

A New Coptic Anaphora Fragment with Quotations from *Didache 9* (London, British Library, Or. 6877)*

Ágnes T. MIHÁLYKÓ

Keywords: *Anaphora*, *Didache*, *Coptic Liturgy*, *Sabidic manuscripts*, *Euchologion*

1. *Introduction*; 2. *Edition*; 2.1. *Text*; 2.2. *Translation*; 2.3. *Philological commentary*; 3. *Liturgical commentary*

1. *Introduction*

The eucharistic prayers of the *Didache* have puzzled modern scholars and ancient liturgists alike. After the publication of its Greek text from the Bryennios Codex (Codex Hierosolymitanus 54 from 1056 AD) in 1883, modern liturgiologists were long disturbed by the radical difference between these simple prayers and the ‘classical anaphoras’ of the fourth century, and by the notable absence of any reference to the Last Supper tradition in this archaic liturgy. Therefore, they repeatedly sought to interpret the ritual in *Did 9* and 10 as anything else than a Eucharist.¹ Only in recent years did the consensus emerge that these

* This research was funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) 1055776/ESP7862124. I am grateful to Ivan Miroshnikov and Harald Buchinger for their useful comments on this article. Papyrus editions, corpora, and series are cited according to their conventional abbreviation in the *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic, and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca, and Tablets* at <http://papyri.info/docs/checklist> (accessed on 09/10/2025). The dates of the papyri are taken from Ágnes T. Mihálykó, *The Christian Liturgical Papyri: An Introduction*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 114, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen 2019, Appendix [doi: <https://doi.org/10.1628/978-3-16-157552-5>].

1. For a concise but thorough summary and critique of this position, see Predrag Bukovec, *Die fröbchristliche Eucharistie*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 499, Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen 2023, 167 n. 19 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.1628/978-3-16-157730-7>]. Cf. Paul

prayers in fact belong to a eucharistic celebration, albeit of an archaic type, representing one variety among the diversity of early Christian meals.²

Fourth- and fifth-century liturgists were no less puzzled by this document, which boasted of apostolic authorship and contained prayers explicitly entitled “about the Eucharist” that differed so radically from the anaphoras they knew, the complex structure of which was consolidating by this period. The authorities resolved this tension in a variety of ways, as Predrag Bukovec has shown.³ The redactor of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, active ca. 380, reworked the prayers thoroughly in order to approximate them to the standards of his time (VII,25-26). The author of the Pseudo-Athanasian *De virginitate* 13 presented *Did 9,3* and 4 as a table prayer for of virgins.⁴

Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, SCPK, London 1992, 119-121 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195217322.001.0001>]; Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary*, Hermeneia, Augsburg Fortress 1998, 141-143 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvb936dt>]; Georg Schöllgen (ed.), *Didache. Zwölf-Apostel-Lehre*, *Fontes Christiani* 1, Herder, Freiburg a. Br. 1991, 50-54.

² See P. Bukovec, *Die frühchristliche Eucharistie*, 166-188 with ample bibliography.

³ Predrag Bukovec, *Anmerkungen zur Filiation der Didache*, in Wolf B. Oerter – Zuzana Vítková (eds.), *Coptica, Gnostica und Mandaica: Sprache, Literatur und Kunst als Medien interreligiöser Begegnung(en)*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 185, De Gruyter, Berlin – Boston 2020, 237-276 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110619904-012>]. Before Bukovec, Luigi Clerici also treated the question of the reception of the ‘gathering’ motive (from *Did 9,4*), who noted besides the examples analysed by Bukovec also the Ethiopian anaphoras of Gregory the Wonderworker and Jacob of Sarug (*Einsammlung der Zerstreuten: Liturgiegeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Vor- und Nachgeschichte der Fürbitte für die Kirche in Didache 9,4 und 10,5*, Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 44, Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Münster 1966, 104-124). I thank Harald Buchinger for suggesting this book to me.

⁴ The description of the meal has eucharistic overtones. The virgin is to seal and break the bread, her prayer is described as εὐχαριστούσα “giving thanks”, and the prayer before the meal contains the verb πλήρωσον “fill”, the key verb of the first epiclesis of the anaphora of St. Mark. For a study, see Teresa Berger, *Women’s Liturgical Practices and Leadership Roles in Early Christian Communities*, in Joan E. Taylor – Ilaria Ramelli (eds.), *Patterns of Women’s Leadership in Early Christianity*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2021, 180-194, 192-194 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198867067.003.0010>]. Berger considers the meal a “home communion of ascetic women” celebrated alongside attendance of the public liturgy. By contrast, for P. Bukovec (*Anmerkungen*, 254) it is a simple meal, though he acknowledges the eucharistic overtones. For deciding whether this was a Eucharist in the eyes of the author of the text (or the virgins), one should know if they

Finally, the motive of gathering from *Did 4* was incorporated into four anaphoras from the Alexandrian liturgical area: the anaphora attributed to Sarapion of Thmuis,⁵ the anaphora fragment preserved on the so-called ‘Bala’izah papyrus’,⁶ the Ethiopic anaphoras of John, Son of Thunder⁷ and Gregory II,⁸ whereas in the Ethiopic liturgy of Jacob of Sarug it appears in the prayer of fraction.⁹ Though this may attest to an independent popularity of the motive,¹⁰ Predrag Bukovec has argued instead that it was borrowed from *Did 9,4* and saw it as a proof of the reception of the church order.¹¹

The fragmentary anaphora edited here for the first time is another witness to the liturgical reception of *Did 9* in late antique Egypt and yet another solution to the tension outlined above. The two parchment

subscribed to a binary opposition of Eucharist vs all other meals, a position stressed by normative sources of the fourth century, or if their thinking allowed for more ambiguity.

- 5 Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis: A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 249, Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome 1995, 46-51.
- 6 Oxford, Bodleian, Ms Gr. liturg. c 3 (P) and d 2-4 (P), henceforth P.Bala’izah. Ed. C. H. Roberts – B. Capelle, *An Early Euchologium: The Der-Balizéh Papyrus Enlarged and Re-edited*, Bureaux Du Muséon, Louvain 1949; fol. ii was reedited as Pap. Colon. XXVIII 16.
- 7 Ed. Sebastian Euringer, *Die äthiopischen Anaphoren des hl. Evangelisten Johannes des Donnersohnes und des hl. Jacobus von Sarug*, Pontificium Istitutum Orientalium Studiorum, Roma 1934, 5-77. English translation in Marcos Daoud – H. E. Blatta Marsie Hazen (eds.), *The Liturgy of the Ethiopian Church*, Ethiopian Orthodox Church, Kingston 1991², 64-73, here 70, cited from the on-line edition of 2006, available at <https://www.ethiopianorthodox.org/english/church/englishethiopianliturgy.pdf> (accessed on 09/10/2025).
- 8 Ed. Oscar Loefgren, *Die beiden gewöhnlichen äthiopischen Gregorius-Anaphoren*, übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen versehen von Sebastian Euringer, *Orientalia Christiana* 30.2, Pontificium Istitutum Orientalium Studiorum, Roma 1933. English translation in M. Daoud – H. E. Blatta Marsie Hazen (eds.), *The Liturgy of the Ethiopian Church*, 164-168, here 165. The paraphrase of *Did 9,4* is close to that found in the anaphora of John, Son of Thunder, but the requests are placed before the offering and the institution narrative, not after them.
- 9 S. Euringer, *Die äthiopischen Anaphoren*, 79-122. English translation in M. Daoud – H. E. Blatta Marsie Hazen (eds.), *The Liturgy of the Ethiopian Church*, 151-158, here 155. The text paraphrases only the first half of the gathering prayer but not the request.
- 10 Thus L. Clerici, *Die Einsammlung der Zerstreuten*, who however considered some of the texts to witness the direct reception of the *Didache* and was not always clear about this distinction. Cf. also Alistair Stewart, *Breaking Bread: The Emergence of Eucharist and Agape in Early Christian Communities*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI 2023, 116.
- 11 P. Bukovec, *Anmerkungen*, 267: “Die Metapher blieb in der Formulierung an *Did 9,4* angelehnt – was die Kenntnis und Rezeption dieser Kirchenordnung seit der Spätantike dokumentiert.”

double leaves catalogued as London, British Library, Or. 6877 contain in Sahidic Coptic the last two fruits of communion of an anaphora with a doxology, followed by quotations from *Did* 9,3, 9,4, and 9,2 in this order and an intercession for the deceased, which breaks off in the middle. Though the codex can be dated on the basis of palaeographical and codicological considerations to the sixth or seventh centuries, this combination, as I will argue below, was probably created earlier, in the fourth or fifth centuries. The fruits of communion and the doxology bear close resemblance to the so-called ‘anaphora of Barcelona’ (henceforth BARC).¹² The quotes from *Did* are near verbatim, even the doxologies are kept; the small-scale modifications are motivated either by the desire to remove theologically problematic wording or by the wish to align the text with contemporary liturgical practice. The intercession derives from a so-called ‘independent intercession’.¹³ The text is thus a veritable bricolage: to the end of an anaphora a compiler annexed the prayers from *Did* 9 in the order ‘bread’, ‘gathering’, ‘chalice’ dictated by the normative institution narrative, then a further intercession was added.

