August 23, 2009

11TH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

FEAST OF THE MARTYR AND ARCHDEACON LAWRENCE AND THE VENERABLE POPE SIXTUS OF ROME

RESURRECTIONAL TROPARION - TONE TWO:
When You did descend to death, O Life Immortal, You did slay hell with the splendor of Your Godhead! And when from the depths You did raise the dead, all the powers of heaven cried out: O Giver of Life! Christ our God! Glory to You!
http://www.westsrbdio.org/AUDIO_Bulletin/Troparion_Resurrection_Tone_2.wav

TROPARION TO THE MARTYR LAWRENCE—TONE FOUR:
Victorious martyr of Christ our God, by the sign of the Cross you gave sight to the blind; you distributed the riches of the Church to the poor; you were tried by fire and no evil was found in you. As you endured the burning, may your prayers extinguish the flames of our many sins, blessed Archdeacon Lawrence!

RESURRECTIONAL KONTAKION - TONE TWO:
Hell became afraid, O Almighty Savior, seeing the miracle of Your Resurrection from the tomb! The dead arose! Creation, with Adam, beheld this and rejoiced with You! And the world, O my Savior, praises You forever.
http://www.westsrbdio.org/AUDIO_Bulletin/Kontakion_Resurrection_Tone_2.wav

KONTAKION TO THE MARTYR LAWRENCE—TONE TWO:
Your heart burned with divine fire as the flames of the passions died within you. God-bearing martyr Lawrence, the pillar of those who struggle, you cried out in the midst of your contest: "Nothing can separate me from the love of Christ."

HYMN TO THE MOTHER OF GOD - TONE SIX:
Steadfast Protectress of Christians and constant advocate before the Creator, do not despise the cry of us sinners; but in your goodness come speedily to help us who call on you in faith. Hasten to hear our petition and to intercede for us, O Theotokos, for you always protect those who honor you!

ХИМНА БОГОРОДИЦИ – ГЛАС 6:
Непостидна заштитнице Хришћана, незаменљива пред Творцем Посреднице, не презри гласе мољења нас грешних, него као Блага притекни у помоћ нама који Ти са вером вапијемо: Пожури на молитву и похитај на умољавање, Богородице, свагдашња Заштитнице оних који те поштују.

EPISTLE & COMMENTARY

THE PROKIMENON (PSALM 118: 14) IN THE 2ND TONE:
The Lord is my strength and my song. He has become my salvation.

The Epistle Lesson—1 Corinthians, 9: 2-12

Brethren, if I am not an apostle to others yet doubtless I am to you. For you are the seal of my apostleship in the Lord. My defense to those who examine me is this: Do we have no right to eat and drink? Do we have no right to take along a believing wife, as do also the other apostles, the brothers of the Lord and Cephas? Or is it only Barnabas and I who have no right to refrain from working? Who ever goes to war at his own expense? Who plants a vineyard and does not eat of its fruit? Or who tends a flock and does not drink of the milk of the flock? Do I say these things as a mere man? Or does not the law say the same also? For it is written in the law of Moses, "You shall not muzzle an ox while it treads out the grain." Is it oxen God is concerned about? Or does He say it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written that he who plows should plow in hope, and he who threshes in hope should be partaker of his hope. If we have sown spiritual things for you, is it a great thing if we reap your material things? If others are partakers of this right over you, are we not even more? Nevertheless we have not used this right, but endure all things lest we hinder the gospel of Christ.

THE ALLELUIA VERSES (PSALM 20: 1, 9):
The Lord answer you in the day of trouble! The name of the God of Jacob protect you! Save the king, O Lord, and hear us on the day we call.

EPISTLE COMMENTARY

The Apostle Paul writes concerning the wages of those who minister. It is important to remember that the pastor deserves his wages. A bishop, a priest or a deacon should not go hungry, nor be unable to provide for his household simply because he does not labor in material goods. He should also be permitted respite from his spiritual labors, so that he is not physically and spiritually exhausted. For how can a man care for others, if he is unable to care for himself? First take care of the self, so that you can give that self to others.

Miracle-working icon of St. Panteleimon (18th century) from the Holy Skete of Koutloumousi, Mt. Athos.

GOSPEL & COMMENTARY

Matthew 18:23-35

At that time Jesus said, "Therefore the kingdom of heaven is like a certain king who wanted to settle accounts with his servants. And when he had begun to settle accounts, one was brought to him who owed him ten thousand talents. But as he was not able to pay, his master commanded that he be sold, with his wife and children and all that he had, and that payment be made. The servant therefore fell down before him, saying, 'Master, have patience with me, and I will pay you all.' Then the master of that servant was moved with compassion, released him, and forgave him the debt. But that servant went out and found one of his fellow servants who owed him a hundred denarii; and he laid hands on him and took him by the throat, saying, 'Pay me what you owe!' So his fellow servant fell down at his feet and begged him, saying, 'Have patience with me, and I will pay you all.' And he would not, but went and threw him into prison till he should pay the debt. So when his fellow servants saw what had been done, they were very grieved, and came and told their master all that had been done. Then his master, after he had called him, said to him, 'You wicked servant! I forgave you all that debt because you begged me. Should you not also have had compassion on your fellow servant, just as I had pity on you?' And his master was angry, and delivered him to the torturers until he should pay all that was due to him. So My heavenly Father also will do to you if each of you, from his heart, does not forgive his brother his trespasses."

