum; 1). P. 877); Clemens Alexandrinus, *Quis dives salvetur* 42 (Stählin O., Früchtel L., Treu U. (ed.) *Clemens Alexandrinus, Werke*. (Berlin, 1970 (2nd ed.): Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller; 17). Bd. 3. S. 191); Origenes, *Epistula ad Africanum* (PG 11. Col. 48); Hippolytus Romanus, *Commentarium in Daniele* 4. 60. 3 (Lefèvre M., Bardy G. (eds.) *Hippolyte, Commentaire sur Daniel*. (Paris, 1947: Sources chrétiennes; 14). P. 386). *Constitutiones Apostolorum* VII. 25-27; 38; VIII. 5; 13; 40; 41; 48 (Metzger M. (ed.) *Les Constitutions Apostoliques: T. 3*. (Paris, 1987: Sources chrétiennes; 336). P. 52-56; 88; 146; 208; 254; 258; 310). See also: Roca-Puig R. *Citas y reminiscencias bíblicas en las anáforas griegas más primitivas: Los vocablos πᾶς γ' ἡγαπημένος en P. Barc. inv. n° 154b-157*, in: *Byzantina*. Vol. 4 (1972). P. 193-203. Cf. footnote 97.

δι' οὗ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς—cf. 2 Thess 2: 14; 1 Pe 2: 9; Acts 26: 18.

⁶⁷ ἀπὸ φθορᾶς θανάτου εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν—cf. 4 Macc [LXX] 9: 22; Rom 8: 21; 1 Cor 15: 42; Athanasius Magnus, *De incarnatione Verbi* 8. 4 (Kannengiesser G. (ed.) *Athanasie d'Alexandrie, Sur l'incarnatione du Verbe*. (Paris, 1973: Sources chrétiennes; 199). P. 292-294).

⁶⁸ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον—cf. Dan 12: 2; Mt 25: 46; Jn 4: 14; 6: 27; Acts 13: 48; Rom 5: 21; 1 Tit 1: 16; Jud 1: 21.

⁶⁹ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ ἄρματος χερουβὶν καὶ σεραφὶν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ. Another variant of translation: “Who sits on the chariot of Cherubim, and Seraphim before it”; cf. Is 6: 2; Ezek 43: 3; Sir [LXX] 49: 8; Acts 8: 28. I prefer the variant “Who sits on the chariot, Cherubim and Seraphim before it” because this would opt for a specifically Egyptian exegesis of Is 6: 2 (see Johnson. *Op. cit.* P. 208-216).

⁷⁰ χίλια χιλιάδες <...> καὶ μύρια μυριάδες = Dan 7: 10. Compare also χίλια

thrones and dominions,⁷¹ hymning and glorifying, with whom we are also hymning, saying:⁷²

‘Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord of Sabaoth! Heaven and earth are full of Your glory,’⁷³

χιλιάδες καὶ μύρια μυριάδες ἀγγέλων with Rev 5: 11 (καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν ἀγγέλων πολλῶν . . . καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν μυριάδες μυριάδων καὶ χιλιάδες χιλιάδων).

⁷¹ ἀγγέλων, ἀρχαγγέλων, θρόνων καὶ κυριοτήτων—cf. Col 1: 16. This list of angelic orders coincides with the beginning of the same list in, for example, anaphora of the Euchologion of Sarapion (Johnson. *Op. cit.* P. 46; see also: *Ibid.* 215-216; Winkler G. *Beobachtungen zu den im ante Sanctus angeführten Engeln*, in: *Theologische Quartalschrift*. Bd. 183 (2003). S. 213-238).

⁷² ἡμεῖς ὑμνοῦντες, λέγοντες—cf. Dan [LXX] 3: 24.

⁷³ Ἄγιος, Ἄγιος, Ἄγιος, Κύριος Σαβαώθ· πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης σου—cf. Is 6: 3. Without conjectures, P.Monts.Roca inv. 154b gives the Trisagion in the following form: “Holy, Holy, Holy, the Lord of hosts, Your heaven is full of Your glory”.

It should be noted that S. Janeras suggests to read the text here as: Ἄγιος, Ἄγιος, Ἄγιος, Κύριος Σαβαώθ· [πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης σου]. Πλήρης <γὰρ ἐστιν>? ὁ οὐρανὸς τῆς ἀγίας σου δόξης, ἐν ἧ ἐδόξασας etc. (See: Janeras S. *Sanctus et Post-Sanctus dans l'anaphore du P.Monts. Roca inv. n° 154b-155a* in: *Studi sull'Oriente Crhistiano*. Vol. 11 (2007). P. 9-13). In fact, the Louvain fragment doubles indeed the phrase πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ {ταύτης} τῆς δόξης [σου] {Κύριε}, giving it first in Greek (beginning with the word γῆ—the previous part is completely lost), and then in Coptic (σου has only the Greek text, equivalents of ταύτης and Κύριε—only the Coptic one). But should this variant be taken as the original? Janeras points out at the Vienna fragment, citing its text as: καὶ ἡ γῆ τῆς ἀγίας σου δόξης ἐν ἧ ἐδόξασας etc. (see: *Ibid.* P. 10), and concludes that the Vienna fragment supports the reading of the Louvain one. But the text of the Vienna fragment which he cites is already a reconstruction! The line in question contains only the following legible letters: ις κ(αὶ) π . . . αγι (Diethart J., Treu K. *Op. cit.* S. 68) or .ς κ(αὶ) ἡ γῆ τῆς ἀγί (Hammerstaedt. *Op. cit.* S. 156); obviously, these are insufficient to prove that the doubling of the words πλήρης ὁ οὐρανὸς etc. is the original reading. Janeras is right in stating that without such doubling the anaphora is too clumsy from the literary point of view. Nevertheless, from this point of view all the text of the anaphora is not so much well-done indeed—for example, in line 155a, 15 it turns out to be addressed to Christ instead of the Father, as in its beginning and in its end. Janeras rightly interprets the Greek instance of the phrase in question in the Louvain fragment as an example of the well-known feature of Coptic liturgical practice—to sing or say the most important acclamations in original Greek. But should the Coptic instance of the same phrase in the Louvain fragment be interpreted as an originally separate introduction to the next section of the prayer—or as just a partly translation of an acclamation sang in a foreign language, made in order to provide the Coptic audience with the meaning of its text and being unnecessary in the Greek original? In any case, basing on both Greek manuscript witnesses, I do not take the reading suggested by Janeras as inevitable, though agree that it is reasonable.

