

The Epiclesis Question in the Light of the Orthodox and Catholic *Lex Orandi* Traditions¹

ROBERT F. TAFT, S.J.

The Latin adage of Prosper of Aquitaine (d. ca. 463), "*legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi* — let the rule of prayer set the rule of belief,"² often collapsed to the shorthand "*lex orandi est lex credendi* — the rule of prayer is the rule of faith," summarizes the relationship between a community's

1. I began work on this article during July-August 1988 as a Summer Fellow in Byzantine Studies at the Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies in Washington, D.C. I wish to express my gratitude to the Trustees of Harvard University who awarded me this fellowship and to the director and staff of Dumbarton Oaks, as well as to the community of Summer Fellows, for their kindness and cooperation. A special word of thanks is due to Jill Bonner, Assistant for Technical Services, and Mark Zapatka, Assistant for Readers' Services, in the Byzantine Library of Dumbarton Oaks. Their unfailingly kind, generous, and prompt assistance in obtaining materials rapidly and efficiently greatly facilitated my work.

The following abbreviations are used in subsequent notes:

AP	The no-longer extant Antiochene Greek Liturgy of the Apostles from which CHR and APSyr are presumed to derive
APSyr	The Syriac Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles (I)
BAS	The Liturgy of St. Basil (the Byzantine redaction unless otherwise specified)
CHR	The Byzantine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom
CPG	<i>Clavis Patrum Graecorum</i> I-V, ed. M. Geerard, F. Glorie (Corpus Christianorum, Turnhout: Brepols, 1983-87)
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (Vienna, 1866-)
LEW	F. E. Brightman, <i>Liturgies Eastern and Western</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896)

worship and its beliefs. As you pray, so do you believe. If you want to know what Christians are all about, observe what they do and say when they gather in church to express before God and one another what they think about him, themselves, and their relation to one another and to him. Gerhard Delling has put it in contemporary terms:

Worship is the self-portrayal of religion. In worship the sources by which religion lives are made visible, its expectations and hopes are expressed, and the forces which sustain it are made known. In many respects the essence of a religion is more directly intelligible in its worship than in statements of its basic principles or even in descriptions of its sentiments.³

This is what the theologians call "*theologia prima*" or first-level theology, the faith expressed in the life of the Church antecedent to speculative questioning of its implications, prior to its formulation in dogmatic propositions resulting from "*theologia secunda*" or second-level theology, systematic reflection on the lived mystery in the Church.

In these pages I would like to reflect on the *lex orandi* traditions of the traditional Byzantine and Roman anaphoras (prayers of the eucharistic offering) in the light of presumed or perceived differences between the Orthodox and Catholic *leges credendi* on the issue of the form(ula) of eucharistic consecration.

Mansi	J. D. Mansi, <i>Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio</i> (53 vols., 1st ed. Florence, 1759-; reprinted Paris/Leipzig: H. Welter, 1901)
OCP	<i>Orientalia Christiana Periodica</i> (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1935-)
PE	A. Hänggi and I. Pahl, <i>Prex Eucharistica</i> (Spicilegium Friburgense 12, Fribourg: Ed. Universitaires, 1968)
PG	J.-P. Migne (ed.), <i>Patrologia cursus completus, series graeco-latina</i> (161 vols., Paris: Migne, 1857-66)
PL	J.-P. Migne (ed.), <i>Patrologia cursus completus, series latina</i> (221 vols., Paris: Migne, 1844-65)
SC	Sources chrétiennes (Paris: Cerf, 1941-)

2. It appears around 435-440 in the *Indiculus* of Pseudo-Celestine (Mansi 4:461), which is now attributed to Prosper.

3. *Worship in the New Testament* (London, 1961), p. xi.

I. "Epiclesis"

The Greek substantive ἐπίκλησις, "invocation," from the verb ἐπικαλέω, "call upon" or "invoke," has given rise to the English term "epiclesis," which is used in liturgical nomenclature for a prayer calling down the Holy Spirit upon an object — e.g., the water of baptism — to sanctify it and render it fruitful for its destined use. In particular, "epiclesis" has become the technical term for that section or sections of the anaphora or eucharistic prayer in which the priest prays God the Father to send the Holy Spirit or Logos, or directly calls on the Holy Spirit or the Logos to come upon the oblation in order that it might attain the purpose for which Jesus is believed to have instituted it and ordered it repeated. This latter sense is the one in which I use the term "epiclesis" here.

The prehistory of the eucharistic epiclesis, before the emergence of its present form, I have treated elsewhere.⁴ The evidence from Palestine, Syria, and Egypt points unmistakably to an anaphoral Spirit epiclesis by the second half of the fourth century, and it has sometimes been presumed that the Spirit epiclesis is a fourth-century development.⁵ But what we now know from third-century sources like the anaphora of *Apostolic Tradition* 4,⁶ and especially the *Didaskalia*, which assigns a notable role to the Holy Spirit in the Church,⁷ specifically in the ministry of word and sacrament, including the sanctification of the eucharist (VI.21-22),⁸ has rendered untenable the view that a Spirit epiclesis *could not* have existed before the second half of the fourth century. Whether or not one actually did remains moot because of unresolved disputes concerning the epiclesis text of *Apostolic Tradition* 4.

At any rate, "epiclesis" is used in our modern, eucharistic sense — though not exclusively — from at least the fourth century. Also germane for our purposes is the earlier use of the term "epiclesis" for the entire prayer over the gifts, a point I will return to later.⁹

4. R. F. Taft, "From Logos to Spirit: On the Early History of the Epiclesis," in A. Heitz and H. Rennings (eds.), *Gratias agamus. Studien zum eucharistischen Hochgebet. Für Balthasar Fischer* (Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1992), pp. 489-501.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 494-98.

6. Cited below at note 11.

7. I.1.8; IV.5; V.1; VI.7.14, 23, *Didascalia apostolorum: The Syriac Version Translated and Accompanied by the Verona Fragments, with an Introduction and Notes*, by R. H. Connolly (Oxford: Clarendon, 1929), pp. 3, 20, 156, 161, 200, 212, 258.

8. *Ibid.*, pp. 242-52.

9. See below at notes 81-85.

II. From Communion to Consecratory Epiclesis

The epiclesis immediately follows the anamnesis in anaphoras of the Antiochene type. In its evolved form in prayers like the Byzantine anaphoras of St. Basil (BAS) and St. John Chrysostom (CHR), this Antiochene epiclesis comprises three easily identifiable parts: (1) the petition for the coming or sending of the Spirit, (2) the petition that this coming effect the consecration of the gifts, and (3) the petition that this coming make these consecrated gifts fruitful unto salvation for those who receive them in communion.

The earliest anaphoral epicleses, however, contained only parts 1 and 3 of this structure of the later, developed consecratory-type epiclesis, with no part 2, i.e., no explicit petition for the consecration of the elements. The apocryphal *Acts of Thomas* 133, from the first half of the third century, for example, has this eucharistic epiclesis: "May the power of blessing come and dwell in the bread, so that all the souls who partake of it may be washed free of sin."¹⁰ Our earliest extant complete anaphoral text, *Apostolic Tradition* 4 (ca. 215), concludes the eucharistic prayer with a similar primitive epiclesis: "And we ask you to send your Holy Spirit upon the offering of the holy Church. Congregating [them] into one, to all the saints who receive [it] grant [it to be] for the fulfillment of the Holy Spirit unto the confirmation of faith in truth. . . ." ¹¹ Likewise the original epiclesis of the fifth-century *Testamentum Domini* I.23,¹² would read, according to Botte's convincing reconstitution of the original Greek text: "Lord, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, send the Holy Spirit upon this drink and upon this your holy food. Make it be for us not unto judgement, shame, or condemnation, but for the healing and strength of our spirit."¹³

Disputes about the original shape of these texts notwithstanding¹⁴ —

10. PE 78.

11. B. Botte (ed.), *La Tradition apostolique de S. Hippolyte. Essai de reconstitution* (Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 39, Münster: Aschendorff, 1963), p. 16; see also B. Botte, "L'épiclese de l'anaphore d'Hippolyte," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 14 (1947), pp. 241-51.

12. *Testamentum Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, ed. I. E. Rahmani (Mainz: Kirchheim, 1899), p. 43.

