i. In his book on the “Churches of Eastern Christendom” written for the general reader, Dr. Kidd did not pay very much attention to the “internal life” of these various churches. His only remark about the liturgy of the Nestorians was that they “held to the common standard of Christendom.” Therefore it is the more striking that he gives the following extensive quotation from a book of Fortescue’s (from 1911) on the other Syriac church of the Jacobites: “They produced a ‘brilliant school of liturgical science’; and Dionysius bar Salibi († 1171), Bishop of Amida (Diabekr) is famous as the author of a treatise (the Liturgy of St. James) such as no other church could show in the Middle Ages. The result of this is that we know more about the history of the Jacobite rite than of any other.” Some grave objections must be made against this statement. In the first place (what could not possibly be known to Fortescue), that the exposition of Dionysius mentioned before is for a great deal nothing but plagiarism, as is also found in several of his works. This appears when it is compared with the texts published in 1913 by Dom. Connolly, the expositions of George of the Arabs and Moses Bar Cepha. Dionysius was a remarkable author of the Jacobite Renaissance but a very traditional one (this fact gives him some importance), more excelling in volubility than in originality. Secondly one wonders where this “brilliant school” comes from; it cannot be founded on this writing alone and we do not know more about it, for the fact that several authors on liturgical matters lived in the course of many ages does not permit us to speak of a “school”. In the third place (and this is important for our investigation): this wording ignores absolutely that liturgical activity was not in the least confined to the Jacobite Syrians. It lies outside the scope of this work to show this in detail.

with regard to the other churches. As to the Nestorians\(^1\) the rest of this book will form a sufficient refutation, I hope.

His opinion can largely be explained\(^2\) from ignorance; for the Nestorians did not attract the attention of scholars in the same measure as the Jacobites. Though J. S. Assemani devoted two of the four volumes of his “Bibliotheca” to them and gave extensive extracts from their writings, it lasted one century and a half before further studies and publications were made. It seemed as though people were quite satisfied with what he had published. The reasons are obvious. The rise of the study of Syriac literature coincides with the acquisition of a great part of the treasures of the Library of the Syriac-Jacobite “Monastery of the Mother of God” in Scete (Egypt) by the British Museum. This new era was inaugurated by Dr. Cureton (the Vatican Library, which contained a good many Nestorian Mss. from which Assemani got his information, was practically inaccessible). These writings were all of Jacobite origin, or at least transmitted by the Monophysites. All the large collections of Syriac Mss. in Europe were in the same position. But this was not the only reason, for there were Nestorian Mss. In the first place the attention of editors was attracted by works written in Greek before the confessional division, and lost in the original language, but preserved in Syriac; and moreover these sources gave a clearer picture of an important part of church history, such as the time of Justinian and the rise of Monophysitism.\(^3\) The Jacobites had always been in contact with the Greek Church and were nearer to Europe than the Nestorians who lived in the plains of Mesopotamia or mountains of Kurdistan.

The interest for the Nestorians came later (± 1890). Various reasons worked together: several libraries enlarged their fund of Nestorian Mss.; important publications were made (Gismondi’s Chronicles, the “Book of the Governors”). The adherents of this creed came out their refuges in the mountains round about Lake

---

\(^1\) It is not impossible that they even influenced the later Jacobites: Bar Hebraeus quotes Persian Canons in his: \textit{Nomocanon} iv 2, compiled from John Bar Aligare (see p. 133–135); Dionysius copied much from Isha’Dad of Merv; the same holds good for the mystics. \(^2\) Not as a whole; for an impression of the Nestorian activity is given by the list of \textit{L.E.W.} p. 10x, and by A. Baumstark, \textit{L.G.}, passim which, I do not know for what reason, remained unknown to Dr. Kidd. \(^3\) An important remark is made by A. J. Maclean, \textit{Syrian Christians}, in: \textit{E.R.E.}, xii, p. 167: “The history of many of these Christians has usually been considered in Europe only as far as it affects their relations with certain heresies, i.e., only from one episode (however important) of their annals.
Van and Urmia and the neighbourhood of Mosul where they had hidden themselves before the persecutions of the Turcs and Kurds. The Roman Catholic and Anglican Missions tried to come into touch with them, and this created the practical need for books. Of the Roman Catholics it will be sufficient to mention the name of P. Bedjan who provided the Chaldeans (Uniates) with numerous editions of their ancient authors for devotional purposes (Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum etc.) this literature serving at the same time scientific research. The mission of the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury printed especially liturgical books (Maclean). Since that time the number of publications of works of Nestorian origin increased steadily; we do not need to register them as it has been excellently done by Prof. Baumstark in his “Geschichte der syrischen Literatur” A. ii, B. i and iii. His pages give a clear impression of the bulk of this literature. He registered, too, the Mss. that had once been found in the East but got lost in the World War. What was left by that disaster was collected by Dr. Mingana on his travels in the Near East and incorporated in his collection (at the Selly Oak Colleges’ Library, Birmingham).

But is that impression right? Are we not the victim of an optical illusion? If one makes a list of the eight centuries during which the Nestorian Church had its flourishing time and if one takes into account the expansion made by its mission far into Asia and realizes the number of books, it must be confessed that it is somewhat poor! Startling gaps make it almost impossible to compose something that looks like a history in the modern sense of the word. These gaps cannot be bridged over by generalizing a statement about one century and assuming that it remained the same in another age or place. Nor can we say that everything is traditional if sources are wanting.

We cannot think of writing even a short history of the Nestorian church. Yet it seems to be necessary to give a short characteristic of some sources that are of fundamental importance for its history and which will constantly be used in the following pages. We pass by publications from the hand of a particular person like exegetical works, poems, books with letters (such as those of Isho’yabh iii and Timothy i), books dealing with the School of Nisibis or Chronicles of a particular city such as that of Scért and of Arbel, important though they may be (liturgical expositions etc. will be discussed later on) because they do not deal with the Church as a whole. In general we may say, that their importance for the study of
the liturgy is next to nothing. This is due to two reasons. In the first place to a certain habit of the Syrians in general which was formulated by Prof. Burkitt in relation to Ephraim in this way: "(Ephraim) whose works are excessively voluminous and well preserved, cannot help affording us many curious glimpses into the life and thought of the Church to which he belongs. But it is a weary task, gleaning the grains of wheat among the chaff. Ephraim is extraordinarily prolix, he repeats himself again and again, and for all the immense mass of material there seems very little to take hold of."

Secondly it finds its origin in the nature of the liturgical development itself: "still und geräuschlos vollzog sich allgemein bis zum 16. Jahrhundert, vollzieht sich heute noch im Orient aller liturgische Einzelfortschritt," while it is also true that we do not hear what was selfevident to the people themselves.  

We begin our summary of these general sources of the Nestorian churchlife by mentioning the Chronicles of Mari, Amr and Siba, published by Gismondi. They give the history of the church of the East from its beginning up to their time (12th and 14th century) in a list of the Patriarchs. The dates of them are given together with a short characteristic in fairly general terms; some facts, which the compilers thought outstanding are mentioned. They do not give a clear insight into the times recorded, but because they form the only source of first rate knowledge, we must be thankful for them. Based upon them is the third part of the "Chronicon Ecclesiasticum" of the Jacobite Bar Hebraeus who deals with the Nestorian patriarchs in describing the life and works of the Metropolitans of the Eastern Jacobites. It is also written in the typical style of Chroniclers (cf. the style of the biblical Books of Kings and Chronicles).

More promising for the study of our theme may seem the reading of the "Synodicon Orientale", first published in a German translation by Oscar Brauns and some years later in the original together with a French translation by J.B. Chabot. This work con-

cludes with a piece from the hand of Ḥenanisho’ī (773–74/779–80)¹ so that it is very probable that this work was compiled during his reign or shortly after. It contains a number of decisions and edicts of a great many Nestorian Synods and Patriarchs from the first Synode of the Persian Church in 410 onward in chronological order. This work has a great importance for the study of the church in general, but it does not afford much information about liturgical matters, in spite of a statement of Labourt.¹ The documents which are of importance for the liturgy will be mentioned in ch. vi. We read about many admonitions to Priests who do not perform their duty and therefore need reproof, and more of that kind. The Synodicon gives us a picture of the life of the church, but we must remember that it is always dangerous to use judicial decisions as sources of the real state of a church. On a whole the greater part of these canons is merely canonical in nature. We record here (because it will be of some use later on, p. 121), that there exist of this Synodicon two Arabic translations. These have not been considered in preparing the above editions. There is only one statement about the interrelation of these three texts given by Prof. I. Guidi and quoted by all other authors.¹ Guidi wrote: “Ich habe die Borgenische Handschr. mit den arabischen Uebersetzungen des Elias und des Ibn at–Tayyib verglichen und gesehen, dass dieselben weit davon entfernt sind, uns das alte Synodicon treu zu repräsentieren. Ibn at–Tayyib’s Buch ist sehr regelmässig und gut geordnet, aber vieles, dass nicht nothwendig oder praktisch nützlich schien, ist getilgt und zum Teil ausgelassen worden . . . ja selbst die Canones sind zwar inhaltlich wiedergegeben, aber nicht selten stark abgekürzt. Bei Elias dagegen ist die alte Form oft bewahrt, sehr vieles aber gänzlich ausgelassen”.¹ It is not quite certain when these translators lived; the common opinion is: Elijah of Damascus (893) and Ibn at–Tayyib († 1043), to which Dr. Riedel objected assigning them to the 14th century.¹ These collections are remarkable since they are often quoted by the Coptic canonist Abu ‘l

Barakat and seem to have had some influence on these Alexandrian collections!

The Synodicon was continued in the following ages with a great collection of letters and other canonical decisions, only a part of which has been published by Prof. Sachau.1

The "Nomocanon" of 'Abdisho' published by A. Mai in 1831 brought together the civil and ecclesiastical laws arranged in a systematical order; in it have been preserved a good number of canons which otherwise would have been lost. This became the official lawbook of the church since its composition at the end of the 13th century.2

Though the "Book of the Governors" of Thomas of Marga,3 deals professedly with the history of the Monks until the middle of the 6th century it gives us much insight in church life in general, so that it may be counted among the chief sources.

Some points from this history which may elucidate the importance of the study of the Nestorians and furnish a background to that of their liturgy in particular must be given here. For it was rightly pointed out by Prof. Baumstark, that "nur von dem Hintergrunde eines kirchlich-kulturgeschichtlichen' Gesamtbildes vermag sich die liturgischgeschichtliche Einzelerscheinung im richtigen Lichte abzulegen".4 This remains true even if we are concerned only with a small field for it is linked up with many essential threads of ecclesiastical history. But it is premature to give more than some points since a critical history belongs still to the pia vita. Asciani's big volumes contain much stuff and afforded the material for study of many generations, but it is, especially in part iii 2, arranged according to a wrong standard of criticism. Our

---

century produced some rather minute sketches in some encyclopedia's; regarding the history before the conquest of the Arabs, the books of Labourt and Wigram are still the right guides, supplemented by Sachau's translation and use of the chronicle of Arbela. But all these books important though they are give only the outward history of the Nestorian Church. So none of them gives more than superficial remarks about the subject that interests us here; and one misses a clear discussion of the wider questions of historical and dogmatical interest. Nevertheless the history of the Church in Mesopotamia before the rise of Islam is pretty clear compared with that after the fall of the Sassanide-empire. The Arabic period is still waiting for a thorough investigation. There are two short monographs about Sahdona and Timothy; the "Literaturgeschichte" of Baumstark shows some pathways. Browne has worked up much material (also from Arabic sources) in discussing the question of the "Eclipse of Christianity in Asia", but nevertheless it cannot be called a historiography of that age. The picture can and must be more detailed than this; its outlines should be marked sharper, the "internal" history of the church should be brought to light and the characters of the leading churchmen should be made clearer. The frame work of the geographical expansion is furnished in a succinct form in the papers of Dr. Mingana.

The history of the Nestorian church properly speaking begins with the year 410 when at a Synod at Seleucia-Ctesiphon this See was made independent by the Persian Bishops and put on the same

---


(4) L. E. Browne, The Eclipse of Christianity in Asia, Cambridge, 1939; While my book was in the press I saw an advertisement of: A. R. Vines, The Nestorian churches, a concise history of Nestorian Christianity in Asia from the Persian schism to the modern Assyrians, London, 1957. I was unable to use it for the present work; so this note must suffice.

(5) A. Mingana, The early spread of Christianity in Central Asia and the Far East, Manchester, 1925; The early spread of Christianity in India, Manchester, 1926. (I used the separate reprints).
rank with the great Patriarchates. As a matter of fact this was largely influenced by the king. Dogmatically one stood on the Nicene-Creed; discipline was largely the same as in the rest of the Eastern churches. It was through the labours of Barsauma that Nestorianism definitely conquered Persia. Before 410 this area had been spiritually dependent on Edessa which itself had a strong connection with Antioch. The Patriarch of the latter See was the head of those churches and it was the centre both for the Government of the state and for learning and culture, fundamentally Greek. But as far as the older history of Edessa and its hinterland is concerned, a genuinely Aramean mission and christianity had sprung up very early, which only at a later date was covered by Greek influences. The exact nature of this process escapes our observation; but from the writings of the Persian Sage Afrahat it may be seen how a Christianity outside the trend of the Greek world developed (he wrote after Nicæa); “it was possible to hold the Christian position with different watchwords from those which the Church borrowed from her refractory sons Tertullian and Origen”. It is a widespread opinion that the origin of this development was for a good deal Jewish. It is well known that there were large Jewish colonies in the cities of Mesopotamia. On the other hand travellers in the 19th and 20th cent. have noticed various usages among the Christians of Kurdistan that found their parallels in the Old Testament and seemed to be derived from Jewish origin; the same was found in some books of law of the Syrian Christians. But it is rather dangerous to draw this conclusion from these facts, for in the years that lay between these two poles, the O.T. had a growing influence upon the whole Christian life; besides that those usages find their parallels on the Greek soil too, where any possi-

bility of Jewish influence is excluded. It may not be overlooked, that they are often common Eastern habits, that survived on one place longer than on another. The possibility of a contra-distinction against the Jews did also exist!

