THE LITURGY OF THE GREAT CHURCH: AN INITIAL SYNTHESIS OF STRUCTURE AND INTERPRETATION ON THE EVE OF ICONOCLASM*

ROBERT TAFT, S. J.

INTRODUCTION

Medieval liturgical commentaries, sometimes disparagingly referred to as "allegories," are not our most esteemed theological literature today.[1] But only at the risk of one's credibility as an objective student of cultural history could one summarily dismiss so resiliently durable a literary genre as the Byzantine liturgical commentary. And indeed, recent research has already prepared the ground for a more nuanced evaluation of this material.[2]

In the following pages I shall discuss chiefly the commentary of Patriarch St. Germanus I of Constantinople († *ca.* 730) and the liturgy of the Great Church that he describes.[3] Although Maximus Confessor is surely a more significant author, and his *Mystagogy* (*ca.* 630), the first extant Byzantine commentary, is in many ways the most important, unlike Germanus' work it is directed more at monastic contemplation than at popular liturgical piety,[4] and had ultimately less influence in the final synthesis of Byzantine liturgical symbolism. And although the commentary of Nicholas Cabasilas (*ca.* 1350) best represents this final synthesis, when the liturgy had reached full form in the διάταξις of Philotheus,[5] and is the most popular of the

* This paper is a revised version of a lecture delivered at the Dumbarton Oaks Symposium on Byzantine Liturgy, May 10–12, 1979.

[1] Cf., for example, O. Demus, *Byzantine Mosaic Decoration. Aspects of Monumental Art in Byzantium* (London, 1947), 15; J. Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology. Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York, 1976), 118, 202ff.; A. Schmemann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, Library of Orthodox Theology, 4 (London, 1966), 99ff.; H.-J. Schulz, "Kultsymbolik der byzantinischen Kirche," in *Symbolik des orthodoxen und orientalischen Christentums* (Stuttgart, 1962) (hereafter Schulz, "Kultsymbolik"), 17, 20–21; M. Solovey, *The Byzantine Divine Liturgy. History and Commentary* (Washington, D.C., 1970), 70ff.; J. van Rossum, "Dom Odo Casel O.S.B. († 1948)," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 22 (1978), 150–51.

[2] R. Bornert, *Les Commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie du VII^e au XV^e siècle*, AOC, 9 (Paris, 1966) (hereafter Bornert, *Commentaires*); H.-J. Schulz, *Die byzantinische Liturgie. Vom Werden ihrer Symbolgestalt*, Sophia, 5 (Freiburg/B., 1964) (hereafter Schulz, *Liturgie*).

[3] On Germanus, see L. Lamza, *Patriarch Germanos I. von Konstantinopel (715–730)*, Das östliche Christentum, N.F. 27 (Würzburg, 1975).

[4] Cf. Bornert, *Commentaires*, 85–86, 181.

[5] *Ibid.*, 25, 243; Schulz, *Liturgie*, 165–66. Philotheus Kokkinos' rubric book dates from before 1347, when he was still higoumen of the Great Lavra on Athos. It gained great prestige after Philotheus' accession to the patriarchal throne of Constantinople in 1353, eventually became normative throughout the Byzantine Church outside Italy, and was incorporated into Demetrius Doucas' *editio princeps* of the liturgy (Rome, 1526). Cf. R. Taft, *The Great Entrance. A History of the Transfer of Gifts and Other Pre-anaphoral Rites of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, OCA, 200 (Rome, 1975) (hereafter Taft, *Great Entrance*), xxvi, xxxvi–xxxviii.

commentaries today[6]—we do not even have a translation of Germanus—Cabasilas' work and the liturgy it interprets are the end product of developments that mature in the period of struggle and victory over Iconoclasm (726–775, 815–843),[7] the great watershed event in the history of Byzantine liturgy after the golden age of Justinian.[8] As in the grossly mislabeled "Dark Ages" of Western Europe, this is a period of profound change in piety.[9] The patriarchate of Germanus (715–730) stands at the gate of this watershed, and his work is our earliest witness to the new synthesis in popular liturgical piety.

The remarkable success of this synthesis is proved by its durability. Germanus' Ἱστορία ἐκκλησιαστικὴ καὶ μυστικὴ θεωρία, continually expanded and updated through the centuries by successive interpolations to align it with each new development in the liturgy itself, eventually achieved quasi-official status with its incorporation into the liturgical books.[10] Indeed this continual reworking of the text may well be the reason why modern scholars have paid so little attention to Germanus. The text in Migne (PG, 98) is hopelessly corrupt, and the authenticity of the commentary was rarely affirmed until the restoration of Borgia and, most recently, the masterful study of Bornert.[11]

Following this restored text, I hope to show that Germanus' work is no fanciful allegory, but a viable, consistent eucharistic theology, suited to the mentality of his times and in continuity with the patristic tradition to which he was heir. The legitimation of his work has, of course, the limitations inherent in any such revisionist enterprise. *A* theology is not *the* theology; *his* times are not *all* times. But studies in the history of theology always show the fatuousness of seeking anything more. Out of the common basis of the New Testament message each age and its liturgical tradition molds its own *Symbolgestalt* to express its particular view of the

[6] At least if one can judge from the attention he receives. In addition to several translations of his major works, there are a new critical edition of his commentary: Nicholas Cabasilas, *Explication de la Divine Liturgie*, trans. S. Salaville, 2nd ed. with R. Bornert, J. Gouillard, P. Périchon, SC, 4 bis (Paris, 1967); and at least two major studies of his theology: M. Lot-Borodine, *Nicolas Cabasilas, un maître de la spiritualité byzantine au XIV^e siècle* (Paris, 1958), and W. Völker, *Die Sakramentsmystik des Nikolaus Kabasilas* (Wiesbaden, 1977). On the influence of Cabasilas in Western theology, see Bornert, *Commentaires*, 244.

[7] Cf. Schulz, *Liturgie*, 165ff.; Bornert, *Commentaires*, 179–80. Actually, the shift begins earlier, in the sixth century, with the growth of icon worship, to which Iconoclasm was a conservative reaction. Cf. E. Kitzinger, "The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm," *DOP*, 8 (1954), 83–150.

[8] For a summary of the various stages of Byzantine liturgical history, see M. Arranz, "Les grandes étapes de la liturgie byzantine: Palestine-Byzance-Russie. Essai d'aperçu historique," in *Liturgie de l'église particulière, liturgie de l'église universelle.* Conférences S.-Serge, 1975, Bibliotheca *EphL*, Subsidia 7 (Rome, 1976), 43–72.

[9] The Western "Dark Ages" and the new society to emerge from them were less continuous with what preceded, but the Eastern Empire also knew its "dark centuries" (C. Mango, *Byzantine Architecture*, History of World Architecture [New York, 1976], 161), from about 610–850, and the new cultural synthesis in both areas had perhaps more in common than is often recognized, especially with respect to liturgical understanding. Cf. A. Kolping, "Amalar von Metz und Florus von Lyon, Zeugen eines Wandels im liturgischen Mysterienverständnis," *ZkTh*, 73 (1951), 424–64. The history of the piety of this period still awaits a definitive study; for the West the best survey is still J. A. Jungmann, "The Defeat of Teutonic Arianism and the Revolution in Religious Culture in the Early Middle Ages," in *idem*, *Pastoral Liturgy* (New York, 1962) (hereafter Jungmann, "Arianism"), 1–101.

[10] Bornert, *Commentaires*, 125, 161ff. The interpolated text was first printed following the three liturgies in the *editio princeps* of Doucas. From the thirteenth century it appears in Russia in Slavonic MSS, and large sections of it were included in the popular *Služba tol'kovaja* (*The Liturgy Commented*), which was sometimes incorporated into the Slavonic euchology or *Služebnik* itself. Cf. Solovey, *op. cit.*, 77ff.

[11] Bornert, *Commentaires*, 125–42, gives an exhaustive study of the textual problem. On Borgia's edition and the question of authenticity, cf. *ibid.*, 127–32, 142–48.

myriad richness this original vision bears. All we can ask of Germanus is what we ask of theology today: that his "model" of the eucharist present a valid expression of the common tradition so as to make it alive for the genius of his age. For it is at the intersection of tradition and contemporary culture that the theological craft is exercised, and in Byzantine liturgical explanation at the start of the eighth century this crossroad was occupied by Germanus.

Eighth-Century Worship in the Great Church: Historia/Theoria[12]

1. *Hagia Sophia*

In no liturgical tradition is liturgical space such an integral part of the liturgy as in the Byzantine, and in no tradition has one edifice played such a decisive role as Justinian's Hagia Sophia. No church even half as big was ever again built in the Byzantine realm; indeed, by the time of the liturgy we are discussing, monastic churches of quite reduced scale has already begun to take over the field.[13] Still, Hagia Sophia was the cathedral church of the city where the Byzantine rite was molded and celebrated, and where the vision of its meaning, enacted elsewhere on a smaller stage, was determined and kept alive.

What was most new about this building, far more so than its startling architecture, was the *vision* created by its marvelous interior, and the formative influence of this vision on the spirit of the ritual it was built to house. A church is not a temple, at least in its original conception. The community, rather than some material shrine, is the dwelling of God's presence.[14] In time it became customary to see the building as a symbol of the mysteries it housed, but it was not until Hagia Sophia that the contents created for themselves a vessel worthy of reflecting this reality. With Hagia Sophia the *domus ecclesiae* becomes the New Temple, and Justinian the New Solomon, as he himself is said to have exclaimed on the occasion of the dedication in 537.[15]

The Byzantines did not, of course, invent the notion of the church as image of the cosmos God created and inhabits, from the upper reaches of His throne upon the cherubim to the lower stage where human life is enacted.[16] But Hagia Sophia gave it awesome expression in a way never achieved before. The sheer mass of its exterior bulk looming over the city made it "a spectacle of great beauty, stupendous

[12] On the meaning of these terms, borrowed from patristic exegesis by Byzantine mystagogy, see *ibid.*, 65ff., 90ff., 218ff., 266. Ἱστορία is the literal exposition of the sense of a rite; Θεωρία is the contemplation of its underlying mystery.

[13] Mango, *Architecture*, 107, 178ff.

[14] Cf. Mark 14:58; John 2:21; 1 Cor. 3:16, 6:19; 2 Cor. 6:16; 1 Pet. 2:5; Eph. 2:19–22. See Y. M.-J. Congar, *The Mystery of the Temple* (Westminster, Md., 1962), chap. 8.

[15] According to the legendary account in the ninth-century *Anonymi narratio de aedificatione templi S. Sophiae*, 27, ed. T. Preger, *Scriptores originum constantinopolitanarum*, I (Leipzig, 1901), 105.

[16] Though first systematized in Christian literature by Maximus (*Mystagogia* 1–5, PG, 91, cols. 664–84), the notion of temple as microcosm is a commonplace of human religiosity. Cf. M. Eliade, *Images and Symbols. Studies in Religious Symbolism* (New York, 1969), chap. 1. As far as I know, it is first applied to the Christian church in a sixth-century poem on the cathedral of Edessa, ed. H. Goussen, "Über eine 'Sugitha' auf die Kathedrale von Edessa," *Le Muséon*, 38 (1925), 117–36; trans. C. Mango, *The Art of the Byzantine Empire, 312–1453*, Sources and Documents in the History of Art Series (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972) (hereafter Mango, *Art*), 57–60. Cf. A. Grabar, "Le témoignage d'une hymne syriaque sur l'architecture de la cathédrale d'Edesse au VI^e siècle et sur la symbolique de l'édifice chrétien," *CahArch*, 2 (1948), 41–67.

to those who see it and altogether incredible to those who hear of it."[17] But if the exterior was incredible, the interior was terrifying: Hagia Sophia enclosed the largest single unobstructed interior ever put under roof.[18] Those who describe the church are dumbfounded by the same two qualities: the vastness of the nave, and the brilliance of its lighting.[19] The overpowering impact made by roofing in such an expanse of open space uncluttered by pillars made the dome seem to hang from heaven like the sky, unsupported by any earthly force.[20] And the sun streaming in through the innumerable windows, sparkling and reflecting from the golden, mosaic-covered interior and silver-decked furnishings, seemed to originate from some inner source in the life of the edifice itself.[21] This awesome splendor led observers of every epoch to exclaim with remarkable consistency that here, indeed, was heaven on earth, the heavenly sanctuary, a second firmament, image of the cosmos, throne of the very glory of God.[22]

Note that the space itself, not its decoration, created this impression.[23] Only in later, less magnificent structures of a poorer age was this symbolism made explicit in mosaic and fresco, in accord with the more literal spirit of the post-iconoclastic age.[24] A similar impression was created by the liturgy celebrated therein, as we read in the famous account of the embassy sent to Constantinople by Prince Vladimir of Kiev in the year 987: "...We knew not whether we were in heaven or on earth. For on earth there is no such beauty, and we are at a loss how to describe it. We only know that God dwells there among men...."[25]

2. *Sources of the Liturgy*[26]

What sort of liturgy did they observe on this fateful occasion, so overwhelmingly impressive that it became the foundational symbolic event in the legend of the

[17] Procopius, *De aedif.* I, i, 27, Loeb, VII (Cambridge, Mass., 1954), 12–13; and Mango, *Art*, 73–74.