13. Botte, "L'épiclese," pp. 245-48.

14. E.g., the *Apostolic Tradition* Spirit epiclesis is considered a fourth-century interpolation by such authoritative commentators as Dix and Bouyer: G. Dix, *The*

they concern the question whether the petition for the fruits of communion originally commenced with a prayer for the coming of the Spirit — the point I wish to make remains unaffected: the original petition was not explicitly consecratory, regardless of whether the coming of the Spirit was considered the cause of these benefits.

So the pristine epiclesis was primarily a prayer for communion, not for consecration. It was directed at the sanctification of the *communicants*, not of the *gifts*. Or, better, it was a prayer for the sanctification of the *ecclesial communion*, not for the sanctification of its sacramental sign, the *Holy Communion*.

The old Roman canon retains such an ancient communion-type epiclesis following the institution. It is a text redolent of the *Testamentum Domini* I.23 epiclesis in Botte's reconstruction just cited:

*Supplices te rogamus, omnipotens Deus, iube haec perferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum in conspectu divinae majestatis tuae, ut quotquot ex hac altaris participatione sacrosanctum Filii tui corpus et sanguinem sumpserimus, omni benedictioni caelesti et gratia repleamur.*¹⁵

Humbly we implore you, almighty God, bid these offerings be carried by the hands of your holy angel to your altar on high in the presence of your divine majesty, so that those of us who, sharing in the sacrifice at this altar, shall have received the sacred body and blood of your Son, may be filled with every heavenly blessing and grace.

Modern commentators are right, then, to distinguish the more primitive "communion epiclesis" from the "developed" or "consecratory epiclesis" containing the later interpolated explicit prayer for the hallowing of the gifts and their change into the body and blood of Christ.

If this distinction has proved useful for the history and interpretation of liturgy, its *theological implications* must not be pushed beyond the evidence. For it is clear that *any prayer* for the power of God to come upon something in order that it be unto salvation for those who partake of it or participate in it as God intended necessarily implies that God *do something*

Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St Hippolytus of Rome, Bishop and Martyr (London: SPCK, 1937), pp. 75-79; L. Bouyer, *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer* (Notre Dame/London: University of Notre Dame, 1968), pp. 170-77.

15. PE 435.

by his coming to make that object salvific — in this case, to make bread and wine the body and blood of Christ. Hence to call a text a "communion epiclesis," not a "consecration epiclesis," is only to comment on the structure of its text and not in any way to infer that such a more primitive, less explicit epicletic prayer is not, in fact, implicitly consecratory.

This realization led early on to rendering this theology explicit. For if the petition of the earlier Spirit epiclesis in *Apostolic Tradition* 4¹⁶ is directed at the benefits of communion rather than the consecration of the gifts, already in Cyril/John II, *Catechesis* 5.7 (cf. 1.7; 3.3),¹⁷ Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Homily* 16.12,¹⁸ and *Apostolic Constitutions* VIII.12.39,¹⁹ our earliest witnesses to the Spirit epiclesis after *Apostolic Tradition* 4, the prayer is expressly consecratory.

III. The Byzantine Epiclesis Texts

The epiclesis texts of CHR and BAS read as follows. I give the CHR text from the earliest manuscript, the eighth-century Vatican codex *Barberini Gr. 336* (ff. 31v-32r).²⁰ Italicized texts are peculiar to one or the other

16. Note 10 above.

17. Cyrille de Jérusalem, *Catéchèses mystagogiques*, introduction, critical text, and notes by A. Piédangel, tr. P. Paris (SC 126bis, Paris: Cerf, 1988), pp. 94, 124, 154. The date of this witness to the intercessions/commemorations in the hagiopolite eucharistic anaphora depends on the much controverted question of authorship between Cyril during his turbulent episcopacy (348-357, 362-367, 378-386) and his successor John II (386-417). Piédagnel has reviewed the evidence, and the weight of opinion seems to be leaning toward the following conclusions: the catecheses are from the end of the century, most likely after 380 (Cyril died in 387); *in their present form* they are attributable to John as their final redactor; but they probably go back to texts of Cyril that were used year after year, undergoing redactional emendations in the process; they still retain elements derived directly from Cyril (*ibid.*, Introduction pp. 21-28, Appendix I: "L'auteur des Catéchèses Mystagogiques," pp. 177-87, esp. pp. 185-87).

18. R. Tonneau and R. Devreesse, *Les homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste* (Studi e testi 145, Vatican City: Vatican Polyglott Press, 1949), p. 553.

19. *Les Constitutions apostoliques*, ed. M. Metzger, vol. 3: V-VIII (SC 336, Paris 1987), pp. 198-200.

20. Since the same parallel passages of these two anaphoras will be referred to often in the following pages, I give here once and for all the editions where they may be found in the original Syriac and Greek: APSy: *Anaphorae Syriacae, quotquot in*

redaction and are presumed not to be part of the lost *Urtext*, the Greek Anaphora of the Apostles (AP), from which both CHR and APSyr derive.²¹ The final section [8], the petition for the fruits of communion, I have already treated elsewhere.²²

CHR

1. *Again we offer you this reasonable and unbloody worship,*

2. *and we invoke and pray and beseech [you],*

3. *send down your Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these offered gifts,*

4. *and make this bread the precious body of your Christ,*

5. *changing [it] by your Holy Spirit,*

6. *and that [which is] in this chalice the precious blood of your Christ,*

APSyr

1. *So then,*

2. *we ask of you, Lord almighty and God of the holy virtues, prostrate on our faces before you,*

3. *that you send your Holy Spirit upon these offered gifts*

4. *and show this bread [to be] the precious body of our Lord Jesus Christ,*

6. *and this chalice [to be] the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ,*

codicibus adhuc repertae sunt, cura Pontificii Institutii Studiorum Orientalium editae et Latinae versae, I-III (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1939-81) 1.2, pp. 203-27, here pp. 218-20 = H. Engberding, "Die syrische Anaphora der zwölf Apostel und ihre Paralleltexthe einander gegenübergestellt und mit neuen Untersuchungen zur Urgeschichte der Chrysostomosliturgie begleitet," *Oriens Christianus* 34 = series 3, vol. 12 (1938), pp. 213-47; here 224-28 = PE 267; CHR: LEW, 329-30 = PE 226.

21. On this whole question see R. F. Taft, "The Authenticity of the Chrysostom Anaphora Revisited: Determining the Authorship of Liturgical Texts by Computer," *OCP* 56 (1990), pp. 5-55, esp. pp. 5-21, 48-55.

22. R. F. Taft, "The Fruits of Communion in the Anaphora of St. John Chrysostom," in I. Scicolone (ed.), *Psallendum. Miscellanea di studi in onore del Prof. Jordi Pinell i Pons*, O.S.B. (Analecta liturgica 15 = Studia Anselmiana 105; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Liturgico Sant' Anselmo, 1992), pp. 275-302.

7. *changing [it] by your Holy Spirit,*

8. *so that for those who receive [them] they might be for sobriety of soul, for forgiveness of sins, for communion in your Holy Spirit, for fullness of the kingdom, for filial confidence before you, and not unto judgement or damnation.*

so that for *all* those who receive them they might be for *life and resurrection, and the forgiveness of sins, and the health of soul and body, and the enlightening of the mind, and for a good defense before the dread judgement seat of your Christ, and that no one of your people might perish, Lord, but make us all worthy . . . etc.*

The corresponding text of BAS reads as follows. The segments in brackets are found in the Byzantine redaction but not in the *Urtext* extant in the Sahidic BAS:²³

1. Wherefore, all-holy Master, we too, your sinful and unworthy servants, deemed worthy to serve at your holy altar . . . because of your mercies and compassions which you have so abundantly showered upon us, dare to approach your holy altar and, offering you the figures (τὰ ἀντίτυπα) of the holy body and blood of your Christ,

2. we pray you and beseech you, O holy of holies, that, by the favor of your goodness,

3. your Holy Spirit may come upon us, and upon these offered gifts,

4. [and bless] and hallow and show (ἀναδείξει) this bread to be [indeed the precious body of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ,

6. and this cup to be indeed the precious blood of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ shed for the life of the world],

8. so that all of us who partake of this one bread and chalice may be united to one another in the communion of the one Holy Spirit, and that the partaking of the holy body and blood of your Christ may be for none of us unto judgment or condemnation, but that we might find

23. Sahidic UrBAS: J. Doresse, E. Lanne, *Un témoin archaïque de la liturgie copte de S. Basile* (Bibliothèque du Muséon 47; Louvain: Publications Universitaires/Institut Orientaliste, 1960), pp. 21-22; Byzantine BAS: LEW, 329-30 = PE 236, cf. 352.

mercy and grace together with all the saints . . . [there follows the commemoration of the saints and of the dead].