In connection with our theme we must mention here also the "Acts of Thomas", that document that most of all N.T.ical Apocrypha gave rise to long discussions. I do not dare to give a well-founded opinion about the all-important question: Gnostic or Catholic; this decides about the value of the accounts of a kind of Eucharist in Ch. 27, 29, 49-50, 133 in which bread is the sole element. However this may be, no line seems to lead to the later Nestorian liturgy which has bread and wine and quite a different structure, in accordance with all the Greek liturgies. A research of the facts afforded by the Acts of the Martyrs and the writings of Ephraim, enabling us to get a better idea of the pre-Greek times is badly wanted. We have shown some lines of which it must be asked whether they have found their continuation in the later Persian theology etc. and survived as an undercurrent of the official teaching; or has the overflowing Greek movement pushed away all what was ancient? Has e.g. the Nestorian church kept the Agape for long ages while it had vanished in the other churches (we find a notice that it was celebrated in the 12th century); is this old or a revival without connection with the practice of the early church?

The school of the Persians in Edessa had followed and propagated the Doctrines of the great Antiochene School and by that way this particular Christology came to Persia. In the Christological struggles of the 5th century which are related in every book on the History of Dogma, it receded to this country where it had the preference of being politically undangerous, as it was not the religion of the Byzantine Emperors. But in spite of that the struggle with the State and with the Magians occupies an important place.

(1) Cf. H. Lietzmann, Messe, S. 243-245; on the Acta Thomas in general cf. the Introduction of W. Bauer, in: E. Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, Tübingen, 1934, S. 256-258, and the literature quoted there. (2) While remembering what was said by Burkitt, L.L., p. 100. (3) See e.g. the Peshita which was recasted from older translations. (4) Giamondi i, p. 4: "Torro (after the death of the Apostel Mari) Madainae fideles e gente magorum conveniabant ad convivium post liturgiam, secundum praeceptum charitatis, a pravis moribus abhorrentes, quod et servant qui montes incolunt". J. M. Hansens, Institutiones, ii, p. 293 refers to Expos. ii, p. 83.
Nevertheless the church flourished under the spiritual leadership of men as Narsai and Babai the Great, who established for ever the Antiochene traditions in the Persian church. The following time brought a definite separation from the Greek church. It is a matter of course that this cannot be taken absolutely. We hear that Mar Thomas of Edessa and Mar Abba travelled in the West and brought with them a translation of the liturgy of Nestorius; there are some rather similar traditions about a mission of the Persians to the Emperor of which the Patriarchs Isho'yahbi and ii participated and during which they celebrated the Mass with the Byzantine Emperor who was astonished that their liturgies were almost identical. But except for merchants the contact does not seem to have existed. Yet the fact may not be overlooked that the Monks played a great part in this church (a good many of the Bishops were taken from them) and that they found their spiritual ideal among the Egyptian Fathers of Scete; they had this in common with the Greeks and the Jacobites and it would be worth while to investigate what actual and spiritual relations have existed between the different departments of the Christian Church. The Nestorian character was endangered by some men as B'nya who tried to introduce the Alexandrian theology which was forcibly opposed by the other leaders and reinforced the position of the Antiochians by canonizing Theodore of Mopsuestia as the "Interpreter". In later ages some deviations from this position may be found in the exegesis of Isho'dadh of Merw. This shows that a clear knowledge of what was really Nestorian is wanting. More than is done so far, future investigations will have to determine what is the exact relation between the position of Theodore and his companions and of the Nestorians and whether there is a development in dogmatics. Saldona tried to get the

(1) Nestorians were practically not found in the West, cf. J. Pargore, l'Eglise Byzantine de 537 à 847, Paris, 1923, p. 27. "Avec elle [sc. the Church of the Roman Empire] on n'avait aucune relation officielle; mais c'était toute la disidence car aucun anathème n'avait été lancé ni d'un côté, ni de l'autre", said L. Duchesne, L'église au xive siècle, p. 326, quoted by Kidd, Churches of Eastern Christendom, p. 316. (2) Cf. A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 120 and Ak. 1–3. (3) The contact with the Monophysites was closer than with the Greeks. To characterize it as "idolfeindschaft" (see p. 40) is too strong. The relations were often friendly, even while one condemned each other's doctrinal position as heretical. Unfortunately, they have never been properly studied. (4) A. Baumstark, a.a.O., S. 127. (5) G. Dietrich, Die Stellung Isho'dad's in der Auslegungsgeschichte, Giessen, 1902. (6) Leading up to a state in which the particular Nestorian theology is not
Chalcedonian Creed acknowledged by the church in the time of Isho'yabh iii, but he was condemned as a heretic. Mysticism flourished in the 7th century with men as Isaac of Nineveh and Dadisho' and it has been observed that it had many points of resemblance with the other churches and even with Mohamme
danism. Though it did not last long, its influence was considerable. The same may be said about philosophy and medicine; the place of Nestorian physicians at the court of the Sassanides and Chalifs is well known; it is a striking fact, that several Patriarchs had studied medicine which was also taught at the schools (cf. the rule for the schools of Theodosius 853–858, in: ‘Abdisho’, Nomocanon, vi 3). In all these departments the Nestorians passed the learning of the Greeks on to the Arabs by whom it was cultivated and became influential on the development of these studies in Western Europe in the Middle Ages. The Nestorians were a separate body from the political point of view in the same way as other subjected communities: their Patriarch was both their religious and civil head. They were all treated in the same way, that is to say periods of spiritual power alternated with those of severe persecution, which often found their cause in the over-boldness of the Christians. From the fact that the Patriarch was also the civil leader, it followed that he had also to give canons about all kind of secular matter which are also incorporated in the churchbooks. This juridical tradition has never been systematically investigated as far as I know; a comparison with the Lawbooks of other churches would show that this tradition is rather complicated, but that there exists a definite relationship, possibly parallel with the liturgical affinities, a relation about which we do not get information from other sources. Right from the beginning a great

even known as is found in the present time; A. J. Maclean, Nestorianism, in: E.R.E., ix, p. 332.

(1) A thorough study of this subject is still a desideratum; for the present, see the Introduction of Prof. A. J. Wensinck, to his translation of Isaac of Nineveh, Amsterdam, 1923, and the small book by the same author: Oostersche Mystiek, Christelijke en Mohammedaansche, Amsterdam, 1930; and: A. Mingana, W.S. vii, Early Christian Mystics, Cambridge, 1934, passim. (2) A. Baumstark, Ostryisches Christentum und ostyrischer Hellenismus, in: Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte, 1908, ii, S. 17–35 shows in an essay “für weitere Kreise” the influx of Western ideas into the East as a counterpart of Strygovski’s well-known thesis of the oriental influence upon the West. (3) A beginning of it was made by W. Riedel, Kirchenrechtsschule des Patriarchats von Alexandrien, Leipzig, 1900, who shows that Nestorian books were used in Alexandria.
missionary expansion has taken place even to India and China.\(^1\) We have but very little indications about its nature. At any rate it is sure, that it was simply a transplantation of the Persian church-life; the services were all held in Syriac (so among the Thomas-Christians in India\(^1\)); although some traces of translation of liturgical books were found among the documents discovered by expeditions in Central Asia.\(^1\) All these mission-fields were subjected to the Patriarch at home. This mission, too, has had its ups and downs and the contact with the motherchurch was not always strong. Some very interesting documents from the 13th century are the history of Yabhallaha and the travelstory of the Franciscan William of Rubruci; they give a clear picture of the great extension, but also of the low standard in respect of churchlife of the Nestorian church of that time. It is difficult to say whether this expansion has taken place at the cost of the intensity of religious life of the home-church itself. In any case it is true that the sources do not show us a glorious picture of spiritual life: intrigues at every choice of a Patriarch and intervening of the state; simony; slackening of discipline; several officers ignorant themselves of the traditions of the church, etc. Many attempts to lift the standard were undertaken, e.g. by reorganizing the schools (Sabarisho'; Theodosius, etc.). But the recurrence of these efforts show that it was extremely necessary. At the same time we hear of apostasy to Islam. Further investigations will have to determine whether this picture is too dark and to consider the question why there have always been people who stuck to the faith of their fathers in spite of the persecutions in the centuries that came with Timur Lenk. It will show, I believe, that the vital forces of Christianity were still living among much superstition. Fetishism alone is too easy an answer.

What questions do result from this history? \(^1\) Seclusion from

---

\(^1\) Details about this missionary efforts were given by Dr. Mingana in his books on Christianity in Central Asia and the Far East and about India, see p. 22 note 5. About the Nestorians in China see: P. Y. Sack, The Nestorian Documents and Relics in China, 1937. (2) We do not need to enter into the history of this church nor into that of their liturgy, as the latter was nothing but the Nestorian rite; literature about them in: A. Mingana, Early Spread of Christianity in India, Manchester, 1926; R. H. Connolly-E. Bishop, The Work of Menezes on the Malabar Liturgy, in: J. Th. St., 1914, p. 395-425, 569-593; F. C. Burkitt, The Old Malabar Liturgy, in: J. Th. St., 1928, p. 155-157; D.A.C.L., s.v. Malabar, t. x, col. 1260-1277, and: Hansens, ii, p. 389-393. (3) A. Mingana, Central Asia, p. 43-44.
the other churches and struggles with the ruling non-Christian powers. 2) Maintaining of pre-Greek traditions and of Antiochene Theology (they preserved important works of Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia); not only as a special Christological doctrine, but as a special conception of Christianity as a whole.

3) Passing on of mysticism. 4) Connection with other churches in doctrine and discipline; monasticism. 5) Expansion. Only when these points are sufficiently made clear, the time will come to write a history according to critical standards, and to determine the position of the Nestorians historically, theologically, religiously.

One further point may be mentioned which is of special interest for the study of the New Testament. During the last fifteen years a good deal has been made of the Mandaeans and their religion. It was thought that they are the true followers of John the Baptist, and that their books (dating from the 9th century and later!) give us an insight into the world of Eastern “Gnosis” which had influenced the beginnings of Christianity to a very large extent. A strong blow against this theory was given in an article of Prof. Lietzmann, who showed that the Mandaeans were totally dependent on the Nestorians and that the Nestorian ritual of Baptism was the pattern on which the most conspicuous rite of the Mandaeans was made.

All the points mentioned above tend to show the importance of the investigation of the liturgy; for it is different from that in other churches; preserved traditions from the ancient church of

(1) Cf. A. Baumstark, Die nestorianische Schriften “de Causis Fessorum”, in: O.C., 1901, S. 341–342. (2) For our purpose it is not necessary to mention the great mass of books and articles in which the statement made in the text was debated, nor to discuss the points involved. It will be sufficient to refer the reader to the article of K. Kessler (1903), Mandäer, in: P.R.E., xii, S. 155–183 for the older literature, while the discussions we have in view are summarized by H. Schlier, Zur Mandäerfrage, in: Theologische Rundschau, 1933, S. 1–34; 69–92, and: J. Thomas, Le mouvement baptiste en Palestine et Syrie (150 av. J.-C.–300 ap. J.-C.), Gembloux, 1935, p. 184–267. (3) H. Lietzmann, Ein Beitrag zur Mandäerfrage, in: Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1930, S. 556–608. As it is our sole aim to draw attention to the part which the Nestorians play in this discussion, we do not examine the question whether Prof. Lietzmann’s case is sound or that of his critic Schlier, a.a.O., S. 84–90; cf. the mediating position of J. Thomas, l.c., p. 217, n. 2; 218 and p. 221, n. 2: “nous ne nions pas que les Mandéens aient emprunté à la liturgie syrienne; ce que nous nions, c’est qu’on puisse expliquer par là toute le complexe de leur rituel baptismal.”
Mesopotamia and of the Antiochene teachers (in the Mystagogy); mysticism was often connected with liturgy; and the Canons about it were often the same in various churches; while being the centre of religious life it was spread all over Asia and formed the heart of christianity, even its single expression for many people during several ages.¹

ii. A short summary of what has been written about the Nestorian liturgy will be useful to become acquainted with the questions that are under discussion and the material that is at our disposal.¹ We pointed out before, that it was not before 1890 that the Nestorians came to the fore in scientific literature. In general this statement is true, but it must be modified with regard to their liturgy. For at the very beginning of the comparative study of the liturgy the classical work of E. Renaudot made known the three Eucharistic formularies used by the Nestorians, viz. that of the Apostles Addai and Mari, of Theodore of Mopsuestia and of Nestorius,¹ in a latin translation with notes (which are, however, not so complete as those on the Coptic and Jacobite rite).¹ He made a "Dissertatio" which is as always full of good remarks. He begins by telling that these translations have been made from real nest. Mss., but these authorities were not many

