

GABRIELE WINKLER

**SOME OF THE NEW FINDINGS CONCERNING THE
ARMENIAN ANAPHORAS AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE**

Historians seek to understand other people and cultures of earlier periods as they understood themselves and on their own terms, accessible to us through their specific languages and cultural manifestations. It does seem to me that one especially noteworthy aspect of the Christian Orient, enduring over centuries, is its adherence to the Christian faith and the spiritual centrality of worship day in day out, again accessible to us through the historical evolution of liturgies, enriched from early on already by credal statements.

It is to be regretted that, due to our completely secularized society, the liturgical traditions as one of the main contributors to the self-understanding and identity of the Christian East, is often neglected in today's rich panoply of studies on the Christian Orient.

Turning our attention to liturgical scholarship, it can be said that in the past three decades we have overcome long held convictions of an allegedly Cappadocian-Greek and exclusive Byzantine background of Armenia's Liturgy during the early formative period, investigating instead the Armenian evidence in the context of Armenia's ever oscillating interactions with its mighty neighbours Iran and the Roman-Byzantine empire. During this process we have learned to look no longer exclusively to the Greco-Roman orbit and Byzantium in order to explain the earliest strata of Armenia's liturgical evolution, but investigate much more closely also the other clues that point primarily to the Syriac substrata present in the earliest Armenian sources. For it is undeniably true that not only politically and socially but also liturgically Armenia formed part of the Iranian cultural orbit as well, implying thereby close ties with the Syrian Church of Mesopotamia. This includes, for example, the substrata of the Armenian Rites of Initiation¹ and the earliest Arme-

¹ Cf. **G. Winkler**, *Das armenische Initiationsrituale. Entwicklungsgeschichtliche und liturgievergleichende Untersuchung der Quellen des 3. bis 10. Jahrhunderts* (*Orientalia Chr. Analecta* 217, Rome 1982); *eadem*, "Die Tauf-Hymnen der Armenier. Ihre Affinität mit syrischem Gedankengut", in: **H. Becker, R. Kaczynski** (eds.), *Liturgie und Dichtung I* (*Pietas Liturgica* 1, St. Ottilien 1983), 381-419; *eadem*, "Der armenische Ritus:

nian Eucharistic Prayer which seemingly took shape via Syrian mediation, as the many clues suggest².

Moving now more closely to the Eucharistic Liturgy, we have to remember that initially neither the Liturgy of Chrysostom served as the main Eucharistic Prayer of the Byzantine Rite nor the Liturgy of Athanasius in the Armenian Church. Neither Liturgy formed center-stage during the formative period of the development of the Eastern Liturgies and for many centuries thereafter. Initially not the Liturgy of Chrysostom was used as principle Eucharistic Prayer in Byzantium but the Anaphora of Basil named after the famous Cappadocian Saint, and likewise in Armenia it was not the Liturgy of Athanasius but an Anaphora named after the most important Armenian Saint, Grigor Lusaworič', who according to the Armenian tradition baptized the royal House of the Arsacids.

Only at the turn of the tenth to eleventh century, the Anaphora of Chrysostom supplanted in significance the Anaphora of Basil in the Byzantine tradition, taking over first place from the Anaphora of Basil as the principal liturgy, as also in the Armenian Rite the Anaphora of Athanasius assumed priority over the Anaphora of Grigor Lusaworič' from the ninth to tenth century on³.

Bestandsaufnahme und neue Erkenntnisse sowie einige kürzere Notizen zur Liturgie der Georgier", in: **R. F. Taft** (ed.), *The Christian East: Its Institutions and its Thought. A Critical Reflection. Papers of the International Scholarly Congress for the 75th Anniversary of the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome, 30 May - 5 June 1993* (*Orientalia Chr. Analecta* 251, Rome 1995), 265-298.

² Cf. **G. Winkler**, *Die Basilius-Anaphora. Edition der beiden armenischen Redaktionen und der relevanten Fragmente, Übersetzung und Zusammenschau aller Versionen im Licht der orientalischen Überlieferungen* (*Anaphorae Orientales II, Anaphorae Armeniacae* 2, Rome 2005); *eadem*, "Armenia's Liturgy at the Crossroads of Neighbouring Churches", *Orientalia Chr. Periodica* 74 (2008), 363-387; *eadem*, "A Decade of Research on the Armenian Rite 1993-2003", in: **R. F. Taft** (ed.), *The Formation of a Millennial Tradition: 1700 Years of Armenian Christian Witness [301-2001]* (*Orientalia Chr. Analecta* 271, Rome 2004), 183-210.