IV. Animadversions on the Texts

1. *The Consecratory Petition of BAS [4, 6]*

In the BAS *Urtex*¹ extant in the ancient Sahidic redaction, the object of the consecratory verbs is simply “the holy of holies,” replacing the entire bracketed segment so that the relevant consecratory expression reads: “. . . and we pray you our God, sinful and unworthy and miserable as we are, and we adore you: by the favor of your goodness may your Holy Spirit come upon us and upon these offered gifts and sanctify and show [them to be] the holy of holies.” There are also variants in the petition for the fruits of communion, but that section does not concern us here.

2. *The Consecratory Petitions of CHR [4-7]*

I have already discussed certain redactional emendations in the CHR text necessitated by the later reworking of the transition from anamnesis to epiclesis.²⁴ But this issue does not affect the point under discussion here, which concerns the explicitly consecratory petitions [4-7]. I would consider this entire formula, and not just where CHR departs from APSyr, not to have been a part of UrAP — which is also UrCHR — but a later interpolation into both recensions, with APSyr giving the earlier, first stage of the expanded redaction. The formula is designed to explicitate the consecratory action of the Holy Spirit in changing the elements, transforming an earlier “communion epiclesis” into a later, more evolved “consecratory epiclesis.”

The reader should please note that my view here is not dictated by

24. R. F. Taft, “Some Structural Problems in the Syriac Anaphora of the Apostles I,” to appear in a Festschrift for Sebastian Brock (a special number of *ARAM Periodical*); “Understanding the Byzantine Anaphoral Oblation,” to appear in a Festschrift for Aidan Kavanagh; “The Oblation and Hymn of the Chrysostom Anaphora: Its Text and Antecedents,” *Bolletino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* 46 (1992), pp. 319-45; “Reconstituting the Oblation of the Chrysostom Anaphora: An Exercise in Comparative Liturgy,” *OCP* 59 (1993), pp. 387-402.

any Catholic vs. Orthodox polemic in the epiclesis vs. institution narrative question. As I explain below, I consider the extreme position of both sides to be equally erroneous. What interests me here is the text history of the formula. It is perfectly clear not only that the Holy Spirit epiclesis, in its most explicitly consecratory sense as a petition to change the gifts, had evolved long before any East-West dispute over the question. It is also clear that this development does no more than explicitate the meaning already implied in the more primitive communion epiclesis — and indeed, in the New Testament words of institution themselves (“this is my body, this is my blood”), as the saner theologians of East and West have held all along.

In my view, far too much has been made of the (per se undeniable) difference between the two types of epiclesis, for as Cyril/John II, the earliest witness to an expressly consecratory Holy Spirit epiclesis, says in *Catechesis* 5.7, “Whatever the Holy Spirit has touched is sanctified and changed,”²⁵ and that remains true whether the prayer asks for that change expressly or only implicitly. Hence a simple petition for the Spirit to come upon the gifts so that they may be for us unto sanctification implies that this is not an empty petition without effect.

But the explicitation of this effect via the insertion into the anaphoral epiclesis of a change petition is a later development, and since APSyr and CHR diverge at this point, I consider the entire “and make . . .” formula a later interpolation.

3. *The Consecratory Verbs: “Show” vs. “Make” [4]*

Over against the strong CHR verb “make” [4], the petition of APSyr [4] for the Spirit to “show” or have the gifts “appear” to be the body and blood of Christ²⁶ seems a more subtle, sacramentally sensitive term, referring to the “mystery of faith” to be “seen” only with the eyes of faith. I would consider it more primitive than the CHR reading, especially since it is supported by analogous expressions in *Apostolic Constitutions* VIII.12.39 (“so that [the Holy Spirit] make this bread appear [ἀποφῆνῃ] as the body

25. Ed. Piédagnel, SC 126bis:154.

26. PE 267. The reading is not, like so many of APSyr’s divergences from CHR, a Syriacism from the Syriac redaction of the anaphora of St. James, which has “make”: PE 271.

of your Christ”), BAS 4-6 above (“bless and sanctify and show [ἀναδείξει] this bread [to be] indeed the precious body of our Lord . . .”),²⁷ and Theophilus of Alexandria, *Epistula Paschalis* 13 (A.D. 402), preserved in Jerome’s Latin version (“The dominical bread in which the body of the Savior is shown [*ostenditur*] and the holy chalice . . . are sanctified through the invocation and coming of the Holy Spirit”).²⁸

Jugie has pointed out the parallelism between the “show” (ἀναδείξει) reading of the BAS epiclesis and the words of institution in the same anaphora.²⁹ Jesus, “taking bread in his holy and immaculate hands, and having presented (ἀναδείξας) it to you, the God and Father. . . .”³⁰ In the institution, together with Jesus we dedicate to the Father the gifts that the Father will then present to us in communion as Jesus’ body and blood.³¹

But any attempt to exploit such expressions to weaken the consecratory thrust of the formula would be anachronistic and without theological foundation. If sacramental signs as manifestations of a mystery of faith are to have any meaning at all, then to ask God to *show the gifts to be* the body and blood of Christ is to ask him that they, in fact, be what we believe them to be. It has already been shown, and is now generally accepted, that ἀναδείκνυμι, literally “show, show forth, manifest as,” was used in pagan Greek as a sacral term meaning “dedicate” or “consecrate” something to a god, and in patristic Greek to mean “bring forth, produce.”³² The Byzantine marriage rite uses it several times in

27. PE 92, 236.

28. “Panis dominicus quo Salvatoris corpus *ostenditur* et sacer calix . . . per invocationem et adventum Spiritus Sancti sanctificantur.” PL 20:801; cf. M. Jugie, “De epiclesi eucharistica secundum Basilium Magnum,” *Acta Academiae Velehradensis* 19 (1948), p. 204.

29. Jugie, “De epiclesi,” pp. 205-6.

30. PE 234.

31. For ἀναδείκνυμι in this sense of “offer, dedicate,” see also *Apostolic Constitutions* VIII.12.44, ed. Metzger, SC 336:202.

32. Literature and references in J. H. McKenna, *Eucharist and Holy Spirit: The Eucharistic Epiclesis in 20th Century Theology* (Alcuin Club Collections 57; Great Wakering, Essex: Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1975), p. 108 and p. 215, n. 18; J. Moreau, *Les anaphores des Liturgies de Saint Jean Chrysostome et de Saint Basile comparées aux canons romain et gallican* (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1927), p. 59, n. 1; E. Peterson, “Die Bedeutung von ἀναδείκνυμι in den griechischen Liturgien,” in *Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927), pp. 320-26; G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), p. 101.

this sense, for God having joined Adam and Eve in one body, (ἀμφοτέρους αὐτοὺς ἐν μέλος ἀναδείξας διὰ τῆς συζυγίας), having produced (ἀναδείξας) the twelve patriarchs from the union of Jacob and Rachel, and making the marriage being celebrated an honorable one (τίμιον αὐτοῖς τὸν γάμον ἀνάδειξον).³³ So ἀναδείξει can be taken as a synonym for the “make” (ποίησον) of the epicletic blessing in CHR [4], the Greek anaphora of St. James, and numerous other anaphoras, a reading which is only *apparently* stronger because of our modern rationalistic disjunction between the symbolic and the real, a disjunction completely foreign to the patristic mentality in both East and West.³⁴ But in BAS, too, the explicit request to send the Spirit on the bread and cup is a later interpolation not found in UrBAS. This strengthens my hypothesis that the parallel formula in CHR is a later addition as well.

4. The Change Petition of CHR [5, 7]

The phrase “changing [it/them] by your Holy Spirit,” with the direct object understood but not expressed, is repeated twice in *Barberini Gr.* 336, once over the bread and once over the cup [5, 7],³⁵ though not in other manuscripts of the ancient recension of CHR, which just give it once, over both bread and cup together, as in the *textus receptus*. The Constantinopolitan

33. J. Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον sive Rituale Graecorum . . .* (2nd ed., Venice: Bartholomaeus Javarina, 1730, reprinted Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1960), pp. 315-16, 318, 320.