¹ We do not deal with the history and liturgical practices of the so-called Chaldæans = Nestorians, united with Rome. Their history begins at 1550. Their liturgy is practically identical with that of the true Nestorians; some slight differences are found; see: Badger ii, p. 241-243, and: L.E.W., p. lxxx, referring to: G. Bickel, Der katholische Orient, Münster, 1874, no. 6. But they cannot be considered as maintaining the Nestorian traditions, for all that was inconsistent with the Roman doctrine, was expurgated; cf. L. Duchesne, Origines de Culte chrétien ⁴, Paris, 1925, p. 72, n. 2: "Ceux qui servent aux communautés catholiques ont suivi de nombreuses retouches inspirées par un zèle qui n’a pas toujours été selon la science"; and: A. Mingana, India, p. 167. See about the Chaldæans, R. Janin, Les églises orientales et les rites orientaux ⁴, Paris, 1926, p. 131-132. (2) We do not propose to give a complete bibliography, but only those works which contain observations of some special importance for our subject; neither did we register all translations. (3) The ordo communis of these formularies is the same. The Anaphora of "Theod." is used from the First Sunday of Advent till Palm Sunday; "Nest." is used five times a year, viz. on Epiphany, Jan. 6th; Friday of John the Baptist (first Friday after Epiphany); Memorial of the Greek Doctors (Friday after the 4th Sunday of the Epiphany); Thurday of the Rogation of the Ninevites (cfad Q. 11); Passover (cf. ad Q. 50). "Addai" is the anaphora during the rest of the year. (4) E. Renaudot, Liturgiam Orientalium Collecta, 2 volumes; 1st edition, Paris, 1716; and ed., Francofurti ad Moenum, 1847. The translations mentioned in the text: ii, p. 578-642. (5) L.O.C., ii, p. 561-577.
nor were they old; on the other hand they agreed practically in
every thing.¹ His argument is directed against the Italian mis-
sionaries who had treated the venerable rite of the Indian Chris-
tians in such a miserable way at the Synod of Diamper (1599)
and had introduced several new ceremonies instead of leaving to
the Thomas-christians (cf. p. 27, n. 2) their own liturgy without
heretical names (the ordinary Roman Catholic way of treating
the Uniates). As a matter of course it is also against the Protestants
to prove the correctness of the R.C. attitude regarding the
Eucharist (this is the aim of both volumes). Therefore this intro-
duction deals with two points: a. the Nestorian ritual is old; b. it
is not infected by stains of nest. heresy. ‘Addai’ is called after the
Apostles who according to the common Syriac tradition won
these countries for Christianity, and the Jacobites and Greeks
have never blamed them for making a Nestorian liturgy on their
own hand; consequently Renaudot is inclined to affirm the first
part of the question whether this is the old Mesopotamian liturgy
or imported from the heretics, though he acknowledges that it is
rather difficult to decide. The fact that its prayers are generally,
compared with those of other rituals, simple and not verbose, is a
proof of their age. This cannot be said about the rubrics as these
were generally not inseted, but handed down in other books.²
Besides the other liturgies refer to the former and not the other
way round. It goes back to the time before the division. Nothing
particularly Nestorian will be found in them except some places
in ‘Nest.’ (as opposed to the Daily Office that is full of it). The words
of the Institution (which are missing in ‘Addai’) are the same as in
other eastern liturgies, and are followed by an Epiclesis.³ These
liturgies contain all the elements of a “valid” liturgy. The words
of the Institution are not found in the older codex, but some pages
of it are missing on which they might have been written, for it is
impossible that they should have been omitted and they are also

¹ He used one MS. that was mutilated and repaired; one written by the
Chaldaean Patriarch Joseph in Rome 1697 (corrected after R.C. Missals) while
some help could be derived from the translation of the liturgy found in India
by the Missionaries mentioned in the text. (² L.O.C., ii, p. 563: “De ritibus
certam certa conjectura ducti non potest: cum in plerisque Missalibus libris
cujuscumque linguae, non semper adscripti sunt, nam aliquo peti solent. Aliquos
ex albis Ecclesiasticis monumentis agnoscimus, quorum Codices in Oriente
scripti mentionem nullam factunt, de quibus tamen dubitare non possumus,
quemvis notitia illorum sita obscura sit, quia libri Nestorianorum prae caeteris
rarissimi sunt.” (³ Cf. ad Q. 15.
found in ‘Theod.’ and ‘Nest.’. ‘Addai’ has also an Epiclesis before the words of Christ (in an ordinary scheme of liturgy), but not in the usual place for which Renaudot gives some parallels; he assumes that there was a double Epiclesis. It does not matter that the breaking and signing of the host is the same as found elsewhere; on the contrary it proves its unity with the rest in the doctrine of transubstantiation. With regard to his translation he says that it is as literal as possible, but that the Syriac style does not allow a verbal one in Latin. At the end he says that the Greek authors do not betray any knowledge of the Nest. liturgy. Leontius of Byzance is the only one, but his statement cannot be pressed and he tells only that there was a liturgy known as that of Theodore. If this was true that it was full of blasphemy, it is different from that called ‘Theod.’ by the Nestorians.' Summing up we find that here is given a publication of the texts that falls short of its own requirements; that questions about origin, words of the Institution and Epiclesis are put; that the Greek evidence is negative and that the Nestorian doctrine of the Euch. agreed with the Roman Catholic. On the other hand nothing is said about historical development of the formularies.

About ten years later J. S. Assemani published his famous “Bibliotheca Orientalis”, iii 1 (1725) giving in it several new texts (Canons and Letter of John Bar Abgare—excerpts from the expositions of George of Arbela and Timothy ii), and 2 (1728) containing a systematical survey “De Syris Nestorianis”. He dealt with the Eucharist in § 12 of Chapter vii that tells about “Nestorianorum veterum et recentiorum errores”. This title is eloquent! Its aim is controversial by nature; it does not clear the historical questions. It does not contain a discussion of the questions raised by the liturgy (had this sufficiently been done by Renaudot?), but of liturgical usages and Eucharistic teaching in which the Nestorians seemed to deviate from the Catholic doctrine. All utterances of

---

(1) As this text is used over and over again in the discussions I shall give it here in full: Leontius Byzantinus, adversus incorruptibles et Nestorianus, iii 19, in: M.S.G., 86, 1, p. 1368b: τῆς μαθηματικῆς ἐγγίζων ἐποιοῦμαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τῶν ἐκκλησίας παραδοθείματι, μετὰ τὴν τῶν ἑορτῶν αἰείων μετὰ τὸν τῶν μεγάλην Βασιλέων ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι συγγραφεῖσιν λόγον τῶν χρόνων ἑκατὸν ἐν ἐν ἀναφοράς ἀλληγοριῶν (οὐ γὰρ τίγχος) τῶν εἰσπράξεων. Since this statement has no bearing upon the questions discussed in the main part of this thesis we do not need to give an exact interpretation of these words.

(2) B.O., iii 2, p. ccxx—cccxxviii.
the Nestorians (Babai, George of Arbela, Timothy ii, ‘Abdisho’) are placed on the same level, though he points out at various occasions that the older Nestorians were closer to the Catholic truth than their posterity ± 1700. We may summarize his argument in the following way: The Nestorians adhered to the doctrine of their spiritual father who taught: “In sacramentis vivificantibus nos hominis simplicis corpus et sanguinem sumere”, though they confessed the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Their teaching is the same as that of the R.C. but in explaining it there are two opinions “Plerosque quidem confiteri, in Eucharistia vere ac realiter existere idem corpus Christi, quod est in coelo; nonnullos vero asserere, Eucharistiam nil aliud esse, quam corpus mysticum, idest, unitum vero et naturali corpori Christi, non ipsum Christi corpus”. Next comes a discussion of the rebukes of Joseph ii, the uniate Patriarch, about the preparing of the Euch. bread from the ferment, called Malcha, about the use of grapes instead of wine, about the omission of the words of the Institution, about the consecration effected by the Epiclesis, about the offering of a host in honour of the Virgin which is supposed to be her body, about the fact that the Patriarch officiates with his head covered. In connection with the first point he mentions the apocryphal story about the particle of the Eucharistic bread of the Lord’s Supper itself, which was handed down to the Eastern churches whose tradition goes right back to the Lord himself. The belief that the elements are changed by the Holy Spirit is a later intrusion, the words of the Institution must be supplied from the other formularies. The other points are of minor importance, e.g. the objections against the Nestorians by a certain Thomas about their receiving the Eucharist in their hands and the “Communio sub utroque”. Assemani accuses the Nestorians of the following mistakes: some of them think that “Communio sub utroque” is absolutely necessary, which he denies by pointing to the children’s communion, and that of the sick; they condemn the use of the Greeks of the instinct bread and of putting hot water into the chalice; they do not practise the reservation of the Eucharist; some of them forbid the Eucharist to be taken to the sick; they forbid to hold mass twice a day on the same altar; they do not know private masses; they think the bread and wine are polluted by various occurrences;¹

¹ Joseph ii lived ± 1700. (a) See ad Q. 52. (b) In this connection Assemani uses our “Questions”.
they do not read the scriptures in ferial offices; and according to some people they celebrate the liturgy on Maundy Thursday after sunset. All these points are extensively discussed. A grave defect, however, consists in the fact that this part is really controversial and that the texts quoted are not historically arranged, but systematically. Consequently we cannot say, that his work helps much towards the solution of the questions connected with the history of the rite. The texts he published had some importance. But unfortunately the subsequent writers used these excerpts without recurring to the original texts. It goes without saying that their interpretation was often wrong, because the contexts were missing.

Within the scope of his great work on the "History of the Holy Eastern Church" Dr. J. M. Neale, one of the leading liturgiologists of the middle of last century, said some words about the origin of the Nest. Liturgies (the Nestorians are not treated separately). He argued that a part of 'Nest.' was older than 431 since the Nestorians did not borrow from Constantinople anything after that date, and that 'Nest.' has its origin in Byzance is proved by an addition to the Epiclesis. Because 'Addai' forms the pro-anaphorical part of the other two, this must be considerably older. The names show Persian origin. Neale puts this dilemma: Seleucia had little contact with the Roman Empire; "they (the Nestorians) must therefore either have had the liturgy of S. James, and after the time of their separation have rejected it, and formed an other office from their own fancy; or they must have had a primitive liturgy from their own apostles, to which they stead-fastly clung". The first supposition is excluded by the School of Edessa, neither does the liturgy contain Nestorianism nor were they ever blamed for changing it. Conclusion: the last assumption is right! Sign of its old age is its simplicity; the structure cannot be deduced from Cesarea or Jerusalem. So he argues for a higher estimation of this particular liturgy that has always been neglected; it "is one of the earliest, and perhaps the very earliest of the many formularies of the Christian Sacrifice". The latter statement is right, I think;

(1) Palmer's argument against its old age, viz. that Ephraim Syrus shows a variation, if compared with all three Nest. liturgies, since they have the Intercessions before the Epiclesis and Ephraim after it, is dismissed by pointing to other transpositions of prayers in other liturgies. (2) J. M. Neale, Introduction to the History of the Holy Eastern Church, London, 1849, i, p. 319–323.–On the
but the way in which it is reached cannot be approved of from the historical point of view; his way of arguing is untenable in view of the evidence which could not be known to him. That the Apostles have entrusted a complete liturgy to every one of their churches is a fundamental idea of Neale¹ that is inspired by his dogmatical view, but cannot possibly be held. Besides that his discussion only deals with the origin of the Nestorian liturgy, but leaves aside its subsequent history in the church. The texts published by Assemani have not been used.

In the same time, Rev. G. P. Badger published the results of two travels in the East which he had made to see what could be done by the English to help the Nestorians. He wrote his well-known "The Nestorians and their rituals". The second part is of special interest and it marked a new step forward, because it had collected a great number of liturgical texts in an English translation. As to the Eucharist he gave 'Nest.' and elucidated some dogmatical points by quotations from the Daily Offices and 'Abdisho's book "The Pearl". His method consisted in following the 39 Articles of the Anglican Church and comparing the Nestorian doctrine with them.¹ About the Lord's Supper they believe in the real presence: the Lord distributes Himself to the worthy recipient and seals to him the forgiveness of sins and strengthens the grace of God; they believe that the elements are changed by the Epiclesis; the wicked do not eat Christ's body, therefore there are strong admonitions to humbleness; they communicate "sub utraque" though under Roman Catholic influence some ignorant priests(1); practise the "communio sub una"; as to the sacrifice the Nest. know only one real sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, that upon

omission of the words of the Institution, see p. 485-487. Mr. Neale considered it to be late.

(1) As to the liturgies of James, Marc, Basilius and Chrysostomus he simply takes over the results of such writers as Renaudot, Le Brun, Le Quien, Bona, Palmer and others; he assumes "that these Liturgies, though not composed by the Apostles whose names they bear, were the legitimate development of their unwritten tradition, respecting the Christian Sacrifice; the words, probably, in the most important parts, the general tenor in all portions, descending unchange from the Apostolic authors." (2) G. P. Badger, The Nestorians and their Rituals, London, 1852, 2 volumes; about his method cf. ii, p. 268.—The Eucharist is dealt with in chapter xxxii-xxxv and xliii; the discussion was based upon Oriental Miss.; the text of 'Abdisho' was already published by A. Mai, Venerum Scriptorum Nova Collectio, x, Romae, 1838 with a Latin translation. (3) The same words as found in our treatise, cf. ch. vi.
the altar is commemorative; there are no solitary masses; the prayers for the dead are only for those departed in righteousness. Quite rightly his book was qualified by Dr. Baumstark as “für seine Zeit höchst verdienstvoll”, but he adds that it is only concerned with the final result of the development, while it does not say anything about the other documents which may throw some light upon this development. This is exactly the right estimation of the value and defect of this book. For its importance lies in the fact that it had collected so many different formularies and as such it has done service to many scholars.