[18] T. Mathews, *The Byzantine Churches of Istanbul: A Photographic Survey* (University Park, Pa., 1976), 263.

[19] Cf. Evagrius Scholasticus, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV, 31, PG, 86², cols. 2757–61; Paul Silentiary, *Descr. S. Sophiae* 398, 489, 506, 532, 668, 720, 806, 834, 839, 862, 871, 884, *ibid.*, cols. 2135–52; *Descr. ambonis* 76, 163, 191, *ibid.*, cols. 2255, 2258–59; Procopius, *De aedif.* I, i, 29ff., Loeb, VII, 16ff.; all in Mango, *Art*, 74–75, 79, 82ff., 92, 94.

[20] Procopius, *De aedif.* I, i, 33–34, 46, 50, Loeb, VII, 16–23; Evagrius, *Hist. eccl.* IV, 31, PG, 86², cols. 2760–61; Paul Silentiary, *Descr. S. Sophiae* 352, 398, 489, 552, *ibid.*, cols. 2133–40; all in Mango, *Art*, 74–75, 79, 81–83.

[21] Procopius, *De aedif*, I, i, 30, Loeb, VII, 16; Mango, *Art*, 74.

[22] Cf. Procopius, *De aedif.* (sixth century), I, i, 61, Loeb, VII, 26; Mango, *Art*, 76; Adamnanus (*ca.* 705), *De locis sanctis libri tres*, III, 3. *Itinera Hierosolymitana saeculi IIII–VIII*, CSEL, 39, 286; the text of Germanus (*ca.* 730) cited *infra*, in the conclusion; Michael Psellus (eleventh century), *Monodia*, PG, 122, col. 912; Nicetas Choniata (1206), *Historia* 4, Bonn ed. (1835), 782.

[23] The original decoration of Hagia Sophia was minimal. Its present iconographic program dates from *ca.* 866–913, after the defeat of Iconoclasm. See C. Mango, *Materials for the Study of the Mosaics of St. Sophia at Istanbul*, DOS, 8 (Washington, D.C., 1962), 93–94.

[24] On the iconographic program of the Middle Byzantine church, see Demus, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 1); Mango, *Architecture* (*supra*, note 9), 249ff.; Schulz, *Liturgie*, 92ff.; E. Giordani, "Das mittelbyzantinische Ausschmückungssystem als Ausdruck eines hieratischen Bildprogramms," *JÖBG*, 1 (1951), 103–34; and the documents in Mango, *Art*, chap. 6. On the later program in Hagia Sophia, see Mango, *Materials*.

[25] S. H. Cross and O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor, *The Russian Primary Chronicle, Laurentian Text* (Cambridge, Mass., 1953), 110–11. See also the impressions of the pilgrim Anthony of Novgorod (A.D. 1200), *Kniga palomnik. Skazanie mest svjatyh vo Tsaregrade Antonija Arhiepiskopa Novgorodskago v 1200 godu*, ed. H. M. Loparev, *Pravoslavnyj palestinskij sbornik*, 51 (1899), 13, 17, 20; trans. B. de Khitrowo, *Itinéraires russes en orient* (Geneva, 1889), 94, 99.

[26] For complete information on sources of the pontifical rite, see pt. II of R. Taft, "The Pontifical Liturgy of the Great Church According to a Twelfth-Century Diataxis in Codex *British Museum Add. 34060*," I: Text, *OCP*, 45 (1979), 279–307; II: Commentary, *OCP*, 46 (1980), 89–124 (hereafter Taft, "Pontifical Liturgy").

conversion of Rus? The commentaries of Maximus Confessor and Germanus are the only extant witnesses to the patriarchal eucharist of the Great Church in the period between Justinian and Iconoclasm. But the nonstational service did not change much in the two centuries between Germanus and our next sources, so out of necessity, and with the usual *caveats* about such a procedure, I shall use some of these later sources, but only to complete our picture of rites that Germanus clearly alludes to. Among these sources, the tenth-century *De cerimoniis* of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus recounts those rites of the patriarchal liturgy—such as the entrances, kiss of peace, communion—in which the emperor sometimes played an active role. Then there is the most important tenth-century Typicon of the Great Church;[27] and, finally, *Codex Isidore Pyromalus* and the related Latin version of Johannisberg, both sources for the tenth-century Liturgy of St. Basil that contain explicit rubrics for the pontifical celebration of Hagia Sophia.[28]

But for a complete description of the integral rite we must await the Late Byzantine διατάξεις or rubric books, which from the twelfth century begin to multiply as a new genre in Byzantine ecclesiastical literature.[29] The first of these is the eleventh-century *Order of the Holy Liturgy according to the Rite of the Great Church*, found in a twelfth-century vellum portion of codex *British Library Add. 34060*.[30]

3. *Preparatory Rites*

From these and other somewhat disparate sources, mostly from the Middle Byzantine period, we can reconstruct with reasonable accuracy the liturgy commented upon in the *Historia ecclesiastica* of Germanus in the first quarter of the eighth century. The preparations for the service, which had not yet assumed their present proportions or importance, took place in the small rotunda called the skeuophylakion or treasury, a separate edifice adjacent to the church, located just off the northeast corner of Hagia Sophia.[31] There the church vestments, plate, and other liturgical paraphernalia were stored; there the people left their offerings before the liturgy; there the clergy vested and prepared the necessary vessels and gifts before the liturgy began. It is not yet possible to speak of a prothesis rite except in embryonic form.[32] The deacons just selected the requisite amount of bread from among the offerings and prepared the chalices.[33] When the patriarch had arrived from his palace at the opposite extremity of the cathedral and had vested, he put the breads on the patens, incensed them, and said the offertory prayer. Such at least is the ceremonial as described in the tenth-century sources of the Liturgy of St. Basil.[34] The prayer was already part of the liturgy in the eighth

[27] J. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Eglise. Ms. Sainte-Croix no. 40. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes*, OCA, 165–66 (Rome, 1962–63).

[28] *Codex Pyromalus*, now lost, is edited in J. Goar, Εὐχολόγιον *sive rituale graecorum*..., 2nd ed. (Venice, 1730) (hereafter Goar), 153–56. On the Johannisberg version, see Taft, *Great Entrance*, xxvii, cited from *Speculum antiquae deuotionis circa missam, et omnem alium cultum Dei: ex antiquis, et antea nunquam euulgatis per typographos autoribus, à Ioanne Cochlaeo laboriose collectum*... (Mainz, 1549).

[29] See Taft, *Great Entrance*, xxxv–viii.

[30] Edited in Taft, "Pontifical Liturgy," pt. I.

[31] Cf. Taft, *Great Entrance*, 185–92.

[32] On the sources and evolution of this ritual in the pontifical rite, see *ibid.*, 265–70.

[33] References *ibid.*, 274 note 73.

[34] Ed. Cochlaeus, 267, and Goar, 153 (both *supra*, note 28), cited in Taft, *Great Entrance*, 267–68.

century,[35] but this is the first reference we have to the patriarch saying it. In the time of Germanus, on nonstational days when the liturgy was not preceded by a procession, it is more probable that the patriarch vested in the palace and entered the outer narthex via the "beautiful door" in its south wall facing his residence.[36] If there was a station, clergy and people arrived together in procession, going in through the atrium to the chant of an antiphonal psalm. Upon entering the narthex, the patriarch and clergy paused before the central or "royal doors" leading into the nave to say the introit prayer, while the people flooded into the nave via the other six doors, three on each side of the three central ones reserved for the emperor and clergy.[37]

4. *The Enarxis*[38]

At nonstational liturgies, before the entrance of the patriarch and his entourage at least one presbyter and one deacon would have gone in before the chancel to lead the gathering congregation in the office of the enarxis, a simple rite of three antiphons, each preceded by an oration and its customary *oremus*.[39] Neither the opening blessing nor the great synapte ("litany of peace") were part of the enarxis at that time.[40]

5. *The Introit*

All this is preparatory; the liturgy is still to begin. By now the patriarch is seated in the narthex before the royal doors, awaiting the signal for the introit.[41] When the psalmists in their chamber beneath the ambo intone the Monogenes, traditional refrain of the introit psalm—the third antiphon of the enarxis on nonstational days—the patriarch goes before the royal doors to say the introit prayer.[42] To the patriarch, his view into the nave focused past the open doors and interior western buttresses onto the central axis of the ambo, solea, and sanctuary which were bathed in the rays of sun streaming in through the windows of the apse,[43] the words of the

[35] Codex *Barberini 336*, earliest extant MS of the liturgy, ed. F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (Oxford, 1896), 309. This prayer, as one of the formulae common to both Constantinopolitan eucharistic liturgies (St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom), is a later addition to both, after they had begun to share a common history as variant formularies of the same local Church.

[36] On the stational rites and the development of the enarxis from them, see J. Mateos, *Célébration de la Parole dans la liturgie byzantine*, OCA, 191 (Rome, 1971), 34–71; R. Taft, "How Liturgies Grow: The Evolution of the Byzantine 'Divine Liturgy'," *OCP*, 43 (1977) (hereafter Taft, "Liturgies"), 360ff. The "beautiful door" is not to be confused with the "beautiful doors" or "royal doors" leading from narthex to nave. Cf. Taft, "Pontifical Liturgy," pt. I, note 12, to which should be added the references in Mango, *Materials* (*supra*, note 23), 96–97.

[37] Taft, *Great Entrance*, 192 note 51.

[38] See *supra*, note 36.

[39] Johannisberg version, cited in Taft, *Great Entrance*, 267, from Cochlaeus (*supra*, note 28), 119. On the development of the synapte from the *oremus*, see R. Taft, "The Structural Analysis of Liturgical Units: An Essay in Methodology," *Worship*, 52 (1978), 319–21.

[40] Taft, "Liturgies," 362.

[41] Taft, *Great Entrance*, 268–69; "Pontifical Liturgy," pt. I, Text **I. 1**, and pt. II, commentary, 105–6.

[42] On the location of the psalmists, see references in Taft, *Great Entrance*, 79 note 109. The Monogenes, believed to have been composed by Justinian in 535–536, is today the περισσή or variant concluding refrain of the second antiphon (cf. Brightman, *op. cit.*, 365 line 33–366 line 9). For its original place at the introit, and how it got shifted by the eleventh century, see Mateos, *Célébration*, 50ff.; *idem*, *Typicon* (*supra*, note 27), II, 111 note 4. For its history, see V. Grumel, "L'auteur et la date de composition du tropaire Ὁ μονογενής," *EO*, 22 (1923), 398–418.

[43] See the photograph of this view in H. Kähler, *Hagia Sophia* (New York-Washington, D.C., 1967), illus. 23, and the description, 28ff.

prayer, like those of the many commentators, must certainly have evoked the vision of the heavenly sanctuary resplendent to the east, before his very eyes:

> O Lord and master, our God, who in heaven has established the orders and armies of angels and archangels to minister unto your majesty, grant that the holy angels may enter with us, and with us serve and glorify your goodness....[44]

And to the people now turned in expectation to watch the appearance of the patriarch and his retinue, splendidly attired in the rich vestments of their order and bearing the Gospel and cross, symbols of Christ, the psalm (LXX, Ps. 94) and its antiphon must indeed have presaged the imminent appearance of the heavenly celebrant Himself in their midst:[45]

> Come, let us rejoice in the Lord, let us shout with jubilation unto God our Savior,
>
> Let us come before His countenance with thanksgiving, and with psalms let us shout in jubilation unto Him.
>
> For the Lord is a great God and a great king over all the earth...
>
> O come, let us worship and fall down before Him...
>
> O only-begotten Son and Word of God, though immortal you condescended for our salvation to take flesh from the holy Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary. Without change you became man and were crucified, Christ God, trampling down death by death. You who are one of the Holy Trinity, glorified with the Father and the Holy Spirit, save us!

6. *Theoria*

Germanus (24/33)[46] interprets this "entrance of the Gospel" as the coming of Christ to the world:

> The entrance of the Gospel shows the appearance and the entrance of the Son of God into this world, as the apostle says, "When He—i.e., God the Father—brings the first-born into the world, He says: Let all His angels worship Him" (Heb. 1:6).

The pontiff in his red vestments represents the incarnate Christ, now appearing not in a manger of irrational beasts but in the table of the Word of rational men. Just

[44] Brightman, *op. cit.*, 368. This is the original Constantinopolitan introit prayer. Jacob has demonstrated that the variant prayer found in MSS from southern Italy (cf. *ibid.*, 312, right column) is an Italo-Byzantine peculiarity: A. Jacob, "La tradition manuscrite de la liturgie de S. Jean Chrysostome (VIII^e–XII^e siècles)," in *Eucharisties d'Orient et d'Occident*, Lex orandi, 47 (Paris, 1970), 109–38; cf. Taft, *Great Entrance*, xxxi–ii, 128–29.