³ For the date of the shift from the Liturgy of Basil to Chrysostom as the main Eucharistic Prayer in the Byzantine tradition at the turn of the 10th-11th cent. cf. **R.F. Taft**, *The Great Entrance. A History of the Transfer of Gifts and Other Preanaphoral Rites of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom* (*Orientalia Chr. Analecta* 200, Rome 1994), xxxii; for a new assessment of the date see now, however, the contribution of **M. Zheltov**, "The Rite of the Eucharistic Liturgy in the Oldest Russian Leitourgica", in: **B. Groen, St. Hawkes-Teeples, St. Alexopoulos** (eds.), *Inquiries into Eastern Christian Worship. Selected Papers of the Second International Congress of the Society of Oriental Liturgy, Rome, Sept. 17-21, 2008* (*Eastern Chr. Studies* 12, Leuven 2012), 293-310; for the shift from the Anaphora of Gregory the Illuminator to the Liturgy of Athanasius in the

The attribution of the initial Armenian Anaphora to Gregory the Illuminator in the Armenian manuscripts deserves particular attention for two reasons: the attribution suggests an obvious desire to provide greatest possible authority to her liturgical tradition and it implies the attempt to associate Armenia's liturgy with orthodoxy.

This concern for "orthodoxy" manifests itself by no means just among the Armenians alone, but it is present in the Byzantine Eucharistic tradition as well, allowing similar observations regardless of Greek claims of Saint Basil's authorship of this anaphora: the attribution of the main Eucharistic Prayer to Basil, Cappadocia's greatest Saint, undoubtedly has something to do with the onset of the fourth century Christological disputes and the struggle for orthodoxy in the attempt to overcome Arianism.

The basic Christology in the Anaphora of Basil seems to be slightly earlier than the Christological tenets of Saint Basil himself, and they apparently pertain not to Cappadocia but to the Antiochene struggle for orthodoxy in the aftermath of the Council of Nicea.

This Antiochene Christology is present throughout the entire Anaphora and in *all* versions, the longer Armenian, Syriac, and Byzantine versions of the Anaphora of Basil, *and* in the short Egyptian redactions⁴.

The main prayers of the Anaphora of Basil, in particular the Prayer after the Sanctus, but other parts as well, reflect the Christological position of the Antiochene Synod in 341, summoned in the aftermath of and opposition to the Nicene Council in 325, as I have shown in detail in my investigations of the Anaphora of Basil⁵.

Armenian tradition during the 9th-10th cent. cf. **S. P. Cowe**, *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy by Xosrov Anjewac'i. Translated with an Introduction (Armenian Church Classics, New York 1991)*, 23-24; **H.-J. Feulner**, *Die armenische Athanasius-Anaphora. Kritische Edition, Übersetzung und liturgievergleichender Kommentar (Anaphorae Orientales I, Anaphorae Armeniacae 1, Rome 2001)*, 79; **G. Winkler**, "On the Formation of the Armenian Anaphoras: A Completely Revised and Updated Overview," *Studi sull'Oriente Cristiano* 11/2 (2007), 97-130, here: 121-122 with n. 136.

⁴ Cf. **Winkler**, *Die Basilius-Anaphora*, 24-25, 866-868; *eadem*, "The Antiochene Synods and the Early Armenian Creeds Including the 'Rezeptionsgeschichte' of the Synod of Antioch 341 in the Armenian Version of the Anaphora of Basil," *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* III/3 (2006), 275-298.

⁵ Cf. **Winkler**, *Die Basilius-Anaphora*, 24-25, 866-868; *eadem*, "Fragen zur zeitlichen Priorität der ägyptischen Textgestalt gegenüber den längeren Versionen der Basilius-Anaphora", in: *Acts of the First International Congress of the Society for Oriental Liturgies [Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata III/4 (2007)]*, 243-273, 243-273,

The widespread attribution of these Anaphoras to the most authoritative figures of the time as guarantors of "orthodoxy" as, for example, the attribution to Saint Basil in the Byzantine tradition; or, as in the Armenian manuscript tradition, its attribution to St. Gregory, "the Illuminator" of the Armenian people; moreover, the claim that some Liturgies even go back to Apostolic times, as is the case with the Anaphora of "James, the brother of the Lord", or that other anaphoras are connected with other apostles; all these attributions have apparently more to do with the claim for authority in the context of a divided Christianity than with historical facts⁶.

For many centuries, the Anaphora of Basil formed center-stage not only in the Byzantine Rite, but also in the Alexandrian tradition. Moreover, the Anaphora of Basil has come down to us in virtually all the languages of the Christian East, the most important being⁷

the *short Alexandrian* version (in Greek, Coptic, Ethiopic)⁸;

the *longer* redaction extant not only in two different Armenian texts, namely in an older and a younger translation⁹;

here: 247-260; *eadem*, "The Antiochene Synods and the Early Armenian Creeds Including the 'Rezeptionsgeschichte' of the Synod of Antioch 341", 275-298.

