

THE CENTRAL PART OF THE BYZANTINE ANAPHORA

A TRANSLATOR'S NOTES

As a translator of Orthodox texts I often console myself with some remarks made by the translators of the King James version of 1611 in their letter *The Translators to the Reader*, which sadly is seldom, if ever, printed in most modern editions.

Zeal to promote the common good, whether it be by devising any thing ourselves, or revising that which has been laboured by others, deserveth certainly much respect and esteem, but yet findeth but cold entertainment in the world. It is welcomed with suspicion instead of love, and with emulation instead of thanks: and if there be any hole for cavil to enter, (and cavil, if it do not find an hole, will make one) it is sure to be misconstrued, and in danger to be condemned. This will easily be granted by as many as know story, or have any experience. For was there ever any thing projected, that savoured any way of newness or renewing, but the same endured many a storm of gainsaying, or opposition?

The following notes are concerned with some of the problems that confront a translator of the central part of the anaphora, or eucharistic prayer, of the Liturgies of St Basil and St John, from the Memorial, or *Anamnesis*, to the end of the Invocation, in Greek *Epiklesis*.

One of the most difficult phrases in the Liturgy is the phrase κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα which occurs at the elevation of the Gifts just before the invocation of the Holy Spirit. In the original text the whole sentence runs:

Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοι προσφέροντες, κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα.

In Slavonic this is translated:

Твоѡ ѿ твоеѡхъ тевѣ приносѡмъ ѡ всѣхъ и за всѡ

There is no serious disagreement about the first words, apart from the question of the original Greek, and all are agreed, though Patrick Thompson¹ is almost alone in translating, correctly, by a participle, that it means something like:

‘As we offer you what is your own from what is your own.’

The evidence of the Greek manuscripts is overwhelming that the true reading is προσφέροντες and not, as in the current Greek books, προσφέρονμεν.

¹ The Rev. Patrick Thompson's translation of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom from the Slavonic text was published in 1939 by SPCK and was frequently used at meetings and Summer Conferences of the Fellowship of Sts Alban and Sergius.

Trembelas, of the numerous manuscripts in Athenian libraries that he examined, only cites one with the latter reading, against seventy two with the former, and in that manuscript a second hand has corrected προσφέρομεν to προσφέροντες. This is also the reading of the earliest manuscript of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, the Codex Barberini, which is dated by its latest editor to the of the second half of the eighth century.² The People's invocation follows grammatically, and also theologically, from the words of the Priest, as Trembelas writes, 'the word on which the participle depends [is] in the following hymn by the people, "We praise you"'.³ He points out that the following priestly prayer, 'Also⁴ we offer' follows naturally from the people's response, rather than the priest's "in all things and for all things". When the translation committee of the Archdiocese of Thyateira discussed this phrase, Bishop Kallistos regretted not starting with "Your own from your own", but I cannot see how to do so in English without great difficulty. Enquiry shows that people tend to feel that the present text appears to make a distinction between the clergy, who offer, and the people, who praise etc. In fact both "we"s are inclusive of both priest and people. It is interesting to note that Dr Covel⁵ got this right in the seventeenth century, which suggests that the books he saw in Constantinople then were correct. The edition he was using was a Venetian Euchologion of 1673, 'it being', he tells us, 'the very Edition which the

² The Barberini Codex gr. 336 is now easily accessible in an excellent edition by Stephano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, Rome 2000. Goar is unreliable here Unfortunately there is a lacuna in the text of St Basil at this point, which extends the middle of the Intercession. The text with the participle is also that of the eleventh century use of the Great Church. See Miguel Arranz *L'Euchologio Costantinopolitano agli inizi del secolo XI* (Rome 1996) pp. 483 and 504.

³ P. N. Trembelas, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, (Athens 1935, reprinted 1982) p. 110.