The “Dissertatio” of Th. J. Lamy (1859) does not possess any value of its own (this judgement does not affect the main part of the book, being the publication and commentary of two important Jacobitic writings, but the pages on the Nestorians). It depends on the texts published by Assemani. He is only concerned with the dogmatical and controversial question; the first part of his writing tries to prove from Syriac sources that the Protestant opinion about the Eucharist is wrong and that the R.C. position is strengthened by the evidence, even of these heretics. He concludes that: “Realem autem Praesentiam a Nestorianis negari nullus Syrorum hucusque, quod sciam, dixit. Semper itaque in admittendo eo dogmate cum catholiciis convenerunt Nestoriani sive antiqui sive recentiores, etsi in explicacione illius mysterii saepè hallucinati sunt, et in re disciplinari merito reprehensi” (p. 59) though he admitted that some Nestorian authors held an other view (but they, he thinks, were not of importance); the same result as that of Assemani.

Dr. Steitz who wrote a long series of articles on the Eucharistic teaching of the Greek church which were of great influence, stands in the same relation to Assemani. He formulated his conclusion after a reproduction of some of Assemani’s texts, in this way: “Dass die Nestorianer dem symbolisch-dynamischen Standpunkte in der Abendmahlslehre treu geblieben sind, wie er in den Jahrhunderten

(1) A. Baumstark, Festvorspr und Kirchenjahr, S. a. (2) Th. J. Lamy, Dissertatio
  de Syrorum fide et Disciplina in re Eucharistica; accedunt veteris ecclesiæ syriacæ
  monumenta duo, Lovanii, 1859, Art. vii, p. 44–59. (3) F. Kattenbusch, Lehrbuch der
  vergleichenden Confessionskunde, Freib. i. Br., 1892, i, S. 413 ff. based his paragraph
  on the Eucharist upon them; and A. von Harnack, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte,
  Tübingen, 1931, ii, S. 457 ff. constantly refers to him as the great authority.
(4) G. Steitz, Die Abendmahlslehre der griechischen Kirche, in: Jahrbücher für deutsches
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der grossen christologischen Kämpfe der Kirche übereinstimmend festgehalten wurde.” This could be compared with the Christology “in ähnlicher Weise namen sie zwar das in seiner natürlichen Integrität unverändert fortbestehende Brot als Bild des zum Himmel erhöhten Christus, bekannten aber gleichwohl einen Leib im Abendmahl und im Himmel vermöge der Identität der ver- sönenden Kraft und Wirkung. Diese Ansicht hat vermöge des dynamischen Symbolismus, von dem sie ausgeht eine unverkennbare Verwandtschaft mit der monophysitischen” though their christologies were totally different (S. 58). He does not accept the double line of Assemani-Lamy; all texts are, in his opinion, explained by the theory formulated above.

This paper was the last in which the dogmatical position of the Nestorians regarding the Eucharist was discussed. After that time this question rested and this was right, I think. The mistake was that the discussions were held 1) with insufficient survey and criticism of the sources; the difference that exists between the nature of various books quoted, was overlooked; all utterances were thought to be of equal importance and the possibility of historical and dogmatical change was not taken into account; 2) with questions and arguments determined by Western controversies: R.C.-Anglican-Calvinistic-Lutheran. The fact was not considered that the Nestorians, like the Eastern Church in general, might have had an opinion that did not fit in with Western categories, that their approach to “Sacrament” was different. Though these discussions were not so heated as those regarding the Greeks and other liturgical families that were better known¹, yet it was fortunate that it came to an end, since it was hopeless because of the scarcity of texts. Yet the publication of Renaudot had a lasting value and Assemani had shown that the information about the history of the Nest. liturgy could be enlarged. But the problems concerning the fate of the liturgy during some 15 or more centuries had not yet been detected. The second phase in which the texts were published is marked by an absolute change of interest. This change coincided with and was the result of the great development of the historical investigation of Christianity and of the growing understanding of the meaning of “Liturgy”.

(1) Cf. Neale, l.l., p. 519: “It (the Nestorian liturgy) is generally passed over as of very inferior importance”; and: F. E. Brightman, L.E.W., p. x.
This new era¹ began already in 1871 when Dr. Bickel edited two leaves of the MS. Brit. Mus. Add. 14669 exhibiting an anaphora-text of the sixth century in a very mutilated state.² This anaphora was clearly of an East-Syrian type. But for the moment nothing could be made of it as the historical background was wanting. The same scholar once prepared “eine auf dem gesamten Quellenmateriale beruhende Entwickelungsgeschichte und Darstellung der ostsyrischen L.” But, unfortunately, this book has never been issued and I do not know what was the state of his investigations or what has become of his notes. The article he contributed to the encyclopaedia of Prof. Kraus³ must take its place. This rite existed before the Nestorians came to Persia; this older formulary has been treated by Isho’yabhi iii in the same way as the Roman Mass by Gregory i. He gives a survey of the various texts: ‘Fragment’ is typically Persian (“memento” before the Epiclisis); it is “ein Uebergangstadium von der gemeinsamen Grundlage zu der spättern nestorianischen Form”; probably it represents a rest of the normal liturgy before its curtailment by I. iii.—‘Addai’ is “wohl im Folge jener Abkürzung im Kanon, arg zerrüttet und der Berichtigung durch die beiden andern nestorianischen Anaphoren

(1) We pass by the books on “Konfessionskunde”, such as: F. Katzenbusch, a.a.O.; F. Loofs, Symbolik, Tübingen, 1902, and: H. Mullert, Konfessionskunde, Giessen, 1927, as their sections on the Nestorians are very small and do not furnish details.—R. Janin, Les églises orientales et les rites orientaux, Paris, 1926, p. 478-496 has much about it, but only the present usages; he assumes influence of Antioch (Palestine) upon the Persian rite, revision by Isho’yabhi iii, and enriching in later times, p. 479. The historical apparatus and proofs for these statements are wanting.—A most excellent and up-to-date first part of a “Konfessionskunde” was published this year by Prof. F. Heiler, Urkirche und Ostkirche, München, 1937. As to the Nestorians it does not embody original research, but is a comprehensive survey based upon the best authorities. He does not speak about the history of the rite (S. 446-450) but only mentions the fact that ‘Addai’ is the liturgy of Seleucia and got its present form through Isho’yabhi i and ii (byzantine influence); the main part consists of a description of ‘Addai’—the words of the Institution are omitted because of the holiness of the words. He sums up the other anaphora-texts and the days in which they are said. In dealing with the Nestorian doctrine of the Euch. he uses the texts of Jugie (cf. p. 55), but without their Roman-Cath. interpretation (S. 441). —F. Salaville, Les Liturgies Orientales, Paris, 1932, deals exclusively with the Greek rite; what is said about the Nestorians is extremely poor and without value.


bedürftig" (it misses the words of the Institution, though they are usually said) — 'Theod.' and 'Nest.' are not written by these heretics. 

Next he offers a survey of the text as he thinks it had been fixed by L. iii, a reconstruction from the texts in Mss. and printed books controled by the older nestorian liturgists. In spite of a number of additions "stimmt die ostsyrische L. auf das Genaueste in ihrer ganzen Anordnung mit der vornicäischen gemeinschaftlichen ueber ein wie sie denn auch in ihre Diction und Anschauungsweise einen höchst alterthümlichen Charakter bewahrt hat". He describes the Roman Catholic editions of the Missale for Mesopotamia and India and refers to his own critical edition in: "der katholische Orient" 1874. based upon some printed texts and one London MS. — I have summarized this article, partly in his own words, because it is an excellent piece of work which shows in every line the great knowledge of its author on this subject. It makes us regret the more that death prevented him to publish the book he promised.

To this we join the book of the well-known liturgiologist at the end of last century Prof. Probst. In his usual manner he had collected from the latin translation of the Ephraim-edition of the Assemani's those places that seemed to him to contain reminiscences of the liturgy of 'Addai'. They show according to Probst that this liturgy was known to Ephraim from beginning to end and that the Nestorian tradition that it had been composed by the Apostles themselves was right. No further use is made of this argument. We cannot think of discussing all the places he adduces, but we may point out that he often gives the text a meaning that cannot be taken for an unprejudiced exegesis. He overlooked that it is not certain that the 'Addai' was the liturgy of Edessa. (For the use that can be derived from Ephraim's writings see p. 19; many of the works of Ephraim are spurious and a critical sift is necessary before using them.)

The complete Syriac text of the Liturgy had been published some years before by the Anglican Missionaries in Mesopotamia, in the: "Liturgia Sanctorum Apostolorum Adaei et Maris, etc."

(1) F. Probst, Die Liturgie des 4. Jahrhunderts und deren Reform, Münster, 1896, S. 308–318; (2) O. Bardenhewer, Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur, 1-3, Freib. i. Br., 1924, iv, S. 326–349. (3) Liturgia Sanctorum Apostolorum Adaei et Maris, cui accedunt duo alia in quibusdam festis et feris dicendae: Nuncius Ordo Baptismi, Urniac, Typis Missionis Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis, 1890 (the volume I used had only one title-page; in: L.E.W., p. lxvii it is said that it was published in two parts, resp. 1890 and 1892).
With regard to the Eucharist this Missal contained besides the Ordo Communis and the three Anaphoratexts, the formulary for the renewal of the Holy Leaven and for the Preparation of the Elements. 27 Canons containing “Admonitions of the Altar” were joined to it. An introduction dealing with the Mss. etc. has not been prefixed, as this book was destined for practice. Something about it, though in an other form than is wanted in a scientific edition, was given by Dean Maclean who had helped to prepare it: “In the preparation of this edition of the Takhsha several comparatively modern manuscripts, the only ones available, were collated from different districts inhabited by the East Syrians. The oldest of these, written at Alqosh about 1500 A.D., was taken as the basis, and all matter taken from other manuscripts was included in brackets. We must specially notice that these printed books aim rather at representing the present use of the East Syrians than at reproducing the most ancient text, and are published for practical rather than antiquarian purposes.”1 Nothing is said about the canons. It seemed as though it had escaped the attention of the editors that they are the same as those of John B. Abgare published by Assemani.2

The section on the Eucharist given by Browne and Maclean in their book on the East Syrians, is mainly a description of the Lord’s Supper as celebrated by the Nestorians. It is based upon these texts and their personal impressions. They wrote their book to excite interest in their missionary efforts, not to give a critical exposition of the history of Nestorianism; so it describes the state of this church ± 1890. They were of opinion, that ‘Theod.’ and ‘Nest.’ did not originate from Mopsuestia and Constantinople; but that the latter certainly was composed by using a Constantinopolitan liturgy (St. Basil) though the heretical traces are of Syrian origin.3 Dean Maclean was also assisting in preparing the translation of the Persian rite in Brightman’s collection,4 that is made upon the Takhsha-text. The Introduction (p. lxxvii–lxxxi) gives in its usual way much bibliographical information. Dr. Brightman mentions

the liturgical books and their printed texts (including the Chaldean ones); the Mss. known to him; and he gives the sources for the history of the rite, though this is not tabulated in an Appendix. He sums up: three other Anaphoratexts, viz. of Barsauma and Narsai, mentioned by ‘Abdisho’ (B.O., iii, p. 66, 65) and of Diodore of Tarsus, mentioned in the account of the Synod of Diamper of which Renaudot (L.O.C., ii, p. 369) questioned the existence and of which nothing else is known. As to ‘Theod.’ he points to the evidence of Leontius Byzantinus. The assigning of Bickel’s text to Diodore by Dr. Wright was groundless. For further information he refers to the “Commentators, of whom the works of the following are extant”: Isho’yabb i, George of Arbel, Yabhallaha ii, Questions found in Vat. Syr. 150; George of Arbel, Exposition of the ecclesiastical offices; ‘Abdisho’, the Pearl; Timothy ii, On the seven causes of the Mysteries; the Book of the heavenly Intelligences. The following he enumerates as lost: an exposition by Narsai, by Hannana of Hedhaiyabh and by Isho’barmun. He has omitted the canons of John v.; ‘Fragment’ has been reprinted in an appendix (cf. p. 37 n. 2). An examination of this summary must be postponed until the moment when we make out what problems result from the discussions.¹

In his popular book “die Messe im Morgenland” Dr. Baumstark associated himself with Dr. Brightman to a large extent; he gives the flesh to the skeleton of his predecessor. He points out, that the West-Syrian mass (Jerusalem type) could not supersede the East-Syrian one, because this had become the Nestorian formulary to which the Jacobite stood “im Verhältniss der Todfeindschaft”. Christianity in Edessa c.a. had been purely Aramean, thus a liturgy must have coincided “mit der ersten erfolgreichen Predigt” (S. 48; where does B. know this from?). The indications of Ephraim are scarce and rather unimportant, though his writings like those of James of Sarug and Philoxenos of Mabbug (Jacobites) need a closer

¹ W. Wright, Syrische Literature, London, 1894, p. 38. (2) The article of Mr. H. W. Codrington, on the Nestorian liturgy of the Presanctified, in: J. Th. St. 1904, will be found summarized in the Commentary ad Q. 16. (3) A. Baumstark, Die Messe im Morgenlande, Kempten, 1906 (1921), S. 48-51. - Dr. Baumstark wrote in 1922 about this former book: “Ein ohne Vorwissen des Verfassers veranstalteter Neudruck der infolge vieler und hochbedeutsamer Funde heute naturgemäß vielfach völlig veralteter Arbeit, erschien 1921” in: Vom geschichtlichen Werden der Liturgie, Freib. i. Br. 1922, S. 199. But this declaration affects other parts, but not so much that on the East-Syrians, for the discoveries which gave many problems a new aspect were not in this field.
investigation from the liturgical point of view which may yield some result. The expositions of Barsama and Narsai were still known in the 13th-14th century, they may have reflected the use of Nisibis. He mentions the fragment of Bickel as the sole survival of the old East-Syrian lit. ‘Addai’ must be considered as the liturgy of Seleucia-Ctesiphon which was extended all over Asia. Its previous history may be found in some places of the Acts of the Persian Martyrs and the ‘Synodicon Orientale’. The activity of Isho’yabbi was of extreme importance and that of Isho’yabbi iii was conclusive. The latter had been in the West and some traces of Byzantine influence may go back to his time. The edition of Tahkha has no historical value, since it is based upon Mss. not older than the 15th century. The history must be found in the expositions, of which he mentions the same as Brightman (but not ‘Abdisho’). As his work was destined for general readers, these facts are only stated, but not proved by references to the sources.