⁶ Cf. **G. Winkler**, *Die armenische Liturgie des Sahak. Edition des Cod. arm. 17 von Lyon, Übersetzung und Vergleich mit der armenischen Basilius-Anaphora unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der östlichen Quellen zum "Sancta sanctis" (Anaphorae Orientales III, Anaphorae Armeniacae 3, Rome 2011)*, 432; *eadem*, "Preliminary Observations About the Relationship Between the Liturgies of St. Basil and St. James," *Orientalia Chr. Periodica* 76 (2010), 5-55, here: 7.

⁷ H. Engberding had established the four most important versions of the Anaphora of Basil in his seminal 1931 dissertation: cf. **Engberding**, *Das Eucharistische Hochgebet der Basileiosliturgie. Textgeschichtliche Untersuchung und kritische Ausgabe (Theologie des Christlichen Ostens. Texte und Untersuchungen, Münster 1931)*: LXXXVII; for an overview and assessment of Engberding's pioneering study cf. **Winkler**, *Die Basilius-Anaphora*, 9-21.

⁸ Cf. **A. Budde**, *Die ägyptische Basilius-Anaphora. Text – Kommentar – Geschichte (Jerusalem Theologisches Forum 7, Münster 2004)*; for my detailed review cf. *Oriens Christianus* 89 (2005), 264-275; *eadem*, *Die Basilius-Anaphora*, 30-37. For the Sahidic version cf. moreover, **J. Doresse – E. Lanne**, "Un témion archaïque de la liturgie copte de S. Basile." En annexe: les liturgies "basiliennes et saint Basile" par **B. Capelle**, *Bibliothèque du Muséon* 47 (Louvain 1960), 10-75; for the Ethiopic version cf. **S. Euringer**, "Die äthiopische Anaphora des hl. Basilius nach vier Handschriften herausgegeben, übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen," *Orientalia Christiana* 36 [Nr. 98] (1934), 135-223.

⁹ Cf. **Winkler**, *Die Basilius-Anaphora*: Foreword (v-viii); Table of Content (ix-xxiv); Bibliography (xxv-lx); Status Quaestionis (1-37); Methodology (38-52); Overview on the extant Armenian Manuscripts and Fragments (53-132); Edition and translation of

but also in a Syriac translation¹⁰;
and in a Byzantine Greek version¹¹.

These manifold redactions of the Anaphora of Basil clearly show the eminent position of this Liturgy within the Eucharistic tradition.

Now, the oldest Armenian Anaphora, attributed to Saint Gregory “the Illuminator” in the Armenian manuscripts, belongs in reality to one of the most important redactions of the Anaphora of Basil, thereby assuming a central place in the transmission of the Anaphora of Basil.

I. The Significance of the First Armenian Redaction of the Anaphora of Basil (arm Bas I)

Not only the first Armenian version but sometimes also the second redaction is of considerable significance for they allow glimpses into the original structure and formulation and thereby pristine meaning of some parts of the Anaphora of Basil. Here are several examples:

1. The Opening of the Anaphora

The Opening of the Anaphora generally consists of the diaconal admonition (“In fear let us stand”) followed by the Dialogue between the celebrant and the faithful with its centre-piece: “Sursum corda”. Virtually all the publications on the subject have claimed that this Dialogue serves as an introduction to the ‘ἀναφορά’, i.e. to the oblation of bread and wine on the altar.

Now, the new studies on the Eastern anaphoras, in particular the recent investigations on the East-Syrian Anaphora of Addai and Mari and the Anaphora of Basil have shown that initially neither the Anaphora of Basil nor Addai and Mari contained any reference to an ‘oblatio’ (= ἀναφορά) in the Opening¹².

In addition, the first Armenian version (**arm Bas I**) adds to the admonition: “In fear let us stand” the intriguing call: ‘*Let us look with attention*’ and the answer: ‘*To you, o God*’.

the first Armenian redaction (135-197); Edition and translation of the second Armenian redaction (199-275); Comprehensive Commentary (277-861); Summaries (862-882); Indices (885-901).

¹⁰ For the Syriac version we are still dependent on **I. E. Rahmani**, *Missale iuxta Ritum Ecclesiae Apostolicae Antiochenae Syrorum* (Sharfé 1922).

¹¹ A critical edition of the oldest Greek manuscript (*Barb. gr. 336*, 8th cent.) was provided by **St. Parenti and E. Velkovska** (eds.), *L’Euclologio Barberini gr. 336* (BELS 80, Rome, second ed., 2000)

¹² For Addai and Mari (**syr Ap-An**) and also **syr TheoMop + syr Nest** cf. **Winkler**, *Die Basilius-Anaphora*, 291-313; for **Bas**, 286-290, 313-315, 331.