in which You have glorified us⁷⁴ through Your Only-Begotten, the firstborn of every creature,⁷⁵ Jesus Christ, our Lord, Who sits on the right hand of Your greatness in Heaven,⁷⁶ Who is coming to judge the living and the dead,⁷⁷ <the remembrance of Whose death we do>.⁷⁸

Through Him we offer You these Your creations,⁷⁹ the bread and the cup: we ask and beseech You to send onto them Your Holy and Comforter Spirit⁸⁰ from Heaven, to represent them materially⁸¹ and to make the bread the Body of Christ and the cup the Blood of Christ, of the New Covenant,⁸²—

as He Himself,⁸³ when He was about to hand <Himself>, having taken bread and given thanks, broke it and gave it to His disciples,⁸⁴ saying:

‘Take, eat, this is My body;’⁸⁵

⁷⁴ ἐν ἧ ἐδόξασας ἡμᾶς—cf. Wisd [LXX] 18: 8.

⁷⁵ μονογενοῦς... καὶ πρωτοτόκου πάσης κτίσεως = Origenes, *Contra Celsum* VI. 48 (PG 11. Col. 1373); idem, *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* 20. 39. 367; 32. 16. 193 (PG 14. Col. 665; 784).

Additional parallels:

διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου—cf. Jn 3: 18.

πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως = Col 1: 15.

⁷⁶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης σου = Ephraem Syrus (“Ephremus Graecus”), *Sermo paraeneticus* (Phrantzoles K. (ed.) *Ὁσίου Ἐφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου ἔργα*. (Θεσσαλονίκη, 1988). Vol. 1. P. 411). Cf. Heb 1: 3; 8: 1.

⁷⁷ ὅς ἔρχεται κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς—cf. 2 Tim 4: 1.

⁷⁸ οὗ τὴν θανάτου ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμεν—cf. 1 Cor 11: 24-25. P.Monts.Roca inv. 155a does not contain these words, but they are given in both Louvain. Copt. 27 and P.Vindob. G 41043.

⁷⁹ τὰ κτίσματά σου ταῦτα—cf. anaphora from the papyrus from Dêr-Balyzeh: τὰ κτίσματα ταῦτα (van Haelst. *Une nouvelle...* P. 449).

⁸⁰ τὸ ἅγιόν σου καὶ παράκλητόν σου Πνεῦμα—cf. Athanasius Magnus, *Epistola de synodis Arimini in Italia, et Seleucia in Isauria, celebratis*. 8 (PG 26. Col. 693).

⁸¹ εἰς τὸ σωματοποιῆσαι αὐτὰ—cf. Justinus Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo* 70 (Marcovich. *Op. cit.* P. 192); Clemens Alexandrinus, *Paedagogus* I. 6. 38 (Marrou, Harl. *Op. cit.* P. 180); Origenes, *De oratione* 33 (PG 11. Col. 557); Pseudo-Macarius Magnus, *50 Homiliae spirituales (coll. H)* 4 (PG 34. Col. 481b); idem, *64 Sermones (coll. B)* 49. 7 (PG 34. Col. 896a). Cf. footnotes 39-40.

⁸² ποιῆσαι τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τὸ δὲ ποτήριον αἷμα Χριστοῦ, τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης—cf. anaphora of the papyrus from Dêr-Balyzeh: ποιῆσον τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸ δὲ ποτήριον αἷμα τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης (van Haelst. *Une nouvelle...* P. 449).

⁸³ Καθὼς καὶ αὐτός... Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—cf. Mt 26: 26-30; Mk 14: 22-26; Lk 22: 14-39; 1 Cor 11: 23-26.

⁸⁴ λαβὼν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας καὶ ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς—cf. Mt 26: 26a.

⁸⁵ Λάβετε, φάγετε, τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα—cf. Mt 26: 26b; Mk 14: 22b.

likewise after supper,⁸⁶ having taken a cup and given thanks, He gave it to them, saying:⁸⁷

‘Take, drink the blood, which is shed for many for remission of sins.’⁸⁸

And we also do the same in Your remembrance,⁸⁹ like those—whenever we meet together, we make the remembrance of You,⁹⁰ of the holy mystery of our Teacher and King and Savior Jesus Christ.⁹¹

Even so, we pray to You, Master, that in blessing You will bless⁹² and in sanctifying sanctify . . . for all communicating from them for undivided faith,⁹³ for communication of incorruption,⁹⁴ for communion of the Holy Spirit,⁹⁵ for perfection of belief and truth,⁹⁶ for fulfillment of all Your will,

⁸⁶ μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι = Lk 22: 20a; 1 Cor 11: 25a.

ὁμοίως μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι = anaphora from the papyrus from Dêr-Balyzeh (van Haelst. *Une nouvelle* . . . P. 449).

⁸⁷ λαβὼν ποτήριον, εὐχαριστήσας, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων = Mt 26: 27a.

⁸⁸ Λάβετε, πίετε τὸ αἶμα τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν—cf. Mt 26: 28.

⁸⁹ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιούμεν εἰς τὴν σὴν ἀνάμνησιν—cf. Lk 22: 19b; 1 Cor 11: 25b. It should be noted that in lines 155a, 14-6 the anaphora seems to be addressed not to God the Father, as in the other lines, but to Jesus Christ.

⁹⁰ ὡς ἐκεῖνοι ἄν, οὓν ἔρχοντες ποιούντες σου τὴν ἀνάμνησιν—cf. 1 Cor 11: 25b-26.

⁹¹ βασιλέως καὶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—cf. Athanasius Magnus, *Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae* (PG 25. Col. 593). A similar expression is found in the Egyptian Liturgy of Gregory of Nazianzus: τὸ τίμιόν σου αἶμα, τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης σου, τοῦ Κυρίου δὲ, καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ σωτήρος καὶ παμβασιλέως ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Gerhards. *Op. cit.* P. 36).

