

# Introduction

Academic discourse on liturgical reform tends to employ a rigorous methodology and use complex terms to narrate history, establish patterns, and provide platforms for the agenda of liturgical reform. Ultimately, however, the source of discourse on liturgical reform comes from the Church itself. This reference to “the Church” should not evoke an image of a dozen or so men sitting around a table at a meeting and deliberating on the pros and cons of excising material from the liturgy or adding new components. Internal Church discourse involves ordinary people and their experiences of the liturgy.

Christian faithful attend liturgy for many reasons. For what one might refer to as the “core group,” attending liturgy is an obligation required by divine law. God commands Christians to keep the Sabbath, to remember and honor God one day a week, and in obedience to this command, Christians attend liturgy. Others attend liturgy according to an irregular schedule. Many adults work on Sundays, so it is not possible for them to attend Sunday liturgy.

Others attend alternative events: soccer games for their children, birthday parties, and other social gatherings. For some, Sunday is a day entirely devoted to rest, relaxation, and recreation. Of course, there are families who desire to attend liturgy, but after spending

a week hurrying through the morning routine of packing lunches, waiting for the shower, shuffling children off to school, sitting in traffic jams, and trying to finish nine hours of work in seven hours, only to return home to prepare a dinner, help children with homework, and collapse on the couch—with no maid service to clean the house—a family’s most earnest intention to arrive at liturgy on time might fall short.

Pastors who devote the entirety of their lives to ministry express their frustration with people who arrive late to church. Church bulletins contain messages with rules stipulating the degree to which people participate depending on their arrival time. Samples of rules I have seen in parish bulletins include “faithful who wish to receive Holy Communion must arrive no later than the Gospel reading, and should really strive to arrive for the beginning of liturgy.” Pastors and their assistants have dreamt up dozens of strategies and tactics to garner the people’s attention. They attempt to enliven liturgy by adding music that appeals to the people, delivering special sermons and related programs for children, integrating catechesis into the liturgy, opening up ritual actions to laity to enhance participation, and removing material that appears to make the liturgy burdensome. Recognizing the liturgy as the sole opportunity to speak to the people, pastors tend to communicate dozens of messages to the people in the course of one liturgy. A homily may be lengthened to expose the people to the life of a saint or material from historical theology that is essential for their salvation. Catechesis or impromptu sermons may be added to the end of the liturgy to continue the theme started at the homily, or to introduce a new one. Pastors may remind people of the rules they are to observe during solemn seasons: they must make an annual confession or follow the Church’s fasting guidelines.

One can understand why pastors attempt to seize crucial moments

within the liturgy to address the assembly. These moments, usually near the dismissal or before Holy Communion, are the times during the liturgy where attendance is the highest. Pastors are often occupied with urgent business after the liturgy: meetings with parish officials, visits to the sick, and unscheduled prayers for the dead, among other items. This pastoral business cannot be ignored, but it precludes the possibility of transitioning from the liturgy to the next community gathering, where the pastor can mix with the people. Hence, pastors maximize the limited time they have to talk to the people.

What do the people experience in this convergence of disparate messages? Did the exhausted parents who arrived during the Gospel reading absorb each bullet point of the pastor's thirty-minute sermon? Did they remember to populate their grocery list with foods that adhere to their Church's fasting rules? Were they attuned to the music specially chosen and rehearsed for this assembly after spending an evening listening to their children play and sing the Frozen playlist eight consecutive times? Will they remember the significance of the life of the saint celebrated, along with the meaning of living in God's communion through Christ and in the Spirit?