These two facts (the original absence of any reference to an “oblation” in the Opening of the East-Syrian Anaphora of Addai and Mari and the Armenian plus Egyptian versions of Basil), combined with the invitation: ‘*Let us look* with attention – *To you*, o God’ in the oldest Armenian version of Basil) warranted closer scrutiny begging for an explanation: What purpose serves this Dialogue? Was this Dialogue really meant as an introduction to the offering of bread and wine on the altar as was generally assumed? The close analysis of the Armenian and Syriac vocabulary and the structure of this part showed that this Dialogue had originally the function to introduce the theme of the ‘Heavenly Liturgy of the Angels’ in the both liturgical traditions, the East-Syrian Anaphora and the original text of the Anaphora of Basil. In these liturgical texts traces of the original intention of this Dialogue have survived, namely the Opening as inauguration to the ‘Liturgy of the Angels in Heaven’, which only later on became reworked by interpolating the theme of the oblation of bread and wine.

Originally the Opening served as an introduction to the ‘Heavenly Liturgy’ of the Angels with its climatic highpoint in the *Qedušša*¹³, as the older Armenian version of the Anaphora of Basil suggests, corroborated by the similar traces in the East-Syrian anaphoras.

However, given the increasing significance of the concept of the ‘Offering’ with its reference to the ‘Institution Narrative’ (the latter being absent in Addai and Mari) the Opening became reshaped by introducing the theme of ‘*Thanksgiving*’ in reference to the ‘*Offering*’, the ‘*Anaphora*’. Originally there was no mentioning of the offering at the Initial Dialogue of the Anaphora of Basil (as the Egyptian + the older Armenian version show) or in the Anaphora of Addai and Mari.

The admonition ‘*Let us lift up*’ or hearts, in addition the admonition in the Armenian text: ‘*Let us look* with attention – *To you*, o God’ fits much better the theme of beholding what is happening *above in heaven* (namely the worship of God by the Angels) than the theme of the oblation of bread and wine *on the altar*. The pristine formulation of the Opening in these liturgies suggests that the faithful should become aware of what is happening *above in heaven*: namely the Praise of God by the highest ranks of Angels. According to the original intent, traces of which are still present in the above mentioned Eucharistic Prayers, we should lift up our hearts (or: minds) in order to witness how the highest ranks of

¹³ *Ibid.*, 279-350.

Angels worship God, culminating in the exclamation of the ‘Thrice-Holy’, the Sanctus. With the admonition: ‘Lift up your hearts (or: minds)’ the faithful should begin the journey up into heaven in order to ‘see’ and ‘hear’ how the Angels adore and praise God in order to imitate them.

In contrast to this initial intent of the Opening, the later interpolated theme of the *Oblation of bread and wine* culminating in the ‘Institution Narrative’, brought with it also the concept of Thanksgiving, whereas *the Angels* before the throne of God *do not give Thanks but worship Him by praising Him*¹⁴.

2. The Liturgy of the Angels

The close analysis of this Heavenly Liturgy of the Angels moored in the visions of the OT prophets, in particular of Isaiah (chap. 6, 2-3) and Ezekiel (chapt. 1+3), showed once more how significant the older Armenian version of the Anaphora of Basil (**arm Bas I**) is, since it is the Armenian version which holds the key to a better understanding of the original structure and meaning of the worship of the Angels, the Heavenly Liturgy imitated by the faithful, which constitute the pristine central part of the Prayer before the Sanctus.

Now contrary to the hitherto held assumption that the angels mentioned in the “ante Sanctus” are grouped in *triads* allegedly influenced by Ps. Dionysios, the presence of *pairs* of angels in the Anaphora of Basil is much older than the testimony of triads in Ps. Dionysios. There seemingly exists a very old layer of the “Liturgy of the Angels in Heaven” which later on became even expanded¹⁵. The highest ranks of the angels consist of the *pair* of the Cherubim and the Seraphim, referred to with good reason in that order, for according to Ezekiel (3:12) the Cherubim “praise” (εὐλογεῖν) God, leading up to the exclamation of the thrice “Holy” (Is 6:3) by the Seraphim in the Anaphoras, attested for the first time in the Anaphora of Addai and Mari.

Another striking feature is the fact that specific verbs are allocated to the worship of these angels which is imitated by the faithful as the vocabulary clearly demonstrates. The older Armenian version begins the praise of God by the faithful with just one single verb of praise in the in-

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 298.

¹⁵ For the evolution of the “Heavenly Liturgy” cf. **Winkler**, *Die Basilius-Anaphora*, 279-451; for the function of the angels cf. 452-516; summary concerning Bas, 508-516.

finitive: “to glorify you” (*p’araworel* = δοξάζειν)¹⁶, in contrast to all the other versions which offer an entire string of praise-verbs in the indicative (cf. **byz Bas**: αἰνεῖν, ὑμνεῖν, εὐλογεῖν, προσκυνεῖν, εὐχαριστεῖν, δοξάζειν)¹⁷.