⁹² εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσης = 1 Chron 4: 10.

⁹³ πᾶσιν ἐξ αὐτῶν μεταλαμβάνουσιν εἰς πίστιν—cf. anaphora of the Liturgy of Mark: πᾶσιν ἡμῖν τοῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν μεταλαμβάνουσιν εἰς πίστιν (Cuming. *Op. cit.* P. 48-49).

πίστιν ἀδιάκριτον—cf. Origenes, *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* 13. 10. 63 (PG 14. Col. 413); [Pseudo]-Justinus Martyr, *De resurrectione* 10 (Otto J.C.T. (ed.) *Corpus apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi*. (Jena, 1879 (3rd ed.). Wiesbaden, 1971 (repr.)). Vol. 3. P. 247).

⁹⁴ εἰς μετοχὴν ἀφθαρσίας—cf. Irenaeus, *Contra Haereses* V. 3. 3 (Rousseau A. et al. (eds.) *Irenée de Lyon, Contre les Hérésies: Livre V* (Paris, 1969: Sources chrétiennes; 153). P. 54).

. . . μετοχὴν ἀφθαρσίας, εἰς κοινωνίαν Πνεύματος ἁγίου = prayer (end of the anaphora? thanksgiving prayer? see: Brakmann H. *Der Berliner Papyrus 13918 und das griechische Euchologion-Fragment von Deir el-Bala'izah*, in: *Ostkirchliche Studien*. Bd. 36 (1987). S. 31-38) from the papyrus Baden 4.58 (van Haelst N 859): [. . .]ν ἀφθαρσίας, εἰς κοινωνίαν Πνεύματος ἁγίου (Lietzmann H. *Ein liturgischer Papyrus des Berliner Museums*, in: *Festgabe für A. Jülicher*. (Tübingen, 1927). S. 213-228, here: S. 214), where an expression διὰ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου σου παιδὸς (see footnotes 66 and 97) is also found.

⁹⁵ εἰς κοινωνίαν Πνεύματος ἁγίου—cf. Phil 2: 1.

⁹⁶ εἰς καταρτισμὸν πίστεως καὶ ἀληθείας—cf. Eph 4: 12.

so that in this and again we will glorify Your all-revered and all-holy name, through Your sanctified Child, our Lord Jesus Christ,⁹⁷ through Whom glory [be] to You, power unto the unblended ages of ages.

Amen.

[*Thanksgiving prayer*]

—One God⁹⁸

Again we pray⁹⁹ to You, O Master, God Pantocrator, and give You thanks for the communion of the bread of life and the cup, and of the Sanctified, and we beseech You, so that You will sanctify all of us who have partaken of them¹⁰⁰—so that they will be to us, the communicants, neither for judgment nor for condemnation,¹⁰¹ but rather for health¹⁰² of body and soul, for renovation of our spirit, for faith and chastity, for strength and force, for love and mutual love, for¹⁰³ perfection of Your will, for your perfect man,¹⁰⁴ who is created after God,¹⁰⁵ —so that we will be perfect and clean,¹⁰⁶ invincible, saved from each of crimes¹⁰⁷ and being accomplished in every will of God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,

through Whom [be] to You glory, power, honor of aeon, greatness, now and unto all the ages of ages.¹⁰⁸

Amen.

—One God¹⁰⁹

⁹⁷ διὰ τοῦ ἁγιασμένου σου παιδὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—cf. footnote 66.

⁹⁸ See footnote 61.

⁹⁹ Or: “*Then*. We pray...”—ἔτι here can be taken as merely a rubric. Cf. footnote 62.

¹⁰⁰ μετεπιληφῶτας ἀπ’ αὐτῶν—cf. Athanasius Magnus, *Expositiones in Psalmos* (PG 27. Col. 296).

¹⁰¹ εἰς κρίμα ἢ εἰς κατάκριμα—cf. Rom 5: 16.

¹⁰² Or “purity” (ἁγνεΐαν).

εἰς ὑγείαν/ἁγνεΐαν... θελήματός σου—cf. Clemens Romanus, *Epistula ii ad Corinthios* 59. 2 (Jaubert A. (ed.) *Clément de Rome, Épître aux Corinthiens*. (Paris, 1971: Sources chrétiennes; 167). P. 194).

¹⁰³ εἰς ἀγάπην καὶ φιλαλληλίαν, εἰς...—cf. prayer from the papyrus P. Lond. Li. 232 (van Haelst N 934): [...]εἰς χαρὰν καὶ ἀγά[πην...] φιλαλληλίαν, εἰς etc. (Milne H. *Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the British Museum*. (London, 1927). P. 196).

¹⁰⁴ τέλειόν σου ἄνθρωπον—cf. Col 1: 28.

¹⁰⁵ ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθέντα = Eph 4: 24.

¹⁰⁶ ὄμειν τέλειοι καὶ καθαροὶ—cf. Mt 5: 48; Jam 1:4.

¹⁰⁷ σεσωσμένοι ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀνομιῶν—cf. Ps 17: 17.

¹⁰⁸ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων—this form of concluding doxology is common for prayers of the Euchology of Sarapion (see Johnson. *Op. cit.*).

¹⁰⁹ See footnote 61.