[45] Incense, cross, and Gospel were carried in the introit (Taft, "Pontifical Liturgy," pt. II, 106–9), but Germanus mentions only the Gospel (cf. *infra*). For the psalmody, see Mateos, *Célébration*, 48–53.

[46] References to Germanus will be given in the text, the two numbers referring, respectively, to the paragraph numbers of the two available reconstructions of the Urtext: N. Borgia, *Il commentario liturgico di S. Germano Patriarca Costantinopolitano e la versione latina di Anastasio Bibliotecario*, Studi liturgici, 1 (Grottaferrata, 1912); F. E. Brightman, "The 'Historia Mystagogica' and Other Greek Commentaries on the Byzantine Liturgy," *JThS*, 9 (1908), 248–67, 387–97.

as the angels at His coming sang "Glory to God in the highest" (Luke 2:14), we sing "O come, let us worship and fall down! Save us, O Son of God!" And as the Magi offered gold, frankincense, and myrrh, we offer our faith, hope, and charity, expressed in the Trisagion hymn (25/34), which was chanted, as today, right after the introit antiphon.

The antiphons that precede this appearance Germanus interprets as the prophecies that announced Christ's coming (23/32). The ascent to and session at the throne of the bishop, vested in his omophorion, show Christ's ascension and enthronement in majesty at the right hand of the Father, bearing on His shoulders and offering to the Father the whole race of Adam (27/38).

Upon arriving at the throne in the apse, the patriarch greets and blesses the congregation with the traditional "*Peace to all*" and is seated. There follow immediately the gradual psalm or prokeimenon, epistle, alleluia psalm, and Gospel. The prokeimenon and Gospel herald once again the appearance of Christ (28/39, 31/43). Indeed, this "parousia"—a term Germanus uses five times (23/32, 24/33, 28/39, 31/43) in the context of the presence of Christ in the entrance rites and Word service—is the main theme stressed by Germanus in this part of the liturgy:[47]

> The Holy Gospel is the appearance of God in which He is seen by us, no longer through clouds and speaking in riddles as once to Moses... but He appeared openly as true man and was seen by us... through whom God the Father has spoken to us face to face and not in riddles, concerning whom the Father gives witness from heaven and says, "This is my beloved son," wisdom, word and power, announced to us in the prophets, and revealed in the Gospels, so that "all who receive Him and believe in His name receive power to become children of God." To Him whom we have heard and with our own eyes have seen to be the wisdom and word of God, we all cry "Glory to you, O Lord!" (31/43).

This is no more than an eighth-century Byzantine way of saying what Christians say of the Word service today: "In the liturgy the living God comes to meet us in His Word and His Sacrament."[48] Christ is the Word made flesh who still dwells among us in the Word of His revelation as well as in the sacrament of His body and blood. For Germanus the introit with the Gospel, ritual symbol of this coming to us now in Word, reminds us of the first appearance in the flesh, of which the presence in Word is but the continuation in sacramental form, gauge of the coming parousia of the final days (33/45).

7. *The Great Entrance*[49]

After the Gospel and homily the patriarch and accompanying clergy descend the synthronon and proceed to the altar while one of the deacons mounts the ambo to

[47] In Maximus, whom Germanus is following here, the parousia represented by the descent of the pontiff from the throne for the reading of the Gospel is clearly the second coming of Christ (*Mystagogia* 14, PG, 91, col. 693). As we shall see, this modification of Maximus is demanded by Germanus' interpretation of the Great Entrance.

[48] A. Verheul, *Introduction to the Liturgy* (Collegeville, Minn., 1968), 21.

[49] See Taft, *Great Entrance*, pt. I, for a detailed history of this rite.

proclaim the intercessions for the catechumens and their dismissal, an empty formality by the time of Germanus.[50] Then the eiliton is spread over the altar, and as one of the deacons continues the intercessions from the ambo, the several others take the thurible and leave the sanctuary via the north chancel gate, going out of the church to the skeuophylakion by the northeast door. In the skeuophylakion they make the final preparations of the gifts, then pass through the rotunda, perhaps exiting by its west door and entering the cathedral again by the doors in the north side, just across from the ambo.[51]

After the intercessions have been completed, the deacons in the cortège herald their arrival with the gifts by intoning the Cherubicon, which is then taken up by the psalmists, who have left their customary place in the chamber beneath the ambo and lined up on both sides of the solea to form an honor guard through which the procession of the gifts, accompanied by numerous candles and the fragrance of smoking thuribles, now passes.[52] When the archdeacon at the head of the procession arrives at the holy doors of the chancel, the procession halts while he enters to incense the altar, the patriarch, and other sacred ministers awaiting the arrival of the gifts.[53]

Like the first introit chant, which served to prepare the people for the coming of Christ in the mystery of His Word, the Cherubicon, sung during this procession without the interruption of the later medieval commemorations, served to prepare the people spiritually for the imminent oblation (anaphora) and communion, exhorting them to elevate their minds and hearts to God, to sing the angelic *Sanctus*, and to prepare to receive their king in communion:[54]

> We who mystically represent the Cherubim and sing the thrice-holy hymn to the life-giving Trinity, let us now lay aside all worldly care to receive the King of all escorted unseen by the angelic corps. Alleluia!

The splendor of this procession is as legendary as the building in which it took place. Indeed, it came to symbolize, by a sort of ritual synecdoche, the entire Byzantine Divine Liturgy.[55]

The ritual preparation for the anaphora is completed with the deacons arranging the patens and chalices on the altar and covering them with the aer, in those days a great veil large enough to cover much of the altar. Not until the thirteenth to fourteenth century does this deposition rite begin to acquire formulae, under the

[50] Since the eighth century another litany, the ἐκτενή, originally from the stational rogations, has been inserted before this (cf. Taft, "Liturgies," 368–69). The dismissals were an inoperative formality from at least the seventh century.

[51] For the sources of this reconstruction, see T. Mathews, *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy* (University Park, Pa.-London, 1971), 155ff.; Taft, *Great Entrance*, 194ff. That the procession went to the skeuophylakion to fetch the gifts is established beyond challenge; the details and route of the procession are hypothetical.

[52] *Ibid.*, 79–80.

[53] Or so it is in our earliest extant description: *De cerimoniis* I, 1, *Constantin VII Porphyrogénète, Le Livre des cérémonies*, ed. A. Vogt (Paris, 1935), I, 13. Cf. Taft, *Great Entrance*, 151ff.

[54] *Ibid.*, 62ff., 78–79, 227ff.

[55] Medieval frescoes of the "Divine Liturgy" always depict this procession. See G. Millet, *Monuments d'Athos*. I: *Les peintures* (Paris, 1927), pls. 64,1, 118,2–3, 218,2, 219,3, 256,2, 257,2, 261,1–2, 262,1–2; J. D. Ştefanescu, *Illustrations des liturgies dans l'art de Byzance et de l'Orient* (Brussels, 1936), 73ff., 189–90, and pls. XXIX,1–2, XXX,1–2, LX.

influence of the increasing symbolic importance the later commentators assigned to it as the burial of the body of Christ.[56]

While the psalmists are completing the final repetition of the entrance troparion, the patriarch withdraws from the altar to a spot just inside the holy doors and bows to the concelebrating hierarchs lined up on either side of the path from the holy doors to the altar, asking their prayers for the sacred action he is about to begin. They respond with the annunciation text from Luke 1:35: "*May the Holy Spirit come down upon you, and the Power of the Most High overshadow you.*" Then the patriarch moves up to the altar between the ranks of his concelebrants and commences the anaphora, beginning with the preparatory Proscomide Prayer.[57]

8. *Theoria*

In the later development of Byzantine liturgical symbolism the interpretation of this procession and deposition of gifts became the axis around which the whole symbolic structure turned: all that preceded and followed ultimately came to depend on it. But the earliest level of symbolism, that of the angelic liturgy which we already saw expressed in the introit prayer, is also found in the Cherubic Hymn introduced into the liturgy under Justin II in 573–574,[58] and Germanus both continues and enriches this hermeneutic.

> By means of the procession of the deacons and the representation (ἱστορία) of the ripidia bearing an image of the seraphim, the Cherubic Hymn shows the entrance of the saints and all the just, entering together before the cherubic powers and angelic hosts, invisibly going before Christ the great king proceeding to the mystical sacrifice... (37/49).[59]

Symbolized in the fire and sweet smoke of incense is the presence of the Holy Spirit, "Who comes invisibly upon us and perfumes us with the mystical, life-giving, and bloodless worship and fruition." And the angelic choirs, "seeing Christ's economy consummated in His cross and death, and the victory over death, descent into hell, and resurrection on the third day, sing with us alleluia!" (37/49).

In this interpretation of the Great Entrance as a prolepsis of the entire eucharistic anamnesis, Germanus remains faithful to the earliest Byzantine interpretation, expressed in the Cherubic Hymn. I have shown elsewhere that the Great-Entrance chants of the Byzantine and indeed of most Eastern liturgical traditions are not "offertory" chants, but serve rather to introduce the whole ritual to follow, much as the introit antiphon once did for the synaxis of the Word.[60] And in traditional fashion Germanus makes it quite clear that the anamnesis includes Christ's glorious

[56] Taft, *Great Entrance*, 209–10, 216ff., 242ff.

[57] The basis for this reconstruction of the Urtext of the *orate fratres* dialogue is found *ibid.*, 290ff.; for the rubrics, see pp. 308–10.

[58] Cedrenus, *Hist. compendium*, PG, 121, col. 748. Cf. Taft, *Great Entrance*, 68–69.

[59] Here, too, Germanus modifies the interpretation of Maximus' *Mystagogy* (16, PG, 91, col. 693). There, the procession is seen as an anticipation of the entrance of the just into heaven at the parousia, thus inaugurating the final age which, in Maximus' system, is represented by the eucharistic part of the liturgy following the Great Entrance (*Myst.* 16–21, PG, 91, cols. 693–97). Germanus' emphasis on the liturgy as the memorial of the earthly economy of Christ, more than as the anticipation of the final kingdom, does not permit him to follow Maximus here.

[60] Cf. Taft, *Great Entrance*, 62–68.

passover in its fullness. It is not a representation of the passion, as it came to be seen in the late medieval West, with such dire consequences in the singular impoverishment of late scholastic and Reformation eucharistic theology.[61]

But Germanus enriches this pristine interpretation with another, later tradition that would eventually become normative: the procession and deposition as the funeral cortège and burial of Christ.

> It is also in imitation of the burial of Christ, just as Joseph took down the body from the cross and wrapped it in a clean shroud, and after anointing it with spices and myrrh, carried it with Nicodemus and buried it in a new monument cut from rock. The altar and depository is the antitype of the holy sepulcher, that is, the holy table on which is placed the immaculate and all-holy body (37/50).

By the time of Germanus this new, Antiochene interpretation has begun to spin its web of allegory not only at the entrance itself, but back into the rites that precede it, initiating a process whereby the whole liturgical action before and after the transfer of gifts is interpreted in function of the idea that the gifts at the entrance represent the body of the already crucified Christ.[62] Thus the eiliton, spread on the altar by the deacons before going out to fetch the gifts, symbolizes the shroud in which the dead body of Christ was wrapped and laid in the tomb (34/47); and the final preparation in the skeuophylakion prior to the entrance images Mount Calvary where Christ died, prefigured in the sacrifice of Abraham (36/48).

Chapters 38–41/52–54a stretch the symbolism into allegory: the paten is the hands of Joseph and Nicodemus; its cover is the napkin that covered Christ's face in the tomb; the great veil (aer) is the stone rolled over the tomb, and the watch set before it by Pilate.

9. *The Pax, Creed, and Anaphora*[63]

Upon concluding the doxology of the Proscomide Prayer, the patriarch greets the people "*Peace to all,*" and the archdeacon gives the command to share the *pax*: "*Let us love one another!*" The only response was the kiss itself, exchanged within each order by everyone in the church. Then all chant the creed and, finally, the great veil is removed from the gifts in readiness for their blessing in the anaphora. The anaphora itself, a prayer recited silently by the celebrants around the altar,

[61] See the recent study of F. Pratzner, *Messe und Kreuzesopfer. Die Krise der Sakramentalenidee bei Luther und in der mittelalterlichen Scholastik*, Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie, 29 (Vienna, 1970), and the literature referred to there. The problem is summarized well in A. Gerken, *Theologie der Eucharistie* (Munich, 1973), 97ff.

[62] I use "allegory" here in the sense in which it is generally understood in contemporary liturgical writing (cf. Bornert, *Commentaires*, 44–45). Christian liturgical signification is rooted in biblical typology based on the correspondence between the phases of salvation history, including the sacramental. But it is the whole sacramental rite, not its individual details, that bears this signification. "Allegory" violates these presuppositions either by overstepping the bounds of objective biblical typology, seeing in the rites meanings that are personal to the allegorist and have no warrant in the biblical interpretation of salvation history; or by fragmenting the integrity of symbol and signified, assigning to individual details of a sacramental action separate aspects of the signified reality. In both cases, symbol is stretched to the breaking point. Hence the name "allegory," by analogy with its meaning in classical rhetoric: an extended metaphor. This is not, however, the traditional sense of "allegory" in Christian tradition (see *infra*, note 72).

