

College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University

DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU

School of Theology and Seminary Graduate
Papers/Theses

School of Theology and Seminary

9-9-2013

The Development of the Epiclesis: Alexandrian or Syrian?

Nathan Peter Chase

College of Saint Benedict/Saint John's University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/sot_papers



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#), and the [Liturgy and Worship Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Chase, Nathan Peter, "The Development of the Epiclesis: Alexandrian or Syrian?" (2013). *School of Theology and Seminary Graduate Papers/Theses*. 1377.

https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/sot_papers/1377

This Graduate Paper is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Theology and Seminary Graduate Papers/Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@csbsju.edu.

The Development of the Epiclesis: Alexandrian or Syrian?

by

Nathan Peter Chase

321 McMillen
Murphy, Texas
75094

A Paper Submitted to the Faculty of the School of Theology Seminary of
Saint John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota, in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts in Liturgical Studies

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY SEMINARY
Saint John's University
Collegeville, Minnesota

September 9, 2013

This paper was written under the direction of

Dr. Kimberly Belcher
Director

Nathan Peter Chase
has successfully demonstrated the use of
Greek
in this paper.

Dr. Kimberly Belcher
Director

September 9, 2013

The Development of the Epiclesis: Alexandrian or Syrian?

Description:

This paper explores the origins and development of the epiclesis in Eucharistic prayers. It begins by looking at the pneumatological developments around the time of the First Council of Nicaea and the First Council of Constantinople in the 4th century. It then turns to the work of influential scholars in the field to try and present a *status quaestionis* on the epiclesis which seeks to answer the questions: 1) How did it develop?, 2) Where did it develop?, and 3) Why did it develop? The paper ends by affirming the uncertainty of scholarship on the answers to these questions, while at the same time advocating for probable Syrian leadership in the development of the epiclesis.

This paper may not be duplicated.

September 9, 2013

Introduction

The development of the epiclesis provides us with important insights into the development of Eucharistic prayers and the relationship between *lex orandi lex credendi*. Across all traditions in the 4th century, the epiclesis evolved into an explicit Spirit epiclesis in both the baptismal and the Eucharistic liturgies in line with the First Council of Nicaea and the First Council of Constantinople, which articulate the development of a more nuanced understanding of the persons of the Trinity, as well as their operations, leading to an affirmation of the divinity of the Holy Spirit and its distinction from the Logos. The development of an explicitly Spirit-based epiclesis also coincides with the Trinitarian controversies of the 4th century between orthodox Christians and the Pneumatomachi, those who were against the divinity of the Spirit. The shift during this time in regard to the epiclesis—some would argue from a *Logos* to a *Spirit* epiclesis—is most obvious in the Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis, as well as the baptismal and Eucharistic prayers from Syria and the *Mystagogic Catecheses* of Cyril of Jerusalem.¹ The development to a Spirit-based epiclesis is still a matter of historical and theological discussion today, and touches on the intimate Christ-Holy Spirit relationship that provides the backdrop for questions concerning the action of the Holy Spirit within this prayer unit.

¹ Abbreviations

JAS = Anaphora of St. James

ByzBAS = Byzantine Anaphora of St. Basil

CHR = Anaphora of St. John Chrysostom

GREG = Anaphora of St. Gregory

SJAS = Syriac Anaphora of St. James

GJAS = Greek Anaphora of St. James

ApConst = Apostolic Constitutions

ApTrad = Apostolic Tradition

MC = Cyril of Jerusalem's *Mystagogical Catechesis*

Holy Spirit in Sacramental Thought

Before looking at the epiclesis specifically, it is important to look at the current understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit in sacramental thought. The role of the Holy Spirit in the sacraments is crucial. In fact, according to Vorgrimler, “God’s presence is only made evident for us through God’s holy *pneuma*, the divine Spirit.”² Thus, the Holy Spirit has a unique role to play in humanity’s relationship with God. This unique role does not, however, stand opposed to the unique mediation of Christ. In other words, the Holy Spirit is not another mediator to the Father. Rather, “the presence of God and the presence of Jesus, as Son of God and as glorified human being, can always and only be a *pneumatic* presence.”³ Thus, the Holy Spirit makes Christ, and His unique mediation, present to us today. The role of the Holy Spirit in the sacraments, then, is to be the relational bond of love through which we experience Christ.

Edward Kilmartin goes deeper into the role of the persons of the Trinity in relation to our sacramental system. One must realize that “Christ, in the power of the Spirit, is the source of the real communication between the liturgical assembly and the Father of all.”⁴ This is a Christological way of framing Vorgrimler’s statement on the Holy Spirit. It is important to realize that each person of the Trinity has a unique and complementary role in sacramental theology. This is because, ultimately, sacramental theology is a participation in the economic Trinity.⁵ To see this, one must begin by turning to the hypostatic union of Christ in which “the Spirit binds the humanity of Jesus to the Word in hypostatic union.”⁶ The Holy Spirit should not, however, be seen as an obstacle between the humanity of Jesus and the Word. Rather, it is a binding force. Similarly, this can be applied to the Church: “the Spirit binds the Church to

²Vorgrimler, Herbert. *Sacramental Theology* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 135.

³ Vorgrimler, 135.

⁴ Kilmartin, Edward. *Christian Liturgy I. Theology* (Kansas City: Sheed & Ward, 1988), 14.

⁵ Kilmartin, 102.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 107.

Christ, but is not a medium between Christ and the Church.”⁷ Thus, the presence of God—in the person of Christ—in the sacraments is through the Spirit. However, the Holy Spirit should not be thought of as a medium between the Church and God, but rather as the glue. In this way, “the Spirit is the bond of union between the primordial sacrament Jesus Christ and the Church.”⁸

This of course begins to touch on the epiclesis, the prayer in which sacramentally this bond of union—the Holy Spirit—is asked for.⁹ However, it is important to realize that the understanding of the Trinitarian structure of the sacramental system and God’s presence in the sacraments has developed gradually. As Kilmartin points out

up to the middle of the fourth century the Logos, generally viewed as accomplishing his own incarnation, was also understood as the one who effects the change of bread and wine into his body and blood. Afterwards, the Holy Spirit is assigned both the role of effecting the incarnation and the transformation of the Eucharistic gifts in Greek theology. As a consequence a Logos epiclesis, asking for the sanctification of the Eucharistic bread and wine, is no longer found in the East from the end of the fourth century. Moreover the earlier Spirit epiclesis, understood as an invocation of the Logos, was not interpreted as the invoking of the coming of the Holy Spirit. This new view influenced a change in the content of the Eucharistic epiclesis. The earlier type called for the descent of the Spirit on the gifts in order to sanctify the participants of the Eucharist, and nothing was said about the transformation of the elements of bread and wine.¹⁰

This points to the 4th century shift in the Church’s understanding of the roles of each person of the Trinity in the sacramental system. Kilmartin’s scholarship attests to this shift in understanding in regards to the Eucharist. There is a shift in the operation of the Trinity in the Eucharist from the agency and role of the Logos, to the agency and role of the Holy Spirit. At first, the Logos was agent of his own “incarnation” in the Eucharist:

at the beginning of the post-apostolic period, and up through the first part of the fourth century, the change of the Eucharistic elements is seen as a kind of Eucharistic incarnation, and the Logos plays the key role. As the theology of the Holy Spirit

⁷ Kilmartin, 107.

⁸ Ibid., 108.

⁹ McKenna in his essay *Eucharistic Prayer: Epiclesis* points out, however that “the ‘epiclesis attitude’ is also an absolute necessity in the realization of the Eucharist, even when it is not made explicit in an epiclesis proper” (287).

¹⁰ Kilmartin, 165-166.

developes [*sic*], the accent gradually shifts to the role of the Spirit in the mediation of the incarnation. This goes a long way toward explaining the corresponding emphasis on the Spirit's activity in the transformation of the bread and wine of the Eucharist.¹¹

Another thing to keep in mind is that “the change in the content of the epiclesis, with the emphasis placed on the Spirit's role in the conversion of the Eucharistic elements, presumably occurred after 381, the year of the First Council of Constantinople, which defended the consubstantiality of the Spirit against the so-called Macedonians, or Pneumatomachians.”¹²

Therefore, it appears that Nicaea coincides with the shift from a Logos to a Spirit epiclesis. During the pneumatological controversies at this time, the epiclesis, now increasingly seen as relating explicitly to the Holy Spirit, becomes a battleground between orthodoxy and heresy. In response to heretic teachings, the epiclesis is given even more importance and thus begins to take on a more consecratory role. At the First Council of Constantinople, the role of the Holy Spirit is ultimately solidified. Furthermore, in Cyril of Jerusalem's MC, we see the first “evidence anywhere of an explicitly consecratory Spirit epiclesis.”¹³ If this is true, than earlier scholarship which tried to date Cyril of Jerusalem's MC to c. 350 must be questioned.

Regardless, as Congar points out,

an epiclesis asking for the gifts to be consecrated, even after the account of the institution, was developed when the orthodox teachers of faith insisted, in opposition to Macedonius and the Pneumatomachi, on the personality and the divinity of the Spirit. Gregory Dix thought that the epiclesis was not authentically due to Hippolytus. Whatever may be the case, it is certainly not an epiclesis of consecration. It was apparently added during the second half of the fourth century, in the text of Addai and Mari. J. Quasten has likewise shown that, before the First Council of Constantinople in 381, the descent of Christ into the water of baptism was invoked, whereas, after the Council, it was the coming of the Spirit that was invoked... This was done especially in Western Syria–Antioch and other centres—during the second half or the last third of the

¹¹ Kilmartin, 178.

¹² *Ibid.*, 178.

¹³ Taft, Robert. "From logos to spirit: On the early history of the epiclesis." In *Gratias agamus : Studien zum eucharistischen Hochgebet : für Balthasar Fischer*, edited by Balthasar Fischer (1992): 498.

fourth century. It is at this time and place that the texts of the so-called ‘consecratory’ epicleses appear.¹⁴

While the exact dating is perhaps not as refined as we would like, Quasten points out that generally speaking, the First Council of Constantinople is a benchmark in the development of the epiclesis. What is also significant to note is the close relationship between baptism and the development of a consecratory epiclesis in Syria.

Early Scholarship on the Epiclesis: Dix and Bishop

The epiclesis and its origins has been a source of conversation among historians in liturgical studies for quite some time. Both Dix and Bishop, renowned historians of the liturgy, took up the question of the epiclesis. Foundational to Dix’s treatment of the epiclesis is his treatment of the Logos epicleses in the prayers of Sarapion and subsequently the epiclesis in MC.

In this regard, Dix says that

the parallel made by Sarapion and his contemporaries (which does not appear, I think, before the fourth century) between the consecration of the eucharist and the incarnation is important. It is obvious that as soon as the incarnation came to be understood generally as a ‘conception by the Holy Ghost’ and not a ‘conception by the Word’, the parallel would be likely to suggest that the eucharist also is an operation of the Holy Ghost.¹⁵

If this parallel holds true, the Egyptian or Alexandria Eucharistic prayers would naturally evolve along with the developing understanding of the role of the Holy Spirit in the incarnation. Thus it would be natural for the Egyptian epiclesis to become more Holy Spirit centered around the time of the First Council of Constantinople. That being said, Dix points out that in Syria and ultimately in Cyril of Jerusalem this parallel does not hold true: “His petition for consecration is explicitly based not on a parallel with the incarnation, but on a theological theory about the office and mission of God the Holy Ghost in Himself... Thus, though the invocations in Sarapion

¹⁴ Congar, Yves. *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*. Edited by David Smith (New York City: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1983), 231.

