

A History of the Chaldean Mass

William F. Macomber, Ph.D. †

Of all the liturgies of Christendom one of the most interesting to study is the one called Chaldean.¹ It was, in fact, the first one to crystallize, acquiring substantially its present form already at the beginning of the seventh century. It is a very archaic rite, therefore, and one that is relatively free from outside influences, especially those derived from the Hellenistic culture of the Roman Empire. Indeed, no other rite was able to develop in such a degree of isolation from Hellenism, and hence no other can exemplify so well for us today Christian liturgy expressed in a non-Hellenic culture. The Chaldean rite can be considered to be the product of a fusion of Judeo-Christianity with the Assyro-Babylonian and Iranian cultures.

The predominant element of this fusion was undoubtedly Judeo-Christianity. The Chaldean rite was the rite of the Christians of the Persian Empire, in which Christianity was first preached among the Jewish communities.² Its liturgical language and its thought categories and imagery were closely akin to those of the Jews of Mesopotamia. Nonetheless, these Jewish communities were planted amid a pagan people that carried on the religion and other traditions of the ancient Assyrian and Babylonian Empires, and they were

† Dr. Macomber has been assistant professor of Oriental Liturgy at the institute of Oriental Studies in Rome. He is now cataloguer of Oriental manuscripts at the Hill Monastic Manuscript Library, Saint John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota. In 1964 he discovered in the parish church of Saint Isaiah in Mosul, Iraq, the oldest known manuscript of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari and subsequently edited it in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 32 (1966).

¹This article is intended to be the first in a series on the Chaldean mass. The nucleus of the series will consist in an analysis of the mass, primarily as celebrated by the Orthodox followers of the Chaldean rite (often called Nestorians), from the historical and comparative viewpoints. This analysis will be preceded by a consideration of the sources available for our study and other introductory topics such as the traditional disposition of a Chaldean church building, vestments, types of celebration, the preparation of the elements, and so on.

²For the history of the Church which celebrates the Chaldean rite, cf. the classic work by the late Cardinal E. Tisserant, "Nestorienne (L'Église)," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, vol. XI, part 1 (Paris 1931) 157-263. For the earliest period, cf. J. M. Fiey, *Jalons pour une histoire de l'Église en Iraq* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium [=CSCO] 310/subsidia 36; Louvain 1970). For the Sassanian period, cf. J. Labourt, *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse sous la dynastie sassanide [224-632]* (Paris 1904). For some of the more recent literature concerning the past five centuries, cf. the footnotes to my own article, "The Vicissitudes of the Patriarchate of Seleucia-Ctesiphon from the Beginning to the Present Day," *Diakonia* 9 (1974) 35-55.

governed by masters from Persia who had introduced their own culture and the religion of Zoroaster.

The ancient Chaldeans had, of course, made themselves masters of Babylon and Assyria, the same region where Christianity would later be concentrated, but their contribution to the fusion of cultures was negligible and in no way such as to justify their name being given to the rite. If I do so, my reason is one of practical utility. The name "Chaldean" seems to have been first used by the Roman ecclesiastical authorities at the Council of Florence.³ A small community of "Nestorians" living on the Island of Cyprus sought and obtained full communion with the bishop of Rome during the council. This happy event at once created the problem of nomenclature. It was unacceptable to go on designating them by the name of Nestorius, a condemned heretic, and the solution that was arrived at was to call them by the name "Chaldean," which properly designated the language of the Aramaic parts of the Old Testament, a language closely akin to Syriac, the liturgical language of the rite, which is merely another Aramaic dialect. Indeed, Syriac was often called Chaldean in Roman circles as late as the eighteenth century.⁴

Other names for the rite have been suggested. Brightman calls it the Persian rite,⁵ which may have been a suitable name in the fifth century, when the Church which celebrates the rite was mainly located within the territory subject to the Sassanian Emperors of Persia, but it has not been suitable since the overthrow of their empire by the Arabs in the seventh century. Much more commonly, liturgists and ecclesiastics have called this rite by the compound names, East Syrian and East Antiochene. Such names, however, create the erroneous impression that the Chaldean rite is merely another branch of the rite of Antioch, an impression that is without solid foundation in fact and should be discarded today.⁶ The designation "Nestorian," whatever one may think of the justice of its application to the christology of the Orthodox users of this rite, is clearly opprobrious and acceptable to no one. The Orthodox apply to themselves the name *Mšiḥaye*, that is, "Christians," or *Suryaye*, "Syrians," and they call their church the Church of the East, but such names are unsuitable for our purposes, as they do not distinguish the rite in question from others. Many Orthodox also use the name Assyrian for themselves, but this name has virtually as little historical justification as Chaldean, is a modern ethnic name not accepted by most actual

³ Tisserant, *art. cit.*, 225ff.