II. Contents and Dating of the Anaphora and Thanksgiving Prayer

Contents of the anaphora from the Barcelona papyrus can be outlined as follows:

- I. Introductory dialogue (Εἰς Θεός... Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον: 154b, 1-5).
- II. Preface (Ἄξιόν ἐστιν... εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον: 154b, 5-14), which includes:
 - A. four initial praise-verbs (σὲ αἰνεῖν... εὐχαριστεῖν: 154b, 5-6) introducing a direct address to God;
 - B. Creation narrative (ὁ ποιήσας... ἐν αὐτοῖς: 154b, 7-10);
 - C. Christological section (διὰ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου... εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον: 154b, 10-14).
- III. Pre-Sanctus (ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ ἄρματος... λέγοντες: 154b, 14-19), Sanctus (Ἄγιος... δόξης σου: 154b, 20-21) and Post-Sanctus (ἐν ᾧ ἐδόξασας ἡμᾶς... ἀνάμνησιν ποιοῦμεν: 154b, 21-25).
- IV. Oblation and Epiclesis I (δι' οὗ προσφερόμεν... τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης: 155a, 1-7).
- V. Institution narrative (Καθὼς καὶ αὐτός... ἁμαρτιῶν: 155a, 7-14).
- VI. Anamnesis (Καὶ ἡμεῖς τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦμεν... Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: 155a, 14-18).
- VII. Epiclesis II and/or petition for worthy Communion (Ναί, ἀξιουμέν σε... παντὸς θελήματός σου: 155a, 18-23).
- VIII. Concluding doxology (ἵνα ἔτι... αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων Ἀμήν: 155a, 23-27).

This structure clearly belongs to the Egyptian anaphoral type, the main indication of which is the Sanctus=>Epiclesis I=>Institution narrative sequence. A short form of the Sanctus is also a well-known mark of Egyptian anaphoras.¹¹⁰ As was shown above,¹¹¹ many of the anaphora's expressions

¹¹⁰ See: Schermann Th. *Ägyptische Abendmahlsliturgien des ersten Jahrtausends in ihrer Überlieferung*. (Paderborn, 1912); Τρεμπέλας Π. *Συμβολαὶ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τῆς χριστιανικῆς λατρείας. Τ. 2: Λειτουργικοὶ τύποι Αἰγύπτου καὶ Ἀνατολῆς*. (Ἀθῆναι, 1961; 1998²); Krause M. *Aegypten II (literaturgeschichtlich): Christlich*, in: Th. Klauser, E. Dassmann et al., eds. *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*. (Stuttgart, 1985. Suppl. 1:2). Sp. 68-88; Johnson M.E. *Liturgy in Early Christian Egypt*. (Cambridge, 1995: Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study; 33); Желтов М.С. *Древние александрийские анафоры*, in: *Богословские Труды*. Сб. 38 (2003). С. 269-320.

¹¹¹ See the footnotes 64-94.

find close parallels in the works of Egyptian authors and in the known Egyptian anaphoras (especially, the anaphora from the papyrus from Dêr-Balyzeh), which stresses again the Egyptian provenance of our text.

Nevertheless, the contents of the anaphora show some peculiarities—an “Egyptian” direct link between the Sanctus and the Epiclesis I is interrupted here by a Christological Post-Sanctus (this resembles anaphoras of the “Antiochene” type which usually contain a Christological section after the Sanctus);¹¹² the anaphora contains no intercessions; an initial greeting of the celebrant is replaced by the “Ἐἰς Θεός” acclamation (in this brief form once very popular in Egypt); Epiclesis II seems to contain a petition to sanctify the communicants, but not the Gifts.

The thanksgiving prayer, in its turn, seems to be a reworking of the last (VII and VIII) sections of the anaphora. This is quite clear from a comparison:

Anaphora

Ναί, ἀξιούμέν σε, Δέσποτα,

Thanksgiving prayer

Ἦτι δεόμεθά σου, Δέσποτα
 Θεὸ παντοκράτωρ,
 καὶ εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι
 ἐπὶ τῇ μεταλήμψει τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς
 ζωῆς
 καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου, καὶ τοῦ

¹¹² In fact, there is another anaphora presenting the same Sanctus=>Post-Sanctus=>Epiclesis=>Institution narrative structure—namely, the anaphora from the so called Sunarti fragments (see a reconstruction of its text here: Hammerstaedt, *Op. cit.* S. 203-218), which also originates from the Egyptian liturgical area. So I suggest to speak not of a single but of two Egyptian anaphoral types, one which is characterized by the Sanctus=>Epiclesis=>Institution narrative sequence, another one—by the Sanctus=>Post-Sanctus=>Epiclesis=>Institution narrative sequence. The most important representative of the first one is the anaphora of the Liturgy of Mark, of the second one—our anaphora in question. In the light of this distinction between two different anaphoral traditions in the Egyptian liturgical milieu such anaphoras as those from the papyrus from Dêr-Balyzeh and from the Euchologion of Sarapion clearly witness an interference between both types. I have developed this idea in a paper presented at the 2007 Oxford Patristic Studies Conference (the paper is to be published in the forthcoming volumes of the “*Studia Patristica*” series). It should also be stressed that in his 2007 article S. Janeras, investigating the interdependence between the anaphoras from the Liturgy of Mark, from the Barcelona papyrus and from the papyrus from Dêr-Balyzeh, independently comes to similar conclusions (Janeras. *Sanctus et Post-Sanctus*... P. 12-13).

Anaphora

ὅπως
 εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσης
 καὶ ἀγίως ἀγίασης
 ? (*a lacuna in the text*)
 τοῖς πᾶσιν
 ἐξ αὐτῶν

 μεταλαμβάνουσιν

 εἰς πίστιν
 ἀδιάκριτον,
 εἰς μετοχὴν ἀφθαρσίας,
 εἰς κοινωνίαν Πνεύματος ἁγίου,
 εἰς καταρτισμὸν πίστεως
 καὶ ἀληθείας,
 εἰς συντελείωσιν παντὸς θελήματός
 σου,

 ἵνα ἔτι καὶ ἐν τούτῳ δοξάζωμεν

 τὸ πανέντιμον καὶ πανάγιον
 ὄνομά σου,
 διὰ τοῦ ἁγιασμένου σου παιδὸς
 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν,
 δι' οὗ σοὶ δόξα, κράτος

 εἰς τοὺς ἀκηράτους αἰῶνας τῶν
 αἰώνων·
 Ἀμήν.