¹⁵Dix, G. *The Shape of the Liturgy* (New York City: Continuum, 1945), 277.

and Cyril are both ‘consecratory’ and so superficially parallel, they really rest upon rather different ideas about consecration.”¹⁶ Therefore, the understanding of the epiclesis in Antioch and Jerusalem would develop with the understanding of the Holy Spirit itself. Thus, like the Alexandrian school, their epiclesis would come to reflect the theology of the Holy Spirit around the time of the First Council of Constantinople. However, this parallel development is not what the sources necessarily reveal. Rather, as shall be argued later, the focus turns toward the Antiochene and Jerusalemite school of thought, which considers the agency and character of the Holy Spirit itself as the driving concern, not the way in which the Holy Spirit participates in the incarnation. Because of the influence of the Antiochene and Jerusalemite school at this time, it is fair to say that after this time period, the workings of the Persons of the Trinity in the Eucharist and other sacraments are interpreted, not through an understanding of the incarnation, but through the role and agency of the Persons of the Trinity in and of Themselves. However, the way the Holy Spirit is seen as participating in the incarnation develops as well.

What this demonstrates is a fundamental change in Eucharistic doctrine. The shift from a Logos to a Spirit epiclesis means a departure from earlier Eucharistic understandings. Thus Dix says that

Cyril differs not only from Sarapion but the whole pre-Nicene church. Sarapion follows the universal tradition in making the eucharist emphatically an action of Christ, the Word, the Second Person of the Trinity. But from end to end of Cyril’s account of the liturgy and throughout his Eucharistic teaching, Christ plays only a *passive* part in the eucharist. He is simply the divine Victim Whose Body and Blood are ‘made’ by the action of the Holy Ghost.¹⁷

Dix points this out as a significant departure, but one which has basis in the *Didascalia* from Syria. Dix does not think that Cyril would have been able to cause this dramatic change alone. Sebastian Brock suggests that it is the development of the Syrian baptismal tradition which

¹⁶ Dix, *The Shape*, 278.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 278.

provides Cyril (JAS) with the historical basis for this change. Dix, however, leaves us with an important question, a question which will be reaffirmed by his colleagues and even contemporary theologians: Who consecrates? In his analysis of Sarapion's focus on the role of the Holy Spirit in the incarnation versus the power of the Holy Spirit Itself, Dix points out that "consecration by the Son and by the Spirit may be reconcilable doctrines, but they are two different ideas."¹⁸ However, it is important to note that the question "Who consecrates?" is a modern question which would not have concerned the Early Church Fathers.

Bishop follows Dix on these matters quite closely and couches the discussion on the development of the epiclesis in the controversies surrounding the role of the Holy Spirit. It is Bishop who bridges the gap between Dix and Brock's treatment of the development of the epiclesis in the Syrian baptismal liturgies. Bishop points out a significant point concerning the Eucharistic prayers in relation to the pneumatomachian controversy. He observes that

one Father after another in the course of the pneumatomachian controversy enumerates in detail and explains the sanctifying operations of the Holy Ghost in the Church in proof and as evidence of His coequal Godhead. Whilst in these elaborate reviews holy baptism and its formulae are adduced again and again, no appeal is ever made to, not a word is said about, any Invocation of the Holy Ghost in the Eucharist, although the obvious opportunity for such appeal occurs again and again.¹⁹

Bishop seems to point out, that during the pneumatological controversies, appeals were made to the operation of the Holy Spirit in baptism, but not in the Eucharist. This suggests that perhaps the work of the Holy Spirit in baptism (specifically at the epiclesis) was more developed at this time than in the Eucharist and thus a Spirit epiclesis had not yet fully developed in the Eucharistic prayer. Could this then potentially mean that the development of the Spirit epiclesis began outside of the Eucharistic context?

¹⁸ Dix, *The Shape*, 282.

¹⁹ Bishop, Edmund. *Appendix: Observations on the Liturgy of Narsai*. Vol. 8.1, in *Texts and Studies*, edited by J. Armitage Robinson (London: Cambridge University Press, 1916), 140-141.

Bishop writes further “with this single exception [Cyril of Jerusalem], I have been able to find a passage in no writer earlier than St. John Chrysostom in the East, and Optatus in the West, ascribing the consecration of the bread and wine specifically to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity.”²⁰ Though, this is equally true of the ascription of the words to Christ. Because of the close ties between Antioch and Jerusalem, Cyril of Jerusalem was heavily influenced by Syrian baptismal practices, thus leading to the possibility of his adoption of the language of the Syrian baptismal epiclesis into the Jerusalem Eucharistic prayer. This prayer is found in JAS, which is disseminated across the Mediterranean. After the First Council of Constantinople, the adoption of a Spirit epiclesis into the Eucharistic prayer would be warranted if Cyril of Jerusalem was trying to defend his reputation.

Current Theology of the Epiclesis: McKenna

In contemporary scholarship, John McKenna continues Dix’s investigation in the operation of the Son and the Holy Spirit in his article “Eucharistic Epiclesis: Myopia or Microcosm?.” McKenna is also concerned with Dix’s point regarding the operation of the Son and the Holy Spirit in the consecration of the Eucharist. He writes that “the need to reconcile the activity of Christ with that of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist is inherent in the view which sees the epiclesis as an expression of the Spirit’s role in the Eucharist.”²¹ For McKenna, the Sarapion-Alexandrian school’s stand which draws a parallel between the incarnation and the Eucharist is important but not fully developed, and lacks a truly Spirit-filled awareness. Similarly, the Cyriline-Syrian school’s desire to affirm the power of the Holy Spirit is not fully developed and lacks a proper awareness of Christ. As we saw earlier with Vorgrimler and

²⁰ Bishop, 142.

²¹ McKenna, John. "Eucharistic Epiclesis: Myopia or Microcosm?" *Theological Studies* 36, no. 2 (1975): 275.

Kilmartin, to properly understand the role of the Holy Spirit in the epiclesis one must see the intimate connection between Christ and the Holy Spirit.

This leads McKenna to speak about the economy of the Trinity. He writes that

if Christ is the sacrament of encounter between God and man, it is because he bears within his body-person the fullness of the Spirit. One may speak of a Johannine-Alexandrian approach, which stresses the Incarnation or the descendent, Logos-Flesh movement...[and] the Pauline-Antiochene approach, which stresses the death-resurrection (glorification) or the ascendant, Man-God movement.²²

McKenna points out that regardless of which approach you choose, it always involves the intimate Christ-Spirit relationship. This relationship, however, was not worked out, nor could it be worked out, until the First Council of Constantinople. Furthermore, the Christ-Spirit relationship has an effect on the way we view the link between the words of institution and the epiclesis. If we focus on the Christ-Spirit relationship, we realize that one cannot divorce the words of institution from the epiclesis, or vice versa, because just as Christ and the Spirit are intimately united, so too are the words of institution and the epiclesis (something I am not concerned with here). In the end, McKenna is right in saying that “the relationship of Christ and the Spirit in the saving economy flows from the fact that the Eucharist is an activity of the triumphant Lord, the glorified Kyrios. To say that the glorified Lord is at work is automatically to say that the Holy Spirit is at work, since the glorified Lord is the Spirit-filled Lord, the ‘pneumatic Christ.’”²³

Bradshaw’s Summary of Current Scholarship

Moving from the theology underlying the epiclesis to its concrete development, Bradshaw’s book *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* provides a helpful transition from Dix, Bishop, and McKenna to the work of Johnson, Brock, Spinks, Winkler, and Taft. In

²² McKenna, *Myopia*, 275.

²³ *Ibid.*, 277.

his discussion on Winkler's work on the incorporation of the Sanctus into the Eucharistic prayer, he points out that "Gabriele Winkler has put forward the interesting argument, based on liturgical material found in the apocryphal scriptures, that it first emerged in Christian usage within Syrian initiatory rites, along with the epiclesis, both forming part of prayers for the consecration of oil and water."²⁴ If Winkler is correct, as I believe she is, she articulates three stages of development which ultimately lead to the placement of a Spirit epiclesis in almost every Eucharistic Prayer: 1) the development of the epiclesis first in Syrian baptismal rites, 2) its incorporation into the Eucharistic prayers from the baptismal liturgies, and 3) its dissemination across the Christian world.

Furthermore, Bradshaw points out Winkler's reliance on Sebastian Brock's work on the development of the epiclesis. Bradshaw furthermore states that

Studies by Robert Taft and Maxwell Johnson also suggested that, while in the Syrian tradition the Holy Spirit was most often seen as the agent of the action, in Greek circles it tended instead to be the Son as Logos: the only two apparently pre-fourth-century references to the Holy Spirit in Greek texts come from the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, which doubtless reflects the Syrian tradition, and from the *Apostolic Tradition*, the date and provenance of which are very uncertain.²⁵

In the studies of Taft and Johnson, we can see the centrality of the Holy Spirit as the agent of action in the Syrian Eucharistic prayers. This was against the Greek tradition at the time which was focused on a Logos tradition. Bradshaw does, however, qualify Winkler's work in two regards. First, we cannot assume there was an original form of the Syrian epiclesis, but rather it seems as though there was a wide diversity which slowly solidified into various types. Second, Bradshaw questions Winkler's assertion that the baptismal context was the source for the Eucharistic epiclesis. He writes:

²⁴ Bradshaw, Paul. *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* (New York City: Oxford University Press, 2002), 136.

²⁵ Bradshaw, *The Search*, 137.

the baptismal context may not have been the ultimate source of the Sanctus or the epiclesis, from which they then migrated to the eucharistic prayer. It is at least possible that these were already standard prayer units in the tradition, and in parallel developments then became part both of the consecration of baptismal oil and water and of Eucharistic prayers at around the same time, rather than moving from the one to the other.²⁶

While I think Winkler is right to maintain that the epiclesis first moved into the Eucharistic prayer from Syriac blessings over the font in the baptismal liturgy, and other initiatory practices, it is still perhaps possible that it was already a standard prayer unit that could be incorporated into either the baptismal or the Eucharistic liturgy. While it might have been a prayer unit that developed outside of a baptismal and Eucharistic context and then got integrated into the baptismal and Eucharistic liturgies as Bradshaw proposes, the evidence seems to suggest that it first migrated into the baptismal liturgies, which in the very least subsequently impacted the form it took when it migrated into the Eucharist. This seems to be the case for two reasons. First, the baptismal liturgy would be the ideal place for the epiclesis to begin (or to migrate into a more solemn liturgy) because of the inherent focus on the Holy Spirit in the rites of initiation, especially in Syria.²⁷ In fact, the strong pneumatological undertones of the rites of initiation led to the development of Confirmation in the West, a rite for the unique bestowal of the Holy Spirit. Interestingly, the Roman Rite is the also the only tradition without an explicit Spirit epiclesis (this will be taken up below). Second, as we saw in Bishop's work above, the first mention of a Spirit epiclesis by the Church Fathers in regards to the Eucharist is in MC while in regards to baptism it is quite frequent before Cyril's MC. For these two reasons it seems that the migration of the epiclesis into the baptismal liturgy was prior to the Eucharistic migration, or at least the epiclesis was more established in a baptismal context than a Eucharistic one by the time of Cyril's MC.

²⁶ Bradshaw, *The Search*, 137.

²⁷ Maxwell Johnson, *The Rites of Christian Initiation* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2007), 17.

Bradshaw provides one other significant comment in regards to the epiclesis. In talking about the 4th century doctrinal developments which dramatically shaped the liturgy, he writes that “the fourth-century pneumatological debates appear to have affected the specific shape of liturgy in several ways, especially in the wording of doxological formulae, the development of the epicletic element in the Eucharistic prayers, and the spread of a post-baptismal anointing related to the Holy Spirit.”²⁸ Thus, the pneumatological controversies provided a catalyst for the further refinement of the liturgical moments in which the Holy Spirit was seen as taking an active part. Thus the epiclesis was developed in light of the pneumatological debates.

