

**Protopresbyter  
Alexander Schmemmann**

# The Byzantine Synthesis

Chapter 4 of *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, Crestwood, New York, 1975 and 1986), pp 149-220.

*The concluding chapter of Father Alexander's game-changing Introduction to Liturgical Theology is a tour-de-force on the development of the Byzantine liturgical tradition as a whole.*

*As such, it provides the integral perspective necessary for any talk of 'liturgical renewal' or even if any adjustments are to be made to the typicon at a purely practical, pastoral level. Without such perspective, we will inevitably end up emphasizing what is secondary, while eliminating elements that belong to the essential structure of our services.*

*The fact is, we don't understand the typicon very well today, whether we seek to follow it maximally, or to simplify the services in order to make them more accessible. Fr Alexander shows why the development of dogmatic thought went hand in hand with a weakening of ecclesial consciousness, and how this was reflected in our liturgical offices.*

*The empire and the 'desert' both obscured the reality of the Church as the people of God and the new Israel, a chosen people, a royal priesthood. This is true even if the dogmatic decisions of the Councils were not just transposed in Byzantine worship from philosophy into sacred poetry, but actually revealed in all their significance.*

*Whatever we do liturgically, we need to recover and strengthen that ecclesial consciousness that lies at the very heart and root of the Church's liturgical life.*

Page 149

As a history of the synthesis between these two lines of development in the Ordo, the history of the *Typicon* falls naturally into two periods. If the rule of prayer at the end of the third century is taken as the point of departure for this process, then the first period extends from the fourth to the ninth centuries, and the second from the ninth century down to the present. The first period was a time when both types of worship—parish and monastic—developed simultaneously, the period of their gradual merging and influence upon one another. This process may be regarded as complete by the ninth century. The second period is a time of the development of the Ordo within an already completed synthesis, and of the conflict and interaction between its different variants. This division into periods can be found in every history of the Ordo. However, historians of the *Typicon* usually concentrate all their attention on the second period, and

this is because written evidence in the form of complete texts of the Ordo have been preserved only from this period. We know very little about the first era which, in the words of Skaballanovich, 'was the most decisive period in the formation of our liturgical Ordo.' 'Information concerning the extensive activity of that period,' he writes, 'is very meagre, falling far short of what we know from the periods preceding and following.' [1] As far as our own work is concerned, it is just this period which is of special interest, in

150

so far as the synthesis of the original Christian *lex orandi* with the new 'emphases' of liturgical piety, and their 'digestion' by the mind of the church, occurred during this time. While granting the necessarily hypothetical character of our general presentation, we shall therefore

concentrate our attention on this period of the formation of the Byzantine synthesis.

If we were to take everything out of the *Typicon* that was introduced into it after the ninth or tenth centuries, during the era of its finalized form and structure (and it would not be difficult to do this, since this process of accumulation is rather well documented in the numerous manuscripts which have been preserved), three basic 'strata' would remain, corresponding to the three concepts or views of the 'rule of prayer' which we have been analysing. There would be, first, the ordo which arose out of the synagogical and Judeo-Christian foundations of the Christian cult. Second, there would be those elements which are connected with the new liturgical piety of the 'parish church' and are rooted in the new relationship of Church and world created by the conversion of Constantine. There would be, finally, the monastic stratum. The problem of the historian is to define each of these layers separately, and also to discover their inter-relationship within the final synthesis, within the one design or Ordo. The problem is a difficult one, since the whole significance of this Byzantine synthesis is that these three layers were not simply 'linked' to one another in some kind of mechanical unity, but transformed within a genuine synthesis, changed in accordance with a general design, a general theology of the Ordo. The problem has not yet been resolved, and this has deprived both the historical and theological study of the Ordo of all perspective.

## 1. The First Stratum: The Pre-Constantine Ordo

First, then, there is the question of the early Christian or pre-Constantine 'layer' of the Ordo. In the most general

151

terms this question can be formulated as follows: 'What elements in the Church's contemporary "rule of prayer" must be traced back to this fundamental layer?' In the chapter devoted to the origin of the Ordo, we have tried to demonstrate the source of the very idea of ordo— i.e. of structure, order— in the fundamental *lex orandi*, and also to show the general connection between this order and the liturgical traditions of the synagogue. Now we can make this description more detailed, on the basis of texts from the third century, when the liturgical life of the early Church can be regarded as rather well defined and the factors related to the crisis of the fourth century had not yet begun to have their effect. Our brief analysis will fit naturally into the scheme already familiar to us: the three cycles of the liturgy of time, and then their rela-

tionship with the Eucharist as the Sacrament of the Church.

### *The Daily Cycle*

Two basic services in the worship of the daily cycle have special significance: Vespers and Matins. Both undoubtedly originated in the pre-Constantine layer of the Ordo not only because of their place in the general order of worship, but also because of their liturgical structure. We now know much more about the original substance of these services than was known in the time of Duchesne and Battifol. The methods of comparative liturgics have helped us, together with the ever deepening study of the synagogue worship. In the words of Hanssens, author of one of the more recent studies of the history of Matins, 'the theory concerning the monastic and local origin of these services in the fourth century must be regarded as inadmissible.'<sup>[2]</sup> In our present order for Vespers and Matins three basic elements, which in combination form their ordo, must be traced back to this original layer. These are: (a) the chanting of psalms, (b) eschatological material, and (c) hymns. These three elements stem in one way or another from the worship of

152

the synagogue. What was borrowed from the synagogue was first the very principle of the liturgical use of the Psalter, with its divisions into separate psalms and their habitual use at set times in worship. We may assume also that certain groups of psalms were borrowed— for example, the use of psalms of praise at Matins, which was 'one of the most widespread customs,' in the words of A. Baumstark, the father of comparative liturgics.<sup>[3]</sup> From the evidence of early texts the morning and evening worship of the Church developed around certain psalms or groups of psalms. At Matins there was the morning psalm (ἑωθινός, *heōthinos*)— psalm 63; and at Vespers the evening psalm (ἑσπερινός, *hesperinos*)— psalm 141. To these could be added the psalms of praise (148, 149, 150) at Matins, and the 'candlelight' psalms (15, 142, 132, 130) at Vespers. These psalms still form an unchanging part of the daily cycle. As for the way in which these psalms were used, there is still no agreement between the defenders of the theory of the musical dependence of the early Church on the synagogue, and those who think that the psalms (and the prophets) were originally read, and only later, at the beginning of the third century, in the struggle against gnostic hymnography, became 'the Church's song.'<sup>[4]</sup> There can be no doubt, however, about the existence of some form of psalmody as a basis of the daily office in the pre-Constantine Ordo.

The prayers also may be traced to the early Judeo-Christian worship. In the contemporary Ordo both the morning and the twilight prayers have become secret and are read by the officiant one after another during the reading of the Psalter. But it is plain from their text that they were related originally to particular moments of worship, and actually alternated with the psalms and hymns.[5] Their rubrics in early manuscripts give evidence of this usage: 'prayer of the 50th psalm,' 'prayer at the praises,' etc. In content these prayers were close to the *tephilla*— the intercessory prayers

153

of the synagogue worship, which points to their early inclusion in the Ordo of the daily offices.[6] The Syrian *Didascalia* and other texts connected with it refer to these prayers as an important part of these offices.

In St. Paul we find mention of psalms, hymns and spiritual songs (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16), and this list, in the words of E. Wellecz, 'is understood uniformly now by every student of comparative liturgics. These three groups correspond to the three kinds of singing usually found in Byzantine ritual. They originate in the Hebrew worship of the synagogue, which the disciples of Christ attended daily.'[7] A list of the first hymns used in the Church has been preserved in an Alexandrian codex of the fifth century,[8] but there are good grounds for believing that they were used in Christian worship even before Constantine.[9] This list includes our present ten Old Testament songs, which later formed the Canon, and also the Great Doxology, the Song of Simeon the God-receiver, the Prayer of King Manasseh, etc. Using the comparative method, Baumstark shows the gradual 'formulation' of this early hymnological tradition, in which the Song of the Three Children represents, in his opinion, the original element. What is important for us here is simply the fact that there were hymns in the Ordo of the earliest daily offices. As far as the term 'spiritual songs' is concerned, in Wellecz's opinion these are chants of the 'melismatic' type, of which the *alleluia* is a major form.[10] It is clear to any one familiar with the order of our worship today that our present use of *alleluias* clearly suggests that they had a greater significance in ancient times. Here too we can establish the connection with the synagogue tradition. It is demonstrated, for example, in the musical structure of the *alleluias* of the Ambrosian liturgy, the earliest form of *alleluia* which has come down to us.[11]

To this list of the primitive elements of Matins and

154

Vespers we must also add (1) the undoubtedly liturgical character of these services; both the *Didascalia* and the *Apostolic Constitutions* (in their descriptions of these

services) invariably mention a leading person, an officiant, and both clergy and people, i.e. the 'pleroma' of the Church[12]— these were not private prayers, therefore, but liturgical actions, performed by the Church and in the name of the Church; and (2) their structural similarity to the first part of the Eucharistic assembly (the pre-anaphora), which supports Dugmore's conjecture[13] that these services— constructed on the pattern of synagogue worship— formed the first part of the Eucharist on the days of its celebration, and on other days were independent offices.[14]

In our present study it is not too important to us whether these services were conducted in all places and at all times in the first centuries of Christianity (for example the words 'every day in the morning and the evening' were inserted into the *Didascalia* by the compiler of the *Apostolic Constitutions* at the end of the fourth century). What is important is their general similarity to the cult of the synagogue, pointing to their very early acceptance by the Church, and also the universality of their basic pattern, which has been clearly demonstrated by specialists in the field of comparative liturgics.

### *The Weekly Cycle*

There can be no doubt whatever about the existence of the weekly cycle— the Eucharistic cycle of the Day of the Lord— in the earliest layer of the liturgical tradition. We should make some brief mention here of two questions which have so far not received adequate answers. These are the questions of the liturgical character of the Sabbath and of the daily reception of Communion. In the East, at the end of the third century, the Eucharist was celebrated not only

155

on the day of the Resurrection but also on Saturday, and Saturday preserves this liturgical character even now in the Orthodox liturgical Ordo.[15] Opinions of scholars differ on the explanation of this fact. Skaballanovich believes that the tendency to celebrate Saturday on a par with Sunday arose only at the beginning of the third century, as a result of the gradual weakening of the anti-Jewish feeling among Christians.[16] But in the opinion of other scholars the development of Saturday simply continued the Judeo-Christian tradition in the Eastern Churches, a tradition discarded at an early date in the West.[17] We repeat, this question deserves special study. In the meantime the second hypothesis seems more probable and to correspond more nearly to the early Christian theology of time. It should be remembered that Judeo-Christianity in the broad sense of this term (as it is used, for example, by Fr. Daniélou in his *Theology of Judeo-Christianity*) was not at all a sort of

spiritual Judeophilism. Thus the 'Epistle of Barnabas' is not only a memorial of the anti-Jewish polemic but also a memorial of Judeo-Christianity, i.e. of Christianity expressed in the language and concepts of *Spätjudentum* [Late Judaism]. We have spoken of the correlation of the 'eighth Day' or first day of the week with the seven days ending with Saturday within the Judeo-Christian tradition. It can hardly be doubted that the Judeo-Christian communities continued to celebrate Saturday as a holy day, above all as a commemoration of the Creation.[18] The joining of this holy day with the celebration of the Eucharist was probably not something which happened at the very beginning, but it occurred naturally under the influence of the view of the Eucharist itself as a festival, and was possibly a reaction against the overly 'Judaized' Christians. An echo of this view of the Saturday Eucharist can be found

156

in one of the memorials of the Ethiopian Church, a memorial from a later date, of course, and yet in view of the century-old isolation of Abyssinian Christianity, one which probably reflects a rather early tradition. In 'The Confession of Claudius, King of Ethiopia,' it is said: 'We observe it (Saturday) not as the Jews, who drink no water and kindle no fire on this day, but we observe it by celebrating the Lord's Supper and the feast of love as our fathers the Apostles commanded us and as it is prescribed in the *Didascalía*. But we also observe it not as the festival celebration of the first day (Sunday), which is a new day, of which David spoke: "This is the day the Lord has made, let us rejoice and be glad in it."'[19] The liturgical observation of Saturday could hardly have grown out of local and later customs. It is more reasonable to suppose that it reflects the early Christian theology of the week, which began to pale after the 'Lord's Day' was 'naturalized' and returned into the time of this world as a day of rest.

### *Fasting*

In early Christian texts we see the development of Wednesday and Friday as fast days.[20] This raises two questions: one concerning the reason for the setting apart of precisely these days; the other concerning the place and significance of fasting in the early tradition. Until very recently there has been a widespread opinion that these days were established in opposition to the Hebrew fast days— Monday and Thursday, i.e., were motivated by anti-Judaism.[21] After discovery of the Qumran documents, however, it may be considered as proved that the origins of this tradition lie in the ancient sacred calendar which the Essenes observed and which in all probability was accepted by the Judeo-Christian

communities in Palestine.[22] Wednesday and Friday have special significance in this calendar. Christians appropriated these days and later added a new meaning to them as commemorations of the days of Christ's betrayal and His death.[23] These days were described as days of fasting or *station days*, and this raises the question of the meaning of fasting and its relationship to the Eucharist. The evidence which has come down to us is, outwardly, conflicting. Thus, according to St. Basil the Great,[24] the Eucharist was celebrated on Wednesday and Friday, while in the words of Socrates: 'Alexandrians read the Scriptures and their teachers expound them on Wednesday and on the day of preparation, as it is called; on these days everything is done as it usually is, except for the Mysteries.'[25] Much earlier, in the work of Tertullian, one can find an echo of the African controversies over whether Communion should be received on the station days.[26] In studying this question it should be remembered that the early pre-Constantine and pre-monastic tradition understood fasting primarily as a one-day fast involving the complete abstinence from food, and not as abstinence from certain foods, as it came to be understood later on. This complete abstinence continued to the ninth hour (3 p.m.). Such a concept of fasting (again, borrowed from Judaism) could be defined as liturgical. It was connected with the concept of the Church as being not of this world' and yet existing 'in this world.' Fasting was the 'station' of the Church herself, the People of God standing in readiness, awaiting the *Parousía* of the Lord. The emphasis here was not on the ascetical value of fasting but on the expression— in the refusal of food, the denial of one's subjection to natural necessity— of that same eschatological character of the Church herself and her faith which we have discussed above. 'Fasting was regarded,' Skaballanovich remarks, 'as a form of festival or solemn celebration.'[27] Hence the correlation between fast-

158

ing and Communion as between waiting for and being fulfilled by and receiving the food and drink of the Kingdom. According to the *Testament of the Lord*: 'The sacrifice must be offered on Saturday and Sunday only and on the days of fasting.'[28] Differences concerned only the question whether there should be a Communion in the Eucharist itself or by means of the Presanctified Gifts. It may be supposed that where there was a practice of receiving Communion by the Presanctified Gifts, it was received on Wednesday and Friday at the ninth hour, and later, after this practice was abolished or restricted, the complete Eucharist began to be celebrated on these days, but in the evening, so that the Communion would

terminate the fast or vigil; while the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts was celebrated during Lent. All the early rubrics concerning the pre-Easter fast bear witness to the connection between fasting and the Sacrament.[29] The Lenten fast developed out of the practice of catechumens fasting in preparation for Baptism and entry into the Church. 'Let them fast before Baptism,' the *Didache* teaches, 'and let the baptized and others too if they can fast also with the catechumens.'[30] According to St. Justin, the newly converted 'are instructed to beg God with prayer and fasting for forgiveness of sins, and we too pray and fast with them.'[31] Baptism is a Sacrament of the Kingdom— the whole Church participates in it and is enriched by it, so that the preparation for it is a 'station'— i.e. a state of waiting and purification. Baptism was celebrated at Easter, and the fast was ended after the Baptismal and Paschal festival. Tertullian speaks of the prohibition of fasting during the Fifty Days, when the 'need for joy and thanksgiving' keeps us from fasting.[32] Monasticism will introduce a great change

159

in this concept— with its view of fasting as primarily an individual ascetical exploit. In the late Byzantine *Typicon* these two concepts of fasting are interwoven— which explains the curious contradictoriness of the prescriptions on fasting in the period of Pentecost. We shall have more to say about this change later. Here we must say once again that in the pre-Constantine Ordo fasting was related to worship, to the liturgical rhythm of the Church's life, since it corresponded to the Church as a vigil and waiting, to the Church as being in this world and yet directed toward the fulfilment of the Kingdom in the *Parousia* of the Lord. It was therefore related to the Eucharist as the Sacrament of the *Parousia*, the Sacrament in which the coming of the Lord and participation in this Kingdom was anticipated. This original tradition concerning fasting is essential for an understanding of the further development of the Ordo.

### *The Church Year: Easter and Pentecost*

Finally we know that the Church Year, in its general structure, undoubtedly originated in the pre-Constantine Ordo, in the annual cycle of Easter and Pentecost. We have spoken of the relationship of these festivals to the Hebrew year on the one hand, and to the eschatological theology of time on the other. Recent studies seem to indicate a remote Judeo-Christian foundation for the Feast of Epiphany also, and therefore for the liturgical cycle of the Nativity which is with it and which later developed out of it. This thesis cannot yet be considered as proved, and so we shall limit ourselves here to a general outline of its main features.[33] It begins with the ques-

tion why, having kept the Passover and Pentecost in her liturgical tradition, the early Judeo-Christian Church did not keep the third great messianic and eschatological feast of late Judaism— the Feast of Tabernacles. What led scholars to this question was the undoubted presence of the symbolism and ceremonies

160

of the Feast of Tabernacles in the New Testament, especially in the Johannine literature, where the Feast of Tabernacles is connected with the messianic vocation of the Saviour and also with the theme of the water of life, i.e. with Baptism (cf. John 7:10, 37-8). In his analysis of these texts and the symbolism of the Apocalypse, P. Carrington writes: 'It is clear from the Gospel of John and from the Revelation that the Feast of Tabernacles was a living tradition in Johannine circles.'[34] In the Synoptics the symbolism of the Feast of Tabernacles is evident in the description of our Lord's entrance into Jerusalem. 'Everything here,' writes Fr. Daniélou, 'reminds us of the Feast of Tabernacles— the branches from palm trees, the singing of Hosanna (Psalm 118, which was prescribed for use at this festival and mentioned also in the Apocalypse), the procession itself...'[35] Thus the theme and symbolism of the Feast of Tabernacles in the New Testament literature is connected with the theme of Baptism on the one hand and with the messianic entrance of the Saviour into Jerusalem on the other. Carrington has proposed that the Gospel of Mark is constructed as a series of liturgical readings for the year beginning with the Baptism in Jordan and ending with the entrance into Jerusalem (the chapters on the Passion forming a separate cycle, in his opinion).[36] But Mark's calendar— as A. Jaubert has recently shown[37]— is an ancient sacerdotal calendar according to which (in contrast to the official Jewish calendar) the year was counted from the month Tishri, i.e. September. In this calendar the Feast of Tabernacles coincided, therefore, with the end and the beginning of the year. Thus it may be supposed, and Daniélou defends this thesis, that the earliest Judeo-Christian tradition did include a Christian 'transposition' of the third great messianic festival. On the one hand

161

the final feast day of the Saviour's earthly ministry— His entrance into Jerusalem (the end of the year)— and on the other hand the theme of Epiphany or Baptism (the beginning of the year) were, in this theory, the main themes of this transposition. What happened then? In Daniélou's opinion there was a branching out or separation of the traditions, related to the difference in the calendar. The first stage was the adoption by the Judeo-Christian communities outside Palestine, especially in Asia Minor, of the official Jewish calendar as opposed to

the ancient one still retained by the Essenes. This change is reflected in the Johannine literature, as A. Jaubert has demonstrated brilliantly in her work on the Lord's Supper.[38] In the official calendar the year began with the month Nisan (April), in the period of the Passover. Thus also the Christian year was reconstructed, extending from the theme of Baptism Manifestation (ἐπιφανεῖα, *epiphaneia*) to that of the messianic Entrance into Jerusalem. Our contemporary Ordo preserves traces of the calculation of the Church year from Passover to Passover: Quasimodo Sunday\* is called the 'New Week' and marks the beginning of the counting of weeks. Moreover— and this tends to support Daniélou's hypothesis— immediately after Easter we begin the reading of the Gospel of John, and in fact with the chapter on the Baptism. Thus also here— as in the conjectured original structure of Mark— the Gospel corresponds to the Church Year, which opens with the theme of the Baptism and ends with the theme of the Entrance into Jerusalem. In this shift from one reckoning of time (that of the Judeo-Christians in Palestine) to another, the Feast of Tabernacles was as it were dissolved in the Feast of Easter which became also the festival of the transition from the old into the new year. 'We can then begin to understand,' writes Daniélou, 'the significance attached in Asia to the date of Easter, as evidenced in the controversies on this subject. It was the key to the liturgical year, the beginning and the end, the transition from the old into the new year as a figure of the transition from the old into the new life. It combined all the Hebrew festivals into one

162

Christian festival.' [39] But if one part of the symbolism of the Feast of Tabernacles— embodied in the narrative of the Entrance into Jerusalem— retained its relationship to Easter, then the other— connected with the Lord's Baptism and His *epiphaneia*— was developed as a special feast. For the Gentile Church neither of these Jewish calendars could have any real significance, since this Church was already living by the official calendar of the Empire, beginning in January.[40] But even here the tradition of the general order of the Christian Year remained in force, as the cycle of our Lord's messianic ministry with its beginning in the Epiphany and its ending in the messianic entry into Jerusalem. The January Feast of the Epiphany, as a festival of beginning and renewal, grew out of this tradition, as well as being influenced by other and external factors. Perhaps it is not accidental that in the course of the Gospel readings at the end of the year, in December (both in the East and in the West), Christ's eschato-

---

\* [The Sunday after Easter.]

logical sermon is read, a sermon that followed His entry into Jerusalem and was connected with it by a common messianic theme. No matter what the ultimate fate of these hypotheses may be, what has been said points to the major place of the idea of the Church (or Liturgical) Year in the early, pre-Constantine Ordo, and to the undoubted origin of this idea in that eschatological and ecclesiological theology of time which was the basis of the early Christian *lex orandi* and the first stratum in the Church's liturgical tradition.

## 2. The Second Stratum: The 'Secular,' or 'Cathedral,' Ordo

Let us turn now to the second layer, to those elements or features of the Ordo which owe their place in it to the liturgical changes of the post-Constantine period and are connected with what we have called the new liturgical piety. We will define this layer provisionally as 'secular,' in con-

163

trast to the liturgical elements introduced by monasticism. No full description or ordo of this 'secular' worship has come down to us, which would show us how it was formed and developed in the epoch of exuberant liturgical growth in the fourth and fifth centuries. Nevertheless it is possible to distinguish the main features or 'emphases' of this type of worship. Apart from isolated pieces of evidence scattered in various memorials, the basic sources here are two documents whose extraordinary significance for liturgical research has long been acknowledged by such scholars as Dimitrievsky and Mansvetov. We have in mind the remarkable *Typicon of the Great Church* published from a Patmos manuscript of the tenth century by A.A. Dimitrievsky,[41] and the text of an *Asmatiki Akolouthia* (Sung Service) of the fifteenth century as described by Simeon of Thessalonica.[42] Neither of these texts, of course, can be accepted as first hand testimony from the era which interests us. They contain many later accretions which still require a great deal of painstaking work before they can be clearly defined. And yet they do give a general picture of the worship which Baumstark has called 'cathedral rite,' and undoubtedly they reflect an earlier era than the one in which they were written. Baumstark has shown that the Patmos text for the most part may be traced back to the Constantinople *Typicon* of 802-806.[43] As for the Sung Service, Simeon himself remarks that it is 'no longer observed either in Constantinople or in other places, having been replaced by another Ordo.' [44] These facts would seem to indicate that the Ordo of St. Sofia in

Constantinople (described in both memorials) was not an exception to the general rule, was not radically different from the worship in other churches. Nor can the Patmos *Typicon* or the text of the Sung Service be traced to one Constantinopolitan tradition. 'The fundamentals of the Sung Service,' Mansvetov wrote, 'and its general type of service precede the epoch when particular ordos appeared. In it are found all the original and fundamental norms which were in one way or another worked out in subsequent practice. In the usage of the Great Church this archaic order of service was retained and elaborated with few departures from the original pattern; the honour of creating this order, however, did not belong to her....'[45] It is true that this respected liturgiologist falls into self-contradiction when he ascribes this honour to monasticism, since a little farther on he himself asserts that the 'make-up of the prayers of the chanted service have their origin in the liturgical order of the early Christian Church.'[46] What is important for us here is not this contradiction, which may be explained by Mansvetov's general approach to the history of the *Typicon*, but rather his conclusion— concerning the significance which the ritual described by Simeon had for the whole Church. We have in it an important witness to the development and elaboration which the original Ordo underwent as a result of the new 'liturgical situation' created after Constantine.

Let us give here a general characterization of this type of 'secular' worship which will embrace all the cycles and individual services of the Church's liturgy. Its basic features were, first, the new and great importance acquired by chanting in worship; and, second, the dramatic nature of its ritual.

### *Chanting and Music*

We have said that the chanting of 'songs and hymns and spiritual songs' was an essential part of Christian worship

165

and was inherited by it from the Hebrew tradition. In spite of this demonstrated inheritance by the Church of Hebrew chant forms and traditions, however, there can be no doubt that here again after the fourth century a profound change gradually occurred. This was not a change or development in musical theory or technique, but a change in the function of the Church's chanting, its new place in the general structure of worship, its acquisition of new liturgical significance. This change is best demonstrated by the peculiar duality in the place and function of chanting in our modern worship. On the one hand, a 'singing quality' has been assigned to almost

every word pronounced in Church; western rubrics still speak of the 'chanting' of the Gospel by the deacon, and the manner of reading the psalms or *parimia* [readings] is close to being a form of chant. In using the term 'chant' ancient ordos had reference to the entire service, which was thought of in all its parts as a singing of praise to God. We find the same definition of worship as chanting in the New Testament. In the Revelation the elders sing a new song before the Lamb, and the Apostle Paul summons the faithful to 'teach and admonish one another... by grace singing in your hearts to the Lord' (Apoc. 4:9; 14:3; 15:3 and Col. 3:16). While not dealing here with the heart of the question, whether there was here a 'Semitic' concept of liturgical chanting,[47] we may note simply that the first meaning of chanting in our Ordo and worship corresponded precisely to this Semitic concept. This does not mean that early Christian worship recognized no difference between the various types of chanting and made no special provision for 'hymns'— i.e. for material written expressly to, be sung (for example, the biblical 'song'). But their function was the same as that of prayers and psalms and litanies— all were to the same degree the prayer of the Church, all were subordinated equally to the, general scheme of worship.

On the other hand there is within our Ordo a second, narrower, more specialized concept of chanting. This is the chanting which is set in contrast to reading. A whole great area of worship (the *Oktoichos*, for example) consists almost

166

exclusively of hymnody: *troparia*, *canons*, versicles, etc. Moreover the musical execution of this material, its division according to tones, stylistic similarities, etc., represents its main purpose. It can be said that here chanting acquires its own independent significance, is set apart as a special element of worship distinct from all others. If in the first view all worship is expressed melodically, and is chanting in some sense, then in this second view chanting is isolated and acquires its own special function in worship. So much significance is attached to this function that the Ordo directs the chanting or non-chanting of a given text depending on the festal nature of the service. One of the earliest Church hymns or canticles— the Great Doxology is, in our modern Ordo, directed sometimes to be sung and sometimes to be said. Chanting has become the expression and sign of festival character, of a festal day (by means of the number of versicles, etc.). Secondly, chanting has acquired its own special material, which has gradually taken a central place in worship.

In this evolution of the place and significance of chanting in the Ordo, we must distinguish the historical factors which brought it about, and also the interpretation which was given to it and permanently fixed its significance in Byzantine liturgical theology. We have already pointed out its general cause: the change in the external conditions of worship which marked the period after Constantine, reflected first of all in huge church buildings, with their need for a corresponding 'amplification' of liturgical material. The influence of the Imperial court ritual undoubtedly played a great role in this 'amplification' and development in worship of external festal solemnity. We may assume that the terminology of the Hellenistic cult of the emperor was partially appropriated by the Church even at an earlier date and applied to Christ. It cannot be doubted that after Constantine both the language and the form of this cult were received into Christian worship and became one of its characteristic 'expressions.'<sup>[48]</sup> Hymnographical material (greet-

167

ings, anthems such as 'long live the Emperor,' etc.) played a very prominent part in this cult.<sup>[49]</sup> The experience and view of chanting as a special liturgical function, as a manifestation of festal solemnity, was a natural result of the new liturgical piety— i.e. the understanding of the cult as primarily a sacred, solemn ceremonial. But if Christian worship acquired its general concept and experience of the function of liturgical chanting from this 'secular' source, this source did not determine the content of Christian hymnography. Modern studies of the history of Byzantine chanting point clearly to the Church's resistance to 'Hellenic' poetry, even when vested in Christian clothes.<sup>[50]</sup> This is not the place for a detailed description of this antagonism. In his *Hymnography of the Greek Church*, Cardinal Pitra has stressed the fact that the Church rejected the forms of classic poetry even when the early Fathers were its authors, preferring a more 'lowly poesy.'<sup>[51]</sup> Since then the purely technical study of Byzantine Hymnography has taken a great step forward, and it may be accepted that the decisive influence both in form and content was not Greek but Semitic poetry.<sup>[52]</sup> The earliest forms of this hymnography— the *troparion* and *kontakion*— show a dependence on Syrian poetry (the so-called *memra* or preaching homily<sup>[53]</sup>) and, as Wellecz notes, 'the music of the Byzantine Church developed directly out of the music of the early church.'<sup>[54]</sup> Thus the position of chanting in Byzantine worship was determined by two 'co-ordinates.' Its place in the structure of worship, what we have been calling its liturgical function, may be traced to the ceremonial, 'festal'

concept of cult, characteristic of Hellenic liturgical piety, while its content and poetic form may be traced back to the early Christian, biblical and 'Semitic' tradition. These two co-ordinates reach a synthesis in that theologically liturgical interpretation of the Church's chanting which we find first clearly expressed in Pseudo-Dionysius, which in turn defined the whole subsequent development of the Church's hymnography within the framework of the Byzantine Ordo. According to Dionysius the hymns, songs and poems used in Church are a 'resounding' or echo of the heavenly chanting, which the hymnographer hears with a spiritual ear and transmits in his work. The Church's hymn is a copy of the heavenly 'archetype.'<sup>[55]</sup> We recognize here that familiar principle of consecration to a higher order, a hierarchical ascent to an invisible reality. The Church's canticles are proclaimed by angels, and therefore the hymnographer must follow the established types of heavenly origin (hence the significance of the 'model' in Byzantine hymnography, understood as a 'metaphysical' concept rather than as an object of simple imitation). We shall have more to say about this theology below, as a decisive factor in the Byzantine liturgical synthesis. Here it is important only to take note of this new understanding of the Church's chanting as a special element in worship, an understanding clearly connected with the experience of worship as a festal and mysteriological ceremony.

Simeon's' description of the *Sung Service* in all probability reflects a rather early stage in the development of this type of worship— since in it the chanted material is still closely bound to biblical texts and has not yet developed, as it did later, into an independent hymnody. His description is interesting, first, because already there is an unusual stress laid on chanting. 'All catholic Churches in the whole world,' he writes, 'have observed it (the *Sung Service*) from the beginning and have uttered nothing in worship except in song'<sup>[56]</sup>; and second, because of Simeon's contrasting of this— from his point of view— ancient and universal type of

169

worship with the monastic type, celebrated without chanting. 'Of course,' he remarks, 'this latter institution was brought on by necessity and was determined by pastoral authority.'<sup>[57]</sup> By necessity 'all the sacred monasteries and Churches followed this Ordo and only a few retained for a while the Ordo borrowed from the great Church of Constantinople.'<sup>[58]</sup> Simeon's service is undoubtedly an early one; this is indicated by its antiphonal structure and, more important, by the absence of an elaborate hymnody in the form of independent *canons*

and groups of *troparia*. For this reason we can see in it all the more clearly the point of departure for the general path of development of this hymnody from refrains to verses of psalms, from biblical songs to hymns actually displacing the biblical texts. (Thus, for example, to the verses of the ancient Vespers psalm 'Lord I have cried...': the refrain was added, 'Thy life-giving Cross we glorify, O Lord...' this being the embryo of future hymns based on 'Lord I have cried.') There is no need here to set forth the further development of hymnody, since although the forms of hymns were later modified (*troparia* developed into *kontakia*, *kontakia* into *canons*), the liturgical function of chanting and its general place in worship remained unchanged. This process of development, as modern research is showing, was very complicated, influenced by a multitude of different factors. One thing is sure: there was a gradual complication and expansion of hymnody; increasingly hymns took a central place in the liturgical life of the Church. Pitra has indeed called the introduction of the *troparion* a 'revolution' in the common prayer of the Church. This did not mean simply the addition to the service of new material more suitable to its festal and ceremonial nature. It was the result of a profound change in the very understanding of worship. 'It would be easy,' writes Pitra, 'to find many analogies between a solemn service of the Greek rite and the ancient Greek drama. It has already been noted that the choirs and semi-choirs correspond to the antiphonal chanting of psalms, the *idiomela* and *katabasia*

170

to the monostrophes and parables, the anthems to the responsive verses, etc. Undoubtedly we must attribute the terms *kathisma*, *katabasia*, etc., whose mystical etymology is extremely obscure, to the significance of groups either moving or standing still during the singing of sacred songs. It may be that the term *oikos* refers simply to the groups arranged in a circle around the leading chorister or precentor as he recited a poem, which was then continued in a musical form since given the name *kontakion*...' [59] Again let us note that the details of this complicated process— leading to the substitution of the *kontakion* by the *canon*, etc.— have been set forth in special studies, and there is no need for us to repeat them here. In these works one can also trace the gradual growth of *troparia* and *heirmologia*— their slow organization in the form of the *Oktoichos*. All this belongs to a special field in the history of the Church's chanting. [60] From the viewpoint of the history of the Ordo it is important simply to point out the general fact— this rapid growth of hymnody and the transformation of chanting into a very special and complex stratum in the Church's liturgical tradition.

### The Dramatic Element

The growth of hymnody is organically bound up with the second main feature of 'secular' worship as it developed after the fourth century, what we have called the dramatic nature of the ritual. Worship gradually acquired the form of a symbolic drama with a complicated system of entrances and exits, processions, etc., and as a corollary to this, the church building itself, where the drama was performed, was overgrown with complicated symbolism. There is a description of the Sunday Matins given by Simeon of Thessalonica. [61]

171

The service begins in the entrance of the church, before the closed royal doors, 'in which there is a representation of eternal paradise and heaven or, rather, which actually lead into paradise and heaven.' The royal doors are closed, 'inasmuch as by our sins we have closed off and are still closing off for ourselves both paradise and heaven. The beginning of Matins is announced by the priest, 'as a mediator and one who has the form of an angel.' Then the Six Psalms are sung, and 'both sides of the church take up the refrain alternately.' During the chanting 'the priest opens one door of the church at the holy words "Look upon me, O Lord, and be merciful unto me," showing us that the door of heaven has been opened to us by the incarnation of the Lord, who looks upon us from heaven, and who was made man through the heavenly 'and living door of the Theotokos.' During the chanting of the words 'Let my inheritance abide before thee, O Lord,' the priest opens the doors wide and sings loudly the introit with the alleluias and all enter (the church) as if it were heaven itself, following the priest who carries the cross and represents the Lord who saves us by the Cross. Three candles are set in the cross, signifying the light of the three suns. In the meantime both groups, standing in the middle, sing the remainder of the psalm antiphonally, and also the Song of the Three Children. During this chanting the priest goes up, in the company of all, to the altar, as to the throne of God, representing the Lord's ascension and sitting down (with the Father) in heaven.' We find also in Simeon the most detailed explanations of the symbolism of censing, and of literally every moment of the officiant and the congregation. Of course Simeon is a late author and he comes at the end of the long tradition of symbolic explanation of worship so popular in Byzantium. Nevertheless, the 'Catechetical Instructions' of Cyril of Jerusalem, the 'Diary' of Sylvia of Aquitain, and many other memorials which do not give such a complete picture but which reflect the same liturgical theology, all bear witness to the fact that this tradition began at an early date and was certainly

connected with the new 'liturgical piety' of the post-Constantine era.

172

### *The Complication of the Ordo*

On the basis of this general characterization of what we have called the 'second layer' of our Ordo, we may now try to note briefly what its effect was upon the structure of worship, what it added to the pre-Constantine Ordo. Clearly it introduced into the services of the old cycle first a new view of chanting in worship and, second, a complication of ceremonies, a system of entrances and processions. Basically the 'secular' Matins and Vespers as described in the Patmos *Typicon* and by Simeon preserved their original structure. They are made up of a series of antiphons, the chanting of psalms and biblical songs, the deacons' litanies and the priest's prayers. Simeon notes that many people were surprised at the similarity of chanted Vespers to the first part of the Liturgy. This similarity in ordo only witnesses to the preservation in the 'secular' rite of the original antiphonal structure of the ancient services. That this structure was more ancient than that of our present Vespers is indicated by several of the 'Candlelight' prayers read now by the priest during the appointed psalms, which are nothing more than paraphrases of the antiphons sung at a chanted Vespers. In the latter the officiant's prayer repeats the antiphon— 'that through the priest all might be offered up to God.' For example, our first Candlelight Prayer ('O Lord, bountiful and compassionate...') is an exact paraphrase of Psalm 86, which was, according to Simeon, a part of the first antiphon of the *Sung Vespers*. But of course the main thing to note is the result of this line of development: hymnographical elaboration. In our contemporary worship the chant 'Lord I have cried...' is regarded as a kind of preface to the chanting of the canticles 'I have cried unto the Lord,' and usually only a few verses of the evening psalms are sung— at the beginning and end, where they denote the number of the canticles (10, 8, 6, etc.) So too at Matins the Six Psalms on the one hand and the 'psalms of praise' on the other are regarded as the beginning and end of Matins, while originally they formed its main content, and the whole of the mid-section is now taken up

173

by the *canon* with its special (seated) psalms and *kontakia*. In the so-called *irmos* the connection with the original biblical songs is preserved only by their use of the traditional biblical themes and figures. The chanting of Psalm 119— the 'psalm of the innocents'— disappeared, but the chanting of the '*troparion* of the Innocents' is preserved, and so on. All this was the result of

the shifting of the centre of gravity brought about by the new 'liturgical piety.' In modern liturgical books no less than 80 per cent of the material printed is hymnody, comparatively late hymnody at that, since whole sections have been dropped out and subsequently replaced. This does not mean that all this hymnody was developed exclusively within the realm of the 'secular' liturgy. On the contrary, monasticism played a tremendous role in its growth, and the most recent layer of hymnody (actually in use today) is primarily monastic. But this monastic hymnody began its development within and not prior to the Byzantine synthesis of the Ordo, while what we have called the new liturgical function of chanting was connected essentially with the 'secular' form of the liturgical tradition. The same can be said about the ceremonial complication of worship. It will be adopted and 'integrated' within the final Ordo from this 'secular' liturgical usage, above all from the festival cathedral ceremony of the church of St. Sofia. Once adopted and received, however, it will be reinterpreted in categories of monastic mystical theology.

But of course nowhere has the influence of the new liturgical piety been felt so powerfully as in the evolution— in the era after Constantine— of the liturgical year. It was here especially that our second 'stratum' in the Ordo was of decisive importance. Without going into the details of this process (we hope to dwell more fully on this in a special section of this study dealing with holy days), we want to indicate here its general meaning and path of development. Its general meaning lay in the transition from the original eschatological concept of the liturgical year to its acceptance in historical and myste-riological terms. We have already indicated that even in the last phase of its pre-Constantine 'formulation,' at the end of the third century, the structure

174

of the Church year continued to be an expression of the original theology of time or, to put it another way, of the theology of the Church as the Sacrament of the Kingdom in time. This theology also determined the Christian 'transposition' of the Jewish year, the Church's reception of Passover as the central festival of the passage from the 'aeon' of this world into the 'Aeon' of the Kingdom, as the beginning of the time of the Church, of her messianic and eschatological 'fulfilment.' The Church and her time were a triumph of the 'new day' over the old conquered time of this world. The Church herself, especially in her Eucharistic expression, in her fulfilment as the feast of the Kingdom, was a participation in the new life, the new time. In the fourth century, the idea of feast changed, and this change was connected with the reformation of the eschatological self-consciousness of

the Church. As Dom Odo Casel has written: 'The original and fundamental idea of the feast is to be contrasted with another which historically re-presents every event and saving act. Of these two concepts one concentrates on the work of Christ in its historical, the other in its metaphysical dimensions.' [62] Also bound up with this shift of emphasis was the multiplication of festivals, which is a characteristic feature of the fourth century. We already know that one of the major causes of this multiplication was the Church's need to replace the pagan festivals, to carry out the new missionary task which was suddenly set before her. 'There was a need in the now Christian Empire,' writes Daniélou, 'to replace the old pagan festivals with Christian festivals which would answer the demand basic in every society for holidays celebrating the most important moments in natural life. Clearly this kind of festival was unknown to early Christianity. For it the end of time was felt to be at hand. Baptism introduced each person into the only Feast the eternal Passover, the Eighth Day. There were no holidays— since everything had in fact become a holy day.' [63] The introduction of these holidays and their multiplication, while fully justified from the mis-

175

sonary standpoint, could not fail to alter the idea of holy days already existing in the Church. Holy days naturally acquired the meaning which they had in the minds of those for whom they were introduced: i.e. a mysteriological meaning. They acquired the significance of commemoration as a cultic re-enactment of the central actions in a given event, as a communion in this event, as a reception of its meaning, power and special efficacy. This is the mysteriological concept of a holy day. The word 'sacrament' (μυστήριον, *mysterion*), which in St. Paul's writing and in early Christianity as a whole meant always the whole Body of Christ, the whole of salvation, was now as it were narrowed down and used to define separate holy days, sacred actions and ceremonies, in which the essence of the individual actions of our Saviour were remembered by and communicated to the faithful. 'Here is another work of Christ, another sacrament,' exclaims St. Gregory the Theologian on the Feast of the Epiphany, 'Christ is transfigured, and we also will shine gloriously with Him. Christ is Baptized, let us also descend with Him, that we may also rise with Him....' [64] 'Let us note this use of the word *mysterion* in connection with the "sacraments" of Jesus as a key to the new understanding of liturgical festivals,' writes Daniélou. 'This usage, so closely related to the mysteriological cults, appeared only in this period.' A similar evolution was taking place at the same time in the West. 'It is necessary to look in the works of St. Ambrose and later St. Augustine,' writes

P. de Chellink, 'for the source of that terminology which Pope Leo was to popularize half a century later and which involved the application of the word *sacramentum* to every dogma and feast of the liturgical cycle. *Sacramentum incarnationis, passionis, resurrectionis redemptionis, ascensionis...*' [65] As it acquired its own identity in contrast to other holidays, each holiday naturally became the expression of a definite theological idea, became a dogmatic feast. Holidays were 'set apart not only as commemorations of individual events in Christ's life but also as the expression and affirmation of separate elements in the Church's doctrine. It has been noted more than once

176

that the multiplication of feasts went hand in hand with the great theological controversies and was in a way a reflection of the results attained in these controversies. Thus the development of the nativity cycle was connected on the one hand with the necessity to Christianize and 'church' the dates of the great pagan feasts of December 25 (*natale invicti solis* ["birth of the unconquered sun"]) and January 6 (the birth of Ion or Dionysius),\* and on the other hand with the fight for Nicene orthodoxy, for the term ὁμοούσιον (*homoousion* ["of one essence"]). [66] Typical was the substitution by the Cappadocians of the earlier name of the feast— ἐπιφανεῖα (*epiphaneia*)— by a newer and more theological term: Θεοφανεῖα (*Theophaneia*), God-manifestation. Christmas is simultaneously the feast of the triumph over the darkness of paganism (the manifestation of the 'sun of truth'), and of the triumph of Nicaea over Arianism (the affirmation of the divine nature of Christ). [67] The content and purpose of the liturgical mystery came to be the revelation and communication to its participants of a definite saving truth about God and Christ, which in turn led to the rise of the 'Feast Day' in its pure form, for example, the Feast of the Circumcision of the Lord in the nativity cycle, or the special day of the Holy Spirit after Pentecost. [68]

---

\* [Subsequent scholarship has proven this commonly held idea to be incorrect, and hence the entire discussion in these paragraphs must be modified. The date of these feasts results from back-calculation from the Quartodeciman date of Pascha, and not from an effort to 'baptize' or to 'substitute for' the pagan feasts. In fact, the relationship actually seems to have gone the other way around: the pagan festivals, fairly minor before the development of the Christian feasts, were emphasized in order to *counteract* them, as more and more people became Christian. See Thomas J. Talley, "The Day of His Coming", in *The Origins of the Liturgical Year* (Pueblo Books, Liturgical Press, Collegeville: 1986 and 1991), pp 79-103, and "Further Light on the Quartodeciman Pascha and the Date of the Annunciation", *Studia Liturgica* 33 (2003) 151-58.]

In the development of the Nativity cycle we have the best example of the process which led to the new concept and function of a Feast Day in the liturgical life of the Church. First a 'missionary' factor determined the substitution of the pagan *natale solis* by the feast *Natale Christi*, the manifestation of the Saviour to the world. Then, under the influence of the historico-mysteriological concept of a Feast Day on the one hand, and of the dogmatic controversies on the other, this ancient Feast of the Epiphany was splintered: the date of December 25th became a special commemoration of the God-made-Man, January 6th of the Lord's Baptism as a Divine Epiphany, i.e. the first manifestation of the Trinity in the world. And finally, a third 'historical' stage is seen in the further development of the cycle: the appearance of the special weeks before, Christmas of the Fore-

177

fathers and the Fathers, the intermediate Feast of the Circumcision, and the final Feast of the Purification. This was wholly analogous to the development of the Paschal cycle— with its gradual completion in the special historical commemorations of Holy Week, the Ascension, and the Descent of the Holy Spirit.[69]

But the real, and in a way paradoxical result of this development and multiplication of Feast Days was the gradual weakening of the idea of the Church year as a liturgical whole. The dogmatic and mysteriological concept of the feast as a kind of special and isolated liturgical event gradually changed its 'relationship' to the whole, to any single theology of time embracing the whole liturgical life of the Church. No matter how strange it may sound, there was a greater connection with time, a greater 'cosmic' content in the original and eschatological concept of worship and its rhythm than in the elaborately detailed and perfected Church Year of a later era. This is explained first of all by the fact that every Feast Day in this 'mysteriological' piety became an end in itself. As such it acquired a depth, beauty and richness of content which indeed transmitted the inexhaustible 'joy of the Church,' in the words of Fr. S. Bulgakov. But at the same time it ceased to be really connected with time, to be its real fulfilment as 'the new time,' as the manifestation in the time of 'this world' of the fullness of the Kingdom. Feast Days came to be experienced as a series of 'breakthroughs' into a sort of other world, as communion in a reality in no way connected with 'this world.' It would not be hard to show that our present Church Year has no real, organic wholeness. It is divided into a series of festal cycles frequently interwoven with one another, yet inwardly disunified and out of harmony. Theoretically the Paschal cycle embraces the whole year. But a multitude of other cycles and feast days have been

inserted into it, each subject to another 'key' and unconnected with it on the calendar. The idea of the year as a unit and as real time within which the Church dwells for the purpose

178

of its fulfilment is so weak that the Byzantine list of months begins with September, a month which in our present calendar has no special liturgical 'significance' whatever. In the Nativity cycle the original theme of the yearly renewal, the end of the 'old time' and the beginning of the 'new,' which connected this feast with the annual 'birth' of the sun and the return of light to the world, although it is reflected in our liturgical texts, is so little understood by the mind of the Church that the 'Church's New Year' is separated from the world's New Year quite painlessly. The date of the Feast became in fact indifferent— since the liturgical formula 'On this day...' ('On this day the Virgin bore the Eternal One') is in no way connected with time. The whole meaning of the Feast Day is to give us a vision of the eternal 'this day,' i.e. of the supra-temporal, ideal substance of the enacted 'mystery.' The traditional interest of the Church in the calendar (cf. the controversies over the old and new style of dating) is completely academic. Least of all is there an interest here in real time. On the contrary, there is a conscious or unconscious faith in a 'sacred calendar' having no direct relationship with real time.

### *The Multiplication of Holy Days*

Very striking in this respect is the later development of secondary Feast Days and cycles. If in the Paschal and Christmas cycles there is still at least a theoretical connection with the year (time) and its rhythm, this disappears completely later on. The dating of the Feast of the Transfiguration of the Lord on August 6th has no explanation other than that this was the date of consecration of three churches on Mount Tabor.[70] Before its 'formulation' as a separate Feast Day, however, the commemoration of the Transfiguration was certainly connected with the Paschal cycle and this is still indicated in the *troparion* and *kontakion* for this day: 'Let them look upon Thee crucified....' And in the west the Gospel account of the Transfiguration is still the lection

179

for the first Sunday of Lent. On the other hand, among the Armenians this Feast Day enters into the calendar of liturgical weeks. This is a vestige of the time when the Transfiguration was a part of every cycle of time. Once torn away from the whole it became overgrown with its own cycle of 'pre-festal' and 'festal' material, and has become isolated from the general structure of the litur-

gical year. Even more interesting is the history of the Mariological festivals. Veneration of the Mother of God was first expressed in the form of 'supplementary' feast days (*fêtes concomitantes* in the words of A. Baumstark). The Feast of the Cathedral of the Most Holy Virgin must be regarded as the first of these days, directly connected as it was with the Nativity of Christ (and by analogy also with the commemoration of John the Baptist after the Feast of our Lord's Baptism). Here it was still related to the general structure of the cycle, it still occupied a definite and 'logical' place in it. In the West there was an accompanying development of the *Natale Sanctae Mariae* on January 1st, noted in several ancient liturgical texts. In the East—in the Syrian tradition there were also the two last Sundays before Christmas, called 'Annunciation Sundays,' dedicated one to the memory of the Mother of God and the other to that of John the Baptist.[71] All this points to the primitive connection of the veneration of the Mother of God with the Nativity cycle, which in turn was defined originally by the idea of the year. This connection was weakened as the idea of the Feast Day was isolated from the general structure of the liturgical year. Our present cycle of great Mariological feasts cannot really be called a cycle at all. The dates of these feasts are accidental, with the exception of the date of the Annunciation—which has a purely artificial connection with the Nativity cycle (nine months before Christmas).[72] The Feast of the Assumption, on August 15th, originates in the

180

consecration of a church to the Mother of God located between Bethlehem and Jerusalem,[73] and the dates of September 8th[74] and November 21st[75] have a similar origin. Outside the Mariological cycle there appeared, for similar reasons, the Feast of the Exaltation of the Cross (connected with the consecration of the Holy Sepulchre),[76] and the Feast of the Beheading of John the Baptist on August 29th (the consecration of the Church of St. John the Baptist in Samaria at Sebaste).[77]

### *A New Understanding of Time*

The development of the 'liturgical year' in the Byzantine era may be defined far more accurately as a development of Feast Days. The new historico-mysteriological idea of the Feast Day was after all not connected with time or the theology of time, or with any clear understanding of how the Church (the new people of God belonging to the Aeon of the Kingdom) was related to 'this world,' to the old aeon. Instead it was rooted in a special concept of commemoration in which an event of the past is 'made present' in all its saving and sanctifying power. The original understanding of the Feast Day,

which we find in the early Christian experience of the Lord's Day or of the Passover, was rooted primarily in the awareness of the Church herself as a Feast Day, as the actualization of the 'eschaton' in this world. Hence its profound connection with real time, with the time of 'this world.' The early Christian theology of the 'eschaton' did not destroy, did not empty time, or abolish its significance, but transformed it into the 'time of the Church,' into the time of salvation. Within the

181

Church time becomes a progressive movement toward the fullness of the Kingdom of Christ, toward His cosmic and historical triumph. This world is condemned by the coming of Christ 'in the fullness of time'; by His death and resurrection heaven and earth are done away. But by this same coming the world is saved in 'the children of light,' in the new people of God, in the Church, where it acquires the life of a new creation. So then a 'Feast Day' is in fact the fulfilment in the Church of the new life, a communion through the Church in the 'New Aeon.' In 'this world' where Christ was condemned to death a true Feast Day is impossible... 'in this world you will be sorrowful.' In this world the Church is 'possible' only as a 'station,' an expectation, a preparation, as an ascetical action. But Christ overcame the world and triumphed over it; in Him there was accomplished a renewal of nature and a new creature was born, there was the beginning of a new life. The Kingdom of God was at hand. Those who are in Him now overcome the world, which means that they receive their life in Him as new life and have the power which comes with a new and pure communion with Him. In other words their very life in this world is already a new life—a life in grace—in and through which the world itself is renewed. 'For the pure all things are pure.' This same condemned world becomes in the Church the 'matter' of the Eucharist, is transformed into the Body of Christ. The Church does not simply dwell in this world, waiting for the end of the world. The very fact that she is dwelling in the world is its salvation. The Church condemns it to exhaustion and death, but she also is its resurrection and the beginning of new life. The Feast Day in the early Church was eschatological because it was the manifestation and actualization of the Church herself, as the new life, as an anticipation of the unending day of the Kingdom. This was the sole content of 'Feast Day' for Christians dwelling in 'this world.' But to the extent that such a day was eschatological it was connected also with the real time of 'this world,' since it was only for the sake of this world 'which God so loved' that the Church was created, with her vocation to be

the world renewed by the power of Christ's victory in it and over it. Hence the significance for the early Church of a 'reckoning of time,' a calendar, a correspondence between the liturgical year and the 'cosmic' year, a significance which is becoming ever more apparent to historians who have delivered themselves from a one-sided and false understanding of the 'eschatology' of early Christianity as complete indifference to the world. One could even go so far as to say that only in early Christianity were the categories of time— the week and the year— real, and real from the liturgical standpoint, since the Church's liturgy itself was rooted in a theology of time, in a contrasting conjunction of the time of this world and the time of the Kingdom. The new idea of the Feast Day which developed out of its acceptance as something 'mysteriological' was a departure from this theology. Its object was not the time of the Church but the history of salvation understood mysteriologically, as something liturgically commemorated and repeatedly experienced in the cult in all its saving significance. The connection of such a Feast Day with real time, i.e. with the world and its life as measured by time, was more or less accidental. If in the comparatively early Nativity cycle both the theme and the content of the Feast were to a certain extent defined by its place in 'real time,' by its date in the cosmic year, then in the later liturgical development any date (even one chosen at random) acquired all its significance from the Feast celebrated on that day. The Church calendar which was formed as a result of this process is simply a listing of the dates of separate feasts and cycles more or less artificially set in the framework of 'real time.' In mysteriological theology the commemorated or celebrated event is in itself an extra-temporal eternal reality and the meaning of the celebration consists in the spiritual contemplation of this reality and communion with it, by way of its liturgical performance and elucidation. Such celebrations are set in the framework of the calendar and form in it a series of sacred as opposed to non-sacred, profane or 'working days.' This distinction changes nothing in time

itself, since it is not the bringing into old time of the principle of its renewal and conquest by the 'new life'; there is here no inner subordination of the old time to the Aeon of the Kingdom, nor is old time illuminated by the New Aeon. Rather it is the setting apart and 'sacralization' of separate bits of old time and their conversion into 'sacred time' to mark the contrast with time that is profane. In the early eschatological theology of time, time as such, i.e. the time of 'this world,' could not become 'sacred,' since the 'form of this world was passing

away.' It could not become the Kingdom; it was ultimately condemned, and 'lay in evil.' The Lord's Day is not 'one out of several' days of the week and does not belong to time, just as the Church is 'not of this world,' and cannot be a part of it. But at the same time the Lord's Day, the first and eighth day, does exist in time and is revealed in time, and this revelation is also the renewal of time, just as the existence of the Church in the world is its renewal and salvation. In the eschatological consciousness of the early Church the central categories were not 'sacred' and 'profane' but 'old' and 'new'; the fallen and the saved; the regenerated. For believers, for those who had been baptized and regenerated and who had tasted the Kingdom, participation in the new time meant that the whole of time became new, just as in their new life the whole world was being renewed. Their life was not divided up into 'profane working days' and 'sacred feast days.' The old had passed, now all things were new. So then their calendar could not be merely a rhythmic alternation of 'profane' and 'sacred' days. It expressed the antithetical conjunction of the Church and the world, in which 'this world' and its time— not by being sanctified as such but rather by dying away— is transformed into a 'new creation,' becoming a new time, rising into a new life. This calendar was not symbolic but real, just as real as the 'new life' in Christ and the victory 'overcoming the world— even our faith.' But the antinomy disappears in the categories of 'sacred' and 'profane.' Sacred feast days belong wholly to the time of this world, they are distinguished only as being 'holy' days. They can delimit time—

by being usually associated with certain dates, and can 'break into' time— by the mysteriological commemoration of a certain event. They can, in other words, introduce into time a kind of 'other world,' an alien reality; but they do not transform it into new time, they do not renew it from within.

The evolution of the 'Lord's Day' must be regarded as the first instance of this departure from the eschatological understanding of the Feast Day. Constantine's decree made Sunday the official holy day and the day of weekly rest. In doing this he returned it to the week, setting it within the rhythm of the 'old' time, with its alternation of holy and working days. But in this sanctioning of the day of Resurrection there was a weakening of its understanding and experience as the New Day, as the manifestation of the new time in the old. Sunday simply replaced Saturday, acquiring all its sacred functions. But in the Old Testament, in the Judaic tradition (as we have pointed out) even the sabbath had a connection with the eschatological reckoning of time. It was not only the com-

memoration of the cosmic 'It is very good' of Creation but also of the Last Day, thus pointing to its own fulfillment in the 'New Sabbath' of the messianic Kingdom. In the context of the Hellenistic understanding of a sacred day, the day of the Resurrection was 'naturalized,' was finally merged with the idea of the natural cycle of work and rest. Later this same idea was transferred to other Feast Days. Once the Feast Day became in content the mysteriological commemoration of a certain extra-temporal reality having no essential connection with time whatever, it acquired the character in the Church's Calendar of a 'holy' day, an interruption of work, a holiday.

It is true that what developed as a result of this evolution of Feast Days was in fact a Christian year, that is, a general scheme or Calendar which was gradually filled out by custom, traditions, special local circumstances, etc., etc. Natural social and family life was in some sense in harmony with this Calendar. From this viewpoint the 'missionary victory' of the Church should not be minimized. Nor should it be exaggerated, however, as it often is by those

185

who see this linking of the life of the common people with the dates of the Calendar as the major expression of the 'churching' of life and the cosmic victory of Christianity. This victory was at best equivocal. We are unable to dwell here on the countless examples of 'double faith' in the Church, the preservation of pagan customs and beliefs under the mask of Christian Feast Days. It is no accident that this 'double faith' was revealed most strongly precisely in the annual liturgical cycle. Most important, the ambiguity of the victory was a theological and liturgical ambiguity. For although, as we shall see below, the Feast Day preserved its ecclesiological and eschatological content and meaning in the depths of the Church's consciousness—in the deep and ultimate 'logic' of the Church's *lex orandi*—nevertheless this content was expressed least of all in the 'Christian Year' or Calendar as it existed in the empirical life of the Church. That theology of time and the Church which the Feast Day 'actualizes' liturgically finds only a partial, incomplete and oblique expression in the Calendar, and is almost completely rejected in our present 'liturgical piety.' Feast Days and festal cycles remain disconnected and isolated. Many aspects and moments of man's life in the world are marked and adorned by these days, but in the understanding of 'liturgical piety' they do not appear as the new time, the time of the Church, which alone can truly renew the life of 'this world' and transform it into the life of the New Creation.

## The Veneration of Saints

Last but not least in our description of the second 'stratum' of the Ordo, we must take note of the extraordinary and rapid growth of the veneration of saints which marks the history of worship from the fourth century on. Since the early work of the Bollandists the study of the cult of saints has developed into a specialized and complex science, and there is no need for us to describe here in any detail the process of the inclusion of an ever-increasing

186

number of memorials to the saints in the Ordo.[78] It would be hardly an exaggeration to say that at present no less than half of all the liturgical texts of the Orthodox Church have some connection with historiography and the glorification of the saints. In the overwhelming majority of cases the 'rubrics' give preference to this material over the texts of the *Oktoichos* (the weekly cycle), so that the *Menaion* can really be called the most frequently used of all the liturgical books. The attention of liturgical historians has been for some time directed at this virtual inundation of worship by the monthly calendar of saints' days. Certainly this inundation is a significant and striking fact in the whole development of liturgical piety. It is now known that the veneration of saints began in the local cult. It was at first the veneration by the local Church of her own martyrs and leaders. 'The primitive *sanctorale*,' writes Baumstark, 'was rooted in a strictly local and two-faceted tradition: the *memoriae* of local martyrs and bishops, whose commemoration was inseparably connected with their place of burial. It is this connection which gave birth to the system of stations, touching all liturgical functions. This principle of stations was by nature in keeping with the primitive form of the *sanctorale*, with its connection of a specific liturgical commemoration with a specific location.' [79] The local character of the cult of saints was preserved up to the end of the third century, and the close connection between this veneration and the grave or body of the saint must be regarded as its essential and distinctive feature. It is an accepted fact that the early Church knew nothing of our distinction between glorified or canonized saints and 'ordinary' members' of the Church. Holiness pertained to the Church and all those who constituted the Church were holy because they were members of a holy people.[80] The setting apart of the bodies of the

187

martyrs for special liturgical veneration was rooted therefore not in any specific opposition of holy to non-holy, but in the early Church's faith that Christ appeared (was revealed) in the martyr in a special way, bearing

witness (*martyria*) through the martyr to His own power and victory over death.[81] The body of a martyr was therefore a witness left to the Church, a pledge of the final victory of Christ. Hence the connection from earliest times between the Eucharist and the *natalia*, the memorial days of the martyrs.[82] This connection points not to a liturgical emphasis on the saint's name in the original cult of saints (commemoration in the modern sense of the word) but rather to its eschatological character, to the early Christian faith that the Kingdom of God which was coming in power (the new life now stronger than death) was actually 'attested' in martyrdom. Furthermore the cult of saints in the early Church was not mediatory. The supplication *ora pro nobis* ('pray for us') in the *graffiti* of the catacombs was addressed to all the faithful departed in the communion of the Church. Nor was it sanctifying, in the sense of a sanctification of the faithful by way of touching the remains of the saint. It was sacramentally eschatological. It was 'sacramental' in the sense that the presence of Christ attested to by the martyr's exploit was manifested in his body. It was eschatological because the martyr by his death demonstrated the power given to him by the Church ('The water of life whispers within me: "Come unto the Father,"' said St. Ignatius), and because in his decision to die that he might live he manifested its reality. In celebrating the Eucharist on the martyr's tomb the Church confessed and revealed that she belonged to this new life and had the same desire which St. Ignatius confessed on the way to his death: 'I desire the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ; I wish to drink His blood, which is incorruptible love...' i.e., the desire for the fullness of the Kingdom, its fulfilment in the final triumph of the Lord.

188

Basically the cult of the saints remained faithful to this original concept— even when the age of persecution ended, even in the period of its greatest growth. While they built martyr-churches and surrounded them with ecstatic veneration, Christians did not forget the original meaning of 'holiness' as the Church's self-attestation. From this viewpoint the results of Grabar's painstaking analysis of the influence of the cult of saints on architecture are remarkable: 'Architecture of the fourth and fifth centuries,' he writes, 'did not allow itself to be carried away by popular distortions of Christianity. From our analysis of eastern Syrian and Greek churches we must recognize the following essential fact: No matter what location was assigned in these churches for the preservation of the saint's relics or the celebration of his cult, and, no matter what their architectural form, all these churches were constructed for the normal Eucharistic assembly.' [83] In other words, that whole development of the

cult of saints which found expression in the connection of their sepulchres with churches and later with altars, in relating the body of the martyr to the Eucharist— all this bears witness to the development of the original and basic understanding of the place of the saints in the Church and her worship. But at the same time this area of the Church's life was subjected perhaps more than others to the pressure of the new 'liturgical piety.' At one time the theory was fashionable that the Christian cult of saints was essentially a 'transformation' of the ancient pagan cult of gods and heroes.[84] This theory, like the one which deduced the whole Christian cult from the pagan mysteries, is probably not defended seriously today. The critical works of such scholars as Fr. H. Delehaye, the publication of texts, the great 'theological' penetration into Church history, have brought the whole question of the veneration of saints back into a more healthy perspective. 'Almost all these supposed metamorphoses,' writes Delehaye, 'were based on superficial comparisons, and if one carefully weighs each argument

189

advanced by critics of this tradition, one will be struck by the logical consequences of their fundamental error.' [85] This error was the simple assumption that the cult of saints originated in the cult of gods and heroes. What actually happened was that the Church's quite independent and unique veneration of saints (it was rooted, after all, in the faith and experience of the Church) began, from the fourth century on, to be coloured more and more by elements belonging to the mysteriological 'liturgical piety,' and appropriated many of its features. In the broadest terms this change may be defined as follows. The 'emphasis' in the cult of saints shifted from the sacramentally eschatological to the sanctifying and intercessory meaning of veneration. The remains of the saint, and later even articles belonging to him or having once touched his body, came to be regarded as sacred objects having the effect of communicating their power to those who touched them. Here is the basis of the cult of the saints which appeared in the Church in the fourth century. The early Church treated the relics of the martyrs with great honour— 'But there is no indication,' writes Fr. Delehaye, 'that any special power was ascribed to relics in this era, or that any special, supernatural result would be obtained by touching them. Toward the end of the fourth century, however, there is ample evidence to show that in the eyes of believers some special power flowed from the relics themselves.' [86] This new faith helps to explain such facts as the invention of relics, their division into pieces, and their movement or translation, as well as the whole development of the veneration of 'secondary holy objects'— objects which have touched relics and

become in turn themselves sources of sanctifying power. At the same time the intercessory character of the cult of saints was also developing. Again this was rooted in the tradition of the early Church, in which prayers addressed to deceased members of the Church were very widespread, as evidenced by the inscriptions in the catacombs. But between this early practice and that which developed gradually from the fourth

190

century on there is an essential difference. Originally the invocation of the departed was rooted in the faith in the 'communion of saints'—prayers were addressed to any departed person and not especially to martyrs. In the new life of the Church the communion of saints in Christ (their prayers for one another and their bond of love) was not destroyed by death, since in Christ no one was dead, all were alive. But a very substantial change took place when this invocation of the departed was narrowed down and began to be addressed only to a particular category of the departed. From the fourth century onward there appeared in the Church first a practical and unnoticed but later a carefully worked out theological concept of the saints as special intercessors before God, as intermediaries between men and God. Saint Augustine was the first, perhaps, to offer a definition of the difference between prayers for the dead and prayers addressed to the saints, a distinction which lies at the heart of the whole subsequent cult of saints in the Church. 'The righteousness (*justitia*) of the martyrs is perfect,' writes St. Augustine, 'they have attained perfection through their action. Therefore, the Church does not pray for them. She prays for others of the faithful departed; but she does not pray for the martyrs. They have departed from this world in such perfection that instead of being our "clients" they are our advocates' (*ut non sint suscepti nostri sed advocati*).[87] The original Christocentric significance of the veneration of saints was altered in this intercessory concept. In the early tradition the martyr or saint was first and foremost a witness to the new life and therefore an image of Christ. Not only did the veneration of such a martyr have reference to Christ, to Christ's glorification, it was also by its very nature a manifestation of this new life, a communion with the martyr in this life. Therefore the liturgical cult included the Eucharist and the reading of the martyr's acts or a description of his trial and death (*passio*). The purpose of this reading was to show the presence and action of Christ in the martyr, i.e., the presence in him of the 'new life.' It was not meant to

191

'glorify' the saint himself. For the glory revealed and manifested in the martyr was the glory of Christ and the glory of the Church. The martyr was primarily an example, a witness, a manifestation of this glory, and the description of his acts therefore had a didactic significance. But in the new intercessory view of the saint the centre of gravity shifted. The saint is now an intercessor and a helper. 'The healthy person,' writes Theodoret of Syria, 'asks (the saint) for the preservation of his health; the sick, for healing. Childless couples ask the martyrs for children, and women appeal to them that they may become mothers. Those who are about to set off on a journey hope that the saints will be their travel companions, and those who return offer them thanks. They are addressed not as gods, but as divine people, who are asked to intercede....'[88] Hence in the liturgical cult the shift in emphasis to the glorification of the saint's power, to the description and praise of his miracles, to his mercy and kindness towards those who turn to him for help. We know also how important in the development of Christian hagiography was the adoption of the form of the panegyric. 'A careful examination of these panegyrics,' writes R. Aigrain on this point, 'reveals often an eloquent use of rhetoric, and such a studied effort to conform to the laws of eulogy and to the rules laid down for this type of composition by the Sophists that nothing else is noticed, especially when the orator states his resolve to avoid such embellishments. The formulas used by an author to declare that he is occupied with the loftiest verities and therefore will not restrict himself to the established usages of this school remain nevertheless so clearly dependent on them that we are provided with a complete review of themes previously dealt with by the Sophist masters: Menander of Laodicea or Theo of Alexandria....'[89] It was precisely this conventional, rhetorical form of solemn praise which almost wholly determined the liturgical texts dealing with the veneration of saints. One cannot fail to be struck

192

by the rhetorical element in our *Menaion*, and especially the 'impersonality' of the countless prayers to and readings about the saints. Indeed this impersonality is retained even when the saint's life is well known and a wealth of material could be offered as an inspired 'instruction.' While the lives of the saints are designed mainly to strike the reader's imagination with miracles, horrors, etc., the liturgical material consists almost exclusively of praises and petitions.

We may close our brief analysis of the second layer of the Ordo with some remarks about the development of the monthly calendar. The honouring of saints, which

little by little was separated from the place of burial and from any direct connection with the saint's body, fell almost at once into the category of the Feast Day which we have described above. It became a mysteriological commemoration having as its purpose the communication to the faithful of the sacred power of a particular saint. The saint is present and as it were manifested in his relics or icon,[90] and the meaning of his holy day lies in the acquiring of sanctity by means of praising him and coming into contact with him, which is, as we know, the main element in mysteriological piety. In this way the idea and experience of the Feast Day is separated all the more from time and the theology of time. In the mind of the faithful the difference between a Feast Day marking an event in the sacred history of salvation and a Feast Day of a saint is only one of degree, not a difference in the 'nature' or 'function' of the Feast days themselves. Both are holy days— both are independent and self-sufficient occasions for liturgical pomp and ceremony, sacred days requiring a corresponding liturgical 'formulation.' Two Feast Days which are completely different in their origin, nature and function in the Church (for example, the Circumcision and the commemoration of St. Basil the Great) can be celebrated at the same time, and gradually the Church's Ordo works out a complicated system of principles to handle such concurrences. The idea of the Feast Day as a sacred day of rest, and of the festival as a sanctifying, mysteriological cultic act, has almost completely

193

displaced the original meaning of the Feast as the passage constantly being realized in the Church from the old to the new, the passage out of 'this aeon,' out of time, out of the life of this world, and into the new time of the new creation.

### 3. The Third Stratum: The Monastic Ordo

We have already spoken about the influence of monasticism on the development of worship, on the third 'stratum' of the Ordo. We may recall that under the influence both of monasticism's original ideology and of the liturgical situation in which it found itself following its 'anchorite' withdrawal from the Church's community, the determining fact in monastic worship was the inclusion in it of a devotional rule or, more accurately, the merging of this rule with the original Ordo of the Church. The beginnings and the development of this merger are very evident in the early ordos of the Pachomite monasteries, and later in the descriptions of them by Cassian. In the

*Angelic Rule* the devotional rule is related basically to the hours of prayer in the Church, but consists of completely uniform rites in each of which there is a reading of twelve psalms and prayers. Its 'hours' originate in the Church's 'rule of prayer,' but its content comes from the devotional rules of the hermits. '*The Rule of Holy Pachomios*' writes Skaballanovich, 'introduces special and more uniform services. in place of the Church's services, which were inaccessible to the monks, obliged as they were to remain in the monastery without priests.'[91] In the writing of Cassian, who lived in Egypt in the last decade of the fourth century, we see a further stage in the development of this monastic Rule. The devotional rule became worship, and acquired a 'rite' (*modum*) which Cassian describes in detail. An ascetical devotional rule has been turned into worship: 'It is to be observed,' writes Skaballanovich, 'how everything which had been developed in worship up to that time by the secular churches was

194

eliminated: not only the litanies and special prayers (which was natural, since a person in orders was considered necessary for their recitation), but even the psalms appropriate to the hour of worship— the 141st at Vespers and the 63rd at Matins. The psalter was sung in worship simply in sequence, and the whole service was determined by this procedure.'[92] This 'chanting of the psalter in sequence was the basic change introduced by monasticism into the liturgical Ordo. What had been characteristic of the early Ordo was the *psalmus fixus*, a specific psalm related in its theme to the structure of worship— expressing some particular element of this structure. The reading of psalms in sequence preserved in our present-day *kathismata*, and also the reading of Scripture according to the principle of *lectio continua*, separated these readings from 'structure,' or rather, introduced into the rite ascetical elements quite independent and unconnected with its general order. What is typical of monastic worship is the emphasis on the quantity of assigned readings or chants, because the quantity of texts or the length of worship has become a measure of the ascetical exploit, a measure of the strictness of the devotional rule. In the writings of Pachomius, Hieronymus [Jerome] and Cassian there are many indications of 'holy discord' among the monks over the length of the rule, the number of psalms, and so on.[93] 'Each according to his zeal, without remembering the weakness of others, wished to introduce into the rule what he considered to be easy of fulfilment. Some were thinking of requiring a huge number of psalms, one fifty, another sixty, while others were not satisfied with this number and felt it was necessary to assign even more.'[94] In this way the

principle of inserted and structurally unconnected readings entered into the Ordo and has remained, along with the 'principle of prolongation' (the repetition of the same prayer— like the 'Lord have mercy upon us'— forty times; the supplementary readings in the liturgies for fast and feast days, etc.), an idea which regards worship not so much as a 'rite' (as a dialectical elaboration of a theme) as it

195

is a rhythm of prayer, requiring above all— if it is to be useful— a prolonged ascetical effort.

Deprived in its very structure of 'dramatic ceremonial,' monastic worship has nevertheless made its mark on this aspect of the cult too. First of all there are the prostrations or bows, which still play such a large part in the prescriptions of the *Typicon*. Indeed, a whole type of worship is defined by this word. Cassian comments on the significance attached to bowing in the monastic devotional rule, and finds it necessary to give a detailed comparison of western and eastern practices. They (the Egyptian fathers) begin and end the appointed prayers,' he writes, 'in such a way that in finishing a psalm they do not immediately bend the knee, as certain of us do... But, before bending the knee they pray for a while, and spend more time in this standing prayer (than in bending the knee). After this, having fallen down for a very brief moment, as if only to pay respect to the Divine goodness, they quickly rise again...'[95] This attention to bowing, which might appear to be a minor detail, is in fact quite significant. There is the expression here of another ethos, another experience or sense of worship, distinct from both the original and the 'secular' concepts. The bow, as a ceremony of ritual veneration, like the *adoratio* (προσκύνησις, *proskynêsis*) in the imperial ritual, is subconsciously transformed into the expression of a spiritual state— the state of contrition, repentance and receptivity, and it is precisely this state which the monk seeks to embody in worship. Even in its most *kenotic* form, when it was devoid of all external solemnity, early Christian worship was still solemn in its nature and purpose, since its object was always the Kingdom, manifested, revealed, and given by Jesus the Lord. We have seen how secular and liturgical piety embodied this inner solemnity in the mode of external solemnity, in chanting, in praise, in the ritual, dramatic development of the whole cult. Monasticism, on the contrary, strove to exclude outward solemnity from its worship, since worship when seen primarily as a devotional rule is an exploit, an ascetical act, repentance, a protracted spiritual activity. 'Monks have not

196

left the world,' says the Abbot Pamus, 'in order to make fools of themselves before God, to sing songs, to raise their voices, to wave their hands and stamp their feet. We ought rather to lift our prayers to God with much fear and trembling, with tears and sighs, with reverence and deep feeling, with a soft and humble voice.'[96] It was not just bowing as such which became an organic part of the liturgical Ordo and one of its determining principles, but also that ascetically penitential concept of worship which the bow expressed.

### *Fasting*

Special mention must be made of the way in which the theory and practice of fasting as adopted by monasticism were reflected in the liturgical Ordo. As we have seen, fasting in the Church was originally related to worship and involved the complete abstinence from food over a relatively short time. The idea of fasting was rooted in biblical typology. 'John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine... the Son of Man, came eating and drinking...' (Luke 7:33-4). John the Baptist is the figure of the Old Covenant, of waiting and preparation for the Kingdom, and his figure is one of fasting. But in Christ the messianic Kingdom has come and is revealed— how then can the 'guests of the wedding feast fast, when the bridegroom is with them?' (Luke 5:34). In biblical typology the Kingdom is described as a banquet, i.e., as the breaking of a fast. The Eucharist is the Banquet of the Kingdom, its eschatological anticipation, and therefore fasting is related to it— is thought of and undertaken in relation to it— as to the 'fulfilment' of the Church. In this view of fasting there is of course no differentiation between kinds of food, since it involves the complete abstinence from food. Inasmuch as 'for the pure all things are pure,' every kind of food is acceptable for Christians outside the fast. The monastic fast springs from a completely different premise. It is an ascetical

197

fast; fasting as mortification of the flesh and as a protracted effort to restore the spiritual freedom and essence of man. Adam's tasting of the forbidden fruit enslaved man to food, and the purpose of ascetical fasting is to return man to freedom, to a life which does not depend on bread alone. What is meant here by the term fast is not a complete abstinence from food but primarily the regulation of its quantity and quality. In early monasticism much space is given in the rubrics to rules concerning hours for eating, the methods of food preparation, its quality and quantity.[97] The rule of fasting is related therefore to the devotional rule and completes it. The purpose of each is the same: to assist the monk in

his ascent to perfection. But as the devotional rule became worship and began to determine worship from within, so also ascetical fasting as an individual exploit entered into the Ordo and exercised an influence upon its structure. Typical in our printed *Typicon* is the mixture of purely liturgical sections with prescriptions concerning fasting, and above all references to fasting as a liturgical principle. Under the influence of the monastic idea the principle of liturgical fasting, which occupied such a central place in the original Ordo, was relegated to a secondary position. It was transformed gradually into a disciplinary regulation for the receiving of Holy Communion 'on an empty stomach.' All this reflects the contradiction preserved in the Ordo up to the present day between the concepts of liturgical and ascetical fasting. According to the liturgical principle Eucharistic days cannot be fast days, because the Eucharist is itself both the breaking and the fulfilment of the fast. Hence the prohibition of fasting on the Lord's Day and on Saturday, as Eucharistic days (cf. Apost. Canon 66: 'If a presbyter fasts on the Lord's Day or Saturday, let him be deposed; if a layman, let him be excommunicated'). But according to the logic of ascetical fasting the whole of Lent is one long rule of abstinence— hence the prohibition against 'terminating the fast'— even on Eucharistic days. Fasting as a condition of the Church, as the rhythm of expectation and fulfilment which is a part of her eschatological nature, was

198

replaced by fasting as an ascetical act, and as such became the determining factor in the 'formulation' of our Ordo.

### *Eucharistic Practice*

Probably the most important and profound of all the changes brought about in 'liturgical piety' by monasticism was bound up with this view of worship as a devotional rule and the idea of ascetical fasting. We have in mind the monastic theory and practice of receiving Communion. Within monasticism the receiving of Communion, while it remained at the very heart of the Christian life, was broken away from the rhythm of the Church and entered into the rhythm of the individual's ascetical life. We have already mentioned early examples of 'private' Communion by hermits from the Holy Gifts reserved for this purpose, and also the celebration of 'private' liturgies of a sort in the cells of anchorites who did not wish to break their solitude. With the 'establishment' of monasticism in the cities and the development of monastic Ordos both these practices disappeared. But the principle which first appeared in them remained: the view of Communion as an ascetical activity— as an indi-

vidual act related to the individual needs or private spiritual state of the believer. It is not the variations in the Ordos or the differences in practice which are important for us here... whether Communion was received daily or comparatively rarely, or even only once a year. What is important is the appearance of the concept of 'frequent' and 'infrequent' Communion, a concept no longer connected with the Church's *lex orandi*, but with the spiritual state of the one receiving Communion, the decision of his spiritual director, or the discipline of the monastery, etc. What is most important (for the history of the Ordo) is the accompanying change in the place of the Eucharist in the whole structure of liturgical life. It is precisely this new view of Communion which must be related to the institution— in the monasteries— of the practice of a daily celebration of the Liturgy, of the Liturgy as something actually inserted into

199

the cycle of the Liturgy of time and regarded as simply one of the services in this cycle. As A. Salaville has shown clearly in his article 'Messe et Communion d'après les Typica monastiques byzantine',[98] 'the daily celebration of the Eucharist became the norm in monasteries in the eighth-ninth centuries. But this norm did not imply a daily receiving of Communion. Reception of Communion was governed by another, private rhythm. The daily Eucharist was the opportunity given to each one to establish, his own individual rhythm.[99] Once included within the liturgy of time, the theology of the Eucharist was changed, and also the theology of time related to it, which together had formed one of the foundations of the original Ordo. In this Ordo the rhythm of the Eucharist was determined by the rhythm of the Lord's Day, of the New Time, set within the framework of real time as the principle of its renewal, but also distinct from real time, since the Eucharist does not belong to time. Thus the distinction between liturgical and non-liturgical days in the early Ordo had another meaning than that which it acquired under the influence of the monastic Ordos. In reality no day in the time of 'this world' can be 'liturgical' or Eucharistic, because as such it is separated from the 'New Time' in which the Eucharist is celebrated and of which the Eucharist is the expression and actualization. On the other hand all this old time is renewed in the Church, and she lives a new life within it in all things. It was Ignatius of Antioch who wrote that Christians always live 'according to the Day of the Lord,'[100] and Origen who stated that 'the perfect Christian always belongs by nature to the Lord, in word and deed and thought... and dwells always in the Lord's day...'[101] The customary celebration of the Eucharist on a particular day signified therefore not the opposing of one day to all others, the

setting aside of a 'liturgical' day in contrast to simple (ferial) or non-liturgical days. On the contrary, it signified the antithetical relationship of the Church to time;

200

as the first day of the week it remained within the limits of the cycle of 'old time,' but in the Eucharist this day was 'renewed' as the first day, the beginning of the New Time, as the 'eighth day,' outside the limits of the week and therefore outside the limits of old time. In this way the old time was related to the new but not confused with it. This relationship expressed not the connection of the Eucharist with a particular day, but its conjunction with that time which the Church was 'renewing in her own life. On the other hand the customary celebration of the Eucharist on a particular day was based on the organic unity (in the mind of the early Church) of the Eucharist with the Assembly of the Church, and on the need therefore to observe at least some kind of set rhythm. In the monastic Ordo the concept of a liturgical day was altered. In practice every day became liturgical. It was the non-liturgical day which became special, a day on which for one reason or another there was no provision for a celebration of the Eucharist. In other words, the celebration of the Liturgy came to be understood as something self-evident and natural in time, while its non-celebration was regarded as a sign of the special nature of a given day or period in the Church's life. But if in its monastic origin this practice was still connected with an assembly of the community, since the daily Liturgy was still a part of the liturgical Ordo, in its adoption later by parish churches it led to a gradual separation of the Liturgy from the assembly, to an understanding of it as a service performed by the clergy and not necessarily requiring the participation of all— ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, *epi to auto*. Both views of the place of the Eucharist in the Church's liturgical life can be distinguished in our contemporary *Typicon*, the earlier one as well as the one which owed its appearance to monasticism. On the one hand the Eucharist is still 'prescribed' on Sunday and Feast Days, retaining its original connection with definite times and hours and its nature as a festival of the Church. In contrast to the West the practice of daily celebration has never acquired the character with us of a self-evident norm, except in the monasteries and great cathedrals and churches. It is still generally understood as a festal or

201

at least special service. On the other hand, this same Ordo, obviously assumes a daily celebration of the Liturgy. As an indication of this there is the series of apostolic and Gospel readings arranged as if the Liturgy was to be

celebrated each day (this late 'lectionary' undoubtedly originated in the monastic Ordo and was simply inserted in the final synthesis of the Ordo of the Church). Then there is the already mentioned distinguishing of non-liturgical days, which would be meaningless if in the Ordo which so definitely stresses this distinction the Liturgy was not thought of as a daily office.

Without developing this thought further it is possible to say that this monastic 'stratum' is connected with one of the most important and profound upheavals ever to occur in liturgical piety, precisely the separation of the Eucharist (in the minds of believers) from its eschatological and ecclesiological significance.

#### 4 The Synthesis of 'Secular' and 'Monastic' Practice

There is sufficient reason to believe that these two lines of liturgical development—the 'secular' and the 'monastic'—began not only to move apart in the course of time, but also to come into conflict. There was a definite liturgical 'polarization' in the approach to the Byzantine synthesis. Although the principle of the Church's *lex orandi* and its application to all believers was by no means denied in monastic circles, still the general spirit, of its 'transposition' within the secular post-Constantine liturgy of time certainly fell under a great shadow of doubt.[102] We have already referred to one of the Egyptian ascetics, quoted by Nikon of Chernigov. In him we heard a protest against the development of hymnody. Evidence of a similar protest is found at the beginning of the fifth century. In answer to the complaint of one accustomed to the hymns of Cappadocia a certain monk of Nitre said: 'As for the singing of *troparia* and *canons* and the use of musical melodies, this is suitable for secular priests and worldly men

202

in order that people may be drawn into the Church. For monks, however, who live far from the world's noise, such things are not useful.'[103] From the side of 'secular' worship we can also distinguish certain signs of opposition to the monastic type. We have already seen that for Simeon of Thessalonica, an advocate of the ancient *Sung Service*, the 'simple' worship of monasticism was a kind of decline. The canonical tradition has preserved traces of opposition to the monastic view of fasting. Also the services of so-called mixed type described in certain quite late versions of the *Typicon* bear witness to the peculiar conflict between these two general tendencies.[104]

We do not know how far this polarization went or what connection it has with the controversies and doubts about monasticism clearly indicated in memorials from the fourth century (in the canons of the Council of Gangra, for example). For the history of the Ordo it is important to recognize that this polarization was temporary and that it led to the combining of both tendencies in what we have called the Byzantine liturgical synthesis. Also important is the fact that this synthesis was 'formulated' by monasticism, that our modern *Typicon* can rightly be called monastic both in its form and content. But this monastic character of the Byzantine Ordo does not mean that the process of liturgical unification was a simple victory of monastic liturgical piety over what we have called 'secular' piety. For an understanding of the real nature of this unification and the meaning of the Byzantine synthesis, it is necessary to remember that the fundamental fact in its formulation was the return of monasticism into the world, and its subsequent theological evolution. This enthronement of monasticism, this crowning of the 'anchorite ideal of a separation from the world for the sake of the 'one thing needful' and of monasticism as the guide and conscience of the world, must be regarded as one of the great paradoxes of Byzantium. The chief exponent of this view of monasticism as the 'nerve and mainstay of the Church' (and therefore of the whole Christian

203

society) was St. Theodore of Studion.[105] The view was crystallized in its final form after the iconoclastic crisis, which was 'monastoclastic' as much as it was iconoclastic, and was a conflict in which the main glory of victory over heretical emperors must be credited to monasticism.

### *The Triumph of Monastic Piety*

But the process of return actually began much earlier, and by the end of the fourth century monasteries had begun to penetrate the capitals and other cities. In 586, according to the signatures on one official document, the Eparchy of Constantinople included sixty-eight monasteries for men while the neighbouring Eparchy of Chalcedon had forty.[106] The monks became instructors, spiritual advisers and teachers of the people, and also guardians of orthodoxy. One need only recall the role they played at the time of the Christological controversies and in the ecumenical councils. These facts may help us to understand the liturgical influence which the monasteries began to exercise even at a very early date. 'Constantinople,' writes Skaballanovich, 'created a special type of monastery, and long before the first blows struck by the Crusaders it had become a legislator in the realms

of cathedral and parish worship as well as that of the monasteries.' [107] Chrysostom also speaks of the monasteries in the region around Antioch.[108] The relationship between Egyptian monks and the Church of Alexandria are well documented.[109] Before becoming centres of liturgical life and legislators in matters of Ordo, however, the monasteries themselves had to modify their own worship. Among the anchorites' in the desert, cut off from the hierarchy, the liturgical situation was much different from that which was created now in the communal monasteries of the capital, built under the special patronage of the court and

204

aristocracy. 'It is reasonable to believe,' says Skaballanovich, 'that once separated from the life of the desert and called to satisfy the spiritual needs of the urban population, these monasteries were forced to accommodate themselves to the rites of the secular churches as developed in that time.' [110] A 'synthesis' of the two liturgical traditions was necessary and natural simply by virtue of external circumstances and the new 'status' of monasticism itself with the Church.

But operating to further this synthesis and bring it to completion was another, internal cause, no less important than these external factors. This was the evolution taking place in monasticism's understanding of itself or, as we said earlier, that new theology of monasticism which was adopted after it took root on the soil of Hellenistic culture. There is no need for us to set forth in detail the development of this mystical monastic theology, which runs from Origen through the Cappadocians, Evagrius, and Pseudo-Dionysius, down to Maxim the Confessor and the late Byzantine mystics. It is enough to say that this was an interpretation of monasticism in the language and categories of the neo-Platonic speculative tradition. In other words, it was an interpretation of monasticism in those same 'mysteriological' categories which were applied to worship from the fourth century on. The monastic life became a special initiation or mystery, and it is no accident that in Pseudo-Dionysius monasticism is counted in fact as one of the Church's Sacraments. Monasticism was an initiation into the path toward an exalted 'ecstasy,' to a flight into the 'cloud of unknowing,' which was indeed the true contemplation of God. It was the receiving of the form of an angel; and in Dionysius' teaching angels were heavenly intellects, a loftier hierarchy united in a system of mediation with the hierarchy of men. For Dionysius monasticism was next to the highest class in the Church—standing above the catechumens and 'sanctified ones' but beneath the hierarchy. According to Dionysius, the title of monk itself was an indication of that comprehensive, undivided, 'uniform'

or monadic life which monks must lead. They must direct their spirit toward the 'God-

205

formed monad.' Dionysius speaks in the same language and with the same concepts about worship. 'Worship is the path of deification and sanctification.' The Church, for Pseudo-Dionysius, is above all a 'world of sacraments,' a world of sacred rites by means of which one ascends from the sensual to the supra-sensual, to enlightenment and deification. In this way the two hitherto unrelated traditions acquire a common soil, a common tongue. On the one hand the success of monasticism, the acceptance by the ecclesiastical community of its ideals of asceticism and maximalism as ideals toward 'which even people in the world must strive according to their strength, compelled the 'secular' churches to imitate the monastic peculiarities and 'rubrics' of worship, and also made monasticism the centre of liturgical influence. On the other hand, mystical theology opened up to monasticism the world of ceremonial, the world of mysteriological, liturgical piety, and moreover turned this world into a natural expression of the 'sacrament' of monastic life. Within the Byzantine synthesis the original 'emphases' and categories of both contrasting liturgical traditions were interwoven and their contradictions removed. 'Mysteriological' piety acquired an ingrafting of 'ascetical' piety, since asceticism remained an indispensable step in the mystical interpretation of monasticism. But then the ascetical, almost a-liturgical view of worship which we have found in early monastic texts also 'absorbed' the mysteriological moment. From the Areopagite down to Cabasilas we see the elaboration of one and the same theology— a theology simultaneously monastic (ascetical) and mysteriological in its whole spirit and movement. This theology was the determining force in the development and completion of the Byzantine *Typicon*.

### *The Completion of the Typicon*

We have an inadequate knowledge of the path of this development and synthesis, but surely it is not by chance that the Orthodox liturgical tradition has kept a memory of the two main sources of the *Typicon*, in the *Ordos* of the

206

Palestine monastery of St. Sabbas and the Studite monastery in Constantinople. We must conclude that these monastic centres were the places where the 'synthesis' which had been developing in various places and in various ways found its final expression and was, so to speak, 'codified.' The investigations of Mansvetov, Dimitrievsky,

Skaballanovich and others show clearly, however, that neither the St. Sabbas nor the Studite monastery can be regarded as the place where the *Typicon* was actually created. Furthermore, under no circumstances does either the Jerusalem or the Studite tradition represent a wholly independent line of development in the growth of the *Typicon*. 'In the first period (before the appearance of complete transcripts of the *Ordo*) there were certainly copies of *Ordos* which have not come down to us,' writes Mansvetov.[111] Yet the similarity of the Jerusalem and Studite *Ordos* is plain to any one who has studied their manuscript tradition. Thus we are speaking here first of centres of codification and elaboration of the *Ordo*; and second, of centres which due to their position and the intensity of the liturgical work which they undertook exercised a very great liturgical influence upon the Church at large.

### *The Jerusalem Ordo*

Both chronologically and in the light of the role it played in the work of completing the synthesis of the *Ordo*, first place should be given to the centre in Palestine. According to a late but firm tradition it was precisely in Palestine that the *Ordo* was drawn up— 'The ritual, rite and order, as they were given to us and authorized for us by the holy Fathers in the monasteries, that is, by Euphemius the Great, St. Sabbas, Theodosius the Cenobite and Gerasimos of Jordan, who was ministered to by a wild beast, by Chariton the Confessor and Cyprian the Hermit, such an *Ordo* as this did the great patriarch Sophronius write down for the generations to come. But when the barbarians burned down the great monastery of St. Sabbas and the manuscript written by blessed Sophronius was

207

sacrificed to the flames, the most wise John of Damascus, like an industrious bee, once again transmitted this tradition to his descendants, and it has been preserved thus to the present day.'[112] Simeon of Thessalonica gives us an identical version of this tradition of the *Ordo*. 'Our divine father Sabbas wrote out the *Ordo*, having received it from St. Euphemius and St. Theokritus, and they had received it from those before them and the Confessor Khariton. But when this *Ordo* was destroyed, then our father Sophronius, who is among the blessed, industriously wrote it out, and then after him our divine father John of Damascus, expert in theology, restored it and copied it out.'[113] As Skaballanovich remarks, 'Of course it is possible to question the reliability of all the details of this genealogy, but for it to have arisen at all there must be a kernel of historical truth lying at its basis.'[114] Its historical probability lies primarily in the fact

that in all the fragmentary evidence which has come down to us from all monastic traditions it is precisely the Palestine tradition which has from the beginning been connected especially with the 'secular' worship, and which has therefore been most open to the movement toward synthesis. The majority of Palestinian monasteries were located not far from Jerusalem, and we know how famous the Holy City was for its liturgical splendour and influence after its restoration as a centre of Christianity during the reign of Constantine, 'The Catechetical Instructions' of Cyril of Jerusalem and the descriptions of Sylvia show that Jerusalem was in fact one of the main centres in the rise of that historical-mysteriological worship which became central in the 'secular' layer of the Ordo. Sylvia refers to the participation of the monks in the solemn services of worship in Jerusalem. Later memorials indicate the existence of a special monastery of 'vessel bearers' near Episcopia. 'It is to be noted,' Skabalanovich remarks, 'that the role of "vessel-bearers" (*spudei*) in the *Typicon* of the Holy Sepulchre of 1122 is exactly the same as that described in the *Pilgrimage of Sylvia*.' From Cassian we know that the distinctive feature of Palestinian monas-

208

ticism was the similarity of its Ordo to that of the secular churches, especially in what touched on the hours for and structure of prayer.[115] Thus it is in Palestine, in the immediate vicinity of the sacred and holy centre of the entire Christian world, indeed in its liturgical centre, that we may properly see the beginning of the synthesis in the Ordo. This conclusion is supported by the unanimous agreement of all Byzantine liturgiologists. It may also be assumed that in one of its first stages the synthesis was accepted in the Studite monastery of Constantinople. The liturgical connection between Constantinople and Jerusalem is beyond doubt. There is also a very probable dependence of the '*Spudaiôn* Monastery,' founded in Constantinople in the fifth century, on the Jerusalem monastery which served as its prototype. Finally, there are grounds for believing that the 'vessel-bearers' of Constantinople were closely associated with the rise of the Studite monastery. It is more than probable therefore that the Jerusalem 'synthesis' was accepted at the Studite Monastery and subjected to revision there, and that it formed the basis for the independent development of the Studite Ordo.[116].

We must take into account also the fact that there was an especially strong note of mysticism in Palestinian monasticism, borne out by the violent controversies over the theology of Origen (in fact over the nature and purpose of the monastic life) in the sixth century (during the lifetime of St. Sabbas the Blessed), which led to the con-

demnation of the Alexandrian Doctor by the fifth ecumenical council. By remaining orthodox after the falling away of Egypt and the East, Palestinian monasticism found itself at the centre of the Christological controversy, and it withstood the attack of monophysitism. It was for just this reason that monasticism in Palestine was especially sensitive to theological interpretations, and moreover open to that mystical and mysteriological concept of monasticism which took form in this period in the eastern provinces of the Empire. When taken together, these conjectures do give some real support to and offer at

209

least a general explanation for the tradition which connects the beginning of the *Typicon*— the general rule of prayer' for the whole Church— with the Palestinian and indeed the most important of all Palestinian monasteries.[117]

No copy of this original Jerusalem Ordo has come down to us. But besides the already mentioned tradition concerning the liturgical work of Sabbas, Sophronius and John of Damascus, later compilers of the *Typicon* also testify to the fact that copies did exist. Nikon of Montenegro (11th cent.) writes: 'The various Studite and Jerusalem *Typicons* were simplified and collated...' He also quotes directly from the 'Ancient Secret *Typicon* of Jerusalem' found by him 'near Spas in Laodicea,' and this *Typicon* was used by him as the basis for his own work as a compiler.[118] The author of the short 'Description of the Studite Monastery' and St. Athanasius of Athos also mention the existence of numerous written Ordos before the appearance of complete texts of the Studite and Jerusalem *Typicons*. [119] On the other hand there can be no doubt that all these Ordos which have been lost to us were variations of one common Ordo, i.e., various recensions of a synthesis which was already basically complete. This is clear from the fact that the differences and disagreements between them which are mentioned by later compilers touch only on details and minor points. The common structure and rite of each individual service is beyond all question. Thus the basic synthesis of the Ordo can be regarded as complete by the ninth century.

The second period in the history of this synthesis— the era of its final 'crystallization'— begins with the 'triumph of orthodoxy' at the end of the iconoclastic crisis. This has been an epoch of conservative approach to ancient traditions, and its characteristic feature has been the striving for uniformity, for an Ordo considered no longer merely as a norm but as a 'law' worked out in every detail, and as far as possible providing answers to all 'per-

plexing questions.' This era has been well documented. A.A. Dimitrievsky has col-

210

lected and described the texts from this period, and his remarkable work is still the major if not the only tool for any one working in the field of the history of Byzantine worship. Here the original synthesis (what we may call the early Jerusalem-Palestine Ordo) is set before us in two basic 'recensions.' These are the Jerusalem (in the narrow sense of the term) and the Studite Ordos. We are well-informed about the development and crystallization of the Jerusalem 'recension' of the synthesis, first of all by Nikon of Black Mountain, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Simeon of the Wondrous Mount, not far from Antioch.[120] In his canonical regulations and *Tacticon* he 'made a start,' in the words of Mansvetov, 'on the tremendous task which the Ordo of that period had set before liturgiologists.' [121] But it is important to emphasize that this task consisted in the comparison and collation of different variations of essentially the same Ordo, in the 'correction of its weak points and the introduction of uniformity.' It was not creative theological work, but rather the business of compilation. Nikon is very characteristic of his time in his desire for complete uniformity, in his interest in 'rubrical details.' It is also possible to trace, the process of the unification and formulation of the Jerusalem Ordo in the *Typicons* described by Dimitrievsky. His earliest complete texts date from the twelfth century— and in them the final development of the Ordo (in the second, 'legal' sense of this word) is completely clear. It is different from our modern *Typicon* only in a few details. These details (e.g., the chanting of 'Since ye are baptized in Christ' at Pentecost, the liturgical similarity of the Christmas fast with Lent, etc.) are sometimes remarkable and interesting, in that they either explain the obscurities in our modern practice or bear witness to the existence of certain liturgical tendencies which have disappeared and been forgotten. But the development which can be traced through these *Typicons* no longer involves the structure of the Ordo as a whole.

211

### *The Studite Ordo*

As for the Studite recension, its success and widespread distribution is explained by the importance of the Studite Monastery in the capital in the post-iconoclastic epoch. Many Byzantine texts bear witness to the intensiveness of the liturgical and rubrical work begun as early as the lifetime of Theodore, and continued under his successors. The Studite tradition is especially notable for its hymnographical creativity— above all for the development of the Lenten *Triodion*. As for the Ordo in the

proper sense of the word, here again stress was laid on the harmonizing of ancient Ordos, on liturgical 'uniformity.' The Studite Ordo is also the 'synthesis of a synthesis' and its difference from the Jerusalem recension is explained, first, by the unique position of the Studite Monastery itself, the adaptation of the Ordo to specific external circumstances (e.g., the elimination of Vigils and Little Vespers— a distinctive feature of the Studite tradition noted by all historians). It should be observed here that although the sphere of influence and acceptance of the Studite Ordo was very wide (Dimitrievsky traces nine of his western manuscripts to Greek monasteries in southern Italy), and although it 'took the lead' over the Jerusalem Ordo for a long time, not one reliable copy of it has come down to us. The Ordos which we possess were written for specific monasteries (the so-called 'Wardens' Ordos'— or 'Collated Ordos'— see, for example, the remarkable *Typicon* of the patriarch Alexios the Studite, compiled for the Monastery of the Assumption in Constantinople), [122] and they reflect the 'adaptation' of the Studite Ordo to local situations. 'The pure Studite Ordo has yet to be found,' writes Dimitrievsky, 'and in the meantime, without a definite and clear knowledge of what the Studite analysis was like or what were its distinctive peculiarities, further work on the historical development of our *Typicon* is impossible.' [123] But here as in the Jerusalem recension enough is known to be certain, first, of the basic structural identity of the Studite and Jerusalem

212

Ordos (demonstrating that both are variations of the original Byzantine synthesis), and second, of the completed state of this Ordo in the age of the texts which have come down to us.

### *Subsequent Ordos*

The development of the Ordo in the time since then, no matter how important or interesting it may be from various viewpoints, reflects no change either in structure or in its expression of the 'rule of prayer.' The history of the development of the Ordo as such is ended. The process that follows is a process of 'filling up' this Ordo with elements previously lacking (new hymns, memorials, etc.), and the refining of 'rubrics.' Characteristic of this process was the liturgical work of the patriarch Philotheus Coccinus (14th cent.), and the growth of the so-called 'Chapters of Mark.' [124] In the first case we have an example of the completion of the Ordo by the addition of rules obviously required by the context but missing from the text. The rubric on censuring, the clarification of the rules concerning the vesting of the sacred ministers, the differentiation of festal from simple services: these are the

kinds of problems dealt with in Philotheus' *Diataxis*. They clearly grow out of the view of the Ordo as a precise law, out of the whole spirit of the late Byzantine striving for complete uniformity. 'The Chapters of Mark,' which form an imposing part of the modern *Typicon*, show the very characteristic concern of late Byzantine liturgiologists to define with utmost exactitude the principles for combining different cycles in one service. (Cf. the endless variations in the combining of the Feast of the Annunciation with the Paschal cycle.) But as in the case of Patriarch Philotheus the revisions touch on details only. The Ordo, as a whole is regarded as complete and unchangeable.

213

## 5. Conclusion: An Evaluation of the *Typicon*

What are the principles underlying the Ordo? This is the question which we must try to answer in the final pages of our present work. In our approach to this question we have had occasion to speak at length about certain things in the development of the Ordo which might seem to be of small value. Side by side with the true development and discovery of the Church's *lex orandi* there has been an obscuring of her tradition. We feel that this fact should be admitted and at least some attempt made to explain it, no matter how much this conclusion may run counter to the extraordinarily widespread and blind 'absolutization' of the *Typicon* in all its details which exists throughout the Orthodox Church. What is truly fixed and eternal in this Ordo which has come down to us through such a complicated process, and which includes so many various layers of material? What is its essential nature as the liturgical tradition of the Church, as the 'rule of prayer,' which, according to the Church's teaching, contains and reveals her 'rule of faith'? If we have termed the culmination of this development and building up of layer upon layer a 'synthesis' rather than a hodge-podge, in what way does this synthesis have a creative and *determining significance* for the future? At a moment when the world in which the Church lives can no longer be called Christian in the sense in which it was Christian from the fourth to the twentieth centuries, this is the only question which really matters. No restoration in history has ever been successful. Only if there is a lack of faith in the Church herself as the source of Life can the traditions of the past be dealt with on the principle 'Let what has been set before us remain for ever!' Tradition for the Church is not the vista of a beautiful past which can be admired in a mood of aesthetically religious nostalgia, but rather a summons and an inspiration. Only a liturgical theology, that is, a detailed study and elucidation

of all the elements which form the liturgical tradition of the Church (her Sacraments, cycles, rituals and ceremonies) can provide a true answer to our

214

question. The present work is only a very general introduction to a proposed complete course in liturgical theology. In concluding this introduction we must point to what we are convinced the Ordo shows to be the guide in the study of Orthodox worship.

What is absolutely essential for a correct understanding of the general spirit of the Byzantine synthesis is that it was unquestionably formed on the basis of the Church's original rule of prayer, and from this point of view must be accepted as its elaboration and revelation, no matter how well developed are the elements which are alien to this *lex orandi* and which have obscured it. Thus in spite of the strong influence of the mysteriological psychology on the one hand and the ascetical-individualistic psychology on the other, the Ordo as such has remained organically connected with the theology of time which contained its original organizing principle. This theology of time was obscured and eclipsed by 'secondary' layers in the Ordo, but it remained always as the foundation of its inner logic and the principle of its inner unity.

This connection is evident, first, in the correlation (preserved throughout all the changes) of the Eucharist with the liturgy of time or, in other words, in the special place occupied by the Eucharist in the general structure of the Ordo. The Eucharist has its own time, its *καιρός*, [(*kairos*, 'moment; opportunity'), and this time is distinct from the units used to measure the liturgy of time. We have spoken of the ascetical and individualistic modification which occurred in the view of the Eucharist under the influence of monasticism, and of how, in connection with this, the Eucharist was included within the liturgy of time as one of its component offices. But this change was never fully accepted in the Ordo, and in it there is a characteristic ambiguity toward the Eucharist. The lectionary, the setting apart of a relatively small number of non-liturgical days, and a whole series of other rubrics all point to the success of one tendency in this process. Its success can be traced also in the popular acceptance of the so-called 'votive masses,' of the idea that the Eucharist can be subordinated to individual needs. On the other hand if all the rest of

215

the prescriptions of the Ordo are taken together, if one carefully considers their inner logic and also the rite of the Liturgy itself, it can hardly be doubted that the Eucharist has preserved its basic character as the Feast of the Church, as the expression and actualization of her

eschatological fullness, as an action which is combined with the liturgy of time and related to it, but precisely by virtue of its ontological difference from it. It is true that the prescriptions concerning the *kairos* of the Eucharist have become a dead letter in modern times. But what is important is that these prescriptions have in fact been preserved, and this means that for those who have been brought up on the 'Byzantine synthesis' they constitute an inviolable part of the liturgical tradition of the Church and are part of her rule of prayer. What else do these prescriptions prove, this whole complicated system of relationships between the Eucharist and time— with its hours, days and cycles— if not that the time of the Eucharist is something special, and that what it expresses in time fulfills time and gives it another standard of measurement? The fundamental meaning of these different prescriptions must be seen in the principle of the incompatibility of the Eucharist with fasting. The Eucharist is not celebrated during Lent. On the strict fast days of the eves of Christmas and Epiphany it is celebrated in the evening, just as the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts is celebrated in the evening. The whole complicated system for the transfer of the Christmas and Epiphany eves of fasting to Friday if they happen to fall on Saturday or Sunday expresses the same idea: Saturdays and Sundays, being Eucharistic days, are incompatible with fasting. Obviously what is preserved here in full force is the liturgical concept of fasting as a condition of expectation in the Church herself, related to the Eucharist as the Sacrament of the *Parousia* of the Lord. Even where the Eucharist is thought of as a daily service, it is not simply inserted into the system of daily offices, but preserves its special *kairos* depending on the length of the fast, the degree of importance of the commemoration, etc. The meaning of all these prescriptions is clear: the Eucharist must be preceded by a fast or vigil (which is in fact the liturgical expression of fasting, as a

216

station, or *statio*, *vigilia*), since in this fast or vigil, in this time of expectancy and preparation, time itself is transformed into what it has become in the Church: a time of waiting and preparation for the unending Day of the Kingdom. The entire life of the Christian and the entire earthly life of the Church become a fast in the deepest meaning of this word: they receive their significance and their secret fullness from the *eschaton*, from the end and fulfilment of time, since everything is connected with this End, everything is judged and illuminated in relation to it. But this 'End' can become a force which transforms life and transmutes 'fasting' into 'joy and triumph' only because it is not something in the future only, the terrifying dissolution of all things, but rather something which has

already come, already begun, and is being eternally 'actualized' and 'fulfilled' in the Sacrament of the Church, in the Eucharist: 'We have been fulfilled by thine everlasting life, we have joyfully tasted thine inexhaustible food, which thou hast deigned to communicate to us all in the age to come...' That same Life will appear at the End which is already in existence, that New Aeon will begin in which we are already participating, that same Lord will appear who is now coming and is with us. This rhythm of fast and Eucharist which is perhaps the forgotten and unfulfilled but still obvious and basic principle of the Ordo shows that at the foundation of the Church's liturgical life there is still that same unchanging and inexhaustible experience of eschatology, the experience of the Church as new life in new time existing within this old world and its time for the express purpose of its salvation and renewal.

Thus too in the daily cycle, which is the basis of the liturgy of time, the Ordo, or structure of its services can be understood only in relation to the theology of time which they contain and express. Outside it they become an inexplicable, arbitrary sequence of diverse elements connected in no way other than by a 'formal' law. The Christian theology of time is clearly expressed in Vespers and Matins, in which four themes follow one another in a definite sequence. In Vespers there is the theme of Creation as a beginning (the preparatory psalm 'Praise the Lord, O my soul'), the theme

217

of sin and fall ('Lord I have cried...'), the theme of salvation and the coming into the world of the Son of God ('O Gentle Radiance'), and the theme of the End ('Lord, now lettest thou thy servant...'). The same themes form the order for Matins, only in the opposite order. The daily cycle is a kind of constant contemplation of the world and the time within which the Church dwells, and of those ways of evaluating the world and its time which were manifested by the *Parousia* of the Lord. The note of cosmic thanksgiving, the perception of God's glory in creation, its affirmation as something 'very good,' these insights which come at the beginning of Vespers, followed by the commemoration of the fall of this world, of the indelible mark of separation from God which accompanied it, the relationship of all things to the Light of salvation which has come into and illuminated this world and, finally, the concluding 'thy Kingdom come' of the Lord's prayer— here is the liturgical order of the daily cycle. Each day Christians pray that in and through the Church the time of this world may become the new time for the children of light, may be filled with new life for those whom she has brought to life. And so she 'refers' this day to that which constitutes her own life, to the

reality of the Presence which she alone in this world knows, and which she alone is able to reveal.

The Church year, which has been torn away from the theology of time more than all the other liturgical cycles, still preserves the sign of its original and ineradicable connection with this theology in Easter and its year long cycle. No matter how many other Feast Days there are and no matter what they celebrate, they all reflect something of the light of Easter, and it is not by chance or for the sake of an artificial emphasis that the late Byzantine liturgiologists constructed the 'pre-festivals' of Christmas and Epiphany— two of the most ancient and important feast days of the Christian year— on the pattern of Holy Week. Whatever is being celebrated, the celebration is fulfilled in the Eucharist, in the commemoration of that Paschal night when before His Sacrifice our Lord bequeathed the Supper of the Kingdom to the Church, in the commemoration of that morning

218

when the new life shone in the world, when the Son of Man had completed His passage to the Father, and when in Him the New Passover had become the Life of men. Each Feast Day is related to that New Time which is celebrated by Easter. Like the Lord's Day in the week, so also Easter each year manifests and 'actualizes' that eternal beginning which in the old world appears as an end, but which in the Church signifies an End that has been turned into a Beginning, thereby filling the End with joyous meaning. Easter is an eschatological feast in the most exact and deepest meaning of this word, because in it we 'recall' the resurrection of Christ as our own resurrection, eternal life as our own life, the fullness of the Kingdom as already possessed. As the beginning and end of the Church year Easter links this eschatological fullness with real time in its yearly form. Life in the world becomes a 'correlative' of the eternal Easter of the New Aeon. Thus Easter reveals the essential nature of every Feast Day, and is in this sense the 'Feast of Feasts.'

Having preserved the eschatological theology of time as its foundation and principle of formulation, the Byzantine synthesis has also preserved the ecclesiological significance of the Church's 'rule of prayer.' No symbolical explanation, no mysteriological piety and no ascetical individualism could obscure completely the unchanging essential nature of worship as the Church's act of self-revelation, self-fulfilment, self-realization. It must be frankly admitted that in our modern 'liturgical piety' this essential nature has been very poorly understood. Nowhere is the need to 'unfetter' the meaning of the Ordo so apparent, nowhere is the need to rediscover the meaning of the Ordo's now dead language so urgent. The Ordo was fettered and became the private posses-

sion of the *typikonshchiki* precisely because the ecclesiological key to its understanding and acceptance had been lost and forgotten. It is only necessary to read over the 'rubrics' and prescriptions with new eyes, and to meditate on the structure of the Ordo, in order to understand that its major significance lies in its presentation of worship as the service of the new people of God. From the unchanging

219

liturgical 'we' of all liturgical texts to the most complicated rite for an All-Night Vigil, with its vesting and unvesting of the clergy, its shifting of the centre of the service from the altar to the middle of the church, its censings, processions, bows, etc., everything that is important and basic in the Ordo is a Byzantine 'transposition' of the original meaning of worship as the corporate act and 'fulfilment' of the Church. From the standpoint of 'eternal' value and inner consistency certain details of this transposition can be called into question; one can distinguish between what is local (and often accepted as 'universal') and what is universal (and often accepted as 'local'); but it is impossible to deny that in the overall design of the Ordo, in its essential and eternal logic, it was, is and always will be the Ordo of the Church's worship, a living and vital revelation of her doctrine about herself, of her own self-understanding and self-definition.

Finally, the ultimate and permanent value of the Ordo, a value which determines the whole complex path of its Byzantine development, is the Church's 'rule of faith' which is revealed and imprinted within it. The theology of time and ecclesiology which in some way define the very essence of the Church's cult have been preserved in the Ordo in spite of the various pressures exerted upon it, and the revelation in and through the Ordo of the Church's dogmatic teaching must be regarded as a genuine product of Byzantine Christianity. The Byzantine period of history still awaits a proper evaluation in the mind of the Church. It can hardly be doubted that the development of dogmatic thought went hand in hand with a weakening of ecclesiological consciousness. The 'Christian world' on the one hand and the 'desert' on the other obscured the reality of the *Church*, which had come to be understood more as the source of a beneficent sanction, as the dispenser of grace, than as the people of God and the new Israel, a chosen people, a royal priesthood. This eclipse of ecclesiological consciousness was reflected in liturgical piety, in the forms and the view of the cult. But what constitutes the permanent value of this period is that in Byzantine worship the Councils of Nicaea, Con-

stantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon were not simply 'transposed' from the language of philosophy into the language of sacred liturgical poetry; they were revealed, fathomed, understood, manifested in all their significance.

On this note we may suspend rather than terminate our analysis of the problem of the Ordo. The view presented here of the theological problem of the Ordo and its development can find its application and 'justification' only in a liturgical theology in the true meaning of this term, i.e., in a theological apprehension of worship itself. The present work is offered simply as an introduction. Its goal has been to define the perspective and to mark out basic guidelines. If we are right in our view that what actually determines the whole liturgical and devotional life of the Church is the Ordo, that by its very nature it contains the theological meaning of this life and therefore ought to be subjected to theological investigation; if, furthermore, we are right in saying that such a study of the Ordo and of the cult which it regulates is impossible without at least some preliminary understanding of its historical formulation; and if, finally, we are right in asserting that the absence of both these conditions (extending now over many centuries) only underlines the urgency of the problem of the Ordo in our own time, then this introduction will perhaps have served some good purpose.

### Footnotes to Chapter Four

- 1 Skaballanovich, op. cit., p. 318.
- 2 J. M. Hanssens, *Nature et Genèse de l'Office*, p. 58.
- 3 Baumstark, op. cit., pp. 118ff.; cf. L. Petit, article 'Antiphones' in *Dict. Arch. Lit. chrét.*, I, 2461-88.
- 4 cf. J. A. Jungmann, 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der Gebetsliturgie,' in *Zeitschr. f. Kathol. Theol.*, 72, 1950, pp. 223-6.
- 5 cf. Baumstark, op. cit., pp. 60ff.; Skaballanovich, op. cit., pp. 88ff.
- 6 Baumstark, op. cit., pp. 69ff.
- 7 E. Wellesz, *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, Oxford University Press, 1949, p. 26; also Pitra, op. cit., pp. 39ff.
- 8 Wellesz, op. cit., p. 29.
- 9 Baumstark, op. cit., pp. 37ff.
- 10 Wellesz, OP. Cit., pp. 33-5.
- 11 *ibid.*, pp. 33, 273.
- 12 Cf. F. E. Warren, *Liturgy of the Ante-Nicene Church*, London, S.P.C.K., pp. 374ff.
- 13 Dugmore, op. cit., p. 57.
- 14 Skaballanovich, op. cit., pp. 89ff.
- 15 Thus, during Lent when the celebration of the Eucharist is not permitted on weekdays, Saturday always preserves its liturgical character.
- 16 Skaballanovich, op. cit., pp. 120ff, 264ff.

- 17 cf. Paul Cotton, *From Sabbath to Sunday: a Study in Early Christianity*, Bethlehem Pa., 1933.
- 18 cf. the texts of Irenaeus of Lyons (P.G. 8, 1012), Origen (P.G. 12, 749); 'Origen's picture of the Sabbath... is strangely reminiscent of the best rabbinic teaching on the subject' (Dugmore, op. cit., p. 31); in the West there was no fast on Saturday before the third century.
- 19 Quoted by H. M. Hyatt, *The Church of Abyssinia*, p. 292.
- 20 Didache, 8; Clement of Alex., *Stromat.*, 7, 12; Origen, In Levit. 10; *Didascalia*, 5, 13; Can. Hyppolit., 157.
- 21 cf. H. Lietzmann, *Hist. de l'Eglise ancienne*, Vol. II, Paris, Pagot, 1937, p. 132.
- 22 cf. A. Jaubert, *La Date de la Cène*, Paris, Gabalda, 1957.
- 23 Warren, op. cit., pp. 101ff.
- 24 Basil the Great, *Epis.* 93, P.G. 32, 484-5.
- 25 Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.*, 5, 22.
- 26 De Orat., 19.
- 27 Skaballanovich, op. cit., p. 122.
- 28 Testament, 1, 22.
- 29 On the development of the pre-Easter fast cf. Baumstark, op. cit., pp. 203ff.; A. Chavasse, 'La Structure du Carême et les lectures des messes quadragésimales dans la liturgie romaine' in *Maison-Dieu*, 31, 1952, pp. 76-119; McArthur, op. cit., pp. 114ff.; J. Daniélou, 'Le symbolisme des Quarante Jours,' in *Maison-Dieu*, 31, 1952.
- 30 Didache, 7.
- 31 Justin Martyr, *1st Apol.*, 61.
- 32 Quoted in Skaballanovich, p. 124.
- 33 cf. J. Daniélou, 'Les Quatre-Temps de Septembre et la fête des Tabernacles' in *Maison-Dieu*, 46, 1956, pp. 114-36; criticism in A. Jaubert, op. cit., p. 114.
- 34 P. Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Calendar*, Cambridge, 1940, p. 44, E.C. Selwyn, 'The Feast of Tabernacles, Epiphany and Baptism' in *Journal of Theology*, 1911, pp. 225-36.
- 35 Daniélou, 'Les Quatre-Temps,' p. 117.
- 36 Carrington, op. cit., pp. 23-31; Cf. criticism of this theory by W. D. Davies, 'Reflections on Archbp. Carrington's *The Primitive Christian Calendar*' in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, Cambridge, 1956, pp. 124-53.
- 37 Jaubert, op. cit., pp. 92ff.
- 38 *ibid.*, pp. 105ff.
- 39 Daniélou, 'Les Quatre-Temps,' p. 124.
- 40 *ibid.*, p. 127.
- 41 A.A. Dimitrievsky, *Opisanie liturgicheskikh rukopisey khranyashchikhsya v bibliotekakh pravoslavnago vostoka* (A Description of Liturgical Manuscripts Preserved in the Libraries of the Orthodox East), Vol. 1, 'Tipik' (*Typicon*), Kiev, 1895; also N. F. Krasnoseltsev, *Tipik Sv. Sofii v Konstantinople 9-go veka* (The *Typicon* of St. Sophia in Constantinople in the Ninth Century), Odessa, 1892.
- 42 *Pisania Sv. Otsov i uchiteley Tserkvi odnosyashchikhsya k istolkovanhiu pravoslavnago bogosluzheniya* (The Writings of the Fathers and Teachers of the Church Pertaining to the Interpretation of Orthodox worship), Vol. 2, St. Petersburg, 1856, pp. 402ff., 155, 628ff.
- 43 A. Baumstark, 'Das Typikon der Patmoshandschrift 266 und die altkonstantinopolitanische Gottesdienstordnung' in *Jahrbuch Liturgiewissenschaft*, Vol. VI, 98-111.
- 44 *Pisania Sv. Otsov*, p. 470.
- 45 I. Mansvetov, 'O pesnenom posledovanii' ('On the Sung Service') in *Pribavlenie k tvoreniam Sv. Otsov* (Supplement to the works of the Holy Fathers), 1880, pp. 752-97.
- 46 *ibid.*, p. 752.

- 47 Cf. Wellecz, op. cit., pp. 119ff.
- 48 Cf. M. Setton, *The Christian Attitude Towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century*, New York, 1951; Dix, op. cit., pp. 397ff; J. A. Jungmann, *Missarum Solemnia*, Vol. 1, Paris, Aubier, 1951, pp. 67ff.; H. Leclercq, 'Adoration' in *Dict. Arch. Lit. chrét.*, 1, 539-46; E. Bishop, 'Ritual Splendour' in R. H. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, Cambridge, 1909, pp. 88-91.
- 49 A. Alfoeldi, 'Die Ausgestaltung der monarchischen Zeremoniells am römischen Kaiserhof,' *Mitteilungen der Deutsch archaeolog. Inst. Rom.*, 49, 1934, pp. 1-118; Wellecz, op. cit., pp. 86ff.; 11. J. W. Tillyard, 'The Acclamations of Emperors in Byzantine Ritual,' in *The Annual of the British School in Athens*, 18, 1911-12, pp. 239-60.
- 50 Wellecz, op. cit., pp. 32, 119ff.
- 51 Pitra, op. cit., p. 25.
- 52 A. Baumstark, 'Festbrevier und Kirchenjahr der Syrischen Jacobiten,' *Geschichte und Kultur der Altertums*, 3, 1910; P. Maas, 'Das Kontakion,' *Byz. Zeitschr.*, 1910, pp. 290ff.
- 53 cf. C. Emereau, *St. Ephrem le Syrien*, Paris, 1919, pp. 97ff.; also E. Wellecz, 'Melito's Homily on the Passion: An investigation into the sources of Byzantine Hymnology,' in *Journal Theological Studies*, 44, 1943, pp. 41ff.
- 54 Wellecz, *Byz. Hymnography*, p. 129.
- 55 The Heavenly Hierarchy, 2, 4.
- 56 Pisania Sv. Otsov, p. 472.
- 57 *ibid.*, pp. 404-5.
- 58 *ibid.*, p. 405.
- 59 Pitra, OP. Cit., p. 45.
- 60 Besides the names of Wellecz and Pitra, see also: P. Maas, 'Fruhbyzantinische Kirchenpoesie,' in *Kleine Texte*, 52/53; A. Baumstark, 'Te Deum und eine Gruppe griechischer Abendhymnen,' *Orient chrétien*, 34, pp. 1-26; J. Jeannin, 'Octoechos,' *Dict. Arch. Lit. chrét.*, XII, 1889; E. Mioni, *Romano il Melode*, Turino, 1937 (cf. bibliography in this book).
- 61 Pisania Sv. Olsov, p. 485.
- 62 O. Casel, 'Art und Sinn der aeltesten Christlichen Osterfeier,' *Jahrbuch f. Liturgiewiss.*, 14, 1938, 8, 58.
- 63 J. Daniélou, *Origines Chrétiennes* (mimeographed lectures), p. 73.
- 64 Sermon on Epiphany, P.G.36, 349.
- 65 P. de Ghellink, *Pour l'histoire du mot sacramentum*, Louvain, 1924, p. 17.
- 66 Baumstark, *Liturgie Comparée*, p. 171.
- 67 Botte, *Les Origines*, pp. 78-9.
- 68 Baumstark, *Liturgie*, p. 200.
- 69 McArthur, op. cit., pp. 77ff., 141ff; J. W. Tyrer, *Historical Survey of Holy Week*, London, S.P.C.K., 1932, pp. 31ff.
- 70 cf. J. B. Ferreres, *Ephemerides theol. Lovaniensis*, 5, pp. 623ff.; A. Baumstark, *Oriens Christiana*, 3, 1, 1936, p. 113.
- 71 Cf. M. Jugie, 'La première fête mariale en Orient et en Occident: l'Avent primitif,' *Echos d'Orient*, 22, pp. 153-81; Baumstark, *Liturgie*, pp. 199ff.; B. Botte, 'La première fête mariale de la liturgie romaine,' *Ephem. liturg.*, 1933, pp. 425-30; 1935, pp. 61-264.
- 72 Baumstark, *Liturgie*, pp. 202ff., E. Flicoteaux, 'Notre Dame dans l'année liturgique,' *Maison-Dieu*, 38, 1954, pp. 95-121.
- 73 F. Cabrol, 'Assumption,' *Dict. Arch. Lit. chrét.*, 1, Baumstark, *Liturgie*, p. 202.
- 74 P. de Puniet, 'La fete de la Nativité de la Vierge,' in *Vie et Arts Liturgiques*, 1926, pp. 481-9.
- 75 H. Leclercq, 'Présentation de Marie,' *Dict. Arch. Lit. chrét.*, 14, 2, 1729-31; E. Bouvy, 'Présentation de la Vierge,' *Bessarione*, 1897, pp. 552-62;
- S. Vaillhé, 'La Fête de la Présentation,' *Echos d'Orient*, 5, 1901, pp. 221-4.
- 76 Baumstark, *Liturgie*, p. 196.
- 77 *ibid.*, p. 195.
- 78 H. Delehaye, *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae e codice Sirmondiano nunc Berolensi...* Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris, Brussels, Bollandistes, 1902; P. Pecters, *Le Tréfonds Oriental de l'Hagiographie Byzantine*, Brussels, Bollandistes, 1950; R. Aigrain, *L'Hagiographie*, Paris, Bloud et Gay, 1953.
- 79 Baumstark, *Liturgie*, p. 192.
- 80 H. Delehaye, *Sanctus: Essai sur le culte des Saints dans l'Antiquité*, Brussels, Bollandistes, 1927, pp. 2-73.
- 81 cf. Grabar, *Martyrium*, 1, pp. 28ff.
- 82 Delehaye, *Les Origines*, pp. 40ff.
- 83 Grabar, op. cit., p. 349.
- 84 Delehaye, *Les Origines*, pp. 461ff.; and his *Les Légendes Hagiographiques*, second edition, Paris, pp. 222-32.
- 85 Delehaye, *Les Origines*, p. 463.
- 86 *ibid.*, p. 139.
- 87 Sermon 285: 5, P.L. 38, 1295.
- 88 Quoted in Delehaye, *Les Origines*, pp. 137-8.
- 89 R. Aigrain, *L'Hagiographie*, pp. 12 1-2; Cf. H. Delehaye, *Les passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires*, Brussels, Bollandistes, 1921.
- 90 cf. Grabar, *Martyrium*, 11, pp. 343ff.
- 91 Skaballanovich, *Typikon*, p. 231.
- 92 Quoted in Skaballanovich, pp. 239ff.
- 93 Skaballanovich, *Typikon*, p. 243.
- 94 Cassian, *Inst.*, 2, 5.
- 95 *ibid.*, 2, 7.
- 96 Quoted in Skaballanovich, p. 243.
- 97 For details see Skaballanovich, pp. 202ff.
- 98 *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 13, 1-2 (Miscellanea Guillaume de Jerphanion 1), pp. 282-98.
- 99 cf. J. Pargoire, *L'Eglise Byzantine de 527 à 847*, Paris, Gabalda, 1923, p. 339.
- 100 Epis. to Magnesians, 9.
- 101 *Contra Celsum*, 8, 22-3.
- 102 cf. Pitra, *L'Hymnographie*, pp. 43ff.
- 103 *ibid.*, p. 43.
- 104 Skaballanovich, p. 418.
- 105 cf. A. P. Dobroklonski, *Prep. Feodor, Ispovednik i Igumen Studisky* (St. Theodore, Confessor and Abbot of Studion), Vol. 1, Odessa, 1913.
- 106 Mansi, *Ampliss. Concil. Collectio*, 8, 1007-18.
- 107 Skaballanovich, p. 258.
- 108 *In Matt.* 69, 70.
- 109 Skaballanovich, p. 221.
- 110 *Ibid.*, p. 261; cf. Pargoire, op. cit., pp. 210ff.
- 111 Mansvetov, op. cit., p. 61.
- 112 Quoted by Skaballanovich, p. 248.
- 113 *On Divine Prayer*, Chaps. 302-3.
- 114 Skaballanovich, p. 249.
- 115 *Ibid.*, p. 250.
- 116 *ibid.*, pp. 258ff.

117 cf. A. Ehrhard, 'Das Griechische Kloster Mar-Saba,' *Palaestina Rom. Quartalsch.*, 7, 1893, pp. 32-79.

118 Skaballanovich, p. 411.

119 Mansvetov, pp. 61-2.

120 Cf. Mansvetov, pp. 187ff.

121 Ibid., p. 192.

122 Cf. Mansvetov, pp. 103ff.

123 Dimitrievsky, op. cit., p. 143.

124 Cf. Mansvetov, pp. 2 16ff.