

---

## *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and Ecumenical *Ressourcement*

2013 marked the fiftieth anniversary of the Second Vatican Council's renowned Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (SC). In recent years, Catholic scholars throughout the world have debated the interpretation, impact, and implementation of SC. Frequently, sharp disagreement on particular aspects of SC's implementation erupts into "liturgy wars."<sup>1</sup> The "Liturgy wars" cover several topics such as preferred musical styles, liturgical gestures, the position of the liturgical presider, the translation of the liturgy, and many others. Catholics from both sides often turn to the Byzantine

1. See the study by Massimo Faggioli, *True Reform: Liturgy and Ecclesiology in Sacrosanctum Concilium* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012). Also see Rita Ferrone, *Liturgy: Sacrosanctum Concilium* (New York: Paulist Press, 2007); John O'Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008); John Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008); and Kevin Irwin, *What We have Done, What We Have Failed to Do: Assessing the Liturgical Reforms of Vatican II* (New York: Paulist Press, 2014).

liturgy as a model of authentic tradition, expressing the devotion of Byzantine Rite while remaining faithful to their unchanging liturgy.<sup>2</sup> This devotion is perhaps stereotypically attributed to Russian Orthodox Christians, who supposedly observe an unadulterated ordo inherited from the Constantinopolitan patrons who initiated them into Christianity.

Fortunately, many liturgical scholars have labored hard to create a more accurate narrative of Byzantine liturgical history. The best of these works come from Jesuit scholars such as Juan Mateos, Miguel Arranz, and Robert Taft. Taft's detailed historical study of the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom and attention to the complex process of the formation of the Byzantine Rite demonstrates that the Orthodox liturgy underwent change and reform.<sup>3</sup> Taft, Paul Meyendorff, Thomas Pott, and others contribute further to the narrative by identifying particular episodes of reform in Byzantine liturgical history. In short, Byzantine liturgical reform followed the common thread of adjustment to new environmental circumstances.<sup>4</sup>

2. See Robert F. Taft, "Between Progress and Nostalgia: Liturgical Reform and the Western Romance with the Christian East; Strategies and Realities," in *A Living Tradition: On the Intersection of Liturgical History and Pastoral Practice: Essays in Honor of Maxwell E. Johnson*, ed. David Pitt, Stefanos Alexopoulos, and Christian McConnell (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 30-36, and Anne McGowan, "Eastern Christian Insights and Western Liturgical Reforms: Travelers, Texts, and Liturgical Luggage," in *Liturgy in Migration: From the Upper Room to Cyberspace*, ed. Teresa Berger, foreword by Martin Jean (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2012), 179-208.
3. In addition to Taft's five-volume *History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom* published in the *Orientalia christiana analecta* series, also see idem, *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), and "Mount Athos: A Late Chapter in the History of the Byzantine Rite." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 42 (1988): 179-94.
4. See Thomas Pott, *Byzantine Liturgical Reform: A Study of Liturgical Change in the Byzantine Tradition*, trans. Paul Meyendorff, Orthodox Liturgy Series, 2 (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2010); Paul Meyendorff, *Russia, Ritual, and Reform: The Liturgical Reforms of Nikon in the 17th Century* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991); Marcel Mojžes, *Il movimento liturgico nelle chiese bizantine: analisi di alcune tendenze di riforma nel XX secolo*, Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae subsidia 132 (Rome: Edizione Liturgiche, 2005); Peter Galadza, "Schmemmann Between Fagerberg and Reality: Towards an Agenda for Byzantine Christian Pastoral Liturgy," *Bolletino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* 4 (2007): 7-32;

The last one-hundred plus years witnessed a series of global events and developments necessitating ecclesial adjustments. In the twentieth century, Christianity adjusted to modernization, urbanization, nationalism, revolutions, totalitarianism, two horrifying world wars, the Cold War and the collapse of the Berlin wall, and the emergence of a professionalized workplace. The twenty-first century generates new challenges such as the information age and the technological revolution, globalization, egalitarianism, the emergence of new forms of slavery and human trafficking, and (according to some) the post-Christian era. Perhaps the most elaborate and instrumental ecclesial response to the challenges of modernity is the Second Vatican Council. Energized by *aggiornamento* and *ressourcement*, Vatican II promulgated a vision of the Church actively engaging and participating in the world as citizens of God's kingdom. The Council encouraged the conscious and active participation of the people in the Church's liturgy, a participation not limited to joining in the performance of gestures and singing of hymns, but also seeking to enter into the divine life of the Triune God. The Council envisioned a significant body of Christians participating in Christ's eternal liturgy offered to God; having partaken of God by hearing the proclamation of the word and receiving Holy Communion, Christians return to the world to bear Christ and contribute to society's transformation and transfiguration into an icon of God's kingdom.<sup>5</sup> Reform was to be implemented with structures and catechesis demanded by the nature of liturgy itself, with the hope that the reformed liturgy would shape and form

Nicholas Denysenko, "Towards an Agenda for Byzantine Pastoral Liturgy: A Response to Peter Galadza," *Bolletino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* 7 (2010): 45-68.

5. See Mark Searle, *Called to Participate: Theological, Ritual, and Social Perspectives*, ed. Barbara Searle and Anne Koester (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2006), 2-16; Ferrone, *Liturgy*, 25-6.

multiple generations into a holy priesthood that served God in the world.

SC emerged within the context of the liturgical and ecumenical movements.<sup>6</sup> A core tenet of these movements was *ressourcement*, the return to the sources of antique Christianity, particularly the patristic epoch. *Ressourcement* aimed to illuminate a more holistic ecclesial history so that the contemporary Church would reform herself in light of her whole story. Vatican II did not inaugurate *ressourcement*, but the Council employed and encouraged it. At the same time, *ressourcement* was and remains an ecumenical endeavor. The Catholic dimension of the liturgical movement has a parallel in the Oxford movement of the Anglican tradition. Similarly, the Orthodox Church experienced periods of *ressourcement* from the eighteenth through the twentieth centuries.<sup>7</sup> The Russian Orthodox Church studied the history of the Byzantine liturgy and proposed and assessed numerous reforms that would bring the Church up to date, essentially an Orthodox version of *ressourcement*. For the Orthodox, the context of *ressourcement* shifted after the Bolshevik revolution, with the center moving from the academies of the Russian Empire to a variety of centers established by immigrants in the West. Among the most

6. See Faggioli, 30–37. Also see John Fenwick and Bryan D. Spinks, *Worship in Transition: the Liturgical Movement in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Continuum, 1995); Keith F. Pecklers, *The Unread Vision: the Liturgical Movement in the United States of America, 1926–1955* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998). Michael Kinnamon and Brian E. Cope, eds., *The Ecumenical Movement: an Anthology of Key Texts and Voices* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996).