Thanksgiving prayer

ἁγιασμένου·
 καὶ παρακαλοῦμέν σε

 ὅπως

 ἀγίασης
 ἡμας
 πάντας τοὺς μετειληφότας
 ἀπ' αὐτῶν·
 πρὸς τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι ἡμῖν
 εἰς κρίμα ἢ εἰς κατάκριμα,
 τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσιν,
 ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον
 εἰς ἀνανέωσιν τοῦ πνεύματος ἡμῶν,
 εἰς πίστιν
 καὶ σωφροσύνην,
 εἰς ἰσχὺν καὶ δύναμιν,
 εἰς ἀγάπην καὶ φιλαλληλίαν,

 εἰς συντέλειαν παντὸς θελήματός σου,
 εἰς τέλειόν σου ἄνθρωπον
 τὸν κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθέντα·
 ἵνα ὦμεν
 τέλειοι καὶ καθαροὶ, ἀμάχητοι,
 σεσωσμένοι ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀνομιῶν
 καὶ τελειομένοι ἐν παντὶ θελήματι
 τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς

 Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ·
 δι' οὗ σοὶ δόξα, κράτος,
 αἰῶνος τιμὴ, μεγαλωσύνη·
 καὶ νῦν
 καὶ εἰς τοὺς σύμπαντας αἰῶνας τῶν
 αἰώνων·
 Ἀμήν.

Both the anaphora (in its final form!) and the thanksgiving prayer are obviously no later than the 4th century, when the papyrus containing them was written. But was the anaphora actually composed in that very century? Some features of the theological contents of the anaphora could suggest an earlier dating. Two of these features are the most striking: the

anaphora uses the term $\pi\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ as a name of Christ and develops the idea of knowledge given by Christ (section II. C)—both correspond to the well known “archaic” features of the Eucharistic prayers of the *Didache*¹¹³ as well as of some other monuments. Such irregularities in the anaphora (in comparison with the practices known from the 4th century on) as the lack of intercessions, unelaborated Creation and Redemption narratives, shift of the address (from God the Father to Christ and back) in section VI,¹¹⁴ the use of the Εἰς Θεός acclamation in the introductory dialogue—all of these characteristics¹¹⁵ could also be taken as indications of an earlier dating than mid-4th century, when we find a more developed anaphora of the Euchologion of Sarapion.¹¹⁶

But how should we evaluate the presence in this anaphora of the fully elaborated Sanctus, epiclesis and Institution narrative—i.e., of the parts which are taken by many current scholars to be the 4th-century developments?¹¹⁷ The main argument that these parts were fully developed only in the 4th century is based on the evidence of the Strasbourg papyrus—but, as I will show below, in the light of the evidence of the Barcelona papyrus this hypothesis needs a revision, and this means that the dating

¹¹³ See: Niederwimmer. *Op. cit.*; W. Rordorf et A. Tuilier (eds.) *La Doctrine des douze apôtres: Didachè*. (Paris, 1978: Sources chrétiennes; 248); van de Sandt H., Flusser D. *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*. (Assen; Minneapolis, 2002: Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum III: Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature; 5). See also: Metzger M. (ed.) *Les Constitutions Apostoliques: T. 2*. (Paris, 1986: Sources chrétiennes; 329). P. 11-39; Roca-Puig. *Citas y reminiscencias...*

¹¹⁴ Cf. this with the same shifts in the anaphora of Addai and Mari, also taken to be “archaic” (see, for example: Gelston A. *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari*. (Oxford, 1992); Spinks B. *Worship: Prayers from the East*. (Washington, 1993)).

¹¹⁵ To the listed features one more could be added: the Institution words in the anaphora are cited in an asymmetrical form (words about the bread do not parallel words about the cup), which also inclines for an earlier dating.

¹¹⁶ Johnson. *The Prayers...* I find Maxwell Johnson’s arguments on this dating of the Euchologion fully convincing.

¹¹⁷ Current scholarship is so convinced by the “4th-century insertions” theory, that, for example, Paul Bradshaw sees the presence of an Institution narrative and epiclesis in the anaphora of the so called Apostolic Tradition as a crucial argument for his 4th-century re-dating of the current form of the document (see: Bradshaw P.F. *Redating the Apostolic Tradition: Some Preliminary Steps*, in: J.F. Baldovin, N. Mitchell, (eds.) *Rule of Prayer, Rule of Faith: Essays in Honor of Aidan Kavanagh*. (Collegeville (Minnesota), 1996). P. 3-17; idem. *Eucharistic Origins*. (London et al., 2004); idem, Johnson M.E., Phillips L.E. *The Apostolic Tradition: A Commentary*. (Minneapolis, 2002)).

of the anaphora considered here should not depend on the “4th-century insertions” argument at all.

The thanksgiving prayer from the Barcelona papyrus, as has already been suggested, is a reworking of the last part of the anaphora. However, taken as a whole, the anaphora and the thanksgiving prayer form an archaic Eucharistic rite—with no other prayers than the anaphora and post-Communion prayer. This structure¹¹⁸ can be compared with the Eucharistic prayers of the Didache, with its prayers “concerning the Eucharist” (chapter 9) and “after the meal” (chapter 10) or, more precisely, with the reworking of these Didache prayers given in the VIIth book of the Apostolic Constitutions (chapter 25: anaphora; chapter 26: thanksgiving prayer).¹¹⁹ Already by the middle of the 4th century Egyptian Eucharistic rites were much more complex, as it is perfectly clear from the evidence of the Euchologion of Sarapion. This could once again suggest an early dating for our prayers. It should be noted, however, that the codex from which the anaphora and thanksgiving prayer come was written not for liturgical but for some scholarly purposes and thereby could present not a full Eucharistic rite but just a portion of it.

On the other hand, the anaphora contains several long citations from writings of the early Church fathers,¹²⁰—hence, it appears that these insertions must have been the result of a deliberate work of some educated editor. A number of expressions in the anaphora find parallels in the writings of Athanasius of Alexandria,¹²¹ so I very cautiously suggest that this hypothetical editor could be Athanasius himself. This hypothesis can be further strengthened by the fact that we possess an anaphoral fragment with precisely the same initial address to God, which is explicitly ascribed to Athanasius.¹²² Sometimes the hand of an editor of a prayer text can be discerned in his adherence to a set of particular verbal expressions or theological predilections (for example, Robert Taft has investigated a

¹¹⁸) By this term I mean here not the prayer texts themselves, but precisely such an overall structure of a Eucharistic rite, when it contains only two prayers.