[63] On the history of the rites of the *pax* and creed, see Taft, *Great Entrance*, chap. 11.

requires no ceremonial elucidation and receives none from Germanus.[64] More surprising is his silence concerning the *pax* and creed.

10. *Theoria*

Germanus begins his comments on the anaphora with a dramatic proclamation of the deposition symbolism that later entered the liturgical formulary itself in some medieval Italian manuscripts:

> Behold, Christ is crucified, life is buried, the tomb closed, the stone sealed! The priest approaches together with the angelic powers, not as one on earth but as if in the heavenly sanctuary, standing before the altar of God's throne. He contemplates (θεωρεῖ) the great and indescribable and inscrutable mystery of God. He confesses the grace, proclaims the resurrection, seals the faith of the Holy Trinity (41/58).

The deacon on the ambo announcing the anaphora with the triple call: "*Let us stand aright! Let us stand with fear! Let us be attentive to offer the holy anaphora in peace!*" is like the angel at the stone of the sepulcher announcing Christ's three days in the tomb. In response, "The people exclaim the grace of Christ's resurrection: '*A mercy of peace, a sacrifice of praise!*' And then lifting up everyone to the heavenly Jerusalem, to his holy mountain, the priest cries: '*Look! Let us lift up our hearts!*'..." (41/58). Here, too, Germanus inserts the historical theme of the burial into the larger context of the whole accomplished economy of Christ's death and resurrection, henceforth ever present in the eternal mystery of the heavenly liturgy.

It is to this heavenly mystery that Germanus directs his exclusive attention in the rest of his commentary on the anaphora. The priest approaches the throne of God's grace with confidence and faith, speaking to God no longer in a cloud as did Moses, but face to face, with the clarity of faith in the mystery of the Holy Trinity as revealed in Christ. The ripidia and the deacons show the presence of the seraphim and cherubim; the people chant the angelic Trisagion (*Sanctus*). The explication of this text from Isaiah 6 provides Germanus with the opportunity to expound his theology of the eucharist.[65] Overcome by his dread vision of the throne of the Lord surrounded by seraphim crying, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts! The whole earth is full of His glory!" the prophet said, "Woe is me! For I am lost; for I am a man of unclean lips...." But one of the seraphim flew to him with a burning coal

[64] See R. Bornert, "L'anaphore dans la spiritualité de Byzance. Le témoignage des commentaires mystagogiques du VIII[e] au XV[e] siècles," in *Eucharisties d'Orient et d'Occident* (*supra*, note 44), 241–64. The Constantinopolitan anaphora had begun to be said inaudibly by the sixth century. Cf. Novella 137, 6 of Justinian's Code, *CIC*, III, *Nov* (Berlin, 1899), 699; P. Trembelas, "L'audition de l'Anaphore eucharistique par le peuple," in *1054–1954. L'Eglise et les Eglises. Neuf siècles de douloureuse séparation entre l'Orient et l'Occident*, II (Chevetogne, 1955), 207–20.

[65] See the similar use of Isa. 6 by Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Homily 16*, 6–10 and esp. 36–38, in R. Tonneau and R. Devreesse, *Les homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste*, ST, 145 (Vatican City, 1949) (hereafter Tonneau-Devreesse), 543–49, 591–97; Narsai, *Homily 21*, in R. H. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, Texts and Studies, VIII,1 (Cambridge, 1909) (hereafter Connolly, *Narsai*), 57. Germanus undoubtedly borrowed the theme from Theodore. His commentary betrays Theodore's influence throughout, as I indicate *infra*, pp. 62ff., 72ff.

from the altar and touched his mouth, saying: "Behold, this has touched your lips; your guilt is taken away and your sin forgiven" (Isa. 6:1–7). This

> ... signifies the priest who takes the spiritual coal Christ in the forceps of his hand in the holy sanctuary, and sanctifies and purifies those who receive and communicate. "For into a heavenly sanctuary not made by hands has Christ entered (Heb. 9:24), and has appeared in glory before the face of God, having become for us a high priest (6:20) who has passed through the heavens (4:14), and we have Him as an advocate before the Father, and as a propitiation for our sins" (1 John 2:1–2), who provided for us His own holy and eternal body, a ransom for all of us, as He says: "Father, sanctify in your name those whom you have given me, that they may be made holy" (John 17:11, 17, 19); and: "I desire that they may be where I am and behold my glory, because you have loved them as you have loved me before the foundation of the world" (John 17:24) (41/59–60).

What follows is a straightforward exposition of the anaphora following the *Sanctus*: the narration and anamnesis of the economy of salvation; the consecration of the bread and wine, by the power of the Holy Spirit, into the body and blood of Christ, who said, "I sanctify myself so that they too might be sanctified" (John 17:19); "Who eats my flesh and drinks my blood remains in me and I in him" (John 6:56) (41/60). The holy mystery is celebrated by the priest bowed, in colloquy with God alone, contemplating the divine light and the splendor of the glory of the face of God.

The dead and the living are remembered along with the saints:

> The souls of Christians are called with the prophets and apostles and hierarchs to gather and recline with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob at the mystical table of Christ the king. Therefore, gathering together "*in unity of faith and the communion of the Holy Spirit,*" through the economy of Him who died for us and is seated at the right hand of the Father, we are no longer on earth but standing before the royal throne of God in heaven, where Christ is, as He Himself says: "Just Father, sanctify in your name those whom you have given me, so that where I am they may be with me" (John 17:13, 16) (41/60–61).

And as adopted sons and co-heirs with Christ (Gal. 4:5, Rom. 8:17, Eph. 2:8) we dare to say "*Our Father...*" (41/61).

11. *The Lord's Prayer and Communion*

After a not especially relevant commentary on the Our Father, Germanus concludes somewhat abruptly in chapter 43 with the communion. Once again he refers to the Epistle to the Hebrews (9:19ff.): Moses sprinkled the blood of calves and goats as the blood of the covenant, but Christ gave His own body and blood. "And hence with this understanding we eat the bread and drink the cup as the body and blood of God, confessing the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, to whom glory unto the ages, amen!" (43/62; *end of authentic text*).

Since Germanus does not comment on the communion ritual, I shall not describe it here, but refer those interested to my article on the patriarchal diataxis of *British Library Add. 34060.*[66]

Germanus' Place in Tradition

1. *The Originality of Germanus' Work*

The unbalanced shape of Germanus' commentary is the result of innovations in liturgical interpretation that were to be of crucial importance in later Byzantine liturgical piety. These changes concern the symbolism of the church and of the preparation and transfer of gifts. Not only are they given an inordinate amount of space—far more than the anaphora and communion—but the passages that comment on these rites reflect an attempt to integrate a new level of symbolism into an older system preserved intact in the explanation of the anaphora.

Germanus' treatment of the anaphora is wholly biblical. What we memorialize there is Christ's economy for us: His saving life, death, and resurrection in order that we may be purified and sanctified by receiving His heavenly gifts. The theology of the Letter to the Hebrews provides the basis for the efficacy of this anamnesis: Christ has become our high priest and has entered the heavenly sanctuary once and for all. Thereby, the Supper of the Lord has become the messianic banquet of the kingdom, and our earthly ritual a participation in this heavenly worship. This is possible by the power of the Holy Spirit. By this worship we confess our faith in the saving death and resurrection of the Lord. It is indeed a memorial of all Christ did for us, not in the sense of a ritual reenactment of a past event in its several historical phases, but as an anamnesis of the total mystery that is Christ in its present efficacy, the eternal intercession before the throne of God of Christ our high priest. Its force is rooted in our Trinitarian faith. Its efficacy is the work of the Holy Spirit, sent by the will of the Father, through the hands of the priest, to bring us Christ as He did in the incarnation.[67]

But if we turn to the θεωρία of the church, and of the prothesis, transfer, and deposition of gifts, we see an attempt to integrate into this pristine vision, rooted in the Letter to the Hebrews, another strain, equally primitive though less prominent in the early stratum of Byzantine liturgical symbolism: that of the eucharist as a memorial of Christ's passion and death, even to the point of seeing in individual details of the concrete ritual a dramatic reenactment of those awesome events.

So what we find in Germanus is the encroachment of a more literal tradition upon another, more mystical level of Byzantine interpretation—and this precisely

[66] Cf. Taft, "Pontifical Liturgy," text and commentary, section **X.** This MS has the earliest full description of the rite. I give a partial reconstruction in "Liturgies," 374ff., and "Structural Analysis" (*supra*, note 39), 324ff.

[67] On the parallelism between incarnation and eucharist in the patristic tradition, cf. J. Betz, *Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Väter.* I,1: *Die Aktualpräsenz der Person und des Heilswerkes Jesu im Abendmahl nach der vorephesinischen griechischen Patristik* (Freiburg/B., 1955) (hereafter Betz), 267ff.; G. Kretschmar, "Abendmahl, III/1: Alte Kirche," in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, I (Berlin-New York, 1977) (hereafter Kretschmar, "Abendmahl"), 68; E. Kilmartin, "The Eucharistic Prayer: Content and Function in some Early Eucharistic Prayers," in *The Word in the World. Essays in Honor of Frederick L. Moriarty, S.J.*, ed. R. J. Clifford and G. W. MacRae (Weston, Mass., 1973), 122ff. Contemporary with Germanus we find it in John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa* 4, 12, PG, 94, col. 1141, and it has influenced the evolution of the *orate fratres* dialogue. Cf. Taft, *Great Entrance*, chap. VIII.

on the eve of Iconoclasm, when shifts in Byzantine piety led to such growth in the cult of images that Orthodoxy soon found itself locked in mortal combat to defend this new expression of radical incarnational realism against the reaction of a more traditional iconoclastic spiritualism. Kitzinger has shown the importance of the period between Justinian and Iconoclasm for the rise of the cult of images.[68] I believe it is an equally important period in the growth of liturgical piety, where the same dynamics were at work, producing in mystagogy a realism parallel to that in religious art. Since even the most audacious theological innovations usually can be traced to traditional roots, let us cast our net beyond the waters of the Bosporus in search of where this whole business began

2. *The Background: Exegesis and Mystagogy in the Fathers*[69]

All healthy liturgical interpretation depends on a ritual symbolism determined not arbitrarily, but by the testimony of tradition rooted in the Bible. Like the scriptures, the rites of the Church await an exegesis and a hermeneutic and a homiletic to expound, interpret, and apply their multiple levels of meaning in each age. Mystagogy is to liturgy what exegesis is to scripture. It is no wonder, then, that the commentators on the liturgy used a method inherited from the older tradition of biblical exegesis.

For the Fathers of the Church, Sacred Scripture presents more than a holy history. Contemplated in faith, the historical event is perceived as containing a higher truth, its eternal verity, as well as a practical application for here and now, and a sign that points to what is to come. These are the famous four senses pithily summarized in the oft-quoted medieval distich attributed to Augustine of Dacia († *ca.* 1282):

> *Littera gesta docet, quid credas allegoria,*
> *moralis quid agas, quo tendas anagogia.*[70]

The original basis of this exegesis is found in the New Testament itself, which recognizes two senses to "the scriptures" (at that time, the Old Testament), the literal and the spiritual:

> You search the scriptures, because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that bear witness to me (John 5:39).
>
> If you believed Moses, you would believe me, for he wrote of me (John 5:46).
>
> And beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself (Luke 24:27).

[68] Cf. Kitzinger, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 7).

[69] The major work in the history of patristic and medieval exegesis has been done by H. de Lubac: see *Histoire et esprit. L'intelligence de l'Ecriture d'après Origène*, Théologie, 16 (Paris, 1950); and especially his monumental *Exégèse médiévale. Les quatre sens de l'Ecriture*, pt. I, vols. 1–2; pt. II, vols. 1–2, Théologie, 41, 42, 59 (Paris, 1959–64). J. Tigcheler, *Didyme l'aveugle et l'exégèse allégorique. Etude sémantique de quelques termes exégétiques importants de son commentaire sur Zacharie*, Graecitas christianorum primaeva, 6 (Nijmegen, 1977), gives an excellent summary of de Lubac's work. On mystagogy, the basic work is Bornert, *Commentaires*.

[70] On the text and its transmission, see H. de Lubac, "Sur un vieux distique. La doctrine du 'quadruple sens'," in *Mélanges F. Cavallera* (Toulouse, 1948), 347–66; *idem*, *Exégèse*, I,1, 23ff.

Thus the Old Testament historical events are understood as having their real meaning only in relation to Christ. This is not a secondary, "added" sense. Until it is grasped, the Old Testament has simply not been understood:[71] "These are only a shadow of what is to come; the substance belongs to Christ" (Col. 2:17; cf. Heb. 10:1, Rom. 5:14, 2 Cor. 3:6–16). To uncover this Christian sense was the sole aim of Early Christian exegesis; its justification was found in the words of Jesus Himself.