The contribution of the same author to the “Χρυσοστόμου” does not belong, properly speaking, to the works discussed here. For it aimed at showing that in ‘Nest.’ the liturgy of Constantinople before the 6th century has been preserved, though it had undergone various changes and was modeled after the East-Syrian pattern. This was done by Mar Abba and Mar Thomas, who translated it after their visit to the West (cf. the texts S. 777-781). Baumstark tries to prove that this liturgy is a neglected source for the history of the Byzantine rite previous to ‘Chrysostomus’. It is noteworthy that B. pointed out that the dogmatical retouches are not of “Nestorian” (in the heretical sense) origin, but are

(1) Cf. A. Baumstark, Ostyrisches Christentum und ostyrischer Hellenismus, in: Römische Quartalschrift, 1908, ii S. 24: “Im 7. Jahrhundert ist der Schöpfer der endgültigen Ordnung nestorianischen Gottesdienstes (Isho’yabbi iii) in Konstantinopel gewesen, und man braucht nur das von Bedjan zum Druck besorgte Brevarium Chaldaicum aufmerksam durchzugehen, um zu empfinden, wie bedeutungsvoll die Reise nach der byzantinischen Kaiserstadt für das Lebenswerk des Mannes geworden sein muss.” (a) A. Baumstark, Die Chrysostomosliturgie und die syrische Liturgie des Nestorios, in: Χρυσοστόμου, Roma, 1908, S. 771-837. His results were disputed by Th. Schermann, in: Theologie und Glaube, 1913, S. 299-313, 392-393. (I have not seen this paper.)—This discussion is important for the history of the Greek liturgy, but does not really affect that of the Nestorian liturgy. Therefore it has been mentioned by the great investigator of the Byzantine rite, Dom. Pl. de Meester, in: D.A.C.L., s.v. Grecques (liturgies), t. vi, col. 1602 [1924]. He expresses his judgement in these words: “M. A. Baumstark n’enlèvera pas la conviction que ses études restent entachées d’un a priorisme indéfendable”.
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anti-pneumatological. He says that ‘Theod.’ was the liturgy of Mopsuestia treated in the same way (p. 850; 848).\(^1\)

In the large "Dictionnaire" of Dom. F. Cabrol-Dom. H. Leclercq a very short and unsatisfactory article is written by V. Ermoni.\(^2\) It says something about the title of ‘Addai’ and about the mission in Edessa which has no connection with the liturgy. It is pointed out, that the Nestorian tradition ascribes the definite formulation "dans la forme abrégée" to Išho’yahb iii. Then a survey of the service is given (according to Renaudot). The peculiarities of it are 1. the great intercession is placed before the Epiclesis and after the Anamnesis; 2. bread and wine are covered by a separate cloth and then by a common one, called Anaphora; 3. at the beginning they use incense; 4. there are two fractions, during the first the bread is broken into two parts, during the second into more for the communion. Nothing more is said and no effort is made to solve the riddles, nor to give a survey of the problems connected with this liturgy and its history. The points he mentions, are not of great importance.\(^3\)

The knowledge of the sources was greatly enhanced by two publications of Dom. R. H. Connolly. In 1905 Dr. Mingana had published two volumes with poems of the "Harp of the Holy Spirit" Narsai.\(^4\) Among them some were of special interest for the study of the liturgy in general, viz. the numbers xvii, xxi, xxii and xxxii; and the first two for the Eucharist in particular. These four were translated by the well-known Syriac scholar into English, and so readily accessible. Hom. xvii contains a mystagogical exposition of the complete service without the Mass of the Catechumens (corresponding to: *L.E.W.*, p. 267–304); xxi some very short references, the Eucharist being treated here only as a sequence to Baptism. The former is by far the more complete and important. For in its extra-anaphorical part it runs parallel with ‘Addai’ (cf. the Table

---

(1) A Greek reconstruction of what he thought to be the original, is given in: A. Baumstark, *Die konstantinopolitische Missliturgie vor dem ix. Jahrhundert*, in: *Kleine Texte 35*, Bonn, 1909. (2) V. Ermoni, *D.A.C.L.*, s.v. Adde et Maris (Liturgie d’...), t. i, col. 519–523. (3) Indispensable though *D.A.C.L.* is for the beginnings of Christianity and for the Western part of the Church, it is extremely disappointing to notice that the East has been treated in a very insufficient, and sometimes absolutely deficient manner. An article on the Nestorian liturgy is missing. It may be found in very few words s.v. *Orientalia (liturgies)*, t. xii, col. 2659 (9 lines!!). (4) A. Mingana, *Narsai homiliae et carmina*, Mosul, 1905, 2 vols. – R. H. Connolly, *The liturgical homilies of Narsai*, in: *Texts and Studies*, viii 1, Cambridge, 1909.
of Connolly, p. 1–lxii) which would prove its age (the plus in ‘Addai’ is ‘elaboration’). If it were genuine! This is not absolutely certain. The homily is not found in the Mss. that formed the basis for the edition; it is ascribed by some authors to ‘Abdisho’ of Elam (13th century) and contains elements that are certainly of a later date than Narsai. Dr. Mingana pointed out that the authorship of a 13th century–writer is impossible, as it is written in a non-rimning style, while all verses of the 13th century are riming; but that it had been brought up to date by a man living some centuries after Narsai. The greater part of Connolly’s introduction discusses this genuineness: the internal evidence of metre, the use of words and similarity of ideas with the homilies that are undisputed show to him that Narsai was the writer. Comparison with ‘Addai’ showed that it ‘runs parallel with the Liturgy of the Apostles except in the Anaphora portion’, the deviations in the anaphora consisting in: shorter form of the Sanctus, a short prelude to the Institution, an Intercession in the same place, but much longer (agreement with ‘Nest.’ and ‘Theod.’); an apparently different invocation. Connolly suggested that Narsai who is credited with a “Quedash” by ‘Abdisho’, used here his own work that agreed with ‘Nest.’ in the intercession (Connolly assumed that Anaphora’s of Barsauma and Narsai once existed, p. lxx). With regard to the anaphora of ‘Addai’ we have no answer that was older than N. As to ‘Nest.’ and ‘Theod.’ he holds the usual opinion. He has an important “Additional note” in which he compares the underlying liturgies of Narsai and George of Arbela; the latter stands between N. and the present rite. He discusses interpolations viz. the Lord’s Prayer (as to the Litany p. 24–25, cf. Expos. I. iv, c. 25, he does not consider it spurious); he shows that George knew ‘Theod.’ and ‘Nest.’ (a.o. with regard to the words of the Institution). A very valuable appendix was added by Mr. E. Bishop. It contains a storehouse of comparative material, inserting the information furnished by N. into the history of the liturgy of the ancient church. We may note the following observations: Narsai does not seem to know altarveils, the faithful could see everything (p. 90–91); N. stresses the feeling of “Awe and Fear” towards the Eucharist, like Chrysostomus (Antioch), contrasted with the Cappadocians whose feelings are different, ‘Addai’ is reticent and more on the side of

(1) See: Connolly, II., p. xiii, where a letter of Dr. Mingana is quoted. (2) Cf. P. 44.
the latter (p. 94–97); he thinks that the “diptychs” were introduced into the mass in the East in the course of the 4th century (p. 113); that the canon was said in a voice not audible to the congregation in the 5th century in Persia in the same way as in Constantinople in the 8th (p. 126); about the moment of consecration he suggests that Narsai used an earlier East-Syrian terminology in which our Lord Himself is designated in the Eucharist as “the Spirit” (p. 148).

Some years later the exposition, generally ascribed to George of Arbela, was published by the same Benedictine together with a Latin translation. The fourth book explains the Eucharistic service, including the Missa Catechumenorum, in a mystagogical way. It does not contain many historical references. In a very short introduction Connolly showed that it was baseless to assign it to George as there is no evidence in the MSS. In 1913 he thought ‘Abdisho’ B. Nahriz (beginning 11th century) was the writer; two years later he changed his opinion and then his conclusion was, that it was written probably in the 9th century by an unknown author (ii, p. 3). Connolly did not add any investigation; only a sketch of an Nestorian church based upon these treatises was given (i p. 195–97).

The second volume also contained the text of Abraham Bar

---

(1) Anonymi Autoris Expositio Officiorum Ecclesiae Georgio Arbelensi vulgo adscripta, ed. R. H. Connolly, in: C.S.C.O., ii 91–92, 1911–1915, 4 volumes.—About its contents, see p. 127. (2) Cf. Expos. ii, p. 2: (mysteria) “figuram alicuius rei praeteritae vel futurae depingunt” viz. the history of the world, culminating in the death and resurrection of the Lord, and its future till the second-coming of Jesus and the fulfilment of the Kingdom of Heaven.—Some remarks on “Mystagogy” will be found on p. 61, n. 3. (3) That it was not written by George (so since Assemani every author) is the prevailing opinion at the present moment, see: A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 239 and: J. B. Chabot, La Littérature Syrienne, Paris, 1934, on the authority of Dom. Connolly. —I think his conclusion is right, though his arguments are absolutely wrong. (4) Not for its intrinsic value but because it has not been mentioned by Connolly and because A. Baumstark has a long note upon it, we state that the Ms. of which G. Dietrich saw the beginning, the rest being missing, was identical with Expos., see: G. Dietrich, Bericht über neu entdeckte handschriftliche Urkunden zur Geschichte des Gottesdienstes in der nestorianischen Kirche, in: Nachrichten von der kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1909, S. 160–218, Ms. ii, described on: S. 170–182. A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 200, Ak. 14, asked whether this writing had been identical with that in five books of Gabriel of Beth Qatraja though this is impossible if the agreement with George of Arbela must be explained by dependence of the former on the latter. The extracts from the text given by Dietrich are: S. 176 = Expos. i, p. 25, 23–26, 29 (text); 178 = 28, 18–30, 13; 180–181 = 31, 6–32, 5; the list of chapters is the same, except ch. ix (Con.). The only difference was that Con.’s text was divided into seven books, the other into nine.
Lipheh’s Exposition. This one seems to be incomplete; for Abraham b. Lipheh is quoted in the Expos. at various occasions in which these sentences can not be traced in the present edition. It is not sure when its author lived; Connolly decided for the 7th or certainly 8th century (ii, p. 150), but this supposition is extremely weak. The greater part of this work forms a Mystagogical explanation of the Eucharist in very short words.

Dr. J. H. Srawley dealt with the Eucharist before 431 A.D.; so a discussion of the Nestorian evidence did not fall within the scope of his book. Yet he thinks that ‘Addai’ is older than that date and has importance, as it comes from a region that “was not affected so early or to so great an extent as other regions in Eastern Christendom by the developments which were taking place in Greek-speaking lands during the fourth century”. As characteristics he gives: no words of Institution; no parallel to the Anamnese; the Invocation has something in common with that of the Ethiopic Churchorder; the prayers before the communion prepare for the communion; there is no correspondence with the intercession for the dead.¹

It is a matter of course that the history of Syriac literature of Prof. Baumstark contains a good many references, that are of importance for the history of the liturgy too. We need not register all the places where he mentions it. Of special interest are the following. ¹) Giving his opinion about the authorship of Homily xvii of Narsai he says that it is impossible to find here a work of this Father as the underlying liturgy seems to suppose knowledge of ‘Nest.’ which was translated after his time;² it may be that he was the redactor of ‘Addai’ or made himself an anaphora. As to the “Qudasha” of Barsauma he thinks that this was not a lost Eucharist-formulary, but the prayer ascribed to him in the ritual of altar-consecration.³) The fragment of Bickel is important because it gives us an insight into the peculiar nature of the Eucharistic prayer of the Monophysites in Mesopotamia. Its structure is much akin to that of the Nestorian ‘Addai’.⁴) His most important remarks are of course about the great reformer of the liturgy Isho’yahb iii. It is generally supposed by later writers, that he reformed the ritual of Baptism and Reconciliation that bear his

name, as well as the Eucharist. It is said that he forbade to use any other anaphora besides the three and that he shortened a very long text, probably that of 'Addai' that gives really the impression of being handled in that way. Baumstark gives a list of the Mss., none of them being older than the 14th century. Most of them give a normal text that cannot be traced earlier than the 15th century, while two of them show that there existed even in the 13th century a text different from the normal one (Ms. Seer 38, lost; Berlin 38=Sachau 167, 1496 A.D.). We pass over all the other names of those who have written anything about the liturgy and whose works are indicated with Baumstark's well-known carefulness; most of them will be adduced in the sequence of our book.