Obviously, the answers to these hypothetical questions will vary, but it is my conviction that these are the kinds of questions pastors should ask when they think about the liturgy, after considering two fundamental questions: did God attend the liturgy? Did the order of liturgy permit the people to meet and relate to God, to have an audience with God in the context of a meal? I ask these two fundamental questions as a serious consideration of the interplay between the order of liturgy and the people's engagement with it. Readers already know that most folks view their encounters and dialogues with God through the multidimensional lens of daily life and participation in liturgy. Church attendance is formative, and the time one spends in the midst of a praying assembly matters because

an encounter with God has the capacity to inscribe meaning on one's life. The reality of what happens at liturgy can matter even for Christians on the far ends of the Church's periphery, who often attend Church only once or twice each year. The finest contributions of liturgical theology from theologians of the apostolic age, late antiquity, monastic communities, scholasticism, the Reformation, the modern *ressourcement* movement, and postmodernity can assure the reader of one absolute truth: God is present at liturgy, eternally reaching out to seek covenantal communion with those who have gathered in response to the divine invitation to convene. Furthermore, God invites those who are gathered to receive a divine blessing, so they can change by gradually becoming citizens of the royal nation and kingdom of priests God invites them to join. Most experts agree that minor variations in order, style, and content do not change the truth of God's presence and the capacity of the people to receive a divine blessing to become God's people. Historically, the fissure between the core foundation of the liturgy and the people's perception of it has occurred in the dynamic interplay of space, place, rite, word, music, and art. Pastors have failed, albeit involuntarily, to celebrate liturgy in such a way that the people can fully sense God reaching out to them.

Meticulous study of liturgical history facilitated by the *ressourcement* movement enabled liturgical historians to narrate the development of liturgy through Christian history, and has illuminated how the people gradually became disconnected from the liturgy and attempted to find new ways to seek union with God through individualized spiritual and devotional practices, sometimes employed during the liturgical celebration. This project of academic liturgical scholarship, better known to academics as *Liturgiewissenschaft*, has shed light squarely on the liturgy as the primary theological event, the source of encounter with and

reflection on God that provides the spiritual energy informing Christian life. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the ecumenical movement included the collaboration of academics and pastors who identified the liturgy as the primary event where the Church encountered God.<sup>1</sup> Given that liturgy was the people's primary experience of Church and had a vast capacity to transform them into a kingdom of priests, numerous Christian bodies studied, deliberated, and implemented programs of reform that would reconstruct liturgical celebrations that communicated the royal and priestly vocation to participants and invited them to actively engage the liturgy, ultimately equipping them to be God's servants in, to, and for the life of the world.

This long introduction constitutes my attempt to explain the significance of this book studying the history of liturgical reform in modern Orthodoxy in dialogue with the legacy of Vatican II: liturgical reform is relevant for the past, present, and future of a vibrant Christianity and its ministry to the world. The reforms imagined and implemented in the Roman communion and in some Orthodox Churches were inspired by the pastoral recognition of a renewed liturgy as the source of a renewed Church. Numerous studies and ongoing colloquia treat liturgical reform by debating the details on spatial configuration, euchology, aesthetics, and *ars celebrandi* because these are the primary experiential elements perceived by the senses in liturgy, and consequently spark the most heated debate, better known to readers as "liturgy wars." However, examinations which focus exclusively on specific liturgical components or a selection of controversial issues run the risk of ignoring the theological foundations that support each liturgical ordo.

1. For an overview of the liturgical movement, see John Fenwick and Bryan Spinks, *Worship in Transition: The Liturgical Movement in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Continuum, 1995).

In this study, I examine the theological foundations of contemporary liturgical reform in the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches to show how the reconfiguration of the layered orders of priesthood restored the order of the laity, revealing the priestly, prophetic, and royal dignity of each Christian man, woman, and child. Liturgical structures that clearly communicate the priestly vocation to each participant invite the faithful to actively engage the liturgy, and it is through this engagement where they receive divine blessings from God and are equipped to be God's priests in service to the world.