The significance of this fragment is thus threefold. First, it contains a Coptic text of *Did* 9,2-4, which was hitherto not attested at all. Second, it provides further evidence to the high regard in which the *Didache* was held in late antique Egypt. Third, the fragment gives us new insight into late antique redactional work on anaphoras and illuminates processes by which these complex prayers were expanded through the addition of new units. In section 3, I will elaborate on these aspects, after presenting an edition of the text with translation and philological commentary in section 2.

¹² This anaphora, preserved in a complete form in a fourth-century codex (P.Monts.Roca inv. 154b-155a) as well as in two fragmentary witnesses from the sixth century (Pap.Colon. XXVIII 13 in Greek and Copt.lov. 27 in Coptic), was once popular in Upper Egypt. For a detailed study see Nathan P. Chase, *The Anaphoral Tradition in the ‘Barcelona Papyrus’*, Brepols, Turnhout 2023 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.1484/m.stt-eb.5.133150>].

¹³ For this term, see the discussion below.

2. *Edition*

London, BL, Or. 6877

Middle Egypt??

second half of VI/ first half of VII

Fragment of two parchment bifolia of miniature size from the middle of a quire. The size of the leaves is ca. 9.5 × 7.5 cm. Of the outer double leaf, the left-hand leaf (fol. a) is mostly lost, with only a few letters extant, while the right-hand leaf (fol. d) is largely intact. Of the inner double leaf, the left-hand side (fol. b) is damaged by holes, whereas the right-hand side (fol. c) is well preserved. The flesh sides, especially fol. b, V and fol. c, R, are faded. The binding holes and small parts of the binder's thread are extant, these cover a few letters on fol. a, V. The pages were inscribed in brown ink in one neat, squared column of ca. 4.9 × 4.8 cm with 13 lines. The scribe left ample margins: ca. 1 cm inner, ca. 1.5 cm outer, ca. 1.5 cm at the top, and ca. 3 cm at the bottom. The page numbers ιθ/κ are preserved on fol. b, κβ on fol. c, V, and κγ/κλ on fol. d, implying that the leaves likely come from the second quire of the codex.

The scribe employed middots and *cola* to divide clauses. He furthermore used *koronis* and *paragraphos* signs to divide sections of the prayer; the sign on fol. c, V is elaborate. He placed two line fillers after ΣΑΜΗΝ on fol. c, V, 4 and left the rest of the line empty; similar signs may mark the end of the section on fol. c, R, 2 too, but they are faded. The scribe clearly understood the sections after the two ΣΑΜΗΝ-s as separate units. He used both connective and syllabic superlinear strokes.

The hand is a formal upright majuscule with marked contrast between thin and thick strokes; this style is based on the Biblical majuscule, with some letter forms (especially the Μ in three strokes and the curvy α) taken from the Alexandrian majuscule. The hand, the layout, the *koronis*, *paragraphos*, and line filler signs closely resemble Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, Cpt. 814 (Codex B, 12 × 10.5 cm) from

the Monastery of Apa Jeremiah in Saqqara, which was dated to the second half of the sixth century on the basis of coins found with it.¹⁴ The dimensions and the decoration are furthermore similar to Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, Cpt. 815 (Codex C, 10.5 × 8.5 cm, equally from the second half of the sixth century and Saqqara), which however exhibits slightly different letter forms.¹⁵ Further parallels to dimensions, hand, and decoration can be found among Coptic euchologia: Copt. Lov. 27 (8 × 7 cm) and P.Bal. I 30 (9 × 8 cm), but these lack a secure date. Based on the parallel of Dublin, Chester Beatty Library, Cpt. 814, a date into the second half of the sixth century or the first half of the seventh is likely for our leaves as well. The similarities with P.Bal. I 30 from Deir el-Bala'izah and the codices from the monastery of Apa Jeremiah in Saqqara may furthermore signal a provenance from Middle Egypt, but since nothing is known about its acquisition history, even this remains uncertain.¹⁶

The leaves were described and partially transcribed by Bentley Layton in his *Catalogue Catalogue of Coptic Literary Manuscripts in the British Library Acquired since the Year 1906* (P.Lond.Copt. II) as no. 64. The present edition is based on high resolution and multispectral images obtained from the British Library, which were also enhanced by Hierax.¹⁷

¹⁴ For this codex see Herbert Thompson, *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic Dialect*, University Press, Cambridge 1932, xiii-xv, pl. VII-X. See also the PATHs database, <https://atlas.paths-erc.eu/manuscripts/65> (accessed on 03/09/2025).

¹⁵ For this codex see H. Thompson, *The Coptic Version*, xvii-xx, pl. XI-XIII. See also the PATHs database, <https://atlas.paths-erc.eu/manuscripts/66> (accessed on 03/09/2025).

¹⁶ I thank Alin Suciu for giving his opinion about the date and provenance in private communication, September 2025.

¹⁷ Vlad Atanasiu – Isabelle Marthot-Santaniello, *Hierax: Software for Enhancing the Legibility of Papyri*, online, <https://hierax.ch> (accessed on 09/12/2025).

2.1. *Text*

fol. a, R (flesh) -----

1	.	[
2	ic	[
3	λ	[
4	η	[
5	c	[
6	η	[

fol. a, V (hair) -----

1].	
2]. .	
3]. .	
4] ^κ η	
5]. ο	
6] ^ω φ	

fol. b, R (hair)

	ΙΘ
1	εγκοινωνια <u>μ-</u>
2	πνα εφογλαβ·
3	εγχωκ εβολ [μ-]
4	πετρανακ τ[η-]
5	ρ· χ[εκ]λε εφ[ε-]
6	χι εφ[ογ] γν γω[β]
7	νιμ [νε]ι πεκ-
8	ρ[λ]ν[ετ]ταιηγ
9	ε[βολ 2]ιτμ πρα(ν)
10	μ[πε]κωηρε
11	ε[τ]ογλαβ ιc πε-
12	χ[c] πενχοεις·
13	πεφογ νακ [εβ]ολ

fol. b, V (flesh)

κ

- 1 [γιτο]οτῷ ωλε ε-
- 2 [ν]εξ νενεξ ?δ-
- 3 [μην] τῶνων
- 4 [γμοτ ντ]οοτκ
- 5 [πε]νειω[τ] ετβε
- 6 ηωνς μ[ν] πιο-
- 7 ογν μ[ν τ]μντ-
- 8 [α]τμο[γ ται εν]τα[κ]-
- 9 τάμον [ερος?]
- 10 ?[τ]ν ic [πεχσ]
- 11 [π]εκωψ[ρε μμερ]ιτ
- 12 [πεν]χοε[ι]ς πε[οογ]
- 13 [νακ] εβολ ?[το-]

fol. c, R (flesh)

- 1 οτῷ ωλε ενεξ
- 2 γαμην:
- 3 νθε . [ca. ?]
- 4 ετχο[ορε εβολ]
- 5 εχμ π[τοογ]
- 6 αγω α . [σωογ?]
- 7 εσογν ελ . [ρ ογλ]
- 8 ?ν τειξε μαρογ
- 9 σφογγε εσογν
- 10 ητεκεκκλη-
- 11 σια εβολ ?[ν αρη-]
- 12 χφ μπκ[λα τηρφ?]
- 13 ετεκμη[τρρο]

A New Coptic Anaphora Fragment



From the British Library Collection: Or. 6877 flesh side, UV.



From the British Library Collection: Or. 6877 flesh side.



From the British Library Collection: Or. 6877 hair side.

fol. c, V (hair)

ΚΒ

1 ΧΕ ΤΩΚ ΤΕ
 2 ΤΒΟΜ ΜΝ ΠΕΟ-
 3 ΟΥ ωλ ΕΝΕΩ
 4 ΣΔΜΗΝ: >
 5 ΤΝΩΠ ΣΜΟΤ
 6 ΝΤΟΟΤΚ ΠΕΝ-
 7 ΕΙΩΤ ΕΞΗ ΤΒΩ
 8 ΝΕΛΟΟΛΕ ΜΜΕ
 9 ΝΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΤΑΪ ΕΝ-
 10 ΤΑΚΟΥ ΣΩΝΣ Ε-
 11 ΡΟΝ ΣΙΤΜ ΠΕΚ-
 12 ΦΗΡΕ ΜΜΕΡΙΤ
 13 ΙC ΠΕΧΣ ΠΕΝΧΟ-

fol. d, R (hair)

ΚΓ

1 ΕΪC ΠΕΩΟΥ ΝΑΚ
 2 ΕΒΟΛ ΣΙΤΟΟΤΨ
 3 ΜΝ ΠΕΣΜΟΥ ΜΝ
 4 ΤΕΣΟΜΟΛΟΓΗ-
 5 ΣΙC ΧΙΝ ΤΕΝΟΥ
 6 ΝΧΩΜ ΝΙΜ Ν-
 7 ΧΩΜ ωλ ΕΝΕΩ
 8 ΝΕΝΕΩ ΣΔΜΗΝ
 9 ΕΤΙ ΜΑΡΝΣΕΠΣ
 10 ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΠΕΙ-
 11 ΦΤ ΣΑ ΝΕΣΝΗΥ
 12 ΤΗΡΟΥ ΣΕΝΤΑΥ-
 13 ΝΚΟΤΚ: ΧΕΚΑΣ

fol. d, V (flesh)

ΚΔ

1 Εφερ πεγμέεγ-
2 Ε ΤΗΡΟΥ ΔΥΩ
3 ΝΨΤ ΜΤΟΝ ΝΑΥ·
4 ΣΑΪΟ ΠΧΟΕΙC Δ[Ρ]!
5 ΠΜΕΕΥΕ ΝΝΕ-
6 ΣΝΗΥ ΤΗΡΟΥ
7 ΕΝΤΑΓΝΚΟΤΚ
8 ΧΙΝ ΑΔΑΜ ΩΔ-
9 ΣΡΑΙ ΕΠΟΟΥ Ν-
10 ΣΟΟΥ: ΝΕΝ-
11 ΕΙΟΤΕ ΕΤΟΥΔ-
12 ΑΒ ΜΠΑΤΡΙΑΡ-
13 ΧΗΣ· ΝΕΝΕΙΟ-
[ΤΕ]

fol. b, R, 1. κοινωνία 2. πνεῦμα 9. ΠΡΔ membr. fol. c, R, 10-11. ἐκκλησία fol. d, R, 4-5. ἔξομολόγησις fol. d, V, 12-13. πατριάρχης

2.2. *Translation*

“fol. b, R ...for communion of Holy Spirit, for fulfilment of all that pleases you,⁵ so that in everything your revered name shall be glorified through the name ¹⁰ of your holy Son Jesus Christ our Lord, glory to you ^{fol. b, V} through him forever and ever, amen.

We thank you, ⁵ our Father, for the life and knowledge and immortality [which you] made known to us ¹⁰ through Jesus [Christ] your [beloved] Son [our] Lord, [glory to you] through ^{fol. c, R} him forever, amen.

Even as [this piece of bread³] that was scattered ⁵ over the hill and was [gathered] together [and became one], in this way let ¹⁰ your church be

gathered together from the ends of the [whole⁷ earth] to your kingdom,
fol. c, V for yours is the power and the glory forever, amen.

⁵ We thank you, our Father, for the true vine of David, which ¹⁰ you revealed to us through your beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord, ^{fol. d, R} glory to you through him and blessing and confession from now ⁵ to all generations of generations, forever and ever, amen.

Again let us beseech ¹⁰ God the Father for all the brethren who have fallen asleep, so that ^{fol. d, V} he will remember them all and give them repose. Verily, Lord, ⁵ remember all the brethren who have fallen asleep since Adam until today, ¹⁰ our holy fathers the patriarchs, our fathers..."

2.3. Philological commentary

fol. b, R, 1-5. These two fruits of communion agree with two out of the last three fruits of communion of BARC in P.Monts.Roca inv. 155a, 21-23: *εἰς κοινωνίαν πνεύματος ἀγίου* and *εἰς συντελείωσιν παντὸς θελήματός σου*; the one in between, *εἰς καταρτισμὸν πίστεως καὶ ἀληθείας* “for strengthening of belief and truth”, is missing.¹⁸ When rendering *κοινωνίαν πνεύματος*, the translator follows the Sahidic translation of the reference verse, Phil 2:1,¹⁹ in keeping the two Greek nouns, though there the definite article is introduced. The construction **ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΕΦΟΥΓΔΑΒ** is also used in the Sahidic translation of Heb 2:4.²⁰

⁵-fol. b, V, 3. The doxology is close to the final doxology of BARC in P.Monts.Roca inv. 155a, 23-27, though with some variation: The *ἔτι καὶ ἐν τούτῳ* link is missing; instead of the active *δοξάζωμεν*, a passive form, **ΕΦΕΧΙ ΕΟΟΥ**, is employed, which is more common in the Egyptian tradition;²¹ the name of God has only one attribute, ‘revered’; the end

¹⁸ The text of BARC will be quoted from N. P. Chase, *The Anaphoral Tradition*, 19-21.

¹⁹ Cf. G. W. Horner, *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect*, vol. 5, *The Epistles of Saint Paul (continued)*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1920, 280 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.31826/9781463228071>].

²⁰ G. W. Horner, *The Coptic Version*, vol. 5, 10.

²¹ Cf. N. P. Chase, *The Anaphoral Tradition*, 281.

of the doxology matches the doxologies of the *Didache* prayers in fol. b, V, 13 - fol. c, R, 1 and fol. d, R, 1-2 and lacks two words, 'power' and 'unmixed', from that of P.Monts.Roca inv. 155a, 26-27. The most curious difference is the statement that the glorification happens through the name of Christ, a phrasing that does not find any parallels to my knowledge in other prayers. At the same time, Christ does not have a qualifier as in P.Monts.Roca inv. 155a, 25. There, this qualifier was copied as ἀγιασμένου (the same spelling occurs in inv. 155b, 3-4). This may have stood for ἡγιασμένου, or, as the parallel of the 'Milan euchologion',²² fr. 3, 2 and fr. 4, 9 suggests, it may be a corruption from ἀγιασμοῦ. In inv. 155b, 4 the qualifier is furthermore ἀγιάσματος which implies a certain fluidity. If ἀγιάσματος was the qualifier of Christ in the doxology of BARC in certain redactions, this may accidentally have been changed to ὀνόματος, the Greek behind the Coptic ΠΡΑ(Ν), and this may explain this unique form of the doxology, aligning the two doxologies further with each other. The quotation from the *Didache* begins in the same line.

3-fol. c, R, 2. These lines contain, with minor variants, the bread prayer from *Did* 9,3 (ed. Schöllgen, pp. 120-122): Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως, ἡς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου, σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. The choice of Coptic words for the translation differs slightly from that in the Fayumic version of the *Didache* in the *myron* prayer (London, British Library, Or. 9721), which has τενωψεπ γματ' ῥταλτκ' πιωτ ετβε ηεστν[ογ] φι ετεσακ' τάμαν ελαφι εβαλ [21] τη̄ ιη̄ς πεκω[η]ρι πωκ η[ε π]αογ ηψανεε εμην.²³

²² Ed. Nathan P. Chase – Ágnes T. Mihálykó, "The «Milan Euchologion»: Reconstructing an Unknown Fourth-Century Anaphora and Its Post-Anaphoral Prayers", in *Vigiliae Christianae* 79 (2024), 1-52 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.1163/15700720-bja10091>].

²³ F. Stanley Jones – Paul A. Mirecki, *Considerations on the Coptic Papyrus of the Didache* (British Library Oriental Manuscript 9271), in Clayton N. Jefford (ed.), *The Didache in Context: Essays on Its Text, History and Transmission*, Brill, Leiden 1995, 47-87. 52 [doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004267237_005].

7-8. [Τ]ΜΝΤ[λ]ΤΜΟ[Υ]: ‘Immortality’ does not figure in *Did* 9,3, but most letters are visible, especially on the UV image, and the reading is likely. ἀθανασία is the third word (after γνώσις and πίστις) in a similar list in *Did* 10,2.

8-9. [ΤΑΙ ΕΝ]ΤΔ[Κ]ΤΔΜΩΝ [ερος]? The letters are unclear. The chalice prayer in fol. c, V, 9-11 translates ἡς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν as ΤΑΙ ΕΝΤΑΚΟΥΟΝΣ ΕΡΟΝ. However, [ΤΑΙ ΕΝ]ΤΑΚΟΥΟΝΣ ΕΡΟΝ] cannot be read here, as the UV image makes it clear that the letter before the lacuna is not an Υ, and the traces around the small lacuna cannot be a Κ either. This leads us to the Fayumic text of the *Didache*, which rendered ἡς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν as ΕΤΕΓΑΚ’ ΤΔΜΔΝ ΕΛΑΨΕΒΑ. On analogy, [ΤΑΙ ΕΝ] ΤΔ[Κ]ΤΔΜΩΝ [ερος] can be proposed, which also fits the traces: the two verticals of the Μ appear on the two sides of the lacuna, and the bottom of the two verticals of the Ν are visible at the end. Apparently, the translator renounced of symmetry in the translation of these clauses. The indirect object is probably in the singular feminine, as in the Greek, but the semantically more correct plural cannot be excluded either.

10-12. The clause “Jesus your child” is expanded to reflect liturgical language. The words are the same as in the chalice prayer, fol. c, V, 11 - fol. d, R, 1, but the word order differs. ΠΕΚΜΕΡΙΤ ΝΩΨΗΡΕ is the translation of ἡγαπημένος παῖς, an archaic expression in doxologies later replaced by μονογενῆς υἱός.²⁴ The Coptic translation removes the ambiguity of παῖς, but it keeps the adjective ‘beloved’.

12-fol. c, R, 2. The doxology coincides with the Greek, though a reference to Jesus’ mediation, ΣΙΤΟΟΤΨ ‘through him’, is inserted.

²⁴ See Michael Zheltov, “The Anaphora and the Thanksgiving Prayer from the Barcelona Papyrus: An Underestimated Testimony to the Anaphoral History in the Fourth Century”, in *Vigiliae Christianae* 62 (2008), 467-504. 488 n. 66 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.1163/157007208x306551>] and Ramon Roca-Puig, “Citas y reminiscencias bíblicas en las anáforas griegas más primitivas: Los vocablos παῖς y ἡγαπημένος en P. Barc. inv. no. 154b-15”, in *Byzantina* 4 (1972), 193-203. In the papyri, ἡγαπημένος παῖς figures only in P.Monts.Roca inv. 154b, 10 internally, as well as in the doxologies of P.Berol. 13918, 5 (late 5th or early 6th c.) and P.Bala’izah fol. I, R, 22 (6th or 7th c.); the former is abbreviated, but the latter is probably a late outlier of the δι’ οὗ-type of the doxology, which yields to the δι’ καὶ μεθ’ οὗ-type from the fifth century onwards, see below.

ΣΑΜΗΝ is followed by a colon, which marks the end of the prayer; the end of the line may be filled with decorative signs, as in fol. c, V, 4, but it may also be empty; it is too faded to tell. In any case, the new section starts in a new line.

3-fol. c, V, 4. These lines contain, with minor variants, the ‘gathering’ prayer from *Did 9,4* (ed. Schöllgen, p. 122): ὥσπερ ἦν τοῦτο <τὸ> κλάσμα διεσκορπισμένον ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο ἔν, οὕτω συναχθήτω σου ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν, ὅτι σοῦ ἔστιν ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ δύναμις διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

3-7. Νῷε η[τειλακμε] ετχο[ορε εβολ] εχ̄μ η[τοογ] αγω ας[χωογ] ερογη εας[ρ ογα]? The translation of τοῦτο τὸ κλάσμα would be ΝΤΕΙΛΑΚΜΕ (or ΝΤΙΛΑΚΜΕ). However, since in the anaphora of Sarapion, in P.Balaizah fol. 2, V, 3, and Ps-Athanasius, *De virginitate* 13 the passage contains ἄρτος ‘bread’ rather than κλάσμα,²⁵ it is also possible that ΜΠΕΙΟΕΙΚ (or ΜΠΙΟΕΙΚ) stood here. The traces are too faint to make sure, however, some observations speak for ΝΤΕΙΛΑΚΜΕ. First of all, the trace after Νῷε seems to be a Ν, as the oblique is visible on the UV image. Furthermore, in l. 6 the faded trace after the Α seems to be more compatible with a Κ than with a Κ: the bottom half of a circle is visible on the UV image, which would be too narrow for the curve of the Κ. In l. 7 only the bottom left quarter of a circle is visible after the faded traces of what likely was εά, but this is compatible with both a Κ and a Κ. Altogether, these suggest that the translator had κλάσμα rather than ἄρτος in front of him. If correct, this would be a further late antique testimony to the reading κλάσμα instead of ἄρτος or a simple τοῦτο in *Did 9,4*.²⁶

The reconstruction of these lines is aided by the Sahidic parallel in the *Acts of Andrew and Philemon*, ΑΚΟΥΓΕΣΑΣΝΕ ΕΤΡΕΝΩΝΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ

²⁵ Cf. P. Bukovec, “Zur Filiation”, 254 and 269.

²⁶ For a discussion of these variants, see K. Niederwimmer, *Didache*, 148 and 150, who reconstructs ὥσπερ ἦν τοῦτο διεσκορπισμένον (against Schöllgen, who keeps τοῦτο τὸ κλάσμα from the Bryennios Codex).

ΕΤΧΟΟΡΕ ΕΒΟΛ ΕΤΟ ΝΒΛΒΙΔΕ ΣΩΟΥΓΣ ΕΣΟΥΝ ΕΛΥΡ ΟΥΑ ΝΟΥΩΤ
“you commanded all the stones—that are scattered and are grains—to gather, and they became one” and later ΣΕΝΩΝΕ ΝΕΝΤΑΓΣ[ω]ΟΥΓΣ
ΕΣΟΥΝ [ΕΛΥΡ ΟΥΑ] ΝΟΥΩΤ “some stones that have been gathered and they [became] one”.²⁷ On the basis of this parallel, the end of l. 4 may be reconstructed as ΕΤΧΟ[ΟΡΕ ΕΒΟΛ] (rather than ΕΣΡΑΙ, the other possibility). It also supports ΑΣ[ΣΩΟΥΓΣ] ΕΣΟΥΝ ΕΔΣ[Ρ ΟΥΑ] in ll. 6-7.

12. Though it has no equivalent in the Greek, ΤΗΡΨ is proposed to fill the expected space.

fol. c, V, 1-4. The doxology this time misses the reference to Jesus’ mediation, present in the Greek.

5-fol. d, R, 8. These lines contain, with minor variants, the chalice prayer from *Did 9,2* (ed. Schöllgen, p. 120): Εύχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ήμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀγίας ἀμπέλου Δαυὶδ τοῦ παιδός σου, ἡς ἐγνώρισας ήμīν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου. σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

8. The vine is characterized here as ‘true’ rather than ‘holy’ as in the Greek. This wording is under influence from John 15:1; the choice of words follows the Sahidic Bible closely.²⁸

9-fol. d, R, 1. The characterization of David as τοῦ παιδός σου is dropped, doubtless because this title was used for Jesus in the next clause (translated into Coptic as ψηρε ‘son’) and because applying it to David as well was theologically inconvenient. The qualification of Jesus is more elaborate than in the Greek and uses the same words as in the ‘bread’ prayer.

fol. d, R, 1-8. The doxology is much longer than in the Greek text. Besides mentioning the mediation of Christ, as in the ‘bread’ prayer, two further praise nouns and a longer ending were added. This form parallels the doxologies in P.Bala’izah fol. 1, R, 23-26, Bonn,

²⁷ Ivan Miroshnikov, “The Acts of Andrew and Philemon in Sahidic Coptic”, in *Apocrypha* 28 (2017), 9-83, 47, transl. p. 76 modified [doi: <https://doi.org/10.1484/j.apocra.5.116635>]. I am grateful to Ivan Miroshnikov for pointing out this parallel to me.

²⁸ Cf. Hans Quecke, *Das Johannesevangelium Saïdisch*, Papyrologica Castroctaviania, Roma 1984, 180.

Universitätsbibliothek, SO 267, R, 8-9 (6th or 7th c.),²⁹ and P.PalauRib. inv. 138, V, 7-II (6th c.),³⁰ especially the latter two, where the exact same praise nouns are used, only εἰς γενέας τῶν γενέων is rendered differently, as χὶν ηὔωμι εὔωμι in Bonn, Universitätsbibliothek, SO 267, R, 9 and as χὶν ηὔωμι ηὔωμι εὔωμι in P.PalauRib. inv. 138, V, 10-II. This is the longest of the three doxologies of the three prayers from the *Didache*; it was likely enlarged because this was understood to be the end of a larger unit (or possibly of the anaphora itself at a point in its redactional history).

fol. d, V, 1-3. The two requests resemble anaphoral intercessions; both come across in the anaphora of St. Mark, though in the reversed order,³¹ as well as in the Egyptian anaphora of St. Basil.³²

5-10. The request for “all the brethren who have fallen asleep since Adam” does not figure in any Egyptian anaphoras. Instead, it appears in several Syriac anaphoras: that of Julius,³³ of Philoxenus,³⁴ of the Doctors,³⁵ of John of Bosra,³⁶ of Ignatius³⁷ and twice in the first Syriac anaphora of John of Sarug.³⁸ A similar clause, οἱ ἀποθανόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι τὴν σήμερον, furthermore appears in the *First Apocryphal*

29 Ed. Hans Quecke, “Ein neues koptisches Anaphora-Fragment”, in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 39 (1973), 216-223. His reading of R, 8-9 has to be corrected into μῆν πεῖμ[ογ] μῆν τεξ|[ο]

μολοιη[ci]ς (based on an image obtained from the Universitätsbibliothek).

30 Ed. Hans Quecke, “Ein koptischer Papyrus mit den Einsetzungsworten der Eucharistie (PPalau Rib. Inv. 138)”, *Studia Papyrologica* 8 (1969), 43-53. His reading of R, 8-9 has to be corrected into μῆν πεῖμου μῆν | τεξομοογε|cic (based on the image printed in the edition).

31 Cf. N. P. Chase – Á. T. Mihálykó, “The «Milan Euchologion»”, 22-23.

32 Achim Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilius-Anaphora*, Jerusalemer Theologisches Forum 7, Aschendorff, Münster 2004, 190-191.

33 *Anaphorae Syriacae quotquot in codicibus adbuc repertae sunt, cura Pontificii Instituti Studiorum Orientalium editae et latine versae*, vol. 3.1, Pontificium Istitutum Orientalium Studiorum, Roma 1981, 92-93.

34 Eusèbe Renaudot, *Liturgiarum orientalium collectio*, vol. 2, Joseph Baer, Frankfurt 1847², 314-315.

35 E. Renaudot, *Liturgiarum*, vol. 2, 414.

36 *Anaphorae Syriacae*, vol. 3.1, 32-33.

37 E. Renaudot, *Liturgiarum*, vol. 2, 515.

38 *Anaphorae Syriacae*, vol. 2.1, Pontificium Istitutum Orientalium Studiorum, Roma 1951, 28-29 and 30-31.

Apocalypse of John (CANT 331).³⁹ The request is also particular in that it prays for “all brethren”. Other anaphoras tend to limit their requests explicitly to the souls of the saints, the faithful, or those commemorated by the congregation—though probably also here only the faithful are intended by “brethren”. In the following, a characteristic list of classes of saints begins, of which only the first item and the beginning of the second is preserved.⁴⁰ The wording of this prayer is unique in repeating “our fathers” before each class and not only before the whole list, as is commonly done.

3. Liturgical commentary

These parchment leaves preserve a fragmentary anaphora addressed to the Father. Though most of the characteristic units of an anaphora are now lost, enough is preserved of the sequence to support this identification. The fruits of communion are standard elements of anaphoras (though they also occur in prayers of thanksgiving for communion⁴¹), whereas paraphrases of *Did 9,4* also appear in four other anaphoras from the Alexandrian liturgical area (see above). The intercession for the deceased, though in theory it can also belong to the

³⁹ This text has been variously dated to the fourth century (W. Bousset, *The Antichrist Legend: A Chapter in Christian and Jewish Folklore*, Hutchinson & co., London 1896, 42-43), to the fifth-sixth (Jean-Daniel Kaestli, *La figure de l’Antichrist dans l’ “Apocalypse de saint Jean le Théologien” [Première Apocalypse apocryphe de Jean]*, in Yves-Marie Blanchard – Bernard Pouderon – Madeleine Scopello [eds.], *Les forces du Bien et du Mal dans les premiers siècles de l’Église*, Théologie historique 118, Beauchesne, Paris, 2011, 277-290. 288 n. 15), to the seventh/eighth (Péter Tóth, *New Wine in Old Wineskin: Byzantine Reuses of the Apocryphal Revelation Dialogue*, in Averil Cameron – Niels Gaul [eds.], *Dialogues and Debates from Late Antiquity to Late Byzantium*, Routledge, New York 2017, 77-93. 82-83 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315269443>]) or the eighth/early ninth (Alice Whealey, “The Apocryphal Apocalypse of John: A Byzantine Apocalypse from the Early Islamic Period”, in *The Journal of Theological Studies* 53 [2002], 533-540 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jts/53.2.533>]). Given the parallels with the *Quæstiōnes ad Antiochūm* pointed out by Péter Tóth, a date in or after the seventh century is most likely.

⁴⁰ On such lists see A. Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilius-Anaphora*, 481-483.

⁴¹ See Harald Buchinger, “Die Postcommunio. Zu Frühgeschichte und Charakter eines eucharistischen Gebetes”, in *Ecclesia Orans* 37 (2021), 45-94. 84.

pre-anaphora, is also a typical part of anaphoras. Indeed, this unit also stands at the very end of the anaphora attributed to Sarapion of Thmuis and the so-called ‘Milan euchologion’. Altogether, the combination of these three elements can only come from an anaphora, a conclusion further supported by the parallels with BARC in the first unit.

This anaphora is however not a unitary composition. It is divided by doxologies, which are written out full, including the ‘amen’. The first doxology resembles closely the final doxology of BARC, whereas the others are modified versions of the doxologies of the *Didache* prayers. The units are moreover mostly copied in new lines (*Did* 9,4 in fol. c, R, 3; *Did* 9,2 in fol. c, V, 5; the intercession in fol. d, R, 9—though not *Did* 9,3 in fol. b, V, 3) and marked with lectional signs in the margin. Such internal doxologies are known from other anaphoras too and are usually taken as witnesses to the original independence of these units and the sign of a compiler’s activity who did not suppress them.⁴² The doxologies divide the text into three distinct units: 1.) the end of an anaphora with two fruits of communion and a doxology; 2.) quotations of the three prayers from the *Didache*; 3.) and an intercession. Let us look at these in detail.

1.) The two last fruits of communion that are preserved correspond verbatim to two out of the last three fruits of communion of BARC in P.Monts.Roca inv. 155a, 21-23 (see notes to fol. b, R, 1-5).⁴³ The doxology too stands in the tradition of BARC, though here the variation is

⁴² On internal anaphora doxologies, see Bryan Spinks, “A Complete Anaphora? A Note on Strasbourg Gr. 254”, in *Heythrop Journal* 25 (1984), 51-59 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2265.1984.tb00535.x>] and Walter Ray, *The Strasbourg Papyrus*, in *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers*, Liturgical Press, Collegeville, MI 1997, 39-56, 47, 50-52, and 53-54. Among late antique Egyptian anaphoras, the ‘Milan euchologion’ fr. 1, 3-5, Bonn, Univ.-Bibl. inv. So 267, R, 8-9, P.PalauRib. inv. 138, V, 7-11, and probably P.Strasb. inv. Gr. 254 (Pap.Colon. XXVIII 1), V, 24-26 contain such internal doxologies.

⁴³ The absence of the third clause is not particularly significant for determining whether the anaphora in question may or may not have been BARC. Fruits of communion are among the most changeable parts of anaphoras both in numbers and in order. Those of the anaphora of St. Mark grew from 4 in its earliest extant complete redaction to 16 in its redaction in the fourteenth-century Kacmarcik codex, see N. P. Chase, *The Anaphoral Tradition*, 268-270.

more extensive, see notes to fol. b, R, 5-fol. b, V, 3 for details. However, even with these differences the wording can be seen as standing in the tradition of BARC, despite some modifications that aligned it with the Egyptian tradition in general, and the insertion of an idiosyncratic glorification of God's name through the *name* of Christ (which however may be a corruption). The complexity of the doxology implies that it once marked the end of an anaphora, which shared its extant phrases with BARC and stood in its tradition. It may even have been a redaction of BARC itself, but as the extant phrases are simply too few and belong to a formulaic part of the anaphora, this cannot be proven.

2.) To this anaphora, the three prayers from *Did 9* were appended, in the order 'bread'—'gathering'—'chalice'. This is the most interesting feature of the text. As the only other Coptic witness to the *Didache*, London, BL, Or. 7621 from the fifth century, does not preserve *Did 9*, this is the first witness to the Coptic text of these prayers—so far only the 'gathering' prayer of *Did 9,4* was known from the paraphrase of the *Acts of Andrew and Philemon*.⁴⁴ Though faded script and lacunae impede legibility, most of the text can be read or reconstructed. The wording is close to that of the Bryennios Codex, though with some notable differences.⁴⁵ The most significant ones are in and around the doxologies: In the mediation clauses of both the 'bread' and the 'chalice' prayers (*Did 9,3* and *9,2*) the archaic reference to Jesus, διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου, was expanded into "your beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord". Furthermore, in the doxologies of the 'bread' and 'chalice'

44 In this apocryphal acts, edited by Ivan Miroshnikov, who placed its composition in the sixth or seventh century, the 'gathering' prayer is paraphrased for a prayer that Andrew recites to reassemble the dispersed body members of a newborn and to resurrect him. The paraphrase refers to an otherwise unknown apocryphal miracle of Jesus on Mount Ebal where he reassembles stones into an altar, which the prayer uses as an archetype. The prayer has strong eucharistic overtones and contains an epiclesis of the power of God. The creative inclusion of the 'gathering' prayer was likely inspired by the currency of this formula in eucharistic prayers known to the author. For a commentary on this miracle, see I. Miroshnikov, "The Acts of Andrew and Philemon", 82.

45 For details, see above, notes to fol. b, V, 7-8, 10-12, 12 - fol. c, R, 2, 3, 12; fol. c, V, 1-4; fol. d, R, 8, 9 - fol. d, R, 1, fol. d, R, 1-8.

prayers, a reference to Jesus' mediation, “through whom”, was added, whereas the clause “through Jesus” was removed from the doxology of the ‘gathering’ prayer (*Did* 9,4). Finally, the doxology of the ‘chalice’ prayer was expanded into a form that parallels doxologies found in three papyri from the sixth-seventh centuries. Further, smaller differences on the level of words include the addition of “immortality” in the ‘bread’ prayer (fol. c, R, 7-8), the change of “holy vine” into “true vine” (under influence from John 15:1, fol. c, V, 8), and the removal of David’s qualifier *τοῦ παιδός σου* in the ‘chalice’ prayer (fol. c, V, 9 - fol. d, R, 1).

When compared to the more extensive reworking of the same source material in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (VII,25,2-4)⁴⁶ or to the paraphrases of the ‘gathering’ prayer in the anaphora attributed to Sarapion, in P.Bala’izah, and the Ethiopic liturgies referenced in the introduction,⁴⁷ these differences are modest. Most of them seem to be theologically motivated alterations on the level of words and/or adjustments to later liturgical language (especially in the doxologies and mediation clauses). Clearly, the compiler wished to have all three prayers from his source and in a form close to his source—he even kept the internal doxologies and perhaps retained the archaic word *κλάσμα* in the ‘gathering’ prayer.⁴⁸ His adherence to the source may imply that some of the different wordings, especially the smaller ones that cannot be explained with liturgical compliance, can have been taken from a Greek text of the *Didache* that differed in these details from the text of the Bryennios Codex.⁴⁹ At the same time, it is clear that the compiler was responsible for certain differences: for adjusting the order of the clauses to the order dictated by the normative institution narrative

⁴⁶ See P. Bukovec, “Zur Filiation”, 241-252.

⁴⁷ See *ibid.*, 267-272.

⁴⁸ Against *ἄρτος* in all other liturgical uses of this prayer, cf. P. Bukovec, “Zur Filiation”, 254 and 269 (note however that the reading is very uncertain, see notes to fol. c, R, 3-7).

⁴⁹ As G. Schöllgen notes, “Die starken Abweichungen der vollgestellten Textzeugen (der direkten Überlieferung) machen wahrscheinlich, daß es bereits im 4/5. Jahrhundert mehrere unterschiedliche Textrezensionen der *Didache* gegeben hat” (*Didache*, 93).

(‘bread’—*Did* 9,3, ‘gathering’—*Did* 9,4, ‘chalice’—*Did* 9,2) and probably also for the changes in the doxologies, some of which reflect the liturgical context and others the new order of the clauses. This leaves the possibility open that he intervened also elsewhere, guided by his theological conviction. Therefore, we cannot reliably reconstruct the Greek text of the *Didache* that he used.

The compiler’s wish to include all three prayers in a form close to the original betrays his loyalty to the very text of the *Didache* as well as his conviction that these prayers are to be understood as prescriptive eucharistic prayers and treated accordingly. It was probably this wish that moved him to position them at the end of his anaphora, after the final doxology. Whereas the other four anaphoras that include a paraphrase of *Did* 9,4 place it near the institution narrative—anamnesis unit,⁵⁰ our compiler apparently thought that inserting three complete prayers there would break the flow of the anaphora he was modifying, the structure of which seems to have consolidated by that time—therefore, he decided to place all his additions to the end.

3.) After the prayers from the *Didache* an intercession for the deceased was appended. This prayer once again bears clear mark of having once been an independent unit, a so-called ‘independent intercession’ from the *oratio universalis*.⁵¹ Its first section (fol. d, R, 9 - d, V, 3) speaks about

⁵⁰ See P. Bukovec, “Zur Filiation”, 271–272 and M. Daoud – H. E. Blatta Marsie Hazen (eds.), *The Liturgy of the Ethiopian Church*, 165 for the anaphora of Gregory the Wonderworker. The only exception is the liturgy of Jacob of Sarug, where part of the ‘gathering’ prayer is incorporated into a complex prayer after the anaphora entitled “Prayer of Fraction” that also contains offering language and intercession (cf. M. Daoud – H. E. Blatta Marsie Hazen [eds.], *The Liturgy of the Ethiopian Church*, 154–155); given the late date and complex composition of the Ethiopian anaphoras it is useless to speculate here on how this prayer may have come about.

⁵¹ By ‘independent intercession’ I mean an intercession which has a separate address to God and a separate doxology and typically treats one topic (e.g. peace, the sick, those who travel etc.). Building a sequence of such independent intercessions recited by the priest was the main late antique Egyptian solution to the *oratio universalis*, as manifest in the prayer collection attributed to Sarapion (prayers no. 21–25), in the Euchologion section of the Aksumite collection (fol. 46^{ab}–51th), and in some papyri. However, such prayers could be used alone as well in various situations (e.g. the independent intercession for those who travel was recast as a prayer for pilgrimage in the Euchologion section of the Aksumite collection, fol. 61^{ta–vi}).

God in the third person singular, which betrays that it was once part of the priest's exhortation to prayer. Such exhortations to prayer are otherwise unknown in anaphoras, whereas they were a conventional part of various types of prayer in Alexandria, as it is evident from the Aksumite collection⁵² and some papyri.

In such exhortations or *prooimia*, the presider first invited the congregation to "beseech the almighty God", then introduced the object of the prayer in a few clauses, in which God was referenced in the third person, and rounded off the prayer with a repeated address of God. This was followed by the deacon's call for prayer, at its simplest "Pray", but a reference to the object of the prayer could be added. After the deacon's call (and potentially the people's response "Lord have mercy"), the priest continued with the actual prayer, which oftentimes repeated the topics and the wording of the preface. As an example, the *prooimion* of the independent intercession for the deceased in the Euchologion section of the Aksumite collection can be cited (fol. 49^{va}): "And then we beseech the almighty God, Father of the Lord our Saviour Jesus Christ, for our brethren who have fallen asleep so that he transfers their soul «in the grassy place» where «there is the water of rest» (Ps 22:2) and he reunites (them), <having resuscitated> the body in the day which he has established; according to his hope that does not lie, may he distribute the kingdom of heavens, he who has authority for all rest, the Lord our God."⁵³

⁵² The Aksumite collection is a canonico-liturgical collection preserved in a *codex unicus* in Ethiopian but going back to a late fifth or sixth century Greek original presumably from Alexandria, see Alessandro Bausi, "La collezione aksumita canonico-liturgica", in *Adamantius* 12 (2006), 43-70 and Alessandro Bausi – Antonella Brita – Marco Di Bella – Denis Nosnitsin – Ira Rabin – Nikolas Sarris, "The Aksumite Collection or Codex Σ (Sinodos of Qəfrayā, MS C3-IV-71/C3-IV-73, Ethio-SPaRe UM-039): Codicological and Palaeographical Observations. With a Note on Material Analysis of Inks", in *COMSt Bulletin* 6 (2020), 127-171 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.25592/uhhfdm.8469>]. The Euchologion section remains inedited, I am grateful to Alessandro Bausi for having shared his preliminary transcription and translation (version May 2020) with me.

⁵³ Translation by Alessandro Bausi, taken from N. P. Chase – Á. T. Mihálykó, "The «Milan Euchologion»", 22-26.

In the Aksumite collection, the following prayers had such exhortations: independent intercessions, fraction prayers, the ‘first prayer of the morning’, and prayers for the morning, evening, and night. In the papyri too, the exhortation appears in similar positions.⁵⁴ While a prominent feature of the Aksumite collection, the *prooimion* is not attested in the prayers of Sarapion, and we can find prayers of these types without a priestly exhortation among the papyri as well.⁵⁵ This suggests that it was originally an Alexandrian feature that was imported to Upper Egypt but not accepted everywhere and in every period.

The first lines of our intercession (fol. d, R, 9-d, V, 3) exhibit elements of a *prooimion*: the lack of direct address to God, the characteristic opening “again let us beseech God the Father”, and requests overlapping with the actual prayer in the next lines (fol. d, V, 4-13). These parallels suggest that the opening lines are the vestiges of an exhortation, and by consequence that the prayer was once an independent intercession with a *prooimion*. The full structure is however no longer there. The deacon’s call is missing, as is the characteristic repetition of the address (a short one at the end of the *prooimion*, then a more elaborate one at the beginning of the actual

54 Independent intercessions: O.Petr.Mus. 19 (early 7th c.?, for the *papas*) and P.Bal. I 30, fol. 9b, V (6th or 7th c., for the church); fraction prayers: Oxford, Bodleian, Gr. th. e. 5 (P) + P.Gen. inv. 199, fol. iii, V (5th or 6th c., ed. Ágnes T. Mihálykó – Konstantine Panegyres, “Two Liturgical Papyri from the Bodleian Library”, in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 70 [2024], 317-370. 317-362 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/apf-2024-0020>]) and BM EA 54036, V (6th or 7th c., ed. Hans Quecke, “Ein saïdischer Zeuge der Markusliturgie [Brit. Mus. Nr. 54036]”, in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 37 [1971], 40-54); a prayer for the evening, P.MoscowCopt. 96 (7th or 8th c., Western Thebes); as well as a thanksgiving for communion prayer in P.Bad. IV 58, fol. 2 (7th or 8th c.).

55 Independent intercessions: P.MoscowCopt. 95, P.Berol. 709 (ed. Ágnes T. Mihálykó, “Two Coptic Prayers on Ostracon [P.Berol. 709 and 9444+4790]”, in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 65/1 [2019], 133-155. 133-144 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/apf-2019-0008>]), P.Rain.UnterrichtKopt. 197, R (all three 7th or 8th c., Western Thebes), P.Ryl. III 465, V (6th c., Fayum??). Fraction prayer: Louvain, Ms Lefort copt. 28A (7th c., Middle Egypt, ed. Jean Doresse – Emmanuel Lanne, *Un témoin archaïque de la liturgie copte de S. Basile*, Bibliothèque du Muséon 47, Institut Orientaliste – Publications Universitaires, Louvain 1960). First prayer of the morning: P.Berol. 13415 (4th or 5th c., Hermopolis, ed. Carl Schmidt, *Zwei altchristliche Gebete*, in *Neutestamentliche Studien Georg Henrici zu seinem 70. Geburtstag*. J. C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig 1914, 66-78), P.Berol. 9444+4970 (7th or 8th c., Western Thebes, ed. Á. T. Mihálykó, “Two Coptic Prayers”, 145-155).

prayer) and perhaps some additional requests of the *prooimion* were removed too. These elements were replaced by *zaio* ‘yeah’ and a short address ‘Lord’.⁵⁶ These interventions smoothed the text somewhat, but the vestiges of the *prooimion* still break the unity of the text, which is addressed to the Father in the second person throughout, whereas the *prooimion* no longer serves its original purpose, the exhortation to prayer. This implies that the compiler (or, in case he found this text in this form, then whoever truncated the independent intercession before him) did not understand the nature of the priestly exhortation. This happened most probably in a place where these exhortations were not used in the liturgy, i.e. outside Alexandria. By contrast, the original independent intercession must have come from a place where the *prooimion* was common, for which Alexandria is the best candidate. The exhortation part of the prayer indeed parallels the wording of the intercession in the tradition of the anaphora of St. Mark (see note to fol. d, V, 1-3). On the other hand, the prayer part contains a reference to “all brethren who have fallen asleep since Adam until today”, which finds parallels in Syrian anaphoras (see note to fol. d, V, 4-13).

Since the leaf breaks off, we do not know if this intercession was the only one or the first of a sequence. It is however worth noting that all Egyptian anaphoras with a full intercessory sequence start with the living and include the dead only towards the end. The only other anaphora that starts with the deceased is in the ‘Milan euchologion’, which however likewise breaks off, thus we do not know how many intercessions it once contained. Furthermore, the anaphora attributed to Sarapion contains intercessions for the dead and those who offer gifts; these follow requests for the congregation that are in fact

⁵⁶ Similar interventions were undertaken when the last three independent intercessions of the ancient *oratio universalis* were collapsed into the Bohairic ‘Three Great Prayers’, where again the requests of the *prooimion* and the repeated address were removed. For the text of these prayers, see Andrea Nicolotti (ed.), *Il libro delle anfore della Chiesa copta ortodossa*, Jerusalemer Theologisches Forum 45, Aschendorff, Münster 2023, 396 § 424, 398 § 429, and 404 § 435.

extended fruits for communion requests.⁵⁷ These three Egyptian anaphoras thus share both the position of the intercessions at the end and the intercession for the deceased as first. Based on the parallel of the anaphora attributed to Sarapion, the hypothesis may therefore be tentatively advanced that the other two, fragmentary witnesses of this structure equally had two intercessions, for the deceased and for those who offer gifts; however, due to the loss of text this cannot be proven.

The detailed analysis of the three units thus supports my initial observation that the text of the manuscript is a compilation from an anaphora in the tradition of BARC, the three prayers from *Did 9*, and an independent intercession for the deceased. The two additions were both adjusted to their new context, but the original anaphoral doxology and the internal doxologies of the *Didache* prayers were not removed. The compiler apparently wished to update an anaphora that did not contain two elements he considered essential: the prayers of the *Didache* and anaphoral intercessions. He added these, one after the other, to the end of his anaphora, presumably because its structure had already stabilized and he did not wish to break its flow.

When could this update have taken place? The *terminus ante quem* is the sixth or seventh century, the date of the codex. As liturgical manuscripts are usually not archival copies but practical manuals reflecting one given shape of the ever-changing and highly local late antique liturgy, it requires much caution to propose an earlier date. However, in this particular case, there are arguments for dating back the compiler's intervention to the fourth or fifth centuries.

My primary argument lies in the doxologies. These are formulated "through whom" but lack the addition "with whom" and the mention of the Holy Spirit. Thereby they align with the doxologies found

⁵⁷ Nathan P. Chase, "The Fruits of Communion in the Classical Anaphoras", in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 87 (2021), 5-70. 22-23.

in fourth and fifth century papyri⁵⁸ and in the prayers attributed to Sarapion. However, in Egypt this form became obsolete in the fifth century with the rise of a particular doxology that may be called the ‘late antique standard doxology’ on account of its remarkably stable wording: “through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, through whom and with whom to you the glory and the power, with your Holy Spirit, now and always and forever, amen”.⁵⁹ It appears, with some variation mainly in the first clause, in all prayers of the Aksumite collection, as well as in a number of papyri from various locations.⁶⁰ Its success against the earlier, subordinationalist form of the doxology, of which only one instance is known beyond the fifth century,⁶¹ implies a centrally directed, theologically motivated, and remarkably successful liturgical

58 P.Monts.Roca inv. 155a, 23-27, 155b, 16-18, and 156a, 3-5 (cf. N. P. Chase, *The Anaphoral Tradition*, 282-286), P.Oxy. III 407, P.Strasb. inv. Gr. 254 (Pap.Colon. XXVIII 1), V, 24-26, P.Berol. 13415, R, 8-10.

59 This is the slavish rendering of the Greek διὰ τοῦ καὶ υρίου καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δι’ οὗ καὶ μεθ’ οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος σὺν τῷ ἁγίῳ σου πνεύματι καὶ νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων ἀμήν, which can be read *in extenso* in O.Petr.Mus. 19, R, 8-10.

60 Its earliest possible, though fragmentary, papyrological attestation, P.Laur. IV 143, V, 2-5, is dated to the fifth century. Others include the Greek P.Bad. IV 58, fol. 1, R, 11-V, 5 and fol. 2, V, 7-13 as well as the Coptic P.Bal. I 30, fol. f 8b + d 167a, R, 1-4, P.Bal. II 412, V, 11-14 (both 6th or 7th c., Deir el-Bala’izah), O.Frangez 730, 10-15, P.MoscowCopt. 95, 7-10, P.MoscowCopt. 96, 10-12 (all three 7th or 8th c., Western Thebes), Vienna, KM inv. K 8586a, V, 2-7 (7th c., Western Thebes?), ed. Helmut Satzinger, “Koptische Papyrusfragmente des Wiener Kunsthistorischen Museums [Liturgische und biblische Texte]”, in *Chronique d’Egypte* 46 [1971], 419-431, 426-428), BM EA 5892 + 14241 + O.Bachit 929 + P.Berol. 1080, 14-16 (7th or 8th c., Deir el-Bachit, Western Thebes, see Ágnes T. Mihálykó, “A Sahidic Prayer for the Vesting of a Monk and a List of Month Names”, in *Eastern Theological Journal* 10 [2024], 91-101). The ‘late antique standard doxology’ may furthermore lurk behind the many abbreviated doxologies of the sixth to eighth century papyri, a trend that was much less prominent in the fourth-fifth centuries. Such abbreviated doxologies are found in Provo, Maxwell Inst., inv. Copt. 90, R, 13-14 (6th c., ed. William F. Macomber, “The Nicene Creed in a Liturgical Fragment of the 5th or 6th Century from Upper Egypt”, in *Oriens Christianus* 77 [1993], 98-103), PSI Com. IX 1, 19-20 (second half of 7th or early 8th c.), P.Bal. I 29, R, 3-5 (6th or 7th c., Deir el-Bala’izah), and P.Berol. 1086, 14-20 (7th or 8th c., Western Thebes, ed. Ágnes T. Mihálykó, “A New Complete Witness of a Sahidic «Prayer of Offering» on Ostracon [BM EA 14180+P.Berol. 1086]”, in *Journal of Coptic Studies* 21 [2019], 163-171 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.2143/JCS.21.0.3285806>]).

61 P.Bala’izah fol. i, R, 21-26 (the connection δι’ οὗ is lost in a lacuna, but its reconstruction is likely and the absence of the Holy Spirit is certain).

reform.⁶² However, our compiler, while updating the doxologies of the *Didache* to the usage of his time, did not align them with the ‘late antique standard doxology’, which implies that he did not yet use this form. This would be unlikely after the fifth century.

Another argument for the fourth or fifth centuries is the near-canonical status that the *Didache* enjoyed in Egypt in this time. In his famous Festal Letter of 367, the patriarch Athanasius lists this work among the ambiguous category of books that are not canonical but “are read” (ἀναγιγνωσκόμενα).⁶³ Furthermore, at least three other adaptations of these prayers, the anaphora attributed to Sarapion, Ps-Athanasius’s *De virginitate*, and *Apostolic Constitutions* VII,25-26, also date from this period; the first of these is certainly Egyptian and the second may be.⁶⁴ The two extant papyrological copies of the *Didache*, the Greek P.Oxy. XV 1782,⁶⁵ and the Fayumic London, BL, Or. 9721, are also dated to the fourth and to the fifth century respectively. After these centuries, the biblical canon stabilized and the *Didache* lost its prestige. This consideration thus also speaks for the fourth or

62 It is possible that the reform happened under Cyril of Alexandria (or one of his predecessors), since Cyril is already consistent in using the ‘through him and with him’ formula (cf. Joseph Jungmann, *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer*, transl. from the 2nd revised edition of 1962, Alba House, Staten Island 1965, 186).

63 On this category see Jean Ruwet, “Le canon alexandrine des Ecritures. Saint Athanase,” in *Biblica* 33 (1952), 1-29; David Brakke, “Canon Formation and Social Conflict in Fourth-Century Egypt: Athanasius of Alexandria’s Thirty-Ninth «Festal Letter»,” in *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994), 395-419, 397-398 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0017816000030200>]; Alberto Camplani, *Atanasio di Alessandria: Lettere Festali Anonimo: Indice delle Lettere Festali*, Paoline, Milan 2003, 501; Eric Junod, *D’Eusèbe de Césarée à Athanase D’Alexandrie en passant par Cyrille de Jérusalem: De la construction savante du Nouveau Testament à la clôture ecclésiastique du canon*, in Gabriella Aragione – Eric Junod – Enrico Norelli (eds.), *Le canon du Nouveau Testament. Regards nouveaux sur l’histoire de sa formation*, Le Monde de la Bible 54, Labor et Fides, Genève 2005, 169-195, 195; Dan Batovici, *The Reception of Early Christian Apocrypha and of the Apostolic Fathers: Reassessing the Late-Antique Manuscript Tradition and the Patristic Witnesses* (PhD thesis, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven 2015), 28-32. I am grateful to Dan Batovici for sharing his unpublished dissertation with me.

64 Besides Egypt (cf. P. Bukovec, “Zur Filiation”, 252), Asia Minor and Cappadocia have been suggested as place of origin.

65 For a new edition, see Lincoln H. Blumell – Thomas A Wayment, *Christian Oxyrhynchus: Texts, Documents and Sources*, Baylor University Press, Waco, TX 2015, 282-285 No. 78.

fifth centuries as the period in which a compiler could arrive at this combination.