Since Origen († 253), these two senses have been referred to as "literal" or "historical," and as "spiritual" or "mystical" or "allegorical," though "allegory" here does not bear its contemporary pejorative connotation.[72] Later classification into four senses is just an explication of the "spiritual" sense under three aspects:[73]

1. the *allegorical* or dogmatic aspect. It interprets the Old Testament as referring to the mystery of Christ and of the Church. Its realm is *faith.*
2. the *tropological* or moral and spiritual aspect. It relates the allegorical sense of the mystery to Christian life; what we believe to what we do. Its realm is *charity.*
3. the *anagogical* or eschatological aspect. It refers to the final accomplishment we await in the kingdom to come, and to our present contemplation of this future heavenly reality. Its realm is *hope.*

This exegesis remains the basis of every decent sermon, of every contemplation of the Word of God in the quiet of one's chamber. It is rooted in the conviction that the Bible has relevance for human life in every age, a conviction based on the belief—stated explicitly in the New Testament—that the old dispensation prefigures and can be understood only in light of the new; that the mystery of divine life revealed and lived by Christ is the wellspring and model for the lives of all who are baptized

[71] Cf. Tigcheler, *op. cit.*, 11ff.

[72] *Ibid.*, 13ff. In classical rhetoric, allegory is an extended metaphor. Christian exegetes borrowed this figure of *speech* and applied it not to *language*, but to *event*, as when the passage of the Red Sea is seen as a figure of Christ's baptism: *Allegoria est, cum aliud geritur et aliud figuratur* (Ambrose, *De Abraham* I, iv, 28, PL, 14, col. 432). It is not a question of the hidden sense of the text, or of the relation between visible and invisible realities, but of the relation between two historical events of different epochs in salvation history, such as the passover of the Jews and that of Jesus. But in addition to this *allegoria facti* there was also the *allegoria dicti*, which sought hidden meanings, often contrived, in the biblical text. As we have seen (*supra*, note 62), it is the application of this arbitrarily extended metaphorical interpretation to liturgical rites in the Middle Ages that contemporary liturgists generally refer to, pejoratively, as allegory. On this whole topic, see Tigcheler, *op. cit.*, 44–50; J. Daniélou, "Exégèse et typologie patristiques," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, IV (Paris, 1960), 132–38; H. de Lubac, " 'Typologie' et 'allégorisme'," *Recherches de Science religieuse*, 34 (1947), 180–226; *idem*, "A propos de l'allégorie chrétienne," *ibid.*, 47 (1959) 5–43; *idem*, *Histoire et esprit*, 384–95; *idem*, *Exégèse*, I,2, 373–96, 489–522; II,2, 125–49; Bornert, *Commentaires*, 42ff., 78–80, 269–70.

[73] De Lubac, *Exégèse*, I,1, 305; I,2, 416, 420; Tigcheler, *op. cit.*, 16ff. This schematization attempts to generalize a tradition that goes from Origen to the Middle Ages, and, as with all synthetic models, each detail is not found in all particular instances. Cf. de Lubac, *Exégèse*, I,2, 657ff.; Tigcheler, *op. cit.*, 38. All four levels are expressed in Heb. 13:11–16: "...the bodies of those animals whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest as a sacrifice for sin are burned outside the camp. So Jesus also suffered outside the gate in order to sanctify the people through his own blood. Therefore let us go forth to him outside the camp, bearing abuse for him. For here we have no lasting city, but we seek the city which is to come. Through him, then, let us continually offer up a sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips that acknowledge his name. Do not neglect to do good and to share what you have, for such sacrifices are pleasing to God." Cf. 1 Cor. 10: 1ff. This method is also used in the earliest liturgical homilies, which represent its first application to liturgical understanding, as seen in Melito of Sardis' paschal homily, *ca.* A.D. 160–170: *Méliton de Sardes, Sur la pâque et fragments*, ed. and trans. O. Perler, SC, 123 (Paris, 1966).

into Him; that this mystery will reach its hoped-for consummation in the end of days. In short, it is rooted in the present state of the Church as the New Jerusalem, prepared in the Old, and striving toward the Johannine Heavenly Jerusalem of which she is already the beginning and the hope. This is quite the opposite of modern scripture studies, which interpret the New Testament in light of the Old, not vice versa, as did the Fathers.

Be that as it may, the patristic method was to become and has remained the basis of Christian liturgical symbolism. For the literal/spiritual senses encompassed a field far broader than the relation between the Old and New Testament writings, between the events of Israel's history and those of Christ's life. Although the Fathers are reluctant to speak of the New Testament in terms of allegory—that would have implied it was only the shadow of a definitive revelation still to come—they knew from it that the prefigured reality fulfilled in Christ remained dynamically operative in the mysteries of the Church and in the lives of the saints of every age until the final days.

The fourth-century catechetical homilies extend to the understanding of Christian worship this method of scriptural exegesis first systematized by Origen to interpret Old Testament cult, and Christian mystagogy becomes a genre unto itself. Thenceforth, all patristic interpreters of the liturgy will stress one or another aspect of this many-faceted reality. The Antiochenes, more attentive in exegesis to the literal sense of scripture, favored a mystagogy that saw the liturgical mysteries chiefly as a portrayal of the historical mysteries of salvation. The Alexandrines, following the Origenist exegetical penchant for the allegorical, interpreted liturgy by a process of anagogy whereby one rises from letter to spirit, from the visible rites of the liturgical mysteries to the one mystery that is God.[74]

The "Alexandrine" Mystagogy of Ps.-Denys[75]

This anagogical or "Alexandrine" method of liturgical interpretation, in which the contemplation of liturgical rites leads the soul to the spiritual, mystical realities of the invisible world, reaches organic systematization at the end of the fifth century in the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* of Ps.-Denys: "The sensible rites are the image of intelligible realities. They lead there, and show the way to them" (II, 3:2).[76] In the Dionysian system there is little room for biblical typology. Allegorical anagogy predominates: the liturgy is an allegory of the soul's progress from the divisiveness of sin to the divine communion, through a process of purification, illumination, perfection imaged forth in the rites.[77] There is little reference to the earthly economy of Christ, and none whatever to His divine-human mediatorship, or to His saving

[74] Bornert, *Commentaires*, 60–82.

[75] Cf. *ibid.*, 65–72; E. Boulard, "L'eucharistie d'après le Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, 58 (1957), 193–217; *ibid.*, 59 (1958), 129–69; R. Roques, *L'univers dionysien. Structure hiérarchique du monde selon le Pseudo-Denys*, Théologie, 29 (Paris, 1954); Schultz, *Liturgie*, 51ff.; *idem* "Kultsymbolik," 9–17.

[76] Text in PG, 3, cols. 369–485. Chapter references will be given in the body of the article.

[77] See *Eccl. Hier.* I, PG, 3, cols. 369–77, where Denys explains his system. Cf. Bornert, *Commentaires*, 67ff.; Roques, *op. cit.*, 245, 292, 294.

death and resurrection.[78] What little christological content the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* does display focuses, in typical Alexandrine fashion, on the incarnation, source of our union with the divinity.[79] The liturgy of the eucharist brings before our eyes the life of the incarnate Christ who entered our divided condition in order to bring us to participation in Himself by union and assimilation to His divine life, a union symbolized in the eucharistic κοινωνία (III, 3:13). There is not a breath about "proclaiming the death of the Lord until He comes" (1 Cor. 11:26), or about Christ's mediatorship, high priesthood, or self-oblation. The memory of God's saving deeds is announced in the readings and chants and eucharistic prayer, but the Christian economy, apart from the incarnation, is simply not the model for Denys' eucharistic explanation.[80] The eucharist is in no way a ritual re-presentation of Christ's self-oblation in His passion and death. For that we must turn to the Antiochenes.

The "Antiochene" Mystagogy of Theodore of Mopsuestia[81]

Schooled in a literal exegesis more attentive to ἱστορία than to θεωρία, Antiochene exegetes were less prone than the Alexandrines to interpret the Old Testament in terms more allegorical than typological,[82] and the same bias is manifest in their mystagogy, with its strong emphasis on the relation between the liturgical rites and the saving acts of Christ's life. We see this clearly in the fourth-century baptismal catecheses and other writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, and Theodore of Mopsuestia.[83] Prefigured in Old Testament types, the sacramental rites are an

[78] *Eccl. Hier.* III, 1; III, 3:3ff., PG, 3, cols. 424–25, 428ff. For a critique of Denys' view of the eucharist, cf. Roques, *op. cit.*, 269ff., 294–302 Denys does link baptism to Jesus' death and resurrection (II, 3:7–8, PG, 3, col. 404), but in his explanation of the eucharist the only reference to the passion is in the contemplation for neophytes, where communion is a reminder of the Last Supper (III, 3:1, PG, 3, col. 428). On the whole problem of the christological content of Denys' work, see Roques, *op. cit.*, 248ff., 269.

[79] See especially *Eccl. Hier.* III, 3:6–7, 11–13, PG, 3, cols. 432–33, 440–44 (cf. Bornert, *Commentaires*, 69ff.). It is not by accident that Origen and the Alexandrines in general developed a soteriology emphasizing the transforming power of the incarnational union with the prototype, with less scope given to the free, human saving activity of Jesus as man. On the whole question, see A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, 2nd ed., I (Atlanta, 1975), 141ff.; J. N. D. Kelley, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 4th ed. (London, 1975), 126ff., 184ff.; good summary in P. Smulders, *The Fathers on Christology. The Development of the Christological Dogma from the Bible to the Great Councils* (De Pere, Wisc., 1968), 41ff. For the influence of this soteriology on Alexandrine eucharistic theology, which stresses the present divine saving activity in the liturgy, with less attention to the connection between this present reality and the historical economy of Christ, see Betz, 99, 125ff.; Gerken, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 61), 65–84. See also the excellent new study of L. Lies, *Wort und Eucharistie bei Origenes. Zur Spiritualisierungstendenz des Eucharistieverständnisses*, Innsbrucker theologische Studien, 1 (Innsbruck, 1978). This salvation via union with the prototype is the model for Denys' interpretation of the eucharistic liturgy.

[80] *Eccl. Hier.* III, 3:4–5, 11–13, PG, 3, cols. 429–32, 440–44. He does state that the whole purpose of the eucharist is to commemorate the economy of salvation (III, 3:11–13), but the incarnation is the only aspect of Christ's earthly economy really integrated into his system.

[81] Cf. Bornert, *Commentaires*, 80–82.

[82] On the Antiochene school of exegetes, see C. Schäublin, *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese*, Theophaneia, 23 (Cologne-Bonn, 1974). Its founder, Diodore of Tarsus († *ante* 394) and his pupils John Chrysostom († 407), Theodore of Mopsuestia († 428), and Theodoret of Cyrus († *ca.* 466), are its chief representatives, among whom Theodore of Mopsuestia is the most important exegete (*ibid.*, 11).

[83] *Cyrille de Jérusalem, Catéchèse mystagogiques*, ed. A. Piédagnel, trans. P. Paris, SC, 126 (Paris, 1966); *Jean Chrysostome, Huit catéchèses baptismales inédites*, ed. and trans. A. Wenger, SC, 50 (Paris, 1957); and Tonneau-Devreesse. Cf. the study of H. Riley, *Christian Initiation. A Comparative Study of the Interpretation of the Baptismal Liturgy in the Mystagogical Writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Ambrose of Milan*, The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity, 17 (Washington, D.C., 1974).

"imitation" (μίμησις: Cyril) or "memorial" (ἀνάμνησις: Chrysostom) of the saving acts of Christ's life, and an anticipation of the heavenly liturgy.[84] What was prefigured in the Old Testament and fulfilled in Christ has passed into sacrament, in expectation of its final fulfillment. Furthermore, participation in these mysteries is a pledge of commitment to the Christian way of life.

Theodore of Mopsuestia, in his last two homilies (15–16), gives the most extensive application of this method to the eucharist.[85] For him the liturgy is an image and prefiguration of the heavenly and eschatological realities, and a memorial representation of the historical economy of Christ, though he prescinds from Old Testament typology,[86] undoubtedly out of distaste for the allegorical exegesis of the Alexandrine school.

Theodore is exceedingly verbose, but the synopsis preceding *Homily* 15 gives an idea of its dual spirit:[87]

> ...The duty of the High Priest of the New Covenant is to offer this sacrifice which revealed the nature of the New Covenant. We ought to believe that the bishop who is now at the altar is playing the part of this High Priest, and that the deacons are so to speak presenting an image of the liturgy of the invisible powers.... We must see Christ now as he is led away to his passion, and again later when he is stretched out on the altar to be immolated for us. This is why some of the deacons spread cloths on the altar which remind us of winding sheets, while others stand on either side and fan the air above the sacred body....