### **Vatican II and Orthodox Liturgical Reform**

The title of this monograph pairs Vatican II and Orthodox liturgical reform in the same descriptive sentence, suggesting that they are related. A common perception among Orthodox people is that Vatican II invented liturgical reform, especially instances that appear to be radical. This perception tends to appear in response to changes in liturgical aesthetics, especially in sacred architecture and music. Orthodox people familiar with the celebration of Mass according to the Missal of Pius V, or the Tridentine Mass, identify qualities of liturgical celebration that evoke the Byzantine liturgy. Besides the obvious differences between the two traditions, especially the Roman practice of celebrating private Mass, the pre-Vatican II liturgy was performed entirely in Latin, the prayers were recited quietly, the altar table was on the back wall of the Church and the priest celebrated *ad orientem*, with his back to the people. Churches were decorated with stained glass windows and had many shrines, and it was common for the priest and singers to employ Gregorian chant or polyphonic choral music in liturgical performance.

Orthodox laity found shared practices in the Roman tradition

of making an annual Lenten confession and receiving Holy Communion once a year. Like the Orthodox, Catholics observed Lent with fasting, baptized babies in water in the name of the Trinity, and delineated the roles of the clergy and laity in Church clearly. To be sure, Orthodox were likewise aware of the significant differences in liturgical practices between the two churches (such as Confirmation and Chrismation), but there were enough similarities in aesthetics and lay participation to identify common ground.

When Vatican II proclaimed its first official teaching on the sacred liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (henceforth, “SC”), the council initiated a process of reforming the liturgy that resulted in an enormous experiential change for the people.<sup>2</sup> Besides the introduction of a new order of Mass, which required a considerable adjustment by the clergy and laity, the environmental context of the Roman liturgy changed drastically in accordance with regional applications. The presider celebrated the liturgy *versus populum* (facing the people rather than away), ministers introduced new music and art, and encouraged the people to participate in acclamations and psalm refrains. Frequent participation in Holy Communion became the norm, and in many places, the vernacular was used instead of Latin. The list of changes mentioned here barely scratches the surface of the impact of liturgical reforms on the people: we can summarize this impact as dramatic, requiring a generation of faithful accustomed to one style of liturgical celebration to adjust to an entirely new one.

The global nature of Roman liturgy exposed these changes to all Christian communities, which resulted in a prevalent perception: Vatican II inaugurated radical liturgical reform for the sake of encouraging the active and conscious participation of the faithful in the liturgy, but the actual outcome was chaos. Certainly, this

2. For a helpful overview, see Massimo Faggioli, *True Reform: Liturgy and Ecclesiology in Sacrosanctum Concilium* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 132–45.

perception was not held universally, but Orthodox who paid attention to the structural and aesthetical changes of the liturgy took note and began to view Vatican II's liturgical reform as a cautionary tale and an anti-model for Orthodox liturgical renewal.

The perception of Vatican II as the harbinger of radical liturgical reform resulting in chaos is unfortunate not only for Roman Catholics, but also for Orthodox who attend only to perceptions. In reality, *SC* was the result of a long process of liturgical scholarship drawing from tradition and presenting possibilities for liturgical reform that would update and energize the life of the Church.<sup>3</sup> In other words, Vatican II and *SC* did not inaugurate liturgical reform, but were instead the results of a lengthy process of study, reflection, and deliberation on the liturgy. Vatican II received the reputation of causing liturgical reform because of its stature, its enormous impact, and the authority vested in the teaching of an ecumenical council. *SC*'s teaching on the active and conscious participation of the laity in liturgy were not invented by Vatican II, but achieved fame and stature because *SC*'s statements enshrined them permanently into the global theological vocabulary where they became fixtures of Roman Catholic doctrine.