At the conclusion of the praise of God by the people, the older Armenian version has the verb *awrhnen* (cf. εὐλογεῖν), seemingly modelled after the praise of the highest ranks of angels, the Cherubim and Seraphim, immediately before the Sanctus (here in both Armenian versions), which is absent in the other versions¹⁸. In connection with the *other* ranks of angels just *one* verb, namely προσκυνεῖν, is mentioned, which occurs in all versions of this anaphora (with the exception of the Byzantine text, which has αἰνοῦσιν)¹⁹.

Hence in the older Armenian version the worship of God by the faithful is limited to the verb (*p’araworel* = δοξάζειν), whereas the lower ranks of the angels, arranged in pairs, “adore” God (*erkir paganen* cf. προσκυνεῖν), and the highest ranks of the angels, the Cherubim and Seraphim, “praise” (*awrhnen* cf. εὐλογεῖν) him²⁰.

These verbs in the Armenian version are exactly mirroring the verbs in the East-Syrian Anaphora of Addai and Mari. According to Macomber's reconstruction, the *Oratio ante Sanctus of Addai and Mari* began with: “Glory be to Thee (*Kl ajbwç*)”²¹ yet very likely it was once not a substantive but the verb δοξάζειν, which in the Syriac liturgical tradition generally replaces εὐλογεῖν²².

The lower ranks of the angels, referred to in Addai and Mari as the “upper beings”, “adore” (*Nydgh* = προσκυνεῖν) God whereas the highest ranks, namely the Cherubim and Seraphim (duplicated by the “camps and servants” due to the Targumim), “glorify” (*Nyjbcm* cf. δοξάζουσιν) God²³.

¹⁶ Cf. **Winkler**, *Die Basilius-Anaphora*, 140/141, 442-445, 447, see in addition: 388-392, 416-417, 431-451, 871.

¹⁷ Cf. **Parenti – Velkovska**, *L’Eucologio Barberini gr.* 336, 64.

¹⁸ Cf. **Winkler**, *Die Basilius-Anaphora*, 438, 442, 444-445.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 438, 442-445; **Parenti – Velkovka**, *L’Eucologio Barberini gr.* 336, 64.

²⁰ Here **arm Bas I** has 3 verbs, whereas the original single verb is preserved in **arm Bas II**; cf. **Winkler**, *Die Basilius-Anaphora*, 438, 442.

²¹ Cf. **W. F. Macomber**, “The Ancient Form of the Anaphora of the Apostles”, in: **N. Garsoïan – Th. Matthews – R. Thomson** (eds.), *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period* (Washington 1982), 77-88.

²² Cf. **Winkler**, *Die Basilius-Anaphora*, 413, 415-417, 431-434, 437-439, 450-451, 871.

²³ *Ibid.*, 432 with notes 30-31, 463-477, 872.

Thus the Armenian redaction has, with regard to the verbs used in the context of the praise of God, considerable affinity with the East-Syrian tradition, as the comparison between the Armenian version of Basil and the Anaphora of Addai and Mari indicates. No other redaction of Basil shows such close affinity with the East-Syrian tradition as is the case with the Armenian redactions.

In addition, all the longer versions of the Anaphora of Basil (not, however, the Egyptian redactions) indicate that the Sanctus is *brought forth* by the *movement* of the wings of the Seraphim²⁴. This tradition has its roots in the Targumim of Is 6:2 + Ez 1:24, which again points toward Syrian mediation²⁵.

A good many other parallels could be mentioned here, as for example, the shape and original function of the Epiclesis, where the second Armenian version (**arm Bas II**) and the early manuscripts of the Byzantine redaction (**byz Bas**) assume priority over against the first Armenian version (**arm Bas I**) which has abandoned, at the Epiclesis, the genuine tradition of the Anaphora of Basil interpolating instead the vocabulary of the (Syriac version) of the Anaphora of James.

II. The New Findings With Regard to the Importance of the Armenian Liturgy of James

By the end of 2013 my book-length investigation of all the versions of the Liturgy of James has appeared²⁶, after the publication of the Anaphora of Basil in 2005²⁷ and the Armenian Liturgy of Sahak in 2011²⁸, all of them edited and analysed on the basis of the extant Armenian manuscripts²⁹.

Here are some of the new findings concerning the Armenian version of the Liturgy of James in the context of the other versions:

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 463-464, 471-476, 872.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 463-482, 872.

²⁶ Cf. **G. Winkler**, *Die Jakobus-Liturgie in ihren Überlieferungssträngen. Edition des Cod. arm. 17 von Lyon, Übersetzung und Liturgievergleich (Anaphorae Orientales IV, Anaphorae Armeniacae 4, Rome 2013)*. See now also the English short summary: "A New Study of the Liturgy of James", *Orientalia Chr. Periodica* 80 (2014), 23-33.

²⁷ Cf. **Winkler**, *Die Basilius-Anaphora* (as note 2 above).