These themes are resumed in the body of the sermon:

> (15) ...Since the bishop performs in symbol signs of the heavenly realities, the sacrifice must manifest them, so that he presents, as it were, an image of the heavenly liturgy....
>
> (18) ...We continue in faith until we ascend into heaven and go to our Lord.... We look forward to attaining to this state in reality at the resurrection ...in the meantime we approach the first-fruits of these blessings, Christ our Lord, the High Priest of our inheritance. Accordingly we are taught to perform in this world the symbols and signs of the blessings to come, and so, as people who enter into the enjoyment of the good things of heaven by means of the liturgy, we may possess in assured hope what we look for....
>
> (19) It follows that, since there needs to be a representation of the High Priest, certain individuals are appointed to preside over the liturgy of these signs. For we believe that what Christ our Lord performed in reality, and will continue to perform, is performed through the sacraments....

[84] Bornert, *Commentaires*, 73ff.

[85] On Theodore's exegetical method, see the introduction to H. Sprenger, *Theodori Mopsuestensi commentarius in XII prophetas. Einleitung und Ausgabe*, Göttinger Orientsforschungen, ser. V, Biblica et patristica, 1 (Wiesbaden, 1977); R. Greer, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, Exegete and Theologian* (Westminster, 1961), esp. 76ff., 86ff.

[86] Greer, *op. cit.*, 76ff.; Bornert, *Commentaires*, 80–82.

[87] Unless otherwise noted, I cite the version of T. Yarnold, *The Awe-inspiring Rites of Initiation. Baptismal Homilies of the Fourth Century* (Slough, 1971), who, however, has taken the liberty of collapsing Theodore's verbiage into more manageable English.

> (20) ... Every time, then, there is performed the liturgy of this awesome sacrifice, which is the clear image of the heavenly realities, we should imagine that we are in heaven.... Faith enables us to picture in our minds the heavenly realities, as we remind ourselves that the same Christ who is in heaven... is now being immolated under these symbols. So when faith enables our eyes to contemplate the commemoration that now takes place, we are brought again to see his death, resurrection, and ascension, which have already taken place for our sake.
>
> (21) Since Christ our Lord offered himself for us in sacrifice and so became in reality our High Priest, we ought to believe that the bishop who is now at the altar is playing the part of this High Priest. He is not offering his own sacrifice, for he is not the real High Priest here: he only performs a kind of representation of the liturgy of this sacrifice that is too great for words. By this means he performs for you a visible representation of these indescribable heavenly realities....

Theodore also saw the liturgy as a dramatic reenactment of the historical economy. The following paragraph pulls together both facets: earthly economy and heavenly continuation.

> (24) Christ our Lord established these awesome mysteries for us. We look forward to their perfect fulfillment in the world to come, but we have already laid hold of them by faith.... Accordingly we need this sacramental liturgy to strengthen our faith in the revelation we have received; the liturgy leads us on to what is to come, for we know that it contains, as it were, an image of the mysterious dispensation of Christ our Lord, and affords us a shadowy vision of what took place. Accordingly at the sight of the bishop we form in our hearts a kind of image of Christ our Lord sacrificing himself to save us and give us life. And at the sight of the deacons who serve at the ceremony we think of the invisible ministering powers who officiate at this mysterious liturgy; for the deacons bring this sacrifice—or rather the symbols of the sacrifice—and lay it out on the awesome altar....

In *Homily* 15:25 Theodore graphically describes the transfer of gifts in light of the topographical symbolism in which the sanctuary is the sepulcher whence, in the resurrection, salvation comes forth:

> By means of the symbols we must see Christ who is now being led out and going forth to his passion, and who, in another moment, is laid out for us on the altar.... And when the offering that is about to be presented is brought out in the sacred vessels...you must think that Christ our Lord is coming out, led to his passion...by the invisible host of ministers.... And when they bring it out, they place it on the holy altar to represent fully the passion. Thus we may think of him placed on the altar as if henceforth in a sort of sepulchre, and as having already undergone the passion. That is why the deacons who spread linens on the altar represent by this the figure of the linen cloths of the burial...and when we see the oblation on the altar as if it were being placed

> in a kind of sepulchre after death, a great silence falls on those present. Because that which is taking place is awe-inspiring, they must look on it in recollection and fear, since it is suitable that now, by the liturgy...Christ our Lord rise, announcing to all the participation in ineffable benefits. We remember therefore the death of the Lord in the oblation because it makes manifest the resurrection and the ineffable benefits.[88]

The analogy continues in *Homily* 16. The resurrection, effected in the invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the gifts, i.e., in the consecration, is the effective sign of salvation (16:11–12), and this divine life comes forth to us from the tomb in communion. The sharing of these gifts in communion is like the appearances of the risen Lord (16:18, 20). It is in reference to communion that Theodore stresses the moral commitment to a Christian life of virtue that such a participation in immortal mysteries requires (16:22ff.). So in spite of the fact that Theodore omits Old Testament typology, it is perfectly clear that he is applying to the liturgy the methods of patristic exegesis described above. What is new, however, is his systematic interpretation of the liturgical *historia* as a dramatic reenactment of the passion of Christ, an interpretation that will enter the Byzantine tradition via Germanus.[89]

The Influence of Jerusalem

This perspective can be traced, I believe, to the tradition of Palestine in the fourth century. In Jerusalem we first hear of the topographical system of church symbolism, in which various parts of the building are seen to represent places hallowed during the passion triduum: cenacle, calvary, tomb. After the Peace of Constantine (313) and the discovery, real or supposed, of the holy places long buried beneath the pagan city of Aelia Capitolina, the liturgy of the holy city came to revolve around its sacred topography. Stations at the holy shrines characterize Jerusalem services, and of special import was the church of the Anastasis or Holy Sepulchre (326–335).[90] Considered the New Jerusalem,[91] its influence, soon felt in liturgical symbolism, has lasted until our own day.

This can be seen already in the diary of the famous peregrinating nun Egeria, written about 381–384: the sepulcher, though not located within the sanctuary of the *martyrium* or basilica where the eucharist was celebrated, is the focal point of vespers and of the resurrection vigil, Jerusalem services that have survived in the Byzantine office.[92] Here is how Egeria describes the lamplighting of evensong:

[88] I use here the more literal version of A. Mingana, *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist*, Woodbrooke Studies, 6 (Cambridge, 1933) 85–89, somewhat revised on the basis of Tonneau-Devreesse, 503ff.

[89] Bornert, *Commentaires*, 82.

[90] On the stational liturgy of Jerusalem, see A. Renoux, *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121*, I, *Introduction. Aux origines de la liturgie hiérosolymitaine. Lumières nouvelles*, PO, 35, fasc. 1, no. 163; H. Leeb, *Die Gesänge im Gemeindegottesdienst von Jerusalem (vom 5. bis 8. Jahrhundert)*, Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie, 28 (Vienna, 1970), chap 5; R. Zerfass, *Die Schriftlesung im Kathedraloffizium Jerusalems*, LQF, 48 (Münster, 1968).

[91] Eusebius (?), *Vita Constantini* III, 33, ed. F. Winkelmann, *Eusebius Werke*, I,1, GCS (Berlin, 1975), 99; cf. Mango, *Art*, 12; Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* I, 17 and 33, PG, 67, cols. 120, 164.

[92] See 24–28: E. Franceschini and R. Weber, *Itinerarium Egeriae*, CChr, 175 (Turnhout, 1958), 67–90. On the offices in Egeria, see J. Mateos, "La vigile cathédrale chez Egérie," *OCP*, 27 (1961), 281–312; "Quel-

> ...at four o'clock they have *Lychnicon*, as they call it, or in our language, Lucernare. All the people congregate once more in the Anastasis, and the lamps and candless are all lit, which makes it very bright. The fire is brought not from outside, but from the cave—inside the screen—where a lamp is always burning night and day (24.4).[93]

The symbolism is familiar: out from the tomb comes the risen Christ, the light that illumines, i.e., saves: φώτισμα (illumination) means baptism (cf. John 1; Heb. 6:4–6; etc.).

What was spread across the map of Jerusalem's holy history came to be written small in the humbler churches of eastern Christendom, just as in a later period the stational system of Rome determined the symbolism of the Romanesque conventual church.[94] Thus the sanctuary apse becomes the cave of the sepulcher, and the altar the tomb from which salvation comes forth to the world. The opening rites of today's Byzantine Easter Matins—the light issuing forth from the sanctuary-tomb to the darkened nave-world, the opening of all the doors of the iconostasis—are based on this symbolism.[95] Its application to the eucharist was so congruous as to be inevitable. The next step, or perhaps a concomitant one, since the evolutionary sequence is not all that clear, was the burial cortège symbolism at the transfer and deposition of the gifts.

Whatever its remoter origins, this symbol-system clearly depends on an Antiochene hermeneutic. Theodore of Mopsuestia, by applying it to the eucharist, inaugurated a tradition of interpretation that eventually spread throughout the whole of Christendom, though it came to play a dominant role in the eucharistic symbol-system of only the Byzantine and East-Syrian traditions.[96] We find it in St. Isidore of Pelusium († *ca.* 435), Alexandrine in origin though decidedly Antiochene in his exegesis.[97] It appears in the liturgical homilies of Narsai († 502) and in the later medieval East-Syrian commentaries.[98] It also had its day in the medieval West, appearing there first in Venerable Bede (672–735), contemporaneous, therefore, with its first Byzantine appearance in Germanus.[99]

---

ques anciens documents sur l'office du soir," *OCP*, 35 (1969), 359–71, 374; Leeb, *op. cit.*, chaps. 2–4. On the history of the Jerusalem office and its adoption in Constantinople, see Arranz, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 8), 43–72; N. Egender, *La prière des heures: Horologion*, La prière des églises de rite byzantin, I (Chevetogne, 1975), 34–49; G. Winkler, "Über die Kathedralvesper in den verschiedenen Riten des Ostens und Westens," *ALw*, 16 (1974), 72ff.

[93] Trans. J. Wilkinson, *Egeria's Travels* (London, 1971), 123–24.

[94] Cf. A. Häussling, *Mönchskonvent und Eucharistiefeier. Eine Studie über die Messe in der abendländischen Klosterliturgie und zur Geschichte der Messhäufigkeit*, LQF, 58 (Münster, 1973), 55, 70, 186–201, 316–19, 347.

[95] See G. Bertonière, *The Historical Development of the Easter Vigil and Related Services in the Greek Church*, OCA, 193 (Rome, 1972).

[96] For the Byzantine tradition, see Taft, *Great Entrance*, 35–40, 173, 210–11, 216ff., 226–27, 244ff.; for the East-Syrian, see *infra*, note 98. The same theme appears, though not predominantly, in other traditions (cf. the following note).

[97] *Ep.* 1, 123, PG, 78, cols. 264–65. Cf. Bornert, *Commentaires*, 79; Taft, *Great Entrance*, 245.

[98] Connolly, *Narsai, Homily 17*, pp. 3–4; cf. also *Homily 21*, pp. 55–56. On the later commentators, see W. F. Macomber, "The Liturgy of the Word According to the Commentators of the Chaldean Mass," in *The Word in the World* (*supra*, note 67), 179–90.

[99] *In Lucae evangelium expositio* 24: 1, CChr, 120 (Turnhout, 1960), 410. Amalarius of Metz (*ca.* 780–850) borrowed it from Bede, and thus it entered the medieval Western tradition of liturgical explanation. Cf. Amalarius, *Eclogae de ordine romano* 23, 25, ed. J.-M. Hanssens, *Amalarii episcopi opera liturgica omnia*,

3. *Eucharist as Anamnesis*

What is one to make of such an interpretation? Can it be dismissed as mere allegory? In the first place, the interpretation of Christian worship as a ritual memorial of certain events of Christ's earthly life was not a fourth-century innovation, a "salvation-history" view of sacraments in opposition to an earlier, purely "eschatological" viewpoint.[100] The New Testament itself expresses a theology of ritual anamnesis in Christ's command: "Do this as my memorial (anamnesis)" (Luke 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24–25), with the Pauline explanation: "Every time you eat this bread and drink this cup, you are proclaiming the death of the Lord until He comes" (1 Cor. 11:26). I shall not enter into the disputed question of the meaning of cultic *zikkaron* or anamnesis in the Bible.[101] Christians have often been in disagreement over the theological niceties of just how their supper ritual, in obedience to the New Testament "command to repeat," effectively memorializes the passover of Christ, but all agree that it does. Furthermore, it is beyond cavil that the New Testament presents this sacrificial meal as both the fulfillment of the Jewish Passover[102] and a foreshadowing of the messianic banquet of the new age.[103] And it is precisely the dynamic unity of all these levels: prepared in the Old Testament, ritually prophesied in the Last Supper, accomplished on Calvary, eternally present as a heavenly offering before the throne of the Father, re-presented ritually in the liturgical mysteries—it is all this, in dynamic unity, that a Christian liturgical theology must comprise.

The fourth-century Fathers of the Antiochene school, therefore, did not invent salvation-history symbolism; they just chose to emphasize and synthesize it in their theology of baptism, thus "Antiochizing" Origen's view of baptism as imaging the process of growth into Christ by interpreting it as a ritual reenactment of His saving actions.[104] Theodore of Mopsuestia then took and applied the method

---

III, ST, 140 (Vatican City, 1950), 252–58; *Ordinis totius missae expositio* I, 11, 14–16, *ibid.*, III, 308–11; *Liber officialis*, III, 30–31, *ibid.*, II, 359–62. I have the information in this note from Barbara Newman, "The Burial of Christ in Liturgical Allegory from Theodore of Mopsuestia to Amalarius of Metz" (unpublished paper, Yale University, December 1977), written for Professor Aidan Kavanagh of the Divinity School and shown to me through his kindness.