⁴ In passing it is worth noting that the Greek word ἔτι used on its own in the Liturgy almost always means "also", "further", rather than "again", a meaning not found in the standard Greek lexicæ such as Liddell and Scott This is also the meaning of the Slavonic. Neale and Littledale (1869) translate correctly, "Further". James King (1722), who is followed by Miss Hapgood, however, generally has "Again", and this may be the origin of the error; though interestingly King does not translate the word at all at this point. The normal Greek for "again" is πάλιν. The *Complete Dictionary of Church Slavonic*, first published in Moscow 1900 and reissued with the blessing of Patriarch Alexey II in 2000, does not include the word, presumably because the meanings are sufficiently close to those of modern Russian емѣ as it make its inclusion unnecessary. The meanings given to the latter in the *Oxford Russian Dictionary* (1997) are remarkably similar to the meanings given to the ancient Greek word in Liddell and Scott. The Slavonic gets the force of this nuance by using two translations of the Greek ἔτι. When the word is repeated it uses пакѣ, which the *Complete Dictionary* gives as a translation of the Greek πάλιν., but when it is on its own it uses емѣ.

⁵ John Covel [1638-1722] was chaplain to the Levant Company and served the ambassadors in Constantinople from late 1670 until May 1676. He returned to England in 1679 and later to Christ's, his college in Cambridge, of which he became Master in 1688. See now Judith Pinnington *Anglicans and Orthodox*, (Gracewing 2003), pp.108-155 and Ephrem Lash, "Incoherent Pageantry" or "sincere Devotion": Dr John Covel (1638-1722) on the Liturgy in Constantinople', in *Anglicanism and Orthodoxy*, ed. Peter M. Doll (Peter Lang 2006), pp. 133-152.

KATA PANTA KAI DIA PANTA

Greeks every where made use of in my time'. The Euchologia of 1602 and 1622 have προσφέροντες, and the Slavonic, which is presumably based on that of 1602, the edition used by Patriarch Nikon for his notorious reform, has the participle.⁶ Goar, on the other hand, who was using one of 1638, reads προσφέρομεν, nor does he give any variant readings at this point. In St Basil's Liturgy, however, he has the participle.

The latest edition of the Greek *Ieratikon*, published by the *Apostliki Diakonia* in 2002, prints προσφέρομεν in the text, but has a footnote pointing out that 'the more correct text' has προσφέροντες. A further note explains that the incorrect text has been retained because it has 'already been consolidated by long use and does not do violence to the syntax and meaning of the prayer'. Neither reason is convincing, and, although the note refers to Trembelas' explanation of the true reading, the editors disregard it.

The *Liturgikon*, issued by the Antiochian Archdiocese of North America in 1989, also prints the incorrect text 'we offer', but with a misleading⁷ footnote giving the correct, 'offering'.

The real problem is in the last five words. Here are some of the translations that have been proposed, in chronological order. Orthodox translations are marked with an asterisk;⁸ Catholic ones with a obelus:

In all things and for all things

[Covel 1722] [*Thyateira 1995]

In all and for all

[King 1772] [*Faith Press 1951] [Patrick Thompson 1939] [*Archbishop Athenagoras 1979] [*Holy Cross 1985]

In behalf of all, and for all

[Neale and Littledale⁹, 1869] [*Hapgood 1906] [*American Antiochian 1989]

Entirely and for all things

[Athelstan Riley 1922]

⁶ I have been able to confirm this personally, since Chetham's Library in Manchester possesses what seems to be one of the very few copies of this edition in western Europe. See Paul Meyendorff *Russia, Ritual and Reform* (New York, SVSP 1991) p.11.

⁷ The note speaks of, 'The original reading, found in manuscripts until the mid-twelfth century'. The manuscripts down to the eighteenth century and printed texts until the seventeenth have the correct.

⁸ I have bestowed the asterisk on Miss Hapgood because her translation was endorsed by Patriarch Tikhon in 1921, though I doubt, given the date of his letter, whether he had much time to peruse the details of her work.

⁹ This translation has the following note: κατὰ πάντα is better rendered by 'in relation to all' or 'in behalf of all', than by the usual version, 'in all'.