¹¹⁹) Metzger. *Les Constitutions Apostoliques: T. 3*. P. 53-57.

¹²⁰) See footnotes 65, 75 and, especially, 66.

¹²¹) See footnotes 64, 67, 80, 91; also footnote 100 (thanksgiving prayer). Athanasius’ affection for the teaching of Hermas’ “The Shepherd” (mentioned by name in *Epistula ad Afros episcopos*—PG 26. Col. 1037) on creation *ex nihilo* should also be considered—the corresponding Hermas’ (and Philo’s) expression is cited in the anaphora almost verbatim, cf. footnote 65.

¹²²) Frend, Muirhead. *Op. cit.* See footnote 64.

similar set of expressions in the anaphora of John Chrysostom, proving that this anaphora justly bears his name),¹²³ so this hypothesis deserves careful consideration.

Finally, using the cumulative argument, I argue for the 3rd century as a probable dating for the Ur-text of the anaphora. In the first half of the 4th century this Ur-text was somewhat expanded by the insertion of a few patristic citations, but we find no traces of the insertion of whole sections (such as the Sanctus or epiclesis). In any case, the anaphora would have achieved its final form no later than in the middle of the 4th century.

This anaphora certainly was well known in Egypt: if other anaphoras of the Egyptian type are preserved only in a single manuscript (excluding, naturally, the anaphora of the Liturgy of Mark/Cyril), this one is preserved in three manuscripts (P.Monts.Roca inv. 154b-155a, Louvain. Copt. 27 and P.Vindob. G 41043). Also, if other anaphoras of the Egyptian type are known only in Greek¹²⁴ or Coptic,¹²⁵ only the anaphora of Mark and our text are known both in Greek and in Coptic. But since in the later times neither Greek, nor Coptic practice knew this anaphora, so it must have fallen into disuse at an early date.

III. The Anaphora from the Barcelona Papyrus and Current Scholarly Views on the History of Anaphoral Development

It is perfectly clear that the anaphora from the Barcelona papyrus is an important source for the liturgical scholarship in general and for the reconstruction of the history of the anaphoral development in particular.

¹²³) Taft R.F. *The Authenticity of the Chrysostom Anaphora Revisited: Determining the authorship of liturgical texts by computer*, in: *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*. Vol. 56 (1990). P. 5-51.

¹²⁴) The anaphoras from the papyrus from Dér-Balyzeh, from the Euchologion of Sarapion, from the Sunnarti fragments,—the identification of some other prayer fragments as parts of other unknown anaphoras is doubtful to a certain degree.

¹²⁵) The anaphora of Thomas from the Euchologion of the White Monastery (other original Coptic anaphoras from this famous collection do not belong to the Egyptian anaphoral type). See: Zentgraf K. *Eucharistische Textfragmente einer koptisch-saidischen Handschrift*, in: *Oriens Christianus*. Bd. 41 (1957). S. 67-75; Bd. 42 (1958). S. 44-54; Bd. 43 (1959). S. 76-103; Lanne E. *Le Grand Euchologe du Monastère Blanc*. (Paris, 1958: *Patrologia Orientalis*; 28, fasc. 2); Желтов М.С. *Анафора ап. Фомы из Евхология Белого монастыря*, in: Graziansky M., Kuzenkov P. (eds.) *KANISKION · Festschrift für I.S. Chichurov* (Москва, 2006). С. 304-317.

However, could its testimony affect current scholarly views on the latter? The problem of the genesis of different anaphoras (and, more generally, of the anaphoral types) arose many centuries ago. Until the 20th century this problem was usually solved by choosing one or another hypothetical source for the anaphora and claiming that all known anaphoras are further redactions of this source. Already in the 17th century a few German scholars argued that this source should be Jewish¹²⁶ and since the end of the 19th century the discussion regarding possible connections between liturgical practices of Judaism and early Christianity goes on continuously.¹²⁷

A very important step in liturgical scholarship was the publication of the *Didache*¹²⁸ with its thanksgiving prayers which bear a striking resemblance to the Jewish prayers after meals (*birkat ha-mazon*), and from the beginning of the 20th century it became accepted by a number of scholars that the structure and pattern of these prayers were at the basis of the anaphoras.¹²⁹ But as the *Didache* does not contain such elements of

¹²⁶ Scaliger J.J. *De emendatione temporum*. (Paris, 1583); Buxtorf J. (der Jüngere) *Dissertationes philologico-theologicae accesserunt Isaaci Abarbenelis eliquot elegantes & eruditae dissertationes ab eodem ex hebraea in latinam linguam versa*. (Basileae, 1662⁴).

¹²⁷ It should be noted that recent achievements in the study of early synagogal Jewish worship question many previous developments in this discussion. See: Heinemann J. *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns*. (Berlin et al., 1977: *Studia Judaica*; 9); Sarason R.S. *On the Use of Method in the Modern Study of Jewish Liturgy*, in: W.S. Green (ed.) *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice*. (Missoula (MT), 1978: *Brown Judaic Studies*; 1). P. 97-172; Bokser B.M. *Recent Developments in the Study of Judaism 70-200 C. E.*, in: *Journal of Early Christian Studies*. Vol. 3 (1983). P. 1-68; Zahavy Tz. *Studies in Jewish Prayer*. (Lanham (Maryland), 1990); Reif S. *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer: New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History*. (Cambridge, 1993); Langer R. *Revisiting Early Rabbinic Liturgy: The Recent Contributions of Ezra Fleischer*, in: *Prooftexts: A Journal of Jewish Literary History*. Vol. 19 (1999). P. 179-194; Runesson A. *The Origins of the Synagogue: A Socio-historical Study*. (Stockholm, 2001: *Coniectanea Biblical New Testament Series*; 37); Leonhard C. *Die älteste Haggada*, in: *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*. Bd. 45 (2003). S. 201-231; A. Gerhards, A. Doeker, P. Ebenbauer (eds.) *Identität durch Gebet: Zur gemeinschaftsbildenden Funktion institutionalisierten Betens in Judentum und Christentum*. (Paderborn et al., 2003: *Studien zu Judentum und Christentum*).