⁴ Cf. The title of J. S. Assemanus, *Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codicum manuscriptorum catalogus*, partis I^{ae}, t. 2^{us}, *complectens codices chaldaicos sive syriacos* (Rome 1758).

⁵ F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, vol. I, *Eastern Liturgies* (Oxford 1896) lxxvii-lxxxii and 245-305.

⁶ Cf. my article, "A Theory on the Origins of the Syrian, Maronite and Chaldean Rites," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* [=OCP] 39 (1973) 235-236.

followers of the rite, who live on the western side of the southern tip of India, and is claimed, in any case, by many members of the Syrian rite.⁷ Accordingly, I designate without scruple the rite as Chaldean.

The oldest reference to the rite with which I am acquainted occurs in one of the canons of the first general synod of the Church of Persia held in A.D. 410. The synod was convoked by the Emperor Yazdegerd I, who had apparently reached the conclusion that it would be easier to control his Christian subjects by centralizing the ecclesiastical authority over them in the person of the bishop of his own capital city, Seleucia-Ctesiphon, rather than by persecuting them. This result he achieved at the above-mentioned synod, which met under the joint direction of Isaac, metropolitan bishop, or Catholicos, of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, and Marutha, bishop of Martyropolis, who was the ambassador of the East Roman Emperor and who most probably suggested the idea of a synod to Yazdegerd.⁸ The synod concerned itself with centralization, not only with regard to ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction, but also with regard to liturgical rite: "Now and henceforward," the bishops decreed in the 13th canon, "we will all with one accord celebrate the liturgy according to the western rite, which the Bishops Isaac and Marutha have taught us and which we have seen them celebrate here in the church of Seleucia."⁹

Unfortunately, we have practically no way to determine the significance of this decree. Was the rite that the two prelates celebrated publicly at the synod the rite of Martyropolis or that of Seleucia-Ctesiphon? Were the divergences throughout the Persian Empire from this newly canonized rite very great and substantial, or were they minor and accidental? How much influence did this decree have on subsequent liturgical practice? What little evidence we do have suggests that the remarkable degree of liturgical uniformity that later characterized the Church of the East was not achieved until the time of the Patriarch Išō'yahb III (650-659), or even of Timothy I (780-823).¹⁰ In any case, did this uniform rite derive from the "western" rite of Bishops Isaac and Marutha, or rather from one of the local rites that the decree intended to suppress? We are simply unable today to arrive at certain knowledge on any of these questions.

⁷ Especially by those now living in the United States who came from Asia Minor.

⁸ Cf. my article, "The authority of the Catholicos Patriarch of Seleucia-Ctesiphon," *I patriarchati orientali nel primo millennio*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 181 [=OCA] (Rome 1968) 181, n. 10, and 200.

⁹ J. B. Chabot, *Synodicon orientale, ou recueil de synodes nestoriens* (Paris 1902) 266.

¹⁰ Patriarch Išō'yahb I (582-595), writing about 585 to James, bishop of Darai (an island in the Persian Gulf near Bahrein), tells him that the rite of signing in the mass should not be performed as James had indicated, but as he would now indicate. Chabot, *Synodicon*, 428. Barhebraeus further notes that Timothy I succeeded in suppressing some deviant usages of the province of Fars with regard to clerical attire. J. Abbeloos and T. Lamy, *Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon ecclesiasticum*, t. III (Louvain 1877) 170-171. It would be surprising if the deviations of Fars did not extend to the liturgy of the mass.

Nonetheless, the striking similarities between the Chaldean rite, as it can be known historically, and the oldest elements of the Maronite rite – including not only a common anaphora, called variously Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari, Anaphora of the Apostles, Third Anaphora of St. Peter and Šarrar,¹¹ but also other prayers of the mass, parts of the baptismal rite and hymns of the divine office – have led me to hypothesize the existence of a common rite, centered at Edessa, for all the Aramaic-speaking parts of what is now Syria, Turkey, Iraq and Iran, that cut across the political frontier between the Roman and Persian Empires.¹² This we may suppose to have been the “western rite” of Isaac and Marutha, and it was ultimately successful in supplanting any local rites that diverged from it substantially. I suspect, however, that, apart from those parts of Persian Empire and the regions beyond where Aramaic was not spoken, like India and the province of Fars, the local rites did not differ so very much. Many, at least, of the differences between the modern Maronite and Chaldean rites can be attributed to the massive influence exercised on the former by the Syrian and Latin rites.¹³

The contact between the liturgical rites of the Aramaic areas of the two empires continued for at least a half century after the synodal decrees of uniformity. During this time, many of the more influential future leaders of the Church of Persia were formed intellectually at the famous school of the Persians at Edessa in the Roman Empire. Simeon of Beth-Aršam gives us a long list of graduates of the school who later became bishops of the Church of Persia and continued to exert their influence, in some cases, even into the sixth century.¹⁴ It is practically inconceivable that they were unaffected by the liturgical usages of Edessa. It was probably at this time that the prefatory dialogue of the Anaphora of the Apostles was modified to bring it into greater conformity with the Antiochene dialogue, which the students would have encountered when they studied Theodore of Mopsuestia’s commentary on the mass and which may also have been introduced into the local liturgy that the students attended at Edessa.¹⁵

The next moment of change that we hear of with regard to the Chaldean mass is patriarchate of Mar Aba I (540-552).¹⁶ Before ascending the patriarchal

¹¹ Cf. my article, “The Maronite and Chaldean Versions of the Anaphora of the Apostles.” *OCP* 37 (1971) 55-84. Since the appearance of that article, the critical text of the Maronite version of the anaphora has been edited by J. Sauget in A. Raes, *Anaphora syriacae*, vol. II, fasc. 3 (Rome 1974).

¹² Cf. my article, “A Theory,” *OCP* (1973) 235-236.

¹³ *Ibid.* 241-242.

¹⁴ The list is given in a letter edited by J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana [=BO]*, vol. 1 (Rome 1719) 351. Cf. also Labourt, *op. cit.* 133.

¹⁵ Cf. my article, “The Maronite,” *OCP* 37 (1971) 64 and 82-83.

¹⁶ Cf. A Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn 1922) 119-120.

throne, while he was a professor at the School of Nesibis, this zealous disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia took an extended trip through the Byzantine Empire in order to look for copies of the works of Theodore and also of Nestorius, in view of their eventual translation into Syriac and their dissemination in his homeland. Among the texts that he brought back with him were two eucharistic anaphoras attributed, respectively, to these two Greek authors,¹⁷ and, after his election as patriarch, he was in a position to assure their acceptance in his Church. Another effect of his trip may have been the introduction into the mass and divine office of two litanies that have much in common with two that are today characteristic of the Byzantine rite.¹⁸

At some time during the sixth century, there occurred another important development, the end of the institution of the catechumenate and its associated *disciplina arcani*, whereby some of the ceremonies of the mass lost their original sense and other changes were probably induced.¹⁹ Early in the following century came two other key developments, the establishment of a rival Monophysite hierarchy and the conquest of the region by the religion of Islam. These had the effect of isolating the Church of the East and of insulating its liturgy against outside influences. It was at this time, accordingly, that the Chaldean mass crystallized into its actual form.

The process was virtually consummated by the patriarchate of another liturgical reformer, Išo'yahb III (650-659).²⁰ To him are attributed three works that had a powerful standardizing effect on the liturgy of the mass. One was his recension of the *Ḥudra*, the dominical antiphony,²¹ in which he assigned which

¹⁷ Ebedjesus of Nisibis, "Catalogus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum," §§ 19 and 20, *BO* III¹.

¹⁸ Cf. Brightman, *op. cit.* 262-263 and 266, compared with 362-363 and 381-382.

¹⁹ The changes are reflected in the as yet unpublished commentary of Gabriel Qaṭ raya, which dates from the early part of the seventh century. Gabriel, commenting on the dismissals, fails to interpret them in this frame of reference, contrary to the interpretation of Narsai (died ca. 503). Furthermore, the structure of the diaconal prayers that precede the dismissals, which is already that of today's missals, would seem to be unsuitable on the assumption of a living catechumenate. Although, Gabriel's commentary is unedited, the essentials of it are contained in the work of his countryman, Abraham Bar Lipheh Qaṭ raya: R. H. Connolly, "Abrahae Bar Līphae Interpretatio officiorum," in his, *Anonymi auctoris Expositio officiorum Ecclesiae*, part II (CSCO 72, 76/scriptores syri 29, 32; Paris/Rome 1913, 1915), text 173-174/transl. 159ff.

²⁰ Cf. Baumstark, *op. cit.* 197-200, and J. M. Fiey, "Išo'yaw le Grand. Vie du catholicos nestorien Išo'yaw III d'Adiabène (580-659)," *OCP* 36 (1969) 305-333, and 36 (1970) 5-46.

²¹ Cf. J. Mateos, *Lelya-Ṣapra. Essai d'interprétation des matines chaldéennes* (OCA 156; Rome 1959) 5-9, and my article, "A List of the Known Manuscripts of the Chaldean *Ḥudra*," *OCP* 36 (1970) 120-121.

anaphoras were to be used on which liturgical days²² and thus effectively reduced their number to the actual three.²³ If his recension of the *Ḥudra* included the actual texts of the anaphoras, as they are found in most of the older manuscripts of this liturgical book,²⁴ then it must also have involved a revision of their texts. In the case of the Anaphora of the Apostles, especially, since he had elected to make it the ordinary anaphora, he considered it necessary to abbreviate its lengthy text.²⁵ One of the more plausible explanations of the absence of the institution narrative in the actual text of this anaphora is that the original narrative was eliminated by Išo‘yahb when he shortened the anaphora.²⁶ Even if the anaphoral texts were not part of his recension of the *Ḥudra*, they were certainly found in his recension of another liturgical book, the *Ṭaksa*, a euchology for priests, which contains both rubrics and texts of the mass and its three anaphoras, besides other ceremonies like baptism.²⁷ This work had the effect of fixing the ceremonies of the mass almost as effectively as did the missals of Pius V in the Latin Church. His third work contributed to the same end, for it was a commentary on the ceremonies of the mass, office and other liturgical rites that seems to have set down the theological sense of the ceremonies, thus investing them with a sacrosanct quality resistant to change.²⁸

The next great patriarch, Timothy I (780-823) also seems to have left his mark on the mass. To him is attributed the introduction of the Our Father in farced form at the beginning and end, not only of the mass, but of most offices

²² The rubrics are still found in manuscripts of the *Ḥudra* at the end of the offices for the First Sunday of the Annunciation, the feast of the Epiphany and Great (Holy) Saturday.

²³ According to the eleventh century author, Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib, the “Fathers” (i.e., Išo‘yahb III’s predecessors?) had ordered the celebration of a fourth anaphora, that of John Chrysostom. Cf. W. Hoenerbach and O. Spies, *Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib. Fiqh an-Naṣrānīya. “Das Recht der Christenheit,”* part II (CSCO 167, 168/scriptores arabici 18, 19; Louvain 1957), text 90/transl. 93. However, Išo‘yahb did not retain it in his recension of the *Ḥudra*.

²⁴ Cf. my article, “A List,” *OCP* 36 (1970) 122-123.

²⁵ Ibn aṭ-Ṭayyib, *loc. cit.*

²⁶ Cf. my article, “The Maronite,” *OCP* 37 (1971) 74. The question will evidently be discussed at greater length in a subsequent article.

²⁷ Cf. Baumstark, *op. cit.* 199-200.

²⁸ This work, now lost, is repeatedly referred to in an anonymous commentary on the office, mass and other liturgical ceremonies, probably composed in the ninth century: Connolly, *Anonymi*, part II, 5, 12, 20, 40, 52, and *passim*.

and liturgical rites as well, a peculiar and characteristic feature of Chaldean liturgical functions.²⁹

During the Middle Ages, there is one isolated instance of liturgical contact with the Latin rite through Dominican missionaries. Išo'yahb Bar Malkon, metropolitan of Nisibis, in fact, not only sent around A.D. 1250 a profession of Catholic faith to the pope,³⁰ but he also made some minor changes in the *Ṭaksa* that he used, which still survives in the library of the Chaldean patriarchate in Baghdad.³¹ Besides admitting the Latin formula of baptism as an alternate, he made a change in the wording (but not in the name) of the Anaphora of Nestorius, calling Mary the "Mother of Christ, who is our God." These changes, however, do not seem to have been imitated elsewhere.

A medieval development that did have capital importance was the falling into disuse of the *bema*, a raised platform in the center of the nave where the liturgy of the word was celebrated. Much of the splendor of the ancient Chaldean mass was concentrated in the solemn processions from the sanctuary to the *bema* and back again,³² which naturally disappeared when there no longer was a *bema*. My suspicion is that the *bema* was more characteristic of the larger churches of southern Iraq and that when these were demolished, presumably on the occasion of the Tatar invasions, the *bema*, as a characteristic feature of Chaldean church architecture, virtually disappeared with them.

In the middle of the sixteenth century, the Church of the East was afflicted by a major schism.³³ For some years previous, the patriarchate had been confined to a single family, usually passing from uncle to nephew. Revolting against this manifest abuse, a party of bishops and notables elected an anti-patriarch, John Simon Sulaqa, and sent him ultimately to Rome for consecration by the Bishop of Rome. Although this first union with Rome, that lasted for about 120 years, seems to have had little direct effect on the liturgy, judging by the scanty manuscript evidence available to us, it does seem to have led to the crystallization of two distinct traditions with regard to the mass, a relatively

²⁹ *Anonymi* II, 7-8, and IV, 27 (Connolly I, text 151-157/transl. 121-125, and II, text 91/transl. 82-83). Cf. also W.C. van Unnik, *Nestorian Questions on the Administration of the Eucharist*, by Išo'yahb IV (Amsterdam 1937) 181 (QQ. 105ff).

³⁰ Cf. Tisserant, *art. cit.* 220.

³¹ Chaldean Patriarchate MS. 36. Cf. my article, "the Oldest Known Text of the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari," *OCP* 32 (1966) 346-347.

³² Cf. *Anonymi* IV, 3, 7-8 and 16 (Connolly II, text 6ff, 18-19 and 37-40/transl. 9ff, 19-20 and 37ff).

³³ Cf. J. Habibi, "Signification de l'union chaldéenne de Mar Sulaqa avec Rome en 1553," *L'Orient syrien* 11 (1966) 99-132 and 199-230. Cf. also my article, "The Vicissitudes," *Diakonia* 9 (1974) 40-41.

simple form that was adopted in the patriarchate united with Rome and more elaborate form that soon became fairly standard in the rival patriarchate.³⁴

The anti-patriarch, John Simon Sulaqa, who was consecrated in 1553 by Pope Julius III, succeeded, before he was killed by the Turks, in consecrating a successor. He, in turn, consecrated Sulaqa's brother, Joseph, as metropolitan of India.³⁵ Thither he brought the simpler form of the mass mentioned above,³⁶ if, indeed, it was not already prevalent there. The Portuguese authorities, however, were unconvinced of the sincerity of Joseph's Catholic faith and sent him as a prisoner to Lisbon and, eventually, to Rome.³⁷ His successors fared no better, with the result that the followers of the Chaldean rite in India were soon subjected to bishops of Portuguese origin. These, frustrated in their preference simply to substitute the Latin for the Chaldean rite, were compelled by popular resistance to compromise. The Chaldean lectionary and the rituals for the sacraments were replaced by the corresponding books of the Latin rite translated into Syriac, the divine office and funeral ritual were radically simplified and the missal was expurgated and reformed in a Latinizing sense. Despite the schism that this high-handed interference by the Portuguese ultimately caused, the liturgical "reform" seems to have been quite successful, for all known manuscripts and editions of the mass are practically identical with the one drawn up by Francis Roz, the first Portuguese consecrated as bishop over the Chaldean rite Christians of India³⁸ - all, until the beginning of this century, when some prayers derived from a missal intended for the Catholic Chaldeans of the Middle East were added as optional.

In 1960, however, a valiant effort at a return to traditional Chaldean usages was concretized by liturgists in a new printed missal, which was quickly translated from Syriac into Malayalam, the vernacular of the Indian State of Kerala, where the Chaldean or Malabar rite Christians are concentrated. This reform encountered, considerable resistance from older priests and bishops. The latter, therefore, published yet another vernacular missal in 1968. This missal, to the dismay of those interested in the original heritage of this Church, restored

³⁴ In the patriarchate that remained faithful to the original patriarch, all manuscripts of the mass after 1570 (Brit. Museum Add. MS. 7181) adhere, with but minor variants, to the more elaborate form.

³⁵ Cf. G. Beltrami, *La Chiesa caldea nel secolo dell'unione* (Orientalia Christiana 29, no.93, Rome 1993) 25 and 36-37.

³⁶ Found in Vatican Syriac MS. 66. Although most of the codex was copied in 1529, the rite of the mass was copied by Mar Joseph himself, apparently in 1566.

³⁷ Cf. E. Tisserant, "Syro-Malabare (L'Église), " *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, vol. XIV, part 2 (Paris 1914) 3101-3104, and Beltrami, *op. cit.* 35-51 and 86-94.

³⁸ What is thought to be the original manuscript of Roz's reformed missals was discovered a few years ago in Portugal by the E. R. Hambye, of De Nobili Theological College, Poona, India.

some of the Latin usages that had been suppressed in 1960 and even introduced new ones inspired by the reforms enacted for the Roman rite by the Second Vatican Council.³⁹

Meanwhile, in the Middle East the liturgy of the mass was becoming increasingly uniform. This was true above all in the patriarchate that had remained officially Nestorian, whose patriarchs resided in the village of Alqoṣ near Mosul and bore the name without exception after 1558 of Elias. However, even in the other patriarchate, whose patriarchs resided first in northwestern Iran and then in the high mountains of southeastern Turkey, all bearing the name Simon and being at least nominally in communion with Rome for a little more than a century, the form of mass that was characteristic of the Alqoṣ patriarchate gradually began to penetrate and supplant the earlier, simpler form. The reason for this tendency towards uniformity is not known. Within the “Nestorian” patriarchate there may possibly have been a patriarchal decree imposing uniformity, but this would certainly not explain the acceptance of the reform in the rival patriarchate. My own suspicion is that the professional copyists of Alqoṣ, where the officially “Nestorian” patriarchs resided, enjoyed a wide reputation for the beauty and clarity of their calligraphy that was unmatched elsewhere, making their missals in general demand in both patriarchates.

The trend towards complete uniformity, however, was interrupted by an unexpected turn of events. Before the Alqoṣ form of the mass was accepted at Diarbekir, the bishop there, under the influence of Capuchin missionaries, made in 1672 a public profession of Catholic faith and obtained recognition by Rome nine years later as Patriarch Joseph I,⁴⁰ an action that may well have decided Patriarch Simon to break relations with Rome and revert to open schism. Joseph I (1681-1696) limited his textual changes with regard to the mass to the insertion of the institution narrative in the Anaphora of the Apostles,⁴¹ but his successor, Joseph II (1696-1712), was educated in Rome and was a zealous Latinizer. He is known to have introduced several feasts from the Roman calendar, especially feasts of our Lady, and it may be presumed that it was he who introduced into the mass the Confiteor, a form of the Agnus Dei and the last gospel. He, too, may well have been responsible for certain “Maronitisms” that found entrance into the Chaldean mass at this same time.⁴² Further innovations were the suppression of

³⁹ Cf. the analysis of this missal by G. Vavanikunnel and J. Madey, “A ‘Reform’ of the Restored Syro-Malabr Qurbana?,” *Ostkirchliche Studien* 18 (1969) 172-181.

⁴⁰ Cf. A. Lampart, *Ein Märtyrer der Union mit Rom, Joseph I (1681-1696), Patriarch der Chaldäer* (Einsiedeln 1966).

⁴¹ Judging, at least, by Vatican Syriac MS. 491, which was copied in 1686, five years after Joseph’s recognition by Rome as patriarch.

⁴² The “Maronitisms” were an offertory prayer, a prayer of inclination (*ghanta*) of the Anaphora of the Apostles directed to the Virgin Mary, a hymn of James of Sarug at the

the chalice in the communion of the people and the abandonment of the Anaphoras of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius, but it is not clear exactly when they were made. Two final changes should be noted that were probably initiated by the first patriarch of this line, Joseph I, and which had important consequences for the future development of the mass, the celebration of daily mass, which necessitated a simpler form of the liturgy, and the multiplication of masses on Sundays and feasts, which encouraged the use of this simpler manner of celebration even on such solemn liturgical days.

A little more than a century after the union of Diarbekir, in 1778, the heir designate of Alqoš patriarchate, John Hormez, also made a public profession of Catholic faith and, despite many stormy vicissitudes during fifty years, succeeded in bringing the entire patriarchate into communion with Rome and in obtaining Roman recognition of himself as patriarch, not only of the Alqoš patriarchate but even of that of Diarbekir as well.⁴³ Juridical union of the two patriarchates, however, did not at once bring about liturgical union. Hormez' second successor, Joseph VI Audo (1847-1878), who had received his clerical formation as a monk in the Diarbekir patriarchate, seems to have made efforts at propagating the Latinized form of the Chaldean mass to which he was accustomed,⁴⁴ but not even the thirty years during which he presided over his Church were sufficient for this purpose.

It finally fell to Audo's second successor, 'Abdišo V Khayyat' (1894-1899), to undertake a serious reform that would reestablish liturgical unity. The missal that he submitted to his bishops, however, practically canonized most of the Alqoš usages and raised a storm of opposition from the defenders of the usages of Diarbekir.⁴⁵ Only under the next patriarch, Emmanuel II Thomas

fraction and a farewell to the altar at the end of mass. I suspect that Chaldean seminarians in Rome were lodged at the Maronite College.

⁴³ Cf. S. Bello, *La congrégation de s. Hormisdas et l'Église chaldéenne dans la première moitié du XIX^e siècle* (OCA 122; Rome 1939) 11-12. Cf. also the autobiography of John Hormez, in G. P. Badger, *The Nestorians and their Rituals*, vol. I (London 1852) 150ff.

⁴⁴ He arranged for a new edition of the Latinized missal at Constantinople in 1871, despite the fact that he was in open revolt against papal authority at the time, and even made manuscript copies himself. Chaldean Patriarchate MS. 272 was copied by Audo while still in Rome, 16 August 1870, just after the end of Vatican I (perhaps used for his edition of 1871), and MS. 169 was copied at Constantinople, 22 January 1871.

⁴⁵ His proposed missal was anticipated in 1880 in a manuscript prepared by the Deacon (later Priest) Abraham Šekwana of Alqoš, which is now kept at the residence of the Chaldean archbishop of Mosul. It already has the institution narrative in its actual position and contains all three anaphoras. Concerning the whole question of the proposed missal, the opposition that it raised and the compromise that resolved the dispute, cf. E. K. Delly, "L'édition du missel chaldéen de 1901," *OCP* 23 (1957) 159-170. The library of the Chaldean patriarchate also has a dossier of documents in preparation for the edition that would be interesting to study.

(1900-1947), was a compromise reached that preserved one “Latinism” and one “Maronitism” from the rite of Diarbekir, but remained substantially faithful to the rite of Alqoš, while eliminating some of its more peculiar usages.⁴⁶ One change of importance that was already present in Khayyat’s missal should be noted, the insertion of a “Chaldeanized” version of the institution narrative, no longer outside the anaphora proper, as had been done in India and at Diarbekir, but in a plausible position within the Anaphora of the Apostles. Furthermore, the new missal, published in 1901, restored the other two anaphoras, without, however, the names of their supposed authors.

After the liturgical reforms of the Roman mass at the Second Vatican Council, the Chaldean Catholics were also inspired to initiate their own liturgical reform. This was a much more modest and discreet effort than the one promoted by the bishops of India and had the effect of suppressing the last “Latinism” and “Maronitism” that had survived from the rite of Diarbekir, but otherwise left the mass virtually untouched.⁴⁷

Meanwhile, the rival Simonian patriarchate was staunchly upholding the liturgical usages of the Alqoš patriarchate, along with its “Nestorian” doctrine. Yet even here occidental influence finally made itself felt through the work of missionaries. The first to come were Catholic, the Lazarists, who worked in northwestern Iran. Most of those whom they influenced were induced to adhere to the Diarbekir patriarchate and its form of mass, but I have discovered at least one missal of a priest who acknowledged Simon as his patriarch in which the narrative institution was incorporated as part of the text and not as a marginal addition.⁴⁸ Later, the Anglicans arrived and even printed a missal for the “Nestorians” in which the mass begins with the sign of the cross and contains the Pauline version of the narrative as an optional insertion. Both of these usages now seem fairly universal in this patriarchate.⁴⁹ After the Anglicans came the Russians and, while persuading many to embrace the Orthodox dogma, induced

⁴⁶ The Latinism that was retained was the *Angus Dei* before the celebrant’s communion; the Maronitism was the offertory prayer. In devotional practice, however, the Maronite farewell to the altar has also survived.

⁴⁷ In addition, the rite of the preparation of the gifts has been shortened and shifted to a place immediately before the offertory.

⁴⁸ Harvard Syriac MS. 522, dated A.D. 1786.

⁴⁹ Some copies of J. E. Y. Kaleita’s *The Liturgy of the Church of the East* (Mosul 1928), have the narrative on an inserted slip of paper, but others I have seen (the copy of the Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, Rome) do not. The latest missal published at Trichur, India in 1959, on the other hand, has it as an integral part of the text. All masses that I have attended in recent years in which the Anaphora of the Apostles has been used have included this version of the narrative. As for the sign of the cross, it is in the Anglican edition of the missal as part of the text, and no Nestorian today would think of challenging it.

some of them to adopt at least the Anaphora of John Chrysostom in Syriac translation.⁵⁰

There are thus today, apart from some minor splinter churches, three principal communities that celebrate the Chaldean mass, two Catholic and one "Nestorian." This last-named has retained the usages of Alqoṣ substantially intact, but with the addition of the initial sign of the cross and the narrative. The two Catholic communities are the Chaldeans of the Middle East and the Malabarians of Kerala State in India. The former have basically the Alqoṣ mass, usually in a simplified form adapted for daily mass, with the same kind of modifications that the Nestorians have adopted, along with some others. The Malabarians, on the other hand, seem to be in a state of transition. The hierarchy seems to be aiming at a modernized liturgy that will be open to Indianization and to ultimate unification with the local Latin liturgy, once that, too, will have become Indianized. Their reforms, therefore, are taking the Malabarian mass on a course that emphatically diverges from tradition, even though the textual changes thus far introduced are far short of what their ultimate intentions seem to be. They are, however, encountering considerable vocal opposition on the part of many priests who prefer the reformed mass of 1960, which approached the Alqoṣ mass much more closely than the Chaldean Catholic mass has done, even in its most recent form. As for the splinter churches, at least two of them are known to exist in Middle East and the United States, but information concerning the mass that they celebrate and their fidelity to tradition does not seem to exist in print.⁵¹

⁵⁰ At the residence of the Chaldean archbishop of Teheran there is a manuscript copy of the Mass of John Chrysostom in Syriac dated A.D. 1904.

⁵¹ In Baghdad I have encountered a splinter church that accepts the dogma of the Russian Orthodox Church, but neither its hierarchical authority nor its liturgy. In the United States, moreover, there is a small church of former Protestants that has adopted the Chaldean liturgy, perhaps in a modified form. I have met one of the bishops of this church, John M. Stanley O.S.J., metropolitan of India, Holy Apostolic Church, Chaldean Rite, whose address is or was: Route 2, Box 96, Burton, Vashon Is., Washington 98013. This group must have some relationship to the Apostolic Episcopal Church, headed by Arthur W. Brooks B.D., bishop, Apostolic Episcopal Church, 9148 193rd St., Hollis, New York. According to Professor Bertil Persson, St. Ephrem's Institute, Solna, Sweden, the bishops of this church claim to have received their orders from the Catholic Chaldean Patriarch Emmanuel II Thomas in 1925.