Bradshaw in another work affirms this:

since the doctrine of the Trinity had not yet fully developed, Christians did not distinguish clearly between Christ, the spirit of Christ and the Holy Spirit. However, the pneumatological debates of the second half of the fourth century caused Eastern Christians to be more precise in their use of language and to adopt an explicit invocation of the Holy Spirit in their Eucharistic prayers, if they had not already got one. This invocation was no longer addressed directly to the Holy Spirit or to Christ, but was increasingly in the form of a request to God to ‘send’ the Holy spirit upon the Eucharistic elements as well as upon the gathered community, and often with an explicit request for them to be transformed into the body and blood of Christ.²⁹

This serves as an example of the close relationship between *lex orandi* and *lex credendi*. It also attests to the uniquely Eastern concern for the Spirit epiclesis. The lack of an explicit or developed epiclesis in the Roman Canon is due to the fact that the Roman Canon was redacted prior to the pneumatological debates.³⁰ However, the Eastern prayers were still undergoing revision and development, thus it is not surprising that they were changed in light of 4th century concerns. In fact, in four representative Eucharistic prayers we can see the development of the epiclesis: the Roman Canon, which lacks an explicit epiclesis, the Prayers of Sarapion which

²⁸ Bradshaw, *The Search*, 226.

²⁹ Bradshaw, Paul. *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1997), 17.

³⁰ Johnson, Maxwell. *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2010), 61. See also Jerome Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2001), 60-63.

have Logos epicleses, Addai and Mari with a “come” Holy Spirit epiclesis, and the liturgy of St. James based in Jerusalem, with a highly developed “send” Holy Spirit epiclesis.

Johnson – Sarapion of Thmuis

Turning to the works of Johnson, Brock, Spinks, Winkler and Taft, I would like to begin by looking at the work of Johnson on the Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis. This is because the Sarapion liturgy provides two perfect examples of the Logos epiclesis that will be transformed during the end of the 4th century into a Spirit epiclesis. The two places in the Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis that we will look at are the Logos epiclesis in the Eucharistic Prayer and the Logos epiclesis in the sanctification of the waters for baptism. As can be seen below, the Prayers of Sarapion very explicitly use a Logos epiclesis in its early form.

Prayer 1: The Anaphora³¹

Ἐπιδημησάτω θεὸς τῆς ἀληθείας ὁ ἅγιός σου **λόγος** ἐπὶ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, ἵνα γένηται ὁ ἄρτος σῶμα τοῦ λόγου, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο, ἵνα γένηται τὸ ποτήριον αἷμα τῆς ἀληθείας.

God of truth, let your holy **Word** come upon this bread in order that the bread may become body of the Word, and this cup in order that the cup may become blood of truth.

Prayer 7: Sanctification of the Waters

Καὶ ὡς κατελθῶν ὁ μονογενῆς σου **λόγος** ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ἅγια ἀπέδειξεν, οὕτως καὶ νῦν ἐν τούτοις κατερχέσθω καὶ ἅγια καὶ πνευματικὰ ποιησάτω πρὸς τὸ μηκέτι σάρκα καὶ αἷμα εἶναι βαπτιζομένων...

And as your only-begotten **Word**, when he descended upon the waters of the Jordan, made them holy, so also let him descend into these. Let him make them holy and spiritual in order that those who are baptized may no longer be flesh and blood...

In looking at the prayer for the Sanctification of the Waters, Johnson begins by referencing Johannes Quasten who “argued that Sarapion’s epiclesis ‘is the oldest formula of this kind that we possess’ but that Cyril of Jerusalem reflects the same school of thought in his

³¹ Prayer 1 and 7 are taken from "The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis." *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* (Pontificio Istituto Orientale) 249 (1995): 233-234.

reference to ‘Christ-bearing (Χριστοφόρων) waters’ in Procatechesis 15.”³² One of the reasons why Johnson is so careful with the epicleses in Sarapion’s prayers, is because the Logos epicleses of the Sarapion prayers have been used to vigorously deny the orthodoxy of the Prayers of Sarapion. However, Johnson thinks a proper understanding of the development of the epiclesis affirms the orthodoxy of Sarapion’s prayers. Sarapion’s prayers do not represent the views of a heretic; rather, they represent a transitional stage in the development of the theology of the Holy Spirit and the epiclesis. In other words, the connection between Sarapion’s prayer for the sanctification of the waters and Cyril of Jerusalem’s MC is one of development not theological contradiction.

Furthermore, Johnson tries to show a new parallel between Sarapion’s prayer and some of John Chrysostom’s explanations on the Syrian baptismal formula. Johnson looks at Chrysostom’s *Cat.* III, 3, given at Antioch in 388, in which “Chrysostom refers to the activity of the λόγος in the Jordan.”³³ Chrysostom writes:

...what happened in the case of our Master’s body also happens in the case of your own. Although John appeared to be holding his body by the head, it was the divine Word (Θεὸς Λόγος) which led his body down into the streams of Jordan and baptized him. The Master’s body was baptized by the Word, and by the voice of his Father from heaven which said: This is my beloved Son, and by the manifestation of the Holy Spirit which descended upon him. This also happens in the case of your body.³⁴

In explaining this passage, Johnson points out that “while there is no evidence for a formal epiclesis of the λόγος in Chrysostom’s baptismal rites [which if we recall is a Syrian baptismal rite], a similar theological interpretation of the active role of the λόγος in the Jordan and, consequently, in the rite of baptism appears to be implied.”³⁵ If Johnson is correct, this may imply that there was an earlier Logos epiclesis in the Syrian baptismal rite which at some point

³² Johnson, *The Prayers*, 128.

³³ *Ibid.*, 128.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 128.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 128.

gave way to a Spirit epiclesis. In light of Brocks scholarship below, such a shift is not necessarily a surprise, however, its late dating does shed some light on the MC and its role in spreading the epiclesis. If Chrysostom's baptismal rite still has a Logos epiclesis and it postdates MC, which knows of a baptismal and Eucharistic Spirit epiclesis, then the placement of the MC in the development and spread of the Spirit epiclesis becomes more important. The argument for the MC as the pivotal document which transitions to a Eucharistic Spirit epiclesis can thus be affirmed and the MC can be seen as the leader in this shift, and thus the lynch-pin in the manuscript tradition.

While Johnson's treatment of the baptismal prayers is rather short, his treatment of the Logos epiclesis in the anaphora is much longer. The origins of the Sanctus are intimately linked with the development of the epiclesis. In fact, the Sanctus and epiclesis are often taken as a unit which is thought to have moved together. Johnson discusses the current debates about the Sanctus, and like him, I will keep it brief. Dix thought that Alexandria was the place where the Sanctus began to be used in the Eucharistic liturgy; however, "current scholarship has been converging towards viewing the anaphoral sanctus as having its origins in Syria (Cappadocia) from where it passed elsewhere."³⁶ If we treat the Sanctus and the epiclesis as a unit, then one must assume that the epiclesis also originated in Syria. Yet as Johnson and Taft point out the Sanctus of Sarapion is not Syrian at all, but Egyptian. This could mean several things: 1) if the Sanctus moved into the anaphora in Syria, then when it was adopted by the Egyptians it was heavily reworked, 2) the anaphoral Sanctus developed in Egypt and Syria independently, or 3) the Sanctus moved into the anaphora in Egypt and was then reworked by the Syrians.³⁷ While the origins of the Sanctus might have a bearing on the origins of the epiclesis if they did in fact

³⁶ Johnson, *The Prayers*, 211.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 212.

enter as a unit, what is more important, according to Taft, is that “Sarapion’s [Sanctus] text reflects a pre-Nicene Trinitarian understanding (‘face’ versus ‘faces’) consistent with the theological interpretation given to it by Origen (or by his Hebrew teacher) in the first half of the third century, an interpretation possibly reflected also in DB [the Deir Balyzeh papyrus] and in the mystagogical catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem.”³⁸ If again the Sanctus and the epiclesis enter as a unit, this would show the ancient nature of the Sarapion epiclesis. However, the connection to the MC of Cyril of Jerusalem cannot be ignored because it shows the possibility of exchange and dependence. This could again provide evidence for the MC as the leading document for multiple shifts in Eucharistic praying.

In an effort to assess this connection, Johnson looks at the heavenly orders of Colossians 1:16 (this is the reference to “thrones, dominions, powers, and principalities”) which have been included in the Sarapion text as well as in Cyril’s MC. He notes the unique connection between the two texts. He writes that

It may be then, in spite of the lack of the four heavenly orders in other Egyptian-type anaphoras, that these orders were, in some form, part of an earlier Egyptian tradition and from that tradition passed into both Sarapion and the Eucharistic liturgy of Cyril of Jerusalem, and from Jerusalem to elsewhere in the Antiochene East. Combined with the parallel reference to reconciliation and the Spirit in both Cyril and Sarapion and the parallel reference to life and immortality in both JAS and Sarapion, this may, therefore, serve as further cumulative evidence for either the Egyptian origins of the Jerusalem liturgy, Jerusalem influence on Sarapion, or for the common origins of both.³⁹

Johnson’s work shows the deep interconnection between Cyril and Sarapion and the possible influence of the one on the other. The fact that these traditions could have developed simultaneously and in communication with each other should not be underestimated.

Johnson is not willing to exclude West Syrian or Antiochene influence on Sarapion’s preface. In fact, Spinks is quoted in Johnson’s work as noting that the hymn of praise is “more

³⁸ Johnson, *The Prayers*, 214-215.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 216.

akin to Antioch.”⁴⁰ Johnson also draws parallels between Sarapion and ByzBAS which are not found in other Egyptian anaphoras. In concluding his section on the Sanctus, Johnson notes that

there is nothing in this part of the anaphora to suggest—against Botte—a time beyond the traditional dating of this text. If anything, it would seem to belong to an earlier period of anaphoral development, i.e., before the middle of the fourth century. Indeed, Sarapion’s ‘preface’ and sanctus-unit appear to be nothing other than the theological interpretation of Origen expressed in liturgical form.⁴¹

Thus regardless of the connection between Cyril and Sarapion, ByzBAS and Sarapion, and other Antiochene or Syrian texts and Sarapion, the fact remains that the Sarapion prayers should be placed in the early developmental stages of the Sanctus and the epiclesis. Let us now turn directly to the Logos epiclesis in the anaphora.