²⁸ Cf. **G. Winkler**, *Die armenische Liturgie des Sahak. Edition des Cod. arm. 17 von Lyon, Übersetzung und Vergleich mit der armenischen Basilius-Anaphora unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der östlichen Quellen zum "Sancta sanctis" (Anaphorae Orientales III, Anaphorae Armeniacae 3, Rome, 2011)*.

²⁹ Cf. **Winkler**, *Die Basilius-Anaphora*, 53-130; **eadem**, *Die Jakobus-Liturgie*, 31-35; **eadem**, *Die Liturgie des Sahak*, 33-47.

(1) The Armenian redaction is based on a Syriac *Vorlage*, a fact already known through A. Baumstark's article of 1918, yet Baumstark's hypothesis that the Armenian redaction has something to do with the Syrian Julianists and Julianos of Halikarnassos³⁰ could not be verified by the closer analysis of the Armenian text of this liturgy. The next question, of course, centered around the problem: which Syriac version actually served the Armenian compiler as a model for the Armenian text? Was it the well known longer redaction, edited by O. Heiming, or was it the shorter Syriac version, edited by A. Raes³¹? The short Syriac version, which so far had been *a priori* excluded from all the studies on the Liturgy of James because of A. Raes's claim in his *Prolegomena* to his edition of the text that this short version was entirely irrelevant for allegedly being just an insignificant shortened text deriving from the longer version which it faithfully follows³².

(2) Before this question could be satisfactorily addressed and solved, the Syriac texts of both versions had to be more closely investigated which never had been done before. And precisely the detailed analysis of the vocabulary and expressions of both versions, while comparing them also for the first time to the other versions in Armenian, Ethiopic, and Greek in greater detail, showed that the short Syriac version does by no means always faithfully follow the longer Syriac text as A. Raes had suggested³³.

Even more decisive was the observation that the short Syriac version, while differing from the longer version, was in agreement with the Armenian and / or Ethiopic versions³⁴. These unexpected congruencies of the short Syriac version with the Armenian and Ethiopic texts, while deviating from the longer Syriac version, even suggested at several places, that the shorter Syriac version possibly reflects an older layer than the longer Syriac redaction. These unexpected observations led to a new appraisal of the significance of the shorter Syriac version. Particularly

³⁰ Cf. **A. Baumstark**, "Denkmäler altarmenischer Meßliturgie: 3. Die armenische Rezension der Jakobusliturgie" (1918), 1-32, here 6-8; **Winkler**, *Die Jakobus-Liturgie*, 19-20, 26-28.

³¹ Cf. **O. Heiming**, "Anaphora syriaca sancti Iacobi Fratris Domini", in: *Anaphorae Syriacae* II/2 (1953), 105-177; **A. Raes**, "Anaphora syriaca minor sancti Iacobi Fratris Domini", in: *Anaphorae Syriacae* II/2 (1953), 181-209.

³² Cf. **Raes**, "Anaphora syriaca minor", 183-190, especially 187-189; **Winkler**, *Die Jakobus-Liturgie*, 17, 23-26; *eadem*, "A New Study of the Liturgy of James", 26-27.

³³ Cf. **Winkler**, *Die Jakobus-Liturgie*, 17, 23-24, 558-559; *eadem*, "A New Study of the Liturgy of James", 26-27.

³⁴ Cf. **Winkler**, *Die Jakobus-Liturgie*, 25-26, 560-569.

noteworthy was the fact that the short Syriac version still contains the original 5th century vocabulary for expressing the incarnation [*Lâiijh* (“he was embodied “)] in contrast to the longer Syriac text which already witnesses the neologism of the 6th century [*N.fjh* (“he was *enfleshed*”)]³⁵. In addition, there are several other conspicuous traits, all of which possibly point to an earlier date for the short Syriac text than the longer version, the latter showing already several parallels with the Greek version, which are absent in the short Syriac, Armenian, and / or Ethiopic texts.

These findings suggest that the Armenian and the Ethiopic version alike, seemingly manifest in their manifold congruencies with the short Syriac version sometimes an older Syriac witness of the Liturgy of James than the testimony contained in the long Syriac version, the latter forming with the Greek and Georgian redactions a later witness of the Liturgy of James.

(3) Another unexpected discovery has to do with the observation that the compiler of the Armenian version of the Liturgy of James used next to one of the short Syriac redactions also the old Armenian version of the Anaphora of Basil³⁶. As a matter of fact, the Armenian text of the Liturgy of James does not only depend throughout the entire liturgy heavily on the Armenian Anaphora of Basil in its older version but follows it verbatim at many places³⁷.

Yet not just the Armenian Liturgy of James is dependent on the older Armenian Anaphora of Basil, but also other Armenian Anaphoras as, for example, the Armenian Anaphora of Athanasius (as the dissertation of H.-J. Feulner has shown)³⁸ or the Armenian Liturgy of Sahak³⁹. Hence recent scholarship has come to the conclusion that several Armenian Liturgies were considerably influenced precisely by that Liturgy, which in the Armenian manuscripts became attributed to Grigor Lusaworič‘. Yet in reality this Liturgy named after the most important Armenian Saint belongs to one of the crucial witnesses of the Anaphora of Basil.