In this study, I will analyze the impact of Vatican II on Orthodox liturgical reform by attending to the reality of *SC* as the result of the liturgical movement and the perception of Vatican II as inaugurating liturgical reform. The first part of my study will explore aspects of the liturgical movement as a common ecumenical enterprise, emphasizing themes of common interest between Catholic and Orthodox theologians. The rediscovery of the laity as an ancient and legitimate order of the Church, established by the laying on of hands and anointing with Chrism, catapulted the laity into the

3. On Vatican II's true place in liturgical reform, see Arthur Sippo, "Liturgical Reform Did Not Start with Vatican II," *New Oxford Review* no. 3 (2011): 40-43.



shared focus of Catholic and Orthodox theologians of the twentieth century, such as Yves Congar, Virgil Michel, Nicholas Afanasiev, and Alexander Schmemmann.<sup>4</sup> These theologians arrived at similar theological notions of the royal priesthood of the laity through the process of studying the sources, even though they represented different ecclesial traditions. The work of theologians such as Congar, Schmemmann, Afanasiev, and many others shows that Orthodox and Catholic theologians did not study liturgical history without reference to other ecclesial traditions, but engaged in frequent and often fruitful exchanges that facilitated the cross-pollination of one another's methodologies and proposals for liturgical reform. The frequency with which Schmemmann draws from Catholic theologians attests to this process of cross-pollination.

Vatican II was the result of the liturgical movement and also the primary beneficiary of the cross-pollinating exchanges between the Orthodox and Catholic churches. One could argue that Eastern Orthodoxy had more of an impact on Vatican II in the liturgical reform because of the number of new prayers, structures, and formulae inspired by the Eastern Christian tradition that Vatican II added to the liturgy.<sup>5</sup> Massimo Faggioli argues persuasively that the addition of Easternisms to Roman liturgy were to honor the Church's adoption of a more Catholic view.<sup>6</sup> Robert Taft traces the origins of Roman interest in Eastern liturgy and notes the development of a pattern of Romans turning to the East to reform the Roman liturgy.<sup>7</sup>

4. See my treatment of this matter in *Chrismation: A Primer for Catholics* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2014), 118–32.

5. 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*, ed. David Pitt, Stefanos Alexopoulos, and Christian McConnell (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 29–39; 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 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 179–208.

6. Faggioli, 34–42.

The composition and addition of three new Eucharistic prayers, including split epicleses and the wholesale adoption of the Byzantine formula for anointing with Chrism for Confirmation, are the ritual reforms that best represent the influence of Eastern liturgy on Roman reforms.<sup>8</sup>

In this study, I assert that the most important aspect of cross-pollination between East and West has been underdeveloped and functions as the apparatus for the liturgical reform: the common development of a definition of Christian priesthood grounded by Christ as the High Priest who eternally offers the liturgy to the Father, and the communication of this religious identity to lay men and women who actively participate in the liturgy to minister as God's priests to the world. The multi-layered priesthood rooted in Christ the High Priest and the active participation of the laity in the liturgy are the two central pillars of liturgical reform that illuminate its ultimate aim. The relationship between priesthood and active participation in the liturgy is not linear, but circular and reciprocal. Liturgical structures, contents, and rituals communicate priestly identity to the people, who are then enabled to embrace their priestly vocation and actively participate in the liturgy. The people's active and conscious participation in the liturgy facilitates more frequent and clear communication of their priestly identity. Ideally, as the people gradually grow into this priestly identity, they become capable of translating the principles of offering, gift-giving, and service rehearsed in the world to all aspects of their daily lives.<sup>9</sup>

Liturgical reform does not stop at the transformation of the

7. Taft, "Between Progress and Nostalgia: Liturgical Reform and the Western Romance with the Christian East," 29-36.

8. See Paul Bradshaw and Maxwell Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 313-17, and Denysenko, *Chrismation*, 144-46.

9. See Mark Searle, *Called to Participate: Theological, Ritual, and Social Perspectives*, ed. Barbara Searle and Anne Y. Koester (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2006), and Stephen Wilbricht,

Church: through the service by the people of God to the world in their daily lives, liturgical reform seeks the transformation and transfiguration of the world as well. The aims of liturgical reform are thus quite bold: ideally, people would notice the effects of liturgical reform in daily life through the behaviors, habits, relationships, and service of Christian people who are transformed into *christs* (anointed ones) and present God to society on a regular, daily basis. This explains why the council fathers elevated liturgy to the highest stature in the life of the people; liturgy provides the spiritual energy required to achieve the noble and bold objectives of Vatican II: to build up a church of priests who transform and transfigure the world. In the fifty-plus years that have elapsed since the council's promulgation of SC, much of the discussion of liturgical reform has focused on the legitimacy of specific reforms. This study is an attempt to redirect the focus of liturgical theology towards the theological rationale underpinning the reforms of Vatican II and the Orthodox churches that deliberated and implemented variants of liturgical reform.