While Johnson sees the need to defend the orthodoxy of the epiclesis, current scholarship now accepts the development of the epiclesis from a Logos epiclesis to a Spirit epiclesis, at least in the Alexandrian tradition. However, a few points should be kept in mind. Johnson begins by quoting Wordsworth:

It appears...that in various parts of Christendom, up to the fourth century, a Prayer for the advent [ἐπιδημία or *adventus*] [*sic*] of the Second Person of the Trinity upon the Eucharistic oblation took the place afterwards usually assigned to the invocation of the Third Person. How the change took place, and why it is has left so little mark on history, we have as yet insufficient means of judging; but it may be certainly concluded that it was connected with the development of the doctrine of the holy [*sic*] Spirit which was forced upon the Church by Macedonian error.⁴²

The concern on the part of earlier scholars about the orthodoxy of the epicleses in Sarapion’s prayers should no longer be seen as an issue. Rather than leading to a discussion on the orthodoxy of the prayers as a whole, Sarapion’s epicleses provide an example of an earlier form of the epiclesis. This is reaffirmed by Lietzmann: “even Lietzmann, who argued most strongly that this second epiclesis was an interpolation due to Syro-Byzantine influence, thought that the

⁴⁰ Johnson, *The Prayers*, 216.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 218.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 234.

use of the λόγος and the description of communion as φάρμακον ζωῆς [medicine of life] reflects a more ancient form of this type of prayer.”⁴³ Yet Capelle and Botte challenged the views of Wordsworth and Lietzmann. Looking at the other parts of the Sarapion prayers alongside Syrian anaphoras, specifically JAS and Cyril of Jerusalem’s MC, they contended that the Logos epiclesis was a unique development of Sarapion, and thus not an ancient practice in Alexandria.⁴⁴ This led some to see this as a “deliberate Arianizing or Pneumatomachian redaction.”⁴⁵

Contrary to this thought, Johnson turns to Cuming’s work in comparing Sarapion to Athanasius. He quotes Cuming’s work in which “Athanasius closely links together the λόγος and the Spirit.”⁴⁶ Cuming writes that: “For Athanasius an epiclesis of the Logos necessarily involves the Spirit also. The first half of the fourth century did not make the sharp distinction between Logos and Pneuma which we take for granted. On this count, at any rate, Sarapion can claim to be completely orthodox.”⁴⁷ Thus, according to Cumings, Johnson and current scholarship, the Logos epiclesis must be understood as being orthodox because it was prior to the development of a more fully formed pneumatology. This is further shown in Johnson’s citation of Charles Kannengiesser’s work on Athanasius between the First Council of Nicaea and the First Council of Constantinople.⁴⁸ Johnson concludes his defense of the orthodoxy of Sarapion’s epiclesis by saying that “in all cases, therefore, Botte’s thesis that the anaphora of Sarapion represents a conscious heretical theological orientation stemming from a time later than the middle of the fourth century may be rejected as lacking any foundation.”⁴⁹ In order, however, to

⁴³ Johnson, *The Prayers*, 234.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 234-235.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 235.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 236.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 236.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 237.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 241.

dispute Capelle's claim that the Logos epiclesis is a Sarapion innovation, Johnson sets out to prove the antiquity of the epicleses.

Capelle claims that because of the witness to a Spirit epiclesis in Alexandria after Athanasius in Peter II (373-380) and Theophilus (382-413), the development of a Spirit epiclesis had long been established in Alexandria. This, however, as Johnson shows is simply absurd. Given the pneumatological controversies and subsequent pneumatological teachings from the First Council of Constantinople in 381, the epiclesis rapidly shifted from a Logos to a Spirit epiclesis. Johnson writes:

For Capelle, both of these citations [from Peter and Theophilus] demonstrated that an epiclesis of the Holy Spirit was not a recent development in the Alexandrian liturgy but part of the inherited tradition...the fact remains that Peter's reference to an invocation of the Holy Spirit in the eucharist is the first such explicit reference to be found anywhere in the Egyptian tradition. Furthermore, since the only place where this reference is found is in Theodoret, this makes it a mid-fifth—not fourth-century—reference.⁵⁰

Johnson, in quoting Quasten, speaks to the strong anti-heretical tendency of Theodoret's work. This for Johnson, means that Theodoret might actually be attesting to a new practice in Alexandria, not a traditional or ancient one. He writes: "it is just as likely, that Theophilus, by specifically focusing on the liturgical invocation of the Holy Spirit in the baptismal and eucharistic rites, is drawing attention to and underscoring something which is, in fact, a relatively recent liturgy development."⁵¹ In other words, just because Theophilus mentions the existence of a Spirit epiclesis in Alexandria does not preclude the fact that it could be a recent change, perhaps a change from Syria. The work of Ezra Gebremedhin on Cyril of Alexandria provides a further impetus for thinking this. In citing Gebremedhin, Johnson says that "even when an epiclesis of the Holy Spirit was clearly a part of the Alexandrian anaphora, Cyril [of Alexandria]

⁵⁰ Johnson, *The Prayers*, 243.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 234.

still understood the λόγος to be the principle agent and δύναμις [power] of consecration.”⁵² This is not unlike the description of agency between the Syrian and Greek schools of thought given above. What is significant is that in Syrian anaphoras, we see not only the fully formed Spirit epiclesis, but we also see the agency shift to the Holy Spirit. This seems to provide further evidence of Syriac leadership in the development of the epiclesis. While the texts of the prayers are developing alongside the pneumatological controversies from a Logos to a Spirit epiclesis, the foundational theology is slower to change in Egypt and the Greek-speaking world than in Syria (though Winkler will argue that the Holy Spirit was always the unique agent in Syria).

Johnson then turns to the writings of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus of Lyons, Clement of Alexandria and Origen of Alexandria to show that regardless of “whether an explicit liturgical invocation of the λόγος is intended or not, [the writings of these authors] might lead one to the conclusion that here, as elsewhere in his anaphora, Sarapion is not innovating but preserving an earlier tradition of eucharistic theology.”⁵³ While they are significant pieces of evidence, Johnson provides more compelling evidence by citing the work of Sebastian Brock and his study of the epiclesis in Antiochene baptismal ordines. In his allusion to a possible connection Johnson writes that

if Brock’s analysis of the development of epicletic verbs in the Syrian baptismal tradition is correct, something quite similar may have taken place also within the Egyptian tradition, a tradition which, as indicated above, does show other developmental and structural similarities at least in the rites of initiation. Sarapion’s epicleses of the λόγος in both the anaphora and Prayer 7, therefore, may well represent an early stage in the development of the Egyptian epiclesis, a stage which preserves both an archaic verb form and an archaic theology of the role of the λόγος in the sacramental rites of the Church.⁵⁴

It is thus to Sebastian Brock’s work that we now turn.

⁵² Johnson, *The Prayers*, 244.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 247.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 252.

Sebastian Brock: Shift from “Come” to “Send”

Sebastian Brock, in 1972, authored a seminal work entitled “The Epiclesis in the Antiochene Baptismal Ordines” in which he discusses the development of the epiclesis. His work is potentially revolutionary, which Johnson alludes to. Brock’s work ultimately leads to two possibilities. First, that the development of the epiclesis in the Antiochene baptismal ordines provides a rough outline for the epiclesis in the Antiochene Eucharistic anaphoras, as well as for the baptismal and Eucharistic liturgies across the Christian world. Additionally, Brock’s work may not only fulfill the first possibility, but perhaps also provide evidence that the Antiochene developments of the epiclesis (primarily in the initiatory setting) are responsible for the development of the epiclesis (both in the Eucharist and in the rites of initiation) outside of the Antiochene context. In other words, it is possible that the epicleses in the Antiochene baptismal ordines are the foci for the development of epicletic thought throughout the known Christian world.

Brock begins by saying that the epiclesis has not always been an invocation addressed to the Father asking for the Holy Spirit to be sent; rather, the form of the epiclesis is much more varied. In his studies, Brock uses ten baptismal services drawn from the Church of the East, the Syrian Orthodox, the Maronite and the Melkite. In his studies on the development of the epiclesis, Brock shows that a multistage development of the epiclesis can be seen in Syria. From oldest usage to newest usage, Brock’s stages are listed in the table below.

Brock's Development of the Epiclesis in <i>The Epiklesis in the Antiochene Baptismal Ordines</i> ⁵⁵			
Stage	Addressee	Verb	Notes
1	Christ	Imperative 'come'	Some epicleses of the <i>Acts of Thomas</i> "In the case of the Eucharistic liturgy this usage can reasonably be taken back, via the <i>Didache</i> , to the New Testament itself, and the liturgical phrase <i>marana tha</i> [(our Lord, come)], quoted by Paul." ⁵⁶ In regards to the baptismal liturgy, Brock points out that this "fit[s] in well with the early Antiochene tradition that Christ sanctified the Jordan by his baptism, and was simply asked to come and reactivate it at each baptismal ceremony." ⁵⁷
2	Christ	'that his Spirit may come'	Present in many of the short baptismal epicleses, which better retain archaic features. Some epiclesis of the <i>Acts of Thomas</i>
3	Father	That the Spirit 'may come'	Brock shows that this is the last stage in "come" language and that "this is the form that we normally meet with in the surviving epikleses of this type." ⁵⁸
4	God	'send the Holy Spirit'	Becomes regular after 5 th century Greek influence, mainly in West Syria In West Syria the Eucharistic and baptismal epiclesis are rather independent The West Syrian baptismal epiclesis follow more closely the Greek anaphora of John Chrysostom than their own anaphoras utilizing 'send.'

While this first work of Brock's seeks to merely set the developmental stages of the epiclesis, his work "Invocations to/for the Holy Spirit in Syriac Liturgical Texts: Some Comparative Approaches," furthers his earlier work on the epiclesis and the relationship between the Eucharistic and baptismal epicleses. At the end of his article, he makes three points. First,

⁵⁵ Table drawn from Brock's scholarship in, Brock, Sebastian. "The Epiklesis in the Antiochene Baptismal Ordines." *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* (Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum) 197 (1974): 183-218.

⁵⁶ Brock, *The Epiklesis*, 213.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 213.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 213.

Brock deduces from his research “that in late antiquity there were in fact many more anaphoras formerly in circulation in Greek, and that out of this diversity a certain uniformity was subsequently imposed.”⁵⁹ In this regard, we must be careful in our claims about the development of liturgical texts. We must realize that many texts have been lost, and so Brock thinks we must be careful in comparing newly discovered texts to older ones. Second, Brock asserts that

while it is absolutely certain that large- and small-scale borrowings between anaphoras did take place, a second possibility—or rather, in my view, probability, needs to be kept in mind, namely that compilers of anaphoras also made use of what can best be described as a store of formulaic building blocks, rather on the analogy of the formulaic features that have been isolated in the composition of oral epic poetry...these formulaic building blocks, often consisted of little more than stock pairs of terms or even just the collocation of specific words or ideas, would then not in themselves be indicators of any genetic relationship; instead, rather like isoglosses in the field of comparative linguistics, or like common variants in open textual traditions, they serve as pointers to a shared stream of tradition. Even if two liturgical texts turn out to have a large number of these formulaic building blocks in common, this may still only indicate that they come from a common milieu, without otherwise being directly related.⁶⁰

This is perhaps the most pertinent and important piece of advice that Brock brings to the study of the development of the epiclesis. This is also in keeping with Bradshaw’s argument above. In this article, Brock looks at the development of the phraseology of the epiclesis and shows that there are common phrases that are used in building the epiclesis. In light of his earlier article, this argument is quite intriguing. In the Syrian tradition, we see the development of the phraseology or the building blocks of the epiclesis, at least in a Syrian context. However, perhaps we are seeing not only the development of exclusively Syrian phraseology and building blocks, but instead are seeing the Syrian tradition building what will later become the universal phraseologies and building blocks of the epiclesis. In other words, it might be that other

⁵⁹ Brock, Sebastian. "Invocations to/for the Holy Spirit in Syriac Liturgical Texts: Some Comparative Approaches." Edited by Robert Taft. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* (Pontificio Istituto Orientale) 265 (2001): 398.

⁶⁰ Brock, *Invocations*, 398.

geographical regions adopted the Syrian phraseology and building blocks and modified them to fit their own traditions.

The last point that Brock makes is in regards to ἐπιφοιτάω (come habitually, to visit again and again) in Greek anaphoras. In the end Brock is lead to say that

one final point which has emerged, in the case of ἐπιφοιτάω, concerns the very probable influence of Syriac usage on Greek. From our historical perspective this may seem something hard to accept: in late antiquity it was Syriac language and literature that was profoundly influenced by Greek, and any movement in the other direction might seem improbable. If, however, we transport ourselves in our imaginations back to, above all, the fourth and early fifth century, the situation is somewhat different: emergent Syriac literature has a high profile. . . Syriac liturgical poetry seems to have been greatly admired in Greek and even Latin circles. Against such a background the transfer of the Syriac technical term *aggen* [to tabernacle] into Greek usage becomes much less surprising, and indeed one is led to wonder whether other such cases of influence, originating in the bilingual milieu of Syria, can be detected.⁶¹

For the purpose of my studies, the terms themselves are of little relevance; rather, the introduction of Syriac technical terms into Greek usage in the fourth and fifth centuries suggests the possibility of profound Syriac influence on the development of the epiclesis as a whole. In a time in which the epiclesis was developing in light of pneumatological concerns and Syriac technical terms were being adopted by other traditions, should it surprise us that other churches outside of Syria might be influenced by the particular usage in Syria of the liturgical formulaic building blocks of the epiclesis?