[100] On this question, see T. Talley, "History and Eschatology in the Primitive Pascha," *Worship*, 47 (1973), 212–21. I do not wish to deny that one can observe a greater emphasis on the historical element from the later fourth century, but the case is usually overstated. And at any rate, Talley has shown convincingly that the historical dimension was not a post-Constantinian invention. As usual, it is a question of a new equilibrium of already existing elements. See the interesting discussion in G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London, 1945) (hereafter, Dix), chap. 9.

[101] Among the best recent studies are B. S. Childs, *Memory and Tradition in Israel*, Studies in Biblical Theology, 37 (Naperville, Ill., 1962); P. A. H. de Boer, *Gedenken und Gedächtnis in der Welt des Alten Testaments* (Stuttgart, 1962); W. Schottroff, *"Gedenken" im alten Orient und im Alten Testament. Die Wurzel zākar im semitischen Sprachkreis*, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 15 (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1964). The concept is applied to the eucharist, though perhaps exaggeratedly, in M. Thurian, *The Eucharistic Memorial*, Ecumenical Studies in Worship, 7–8 (Richmond, Va., 1961).

[102] The synoptics relate the supper to the passover (Matt. 26:17–19, 28; Mark 14:12–14, 24; Luke 22:1, 7–8, 13, 15), whereas John has Jesus crucified at the hour when the paschal lambs were slain (19:14, 29; cf. Exod. 12:22, 46). On Christ as paschal lamb, cf. John 1:29, 36; 19:36; 1 Pet. 1:19; 1 Cor. 5:7 ("Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed"); Apoc. 5:6ff. On the relationship between paschal meal and Last Supper, see J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (Philadelphia, 1966).

[103] Mark 14:25; Luke 22:16–18, 29–30. Cf. G. Wainwright, *Eucharist and Eschatology* (London, 1971); D. E. Aune, *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity*, *NT*, Suppl. 28 (Leiden, 1972).

[104] On Origen's baptismal spirituality, see E. Kilmartin, "Patristic Views of Sacramental Sanctity," in *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Convention of Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine*, 8 (1962), 71ff.

systematically to the eucharistic rites. In so doing, he was developing a trend present in eucharistic thought from the start.

In spite of the complexity in the early history of the eucharist, the basis of the ultimate synthesis was already becoming predominant in the third century: the relationship of the eucharistic meal to the saving work of Christ. All streams of the eucharistic tradition with their diversity of emphasis have in common the New Testament teaching that the eucharist is a memorial of the salvation brought by Christ.[105] In the earliest known prayer, that of the *Didache*, the emphasis is on the eschatological rather than on the salvation-history dimension, which is only adumbrated.[106] But by the beginning of the third century we see in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus a development of the eucharistic prayer into an explicit commemoration of the whole Christ-economy from incarnation to resurrection,[107] and Semitic prayers of the *Didache* type, no longer considered adequate for the eucharist, fall into disuse or are relegated to the agape, which by then had been separated from the memorial supper.[108]

Another step, especially characteristic of the Alexandrines, was to stress the Last Supper theme of Christ as giver as well as gift, thus emphasizing His actual, personal presence as heavenly high priest.[109] This opened the way to a eucharistic interpretation of the Letter to the Hebrews, another key motif in the fourth-century synthesis.

What we see is a subtle shift in emphasis from praise of God for all His gifts to a more explicit anemnesis of Christ's economy, the chief motive for this praise; and from Christ's presence in the gifts to His presence also as eternal offerer of the gifts before the throne of God.

4. *The Fourth-Century Synthesis*

In the fourth century these new emphases are worked into a new synthesis. The Peace of Constantine in 313 provoked a radical readjustment at every level of Church life, including the liturgy. The passage from persecuted minority sect to Imperial Church, with its flood of converts of convenience and returned apostates, presented a massive challenge to the discipline of the eucharist. The inevitable result was new developments to meet the challenge. No longer was the Church a small, tightly knit community of saints. The raw and ruder newcomers, instructed in the awesomeness of the mysteries, responded by abandoning the table of the Lord.[110] The notion of the common eucharistic communion as expression of con-

[105] See G. Kretschmar, "Abendmahlsfeier, I: Alte Kirche," in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, I (Berlin-New York, 1977), 238; *idem*, "Abendmahl," 60.

[106] See 9–10, ed. J.-P. Audet, *La Didachè. Instruction des apôtres* (Paris, 1958), 234–36, 372ff. Cf. Kilmartin, "The Eucharistic Prayer" (*supra*, note 67), 125–30.

[107] See 4, ed. B. Botte, *La Tradition apostolique de s. Hippolyte. Essai de reconstitution*, LQF, 39 (Münster, 1963), 12–16; cf. Kretschmar, "Abendmahl," 60.

[108] Kretschmar, "Abendmahlsfeier," 238; and *supra*, note 106.

[109] Betz, 86ff., 113ff.; Kretschmar, "Abendmahl," 69, 71. Of course, the theme of Christ the high priest was ancient; again, it is a matter of emphasis. Cf. Betz, 136ff.; Jungmann, "Arianism," 13; *idem*, *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer* (New York, 1965) (hereafter Jungmann, *The Place of Christ*), chap. 13; Dix, 251ff., 279–80, 292.

[110] On this novel way of speaking about the mysteries in the catechizing of neophytes, see the homilies of Cyril of Jerusalem (1:5, 5:4), John Chrysostom (2:12, 14), and especially Theodore of Mopsuestia (13:7; 14:2, 6, 10, 18; and homilies 15 and 16 *passim*). Cf. *supra*, note 83, for the respective editions.

gregational unity had already been broken down by the large numbers of non-communicating catechumens and penitents.[111] The decline in frequent communion and the widespread practice of deferring baptism only contributed further to splitting the community into a communicating elite and the mass of catechumens, penitents, and others who were dismissed before the eucharist or, in a later period, were reduced to the status of onlookers. Communion becomes an act of personal devotion rather than the common sharing of the commonly offered gifts.[112] This is only strengthened by the appearance, late in the fourth century, of new devotional attitudes in preaching, and descriptions of the eucharist as an awful mystery, fearful to approach.[113] Under such conditions the eucharist could no longer sustain its former ideology as a rite of κοινωνία, and Antiochene liturgical explanation begins to elaborate a symbolism of the presence of the saving work of Christ in the ritual itself, even apart from participation in the communion of the gifts.

Concomitant with, and perhaps more important than, these sociological changes was the effect of the great christological disputes born of the Arian controversy.[114] The adoptionist and subordinationist threats led to renewed emphasis on the preexistent divinity of the Logos and His consubstantial equality with the Father. The Arians had argued that the liturgy itself, in praying to the Father *through* the Son, was subordinationist. Orthodoxy reacted by leveling the doxological formulae ("... to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit ..."), and by stressing the two-natures doctrine, according to which Christ is mediator not as subordinate to the Father in divinity, but as man.[115] This solution led, in Alexandrine theology, to a weakening of Christ's mediatorship, and among the Antiochenes to greater stress on Christ's high priesthood as pertaining to His humanity.[116] In liturgical interpretation the Alexandrine school, more concerned with the divinity of the Logos, had less to say about the historical economy of Christ's saving work. Among the Antiochenes, always more attentive to the humanity and to the first level of meaning in scriptural exegesis, it produced in the fourth-century writers the opposite effect: a renewed emphasis on Christ's human saving work.

In a sense the middle fell out, the risen God-man interceding for us as high priest *now*, and we are left with the two, unbridged poles of the dilemma: God and the historical Jesus. The point of intersection which is the basis for all Christian liturgical theology is precisely the divine-human mediatorship of the risen Lord. It is this eternal priesthood that renders actual in the present liturgical event both the past

[111] Kretschmar, "Abendmahl," 77.

[112] *Ibid.*, 77–78. The schisms consequent to the christological crises split christendom into separated groups not "in communion," thus further weakening the eucharist as a symbol of κοινωνία, its prime significance in the primitive Church. Cf. G. Hertling, *Communio: Church and Papacy in Early Christianity* (Chicago, 1972).

[113] See *supra*, note 110; and Betz, 126; E. Bishop, "Fear and Awe Attaching to the Eucharist," appendix to Connolly, *Narsai*, 92–97; G. Fittkau, *Der Begriff des Mysteriums bei Johannes Chrysostomus*, Theophaneia, 9 (Bonn, 1953) 122–45; Jungmann, *The Place of Christ*, 245ff.; Kretschmar, "Abendmahl," 77–78; J. Quasten, "Mysterium tremendum. Eucharistische Frömmigkeitsauffassungen des 4. Jahrhunderts," in A. C. Mayer et al., *Vom christlichen Mysterium* (Düsseldorf, 1951), 66–73.

[114] For the liturgical effects of these controversies, see Jungmann, "Arianism"; *idem*, *The Place of Christ*, chaps. 11–14 *passim*; Betz, 121ff.

[115] Basil's *De Spiritu Sancto* (PG, 32, cols. 67–218) is taken up with this issue. See M. Lubatschiwskyj, "Des hl. Basilius liturgischer Kampf gegen den Arianismus," *ZkTh*, 66 (1942), 20–38; Jungmann, *The Place of Christ*, chap. 11.

[116] Betz, 99–105, 121ff., 125ff., 128ff., 136ff., 194.

saving work and the future fulfillment. This anamnetic-eschatological, past-future tension is what worship is meant to resolve, and each school throughout the history of liturgical explanation has struggled with this problem in its own way, in response to the needs of its age. The Arian attack led to more emphasis on the divinity among the Alexandrines. The Antiochenes, while holding to the divinity, were more attentive to the humanity, but in response to the Arian attack on divine mediatorship as subordinationist, Antiochene liturgical writers elaborated their symbolism of the liturgy as a representation of the human saving work of the man Christ.[117]

I am, of course, aware that any attempt at briefly schematizing such an enormously complex history is open to the charge of oversimplification. But I believe that the main lines of this analysis will bear up under scrutiny. At any rate, by the end of the fourth century Theodore of Mopsuestia had woven these themes into a new synthesis, the two poles of which are the historical self-offering of Christ and the heavenly liturgy, united in a system of ritual representation in which the Christ-anamnesis is conceived as a dramatic reenactment of the paschal mystery encompassing the whole eucharistic rite from the transfer of gifts to communion; and the earthly celebrant is seen as an image of the heavenly high priest, the earthly liturgy as an icon of His heavenly oblation. These two leitmotifs become with Germanus a permanent basis of the later Byzantine synthesis.

The Alexandrine approach, stressing in the liturgy the present divine activity and much less attentive to salvation history, is first synthesized in the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* of Pseudo-Denys around the end of the fifth century. This strain enters the Byzantine tradition of liturgical explanation with Maximus Confessor's *Mystagogy*, is integrated by Germanus, is somewhat diminished in later Byzantine commentators, and is then rehabilitated at the end of the tradition in the writings of Symeon of Thessalonika († 1429).[118]

In light of this background, let us take another look at Germanus' interpretation of the Divine Liturgy, and the accusations of allegorism so often advanced against this whole literary genre.

Medieval Allegorism? A Second Look

1. *From Maximus to Germanus*

Germanus' immediate predecessor in Byzantine mystagogy, Maximus Confessor, clearly depends on the Alexandrine-type symbol-system of Ps.-Denys' *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*. For both, the incarnation is the "model" of the soul's union with God, and Maximus' "special" (ἰδικῶς) level of liturgical symbolism—i.e., the liturgy seen as an image of the individual soul's conversion and ascent to union with God—is transparently Dionysian.[119] The entrance into church symbolizes our conversion

[117] It is in this period that a twofold extension of the eucharistic anamnesis can be observed. First, in the liturgical text itself the *content* of the original memorial (the anamnesis in the technical sense, following the "command to repeat" after the institution narrative) is expanded to include mysteries other than the death and resurrection. Secondly, in the *interpretation* of the liturgy, the notion is extended to include not just the anaphora but the entire rite. See Schulz, *Liturgie*, 30–31; *idem*, "Kultsymbolik," 9ff.; Dix, 264ff.

[118] Cf. Bornert, *Commentaires*, chap. 2 *passim*, and 248ff., 268.

[119] Cf. *ibid.*, 118, 121ff.

from evil and material things to God (chap. 9, 23–24); the readings show the divine plan of the spiritual combat and ascent (chap. 10, 23–24); the Gospel is a visitation of the Word, elevating us to the higher contemplation of the intelligible world (chap. 13, 23–24).[120] In the *Sanctus* the Logos places us with the angels and accords us their knowledge of the Trinity. He leads us to the Father as sons by the prayer in which He made us worthy to call God "Father," and brings us to the incomprehensible Godhead in the "One is holy," uniting us to this indivisible unity in communion as far as is possible in the present dispensation. All this is operated by the Spirit, who, ever present invisibly, conforms us to the realities that are prefigured in the liturgical mysteries (chap. 13, 23–24).