Though his remarks about the Nestorians as well as those on the Oriental Liturgies in general are very poor the name of Mgr. L. Duchesne justifies to summarize his opinion. He distinguishes between the usage in Edessa (Roman territory) and Seleucia-Ctesiphon (Persian); about the former he says we are "médiocrement" informed (this is a rather mild expression); the Nestorians have preserved much of the latter for us. A particularity is the place of the "Memento" before the Anamnese. The oldest literary documents are the four homilies of Narsai (xvii is considered genuine);

(1) For details see p. 126. (2) A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 199–200. (3) See the many references in the footnotes which show how much the present writer is indebted to this safe and accurate guide through the complicated history of Syriac literature. The same author's: Vom geschichtlichen Werden der Liturgie, Freiburg i., Br., 1922, does not deal with the Eucharist in particular. (4) G. P. Wetter, Altchristliche Liturgien, Göttingen, 1921–1922, 2 vols., can be omitted. His studies are in many respects very interesting and stimulating, but he "prends son bien où il le trouve", and mixes all liturgies without distinguishing the various centres and their history. What he thinks to be old, is put together. Consequently the Nestorians are not specially mentioned. The only point that is worth while to notice is his suggestion that the omission of the words of the Institution in 'Addai' and 'Fragment' is a very ancient characteristic (he refers to "Canones Hippolyti" and the exposition of Cyril of Hieros.); i. S. 61). As a matter of fact they do not fit in with the conception which Wetter supposed to be the oldest. A reaction on this idea is given by Prof. Y. Briloth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic, London, 1930, p. 41 (the sole place in which he mentions the Nestorians, it may represent an ancient type, but "then it is a lingering relic, in a backwater of the church". This book discusses in admirable clear and succinct way the general idea of the Christian liturgy, but does not offer a detailed study of the separate types and their growth. Accordingly, it is not necessary to refer it in detail. (5) L. Duchesne, Origines du Culte chrétien, Paris, 1925, p. 70–72, (the first edition is of 1889; I think that the impression I used was made ± 1910 and that that of 1925 was a mere reprint).
he mentions the names of the various formularies saying that Renaudot's text was "imparfaitement éditée". The omission of the words of the Institution seems to be a "particularité, évidemment très importante", though they are found in the Malabar-rite and Narsai; it has not yet been explained. 'Addai' is the work of Isho'yabhi, according to the Nestorian tradition, "dans la forme abrégée où nous la présente le texte attribué aux saints Addée et Maris". It does not give us any other information.

Prof. Lietzmann used as a basis for his masterly study in "Messe und Herrenmahl" the Urmiia-text (and Brightman's translation) and the 'Fragment'. He paid no attention to the other sources and did not mention anything that can contribute to the history of the rite. He studied first the separate parts of the anaphora: 1) the words of the Institution are omitted from fear of profanation; because the Liturgy contains an Anamnese, the words must always have been spoken, even if they were not written down; 'Fragm.' points to the place of the Holy Words, but that is a "sekundären Formulierung" (S. 33-35); 2) the Anamnese is not separated from the missing words of Institution by a number of intercessions, which usually follow after the Epiclesis; this is a secondary formation and Lietzmann suggests that it happened after the time when the Institution was thought to effect the consecration instead of the Epiclesis; transition to the idea of offering is not found and this fact, as some other defects that seem to point to antiquity, makes it probable that it is a shortened edition of an older text (S. 54); 3) the Epiclesis of 'Addai' may contain a number of very old features (S. 72); 4) about the Euch. prayer, he judges as follows: "Als Ganzes betrachtet ist somit die Praefatio der Nestorianer ein spätes und überarbeitetes Mosaik aus bekannten Stücken (S. 148, cf. S. 145-149). Summarizing his work and marking its general results, he says that the Antiochene liturgy of the 4th century was built upon the text of 'Hippolytus' and that from this Ant. Lit. descend: Byz. (Bas. and Chrys.)--James (with several other Ana-
phoras); "möglicher, dass die nestorianische Apostelliturgie eine ältere Form repräsentiert oder wenigstens Spuren davon erhalten hat: aber auch dann ist ihre wurzelaße Verbindung mit dem antiochenischen Typ unbezwiefelbar. Möglich ist freilich auch, dass sie einen ganz sekundären Charakter trägt" (S. 261-262). After the foregoing expositions of Lietzmann this conclusion or better: dilemma seems somewhat strange; and it seems as though
he tends to prefer the second part. At any rate the wording shows
that a definite answer cannot yet be given; this result is in contrast
with that about the other liturgies, because his opinion about them
seems fairly settled. In other words a reopening of the investigation
does not seem to be superfluous. In connection with the use of the
sources already referred to an examination of what the history of
this rite may teach us, must precede.1

The year 1929 yielded two very important contributions. The
famous bishop of the Uniate Jacobites Mgr. Rahmani who, a
Syrian himself, was well known for his books on Eastern liturgies,
published the results of a lifetime of study in this field.2 Though
this work betrays on every page the wide knowledge of its learned
author, it cannot be denied that it contains many too rash conclu-
sions, nor can it be called exhaustive. Many books and problems
are clearly overlooked. As a matter of fact, time has not yet come
for such comparative studies, as the necessary preliminary investiga-
tions have not yet been made. A special chapter deals with
"la Liturgie des Syriens orientaux";3 though its treatment was not
so full as that of St. James. We summarize here his argument. The
case whether the Apostles Addai and Mari converted the East,
is left undecided. He mentions by the way the expansion and
separation of the Persian Church. "Les Syriens orientaux se sont
distingués des autres chrétiens par leurs rites et leurs cérémonies." Ac-
cording to the Nestorian tradition the Eucharistic Formulary, made
by the Apostles, was abridged by Isho'yabh iii;4 he observes that no
trace whatever has been preserved from this abridged original. Next
he gives a survey of the sequence and a reproduction of various
prayers (French translation; syriac original in the footnotes) of the
'Fragment'. This shows no similarity neither in form nor contents
with 'Addai'. An important witness of the prior history of the ritual
is the Hymn xxi of Narsai (follows survey), for it contains a tes-
timony of the great antiquity of some ceremonies and prayers in
the Missa Fidelium.5 He denies that Hom. xvii can be regarded

(1) H. Lietzmann, Messe und Herrenmahl, Bonn, 1926, a.a.O. (2) I. E. Rahmani,
Les liturgies orientales et occidentales, Beyrouth, 1929. (3) Rahmani, l.c., p. 335–
376. (4) See below p. 126. (5) As such he mentions: a) Disposition of
bread and wine on the altar; b) the presence of two deacons near the altar,
one with a fan; c) the officiant addresses his prayers on behalf of the congre-
gation to the Father; d) the Susurrum Corda and its response; e) commemora-
tion of living and dead; f) the preface ending with the Sanctus; g) the Epiclesis; h)
the fraction of the host and its signing; i) the formel "the Love of God the Father
as genuine, external arguments (consult the survey of Connolly's book, p. 43) militate against it and ceremonies and prayers are mentioned that were introduced into the Nestorian liturgy in the course of the 7th and 9th century (their origin was mostly, he thinks, Byzantine). Some specially Nestorian usages he sums up next: they have had for long a piece of leather instead of a sacred stone (he does not say since what time); he mentions some particulars of the clerical garments, based on George of Arbela, Expos., I. ii, c. 6; the response after the Sursum Corda: "Unto thee, o God of Abraham etc." (L.E.W., p. 283), and: "The offering is being offered unto God the Lord of all" (ibidem); the response of the people: "And with thee and with thy spirit" (L.E.W., p. 275); the prayers after the Sanctus are addressed to the Son; Byzantine influences may be seen in the following acts: making the sign from the right shoulder to the left, reciting secret prayers ending with an endophones (said in a loud voice), the dialogue between the officiant and the deacon, the litany L.E.W., p. 262-266, a translation of the Greek. Then he surveys the whole mass and his conclusion is: "qu'on ne peut faire remonter au dela du ixe siecle la liturgie nestorienne, dite des apotes, etant donne que c'est le catholicos Jesus-jab qui l'a redigee dans sa forme abregee, et que ses successeurs jusqu'a Timothee ier († 823) y ont introduit des additions empruntees au rite byzantin." (p. 363). It is not of apostolic origin because its Euch. prayer is not addressed to the Father, contrary to the other liturgies of the Apostolic Sees and etc."; 1) the preface to the Lord's Prayer; k) the elevation of the host and the profession of faith; Holy is the Father; l) the communion "sub utraque" and a special formula for each of them.

(1) His arguments seemed to be convincing to a scholar as Prof. A. Rücker, see his review of the book, in: O. C., 1926, 1929, S. 281.-Dom. Leclercq (in his article in: D.A.C.L., s.v. Narsai, t. xii, col. 884-888) simply reproduces the conclusions of Dom. Connolly and Mr. Bishop (see p. 43) and does not say a word on R's objections.-In this connection an article of Prof. F. C. Burkit, the Mss. of "Narsai on the Mysteries", in: J. Th. St., 1928, p. 269-275, must also be mentioned. He drew attention to the difficult manuscript-tradition and added to Baumstark's list: Br. Mus. Add. 18716 with the same text as Cambridge Add. 2618, where Narsai's homily (the authorship has been proved by Dom. Connolly) is preceded by an "Editors Introduction to a 'classic'." The Mss. give an "edition of the ancient Homily on the greatness of the Mysteries, prepared by 'Abdisho', Metropolitan of Elam about A.D. 1222. The edition consisted in a set of prefaces, the insertion of rubrics in the text and also some additions which were almost entirely in prose" (p. 274). It may be that these new points give us the clue to solve the problem.
Justin, (an exception is made by the Coptic Lit. of St. Gregory). Nevertheless there are some expressions and ceremonies "de la plus haute antiquité": the dismissal not only of the catechumenes but also of the non-communicants; the allusion to the Eucharist without mentioning it in that formula; not: the Holy Things to the Holy Ones, but the Holy Thing (cf. Matth. vii 6; and Test. Domini, Ephraim Syrus, James of Sarug, p. 290); the officiant kisses the host at the elevation; he gives the communicants a part in their right hand; he distributes the remnants among the children after the communion. The omission of the words of the Institution is a "grave défaut" of the Mss., but found in the Nestorian authors and in the Maronitic liturgy of St. Peter.¹ Some remarks about the Uniate Missal of Mosul which follow do not concern us here. The 'Theod.' and 'Nest.' were translated by Mar Abba and Thomas as is written in the best Mss., but as the Greek originals are lost we do not know in how far this translation was an accurate one; at any rate the tradition was known in the 10th century. There are a number of places which are tabulated by Rahmani, showing the similarity of 'Theod.' and 'Nest.' with 'Bas.' and 'Chrys.' (p. 368–374). He ends by pointing out that the formula of consecration in 'Nest.' agrees with traditions of Irenaeus (adversus haereses v 33) and Ephraim (quoted by Rahmani on p. 207) about the Lord eating and drinking His own body and Blood. Resuming the arguments of Rahmani we find that: a. 'Addai' in its present form dates from the 9th century; b. it has some very old features; c. we do not know anything about this ancient liturgy; d. it is largely influenced by Byzantine elements. It would be right to accept these conclusions, if they were based on a study of the whole history of the liturgy in the Nestorian Church. This has not been done.² Nevertheless it must be admitted that these pages form one of the most profound investigations of the subject and its results must be seriously weighed by a future student.

The second contribution of the year 1929 was an article by Mr. E. C. Ratcliffe on: "The original form of the anaphora of Addai

¹ In a special paragraph Rahmani pointed out the affinity between 'Addai' and the Maronitic liturgy of St. Peter, p. 322–323. "Cette ressemblance peut s'expliquer par deux hypothèses, ou bien les deux liturgies proviennent d'une source commune, ou l'une des deux dérive de l'autre", p. 322; R. adopts the latter possibility: the Maronites being the borrowers. (2) Ad Q. 105–116, it will be shown that this leads to mistakes which can prove fatal for the whole construction.
and Mari”, called by the writer himself: “A suggestion”. After an introduction in which he points out the fact, that this church of the East was cut off from the rest of the church and had a development of its own, he says that ‘Theod.’ and ‘Nest.’ belong in their present form probably to the middle of the 6th century, “are examples of ‘Jerusalemization’, and are not representative of the earlier East Syrian tradition of Liturgy” (p. 24). Some words are said about the lack of Ms. and the relation of ‘Addai’ and the Malabar-liturgy. Then he goes on arguing that Narsai was deeply influenced by the Greek spirit; “the Eucharistic outlook of his xvii and xxi Homilies is in complete harmony with the spirit of Jerusalem” (p. 26). He is probably commenting upon his own anaphora that must have been of 4th century Greek, Jerusalem type. For while the framework is that of ‘Addai’, he leaves this text in the anaphora, because its prayers were not sufficiently developed to suit a mind acquainted with those Greek liturgies. This anaphora contains an Institution. The simplicity of ‘Addai’ is favourable to its priority. “There is no doubt that embedded in the present anaphora of Addai and Mari, there is to be found the Eucharistic prayer of the old Edessene Church” which was connected with Antioch (p. 26). Narsai has no place for Λάότος; these have been interpolated. There remains: 1. an expanded Eastern form of “Sursum mentes”; 2. address of praise to the Trinity, the Maker and Saviour of men, leading up to the Sanctus; 3. thanksgiving; 4. intercession and oblation; 5. prayer expressing the significance of the rite including an Epiclesis. The place of the intercession does not form part of the oldest stratum: it consists of two parts Λάότος and Λάοτος; the former is not found in George of Arbel, the latter is earlier, but without any connection: “we should note that with it disappears the only mention in the anaphora of the offering of Body and Blood of Christ by priest and people” (p. 27). Mr. Ratcliff tries to show that the Sanctus is an intrusion and the Epiclesis as well, because they have no links with the sequence of the foregoing and following thoughts and he suggests that they were a consequence of Hellenization. The result of this manipulation is: a. an address of praise to the name of the Creator and Redeemer; b. a thanksgiving for what has been done for us; c. a solemn following of Christ’s example and a special commemoration

of His redemptive death and resurrection for which thanks are offered. "This is a ἐξοχρωστία pure and simple... The rite has no necessary connexion with the Last Supper; the connexion is rather with the Emmaus Supper"; it is not simply an Agape, but a ὁρμητική cf. Did. x. The prayers are addressed to the Son; this may be late, but may have some connection with early East Syrian tradition, cf. Acta Thomae.