Portions of other articles by Brock are significant for understanding the relationship between the Syrian baptismal and Eucharistic epicleses. In his article “Towards a Typology of the Epicleses in the West Syrian Anaphoras,” Brock summarizes very succinctly his earlier study on the shift from “come” to “send” in the Syrian baptismal ordines and the West Syrian anaphoras. He points out that “‘send’ represents the usage of all the Greek anaphoras except Basil, while ‘Come’ is found in all three East Syrian anaphoras, as well as in Basil; within the

⁶¹ Brock, *Invocations*, 399-400.

Syriac tradition it clearly represents an archaic element, and it is interesting to find it preserved in quite a large number of anaphoras, though sometimes in combination with ‘send.’”⁶² We can see that in Syriac anaphoras the earlier usage is ‘come,’ whereas the later usage is “send.” It seems that this might be the case in the Greek as well. Brock has argued that on the whole, the Greek anaphoras represent the last stage of development in the 5th century Syrian tradition (the move to ‘send’), and perhaps actually begin the Syrian shift. It is important to note, however, that one of the early Greek anaphoras, Basil, represents the earlier ‘come’ language. This could suggest Syriac influence on Basil and other Greek anaphoras.

Spinks: Cyril of Jerusalem and the Anaphora of St. James

I would now like to take a quick look at Cyril of Jerusalem’s MC and the Anaphora of St. James. Kent Burrenson’s essay on Cyril of Jerusalem’s MC is a very helpful introduction. Burrenson advocates for an Alexandrian influence on Cyril. He writes “the dependency of Jerusalem and Cyril upon the theological and catechetical heritage of Alexandria may also point to dependencies in other areas, including liturgical dependence, especially with regard to the shape and theology of the anaphora.”⁶³ While Burrenson seems to want to strongly assert Alexandrian influence on Cyril, he cannot help but say that “yet, the development of the anaphora cannot be linked solely to the influence of one See, nor identified with one specific type of anaphora (i.e., West Syrian [Antiochene] [*sic*] or Alexandrian).”⁶⁴ In this way, Cyril is seen as a composite of multiple traditions. Burrenson points out that in the work of Geoffrey Cuming, Cyril’s anaphora is seen as being in line with Mark and not West Syrian anaphoras. Thus for Cuming, Cyril’s anaphora is Egyptian. However, Burrenson quotes Spinks as saying

⁶² Brock, Sebastian. "Towards a Typology of the Epicleses in the West Syrian Anaphoras." In *Fire from Heaven* (Burlington: Ashagate Publishing Company, 2006), 179.

⁶³ Bradshaw, *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*, 134.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 140.

that this is simply not the case. Spinks of course argues for the “West Syrian origins and structure of the Cyriline anaphora.”⁶⁵ Spinks’ engagement with the epiclesis is where this is most clearly visible. For Spinks, “Cyril’s phraseology is mature in nature, unique in its maturity without displaying any earlier terminology regarding the epiclesis.”⁶⁶ In his turn to Egypt, Spinks points out that Mark and the Manchester papyrus have very similar phraseology. Spinks concludes that this is because “these two Egyptian anaphoras have been influenced by Cyril and that the term ‘send forth’ is the peculiar Jerusalemite term invoking the Spirit.”⁶⁷ From Cyril the idea of a consecratory epiclesis with such highly evocative phraseology for the Spirit is the first of its kind. Furthermore, the influence of Cyril on other anaphoras is undeniable. However, MC’s importance lies mainly in the fact that “the movement apparent in the anaphora of Cyril...comes to its culmination in JAS, the successor in Jerusalem to the anaphora of MC.”⁶⁸

It is thus to the anaphora of JAS that we turn. Witvliet in his essay *The Anaphora of St. James*, deals with the historical development of the anaphora. He begins by saying that

it is generally assumed that JAS was produced for use in the Jerusalem church sometime near the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the fifth. During this period Jerusalem was under the jurisdiction of Antioch, and was probably influenced by Antiochene theology and liturgical practice. Soon after, in the early fifth century, JAS became the primary liturgy of both Jerusalem and Antioch.⁶⁹

The connection between JAS and Cyril is quite strong as we have seen, and the connection between Cyril and Syria and JAS and Syria is quite strong as well. The fact that JAS came to be the anaphora of Antioch and Jerusalem attests to its compatibility with earlier Syrian anaphora developments.

⁶⁵ Bradshaw, *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*, 142.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 144-145.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 145.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 150.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 153.

Again Spinks becomes an important reference point. In looking at the epiclesis, there are two verbs used, *exapostello* (send out) and *katapempo* (send down), for the calling down of the Holy Spirit. Because of this, there are in effect two epicleses and “Bryan Spinks argues that it is likely that ‘*exapostello* is peculiar to Cyril and James, and may be, therefore, the particular Jerusalem terminology of the invocation of the Spirit,’ while ‘*katapempo* represents an Antiochene Epikletic word.’”⁷⁰ If this is the case, then the Syrian influence on James is quite strong. There is also a clear attempt to hold together the Jerusalemite usage with an Antiochene usage. Does this, however, preclude Syrian influence on Cyril? Or rather does it represent an attempt to bring his usage more in line with the universal Antiochene usage from which it was derived? At the end of his essay, Witvliet is willing to date parts of JAS as early as 370, therefore leading to the possibility, and he is not without other supporters, that Cyril redacts JAS. In fact, Cyril’s MC is assumed to be, at the very least, an early version of JAS. This could still show the Syrian influence on Cyril. In many ways the relationship of Cyril’s MC to JAS is a question of which came first. At this point the answer is unclear. If JAS predates MC, or if the Urtext of JAS containing Syrian epicletic thought predates MC, we might finally have an answer to the question of where MC got its revolutionary epicletic language.

In regards to JAS and Cyril, Spinks writes the article “The Consecratory Epiklesis in the Anaphora of St. James.” He goes over the development of the epiclesis in a way complimentary to Brock. He asserts that Byzantine and Alexandrian Basil have an early type of epiclesis with the word “come;” in Sarapion we have ἐπιδημῶ - “come and dwell;” in Mark, which is addressed to the Father, we have “send;” Greek and West Syrian anaphoras have a further stage

⁷⁰ Bradshaw, *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*, 159.

of development: “send down.”⁷¹ Spinks points to the *Epiclesis of the Syriac Baptismal Ordines* by Brock as the evidence for his conclusions on the Greek and West Syrian anaphoras.

Furthermore, Brock sees the Logos epiclesis (or an invocation to Christ) as an early form of the epiclesis. Drawing from Brock, Spink suggests 3 stages of development: 1) Christ is requested to come, 2) the Father is requested that the Son or Spirit come, 3) the Father is requested to send the Spirit to make the consecration.⁷² While Spinks sees Cyril as unique in his expression of the 3rd form, Cyril is not without some form of inspiration. In looking at Ratcliff’s work, Spinks notes that “Ratcliff is surely correct to note the novelty of Cyril’s phraseology, for by all accounts, it represents a mature form of the consecratory Epiclesis, without any trace of an earlier terminology. The Epiclesis in James is essentially that of Cyril.”⁷³

The question remains, however, who influenced Cyril and the Jerusalem terminology for the epiclesis? At the very end of his article, Spinks notes this problem. The fusion of the Jerusalem and Antiochene terminology is present only in GJAS while SJAS translates only the Jerusalem petition.⁷⁴ Yet the SJAS is not always faithful to Cyril. Spinks breaks up the epiclesis of SJAS, Cyril of Jerusalem’s MC and GJAS into 5 parts.

The Consecratory Epiclesis in Syriac James, Cyril’s MC, and Greek James ⁷⁵			
*The words common to the Greek and Syriac, and which also occur in Cyril have been underlined			
	Syriac James	Cyril of Jerusalem	Greek James
1	<i>Have mercy upon us, O God almighty Father</i>	εἶτα ἀγιάσαντες ἐναντοὺς διὰ τῶν πνευματικῶν τούτων ὕμνων παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν φιλόανθρωπον θεὸν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα	<u>ἐλεησον ἡμᾶς, ὁ Θεός,</u> <u>ὁ Πατήρ, ὁ παντοκράτωρ</u> ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, ὁ Θεός, ὁ σωτήρ ἡμῶν ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, ὁ Θεός, κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἔλεος σου

⁷¹ Spinks, Bryan. "The Consecratory Epiclesis in the Anaphora of St. James." *Studia Liturgica* 11, no. 1 (1976): 26-27.

⁷² Spinks, *The Consecratory*, 28.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 29.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 36.

⁷⁵ Table taken from Spinks, *The Consecratory*, 29-31.

2	<i>and send upon us and upon these oblations which we have placed your Holy Spirit (Encomium of the Spirit, shorter than Greek James).</i>	<u>ἐξαποστεῖλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα</u>	<u>καὶ ἐξαπόστειλον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα ἅγια δῶρα ταῦτα τὸ πνεῦμα σου τὸ πανάγιον (Encomium of the Spirit)</u>
2a			αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ πανάγιον κατάπεμψον, δέσποτα, ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα ἅγια δῶρα ταῦτα
3	<i>so that overshadowing (magen)</i>	<u>ἵνα</u>	<u>ἵνα ἐπιφοιτήσαν τῇ ἁγία καὶ ἀγαθῇ καὶ ἐνδόξῳ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ ἀγίαση</u>
4	<i>He (Syriac is feminine) may make this bread the life-giving body, the redeeming body, the heavenly body, the body which frees our souls and bodies, the body of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins and eternal life for those who receive. Amen.</i>	<u>ποιήση τὸν μὲν ἄρτον</u> <u>σῶμα Χριστοῦ.</u>	<u>καὶ ποιήση τὸν μὲν ἄρτον τοῦτον</u> <u>σῶμα ἅγιον Χριστοῦ</u> <u>Ἄμην</u>
5	<i>And the mixture which is in this cup, He may make the blood of the New Testament, the redeeming blood, the life-giving blood, the heavenly blood, the blood which frees our souls and bodies, the blood of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and eternal life for those who receive. Amen.</i>	<u>τὸν δὲ οἶνον</u> <u>αἷμα</u> <u>Χριστοῦ</u> <u>πάντως γάρ, οὗ ἂν ἐφάγηται τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τοῦτο ἡγιασται καὶ μεταβέβηται.</u>	<u>Καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο</u> <u>αἷμα</u> <u>τίμιον Χριστοῦ</u> <u>Ἄμην</u>

What can be seen from the table above, which Spinks explains in his text, are the shared parts between SJAS, Cyril and GJAS. In #2, SJAS, Cyril and GJAS closely follow one another, thus suggesting that #2 is “the particular Jerusalem terminology for the invocation of the Spirit.”⁷⁶ The verb used is ἐξαποστέλλω (send quite away, dispatch). In #2a GJAS stands alone and uses the verb καταπέμω (send down). Because of this, Spinks notes, we can assume that this part of the Greek text is an interpolation. #2a closely follows Antiochene tradition, and thus has representative partners in CHR and GREG. This leads Spinks to say that the Antiochene tradition has influenced CHR, GJAS, and GREG. Thus “the doublet in Greek James represents a fusion of Jerusalemite and Antiochene Epikletic usage, Syriac James preserving the older Jerusalem form.”⁷⁷ Thus, because SJAS has #2 and lacks #2a, it represents the older and more Jerusalemite tradition.

#3 is of interest because it represents a similar interpolation using Antiochene inspired terms. In the SJAS we get *magen* (while tabernacling), which Brock in his work *Invocations to/for the Holy Spirit* compares to *aggen* in Theodore. In the GJAS we get ἐπιφοίτησαν (Greek for ‘while tabernacling’) which is a Greek version of the word *magen*: “there is good reason for thinking that *magen* represents a technical Epikletic term of the Syriac speaking churches, and that ἐπιφοίτησαν is a Greek borrowing of this technical term, borrowed by the Antiochene Anaphora which in turn found its way into Greek James.”⁷⁸ Thus in #3, SJAS and GJAS closely relate to one another, while not relating to Cyril.

#4 and #5 are even more intriguing. In #4 and #5, GJAS more closely follows Cyril, while SJAS has its own interpolations. These interpolations are once again thought by Spinks to be of Antiochene origin. The exact origins of the expansion are unknown. However, Spinks

⁷⁶ Spinks, *The Consecratory*, 32.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 33.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 34.

turns to a similar expansion in *Acts of Thomas* and in the baptismal epiclesis, particularly in the Byzantine Rite.⁷⁹ It is interesting to note that his inspiration for this turn to the baptismal rites is none other than Brock (see Spinks' footnote #41). Thus, #4 and #5 represent Antiochene influence on SJAS, and in particular, Antiochene baptismal influence. Interestingly in #2 and #2a SJAS represented the older format of JAS, but in #4 and #5, GJAS does.

Spinks then goes on to ponder the possibility of an even older source from which Cyril draws direct inspiration. He writes “one question remains to be considered, namely, the question of earlier forms of Jerusalem Epiklesis ... [I]s there an earlier form comparable with Cyril?”⁸⁰ Spinks thinks there is. Spinks then goes on to look very briefly at two Egyptian Anaphoras: the Manchester Papyrus and Der Balyzeh. He begins by point out that the Egyptian Liturgy of St. Mark was heavily influenced by the Liturgy of St. James from the 4th to 7th centuries; however, he goes on to say that “we may presume that the Egyptian Church was influenced by the West Syrian Church at an earlier date too.”⁸¹ He then goes on to compare the Manchester Papyrus to Cyril (the similarities are underlined).

Και παρακαλουμεν σε, εξαποστειλον σου το πνευμα το αγιον επι τα . .
ορωμενα σου δωρα, επι τον αρτον τουτον και επι το ποιηριον τουτο και
ποιησον τον μεν αρτον τουτον σωμα Ιησου Χριστου το δε ποτηριον αιμα της
καινης διαθηκης αυτου του κυριου και θεου και σωτηρος και παμ βασιλευς
ημων Ιησου Κριστου αμην.⁸²

Spinks points out that there are considerable similarities. He notes the similarities between this text and #2 in SJAS, Cyril and GJAS with the usage of the word *ἐξαποστέλλω* (send quite away, dispatch). Spinks also links this to Sarapion's prayers, suggesting that the verb *ἐπιδημέω* (to come home) found in Sarapion's prayers is earlier than *ἐξαποστέλλω*. Though Spinks does not

⁷⁹ Spinks, *The Consecratory*, 35.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 36.

⁸¹ Ibid., 36.

⁸² Ibid., 36.

give the text of Der Balyzeh, he does mention that in the text we find the verb *κατάπεμψαι* (send down). This of course is close to #2a and thus in line with GJAS. Thus Spinks reaches the conclusion:

may it not be the case that these two fragmentary Anaphoras represent the early influence of West Syria on the Egyptian Epiklesis, the Manchester Papyrus representing Jerusalem influence, and Der Balyzeh (like the later Greek St. Gregory) representing the influence of Antioch? If this is the case, then the Manchester Papyrus preserves a form of the Jerusalem Epiklesis more primitive than that of Greek and Syriac James.⁸³

If this is true that the Manchester Papyrus preserves a form of the Jerusalem epiclesis older than SJAS or Cyril, then it gives us a basis for the later development of Cyril's epiclesis and serves to show the influence of the Syrian tradition beyond Syria at a very early date.

Gabriele Winkler: the Antiquity of the Spirit

I would now like to turn to the influential work of Gabriele Winkler. In her article "Further Observations in Connection with the Early Form of the Epiklesis," she elaborates on another one of her works⁸⁴, but this time looking at the *Veni*-invocations (Come-invocations) of the *Acts of Thomas*, the epiclesis at the eucharist, the blessing of the oil and epicletic evidence from the *Acts of John*. In her concluding remarks, Winkler expands on Brock and calls our attention to two parts of the epiclesis: 1) the verb used and 2) the person addressed. In looking at the verbs, Winkler agrees with Brock's tracing of the epiclesis back to the *Acts of Thomas*, the *Didache* (which is from Syria), and even the New Testament phrase *maranatha* of Paul. Winkler also makes the same conclusion as Brock that "come" represents an earlier development than "may come." This development also, according to Winkler, allows for the possibility of the incorporation of yet another verb leading to "may come and abide." In her work on the *Acts of*

⁸³ Spinks, *The Consecratory*, 36.

⁸⁴ G. Winkler, "Nochmals zu den Anfängen der Epiklese und des Sanctus im Eucharistischen Hochgebet", *Theologische Quartalschrift* 174 (1994): 214-231.

John, she points to not two, but three verbs: “may come and rest and abide.” Thus, Winkler’s discussion of the usage of verbs in the epiclesis collaborates Brock’s.

It is in her discussion on the addressee that Winkler makes some significant departures from the theologians we have thus far discussed. Winkler’s scholarship goes against the commonly held assumption that “the invocations in the Acts of Thomas are in general addressed to Christ.”⁸⁵ Rather, in the anointing during initiation, Winkler sees the Spirit as being invoked as the “Name of the Mesiha” and similarly the Mother, Spirit, in the Eucharist. Thus she writes “there can be no doubt in my mind that the primary place of the presence of a fully fledged epiklesis is the anointing and that the inclusion of a true epiklesis at the eucharist reflects a secondary development.”⁸⁶ Furthermore, Winkler argues that “both invocations addressed to ‘Jesus’ or the ‘Lord,’ be it at the eucharist be it in connection with the anointing, seem also to go back to a later reworking.”⁸⁷ Concluding the development of the addressee of the epiclesis, Winkler points out the most important development:

in the apocryphal Syriac Acts of John from the midfourth century the new addressee is now the Father hitherto unknown in early invocations. At the same time we noticed that the epiklesis became imbedded in repeated Trinitarian doxologies and the Sanctus, the latter initially addressed to the Father, then also Trinitarian in orientation probably because of the doxologies. Thus attention has to be drawn to the fact that the initial epiklesis is steadily making room for doxologies, eventually including the Sanctus as well. At the beginning the two oldest invocations had the shape of a hymnic veni-epiklesis. Then doxological elements were added at the expense of the previous extended form of the epiklesis and finally even the Sanctus became included. In my opinion [*sic*] there is little doubt that the inclusion of the Sanctus into the rites of initiation (which conclude with the celebration of the eucharist!) have to be traced back, like the epiklesis, to the genius of the Syrians: calling down the divine presence, phrasing God in the doxologies and calling out ‘holy’! are nothing else but the two sides of one coin.⁸⁸

⁸⁵ Winkler, Gabriele. "Further Observations in Connection with the Early Form of the Epiklesis." *Studies in Early Christian Liturgy and Its Context* (Brookfield: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1997), 79.

⁸⁶ Winkler, *Further*, 79.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 79.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 80.

Thus as one can see, the development of the epiclesis and its inclusion into the Eucharistic liturgy is closely tied to the Sanctus and the incorporation of the Sanctus via the rites of initiation into the Eucharist. This development, as Winkler points out, is Syrian in origin. For her, the Sanctus and the epiclesis must be thought of as a unit that travels into the Eucharistic liturgy together from the rites of initiation within a 4th century Syrian context.

Winkler in her article “The Blessing of Water in the Oriental Liturgies” takes up Brock’s treatment of the epiclesis again. She writes that

Brock has convincingly shown that, on an analysis of the words, two basic types exist, i.e., the epiclesis, which uses the word ‘come’, and forms using the word ‘send’. In the Greek and West Syrian texts (and those influenced by them) we find a request for the ‘sending’ of the Spirit, whereas in the East Syrian and Maronite epicleses (and forms dependent upon the East Syrian, as, for instance, in the Armenian intercessions at the blessing of water) it is the ‘coming’ of the Spirit (or of Jesus) that is prayed for. Whenever we can show the verb ‘come’ (imperative), we must assume it is to be very ancient, whereas ‘send’ does not establish itself until the fifth century. We must also remember that what we have is often not a prayer for the descent of the *Spirit* but an epiclesis directed to *Christ*, as e.g. in the Acts of Thomas, which presents us with the most ancient form of Christ-epiclesis (not ‘Logos’-epiclesis!).⁸⁹

This is an interesting development. Winkler’s rejection of the Logos epiclesis, at least in the development of Syrian epicletic thought, poses questions about the Sarapion prayer and its usage of Logos epicleses. Also, Winkler disagrees somewhat with Brock’s dating. While Brock’s sequence of the development of the epiclesis remains the same, Winkler thinks the stages happen much earlier than previously thought.

Taft: Logos to Spirit

It is here that I would like to include one article by Taft before concluding with an article by Johnson. In Taft’s article *From logos to spirit: On the early history of the epiclesis*, Taft defends the Logos epiclesis. Unlike Winkler, he contends that the epiclesis in the *Acts of*

⁸⁹ Winkler, Gabriele. "The Blessing of Water in the Oriental Liturgies." In *Blessing and Power*, edited by David Power and Mary Collins (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark LTD, 1985), 55.

Thomas is in fact a Logos epiclesis.⁹⁰ Taft defends the Spirit epiclesis as a 4th century development. He notes that

there is general agreement among those who know enough about the issue to merit attention that before the third—some would say fourth-century no one attributes the role of Eucharistic sanctifier to the Holy Spirit, whereas the role of the Logos as the operative force in the eucharist is abundantly testified to right into the fourth century, in some areas at least.⁹¹

This seems in some ways to go against the work of Gabriele Winkler who tries to show the active role of the Spirit as being implied in the Eucharist much earlier, even earlier than Brock suggests. It is important to note that Taft himself points out that despite the widespread understanding of the role of the Logos in the Eucharist at this time, the only extant Logos epiclesis in a Eucharistic prayer is in the anaphora of Sarapion.

Yet we also know that “the Spirit epiclesis was known at Alexandria in the time of Athanasius’ successor Peter (373-380), whom Theodoret of Cyrrhus (ca. 393-466), Church History IV, 2.7, cites as denouncing the profanities of the Arians ‘on this holy altar where we invoke the descent of the Holy Spirit.’”⁹² Thus, regardless of whether one holds Winkler’s views, the Logos epiclesis of Sarapion is rather quickly phased out after his death. For this reason and others, Taft argues that “I believe it is no longer possible to sustain the view that the Spirit epiclesis could not have existed before the second half of the fourth century.”⁹³ As possible evidence for this, he cites the *Didaskalia*, which is of course an early—perhaps 3rd century—Syrian text. In his concluding remarks, Taft upholds a few important things, the most important being that “the final stage of evolution, the Spirit epiclesis in explicitly consecratory form, observable already in Jerusalem in Cyril/John, Cat. 5,7, is in place elsewhere by the end of the century in

⁹⁰ Taft, 491.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 495.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 496.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 498.