KATA PANTA KAI DIA PANTA

En tout et pour tout

[†Dom Placide de Meester 1925] [†Chevetogne 1947]

In all and for the sake of all

[†Archbishop Raya 1969]

Pour tout et en tout

[*Equipe de Catechèse Orthodoxe 1985]

Because of all and for all

[*Holy Transfiguration Monastery 1987]

In every way and for every thing

[*Australia 1996]

For all and in behalf of all

[*Australian Antiochian 1996]

On behalf of all and for all

[*Sourozh, 1999]

Dr Covell's translation and discussion are extremely interesting. His long and detailed *Account of the Present Greek Church*, which was published in a magnificent folio volume in Cambridge in 1722, has as part of its subtitles *compared with Jac. Goar's notes upon the Greek Ritual or Euchologion*. He is largely concerned to demonstrate that, contrary to the opinion of the learned Dominican, there is no Popish doctrine of transubstantiation in the Greek Liturgy.¹⁰ He is, nevertheless, no great admirer of Orthodox ritual. His description of the whole of the first part of the Liturgy is irresistible, 'Before [the Great Entrance], there is a very long, confused, incoherent piece of Pageantry, rather than solid and severe Devotion. ... In the Middle of this Theatrical Devotion comes in a Scene for reading the Epistle and Gospel'.

He has, however, a detailed knowledge of the liturgy and would appear to have been admitted to the Altar, both in Constantinople and on Mt Athos. His comment on our text is as follows, 'This I fancy (tua ex tuis, Thine of Thine) was taken up and inserted in *Justinian's* time, who having re-edified the *Cupelo* of St *Sophia*, and made a new Holy Table under it with Gold, Silver, precious Stones and all other Materials of immense value, wrote round about the side of it, *Thy Servants, O Christ, Justinian and Theodora offer unto Thee*

¹⁰ The entry in the DNB states that he had been asked by Gunning, Pearson and Sancroft to investigate whether the Greeks held the doctrine of transubstantiation. The writer in DNB remarks that his book 'was little read, for men had ceased to care for the questions it handled'. His manuscript journals, correspondence together with his accounts of his travels are preserved in the British Library [Add. 22910-14] and well repay study.

Thine of Thine, etc. And the Patriarch might probably insert this scrap from thence to flatter the *Emperor*. But if this Phrase was before in the Liturgy,¹¹ *Justinian's* Inscription fairly interprets it; viz. *that these Elements* were not after Consecration *Christ's Body and Blood* but meer *Bread and Wine, Creatures of God* as *Justinian's Gold and Silver and Jewels* were; and were, *as His*, offer'd unto him again. And the words here following, Offering to Thee, *Thine of Thine*, κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα, *in all things and for all things*, must signify that *all things*, whatever we offer to God, are *his Creatures*, or Gifts, or *from Him* and *for all things and purposes for which he hath order'd them to be.*' He says of Goar's note on this passage, 'He hooks in his *Transubstantiation* by this special Gloss'. This 'gloss', incidentally, is 'In sacrificio namque, nec nudus panis, neque Corpus Christi simpliciter, sed panis vere consecratus, & corpus Christi panis speciebus velatum, velut hostia mundi totius immolatur', 'for in the sacrifice it is neither mere bread, nor simply Christ's Body, but bread truly consecrated and the Christ's Body, veiled under the species of bread, sacrificed as a victim for the whole world'.¹²

With the exception of Dr Covell two and a half centuries ago, Athelstan Riley in 1922, the Archdiocese of Thyateira in 1995 and the Greek Archdiocese of Australia in 1996, the main weakness of all these versions is that they do not make it clear whether they take the two πάντα as masculine singular or neuter plural. It must of course be the latter. This is supported by the fact that the Slavonic has plurals. Many people, I suspect, understand 'all' — certainly the second — to refer to people rather than things.¹³ The translations by Neale and the Holy Transfiguration Monastery both seem to imply this. Since Slavonic, like Russian, does not distinguish gender here, both phrases can easily be taken as masculine, or feminine, rather than neuter. A Russian friend told me that she had always understood the words to be neuter plural, but that she had read somewhere that the former was masculine and the latter feminine. This would seem to be by confused analogy with the response to the Deacon after the reading of the diptychs, Ἦ βούχῃ ἡ βού, in Greek καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν.