34. Recall the famous dictum of Adolf von Harnack concerning the difference between the symbolic theology of the patristic period and the later rationalism: “Wir verstehen heute unter Symbole eine Sache, die das nicht ist, was sie bedeutet; damals verstand man unter Symbol eine Sache, die das in irgend welchem Sinne wirklich ist, was sie bedeutet. . . .” (Today we understand by symbol something which is not that which it represents; previously one understood by symbol something that in some sense really was that which it symbolized . . .), *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (4th ed., Tübingen: Mohr, 1909-10), 1:476. For the sort of thing the loss of this mentality led to in East and West, see Bishop Kallistos (Ware), “The Meaning of the Divine Liturgy for the Byzantine Worshipper,” in Rosemary Morris (ed.), *Church and People in Byzantium. Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies, Twentieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Manchester, 1986* (Birmingham: Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies, University of Birmingham, 1980), pp. 18-19.

35. LEW 330.5-6, 9-10 = PE 226.

euchology roll *Stavrou 109* omits the formula entirely,³⁶ but this is an eleventh-century manuscript and all earlier witnesses I have examined contain it. So from the manuscript tradition alone the reading cannot be challenged.³⁷

Nevertheless, this formula is clearly superfluous to the consecratory sense of the CHR epiclesis, being already adequately explicit in the "and make" petition. Furthermore, its variant form in APSyr shows it to be a later interpolation not found in UrAP. Since it does appear in NES,³⁸ a formulary, recognized as dependent on CHR, which dates from the first half of the sixth century, it had probably been interpolated into CHR at least by that time. The novel character of the expression is confirmed by the fact that it is not found in other anaphoras and is not part of the liturgical *Formelgut*, that common stock of vocabulary, phraseology, and set formulas used repeatedly in the Christian liturgical Greek of Late Antiquity.

Its presence in the Armenian anaphora of St. Athanasius³⁹ is doubtless the result of later Byzantine influence, commonly exerted on the Armenian Rite especially from around the tenth century, since it is not witnessed to in the commentary on the Armenian eucharist by Xosrov Anjewac'i (who died 965), written about A.D. 950.⁴⁰ Its presence in some Greek manuscripts of BAS, as well as in the *editio princeps* of Rome, 1526, and other early printed editions of the Basilian liturgy,⁴¹ is an obvious interpolation from

36. A. Grabar, "Un rouleau liturgique constantinopolitain et ses peintures," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 8 (1954), plate 15, following p. 166.

37. Indeed, even in *Stavrou 109* there is in the right margin an interpolation, visible but illegible to me in both Grabar's plate and in the microfilm, which may well be the copyist's or a later hand's correction of this oversight.

38. PE 395.

39. PE 323.

40. *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy by Xosrov Anjewac'i*, translated with an introduction by S. Peter Cowe (Armenian Church Classics, New York: St. Vartan Press, 1991), pp. 176-81 (nos. 103-105). On Xosrov and his commentary, see S. Salaville, "L'Explication de la Messe' de l'arménien Chosrov (950). Théologie et liturgie," *Echos d'Orient* 39 (1940-42), pp. 349-82.

41. P. N. Trepelas, *Αἱ τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας* (Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechischen Philologie 15, Athens: Verlag der byzantinisch-neugriechischen Jahrbücher, 1935), p. 184 (apparatus); and esp. M. I. Orlov, *Liturgija sv. Vasilija Velikago* (St. Petersburg: Sinodal'naja Tipografia, 1909), pp. xxiv-xxv, 208. The earliest manuscript listed by Orlov is *Grottaferrata Arsenii* (= *Cryptof.*

CHR. From there it entered the Slavonic recension,⁴² where it is still found in the *textus receptus* of the Slavonic Orthodox books, though it was rightly excised from the modern Roman editions,⁴³ and is not part of the Greek Orthodox *textus receptus*.⁴⁴ The 1927 Athens edition of the euchology even has a note to that effect.⁴⁵

5. The Chalice Petition [6]

The CHR text, "what is in this chalice," instead of the surely more primitive "this chalice" of APSyr and BAS as well as *Apostolic Constitutions* VIII.12.39⁴⁶ and the Greek anaphoras of St. James, Sarapion, St. Mark, the Der-Balizeh fragment, etc.,⁴⁷ I take to be a later refinement.

V. Ecumenical Reflections

1. Two Liturgical Expressions of Two Liturgical Theologies

Since one must reject any attempt to press texts beyond what they can bear, the most one can say is that the anaphoral texts surrounding the institution and epiclesis in BAS and CHR neither confirm nor exclude any particular

Arsenii), A.D. 1001, a now lost roll of BAS described by Goar, *Εὐγολόγιον* 151 note Y. On this manuscript and its dating see A. Strittmatter, "Notes on the Byzantine Synapte," *Traditio* 10 (1954), p. 89-90 and n. 18. Among other manuscripts Orlov notes with the variant are *Sinai Gr. 971* (13-14th c.) = A. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie liturgicheskix rukopisej xranjashchixsja v bibliotekax pravoslavnago vostoka*, I-II (Kiev: Tipografia Imperatorskago Universiteta Sv. Vladimira N. T. Korchak-Novitskago, 1895, 1901), III (Petrograd: no press indicated, 1917; all 3 vols. reprinted Hildesheim: G. Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1965) 2:249; *Petersburg Imperial Public Library Gr. 558* (14-15th c.) and *561* (A.D. 1561); *Moscow Synod Gr. 264* (554) (A.D. 1602). On this question see also LEW, 406, note a.

42. Orlov, *Liturgija* 209.

43. *Sluzebnik* (Rome: Grottaferrata Abbey Press, 1956), pp. 372-73.

44. For instance, see *Εὐγολόγιον τὸ μέγα* (Athens: M. I. Saliveros, 1927), p. 64; *Ἱερατικὸν* (Athens: Apostolike Diakonia, 1951), pp. 126-27; (1956), p. 186.

45. *Εὐγολόγιον τὸ μέγα* (see previous note).

46. Ed. Metzger, SC 336:198-200.

47. PE 92, 122, 126, 130, 236, 250, 267, etc.

theological thesis of when or by what particular part of the anaphoral prayer the consecration is effected.⁴⁸ My own view is that later precisions, in the sense in which they are sometimes posed today as the result of confessional disputes, are sterile and pointless. They were in no one's mind in the fourth century. Earlier liturgical language is metaphorical and evocative, not philosophical and ontological. Only later doctrinal problems will lead to the sorting out of what, exactly, this language meant in the more dogmatically precise terms of *theologia secunda*.

When that sorting out does occur, I think it fair to say that the overall flow, the thrust and sequence of idea and expression of the Roman Canon on the one hand and of BAS and CHR on the other are more patient of the distinct consecration theologies of the Latin and Byzantine traditions respectively. In short, what we are dealing with here, as in other dogmatic or theological issues that are thought to divide Catholic and Orthodox today are two distinct but complementary and *equally ancient* liturgical expressions of what the Church does in the eucharist. The eagerness with which some theologians, even today, attempt to magnify these issues into major doctrinal differences, even dire portents of defective dogma at the very heart of trinitarian faith, is reflective of little more than their need to bolster their self-identity by showing how different they are from everyone else.

For the Byzantines to denigrate the Roman view because it has no Holy Spirit epiclesis is simply untenable, for the Roman Canon is a prayer more primitive than any anaphora with an explicitly consecratory Spirit epiclesis. As we have seen above, the textual evidence for that is no earlier than the second half of the fourth century, and it would have been unthinkable before the developments in pneumatology in the third century, when we first see the sanctification of the eucharist attributed to the Holy Spirit in Christian writings. Anyone who would wish to argue that such an epiclesis is of the essence of a Christian eucharist must ineluctably conclude that no eucharist could have existed before the third or fourth century.

Equally fatuous would be any attempt to dismiss the consecratory epiclesis by arguing that it is a fourth-century innovation, whereas the institution narrative is found in the New Testament itself.⁴⁹ For the con-

48. I discuss these issues at greater length in Taft, "Understanding the Byzantine Anaphoral Oblation," cited in note 24.