### **The Limits of This Study**

The reader will note that I have selected four models of Orthodox liturgical reform as the primary narrative stories that unveil the impact of the liturgical movement. The four models of liturgical reform examined here are attributed to Alexander Schmemmann, the Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia (ROCOR), the Church of Greece, and New Skete Monastery. Having established that Vatican II was a result of the liturgical movement, and not its cause, I will briefly explain why I have chosen these four models of liturgical reform in Orthodoxy, and will also direct readers to sources that narrate the other stories of Orthodox liturgical reform.

*Rehearsing God's Just Kingdom: The Eucharistic Vision of Mark Searle*, foreword Kevin W. Irwin (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2013).

### Liturgical Archaeology in Pre-Revolutionary Russia

Above, I alluded to the fact that the liturgical reform of Vatican II is a result of the contributions of the liturgical movement. I also noted that Vatican II embraced Eastern Christian traditions, principles, and practices in its liturgical reform. The Orthodox Church was active in engaging liturgical study and constructing its history, and one of the most critical periods and contexts for Orthodox liturgiology was in pre-revolutionary Russia. Many pioneers of the study of the liturgical sources established a path for scholars by creating editions of liturgical sources representing numerous centers of Eastern Christianity. Perhaps the most renowned pioneer of Eastern liturgical sources was Jacques Goar, whose *Euchologion* presenting the contents of numerous medieval *Euchologia* is still consulted by contemporary liturgiologists.<sup>10</sup> The publication of such editions made the study of Byzantine liturgical history possible, and numerous scholars in the pre-revolutionary Russian academies engaged the enterprise, adding to the repository of liturgical sources. These scholars include Alexei Dmitrievsky (also known as the “Russian Goar”) Mikhail Skaballanovich, Ivan Mansvetov, Alexander Golubtsov, Nikolai Krasnoseltsev, Athanasy Papadopoulos-Kerameus, and many others.<sup>11</sup> Among their many contributions are publications that remain useful for the contemporary liturgiologist, including Dmitrievsky’s three-

10. Jacques Goar, *Euchologion sive rituale graecorum*, 2d ed. (Venice: Typographia Bartholomaei Javarina, 1730; Graz: Akademische Druck und Verlagsanstalt, 1960).

11. For a list of pre-revolutionary Russian liturgiologists, see the web site of Michael Zheltov, *Logike Latreia*, <http://www.mhzh.ru/en/authors1/> (accessed November 21, 2014). Zheltov’s site provides some biographical information and links to literature published by each scholar. Also see Peter Galadza, “Liturgy and Life: The Appropriation of the ‘Personalization of Cult’ in East-Slavic Orthodox Liturgiology, 1869–1996,” *Studia Liturgica* 28 (1988): 210–31; Paul Meyendorff, “The Liturgical Path of Orthodoxy in America,” *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 40, nos. 1–2 (1996): 44–49, and Taft, “The Liturgical Enterprise Twenty-five Years after Alexander Schmemmann,” *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 53, nos. 2–3 (2009): 143–44.

volume series of *Typika* and *Euchologia* and Skaballanovich's seminal study of the *Typikon*.<sup>12</sup>

Liturgical scholars did not merely compile editions for the purpose of narrating liturgical history: they also posed questions directed towards understanding the historical development of the liturgy from antiquity to the received tradition of the synodal-era Russian church. In the late-nineteenth century, the bishops of the Orthodox Church in Russia inaugurated a process of church-wide discussion on potential reforms that would equip the Church to meet the pastoral challenges confronting modern Russia.<sup>13</sup> Russia's contact with the West permitted the permeation of ideas of Enlightenment, and the rise of nationalism and collapse of empires in Western Europe challenged the longstanding hegemony of the Romanov dynasty and the unchallenged authority of the Russian Church. For the bishops, the most pressing issue was the Church's subservience to the state. Tsar Peter I had abolished the patriarchate and established a ruling synod with a lay presider, based on a Reformed model. A movement to re-establish the patriarchate gained momentum among the bishops who anticipated that an emancipated Russian Church would have the necessary freedom to respond to the challenges afflicting their flock.

The challenges confronting the bishops were formidable. It is outside the scope of this study to even summarize the problems of this

12. Aleksei Dmitrievsky, *Описание Литургических Рукописей*, 3 vols. (Kiev: Typographia G. T. Korchak-Novitskago, 1895. Reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagbuchhandlung, 1965). For a biography of Skaballanovich, see Peter Galadza, "Baumstark's Kievan contemporary, Mikhail N. Skaballanovich (1871-1931 [?]): A Sketch of his Life and Heortology," *Orientalia christiana analecta* 265 (2001): 761-75.

13. On the preconiliar discussions, see Günther Schulz, "Das Landeskonzil der Orthodoxen Kirche in Russland 1917/1918 und seine Folgen für die russische Geschichte und Kirchengeschichte," *Kirche im Osten* 42-43 (1999-2000), 11-28; James Cunningham, *A Vanquished Hope: The Movement for Church Renewal in Russia, 1905-1906* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1981); and Hyacinthe Destivelle, *The Moscow Council (1917-1918): The Creation of the Conciliar Institutions of the Russian Orthodox Church*, ed. Michael Plekon and Vitaly Permiakov, trans. Jerry Ryan, foreword by Metropolitan Hilarion (Alfeyev) (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2015).

period, but it is relevant because the bishops recognized the role of liturgy in engaging the people and reinvigorating their faith in God. Vera Shevzov's study on the pre-revolutionary Russian Orthodox Church provides crucial insights on the impact societal upheaval had on the lived faith of parish communities in Russia.<sup>14</sup> Shevzov pairs the "social and political climate" of pre-revolutionary Russia with Orthodoxy's attempt to respond to the modernity's challenges. A recent example of the impact of political movements on the life of real communities appears in Gregory's Freeze's English translation of the "Report on the Commission on Raising the Religious and Moral Condition of the Population of Vladimir Diocese (1913)":<sup>15</sup>

The waves of the 'liberation movement' of 1905-1906 also reached the rural population, and life in the countryside then reflected a lot of the senseless willfulness and unbridled passion. . . . Among the rural and factory population, periodically there still appear false teachers; they continue to incite people by disseminating illegal literature, by distributing free brochures and leaflets with anti-religious, socialist, sectarian, and even immoral content. All this plainly aims to undermine the foundations of faith and morality in popular life, to sunder the ties between parishioners and pastors and the trust in them.

The same commission made several recommendations for restoring faith and morality among the people, and their seventh point referred to the liturgy as a primary way of evangelizing the people:<sup>16</sup>

The Commission finds it highly useful to conduct church services on patron saint festivals in as grand and celebratory manner as possible. . . . The first concern of each pastor should be the majesty of church services and sacred rites, which have great importance for the Christian education of believers and for combating rationalist sectarianism.

14. Vera Shevzov, *Russian Orthodox on the Eve of the Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 5-6.

15. Gregory Freeze, "Dechristianization in Holy Rus?," in *Orthodox Christianity in Imperial Russia: A Source Book on Lived Religion*, ed. Heather Coleman (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2014), 218.

16. *Ibid.*, 222.