7. The most recent study is by Hyacinthe Destivelle, *The Moscow Council (1917–1918): The Creation of the Conciliar Institutions of the Russian Orthodox Church*, foreword by Metropolitan Hilarion [Alfeyev], preface by Hevré Legrand, trans. Jerry Ryan, ed. Michael Plekon and Vitaly Permiakov (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, forthcoming in 2015). Also see Paul Valliere, *Conciliarism: A History of Decision-Making in the Church* (Cambridge, UK, and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012). For additional background, see James Cunningham, *A Vanquished Hope: The Movement for Church Renewal in Russia, 1905–1906* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1981); Nicholas Zernov, *The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century* (Salisbury, MA: Regina Orthodox Press, 1999).

important of these centers was St. Sergius Institute in Paris, which produced numerous theologians constituting the so-called “Paris School.”<sup>8</sup> Some of the theologians formed at St. Sergius immigrated to the North America, establishing St. Vladimir’s Orthodox Theological Seminary, an institution led by Alexander Schmemmann and John Meyendorff. Schmemmann and Meyendorff advocated the theological craft of *ressourcement* which occurred in pre-revolutionary Russia and continued in Paris. Orthodox *ressourcement* theology was not limited to these important centers: it was also cultivated by theologians such as John Zizioulas, Anthony Bloom, Olivier Clément, Christos Yannaras, and Kallistos Ware, *inter alia*.

Liturgy was one of the chief topics addressed by the Orthodox *ressourcement* theologians. In Paris, Kyprian Kern and Nicholas Afanasiev presented a renewed Eucharistic theology grounded by patristic sources.<sup>9</sup> Alexander Schmemmann further advanced this Eucharistic theology in his writings and teaching. The theological contributions of the Orthodox theologians occurred largely in the West, among smaller Orthodox populations in North America and Western Europe. The Orthodox Church did not convene any councils at the global level during this period so no large-scale liturgical reform was promulgated by an ecumenical authority. The scale of liturgical reform distinguishes SC and its implementation from Orthodox liturgical reforms. SC, however, was one of the

8. Antoine Arjakovsky, *The Way: Religious Thinkers of the Russian Emigration in Paris and Their Journal, 1925-1940*, trans. Jerry Ryan, ed. John Jillions and Michael Plekon, foreword by Rowan Williams (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013); Aidan Nichols, *Theology in the Russian Diaspora: Church, Fathers, Eucharist in Nikolai Afanasiev, 1893-1966* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Antoine Kartachoff, “Orthodox Theology and the Ecumenical Movement,” *The Ecumenical Review* 8, no. 1 (1955): 30-35; John A. Jillions, “Ecumenism and the Paris School of Orthodox Theology,” *Theoforum* 39, no. 2 (2008): 141-74; Alexis Kniazeff, *L’Institut Saint-Serge: de l’académie d’autrefois au rayonnement d’aujourd’hui* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1974).

9. Syprian Kern, *Eucharistija* (Paris: YMCA Press, 1947); Nicholas Afanasiev, *Трапеза Господня (The Lord’s Supper)* (Kyiv: Temple of the Venerable Agapit of the Caves, 2003).

most influential ecclesial events of modernity and carried serious ecumenical reverberations. The implementation of *SC* influenced subsequent reforms in Reformed Churches, including the rites of initiation, the formation of a three-year lectionary, the composition of new Eucharistic prayers, and a revival of Eucharistic participation.<sup>10</sup> One could assert that *SC*'s teaching on active participation in the liturgy was the most influential of these reforms.

This background raises the question of the potential impact of *SC* on Orthodox liturgical reform. Because many Orthodox Churches participated in the ecumenical and liturgical movements and employed the methods of *ressourcement* theology alongside Catholics and Anglicans, one can plausibly query the impact of *SC* on Orthodox liturgical reform. This chapter surveys the development of a theology of priesthood developed and articulated by Orthodox and Catholic theologians which became a chief cornerstone of the theology of *SC*. I begin by examining the retrieval of a theology of the priesthood of the laity among select Orthodox theologians of the twentieth century. Then, I will survey the contributions of two Catholic theologians from this theological tradition, namely Yves Congar and Virgil Michel. Third, I will demonstrate how the theology of priesthood shared by Orthodox and Catholic *ressourcement* theologians became a staple of magisterial teaching, particularly in *Lumen Gentium* (*LG*), *Apostolicam Actuositatem* (*AA*), and *SC*. Fourth, I will closely read sections of *SC* that articulate the place of priesthood in the liturgy and will discuss how the retrieved theology of priesthood and the active participation in the liturgy serve as the theological foundations for liturgical reform.

10. Paul Bradshaw and Maxwell Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 300. Also see James F. White, "Where the Reformation Was Wrong on Worship," *Christian Century* 99, no. 33 (1982): 1074-77.

## Orthodox Liturgical *Ressourcement* and the Priesthood of the Laity

The twentieth century witnessed the retrieval and restoration of the royal priesthood magisterially defined by Catholics as a priesthood bearing the Christic offices of king, priest, and prophet. Each Christian receives a divine blessing to exercise these offices in, to, and for the world at Baptism and Confirmation. Prominent Catholic and Orthodox theologians developed sophisticated theologies of the royal priesthood grounded by the exercise of king, priest, and prophet. These Christic offices are not mentioned by *SC*, but appear in *LG* and *AA*. I propose that the retrieval and articulation of this theology of the laity was an ecumenical endeavor, and that its restoration provided a common foundation for the Eucharistic theology expounded by Roman and Orthodox theologians.

In the twentieth century, four Orthodox theologians developed a theology of priesthood drawing from liturgical and patristic sources: Nicholas Afanasiev, Paul Evdokimov, Alexander Schmemmann, and Dumitru Staniloae.<sup>11</sup> Afanasiev, Evdokimov, and Schmemmann were products of the so-called Paris School, and Schmemmann's Eucharistic ecclesiology is an elaboration and continuation of Afanasiev's pioneering work in this area. I will streamline this section by limiting the discussion to show how Afanasiev, Evdokimov, and Schmemmann employed liturgical *ressourcement* to articulate this theology of the lay priesthood.

In his *Church of the Holy Spirit*, Afanasiev includes a chapter devoted to the "ordination of laics."<sup>12</sup> Afanasiev develops a theology

11. In this section, I will present perspectives on the three offices as presented by the first three theologians. For a brief overview of Staniloae's interpretation of the three offices, see Radu Bordeianu, "(In)Voluntary Ecumenism: Dumitru Staniloae's Interaction with the West as Open Sobornicity," in *Orthodox Constructions of the West*, ed. George Demacopoulos and Aristotle Papanikolaou (New York: Fordham University Press, 2013), 247–48.

12. Nicholas Afanasiev, *The Church of the Holy Spirit*, trans. Vitaly Permiakov, ed. Michael Plekon

of the priesthood of laics by interpreting select passages from liturgical sources of antiquity, especially the Apostolic Tradition attributed to Hippolytus of Rome, and the contemporary Orthodox rites. Afanasiev asserts that the handlaying gesture in the Apostolic Tradition performed by the bishop after the neophyte was baptized denoted the neophyte's ordination to the order of laics. Afanasiev views the handlaying gesture described by the Apostolic Tradition as symbolizing appointment to priestly ministry, both ordained and lay:

In the ecclesial consciousness of the third century, the laying on of hands at the ordination for ministry signified the ordination for a priestly ministry. In the prayer formula, at the laying of hands on the newly-baptized we find the same verb *servire* (*leitourgein*) used in the prayer formula at the ordination of a bishop. The use of one and the same verb at the laying on of hands in both incidences is not coincidental. Rather this points to one and the same ministry: for one it is a high priestly ministry, for another it is a priestly ministry.<sup>13</sup>

Afanasiev continues to use the Apostolic Tradition as his primary liturgical source for developing a theology of the ordination of laics by referring to the anointing with Chrism performed by the bishop.<sup>14</sup> Afanasiev interprets the anointing as conferring both a royal and priestly ministry because “in the Old Testament only priests and kings were anointed.”<sup>15</sup> It is important to note that the formula for the anointing in the Apostolic Tradition does not mention priests and kings.<sup>16</sup>

(Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007). Afanasiev carefully defines “laic”: “It is inaccurate to regard laymen as a separate group of the members of the Church. According to modern scholastic teaching, lay people are ‘non-consecrated,’ as opposed to the ‘consecrated’ which include all those who belong to the priesthood. As ‘non-consecrated,’ lay people do not receive any ordination and therefore the term ‘lay ordination’ contains in itself a contradiction. This would be accurate if the term ‘lay people’ is understood as ‘laics,’ i.e., the members of God’s people. Therefore, we should speak not of a ‘lay’ but of a ‘laic’ ordination” (25).

13. *Ibid.*, 25–26.

14. *Ibid.*, 26.

15. *Ibid.*



Afanasiev turns to the contemporary Orthodox initiatory rites as he develops the theology of the ordination of laics. He infers that the Byzantine Rite once contained a handlaying gesture and points to the prayer recited at the rite of Ablution on the eighth day as evidence of the ancient episcopal handlaying since it “speaks of the laying on not of the bishop’s but of God’s mighty hand.”<sup>17</sup> Afanasiev turns to the blessing of baptismal waters and cites one of the blessings requested of God for the neophytes, that they would “receive the prize of his high calling and be numbered with the firstborn.”<sup>18</sup> Afanasiev says that the high calling to which the prayer refers is about the neophyte’s priestly ministry.<sup>19</sup> The same is true of the anointing with holy oil in the contemporary Orthodox rite of Chrismation; this seal likewise signifies belonging to the people of God, or “holy priesthood,” as does the donning of the white garment.<sup>20</sup>

Afanasiev describes the ordination of laics as initiating neophytes into “a nation of kings and priests” who exercise their ministry alongside those ordained to preside.<sup>21</sup> The ministry laics exercise is legitimate, and Afanasiev insists that “a laic cannot be viewed in opposition to the consecrated,” because everyone who belongs to the Church has received the pledge of the age to come.

Paul Evdokimov was an important lay Orthodox theologian of the mid-twentieth century. Evdokimov wrote at length on a variety of topics in an ecumenical context. His most important works are his theology of marriage *The Sacrament of Love*, and his exposition

16. Afanasiev cites the formulary from the Apostolic Tradition: “I anoint you with holy oil in God the Father Almighty and Christ Jesus and the Holy Spirit” (ibid.).

17. Ibid. Afanasiev cites the text of the prayer in its entirety.

18. “His” refers to the Holy Spirit; for the text of the blessing of baptismal waters and its context, see the translation by Archimandrite Ephrem Lash, “Baptism,” <http://www.anastasis.org.uk/baptism.htm> (accessed March 25, 2013).

19. Afanasiev, 27–28.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid., 30–31. Afanasiev mentions “kings and priests” twice in his summary, manifesting the first foundation of his narrative.

of modern spirituality, *Ages of the Spiritual Life*.<sup>22</sup> One theological idea threads these two different works: an appeal to everyone—men, women and children—to respond to the universal call to priesthood. Evdokimov articulates a particularly Orthodox notion of lay priesthood by proposing a lifestyle embodying traditional monastic values in the contemporary environment, encapsulated by the now-famous notion of interiorized monasticism. Interiorized monasticism allows the Orthodox layperson an opportunity to employ the core values of the Orthodox ascetical tradition and witness to the world. It was important for Evdokimov to provide the laity with access to the venerable Orthodox way while fully engaging the world as men and women “on the street.”

An important tenet of Evdokimov’s universal priesthood of the laity is the theological contribution of the sacrament of Chrismation.<sup>23</sup> Like Afanasiev, Evdokimov views Chrismation as the ordination of the layperson to the priesthood.<sup>24</sup> The layperson’s ministry is related to the bishop’s: it is an exercise of the priesthood of Christ.<sup>25</sup> The anointing with Chrism equips the layperson with the spiritual gifts needed to exercise these ministries. Evdokimov interrogates several select liturgical sources to illuminate these gifts. For example, he refers to the occasional consecration of Chrism celebrated by the Orthodox Church and quotes the prayer recited by the bishop, which asks that God would seal the recipients so that

22. Paul Evdokimov, *The Sacrament of Love: The Nuptial Mystery in the Light of the Orthodox Tradition*, trans. Anthony P. Gythiel and Victoria Steadman, foreword by Olivier Clément (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1995).

23. Evdokimov expounds his theology of Chrismation in an essay titled “L’Esprit saint et l’Église d’après la tradition liturgique,” in *L’Esprit Saint et l’Église. Catholiques, orthodoxes et protestants de divers pays confrontent leur science, leur foi et leur tradition: l’Avenir de l’Église et de l’œcuménisme*, ed. Académie internationale des sciences religieuses (Paris: Fanyard, 1969), 85–123, and also *Ages of the Spiritual Life*, trans. Michael Plekon and Alexis Vinogradov (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary, 1998), 231–39.

24. Evdokimov, *Ages of the Spiritual Life*, 231.

25. *Ibid.*, 232.

they would bear Christ in their hearts.<sup>26</sup> Evdokimov parenthetically elaborates the meaning of “seal” by defining it as making or anointing the participants into “christs.”<sup>27</sup> He also views the tonsure that occurs at the rite of ablution as having a parallel to monastic tonsure: “In undergoing the rite of tonsure, every lay person is a monk of interiorized monasticism, subject to all the requirements of the Gospel.”<sup>28</sup>

Evdokimov carefully distinguishes the priesthood of the laity from the other orders of the Church by elaborating their relevance in mission to the world. He cites, *inter alia*, St. Macarius of Egypt and Origen to state that the anointing with Chrism makes the laity into kings, priests, and prophets.<sup>29</sup>

Schmemmann develops a theology of lay priesthood by describing the human being’s ministry as following Christ’s pattern. In Chrismation, the neophyte becomes priest, prophet, and king. He defines the content of each ministry in order, king, priest, and prophet, and the purpose of his exposition becomes clear: it is an exercise in theological anthropology. The gift of the Spirit makes one anointed in Christ’s image, and Christ’s priestly ministry is imparted to the restored human being, whose mission it is to carry out this threefold ministry in the world.

Schmemmann’s exposition consists of an essay on the theological anthropology of the rites of initiation and an underlying critique of secular culture. His discussion of the new human being who emerges from the font privileges what he calls “anthropological maximalism.”<sup>30</sup> This new human being was once the king of creation who is now fallen; the human vocation has been restored and humans

26. *Ibid.*, 235. Also see “L’Esprit saint et l’Église d’après la tradition liturgique,” 101-2.

27. Evdokimov, *Ages of the Spiritual Life*, 235.

28. *Ibid.*, 234-35.

29. *Ibid.*, 238-39.

30. Schmemmann, *Of Water and the Spirit*, 82.

are now kings again.<sup>31</sup> Later, Schmemmann explains that humans exercise this restored vocation through the mystery of the cross.<sup>32</sup> Schmemmann attributes the restoration of this gift to humanity to Baptism and the postbaptismal anointing with chrism: “In the eucharistic blessing of water . . . the entire cosmos is revealed again as God’s gift to man, as man’s kingdom. In the anointment with the ‘oil of gladness,’ the new life of the neophyte is announced as power and dominion. He is vested in royal garments, and it is Christ’s own kingship that he receives in the ‘seal’ of the Holy Chrism.”<sup>33</sup> Schmemmann refers to a sequence of ritual components in initiation, namely the blessing of baptismal waters, the prebaptismal anointing of catechumens, and the postbaptismal Chrismation.

Schmemmann’s image of the restored human is positive (a word he frequently italicizes for emphasis), and seems to be suitable for Christian mission. But Schmemmann also appears to have affixed a particular theological anthropology onto the ritual components by ascribing this definition of a Christian to the rite without more direct references to their content. One should also note that Schmemmann completes his discussion on the content of kingship imparted to the neophyte by ascribing it solely to the anointing with chrism.<sup>34</sup> Schmemmann’s exposition on the second and third aspects of the human vocation is likewise attributed to the Holy Spirit. He briefly

31. Schmemmann’s distinctions are intriguing, and reveal his task of defining Christianity’s theological anthropology in the context of secular culture. For example, he addresses the oft-repeated refrain on the universality of human failure by distinguishing between errors and the innate goodness of vocation when he says, “man misuses his vocation, and in this horrible misuse he mutilates himself and the world; but his vocation is good,” *ibid.*, 84.

32. *Ibid.*, 85, 87.

33. *Ibid.*, 83.

34. “Now, and only now, can we answer the question raised at the beginning of this chapter: about the meaning of our kingship bestowed upon us in the sacrament of Chrismation. We can answer it because in the Cross of Christ the content of this kingship is revealed and its power is granted. The royal anointment truly makes us kings, but it is the crucified kingship of Christ himself—it is the cross as kingship and kingship as cross—that the Holy Spirit bestows on us,” *ibid.*, 90.

states that Christ's priesthood is given to the neophyte at Chrismation,<sup>35</sup> along with the gift of prophecy.<sup>36</sup> His explanation of the features of these holy gifts follows the pattern he established with kingship: the gifts profoundly change the neophyte, but Schmemmann does not establish how the initiatory rites communicate the imparting of these gifts.

In summary, Afanasiev, Evdokimov, and Schmemmann developed a theology of the priesthood of the laity by examining the liturgical sources. Afanasiev views the laity as the first order of the Church appointed by God through the laying on of hands at Baptism. Evdokimov follows a similar pattern by defining the lay priesthood through the Christic offices of priest, prophet, and king imparted through the anointing with Chrism. Schmemmann's theology is similar, and like Afanasiev and Evdokimov, he describes the imparting of these priestly gifts as designed for the lay person who exercises his or her ministry in the world. Thus, lay ministry originates with the mysteries of initiation, and the laity receives the spiritual energy required for priestly ministry through the Eucharist. The Orthodox theological teaching on the laity carried the weight of the prominence of its teachers' statures, so the dissemination of the teaching is directly connected with the influence wielded by Afanasiev, Evdokimov, and Schmemmann. In other words, while many Orthodox theologians of the world would affirm and sustain this retrieval of the teaching on the priesthood of the laity, some Orthodox Churches and theologians could ignore it since it did not carry the authority of the canons or an Orthodox council. As we shall see later, the weight of authority distinguishes the impact of the Orthodox theological teaching from its Roman Catholic parallel,

35. *Ibid.*, 94, 97.

36. *Ibid.*, 101, 103.

which was inscribed upon the magisterial teaching of Vatican II and thus bore more authoritative weight in the Roman communion.

### **Catholic Theologians and the priesthood: Congar and Michel**

In the West, the threefold division of Christ's ministry into the kingly, priestly, and prophetic offices has a long and rich history closely associated with the development of a priesthood of all believers.<sup>37</sup> Reformation theologians further refined this theology, especially John Calvin.<sup>38</sup> The triadic office continued to develop in the Catholic Reformation and was taken up by John Henry Newman.<sup>39</sup> One of the most substantial treatments of the Christic offices in modern Catholic theology occurs in Yves Congar's study of the laity in the Church.<sup>40</sup>

Congar's comprehensive study begins with a definition of the layperson and addresses the question of how laity exercise Christ's threefold ministry. Congar offers numerous contributions to lay ministry in the spirit of *ressourcement*, a careful and complete

37. Several seminal essays break open the historical development of the laity as kings, prophets, and priests in Roman Catholic theology. For the classical overview of the historical development of these offices and their interpretation, see Yves Congar, "Sur la trilogie: prophète-roi-prêtre," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 67 (1983), 97-115. Also see David Power, "Priesthood Revisited: Mission and Ministries in the Royal Priesthood," in *Ordering the Baptismal Priesthood; Theologies of Lay and Ordained Priesthood*, ed. Susan Wood (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003), 97-120; Zeni Fox, "Laity, Ministry, and Secular Character," in *Ordering the Baptismal Priesthood*, ed. Susan Wood, 121-51; and Donald J. Goergen, "Priest, Prophet, King: The Ministry of Jesus Christ," in *The Theology of Priesthood*, ed. Donald Goergen and Ann Garrido (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000), 187-210. Also see the analysis by Susan Wood, *Sacramental Orders* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000), 11-19.

38. Power, "Priesthood Revisited," in Wood, ed., *Ordering the Baptismal Priesthood*, 107. For a complete treatment, see Rose Beal, "Priest, Prophet and King: Jesus Christ, the Church and the Christian Person," in *John Calvin's Ecclesiology: Ecumenical Perspectives*, ed. Gerard Mannion and Eddy van der Borght (London, New York: T & T Clark, 2011), 90-106.

39. See Goergen, "Priest, Prophet, King," in *The Theology of Priesthood*, ed. Goergen and Garrido, 191-92. See John Henry Newman, *Sermons Bearing on Subjects of the Day* (London, New York, Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1902), 52-62.

40. Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church: A Study for the Theology of the Laity*, trans. Donald Attwater (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1957, 1963 reprint).

definition of a lay priesthood retrieved from the Church's patristic and liturgical heritage. Congar concludes that the three offices are not mutually exclusive, but reciprocally shape one another for the building up of the people of God, Christ's body.<sup>41</sup> He defines them as producing a plurality of ministries within the Church and is wary of attempting to apply them to the exercise of sacerdotal powers of order and jurisdiction.<sup>42</sup> For Congar, the notion of a plurality of ministries is perhaps best understood when noting that the ordained exercise ministries within the community, and not as external authorities imposing themselves upon the community.<sup>43</sup>

Central to Congar's ecclesiology, and consequently, to his definition of lay ministry, is his cosmology encompassing kingdom, Church, and world. After stating that God's purpose is to "bring mankind into fellowship with his divine life,"<sup>44</sup> Congar explains the intersections of kingdom, Church, and world through the image of the temple:

God wills to make the world the temple of his power and glory; he wills to make mankind his temple built of living stones, his body made of free persons, in a word, the temple of his fellowship. This is whither it all tends: that God wills to dwell and to be praised in mankind as in a single temple, but the indwelling and the praise are spiritual, living.<sup>45</sup>

Congar continues by reviewing salvation history and the inauguration of God's kingdom in the Incarnation of Christ. He describes the present as a space between the fulfillment of the kingdom and its inauguration, and portrays the Church's role in fulfilling God's kingdom accordingly:

41. Congar, "Sur la trilogie: prophète-roi-prêtre," 112.

42. Ibid.

43. Fox, "Laity, Ministry, and Secular Character," in 140-41.

44. Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 53.

45. Ibid., 53-54.

The Church's constitution is in this, that she already has within herself, and as the very things that make her Church, the self-same and decisive causes of that renewal of which the Kingdom will be the consummation: the kingly, priestly, and prophetic power of Christ, and the Holy Spirit. Therefore, the Church co-operates directly in the constitution of the Kingdom, through the exercise of energies that are her own and constitute her reality as Church.<sup>46</sup>

Congar turns to the liturgy to connect the laity and Christ's threefold offices of king, priest, and prophet.<sup>47</sup> He identifies Confirmation as imparting the gift to exercise Christ's ministries to neophytes.<sup>48</sup> His teaching is quite similar to that of the Benedictine pioneer of the liturgical movement, Virgil Michel, who also understood the rites of initiation as imparting the divine vocation of king, priest, and prophet to neophytes, whose responsibility it is to manifest Christ to the world in which they live.<sup>49</sup> Michel's source for this vision of lay ministry is the doctrine of *theosis*, inaugurated by God at baptism. The gift of the indwelling of the Triune God is one Christians are to share with the world, with the priestly goal of transforming it in Christ. Rose Calabretta's description of Michel's last days echoes Congar's theological description of the present as the space between:

The object of this apostolic lifestyle was to obey the mandate of Christ given to his Church in its double commission: a) to announce to all human beings the highest truth about themselves: they were both children of God and members of Christ; and b) to capacitate them

46. *Ibid.*, 88.

47. Congar, "Sur la trilogie: prophète-roi-prêtre," 99-100. Also see *idem*, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 3, trans. David Smith, 219-20.

48. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 3, trans. David Smith, 219-20. Congar also connects the imparting of these gifts to the anointing in his essay "The Structure of Christian Priesthood," in *idem*, *At the Heart of Christian Worship: Liturgical Essays of Yves Congar*, ed. and trans. Paul Philibert (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2010), 90, esp. n. 39.

49. Rose B. Calabretta, *Baptism and Confirmation: The Vocation and Mission of the Laity in the Writings of Virgil Michel*, *Tesi gregoriana, Serie Teologia 47* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1998), 166-67. For a survey of Michel's background, see Michael Woods, *Cultivating Soil and Soul: Twentieth-Century Catholic Agrarians Embrace the Liturgical Movement* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2009), 66-100.



for living out their days, soaring even higher towards their sublimest dignity, thus experiencing new frontiers of authentic freedom. They were destined by their Father to enjoy even in time-bound existence the heavenly life that he wished to give them: to share in the eternal love in the inner communion of the Triune God.<sup>50</sup>

A crucial component of Michel's notion of a baptismal priesthood is its accessibility to the laity. Calabretta notes that Michel translates traditional monastic vocabulary by reintroducing terms such as "ascetic" and "mystical" to make it accessible to the layperson, who truly becomes a fellower of Christ and joins the communion of saints.<sup>51</sup> The transfiguration of social structures is a task belonging to the whole people of God, ordained and lay, each exercising the gifts of the Spirit they receive in the sacraments.

### **Priesthood in the Documents of Vatican II**

The sacramental theology of priesthood developed by *ressourcement* theologians like Afanasiev, Evdokimov, Schmemmann, Congar and Michel became official in two documents of Vatican II. In chapter four of *Lumen Gentium*, the constitution on the Church, Vatican II defines the laity accordingly:<sup>52</sup>

The term laity is here understood to mean all the faithful except those in holy orders and those in the state of religious life specially approved by the Church. These faithful are by Baptism made one body with Christ and are constituted among the People of God; they are in their own way made sharers in the priestly, prophetic, and kingly functions of Christ; and they carry out for their own part the mission of the whole Christian people in the Church and in the world.

50. Calabretta, 213.

51. *Ibid.*, 146-47, 160.

52. Second Vatican Council, *Lumen Gentium* no. 31, Vatican Web Site, [http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_const\\_19641121\\_lumen-gentium\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html) (accessed April 8, 2013).

*Lumen Gentium* distinguishes the vocation of the laity from that of the ordained priesthood by emphasizing lay ministry to the world:

But the laity, by their very vocation, seek the kingdom of God by engaging in temporal affairs and by ordering them according to the plan of God. They live in the world, that is, in each and in all of the secular professions and occupations. They live in the ordinary circumstances of family and social life, from which the very web of their existence is woven. They are called there by God that by exercising their proper function and led by the spirit of the Gospel they may work for the sanctification of the world from within as a leaven. In this way they may make Christ known to others, especially by the testimony of a life resplendent in faith, hope and charity. Therefore, since they are tightly bound up in all types of temporal affairs it is their special task to order and to throw light upon these affairs in such a way that they may come into being and then continually increase according to Christ to the praise of the Creator and the Redeemer.<sup>53</sup>

Vatican II echoes the teaching of theologians like Congar and Michel by placing the ministry of the laity in explicitly worldly terms. The Council connects lay ministry to the apostolate in *AA*. A strong sacramental theology grounded by the rites of initiation and the ministries of king, priest, and prophet again guides the mission of the laity in the world:<sup>54</sup>

The laity derive the right and duty to the apostolate from their union with Christ the head; incorporated into Christ's Mystical Body through Baptism and strengthened by the power of the Holy Spirit through Confirmation, they are assigned to the apostolate by the Lord Himself. They are consecrated for the royal priesthood and the holy people (cf. 1 Pet. 2:4-10) not only that they may offer spiritual sacrifices in everything they do but also that they may witness to Christ throughout the world. The sacraments, however, especially the most holy Eucharist,

53. Ibid.

54. Second Vatican Council, *Apostolicam Actuositatem*, Vatican website, [http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decree\\_19651118\\_apostolicam-actuositatem\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651118_apostolicam-actuositatem_en.html) (accessed April 8, 2013).

communicate and nourish that charity which is the soul of the entire apostolate.

An emphasis on the legitimacy and power of the universal priesthood of the laity appears in the decree's description of the work of the lay apostolate. *AA* describes the laity as “sharers in the role of Christ as priest, prophet, and king,” whose work is absolutely essential to the life of the Church.<sup>55</sup> The laity's ministry of creating encounters between the world and God's kingdom is essential to the divine will because the laity as the body of Christ is the tangible connection of kingdom, Church, and world.

The teachings of Vatican II here thus resonate significantly with the ecumenical *ressourcement* theology flourishing prior to the Council. This theology is a creative synthesis of liturgy, theological anthropology, and the sacramental theology gleaned from the historical development of the rites of initiation. Catholic theology defines the laity as becoming sharers of Christ and his threefold office, conferred through Baptism and Confirmation.<sup>56</sup> As well, the Council retrieves a sacramental theology subtending a salient, missional cosmology—the laity's purpose is to transform and transfigure the world by making Christ present in their daily secular activity. Theologians have assessed the status of this sacramental theology since Vatican II, but the theological anthropology of the laity as exercising Christ's ministries of king, priest, and prophet continues to hold sway in Catholic systematic theology.

### The Direction of Theological Influence

The preceding section suggests that *LG* and *AA* espouse a theology of the laity that draws upon the contributions of Orthodox and

55. Second Vatican Council, *Apostolicam Actuositatem* no. 10.

56. The documents of the Council underscore the former, whereas Congar focuses on the imparting of the Christic offices through the sacraments.

Catholic theologians. The evidence from the early-twentieth century suggests that the primary proponents of this theology in the respective Orthodox and Catholic traditions benefitted from the theological cross-pollination that occurs in dialogical exchange during ecumenical gatherings. Anastacia Wooden traces this process of mutual listening, commencing in the early-twentieth century, when Pope Pius XI instructed the Benedictines to work with the Russian Orthodox Church, resulting in a dual rite community now located at Chevetogne in Belgium.<sup>57</sup> Catholic-Orthodox dialogue flourished as well at the Liturgical Weeks symposia inaugurated by Afanasiev and Kyprian Kern in 1952 at St. Sergius Institute in Paris.<sup>58</sup> Wooden claims that Afanasiev's Eucharistic ecclesiology began to influence Catholic theologians during these encounters, evidenced by his appearance in the preparatory documents of Vatican II and his participation in the final session of the council, which contributed to the mutual lifting of anathemas between the Roman and Orthodox Churches.<sup>59</sup>

Another such example of mutual listening occurred during the Second Vatican Council itself. Orthodox theologians participated in Vatican II as observers, including representatives from the Moscow Patriarchate and Russian Church in Exile.<sup>60</sup> Yves Congar refers to

57. Anastacia Wooden, "Eucharistic Ecclesiology of Nicholas Afanasiev and Catholic Ecclesiology: History of Interaction and Future Perspectives," A Paper presented at the 50th International Eucharistic Congress in 2012, <http://www.iec2012.ie/media/1AnastaciaWooden1.pdf> (accessed October 11, 2013). "Wooden" hereafter.
58. Michael Plekon, "Nicholas Afanasiev," *Key Theological Thinkers: From Modern to Postmodern*, ed. Stale Kristiansen and Svan Reis (Farnham, Burlington: Ashgate, 2013), 374.
59. Wooden, 1. See Wooden's more substantial treatment of Afanasiev's contribution to ecumenical dialogue in her essay, "Eucharistic Ecclesiology of Nicolas Afanasiev and its Ecumenical Significance: A New Perspective," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 45, no. 4 (2010), 543-60. Also see Paul McPartlan, "Ressourcement, Vatican II, and Eucharistic Ecclesiology," in *Ressourcement: A Movement for Renewal in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology*, ed. Gabriel Flynn and Paul D. Murray (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 403.
60. O'Malley, 96. Nikos Nissiotis, a Greek Orthodox layperson, represented the World Council of Churches.

several encounters with Orthodox observers at Vatican II, including contributions from Father Vitaly Borovoj from the Moscow Patriarchate and the active participation of Alexander Schmemmann.<sup>61</sup> Besides exchanging ideas with Nikos Nissiotis and Schmemmann during ecclesiological deliberations, Congar describes a meaningful conversation with both Orthodox representatives over lunch:

We had an interesting chat: about ecclesiology. I told them my way of seeing the ecclesiology of the Fathers and of the liturgy, as including anthropology, and we agreed that the best ecclesiology would be . . . a development on the Christian human being. We also spoke of the *De Beata*. In their view, a *De Beata* is a fairly doubtful step. In the East, Mary is a DIMENSION of everything: of Christology, of the history of salvation (continuity with Israel), ecclesiology, of prayer. That is why the Orthodox mix her up with everything without ever producing a treatise *De Beata*.<sup>62</sup>

Congar's account provides a snapshot of the kind of theologically dense conversation that occurred between Catholics and Orthodox at Vatican II.

Robert Taft also attends to Catholic exchange with Orthodox.<sup>63</sup> Taft demonstrates that Catholic engagement with *ressourcement* theology oriented Catholic theologians towards Eastern sources. Taft states that the West discovered forms and ideas in the East that illuminated Western deficiencies: “the West has tended to define Eastern liturgy in terms of what it perceives itself as lacking.”<sup>64</sup> Taft then identifies four areas of theological wealth (more or less) preserved in the East that enchanted the West: a balance of high

61. Yves Congar, *My Journal of the Council*, trans. Mary John Ronayne and Mary Cecily Boulding, ed. Dennis Minns (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 89, 329–31, 352. Congar also notes that the Ecumenical Patriarchate was opposed to sending observers to Vatican II, in contrast to the open ecumenical participation of the Moscow Patriarchate (82).

62. *Ibid.*, 382–83.

63. Taft, “Between Progress and Nostalgia,” in *A Living Tradition*, ed. Pitt, Alexopoulos, and McConnell, 19–42.

64. *Ibid.*, 31.

Christology and the human, kenotic Christ; radical Trinitarianism; a sense of the holiness, transcendence, and unknowability of God (apophatic theology in the liturgy); and holistic liturgy.<sup>65</sup> Taft cautions the Orthodox that it is easy to misunderstand Western interest in Eastern liturgy, as Catholics were not seeking a return to Eastern Orthodoxy.<sup>66</sup> Catholic theologians are enchanted by the idea of the Orient, in an “attempt to recreate for itself a better present out of an imagined ideal past.”<sup>67</sup> Taft also offers his own assessment of the cross-pollination between East and West in the Catholic liturgical reforms resulting in the promulgation and implementation of *SC*: “the process was . . . a fruitful influence in which both East and West influenced and enriched each other mutually.”<sup>68</sup>

Anne McGowan presents several instances of Western Churches adopting Eastern liturgical practices and offices, including Catholic dependence on the Byzantine formula for anointing with Chrism and the identification of the anointing as the primary form (as opposed to the laying-on-of-hands) in Confirmation.<sup>69</sup> Together, Taft and Wooden suggest that Orthodox liturgy has contributed to the reform of Catholic liturgy in *SC*. Catholic recognition of authentically Eastern liturgical forms and content reached its apogee when the Holy See recognized the validity of the Assyrian form of the anaphora of Addai and Mari, a Eucharistic prayer which does not include the

65. “Eastern liturgy has created and retained a synthesis of ritual, art, church design, and symbolic structure that may at times seem inflexible but that permits it to do what liturgy is supposed to do without the self-consciousness of present-day liturgy in the West. For liturgy serves no purpose outside of itself,” in *ibid.*, 34–36.

66. *Ibid.*, 32.

67. *Ibid.*, 33.

68. *Ibid.*, 37. On this topic, also see Mark Morozowich, “East Meets West in Liturgy: Mutual Influence Throughout the Centuries,” in *Liturgies in East and West: Ecumenical Relevance of Early Liturgical Development. Acts of the International Symposium Vindobonense I, Vienna, November 17–20, 2007* (Vienne: International Specialized Book Services, 2013), 295–305.

69. McGowan, “Eastern Christian Insights and Western Liturgical Reforms,” in *Liturgy in Migration*, ed. Berger, 200–203. Also see Nicholas Denysenko, *Chrismation: A Primer for Catholics* (Colleeville, MN: Liturgical, 2014), 144–50.

Words of Institution. Taft refers to this recognition as “the most remarkable magisterial document since Vatican II.”<sup>70</sup>

The evidence examined to this point suggests that Roman Catholics consulted Orthodox sources in updating magisterial teaching on the Church and her liturgy and implementing liturgical reform. However, there is also evidence suggesting that the Orthodox also borrowed liberally from Roman Catholic voices. Mutual listening was not one-sided, as in only Catholics studying the Orthodox. Faggioli notes that some Orthodox listened to *SC*, including the prominent theologians Olivier Clément, who believed that *SC* could be modular for Orthodox liturgical reform.<sup>71</sup> Schmemmann also indicates active listening to Catholics. For example, one of Schmemmann’s earliest and most important works, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, engages extensively Catholic theologians such as Louis Bouyer, Anton Baumstark, Yves Congar, and Olivier Rousseau.<sup>72</sup> Schmemmann closely follows the Catholic tradition of explaining sacramental theology in his study of Baptism, *Of Water and the Spirit*.<sup>73</sup> In this work, Schmemmann treats Baptism, Chrismation,

70. Robert F. Taft, “Mass Without the Consecration? The Historic Agreement on the Eucharist Between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East Promulgated 26 October 2001,” *Worship* 77, no. 6 (2003): 483. Also see Nicholas V. Russo, “The Validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: Critique of the Critiques,” in *Issues in Eucharistic Praying in East and West: Essays in Liturgical and Theological Analysis*, ed. Maxwell Johnson (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 21–62.

71. Olivier Clément, “Vers un dialogue avec le catholicisme,” *Contacts* 14 (1965): 16–37, quoted in Faggioli, 111n58.

72. Alexander Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, trans. Asheleigh E. Moorhouse (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1986), 9–32. Also see Plekon, *Living Icons*, 179–80; William Mills, *Church, World, and Kingdom: The Eucharistic Foundation of Alexander Schmemmann’s Pastoral Theology* (Chicago: Archdiocese of Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2012), 37–39; and Robert Taft, “The Liturgical Enterprise Twenty-Five Years after Alexander Schmemmann (1921–1983): The Man and His Heritage,” *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 53, nos. 2–3 (2009): 163–64. See chapter 3 of this study for more evidence of Schmemmann’s “listening” to the West.

73. Alexander Schmemmann, *Of Water and the Spirit: A Liturgical Study of Baptism* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1974).

and Eucharist as three sacraments in order, and identifies Chrismation as the sacrament of the Holy Spirit. Schmemmann also offers a rich presentation of Chrismation as the sacrament imparting the Christic offices of king, priest, and prophet, and his discussion of these offices is detached from his presentation on the liturgical components of the anointing with Chrism.