49. However, this sort of thing caused problems for the sixteenth-century Reformers. See D. N. Power, "The Priestly Prayer: The Tridentine Theologians and the

secratory Spirit epiclesis simply makes explicit a theology already implicit in more primitive invocations and is a logical, indeed, perhaps inevitable development, given the later evolution of pneumatology and sacramental theology. Furthermore, today few reputable historians of the anaphora would hold it for certain that the earliest eucharistic prayers included, necessarily, an institution narrative.⁵⁰

Is there any way out of the impasse created by the later hardening of different liturgical systems into doctrinal disputes? It is not the task of the liturgical historian to sort such things out. It is the historian's duty, however, to draw attention to the *facts*, insofar as they can be attained. And on the basis of the facts, neither Latins nor Greeks can sustain, without being simply ridiculous in the face of their own history, a position that their view is the only legitimate one. In Christianity, tradition is the gauge of legitimacy. Both the Latin and Greek liturgical expressions of the eucharistic prayer of blessing over the bread and wine, and the implicit theologies that they unself-consciously expressed, coexisted peacefully for centuries not only in the liturgical celebrations of the one undivided Church. They were also explicitly formulated in the theologies of saints like Ambrose and John Damascene, still revered as saints and Fathers of the Church by both East and West. This means, I would think, that each Church must accept both expressions as legitimate, or render their pretense to orthodoxy untenable for having remained in communion for well over a millennium with a Church, and for continuing even today to venerate in their liturgical calendars its saints, that held, celebrated, and professed heretical views on so fundamental an issue as the eucharist.

In the less irenic past, as well, of course, as in our somewhat more ecumenical today,⁵¹ liturgical theologians with a modicum of historical

Roman Canon," in G. Austin (ed.), *Fountain of Life: In memory of Niels K. Rasmussen, O.P.* (NPM Studies in Church Music and Liturgy, Washington, D.C.: The Pastoral Press, 1991), pp. 133-38.

50. See the discussion and relevant literature in R. F. Taft, "The Interpolation of the Sanctus into the Anaphora: When and Where? A Review of the Dossier," Part I, *OCP* 57 (1991), pp. 289-95.

51. Though the late Timothy S. Healy, S.J., former president of Georgetown University and Librarian of the New York Public Library, rightly said, "anti-Catholicism seems to be the one allowable bigotry," I remain sanguine that the anti-Roman hysteria rife at the moment in certain Orthodox circles is a transitory phenomenon provoked by recent traumas.

knowledge and common sense have adopted a balanced, nonpolemical view of this issue. As early as the seventeenth century, no less a savant than the famous Bossuet (1627-1704) raised his voice in favor of sanity "without inquiring about precise moments" in this issue,⁵² sagely reminding us that

the intent of liturgies, and, in general, of consecratory prayers, is not to focus our attention on precise moments, but to have us attend to the action in its entirety and to its complete effect. . . . It is to render more vivid what is being done that the Church speaks at each moment as though it were accomplishing the entire action then and there, without asking whether the action has already been accomplished or is perhaps still to be accomplished.⁵³

And Dom Charles Chardon, O.S.B., in his *Histoire des sacrements* (Paris 1745) expressed this balanced view of the situation:

Despite this diversity [over the form or moment of consecration] there was formerly no dispute over this subject. The Greeks and Latins were convinced that the species [of bread and wine] were changed into the body and blood of our Savior in virtue of the words of the Canon of the Mass, without examining the precise moment at which this change occurred, nor just which of the words [of the anaphora] effected it as over against other [words]. One side said the change was effected by the prayer and invocation of the priest; the others said that it was the result of the words of Our Lord when he instituted this august sacrament. And they in no way believed that these different ways of expressing themselves were opposed to each other (and indeed they are not, as would be easy to show). But we shall leave that to the theologians to treat.⁵⁴

52. J.-B. Bossuet, *Explication de quelques difficultés sur les prières de la messe à un nouveau catholique* (Paris, 1710), pp. xlvi-xlvi, 1, cited in McKenna, *Eucharist and Holy Spirit* 139.

53. Bossuet, *Explication de quelques difficultés*, 45, ed. F. Lachat, *Oeuvres* 17 (Paris: L. Vives, 1864), pp. 74-75, tr. in R. Cabié, *The Eucharist* = A. G. Martimort (ed.), *The Church at Prayer*, vol. II (new edition, Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1986), p. 147.

54. "Nonobstant cette diversité, il n'y a eu autrefois aucune dispute sur ce sujet. Les Grecs et les Latins étaient persuadés que les espèces étaient changés au corps et au sang de notre Sauveur, en vertu des paroles du canon de la messe, sans examiner le moment précis auquel se faisait cette transmutation, ni les paroles qui l'opéraient plutôt les unes que les autres. Les uns disaient qu'elle se faisait par la prière et l'invocation du prêtre, les autres

2. Two Irreducible Expressions of One Common Faith

But are these two liturgical expressions, Roman and Byzantine, indeed *reconcilable*? Or are they rather two irreducible⁵⁵ if equally ancient and legitimate ways of expressing what everyone agrees is the same underlying reality? I do not think there can be any doubt about the reconcilability of the eucharistic *doctrine* of the two traditions as expressed in their liturgies and interpreted by their moderate exponents. Much has been made of the fact that long before the dispute began, John Chrysostom attributes consecratory efficacy both to the words of institution and to the epiclesis.⁵⁶ For Chrysostom, what happens in the eucharist happens by the power of the Holy Spirit, a teaching common to both the Greek and Latin Churches.⁵⁷ In *De coemet. et de cruce* 3, Chrysostom is clearly speaking of the epiclesis.⁵⁸ But in *De prodicione Judae hom.* 1-2.6, he attributes the consecration to Christ in the words of institution:

It is not man who causes what is present to become the body and blood of Christ, but Christ himself, who was crucified for us. The priest is the representative when he pronounces those words, but the power and the grace are those of the Lord. "This is my body," he says. This word changes the things that lie before us; and just as that sentence, "increase and

disaient qu'elle était l'effet des paroles de Notre-Seigneur quand il institua cet auguste sacrement; et ils ne croyaient point que ces diverses manières de s'exprimer fussent opposées entre elles, comme elles ne le sont pas effectivement, ce qu'il serait aisé de montrer; mais nous laissons cela à traiter aux théologiens." I cite it from the re-edition of J.-P. Migne, *Theologiae cursus completus*, 28 vols. (Paris: Migne, 1839-43), 20:249.

55. By "irreducible" I mean that one cannot simply be identified with or combined with the other without each losing its distinct and proper systems, which are neither identical nor reducible to a least common denominator without distortion.

56. See Salaville in Nicolas Cabasilas, *Explication de la Divine Liturgie*, tr. and notes by S. Salaville, 2nd ed. by R. Bornert, J. Gouillard, and P. Périchon (SC 4bis; Paris: Cerf, 1967), pp. 314-15.

57. *De sacerdotio* III.4.40-50; VI.4.34-44, Jean Chrysostome, *Sur le sacerdoce (Dialogue et Homélie)*, ed. A.-M. Malingrey (SC 272, Paris 1980), pp. 142-46, 316 = PG 48:642-45, 681 (= CPG 4316); *Oratio de beato Philogonio* 3, PG 48:753 (= CPG 4319); *De resurr. mortuorum* 8, PG 50:432 (= CPG 4340); *In pentec. hom.* 1, 4, PG 50:458-59 (= CPG 4343); *In Ioh. hom.* 45.2, PG 59:253 (= CPG 4425); *In 1 Cor hom.* 24.5, PG 61:204 (= CPG 4428).

58. PG 49:397-98 (= CPG 4337).

multiply," once spoken, extends through all time and gives to our nature the power to reproduce itself; likewise that saying, "This is my body," once uttered, from that time to the present day, and even until Christ's coming, makes the sacrifice complete at every table in the churches.⁵⁹

Nicholas Cabasilas (ca. 1350) and numerous Orthodox theologians after him have attempted to weaken the force of this text by arguing that Chrysostom assigns consecratory power not to the priest's *liturgical repetition* of Jesus' words now, but to the *historical institution itself*, that is, to the original utterance of Jesus, the force of which extends to all subsequent eucharistic celebrations.⁶⁰ But is this saying anything different from the position of the Latins, who obviously attribute the efficacy of these words not to the prayer of the priest, as Cabasilas accuses them, but to the indefectible effectiveness of the Word of God? Certainly not, as is perfectly clear in Ambrose, *De sacramentis* IV.4.14-17:

14 . . . to produce the venerable sacrament, the priest does not use his own words but the words of Christ. So it is the word of Christ which produces this sacrament. 15. Which word of Christ? The one by which all things were made. The Lord commanded and the heavens were made, the Lord commanded and the earth was made, the Lord commanded and the seas were made, the Lord commanded and all creatures were brought into being. You see, then, how effective the word of Christ is. If then there is such power in the word of the Lord Jesus that things which were not began to be, how much more effective must they be in changing what already exists into something else! . . . 17. Hear, then, how the word of Christ is accustomed to change all creatures and to change, when it will, the laws of nature. . . .⁶¹

59. PG 49:380, 389-90 (= CPG 4336); English adapted from J. Quasten, *Patrology*, 3 vols. (Utrecht-Antwerp: Spectrum Publishers, 1975), 3:481. This teaching of Chrysostom influenced the consecration theology of the East Syrian liturgical commentator Gabriel Qatraya bar Lipah (ca. 615): E. J. Kilmartin, "John Chrysostom's Influence on Gabriel Qatraya's Theology of Eucharistic Consecration," *Theological Studies* 42 (1981), pp. 444-57.