A final, though admittedly less compelling, argument comes from the history of the anaphoras. While in the earliest period prayers were improvised, the fourth century ushered in the era of written formularies.⁶⁶ Even though the existence of a written text did not exclude extensive redactional activity,⁶⁷ it certainly contributed to the stabilization of the structure and could deter a compiler from lengthy interpolation. Yet, this consideration provides only a *terminus post quem*. On the other hand, the fourth and fifth centuries were also the period when intercessions were becoming essential constituents of anaphoras in Egypt.⁶⁸ They are still missing in BARC and, with the exception of the diptychs, from the redaction of the anaphora of the *Apostolic Tradition* in the Aksumite collection as well.⁶⁹ Likewise, in the Alexandrian mystagogical catechesis from the late fourth or fifth century, the fact that they were split between the preface (intercessions) and the post-Sanctus (diptychs) and that their content was not yet fixed implies a recent addition.⁷⁰ In the ‘Milan euchologion’ (second half of

66 The classical study is Allan Bouley, *From Freedom to Formula: The Evolution of the Eucharistic Prayer from Oral Improvisation to Written Texts*, Catholic University of America, Washington 1981. Important observations were furthermore made by Achim Budde on the anaphora of St. Basil (*Die ägyptische Basilius-Anaphora*, 546-592), who also explored the techniques of improvisation (“Improvisation im Eucharistiegebet. Zur Technik freien Betens in der Alten Kirche”, in *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 44 [2001], 127-144). The early papyrological witnesses to written prayer formularies are discussed in Á. T. Mihálykó, *The Christian Liturgical Papyri*, 224-236. New methodological considerations can be found in N. P. Chase, *The Anaphoral Tradition*, 37-48, who distinguished an oral, an emerging written, and a fully composed written stage.

67 A well-researched example is the Egyptian anaphora of St. Basil, which incorporated much new material, including an entirely new preface, after it arrived in Egypt in the sixth century, see A. Budde, *Die ägyptische Basilius-Anaphora*, 587-593.

68 See N. P. Chase – Á. T. Mihálykó, “The «Milan Euchologion»”, 30-31.

69 See Emmanuel Fritsch, *New Reflections on the Late Antique and Medieval Ethiopic Liturgy*, in Teresa Berger – Bryan D. Spinks (eds.), *Liturgy’s Imagined Past/s: Methodologies and Materials in the Writing of Liturgical History Today*, Liturgical Press, Collegeville, MN 2016, 39-92. 49.

70 See Emmanuel Fritsch, *The Order of the Mystery: An Ancient Catechesis Preserved in BnF Ethiopic Ms d’Abbadie 66-66bis (Fifteenth Century) with a Liturgical Commentary*, in Bert Groen – Daniel Galadza – Nina Glibetic – Gabriel Radle, *Studies in Oriental Liturgy: Proceedings of the Fifth*

4th c.), moreover, an intercession for the deceased was appended to the very end, after a doxology; in this case too the intercession may have come from a separate source.⁷¹ This parallel once again points to the second half of the fourth or the fifth century as the date of the compilation.

There is however one argument against this early date, the Syrian parallels to the clause “since Adam to this day” (see notes to fol. d, V, 5-10), which implies that this was a stock formula of Syrian origin. This points to a period when Syrian influence was decisive on Coptic anaphoras, i.e. the sixth/seventh centuries.⁷² However, this argument bears little weight. The phrase may be a secondary insertion into the text of the intercession, which originally may not have contained a reference to the classes of deceased. It is furthermore not inconceivable that this clause was used in fourth-fifth century Egypt as well. Eventually, it cannot be excluded either that the entire intercession was added at a later point by a second compiler—though the arguments from the history of the Egyptian liturgy speak against such an assumption.

If the update was indeed done in the fifth century the latest, this implies that it was done in Greek, as Coptic became an accepted language for liturgical prayers only from the sixth century onwards.⁷³ In that case, the translation of the *Didache* prayers was also made from the Greek text of the anaphora without necessarily recurring to a Coptic translation of the *Didache*—though some commonalities with the Fayumic version may signal that the translator had access to such a

International Congress of the Society of Oriental Liturgy (New York, 10-14 June 2014), Peeters, Leuven 2019, 195-263. 228-229, 231-232 [doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1q26zsg.14>].

⁷¹ See N. P. Chase – Á. T. Mihálykó, “The «Milan Euchologion»”, 19-21.

⁷² On the reform of the Coptic liturgy on Syriac models, see Heinzgerd Brakmann, *Neue Funde und Forschungen zur Liturgie der Kopten (1984-1988)*, in Marguerite Rassart-Debergh – J. Ries (eds.), *Actes du IV^e Congrès Copte, Louvain-la-Neuve, 5-10 septembre 1988*, vol. 2, Institute Orientaliste, Louvain-la-Neuve 1992, 419-435. 426 and Idem, *Zwischen Pharos und Wüste. Die Erforschung der alexandrinisch-ägyptischen Liturgie durch und nach Anton Baumstark*, in Robert F. Taft – Gabrielle Winkler (eds.), *Acts of the International Congress Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (1872-1948)*, Rome, 25-29 September 1998, Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome 2001, 340-372. 351-360.

⁷³ Á. T. Mihálykó, *The Christian Liturgical Papyri*, 259-260.

translation. It is remarkable that the anaphora was not updated upon translation, and the doxologies, which counted as archaic by this time, were left in place. This implies that the translator held the anaphora in high esteem. Indeed, judging by its position at the beginning of the codex, which is implied by the extant page numbers 19-24, it was copied as the main anaphora of this euchologion. Unless its owner had access to other euchologia (or knew other prayers by heart), this curious, presumably fourth or fifth-century compilation was the default anaphora in a congregation in the Nile valley up until the sixth/seventh century.

Altogether, this fragmentary anaphora, apart from supplying us with a Sahidic text of *Did 9,2-4* and a further example of the late antique liturgical reception of these prayers, provides a further witness to redactional activity on anaphoras. If my arguments for the date hold water, this sixth or seventh-century manuscript brings us close to a compiler at work in the fourth or fifth century. The compilation process is marked by the unsuppressed doxologies and the unaltered exhortation of the intercession. This witness joins two other clear examples of redactional activity from Egypt of a comparable date,⁷⁴ the anaphora of the *Apostolic Tradition* in the Aksumite collection, which had been updated with material from the tradition of the anaphora of St. Mark,⁷⁵ and the ‘Milan euchologion’, where the secondary addition of the intercession to the end is likewise marked by an unsurpassed

⁷⁴ Besides these two obvious cases, many other examples of redactional activity have been proposed on the basis of literary analysis. To name only two Egyptian examples from a vast literature, the development of the anaphora of Sarapion was studied by Maxwell E. Johnson (*The Prayers of Sarapion*, 200-277, esp. 274); whereas the most recent proposal for the development of BARC and MARK was published by Nathan P. Chase (*The Anaphoral Tradition*, 97-143). However, literary analysis, while a valuable tool, is liable to subjectivity and can easily be influenced by scholarly agendas. Therefore, it should be undertaken with a careful consideration of the available evidence and a thoughtful methodology.

⁷⁵ Cf. Emmanuel Fritsch, *How the Antiochene Anaphora of the Apostolic Tradition Became the Ge'ez Anaphora of the Apostles*, in *Holy Spirit University of Kaslik, Faculty of Religious and Oriental Sciences, Institute of Liturgy and Department of Syriac and Antiochian Sciences, International Conference ‘Anaphora in Syriac Rites’* (26-28 April 2017), USEK, Beirut 2017, 115-158.

doxology.⁷⁶ As these examples too suggest, the fourth and fifth centuries were an intense period in the history of anaphoras, during which new units were added to existing structures.⁷⁷ The fragment presented here grants us further insight into this process.

Abstract

This article presents the first edition of an otherwise unknown, fragmentary Sahidic anaphora with translation, philological, and liturgical commentary. The manuscript, London, British Library, Or. 6877, described and partially transcribed by Bentley Layton in 1987, consists of two parchment double leaves and can be dated to the sixth or seventh centuries on palaeographical grounds. The extant text consists of the last two fruits of communion and the doxology of an anaphora, followed by *Didache* 9,3, 9,4, and 9,2 (the ‘bread’, ‘gathering’, and ‘chalice’ prayers), and an intercession for the deceased, which breaks off in the middle. The fruits of communion and the doxology bear close resemblance to the so-called ‘anaphora of Barcelona’. The quotes from *Didache* are near verbatim, even the doxologies of the prayers are kept. The intercession derives from a so-called ‘independent intercession’ of the *oratio universalis*. The anaphora is thus a veritable bricolage: to the end of an anaphora a compiler appended the prayers from the *Didache* 9 and an intercession. His purpose must have been to update an older formulary with units he considered essential in order to bring it in conformity with the usage of his place and time. As I argue, this compilation can be dated to the fourth or fifth centuries. This fragment is therefore a further witness to redactional activity on anaphoras in that period.

76 N. P. Chase – Á. T. Mihálykó, “The «Milan Euchologion»”, 33–35.

77 For an overview of the so-called ‘fourth-century interpolation theory’ and its critique by Michael Zheltov, see N. P. Chase, *The Anaphoral Tradition*, 293–299.