Besides Schmemmann, other Orthodox seemed to have been influenced by Catholic *ressourcement* theology. For example, Alkiviadis Calivas, one of the most important teachers of Orthodox liturgy at Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology in Brookline, Massachusetts, refers to the Eucharist as the “source and summit of the Church’s life” in his treatment of the Divine Liturgy, an obvious instance of adopting the vocabulary of SC.<sup>74</sup> The Church of Greece appears to adopt several aspects of the principles of Vatican II in the symposia its Holy Synod convoked in preparation for liturgical renewal.<sup>75</sup> Vatican II exercised considerable influence on Orthodoxy in America through sacred architecture. Kostis Kourelis and Vasileios Marinis argue that Vatican II “liberated Catholic churches from historical prototypes and precipitated an explosion of wild designs among the Irish, Italian, and Hispanic populations with whom Greeks socialized and intermarried,” resulting in a new phase of Greek Orthodox architecture that abandoned traditional Greek prototypes.<sup>76</sup>

The preceding review of instances of mutual influence of Catholic and Orthodox theology and liturgy suggests that the contributions went in both directions. The ecumenical movement provided an environment for Catholics and Orthodox to engage in theological

74. Alkiviadis Calivas, *Essays in Theology and Liturgy*, vol. 3: *Aspects of Orthodox Worship* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2003), 176–77.

75. I will treat the Church of Greece as a case study of liturgical renewal in chapter 5.

76. Kostis Kourelis and Vasileios Marinis, “An Immigrant Liturgy: Greek Orthodox Worship and Architecture in America,” in *Liturgy in Migration*, ed. Berger, 166.



dialogue which impacted the participants from both traditions. One important difference emerges in the next section: Vatican II. The structure and environment of the council facilitates the inscription of this ecumenical theology onto Catholic magisterial theology. Because the Orthodox Church has not held a council of this magnitude, there is no parallel in Orthodoxy for assessing the permanent impact of Catholic contributions to Orthodox theology. Furthermore, one can only speak of the contribution of Catholic and Orthodox theologians to particular schools of thought within the Orthodox Church and her academy, since no Orthodox council, synod, or corpus of canons has made the reception of the *ressourcement* theology compulsory. Vatican II became a repository of theological contributions from the entire Church, both West and East.

### **The Impact of Ecumenical Cooperation on Vatican II**

Multiple liturgical reforms, employing *ressourcement*, occurred in the twentieth century across ecclesial boundaries. *SC* is the most prominent of these reforms on account of the weight of its impact on the Christian world. On the surface, it appears sensible to assume that the promulgation and implementation of *SC* inaugurated a series of liturgical reforms in sister Churches. The ecumenical priority of Vatican II and the contribution of Eastern voices to its deliberations manifests the evidence of mutual listening discussed in the preceding section. Massimo Faggioli notes that *ressourcement* and its references to plurality in liturgical tradition illuminated the council fathers on the ecumenical nature of the Church.<sup>77</sup> Faggioli also highlights the bishops' experience of this plurality through the celebration of different Catholic rites during Vatican II, which "made the approach

77. Faggioli, 34.

to dialogue with Christians from other traditions, especially with the Eastern Orthodox Churches, much more possible.”<sup>78</sup> Faggioli argues that the liturgical constitution was deliberately ecumenical, designed for rapprochement with estranged Churches, especially the notion of liturgy as the source and summit of the Church as appealing to the Orthodox and a renewed primacy of the Word in liturgy directed to Reformed Churches.<sup>79</sup> Contributions from Eastern Christians to the deliberations of Vatican II also illustrate the ecumenical character of Vatican II. In addition to the contributions of Orthodox observers, Eastern Catholics shaped the ecumenical lens of the Council. Patriarch Maximos IV of Antioch reminded the council fathers of the inherent plurality in liturgical tradition when he addressed them in French and presented the Eastern practice of worshiping in living languages as exemplary for the council fathers, who were then deliberating on the matter of retaining Latin and adopting the vernacular.<sup>80</sup>

The decree *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* (*OE*, promulgated by Pope Paul VI in 1964) implemented the ecumenical agenda established by *SC* and furthered by *Unitatis Redintegratio*.<sup>81</sup> *OE* encouraged the Catholic Churches of the Eastern rites to follow their own native liturgical traditions and to reform the liturgy only in accordance with its own inner organic development, as demonstrated by *OE*, no. 6:<sup>82</sup>

All members of the Eastern Rite should know and be convinced that they can and should always preserve their legitimate liturgical rite and their established way of life, and that these may not be altered except to obtain for themselves an organic improvement. All these, then, must

78. *Ibid.*

79. *Ibid.*, 107-11.

80. See O'Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II*, 136.

81. See the Vatican's English translation of this decree at [http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decree\\_19641121\\_orientalium-ecclesiarum\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19641121_orientalium-ecclesiarum_en.html) (accessed October 11, 2013).

82. *Ibid.*

be observed by the members of the Eastern rites themselves. Besides, they should attain to an ever greater knowledge and a more exact use of them, and, if in their regard they have fallen short owing to contingencies of times and persons, they should take steps to return to their ancestral traditions.

Ironically, Thomas Pott identifies a dissonance in the rationale for reform between *SC* and *OE*. He states that *SC* encourages reform to meet the pastoral needs of the community whereas *OE* promotes restoration by returning to one's native tradition.<sup>83</sup> Pott's insightful distinction between the two types of reform seems to indicate an attitude on the part of the council fathers that the Eastern Churches did not need a liturgical reform, whereas conditions in the Roman liturgy necessitated one.<sup>84</sup> Pott's brief presentation on the reform of the Divine Liturgy in the Melkite Greek-Catholic Church is noteworthy, since this Church's patriarchal synod adopted and approved a new edition of the Divine Liturgy in 1998.<sup>85</sup> Pott states that the reform's aim was pastoral, and ultimately directed towards the reappropriation of the Church's Antiochian-Byzantine tradition.<sup>86</sup> In assessing this reform, Pott notes that the principles draw largely from *SC*.<sup>87</sup>

83. Pott, 43-46.

84. It is also possible that the council fathers hoped to demonstrate their fidelity to the autonomy of the Eastern Churches in ascertaining the need for a reform. *OE*'s respect for the Eastern Churches right for self-rule supports this hypothesis (*OE*, no. 5): "The Sacred Council, therefore, not only accords to this ecclesiastical and spiritual heritage the high regard which is its due and rightful praise, but also unhesitatingly looks on it as the heritage of the universal Church. For this reason it solemnly declares that the Churches of the East, as much as those of the West, have a full right and are in duty bound to rule themselves, each in accordance with its own established disciplines, since all these are praiseworthy by reason of their venerable antiquity, more harmonious with the character of their faithful and more suited to the promotion of the good of souls," [http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decree\\_19641121\\_orientarium-ecclesiarum\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19641121_orientarium-ecclesiarum_en.html) (accessed October 11, 2013).

85. Pott, 59.

86. *Ibid.*, 60-62.

87. *Ibid.*, 61.