Apostolic Constitutions VIII, 12.39, and probably even earlier than that in the Urtext of the Syriac Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles and the related Chrysostom Anaphora.”⁹⁴

Johnson: Current Scholarship and the Various Camps

In closing our discussion on current scholarship on the epiclesis today, I would like to end with an article by Max Johnson: *The Origins of the Anaphoral Use of the Sanctus and Epiclesis*. There are two theories concerning the introduction of the Sanctus and the epiclesis into anaphoral usage. The first is the “Egyptian theory,” which receives support from Dix and Kretschmar. The Egyptian theory looks at the introduction of the Sanctus in Alexandria under the heavy influence of Origen. The second is the “climax theory,” which receives support from Ratcliff. It asserts that the Sanctus goes back to the very origins of Christian Eucharistic celebrations. Johnson says that “most scholars today do not accept Ratcliff’s ‘climax theory’ as an explanation for the origins of the anaphoral use of the Sanctus, some version of the ‘Egyptian theory,’ in spite of Spinks’ attempts to the contrary, still commends itself as a plausible hypothesis.”⁹⁵ At the onset of this article, Johnson deals with the origins of the anaphoral use of the Sanctus and epiclesis from the work of Spinks and Taft. Spinks of course advocates Syrian origin; Taft advocates Egyptian. Johnson notes that the first sources of Sanctus usage are in

such fourth century sources as the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius of Caesarea (Book X), the mystagogical catecheses of Cyril (or John) of Jerusalem, the anaphora of Sarapion of Thmuis, *ApConst.* VIII, 12:27, and the paschal vigil homilies of Asterios Sophistes of Cappadocia for the East, and, if not already present in certain, early fourth-century Gallican and Mozarabic Easter prefaces, Victor of Vita’s fifth-century *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae* for the West.⁹⁶

⁹⁴ Taft, 499.

⁹⁵ Johnson, Maxwell. *The Origins of the Anaphoral Sanctus and Epiclesis Revisited: The Contribution of Gabriele Winkler*. Vol. 265, in *Crossroad of Culture: Studies in Liturgy and Patristics in Honor of Gabriele Winkler*, by Hans-Jurgen Feulner. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, (2000): 406.

⁹⁶ Johnson, *The Origins*, 408.

I find the Easter preface reference intriguing if in fact Winkler is right that the Sanctus moved into the Eucharist from the rites of initiation, which of course occur in this century at Easter. By the 5th century we see, however, its full inclusion in Eucharistic prayers in the East and West. Johnson notes that despite its usage everywhere, its placement in the anaphora reflected two styles: 1) an Egyptian and 2) an Antiochene or Syrian. Reflecting the Egyptian school, Dix, in looking at Sarapion's anaphora claimed "that the Sanctus and its introduction were interpolated into the local liturgy of Thmuis from Alexandria where they were already used within the eucharistic liturgy in the first half of the third century."⁹⁷

Spinks and the Syrian school, however, challenge this theory. This school has turned to the work of

H. Auf de Mar's 1967 publication and study of the paschal vigil homilies (ca. 337) of Asterius Sophistes of Cappadocia (in the region of Antioch), which include some of the earliest indisputed references to the use of the Sanctus in the eucharistic liturgy, [which] has suggested to scholars such an 'Antiochene' provenance for the anaphoral Sanctus at a date early enough for it to have been influenced by synagogue usage.⁹⁸

This shows a much earlier connection between the Sanctus and the Eucharist in Syria than in Egypt. Furthermore, Johnson points to Spinks' work in looking at the prayers of the Jewish synagogues. Spinks has advocated that "however the Sanctus may have entered into the anaphora, it happened within an overall Syrian context."⁹⁹ Yet scholars such as Taft have pointed to the uniqueness of the Egyptian Sanctus and have leaned towards the anaphoral use of the Sanctus as being Egyptian in origin and later adopted by the Syrians. Johnson argues that the connection Taft draws with the Logos epiclesis allows this theory to remain tenable.

It is here that Gabriele Winkler enters. Winkler's study on the inclusion of the Sanctus and epiclesis into the Eucharistic prayer centers around the close relationship between the rites of

⁹⁷ Johnson, *The Origins*, 413.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 414.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 415.

Christian initiation and the eucharist which would have ritually followed. For Winkler the connection between the Sanctus and initiation is quite strong:

As Winkler demonstrates, not only does the Sanctus continue to be present in the East Syrian baptismal rite for the consecration of oil, the West Syrian baptismal rite at the consecration of the baptismal water, the Maronite rite for the consecration of the waters at Epiphany, and the East Syrian Night Office (*Leyla*) for Epiphany, all of which tie the use of the Sanctus to the celebration of Jesus' own baptism—His pneumatic birth and assimilation of 'Adam'—in the Jordan, but early Eastern sources elsewhere make a similar connection between the Sanctus and Christian initiation. In the homilies of Asterios Sophistes of Cappadocia, for example, it is precisely within the context of the Easter Vigil that reference is made both to neophytes and all the assembly singing the Sanctus in the anaphora. . . . Indeed, the very fourth-century change in the meaning of the prebaptismal anointing from pneumatic assimilation to Christ to an exorcistic purification in preparation for the gift of the Holy Spirit by the water bath and subsequent *postbaptismal* anointing (also witnessed to for the first time in Cyril (John) of Jerusalem) suggests to her that his may have caused the Sanctus to be shifted from its prebaptismal location to the Eucharistic liturgy, the culminating rite of initiation.¹⁰⁰

The shift of the Sanctus and the shift of the epiclesis are radically tied together. Johnson again reiterates Winkler's concern that the term Logos epiclesis not be seen within the Syrian context.¹⁰¹ Winkler thus critiques Taft's understanding of the *Acts of Thomas* as a Logos epiclesis. According to Winkler, "the Syrian equivalent of 'Logos' (*melta*) does not occur anywhere in the *Acts*, and thus the term 'Logos epiclesis' should not be used to refer to the early Syrian context at all."¹⁰² Rather, she says that this text preserves a hidden Spirit epiclesis. Therefore, she is critical of connections made between the Sarapion Logos epicleses and the Syrian tradition. She thinks it represents a Greek-influenced 4th century development because of its consecratory nature. Thus to her, "it has no parallel with what [she] believes is the original form of invocation of the name of the Messiah or His Spirit as in the Syrian tradition."¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰ Johnson, *The Origins*, 424.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 425.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 425.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 429.

Additionally she thinks that the translation of the text is misleading, including Max Johnson's, because she does not want to translate ἐπιδημέω as "come" but rather as "come home" or "to rest." Winkler rules out the epicleses of Sarapion and thinks that "the evolution of the anaphoral epiclesis, therefore, should not be designated 'from Logos to Spirit,' but 'from the Coming of the 'Name' of the Messiah or Spirit to the sending of the Spirit.'"¹⁰⁴ Thus Johnson concludes his analysis of Winkler's work saying "Winkler's conclusions are both clear and suggestive. The origins of the anaphoral use of both the Sanctus and epiclesis are to be located within the early Syrian liturgical tradition from where they passed into other traditions. The anaphoral epiclesis itself, it seems, in spite of her earlier conclusion, was essentially a 'Spirit' epiclesis from the very beginning."¹⁰⁵

Johnson concludes his article by discussing the implications of Winkler's work. For Johnson, the most important part of Winkler's work is that she forces us to "take seriously the overall initiation context of eucharistic and anaphoral development in general."¹⁰⁶ But beyond that, Winkler's work suggests a few additional things according to Johnson. First, Taft was right to say, according to Winkler's work, that a Spirit epiclesis did exist before the mid-fourth century. Second, her work following Brock's could help us see *ApTrad* 4 as an interpolation because of its address to God and request for the Holy Spirit to be sent. Finally, Winkler's work says something about our theology of the Holy Spirit and the ancient usage of feminine imagery.¹⁰⁷ Yet Johnson is not willing to totally abandon the Egyptian Theory. Additionally, Johnson has had to amend his own translation of the Sarapion epicleses, while still claiming a Syrian connection. Johnson agrees that "the verb ἐπιδημέω is not the equivalent of ἐρχομαι [the

¹⁰⁴ Johnson, *The Origins*, 430.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 433.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 433.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 434.

proper word for ‘come’], and, thus should not be translated simply as ‘come.’”¹⁰⁸ Johnson is not willing to discount the Logos epiclesis, however, for 3 reasons: 1) “the role of the Logos in Greek sacramental liturgy and theology, whether or not [an] explicit epiclesis of the Logos existed before Sarapion,”¹⁰⁹ 2) the lack of distinction between the Logos and Spirit in Greek tradition, and 3) the fact that an explicit Holy Spirit invocation at the Eucharist, even as early as *Acts of Thomas*, was not widespread enough before the pneumatological controversies to play any real role in heading them off.

Also, Johnson notes that there are 2 epicleses in Sarapion’s anaphora, the second one “placed at what became the traditional Antiochene location of the consecratory epiclesis, that is, after the narrative of institution and anamnesis.”¹¹⁰ Additionally, Johnson notes that the Greek word in the epiclesis for the consecration of the water in the Sarapion prayers is “κατέρχομαι [(go down, come)], a verb clearly based on ἔρχομαι, the frequent epicletic verb used in the Greek translation of the Syrian sources themselves.”¹¹¹ He suggests that this verb choice, while not an exact Syrian match, perhaps represents an “intermediate stage in the development of the Syrian epiclesis.”¹¹² Finally, Johnson notes that the mere usage of ἐπιδημέω might represent a Syrian connection if one looks at the *Acts of Thomas*. All of this might show a Syrian influence on Sarapion. This leads Johnson to conclude that “it may still be, then, that in spite of the absence of the Logos in the early Syrian liturgical sources, it is Sarapion’s epiclesis of the Logos that has preserved some remnant of that early tradition in Egypt, albeit within a world of thought so conceptually and theologically distinct.”¹¹³ It does not seem unreasonable to suggest that while

¹⁰⁸ Johnson, *The Origins*, 438.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 438.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 438.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 439.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 439.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 440.

Egypt had its own tradition, the influence of Syriac thought concerning the Holy Spirit would cause an adjustment in Egyptian praying.

In other words, perhaps the Logos epiclesis is being understood improperly. Winkler and Taft might both be right in their sequences. If Logos at the time was not solely identified with Christ, but as a hybrid Christ-Spirit, then the Logos could stand in both Winkler's and Taft's sequences. Perhaps they are not mutually exclusive as once thought. The sequence of development could be 1) Coming of the Name, 2) Logos or Christ/Spirit hybrid, 3) Spirit. This would not be in contradiction to Brock's analysis in which it moves from Christ, to Christ "that his Spirit may come," to the Father "that the Spirit may come," and concluding with God, that he might "send the Holy Spirit." This would make the Sarapion text a geographical variation of the development going on in Syria. Or it might show a more complicated relationship between Syria and Alexandria than was previously thought, in which they mutually informed one another and through interaction with one another developed what would eventually become universal practice.

Conclusion

Thus to conclude, the exact development of the epiclesis is still contended. On the one hand, there are those who argue that the epiclesis is largely a Syrian development. On the other, there are those who contend it is Egyptian. Regardless, the scholarship of both schools of thought must be taken into consideration before a more definitive answer can be put forth, though one must note that an absolutely definitive answer in historical liturgical scholarship is impossible. I for one closely follow Winkler, Brock and Spinks as seeing the Eucharistic epiclesis as having developed in a Syrian context out of the rites of initiation. I, however, think that it is quite possible that the Logos epiclesis of Sarapion represents an Alexandrian

development in the epiclesis. I think it is quite fair to assume that there was some level of unique development in each theological, liturgical, linguist, and geographical region of the Christian world at this time. However, in the end, the Syrian or Antiochene epiclesis is the one which gets adopted, largely through its influence on Cyril, and more importantly JAS. Thus, while the Alexandria epicleses might have a development slightly different from those in Syria, even amid Syrian influence and may have even impact Syrian practice, it is the Syrian line of epicletic thought which is disseminated across the Christian world.