Of course these are mere hypotheses, so is rather difficult to criticize them. It is not quite certain what Mr. R. understands by "Jerusalemization". It is remarkable that the result of this analysis brings out a type of liturgy that has some striking resemblance with the type analysed by Prof. Lietzmann in his "Messe und Herrenmahl" who called it the "Scapition-type". But these suggestions can only be made fruitfull, if we possess a critical edition of the text. Before that time it is useless to discuss them.

The most comprehensive collection of materials concerning the Eucharist in the Eastern Churches after the publications of Renaudot and Dr. Brightman, are the "Institutiones" of Prof. Hanssen.1 He has not recited the old texts nor brought to light unknown liturgical sources. But he has registered every detail found in the printed texts (formularies, canons, passing references) in an admirable way. He deals with the elements, preparation and administration of the Eucharist; describes the "usus praesens" and the history. He compared all the liturgical groups for every act seperately. Yet, it is not a history in the true sense, but a storehouse of facts. It is a matter of course that all points of Eucharistic practices are also illustrated by Nestorian quotations. It is unnecessary to tabulate all these places as they can easily be found with the help of the index. Yet we may draw attention to the survey of the sources of the history of the liturgy during the 4th–8th century (p. 458–470) and of those of the 9th century till the present time (p. 501–502). He points out that we do not know anything of this rite before the 5th century, but probably it was not very unlike that of Edessa. He quotes the Canons 9, 13, 15 of the Synode of 410 A.D. He thinks that the 'Fragment' was an anaphora from the time before the introduction of Nestorianism and draws some parallels between this one and that of 'Nest.'. Next he gives an extract of Narsai's Hom. xxi, exhibiting a reformed ordo. Hom. xvii

1 J. M. Hanssen, Institutiones Liturgicae, Tomus ii, De Missa Rituum Orientalium Romae, 1930; Tomus iii, 1932; Appendix ad T. ii et iii, Romae, 1932.
he thinks dubious, for the reasons referring to his critical bibliography (this has not yet appeared). He mentions the tradition about ‘Theod.’ and ‘Nest.’ and infers from Canon 14 of Ezechiel i (576) that everywhere the same liturgy was celebrated in Mesopotamia. Then follow the Canons 1, 2, 3 and reference to 5 of Isho’yabh i to James Bishop of Darai. The account of Isho’yabh iii and his reformation is mainly extracted from the “Expositio”; (summing up the pages where I. is mentioned) with the other references (ch. vii, viii) Next comes the survey of Abraham Bar Lipheh. The importance of the “Expositio” is mentioned, but it is not summarized. The “Responsiones” of George of Arbeia in Vat. Syr. 150 are still inedited. Further he mentions a book “De Divinis Officinis” written by Ibn at-Tayyib and refers to the schollaw of Sabarisho ii (831–825). This list is not quite complete, for why has Timothy ii been omitted and other books registered already by Brightman; the Canons of John v are not described either. The third part consists for the larger part of a discussion: “De singulis missae orientalis ritibus”–Ch. xvi (p. 622–632) gives a complete list of the editions of the texts; of the names of the Anaphora’s (“Addai”; Barsama [lost]; Diodore of Tarses [lost; suppressed by Isho’yabh iii, but found in India at the end of xvith cent.]; Ephraim [lost; cf. p. 126]; Nares [lost]; ‘Nest.; ‘Theod.; ‘Fragment’[?]); of the expositions; he mentions the work of Isho’yabh (cf. ch. vi, vii); the origin of ‘Addai’ is Edessa and Leontius Byzant. refers to it (p. 31, n. 1); the origin of ‘Theod.’ and ‘Nest.’ is made known by the colophons in the Mss. (translated by Mar Abba and Thomas Edess. [± 550]); Prof. Hansens refers to the opinion of Rahmani and the discussion of Baumstark without a further decision.

In a small paper Prof. Brightman tried to show that the liturgy of Theodore of Mopsuestia mentioned by Leontius of Byzance is really ‘Addai’; his argument is mainly based upon similarity in ideas, but I cannot find among them anything that is conclusive.

(1) This interpretation of the text is wrong. (2) Hansens says, l.l., p. 465; “In istis autem constitutionibus condendis, Iesuibus earum rerum praestim sollicitus fuerat, quae mysteria experimerent; minus vero ei curae fuit, utrum omnia quae scripsisset diligenter perficerentur necne”. This seems to be a reflex of Expos. ii, p. 33, cf. p. 109, but the last clause does not express the exact sense for in the text it is stated that he was silent about those which did not express a type. This makes a difference! Moreover, this is clearly the idea of the author of Expos., and cannot be taken as the exact reproduction of the thoughts of I. iii. (3) F. E. Brightman, The Anaphora of Theodore, in: J. Th. St., 1930, p. 160–164.
Mgr. Tisserant in his detailed history of the Nestorians has only a very short note on their liturgy. The present Nestorian rite must have some connection with Antioch, "mais le développement s’en est fait d’une façon tellement indépendante qu’il n’y a plus grand’ chose de commun au point de vue liturgique, entre les deux branches de l’Église de la langue syriaque" (col. 314). The words of the Institution have no importance for them, the real presence in which they believe being effected by the Epiclesis. Further he gives some information on their manner of communicating and the preparation of the Malkha (col. 315–316). With regard to the details of the Mass (which he did not discuss) he referred to an article "Orientales (masses)", by I. Ziadé, an extremely poor contribution (at least about the Nestorians). The Persian rite has been simply incorporated with that of Antioch. As to its history he repeats the contents of R. Janin (see p. 37, n. 1; Col. 1436). He does not say a word on the commentaries or Mss. and the main part of it consists of a survey of the course of the liturgie in the different rites belonging to the groups of Antioch, Alexandria, Byzance. Of course the fact that the words of the Institution are missing is mentioned; several explanations are offered. Mr. Z. himself does not know where they should be said properly, but: "il semble impossible que le rite nestorien se serve pour la messe normale d’une anaphore ne possédant pas l’essentiel”.

In 1932 Dom. Engberding published a paper in which he pursued a clue given by Mgr. Rahmani, viz. the comparison of ‘Addai’ with the Liturgy of Peter of the Maronites. This study is a model of its kind from the point of view of method. His conclusion, reached after a careful collation, was: "Das gegensätzige Verhältniss der beiden Bearbeitungen muss dahin bestimmt werden, dass m durchweg die ältere und damit die ursprünglichere Gestalt bietet”; it has "grundlegende Bedeutung" since it exhibits the text of the old Patriarchate of Antioch before 430 A.D. which reigned over Mesopotamia and the Libanon. In passing it may be observed that the author does not believe that Isha’yabb iii curtailed the older texts.

Though it does not belong to the Nestorian Church properly speaking, we may mention here the find of Dr. Mingana, who dis-

covered the "Book of the Mysteries" or "Liber ad Baptizandos" of Theodore of Mopsuestia. For it is well known that this book has not only been preserved by the Nestorians, but has also deeply influenced their ideas about the liturgy. In his preface the learned Editor quotes the first half of Prof. Lietzmann's conclusion, pointing to the antiquity of the Nestorian rite, which is exactly his own opinion too and in favour of which he quotes also an Arabic book of the late Archbishop Joseph David, entitled Ḫusāra. He states that "the Liturgy commented upon by Theodore has nothing in common with the Liturgy ascribed to him, in the East Syrian Church" (p. xiii). The discussion of this liturgy which has been commented upon by Theodore, by Prof. Lietzmann shows that it has the same structure as the ordinary Antiochen type.

The doctrinal aspect of the Nestorian Eucharist was considered by Mr. M. Jugie. He has used all sources available and exposes their doctrine of the "presentia realis" (which all teachers have held though their statements about it were not always sound according to Jugie); of the "materia eucharistiae" (Malkha); of the "forma eucharistiae" and Epiclesis (the older Nestorians held the conversion by the words of Institution, but some of them as the present people attribute the consecration to the Epiclesis—we may quote here a typical sentence [p. 316]: "Inde colligere potes sacerdotes nestorianos, quoties haec liturgia utentur, revera non consecrarce; quod Deus accidere idco fortasse permitit, quod fideles nestoriani sine

(1) A. Mingana, Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, W. S. vii; Cambridge, 1933. (2) Dr. Mingana mentioned only the quotations found in the Greek and Latin Church. It does not seem to be out of place to give the following Nestorian writers who quoted him: Nasræ (xvi, once he is introduced by the author's name, but also the parallels given by Connolly from Cyrillos Hieros. are his); Abraham Bar Lifheh (Expos. ii, p. 165); Dadishe' (in: W. S. vii, p. 94-96); and in the statute for the schools of Sabarisho' ii quoted by 'Abdisho', Nomonana, vi 3, the reading of this book is obligatory even for those who are studying medicine, cf. p. 147. (3) Against H. B. Swete, in: Dictionary of Christian Biography, s.v. Theodore, London, 1887, iv, p. 943, and: O. Bardenhewer, Geschichte der altkirchlichen Liturgie, 3, Freiburg i. Br., 1923, iii, S. 321, who states that 'Abdisho' in his catalogue does not mention it, but he thinks no reason to doubt the Nestorian tradition and Leontius. (4) H. Lietzmann, Die Liturgie des Theodor von Mopsuestia, in: Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1933. (5) M. Jugie, Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab ecclesia catholicæ dissidentium, t. v. De theologica dogmatica Nestoriororum et Monophysitariorum, Parisii, 1915, p. 295-316. A short, but convenient sketch of Nestorian literature will be found on p. 27-38! A remarkable statement of it is the following about Abraham bar Lifheh: "scripsisse videtur ante reformationes liturgicas Iso'yabhi iii" (p. 33). I do not know what are his reasons.
praevia peccatorum confessione ad sacram mensam accedere solent"); of the eucharist as sacrifice and mentions some (very few) practices. It should be said, that it is not a history of the Eucharist but only a small part of it. Its collections and comments must be used with caution, as the learned author uses the roman-catholic schemes and doctrines as a standard which prevents him and his readers to grasp exactly the Nestorian point of view.

What is the result of this variety of opinions? For this word expresses the impression left by reading the books quoted before. In spite of the fact that according to most authors the Nestorian liturgy is of great antiquity and forms a class of its own, a complete monograph of it does not exist, has not even been tackled. Except for the mentioning of editions the above books and articles have not so much in common; the only point that often recurs is the omission of the words of Institution. It is of course impossible to submit all these pages to a thorough criticism; for this would compel us to go outside the Nestorian area and it seems to the present writer that many of the problems touched upon are not yet "spruchreif". Besides that many of the previous authors worked with insufficient knowledge of the sources. Therefore we will only try to form a clear idea of the points at issue. The formulation of the questions is in itself a criticism, as it shows where the learned authors who have written on this subject, fall short.

1) Direct sources: Three liturgies appointed by Isho'iyahb iii; not one of the Mss. known so far goes back beyond the 13th century (this fact is not changed by the Mss. of the Mingana collection). 'Addai' was perhaps shortened by I.; 'Theod'. and 'Nest.' were translated from the Greek in the 6th century. The question is: Have we in our Mss. and editions the unchanged tradition of I. before us? In other words have the 6-7 centuries not influenced their texts? Two forms of the texts are at our disposal: Urmia (Brightman) and Renaudot but a critical edition is wanting. They are not in all respects similar. Takhir has the longer one. Which is the more original? Baumstark gives the impression as though Cod. Berl. 38 shows a totally different recension of 'Addai'; a

---

(1) Except by Bickel, cf. p. 37. The publisher Aschendorf, Münster i. W. announces a forthcoming volume of the: *Liturgische Quellen und Forschungen*, written by Prof. A. Rücker, *Die ostsprachige Messliturgien*, but without any indication of its character. (2) This is certain by manuscript-evidence.
perusal of this Ms. and comparison with T. has not convinced me. Before speaking about the Nestorian Liturgy it must be fixed which text is the purest and oldest. The greatest difference may be found in the rubrics; generally those in T. surpass the rubrics of the others in length. ‘Fragment’ is practically useless, as it does not show historical connections, and everything that is said about it is mere conjecture; for the present it can only be used as a separate type but without great authority.

2) These questions lead us directly to the history of this rite: indirect sources. It can be divided into two periods: by the activity of Isho’yabt iii. It is good to take the chronologically reversed order: a) What changes has the liturgy undergone in the time from 1. till our Mss.? b) What was the character of the reformation of 1.? c) What was the pre-Ish. ‘Addai’ and its connection with the old liturgy of Persia and Edessa?