³⁵ Cf. **Raes**, “Anaphora syriaca minor”, 194/195; **Winkler**, *Die Jakobus-Liturgie*, 25-26, 565-566.

³⁶ Cf. **Winkler**, *Die Jakobus-Liturgie*, 26-28, 569-575; *eadem*, “A New Study of the Liturgy of James”, 28-30.

³⁷ Cf. **Winkler**, *Die Jakobus-Liturgie*, 26-27, 569-575.

³⁸ Cf. **H.-J. Feulner**, *Die armenische Athanasius-Anaphora. Kritische Edition, Übersetzung und liturgie-vergleichender Kommentar (Anaphorae Orientales I, Anaphorae Armeniacae I, Rome 2001)*.

³⁹ Cf. **Winkler**, *Die Liturgie des Sahak*, 4-7, 31-32, 417-428.

In addition, one of the other more striking features concerns the problem of “Orthodoxy”: each one of these Liturgies, be it the Greek Liturgy of Basil named after the Cappadocian Saint, be it the Armenian Liturgies attributed to Grigor Lusaworič, or to Athanasius, or to the famous Armenian Patriarch Sahak, or to the Apostle James and brother of the Lord, – all these liturgies sought to emphasize their ties with “Orthodoxy” by attributing their liturgies either directly to the authoritative figures of Apostolic times, such as the attribution of the Liturgy to James the brother of the Lord, or to the most outstanding defenders of what was then perceived as the orthodox Christological position of the time, beginning with Basil, the eminent Cappadocian Saint, and his attempt to overcome the deadlock after the Council of Nicea, or to Athanasius, the famous Alexandrian defender of the Nicene Creed against a mighty and predominantly Antiochene opposition, or the eminent Armenian Patriarch Sahak with his hellenophile leanings.

The exhaustive analysis of these Liturgies, in particular the investigation of the Anaphora attributed to Grigor Lusaworič, in reality an important version of the so-called Anaphora of Basil, illuminates in fascinating detail the struggle for “Orthodoxy” and the attempt to clarify the Christological tenets in the aftermath of the Nicene Council: the Christological formulae in the various parts of the Anaphora of Basil, in particular the Prayer after the Sanctus and the Anamnesis, but other parts as well, clearly reflect the Christological position of the Antiochene Synod of 341.

Գաբրիելե Վինկլեր
Որոշ նշգրտումներ հայոց «Պատարագ»-ի տարբերակների և դրանց նշանակության վերաբերյալ

Միսակարգային ավանդույթներն անկասկած եղել (և որոշակի չափով այժմ էլ մնում են) Քրիստոնյա Արևելքի հիմնական առանձնահատկություններից մեկը: Արևմտյան հասարակությունների աշխարհիկացման հետևանքով Քրիստոնյա Արևելքի այսօրվա բազմաթիվ ուսումնասիրություններում այս փաստի կարևորությունը հաճախ անտեսվում է:

Վերջին երեք տասնամյակներում մեզ հաջողվել է հաղթահարել կազմավորման շրջանի հայկական արարողակարգի՝ իբր կապալագովկյան-հունական և բացառապես բյուզանդական ծագման մասին երկարամյա համոզմունքը: Այս ընթացքում մեզ համար սովորական է դարձել հայկական ձևի զարգացումը բացատրելու համար փնտրել նաև այլ ուղեցույցներ, առաջին հերթին՝ հնա-

գույն հայկական աղբյուրներում առկա ասորական ենթաշերտում: Չէ՞ որ անհերքելի ճշմարտություն է, որ Հայաստանն իրանական մշակութային ծիրի մաս է կազմել ոչ միայն սոցիալ-քաղաքական, այլև ծիսական բնագավառներում, ինչը սերտ կապեր է ենթադրում Միջագետքի Ասորական եկեղեցու հետ: Սա ներառում է, օրինակ, հավատո հնագույն հանգանակների ձևավորումը, ընծայության հայկական ծեսերի ենթաշերտերը և հայկական ամենավաղ հաղորդության աղոթքը, որը, թվում է, ձևավորվել է ասորականով միջնորդավորված:

Քաջ հայտնի է, որ մինչև Աթանասին վերագրված հայկական Պատարագի կազմավորման, կենտրոնական դերը պատկանել է Գրիգոր Լուսավորչի անունով հայտնի Պատարագին: Իրականում սա Բարսեղի Պատարագի ամենակարևոր վկայություններից մեկն է, որը սովորաբար կոչում են առաջին հայերեն թարգմանություն, ի տարբերություն Բարսեղի Պատարագի երկրորդ թարգմանության:

Նախկինում համարվել է, որ Գրիգոր Լուսավորչին վերագրված այս Պատարագը Բարսեղի Պատարագի բյուզանդական տարբերակի ուղղակի թարգմանությունն է: Սակայն պահպանված հայերեն պատատիկների և ձեռագրերի նոր քննական հրատարակությունը՝ մանրակրկիտ մեկնությունների ուղեկցությամբ, ցույց տվեց, որ այս Պատարագի տարբեր մասեր ձևավորվել են ասորական միջնորդությամբ, երբեմն արտացոլելով ավելի վաղ մի շերտ, քան Բարսեղի Պատարագի ամենահին պահպանված բյուզանդական ձեռագրերը:

Բարսեղի Պատարագի տարբերակները՝ 2005 թ. այս հրատարակությունից հետո 2011 թ. լույս տեսան հայերեն մյուս Պատարագները, ինչպես օրինակ, Սահակի Պատարագամատուցը և 2013 թ. վերջին՝ Հակոբի Պատարագամատուցը: Բոլորը հրատարակվել և վերլուծվել են պահպանված հայերեն ձեռագրերի հիման վրա և համեմատվել Բարսեղի ու Հակոբի պատարագների մյուս լեզուներով հայտնի բնագրերի հետ:

Ահա այդ պատարագներին վերաբերող ամենակարևոր նորությունները.

(1) Սահակի Պատարագամատուցն ամանցյալ է ոչ թե Բարսեղի Պատարագի բյուզանդական տարբերակից, այլ Բարսեղի Պատարագի առաջին հայերեն թարգմանությունից:

(2) Հակոբի Պատարագամատուցի հայերեն թարգմանությունը հիմնված է Հակոբի Պատարագի ասորերեն համառոտ տարբերակի և Բարսեղի Պատարագի առաջին հայերեն թարգմանության վրա:

(3) Ոչ միայն Հակոբի հայերեն Պատարագամատուցն է հիմնված Բարսեղի Պատարագի հայերեն առաջին խմբագրության վրա, այլև մի քանի ուրիշ հայերեն պատարագներ, ինչպես, օրինակ, Աթանասի հայերեն Պատարագը կամ Սահակի հայերեն Պատարագը: Այսպիսով վերջին ուսումնասիրությունները բերել են այն եզրահանգման, որ մի քանի հայերեն պատարագ կրել է հատկապես

այն Պատարագի ազդեցությունը, որը հայերեն ձեռագրերում վերագրվել է Գրիգոր Լուսավորչին, իսկ իրականում, ինչպես տեսանք, Բարսեղի Պատարագի ամենակարևոր վկայություններից մեկն է:

(4) Բացի այդ ամենակարևորն այստեղ «ուղղափառության» խնդիրն է: Այս պատարագներից յուրաքանչյուրը լինի դա կապագովկացի սրբի անունով հանդես եկող հունարեն Բարսեղի Պատարագը, թե Գրիգոր Լուսավորչին կամ Աթանասին կամ հայտնի Սահակ հայրապետին, կամ Հակոբ առաքյալին (կամ Տեառնեղբորը), վերագրված հայերեն պատարագները, այս բոլոր պատարագները ձգտում էին շեշտել իրենց կապն «ուղղափառության» հետ՝ վերագրելով իրենց հեղինակությունը կամ ուղղակիորեն առաքելական ժամանակների անձանց, ինչպես Տեառնեղբայր Հակոբին, կամ ժամանակի ամենաուղղափառ քրիստոսաբանական դիրքորոշման ամենաերևելի պաշտպաններին՝ սկսած հայտնի կապագովկյան սուրբ Բարսեղից՝ Նիկիայի ժողովից հետո առաջացած լճացումը հաղթահարելու նրա ջանքերով, կամ Աթանասին, որը հզոր՝ գերազանցապես անտիոքյան դիրքորոշումից նիկիական հանգանակի հայտնի ալեքսանդրյան պաշտպանն էր, կամ հայոց պատրիարք Սահակին՝ նրա հունասեր ձգտումներով:

Այս Պատարագամատուցների, առաջին հերթին Գրիգոր Լուսավորչին վերագրված Պատարագի (իրականում այսպես կոչված Բարսեղի Պատարագի մի կարևոր տարբերակի), սպառիչ քննությունը զարմանալի հստակությամբ լուսաբանում է պայքարն ի շահ «ուղղափառության» և Նիկիայի ժողովից հետո քրիստոսաբանական ուսմունքը հստակեցնելու ճիգերը. Բարսեղի Պատարագի տարբեր մասերում հանդիպող քրիստոսաբանական բանաձևերը, հատկապես «Սուրբ, սուրբ»-ից և «յիշեա Տէր»-ից հետո, բայց և այլուր, հստակորեն արտացոլում են Անտիոքի 341 թ. ժողովի քրիստոսաբանական դիրքորոշումը: