

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH AND THE NEED FOR LITURGICAL REFORM

Colin Battell

The well-known story of the conversion of Prince Vladimir of Kiev to the Orthodox faith is told in the Russian Primary Chronicle. Wanting to discover the true religion he sent out envoys to observe the worship of a number of different religions. They were unimpressed by the Muslim Bulgars who when at prayer looked like men possessed. ‘There is no joy among them but mournfulness and a great smell and there is nothing good about their system’.¹

Next they travelled to Western Europe where the worship was deemed more satisfactory but seemed to be lacking in beauty. Finally they arrived in Constantinople and at the great patriarchal Church of the Holy Wisdom they realised their quest was at an end. ‘We knew not whether we were in heaven or on earth for surely there is no such splendour or beauty anywhere else on earth. We cannot describe it to you – only this we know that God dwells here among humans and that their service surpasses the worship of all other places, for we cannot forget that beauty’.² Over a thousand years later, at the height of the communist era in the Soviet Union, Patriarch Alexis was asked to define the Russian Orthodox Church. He replied: ‘It is the Church which celebrates the Divine Liturgy’. While it might be said that the Church was so constrained at the time that it was able to do little else, the answer would be one which would resonate for Orthodox Christians in any time or place. Similarly, Nicholas Zernov, who did so much to foster western understanding of the Orthodox Church, once wrote: ‘The best way of

understanding the life and faith of any Christian community is to take part in its worship'.³

It is to be noted that the starting point for understanding the nature of the religion being practised was not seen as doctrinal statements or moral codes but worship. As George Florovsky has put it: 'Christianity is a liturgical religion. The Church is first and foremost a worshipping community. Worship comes first, doctrine and discipline second'.⁴

Lex orandi legem statuit orandi - the theology of worship behind this oft-repeated tag is more profoundly appreciated in the east than in the west. Orthodox is right belief and right worship – they are inseparably two sides of the same coin. The worshipping community respect the divine glory by ritual action. Orthodox is ritualistic because it believes worship to be first and foremost doxology. The Orthodox Church has always been conservative in liturgical matters. This is due in part to the absence of a central ecclesiastical authority that could enforce reforms, but also the firm conviction that the Liturgy is the main vehicle and expression of true Christian beliefs. Consequently, reform of the Liturgy can almost be seen as reform of the faith itself. As John Chryssavagis has put it: 'However inconvenient this conservatism may be the Orthodox Liturgy has preserved many essential Christian values transmitted directly from the experience of the early Church'.⁵ This can help us to understand the great interest in eastern liturgy on the part of western scholars. Indeed much of the scholarly work done

on eastern Liturgy has emanated from the west as Orthodox liturgiologists such as Alexander Schmemmann have readily acknowledged.⁶

The theology of worship has differing assumptions in east and west. In Orthodox worship there is little emphasis on the didactic or educational. The Scriptures are, of course, read with great solemnity and sometimes at great length (the Coptic rite of Alexandria, for example, has five New Testament readings). A homily forms part of the rite though it can often be omitted or given by a layman. In Greece clergy are categorised by their level of education. Those in category D have no license to preach. (Clergy tend to be chosen from the community they will serve).

It is plain to anyone attending the Liturgy that the main purpose is not instruction but rather doxological – inviting us to give glory to God and to see the world in that context. But far from being a retreat into a pious ghetto separate from life, the Liturgy is concerned not just with the transformation of the sacred species or even those attending but the transfiguration of the whole cosmos. The outward signs of the Liturgy are to give expression to the glory of God and everything employed in a worship which involves the whole person has significance to this end. The beauty of holiness is expressed through sacramental signs – heaven on earth. This need for beauty is re-emerging in the west where Liturgy at parish level can often be banal and uninspiring. Only recently Archbishop Piero Marini who is responsible for the Pontifical Liturgy in Rome, was moved to say: ‘The liturgy requires that we give it the most beautiful setting and the best

time so that the words and gestures become the voice of the Spirit who speaks to us of God. Created beauty is a sign of uncreated beauty'.⁷

To Orthodoxy, faith is more important than the seeking of understanding; or rather, there cannot be any understanding without faith. For the Orthodox the theologian is not a professional thinker but, in the words of Evagrius Ponticus, 'one who prays'. We often hear it said at the popular level by those wishing to express dissatisfaction with the reforms of 40 years ago that 'the mystery has been taken out of the Mass'. Of course the mystery is Christ himself and Christ is as present as ever but perhaps from our experience of Orthodox worship we should be asking ourselves how we express the transcendence of God in the way we worship – what does it mean to behave as if we are in the presence of God and his angels? Worship devoid of symbols and ritual can easily become merely cerebral.

At a time when in the secular world many are finding value in 'sacramentals' – candles, incense etc – it is ironic that such things can be dismissed as 'non-essential' in Catholic worship and a zeal for 'explanation', as if such were possible or even desirable, is often given precedence over all other considerations.

This can affect, for example, our attitude even to the way we approach the reading of the Scriptures in the Liturgy. Partly as a result of the predominance of the historic-critical method we may be tempted to restrict the meaning to what was originally intended by the author insofar as that can be ascertained. This can result in our putting ourselves

above the Scriptures and looking down in judgment on them. We judge them rather than they judge us. The very word ‘critical’ surely gives the game away.

The celebrated Coptic monk known as Mathei el-Meskin (Matthew the Poor) expresses this thus: ‘There are two ways of reading. The first is when a man reads and puts himself and his mind in control of the text trying to subject its meaning to his own understanding and then comparing it with the understanding of others. The second is when a man puts the text on a level above himself and tries to bring his mind into submission to its meaning – even sets the text up as a judge over him counting it as the highest criterion.

The first way is suitable for any book in the world, whether it is a work of science or literature, the second is indispensable for reading the Bible.

We make a fatal mistake if we confuse these two methods’.⁸

The appeal of Metropolitan Anthony Bloom’s writings in the 70s and 80s to an audience much wider than Orthodoxy was partly because he recognised the importance of making this distinction.

If the emphasis in the Liturgy is on making it ‘understandable’ to everyone then we may have missed something essential. Orthodox Churches which baptise, chrismate and administer Holy Communion to babes in arms are perhaps less likely to make this mistake.

The church is seen as a spiritual universe in miniature beyond space and time. The brevity of western services is incomprehensible, even shocking to Orthodox. That is not to say they are unaware of the length involved. It has been said by an Orthodox writer

that to survive a Russian Holy Week requires ‘feet of iron’.⁹ This can cause problems when Orthodoxy is transferred to a western context – there are now large Orthodox communities in North America, western Europe and Australia. I remember an Ethiopian bishop living in North America telling me it was not possible to be an Ethiopian Orthodox in America. He meant that the Orthodox faith in his own country was so well inculturated that it was difficult to transplant it to an alien culture. Moreover Orthodox worship is essentially monastic in origin and does not always make concessions to the pace of life outside a monastery.

Nevertheless the Apostolic Letter *Orientalium Lumen* acknowledges this achievement when it says: ‘At a time when it is increasingly acknowledged that the right of every people to express themselves according to their own heritage of culture and thought is fundamental, the experience of the individual churches of the east is offered to us as an authoritative example of successful inculturation’.¹⁰

For Orthodoxy, doctrine emerges out of worship. An example of this might be the way in which the doctrine of the Holy Trinity which is at the fundamental heart of Orthodox belief and all Christian belief emerged and developed out of the Church’s experience of worship. Christians prayed the *Gloria Patri* (*Doxa Patri*). But how could this be squared with the monotheism inherited from Judaism – what did it say about the nature of God revealed by Christ – how did it need to be expressed in catechesis and how should what were regarded as errors be excluded? No form of human words can express the truth about God but it is out of the experience of worship that verbal expression emerges. Of

course, all this was in the context of the Christological controversies that were raging at the time but the principle still holds.

There is much in Orthodoxy that we may readily identify with and even find familiar but we should not forget that the history and experience of Orthodoxy has been very distinctive even before the formal separation in 1054.

Even in the early centuries the theological method was different. The east tended always to be more speculative than the west – compare eastern and western creeds for an example of this - less concerned with precise definition. It is more concerned to see the faith from many different angles – more concerned to explore theological truth poetically than juridically or in precise formulations. It is interesting that the theology of Ephrem of Syria comes to us in the form of poems. No-one could accuse Orthodoxy having an inadequate theology of Mary, the ‘theotokos’, yet they would not wish to express this in dogmatic statements such as the Immaculate Conception (with its Augustinian background concerning the concepts of sin and grace) or the Assumption. By contrast there is in Orthodoxy the Akathistos hymn sung at various times throughout the year which piles phrase upon phrase in honour of the Mother of God. Theology is expressed through doxology. Orthodoxy has had a very different history to the west. The old requests for the east to return to the bosom of Rome was asking her to return to somewhere she had never been. One of the fruits of the Council is that the Catholic Church is irrevocably committed to ecumenical endeavour. The traditions of east and west are parallel but different and equally valid. As Pope John Paul II put it in his

Apostolic Letter *Orientalium Lumen* the Church needs both lungs if it is to be a Body that breathes effectively.¹¹

The subsequent history has also been very different. A church that has not experienced Scholasticism, the Renaissance, the Reformation, the Counter-Reformation nor felt the chill winds of the Enlightenment but is rooted in the Scriptures and in the Greek, Syriac, Coptic and maybe Ethiopian fathers is not likely to see things in the same way as we do. Khomiakov could even call the Pope ‘the first Protestant’, ‘the father of German rationalism’!¹² No should one forget that the effects of the Fourth Crusade and all the bitterness created by it are alive and well in many an Orthodox heart We forget sometimes how much things have changed for Catholics. We may be indignant at being refused admission into the *Catholikon* of the Monastery of *Esphigmenou* on the Holy Mountain, forgetting that in living memory Catholics in this country were sometimes forbidden to enter a non-Catholic Church even for a family wedding. Moreover, the eastern European experience of western proselytism, whether it be from well-funded American protestants or Uniate Catholics, has sometimes made them justifiably suspicious. Incidentally, the Uniate Catholic rites, despite all the problems they pose for Catholic relations with the Orthodox, should at least show that there is nothing un-Catholic about Orthodox worship even though, as Robert Taft has put it, the eastern Catholics should be seen as distinct churches rather than as ‘Indian reservations’!¹³

It could be one of the tasks of monastics to help the west to a better understanding of the eastern traditions just as in a way St Benedict did.

Compared with the upheavals in western liturgy in recent years, Orthodox Liturgy may seem fixed and immutable –even fossilised – with so many accretions that it can be difficult to see the wood for the trees. The shape can be difficult to discern. One recalls Evelyn Waugh's American liturgical expert who accompanied him to the Emperor Haile-Selassie's coronation in St George's Cathedral Addis Ababa: 'I think it's the Little entrance, no it's the secret Gospel...I've just noticed some interesting variations in the canon....Waugh adds laconically: then the Mass began'.¹⁴

The eastern Liturgies represent a long process of development and the Liturgy of Constantinople came to prevail over all others. The Liturgy attributed to St John Chrysostom became basic though others such as the Liturgy of St Basil and St James are also used on certain occasions. Thus even Coptic Chalcedonian Orthodox use a Greek rather than a Coptic rite. This did not apply to the non-Chalcedonians. In Ethiopia, for example, there are still fourteen anaphoras in regular use. In the Byzantine Liturgy there was an evolution over a period of 1000 years from the conversion of Constantine. Before that the focus was on the people rather than the place of worship. After the empire became Christian the emperor had a role in the Liturgy and ceremonial was based on the ritual of the court. The placing of holy relics of martyrs in church made a place where the emphasis was on the holy rather than 'the gathering of an expectant eschatological community'.¹⁵

Above all, the Church of the Divine Wisdom, with its massive dome placed on a square, influenced the development of church architecture. While it is true that western liturgy

has been as we shall see much influenced by eastern liturgical theology, in many ways Orthodox worship would seem to contradict a good deal of current western liturgical thinking. The iconostasis separates Clergy from people – originally a low screen on which small icons were placed, it developed into a massive solid screen pierced by doors that were only opened occasionally and with a curtain behind the doors which is drawn shut at high points in the drama of the Liturgy. (In Ethiopia the Church architecture originally built on the basilica model came to imitate the round structures of domestic architecture and became modelled on the Temple in Jerusalem with at the centre the Holy of Holies (the Meqdes) containing a copy of the Ark of the Covenant, the original of which is believed to be in Axum). The Anaphora is often said in private and sotto voce while the deacon leads the congregation in litanies of various kinds. Yet it would be wrong to say that the congregation are just passive spectators though the sacraments are administered in the passive voice e.g. The servant of God N is baptised in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit...is given the Body and Blood of Christ. The ‘Leitourgia’ is nevertheless just that –the work of the people each with their own roles to play.

Yet there is a strong sense of the corporate in Orthodox worship which contrasts with a western individualism accentuated by western pews which firmly root the worshipper to a particular place. Orthodoxy tends to start with the corporate – the whole Church is present at the Eucharist. The host placed on the discos by the priest is divided up – a central piece representing the Body of the Lord, and then smaller fragments representing

Our Lady and the saints, the faithful living and dead, all of which are put into the chalice.

It is interesting to note that communism which might be seen as a heresy that could only have emerged from a Judaeo-Christian culture took root originally in Orthodox countries where the sense of the corporate was more powerful than in countries where there was more stress on the individual.

Western views of Orthodoxy have changed in modern times but we have to take the Orthodox view on its own merits and not use it to confirm an agenda we have already formulated. For example, the unchanging nature of Orthodox Liturgy at least in any substantial way since the time of the Byzantine synthesis is often confirmed by Orthodox writers themselves. ‘...an Orthodox Christian entering Church for the Liturgy in the 21st century has every reason to believe ...that he or she is sharing the same experience as the Byzantines did in the 10th century. Or the Liturgy may be seen as ‘a seamless robe, a totality in which every part adheres to the whole in primordial and peaceful harmony’.¹⁶ Of course, it has to be acknowledged that although there has been growth and development in Orthodox Liturgy it is always a natural process, never a reform imposed from above or programmed from below. Local variations inevitably are found in a situation where liturgical books are less standardised than in the west.

The distinguished Jesuit Robert Taft, who has contributed so much to the western understanding of eastern liturgy, warns against the danger of seeking to find precedents in earlier tradition for what has already been predetermined.¹⁷

The Melkite presence at Vatican II certainly had an influence on subsequent developments out of proportion to their numbers. Examples of Orthodox influence of western liturgical reform include the following: a vernacular liturgy (it is ironic that despite the pioneering work of SS Cyril and Methodius in providing a vernacular Liturgy, Old Slavonic and even the Greek of the Byzantine liturgy is not readily comprehensible to the ordinary faithful today and the problem of language for the diaspora poses further problems). Other influences include the insertion of an epiclesis into the Eucharistic prayer asking the Holy Spirit to change the gifts into the Body and Blood of Christ, concelebration, communion in both kinds, the revival of the permanent diaconate, a return to the ancient unity in the initiation rites, revision of the ordination and confirmation rites and the attempt to restore the Liturgy of the Hours to the whole people of God'.¹⁸ One should also mention the restoration of Holy Week and the Easter Vigil under Pius XII putting Easter at the heart of the Liturgical year.

In the west the 'preferential option for the east' has sometimes been adopted uncritically in reaction against earlier negative attitudes. Prosper Gueranger of Solemnes, for example, contrasts the liturgical unity of the west which 'alone has been able to render impossible the schism and heresy and declares the eastern rites 'families of degenerate

Christianity'.¹⁹ Later he reveals his hand by showing that what he really wanted to prove was that the neo-Gallican rites in France should be abandoned in favour of the Roman rite. By contrast another Benedictine, Olivier Rousseau, could adopt a wholly romantic attitude towards the east: 'Among Catholics it is a truism that the Orthodox Church has preserved the liturgical spirit of the early Church so that there is no need for a liturgical movement in the Orthodox Church. This church has never departed in its piety and its offices from the liturgical spirit of the early church to which it as always remained faithful'.²⁰

Vatican II saw liturgical renewal as a 'genuine return to evangelical and patristic sources'. Sacrosanctum Concilium wanted the rites to be restored to the vigour they had 'in the tradition of the Fathers'.²¹ – just like, in fact, the stated intention of the Council of Trent which also asked for a return 'to the pristine norm of the Holy Fathers'!²² The Council rightly saw that liturgical archaeology was not the answer to contemporary problems. As Frederick McManus has pointed out 'There is no commitment to one century or other, but only a search for the best sources and the best Christian thought especially in the first few centuries. It is matter of restoration and recovery scrutinizing the past precedents for what can be pastorally sound liturgy in the present.'²³

There has sometimes been a tendency for the west to find in eastern Liturgy what is thought to be lacking in their own tradition and as we have seen there are plenty of obvious things in modern western liturgical reform that have come from the east.

We must, however, beware of thinking that we can identify in eastern liturgy what we think the west has lost. Orthodoxy does not represent the past of western Christianity. In any case one only has to read St John Chrysostom to see that there was no past golden age. Of course there were the wonderful liturgies and the great stational processions of Constantinople but he complains that the faithful were behaving in Church as if they were at the hairdressers or at the pub or even a brothel! Indeed, the behaviour of some at the Easter Vigil was so outrageous that it caused him to fume that it would be better if they had stayed at home.²⁴

Certainly there are some features of eastern Liturgy from which we can learn in response to our own perceived shortcomings. Robert Taft notes a number of these:²⁵

1 The balance between a high Christology and tender devotion for the knowable human kenotic Christ. Christ is the awesome Pantocrator of the dome gazing down in majesty on the faithful – one thinks of the church at Daphne on the outskirts of Athens. The transcendence of God is given due acknowledgement. Indeed the whole Liturgy can be seen to recognise the awesomeness of Christ's presence. Cf. the commentaries on the Liturgy by Theodore of Mopsuestia, Maximus the Confessor and Nicholas Cabasilas. Christ is present in the whole of the Liturgy which corresponds to different aspects of the presence of the Incarnate Lord. Thus the cherubic hymn is sung at the Offertory not the consecration as is the hymn from the Liturgy of St James translated in western

hymn-books as ‘Let all mortal flesh keep silence and with fear and trembling stand’. The worshipper comes not ‘to get something out of it’ but to glorify God.

But Christ the awesome Pantocrator is also the ‘philanthropos’ – the lover of human kind – God with us, immanently present in our midst. Both these two elements are true and how to hold them together in creative tension is the problem of any liturgist. It could be argued that the tension is better solved in eastern liturgy than it has been in the west. The worship is homely even informal but never casual and there is a strong sense of the *mysterium tremendum et fascinans*.

2 Eastern Liturgy is profoundly Trinitarian. All Christians believe in God as a Trinity of Persons but again this seems to be better expressed in Eastern Liturgy. The Roman rite is deeply Christological not least because it took shape against the background of the Christological controversies and before the pneumatological debates. After all, the creed of the Council of Nicaea simply says ‘we believe in the Holy Spirit’ in contrast to the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed of 381 used at Mass today, regrettably with the insertion of the filioque in the 11th century. Eucharistic prayers 2, 3 and 4 all have an epiclesis but more than this is required. It is not only a matter of texts but of mentality. The actual faith consciousness of the community and its Trinitarian expression in the Liturgy is, in Taft’s view, ‘incomparably superior to what was traditional in the Latin west’.²⁶

3 Eastern Liturgy is holistic. The synthesis of ritual, art and music all contribute to what the Liturgy is. The whole person is engaged in a worship which is far more than a cerebral exercise for souls with ears. The repetitions of Eastern liturgy produce a familiarity and repetitiveness that is at the basis of ordinary life, in contrast to the succinctness of western liturgy.

We can learn from the east as they can from us – we need each other – but we need to avoid seeing the east through rose-tinted glasses, an attitude which is certainly not shared by contemporary orthodox theologians. Witness the Russian theologians of the communist era and the writings of such distinguished Orthodox liturgiologists such as Alexander Schmemmann.

The report of the Consultation on Orthodox Renewal and Visible Unity from the New Skete Monastery, Cambridge, New York, outlines a radical agenda for Orthodox liturgical renewal. Again it would probably be argued by some Orthodox that those in the diaspora have been unduly influenced by western theology. ‘Our churches must be willing to support and advance a timely orderly and informed process of liturgical renewal in order to recover the essentials of the liturgical tradition’.²⁷ They plead for worship in the vernacular (English for many in the diaspora), a more open iconostasis, greater congregational participation, a wider selection of Scripture readings and more frequent communion as well as the restoration of the diaconate for women.

Schmemmann can even talk of a ‘liturgical crisis’²⁸ in the Orthodox church. He is speaking in the context of the diaspora where some of the older xenophobic attitudes which can be the negative side of inculturation simply will not do. The eastern Churches need to face modernity in a way that western Christianity has at least attempted to, even if it has only been partially successful.

Schmemmann rails against many of his contemporaries in the field of liturgy who have not moved on from the rubricism of the 19th century that seemed to accept the western divorce, as he saw it, between theology and worship. He was against uniformity in worship. The Greek and Slavonic *typica* show diversity to be a possibility. He traces the development of the Ordo as displayed in the Ordo of Constantinople and the Ordo of Saint Sabba. He is rooted in the tradition of orthodoxy but is also concerned for its lived existential dimension as well. ‘Without worship there is no Church, but Christ did not establish a society for the observance of worship but a way of salvation, a new life’. He was stimulated by western scholars such as Danielou and Louis Bouyer. His interest is in the practice of Orthodoxy today; he was among those who were instrumental in the establishment of an autocephalous north American Orthodox Church. The aim of the Liturgy is ‘the manifestation of the Church’s nature for the salvation of the world’. He is critical of those who identify love of the church with love of the church building.

He outlines an agenda for liturgical reform in Orthodoxy. This would include a stress on the following:

1 The rhythm of fast and Eucharist essential to a sound eschatology.

He does not think the Eucharist should be celebrated every day and many days should be fast days as they were in the west until the time of Popes Pius X and Benedict XV and to a lesser extent until the Second Vatican Council.

2 The daily cycle should be given its proper weight.

3 The unity of the liturgical year should be manifested in the celebration of Easter.

4 Worship should be the corporate act and corporate fulfilment of the Church.

5 Worship must be an expression of the Church's doctrine at the deepest level.²⁹

Aidan Nichols, commenting on this agenda, asks what I suspect is not entirely a neutral question: To what extent is the 20th century liturgical reform (in the west) in its actual realisation to be regarded as a warning about the dangers which lie in the task of reconstructing on theoretical principles an organic tradition of worship? There seems to be a feeling that we have succumbed to some of those dangers and the problem needs addressing. In the face of a growing awareness that this is so, we can look to the East for inspiration but with realism and discernment. Pope Benedict XVI is already giving a lead by calling for a restoration of that beauty in the Liturgy that might even enable us to say with the legates of Prince Vladimir 'we knew not whether we were in heaven or on earth'.

-
- ¹ Quoted in T Ware, *The Orthodox Church* (London: Penguin 1977), p. 265
- ² *Ibid.*
- ³ N Zernov, *Orthodox Encounter* (London: James Clarke, 1961), pg. 51.
- ⁴ George Florovsky, 'The Elements of Liturgy in the Orthodox Catholic Church', *One Church* (New York) Vol. XIII (1959), Nos. 1-2, p.24
- ⁵ John Chryssavagis, *Light Through Darkness* (London: Darton Longman & Todd, 2004), pgs. 32ff.
- ⁶ A Schmemman, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (Faith Press, 1966), p.12
- ⁷ www.Zenit Daily News – 14 April 2006
- ⁸ Matthew the Poor, *The Communion of Love*, (St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984), pp. 16-17
- ⁹ The Travels of Macarius, ed. Ridding, pp. 14, 46
- ¹⁰ John Paul II, *Orientalis Lumen – Apostolic Letter 'On the Light of the East'*, (Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2 May 1995), n.7.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*
- ¹² From a letter printed in W J Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*, p. 67.
- ¹³ Robert Taft SJ, 'Eastern Presuppositions and Western liturgical renewal', www.praiseofglory.com
- ¹⁴ E Waugh, *When the Going was Good*, (Penguin: 1951), p. 96
- ¹⁵ John Binns, *An Introduction to the Christian Orthodox Churches* (Cambridge: 2002), p. 45.
- ¹⁶ John Chryssavagis, *ibid.*
- ¹⁷ Robert Taft SJ, *ibid.*
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁹ Prosper Gueranger, *Institutions Liturgiques* (2nd edition, 4 vols. Paris: 1875), 1:226-227, 229.
- ²⁰ Olivier Rousseau OSB, *Histoire du Mouvement Liturgique, Lex Orandi 3* (Paris: Cerf 1945), p. 188
- ²¹ Documents of Vatican II, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 50
- ²² Pius V, *Quo Primum*, 14 July 1570, cited in Frederick R McManus 'Back to the Future: the Early Christian Roots of Liturgical Renewal', *Worship* 72 (1998) p. 390.
- ²³ *Ibid.*, p. 386-403
- ²⁴ See e.g. PG 60; 190, 218; PG 61; 313-14
- ²⁵ Robert Taft SJ, *ibid.*
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*
- ²⁷ Report of the Consultation on Orthodox Renewal and Visible Unity, New Skete Monastery, Cambridge, NY, 1998
- ²⁸ A Schmemman, *op.cit.*, p. 25
- ²⁹ Aidan Nichols, *Light from the East*, (Sheed & Ward: 1995), Chapter IX 'Alexander Schmemman & Liturgical Theology', pp. 146-169.