This excerpt from the commission of the Vladimir diocese in 1913 is one example of how pastors attended to the liturgy as a primary way of rejuvenating faith and morals among the people and strengthening intra-community fraternal bonds. The Vladimir Commission hardly exhausts the pre-revolutionary Russian perspective on the role of liturgy in addressing the needs of modernity. In preparation for the convening of a council of the Russian Orthodox Church that would seek to restore the patriarchate, among the many pre-conciliar commissions established was one devoted to liturgical renewal. Nikolai Balashov has documented the deliberations, contributions, and fate of the proposals of this commission in his magisterial study.<sup>17</sup> I will refer to select aspects of Balashov's study in two of the four Orthodox models because the scope of the reforms considered and proposed by the preconciliar commission was broad and would have introduced significant changes to the liturgy. However, the Russian council convened in 1917 in the midst of the revolution's turbulence, and its work was interrupted on several occasions by the Russian civil war. Because many bishops were murdered and the Bolsheviks launched a fierce campaign of persecution against the Russian Church, the council's capacity to implement a broad platform of reforms was severely compromised. The council restored the patriarchate, but most of its efforts were reactionary, devoted to addressing the Russian populace, attempting to find a new place in a society governed by a regime hostile to the Church, and mourning the mounting death toll of clergy and laity.

The pre-conciliar deliberations on the liturgy did not cease, however. Thousands of Russians fled to the West, and the debates on the place of liturgy and modernity accompanied them to their new homes. As Russian émigrés acclimated to their new homes—a slow

17. Nikolai Balashov, *На пути к литургическому возрождению (On the Path of Liturgical Renewal)* (Moscow: Round Table on Religious Education and Service, 2001).

process hampered by the hopes that the Bolsheviks would be ousted and they could return home—they established theological schools in cities such as Paris, Belgrade, and eventually New York.<sup>18</sup> While the sciences of liturgical archaeology continued, and were cultivated by scholars associated with the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome, the Orthodox émigrés transitioned from liturgical archaeology to liturgical theology.<sup>19</sup> Orthodox liturgical theology centered on the relationship between the Church and the Eucharist, and the primary figures who developed this Eucharistic ecclesiology were Kyprian Kern, Nicholas Afanasiev, Alexander Schmemmann, and Boris Bobrinskoy.<sup>20</sup> Schmemmann cultivated the Eucharistic ecclesiology at St. Vladimir’s Seminary in New York which resulted in its implementation by the school’s graduates, hence the first model of Orthodox liturgical reform which originated with the pre-revolutionary Russian deliberations on the liturgy.

### Orthodox Model No. 1: Alexander Schmemmann

Schmemmann’s model of Orthodox liturgical reform is the most renowned and analyzed instance of renewal in contemporary Orthodoxy. Schmemmann’s stature among scholars and pastors of East and West is such that several commemorative events were held on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his death in 2008, with numerous

18. The realities faced by the Russian immigrants are depicted soberly by Paul Gavrilyuk, *Georges Florovsky and the Russian Religious Renaissance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 53–59.
19. See Job Getcha “Les études liturgiques russes aux XIX<sup>e</sup>-XX<sup>e</sup> siècles et leur impact sur la pratique,” in *Les mouvements liturgiques: corrélations entre pratiques et recherché, conférences Saint-Serge, Le Semaine d’études liturgiques*, Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae, Subsidia (Rome: Edizione liturgizhe, 2004), 279–91.
20. Nicholas Afanasiev, *The Church of the Holy Spirit*, ed. Michael Plekon, trans. Vitaly Permiakov (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007). Idem, *Трапеза Господня* (The Lord’s Supper) (Kyiv: Temple of the Venerable Agapit of the Caves, 2003); Kyprian Kern, *Eucharistia* (Paris: YMCA, 1947); Boris Bobrinskoy, *The Mystery of the Trinity: Trinitarian Experience and Vision in the Biblical and Patristic Tradition*, trans. Anthony P. Gythiel (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1999); Alexander Schmemmann, *The Eucharist: Sacrament of the Kingdom*, trans. Paul Kachur (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1987).