60. Chapter 29, ed. Salaville, SC 4bis:178-90; cf. the commentary of Salaville, *ibid.* pp. 314-15; McKenna, *Eucharist and Holy Spirit*, p. 59.

61. "14. . . . *ut conficiatur uenerabile sacramentum, iam non suis sermonibus utitur sacerdos, sed utitur sermonibus Christi. Ergo sermo Christi hoc conficit sacramentum.* 15. *Quis est sermo Christi? Nempe is quo facta sunt omnia. Iussit dominus factum*

So it seems to me that Latin theology would be in full agreement with what Chrysostom says on other occasions: the same Jesus accomplishes the same eucharist, the same marvels, in the liturgy as at the Last Supper.⁶² For instance, Chrysostom, in *In 2 Tim hom.* 2.4, affirms:

The gifts which God bestows are not such as to be the effects of the virtue of the priest. All is from grace. His part is but to open his mouth, while God works all. He [the priest] only completes the sign (σύμβολον πληροῖ). The offering is the same whoever offers it, Paul or Peter. It is the same one Christ gave to his disciples, and which priests now accomplish. The latter is in no way inferior to the former, because the same one who sanctified the one, sanctifies the other, too. For just as the words which God spoke are the same as the ones the priest pronounces now, so is the offering the same, just like the baptism which he gave.⁶³

Here we find all the elements of the classic Eastern Orthodox theology of consecration, which, except in some of its extreme polemical expressions, does not attribute the sanctification of the gifts to the Holy Spirit epiclesis *alone*, that is, *sensu negante*, in deliberate exclusion of Jesus and his words. Cabasilas, for instance, says of the words of institution:

Repeating those words, he [the priest] prostrates himself and prays and beseeches, while applying to the offered gifts these divine words of his Only-Begotten Son, the Savior, that they may, after having received his most holy and all-powerful Spirit, be transformed (μεταβληθῆναι) —

est caelum, iussit dominus facta est terra, iussit dominus facta sunt maria, iussit dominus omnis creatura generatus est. Vides ergo quam operatorius sermo sit Christi. Si ergo tanta uis est in sermone domine Iesu ut inciperent esse quae non erant, quanto magis operatorius est ut sint quae erant et in aliud commutentur. . . . 17. Accipe ergo quemadmodum sermo Christi creaturam omnem mutare consueuerit et mutet quando uult instituta naturae. . . ." Ambroise de Milan, *Des Sacrements, Des mystères*, ed. B. Botte (2nd ed., SC 25bis: Paris, Cerf 1961), p. 110 = CSEL 73:52-53; English tr. adapted in part from E. Mazza, *Mystagogy* (New York: Pueblo, 1989), p. 183; cf. *De mysteriis* IX.52: "The sacrament you receive is produced by the word of Christ" (SC 25 bis:186 = CSEL 73:112).

62. *In Mt hom.* 50(51).3; 82(83).5, PG 58:507, 744 (= CPG 4424).

63. PG 62:612 (= CPG 4437); tr. adapted from *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. P. Schaff (reprint, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans), series 1, 13:483.

the bread into his precious and sacred Body, the wine into his immaculate and sacred blood.⁶⁴

Here [in the liturgy] we believe that the Lord's words do indeed accomplish the mystery, but through the medium of the priest, his invocation, and his prayer.⁶⁵

So for Cabasilas, neither epiclesis nor institution narrative stands alone; they are interdependent in the context of the anaphora, as we would say today. If one prescind from the polemical context of Cabasilas's remarks, forced on him by Latin impugning of the Byzantine consecratory epiclesis, one will see a balanced view of the anaphora and of the interrelatedness of its constituent parts: "The words [of institution] do not take effect simply of themselves or under any circumstances, but there are many essential conditions, and without those they do not achieve their end."⁶⁶

Reputable Catholic theologians today would say the same thing, rejecting theologies that would isolate the institution narrative from its essential setting within the anaphora.⁶⁷ Nor is that a novelty in Catholic thought. Similar views can be found in the Latin Fathers in the period anterior to the fourteenth-century epiclesis dispute between Byzantines and Latins. Isidore (ca. 560–636), bishop of Seville from 600–601 to 636, says in *De officiis ecclesiae* I.15.3 that the consecration occurs in the canon. Isidore calls it the "sixth prayer" of the "ordo of the mass and prayers by which the sacrifices offered to God are consecrated" (I.15.1).⁶⁸ From the

64. Chapter 27, ed. Salaville, SC 4bis:174; tr. adapted from Nicholas Cabasilas, *A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy*, tr. by J. M. Hussey and P. A. McNulty (London: SPCK, 1960), p. 70.

65. Chapter 29.4, SC 4bis:182; tr. Hussey-McNulty, p. 72.

66. *Ibid.*

67. For an excellent, fresh Catholic discussion of these issues, see E. J. Kilmartin, "The Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit in the Sanctification of the Eucharistic Elements," *Theological Studies* 45 (1984), pp. 225–53; earlier views are summarized both excellently and in truly ecumenical and irenic fashion by McKenna, *Eucharist and Holy Spirit*, the standard work on the topic. See also his more recent "Eucharistic Prayer: Epiclesis," in A. Heitz and H. Rennings (eds.), *Gratias agamus. Studien zum eucharistischen Hochgebet. Für Balthasar Fischer* (Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1992), pp. 283–91, which, I think, I think, is in basic agreement with the point of view I develop in this article.

68. "Ordo . . . missae et orationum quibus oblata Deo sacrificia consecrantur." PL 83:732.

context it is clear that he is referring to that section of the anaphora following the preface that extends from the Sanctus to the Our Father inclusive (I.15.2):

Then [comes] *the sixth prayer* [of the eucharist], from which results the formation of the sacrament as an oblation that is offered to God, sanctified through the Holy Spirit, formed into the body and blood of Christ. The last of these is the prayer by which our Lord instructed his disciples to pray, saying: "Our Father, who art in heaven."⁶⁹

Isidore is usually considered the "last of the Latin Fathers," so right through to the end of the patristic period the view was current in Latin theology that the eucharistic consecration was the work of the Holy Spirit and that the prayer that effected it was the canon or anaphora, without further specification of one of its component parts as the "form" of the sacrament. Fulgentius of Ruspe (died 533) is another Latin author clearly to be understood in this sense.⁷⁰

Nor is this view much different from that of the medieval Latin

69. "Porro sexta [oratio] exhinc succedit conformatio sacramenti, ut oblatio, quae Deo offertur, sanctificata per Spiritum sanctum, Christi corpori et sanguini conformetur. Harum ultima est oratio, qua Dominus noster discipulos suos orare instituit, dicens: Pater noster, qui es in coelis." PL 83:733. For a full exposition of Isidore's views on this question, see J. R. Geiselmann, *Die Abendmahlslehre an der Wende der christlichen Spätantike zum Frühmittelalter. Isidor von Sevilla und das Sakrament der Eucharistie* (Munich: Max Hueber, 1930), pp. 180–97, 244–47; also S. Salaville, "Épiclèse," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 5:246.