From the point of view of Greek 'in all' may seem at first sight an odd way to translate κατὰ followed by the accusative πάντα, except as some sort of idiom. As an idiom the natural way to take it would, I suggest, be something like 'in every way', 'in all ways'. That this can be the meaning of the phrase is confirmed by many passages in ancient Greek. In Orthodox liturgical texts the idiom is found, for example, in a phrase in the Canon for St Joseph on the Sunday after Christmas, where the Saint is described as being

¹¹ Which of course it was!

¹² J. Goar *Euchologio, sive Rituale Graecorum* (2nd edition Venice 1730, reprinted 1960) p.119.

¹³ When I discussed this question in a paper to the Orthodox Institute in Cambridge, one of the audience said that I quite spoiled the phrase for them.

δίκαιος κατὰ πάντα καὶ ἀληθής, which can only mean ‘just in every way and true’, or ‘in all things’. Giving some such meaning to this phrase in the Liturgy leads naturally to taking the second phrase, διὰ πάντα, as meaning something like ‘by every means’, or even ‘for every reason’. I have not found a precise example, but if διὰ πολλὰ; means ‘for many reasons’, a meaning found in the classical language, it is perfectly natural to take διὰ πάντα as ‘for every reason’.

In fact the phrase should, as the grammarians say, be ‘taken closely’ with what follows rather than what precedes. That is, it should lead directly into the people’s “We praise you, we bless you”. This may be compared to the phrase, “singing, crying, shouting the triumphal hymn and saying”, which leads directly into “Holy, holy, holy” earlier in the Anaphora. This I find very attractive, and we may also compare the introductory dialogue to the Kiss of Peace, where again the priest’s words only make sense when completed by the people’s response, though here the verb is finite, ‘we may confess’, rather than a participle. To realise that this is the structure of the phrase does not solve the problem of translation, but to make the phrase modify what follows, especially if we use the correct text with the present participle, makes admirable theological and liturgical sense. The same phrase in almost the same words occurs in the Syriac of the Liturgy of St James, and Dr Sebastian Brock told me that in Syriac the last words would in fact go much better with what follows than with what precedes, though he said he had not thought of it until I suggested it. The Syriac is clearly neuter plural. In the Syriac Liturgy of St James the exchange is as follows:

Priest: We too, Lord, your weak and sinful servants, give you thanks and praise for all things and by reason of all things.

People: We glorify you, we bless you, we worship you, we believe in you. We pray you, Lord our God, be propitious, have mercy on us, and hear us.

The translation is Brightman’s, slightly adapted, but it is worth noting that the meaning of the Syriac is not unlike that which I suggest as the meaning of the Greek. There should therefore be a full point after “thanks and praise”, and a comma after “of all things”:

Priest: We too, Lord, your weak and sinful servants, give you thanks and praise. For all things and by reason of all things,

People: we glorify you, we bless you, we worship you, we believe in you. We pray you, Lord our God, be propitious, have mercy on us, and hear us.

What the first part of the phrase is saying is that we humans have absolutely nothing whatsoever that we can offer to God, except that which is

wholly and utterly his own; that there is no way in which we could offer something which was not his already. The second part of the phrase is not about for whom, or for what, we are offering, but rather affirms at the most solemn moment of the Liturgy our need to express in the most emphatic way our thanks and adoration of God for all that he has done for us.

This of course does not provide a translation. If my suggested exegesis is not wildly awry, then most current translations will not do, and we shall have to find something that will at first sound very unfamiliar to most of us. It will also have to have some of the “punch” and brevity of the original. Here I admit defeat. I have tried a number of different expressions, but none is entirely satisfactory. For example: ‘In all ways and by all ways’. Or ‘In every way and by every way’. I think the flat English “things” should be avoided where possible. One could try for something “freer”, like ‘wholly and completely’; but this would probably be felt to be too far from the original, though I think that we are here in the presence of an idiomatic expression which does in fact mean something like this. It is also worth underlining the fact that once it is accepted that the last words look **forward** to the people’s response, the apparent oddness of the phrase disappears. ‘In all things and for all things we praise you, we bless you’. A popular Russian commentary on the Liturgy of 1907 says of this phrase ‘the choir, finishing the words of the priest...’ and glosses *и за всѣ* by ‘benefits’, ‘for all that you have done for us’.