The answer to a) can be given, as the list of Brightman seems to give us help. Yet it must be cleared. It has become known that the exposition of George of Arbela (?) enables us to get a survey of the liturgy of his time (but see p. 127–128); the same may be said about the older one of Bar Lipheh (not mentioned by Brightman). The commentary of Narsai, which he stated to be lost, has been recovered in Hom. xvii according to some people, which would be an important evidence to the antiquity (pre-Ish.) of the parts of ‘Addai’ outside the anaphora, this latter being probably his own work; though interpolations are not to be excluded. Other scholars disputed this view and credited later times with this exposition. The question is still sub judice. As to the “exposition of the services” by Isho’Bar Nun that was thought by Brightman to be a Eucharistic document (lost), this may have been a reform of the Daily Offices (Baumstark). The ΜΗΜΑΤΙΑ of Bar Sauma is designated by a word of too vague a meaning to apply this without further comment to the Eucharist, since it means simply “Consecration” which may be said of various liturgical practices. Brightman also mentions an anaphora of Diodorus which is said to be referred to in the Acts of the Synod of Diamper; the Ms. Berlin 39 styles ‘Theod.’ as “of the interpreters Diodorus and Theodorus”. It might be that the

(1) I used a facsimile through the kind offices of Prof. Lietzmann of Berlin.
(2) A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 220; – Or was this the Expositio, ed. Connolly, as seems to be the opinion of Assemani, B.O., iii 1, p. 166 (apparently this has escaped the attention of Connolly)
(3) Cf. A. Baumstark, L.G., S. 120, Ak. 3.
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same is the case in the Acts, so that we need not suppose it was a lost anaphora. ‘Abdisho’ ascribes to Isaac of Nineveh a book “De divinis Mysteriis”; it is not known what this means; it may have been simply an ascetical work. We may point to some books mentioned by Baumstark that seem to be lost or have not been examined yet: S. 218, Ephraim of Elam, a letter against the reception of the communion from the hand of Greeks and Jacobites; S. 240, Elias of Kashkar, a book on the “Mysteries of the Church” (nothing of it is known; is it too bold to venture that this book is the same as the “Expositio”?) ; S. 287, ‘Abdisho’ Bar Bahriz, also an exposition (this was first identified by Connolly with his exposition; afterwards he retracted it and came to the conclusion referred to before); S. 311, John Bar Zö’bî, an other explanation in poetical form (preserved in several MSS.); S. 324, Ak. 5, a short exposition of the Daily Office and the Mass by ‘Abdisho’. The “Pearl” of ‘Abdisho’ does not contain anything that is of interest for the history of the rite; it is dogmatical and shows the Nestorian doctrine about this sacrament in the 13th cent.

So we find that there are left from Br.’s list: the items of Vat. Syr. 150 and the book of Timothy ii. The latter has not found an editor yet. We read the 4th book which deals with the liturgy, in: Codex Mingana Syriacus 13. It appeared that the analysis given by Asemanni is not unsatisfactory. The questions do not contain any information that is actually of importance for the better knowledge of the history (the proper names mentioned by Asemanni are the only ones occurring). In ch. 15 a commentary of the liturgy is given occupying nearly half the treatise; the explanation is very short. Of course it furnishes us with the outline of the liturgy of his days (as far as I could see it does not deviate very much from the ordinary form in T.; it goes without saying that this form is also of importance in collating Codex Berlin 38). At any rate it gives an interesting insight into the questions that were discussed in his time in the Nestorian church, e.g. 14: “Ad Patrem dirigi Orationes in Liturgia” (cf. the remark of Rahmani, p. 48–49). Some of them may be traditional, as appears from 16: “De Consignationibus”, in which the same point is discussed that was treated some centuries before (it is cited ad Q. 89). Vat. Syr. 150 is left; nothing about it is

known except some information scattered in the "Bibliotheca Orientalis" (see p. 65). It is needless to dwell any longer about it as it will be the subject of the next chapters of our introduction.

We asked: what is the value of these writings for the "History of the rite"? Beforehand it must be fixed what is the exact meaning of "rite"; it can contain prayers and indications of liturgical actions. In most cases only the former category is examined but the latter also belong to the liturgy and these are susceptible of expansion. Besides that the liturgy is encircled by usages such as: Communion, Preparation of the Elements, etc. It is not advisable to give it too narrow a meaning. In this connection the Canons of John v Bar Abgare get their importance.

b) We are very badly informed about the character of the reformation of I. iii concerning the Eucharist. A provisional discussion of it will be given afterwards (p. ch. vi, iiic). A definite investigation of the subject must try to detect I.'s liturgical texts. If this has been done, one can test the opinion of Baumstark (copied by Heiler) that he acted under Byzantine influence (it may be asked whether this traces of Byzantine influence are real or merely due to the same origin, or are of a later date than I. iii).

c) Hardly anything based on facts (!) can be stated about it; some information may be derived from the Synodicon Or. along with the Hom. xxi of Narsai. At this point a decision about the genuinity of Hom. xvii is urgent. In how far is Rahmani right with his "ancient features"? Must one be satisfied with hypotheses? What is the relation between the opinion that 'Addai' is the ancient liturgy of Seleucia-Ctesiphon and the statement of Isaac, Canon xiii (quoted p. 118)? Is it possible to reconstruct an original form by comparison with other formularies? This is the more important for 'Addai' which is a complete liturgy while the others are merely anaphora-texts.

3) Not before a careful examination of these points has brought about what is the value of the printed texts and what can be separated as later intrusions, one may go in for an investigation into the filiation with other liturgical groups. It is natural to do

(1) As to the study of the liturgical relation between the Nestorians and their neighbours, one should keep in mind that the Nestorian Church had a development of its own, but that churches were not in watertight compartments: there was intercourse between the Nestorians and the Jacobites (cf. p. 17, n. 1, and p. 25, n. 1). A very interesting symptom of it is offered in our treatise Q. 108. This relation must be taken into account and it seems to the present writer that the
so with 'Theod.' and 'Nest.,' since it has been handed down that
they originate from the Greek church. 'Nest.' was already subjected
to a discussion between Prof. Baumstark and Prof. Schermann. As to
'Theod.' a careful comparison with the liturgy underlying Theodore's commentary must be recommended in spite of the verdict of
Dr. Mingana who nevertheless left the final decision to professional
liturgiologists. Are they really the liturgies of respectively Constan
tinople and Mopsuestia? In case of the latter it seems advisable
to break away for the present from the statement of Leontius
Byzant.; every interpretation of what he meant by "Blasphemies"
was mere guessing. It is possible that Leontius who lived a century
later has made a mistake and it should not be overlooked, that
he was a polemist! Perhaps "Blasphemies" must not be limited to
wrong teaching about the dogmas; everything called by Theodore
"Prayer" was on itso blasphemous for his opponent; what mattered
was the interpretation of the same statements. The case of 'Addai'
is not so easy; it must undoubtedly be considered as the oldest,
as was seen already by Renaudot, and provisionally as a separate
type. Here we get back the dilemma formulated by Prof. Lietzmann.
Perhaps it cannot be solved before more is known about the
liturgical history of the Nestorians and the rival churches.

This concerns the prayers of the liturgy (in Lietzmann's book
only those of the anaphora). Besides them there are the acts. These
too must be submitted to a comparative research, keeping in view
three questions: is this spontaneous development; or borrowing;
or descent from common ancestors? In so far as I can see, the
answer to these problems will be different from that mentioned
before and will not corroborate it; other filiations and links will
appear. At any rate it is wrong to neglect this growth of the rubrics
eetc. especially as these acts had a dogmatical meaning for later
generations.

The Homilies of Narsai, the "Expositio" etc. were valued before

formula of Dom. H. Engberding, Altantiohenisches Eucharistisches Hochgebot, in:
O.C., 1932. S. 47: "der methodische Grundsatz der vergleichenden Liturgie-
geschichte (ist): Wo in getrennten Kirchengemeinschaften ein gemeinsamer
Text sich findet, ragt dieser in seinem Alter bis in die Zeit vor der Trennung
hinauf" though right in many cases, should not be applied in a too simple or
too doctrinaire manner.

(1) O. Bardenhewer, Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur, Freiburg i. Br., 1932,
v. S. 9-13. (2) Compare for instance the totally opposite conclusions drawn from
the same Nicene Creed by Nestorians and Jacobites.
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only as sources to reconstruct the liturgy in use at a certain date. As a rule this is the only use made of these books. But it is not the end which their authors had in view (see e.g. the quotation on p. 127).

4) In this way we come to more dogmatical positions with regard to the Eucharist, viz. to the question: what is the meaning of all these actions and prayers? Does there exist a special doctrine about essence, aim and working of the Sacrament? What is the relation with the Mystagogy, i.e. the exposition of Eucharist? Is there a connection with Mysticism? The point must be considered whether additions have been made for dogmatical reasons. It is a matter of course that these questions must also be dealt with by way of comparison. This will explain much that is obscure.¹ The study of the Mystagogy or explanation of the liturgy is still waiting. Yet it should not be neglected as it reveals the feelings of the believers during the celebration.² From these sources it is obvious that the Nestorian teaching has not been so traditional as it is often thought³ and that it changed through the ages (read: Narsai, Hom. xvii[?]) and xxi; Abraham b. Lipeh; Expos.; and Timothy ii). The influence of Theodore (see p. 55, n. 2) and of Dionysius Areopagita, who is generally considered as the great teacher in these matters,⁴ can be examined here. Then arises the question about the

---

¹ Cf. Expos. ii, p. 4, about this obscurity.  
² Cf. R. H. Connolly, Two Commentaries, p. x: "... commentaries on the whole Liturgy, which give a more lively picture of the manner in which the Holy Eucharist was celebrated by the Syrian Jacobites in the Middle Ages than the manuscripts, with their brief rubrics and limited scope can afford. In these commentaries we have, moreover, the ideas and sentiments connected with the celebration of the Christian Mysteries in the minds of living men."—Many Greek and Syriac commentaries are left which have never been investigated. Something of it in: F. Kattenbusch, Mystagogische Theologie, in: P.R.E., 612–622 (D.Th.C. and D.A.C.L. do not contain an article; A. Wilmart, D.A.C.L., s.v. Expositio Missae, i.e. col. 1014–1027 treats the Western church alone, a defect which is often found in this indispensable and magnificent work).  
³ There is a marked difference between the Nestorians and the Jacobites. The latter have a strong chain of tradition as will be seen in reading Codrington–Connolly, Two Commentaries as compared with the Exposition of Dionysius b. Salibi (ed. Labourt). Of the former everyone has his own view (the same will be found in another department, p. 136, n. 1); Expos. ii, p. 34 dares to say about his predecessor Abraham b. Lipeh: "Ab. in dementia sua!" (4) A. Ehrhard, ap. K. Krumbacher, Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur, München, 1897, S. 141, says about Dionysius' influence on the Byzantine Church: "Den Ausgangspunkt derselben (Mysticism) bilden die mystischen Schriften des Dionysius Pseudoareopagitae von denen sie ihre Eigenart, ihre kultisch-symbolische Richtung empfangen haben".—Dionysius was known in the Nestorian church (see: Timothei I Patriarchae, Epistulae xvi, ed.
connection with Christology as discussed in several places of Babai, "Liber de Unione", and others. In this borderland of liturgy and dogmatics one must always keep in mind the links with both. For in the life of the church the one could not be thought of without the other. Practically nothing has been done so far in this field! The knowledge of liturgical hymns is connected with it. It will enable us to answer what is typically Nestorian, what is the relation with the Antiochene school, and in what respect we may speak of a common "fond" with the other churches. By combining 3 and 4 the omission of the words of Institution can only be fruitfully discussed (it has also been omitted in Theodore's explanation).

We see several diverging sets of problems arising from the evidence, which cross each other in the study of the liturgy. Reviewing what has been done to solve them permits us to say that it is still the "least known of Eastern rites" (Brightman). It is out of question to examine all these subjects in one book though we must be aware that all these problems are linked up with each other. We must begin at the beginning. Our attention is drawn by the question: what are the contents, nature and meaning of the treatises com-

O. Braun, p. 120 (in: C.S.C.O., ii 67); xxxii, p. 156; W.S. vii, p. 13-15; Isaac of Nineveh, tr. A. J. Wensinck, p. 114; but I do not believe that he had a far-reaching influence upon the liturgical explanation; in that connection he is never quoted.

(1) Babai Magni, Liber de Unione, ed. A. Vaschalde, in: C.S.C.O., ii 61, Parisis, 1915. (2) Dom. H. Engelberting, Die Kirche als Braut Christi in der ostyrischen Liturgie, in: Orientalia Christiana Periodica, Roma, iii, 1937, S. 5: "Man kann nicht behaupten, dass die wissenschaftliche Forschung das Gebiet der ostyrischen Liturgie stiefmütterlich behandelt. Im Gegenteil, die letzte Jahrzehnte haben manche, z. T. recht wertvolle Arbeit, herausgebracht (on S. 44-48 he gives a bibliography of the work of the last century; it contains all sorts of liturgical editions and studies, not only eucharistic. "With regard to the great task I cannot help thinking that these words of Dom. E. give too favourable a representation of the results attained). Und doch lässt sich nicht leugnen, dass alle diese Arbeiten, eine einzige ausgenommen, einen Bereich fast vollständig ausser Acht lassen: den der Theologie, d.i. der systematischen Aufarbeitung und Untersuchung des in der genannten Liturgie niedergelegten religiösen Gedankengutes". (3) Cf. this judgment of Reranudot, L.O.C., ii, p. 565: "Liturgiae iliae, prima ('Addai') praesertim, etiam in codicibus non admodum vetustis, inter multas, variique generis orationes vix ullam habent, quae Nestorianae doctrinae particularum aliquam representent, una Nestorii excepta", and of A. J. Maclean, E.S.D.O., p. xxv: "The infrequent occurrence of Nestorian language will perhaps surprise the reader... we shall find no trace of heterodoxy in the following pages... On the other hand, we find much that is quite inconsistent with true Nestorianism." (4) L.E.W., p. x.
tained in Vat. Syr. 150. For we must first have a profound knowledge of the materials that can be disposed of, before we come to other questions, because otherwise the uncertainty will remain whether this unknown source will interfere with the results reached. In the following pages we propose to publish and comment upon the first part of them, the “Special Introduction” will discuss the problems involved. The plan to do so is evident. We must try to determine the exact date of the writing and after that ask whether its form or contents enable us to consider the whole book as a piece of evidence of the practice of some centuries before. The commentary will discuss the same for the separate questions and special points. Although the first part will be published, it is a matter of course that the author examined the other parts too, as will be seen from many places in which they are quoted.