70. *Ad Monimum* II.6, 9–10, PL 65:184–85, 187–88. Geiselmann, *Abendmahlslehre* 198–224 cites as reflecting this view numerous other Latin exponents, but many of the texts he adduces are far from probative. One is the much-discussed fragment of Pope Gelasius I (492–496), *Letter to Elpidius, bishop of Volterra 2*: "Nam quomodo ad divini mysterii consecrationem coelestis Spiritus invocatus adveniet, si sacerdos, et qui eum adesse deprecatur, criminosis plenus actionibus reprobetur?" ("For how can the Holy Spirit come who is invoked for the consecration of the divine mystery, if the priest, who calls upon him to be present stands condemned because he is filled with wicked deeds?") = Frag. 7, *Gelasius Elpidio episcopo Volaterrano 2*, ed. A. Thiel, *Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae et quae ad eos scriptae sunt*, vol. I: A S. Hilario usque ad S. Hormisdam, ann. 461–523 (Braunsberg: E. Peter, 1868), p. 486 = PL 59:143A; tr. McKenna, *Eucharist and Holy Spirit*, p. 66. But a posthumously published study of C. Callewaert has demonstrated that this text does not necessarily refer to the Canon Missae: "Histoire positive du Canon romain. Une épiclese à Rome?" *Sacris erudiri* 2 (1949), pp. 95–110, esp. pp. 95–98.

commentators, as Cabasilas himself recognized when he cited the *Supplices* prayer following the institution in the Roman Canon⁷¹ as saying basically the same thing as the Byzantine epiclesis.⁷² Peter Lombard (ca. 1095–1160), speaking of the *Supplices*, says in his *Sentences* IV.13:

It is called “Missa” that the heavenly messenger *might come to consecrate the lifegiving body*, according to the expression of the priest: “Almighty God, bid that this be borne by the hand of your holy angel to your altar on high. . . .”⁷³

Even more explicitly, shortly after 1215, John Teutonicus’s comment on the same prayer in the *Glossa ordinaria ad Decretum Gratiani* — and its inclusion in such an anthology shows how common and acceptable such a view must have been — says: “‘Bid,’ that is: *make*. ‘Be borne,’ that is: *be transubstantiated*. Or: ‘be borne,’ that is, be assumed, that is: *be changed*. . . .”⁷⁴ Note, please, that both these authoritative medieval Latin commentators are speaking here of a prayer said *after* the words of institution in the Roman Canon.

Finally, a modern Catholic classic on the eucharist, Maurice de la Taille’s *Mysterium fidei*, while rejecting some of Cabasilas’s affirmations made in the heat of anti-Latin polemic, accepts his identification of the *Supplices* prayer as “a Roman epiclesis that corresponds both in the place it occupies and in its meaning — though not in its external form — to the Eastern epicleses.”⁷⁵

So if the classic Latin doctrine on the words of institution as the form of consecration can be traced back to Ambrose, who states the teaching

71. Cited in full above at note 15.

72. Chapter 30, ed. Salaville, SC 4bis:190-99; tr. Hussey-McNulty 76-79.

73. “Missa enim dicitur eo quod caelestis nuntius ad consecrandum vivificum corpus adveniat, juxta dictum sacerdotis: Omnipotens Deus, jube haec perferri per manus sancti Angeli tui in sublime altare tuum. . . .” PL 192:868.

74. “Jube, id est: *fac*. Perferri, id est: *transsubstantiari*. Vel: perferri, id est sursum efferri, id est *converti*. . . .” *Decretum de consecratione* 2.72, in *Glossa ordinaria* (Rome, 1582) II, 1813, cited in Salaville, SC 4bis:322. Salaville cites numerous other ninth to sixteenth-century Latin authors in his classic (if one-sided) study “Épiclèse,” pp. 265-70.

75. “. . . épiclèse romaine, répondant, pour la place qu’elle occupe et pour le sens qu’elle a, quoique non par sa forme extérieure, aux épicleses orientales.” M. de la Taille, *Mysterium fidei* (3rd ed., Paris: Beauchesne, 1931), p. 276; cf. Salaville, SC 4bis:319-20, for similar modern Latin views.

unambiguously in his *De sacramentis* IV.4.14-17, 5.21-23, and *De mysteriis* IX.52-54,⁷⁶ not until the twelfth century do the scholastics formulate the thesis that the words of institution are the essential “form of the sacrament” that alone effect the consecration of the bread and wine.⁷⁷ This, of course, poses a problem of method. As Hughes notes, if the idea that the eucharistic consecration takes place through the recitation of the words of institution alone did not become general in the West until well into the Middle Ages, centuries after the Roman Canon was first formulated, it is illegitimate to read into its prayers a meaning that was unknown when those texts originated.⁷⁸

Nonetheless, it is equally clear that we are dealing with two distinct liturgical traditions both then and now. Following long Catholic tradition, the prayers of the “split” or “double” epiclesis in which the traditional Roman anaphoral structure embeds the institution narrative — prayers which, in Cabasilas’s words, “apply” the words of Jesus to the gifts — place the overtly consecratory petition *before* the institution narrative, giving a more explicit “formularly” character to Jesus’ words. This cannot be said of the Byzantine anaphoras, which tell the story and *then* ask for the consecration of the gifts. Hence when Orthodox authors say that the institution account of CHR and BAS is pronounced *narratively*, not *significatively*,⁷⁹ they are simply affirming what is clear from the text of their prayers, as H.-J. Schulz’s recent serenely objective Catholic commentary, devoid of all polemics, admits, *pace* earlier Catholic apologists.⁸⁰

76. Ed. Botte, SC 25bis:110, 114, 186-88 = CSEL 73:51-53, 55-56, 112-13.

77. Geiselmann, *Abendmahlslehre* pp. 192-94, 144-47; J. J. Hughes, “Eucharistic Sacrifice: Transcending the Reformation Deadlock,” *Worship* 13 (1969), p. 540; J. A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Missarum sollemnia*, 2 vols. (New York: Benzinger Brothers, 1951, 1955), 2:203-4, n. 9: “In general Christian antiquity, even until way into the Middle Ages, manifested no particular interest regarding the determination of the precise moment of the consecration. Often reference was made merely to the entire Eucharistic prayer. It is Florus Diaconus, *De actione miss.*, c. 60 (PL 119:52f.), in the Carolingian period, who with particular stress brought out the significance of the words of consecration; *ille in suis sacerdotibus quotidie loquitur.*”

78. Hughes, “Eucharistic Sacrifice,” p. 539.

79. Cabasilas 29.22, ed. Salaville, SC 4bis:190; tr. Hussey-McNulty, p. 76.

80. *Ökumenische Glaubenseinheit aus eucharistischer Überlieferung* (Konfessionsskundliche u. kontroverstheologische Studien 39; Paderborn: Bonifacius-Druckerei, 1976); “Liturgischer Vollzug und sakramentale Wirklichkeit des eucharistischen Opfers,” *OCP* 45 (1979), pp. 245-66; 46 (1980), pp. 5-19. Also “Ökumenische Aspekte der Darbrin-

VI. Conclusion

So I believe that there *are* irreducible local differences in the *liturgical expression* of what I would take to be the fully reconcilable *teaching* of both Churches on the eucharist: that the gifts of bread and wine are sanctified via a prayer (the anaphora), which applies to the present gifts of bread and wine the words of Jesus narrated in the institution account. *How* the individual anaphoras make this application has varied widely across the traditions. Broadly speaking, that reality is expressed:

1. by narrating the story of the Last Supper — the institution account — which provides the biblical warrant for what is being done; and
2. by asking, in some way or other, that God receive or accept or bless or sanctify the gifts or oblation, so that they may be unto salvation for the communicants and for the benefit of all the living and dead.

Just how these two pieces are arranged and articulated and how they express what they express, is a matter of local tradition, particular history, the doctrinal concerns of time and place. These should not, indeed in my view cannot, with any historical legitimacy be seen in conflict with parallel but divergent expressions of the same basic realities in a different historico-ecclesial milieu. Orthodox theologies that attempt to restrict the consecration to the epiclesis only; Catholic theologies that wish to isolate the words of institution from its context as a “form of consecration” independent of the anaphoral setting in which they are embedded and that reveal their meaning and apply them to the rite being celebrated; Orthodox or Catholic theologies that attempt to identify within the anaphora a particular “moment of consecration” not merely as an explanation of the most significant portions of

gungsaussagen in der erneuerten römischen und in der byzantinischen Liturgie,” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 19 (1978), pp. 7-28; “Orthodoxe Eucharistiefeier und ökumenisches Glaubenszeugnis,” *Der christliche Osten* 34/1 (1979), pp. 10-15; “Das frühchristlich-altkirchliche Eucharistiebet. Überlieferungskontinuität und Glaubenszeugnis,” *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 70 (1980), pp. 139-53; “Patterns of Offering and Sacrifice,” *Studia Liturgica* (1982), pp. 34-48. On BAS see also the recent study of R. Meßner, “Prex Eucharistica. Zur Frühgeschichte der Basileios-Anaphora. Beobachtungen und Hypothesen,” in E. Renhart and A. Schnider (eds.), *Sursum corda. Variationen einem liturgischen Motiv. Für Philipp Harnoncourt zum 60. Geburtstag* (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt und Andreas Schnider Verlags-Atelier, 1990), pp. 121-29.

their prayer tradition, but in polemical opposition to another “moment” in another tradition and that then interpret in function of this “moment” whatever precedes and follows it in the anaphoral text — none of these tendencies represent the best of the common tradition of the undivided Church of the first millennium, and they are to be resolutely rejected.