In addition to this "special" level of interpretation there is a "general" (γενικῶς) interpretation in which the eucharistic liturgy is perceived as the memorial of the divine economy in Christ, and as an anticipation of the parousia and eschaton. The structure of this *historico-eschatological* typology, which Maximus usually refers to as *symbol* (σύμβολον), is conditioned by his allegorical view of the church as *type and image* (τύπος καὶ εἰκών) —again, his words—of the universe: the nave representing earthly realities, the sanctuary the heavenly.[121] So the entrance of the bishop signifies the coming of Christ in the incarnation, and His saving passion; his entrance into the sanctuary and ascent to the throne in the apse symbolize Christ's ascension and heavenly enthronement (chap. 8). The rest of the Word service, which unfolds outside the sanctuary, is the time of the Church, in which God's gifts for the struggle with the Adversary are mediated to us from the heavenly sanctuary. This struggle culminates in the Gospel reading, symbol of the consummation of the world: the descent of the bishop from his throne, the expulsion of the catechumens, and the closing of the doors signify the descent of Christ in the parousia, the expulsion of ehe wicked by the angels, and the entrance of the just into the mystical chamber of the bridegroom (chaps. 14–16). Thus the Liturgy of the Word represents the divine economy from incarnation to parousia.

The eucharistic synaxis is the symbol and foretaste of the postparousian economy of the world to come, disclosed in the entrance of the mysteries (chap. 16). The *pax* is the total union that will reign in the kingdom, when all are totally one with the Word (chap. 17); the creed is the eternal hymn of thanks for the divine economy (chap. 18); the *Sanctus* shows our unity and equality with the angels in the divine praises of the future age (chap. 19); the Our Father manifests the plenitude of our adopted sonship (chap. 20); the chant "One is holy" shows the eternal union of the divine simplicity and purity; communion is the grace and beginning of the eschatological deification that will then be ours (chap. 21).

So for Maximus the liturgy represents not just the *earthly* economy of Christ, but *all* salvation history from incarnation to final consummation. Though basically a disciple of Denys, his originality is seen in the far greater emphasis he puts on the historical economy. But he remains decisively Alexandrine in his relative neglect of the earthly phase of this economy in his symbolic structure, emphasizing above all the incarnation, with little to say about the paschal mystery of Christ.

[120] The text is in PG, 91, cols. 657–717. Chapter references will be given in the body of the article.
[121] Bornert, *Commentaires*, 117–21.

2. *Antiochene "Realism" and the Iconoclastic Crisis*

Germanus was what every theologian must be: a man of tradition and a man of his times. Building on this Dionysian heritage transmitted in elite monastic form by Maximus, Germanus, writing a century later in an age hostile to the spiritualization of symbolism, effected an "apertura ad Antiochia," preserving all the while the Maximian vision with some retouching.

This shift is betrayed in the very title of his work: Ἱστορία. It is a commonplace to speak of the symbolic character of Byzantine art and liturgy. But in the struggle with Iconoclasm what we see is actually the victory of a more literalist popular and monastic piety, precisely in favor of a less abstractly symbolic and more representational, figurative religious art: already in the Quinisext Council in Trullo (692), canon 82 ordains that Christ be portrayed henceforth in human form, and not symbolically as the Lamb of God.[122] Now symbolism and portrayal are not at all the same thing either in art or in liturgy, and the effect of this popular mentality on liturgical theology can be observed in the condemnation of the iconoclastic view that the eucharist is the only valid symbol of Christ.[123] Orthodoxy responded that the eucharist is not a symbol of Christ, but indeed Christ Himself.[124] Analogous developments reached their head later (ninth century) in the West, during the dispute between Ratramus and Paschasius Radbertus of Corbie, but Eastern image-theology was able to preserve Byzantine liturgical theory from the radical disjunction between symbol and reality that was to plague Western eucharistic theology until modern times.[125] I do not wish to insist overly much on any causal nexus between the iconodule theory of religious images and a more representational view of the liturgical anamnesis. But the fact of the matter is that both gain the upper hand in *Byzantine* theology at the same time, and represent, in my view, the victory of monastic popular devotion over a more spiritualist approach.

Conclusion: The Synthesis of Germanus and the Metaphorical Nature of Religious Language

This is what Germanus effected for liturgy. How he did so can be seen by re-reading the passages cited or summarized above. A clear example, deliberately saved until now, is Germanus' explanation of the church building, in one of the most frequently quoted passages of Byzantine liturgical literature:

> The church is heaven on earth, where the God of heaven dwells and moves. It images forth the crucifixion and burial and resurrection of Christ. It is glorified above the tabernacle of the testimony of Moses with its expiatory and holy of holies, prefigured in the patriarchs, founded on the apostles, adorned in hierarchs, perfected in the martyrs (1/1).

[122] Mansi, 11, 977–80.

[123] Horos of the iconoclastic council of 754, Mansi, 13, 264 (Mango, *Art*, 166).

[124] Seventh Ecumenical Council (787), *loc. cit.*

[125] See references *supra*, note 61. A. von Harnack summed up the issue with his usual perceptiveness: "Wir verstehen unter Symbol eine Sache, die das nicht ist, was sie bedeutet, damals verstand man unter Symbol eine Sache, die in irgendwelchem Sinne das wirklich ist, was sie bedeutet"; *Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte*, 4th ed., rev., I (Tübingen, 1905), 476.

> The holy altar stands for the place where Christ was laid in the grave, on which the true and heavenly bread, the mystical and bloodless sacrifice, lies, His flesh and blood offered to the faithful as the food of eternal life. It is also the throne of God on which the incarnate God reposes . . . and like the table at which He was in the midst of His disciples at His mystical supper . . . prefigured in the table of the Old Law where the manna was, which is Christ, come down from heaven (4/3).

The same themes are resumed in the succeeding paragraphs. The sanctuary is the place where Christ offered the Father His body as lamb and priest and Son of Man, the offerer and offered, prefigured in the Old Testament passover and consumed by the faithful, by which they become partakers of eternal life. Further, this same sanctuary is a type of the invisible heavenly sanctuary where the heavenly ministers mingle with the earthly, "since the Son of God and creator of all legislated both the heavenly rite and the earthly ritual" (6/5). The episcopal throne in the apse is where Christ presides with His apostles. It foreshadows His session in glory at the parousia (7/6). The chancel is like the chancel of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem (9/8). The monumental ambo rising up before the central doors of the chancel is like the great stone rolled back from the mouth of the tomb. From it the angel first proclaimed to the myrrhophores the good news of the resurrection of the Lord (10/9).

And so he proceeds, step by step, throughout the whole commentary preceding the anaphora, giving first the traditional interpretation of Maximus, then adding the new "Antiochene" level of meaning based on the historical economy of Christ. The sobriety of this symbolism and the unity of method is so apparent that one is perplexed by the negative judgments passed on it. For instance:

> In the realm of topographical symbolism . . . over-interpretation set in fairly soon, more than one symbolic identification being applied to one locality or even to a single object of church furniture. Examples of this can be found in the *Ecclesiastical History* of the Patriarch Germanos. . . .[126]

This misses the point, I think, because it fails to grasp Germanus' methodology, the whole basis of his symbol-system. For the problem of later medieval liturgical allegory consists not in the multiplicity of systematically layered symbols, such as we find here and in patristic exegesis. The later one-symbol-per-object correspondence results not from the tidying up of an earlier incoherent primitiveness, but from the decomposition of the earlier patristic mystery-theology into a historicizing system of dramatic narrative allegory. All levels—Old Testament preparation, Last Supper, accomplishment on Calvary, eternal heavenly offering, present liturgical event—must be held in dynamic unity by any interpretation of the eucharist. To separate these levels, then parcel out the elements bit by bit according to some chronologically consecutive narrative sequence, is to turn ritual into drama, symbol into allegory, mystery into history.

This is crucial: allegory represents the breakdown of metaphorical language, at least in the pejorative sense in which the term allegory is used in reference to the

[126] Demus, *op. cit.* (note 1 *supra*), 15.

later medieval commentaries.[127] The precise genius of metaphorical language is to hold in dynamic tension several levels of meaning simultaneously.[128] In this sense, one and the same eucharistic table *must be* at once Holy of Holies, Golgotha, tomb of the resurrection, cenacle, and heavenly sanctuary of the Letter to the Hebrews. Germanus' timid allegorical forays out from this center are by no means arbitrary (the ciborium as Golgotha, the ambo as the stone of proclamation), and do not detract from the basic unity of mystery and symbol. This is not to say that his every expression is felicitous, that he never treads the thin ice of allegory. But he rejects the later temptation of the historicizing decomposition of the unitary mystery into the component parts of its actual historical enactment.[129] So it is not the multiplicity of meanings but the attempt to parcel them out than can lead to an artificial literalism destructive of symbol and metaphor, and this is precisely what Germanus refuses to do. In so refusing he is simply remaining faithful to what J. Daniélou, great student that he was of the patristic literature of liturgical explanation, indicated as the unitive vision of these monuments of Christian culture:

> The Christian faith has only one object: the mystery of Christ dead and risen. But this unique mystery subsists under different modes: it is prefigured in the Old Testament, it is accomplished historically in the earthly life of Christ, it is contained in mystery in the sacraments, it is lived mystically in souls, it is accomplished socially in the Church, it is consummated eschatologically in the heavenly kingdom. Thus the Christian has at his disposition several registers, a multi-dimensional symbolism, to express this unique reality. The whole of Christian culture consists in grasping the links that exist between Bible and Liturgy, Gospel and Eschatology, Mysticism and Liturgy. The application of this method to scripture is called spiritual exegesis; applied to liturgy it is called mystagogy. This consists in reading in the rites the mystery of Christ, and in contemplating beneath the symbols the invisible reality.[130]

The proof of the success of Germanus' synthesis is its viability: for over six hundred years it reigned with undisputed primacy over the field of Byzantine liturgical explanation. Not until the new fourteenth-century synthesis of the hesychast epoch, represented in the liturgical codification of Patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos' diataxis, and in the commentary of Nicholas Cabasilas, did Germanus' dominance meet a worthy challenger.[131] But by then the quasi-official status of Germanus' *History* was already secure, and he was not displaced from his primacy by Cabasilas until the latter's discovery by the West.[132]

[127] Cf. *supra*, notes 62, 72.

[128] See D. Stevick, "The Language of Prayer," *Worship*, 52 (1978), 547ff.

[129] As happens in the later *Protheoria* (mid-eleventh century). See Bornert, *Commentaires*, 203ff., 241; Schulz, *Liturgie*, 150ff. But this historico-dramatic view of liturgy never reached the proportions that it did in the medieval West (cf. Jungmann, "Arianism," 48–80 *passim*), which is undoubtedly why medieval liturgical drama is chiefly a Western phenomenon, though it is not entirely unknown in Byzantium. See M. Velimirović, "Liturgical Drama in Byzantium and Russia," *DOP*, 16 (1962), 171–211, and the literature cited there, to which add S. Baud-Bovy, "Le théâtre religieux, Byzance et l'occident," Ἑλληνικά, 28 (1975), 328–49; and, on the whole question of drama and liturgy, B.-D. Berger, *Le drame liturgique de Pâques. Liturgie et théâtre*, Théologie historique, 37 (Paris, 1976).

[130] J. Daniélou, "Le symbolisme des rites baptismaux," *Dieu vivant*, 1 (1945), 17.

[131] Cf. *supra*, note 5.

[132] On Germanus' influence in the West, see Bornert, *Commentaires*, 243–44.

Longevity is, of course, no patent of theological or liturgical suitability, and Germanus' synthesis has its weaknesses. In particular, his introduction of the Antiochene burial-motif displaced the focal point of the eucharistic ritual from its true culmination in anaphora and communion, shifting it back to a new climax at the transfer of gifts. The decline in frequent communion from the fourth century, and the silent recitation of the anaphora from at least the sixth, were undoubtedly responsible for the minimal role assigned them in the *Mystagogy* of Maximus.[133] Germanus actually goes a long way to redress the balance, giving the anaphora a far more central place than his predecessor did. But it cannot be denied that his commentary simply peters out at the Our Father, and the eucharistic communion plays in it no ritual role whatever.

This shift of focus was to provoke later secondary developments in the transfer and deposition rites.[134] More important, it became a determining factor in the incipient theology and developing ritual of the prothesis or preparation of the gifts before the Liturgy of the Word.[135] These were the major developments of the Byzantine eucharistic liturgy after Germanus, and they were largely conditioned by his work. But that is a problem not of Germanus' forebears, but of his heirs.

Pontifical Oriental Institute
Rome

[133] Cf. *supra*, note 64.
[134] See Taft, *Great Entrance*, 245ff.
[135] Cf. *ibid.*, 37; Dix, 282ff.; Schulz, *Liturgie*, 113–18, 162–64.