¹²⁸ Φιλόθεος (Βρυέννιος), μητρ. Διαχρή τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων... (Κωνσταντινούπολις, 1883). See references to a few more recent studies in footnote 113 of the present article.

¹²⁹ See a brief survey of different theories in the book: Bradshaw P. *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*. (New York, 2002²). P. 118-143; among the works cited there one should also list the study by I. Karabinov (Καραβινοβ Ι. Α. *Εὐχαριστική μοιτβα (αναφορα): Οὐμπ ιστορικο-λιτουργικου ανάλιζα*. (Σανκτ-Πετερβυργ, 1908)), which anticipated many ideas expressed by later scholars.

traditional anaphoras as Sanctus, Institution narrative or epiclesis,¹³⁰ this raises the question regarding the origin of these elements. Nowadays most scholars solve this question by assuming that all elements mentioned above were interpolated into the anaphora at a later date. The origin of the interpolated Sanctus is usually found in certain Jewish texts,¹³¹ while the presence of the Institution narrative and epiclesis in the majority of traditional anaphoras (with a few well-known exceptions) is believed to be the result of an intense reworking of eucharistic prayers in the 4th century, a reworking primarily based on theological grounds.¹³²

The weakness of the hypothesis regarding the interpolated character of these parts of the anaphora is the lack of any example of an actual 4th-century insertion into the anaphora. In other words, this hypothesis presupposes the existence of an anaphora which in its older layers did not contain the elements which we mentioned, while featuring these in its later strata. Nowadays such an anaphora is often identified with the anaphora of the Strasbourg papyrus (P.Straßb.Gr.inv. 254), in its full form known as the anaphora of the Liturgy of Mark. The Strasbourg papyrus is a badly preserved sheet of papyrus written in the 5th century or maybe 4th, broken into 6 parts and missing its top 1/3. It was edited and reconstructed in 1928 by M. Andrieu and P. Collomp.¹³³ The papyrus contains fragments of the Preface and Intercession which are very close to the corresponding sections of the anaphora of the Liturgy of Mark and which end with a short doxology.

Michel Andrieu and Paul Collomp as well as Klaus Gamber, Hieronymus Engberding, René-Georges Coquin considered the Strasbourg papyrus to be without any doubt just a first sheet of a set of several folia containing the full anaphora of Mark.¹³⁴ But in 1974 Edward Kilmartin

¹³⁰ Some expressions of the 9-10 chapters of the Didache could be treated as an embryonic epiclesis, though.

¹³¹ See: Spinks B. *The Sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer*. (Cambridge, 1991); Taft. *The Interpolation...*; Winkler. *Das Sanctus...*

¹³² See, for example: Fenwick J.R.K. *Fourth Century Anaphoral Construction Techniques*. (Bramcote (Nottingham), 1986: Grove Liturgical Study; 45); Mazza E. *L'anafora eucaristica: Studi sulle origini*. (Roma, 1992: Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae", Subsidia; 62).

¹³³ Andrieu M., Collomp P. *Fragments sur papyrus de l'anaphore de saint Marc*, in: *Revue des sciences religieuses*. Vol. 8 (1928). P. 489-515.

¹³⁴ Gamber K. *Das Papyrusfragment zur Markusliturgie und das Eucharistiegebet im Clemensbrief*, in: *Ostkirchliche Studien*. Bd. 8 (1959). S. 31-45; Engberding H. *Die anaphorische*

argued¹³⁵ that the Strasbourg papyrus is not a part of a bigger set, but that its text is already a complete “short” anaphora, which is to say that the other parts of the anaphora of Mark (Sanctus, Epiclesis etc.) are later additions. Geoffrey Cuming developed this idea further and many scholars agreed with him, so that nowadays the “testimony” of the Strasbourg papyrus is often used to prove the hypothesis of the interpolated character of certain anaphoral parts.¹³⁶ Yet, other scholars do not agree that the papyrus contains a complete anaphora.¹³⁷ Bryan Spinks has pointed out¹³⁸ that the presence of a doxology at the end of the intercessions in the Strasbourg papyrus—the only solid argument in support of the view that the papyrus contains a complete prayer text—is not necessarily a mark of a prayer’s end. Doxologies are found in the middle of the text in many archaic prayers—for example, in the anaphora of Addai and Mari or in the Roman canon. Therefore a suggestion that the text of the Strasbourg papyrus is an independent integral entity is by no means self-evident.

Any scholar of manuscripts is aware of countless fragments of well-known literary compositions in the manuscript sources. When such a fragment is discovered, nobody claims straight off that this fragment is not just a fragment but the original nucleus of a corresponding composition—such idea deserves a very profound textological argumentation. Therefore, it was absolutely natural that Andrieu and Collomp took the Strasbourg papyrus as just a fragment of the well-known anaphora of Mark, and from the textological point of view there is no need to doubt their interpretation. But liturgical texts are not transmitted in the manuscripts in the same way as literary texts are. They are usually changing

Fürbittgebet der griechischen Markusliturgie, in: *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*. Vol. 30 (1964). P. 398-446; Coquin R.-G. *L’anaphore alexandrine de saint Marc*, in: *Le Muséon*. Vol. 82 (1969). P. 307-356.

¹³⁵ Kilmartin E.J. *Sacrificium Laudis: Content and Function of Early Eucharistic Prayers*, in: *Theological Studies*. Vol. 35 (1974). P. 268-287.

¹³⁶ See a brief survey in: Ray W.D. *The Strasbourg Papyrus*, in: P.F. Bradshaw (ed.) *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*. (Collegeville (Minnesota), 1997). P. 39-56.

¹³⁷ See: Brakmann H. *Neue Funde und Forschungen zur Liturgie der Kopten (1984-1988)*, in: *Actes du 4^e Congrès Copte: Louvain-la-Neuve, 1988*. (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1992: Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain; 41). Vol. 2. P. 419-435; Hammerstaedt. *Op. cit.* S. 22-23.