This view, that the prayer of consecration is the anaphora in its entirety, not just some segment of it set apart as an isolated “formula,” is, I think, more faithful to the earlier common tradition of the undivided Church. Several patristic texts lend themselves to this interpretation, using the term “epiclesis” for the whole prayer over the gifts. Among the earliest second-century witnesses to the eucharist in the period following the New Testament, Justin’s *Apology* I.65-67,⁸¹ written ca. A.D. 150, testifies to a prayer over the gifts that included the institution narrative (I.66). After that prayer, the gifts were no longer “ordinary food or ordinary drink but . . . flesh and blood of that same Jesus who was made flesh” (I.66). From the same period (ca. 185), Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* IV.18.5, calls this consecration prayer “the invocation (τὴν ἐπίκλησιν) of God.”⁸² Indeed, “epiclesis” is commonly used for the entire prayer over the gifts even in sources as late as the fourth century.⁸³ For although Cyril/John II of Jeru-

81. PG 68-72.

82. Irenée de Lyon, *Contre les hérésies*, ed. A. Rousseau and L. Doutreleau, I/1-2 (SC 263-64, Paris: Cerf, 1979), SC 264:611; cf. also *Adv. haer.* I.13.2, *ibid.* I/1-2, ed. A. Rousseau (SC 263-64, Paris: Cerf, 1979), SC 264:190-91.

83. Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium (Philosophoumena)* VI.39.2, PG 16/3:3258 (= CPG 1899; on its disputed authenticity cf. CPG 1870); Firmilian of Caesarea, cited in Cyprian, *Ep.* 75.10, CSEL 3/2:818 (tr. and discussion of this text with relevant literature in A. Bouley, *From Freedom to Formula: The Evolution of the Eucharistic Prayer from Oral Improvisation to Written Texts* [Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity 21; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1981], pp. 143-45; G. A. Michell, “Firmilian and Eucharistic Consecration,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 5 [1954], pp. 215-20); *Didaskalia* VI.22.2, Connolly, *Didaskalia apostolorum*, pp. 252-53; cf. J. W. Tyrer, “The Meaning of ἐπίκλησις,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 25 (1923-24), pp. 139-50; esp. pp. 142-45, 148; O. Casel, “Neuere Beiträge zur Epiklesenfrage,” *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 4 (1924), pp. 169-78, esp. pp. 170-71. Some authors would also include in this list Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto* 27, Basile de Césarée, *Sur le Saint-Esprit*, ed. B. Pruche (SC 17bis, Paris: Cerf, 1968), p. 480 = PG 32:188 = CPG 2839. But I would agree with A. Gelston, *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), pp. 15-17, that Basil is probably referring to the epiclesis in the narrow sense of the term.

salem, *Catechesis* 3.3; 5.7, also uses the term *epiclesis* in its present restricted sense,⁸⁴ in another passage, *Catechesis* 1.7, the word is usually interpreted as referring to the entire anaphora:

Before the holy epiclesis of the adorable Trinity the bread and wine of the eucharist was ordinary bread and wine, whereas after the epiclesis the bread becomes the body of Christ and the wine the blood of Christ.⁸⁵

But is there not still a contradiction in Cyril/John II, at one time seeming to consider the entire anaphora as the consecration, in another assigning this role to the “epiclesis of the Holy Spirit”? We saw something similar in Chrysostom. In one text he attributes the consecration to the epiclesis, in another to the words of institution. Casel is probably closest to the truth when he asserts that

we have to make it much clearer to ourselves . . . that the epiclesis of the Trinity, which was common to all the sacraments, required a definition of its purpose for each particular consecration. In the mass this occurred via the words of institution. Hence one can ascribe the consecration now to the whole eucharistic prayer, now to the epiclesis, now to the words of institution, *without contradicting oneself*.⁸⁶

In short, one and the same early Father of the Church — Chrysostom is the perfect example — might speak now of the anaphora, now of one or another or even both sections of the anaphora wherein its consecratory purpose was stated most explicitly, as the prayer of consecration without seeing any contradiction in his assertions. For he was not identifying a *forma sacramenti* or isolating a “moment of consecration,” but simply affirming that before the gifts are blessed they are not blessed, and after they have been blessed, they are. Hence I think it anachronistic to interpret

84. Ed. Piédagnel, SC 126bis:124, 154.

85. Ibid. 94.

86. “Wir müssen uns vielmehr . . . klarmachen, daß die E. der Trinität, die allen Mysterien gemeinsam war, je nach der speziellen Weihe eines näheren Zweckbestimmung bedurfte; diese erfolgte in der Messe durch die Einsetzungsworte. Man kann demnach bald der Eucharistia, bald der Epiklese, bald den Einsetzungsworten die Konsekration zuschreiben, ohne sich zu widersprechen” (emphasis added): O. Casel, “Neue Beiträge zur Epiklesenfrage,” *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 4 (1924), p. 173. Cf. *idem*, “Zur Epiklese,” *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 3 (1923), pp. 101-2.

Ambrose as meaning that *only* the institution is consecratory, or to maintain that such early Greek Fathers as Cyril/John II of Jerusalem and Basil, or the early anaphoras, considered the epiclesis consecratory in the negative sense of *ante quem non* rather than affirmatively, *post quem* yes. In other words, affirming that the gifts are consecrated after the epiclesis does not justify inferring that they meant that the epiclesis *alone* is consecratory and that the gifts remained ordinary bread and wine until just before it.

That precision is not seen in Greek theology until the dispute over, and ultimate rejection of, the primitive understanding of “antitype” and “symbol” by John Damascene (ca. 675-753/4),⁸⁷ and the iconodule Council of Nicaea II in 787, which condemned the iconoclast Council of 754.⁸⁸ But as I have shown elsewhere, John Damascene’s interpretation of the term “figures” or “antitypes” (ἀντίτυπα) for the gifts in BAS [1] before the epicletic consecratory petition is simply wrong.⁸⁹ And the Nicaea II definition was the fruit of the iconoclastic troubles and not directly concerned with the later formula of consecration dispute between East and West in the fourteenth century.

87. John Damascene, *Expositio fidei* 86.163-166, interprets BAS thus: “Moreover, although some may have called the bread and wine *antitypes* of the body and blood of the Lord, as did the inspired Basil, they did not say this as referring to after the consecration (τὸ ἀγιασθῆναι), but to before the consecration, and it was thus that they called the [unconsecrated] offertory bread (προσφοράν) itself.” B. Kotter (ed.), *Die Schriften des Iohannes von Damaskos* II (Patristische Text u. Studien 12, Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1973), p. 197 = *De fide orthodoxa* IV.13, PG 94:1152C-53B; tr. from Saint John of Damascus, *Writings*, tr. F. H. Chase, Jr. (The Fathers of the Church 37; Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1981), pp. 360-61. The glosses are mine; “prophora (offering)” is the ordinary Byzantine Greek term for the unconsecrated eucharistic loaves used at the liturgy.

88. Cf. the debate at Nicaea II, session 6 (Mansi 13:261E-268A), where the relevant texts of the Council of 754 are preserved because they were read into the Acts of Nicaea II and condemned. A complete English tr. of these texts, with the sections from the Acta of 754 set off in italics, is conveniently provided in D. J. Sahas, *Icon and Logos: Sources in Eighth-Century Iconoclasm* (Toronto Medieval Texts and Translations 4; Toronto/Buffalo/New York: University of Toronto Press, 1986), pp. 92-96. For the debate on the use of “antitype” for the eucharistic species, see Mansi 13:265C = Sahas 95.

89. In my study “Understanding the Byzantine Anaphoral Oblation” cited above, note 24, I bring forward textual evidence proving beyond any doubt that “type” or “antitype” were used for the consecrated gifts. On “antitypes” in BAS see also the discussion in Meßner, “Prex Eucharistica,” pp. 123-25; M. Jugie, “L’épiclèse et le mot antitype de la messe de saint Basile,” *Echos d’Orient* 9 (1906), pp. 193-98, with references to later Greek authors on the topic, though Jugie exaggerates on the other side of the issue.