If this conclusion is correct, it has practical as well as theological implications for the celebration of the liturgy. As Trembelas points out, the reading *προσφέροντες* underlines the total involvement of the people in the Anaphora, so that the people take up and answer what is said by the priest, and he in his turn takes up their reply in the prayer that follows. This has three practical consequences. The first is that the celebrant must chant the end of his ekphosis in such a way that it leads into the people’s reply, and not with a full point. The second is that musical settings of ‘We praise you’ must be short. Most settings currently in use are fairly elaborate and drawn out, designed to ‘cover’ the silent recitation of the Invocation and the beginning of the Intercession. This is especially true of musical settings of the Slavonic, which have to ‘cover’ not only the Invocation itself, but also the preceding triple recitation of the troparion of the Third Hour and the verses from Psalm 50. The introduction of this troparion with the psalm verses is a late addition to the text of the Liturgy. Dom Placide de Meesters suggested that it dated from the 12th or 13th century, but Trembelas puts it later in the 15th or 16th.¹⁴ None of the numerous manuscripts cited by him that include the addition is earlier than the 16th century. It marks an increasing tendency in Orthodox theology, no doubt in large part as a result of controversy with the Latins, to emphasise the role

¹⁴ Trembelas, op. cit. 113.

of the Holy Spirit in the action of the Eucharist, and even to suggest that there is a “moment” of consecration. It is interesting that in a recent edition of the *Sluzebnik*, published with the blessing of the Patriarch in 2000, has bracketed the troparion and psalm verses, though the edition of 2004 does not. This tendency has had other affects on the text of the Liturgy at this point.

The evidence of our earliest manuscript of the liturgy of St John Chrysostom is not without interest.¹⁵ It gives a single ‘Amen’, by the people, only after the second word of institution, that over the Cup. The people, by this ‘Amen’, give this give their assent to the Lord’s command, ‘Take, eat’ and ‘Drink from this all of you’. The development into the present two ‘Amens’, one after each of the dominical words, is perfectly natural. On the other hand there is, so far as I am aware, no evidence that the ‘Amens’ associated with the Invocation have ever been part of the people’s liturgy. In the Codex Barberini there are two, one over the Bread and the other over the Cup, but they are attached directly to the priest’s ‘silent’ prayer; that is they are not even allocated to the deacon. It is worth noting that when the practice began of reciting the anaphora ‘silently’, the only parts that were still chanted aloud were those that called for the People’s response: the Tersanctus, the Words of Institution and ‘Offering you your own...’ This supports the idea that the ‘Amen’s at the Invocation have never been part of the People’s liturgy. The text of the Barberini manuscript is as follows:

The Priest says in a low voice:

Also we offer you this spiritual worship without shedding of blood, and we ask, pray and implore you: send down your Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts here set forth.

The Priest, standing upright, signs, saying in a low voice:

And make this bread the precious Body of your Christ, changing [it] by your Holy Spirit. Amen.

And what is in this Cup the precious Blood of your Christ, changing [it] by your Holy Spirit. Amen.

The Priest in a low voice:

So that those who partake of them may obtain vigilance of soul, forgiveness of sins, communion of the Holy Spirit, fullness of the Kingdom of heaven, freedom to speak in your presence, not judgement or condemnation.

The development into the present arrangement is again natural, but it was also, I think, increasingly influenced by the polemic with the Latins over the ‘moment’ of consecration. This is also to be seen in the Liturgy of St Basil, where in both Greek and Russian use the words ‘Changing them by your Holy Spirit’ have been quite gratuitously introduced from the Liturgy of St

¹⁵..Parenti, op. cit. 78.

KATA PANTA KAI DIA PANTA

John Chrysostom. This seems to occur first in the 15th century, when it is added to the end of the phrase 'poured out for the life of the world'. The development in Slavonic is further elaborated, and in the Moscow Patriarchate's recent editions of the *Sluzebnik* the text runs as follows:

Priest: We beg and implore you, O Holy of Holies, that by the good pleasure of your goodness, your Holy Spirit may come upon us and upon these gifts here set forth, and that he may bless and sanctify them and show:

Then bowing his head, the Deacon indicating the holy bread with his orarion and says : Bless, Master, the holy bread.