¹³⁸ Spinks B. *A Complete Anaphora? A Note on Strasbourg Gr. 254*, in: *Heythrop Journal*. Vol. 25 (1984). P. 51-55.

together with the changing practice.¹³⁹ In other words, if a 4-5th-century manuscript contains a liturgical prayer, it is quite natural to expect that the form of this prayer corresponds with the actual liturgical practice of the 4-5th centuries. Consequently, while we knew little regarding the form of Egyptian Eucharistic prayers in the 4th century,¹⁴⁰ the Strasbourg papyrus could have been interpreted as a stand-alone text of a complete Eucharistic prayer. But the publication of the Barcelona papyrus—which is older than the Strasbourg papyrus (the papyrus itself is not younger than the 4th century and its text, as was shown above, is not younger than the mid-4th century and may go back to the 3rd) and is of Egyptian provenance as well—shows that at least in the mid-4th century Egyptian liturgical practice already knew a much more elaborated form of Eucharistic prayer. Consequently, in the light of the evidence of the Barcelona papyrus, we have no longer any reason to interpret the Strasbourg papyrus, which is in fact a fragment of a well-known text, as a stand-alone nucleus of the latter: the doxology in the end of the Strasbourg papyrus, as was pointed out by Spinks, proves nothing, and, as a liturgical text, the prayer from the Strasbourg papyrus should have been mirroring the current Egyptian liturgical practice, which by the time of creation of this papyrus already knew the anaphoral Sanctus, epiclesis etc. The fact that the discovery of the Barcelona papyrus leaves the hypothesis of the Strasbourg papyrus' integrity unfounded has been already noted by Heinzgerd Brakmann.¹⁴¹ And, together with this hypothesis, it leaves the different variants of the “4th-century interpolations” theory without any actual documentary proof.

Moreover, the archaic features of the theology of the liturgical texts from the Barcelona papyrus¹⁴² indicate that Sanctus, Institution narrative and epiclesis have been already present in at least some 3rd-century ana-

¹³⁹) The only exceptions from this rule are the texts incorporated into some kind of a stable (or quasi-stable) composition (such as the Didache, Euchologion of Sarapion, Apostolic Constitutions etc.) or the texts preserved in the manuscripts copied exclusively for collection purposes (there are, though very rare, medieval examples of such manuscripts).

¹⁴⁰) There is some scarce evidence in the writings of the Egyptian authors of the 3-4th centuries, and the very informative Euchologion of Sarapion (yet the latter's dating was disputed by some scholars—though, as was mentioned already, I agree with Johnson's dating of it).

¹⁴¹) Brakmann. *Neue Funde*... P. 422.

¹⁴²) These are found not only in the anaphora (see above) and other prayers, but also in the acrostic hymn.

phoras (while some other anaphoras—like, for example, the anaphora of Addai and Mari or the anaphora of the Apostolic Tradition—could still lack all or some of these elements). That means, first, that these parts do not have an interpolated but an organic nature;¹⁴³ and, second, that the idea of an initial pluriformity of early Christian liturgical practice¹⁴⁴—the practice, which, in the end, knew not only such prayers as those of the Didache community meal or of the charismatic Eucharists depicted in the apocryphal Acts,¹⁴⁵ but also such well packed anaphoras as those of the Apostolic Tradition or from the Barcelona papyrus¹⁴⁶—is, in fact, working against the belief in the “4th-century anaphoral interpolations.” The 4th century could be considered to be the time when the anaphoras

¹⁴³) Which gives additional weight to such theories of anaphoral development as C. Giraudó's (Giraudó C. *La struttura letteraria della preghiera eucaristica: Saggio sulla genesi letteraria di una forma*. (Roma, 1981: Analecta Biblica; 92)). Giraudó has not analyzed a handful of important witnesses, including the Qumran texts (which could, by the way, throw additional light on the Sanctus question—see, for example: Chason E.G. *Liturgical Communion with the Angels at Qumran*, in: D.K. Falk, F.G. Martinez, E.M. Schuller (eds.) *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998*. (Leiden, 2000: Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah; 35). P. 95-105), yet his important study of *some* prayer traditions in Judaism and Christianity should not be discounted easily.

¹⁴⁴) Paul Bradshaw repeatedly insists on the recognition of initial liturgical pluriformity as one of the most important methodological principles in the study of early Christian worship (Bradshaw. *The Search for the Origins...*), and he is certainly right.

¹⁴⁵) See: Brock S.P. *The Epiclesis in the Antiochene Baptismal Ordines*, in: *Symposium Syriacum 1972*. (Roma, 1974: Orientalia Christiana Analecta; 197). P. 183-218; idem. *Invocations to/for the Holy Spirit in Syriac Liturgical Texts: Some Comparative Approaches*, in: R.F. Taft, G. Winkler (eds.) *Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (1872-1948): Acts of the International Congress*. (Roma, 2001 [2002]: Orientalia Christiana Analecta; 265); Rouwhorst G.A.M. *La célébration de l'eucharistie selon les Actes de Thomas*, in: Ch. Caspers, M. Schneiders (eds.) *Omnes circumstantes—Contribution towards a History of the Role of the People in the Liturgy: Presented to Herman Wegman*. (Kampen, 1990). P. 51-77; Winkler G. *Weitere Beobachtungen zur frühen Epiklese (den Doxologien und dem Sanctus): Über die Bedeutung der Apokryphen für die Erforschung der Entwicklung der Riten*, in: *Oriens Christianus*. Bd. 80 (1996). S. 177-200; Meßner R. *Zur Eucharistie in den Thomasakten: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte der eucharistischen Epiklese*, in: H.-J. Feulner, E. Velkowska, R.F. Taft (eds.) *Crossroad of Cultures: Studies in Liturgy and Patristics in Honour of Gabriele Winkler*. (Roma, 2000: Orientalia Christiana Analecta; 260). P. 493-513.

¹⁴⁶) Which are not late compilations but rather early representatives of the models well known from the famous traditional anaphoras of the Christian East.

of the great Episcopal sees were harmonized, i.e. when some anaphoras could indeed have been supplemented by some elements derived from the others, but solid evidence demonstrating any deliberate insertions into the anaphoras of the elements previously absolutely alien to the Eucharistic prayers, appears to be lacking.