

**WORSHIP
IN A SECULAR AGE**

Dr. Paulose Mar Gregorios

Outstanding scholar, theologian, philosopher, polyglot and man of letters. Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios sought to bring together in a holistic vision, several unrelated disciplines like philosophy, economics, political science, medicine, education, physics and theology.

Born in 1922 at Tripunithura, Kerala, the great scholar-bishop had his earlier stints in his homestate as a journalist and postal service employee. He proceeded to Ethiopia in 1947 accepting the job of a teacher there and in course of time became the Special Secretary to Emperor Haillie Sellasi. He had an exceptional educational career in Yale, Princeton and Oxford Universities. Returning to Kerala, he was ordained as a priest of the Orthodox Church. In 1967 Fr. Paul Verghese became the Principal of the Orthodox Theological Seminary. In 1975, he was elevated as a bishop. Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios took charge of the Delhi Diocese of the Orthodox Church in July 1975.

Honours came unsought to Mar Gregorios. He had the good fortune to be the President of the World Council of Churches and the Indian Philosophical Congress. In 1988, he received the Soviet Land Nehru Award. His Grace travelled widely and showed an unusual intellectual courage to explore new paradigms in human thinking. He was visiting professor in several universities like the J. N. U. in New Delhi. The philosopher-bishop passed away on 24th November 1996 and his mortal remains lie entombed in the Orthodox Seminary Chapel, Kottayam.

Including the posthumous publications, Mar Gregorios has authored more than 37 books. *The Joy of Freedom, Freedom of Man, The Cosmic Man, The Human Presence, Enlightenment East and West, A Light Too Bright* and the spiritual autobiography *Love's Freedom: The Grand Mystery* are some of the most remarkable among these. Hundreds of his articles and lectures have been published in leading newspapers, and international magazines.

WORSHIP IN A SECULAR AGE

Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios

**MAR GREGORIOS FOUNDATION
ORTHODOX SEMINARY, KOTTAYAM**

WORSHIP IN A SECULAR AGE

Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios

© Mar Gregorios Foundation

First Edition: November 2003

Second Edition: May 2013

Third Edition: Sept. 2014

Published by Mar Gregorios Foundation, Kottayam

Distributed by Sophia Books, Kottayam Mob: 99471 20697

Cover, Type Setting & Printing: Sophia Print House, Kottayam

Price **Rs. 100/-**

Contents

<i>Preface to the first edition</i>	6
<i>Preface to the second edition</i>	7
1. Worship in a Secular Age: An Introductory Discussion	9-22
2. The Worship of God in a Secular Age: Certain Terminological Notes	23-37
3. The Worship of God in a Secular Age: Towards a conceptual clarification	38-43
4. Act of Love	44-46
5. What is Prayer? Why Pray? How Pray?	47-54
6. Bible and Liturgy	55-56
7. Church Calendar and Festivals	57-59
8. A Brief History of Choral Music	60-62
9. East Syrian Worship	63-65
10. West Syrian Worship	66-69
11. The Ethiopian Liturgical Tradition	70-83
12. Worship And Discipline in the Coptic Church	84-92
13. Mar Thoma Church Worship	93-95
14. The Liturgical Tradition of the Syrian Orthodox Church	96-105
15. Relation between Baptism, 'Confirmation' and the Eucharist in the Syrian Orthodox Church	106-119
16. Church, Sacrament And Liturgy in Fr. Louis Bouyer's Liturgical Piety	120-147
17. Liturgical And Iconographic Development as Reactions To Docetic - Gnostic and Iconoclastic Heresies	148-157

Preface to the first edition

Metropolitan Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios had a deep insight into the vital connection between liturgy, theology and Christian life. His broad vision of Reality was essentially informed by his liturgical experience as a Christian steeped in the Eastern Tradition. True to the spirit of Eastern Christianity, Mar Gregorios always held that genuine human freedom arose from the true worship of God. It is significant that his first major book, published in 1967, was titled *Joy of Freedom: Eastern Worship and Modern Man*. His concern for God's creation, for the well-being of humanity and building up of a just and peaceful society was the outcome of his theological conviction arising from a liturgical and experiential spirituality.

As part of the project to publish the complete works of Mar Gregorios we are publishing in this volume his articles and papers on worship and liturgy. They span more than 30 years of his life. Most of the materials are already published on different occasions in various publications. This volume is published with the generous contribution of Mr. Paul George, Ernakulam. We wish to express our deep gratitude to him and his family.

We hope this volume will be warmly received by the readers of Mar Gregorios and all those who are interested in liturgical theology and spirituality.

Fr. Dr. K. M. George
President
Mar Gregorios Foundation

Orthodox Theological Seminary
Kottayam
24 November 2003

Preface to the second edition

Metropolitan Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios, thinker, writer, ecumenical leader and great champion of world-peace and environmental integrity was uniquely recognized as a scholar committed to the task of a holistic approach in philosophy and religious wisdom. Two of his books had special reference to one of the most dear areas of his interest viz. Liturgical studies: eastern and western

1. Joy of Freedom : Eastern Worship and Modern Man (1967)

2. Worship in a Secular Age (2003)

In 1965 Mar Gregorios wrote a paper on “the Worship of God in a secular age” for the WCC Uppsala Assembly Section V. This and similar papers related to the theme of Worship were compiled in the form of a book in 2003, under the same title of the keynote-paper, and the present volume is the second edition of the same work, “Worship in a Secular Age”. It is no wonder that the first edition of the work was well received by the readers, and students on account of the depth, diction and design of the contents.

It is hoped that the second edition of “Worship in a secular age” will also be received by scholars and students with interest. The Mar Gregorios Foundation (M.G.F) is hereby entering a new collaboration with Sophia Books, Kottayam for the printing and distribution of this volume while the MGF continues to be the publisher. The Mar Gregorios Foundation is thankful to all those who ventured to bring out the second edition especially to Fr. C. C. Cherian the Secretary of MGF

and Mr. Joice Thottackad the Secretary of Sophia Books for their initiatives, commitment and hard work. We wish all readers of this book a very pleasant experience of real enlightenment. After all, whether secular or not, we all are called to share the joy of worship.

Fr. Dr. Jacob Kurian

President

Mar Gregorios Foundation

Orthodox Theological Seminary

Kottayam

Easter, 2013

1

WORSHIP IN A SECULAR AGE: AN INTRODUCTORY DISCUSSION

Let me open the subject by painting two pictures of worship services I have seen during this year in two different parts of the world, under totally different circumstances.

I shall begin with what happened just ten days ago in Olinda, in the Northeast province of Brazil in a Roman Catholic Church. Olinda is perhaps the oldest Catholic community in Latin America, and the Benedictine Abbey Church where I went for a Sunday evening mass bore eloquent testimony to a bygone era of baroque triumphalism. The sanctuary was dusty and repellent to a sensitive eastern mind, while the tarnished bronze and gold altar bespoke of neglect and decadence as well as of a loud and ugly Spanish splendour that had faded away.

The service, however, was in stark contrast with the setting. The altar had been placed down in the nave, and a handsome young Benedictine monk in shirt sleeves was flitting to and fro in the chancel getting things ready for the mass as the worshippers waited on their benches, chattering informally, some young lovers holding their beloveds in their arms; lots of teenagers and young people happily

gossiping away or chewing gum; a few older and more traditional looking Catholics with rosaries in their hands. The Catholic priest did the first part of the mass up to the Gospel and sermon in his shirt sleeves and preached a sermon on the Good Samaritan- a very good secular sermon, substituting the priest by a Catholic bishop, the Levite by a Protestant pastor, and the Good Samaritan by a city prostitute who took the victim of a car accident to the nearest hospital in a taxi. He made it clear that he was by no means suggesting that it was better to be a city prostitute than a Catholic bishop, but simply that in this particular instance the prostitute was more Christian than the bishop. After this the priest invited a German Lutheran girl of about 20 to talk to the Church about her experiences in Brazil. The girl was clad in dirty red pants and a red striped T-shirt which had obviously not been washed for many weeks. I had noticed this girl coming to Church with a lit cigarette in her mouth, which she had carefully put out before entering, depositing the butt in her purse for later use. She spoke about how the churches had failed to do anything about the real problems of humanity and were insincere and hypocritical. She suggested that the word God should not be used at all since it was much misunderstood. After she finished, the priest vested himself, said mass, and half of those present took communion, while a group of youngsters played some mellow rhythm music on the guitar. What was left in the chalice and paten was given to some teenagers to consume at the altar, and they did so with obvious relish, looking at each other and giggling. There was a song about peace and then the benediction.

The two American Episcopalian friends who were with me were thrilled to their bones, and regretted that their own church could not do anything of the kind. This was truly worship in a secular age, which spoke to the needs of people.

The second experience I want to talk about happened in the Pechora monastery in northwestern Russia last April, during Lent. This monastery is also a silent witness of a bygone age in the history of the Russian Church, an age when Church and State were even more closely linked than in Portuguese Brazil. The gold in the chapels was well maintained and far from tarnished or faded. The icons and frescoes still shone with an inner spiritual vitality which seemed to be quite independent of the iconographer's technique of mixing paints. The monks were old and infirm, not very *au courant* with the passing clouds of ideology or fashion in the outside world. They faithfully did

their manual labour in the monastery gardens, said their offices in the chapels, reverently laid incense in their golden censers and visited the rows of underground tombs of Russia's heroes and saints- all exactly as it had gone on for three or nine centuries in the past. There were some Russian tourists present, and from their clothes and attitudes, one would think that they were completely secular, drawn to this inaccessible monastery only by a historical or archaeological interest. They did not quite know how to make the sign of the Cross, but that did not seem to prevent them from reverent participation in what to many secular people in the west must have appeared sheer superstition and meaningless ritualism.

I must now make a confession to you. I was carried away by the vespers at the Pechora monastery and I had a deep sense of communion with God, with the Saints and with the Russian orthodox people in that ritual, which had no apparent relevance to our secular age, or to the problems confronted by Soviet Russia today. I must also confess that I felt I was a mere spectator at the service in Brazil, with absolutely no sense of participation, though I tried to sing the Portuguese hymns and say the Lord's Prayer in the Mass. Perhaps that confession is enough for some of you to stop listening to me. If so, I shall not be offended. Perhaps my mind and spirit are sick, and I need to be healed and restored to a renewed technological-secular consciousness.

But let me just make a series of simple statements which reveal my own difficulties with this ideology the "Secular" which has marked the ecumenical scene during the past 20 years and is today being quietly superseded.

1. The expression "secular age" is literally a tautology, like saying a "bovine cow" or an "ecclesiastical church" -for *seculum* means age or time - word "Secular age" thus means "temporal time". My Latin is not very good, but it would, translated into Latin, read something like *Saeculum Saeculi*, and if we parody the response to the *Gloria Patri*, would sound like a good response to *Gloria tibi homine*. I will accept the terminology of "Secular age" as a working idea, but not as a concept which can stand philosophical or linguistic justification.

2. That leads me to my second point namely that the Secular ethos of our world today is characterized by two mutually related factors - (a) the eclipse of God and (b) the autonomy of man.

It is important to note that it is the eclipse of God that makes possible the autonomy of man. The eclipse can be interpreted in at least three different ways.

One way has been to talk of the death of God, as an “event which took place in our life time” from which even humanity is to draw the conclusion that man is on his own, and that he must take the responsibility to shape and control reality. This way was first proposed in recent history by Frederich Nietzsche, Jean-Paul **Sartre** and a few so-called theologians .

A second way, which is still a life option for many theologians of the West, is the way proposed by Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Here the proclamation is that God wants man to live as if God did not exist -*etsi Deus non daretur*. The eclipse of God is thus something willed by God Himself in order to make humanity wake up from its passivity and inaction so that it can assume responsibility for the world and do what is needed. Here the demand is for a “church for others” in a “world come of age”, practising a religionless Christianity, a secular gospel lived out in the secular world.

The third and more profound interpretation of the eclipse of God has come from the great Jewish philosopher, Martin Buber. Buber advances two reasons for the eclipse of God which I shall interpret in my own language. The first is an event in the consciousness of man - namely that he has now reached a stage beyond self-awareness. He is now conscious of his consciousness. He knows that he thinks, as for example, Descartes beginning his philosophy with the thought about the fact that he is thinking, and deriving the certainty of his existence from that fact. Now this consciousness of consciousness or thought bending back on itself rises up as a cloud between us and the other about whom I am conscious. In prayer, for example, the consciousness of the fact that I am praying, rises up as a cloud between me and God, and my awareness of myself in prayer shuts out the presence of God and thus makes prayer impossible. The eclipse of God is thus experienced most deeply in the inability to pray. Prayer does not get through. Like modern thought it turns upon itself and feeds upon itself.

A second reason for the eclipse of God, in this way of thinking, is that technology has developed an objectifying tendency on the part of man towards all reality, or in Buber's language, the tendency to turn every “Thou” into an “it”. What was only personally addressed before has now become an object to manipulate and exploit, as we do with

nature today. If God could have been caught in the web of our science, our technology would be there to objectify Him also and enslave Him in order to exploit Him for our own purposes. When God refuses to be caught by our objectifying consciousness, we deny His existence. It is thus the objectifying consciousness which is so central to science and technology that induced the eclipse of God.

3. This leads me to my third point. If the Secular age is one characterized by the eclipse of God, and if it is the eclipse of God that is behind the assertion of the autonomy of man, then the most characteristic feature of the Secular age is the eclipse of God, and we have to evaluate this phenomenon as objectively as we can. I believe that the idea of the death of God is valid and an explanation for the eclipse of God only in the sense that what has died is not God, but only our idea of God. This idea of God, on deeper analysis, turns out to be an idol that has been created by theologians, especially in the West. In that sense the death of this idol is a matter for rejoicing, especially for Christians whose relation to God is not through ideas, but rather through the act of worship and prayer in which God remains a subject and not an object, one who can be addressed, loved and adored, but who cannot be described or conceptualised or comprehended

While I have some sympathy thus with the idea of the death of God, interpreted in this special sense of the death of an idea or of an idol, I have no such sympathy for the second or Bonhoefferian type of interpretation of the eclipse of God. Let me briefly indicate my main difficulty with Bonhoeffer's central demand that God wants us to live "as if God did not exist". Bonhoeffer fully affirms the reality of God, but wants us to cease being passive and to assume full responsibility for the world, "as if God did not exist" -*etsi Deus non daretur*. I can understand the circumstances in which he developed this strange idea in the context of a demonic Third Reich in Nazi Germany. The pietistic majority in the Lutheran Church was too prone to take a literalistic view of the Lutheran idea of two kingdoms and to maintain faith or religion as a purely internal matter in one's consciousness, whereas in all "secular" matters one was simply to give un-questioning obedience to the regime in power, which had, after all, according to St. Paul in Romans 13, been "ordained by God". Neither was it enough, according to Bonhoeffer, simply to maintain the purity of one's faith by confessing only the Lordship of Jesus Christ as Earth had done in re-fusing to confess Hitler as Lord. It

was necessary to accept responsibility for changing the situation and not merely to keep your religion in your heart or to profess it by word of mouth. When Bonhoeffer spoke about religionless Christianity in a secular age, he was rejecting the religion of the Pietists and the Barthians, and was asking for a faith that resulted not in piety or in words, but in action.

Where Bonhoeffer went wrong, it seems to me, was in suggesting that God wants us to live as if God did not exist. For if we are to live as if God did not exist, clearly we cannot pray or worship, since so to do would be to live as if God did exist. Bonhoeffer of course said some things about the *diplina arcana* or the hidden life of prayer, but he was basically mistaken about the place of prayer and worship in the life of the Christian. The Orthodox believe that personal prayer and community worship, rather than theology or proclamation, are the true modes of not only affirming the being of God, but also of confessing and acknowledging the fact that we are not our own, that we are not autonomous, that we have our being from God can only be addressed in prayer and worship.

To live as if God did not exist would therefore be to live without prayer and worship, and to live that way is truly to perish in the lack of the knowledge of God. It is for this reason that the outdated monks of Pechora monastery were more directly relevant to our own existence than the apparently relevant worship of the Abbey Church in Olinda.

4. Here we come to the fourth point. The “Secular Age” is a natural consequence of a God-objectifying theology, and the right way to prevent this happening to our own Orthodox Churches is to renew worship in such a way that it becomes the authentic means of addressing the transcendent God through the incarnate Christ in the Holy Spirit, and of experiencing our union with the transcendent God. Theology has to remain a handmaid of worship, love and service, but not the object or even the mode of expression of faith. The Spirit of Scholasticism with its tendency to objectify God and to analyse Him had already involved and pervaded our own Orthodox Churches quite some few centuries ago, partly due to our struggle with the Latins and with the Protestants. We need today to pull back from this scholastic tendency in our theology to make theology ancillary to worship and mission, rather than the central pre-occupation of the Church. This is particularly urgent because the very ecumenical

movement may expose us to the temptation of expressing the difference between us, the Eastern tradition and those of the Western tradition in purely dogmatic or theological terms. We may be tempted to defend dogma, just because it is being attacked by Western theologians ever since Harnack, despite Barth's attempts to reinstate dogma.

5. Fifthly, I would like to say that we of the Eastern tradition have to learn something from this phenomenon of a secular faith and a secular theology. Our tradition is just as much in danger as was Western theology some centuries ago, of carving out a certain realm of life as the proper field of "religion" and regarding the rest as "secular", of no concern to the Church. This danger calls for three definite reforms in our own Church tradition.

First, our prayer and worship have to become more deeply saturated with a genuine and authentic concern for the life of humanity, especially of the poor and the oppressed. This does not mean developing new and "relevant" forms of experimental worship; but it does mean a thorough revision of all our litanies and intercessory prayers used in the Eucharistic liturgy and in daily offices, as well as in personal or family prayer. The litanies and intercessory prayers that we now use are sadly dated in the past, and we need to create new prayers related to the current situation of our Churches and of the people around us. This calls for a certain boldness in liturgical innovation, which is sure to be strongly resisted and opposed by our own people, but unless this is done we would not truly be fulfilling the role of the Christian Church as the Body of Him who is the Priest of Creation, even Jesus Christ the perpetual Intercessor for the world.

Secondly, the same concern for suffering humanity- and that includes the desperate poor and the lonely rich, the struggling revolutionaries and the callous upper classes - should be expressed also in our preaching, which should always strive to relate the lessons from the Scriptures to the lives of the people around us. A new programme of intensive training of the priests for the understanding of the Bible and for its authentic interpretation has to be envisaged by the Eastern Churches. We are still deplorably weak at this point, and there should be an attempt in which all the seminaries and theological faculties of the Orthodox world can cooperate to make Biblical preaching once again relevant as it was in the days of St. John Chrysostom and the Cappadocian Fathers.

Third, the Orthodox Churches have also been hit by the malaise that has befallen almost all Christian Churches - what I call our middle-class isolation for the masses of people. The people who are most active in the local Church, priest and laity -are usually out of touch with the people of lower socio-economic levels. This phenomenon fundamentally distorts the true character of the Church where the rich and the poor, the Greek and the Russian, the Syrian and the American all belong to the same and only Body of Christ. A special effort has to be made, to interpret the poor and the dispossessed first in the Eucharistic assembly inside the Church building, and also in a life of genuine compassion and sharing in the daily life of the Christian community as a whole. If any one member of the Church suffers, the whole body suffers. This reality must be manifested in the life of the Church which must become a genuine commune, with authentic mutual aid and support. Here is an area where the young are in a better position to pioneer in bringing the healing and comforting presence of the Church to the aid of the poor, the depressed, the oppressed, the lonely, the sick, the bereaved, etc. Women too, it seems to me, have a special role in this ministry of diakonia, without which intercessory prayer in a secular age becomes meaningless and hypocritical.

6. Sixth, it is a matter of rejoicing that the reaction against traditional forms of worship are not half as acute or wide-spread in the Eastern Church as it is in the Western Churches. We can take comfort in the fact that Eastern worship, which follows the authentic tradition of the Church, is a time-tested and basically healthy form. We do not need the gimmicks of experimental worship to pander to the sensation-seeking and the bored. But the fact that we need much less liturgical reform than the West should not lead us to the conclusion that we need none at all.

I want to mention here a few reforms which seem to be totally and urgently necessary.

Regular Communion

I would place as the first reform necessary the restoration of regular communion by all members of the Church except those that have been ex-communicated. I do not doubt that participation in the Divine Liturgy without participation in the Eucharistic Communion has its own value for the Christian, and does help him to be open to God through the Scriptures and through the prayers and the drama of the liturgy. This is why the Tradition insists that even ex-communicated

Christians should attend the liturgy without taking communion. But is it not ironic that the majority of Christians should act like excommunicated Christians every Sunday? What good reasons are there for our believing people not being encouraged to enter into full bodily, sacramental communion with our Lord Jesus Christ and with the saints and the departed and with each other every Sunday? Is that not our true reality? Is that not the reality we have to live in the Resurrection and therefore today? I hope again that the youth of the Orthodox Churches would show the way for the rest of the Church. We need of course to help our bishops and priests see the need for such regular communion. Perhaps it may be possible to start with regular group communion of some young people once every month with the preparation and then move on to regularly weekly communion. Just as Protestant youth is clamouring for indiscriminate inter-communion, which I think is justified among Protestants, our Orthodox youth must show the way forward by practising regularly communion with adequate preparation.

Re-examination of Confession

Many of the Orthodox Churches seem to insist on auricular Confession and Absolution before Communion. We need to have a historical-theological study of the origins of this practice. Clearly this was not the case in the early centuries when everyone took communion every Sunday. The general confession and general absolution were regarded as adequate in those days. Special auricular confession was used very rarely, and that only in the case of graver sins like apostasy, murder and adultery. My own limited knowledge of the tradition has convinced me that the practice of regular auricular confession came into the Orthodox Churches only around the 12th century or later as a result of Latin influence. But I am not arguing for the abolition of auricular confession. I am convinced that this is a pastoral necessity for believers living in a sinful world to have the possibility of a periodic personal confession to a priest of the Church and receiving personal absolution. But this should not be made obligatory every time before receiving communion. What is even more important is to give proper training to our priests to hear confession in a way that is genuinely helpful to the believer. Today quite often confession is perfunctory and therefore a parody of true confession. Spiritual counselling is related to personal confession, but such counselling can be done independently of auricular confession and absolution and can be done

in the home or in the study by a competent priest, or even by unordained but spiritually mature and psychologically trained laymen. This whole matter of spiritual counselling and auricular confession should be thoroughly studied by the Orthodox Churches together and new patterns evolved to make them really serve the purpose of spiritual growth for all believers. This is vital to the renewal of worship and renewal of the life of the Church.

Congregational Participation

I am a great believer in the magnificent contribution that well-trained choirs can make to the spiritual beauty and orderliness of Eastern worship. But I do not think that the choir has any right to usurp completely the role of the congregation in responding to the prayers of the priest and the deacon in the liturgy. The Lord's Prayer, the Creed, the hymns and the responses should be said by the whole congregation and the role of the choir must be to lead the congregation in these responses, prayers and hymns, and not to replace them. The congregation is the worshipping community and they should not be reduced to the level of mere spectators. I feel that this needs proper examination and the formulation of necessary reforms by the authorities of the Church.

The Language of Worship

I do believe that the normal language of the people should be the language used in worship. I think this has always been the practice of the Eastern Churches. Problems are raised for immigrant communities where the older generation places more emphasis on ethnic identity, while the younger members ask for the possibility of more understanding participation. I think the principle of using the normal language of the people should be strongly emphasized, and I doubt the validity of the ethnic identity in the Christian Church. I would however be in favour of retaining certain expressions in the traditional liturgical language of the particular Church, because our ordinary language is inadequate to express our deeper emotions, and certain old expressions for praising God like Halleluyah, Amen, Kyrie Eleison and even the Gloria and its response can still be used in an ancient language to bring more emotional depth into our prayers. But the basic principle should be the use of the ordinary language, without total elimination of some of the expressions in the ancient liturgical language. There are moments in the worship of God when intelligibility has to give place to a kind of speaking in tongues - in ardent exaltation in an unusual language which speaks to the heart more than the mind.

Preparation of the Congregation for Worship

Our most significant form of religious education may be in enabling believers to understand the true meaning of worship, especially of the Eucharist and the other sacramental mysteries of the Church. The structure, the symbolism and the theology of eucharistic worship have to be taught again and again to our people, and we have to train them to participate much more consciously and actively in the worship of the Church. Our people have to be taught why they worship and that worship is an act of the whole Church and not just the priest and the choir. They should not be tempted to evaluate the worship of the Church by the measure of what they get out of it. They have to be trained to see that worship is the great saving act which results from the Incarnation, and therefore to engage in it with joy and readiness, not looking for selfish personal benefits or private edification. A more intelligent rationale for worship and a more profound theology of worship have to be taught to our people, than what they now have. Here is also the place to teach them the relation between worship and daily life.

Architecture and Symbolic Art in the Church

Our Churches are beginning to be led astray by certain contemporary trends in Church art and architecture, where modernity becomes a higher priority than symbolic meaning, and functional utility more than the spiritual atmosphere. The church building is the presence of heaven on earth, an earthly experience in time of the kingdom that transcends time and space. The space inside the Church should therefore be so organised as to transcend ordinary space. The art and the symbolism must certainly point beyond the ordinary concerns of functional utility. The altar must remain a place of mystery into which priests and deacons enter only with fear and trembling and not in the casual manner in which many priests and laymen enter it today. If we become too casual in the Church, we will soon lose all our sense of the transcendent and be reduced to the secular. This applies to the vestments, the iconostasis, and paintings inside the Church, all of which must be conducive to experiencing the sense of the transcendent.

Conclusion

The Secular Age, however tautological an expression that might be, is a reality—a dangerous reality. The eclipse of God is about the

worst thing that can happen to man. It is only by the grace of God that there happen to be some redeeming features in the fact of this secular age. Orthodox Churches have to become aware of both the peril and the opportunity in the crisis. Both the dangerous and the positive aspects call for two related reactions on the part of the Orthodox Church.

The danger lies in the fact that the secular world is a world separated from God. All that is separated from God must perish, for there is no being that can have any being apart or separated from Him who is the source and ground of all being. The world is in peril of being destroyed, for the wrath of God destroys everything that is evil. This means that we in the Orthodox Churches have a special role to play. It is perhaps a role for a creative minority in the Orthodox Church. We are to become like Abraham praying for Sodom and Gomorrah: "Lord if there be 50, nay 10, nay 5 righteous men in these cities, destroy them not, O Lord". The role of the Church, the Body of Him who is the Priest of Creation is to continue incessantly in prayer for our world. Thus alone the Church becomes the saving link between God and the world, even when the world does not recognize God. It is not theology that links God and the world, but the life of the Church united in prayer with the Great Intercessor, who became part of our world in order to link it to God.

The task of vicarious worship and priestly intercession is being increasingly neglected by our secularised western Christian brethren. As in Pechora, there are Catholic monks in Carthusian and Trappist monasteries who continue to engage in this ministry of intercession. But in general, Catholic monasticism is in danger of becoming a secular activist group, while our own monks are not adequately sensitive to the needs and problems of the world of today. The one thing which can revitalize our worship is to have a new kind of monastic movement, fully at home in the modern world and in the world of the great mystery of worship and prayer. I do not think the way to renewal of worship in our Churches is either through a new theology or more active participation in social and political questions, but by developing a genuine, God-centred, loving, vicarious interiority of the Spirit through the disciplined community of worship, work, study and service. Such monastic communities must spring out of the new situations in the secular world — whether in America, Greece, Russia, the Middle East or India. Now I personally wish I could leave aside my globe-trotting and my administrative and other activism, and become a part of such a genuinely eucharistic praying, loving community!

The positive aspect of the secular crisis is that the Orthodox are called upon to re-interpret, re-appropriate and re-live their own Christian heritage in the context of a world that poses new questions to us in the new social setting in which God has placed us. We must not be bullied to inertia by the admiration and praise that we hear from the non-Orthodox or even from the Orthodox about the superiority of our worship forms.

We must also listen to the criticisms leveled against us by our fellow-Christians of the West. These are mainly three:

I. First about our ethnic insularity. The Church cannot belong to anyone nation, whether that nation be Hebrew or Greek, Slavic or Indian. The Church is a Sacrament of the unity of all mankind, of all nations, and peoples, and unless we break open the ethnic barriers, our worship will remain inadequate as a witness to the Kingdom of God in time and space. Here I expect our youth to show us the way in overcoming our petty parochialism, so that a genuinely multi-ethnic Church becomes formed, especially in America and the Middle East, but also in Greece and Russia.

II. The second criticism was recently phrased by a sympathetic Protestant friend who said: "The Orthodox are in communion with each other, but how they hate each other, after having given the embrace of love and taken communion together!" This is a terrible insult to our worship, and unless we do something to overcome this mutual hatred between our Churches, our worship in a secular age would become a parody of true Christian worship. Here again Orthodox youth must break through and show us the way. How my heart grieves to see the great Orthodox Church divided by human pettiness, personality cult and power-seeking!

III. The third criticism is about our insensitivity and lack of concern about the problems of the world in which we live. We may be justified in accusing our western brethren of activism and lack of interiority. But are we not in danger today of having neither time nor interiority nor any love for mankind? The Antonine monks of the ancient Egyptian desert were men who burned with genuine love for mankind and linked that love to the love of God in true prayer. We should stop boasting about the quality of our worship and realize with horror that often what draws us to our Churches is sheer ethnic pride without the love of God or the love of man. The great vocation of the Orthodox Church today is to demonstrate a new way of authentically relating

the two poles of the Christian life, the love of God and the love of man. We are not equipped to do that now. We have to learn prayer again. We have to be released from our personal, group, and ethnic egoism through a deeper experience of the love of God in faith and worship. And we must develop a new awareness of and sensitivity to the fears and aspirations of mankind, identifying ourselves with the victims of misery and oppression of injustice and inhumanity. This love of God and this love for the whole of mankind must be intensely relived, in order that the Church may be purged of the heresy of divisive struggles for power and be purified to fulfill its ministry of being the Priest of Creation and its Good Shepherd who cares for it, nourishes it, and dies for it.

2

THE WORSHIP OF GOD IN A SECULAR AGE: CERTAIN TERMINOLOGICAL NOTES

Title

The title, first formulated in English (*The Worship of God in a Secular Age*), is not easy to translate into other languages. The word *Worship*, for which there seems to be no equivalent in Biblical or modern languages other than English, stands in the document for both corporate worship and all forms of group or personal prayer. Often the words “worship and prayer” or their equivalents are used to facilitate translation.

The word “Secular” as an adjective qualifying our time, connotes the presence in our age both of secularisation as an accelerated process, and of secularism as a complex of assumptions.

Secularization and Secularism (Theses 1-6)

The document maintains a distinction between the two, while recognizing that they are related.

Secularization as an English word goes back to 1706 at least, while the adjective *Secular* was already current in English before

1350 (*Seculer* in Old French). Both are derived from Latin *saeculum* and *Saecularis*, the age, the world, pertaining to the world or to the age.

Secularization should be understood in its double aspect - the intellectual and the institutional.

The acceleration of the process of intellectual secularization in the west begins with the view developed by Duns Scotus and Cekham positing radical discontinuity between faith and knowledge, between revelation and reason. Other developed the line of demarcation further. While for Scotus and Ockham the emphasis was on reason, for Luther it was on Revelation. The cleavage grew wider in the Italian Renaissance, and the search of reason for complete freedom from Revelation received further impetus from Soscartes, Hobbs, Spinoza and Leibruiz, in their attempts to construct a rational picture of the universe based on empirical data alone.

The European process of secularization has a two - fold aspect - the liberation of human thought from religious presuppositions, and the liberation of human institutions from ecclesiastical control. The nature and function of the State, for example, began to be thought of in independent, autonomous, immanent terms rather than in terms of a transcendent order subsidiary to the saving purpose of God through the Church. In political terms this meant liberation from papal control, and thus national "sovereignty."

In the English language, when the word was first used (as far as we know) in 1706, it meant "the conversion of an ecclesiastical or religious institution or its property to secular possession and use" (Shorter Oxford English Dictionary). In French and German also the word was used at this time in much the same sense, when monasteries and church lands were placed under non - ecclesiastical possession and control. In 1789, the French National Assembly placed all church properties at the disposal of the nation, and in the French language the word *secularization* was more or less synonymous with *laicization*.

In the European Enlightenment, secularisation came to stand for emancipation from the overruling power of God Himself, who was till then assumed generally to have full control of everything in the universe. Enlightened European man "came of age" and accepted responsibility for running the world. In a sense this was a lay revolt

against clerical domination, and the denial of the existence of God was often an effective weapon against the influence of the priest. The denial of the “other world” was only a prelude to the denial of the God who inhabited that “other world.”

The emphasis on this world led men like Fontonelle, Montesquieu and Helvetius to rule out all idealism and metaphysics and to deal only with the immediately experienced and the directly tangible.

The current picture of secularization in our age is quite complex, the word itself being used with a wide spectrum of meanings by different groups.

We shall mention only three such groups: (1) those who substitute for the norm of revelation some form of *natural law*, usually revived from stoicism - these are philosophers of secularization. (2) those who commit themselves, without an acknowledged transcendent authority, to the *ideal* of using our best human efforts to achieve maximum of social justice and human welfare in this world - these may be called the prophets of secularization - and (3) those who seek to be as open as possible in their understanding of this world and in choosing the *immediate goals* to be achieved in this world by man and society. These may be named the pragmatists of secularization.

Secularism as an English word goes back to 1846, when it meant a morality based solely on the welfare of men in this world. In 1863 it came to mean taking a stand for an education which excluded religious subjects. In our time it is often used to refer to a complex of assumptions which deny all reference to any reality that is “beyond” the world of our experience. The distinction between secularization as a process and secularism as a complex of assumptions should not be pressed too far, but is adopted in the document mainly to distinguish between two aspects of the same secular movement of thought and action.

Secular Reality (Thesis 4)

Divorce from reality distorts worship. This is the main point of the document. But what aspects of this reality should we be particularly open to, in order that our worship of God may become authentic? In what areas of experience does God call us to a more “incarnate” knowledge of Him? In every height and depth of our so-called secular experience there may be a “beyond” to recognise, and this is done only by integrating all experience into worship, and being worshipful

in all experience. So for the sake of living worship and for the sake of worshipful living, we must be open to all reality.

The Following list seeks only to indicate some of the realms of experience which we may be tempted to keep unrelated to worship, thereby tending to make worship inauthentic:

1. Science - the approach to “matter” and energy on the basis of openness to data and a rigorous experimental method designed to test every hypothesis in practice and to reformulate understanding in the light of every new discovery which stands up to experimental tests. The scientific method helps us to face measurable and inescapable realities, while at the same time the openness which it presupposes constantly reminds us that the full truth will always transcend what we yet know.

2. Technology - Here we have the practical exercise of man’s dominion over nature. We must openly and honestly face what man can do (for good *or* evil), what it seems likely that he will be able to do and what he must discover how to do. From this we shall learn how the true strengths of man point beyond himself to “super - human” possibilities and tasks which are in fact not ‘super - human’ but artial realisations of the divine transcendence already implanted in man.

3. Culture - We must sit down before art and literature and see what is being displayed and said. The achievements of human culture must speak for themselves. Authentic art is not to be prostituted by being distorted into being “illustrations” of religious ‘truths.’ We must see and hear the understanding of reality which men of art and literature seek to express and be open to their revelation and their realistic criticism.

4. Human relationships - we must consider the realities of relationships between persons (their brutality and indifference as well as their tenderness and love), the actualities of marriage, the pressures and shapes of social living, the discoveries and the enquiries of psychology. we must welcome all who clear away muddles so that we may face mysteries. We must encourage all who destroy myths so that we may face facts and be more concerned to be open to the complexities of the human condition than to hold on to any preconceived notion of man or society.

5. Politics and Ethics - Here we have the opportunity of facing up to the problem which men face today, as individuals, as members

of society, as sharing in and suffering from the inter-action of states, nation and groups of all sorts. The Bomb is a fact. Apartheid is a fact, hunger is a fact, the refusal to accept foreign domination of any sort is a fact. Anyone who ignores these facts as well as the ethical questions which they thrust upon him personally is escaping from reality and turning his back upon man and upon God.

6. *The intellectual Search* - Some men ask questions in an articulate and sophisticated form about what it is to be a man. While those of us who are “intellectuals” must beware of the constant danger of over-intellectualizing, nonetheless man’s quest for truth is one of the influential ways in which the human reality is exposed and criticized. This quest brings to light facts which challenge any complacent settling down into false realities too narrow to contain the dimensions of being a man.

7. *Special experiences of the “beyond”*- Is all mysticism nonsense? Are all poets who move us in the depths of our being mad or escapist? Is every “revelation” a ‘hallucination’? Are some hallucinations revelation? The irrational, the contra-rational and the super-rational are, as experiences, part of the data with which being human faces us. We should not find anything that is human foreign to us. And if we do so find some experiences then we need to learn more of what it is or might be to be human.

8. *Ritual and Religion* - This is another whole area of human actions and reactions to be studied openly and phenomenologically. What can be seen Bore when we look realistically, free from the fear that either we might be forced to believe in God or that we might be forced to give us believing in God?

And so the list could go on. Different people and groups of people will find their most vivid contacts with reality in different areas. What must be done is to respond to whatever is authentic and resonant with possibilities of meaning and excitement. We must investigate the energies of the world and of human living wherever we experience them. If we are not open to the energies of the world we shall not be kept sufficiently in touch with reality to be open to the energies of God, for it is these which give fulfillment to the energies of the world.

The Living Tradition of Worship

The document does not seek to summarize the Church’s living tradition of worship, but only to point to five central elements in it

which specially call for renewal: (a) the use of cultural forms, (b) Baptism, (c) the preached word, (d) the Eucharist and (e) personal, family and group prayer. - Another way of listing the central elements of the worship of the Apostolic Church occurs in Acts 2:46 ff, all of which have their background in the Jewish tradition:

(a) The community (*Koinonia*) of Christ, of “one heart and one mind” reminds us of the Jewish communities of the desert, like the Qumran, and of the Commonwealth of Israel.

(b) Unity expressed in the breaking of bread with thanksgiving and the meal (*Klasis tou artou, Eucharistia, trophe* and *agape*).

(c) Continuing in Apostolic Teaching and in the common praise of God (*didache Kai Kerugma ton apostolon* and *ainesis to Thee*).

(d) The sharing of property for the Service of all (*Koinonia - diakonia*).

(e) Rejoicing (*agalliasis*) and the bearing up of the cares and needs of men in intercession (*proseuche*).

A note on Symbols (Thesis 7)

Accelerated cultural change often renders symbols archaic and pointless before the worshipping community becomes fully aware of what has been happening. A great deal of the Church’s symbolism needs either reactivation through teaching or replacement by other symbols more apt to our time.

This applies to verbal symbols as well. Words like “salvation”, “redemption”, “righteousness”, and “sin”, all need drastic reinterpretation in order to relate them to the realities of our life. Do these words say anything about the political and economic as well as personal realities of our time to the hearers?

Are there certain symbols like the Cross, and words like sin and salvation, which cannot be replaced but only re - interpreted? How can we restore the validity of those symbols and words which cannot be replaced?

What are the criteria to be used in the choice of new symbols? Using a hydrogen bomb or a space - rocket as symbol may be modern but not necessarily meaningful in worship.

It appears that the most powerful symbols are those with roots in

elemental human experience - blood, bread, water, etc. we need to continue the use of these.

New symbols, like natural diamonds, are born, not consciously created, under great pressure of experience. We should seek for these unnerneath the burdens of modern life. No symbol is really born without being connected with human suffering. Perhaps artists, painters, poets and novelists are more qualified to prospect for such modern symbols than liturgical specialists. The work of these artists already contains many symbols deeply meaningful in modern life.

Symbols cannot be reduced to a short - hand for that which can be expressed in words. The symbols used in worship should have a transcendent dimension capable of penetrating into the mystery of reality which defies verbal description. symbols have to possess an evective power - a neon light is less powerful than a simple candle in this sense, even in cultures where candles may no longer be in use in daily life.

Rythmic movements, ritual gestures, and even utteranees which are no longer linguistically understood by the congregation (Halleluya, kyrieelaison etc.) may have their role in evoking this transcendent dimension.

Ritual is the matrix of culture in the history of humanity. All art, poetry and literature began in the context of ritual. Modern man, however "secularized" he may be, feels deeply the need for ritual, and now forms of secular ritual are constantly springing up all over the world. The protest marches, The Church, the Slogans, the procession, the banquets of the affluent and the entertainments of the poor, all show this basic tendency in our time.

John Updike, the American writer, offered in a personal letter to the W.C.C the following insights apropos our concern with worship in a secular age:

"This thought occurs to me: men look to the Church for what the world is not. So in times and places of material poverty, the Church and especially the region of the altar is properly sumptuous, lavish, extravagant. In the prosperous times now prevailing in Western Europe and North America, perhaps the Church's worship should be a model of austerity. Certainly, as a layman, I detect in myself impatience with any but the most economical altar appearance.

I do not know how quick the Church should be to bring modern secular devices, such as jazz, into the worship service. Where Christianity is alive, as it was among the American slaves, novel modes of worship, such as the chanted sermons and spirituals, will necessarily evolve. This impetus from within cannot be artificially produced by contemporary minded priests or ministers. In the absence of any powerful pressure toward innovation from the lay worshippers, the Church will do well to be conservative - to conserve, that is, the essentials..... toward the day when new life will be granted to these old forms.”

If Updike is basically sound, then symbolism does not mean that the Church’s worship has to be an exact reproduction of the contemporary world. The function of symbols is to point through the world to the beyond.

A note on Tradition and Experiments with new forms (Thesis 7)

Tradition and experiment are not opposed to each other; innovation belongs to the dynamic of tradition. Without constant renewal tradition becomes lifeless and powerless.

Yet, experiments in worship should not be guided by the quest for novelty; the thirst for authenticity is the right motive for seeking new ways of worship.

The dynamic tradition is brought alive when the constitutive or normative element and the personal or “existential” element are in fruitful tension with each other in the context of a worshipping community. Without that community and without the land - marks of the tradition for guidance, innovation may be little more than an expression of the pride of man.

New forms should not be sprung on the congregation as a surprise; they are to be created by the congregation as an expression of its own worship. In general new forms are best tested in small groups in the congregation or in special gatherings like retreats and conferences. Sunday morning congregations need special preparation if a new form of worship is to be entered into by them as their own.

In our different churches the very possibility of experimenting with worship presents itself differently. Some of these have an almost embarrassing rich inheritance, in the light of which any modernising novelty seems superficial and presumptuous. Others are keenly aware

of their poverty in worship but find a good many experiments hardly better than what they have traditionally known. In the one case the tradition presumably needs to be refined down to its central elements, on the basis of which modern demands can be met; in the other it will be more a case of learning to set the demands to modernity in the much larger context supplied by the total tradition. In both cases what is essential is on the one hand an attentiveness to the living Lord and on the other a bold and creative imagination to transform aspects of the contemporary world through their being offered up in Christian worship.

The value of an experiment cannot be decided by its effectiveness on one occasion. Only such experiments whose validity is established by sustained use can be useful to the Church in the long run. Constant change and the frequent introduction of new forms make it only more difficult for the congregation to enter unself - consciously into the Church's worship. Revalidation of ancient forms is sometimes found to create greater authenticity than the creation of totally strange new forms.

Experiments should seek to maintain and enhance the dramatic element in the liturgy without running the risk of becoming theatrical. Fresh music and art, new architecture and rhythmic movements, new poetic compositions of prayer, can all help to enrich worship, and here the talents in the congregation should be brought into the worship just as fully as those of the pastor or priest.

All must come, however, not from the restless quest for the novel and the interesting, but from the hunger for authentic corporate and personal response in the Spirit to the God who has called us into loving Communion with Him in Jesus Christ.

A note on the Eucharist as Representation and Anticipation (Thesis 10)

The nature of the Eucharist as re-presentation and anticipation - anamnesis and epiclesis - was formulated by the Study Group on the Eucharist of the Faith and Order Commission. The following passage, despite its apparent obscurity, will repay careful study:

“The Montreal Report expressed a consensus on the Eucharist in these terms:

‘... The Lord's Supper, a gift of God to his Church, is a sacrament

of the presence of the crucified and glorified Christ until he come, and a means whereby the sacrifice of the cross, which we proclaim is operative within the Church. In the Lord's Supper the members of the body of Christ are sustained in their unity with their Head and Saviour who offered himself on the cross: by him, with him and in him who is our great High Priest and Intercessor we offer to the Father, in the power of the Holy Spirit, our praise, thanksgiving and intercession. With contrite hearts we offer ourselves as a living and holy sacrifice, a sacrifice which must be expressed in the whole of our daily lives. Thus united to our Lord, and to the Church triumphant, and in fellowship with the whole Church on earth, we are renewed in the covenant sealed by the blood of Christ. In the Supper we also anticipate the marriage - supper of the Lamb in the Kingdom of God."

"On the basis of this consensus we limit ourselves to a consideration of two aspects which are increasingly recognized as essential to the Eucharist and which have not here to fere been given sufficient attention: the anamnotic and epikletic character of the Eucharist:

1. Christ instituted the Eucharist, sacrament of his body and blood, as the anamnesis of the whole of God's reconciling action in him. Christ himself with all he has accomplished for us and for all creation (in his incarnation, servathood, ministry, teaching suffering, sacrifice, resurrection, ascension and Pentecost) is present in this anamnesis as is also the foretaste of his Parousia and the fulfillment of the Kingdom. The anamnesis in which Christ acts through the joyful celebration of his Church thus includes this representation and anticipation. It is not only a calling to mind of what is past, or of its significance. It is the Church's effective proclamation of God's mighty acts. By this communion with Christ the Church participates in that reality.

2. Anamnetic representation and anticipation are realized in thanksgiving and intercession. The Church, proclaiming before God the mighty acts of redemption in thanksgiving, beseeches him to give the benefits of these acts to every man. In thanksgiving and intercession, the Church is united with the Son, its great High Priest and Intercessor.

3. The anamnesis of Christ is the basis and source of all Christian prayer. So our prayer relies upon and is united with the continual intercession of the risen Lord. In the Eucharist, Christ empowers us to live with him and pray with him as justified sinners joyfully and

freely fulfilling his will.

4. The anamnesis leads to epiklesis, for Christ in his heavenly intercession prays the Father to send the Spirit upon his children. For this reason, the Church, being under the New Covenant, confidently prays for the Spirit, in order that it may be sanctified and renewed, led into all truth and empowered to fulfil its mission in the world. Anamnesis and epiklesis, being unitive acts, cannot be conceived apart from communion. Moreover it is the Spirit who, in our Eucharist, makes Christ really present and given to us in the bread and wine, according to the words of institution.

5. The liturgy should express adequately both the anamnestic and epikletic character of the Eucharist.

(a) Since the anamnesis of Christ is the very essence of the preached Word as it is of the Eucharist, each reinforces the other. Eucharist should not be celebrated without the ministry of the Word, and the ministry of the Word points to, and is consummated in the Eucharist.

(b) The anamnestic character of the whole Eucharist should be adequately expressed in the prayer of thanksgiving and in a proper ‘anamnesis.’

(c) Because of the epikletic character of the whole Eucharist, the epiklesis should be clearly expressed in all liturgies as the invocation of the Spirit upon the people of God and upon the whole Eucharistic action, including the elements. The consecration cannot be limited to a particular moment in the liturgy. Nor is the location of the epiklesis in relation to the words of institution of decisive importance. In the early liturgies the whole ‘prayer action’ was thought of as bringing about the reality promised by Christ. A recovery of such an understanding may help to overcome our differences concerning a special moment of consecration.”

A note on Family, Group and Personal Prayer (Thesis 11, 12, 13)

Regular times of prayer, both for families and individuals, also belong to the tradition of the Church inherited from the Jews. Psalms 55:17 speaks of morning, noon and evening as the Psalmist’s time of prayer. Daniel is reported to have prayed three times a day regularly (Dan. 6:10), with petition and supplication.

Jewish family prayers were said at the beginning and the end of

meals, and special family liturgies developed for the beginning of passover and for the beginning and end of Sabbath. Important occasions and experiences in the life of the Jewish family were consecrated by prayer. All time was to be sanctified by prayer. Most of these customs probably originated in the period of the Exile, and by the first century of our era, prayers became the indispensable complement to the reading and interpretation of the scriptures in synagogue worship.

The prayers became also closely related to the Messianic hope, and the opening petitions of the Lord's prayer should be seen in this light. The coming of the Kingdom of God upon earth was the focus of prayer - a time when God's name would be acknowledged and worshipped by all on earth and when righteousness and peace would reign over the whole world. This is the primary focus of Christian prayer also. "Thy name be hallowed; Thy Kingdom come; Thy will be done." Both in content and in the times of prayer, the early Church followed the Jewish tradition. The third, sixth and ninth hours seemed to have been times of prayer (Acts 2:15; 10:9; 3:1) in the Apostolic Church, both for groups and for individuals.

The seven somewhat long daily offices are clearly of monastic origin, and cannot be a norm for all Christians. The churches, however, should provide assistance for laymen developing a regular rhythm of prayer suitable for the pace of life today, and related to the ismes and opportunities facing mankind. Imaginative use of mental prayer, both contemplative as well as intercessory, has been found useful by many.

Prayer has in it an element of skill; as in all skills, early beginnings are important. The pictures on the walls at home, the listlessness or attentiveness of parents at prayer, the content of family prayers - all these make lasting impressions on very small children. The parent has to come near to the child, where he is, using his language and assisting his growth from one stage to another, with loving support and informed understanding. Studies in certain cultures have shown, for example, that children do not think in abstract concepts before the age of 12; their thinking is concrete, and prayer accordingly has to be specific and pointed - not vague and rambling, long and abstract.

Like other skills, prayer also calls for training. It is both caught taught. A great deal of study and programmes of training in prayer are urgently needed in our age, both in the tradition of prayer, and in ours practice.

To shift the primary focus of personal, group and family prayers, from petition for private needs, to intercession for the coming of the Kingdom, from personal spiritual growth to ardent longing for the righteousness of God in society, may also be the call of God for our secular age.

A note on alienation and despair as fundamental modern problem (Thesis 17)

Alienation is the name for the malaise of our secular age. It is primarily a phenomenon which occurs when something created to minister to human needs acquires an institutional life of its own, standing apart from and over against man as if it were an objective entity with its own being, power and authority.

All economic and social systems produce their own set of values and institutions. They are often created by men to prop up the system, usually to the advantage of a given economically dominant class. Quite often these values and institutions are the children of a marriage between religious faith and class interest. But sooner or later all become canonized and ossified, and begin to destroy the lives not only of the oppressed classes, but to some degree of the oppressors as well.

Man is thus subjected to new demonic powers of his own making. The man - made system, value or idea becomes an oppressive power hard to conjure away. Institutions, habits, and concepts become idols. Man, the tool - maker, commodity - producer and idea - creator, becomes alienated from and enslaved by the artifacts of his own mind and hand.

The oppressed and exploited classes, in reacting against the prevailing structure of society, also revolt against its values and institutions, and often, in that process, against God Himself who was wrongly identified as the source of and authority for these values and institutions. Human solidarity is thus broken; the defence of religion appears as the defence of the status quo, and therefore of oppression and exploitation of one class, by another.

In authentic Christian worship, these oppressive idols are to be exercised surrendering them to the victory of Christ over the powers. The world of history has to be acknowledged as man's moving horizon, and fresh institution and concepts designed to serve the whole of mankind have to be devised. All narrow sectarian loyalties,

denominational or ecclesiastical, ethnic or national, parochial or regional, are to be transcended in the Church's acts of worship on behalf of the whole of mankind and the whole of creation.

There is much despair and cynicism abroad, both about the possibility of transcending narrow loyalties and about finding personal meaning in human existence. It is in worshipful faith and faithful worship that despair can be overcome by new hope which the Spirit kindles afresh in our hearts by pouring forth the love of God.

A note on Guilt and Shame (Thesis 17)

The erosion of severity in moral codes, the growing acknowledgment that sin is not primarily a personal act of transgression, and the consequent moral permissiveness widely prevalent in our day, have only accentuated, not resolved, the fundamental problem of human guilt.

Many believe, contrary to the best psychological evidence, that modern man no longer feels guilt. Some preachers therefore try to make man feel guilty in order that man may realise his need of forgiveness and salvation. Pointing out specific acts of "sin" may be one way of producing an artificial sense of guilt. Making men feel ashamed may not be the best way to bring health and salvation to them.

Consciously or unconsciously, man today seems to be more plagued by guilt than even before. In spite of the personal moral code eroding, a thousand moral demands are made on modern man by our culture. Man is asked to be more sympathetic, democratic, loving, generous etc., and all this advice increases the hidden sense of guilt of those who know very well that they are not what they ought to be, but have to behave as if they were.

Hypocrisy in polite external conduct, and a secret system of self-defence of the ego by which guilt is covered up, are the twin walls that man seeks to erect against the attack of too unbearable a sense of guilt.

In this situation, the Church coming in as another advisor, trying to produce in him a sense of guilt about his personal and social sins of commission and omission, succeed only in man's trying to strengthen his defence, and to despise and reject the Church's teaching and authority in self-defence.

The preacher needs to learn to speak from inside modern man's system of defence, by dealing sympathetically with the great stress, anxiety, and agony under which he lives. He should help him to see himself as he really is, rather than stand in judgment over against him.

The preacher does not need to defend God against man. Rather he should defend man against his own despair, by identification with his struggle. A simple declaration of forgiveness does not reach him in the place of his hidden guilt. General confessions and general absolutions may equally fail to touch the depths of man, however relevantly they may be phrased. Personal Confession, in an atmosphere of confidence, of sympathetic understanding and not too permissive help for critical self-evaluation, leading to personal absolution, needs to be reinstated in the churches where it has fallen into disuse or become perfunctory and formalistic. Preaching should also become more closely related to the personal struggle of men against despair and meaninglessness, as well as deal with the great social and political issues confronting mankind. The declaration of forgiveness both in common worship and personal confession should effect real cleansing in the depths. It should also renew and quicken hope.

Men are ashamed of themselves, and the fig - leaves of middle - class respectability hardly suffice cover up their shame. Nations also find it difficult either to forget or to cover up the shame of their past misdeeds. Self - justification, conscious or unconscious, personal or national, is widely indulged in, both by Christians and non - Christians. The worshipping community has to become a catalyst in this situation by being empowered to acknowledge personal and group guilt and to live by grace and forgiveness.

The churches should appropriate to themselves the insights of modern theoretical and therapeutic psychology, and by integrating them with the insights of the Gospel and thereby transforming them, develop adequate programmes of pastoral counselling and personal confession.

3

THE WORSHIP OF GOD IN A SECULAR AGE: TOWARDS A CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION

1. The difficulties which educated men of our time experience in both public and private worship point to a deep intellectual and spiritual crisis in the total development of man. The issue goes deeper than the question of language and forms. The remedy must therefore go beyond adopting new forms and using contemporary terms.

2. For the Christian, corporate worship and personal prayer are inseparable. Both are activities of the Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ, corporately or through a single member of the Body. Renewal of worship should apply simultaneously to eucharistic worship, and to offices sung or said by groups, as to personal prayer. Personal prayer nourishes and is nourished by corporate worship.

3. Worship, like the faith which it presupposes, is neither natural nor easy. It is a gift of God, but a gift to be exercised by man in his freedom. Just as faith demands training and instruction for its nurture, Christians need to be instructed and trained in worship. This has to be done both personally and through the life of the worshipping community.

4. Worship, like faith, has to be deeply rooted in the incarnation of Jesus Christ. It should gather up man's every day life in the world of history, but it is not a natural component of daily life to be easily institutionalized in set patterns or taught like other techniques. Worship is learned only in agony and travail, but like faith it cannot come merely as a result of our striving. It is the Spirit of God who prays in us and through us.

5. The necessity of worship, even when paid lip - service to, is far from universally experienced among baptized Christians. The reality of God is no longer obvious or sure to many. The self - evident God which many cultures too easily assumed as a projection of their highest values has begun to disappear and even among the baptized, thinkers have started either to deny God altogether alleging that he is dead, or to interpret the meaning of the Gospel purely and entirely in "secular" terms without any reference to the transcendent. The difficulty of worship in our time is thus the difficulty of apprehending God - which has never been easy or normal.

6. Though apprehending God has never been easy or natural, the worship of the Church has always been the milieu in which men encountered God in Jesus Christ as a community. If the apprehension of God and therefore the worship of God has become more difficult than it ought to be in the Church, then failure in the worship of the Church should at least in part be responsible for the difficulty.

When both faith and worship become unduly or mainly intellectual and conceptual, as has happened in our time of unprecedented advancement in scientific thinking and technological practice, then new intellectual problems crop up for both faith and worship.

7. One of these, ably described by Martin Buber, is the eclipse of God brought about by a heightened consciousness. Trained to be conscious of the process of one's thought while thinking, modern man often finds that the consciousness of his thought about God comes between him and God eclipsing the latter, or rather the ego refuses to participate fully in the turning toward God, and holds itself back, regarding the thought about God as its possession. The philosopher's effort to "sustain the object of his love as an object of his philosophic thought" has always failed and is bound to fail.

8. Even at a less sophisticated level, our new understanding of the cosmos leaves no room either "within" or "outside" the universe for God's throne. The transcendent God cannot be conceived as "beyond"

the cosmos, since such an expression becomes logically meaningless in a universe which can no longer be conceived in spatial or pictorial imagery but only denoted in mathematical formulae.

9. Man has also matured enough to realize that it is infantile to project a *deus ex machina*, a God - concept brought in to fill the gaps of our conceptual knowledge. As Dietrich Bonhoeffer rightly says, "The 'Beyond' of God is not the beyond of our perceptive faculties. Epistemological theory has nothing to do with the transcendence of God."¹ Neither are we able to use the "God -concept" to deal with our needs and perplexities on the "borders of human existence", like guilt and death and anxiety.

10. The problems of conceptual apprehension of God have led theologians to seek several courses. For example there has been the attempt say that while conceptual knowledge of God is impossible, imaginative (but not necessarily visual) pictures of God and the universe are inescapable for any relation with God at all. A Jesuit theologian² has attempted to reassert the classical axia for thinking about God - (a) that there is a line between the universe and God which cannot be crossed in either direction by univocal thinking, and (b) that apart from the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity God can be apprehended only as undifferentiated (simple) infinite (non - spatio - temporal) Being (dynamic pleni -potentiality).

11. Others in our time, inspired by the developments in mathematical thinking, have sought to apprehend God as Supreme Relativity or as Process, as inclusive of all *de facto* actuality - a pluralistic, functional reality in the process of change and development. To these thinkers, God is not only not absolute, but supremely and uniquely related to everything. And everything that happens, happens in a sense, to the being of God - in - process -and - relation.

12. Yet others, seeking to find meaning in terms of this world alone and no other, and undeaavouring to conform to the canons of certain specific schools of philosophy, have made the effort to interpret God in terms of verifiable statements about facts and events in time and space.

13. All these, however, have been conceptual efforts, which do not always deal with the more - deep - rooted difficulties in worship which are often of different origin. For many of our contemporaries the Worship of the Church is simply an aspect of a whole way of life

that they have left behind, often with some sense of liberation, though at times with feelings of nostalgia. It may be that many who take no part in the active worship of the Church, often associate Sunday Church - going with a form of hypocrisy or an obsolete superstition.

The complaints in such cases refer not so much to the forms of worship as to the type of people who go to Church and to the kind of preaching they get in the Church.

14. Worship however, can never be an act of the intellect alone. In fact, over - intellectualization of worship must bear some responsibility for the current conceptual confusion about God. The renewal of worship in the Church has to pay particular attention to this point. Unless the poetic consciousness of man and not merely his reasoning faculties are aroused in worship, the apprehension of God in worship can become a growingly frustrating and futile effort, leading us to the denial of the reality, not only of worship but also of its object, God.

The psalms of the Old Testament as well as many portions of the New Testament certainly had their origin not in conceptual thinking but in an elated poetic consciousness reflecting on the Grace and bounty of God. The poetic consciousness responds with the whole person, while the rational consciousness refuses to let go of the centrality of the ego, thus rendering authentic worship practically impossible.

15. Worship cannot be limited to listening to the word of God and fulfilling a mission in the world. The proper and primary response to the Word proclaimed in the Eucharist to the Body of Christ is the Eucharistic participation of the Body in the sacrifice of Christ, made once for all on the Cross. The Church, by the Holy Spirit, enters into the eternal sacrifice of Christ, by offering their bodies "as a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God" along with Christ. It is this offering of the bodies of men that makes possible for them to continue their participation in the Body of Christ, the *Shekinah* of God's presence in the world and the agent of His mission for the salvation of the world.

16. Eucharistic worship is thus neither repetition, nor representation, nor even continuation of the sacrifice of Christ. It is participation by the Spirit in that sacrifice. Participation, however, should not be seen as only in a past event. We share, in the Eucharist, also in the world to come, in the world which has already come in the life, death and

resurrection of Jesus Christ and more visibly at Pentecost. What makes the worship of the Church at once dynamic and creative and at the same time historically and culturally rooted is its relation to the past as well as to the coming. Here the logic of space and time is transcended and existence illumined by the awareness of its contingency both on the past and on the coming.

17. Eucharistic worship is also a priestly act of Christ and His Church on behalf of the whole creation. As Christ gathered up the whole life of man in himself and offered it to God in one perfect sacrifice, the Church continuously gathers up the contemporary experience of mankind with all its joys and sorrows, successes and frustrations, fears and aspirations, into the Eucharistic act and lifts them up in her ministry of continuing intercession.

18. Personal prayer is a continuation of this Eucharistic ministry of intercession. Like the Eucharist, it is a participation in the ministry of Christ, who ever lives to intercede for us. Both Eucharistic worship and personal prayer are the marks of sonship and of being members in the Body of Christ. It is because of our union with Christ that we are enabled to intercede with our Father for those in need. Neither personal prayer nor Eucharistic worship can therefore be legitimately regarded as mainly for our own spiritual nourishment, or to lead us to the beatific vision. The ministry of prayer and worship is primarily our due response to God's mercy and grace, ancillary to no other purpose. Secondly, it is a ministry of intercession on behalf of the whole creation. Only in the third place should we regard any personal benefits that may accrue to us through worship and prayer.

19. Prayer and worship thus being the special prerogatives of God's children, to neglect them in favour of anything else is to begin to cease to be God's children. Without meeting our neighbour and knowing him we cannot fulfil our ministry of prayer, but the former cannot substitute for the latter. The horizontal and the "Vertical" are two poles of one circuit and the one cannot function without the other. Direct prayer to a living God cannot be replaced by anything else, for man modern or ancient.

20. Worship divorced from daily life cannot be Christian. Yet the authenticity of Christian worship can never be wholly a matter of relevance to the life of the world. Experience shows that even now, forms created specifically for ensuring relevance to contemporary events can fail to create authentic worship where the transcendent power and majesty of God are not experienced, trusted, and adored.

21. Old forms have in most cases lost their power, and our emotional attachment to them may not be adequate reason for preserving them unchanged. New forms have to be created. This can be done only through various experiments. Experiments should, however, take into account the fact that neither success nor failure at the first try is a sure indicator of its long - range suitability or otherwise. A form that quickens the mind by its shocking power may soon wear out its capacity to do so and become incredibly boring in the long run. All forms require a long period of testing and no form by itself can ensure the authenticity of worship.

22. When the Psalmist exhorts us: “Be still, and know that I am God” (Ps. 46:10) the connection between quietness and the knowledge of God in worship and adoration is made plain. Only by ceasing to strive and learning to lean on the Grace of God with total abandon, can we begin to worship. Freedom from guilt and anxiety, the consequence of faith, is indispensable to worship. Unconfessed and unforgiven sin as well as unbelieving anxiety about the future can render worship all but impossible. The growth of authentic worship in our Churches would in some sense be proportional to the extent to which true faith as unquestioning trust in God and as freedom from sin an anxiety enables mature men and women to cease from striving and to surrender without reserve.

23. Mutual reconciliation in the community of faith as well as in society as a whole is also a necessary pre - requisite to authentic worship. Communities and individuals driven by hate or bitterness can never experience true worship. “If you, bringing your offering to the altar remember that your brother holds something against you, leave your offering there before the altar and go, first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift.” The Royal Priesthood of the whole Church demands from us that we exercise our ministry on behalf of all conflicting groups in society and that we ourselves are sufficiently able to transcend these conflicts at least to the point of overcoming bitterness and hate.

Notes

1. *Letters and Papers from Prison*, English Tr. Fontana, Paperback, p. 93.
2. Thomas Gornall, S. J., *A Note on Imagination and thought about God*, Heythrop Journal, April 1963.

4

ACT OF LOVE

THE LITURGY – MUCH MORE THAN A FORM OF WORDS

The Christian liturgy is not a form of words. It is an action of the community. What kind of an action? Which community?

Action de Grace

The French expression *action de grace* is translated into English as thanksgiving. This latter word, if you are an Indian, means a boring speech at the end of a meeting thanking all and sundry, or if you are an American a sumptuous Turkey dinner in November commemorating a historic event constitutive of the nation. It is true that the Eucharistic liturgy has both these elements, a speech offering thanks to God and a commemorative meal.

Perhaps the least helpful way of understanding the Eucharist or Holy Communion is to regard it as a ‘sacrament’, a means of grace. If we focus on what we *get* out of the Eucharist, we have already missed more than half the point.

The Eucharist is fundamentally a response of love and gratitude, not a means of getting something free called grace from God. It is the response of the Creation to its Creator. It is an expression of gratitude on the part of the Creator both for having brought it into being from

non-being, and for redeeming it in Christ, when it had moved away from being to non-being again by its own wilful choice.

But the liturgy is more than an expression of thanks in words. We can offer thanks to God for creation and redemption without the Eucharist, in ordinary prayer. The Eucharist is not a mere prayer. It is an act of self-offering in love, wherein words can serve a function; but it should be clear that mere words cannot constitute an act of love.

There has to be total, loving, adoring, self-surrender in the act of self-offering. The Eucharist is Agape (love), and the two are inseparable. It is a response of love to God who is love, who made us out of nothing, and who gave his only-begotten Son that we may not perish. The forms of words, unless it expresses this loving response, becomes a mere noisy gong and a clanging cymbal.

Action of the Community

The community that makes this act of love has three dimensions. It is not just a few local people gathered together in a building who offer the Eucharist. It is offered, in every instance, by the whole body of Christ, and not just by the fragment of the Church which is the local group of Christians of one or more denominations. The local Church is the whole Church in its local manifestation. And so in each local Church, it is the whole Church in heaven and earth, i.e. in all time and space, that offers the Eucharist. The commemoration of the departed and of the saints of the Church is not an optional matter in the Eucharist. It is they with us and we with them that lift up the offering, and we have to be aware of each other in the body of Christ.

Second, the Eucharist is offered on behalf of all mankind, and not just Christians. Even those who are not united to Christ by faith and baptism are linked to him by the fact of the Incarnation. It is human nature that Christ assumed, not Christian nature. The whole of humanity is now linked to the Incarnate Christ, whether they recognize it or not. True, there are fundamental distinctions to be made between the relationship to Christ of Christians by faith and baptism, and of all mankind to Christ in spite of themselves. But both relationships exist, and we as Christians and human beings share in both. Our fundamental solidarity with all mankind has to find expression in the liturgy, particularly in the prayers of intercession and in the offertory prayer.

The whole Church, the whole Mankind, and the whole Creation – the three realms in which we as created Christian human beings participate, have all three to be lifted up to God in the Eucharist, along with Christ's self-offering on the Cross. This third aspect has become doubly important in our time when the environment crisis has begun to explode. It is the fruit of the earth, wheat and wine, that we offer up to God. With the elements the whole of material and organic creation is lifted up to God. Man, Christian humanity in Christ, thus becomes the spokesman, the utterance – giver, the highpriest, of Creation as a whole. The Eucharist is the response of the Creation as God's other, to her Lord. Mankind, and the Church are units within the creation where the Creation has developed greater consciousness and deeper awareness.

Christians do not offer the Eucharist in order to get something out of it. The Church in Christ offers the Eucharist as the mouth-piece and High Priest of Creation. This offering is a response to the act of love which created the universe and redeemed it. Like all acts of true love, it is not instrumental to something else, but a manifestation of the highest reality called love, which when made a means for something else, becomes degraded. When we offer ourselves, the whole mankind, and the whole creation, God again gives Himself to us in that continuing act of love called the Communion. His Body and Blood, God's own body, becomes united with ours, and through us with the whole mankind and the whole of Creation.

A true Eucharistic liturgy is the highest art of God and Man, not for some other purpose, but as an expression of the true being of the Creator and the Creation. The offering is made to the Holy Trinity. But one of the Holy Trinity, Christ is both the offerer and the offering, for he has by Incarnation identified himself with the Creation, and offered it once for all in his own body on the Cross. The Holy Spirit is the one who unites us to Christ and makes our sacrifice his. The Holy Spirit also opens the way into the Presence. The Holy Spirit cleanses, sanctifies, removes barriers, and makes the love - offering possible. The Eucharist is thus an act of and in the Holy Trinity, into which we are caught up by grace.

5

WHAT IS PRAYER? WHY PRAY? HOW PRAY?

What is Prayer?

Prayer is like breathing. Without breathing we cannot live. When we breathe, air enters our lungs, cleanses the blood in our veins by relieving it of the carbon dioxide, and supplying it with oxygen. If I do not breathe for a few minutes I die. When I have hard physical work to do, I need more air than when I am sleeping or sitting in a chair.

Fortunately God has so ordained that we do not die spiritually just because we have failed to pray for sometime. But where there is no prayer sin accumulates and the proper functioning of the spiritual life becomes obstructed. And if you have important spiritual work to do you need more prayer than otherwise. Only those who pray constantly are exercising their spiritual muscles.

Prayer is communion or communication with God -opening ourselves to Him and receiving His love. It is by living consciously in this relationship of love that we can be transformed into the image of God. By prayer we become more like God, more loving, more wise, more powerful, more kind and good.

In prayer we are cleansed of the accumulated impurities of our life and we are supplied with power to live a good, kind and holy life.

Written for Orthodox young people in India, 1970's.

Prayer is not a matter of asking God for all kinds of things. Some teen-agers speak to their earthly father only when they need money. We should not become like them in relation to our heavenly Father - going to Him only when we need something. The relationship is valuable in itself, as in all true love. It is not what we get out of it that matters, but the fact that we are in communion with our loving Heavenly Father.

Why Pray?

Does not God know what we need, even before we ask him? Why does He want us to ask? Does prayer change God's will in any way? Can my prayer change the future that God has already determined?

These are legitimate questions that need to be answered. The Bible says clearly 'your Father knows what you need before you ask Him' (St. Mathew 6:8). But God wants that we know what is good for others as well as for ourselves. God wants that our will should not incline towards evil, but desire the good with deep yearning. Prayer is therefore a way of training the will to desire the good, as well as of turning our wills towards the highest concentration of all good, namely God.

Prayer is thus a way of becoming good by using our freedom to turn towards the good and to will the good. By prayer we become like God. God is good and wills the good. We should also become like God in willing and desiring what is good. By communion with God we also learn to desire the good which God also desires.

God said: 'Let there be light' and there was light. And God saw that the light was good (Gen. 1:3-4). What God willed became reality. We are to become like God. So we must also acquire the capacity to will the good, and it will happen as we desire, when we become more and more like God. Prayer is an expression of our will in desiring the good and realising it. When we are delivered from selfishness, pride, and evil desires, our prayers will become more like the creative Word of God, which merely by saying 'let there be light' can create light.

God has made us partakers of His own divine nature. He has called us to share in God's own glory and excellence (2 Pet. 1:4). When we trust in God and live a life of discipline, prayer, worship, virtue, knowledge, godliness, brotherly affection and love (2 Pet. 1:5-8), we are transformed into God's likeness and share in His divine

power. God wants us to have a part in the task of shaping this world through prayer and knowledge and work.

By prayer we do change reality. God has given us that power. But this power is not available to us until we become more godlike. That is why the prayers of the saints are more effective than our own prayer - because they are more god like than we are. If the power to change the world by our will is in the hands of evil men, they will make the world evil. We have to grow in the capacity for prayer by developing the habits of prayer and loving service.

And our prayers should not be selfish. In prayer the first focus is God. The second focus is other people. Only in the third place should we ask things for ourselves. In the Lord's Prayer all the first petitions are focused on God - His name, His kingdom, His will. This is the way our prayer should also be. We pray that God's purposes may be established in the lives of all people, that evil may be banished from the earth, that all men may live together in peace and justice, praising God the centre and source of all good. Even in the prayers that ask for daily food, for forgiveness and for protection from evil, the first person singular (I, me) is not used in the Lord's Prayer. We ask things for us, for all men.

When we all pray with love and faith, without selfishness or pride, our prayer changes things. God has more laws than the laws of physical science. He can make prayer achieve 'miracles' of healing and transformation which cannot be explained by medical science. Our science knows only some of God's laws. Prayer is also subject to certain laws. It is the same power of God which operates in the scientific realm, and in the realm of prayer.

In prayer, we are never alone. Not even alone with God. Especially in group prayer, we commemorate all those who are members of the Body of Christ, for it is as a member of the Body that we pray, and the other members are always with us. This is why we commemorate the Prophets, Apostles, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Martyrs, the Saints, the great Teachers and all the faithful departed and all the faithful living.

How Pray?

Prayer has to be learned. It is like swimming. When you are first thrown into the water, you may sink. You then may think that the law of gravity is final and cannot be changed. But there are other laws,

like those of buoyancy and motion. The mere knowledge of these laws cannot teach you to swim. One jumps in and slowly, by repeated practice, acquires the skills of remaining afloat and of moving on the surface of or under the water. And some people are more skillful swimmers than others, because they have learned the rules and acquired the skills by constant practice.

The first rule in prayer as in swimming, is *not to give up just because you do not succeed in the first three or four attempts*. Prayer is a spiritual skill to be acquired by constant practice.

The second rule, again as in swimming is to ‘*let go*’, to let the water support you, to be unanxious and relaxed. In prayer also we have to let ourselves go, relax, trust in God to support you and teach you how to pray.

The third rule is to *keep up the practice, even if you do not feel like it, or enjoy it*. In the life of prayer, our inherent love of sensual pleasures and our selfish love of laziness and comfort, will interfere to make us reluctant to keep up the practice, finding various excuses for not praying. There is no use saying ‘I don’t feel like praying’ or ‘I do not get anything from it.’ It will take years before you get the habit of prayer and really begin to enjoy it. One must strengthen the will to have control over the laziness of the body and the desires of the flesh if one is to make progress in the art and skill of prayer. There is nothing like regular practice which can teach you to pray.

A fourth rule, closely connected with the third, is: *develop the discipline of prayer through fasting and self-control*. Man does not become free and good like God until he learns to control his own inner drives and passions. Restraint of hunger and thirst, of anger and jealousy, of sexual passion, of the desire for glory and flattery, of the desire for bodily excitement and for sensual stimulation, and of all inner turbulences which make us do things against our own free will, is a necessary preparation for prayer. As good athletes competing for the Olympic Games go through very rigorous self discipline in order to keep their body, muscles and nerves in good condition, so should the man of prayer keep his body, mind and spirit in good condition and under conscious control.

A fifth rule is to *use our whole body and even material things in the service of prayer*. Prayer is an act of the whole man, body, soul and spirit - not simply an act of the mind. The body can participate in prayer through posture, speech, and acts:

Posture - In our Eastern tradition, the posture for prayer is standing, facing east, with arms uplifted or folded in adoration and worship.

Focus - It is good to have a focal point outside - a cross with two candles on each side, icons or pictures of Christ, of the Blessed Virgin Mother and of the Saints, or even a more elaborate prayer - altar fixed in some part of the house, where the whole family assembles for prayer. Crucifixes, i.e. crosses with the representation of the crucified body of Christ on it, belong to the Western tradition and are not to be encouraged in our tradition. In choosing pictures, it is best to use eastern icons. Pictures with the sacred heart of Christ or of the Virgin Mother are to be avoided, because these belong to a particular period in Latin piety and are not helpful for a balanced spirituality.

Lips and Mouth - The body must pray - not merely the mind. Let your lips and mouth sing the praises of God, even if your mind does not always follow. The act of the lips and mouth is also *your* act of prayer, even without the concentration. Singing is better than saying your prayers, for in the very music certain human attitudes and aspirations are expressed.

Wandering of the mind - Do not get anxious about the wandering of your mind. When you become aware that your mind is wandering, bring it back by consciously offering your wandering mind also to God. It is part of our confession about ourselves. "This is what I am Lord, distracted and unable to concentrate. I offer myself to Thee as I am. Take my wandering and distracted mind, and heal it by Thy grace." God will forgive you and transform you gradually.

Gestures - Use the gestures of prostration, bowing the head, making the sign of the cross, and giving the kiss of peace. Words are not the only means of expression we have. Folding the hands and bowing is a sign of adoration, and of waiting for a blessing. Lifting up your hands with palms open, can mean petition, penitence, and intercession. Prostration is like *Sashtangapranama*, the sign of complete surrender and submission, placing yourselves in the hands of God with full trust. Making the sign of the cross is a way of reminding ourselves that we have been saved by the Cross of Christ, in fact crucified with Christ. Keep your three fingers together (thumb, index and middle fingers) to touch the forehead (symbolizing the Trinity, the source of all life and all good) and make a descending motion to the lower side of your chest to signify the descent of the Son of God

from heaven to earth for our salvation, then take your fingers from your left arm to your right arm signifying both the horizontal arm of the cross, and the fact that we who were on the left as children of darkness, have now been brought to the right side of God as children of light. Giving the kiss of peace is the symbol of mutual forgiveness and love, and it is a time for us to overcome all feelings of bitterness or anger against members of the family or others outside.

All these signs are part of a language which goes much deeper than words and transforms our sub-conscious minds which words can seldom reach.

A sixth rule is to *keep the balance between group prayer and personal prayer*. Man is not primarily an individual. It is as a member of the Body of Christ that he has any standing before God. Therefore it is important for us to come into the presence of God regularly as a community - as a family, as a youth group, as a local congregation. And a community is composed of all kinds of people, not all of them exactly like you. They have different tastes, different ways of praying, different habits of prayer. I have to join them even sometimes when I think that their way of worship is not what it should be. Without participating in community worship and making the necessary adjustments necessary for joining them, we cannot get rid of our selfishness and pride, and grow to be a real human being.

But community worship is not enough by itself. We need various levels of community with varying degrees of intensity of relationship. The youth group and the family are more intimate communities than the congregation. New forms can be used in these smaller groups which will be difficult or unfamiliar for the congregation as a whole. The prayers in this book are mainly meant for family and group worship, but can also be used for personal prayer in the privacy of your own room at home or in the hostel.

In addition to these forms, however, some other forms of prayer should be mastered for personal use. The most effective and useful of these forms is called ejaculatory prayer. These are one - sentence prayers which one can repeat as many times as necessary, no matter, where or when. You can say them in your mind when you are waiting for a bus; when you are anxious about something; when you are facing temptation, when you feel bored and lonely, while you are lying in bed, comfortable and too lazy to get up; while going to bed and when sleep does not come immediately, and so on.

The following are some of the possible forms of ejaculatory prayer:

1. Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, be merciful to me a sinner.
2. O God, Thou art my God. I love Thee. I am Thine for ever.
3. Lord, you are my Master and Lord, I give myself to Thee.
4. Lord, keep me in Thy ways, keep me from all evil.
5. Lord, have mercy, Lord, have mercy, Lord have mercy upon me.

You can make up your own forms of prayer, for here the Church lays down no rules for personal prayers. Of these forms above, the first was a favourite with the monks, and is known as the ‘Jesus Prayer.’ They used to recite it thousands of times in a day as a sort of *Mantra*. In Mount Athos, the monks trained themselves to say this prayer along with every breath. They would say “Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God” with every inhaling breath, hold the breath in the lungs for a few seconds and then exhale, saying “be merciful to me a sinner.” The idea was that the prayer should become as incessant an action as breathing, that the Lord Jesus Christ should become established in your heart as a deity is in a temple, and that you should constantly be in an attitude of prayer and repentance.

These forms of personal prayer as well as others should be developed. Each child of God has a right to speak to God any time and at all times, using his or her own words. There are no Church rules for personal prayer. It is an act of your personal freedom, and therefore is all the more pleasing to God when you use your own personal intimate language. Personal prayer enriches group prayer; common prayer in the family, group or congregation enriches one’s personal prayer; neither should be neglected. The two should balance each other. But the use of extemporary prayer is not to be encouraged in group worship.

A seventh rule is that *prayer should be nourished by the reading of the scriptures and meditation*. One can discipline oneself to read a chapter of scripture every day.

Read aloud or silently. Meditate on the meaning of the passage. Devotional books may be helpful, but may also obscure the meaning of the scripture. Do not worry about whether the reading of scriptures gives you a feeling of devotion or not. Feelings are deceptive. What

you need to find out is the answer to the following questions: “What was God saying to the people of that time through this passage? What does God say to me now?”

Systematic reading of the scriptures and memorizing some passages which touch you deeply will be found very helpful as life advances. You will be grateful to God in your middle age that you started reading and memorizing when your mind was still impressionable.

Conclusion

All these rules are to help you to become a praying Christian. Only your own sustained and disciplined practice will make you perfect. But remember one thing. Prayer can never be isolated from the common worship of the Eucharist and from the continuous, active compassionate love for your fellowmen. Let us all pray: “Lord, Teach us to pray. Amen.”

6

BIBLE AND LITURGY

Some definitions of the term Liturgy

(1) “Liturgy can be defined as the public and official service of worship that the Christian Church renders to God.”

F. Cabrol in *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique*

(2) “Liturgy comprises the whole group of symbols, chants and actions by means of which the Church expresses and manifests her religion towards God.”

Dom Gueranger in *Institutions Liturgiques*, Tome 1, p.1.

(3) Adrian Fortescue in Catholic Encyclopaedia distinguishes between the western use of the term to mean “the whole complex of official services, all the rites, ceremonies, prayers and sacraments of the Church, as opposed to private devotions”, and the Eastern use of it to mean only the Eucharistic Service.

Etymology. Greek *leitourgia* translates Hebrew ‘*abodah*’ in the LXX. *Leitos* comes from archaic Greek *Leos* = people, and *ergo* = to do, to work.

In Old Testament, *abodah* can mean the temple service of God, public service, or even slavery.

In New Testament *leitourgia* means temple service (Zachariah, Lk. 1:23, Heb. 9:21), the giving of aid to the Christians in Jerusalem

Address delivered at Orthodox Seminar and Holy Week Worship, Ecumenical Institute, Bossey.

(II Cor. 9:12), the possible martyrdom of St. Paul (Phil. 2:17), the service of assistance rendered by the Philippians to St. Paul (Phil. 2:30), the permanent priestly ministry of Christ (Heb. 8:2, 8:6). The angels are *leitourgikoi* or public servants (Heb. 1:14). Government officials are *leitourgoi* (Romans 13:6). Paul is a public servant of Christ for the Gentiles (Rom. 15:16).

Liturgical Influences in the Formation of the Scriptures

(a) In the cases of the Old and the New Testaments, *leitourgia* in the sense of the public worship of God, precedes the writing down of the Scriptures.

(b) A good deal of the materials in the Old and New Testaments had a liturgical provenance before they were reduced to writing.

(c) certain liturgical formulae can now be found embedded in the scriptural text.

(d) The New Testament has a significant amount of Old Testament sacramental symbolism.

(e) The liturgical practices of the Church, especially in regard to Baptism and the Eucharist are reflected in the New Testament, and have profoundly influenced the form and content of the latter.

Scripture in the formation of the liturgies of the Church

(a) Does the liturgical practice of the Church need in each case to be expressly authorized by the Scriptures?

(b) The place of the reading of the Scriptures within all services of the Church.

(c) Some examples of the scriptural language and thought - structure the prayers of the Church.

Mystery, Revelation and Apostolate or Liturgy, Scriptures and Mission

The unfortunate heritage of opposition between the Bible and Liturgy has a hoary ancestry. Tension between the cultic and the kerygmatic, the priestly and the prophetic, occurs in all religions. The danger is always too easily to resolve the tension in favour of the one and against the other. A study of the Bible itself is the best corrective to this false opposition.

CHURCH CALENDAR AND FESTIVALS

The Western Calendar and the Eastern Calendar The Origin of the Difference

Julian Calendar, established by Roman Emperor Julius Caesar in 46 BC was the calendar followed by church as well as state till the 16th century. This is still followed by most of the Eastern Orthodox churches. The western Church follows the Gregorian Calendar proclaimed by Roman Pope Gregory in 1582. Nearly all governments in the world have accepted the Gregorian Calendar. The Soviet Union accepted it in 1918. Till then it followed the Julian Calendar.

The Gregorian Calendar is more accurate. Sosigenes, the Egyptian (Alexandrian) Astronomer who formulated the Julian Calendar for Julius Caesar took it that the year (time taken by the earth to complete the orbit around the Sun) was 365 days and 6 hours. In fact, it takes only 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes and 46 seconds. The difference is 11 minutes and 14 seconds per year. Julian calculation = 365. 25 days, present precise calculation = 365.242199 days. The error is thus exactly 0.007801 days per year. This error adds up through the centuries. In one century, the difference adds up to 0.7801 days, and in four hundred years it is 3.1204 days. In 1000 years it becomes 7.801. In 2000 years it should 15.6 days. But due to certain later reforms in both the calendars, the actual difference in our century is only 13 days. In the Gregorian Calendar, 1700, 1800 and 1900 are not leap years, though they are divisible by four. The difference of 3 days in 400 years is adjusted by this arrangement.

This means that December 25th, Christmas day in the Julian Calendar, becomes January 7th in the Gregorian Calendar. That is why even today Christmas in Russia and so on is on January 7th. Epiphany (January 6th) becomes January 19th. And so on for all fixed festivals. The Orthodox Churches should accept the Gregorian Calendar because it is more accurate. But most of the Eastern churches refuse to do so, mostly because of an old prejudice against accepting a decision made by the Roman Pope.

Fixed Feasts and Moveable Feasts

Our Calendar is luni-solar or soli-lunar. This means we calculate the year by the sun and the month by the moon. But it is difficult to fit the phases of the moon (new moon to new moon = about 29.5 days) into the 365.25 days of the year.

In the Church there are two cycles of feasts: fixed and moveable. They usually devolve around the dates of Christ's birth (Christmas), and the date of Easter or the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. Christmas, since the 4th century is a fixed feast in the solar calendar, i.e. December 25th. The date of Easter is fixed according to the moon: the formula approved by the Council of Nicea (325 AD) is "first Sunday after the first full moon after the Vernal or spring equinox." The Vernal Equinox is taken as March 21. So the date of Easter can fluctuate between March 22nd and April 25th.

The Eastern churches use the Julian Calendar to calculate the Spring equinox, which for them now falls 13 days later, i.e. on April 4th. This means in some years Easter falls on the same day for East and West, and in other years there is a difference of one to five weeks in the Eastern and Western dates of Easter.

Main Fixed Feasts

Since the 7th century, the fixed feasts turn around Christmas day-December 25th. If Christ was born on that date (there is no evidence that this is so), then the Annunciation by the Angel Gabriel to Mary the Mother of Christ, by which she received the Son of God in her womb, would be nine months before the birth, i.e. March 25th (13 days later, for the Juliansists). Since that is the date for the beginning of the Incarnation. March 25th was the New Year for some centuries.

Let us make a quick list of the main fixed feasts, as of now:

January 1st - present New Year, the circumcision of Christ (8 days

after birth), and also the Feast of St. Basil.

January 6th - (19th for Julian) - Epiphany or the Baptism of Christ
- very ancient festival.

February 2nd - The Presentation of the Infant Christ in the Jerusalem Temple, 40th day after birth.

March 25th - Annunciation.

August 6 - Feast of the Transfiguration.

Besides these a large number of other fixed feasts have been added to the Calendar. e.g.

August 15 - The Feast of the Assumption of Virgin Mary.

September 14 - Invention (Discovery) of the Cross of Jesus.

Then there are the feasts of the Apostles, Martyrs and Saints, which vary from church to church: e.g.

June 29 - The Apostles Peter and Paul.

June 30 - Feast of the Twelve Apostles.

July 3 - Feast of St. Thomas, and so on.

The Moveable Feasts

Moveable feasts depend on the date of Easter - e.g.

7 days before Easter - Palm Sunday.

2 days before Easter - Good Friday.

40 days after Easter - The Ascension of Christ.

50 days after Easter - Pentecost.

8

A BRIEF HISTORY OF CHORAL MUSIC

The Choir or chorus as such, seems to be of Greek origin. We do not find anything parallel to it in early Chinese, Japanese or Indian cultures.

The original Greek word, *Choros* (pronounced *Khorose*) meant actually “group dance accompanied by music.” The primary meaning of the word has more to do with dancing rather than singing. But it was not solo dancing, which often dominates our own *Kathak*, *Kathakali*, *Bharatanatyam*, *Odissi* and other dance recitals.

It was usually a *Choros kuklios* or a circular group, dancing rhythmically in slow or frenzied procession around the altar of a Greek god, like, for example, the altar of *Dionysos* or *Bacchos* at Athens.

Dionysos or Bacchos is the god, not only of wine, but also of dance and frenzy. The cult of Dionysos or Bacchos probably goes back to the pre history of Thrace, from where it came to Athens, Delphin and other places of worship. There is little doubt that this cult among the Greeks was the matrix of choral dancing and singing.

But it was an orgiastic cult, a wild and frenzied dance, very popular with women. Many Greek princes feared this cult, not only because of the sexual license it encouraged, but also because women possessed by Bacchos could become really wild, mad, destructive and murderous. This is reflected in Euripides’ (ca 484 - 407 BC) plays: e.g. *Iphigenia*

at *Aulis* or *Bacchae*. Of course his younger contemporary Aristophanes (ca 445 - ca 380 BC) accused Euripides of being a woman-hater, which to him is the reason why he depicted women as wild and destructive.

In any case the Bacchanalian festivals were characterized by drunken and not always very refined revelry. The choral dance around the altar of Dionysos was called the *dithyramb*, a lofty metric rhythm with high-flown language. The dithyramb was created to celebrate the birth of Dionysus, but because the basis of all Greek poetry. It is a choral dance music and lends itself to slow, ritual movements, with or without frenzy.

In most Greek plays (drama) the chorus represents the people and acts as their mouth piece: their lines are people's comments and questions on the justice or injustice of the happenings of history. The Choir does not itself narrate the events, but only make occasional comments. In our Indian tradition the musical group does the whole narration while the dancer acts it out. In the Greek tradition the choir does not narrate, but only make occasional comments.

In ancient Greece choirs were maintained by the ruler at public expense or financed by a rich sponsor, who is called a *Choregos*. The producer of the play is usually the playwright himself who is a poet. He composes his text and then applies to the ruler for a choir. If he gets a choir, he trains them and actually puts the play (in verse) on stage. The playwright thus was called a "Choro-didaskalos" or Choir-trainer. And if a play is successful, the choir gets the longest applause, as the architects of the play.

The number of persons to take part in the choir was fixed by tradition - 15 persons for tragedies, 24 for comedy and an unspecified number for satirical plays.

The members of the Greek choirs were usually young unmarried persons or boys and they were educated people. In fact in classical antiquity the three main branches of education were music, grammar and gymnastics.

But our present form of the choir is of Christian than of pre-Christian origin. The choir as a separate group within a congregation developed mostly in the Latin and Greek churches, while the Asian African churches to this day practice congregational rather than choral singing.

In the Byzantine Greek tradition, since the 18th century, the choir has virtually taken over from the congregation the chanting of hymns and responses originally sung or said by the congregation as a whole. This was partly the consequence of the development of more complex music and more complex notation systems known only to people with training in music.

Precisely measured music and musical notation systems are comparatively late developments in western history, beginning only around the 14th century. As the churches grew rich, due to the flow of wealth into Europe through trade and piracy both church architecture and church music become more and more elaborate and ornate.

In Asia on the other hand there were quite different traditions, with considerable antiquity. The *No* plays of Japan as well as their less formal *Kabuki* theatre uses choral music as narrative. The Chinese have their *Ching - hsi* (Beijing opera) and the all female *Yueh ch u* or (musical play) and the Manchurian *Ping - hsi* (operetta) which are less choir - based and more like western operas and musicals in form. In Indian drama the choir usually sings but does not act.

In the west, by the 19th century they began developing huge choirs for popular festivals. The Handels festivals of the 19th century western Europe had choirs with hundreds of participants, while the “Berlioz concert monstres” in Paris were real monsters with thousands of participants.

Part singing as well as precise music notation developed from the need to get maximum co-ordination and variety from these huge choirs. Medieval European choirs did only unison singing of plain chant - often “a capella” or without the accompaniment of musical instruments. Their music notation system was also not very precise.

Choirs have played a very large role in the building up of unity and harmony in a community.

9

EAST SYRIAN WORSHIP

Historical

The East Syrian Church (known to many as the Nestorian or Chaldean Church) is the Syrian Church of Antioch as it developed east of the frontiers of the Roman - Byzantine empire. Its centre was Nisibis. But its distinctiveness as a tradition could be dated from the Synod of Beth Lapat in AD 484, when this church recognized Theodore of Mopsuestia as its official teacher. i.e. his teachings were to be the standard by which the faith of other churches was to be tested. During the seventh and later centuries this church spread to Lurkestan (now in the Central Asian republics of the USSR) with bishops in Samarkand, Tashkent, Karakoram and also in Tibet as well as in China and India. Today this Church, except a part now in the Roman Catholic communion, is limited to small pockets in USA, Iraq, Iran and India.

Liturgical Books

The main eucharistic liturgies are three, which go by the names of (a) Addai and Mari, (b) Theodore of Mopsuestia and (c) Nestorius. In addition to various lectionaries (one for the gospels, a second for the apostle Paul and the *qarvana* which contains the first two lessons for the liturgical office, from the OT and the Acts), they have the *turgame*, which are homilies on the lessons in the form of hymns to

be chanted with the aid of the psalter (*Dawida*), consecration of an altar (without chrism), prayers for ferial days, of marriage, the ordination manual, etc. The offices are chanted with the aid of the psalter (*Dawida*), the *hudra*, which contains the propers of the office, antiphons, hymns and prayers, the *gazza*, which contains the offices for the feasts of our Lord and the saints (except those that fall on Sundays), and other books for the choirs.

The eucharistic liturgy

What has astonished many liturgists about the liturgy of Addai and Mari is the absence of the words of institution; this is not unusual in the West Syrian* tradition either (The two other Chaldean anaphorae* do have the words of institution). This is shocking only to those who believe that the recital of the words of institution effect the consecration. There is a form of the Liturgy of the Presanctified (*see Presanctified Mass*) for use on Good Friday.

The Liturgy of the Catechumens begins with the *Trisagion**, which is followed by the lections: One from the OT, and a second from either the OT or the Acts of the Apostles. These are supposed to be read from the *bema*, the raised platform in the centre of the church. After the first two lections, as the priest leaves the *bema* to ascend the altar, the *turgama* or the homiletic hymn for the day is sung, interpreting the main point of the lection from the Pauline epistles which follows it. The *turgama* of the gospel comes next, followed by the gospel itself.

The Liturgy of the Faithful begins with a litany of intercession much as in the Byzantine liturgy. The diptychs* after the creed and the *lavabo** are also in the form of litanies. Mary is commemorated thus: 'For the memorial of Lady Mary the holy virgin who bare Christ our Lord and our Saviour.' The 318 fathers of Nicaea are commemorated, and among the other fathers are mentioned both Theodore and Diodore as well as Nestorius, Flavian, Ambrose and Meletius. Emperor Constantine, his mother Helena, and later Byzantine emperors like Constans and Theodosius are also commemorated.

Even when the words of institution are missing, the epiclesis of the Holy Spirit upon the offering is given in full.

There is a second *lavabo* before the fraction* and consignation.

The priest censes his hands after the *lavabo* before proceeding to the fraction. The Lord's Prayer precedes the elevation and communion. The deacon who read the epistle is to administer the body from the paten and the deacon who gave the peace to administer the blood from the chalice.

The eucharist is called the *Kudasha* or sanctification: the liturgical language is Eastern Syriac, though the vernacular is used in most churches today. Leavened bread is used and communion is generally now in both kinds by intinction.

Offices

The canonical offices are mainly three: *lelya* (nocturns), *sapra* (matins) and *ramsha* (vespers) (see **Canonical Hours**).

Other liturgies

The baptismal liturgy is modelled on the eucharistic liturgy, with a pre-anaphora and anaphora for the consecration of the water with the chrism. Confirmation does not exist as a separate rite. Neither penance nor the sacrament of confession is used in this tradition. The anointing of the sick was also unknown until it was borrowed from the West in the sixteenth century. The marriage liturgy includes crowning and common drinking of wine from the same cup, but it is doubtful whether the East Syrians regarded marriage as a sacrament. The ordination practices are similar to those of other Eastern churches.

Notes

* The text of Addai and Mari is given in ET in F. E. Brightman and C. E. Hammond. *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, I, 1896. Pp. 247-305; G. P. Badger, *The Nestorians and Their Rituals*, 2 vols. 1852; H. W. Codrington, *Studies of the Syrian Liturgies*, 1952.

10

WEST SYRIAN WORSHIP

Introduction

The West Syrian Church, known to many as “Jacobite” (after Jacob Baradeus, the 6th century reorganizer of the West Syrian Church) and as Monophysite (after the erroneous idea prevailing in Byzantium and the Latin West that the West Syrians believed only in the divine nature of Christ), historically inherited the Semitic, Palestinian tradition of Christianity, though not uninfluenced by the Hellenic milieu in which they lived.

The Syrian tradition broke up soon into four families - the East Syrian (Edessa), the West Syrian (Antioch), the Melchite (Greek), and the Maronite (Lebanon).

Liturgical rites

The West Syrian church has probably the richest and most diverse heritage in the matter of eucharistic anaphorae and canonical offices. In addition to these are the rites of baptism and Chrismation of which three different forms are known. Ordination rites also vary substantially; the whole liturgical corpus also includes rites of matrimony (separate rites for first and second marriages), burial (different for clergy, laymen, women and children), anointing of the sick (not extreme unction - again different for clergy and laity),

profession of monks, consecration of churches and altars, translation of relics etc.

The Eucharistic Liturgy

The liturgy is now - a - days celebrated mostly in the vernacular – Arabic in the Middle East, English in America, Malayalam in India and so on – though certain portions may still be said by the priest in Syriac. The officiating priest and the people alternate in practically all the prayers, and the deacon plays an important part, admonishing and directing the people to stand with fear, pray and understand the nature of the event that is going on in the Liturgy. Choirs have not been allowed to usurp the place of the congregation as in certain other liturgies.

Some scholars have spoken of a hundred different west syrian anaphorae, though only about 70 can be traced by the present writer. Some of these, especially the principal anaphora of St. James goes back in its basic structure to the Jerusalem Church of Apostolic times. Other anaphorae come from the 2nd (Ignatius of Antioch) to the 14th centuries, if we take the names of the anaphorae at face value. New liturgies continued to be created in every century up to the 14th, though production was most prolific from the 4th to the 7th. The twelfth century produced at least six new anaphorae and about the same number was produced by the 13th. With the 13th century the development reached its peak in Gregory Bar - Hebrews and has remained more or less static ever since.

Two peculiarities of the West Syrian rite are (a) the liturgy of Incense between the liturgy of the word and the liturgy of the Eucharist proper; and (b) the prayer of adieu to the altar at the end of the liturgy - The liturgy of incense which recalls the offering of incense in the Temple (Exodus 30:1-10) seems to have replaced the dismissal of the Catechumens, and comprises a general absolution of the priest and people before the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice. It also represents a sort of offertory, for incense symbolizes the good works and prayers which are wellpleasing to God. It symbolizes also the prayers of the departed saints which mix with those of the congregation, as a true spiritual offering of praise and adoration.

The *epiclesis* occurs in all the 70 known liturgies, though the form of the *epiclesis* varies verbally from anaphora to anaphora, as also does the verbal content of the “words of institution.”

Not all the 70 anaphorae are in common use. The ones most commonly used in India are St. James (on all principal feasts, for the first Eucharist offered by a priest, or offered at a new altar), Dionysius Bar Salibhi, St. John Chrysostom and St. John the Evangelist.

The canonical offices for ordinary days is called the Schhims, and has recently been translated into English by the Benedictine Fr. Griffiths. The more elaborate office, the Fenqith, has not yet been translated into English or Malayalam and is rarely used even in the Syriac. The Syriac text of the Fenqith is available in our Indian edition as in a Moral edition (1886-1896).

One major feature of the Eucharistic liturgy and the daily offices is the *Sedra*, a long meditative - homiletical prayer, preceded by a *pro - emion* which seems to be an elaborated form of the *Gloria*. These prayers are rich in theological content, and play a considerable role in the religious education of the faithful, especially in the absence of biblical preaching.

An introduction and critical text of the Syriac anaphorae with latin translation have been published by the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome (*Anaphorae Syriacae*, 1953). The 9th century commentary of Moses Bar Kepha on the Syrian liturgies was published with an English translation by R. H. Connolly and H. W. Codrington (*Two commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy*).

The people communicate rather rarely, the legal minimum of once per year being observed by most, usually on Holy Thursday. Communion is in both kinds, usually by intinction for the laity. The priest usually administers, though the deacon is allowed to serve communion to the laity.

Reservation of the sacrament for adoration is forbidden, it may be reserved in case of need for the sick, and for those who fast till the evening.

Confession before communion is often demanded, though this is not necessary for those who communicate frequently. Fasting from the previous midnight is required.

The lections during the liturgy of the word are three, one from the acts or Catholic epistles (representing the twelve), then from the Pauline epistles, and then finally the Gospel which is read with great ceremony by the officiating priest. Sermons had gone out of use, but

are coming back more recently as priests become better trained.

The creed recited is the Niceno - Constantinopolitan, introduced into the liturgy by Peter the Fuller in the 5th century as an anti-chalcedonian measure.

Two of the west syrian anaphora lack the actual words of institution - Mathew the Shepherd and Sixtus of Rome. The latter says simply: "He, when he was prepared for his saving passion, by the bread which by him was blessed, broken and divided among his holy Apostles, gave us his propitiatory body for life eternal; in a like manner, also by the cup etc."

The canon of the mass, with words of institution, ananesis and epiclesis is said aloud by the priest, with responses from the people.

Select Bibliography

1. Fortescue, A *The Lesser Eastern Churches*, London, 1913.
2. de Vries, W. *Sakramententheologie bei den Syrischen Monophysiten*, Rome 1940.
3. Ziade, I article on *Syrienne* (eglise) in *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique*, Paris 1914, vol. 14, pp. 3017- 3088.

THE ETHIOPIAN LITURGICAL TRADITION

The present liturgical corpus of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church is certainly the result of many centuries of varied development; the decisive shape was given to it, however, during the reforms under king Zara Yaekob, who ruled from 1434-1468. During his memorable reign many liturgical and theological books were translated into *Ge'ez*, the national language, from Coptic, Arabic, and possibly Syriac.

Ge'ez, also called *Ethiopic*, is still the official liturgical language, actually in use in practically all the Churches, except in a few city churches where, through the efforts of the Emperor, Amharic, the Modern Ethiopian language, has been introduced.

Liturgical Books

The main sources for Ethiopic worship are *Sunodos* (apostolic canons), *Metshafe - Kidan* (The Testament of our Lord), *Didaskalia Feta Negest* (nomocanon), *Ser'at - we - tezaz* (ordinances and instructions), *Mets'hafe Bahr'i* (The Book of nature), *Te' aqebe Mestir* (Stewardship of the mystery). The 17th century liturgical revision resulted in four major liturgical books - *Mets'hafe Qeddase* (Missal), *Mets'hafe Nuzaze* (Manual of Penitence), *Mets'hafe Taklil* (Matrimony) and *Mets'hafe Qandil* (Manual of unction of the sick). The Missal has two parts, one containing 16 to 20 anaphorae (*Qeddase*) and another with the psalmody for the Eucharist (*Zemmare*), often chanted by choirs specially trained.

In addition there are four books for the canonical daily offices - (a) *Deggwa*, or the antiphonal chants for the whole liturgical year except Lent; (b) *Tsomedeggwa* contains the chants for Lent, but not for the Holy Week; (c) *Mawaseet* an alternate form, less frequently used, of the daily offices; and (d) *Meeraf*, the common order for the daily office.

One could also mention paraliturgical works produced in the monasteries like *Wuddase Mariam* (Praises of Mary) and *Anqutse-Berhan* (the Gate of Light).

Eucharistic Anaphorae

Twenty different anaphorae are known, under the names - (1) The Apostles (2) Our Lord Jesus Christ (3) Our Lady Mary (by Cyriacus or Qirqos) (4) St. Dioscurus (5) St. John Chrysostom (6) St. John the Evangelist (7) St. James the Brother of our Lord (8) The Hosanna - Liturgy of St. Gregory (9) The Christmas Liturgy of St. Gregory (10) The Anaphora of our Lady Mary by St. Gregory (11) Another Anaphora of our Lady by St. Gregory (12) The 318 Orthodox Fathers of Nicea (13) St. Basil (14) St. Athanasius (15) St. Epiphanius (16) The longer St. Cyril (17) The shorter St. Cyril (18) St. James of Sarug (19) St. Mark (20) Yet another anaphora of our Lady Mary. Marcos Dawud, the Egyptian layman who was the first director of the Theological School in Addis Ababa, published in 1954 an English version of the Preanaphora and 14 anaphora (apostles, our Lord, St. John the Evangelist, St. Mary, The 318 fathers, St. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. Gregory, St. Epiphanius, St. John Chrysostom, St. Cyril, St. James of Serugh, St. Dioscurus and St. Gregory II). The Ethiopic and Amharic texts of these also have been published. Many of the anaphorae indicate a Syrian origin, possibly in the syrian monastery of the Skete in Egypt. The liturgy of St. Mark is not widely used in the Coptic church of Egypt (Cyril, Gregory and Basil). There is no reason to believe therefore that the Ethiopian Church simply copied the Egyptian liturgical practice. Elements of Coptic, Syrian and Byzantine liturgical practices are seen in the Ethiopian tradition, but the latter has a personality of its own.

Structure of Eucharistic Liturgy

The Ethiopic Liturgy has two main parts (1) the pre-anaphora, common to all the anaphorae (2) the anaphora proper. The pre-anaphora, which is unusually long, consists of six Psalms (25, 61, 102,

103, 130, 131), prayers for the cleansing of the celebrants and the vessels, prayers of vesting, the pro-thesis of the elements (ending with Psalm 117), the Enarxis (the prayers of the oblation, the prayers of the “wrappings”, the prayers for absolution and a long litany of intercession), and then the liturgy of the Catechumens (Censing of the elements) prayers of intercession for the living and the departed, censing of the priests and people, the three lections from the Pauline Epistles, the Catholic epistles, and the Book of Acts, the Trisagion addressed to Christ and embellished with incarnational epithets; prayers of the gospel, the chanting of an antiphon from the psalms, the blessing of the four quarters of the world, the censing of the gospel, and then the reading of the Gospel and a sermon. The pre-anaphora concludes with a long litany of intercession for the Church and the Catechumens and the people, especially the poor, the dismissal of the Catechumens, a creed or confession of faith in the mystery of the Holy Trinity, in the full deity and humanity of Christ, in the goodness of all that is created, about the underfiled nature of marriage and childbirth, a repudiation of circumcision, etc., followed by the *lavabo*, the prayer of salutation and the kiss of peace.

The Ethiopic anaphorae vary considerably in structure. The basic structure is as follows:

- 1) Eucharistic thanks giving, parallel to the western canon up to the words of institution, 2) Prayers of intercession and conclusion of the thanks giving prayer, 3) Sanctus (which is missing in one or two anaphorae), 4) Institution Narrative (substituted by a prayer in the Anaphora of James of Sarugh), 5) Anamnesis, Epiclesis, (6) Fraction and commixture, (7) Our Father and continuation prayer, (8) Inclination of the head and prayer of penitence before communion, (9) Elevation of the Body and Blood for adoration, (10) the communion, during which Ps. 150 is chanted, (11) Post-communion thanksgiving and a special prayer called the “Pilot of the Soul”, (12) the Benediction and dismissal with the imposition of the hands of the priest.

The Liturgy of the Word

The preparatory service, which is common to all the fourteen liturgies, is impressive in its solemnity and devotional depth. The rubric clearly says that the preparatory service was ordained by “our Egyptian fathers.”

The preparation begins by the priest or deacon reading an admonition to the congregation, which begins

“O my brother, think of thy sins, and ask forgiveness so that thou mayest obtain mercy before going out from the church where the pure sacrifice is offered on their behalf and thine.”

When the priest enters the sanctuary, he prostrates himself in front of the veil separating the sanctuary from the altar, and prays:

O Lord our God and our creator, who didst make all through thy word, who hast permitted us to enter into this mystery, who didst form man through thy wisdom and make him prince over all creatures to rule them in righteousness and truth;

Grant us the wisdom which dwelleth in thy treasuries, create in us a clean heart, O lord; forgive us our sins, hallow our souls and our bodies, make us meet to approach thy sanctuary that we may offer unto thee a sacrifice and a spiritual sweet incense for the forgiveness of thy people’s sins.

O our Lord and our God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hast raised us from the earth and lifted us up from the dust to set us with thy angels and with the princess of thy people:

Make us worthy to serve the word of thy holy Gospel through thy love and the multitude of thy tender mercies, and strengthen us to fulfil thy will at this hour. We offer to thee a sacrifice of a sweet savour, and the spiritual fruit which pleaseth thy goodness.

Grant us thy forgiveness and thy mercy; and accept this spotless sacrifice; and send thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon our offering to glorify it.

O thou only-begotten Son our Lord, our God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, glory be to thee, world without end.
Amen.

The rubric insists that the bishops or priest coming to celebrate the eucharist must know three books well-namely:

(a) the *Mashafe Qedan* or Book of the Covenant. This is a kind of Christomatic, containing “Christ’s teaching to the Apostles during the forty days following the Resurrection.”

(b) The *Synods*, or Book of the Councils, containing canons and decrees from various councils, including some canons attributed to the apostles.

(c) The *Didaskalia* or the Teaching of the Apostles; the Ethiopic version of the *Disascalia* has some passages not found in the Syriac version.

The rubric says that if the bishop or priest does not know these three books thoroughly, he should leave the altar and not celebrate the Eucharist at all. If this were to be enforced today one fears that a good 90% of the present ordained clergy of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church would not be able to celebrate the liturgy at all.

Vestments

The vestments of the priest are to be white or golden as in the Coptic Church. A minimum of three priests and two deacons are necessary for the celebration of the Eucharist in Ethiopia, though the rubric does not stipulate this number, but says only that the priest should make sure that there is one deacon before he begins to vest for the service. The liturgy, however, provides for actions and words from an “assistant priest” and an “assistant deacon.”

The preparatory service may well take two to three hours, depending upon the pace of chanting. Now a days city priests try to do it in much less time.

Offering of Incense

After several prayers and litanies led by the priests and deacons, and a long prayer of absolution during which the whole congregation prostrates itself on the ground, (whether they be standing inside the Church or outside), the ceremony of the blessing of the incense takes place.

The priest takes a few grains of incense, and after blessing the censer, he puts the incense on the coals in the censer. He offers it up at the altar “as a sweet-smelling savour” to the Holy Trinity, beseeching forgiveness of sins for the whole congregation.

He then censes the altar, and goes around it three times, a deacon with a lighted taper preceding him to symbolize John the Forerunner. The serving deacon carries the book of the epistles of St. Paul and follows the procession.

The priest then goes out through the middle of the congregation to the western door and censes the clergy and people. On returning to the altar he censes the “ark” or “Tabot” on the altar three times.

Epistles and Acts

The deacon then reads a passage from the epistles of Paul. After certain prayers the assistant deacon reads from the general epistles.

The rubric says that when Paul is read the deacon should face west, because Paul is the apostle of the West. For the Catholic epistles, the assistant deacon is to face north.

The third reading is by the assistant priest, from the Acts of the Apostles, facing south.¹

Reading of the Gospel

After the three readings, there begins a measure of excitement in the liturgy, in anticipation of the Gospel. During the Sundays after Easter until Pentecost, the Priest will chant thrice:

Christ is risen! By death he has
trampled death under foot and
gave eternal life to those in the
grave!

This is followed by a loud chant of *Qiddus* (Holy) initiated by the priest. The people respond with a thrice repeated Holy God, Holy Mighty, ‘Holy Immortal - addressed first to the God who was born of the Virgin, second to the God who was baptized and crucified, and third to the God who rose again.

This praise of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation is then followed by the Prayer of the Gospel, after which the deacons chant an antiphon from the psalms.

The priest then blesses the four corners of the world that it may be enabled to hear the gospel.

This is then followed by another prayer in preparation for hearing the Gospel:

Lord our God and our Saviour and lover of man, thou art
he who didst send thy holy disciples and ministers, and
thy pure apostles unto all the ends of the world to preach
and teach the gospel of thy kingdom, and to heal all the

diseases and all the sicknesses which are among thy people, and to proclaim the mystery hidden from before the beginning of the world.

Now also, our Lord and our God, send upon us thy light righteousness, and enlighten the eyes of our hearts and of our understanding; make us meet to persevere in hearing the word of thy holy gospel, and not only to hear but to do according to what we hear, so that it may bear good fruit in us, remaining not one only but increasing thirty, sixty, and a hundred fold; and forgive us our sins, us thy people, so that we may be worthy of the kingdom of heaven.

Now begins the procession of the Gospel. The priest, proceeded by the light-bearing fore-runner, and himself walking before the assistant priest carrying the gospel, goes around the altar and there is a dialogue between the two priests giving thanks to Holy Trinity for the gospel.

Then there is a new joyous dialogue in which the priest, the deacon and the people take part, still preparing for the reading of the gospel.

Only after this the gospel is read. If only the priests and the people could really experience the joyous anticipation of the gospel and listen to it with faith and understanding, as the rubrics lay down, what a difference it could make to the lives of the people!

Following the reading everyone kisses the gospel.

Intercessions

After the gospel, there follows a long series of intercessions for all men and even for the beasts and birds, for the dew of the air and the fruits of the earth, the plants and seeds, as well as for the departed.

Dismissal of the Catechumens

After the reading of the gospel the catechumens are dismissed. The rubric insists that none of the baptized should leave until the end of the Eucharist. This is then the occasion for new intercessions for the peace of the holy apostolic church, for the welfare of all people of God, for Patriarchs, bishops clergy and “all the entire congregation of the one holy universal church.”

Recital of the Apostles' Creed

A version of the Apostle's creed is then recited, which reads as follows:

“We believe in one God, Maker of all things, the Father of our own Lord and our God Jesus Christ, our Saviour; His nature is unsearchable. As we have already declared.² He liveth for ever, and he is without beginning or end, and has the light that cannot be extinguished, and no one can approach his presence.³ There is neither second nor third, nor can he be added to. He alone is one, eternal, for he is not hidden so as not to be known; we have known him certainly in the law and the prophets that he is the ruler of all and has power over the whole creation.

One is God, the Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who was begotten before the creation of the world, coequal with the Father, only begotten son, creator of all the hosts, the principalities and powers.

Who was pleased in those last days to become man, and without the seed of man took flesh from our Lady Mary, the Holy Virgin; he grew up as man without sin, without transgression; neither was guile found in his mouth.

After this he suffered in the flesh and died, and on the third day he rose from the dead, he ascended into heaven, to the Father who sent him; he sat down on the right hand where is power; he sent for us the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, who proceedth from the Father and redeemed the whole earth, and who is co-eternal with the Father and the Son.”⁴

To this interesting version is added the following clauses:

We say further that all the creatures of God are good and there is nothing to be rejected, and the spirit, the life of the body, is pure and holy in all.

And we say that marriage is pure, and children undefiled, because God created Adam and Eve to multiply. We understand further that there is in our body a soul which is immortal and does not perish with the body.

We repudiate all the works of heretics and all schisms and transgression of the law, because they are for us impure.

We also believe in the resurrection of the dead, the righteous and sinners; and in the day of judgement, when every one will be recompensed according to his deeds.

We also believe that Christ is not in the least degree inferior because of his incarnation, but he is God, the Word who truly became man, and reconciled mankind to God being the high-priest of the Father.

Henceforth let us not be circumcised like the Jews. We know that he who had to fulfil the law and the prophets has already come.

To him, for whose coming all people looked forward, Jesus Christ, who is descended from Judah, from the root of Jesse, whose government is upon his shoulder:⁵ to him be glory, thanksgiving, greatness, blessing, praise, song, both now and ever and world without end. Amen.

Lavabo

The priest now washes his hands in the manner of Pilate, facing the people and saying to them that he is not responsible if they approach the altar of God unworthily.

Kiss of Peace

This is followed by the kiss of Peace where the priests embrace each other, the deacons likewise; the men salute the men, and the women salute each other, all by kissing on both cheeks or on the shoulders.

The Anaphora or Liturgy of the Eucharist

Now the eucharist proper begins. After the *Sursum Corda*, the benediction of the people and the commemoration of the whole church, the deacon admonishes the people to stand properly.

The words of institution vary from anaphora to anaphora. So does the form of the epiclesis. For example in the Liturgy of the Apostles, the epiclesis, following upon the words of institution, reads:

“We pray thee and beseech thee, Lord
That thou wouldst send the Holy Spirit
and power upon this bread and
upon this cup. May He make them the
body and blood of our Lord and our God
and our Saviour Jesus Christ, world
without end.”

In the Anaphora of John Boanerges, the epiclesis reads:

“Let the gate of light be opened, and
let the doors of glory be unlocked,
and let thy living Holy Spirit
come, descend, light upon, linger,
dwell upon, and bless the offering
of this bread, and sanctify this
cup and make this bread the
communion of thy body,
giver of life, and make this
cup also the communion of thy
blood, giver of mercy.”

In the anaphora of St. Mary and in that of St. Athanasius one does not find a full fledged epiclesis. In these two, as well as in St. Basil, St. Gregory and St. James of Serugh after the *anamnesis*, the priest prays to “the Lord” to bless and hallow himself, the deacon and the people, and concludes:

“Grant us to be united through the Holy
spirit, and, heal us by this
oblation, that we may live in thee
for ever.”

The people repeat the words after the priest.

The epiclesis in the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom is the most elaborate.

We pray thee and beseech thee, as thou didst send thy
Holy Spirit upon thy holy disciples and pure apostles, so
also send upon us this thy Holy Spirit who sanctifieth our
souls, bodies and spirits that we may be pure through
him from all our sins and may draw nigh to receive thy
divine mystery, for thine is the kingdom and the power
and the glory, for ever.

Lord, remember the covenant of thy word which thou didst establish with our fathers and with thy holy apostles to send upon us this thy Holy Spirit whom the world cannot receive. Thou didst teach us that we may call upon thee saying: Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed by thy name, thy kingdom come.

May this Holy Spirit, who is neither searchable nor inferior, come from above the highest heaven to bless this (pointing) bread and to hallow this (pointing) cup, the make this bread the communion of thy life-giving body (benediction once over the bread) and also to make this cup the communion of thy merciful blood (benediction once over the cup and once more over both the bread and the cup).

It is then followed by the same invocation as in the anaphora of Mary, Athanasius, Basil and Gregory.

The words of institution are also different in the various liturgies.

Perhaps the most curious of the anaphorae is that of Mary. This is undoubtedly the fruit of Mariological excesses that have their common source in all ancient churches - in the celibate piety of the monasteries. An Orthodox Theologian finds this liturgy distasteful despite his high regard for the Blessed Virgin Mary, for it must have been written in a time when the understanding of the Eucharist as a participation in Christ's unique sacrifice had already become obscure. A text of this liturgy is given in the appendix, that can make their own evaluations. Here we need refer only to the words addressed to her in the liturgy before the words of institution.

O Virgin who giveth the fruit that can be eaten, and the spring of that which can be drunk:

O Bread got from thee, that giveth life and salvation to those who eat of it in faith.

O Bread got from thee, that is as hard as the stone of "Adams", which cannot be chewed, to those who do not eat of it in faith.

O Cup got from thee, that helpeth those who drink of it in faith to indite wisdom, and that giveth them life.

O Cup got from thee, that intoxicateth those who do not

drink of it in faith and causeth them to stumble and fall
and addeth sin to them instead of the remission of sin!

Hymnody and Music

Syro-Byzantine and Coptic musical elements must have come to Ethiopia already in the 5th century. But it was Yared, a disciple of the Nine Syrian Saints who came in the 6th century, who is the father of the distinctive Ethiopian hymnody and musicology. He is regarded by Ethiopian tradition as the author of all the divine offices, and of the system of Ethiopian chant called Zema, with its three different chants: *ge'ez*, *'ezl* and *araraye*. Yared is also credited with being the author of the Ethiopian musical notation system, which uses letters of the alphabet written above syllable indicate the note.

Liturgical year

The Ethiopian church follows the Julian calendar. The year is divided into 13 months - 12 of 30 each and one of 5 or 6. The year commences on Maskaram Ist, which corresponds to 11th or 12th September in the Gregorian calendar. The year is 7 or 8 years behind the western year (1970 A.D. would be 1962 or 63 in the Ethiopian Calendar). The major feasts are (1) the nine feasts of our Lord - Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection, appearance to Thomas, Ascension, Pentecost, Transfiguration, nativity Epiphany - Baptism, and the miracle at Cana (2) Six secondary feasts - exaltation of the cross, circumcision of the Lord, feeding of the 5000, Presentation in the Temple, Invention of the cross, and Sojourn of Jesus in Egypt (3) the 32 Marian feasts established in the 15th century by king Zara Yaeqob (4) the 50 main feasts of the saints, of the Old and New Testaments, universal and national including the archangels Michael, Gabriel and Raphael.

There is also the special peculiarity of the Ethiopian Church - the liturgical *month*, with its 18 monthly commemorations, 4 for our Lord, 6 for Mary and 8 for other saints.

Fasting

The following fasts are observed very strictly in Ethiopia. The great Lent (55 days preceding Easter). Advent Fast (40 days), the fast of the Apostles (from day after Pentecost till the feast of the Apostles), the fast of Mary, the fast of Nineveh and Wednesday and Friday each week.

Daily Offices

Forms of the daily offices are of Ethiopian origin, following the traditional structure used in all ancient churches. There are forms of Vigils (Wazema) offices for Sunday (Mawaddes), offices for special feasts of saints (kestat-aryam), offices for Lent (Za-atswam) daily matins (Sebhate-nageza-zawoter) matins for principal feasts - (Sebhate-nage zaha' alat' abiyān), Each office consists of

1. Scriptural praises - the 150 psalms and 15 biblical hymns of the old and new Testaments.
2. Special prayers for the feasts or for seasons.
3. Poetic or hymnic elements (Qene).
4. Readings from the scriptures.
5. Prayers and Invocations.

The main manual for the daily offices is the *Me'eraf*, which has been studied in detail by Bernard Velat in the *Patrologia Orientalis*, volume XXXIII (1966).

Notes

1. The altar in Ethiopian churches is to be on the East side, and the priests and the congregation are to face east during the liturgy.
2. i.e. in the Apostle's Creed.
3. i.e. he dwelleth in light unapproachable.
4. Translated from the Amharic, by the author.
5. Isaiah 9:6.

Bibliography

1. Daoud, Marcos *The Liturgy of the Ethiopian Church* (Text of pre-anaphora & 14 anaphorae in English) 252 pp. Berhanenna Selam Press, Addis Ababa, 1954.
2. Hammerschmidt, E. *Studies in the Ethiopic Anaphora*, Akademie - Verlag, Berlin, 1961.
3. Mercer, S. *The Ethiopic Liturgy*, Milwaukee, 1915.
4. Velat, Bernard *Etudes sur le Me'eraf*, Commun de

l'office divin Ethiopien.

Intro.Tr. Franc. Commentaire liturgique et musical, *Patrologia Orientalis* t. XXXIII, Paris, 1966.

12

WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE IN THE COPTIC CHURCH

The study of the worship of the Coptic Church has been made substantially easier with the publication of "*The Egyptian or Coptic Church - A Detailed Description of Her Liturgical Services and The Rites and Ceremonies observed in the Administration of Her Sacraments*"¹ by O. H. E. KHS - Burmester, in 1967. This paper is heavily indebted to that book.

Eucharistic Liturgies

The main liturgies used are three: St. Basil, St. Gregory and St. Cyril or St. Mark. There certainly were other anaphorae, but these have fallen into disuse in Egypt, though some of them continue to be used in a modified form and under a different name in the daughter Church of Ethiopia. Fragments of a certain Anaphora of St. Mathew and of other coptic anaphora have already been published.

The Anaphora of St. Mark (also called St. Cyril) is rarely in use now-a-days, mostly on account of its exceptional length. St. Basil is the shortest and perhaps for that reason the most widely used. An authorized English text of the latter was published by the Coptic Orthodox Patriarchate in 1963.

There are Greek originals for all the three anaphorae in manuscript,² and it is reasonable to suppose that the Copts like the Syrians used the Greek language in their liturgy before the quarrel with the Byzantine churches following the council of Chalcedon in the 5th century. There is evidence that the Greek Liturgy was occasionally celebrated in some of the Egyptian monasteries even as late as the 14th century.³

The anaphora of St. Gregory has been published with text and German translation by E. Hammerschmidt in his *Die Koptische Gregoriosanaphora*.⁴

There is an elaborate preparatory service for the preparation of the elements and the celebrants. This service is itself preceded by the morning office of offering of incense, which has its own long prayers and intercessions, as well as the recitation of the Creed and the reading of the Gospel.

The Coptic Church uses round leavened bread freshly baked by the Sacristan, about three - quarters of an inch in thickness and about 7 inches in diameter, stamped by a wooden stamp with 12 crosses and in the inscription in Coptic, "Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal."

Frequent communion is becoming an accepted practice among many educated young people, and there is no doubt that there are the beginning of a "Eucharistic revival" in the Coptic Church today. It is a characteristic of any movement of renewal in an Eastern Church that it is accompanied by large-scale and well-prepared frequent eucharistic communion. The two other signs of renewal - evangelistic preaching and involvement in relevant social action can proceed in the Eastern churches only from a renewed eucharistic participation.

The Canonical Hours

The canonical offices, being of monastic origin, can be regarded as a coptic contribution to the spirituality of the universal church. The early coenobitic communities established by St. Pachomius (ca. 320 A. D.) in upper Egypt had very few priests or deacons in them, and they were dependent on the priest from the neighbouring parish church for their liturgical services. The canonical hours or offices were usually celebrated by the community without the assistance of a priest. In the beginning probably there were only three much common prayers - morning, evening and midnight. Quite often the morning office was recited by the monk in his cell, thus only vespers and nocturnes being said together by the community.

In course of time the Coptic Church also came to adopt the eight canonical offices, which became universal by the 14th century: Matins, Tierce, Sext, None, Vespers complaines and Nocturnes, and a special service of Prayer for protection recited before going to bed.

The Coptic Church gives great importance to the reciting of the Psalms of David during these offices, as well as to the reading of the New Testament. Each office has the recital of twelve Psalms, while the morning office now has 19.⁵ Lessons from the Old and New Testaments are also read. The Psalms are assigned to the various marks, each reciting one psalm in a rather low voice. The lessons are read more audibly.

Unlike other Orthodox Churches, the Coptic Church does not offer incense during canonical hours, but has separate services for the offering of incense. Again unlike the other churches, the Coptic Services are usually recited (said) rather than sung.

The service of offering of incense takes place twice a day in the churches and monasteries: The evening service is at about 5 pm. (an hour earlier in winter) and the morning service at 5 am. (an hour later in winter). For these services sanctuary veil is drawn back and the lamps lighted, but no liturgical vestments are worn by the priest. These services are reminiscent of the temple services of the Old Testament, and the main emphasis is on the praise of the Holy Trinity in the company of the angels and archangels and the faithful departed. There is also Psalmody and the reading of the Gospel at each service of incense.

Special Services

There are special services for the purification of women after childbirth - forty days after if the child is male, and 80 if it is female. There are also special services for the naming of a child before baptism. These latter are entirely voluntary, but have to be done on the 7th day after birth and is only for male children. A special service of "Prayer of the Basin" is provided in which a basin of water is blessed by the Priest and the child bathed in it and named.

Baptism

The Baptismal service follows much the same pattern as in other Orthodox Churches - two services for the Catechumenate, the service of Exorcism, the anointing with the Holy Oil, the Pouring of the Chrism in the Baptismal waters, the consecration of the Baptismal waters,

then the Baptism itself, with a three-fold immersion and three-fold insufflation (the Baptismal formula is: I baptize thee N... In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit - the active voice being used as in the Latin Church) the chrismation (the candidate is sealed 36 times with the Chrism, making the sign of the cross with it on his forehead, two nostrils, mouth, right ear, right eye, left eye left ear, the heart, the navel, the back, the spine in four parts, then the shoulders, armpits, fore-arm, palms, thighs, hips, knees, calves, ankles, and so on.

After Baptism the newly baptized is now again insufflated with the words "Receive the Holy Spirit and be a purified vessel." The Priest then clothes him in a white garment and then finally crowns him, and girds him with a girdle in the form of a cross. Then the Priest shouts the "axios", as for a bishop, saying "worthy, worthy, worthy is so – and – so the Christian." The people repeat the axios thirty times. He is now blessed by the Priest and dismissed.

On the eighth - day after Baptism, there is, as in the Syrian Church, a ceremony of loosing the girdle (in the Syrian Church, it is the ceremony of taking off the crown, pledging to give it back to him in the eschaton).

The Sacrament of Penitence

The Sacrament of confession or absolution of Penitence has not yet received a definite form in any of the Eastern churches, and the practice of compulsory confession before communion is of very late origin in the Eastern Orthodox tradition. In the Coptic Church confessions can be heard either in the church or at home. The priest wears no liturgical vestments for hearing confession. The Priest, after hearing confession pronounces absolution in a formula which is mainly in the first person plural, and in the form of a prayer: "Bless us, purify us, absolve us, and absolve all Thy people." At the end of the priest's prayer the penitent says: "I have sinned, absolve me." The Priest responds "God absolve Thee."

Matrimony

The service combines (a) engagement (b) betrothal and (c) wedding proper, which includes the service of crowning the bride and bridegroom. The engagement, which means mainly the signing of the marriage contract, usually take place two weeks before the wedding, and can be performed in the bride's home. The ceremony concludes

with a three-fold announcement of the engagement, a prayer of thanksgiving and the exchange of rings. The contract of engagement is technically called “the Our Father” (Jepeniot) from the opening words of the Lord’s Prayer which solemnizes the engagement.

The betrothal service and the wedding service proper can take place either in the home or in the Church, though now-a-days most people prefer to have it in the Church. The ceremony is much simpler than in the Syrian Church and begins with a ratification of the marriage contract by the Priest making the sign of the cross on. This is followed by lections from the scriptures: 1 Corinthians 1:1-10, and St. John 1: 1-17. Various prayers follow.

The service of crowning is impressive. Again there is an epistle: Ephesians 5:22 to 6:3 and the Gospel, Mathew 19:1-6. After various intercessory prayers, and prayers for the blessing of the couple, there is a final prayer asking God to confirm the marriage and assist the couple in their future life.

A special (olive) oil is then consecrated. The Priest anoints the bride-groom and the bride, and then crowns them with a separate crowns kept in the Church. The two crowns are attached to each other by a ribbon long enough to give them some freedom. They are then covered by a white silk bridal veil called the *Lammat* with two crosses embroidered on it.

The couple are then absolved, blessed, admonished and dismissed. There is a later service two to eight days later when the crowns are formally removed, but this has now fallen into disuse.

Unction of the Sick

This service, so clearly taught in the epistle of James (V: 10-20) is administered to the sick, but not as an “extreme unction” as a preparation for the death as in the Latin Church. It is rather a service of prayer for healing, anointing the sick person with a special oil. There are seven prayers of intercession and 14 lections.

(1) James V:10-20, (2) John V:1-17, (3) Romans XV:1-7, (4) Luke: XIX:1-10, (5) 1 Cor. XII:28 - XIII:8, (6) Mathew X:1-8, (7) Romans VIII:14-21, (8) Luke: X:1-19, (9) Galathians II:16-20, (10) John XIV: 1-19, (11) Colossians III:12-17, (12) Luke VII:36-50, (13) Ephesius VI:10-18, and (14) Mathew VI:14-18.

The prayers are similar to those in the Greek rite for the unction of

the sick. After these seven sets of prayers and readings, the priest anoints the sick person. The Lord's Prayer and the Creed are recited followed by 41 Kyrie eleisons. Then the three prayers of absolution follow. Those present are also anointed with the holy oil. The sick man is then anointed continuously for seven days.

Ordination

The Coptic ordination service deserves a chapter to itself, but we have to be brief here, and will confine ourselves to a few general remarks.

The episcopal ordination service insists on the qualifications and method of election of a bishop. This service must be quite ancient, probably fourth or fifth century, as the following rubric bears witness: "It is good on the one hand, if he has not a wife; if, on the other hand, if it is not so, let them ask him if he is the husband of one in holy matrimony; and being likewise of middle age." This must belong to the period when celibacy of the higher clergy was just being introduced and yet it was possible for a family man to become a bishop, The rest of the consecration service describes however the man to be consecrated as bishop to be a "Priest and monk of the monastery of N....".

The bishop is usually consecrated by the Patriarch, on the basis of a request from the priests and people of a diocese. The people take an active part in the election as well as consecration, though a more centralized authority has been coming in with the present Patriarch Cyril VI.

The ordination services today bear great resemblance to the services of the 4th century as we know them from the Euchologion of Serapian of Thmuis. There is no anointing for ordination as in the western church, but only the laying on of hands and the vesting.

In the choosing of a priest or deacon, or even an abbot or arch-deacon, the clergy alone have to vouch for his worthiness. In the case of a bishop, however, the rubric clearly says that he should be chosen "through all the people, according to the good pleasure of the Spirit."

Consecration of the Patriarch

In recent times, the Patriarch is chosen from among the monks and the bishops are excluded from being candidates to the Patriarchate.

The claim is made that this was the practice down to the end of the 19th century when it was discontinued due to the politicking of the bishop.

The candidate is to be elected by a Synod of Bishops and by the representatives of the people. His consecration is to take place in the presence of all the bishops of the church, as well as of representatives of the clergy and people. The deed of election has to be signed by all the bishops, three priests of Alexandria and three deacons, and abbot of a monastery of the Natrun valley, a noble of Alexandria or Cairo. The prayer of consecration is quite similar to that in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus or in seration of Thmuis.

The book of the Four Gospels is held over the head of the Patriarch - elect, as the people say "Axios" (worthy) three times. The senior bishop present lay hands on the candidate after the Evangelion is removed from over his head. While a prayer is being recited, all the bishops lay their hands on him, one by one, each time the people acclaiming "worthy" thrice. After that when the new Patriarch is vested, the bishops, clergy and people again acclaim thrice: "worthy."

This is then followed by the Enthronement. The two senior bishops take hold of the hands of the new Patriarch and make him stand on the "Synthronus", the senior bishop declaring that the Patriarch is now enthroned, and asks all the people to pray for him. After the prayers, the Patriarch is made to sit three times on the throne, each time the people acclaiming 'axios.' The Patriarch then complete the Eucharist in the middle of which the consecration and enthronement took place.

The major feasts of the Coptic Church

The seven major feasts are the universal dominical feasts: Annunciation, Nativity, Epiphany, Palm-Sunday, Good-Friday and Easter, Ascension, Pentecost.

There are seven minor feasts, also related to the life and ministry of our Lord: The circumcission (Jan. 1st), the Presentation in the Temple, the Entry of the Holy Family into Egypt, the first miracle of Cana, the Transfiguration, the Holy Thursday, and the Sunday of appearance to St. Thomas.

The main Marian feasts are Nativity of Mary, Purification (same

as presentation in the Temple) of the virgin, Dormition and Assumption, as well as the consecration of the first Church dedicated to the Theotokes.

Among other festivals there are the New Year (Sept. 11th or 12th) the Invention of the Cross (Sept. 27th), St. Peter and St. Paul, St. Mark, St. Michael, St. John the Baptist etc.

The Coptic Liturgical Calendar

The Year is calculated from the time of the Diocletian persecutions as the Era of the Martyrs, which began on August 29, 284 A. D. (the date of accession of Diocletian, rather than the actual date of the persecutions).

The year is divided into 12 months of exactly 30 days each and the remaining 5 or 6 days are a thirteenth month, the little month. The Gregorian Calendar has not been adopted, and therefore practically the Julian Calendar is still in use which is 13 days behind the Gregorian. There is strong resistance to Calendar reform.

Fasts

Five major fasts are observed in the Coptic Church, in addition to the customary Wednesday and Friday. The Great Lent before Easter is seven weeks. To this seven weeks is added at the beginning an extra week, as the fast of Heraclius (in repentance for emperor Heraclius' permitting the massacre of the Jews Ca. A. D. 628).

The Advent lent is 6 weeks before Christmas. The fast of Nineveh is 3 days. The fast of the Apostles lasts from the day after pentecost till the feast of Peter and Paul (June 29th July 12th in the Gregorian Calendar). The fast of Assumption of the Blessed Virgin is 15 days from August 7th.

During the season from Easter to Pentecost Wednesdays and Fridays are not observed as fast days, since this is a season of joy in the resurrection.

Fasting is more strictly observed today in the Coptic Church than in any other Church with the exception of the Ethiopian people abstain from eating meat, eggs, milk, butter and cheese, and in most cases also fish. Actual fasting, or abstaining from all food is observed now-a-days only up to 9 am. though it was the ancient custom not to eat or drink till 3 pm. on fasting days.

Notes

1. Publications de la societe d' Archaeologic Copte, Le Caire, 1967.
2. See *Liturgiarum Orientalius Collectio*, Ed. E. Renaudot, Vol. I, pp. 57-148, Frankfort, 1847.
3. The Egyptian or Coptic Church, p. 47-48.
4. Berlin, 1957.
5. The Psalmodia now takes place in three instalments daily: morning, evening and midnight.

13

MAR THOMA CHURCH WORSHIP

The Mar Thoma Church is unique in the sense that it is at once Eastern and Reformed. This church still maintains aspects of its Eastern Orthodox heritage, but has undergone a thorough reformation along the lines of the English and Continental Reformations.

The church claims historical continuity with the ancient church supposed to have been established by the apostle Thomas in the first century. The Reformation of the nineteenth century, which originated this church as an independent unit, distinct from the Syrian Orthodox Church of which it formed part before that time, was ostensibly an effort to restore the purity of faith and practice of the original apostolic church which had been corrupted by the Syrian Orthodox.

The liturgical tradition of the Mar Thoma Church thus follows very much the patterns set by the Syrian Orthodox tradition. There have been several revisions of the prayers, especially in the eucharistic liturgy, to eliminate certain supposedly wrong teachings. e.g. 1. to take out all intercessions to the saints or the Blessed Virgin Mary since Christ is the only mediator; 2. to take out all prayers for the departed, since there is no biblical teaching that tells us that the dead will be benefited by our prayers; 3. to take out elements in the liturgical prayers which over-emphasize the sacrificial element in the eucharist; 4. to revise prayers which may seem to imply a doctrine of

transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of our Lord; 5. to revise texts which over-emphasize the powers of the priesthood.

In these reforms the Mar Thoma Church was guided especially by the pattern of the English Reformation as the Church Missionary Society had interpreted it. As in the English BCP, sometimes two alternate versions are given of prayers, one of which has a 'high' theology of the sacrament, whereas the second may reflect a 'low' view. In the revisions, the basic allusions of the Orthodox text have been maintained wherever possible. For example, the opening words of the public celebration of the eucharistic liturgy in the Orthodox and Mar Thoma texts are: *Orthodox* - 'Mary who brought Thee forth and John who baptized Thee - these are intercessors on our behalf before Thee - Have mercy upon us.' *Mar Thoma* - 'Our Lord Jesus Christ who took flesh from Holy Mary and received Baptism from John, pour forth Thy blessing upon us.'

The introduction by the Metropolitan Yuhanon Mar Thoma, Head of the Mar Thoma Church, to the finally revised (1954) text of the eucharistic liturgy, gives these basic principles of the revision: 1. removal of all prayers addressed to the saints; 2. removal of all prayers for the departed; 3. removal of the prayer (at the time of communion): 'Thee I hold, who holdest the bounds of the world, Thee I grasp, who orderest the depths; Thee, O God, do I place in my mouth...'; 4. change of the prayer 'we offer thee this bloodless sacrifice for thy Holy Church throughout the world ...' to read 'We offer this prayer ... for the Church; 5. change of the prayer 'we offer this living sacrifice' to read 'we offer this sacrifice of grace, peace and praise'; 6. removal of the statement 'this eucharist is ... sacrifice and praise'; 7. removal of the declaration that the Holy Spirit sanctifies the censer; 8. omission of the rubric about blessing the censer; 9. alteration of the epiclesis, giving freedom to say '(may the Holy Spirit sanctify it) to be the body of Christ'; or 'to be the fellowship of the body of Christ'; 10. insistence on communion in both kinds separately; 11. abolition of auricular confession to the priest; 12. prohibition of the celebration of the eucharist when there is no one beside the priest to communicate.

Changes along similar lines were made in all the forms of prayer and administration of sacraments. Since the revision has not yet been carried out in a thorough manner, elements of the Orthodox tradition now co-exist with definite Reformation features.

In the canonical offices, the use of incense has been largely discontinued. The prayers for the offering of incense are retained, however, the word 'incense' is replaced by the word 'service' or 'prayers.' That typical Syrian Orthodox pattern of *proemion* (introductory doxology) followed by a *sedra* (long meditative prayer) is retained, but the invariable reference to the departed at the conclusion of the *sedra* is either omitted or replaced by reference to 'all believing members of the church.'

The Mar Thoma Church remains Eastern in not adding the *filioque* to the Nicene Creed, in insisting on the celibacy of bishops, investments and church utensils, in full congregational participation in worship, in the use of the mother-tongue in worship, in adding 'O Christ, who was crucified for us, have mercy upon us in the *Trisagion* and in many other respects.

At the same time there has been a liberal acceptance of and accommodation to Western Protestant or Evangelical forms of worship. The prayer meeting finds a place in the constitution, and each parish is divided into regional groups which meet together for informal group prayer. The eucharistic service is not obligatory on all Sundays, and quite often the priest or presbyter presides over a meeting around the preached word and prayer alone.

Hymns from the Anglican, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Methodist, Baptist and other books are found in the manuals of worship and are frequently used, either in English or in Malayalam. Several litanies and collects have also been similarly adopted.

The traditional seven canonical offices have been reduced to two (morning and evening), following the Reformers at this point. A form for compline has, however, been retained. There are special offices for Sundays and certain feast days, but different forms for the different days of the week are no longer in use.

A special feast called 'Community Day' (Samudayadinam) has been added, and a special form of service provided for the day, which coincides with the feast of St. Thomas. A special offering is taken on this day for the central treasury of the church.

14

THE LITURGICAL TRADITION OF THE SYRIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

The Syrian Orthodox Church, follows the liturgical tradition of the West Syrian Churches, known to many by the misnomer 'Jacobite', a name given to us by our enemies who wanted people to believe that our Church was started in the sixth century by Jacob Burdono.

The actual introduction of this tradition into India must go back into the very early centuries. When the Portuguese came to India, however, it seems that the Church in Malabar was following the East Syrian rather than the West Syrian Church in both faith and worship.

Roman Catholic scholars usually claim that the West Syrian tradition was newly introduced in India after the Coonen Cross Revolt of 1653. There can be little doubt that systematic introduction of the West Syrian tradition into India took place only in 1665, following the arrival of Mar Gregorios, the west syrian bishop.

But the claim of many Orthodox scholars that the church in India received bishops indiscriminatingly from the Patriarch of Babylon who followed the East Syrian tradition and from the West Syrian Maphriana of the East who had also his headquarters in Persia, should not be too lightly dismissed. The history of this Mappriante which produced such illustrious scholars as Moshe Bar Kepha in the 9th

century. Dionysius Bar Salibi and Michael the Great in the 12th and Gregory Bar Hebracus in the 13th bears witness to a flourishing West Syrian Church within the confines of the Persian Empire.

The assumption that the church in India from the 5th to the 16th century was Nestorian is based on the assumption that the Persian Church with which the Indian Church was in contact was always entirely Nestorian. But the facts are certainly otherwise. At least up to the 14th century the Mapprianate in Mesopotamia representing the West Syrian Church was both numerous in membership and flourishing. Portuguese writings in the 14th and 15th centuries refer clearly to the west Syrian Church in India which was not subject either to the Patriarch of Babylon or to the Bishop of Rome. All the portuguese writers make mention of the Indians as a group distinct from both the ‘Jacobites’ and the ‘Nestorians.’

The Jewish writer Benjamin of Tudela who Journeyed in the East from 1116 to 1171 was mainly interested in the Jewish communities. He mentions specifically the spice traders from India and the black inhabitants of Quilon who are Christians, but does not include them among the Nestorians or the Jacobites.

Cardinal Jacques de Vitry, the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem who died in 1240, in his history of Jerusalem speaks thus of the South Eastern extension of Jacobites:- “They inhabit the greater part of Asia and of the entire East; some of them live among Saracens, others possess countries of their own, and do not consort with infidels, to wit, Nubia, which adjoins Egypt, and the greater part of Ethiopia, and all the countries as far as India.”¹ Obviously the Patriarch included the church in India among the Jacobites and not among the Nestorians. These Portuguese writers make it quite clear that the Christians of India were not subject to the Pope. Marco Polo who travelled in the East in the 13th century found both Jacobites and Nestorians living side by side in Baghdad. In India he does not mention either category. The Venetian Nicolo de Conti came to Mylapore in the 15th century and then later visited Quilon, Cochin and Calicut. De Conti also does not say that the Malabar Christians were Nestorians.

If we keep in mind the fact that the Persian church consisted of those who were under the so called Nestorian Patriarch of Babylon, as well as of those so-called Jacobites who were under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Tagait (the Maphriana as he was called) we shall avoid a great deal of confusion. It seems that in the

5th century the difference between the West Syrian and the East Syrian liturgies was not as great as it became after the 7th and 8th centuries.

It is also conceivable that the East Syrian liturgy in its fully developed form was introduced into India only after the 13th century while the fully developed West Syrian liturgy was introduced only in the middle of the 17th century.

The Three Aspects of the Liturgical Tradition

It needs to be said clearly by way of introduction that the liturgy is not a form of words, but a prescribed action of the church as a community. The words are only part of the liturgy, but not the whole of it. The liturgy is the corporate action itself. As has been said, it is an action before God; it is an action of the whole church. It is an action which derives its meaning from its participation in the priestly ministry of Christ.

The total liturgical life of the church has three aspects. *First*, there is the Eucharistic liturgy which is the characteristic and central act of the church. It is the church's participation in the saving events of Christ, His incarnation, His teaching, His ministry of intercession. *Secondly*, there are the other liturgical actions of the church, all of them related to the Eucharist. Baptism and Chrismation initiate us into the Eucharist and make us worthy, by the Holy Spirit, of participating in Christ's priestly ministry. The ministry of forgiveness sometimes called Confession or Penance is also a liturgical function of the church in order to wipe away the sins that accrue to the Christian during his life in this world. The anointing of the sick also helps to restore health to those members of the body who are sick in body and soul. Marriage is equally a liturgical act of the church in which two members are united together as Christ and the church are united, in order that their union may bear fruit for the glory of God. Bishops are consecrated, priests and deacons are ordained, churches and altars dedicated, all in order that the church may be able to perform its Eucharistic and pastoral ministry. The third group of liturgical actions of the church are called the divine offices. These began in Jerusalem influenced by the Temple Services of morning and evening as well as other Jewish canonical hours of prayer. These offices grew very long and very elaborate and very rich in the course of the development of the monastic movement in the church.

The liturgical heritage of the church thus in its written form can be said to be composed of mainly the following:

1. Eucharistic anaphora.
2. Rites of Baptism and Chrismation.
3. Rites of penance, anointing of the Sick matrimony, burial etc.
4. Rites for the consecration of the bishops priests deacons etc.
5. Rites for the profession on monks.
6. Rites for the consecration of churches and altars as well as for the translation of (ceremonial removal) the relics of the departed saints from one place to another.
7. The divine offices or forms of corporate prayer for the seven hours of the day, for different seasons of the year and for different ecclesiastical feasts and fasts.

The Syrian Eucharistic Liturgies

There is general agreement among scholars that the Syrian liturgy continues the earliest Jerusalem tradition of worship in the church and that it is by far the richest and most varied Eucharistic tradition.

The Syrian tradition itself is divided into two: the East Syrian and the West Syrian. The East Syrian tradition has developed along so-called Nestorian lines while the West Syrian tradition has followed the pattern set by the first three Ecumenical Councils. Within the West Syrian church itself there developed two traditions: the one in the Patriarchate of Antioch and the other in the Mapprianate of Mesopotamia and Persia.

The Indian Syrian church followed basically the Eastern branch of the West Syrian tradition, that is, the one developed in Mosul and Baghdad, in Mesopotamia and Iraq.

The number of Eucharistic anaphorae in the West Syrian church remains still unknown. Some scholars have spoken of one hundred different Eucharistic liturgies. But scholars have generally been unable to trace the manuscripts of more than seventy liturgies.

The texts of the following liturgies either in the original or in translation have already been published. We give below the year of death of the person to whom the authorship of the liturgy is ascribed.

1. St. James (+ 62)
2. The Twelve Apostles
3. St. Luke
4. St. John the Evangelist (+ Ca. 96)
5. Liturgy of St. Peter I
6. Liturgy of St. Peter II
7. Liturgy of St. Peter III
8. St. Mark (+ C. 68)
9. St. Clement of Rome (+ 100)
10. Liturgy of Dionysius the Areopagite (was thought to be the disciple of St. Paul but probably lived in the fifth century)
11. Liturgy of St. Ignatius of Antioch
12. Liturgy of the Roman Church (4th century?)
13. Liturgy of St. Xystus of Rome (+ 258)
14. Liturgy of St. Julius of Rome (+ 352)
15. Liturgy of St. Celestine (+ 432)
16. St. Athanasius (+ 373)
17. The 318 Fathers of Nicea
18. St. Eustathius I (+ 330)
19. St. Basil (+ 379)
20. Gregory of Nyssa (+ 395)
21. Liturgy of St. Gregory Nazianzum (+ 390)
22. Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom (+ 407)
23. St. Cyril of Alexandria (+ 444)
24. Dioscurus of Alexandria (454)
25. Timothy of Alexandria (+ 457)
26. Peter of Kallinikus (+ 591)
27. Jacob Baradeus (burdeana) (+ 578)
28. Mar Philoxenos of Mabboug I (+ 523)
29. Philoxenos of Mabboug II
30. John of Sedros (+ 648)
31. James of Zarug (+ 521)
32. Patriarch Kuriakose (+ 815)
33. John of Bostra (650)
34. Severus of Kenneshre (+ 640)
35. Marutha of Tagrith (+ 649)
36. John Sabha (+ 680)
37. Mathew the Shepherd
38. John Maro (+ 707)
39. Thomas of Harkel (+ C. 620)

40. St. Severus (+ 538)
41. Yesu Bar Shushan
42. Moshe Bar Kepha I
43. Lazarus Bar Sabhetha (l. 830)
44. John of Dara
45. Dionysius Bar Salibi I (+ 1171)
46. John of Harron (+ 1165)
47. Michael the Elder (+ 1199)
48. Dioscorus of Kardu (fl. 1285)
49. John the Scribe (C. 1200)
50. John Bar Ma dani (+ 1263)
51. Gregory Bar Hebraeus I (+ 1286)
52. Gregory Bar Hebraeus II
53. Ignatius Ibnwahib
54. Dionysius Bar Salibi II (+ 1171)
55. Dionysius Bar Salibi III (+ 1171)
56. St. Eustathius II
57. Ignatius Behnam
58. Theodore Bar Wahbon
59. Michael the Younger (fl. 1200)
60. Moshe Bar Kepha II
61. David Bar Paulose (fl. 1200)
62. John of Lechphet (+ 1173)
63. Bar Kainaya (c. 1360)

This list is far from complete. Quite often the same liturgy turns up in different manuscripts under different names. The minimum, however, cannot be below seventy different anaphorae in the West Syrian liturgy alone.

A quick glance at the list will make one thing clear. Even while the church regarded the liturgy of St. James as of great importance, this did not prevent the church from creating new liturgies right up to the 14th century. These fathers who wrote new liturgies were in no way departing from the tradition, but keeping the basic structure given by the tradition, they always created fresh forms, more directly relevant to their own times.

It is interesting to note that the Syriac form of the liturgy of St. James itself has come down to us in three different versions, namely:

(a) The ancient version which continued to develop till the 4th century and then was comparatively stable from the 5th to the 8th century.

(b) The version of the liturgy of St. James as revised by James of Edessa in the 8th century (+ 708).

(C) The liturgy of St. James as abbreviated and revised by Gregory Bar Hebraeus (+ 1286) in the 13th century.

The version that has been generally in use in Kerala is (c), i.e. the abbreviated version produced by Bar Hebraeus. Fortunately we have a text of this liturgy in a manuscript coming from, the 13th or 14th century. The original manuscript is in the British Museum (codex 272/ADD. 14693). The liturgy of St. James as revised by St. James of Edessa is also available in ancient MSS coming from the 10th and 11th centuries.

As far as the liturgy before the 8th century is concerned we have no MS of the liturgy of St. James from the period before the 8th century. We have to reconstruct the rite from the 8th book of the Apostolic Constitutions, from the second book of the Didaskalia and from the descriptions given by St. Cyril of Jerusalem and St. John Chrysostom of Antioch in the 4th century. These documents reflect considerable variation and fluctuation. By the 4th century, the liturgical language of cities like Antioch and Jerusalem has become Greek while in the interior of Palestine and Syria, the Syriac language was used from the first.

Why No Liturgical Reform in The Syrian Orthodox Church?

Generally speaking, the Orthodox are considered to be conservative in relation to tradition. We do not jump to conclusions theologically or liturgically. We change things only after mature deliberation, and so we do not fall into error as often as others do. And our liturgy is so rich that even with all kinds of corruptions, it can still give life.

But our fear of change seems to be a comparatively recent phenomenon. Whenever the church had some spiritual vitality combined with a deep understanding of what is essential in the Tradition and what is merely circumstantial, she has been able to introduce changes. The basic structure of the Eucharistic liturgy cannot be changed; but the wordings of most of the prayers can be changed, as is clear from a casual look at the 60 odd different eucharistic liturgies.

A careful and well-planned reform of the Syrian Orthodox liturgy can be authorized only by the Holy Episcopal Synod on the basis of a report by a commission of experts appointed by it.

We suggest below a minimum programme for liturgical reform to be considered by the Church.

Frequency of Communion

The ancient practice is that everyone who is not excommunicated should take communion every Sunday and every time when he attends a Eucharistic liturgy. Non-communicating attendance is a punishment given only to the excommunicated.

Preparation for Communion

Frequent and regular communion requires just as careful preparation as communion once in a year. But confession should be made optional – i.e. only if the believer has something to confess. As a matter of discipline confession should be made compulsory once a year, and required otherwise when there are definite sins of a serious nature to confess.

The Prayers of Intercession

Our present *toobdens* were written about 8th century, probably by St. James of Edessa. There is no reason why, keeping the same number of six prayers, three for the living and three for the departed, new sets of intercessory prayers could not be developed by the Church. The present set of six prayers could continue to be used, but there could be briefer or longer sets which could be used alternatively. We have to pray for our world as we know it today, for our government authorities, for world peace, for the problems of our nations etc.

The Bathmalko

The series of hymns called *kuklion* (cyclion = cycle of prayers) now sung at the time set apart for communion have been put there very recently. These hymns are not part of the eucharistic liturgy, but are taken from the book of daily prayers (*Schimo*). These commemorative hymns about the Blessed Mother of God, the Saints, Priests, and the departed, could also have alternate forms which are much shorter.

Time of Communion

The present practice of administering communion after benediction and dismissal is certainly not the right thing. Communion should be restored to its proper time, namely soon after the elevation of the Holy Elements. The argument that communion is communion

irrespective of the time at which it is given is quite beside the point. After the benediction and dismissal, communion should be administered only to the sick in their home or hospitals.

The Readings and Sermons

The public reading of the scriptures should find a more prominent place in the worship of the Church. At least six passages, three from the Old and three from the New Testament should be read every Sunday. It should be read by people specially trained to read in such a way that the congregation can follow the meaning of the passage. It is possible to train special *Koruye* or readers from among the more educated members of the congregation. Specially gifted members of the local congregation could also be trained to interpret the meaning of the passages, read, so that there is real teaching in Sunday morning worship.

The Training of Altar Assistants

Most parish congregations do not have trained deacons to assist in the Eucharist. Deacons have an important part to play in the liturgy. Now this is done by altar assistants, some of whom are poorly educated and poorly trained. It is important to choose the most holy and most gifted people in the congregation for fulfilling this ministry and to train them properly, in order that the worship of the congregation becomes more dignified and orderly. It is the task of the deacons also to see that the congregation is properly trained and directed to play their part in the eucharistic liturgy.

The Teaching of the Congregation

The congregation must be taught the meaning of the Eucharist and be helped to participate in actively and with some understanding. There should be adequate literature for this purpose, and the Sunday School, Youth Movement, Martha Mariam Samajom and other parish organizations should take a more active part in training the congregation.

Reform of Family Prayer

There is an urgent necessity to develop simple and meaningful forms of prayer for use in our Christian homes. These should be developed with an understanding outlook on the differing conditions in the cities and in the villages, in homes where the pressure of time is less or more etc. It is not difficult to develop three or four different

orders of family prayers for use according to circumstances and at different seasons of the year.

This is a bare minimum set of proposals for consideration by the authorities of the Church, including our priests and laymen.

Notes

1. Francis M. Rogers, *The Quest for Eastern Christians*, Minneapolis, 1962, p. 23.

15

RELATION BETWEEN BAPTISM, 'CONFIRMATION' AND THE EUCHARIST IN THE SYRIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

Only a proper 'liturgical' or eucharistic spirituality can finally span across the divisions of our churches which have their origin in differences of dogma or disputes of jurisdiction. In the final analysis nearly every division in the Church develops into a serious divergence in eucharistic and liturgical spirituality. In modern times, with all the assistance placed at our disposal by recent liturgical research and the possibility of easier mutual communication among the various traditions, the recovery of an authentic Eucharistic spirituality acceptable to all the three main traditions of Christendom seems both imperative and within the range of possibility.

The Eastern Orthodox Tradition is basically one. But it has a pluriformity intrinsic to it. Many both within and outside that tradition are often unaware of this fact. The Byzantine form of the Orthodox tradition is the one best known in the West. But liturgical scholars know that before the development of this tradition there existed a Jerusalemite, an Antiochian and an Alexandrian liturgical tradition. Both the Western liturgical tradition and the Byzantine are essentially derived from this earlier Asian - African tradition. Today the Orthodox liturgical tradition may be said to exist in at least six slightly different

forms: the Western Syrian, the East Syrian, the Egyptian, the Ethiopian, the Byzantine, and the Armenian. Admittedly there exists such a great measure of ‘unanimity’ between these six traditions, that they are better called sub - traditions of one single tradition. It is from within the Syro- Alexandrian or West Syrian sub - tradition that this paper is written.

The present study limits itself to an understanding of the relation between Baptism, ‘Confirmation’ and the Eucharist based on a limited number of liturgical texts used in the Syrian Orthodox Church today. It does not attempt to cope with the whole historical development of that tradition. The currently used texts may have an ancestry reaching back into the earliest centuries, but a critical study of the development of the corpus of Syrian Orthodox liturgical texts does not seem to have been undertaken yet.¹

There exists also the problem of terminology. Several terms taken for granted in the West are for an Easterner difficult to use, e.g. *sacrament*, *confirmation*, *sacramental character*, etc. A ‘sacrament of confirmation’ would be perfectly incomprehensible to the Eastern way of thinking.

A word has to be said about ‘sacraments in general.’ In the West a Sacrament is generally a means and a seal of attestation of some specific grace. The East is not used to thinking in such terms. We prefer to speak of a ‘mysterion’, *rozo* in Syriac, *mistir* in Ethiopic. *Rozo* comes from the root *raz* - to conspire, and might have had its origin in the mystery cults. But in ecclesiastical Syriac, it came to have the special meaning of an act of the chosen community, either initiating into the community, or instructing the baptized, or performing the ‘great mystery of the upper room.’ A mystery or *rozo* can thus show forth some event of eternal significance. The Eucharistic liturgy says “*Hasho wemawtho waqyomtho merazezinan.*”. That is rather untranslatable except as “we show forth through a mystery the passion, death and Resurrection.” The ‘showing forth’ or the celebration is the mystery, not the ‘elements’, though the elements are an integral part of the mystery.

The *rozo* is for us primarily an act of Christ through His Body the church. It is a mystery in so far as it penetrates into the eternal order of reality and thus transcends our timespace logic. That makes it extremely difficult for us to have a logically neat doctrine of what happens to the elements and how. Nor can we too easily classify

grace and specify the various types of grace mediated through the various sacraments. A *mysterion* transcends spatio-temporal logic, is therefore trans-conceptual, and to that extent logically antinomic.

The *rozo* or *mysterion* is a corporate act of a specific body, and is closed to those outside it. It is so to speak, a reality of the eternal order, manifesting itself in time, through a visible corporate action of the Church, to those already initiated into the *mysterion* and living by it. The emphasis therefore is on the corporate action, rather than on the materials used, the form of words pronounced over the elements, the moment of consecration, etc. While there are rather rigid rules about the materials to be used and the form of words to be pronounced, these are neither so uniform nor so central to the meaning of the mystery. The formulae for the various mysteries vary from sub-tradition to sub-tradition. But even within my own sub-tradition there are dozens of forms of the words of institution or the epiclesis.

One more word needs to be said here before we go on to the specific question of the relation between the mysteries. This relates to the number of 'sacraments' in the Orthodox Tradition. To say the least, the number seven is a disputed question amongst us. The second Council of Lyons (1274) of the Roman Catholic Church (Ecumenical XIV for them) fixed the number as seven. Professor Alivisatos of the Greek Orthodox Church claimed in 1932 that this number is generally accepted by all later Byzantine theologians. The number appears in some of the catechetical books of my own tradition. But there has been no conciliar decree binding on the Orthodox which fixes the number seven or specifies which seven.

In the Syrian Orthodox manual of Services, one cannot find any justification for the number seven. The manual now in use (in Syriac and Malayalam), comes to some 500 pages, and its table of contents is interesting:

1. Baptism
2. a) Marriage
b) Second Marriage
3. Burial of the Dead
 - a) Men
 - b) Women
 - c) Children

4. Anointing of the Sick
5. Consecration of a Home
6. Confession
7. Consecration of Vestments and Vessels

Obviously this is not a list of the ‘Sacraments’ of the Church. The Eucharist and ordination are clearly not included here for practical reasons. Yet the difficulty remains as to the basis on which one can say that 1, 2, 4 and 6 are sacraments while 3, 5 and 7 are not. Baptism and Chrismation are clubbed together under the title Baptism.

Another word for ‘sacrament’ in our tradition is *qudosho*, which comes from the root *qadesh*, meaning sanctify, hallow or consecrate. But *qudosho* is used not only for the Eucharist, but also for the consecration of an altar. It is thus very difficult for us to think in terms of seven sacraments, for we would then exclude the consecration of an altar which is in every sense *qudosho*.

The unity of All Sacraments

The unity of all the sacraments is the right context in which to consider the relation between Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist. All the Mysteries are related integrally to the great mystery of the Incarnation and its continuation in the Body of Christ. All of them are equally related also to the operation of the Holy Spirit in Christ’s Body the Church.

Baptism incorporates into that Body, and leads immediately to the permanent indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the member of the Body, signified by Chrismation, which is an integral part of Baptism. Confession or Penance renews baptism (“He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet”), and restores the relation with the Body of Christ broken by post - baptismal sin. The Eucharist is the *mysterion* par excellence, which is more than merely nourishment for the Body of Christ. It is, in fact, the *raison d’etre* of the Body of Christ in the world of space and time. All ‘sacraments’ are completed by the Eucharist.

The Unction of the Sick is again a sacramental exorcism of a member of the Body in whom the Satanic force of sickness has crept in through sin.

The two so - called ‘optional’ sacraments, matrimony and holy orders, while not ‘obligatory’ for individual members, are yet essential

for the life of the Body of Christ. Matrimony does more than assure the continuation of the Body from generation to generation. It is also the great mystery of the Union of the eternal union of the Church and Christ as Bride and Bride - groom. Holy Orders or the Sacrament of Ordination secures for the Body of Christ the Presence of Christ the High Priest and Good Shepherd in its midst.

Certainly the Orthodox tradition does not limit the number of sacraments to three, viz. Baptism, 'Confirmation' and the Eucharist. It is therefore difficult for us to take these three in isolation and discuss their mutual relationship. The only reason for doing so here would be on ecumenical grounds, since the main line Protestant traditions recognize only these three, though Luther himself regarded Penance as a sacrament.

Baptism and Chrismation

As has already been stated, the Orthodox tradition gives very little ground for regarding Baptism and Chrismation as two separate 'sacraments.' It may be possible to regard the consecration of Holy Chrism as a separate mystery from Baptism, but the practice of consecration of Chrism by the Bishops in Council is a comparatively late development. Earlier evidence shows that the 'oil of thanksgiving' was consecrated on the spot by the Baptizing priest or bishop.

It would appear that the separation of Baptism and Confirmation even in the West is a rather late development beginning in the early Middle Ages.²

The *Didache* makes no explicit reference either to Chrismation or to Confirmation. Neither does the first Apology of Justin Martyr. The Apostolic tradition of Hippolytus, however, places the laying on of hands *before* Baptism, conferred even on catechumens (xix:i). The same document speaks of a two - fold anointing with two different oils, the former, of exorcism, applied before baptism, and the latter 'of thanksgiving' consecrated by the bishop on the spot, but applied to the candidate by the presbyters as he 'comes up' from Baptism, with the formula: 'I anoint thee with the oil of thanksgiving' (xxi:19). This is then followed by a third anointing, this time performed by the Bishop with the laying on of hands accompanied by a prayer of *epiklesis* and the formula: "I anoint thee with the Holy Oil in God the Father Almighty, and Christ Jesus and the Holy Ghost" (xxii:2).

St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Catechetical Lectures also refer clearly to the anointing of exorcism before baptism (2:3), and the one after, which he calls a "Christification" (Christ - Chrismated).

The same practice is continued in our tradition. There are two separate oils and two separate anointings in Baptism. The oil of exorcism is called simply *Zeith* or oil, and the second *Myron* or Holy Chrism.

To be baptized is to be incorporated into the Body of Christ, which is the Temple of the Holy Spirit. One cannot be a member of the Body of Christ and not have the Holy Chrism or the Holy Spirit.

Baptism and Chrismation constitute one single mystery. The only circumstance in which Baptism and Chrismation can be separated are the following:

(a) When one who was baptized and chrismated in the Orthodox church leaves the communion of the Church (by excommunication or by joining a schismatic or heretical Church) and then later repents and returns to the Orthodox Church. In such a case he is not re-baptized, but only re-chrismated;

(b) When one who has been baptized in a schismatic or heretical church joins the Orthodox Church; in such a case it is within the authority of the bishop to decide whether he has already been duly baptized. If he has, then he needs only Chrismation to signify the mystery of initiation into the fullness of the Holy spirit Who indwells the true Church.

The inseparability of water and the Spirit (or Baptism and Chrismation) is a recurring emphasis in the early chapters of St. John's Gospel (1:29-34; 2:6-10; 3:5-8; 3:22-38; 4:13-14, 24; 5:7-9).

The rubric of the Syrian Orthodox Baptismal liturgy confirms this inseparability. Already before the candidate is baptized, the priest prays for the Holy Spirit to descend upon the baptismal water. He then lifts up the vial containing the Holy Chrism over the waters, making the sign of the cross and saying:

Priest: The waters beheld Thee, O God; the waters beheld Thee, O Lord, and were afraid!

Deacon: Hallelujah

Priest: The voice of the Lord is upon the waters!
The God of Glory thunders!

The Lord, upon many waters! (Ps. 29:3)

Deacon: Hallelujah

Priest: Glory be to the Father, and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost, now and unto ages of ages.

people: Amen

Here is a clear affirmation of the Holy Spirit brooding over the waters of chaos and bringing life and form out of it. Following this the priest drops in the form of the cross a few drops of the Holy Chrism into the Baptismal font, saying:

Priest: We pour this holy Chrism upon these baptismal waters that by them the Old Man may be renewed and made New.

people: Hallelujah

Priest: In the name of the Father (people: Amen), and of the Son (Amen) and of the Living Holy Spirit, for life unto ages of ages (Amen).

The rite of Chrismation is not thus something which follows baptism and can be separated from it. The Chrism is, so to speak, in, with and under the baptismal waters and inseparable from it.

Baptism and the Eucharist

So when an Orthodox speaks of Baptism he includes Chrismation within it, and there is no reason for him to speak about a relation between two sacraments. There is also no need for him to speak of the relation of the two separately to the Eucharist. However, as we will presently see, Chrismation as an integral part of Baptism, has special relevance to the Eucharistic offering.

We need first to note the fact that both Baptism and the Eucharist are priestly acts performed corporately by the whole Church and not by the priest alone.

The first prayer in the Syrian Orthodox Baptismal rite amply illustrates this:

Priest: Make *us* worthy, O Lord God, of the spiritual priesthood which Thou didst entrust to Thy Holy Apostles in order to baptize with fire and the Holy Spirit. Ordain it, therefore, O Lord that through the intercessions of us sinners, this one who now

approacheth to the laver of regeneration may attain to salvation of soul, and find grace and mercy, both now and unto ages of ages.

People: Amen.

It is interesting to note that all the audible prayers in the Baptismal liturgy are in the first person plural, except where the priest addresses Satan in the rite of exorcism (I do not know if this exception has any theological significance). Even the formulae of baptism and of Chrismation are in the passive voice: “So and so is being sealed”, or anointed, or baptized, etc.

Congregational responses are provided for throughout the service. In the blessing of the water for baptism, the people continually cry, *Kyrie eleison*.

At the time of the epiklesis over the water, the deacon exhorts the people to pray with quietness and awe. The epiklesis itself, the text of which is given in this paper, is in the double form, invoking the Holy Spirit to be sent “upon us and upon this water which is being consecrated.”

The second point of parallelism between Baptism and the Eucharist lies in that the action of the Holy Spirit is central to both. From beginning to end, both are actions of God in Christ through the Holy Spirit. Both are, so to speak, actions taking place within the Trinity Itself.

A parallel rendering of the epiklesis in the Eucharistic liturgy of St. James and that in the Baptismal liturgy will show their great similarity:

St. James

Deacon: How solemn is this hour and how awesome this moment when the Holy and Life-giving Spirit descends from the heavens, from the heights above and broods upon this Holy Offering and sanctifies it! Stand ye in holy fear and worship!

Priest: (inaudibly) Have mercy upon us, O God the Father,

Baptism

Deacon: How solemn is this hour and how awesome this moment when the Holy and Life-giving Spirit descends from the heavens, from the heights above and broods upon this water of baptism and sanctifies it! Stand ye in holy fear and worship!

Priest: (inaudibly) Have mercy upon us, O God the Father

and send upon these offerings laid before Thee Thy Holy Spirit, Who is Lord, Co - equal with Thee and with Thy Son in Throne and Kingship, and in Eternal Ousia, Who Spake in the Old Covenant and in the New, Who descended in the form of a dove upon our Lord Jesus Christ in the river Jordan, and in the form of tongues of fire upon the Apostles in the Upper Room... (audibly) Give answer to me, O Lord (thrice).

People: Kyrie eleison (thrice).

Priest: (audibly) In order that brooding (upon them) he may make this bread the lifegiving Body, the saving Body, the Body of Christ our God....

People: Amen.

Priest: And perfect this chalice into the blood of the New Covenant, the saving Blood, the Blood of Christ our God.

People: Amen.

Almighty and send forth upon us and upon these waters which are being sanctified, from Thine Abode which Thou hast prepared, from Thine infinite bosom, Thy Holy Spirit, Personal, Exalted, Lord, Life - giver, Who spake in the Law, the prophets and the Apostles, Proximate to every place and perfecting all, Who worketh holiness by authority and not as a slave in those in whom Thou art well pleased, Spotless by nature, Diverse in operations, Fountainhead of all divine gifts, One with Thee in Ousia, Who proceedeth from Thee and taketh from Thy Son, Co-equal with Thee in the Throne of the Kingdom that is Thine and of Thine Only - Begotten Son, Our Lord Our God and Our Saviour Jesus Christ.

(audibly) Give answer to me, O Lord (thrice).

People: Kyrie eleison (thrice).

Priest: O Thou Lord God Almighty, Manifest these waters to be waters of healing, waters of joy and gladness, waters mysteriously signifying the Death and Resurrection of Thine Only - begotten Son, waters of cleansing.....

People: Amen.

Priest: (cleansing) the spots

and blemishes of body and spirit,
loosing bonds, forgiving sins,
illuminating the soul and body....

People: Amen.

Priest: The laver of
regeneration (literally ‘of coming
into being from above’), the
charisma of adoption to sonhood,
garment of incorruption, and
renewal in the Holy Spirit.

People: Amen.

Baptism equips for the Eucharist

More important, however, than the parallelism between Baptism and the Eucharist is the fact that the one equips a human being to participate in the other.

It is customary to regard Baptism as the beginning of the new life, and the Eucharist as the means of sustaining and continuing that life. By Baptism one is incorporated into the new life in the Body of Christ; in the Eucharist the members of that Body are fed and nourished.

This is especially so in the Syrian tradition. The Syriac word *haye* can mean life or salvation. To be saved is to be made to live. Baptism saves, gives life; the Eucharist feeds that life. The Baptismal emphasis on life can be seen in the following formula used for the consecration of the baptismal waters:

Blessed, Sanctified, be these waters, that they may be for the divine washing and for the birth from above (Deacon: Bless, Lord). In the name of the Living Father, unto Life (People: Amen). In the name of the Living Son unto Life (Amen). In the name of the Living Holy Spirit unto Life, which is unto ages of ages (Amen).

Immediately after the candidate is baptized with the formula

Baptized is N..... in the hope of Life and of the forgiveness of sins, in the name of the Father (Amen), and of the Son (Amen) and of the Living Holy Spirit, unto Life that is unto ages of ages (Amen).

After the baptism the Deacon sings a hymn of welcome into the Church. while the Priest hands over the candidate to the 'Godparent' as delegated representative of the Church.

The giving of this life is also the giving of the Spirit. The Spirit is the quickener, the life - giver. Baptismal regeneration and the life - giving activity of the Spirit cannot be separated (Romans 8:11). This new life which is 'from above' is to be nourished and sustained by the 'bread of life', the Eucharistic food. Baptism is always performed in the context of the Eucharist, and the newly baptized infant communicates in the Body and Blood of our Lord in the same Eucharistic Liturgy.

The Eucharist is also a saving, a life - giving mystery. The post - communion prayer in the Syriac St. James shows this:

Glory be to Thee, Glory be to Thee, Glory be to Thee,
Our Lord and Our God for ever. O Lord Jesus Christ,
let not Thy holy Body which we have eaten and thy
reconciling Blood which we have drunk, be unto us
for judgment or condemnation, but for the life and
redemption of us all, and be merciful unto us.

The Adoption to Sonhood and the Access with Confidence

Baptism and Chrismation not only open access to life, but also make possible 'the liberty of access' into the very presence of God the Father. Baptism (and Chrismation) alone confers on us the right to call the Lord 'Abba, Father.' This scriptural allusion seems to be to the activity of the Holy Spirit which helps the congregation to say the Lord's prayer in the context of the Eucharist, in the boldness of Sonship:

For you did not receive (in Baptism) the Spirit of slavery to shrink back in fear (as catechumens have to), but you have received the Spirit of Sonship. When we cry Abba, Father, (which only the faithful baptized do, after the dismissal of the catechumens), it is the spirit testifying with our Spirit that we are children of God (Romans 8:15-16).

Parrhesia or access with confidence is a creation of the Spirit in Christ. "Through Him we both have access in one Spirit to the Father" (Eph. 2:18). This passage in the Ephesian Epistle also has a definite Eucharistic context. Baptism confers on us the Spirit of sonship, of

Christification, thus introducing us into the very life of the Trinity: through Christ, in the Spirit, vis-a-vis the Father.

The Eucharist is the characteristic act of Christian *Parrhesia*, and Baptism (with the giving of the Spirit in Chrismation) equips us for this ‘access with confidence.’

Baptism and the Royal Priesthood

In Baptism we are anointed as Kings and Priests (Rev. 1:6), in order that we may fulfil our pastoral and priestly ministry before God and men.

In Syrian Orthodox Baptism, Chrismation takes place both integrally within the baptism itself (pouring of the Holy Chrism into the baptismal waters) and also in the more elaborate anointing and ‘crowning’ which completes the baptismal ordination of the member of the Body of Christ.

After the actual baptism and the handing over of the candidate to the ‘Godparent’, the priest prays:

And may this Thy servant receive in Thy name this sealing and imprint, that he may be counted among Thy soldiers, by the power of faith and of baptism, that by this Chrism he may be filled with all spiritual fragrance, and not overcome by the forces of the adversary, not vanquished by the evil powers of darkness, but walking in Thy light he may be a Son of light.

After the prayer, the priest now places his right hand on the head of the candidate, and with Holy Chrism on his right thumb, marks the forehead of the candidate three times with the sign of the cross, saying

By the Holy Chrism, which is the fragrance of the Messiah, the imprint and seal of the true faith, and the perfection of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, is sealed N..... in the name of the Father (People: Amen) and of the Son (Amen) and of the Living and Holy Spirit, for life unto ages of ages (Amen).

Then the priest anoints the whole body of the candidate, from head to foot, while singing a hymn which has an interesting theology. Given below is a prose translation of this hymn.

1. By the anointment of holiness, said God, let Aaron be anointed that he may become holy.
2. By this anointment of holiness is anointed this chosen lamb that has come to baptism.
3. This anointment, by which this chosen lamb who has attained to baptism is now being anointed visibly is the same as the Spirit of Holiness Who invisibly marks him and divinely indwells and sanctifies him.

The candidate is then led to the altar, and crowned (no visible crowns are always used in the Syrian Orthodox Church, even for weddings, but only the gestures of crowning). Male baptized are then taken inside the sanctuary and made to process around the altar three times. Female candidates are crowned at the door of the sanctuary (which would correspond to the Royal Doors in a Byzantine Orthodox Church). While crowning the priest says the following prayer:

Crown. Lord God, this Thy servant with majesty and glory, and may his life be pleasing unto Thy lordship and worthy of the glory of Thy Holy Name, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, unto ages of ages. Amen.

This is followed by a hymn of congratulation:

Sing, brother dear, sing praises to the Son of the Lord of All,
 for He has adorned thee with the crown for which kings yearn!
 Glistens thy robe like snow, our brother,
 And thy beauty is brighter than the River Jordan.
 Like an angel thou hast come up from baptism,
 Our beloved, by the power of the Holy Spirit,
 The unfading crown has been placed on thy head
 And to the glory of the house of Adam thou hast attained This day
 Heavenly grace, our brother, thou hast received.
 Be on guard against the evil one, lest he snatch it from thee.
 Joyous are thy robes and thy crown as well,
 Which the First-born has woven for thee by the hand of the Priest
 The fruit that Adam was not allowed to taste in Paradise
 This day is being placed in thy mouth with joy
 Child of Baptism, go in peace
 Adore the Cross that will keep thee.

Conclusions

1. Baptism and “Chrismation” are as inseparable as the Body of Christ and the Holy Spirit are inseparable.

2. Baptism is initiation into the Body of Christ, on confession of Faith in Jesus Christ, repudiation of the Devil, and the anointment of exorcism. In Baptism, the baptized is received into the community of the local church, sealed as belonging to God, and anointed and crowned as sharing in the Priesthood and Kingship of Christ.

3. Baptism is participation in Christ’s Baptism only in so far as the latter is itself an anticipation of His death and resurrection. Thus Baptism looks forward to participation in the Eucharistic offering and is consummated by the Eucharist, which cannot withheld from the Baptized. All sacraments are consummated by the Eucharist, and there seems to be no valid theological reason for a long interruption between Baptism and First Communion.

Notes

1. The more significant studies so far have been:

Botte B., *Le baptême dans l’Eglise Syrienne*, L’Orient Syrien I (1956), pp. 137-155.

Brightman, F. E., *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Vol. I, Eastern Liturgies, Oxford 1896. 603 pp.

Codrington, H. W. *Studies of the Syrian Liturgies*, London 1952, 90 pp.

Janin, R., *Eglises Orientales et Rites Orientaux*, 4c ed., Paris, 1955, 548 pp.

Khouri - Sarkis, C., *Les Eglises Orientales et Rites orientaux, d’après le R. P. R. Janin*, l’Orient Syrien I, Paris (1956), pp. 345-373.

Salaville, S., *Liturgies Orientales la messe*, 2 Vol., Paris, 1942.

Vries, W. de, *Sakramententheologie bei den syrischen Monophysiten*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta, Roma, 1940, 263 pp.

For a more comprehensive bibliography, see J. M. Sauget, *Bibliographie des liturgies orientales*, Roma, 1962.

2. See Gregory Dix, *The Theology of Confirmation in Relation to Baptism*, Westminster, 1946 and L. S. Thornton, *Confirmation*, Westminster, 1954.

16

CHURCH, SACRAMENT AND LITURGY IN FR. LOUIS BOUYER'S LITURGICAL PIETY

Two remarks have to be prefaced to this essay:

1. This is not a report but a critical review of Fr. Louis Bouyer's recent work originally in French, Translated into English under the title "Liturgical Piety." The paper presupposes acquaintance with the contents of the work.

2. The Critical point of view is definitely Catholic, i.e., from a perspective formed by life in the Catholic tradition and a Biblical-Patristic way of thinking.

The paper has to deal with the ecclesiology and theology of the sacraments implied in Bouyer's work and then to deal with his view of the Eucharistic Liturgy. However this has not been possible for reasons which will be discussed in the body of the paper.

There are two traditions of thinking, one Protestant and the other Roman Catholic, which come to intersection and fruition in his book, which can be understood only from the perspective of these lines of development, which are, contemporary Neo-Calvinist thought and the Roman Catholic Liturgical Movement of this century. It is unfortunate, in the opinion of this reviewer, that no integration of these two lines of thought have been successfully achieved in the present work.

The Neo-Calvinist frame of his thinking is most conspicuously manifested in the fact that for him the fundamental category for liturgical theology is the word and not the Church as the continuation of the Incarnation, the authentic motif in the Catholic tradition. The latter motif is present in his earlier discussion of the Maria Laach emphasis on the Kultmysterion (see p. 18), but this is not carried through in the discussion of the nature of the Church.

The doctrine of the Church developed by Bouyer shows its Calvinistic and Neo-Calvinistic background, and only very inadequately expresses the fullness of the Catholic understanding of the nature of the Church. The two central concepts in the latter way of thinking about the Church are (1) the Body of Christ as a living organism organically united to the eternal Son of God who was born of the Virgin Mary, suffered, died and rose again, and (2) this Body as constituted or created by the Holy Spirit who unites men and women to Jesus Christ through the proclamation of the good news of the Kingdom and by the sacraments of Baptism, Chrism and the Eucharist. While these central concepts are not entirely absent in Bouyer's thought, they are dominated by the concept of the Church as (1) a covenant people called together by the Word of God, in essential continuity with the Qahal-Yahweh of the Congregation of Israel and (2) a congregation called for the purpose of hearing the Word, adhering to the Word, not by substantial union but by "prayer and Praise", and sealing the Covenant with the Eucharistic sacrifice. The definition of the Eucharist printed in italics, and forming as it were, the central thesis of the whole work reads:

The liturgy in its unity and in its perfection is to be seen as the meeting of God's people called together in convocation by God's Word through the apostolic ministry, in order that the people, consciously united together, may hear God's Word itself in Christ, may adhere to that Word, is proclaimed, and so seal by the Eucharistic sacrifice the Covenant which is accomplished by that same Word (p. 29).

Or again, speaking of the Biblical witness to the life of the primitive Christian Community in Acts 2:42 as "Persevering in the doctrine of the Apostles and in the communication of the breaking of bread and in prayers", he says:

The "doctrine of the Apostles" is that proclamation (*Kerugma*) by which now the Word, incarnate in Jesus, calls into convocation the People of God in its definitive form, and enlightens it by the definitive revelation of itself (p. 27).

There are a few things which a Catholic would say on an exposition of this type and language:

1. *The Centrality* of the idea of *hearing* the Word of God as constitutive of the Church and as the basis of the liturgical action is not part of the authentic tradition, and seems to be more typical of Neo-Calvinist thought, which has recently been using this as the central category of all theology.

The notion of the “Word of God” as a synonym for four or five differing concepts is seen by Catholics as an attempt to salvage the *sola scriptura* principle of the Reformation by substituting for it a category which includes God Himself, but which can be seen as somehow in continuity with the scriptures. The authentic tradition does use the term “Word of God” as a synonym for the second Person of the Trinity, but more often for the “pre-incarnate Logos than for the Incarnate Lord.” The Biblical usage is also limited to the Logos before the Incarnation, wherever the concept is central as in Johannine writings.

The Old Testament usage refers usually to the word as it comes to the Seer or Prophet, though Psalm 119 does use it as synonym for the Torah. The kerygmatic meaning of the term as a message from God dominates the Synoptic and other New Testament writings, but the expression “Word of God” (Logos tou Theou) is rather rare in this connection (Mt. 15:6, Lk. 5:1, Acts 4:31, 18:11, Romans 9:6, 1. Cor. 14:36 and others).

It is a legitimate and common Biblical idiom. One has no quarrel with the expression itself, but historically the emphasis on the centrality of the concept of Word has led to an impoverishment of the concept of the concrete incarnation as well as the rich tradition of the Church and Sacraments. To be addressed and to respond have become the central moments of the relationship between God and Man in Reformation thought, whereas in the Catholic tradition this emphasis is balanced by other and richer concept of genuine substantial union with God in Christ. The weakness of Bouyer’s thought from a Catholic point of view lies in the overstressing of the Word or communication idea in such a way that the idea of union is no longer central. This may be a necessary corrective to some of the excesses of Roman Catholic theology, and Bouyer may be consciously exercising this correction. But to the present writer this appears a definite carry-over from his neo-Calvinist background, which will not be helpful or

authentic in a genuinely Catholic liturgical theology. A theology of the Anaphora based on the idea of communication rather than union is bound to be inadequate.

Since that liturgy is predominantly the coming down of God's Word to us, it is fundamentally a liturgy of the Word. It is obvious that this is true of the first part of the Mass, which is actually nothing but the hearing of God's Word expressed to us in the circumstances and atmosphere that befit it (p. 29).

And then he goes on to say that Mass of the Faithful is also a "Liturgy of the Word" because it is *Verbum visibile*. In what sense does he use the expression *Verbum* here? Possibly in its garden variety of meaning.

At the risk of sounding unnecessarily controversial, it has to be pointed out that this confusion of usages of the expression "Word" does not lead to clarity and is likely to lead to a confusion of thought between the second Person of the Trinity and the Scriptures. For the sake of clarity, again, one would recommend that the expressions Word of God, Jesus Christ, and the Scriptures be used for the eternal Son of God, the Incarnate Son of God, and the Bible respectively. And when it comes to preaching, it may be better to use the word Gospel, or Euangelion, or something similar to that, rather than equating it univocally with the Word of God.

2. The concept of the Church as a convocation through the Apostolic Ministry is again at dissonance with the authentic tradition, on two counts. First, the Apostolic Ministry and the church are seldom conceived in the authentic tradition as two entities standing over against each other temporally or functionally. This is a post-Reformation concept, not only in Reformation theology which sets the Scriptures over against the Church but also in the Roman Church with its doctrine of *ecclesia docens* and *ecclesia credens*. Second, this gives the notion that Church is posterior to the Apostolic Ministry and is created (of course not *ex nihilo*) by that Ministry. This is in fundamental dissonance with the notion of the Church as we see it in the book of Acts where it is something to which the new believers are added, and whose life is informed by the Apostolic Ministry or Tradition which dwells within it.

Reference has already been made to the distinction between the communication idea which is often dominant in Western thinking with

its congenital aversion to the genuinely evangelical scandal of Union with Christ, and the substantial union idea which dominates the Eastern tradition. In the West, the emphasis falls heavily on the Congregation, while for the East whole Church in time and space is a single unit of which the local congregation is a local manifestation but fully participating in the reality of the whole and always acting along with the whole in its worship and prayers. In the West Reformation thinking lays great stress on the Covenant idea, and Catholic thinking on the idea of divine causality (e. g., the doctrine of the keys), whereas in the East the emphasis is on the gracious vocation of God.

Even the Kerugma has *authoritarian* overtones in the Evangelical Tradition, whereas in the East, the grace of God is like the man who has prepared a feast and goes out and begs the beggars to come in and enjoy it. But once the beggar has come in, he is no longer a beggar, but a member of the family, treated with love and grace and even glory. This means of course that in the Missa Fidelorum, Christ and the Apostolic Ministry stand with the Church and all the faithful are united with Him Who eternally offers Himself on the cross. The Church no longer stands over against Christ, but is genuinely grateful to Him, abides in Him, and works because He is working in her (without me ye can do nothing). The ideas of Covenant and Convocation and Congregation are inadequate to express this great mystery, and only the Body of Christ conceived as a living organism within which Christ is present (not over against it), standing in the presence of God the Father, indwelt by the Holy Spirit, is adequate to a genuinely Catholic ecclesiology.

3. The third (and fundamentally of equal significance with the other objections) difficulty in Bouyer's thought for the Catholic is in his doctrine of the Sacraments as derivings their value from the presence of the Word in them. This is a post - Medieval concept which is slightly at variance from the Catholic conception of the Sacraments. But the Sacramental theology is only a manifestation of the theology of the Church which is here conceived in mechanistic and instrumental terms. Here the thought of Fr. Bouyer appears to have been influenced considerably by his work on Newman who conceives the Church first as instrumental and then as vital.

We can now understand how, when God sends His Word to us, He is Himself present in Him Whom He sends....
The fundamental leitourgia of the Church is the permanent

proclamation, the Kerugma of the Mystery, through the ever living and acting Word which is always present in its Apostles as God is present in It. ... The first thing that the Church is to do when it assembles together, therefore, is to hear the full Word of God as given in Christ and as brought to us by the Apostolic Ministry.... In the celebration of the Christian Mystery everything depends on God's Word and on our hearing it with faith (pp. 107-109).

In the first place, it is not very good Christian theology to say that "God was *present* in Him Whom He sent." The logos *was* God says St. John, not that God was *present* in the logos. To speak of the Church as an instrument in the bringing of God's Word to men is true only in so far as Christ may be spoken of as an instrument to bring the Word of God to men. Secondly the fundamental leitourgia of the Church is not the permanent proclamation of the Kerygma, but the living sacrifice of itself in thanksgiving (Eucharist) to God, and going forth into the world with God Himself abiding in it through Christ and the Holy Spirit, to manifest the glory of God in the Christian life. Thirdly, one would like to ask what exactly is meant by the expression "Word of God" in the last quoted sentence from Fr. Bouyer. If Christ is meant "hearing it in faith" sounds incongruous. If the proclamation is meant, "everything depends on it" is a manifest exaggeration, for it is on the living Christ and not on the proclamation that all things depend.

A notion of the concrete historical fact of the Incarnation which continues to this day in the concrete historical fact of the Church abiding in the Incarnate Christ, would lead to a notion of the sacrament as a concrete historical event which is a characteristic action of the Incarnate Body of Christ. Such a notion alone adequate to a truly Catholic theology.

Enough has been said to so far to illustrate what is meant by the statement that Fr. Bouyer's neo-Calvinistic background prevents him from a full appreciation of the Catholic understanding of the Church and Sacraments. We must now set ourselves to the task of acquainting ourselves in some detail with the other current in Fr. Bouyer's thought, namely the liturgical Movement in the Roman Church.

This movement began in the favourable atmosphere prepared for it by Pope (St.) Pius X through his proposal for the Reformation of the Roman Breviary and for the more active and meaningful

participation of the laity in the Sacramental act in order to make the Mass reassume a central position in the devotional life of the congregation.

Dom Lambert Beauduin began a discussion of the subject in 1909 at a Catholic conference in Belgium, focussing on the guiding principles for liturgical reform in the Roman Church. His background and experience as a Chaplain for the working classes made his religious outlook fully alive to the spiritual needs of the average layman. There were two basic principles in Dom Lambert's proposals: (1) Intelligent participation in the liturgy is the most suitable means of religious education for the laity. (2) participation in liturgical worship is the mainspring and standard of devotional life and ethical conduct for layman and cleric alike.

The Decree of Pius X in 1905 on which Dom Lambert's proposals were based (See Decree of the Sacred Council, 1905 in Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, 1981-1986), had laid down that (1) frequent and daily communion was to be available to all Christ's faithful of whatever rank or condition; and (2) that the basic intent of Communion was not, as had often been erroneously taught, to pay due honour and reverence to Christ or to be rewarded for one's Virtues, but, on the contrary, that Christ's faithful may "draw there from strength to overcome concupiscence" and to cleanse themselves of lesser faults of daily occurrence" (see Palmer's Documents, pp. 178-179).

Dom Lambert took the papal degree further ahead to make the Eucharistic sacrifice the central act of the parish. One sentence in the saintly pope's *Motu Proprio* on Sacred Music became the key to the Benedichine monk's program: "Our deepest wish is that the true Christian spirit should once again flourish in every way and establish itself among the faithful and to that end it is necessary first of all to provide for.... the active participation in the most holy and sacred mysteries and in the solemn and common prayer of the Church" (quoted by Bouyer, p. 60).

Among the details of the liturgical reform proposed by Dom Lambert was the suggestion that Gregorian chants should be encouraged, and that the chanters or choir members should make annual liturgical retreats so as to enable them to enter with understanding and devotion into the liturgy. This retreat idea was later expanded to include the parochial clergy also, since their intelligent

leadership of the liturgical act was crucial to its meaningfulness. He sought to communicate his ideas to the laity also through periodicals and conferences.

The spread of the movement was first restricted to Belgium and concentrated on the medium of the parochial clergy, who were encouraged to ask two questions: (1) how can the Eucharistic sacrifice become central in my own life as a parish priest, so that I am enabled to live a truly Christian life, and (2) how can I help my parish to do the same?

Parallel to the Belgian movement was a similar liturgical renaissance in Germany and Austria, its centers being Maria Laach in Germany and Klosterneuberg in Austria. Fr. Jungmann whose work on comparative liturgics has now superseded the classical work of Dom Gregory Dix the Anglican, also comes out of this movement, labouring in Innsbruck, Austria. The movement in Klosterneuberg under the leadership of Augustinians like Pius Parsch was accompanied by a renaissance in Biblical scholarship, the chief mouthpiece of the total movement being the periodical *Bibel und Liturgie*. Sacrament and Scripture were now seen as commentaries on each other.¹ In the Maria Laach movement the two great names are those of Dom Odo Casel, and his student Victor Warnach, though the abbot of the Monastery, Dom Herwegen also should be mentioned in this connection.

The French liturgical movement has its beginnings in the Abbey of Solesmes, but in modern times it has been nurtured primarily by French Dominicans and a few secular priests, and has contributed significantly to the river that began to flow together from Germany, Austria and Belgium. However, it has not by any means been a steady or balanced flow. Many new - fangled ideas like "Para - liturgies" have crept in to pollute its substantial Christian purity, but it has also contributed elements like the restoration of the Easter Vigil, which is so central to a Resurrection - centred Christianity.

In the United States, the Liturgical Apostolate expresses itself primarily in the Summer School at Notre Dame University and in the Dominican monastery of St. John in Minnesota which publishes the periodical *Worship*. Fr. Bouyer lectures annually during the summer at Notre Dame University. There is also an annual national Liturgical Week of Conferences. The work of the Dom Odo Casel Society with branches in Yale, Harvard and Fordham Universities, may also be mentioned in this connection.

Living and writing in this movement, and presumably converted from his Reformed faith into the Roman Catholic Church through contact with this movement. Fr. Bouyer has been influenced primarily by the pastoral concern that dominates it. He would appear not to have worked out in any significant detail or to any appreciable depth the ecclesiology and the Sacramental Theology that underlies the Liturgical movement, presumably for two reasons:

1. The Liturgical Movement itself is a comparatively new phenomenon in the Roman Church in our century, and is still in the process of discovering its own depths. The recovery of the authentic tradition of Christian ecclesiology can only be the climax and not the beginning of the liturgical movement, for in the history of the Church itself, the doctrine of the nature of the Church has been a slow and comparatively difficult development, springing out of the depths of the Christian experience of union with Christ. The Pauline and Johannine depth of experience and consequently profound ecclesiology was but inadequately grasped by Alexandrine Christian thought which laid the foundations of Latin thought in the early centuries of our era. The later development of a scholastic theology and mechanistic metaphysics within the Western Catholic tradition has obscured many of the riches of this ecclesiology, with the result that even the deepest spiritual experiences of the West have been coloured by the notion of the individual's mystical union with Christ and the individual beatific vision as ultimate goals. The idea of the corporate union with Christ which is the basis of a true Catholic ecclesiology has yet to be developed in the west, though it is implied in the Western Mass.

2. Secondly, there is a certain lack of freedom in the Roman Church at present which would stand in the way of the recovery of the authentic tradition in regard to ecclesiology. The dogmatic development since Trent has been in the direction of affirming the categories of causality and power in the doctrine of the Church, and of emphasizing the individual advantages to be derived from the Eucharist.² The Church was conceived as a society belonging to the supernatural order, while the State and the Family are societies belonging to the temporal order (Pius XI, *Rappresentanti in terra*, Dec. 31, 1929). The Church is defined as a perfect and self-sufficient Society, essentially distinct from the two temporal societies, but still conceived under the genera of societies rather than organisms. The hierarchy is conceived as a "cause" rather than as a unit within the organism. The problem of

causality as a category is that it is more suited to a mechanism than to an organism, and to abrogate this category means to run counter to the dominating view of the magisterium, and it may not be wise policy to precipitate the issue at this point and thereby to risk opposition even to the pastoral concerns of the Liturgical Movement.

In summary let me point out that the absence of an authentic Catholic ecclesiology in Bouyer's work can be accounted for by the nature of the twin factors that have influenced his thought, his neo-Calvinist background and the limited and constricted position that the liturgical movement has to occupy within the present authoritarian structure of the Catholic magisterium. Let us at this point briefly summarize our critique of Bouyer's ecclesiology in a few formulae at the risk of being not completely fair to the whole width of his presentation:

1. The grund-motif for his ecclesiology is not the "Body of Christ", but rather the Qehal Yahweh, the People called out by the Word of God (p. 23). This is a definitely Calvinistic motif.

2. The central idea of union with Christ, the authentic motif of Catholic ecclesiology is replaced by the idea of Word and Covenant, thereby running the risk of conceiving the Church as standing over against the Word, which is again a Calvinistic motif.

3. The doctrine of the Apostles, *He didache ton apostolon*, is conceived as the kerugma in the modern Doddian sense of the term, and not as the whole Apostolic tradition or *paradosis*, which is the inner life of the Church. This kerygmatic emphasis is somewhat unbiblical and certainly not Patristic.

The Kult - Mysterion Of Odo Casel

We should now devote our attention to Bouyer's understanding of the Eucharistic liturgy. It is to be regretted that this has to be done without a prior discussion of the general nature of the Sacraments which is essential to a discussion of the nature of the Eucharist. Bouyer has sought, possibly with conscious intent, to keep aloof from all the pitfalls of discussing Sacramental theology as such, or doctrines like *transubstantiation*, *ex opere operatum*, and the various other similar headaches of the western debate of the last five centuries. But it is less than likely that Bouyer's thought would have any real impact on Catholic Theology for this very reason. The doctrines of post Tridentine

Catholicism have arisen within the context of a certain conceptual framework, and doctrines which belong in the rather different Biblical - Patristic framework cannot be grafted on to the old tree of Thomist Orthodoxy with any hope that it will be readily assimilated.

What he has actually done in his work is to take the thought of Odo Casel, and relate it to neo-Lutheran and neo-Anglican theories like those of Brilioth and Thornton, and finally to present it to his fellow - Catholics in an acceptably Catholic form. This is no mean trick in itself. I am sure that this book will stimulate many laymen to think further about the meaning of the Eucharist, while I am also reasonably sure that the work will not have as widespread and impact on Roman Theology as such, due to its lack of thoroughness in founding a Eucharistic doctrine on a sound theological basis and perhaps also due to its lack of adequate documentation.

The concept of Mystery is central to the whole of Bouyer's thought in this work, and it is perhaps of some use to devote some attention to the discussion on this concept in modern times. Dom Odo Casel who brought this concept into recent Catholic theology, himself lived in a decade when significant research was going on in Europe on the nature of the ancient mystery - religions and their relationship to the Christian faith, though the conclusions drawn were in many cases extravagant.

In one sense most of the World's great religions share with the so-called mystery religions of the ancient Graeco - Roman Empire several significant characteristics which would justify to a certain extent all of them being called Mystery Religions. For example, (1) all of them are capable of being conceived as ways for attaining a favorable personal destiny after death; (2) all of them have a basic character of reform and usually stand over against the supposed corruptions of a prevailing non-transcendent religion; and (3) most of them were founded by charismatic leaders who were heroes or inspired men, who transcended the common levels of utilitarian thinking, and claimed to have had some revelation or initiation into truth otherwise unobtainable by discursive thinking.

But the Mediterranean mystery cults have been of real interest to recent scholarship primarily because they were extinct cults, and second because they might have been supposed to explain the origins of Christianity in a perfectly naturalistic way. Our documentary sources, however, for the significant period near the beginning of Christianity

are extremely limited, and any reconstruction of either the form of the cults or their relationship to Christianity has to be essentially conjectural. If one takes the Eleusinian Mysteries as reasonably representative of the form of these cults in general, our conjectural reconstruction of it would reveal the following features: 1. *Katharsis* (purification) and other preliminary rites; 2. *Myesis* (initiation) leading the neophyte into the inner circle of the initiates or *mystai*; 3. *Henosis* or union with the *mystai* and the particular numen of the cult; 4. Degrees or stages of illumination and progress until one becomes a seer; and 5. The mystical ritual which consists of ritual actions and words, conveying secret meaning and spiritual experience which is to be kept totally secret and never to be divulged to the exoteric group. In the ritual actions the *mystai* enter the underworld, 'die', or are wedded to some god or goddess in the ritual, and are symbolically re-born after being cleansed of guilt (symbolized by darkness) and brought into holiness (symbolized by light). In the final stage the initiate becomes 'Makarios' (blessed, beatified).

The Biblical Use of the Concept Mystery

New Testament Usage: The fundamental meaning of the word *Mysterion* in the New Testament is participation in the deeply hidden and inscrutable counsels and purposes of God, of which the central element is the Kingdom of God. Jesus after the public teaching of the parable of the Sower, says to the Twelve: "unto you are given the mysteries of the Kingdom" (see Mt. 13:11, Mk. 4:11, Lk. 8:10). This is the only usage of the word in the Gospels, whereas in Pauline writings the word is used 19 times. The Apocalypse of John uses the word four times.

In I Cor. 4:1 the Apostle Paul speaks of the Apostolic College (including all those who had a direct commission from the Risen Lord) as 'servers or executives of Christ and administrators of the mysteries of God.' Those who speak in tongues 'in the spirit speak mysteries' (I Cor. 14:2).

Even in the Old Testament the prophets were men who were possessed of the Spirit so that they had direct access to the secret counsels of the Heavenly King, through the Word of God which they *saw* or which *came* to them.

The Apostolic preaching is itself a mystery - the mystery of the wisdom of God, which God has fore-ordained, but was hidden till it

was revealed at the appropriate Kairos; something which the rulers of this world did not know, but is now revealed through Christ and the Holy Spirit (not necessarily through Christ alone as certain contemporary schools tend to insist see 1 Cor. 2:7 ff, esp. 10 ff). It is by participation in the spirit of God that we can learn these and not by discursive learning. Actually to have the spirit is to have the mind of Christ (I Cor. 2:16). Revelation is always an act of the whole Trinity, of God the Father, through the Spirit, in Christ. See Eph. 1:3-14. Paul himself claims that the “Mysterion” was made known to him (Eph. 3:4), so that he now shares in the Mystery of Christ which was unknown to previous generations.

The Mystery is the total plan of God, beginning with Creation and reaching to its final fulfillment in the ‘Pleroma Ton kairon’ (Eph. 3:9 ff) - fulness of time.

The book of Revelation speaks of the mystery as an eschatological reality. In the last days, when the final trumpet sounds, “the mystery of God”, as he announced to his prophets should be fulfilled (Rev. 10:7). And the fulfillment is in terms of the kingdoms of this world becoming the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ, so that He shall reign for even and ever (Rev. 11:15).

The mystery is revealed in or by the Church, and is opened up thereby even to the principalities and powers in the heavenly spheres (Eph. 3:9-10).

The New Testament evidence so far adduced can be thus summarized:

1. The mystery is related to the total *oikonomia* of God the Father, which begins with creation, becomes manifest in the Incarnation, and will culminate in the final *anakephalaiosis*, which will be the coming of the Kingdom of God for which we pray in the Dominical Prayer.

2. The Mystery is centered in the Person of Christ, and is revealed to us in the Holy Spirit.

3. It is a mystery to be finally consummated in the last days, and its meaning can never be complete in the historical sphere.

Development in the Patristic Period

It was only during the Patristic period that the Mystery concept began to take a central place in the tradition of the Church.

Among the Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius alone seems to use this word, speaking of the death of Christ as a mystery (Magn. 9:2) and the deacons as the Servants of the Mysteries (Diakonoi - mysterion Ign. Eph. 19:1). Here perhaps for the first time the word is directly applied to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, though the Ignatian reference seems to be an echo of the words in I Tim. 3:9, which lays down that the deacons are to hold the 'mystery of the faith' with a pure conscience.

Its more developed use comes in the pre - Chalcedonian period, in St. Cyril of Jerusalem (315 - 386), in Clement of Alexandria (150 - 220?) and later in St. John Chrysostom (345? - 407), from which three Fathers the concept has taken deep root in the Syrian, Alexandrine and Byzantine traditions. The pragmatically oriented Romans seem to have been not too anxious to assimilate the concept, through Ambrose of Milan, standing in close contact with the Cappadocians, seems to have incorporated it into his thought, as is seen in his treatise '*De Mysteriis*' (Text with Fr. Translation in "Sources Chretiennes" by Dom. Bernard Botte, 1949).

Originating with Cyril of Jerusalem, the word *Rozo*³ became synonymous for Sacrament in the Syriac language as well as in the Syro - Byzantine literature which used 'Mysterion' for the Eucharist partly through the influence of Pseudo - Dionysius (c. 500?) the so - called Monophysite tradition developed a profound sacramental theology, with a distinct Trinitarian emphasis, which was fully articulated in the commentaries of Moses Bar - Kepha (815 - 903), Dionysius Bar - Slibhi (+ 1171) and Gregorius Bar -Hebreus (1226 - 1286). A study of this development is available in the *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* Vol. 125, which is entitled *Sakramenten - theologie bei den Syrischen Monophysiten*.

The development in the Coptic church in Alexandria was started by Clement (See Stromateis I. C. 5:28), and was continued by Cyril and Athanasius, though it was fully developed only in later times through the influence of Syrian scholarship. This development is studied by Cl. Kopp in *Glaube und Sakramente der Koptischen Kirche* (Rome, 1932).

The Byzantine development also owes its origin to the Syrian Father St. John Chrysostom, a contemporary of Cyril of Jerusalem and Athanasius of Alexandria. His Greek homilies gave shape to Byzantine thought in later times, and even Dom Odo Casel's thought can be

traced to him. The relationship is studied by Fittkau in *Der Begriff des Mystriums bei Johannes chrysostomus - Eine Auseinandersetzung mit dem Begriff des Kultmysteriums in der Lehre Odo Casels*, Bonn, 1953.

The Mystery in Dom Odo Casel

It is regretted that this writer has no direct access to the writings of Dom Odo Casel which have yet to be translated into English. *Die Liturgie als Mysteriefeier* (1927?) and *Das Christliche Kultmysterium* (2nd ed. 1935) are perhaps the most influential. The Fittkau work mentioned above, along with van Loewenich's brief report in 'Modern Catholicism', Bouyer's in *Liturgical Piety*, Ernst Koenker's in *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church*, plus an article in the periodical 'Worship' are the only materials used. Two English articles appeared in the Downside review in 1957 and 1958, entitled 'Dom Odo Casel's - A Short Appreciation and a Translation from His Works (Vol. 75 pp. 140-148) and *The Mystery Presence - Dom Odo Casel and the Latest Research* (Vol. 56, pp. 266-273). An English translation of *Das Kultmysterium* has been announced by Longmans Green.

Casel starts with an enquiry into the relationship between the pagan and the Christian Mysteries. He rejects, and we must say, on good grounds, the theory propounded by Lietzmann, Bousset and Reitzenstein as well as by Loisy, which traces the development of the Christian mysteries from the Mediterranean mystery cults. Casel, on the other hand advances the hypothesis that the pagan mysteries were, so to speak, preparations for and anticipations of the great mystery of the oikonomia of God revealed in the Christian Sacraments. The pagan drama, liturgically representing the death and resurrection of a god and the salvation of the mystes by identification with it, would constitute a *praeparatio evangelica* ordained by the Eternal Logos in the Graeco - Roman world. They represent the pattern of humanity's longing for salvation, so that the grace of God which was manifested in Jesus Christ would become readily relevant to human yearnings.

Bouyer, following Victor Warnach, disagrees fundamentally with Casel's thesis and would trace the genesis of the Pauline concept of Mystery from the Hebrew Sapiential literature, with its two fundamental motifs 'Hakkam & Dabar' (Sophia, Logos) and Apocalypsis. It can be clearly seen that in the Pauline usage of the term at least, the expression Mysterion does not refer to the Sacrament

or to any rites of the Christian faith, and we must agree with Bouyer that Paul's concept of mystery could not have been drawn from pagan sources, Paul's meaning is clearly that of the counsels of God, the redemptive plan in the mind of God. And to this extent there is an unbridgeable gap between the lofty Christian idea and the vegetation - and - fertility cults or the more refined mystery cults. But notice has to be taken of the fact that Paul uses the word mystery only in his letters to Corinth, Ephesus and Colossae, all of which were centres of the mystery cults and many of whose Christians probably had a mystery cult background. It is not at least entirely improbable that Paul is consciously using a concept which would be familiar to his pagan converts in these places.

Paul does use the word mystery in other connections which it may be worthwhile to note here. He speaks of the relationship between Christ and His Church as mystery (Eph: 5:32), and also uses the word in connection with the activity of the Evil One (II Thess. 2:7), the temporary hardening of Israel (Rom. 11:25) and the Parousia and Resurrection (I Cor. 15:51), but all these are related to the total *oikonomia* of God. There is more difficulty with the two occurrences in First Timothy where there seems to be a sacramental reference (3:9&16).

In any case, the central motif of the Pauline understanding of Mystery is the revealed Wisdom of God, which relates to His plan according to which He guides and leads history. If the princes of this world had any idea of this mystery they would not have crucified our Lord (I Cor. 2:8). The preaching of the Cross which is foolishness to the wise of this world is the wisdom of God, and therefore truly a mystery, for God is guiding history through the very establishment of the Church and the apparent discomfiture and death of Christians in the world. The ultimate, *telos* of God's purpose is also revealed to us (Eph. 1:9-10).

None of these concepts could have been derived from any pagan mystery cults. To this extent we have to agree with Bouyer's thesis. I do not know if Dom Odo Casel himself would have disagreed with Bouyer at this point, had he lived today. I rather suspect that the great Benedictine would have agreed enthusiastically. Even the most radical of Christian scholars would have difficulty today in suggesting that the *sitz - im - leben* of the dominical institution of the Lord's supper could be found in the cults of Mithra or any other pagan mysteries. Neither do we any longer take seriously the hypothesis

which was current in Dom Odo's time that the resurrection stories had their *sitz - im - leben* or their origin in the pagan stories of a dying and rising god.

But how about the charge that the later developments of sacramental doctrine and eucharistic terminology had some relation to the pagan mysteries? What about the terminology of the mystagogical Catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem? What about the language of Clement of Alexandria who uses the language of the pagan mysteries in order to communicate the Gospel to them? Perhaps a brief survey of the relationship between pagan mysteries and the sacraments in modern scholarship may not be out of place here.

Pagan Mysteries and Christian Sacraments in Modern Scholarship

It is interesting to note that the first serious attempt to relate the Christian Sacraments to the pagan mysteries was made by a Calvinist who sought to discredit the practices of the Roman Church. Isaac Casaubon's work *Exercitationes de Rebus Sacris* (Geneva, 1655) has by now been completely forgotten. The next serious attempt in this connection seems to have come towards the waning phase of the Enlightenment in Felix Korn's (pseudonym: Father Nork) *Der Mystagog, oder Deutung der Geheimnere und Feste der Christlichen Kirche*, Leipzig, 1838. But genuinely scientific research begins only in our own century with the work of Cumont, Hepding, Frazer, Wilamowitz and Kern among others.

But these men were unwilling to draw hasty conclusions about the genetic relationship of the pagan mysteries and Christianity. This was reserved for that fantastically erudite and naively zealous school of Comparative Religion: Hermann Usener, Albrecht Dieterich and Richard Reitzenstein, Reitzenstein's great works, *Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen* (Leipzig, 1910), and *Das iranische Erlösungs - mysterium* (Leipzig and Bonn, 1921) and *Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1929) propounded three theories one after another connecting the Christian religion first to the Hellenistic mysteries next to the newly discovered 'Iranian Mystery of Redemption' and then finally to the cult of the mandaeans. We must keep in mind how much of an uproar and excitement these works must have caused in Germany and surrounding countries in Odo Casel's time to appreciate the appropriateness of his hypothesis to the theories of his secular opponents.

Wilhelm Bousset's attempt to isolate the re-enactment of the death and resurrection of the cult-hero in all pagan religions as the source or basis for the Christian formulation about the significance of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ also came at this time (*Kyrios Christos*, 2nd. ed Gottingen 1921). Bousset, a circumspect scholar, merely sought to identify Paul's doctrine of the meaning of Baptism (Romans 6) with the pagan cultic idea of participation in the death and resurrection of a god, without necessarily seeking thereby to invalidate the meaningfulness of the Pauline concept. It would appear that Bousset had a strong influence on Odo Casel, which may be one of the main reasons for the opposition that he had to face from traditional conservative Roman Catholic Scholarship. Another work that must have influenced Casel is leipoldt's learned treatise '*Sterbende und Auferstehende Gotter*' (leipzig, 1923). Loisy's *Les Mysteres Payens et le Mystere Chretien* (Paris, 1930) seems to have had very little influence on him.

The hypothesis of Christianity's genetic dependence on the pagan mysteries was first questioned by Carl Clemen as early as 1913, in his *Die Einfluss der Mysterienreligionen auf das alteste Christentum* (Giessen), and his guarded verdict was: "Simply to assume that every conceivable mystery regardless of locality already existed in the first Christian century is scientific nonsense." Later on the Iranian and mandaeen theories of Reitzenstein were proved to be untenable. And in the last generation, Karl Prum in his two-Volume work "*Der christliche Glaube und die altheidnische Welt*" (leipzig, 1935) has demonstrated the failure of all attempts to explain the genesis of Christianity on the basis of Comparative Religion. His other work, *Religionsgeschichtliches Handbuch fur den raum der altchristlichen Welt* (Freiburg, 1943) is still a very useful reference book for the mystery cults.

I cannot resist the temptation to cite here a very apt and amusing statement of Harnack's on the whole comparative religion school, made rather early in the debate:

We must reject the comparative mythology which finds a causal connection between everything and everything else, which tears down solid barriers, bridges chasms as though it were child's play, and spins combinations from superficial similarities.... By such methods one can turn Christ into a Sungod in the twinkling of an eye, or transform the Apostles into the twelve months; in

connection with Christ's nativity one can bring up the legends attending the birth of every conceivable god, or one can catch all sorts of mythological doves to keep company with the baptismal dove; and find any number of celebrated asses to follow the ass on which Jesus rode into Jerusalem; and thus with the magic wand of "Comparative religion" triumphantly eliminate every spontaneous trait in any religion.

(Wissenschafts und leben, Vol. II. Giessen, 1911, p. 191) quoted by Rahner in the Eranos Jahrbuch)

Bouyer's Critique of Odo Casel

Bouyer says about Dom Odo's hypothesis that the advance of research in the region of the Mystery cults render it necessary for us to abandon Odo Casel's theory of the relationship between the pagan religions and the Christian Sacraments. Bouyer would like to derive the Christian cultus from purely Jewish elements, and to explain the parallelism between the mysteries and the sacraments in terms of a common psychological motivation. Here I feel that Bouyer is either not being fair to Dom Odo, or else he is seeking to gain support for the liturgical Movement by siding with the conservative Catholic critics of the Casellian hypothesis. Or again this might be a reflection of his neo - Calvinist background, which holds that the Christian religion or the Word of God came down into the world like a bolt from the blue without any pre - existent point of contact or milieu of receptivity.

In any case, it is the feeling of this writer that the contemporary state of scholarship on the mystery religions does not give any ground for an outright denial of the influence of the pagan mysteries on the development of the Eucharistic tradition in the Christian Church. Casel's theory is that while Christianity cannot be *genetically* explained in terms of the mystery religions, the cult -eidos which had assumed a shadowy, antitypical, inchoate form in the pagan mysteries provided at least some of the raw material with which to give concrete expression to the radically new and transforming experience of the Christian gospel.

Granting that St. Paul's concept of the Mystery was perhaps not influenced by the pagan mysteries and is nourished primarily by Jewish Sapiential and apocalyptic literature, we have to concede the possibility

that the deep awareness of the redemptive act was expressed by Paul by using the mystery concept which was familiar to the pagans of his day. This cannot be conclusively demonstrated at this point, but neither can it be denied outright.

However that might be, the case is clearer when we come to the third and fourth centuries of our era. Odo Casel's view is that the all-pervading logos had already given rise to the idea of a cultic participation in the death and rebirth of pagan gods, which the Gospel of the Incarnation was to redeem from its pagan setting and illuminate, fulfill and thus complete the vague yearning of the Gentiles. I do not see why Bouyer has to deny this possibility.

The distinction has been made by a group of Catholic scholars in this connection between "genetic dependence" and "dependence of adaptation", which latter means for them the borrowing of words, gestures and images from the existing cultural milieu in order to give expression to an experience and a reality, the substance of which is derived from the Christian Revelation. Clement of Alexandria puts this all in a brief passage: "Come, I shall show you the Logos, and the Mysteries of the Logos, and I shall explain the mysteries of the Logos in images that are known to you" (protrepticus XII: 119:1). This passage was ostensibly addressed to the followers of the pagan mysteries.

Or to put in the words of Hugo Rahner, to whose scholarly article in the *Eranos Jahrbuch* (*The Mysteries*, Bollingen Series XXX:2, Pantheon, 1955, Eng. Tr.). I am very much indebted for most of my material on the comparison of pagan and Christian mysteries;

"The Church Fathers of the third and fourth centuries, who gave form to the cult, borrowed not as seekers but as possessors of a religious substance; what they borrowed was not the substance but a dress wherein to display it."

It seems to this writer that this much has to be conceded by honest scholarship, and a dogmatic revelationism which ignores the clearly manifest ways of God's working in the sum-total of human history can do so only at the risk of some dishonesty. We should not be surprised if more conclusive evidence were to emerge that St. Paul's interpretation of the meaning of Baptism did make use of certain pagan concepts, even though for the present at least the Jewish

understanding of Proselyte Baptism as a symbolic crossing of the Red Sea which became a sea of death to the Egyptians and life through death for the people of Israel is adequate background for the Pauline idea.

But when it comes to the Patristic period, the evidence is no longer conjectural, but conclusive, to show that the Fathers used the terminology of the pagan mysteries, not in the sense of borrowing, but directly and consciously for the purpose of transmitting the Gospel to the followers of these religions. Clement of Alexandria in his *Protrepticus* (exhortation to the Gentiles) “goes over” (his own term) the mysteries of Egyptians and Greeks, Dionysiac, Bacchanalian, Eleusinian and all. If he were trying to borrow from the pagan mysteries, the language he uses would hardly have been justified:

These, (referring to the mysteries he had described) I would instance as the prime authors of evil, the parents of impious fables and of deadly superstition, who sowed in human life that seed of evil and ruin - the mysteries (Bk. II. #5).

The whole treatise is in this vein. And towards the conclusion of the work, Clement advises his Gentile friends to sail past these absurdities with stubborn will, and then he speaks to them of the true mysteries:

Come, O frenzy - stricken one, not leaning on the thyrsus, not crowned with ivy; throw away the mitre, cast forth thy fawn - skin, come to thy senses. I will show thee the Word, and the mysteries of the Word, expounding them after thine own fashion.

Here again, Clement speaking in the language of the pagan mysteries, is speaking primarily of the mysterious truth to which one has access through Baptism, and not about the Eucharist. The latter Sacrament is the Holy Mystery, the *Rozo Kadisho*, which is not to be spoken about publicly to the uninitiated. In all probability, the reason why the name “Mystery” came to be attached at a rather early date to the sacraments may be the reason which St. Basil clearly articulates in his treatise on the Holy Spirit:

The Apostles and Fathers who laid down laws for the Church from the beginning thus guarded the awful dignity of the mysteries (referring to all the sacraments) in

secrecy and silence, for what is bruited abroad at random among the common folk is no mystery at all. This is the reason for our unwritten precepts and practices, that the knowledge of our dogmas may not become neglected and contemned by the multitude through familiarity (#66 ff.).

Or to take another example, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, whom Bouyer quotes misleadingly, is also thinking of the total pattern of the Christian life as the “Mystery.” Bouyer makes one reference to him as asserting that “incorporation in Christ’s Body.... consisted precisely in the uniting of the neophytes to the assembly of worshippers” (p. 31). But for St. Cyril also the central concept is not “the body of worshippers” which is a congregational concept, but of the body of Christ, which is an organismic concept. If anything could be said *precisely* of St. Cyril’s mystagogical Catecheses, it is that incorporation in Christ’s Body is not to be simply equated with initiation into the body of worshippers. The neo-phytes’ initiation (both terms are taken from the terminology of the pagan mysteries) consisted of the following six moments:

1. Renunciation of Satan and the Old Man.
2. Belief in the Holy Trinity.
3. Exorcism with oil, sharing in the fatness of the eternal Olive who is Christ.
4. Identification with the *glorified body of Jesus Christ* in His sufferings, death and resurrection through the three-fold immersion.
5. The Holy Anointing, by which the baptized person participates in the Holy Spirit, the One with whom the Father anointed Jesus as the Christ (Acts 10:38).
6. After the anointing, one has become a Christian (whereas till now he has been on the way), and now is enabled truly to become one with Christ (mystagogical Catecheses IV:1) by the diffusion of His Body and Blood through our members. And the Kiss of Peace unites us to each other and “our souls are mingled together” (V:3, see also IV:3).

The material cited so far is adequate to demonstrate that while the substance of the Christian Faith may not owe anything to the pagan mysteries, it is not honest to deny that in the articulation of the faith - understanding the Fathers have not hesitated to use the mystery

- cult terminology. And at this point this writer's sympathy is more with Odo Casel than with Louis Bouyer.

Bouyer's attempt to explain the similarities between the centrality of dying and living again the pagan cults and in the Christian faith through the modern Freudian insights into the life and Death instincts common to all humanity is a suggestive hypothesis and ought to be explored further. But what his comments amount to is not substantially different from what Odo Casel says in different terminology. Bouyer says:

We can certainly begin to see an indisputable connection between what the grace of God has given us in Christ in a purely supernatural way, and what the mind and heart of man, groping in the darkness, dimly projected in those waking dreams which were instinctively acted out in the older rites of the mystery religions and illustrated by the myths which later tried to explain these rites (pp. 100-101).

Here Fr. Bouyer is no longer speaking out of his neo - Calvinistic tradition, but expressing genuinely Catholic thought. But we cannot forget that, for us too, the rite came first, in its dominical institution, and the explanations came much later with deeper understanding into the Christian experience through the work of the Holy Spirit. While our Lord was creating a new reality out of elements that existed in the Jewish passover meal, the Chaburach and Kiddush, the later explanations that were put on the cult - eidos seem to have made some use of the language of the mystery religions.

Bouyer's Eucharistology

After having been rather critical of Bouyer's point of view at certain points it remains to pay tribute to his excellent doctrine of the Eucharist, which is marred only by the lack of certain categories of concretion and by its remaining in the spiritual intellectualistic and ethical domain of Calvinism.

The Significance of hearing the Word of God in the Eucharistic is by no means to be minimised, even though this is not to be seen as central. The whole Eucharist is a dromenon of the life and work of our Lord, and the Missa Catechumenorum is a genuine commemoration (with full participation, in the sense of anamnesis) of the teaching ministry of Christ. In the reading of the lessons and their interpretation

through the sermon we are genuinely sitting at the feet of Christ, as disciples, catechoumens, followers, to whom He reveals the great mysteries of the Kingdom which are centred in Himself. The readings are as much Didache as Kerygma (both words are used in the questionable modern senses of ethical teaching and evangelical proclamation). The Whole Missa Catechumenorum is oriented as a dromenon of the public appearance (Epiphania) of Jesus Christ in the Incarnation, which is the source and ground of the Christian sacrifice which is to follow.

But it is the historical fact of the Incarnate Jesus Christ, rather than the abstract spiritual entity “Word of God” that is the basis of the whole Leitourgia. All the prayers surrounding the reading of the lections relate not so much to the Word of God conceived as a saving spiritual power as to the concrete and photographable person who was present in history and continues to be present through the concrete facts of the Church. This concreteness is the essential element in all catholic sacramental theology, and is only inadequately present in Fr. Bouyer’s Word Theology.

In the lections, intercessory prayers, and Sermons, it is Jesus Christ concretely present in the Church as a whole that speaks and prays. The singing of the creed is the response of the faithful as solidly abiding in the Holy Trinity whom they confess with their hearts and lips. And with that they can lift up their hearts to God the Holy Trinity to surrender themselves along with the eternal sacrifice of Jesus Christ, to be lifted up by the Holy Spirit into the heavenlies and to be offered up in the presence of the Father.

It is this dramatic element of a genuine and not antitypical heavenly sacrifice which constitutes the radical difference between the sacrifices of the Qehal Yahweh and that of the Body of Christ. And it is this concrete reality of a historical and eternal event taking place in the Church whenever it offers up the Eucharistic sacrifice that Calvinism with its pre - incarnational ethos finds a stumbling - block. For Calvinism God is still an abstract entity, though genuinely present in the Church, very much after the fashion of the Presence of Yahweh on the Kapporeth in the Holy of Holies in the Tabernacle of Israel. Catholic thought takes seriously the Pauline idea that the mercy - seat (unfortunately both Catholic and Protestant versions translate *hilasterion* in Romans 3:25 as propitiation or expiation, and not as mercy - seat) has now been put outside the holy of holies so that what was before inaccessible to man

is now within reach of every man, because he abides in a living temple which is the Body of Christ, diffused throughout the World.

There is no need to discuss the technical details of the Anaphora which Bouyer does with commendable mastery of the Roman Mass, though often without genuine depth of understanding. In a few instances he takes up a single sentence or phrase from a late liturgical form peculiar to one single area to explain the whole pattern of the Universal Liturgy. His comparative liturgical scholarship also shows deficiencies at various points, and the lack of documentation makes it difficult to check some of his statements.

His discussion of the whole question of the Verba Consecrationis versus the Epiclesis shows that Bouyer has not fully grasped the theological depths of either the Western or Eastern side of the debate, and much too easily rises above it without taking into account the whole nature of the Anamnesis and the Epiclesis in their historical development, the introduction of the latter into the Eucharist in relation to the development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Cappadocia and Syria, the characteristic differences between the Alexandrine and Antiochene theologies and so on.

I shall, for the convenience of the reader, attempt to summarize very briefly the main points of the latter part of his work, which do not reveal any new creative insights:

1. The Eucharist, in order to be truly effective, has to be Christ's offering.

2. The Bishop acts as the *Locum Tenens* of Christ in the Eucharist. Christ is the *Apostolos* of God, Bishop is the *Apostolos* of Christ.

3. In the old covenant, the growth of Israel was through physical generation, and so the father of the family presided at the family meal. In the new it is a spiritual regeneration and a spiritual family, so the spiritual father presides, but only by virtue of the Apostles being sent by Christ, the Bishops by the Apostles and the Priests by the Bishops, so the priests acting in *loco Christi*.

4. When our Lord said "Do this in remembrance of Me" to the Apostles He established not only the Sacrament of the Eucharist but also the sacramental priesthood. That is why ordination takes place within the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

5. "It is only one who always says and does the Eucharist in the assembly of all the people." And in all the Masses performed all over

the world, there is only one Eucharist, namely that of Christ. When the Bishop is present, the priest does not celebrate except by delegation.

6. The central focus of the celebration of the Mystery is the Eucharistic Prayer, the *prex sacerdotalis*. Therefore a private Mass is valid, because validity is dependent only on the *prex sacerdotalis*.

7. But the celebration is always intended for the Whole Body, and so “it loses much of this intended effect and significance in proportion to the absence of the members of the Body and their lack of actual participation” (p. 153).

8. The layman has an important place in the Eucharist, since he is a member of the Body of Christ (“The laymen, what are they?” grumbled and angry bishop to Cardinal Newman. And the answer was “Well, without them the Church would look rather foolish”). Every layman is a *hieruus* or *sacerdos*. Priest, derived from Presbyter, is an administrative office, and not a sacerdotal office in the earliest canonical tradition of Hippolytus. Only the laymen are addressed as *Sacerdos*. The Bishop is the *archieruus*, or *Sacerdos Magnus*. But a Cardinal or a priest derives his priesthood from the episcopal office and his own specific office is only an administrative one.

9. The Mass is the centre of the Mystery, but the Mystery is present and active in all the Sacraments (This is one of the affirmations for which Dom Odo Casel has been accused by his fellow - theologians with the charge of error. Dom Anselm Strittmatter, the great Roman Scholar on the Latin Sacramentaries the other day told me that Dom Odo was wrong on many points, and when asked to specify one, he said, “Odo Casel stated that Christ is present in Baptism exactly as He is in the Mass. On Our side of the fence we do not say such things”). The other sacraments as well as the Hierarchy are to be seen in their relation to the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

10. Baptism is the vesting with the power to participate in the Eucharist, which is the human response to the Word of God as well as Christ’s own Eucharist. Baptism is the passing from the city of Earth to the City of God, the initiation “into the Mystery by fitting him to perform the actions of prayer, offering, and communion through a conformation to Christ” (p. 163). In Baptism the Christian receives the Sacramental character, the character of Christ.

11. The layman’s priesthood is completed when he is anointed in the Chrism and offers the sacrifice of the Eucharist.

12. Penance is resuscitation of the Baptismal grace after it has been affected by sin.

13. Marriage and Oil of the Sick are also expansions of the Eucharist, Love and procreation are now possible without multiplying sin, since the creation has been restored to goodness. The decay of the body is healed by oil blessed immediately after the Eucharist on Maundy Thursday. And all the other Sacramental also derive their effectiveness from the Eucharist (Palms on Palm Sunday, Ash on Ash Wednesday, etc.)

14. The liturgical year is then a rounding out - more than a mere pedagogical device - a reproclamation of the Word with which the Church has been entrusted. The liturgical year hallows time with the representation of the saving events in a sort of natural rhythm.

The problem with all these statements is that they have the wrong category for their explanation. All these can be made genuinely luminous in relation to the key concept of the Body of Christ as Christ's incarnate presence in the time - space world. And any attempt to derive the meaning of all the sacraments from the Eucharist, and not from the Body of Christ is bound to reveal basic flaws as Bouyer's treatment definitely does. There are three central ideas the supply of which will enrich what is otherwise a useful discussion of some of the deepest facts of the Christian heritage:

1. The Concept of the Body of Christ in its incarnate form.
2. A clearer and richer understanding of the nature of sacrifice which is a great deal more than the mere sealing of a covenant.
3. A general metaphysical discussion of the sacramental nature of all history and nature, and the understanding of the Incarnation itself as a Sacrament par excellence from which all sacramental realities including the Body of Christ derive their ultimate meaning.

These will also throw light on prayer and ethics which cannot be derived directly from the Eucharist alone as Bouyer tries to derive in the last chapters of the work. The discussion of time and eternity, of the created and uncreated realms, and of the eschatological nature of the Eucharist in relation to its historical and existential moments, is extremely inadequate in Bouyer. But to expound these points in this paper would be to turn it into full-length volume.

Notes

1. Not, as Fr. Bouyer states, Sacrament as commentary on Scripture, thus ascribing a centrality to Scripture which was not in the minds of the editors of *Bibel und Liturgie*. The idea that the Liturgy is merely a preparation for the proclamation of the Word is certainly an uncatholic notion. On the other hand it is legitimate to say that it is the liturgical setting that shows the Bible in its true perspective, but this latter view ascribes centrality to the sacramental worship and not to the Scriptures or to preaching.
2. See for example the otherwise excellent discussion of the Eucharist in the Leo XIII's Encyclical, *Mirae Caritatis*, May 28, 1902.
3. The root meaning of the verb is "to be initiated into the mystery or mysteries" - a definitely cultic term derived from the Mystery Religions.

LITURGICAL AND ICONOGRAPHIC DEVELOPMENT AS REACTIONS TO DOCETIC - Gnostic AND ICONOCLASTIC HERESIES

The thesis of this paper is that the two strongest pillars of the authentic tradition of the Church, namely the liturgical and iconographic traditions, need to be re-examined in the light of a fresh study of their early historical developments in reaction to two of the greatest heresies that faced the Christian Church, namely the Docetic - Gnostic heresy in the first and second centuries and the Iconoclastic heresy or controversy in the 7th and subsequent centuries.

The present writer, coming from the Oriental Orthodox tradition, which was not involved in the iconoclastic controversy, recognizes the wisdom of the decisions of the Byzantine Orthodox Church in reaction to that controversy. In my own tradition the iconoclastic line did not emerge as an explicit threat, though the problem had to be faced both in reaction to the Islamic civilisations within which many Oriental Orthodox Churches had to function at different periods of their history, and also in relation to Protestant influences which were basically iconoclastic and which swept over several Oriental Orthodox Churches in the 17th and subsequent centuries.

The Gnostic Threat To The Eucharistic Tradition

It remains to this day a matter of controversy whether the Gnostic heresy originated in the Christian Churches or whether it existed as an independent pagan movement before it hit the Christian Church. In any case the earliest records we have of a specifically Gnostic line seem to be Christian, though Judaism was also influenced by Gnosticism around the same time.

It is not possible, within the modest limits of this paper, to make an exhaustive study of the Docetic or Gnostic documents in relation to the liturgical tradition of the Church. In this short paper we attempt only to illustrate the point, with reference to one Docetic - Gnostic Christian text, namely the Odes of Solomon.

The Syriac text of this late first century (or early second century) Christian hymnbook came to the attention of scholars only after Prof. J. R. Harris published the text with English translation in 1909¹. It consists of 42 short hymns, some of which had been known to us through the Christian Gnostic *Pistis Sophia* where they seem to enjoy a status equal to that of the Psalms of David. According to J. R. Harris, it originated in Syria - Palestine in the first century, whereas other scholars like J. H. Bernard suggest a second century origin. It is still disputed whether the Syriac is the original or a translation from a Greek original. The hymns have no explicit reference to the incarnate Jesus Christ, but do speak of the descent into hell of the Son of God as well as of the work of the Holy Spirit. It reflects the kind of Gnosticism before its separation from the Church Catholic and does not therefore contain any spoeific Gnostic heresy. It is characterised by a high spiritual quality of devotion without reference to the historical incarnation of the Son of God.

We know so little of these groups with Gnostic or Docetic tendency who survived within the Christian Church in the early period when there was no specific authority to control the teaching of the Church. The period between the destruction of Jerusalem and the writing of Ireneus' (ca 130 to ca 200) *Against Heresies* was the time during which the Docetic and Gnostic heresies flourished within the Church itself. Ignatius of Antioch warns against some of these early heresies in his epistles. Ignatius (ca 35 to ca 107) writes to the Smyrnans (7:1): "They do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ who died for our sins." "They do not believe in the blood of Christ" (6:1).

We do not know when actually the Gnostic movement left the Church and began organising themselves into separate movements like those of Valentinus (lived in Rome ca 136 to ca 165), Basilides (was in Alexandria ca 125 to ca 150), Marcion (at Rome ca 140 to ca 160) and Saturnius (2nd century). Cerinthus, who was, according to Polycarp, a contemporary of the Apostle John, belongs to the earlier group which had not quite broken from the Church.

The *Odes of Solomon* obviously belong to this period when some eclectic form of Philonic Judaism with Docetic and Gnostic elements subsisted within the Christian Church itself. It is a Christian hymnbook with deep spiritual ethos and an acknowledgement of the Son of God who descended into hell to redeem the souls of the perished. But it is characterized by a singular absence of any reference to the flesh of the Incarnate Lord Jesus Christ or to his suffering in the flesh. There is no reference to the name 'Jesus', but 'Christ' is often mentioned as the One who came down and went up. The 42nd Ode is a glorious hymn of the Resurrection, perhaps the oldest Christian poem on the subject in extra - Biblical Christian literature. But there is no reference to the resurrection of the 'flesh.' The risen Christ is the one who illumines the soul not one who gives life to the flesh.

The *Odes of Solomon* have great affinity with the *Hodayot* of the Qumran Community; it has a Jewish - Christian Proto - Gnostic origin in Syriac (then in Edessa) or in Greek (in that case in Antioch) Christian circles resistant to official episcopal - eucharistic structures of authority, but still within the Christian Community which was far from comprehensively organized at the end of the first century or the first half of the second century - that is the best conjecture that scholars can make today about the genesis of *The Odes*. The impassibility of God and His Oneness are often affirmed. Sebastian Brock, in his review of the critical edition by J. H. Charlesworth² speaks of the *Odes* as "one of the most puzzing products of early Christianity"³ It speaks often of "drinking from the springs of life" and of the "right knowledge", "return to Paradise." Seven times it affirms that "the Lord is unstinting" (*aphthonos aphthonia*, 3:6, 7:3, 11:6, 15:6, 17:12, 20:7, 23:4).⁴ The Lord is spoken of as "High and Merciful" (Syriac - *moriyo mroyimo w-mrahmono*) who is without jealousy (*laith chasmo lewath*). *Chasmo* is variously translated as jealousy (Charlesworth), 'grudging' (Rendell Harris), *Missqunst* (Bauer).⁵

Take for example Ode 7 which come closest to a clear doctrine of the Incarnation, where the classical Patristic dictum that God became one of us so that we may become one with Him finds its earliest expression, but it can still be Gnostic - Docetic:

“He helped me by (bringing down)
His Greatness within my boundedness” (7:3).

Did the Saviour actually die, in the *Odes of Solomon*? This question was raised by Brian McNeil in the same *Symposium Syriacum* in 1976.⁶ Ode 28, echoing Psalm 22, says clearly that “I did not perish.... they sought my death but did not obtain it” (Ode 28:17-18).

“I did not perish because I was not their brother, for my birth was like theirs. And they sought my death, but did not obtain it, because I was older than their memory, and in vain they cast lots against me.”

Brian McNeil, who says he is working on his thesis, states here:

“We are never told explicitly in the Odes that the Saviour died, and the passages that may be references to the Cross (27:1-3, 42:1-2, 35:7 and cf possibly 20:7) do not mention a death. However we are told of his lifting - up, and it would seem obvious that the answer to the question, ‘Whence was he lifted up?’ must be ‘From Sheol.’ Does not this imply death?”⁷

No, says Brian McNeil, and the present writer agrees. The Lord was saved (*ethparaq*) from death - a tradition that found its way into the Holy Quran.

In fact the Saviour is our saviour from death because he himself was saved from death. Christ has three titles in the *Odes*: “Beloved” ‘the Living One’ and “the saved One” (*ethpereq*). The Syriac text says “*Poruqo hwa li*” (he became a Saviour for me) because he himself is the *Ethpereq* (the Saved one). And it is by true knowledge (gnosis: *yede’tha*) that one is saved.

Clearly this is the group, widely prevalent in Asia Minor or the Syrian provinces, that St. Ignatius warns against:

“Close your ears, therefore, if anyone speaks to you without Jesus Christ, the one of the posterity of David,

the one born of Mary, truly born, also ate and drank, was in truth persecuted under Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified and really died, in view of the heavenly hosts, the earthly people and those in the underworld, who was also truly raised from the dead, His Father having raised him up, and the same Father will thus like him in Jesus Christ raise us up also who have believed in him, for without him we cannot have life eternal.”⁸

“Do not be led astray by various heterodoxies, nor by myths and geneologies of the Infinite, or by Jewish fables....”⁹

“As therefore the Lord does nothing without the Father... you also should (do nothing) without the episcopos - neither presbyters, nor deacons, nor lay people.¹⁰ Do not let any among you show himself off as blessed by his own knowledge. This kind is a lawless one and an enemy of God. All should come together in the same place in the prayer; let the one worship be common, one mind, one hope, in love and in faith that is in the Blameless one, Christ Jesus, not to abide in whom is to be nothing. All should as one gather together in the Temple of God, as around the same sacrificial altar, as around one Jesus Christ the Archpriest of the unbegotten God.”¹¹

It seems clear to the present writer that it was the prevalence of the Docetic - proto - Gnostic heresy within the Christian Church that made St. Ignatius emphasize the episcopate and the eucharist so strongly in the letters to the Asian churches. We do not find this emphasis in St. Ignatius epistle to the Romans. To the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Smyrnans and Philadelphians, St. Ignatius repeats the same admonition.

“If some, being atheists, i.e., unbelievers, say that it only appeared that He became a human being, and that He did not truly assume a body, and only appeared to be born, (it is in them that there is only appearance no true being), then why am I in chains and about to be thrown to wild animals?” (Trall.10).

Even though it was customary not to write or speak in public about the mystery of the Eucharist, St. Ignatius refers several times to the

sacrifice, to the body and blood, and to the altar. Gathering around the one Bishop, around the one eucharistic altar of God, was the way ordinary Christians could save themselves from so-called intellectuals or Gnostics who denied the Lord's participation in blood and flesh.

Today, even in Orthodox churches, there are growing up "underground groups", meeting apart from the bishop and the one eucharist, teaching new doctrines according to their own liking. In my own Church such a 'charismatic group' grew up some 20 years ago, but is now on the decline.

In our time, the Orthodox Churches have to keep up the dialectic, maintaining emphasis on the Bishop and the Eucharist on the one hand, and on true faith and true love towards all on the other. There are those everywhere who like to gather without the bishop and the common Eucharist, with leaders who claim to be the true Church. We should be charitable to them, but warn our people, like St. Ignatius, against falling in their traps.

The Iconoclastic Temptation

Iconoclasm is always a tendency of rationalism. In fact cultures that inherited or were influenced by the ideas of the European Enlightenment of the 18th and 19th centuries are generally inimical to the episcopate, and to religious symbolism - the two pillars of Orthodoxy.

The Eucharist is of course the symbol *par excellence* of the Christian Faith. But icons came to play a similar central role in Eastern Christianity. That icons are of Asian origin, primarily in the Syrian provinces and in Egypt, is today no longer disputed. Byzantium drew its iconographic tradition from Asia and Africa, specifically from Syria and Egypt.

The special development of iconographic tradition in the Byzantine tradition, which was assumed also by the Russian Orthodox and other Orthodox Churches in communion with Constantinople, can be seen strictly as a reaction to the Iconoclastic Controversy.

The Jewish tradition, matrix of the Christian Church, was basically iconoclastic. The early Church inherited from the mother Tradition the prohibition against "graven images." In its early struggle against pagan cults with their idols of the various gods, iconoclasm was a powerful weapon in the armoury of the early Church. Early Christians

particularly despised Emperor worship, focussed on Imperial statues. In the Persecutions, Christians were always compelled to pay reverence to the Emperor's statues, and to refuse to do so was part of the faithful witness.

The triumph of Christianity under Constantine and his successors led to riotous Christian campaigns of idol - destruction. This spirit is still present in many modern protestants who abhor icons and statues. They are the inheritors of the example of the Great Reformer John Calvin who defaced the entire religious art in the Geneva Cathedral. There are many Protestants who still regard the development of Christian religious art as a symptom of the paganisation of the Church following the "Constantinian Compromise."

Many leading theologians in the early Church taught against painted images of Christ. The fairly liberal Church historian, Eusebius of Caesaria, in the fourth century, speaks of existing statues of Christ and of the Apostles Paul and Peter, but not with any sense of approval. He regarded these images as capitulation to pagan custom. But behind the anti - iconographic sentiments of people like Asterius of Amaseia (4th to 5th centuries) and Epiphanius of Salamis (died 403), one can see the Gnostic - Neo - Platonic aversion to matter and material reality. Epiphanius for example, admonished his people:

"Have God always in your hearts, but not in the community house; for it does not become a Christian to expect the elevation of his soul from recourse to his eyes and the roaming about of his senses."

The Eastern (including Oriental) Orthodox tradition vehemently opposed this Gnostic - Neo - Platonic antimaterialism, and affirmed that so long as Jesus Christ incarnate was the living icon of God, and since we are ourselves made in the image of God, the body itself being created by God (not a prison of the soul, as the Gnostics and the Neo - platonics taught) making and venerating icons was the best way of making both literates and pre - literates aware of the saving events of the economy of Jesus Christ.

The rise of the iconoclastic movement in the 7th century was in a sense a recrudescence of this same Gnostic - Neo - Platonic anti - materialism. By the time the controversy raged in the Byzantine tradition from ca 725 AD to ca 842 AD that tradition had broken away from the original Asian - African tradition which gave birth to

the iconographic (painting icons) and iconodoulc (venerating icons) traditions.

The So - called 'Monophysites' (a name which the Greeks in their *hubris* gave to those Asians and Africans who thought that there should be a limit to the hellenization of other cultures), who allegedly did not teach the human nature of Christ, were the ones who created the iconographic - iconodoulc tradition, and maintained it without dispute even when the Byzantine tradition was tearing itself asunder for more than a century with the iconoclastic controversy.

Behind the action of Leo III the Isaurian (717-740) were his Paulician teachers strongly under the influence of Manicheism which in turn was close to Gnosticism. He thought an iconoclastic campaign would make Christianity more attractive to Jews and Muslims, and would stop the tide of Islam which was sweeping over Africa and Asia and threatening Europe. He wanted to use the iconoclastic move as a political strategy to gain for the state more control over the Church. His edict of 726 declaring all images as idols and therefore ordering them to be destroyed was a bold political move, but one which backfired.

The end results were (a) more power to the monks who had been persecuted by the iconoclasts, and (b) the almost exaggerated role of iconodouleia in Byzantine Orthodoxy. It also resulted in the exaltation of the great Byzantine scholastic, John of Damascus, to the rank of a great Orthodox theologian which role he hardly deserves, except if you interpret the word "orthodox" in its modern pejorative sense.

But the Council of 787 did not really settle the issue since the controversy revived itself one generation afterwards in the reign of Leo V the Armenian. Only in 843 with the election of Methodius to the Patriarchate of Constantinople did the controversy abate, to be revived again in the West in various movements including the Protestant Reformation, especially the Calvinist and Zwinglian Reformations.

There are still excesses in *iconodouleia* which approach iconolatrea. While the theology of icons follows naturally from the two cardinal doctrines of our faith, namely (a) creation of humanity in the image of God, and (b) the assumption of human flesh by the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, the Orthodox Church cannot sanction undue focus on the Icons as the presence of God's holy

ones, to the detriment of the focus on God's own living presence on the Eucharistic altar. Icons are meant to symbolize for us the presence of God in His Holy Ones, and for us to symbolize the presence of God's Holy Ones joining with us in the worship of God. In both cases the focus should be on the presence of God. When the icons become objects of worship rather than of veneration, we Orthodox are also falling away from the authentic tradition.

The acts of the iconoclastic Byzantine Council of Hieria (754) with 338 Byzantine bishops attending are preserved in the Acta of the Nicene Council of 787, and ought to be studied in dialectical opposition to the decisions of 787. The Hieria theology emphasized the centrality of the Eucharist as the chief Icon of Christ in the Church. The theology behind this conception may have been rather onesided. But Byzantine theology of icons should work out more clearly the difference and distinction between Christ's presence in the Eucharist, and that in the Icons. The council of Hieria was also declared "ecumenical" by the Byzantines, until Nicea 787 rejected that claim. The Fathers at Hieria also demonstrate some Gnostic tendencies, but their basic concern was however to maintain the centrality of the Eucharist, which unlike iconography and iconodouleia, was instituted by our Lord Himself - "Do this till I come."

There is no warrant for iconoclasm in the authentic tradition; but neither can that tradition put the Eucharist and iconodouleia at the same level.

Notes

1. J. Rendell Harris and A. Mingana, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, 2 Vols, Manchester 1916-20, gives the 1909 text.
2. J. H. Charlesworth, *The Odes of Solomon*, ed. with translation and notes, Oxford, 1973.
3. S. Brock, *Journal of Biblical Literature* Vol 93 (1974), p. 623.
4. Cited by W. Bauyer in E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, 3 te auflage, Bd II, Tübingen, 1974, p. 579, anmkg 7.
5. See the interesting analysis by H. J. W. Drijvers, in "Die Oden Salomos und die Polemik mit den Markioniten" - *Symposium Syriacum 1976, Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, Roma, 1978, pp. 39-55.

6. B. Mc Neil, "The Odes of Solomon and the sufferings of Christ", in *Symposium Syriacum 1976*, pp. 31-38.
7. Ibid. p. 32.
8. Ignatius, *Ad Trallianum*: IX. *Sources Chretiennes* No 10, Paris, 1969, pp. 100-102.
9. *ad magnesi*: VIII
10. accepting the reading of Lightfoot: *houto kai humeis aneu tou episkopou, mede presbuteros me diakonos, me laikos* rather than the *Sources Chretiennes* text: *houtos mede humeis aneu tou episkopou, kai ton presbuteron meden prassete*, though the latter gives no variant reading in the notes.
11. *Magnes VIII* Eng. Tr. Present writer - from lightfoot's text - which varies considerably from *Sources Chretiennes*.

Appendix

THE WORKS OF DR. PAULOS MAR GREGORIOS

1. *The Joy of Freedom: Eastern Worship and Modern Man.* London: Lutterworth Press/Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1967; Madras: CLS, 1986.
2. *The Gospel of the Kingdom.* Madras: CLS, 1968.
3. *Date of Easter and Calendar Revision of the Orthodox Churches: A Preliminary Study,* Addis Ababa: The Standing Committee of the Conference of Oriental Orthodox Churches, 1968.
4. *The faith of Our Fathers.* Kottayam: MGOCSM, 1969/Kottayam: Bethel Publications. 1996.
5. *The Freedom of Man.* Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972.
6. *Be Still and know.* Madras: CLS/Delhi: ISPCK/Lucknow: The Lucknow Publishing House, 1974.
7. *Freedom and Authority.* Madras: CLS/Delhi: ISPCK/Lucknow: The Lucknow Publishing House, 1974.
8. *Quest for Certainty: Philosophical Trends in the West: A Sample Survey of Later Twentieth Century Western Thought for the Average Indian Reader.* Kottayam: Orthodox Seminary, 1976.
9. *The Human Presence: An Orthodox View of Nature.* Geneva: WCC, 1978/Madras CLS, 1980/NewYork: Amity, 1987/Newyork: Element Books, 1992.
10. *Truth Without Tradition?.* Tirupati: Sri Venkateswara University, 1978.
11. *Science for Sane Societies: Reflections of Faith, Science and the Future in the Indian Context.* Madras: CLS, 1980/ NewYork: Paragon, 1987.
12. *Cosmic Man. The Divine Presence: An Analysis of the Place and Role of the Human Race in the Cosmos, in relation to God and the Historical World, in the thought of St. Gregory of Nyssa (ca 330 to ca 395 A.D.).* NewDelhi/Kottayam: Publications, 1982.
13. *The Indian Orthodox Church: An Overview.* NewDelhi/ Kottayam: Sophia Publications, 1982.

14. *The Meaning and Nature of Diakonia*. Geneva: WCC, 1988.
15. *Enlightenment East and West: Pointers in the Quest for India's Secular Identity*. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study/ NewDelhi: B. R. Publishing Corporation, 1989.
16. *A Light Too Bright*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1992.
17. *A Human God*. Kottayam: MGF, 1992.
18. *Healing: A Holistic Approach*. Kottayam: Current Books/ MGF, 1995.
19. *Love's Freedom The Grand Mystery: A Spiritual Auto-Biography; All Uniting Love with Creative Freedom in the Spirit, As the Grand Mystery at the Heart of Reality - One Man's Vision*. Kottayam: MGF, 1997.
20. *The Secular Ideology: An Impotent Remedy for India's Communal Problem*. Kottayam: MGF/NewDelhi: ISPCK, 1998.
21. *Global Peace and Common Security*. Kottayam: MGF/NewDelhi: ISPCK, 1998.
22. *Disarmament and Nuclear Weapons*. Kottayam: MGF/NewDelhi: ISPCK, 1998.
23. *Introducing The Orthodox Churches*. Kottayam: MGF/NewDelhi: ISPCK, 1999.
24. *Religion and Dialogue*. Kottayam: MGF / NewDelhi: ISPCK, 2000.
25. *The Church and Authority*. Kottayam: MGF / NewDelhi: ISPCK, 2001.
26. *Worship in a Secular Age*. Kottayam: MGF / CSS, 2003/Kottayam: MGF / Sophia Books, 2013/Kottayam: MGF, 2014.
27. *Glory & Burden: Ministry and Sacraments of the Church*. Kottayam: MGF / NewDelhi: ISPCK, 2005.
28. *On Ecumenism*: Kottayam: MGF / NewDelhi: ISPCK, 2006.
29. *The Mission of the Church*. Kottayam: Gregory of India Study Centre, 2009.
30. *Philosophy East & West*. Kottayam: MGF, 2013.
31. *On Choosing the Good Portion*. Kottayam: MGF, 2013.
32. *വി. കന്യാകമ്മലിയം. കോട്ടയം, 1959.*

- 33. *സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യദീപ്തി: പൗരസ്ത്യ ക്രൈസ്തവദർശനത്തിന്റെ വെളിച്ചത്തിൽ ആരാധനയെക്കുറിച്ചും സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യത്തെക്കുറിച്ചുമുള്ള പഠനം.* തിരുവല്ല: സി. എൽ. എസ്., 1972, 1982, 1997.
- 34. *ദർശനത്തിന്റെ പൂക്കൾ.* കോട്ടയം: കറന്റ് ബുക്സ്, 1992.
- 35. *ദർശനം മതം ശാസ്ത്രം.* കോട്ടയം: കറന്റ് ബുക്സ്/എം. ജി. എഫ്., 1995.
- 36. *പാശ്ചാത്യ പ്രബുദ്ധതയും ആധുനികോത്തരതയും.* കോട്ടയം: കറന്റ് ബുക്സ്/എം. ജി. എഫ്., 1995.
- 37. *മതനിരപേക്ഷത ഒരു സംവാദം; ഇ. എം. എസിന്റെ പ്രതികരണത്തോടു കൂടി.* കോട്ടയം: കറന്റ് ബുക്സ്/എം. ജി. എഫ്., 1996.
- 38. *പൗരസ്ത്യ ക്രൈസ്തവദർശനം,* കോട്ടയം: ദിവ്യബോധനം, 1998.
- 39. *മതം, മാർക്സിസം, മതനിരപേക്ഷത.* കോട്ടയം: സോഫിയാ ബുക്സ്, 1998.
- 40. *മാർ ഗ്രിഗോറിയോസ് മറുപടി പറയുന്നു.* ആലുവാ: ചർച്ച് വീക്ക്ലി, 1999.
- 41. *മാർ ഗ്രിഗോറിയോസ് പഠിപ്പിക്കുന്നു.* ആലുവാ: ഓംസൺസ് പബ്ലിഷേഴ്സ്, 1999.
- 42. *സ്നേഹത്തിന്റെ സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യം.* കോട്ടയം: മാർ ഗ്രിഗോറിയോസ് ഫൗണ്ടേഷൻ, 1999.
- 43. *സ്നേഹം സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യം പുതിയ മാനവികത: സമ്പൂർണ്ണ മലയാള രചനകൾ, വാല്യം 1.* കോട്ടയം: ഗ്രിഗറി ഓഫ് ഇന്ത്യാ സ്റ്റഡി സെന്റർ, 2006.
- 44. *സ്നേഹം ക്രിസ്തു മതത്തിന്റെ അടിസ്ഥാനം.* കോട്ടയം: മാർ ഗ്രിഗോറിയോസ് ഫൗണ്ടേഷൻ/എം. ഒ. സി. പബ്ലിഷേഴ്സ്, 2008.
- 45. *ഈശ്വരൻ മനുഷ്യൻ പ്രപഞ്ചം: നിസ്സായിലെ വി. ഗ്രിഗോറിയോസിന്റെ ദർശനത്തിൽ.* കോട്ടയം: മാർ ഗ്രിഗോറിയോസ് ഫൗണ്ടേഷൻ/എം. ഒ. സി. പബ്ലിഷേഴ്സ്, 2009.
- 46. *ഡോ. പൗലോസ് മാർ ഗ്രിഗോറിയോസ് സംവദിക്കുന്നു.* കോട്ടയം: ഗ്രിഗറി ഓഫ് ഇന്ത്യാ സ്റ്റഡി സെന്റർ, 2011, 2014.
- 47. *നന്മയുടെ നീർച്ചാലുകൾ.* കോട്ടയം: ഗ്രിഗറി ഓഫ് ഇന്ത്യാ സ്റ്റഡി സെന്റർ, 2013, 2014.