The Priest, signing the holy bread, says: This bread to be indeed the precious body of our Lord and God and Saviour, Jesus Christ,

Deacon: Amen.

And again the Deacon: Bless, Master, the holy cup.

The Priest again blesses and says: This cup indeed to be indeed the precious blood of our Lord and God and Saviour, Jesus Christ,

Deacon: Amen.

Priest: Poured out for the life of the world.

Deacon: Amen.¹⁶

Then the Deacon, indicating both holy things, says:
Master, bless both.

Priest, blessing both holy things with his hand, says:
Changing them by your Holy Spirit,

Deacon: Amen, Amen, Amen.

*And bowing his head the Deacon says to the Priest :*Remember me, a sinner, holy Master.

The ritual is further complicated by the fact the flow of the prayer is interrupted after the word 'show' by the insertion of the triple troparion with

¹⁶ The Greek *Ieratikon*, published in 1950 by the *Apostoloki Diakomia* in Athens says nothing here of the Deacon's various interventions, which are a later addition and have not made their way into the older manuscripts of the Liturgy of St Basil. Cf. Trembelas p.183. The "revised" *Ieratikon* of 1977 includes them all, and also includes the incorrect addition from St John's Liturgy "Changing them by your Holy Spirit" The Slavonic books have also "improved" St Basil's theology at this point, and so the error is found in the translations published by the Monastery of St John the Baptist, Tolleshunt Knights, and by Patrick Thompson for the Fellowship of Sts Alban and Sergius. The evidence is clearly set out by Trembelas, op. cit. 183-4. The *Mega Euchologion* published in Athens in 1970 (in effect a reprint of the Venetian edition of 1862) has a footnote condemning the intrusion of the sentence from St John Chrysostom's Liturgy. It supports its condemnation with a reference to St Nikodemos in the *Pedalion*, who, in a note on the 19th Canon of the Synod of Laodicea, says the addition is "ignorant and reckless" and the product of anti-Latin polemic. The latest edition of the Greek *Ieratikon*, published by the *Apostoloki Diakomia* in 2002, rejects the intrusion, for reasons given on p. 345. It retains the late addition of 'and salvation'. The addition is omitted in the translation issued by the diocese of Sourozh in 2000.

the verses of Psalm 50. The translation issued by the diocese of Sourozh does not follow the Moscow text precisely, but omits the addition from the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom.

In both Liturgies, even in the most recent stages of their development, the 'Amens' associated with the Invocation have never been allocated to the people. They are, I suggest, 'Amens' of a different kind to those after the words of Institution. Those at the words of Institution express the People's assent to the Lord's command to 'Take, eat', 'Take, drink'. Those at the Invocation are expressions of awe and reverence at the greatness of the Mystery. I once put this suggestion to Professor Phountoulis and he agreed with me. Again the implications are practical and theological. Unless we are careful, are we not in danger of creating, de facto, a 'moment' of consecration? Many Greek priests, even on Sundays, kneel rather than bow after the Invocation, and remain kneeling until the introduction to the hymn to the Mother of God¹⁷. Does this not also run the risk, of which the late Fr Schmemmann wrote in his book on the Eucharist, of concentrating on the presence of Christ as an end in itself, rather than on his Presence in order that we may eat and drink? After all the text of the Invocation ends, 'changing them by your Holy Spirit, so that those who partake may obtain vigilance of soul, ...' The important thing is to 'partake'. In the Thyateira translation we were careful to print the whole Invocation as one sentence, with the various parts separated by commas and lowercase characters, rather than full points and uppercase ones. Even punctuation can be theological.

ARCHIMANDRITE EPHREM

¹⁷ The latest Greek *Ieratikon* has a lengthy note, on page 345, on the practice of kneeling at this point, largely to justify its rubric after the Invocation, 'And they both make three genuflections [γονυκλισία]. The note, while correctly stating that none of the manuscripts or printed *Euchologia* mention 'kneeling', but only 'bowing', or 'bowing the head', at this point, forbids 'kneeling' during the Invocation itself on Sundays and during Pentecost, but permits 'metanias' after, not during, the Invocation. The Slavonic only mentions the Deacon 'bowing [his] head' before and after the Invocation.