Bibliography

- Anderson, E. Byron. "A Body in the Spirit for the World: Eucharist, Epiclesis, and Ethics." *Worship* 85, no. 2 (2011).
- Atchley, E.G. Cuthbert. *On the Epiclesis of the Eucharistic Liturgy and in the Consecration of the Font*. London: Oxford University Press, 1935.
- Barrett-Lennard, R.J.S. *The Sacramentary of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Text for Students, with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Nottingham: Grove Books Limited, 1993.
- Baumstark, Anton. *On the Historical Development of the Liturgy*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2011.
- Belcher, Kimberly. *Efficacious Engagement*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2011.
- Berger, Teresa, and Bryan Spinks, . *The Spirit in Worship - Worship in the Spirit*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2009.
- Bishop, Edmund. *Appendix: Observations on the Liturgy of Narsai*. Vol. 8.1, in *Texts and Studies*, edited by J. Armitage Robinson, 87-163. London: Cambridge University Press, 1916.
- Blomfield, John. *The Eucharistic Canon*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1930.
- Bouyer, Louis. *Eucharist*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.
- . *Liturgical Piety*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1955.
- Bradshaw, Paul. *Essays in Early Eastern Initiation*. Nottingham: Grove Books Limited, 1988.
- . *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1997.
- . *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*. New York City: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Brock, Sebastian. "A New Syriac Baptismal Ordo Attributed to Timothy of Alexandria." In *Studies on Syrian Baptismal Rites*, by J. Vellian. Kottayam: C.M.S. Press, 1973.
- . "East Syrian Liturgical Fragments from the Cairo Genizah." *Oriens Christianus* 68 (1984): 58-79.

- "Invocations to/for the Holy Spirit in Syriac Liturgical Texts: Some Comparative Approaches." Edited by Robert Taft. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* (Pontificio Istituto Orientale) 265 (2001): 377-406.
- "Passover, Annunciation and Epiclesis: Some Remarks on the Term Aggen in the Syriac Versions of Lk. 1:35." *Novum Testamentum* 24, no. 3 (1982).
- "Some Early Syriac Baptismal Commentaries." In *Fire and Heaven*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2006.
- "Some Important Baptismal Themes in the Syriac Tradition." *The Harp* 4, no. 1-3 (1991): 189-214.
- "Studies in the early History of the Syrian Orthodox Baptismal Liturgy." In *Studies in Syrian Baptismal Rites*, by J. Vellian. Kottayam: C. M. S. Press, 1973.
- "Studies in the Early History of the Syrian Orthodox Baptismal Liturgy." Edited by H. Chadwick, H.E. Root and H.F.D. Sparks. *The Journal of Theological Studies* XXIII (1972): 16-64.
- "The Background to Some Terms in the Syriac Eucharistic Epicleses." *The Harp* 13 (2000): 1-12.
- "The Christology of the Church of the East." *Vestnik Drevnii Istorii* 2, no. 213 (1996): 39-53.
- "The Consecration of the Water in the Oldest Manuscripts of the Syrian Orthodox Baptismal Liturgy." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 37 (1971): 317-332.
- "The Contribution of the Assyrian Church of the East to European Civilization." *The Assyrian* 2, no. 2-3 (1985): 16-7.
- "The Epiclesis in the Antiochene Baptismal Ordines." *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* (Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum) 197 (1974): 183-218.
- *The Holy Spirit in the Syrian Baptismal Tradition*. Poona: Anita Printers, 1979.
- "The Importance of the Syriac Traditions in Ecumenical Dialogue on Christianity." *Christian Orient* 20 (1999): 189-197.
- "The Priesthood of the Baptized: Some Syriac Perspectives." *Sobornost* 9, no. 2 (1987): 14-22.
- "The Rise of Christian Thought: The Theological Schools of Antioch, Edessa and Nisibis." In *Christianity. A History in the Middle East*, by Habib Badr, 143-160. Beirut: Middle East Council of Churches, 2005.

- . "The Syrian Orthodox Reaction to the Council of Chalcedon: Jacob of Serugh's Homily on the Council of Chalcedon." *Texts and Studies* 8, no. 10 (1989-91): 448-459.
- . "Towards a Typology of the Epicleses in the West Syrian Anaphoras." In *Fire from Heaven*. Burlington: Ashagate Publishing Company, 2006.
- . "Two Recent Editions of Syrian Orthodox Anaphoras." *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 102 (1988): 435-445.
- . "World and Sacrament in the Writings of the Syrian Fathers." *Sobornost* 6, no. 10 (1974): 685-696.
- Chadwick, Henry. *The Early Church*. New York City: Pelican Books, 1967.
- Crane, Gregory, ed. *Perseus Digital Library*. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/>.
- Codrington, H.W. "The Heavenly Altar and the Epiclesis in Egypt." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 29 (1965): 141-150.
- Congar, Yves. *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*. Edited by David Smith. New York City: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1983.
- Connolly, R.H. "The Heavenly Altar and the Epiclesis in Egypt." *The Journal of Theological Studies* XXXIX (1965).
- Cutrone, Emmanuel. "The Anaphora of the Apostles: Implications of the Mar Esa'Ya Text." *Theological Studies* 34, no. 4 (1973).
- Dix, G. "The Origins of the Epiclesis." *Theology* 28 (1934): 125-137; 187-202.
- . *The Shape of the Liturgy*. New York City: Continuum, 1945.
- Duba, Arlo. "Hints for a Morphology of Eucharistic Praying: A Study of John 13:31-17:26." *Worship* 57, no. 4 (1983).
- Grisbrooke, W. Jardine. *The Liturgical Portions of the Apostolic Constitutions*. Nottingham: Grove Books Limited, 1990.
- Hall, Jerome. *We Have the Mind of Christ*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2001.
- Hamman, Andre. *Baptism Ancient Liturgies and Patristic Texts*. Staten Island: Society of St. Paul, 1967.
- Herbert, A.G. *The Meaning of the Epiclesis*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1933.

- I.C.E.L. *The Rites*. Vol. 1. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Jackson, Pamela. *The Holy Spirit in the Catechesis and Mystagogy of Cyril of Jerusalem, Ambrose, and John Chrysostom*. Ann Arbor: U.M.I., 1988.
- Jasper, R.C.D., and G.J. Cuming. *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Johnson, Maxwell. "Baptism as "New Birth Ex Aqua et Spiritu": A Preliminary Investigation of Western Liturgical Sources." Edited by Robert Taft. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* (Pontificio Istituto Orientale) 265 (2001): 787-807.
- . *Between Memory and Hope*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2000.
- . *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2010.
- . *The Origins of the Anaphoral Sanctus and Epiclesis Revisited: The Contribution of Gabriele Winkler*. Vol. 265, in *Crossroad of Culture: Studies in Liturgy and Patristics in Honor of Gabriele Winkler*, by Hans-Jurgen Feulner. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 2000.
- . "The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis." *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* (Pontificio Istituto Orientale) 249 (1995).
- . *The Rites of Christian Initiation*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2007.
- Jones, Cheslyn, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold. *The Study of Liturgy*. London: SPCK, 1978.
- Kilmartin, Edward. *Christian Liturgy I. Theology*. Kansas City: Sheed & Ward, 1988.
- Kizhakkeparampil, Isaac. *The Invocation of the Holy Spirit as Constitutive of the Sacraments according to Cardinal Yves Congar*. Rome: Editrice Pontificia Universita Gregoriana, 1995.
- Maclean, Arthur. *The Ancient Church Orders*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2004.
- Maldonado, Luis, and David Power, . *Structures of Initiation in Crisis*. New York City: The Seabury Press, 1979.
- Marsh, Richard. *Prayers from the East*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.
- Mazza, Enrico. *The Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Rite*. New York City: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1986.
- . *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1995.

- McDonnell, Kilian, and George Montague. *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991.
- McGuckin, John. *The Westminster Handbook to Patristic Theology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.
- McKenna, John. "Eucharistic Prayer: Epiclesis." *Studia Liturgica* 17 (1987).
- . "Eucharistic Epiclesis: Myopia or Microcosm?" *Theological Studies* 36, no. 2 (1975).
- . *The Eucharistic Epiclesis*. Chicago: Hillenbrand Books, 2009.
- Nichols, Bridget, and Alistair MacGregor. *The Eucharistic Epiclesis*. Durham: Ushaw College Library, 2001.
- Panicker, Gheevargese. "The Liturgy of St. James and Theology of the Trinity." *Studia Liturgica* 30, no. 1 (2000).
- Paul, K.A., and George Mookan. *The Liturgy of the Holy Apostles Adai and Mari Together with the Liturgies of Mar Theodorus and Mar Nestorius and The Order of Baptism*. Trichur: Mar Narsai Press, 1967.
- Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity. *Guidelines for Admission to the Eucharist Between the Chaldean Church and the Assyrian Church of the East*. 2001.
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_20011025_chiesa-caldea-assira_en.html.
- Power, David, and Mary Collins, *Blessing and Power*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark LTD, 1985.
- Quasten, Johannes. *Studies in Christian Antiquity: Christian Initiation*. Vol. 17. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1974.
- Regan, Patrick. "Quenching the Spirit: The Epiclesis in Recent Roman Documents." *Worship* 79, no. 5 (2005).
- Richardson, Cyril. "The Origin of the Epiclesis." *Anglical Theological Review* 28 (1946).
- . "The So-Called Epiclesis in Hippolytus." *The Harvard Theological Review* 40, no. 2 (1947).
- . "Eastern and Western Liturgies: The Primitive Basis of Their Later Differences: A Note for the Study of Eucharistic Origins." *The Harvard Theological Review* 42, no. 2 (1949).
- Rouwhorst, Gerard. "Baumstark's Methodology in Practice: Historical Research on the Blessing of Baptismal Water in the Roman Liturgy." *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 265 (2001): 963-979.

- Schmemmann, Alexander. *Of Water and the Spirit*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974.
- Senn, Frank. "Toward a Different Anaphoral Structure." *Worship* 58, no. 4 (1984).
- Serra, Dominic. *The Blessing of Baptismal Water at the Paschal Vigil (Ge 444-448): Its Origins, Evolution, and Reform*. Rome: Pontificium Athenaeum S. Anselmi de Urbe Pontificum Institutum Liturgicum, 1989.
- Shepherd, Massey. "The Formation and Influence of the Antiochene Liturgy." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 15 (1961).
- Spinks, Bryan. "The Consecratory Epiklesis in the Anaphora of St. James." *Studia Liturgica* 11, no. 1 (1976): 19-38.
- . "The Integrity of the Anaphora of Sarapion of Thmuis and Liturgical Methodology." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 49, no. 1 (1998).
- . "The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 48, no. 2 (1997).
- Taft, Robert. "From logos to spirit: On the early history of the epiclesis." In *Gratias agamus : Studien zum eucharistischen Hochgebet : für Balthasar Fischer*, edited by Balthasar Fischer, 489-502. 1992.
- Tyrer, J.W. *The Eucharistic Epiclesis*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1917.
- Volf, Miroslav. *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Vorgrimler, Herbert. *Sacramental Theology*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992.
- West, Fritz. *The Comparative Liturgy of Anton Baumstark*. Nottingham: Grove Books Limited, 1995.
- Whitaker, E.C. *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*. London: SPCK, 1970.
- . *The Baptismal Liturgy*. London: SPCK, 1981.
- Winkler, Gabriele. "Further Observations in Connection with the Early Form of the Epiclesis." *Studies in Early Christian Liturgy and Its Context*. Brookfield: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1997.
- . "The Blessing of Water in the Oriental Liturgies." In *Blessing and Power*, edited by David Power and Mary Collins. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark LTD, 1985.

Wordsworth, John. *Bishop Sarapion's Prayer-Book*. Hamden: Archon Books, 1964.

Young, Frances. *From Nicaea to Chalcedon*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.