Gospel Commentary

This gospel speaks of forgiving a large debt. A talent represents approximately the annual wage earned by the average person, while a denarius represents the approximate daily wage. The forgiveness granted to the servant was the equivalent of winning the lottery. And yet, God reminds us that forgiveness is most certainly a two-way street. It is freely given to us, and unless we forgive others just as freely, it can and will be taken away. So forgive those who trespass against you, and be partakers of God's immeasurable forgiveness.

SPIRITUAL ARTICLES

Reflection from *The Prologue* for August 10/August 23 by St. Nikolai Velimirovic

How can we overcome the antagonism of our enemies? By renunciation, meekness and prayer—renunciation in everything, except in faith and purity of life; meekness always; and prayer always. St. Ambrose writes: "This is the weapon of the righteous ones: that in retreating they conquer, just as the skillful archers are able to shoot those stronger than themselves, even as they themselves retreat." A brother was offended by his friend, but, nevertheless, desiring peace with him, went to him to be reconciled. His friend did not even want to open the door for him and, scolding him from within, chased him away from his dwelling. The brother then complained to a spiritual elder, who said to him: "You were going to your friend to be reconciled; yet, all along the way there, you condemned him in your thoughts and justified yourself. Even though your friend sinned against you, I counsel you to establish the thought in yourself that you have sinned against him. Justify him and condemn yourself. In this manner, go to him again." Thus, the brother proceeded. And what happened? Just as the brother approached his friend's abode, his friend opened the door wide, ran up to him, embraced him, and made peace with him.

The Holy Martyrs Archdeacon Lawrence; Sixtus, Pope of Rome; and others with them:

When Pope Stephen was slain (August 2), Sixtus, who was an Athenian by birth, was appointed in his place. Sixtus was at one time a philosopher and then became a Christian. This was a time in which the bishops of Rome were slain one after the other: to become Bishop of Rome meant to be consigned to martyrdom. Emperor Decius was determined to destroy Christianity. Pope Sixtus was quickly brought to trial, with two of his deacons—Felicissimus and Agapitus. As the three were led to prison, Archdeacon Lawrence said to the pope: "Where are you going, Father, without your son? Where, O bishop, without your archdeacon?" The pope consoled him, prophesying to Lawrence that he would undergo even greater tortures for Christ, and that he would shortly take this path. And indeed, as soon as they had beheaded Sixtus and his two deacons, Lawrence was apprehended. Lawrence had presciently placed all of his affairs, and the affairs of the Church, in order. As treasurer and steward of the Church, he removed all of the Church's valuables to the home of the widower Cyriacus. (On that same occasion, he healed Cyriacus of a terrible head pain by the touch of his hand and restored the sight of a blind

man, Crescention.) After being thrown into prison, Lawrence healed Lucillus, a prisoner of many years, of blindness; and then he baptized him. Witnessing this, Hippolytus, their jailer, was also baptized. He later suffered for Christ (August 13). Since Lawrence did not want to deny Christ—but on the contrary, advised Emperor Decius to reject his false gods—his face was beaten with stones, and his body was beaten with a scorpion (a chain with sharp teeth, and a curved handle like a scorpion's tail). Romanus, a soldier present at the torture, converted to the Christian Faith, and was immediately beheaded. In the end, they placed Lawrence on a gridiron, naked, and lit a fire under him. Roasting in the fire, St. Lawrence thanked God and mocked the emperor for his paganism. After Lawrence gave his pure and heroic soul to God, Hippolytus removed his body under cover of night to the home of Cyriacus, and then to a cave, where Hippolytus honorably buried him. St. Lawrence, with the others, suffered in the year 258.

The Martyrs Archdeacon Lawrence, Pope Sixtus,
Deacons Felicissimus and Agapitus, the Soldier Romanus of Rome

Saint Hiron
Hiron was a Christian philosopher. He is mentioned by St. Gregory the Theologian in his books. He died peacefully and took up his eternal habitation with the Lord.

IMPORTANT REMINDERS & ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mark your calendars for Diocesan Days, September 4-6, 2009
Follow this link for information on the 13th Annual Diocesan Days:
http://www.westsrbdio.org/Diocesan_Days/Diocesan_Days_2009/xhtml/index.html

For **Continual Education in Liturgy and Theology,** we recommend the following article:
http://www.westsrbdio.org/Theology/The_Eucharist_and_the_Kingdom_of_God.doc

Serbian version: http://www.verujem.org/pdf/zizijulas_evharistija.pdf
We will offer the same article here in sections on a weekly basis; today, Parts VII and VIII.

THE EUCHARIST AND THE KINGDOM OF GOD

For the things of the Old Testament are the shadow.
Those of the New are an image. Truth is the state of things to come.
(Maximus the Confessor)

IX. Remembrance of the future

The Eucharist is a *remembrance*. But what is meant by "remembrance"? In psychology, remembrance means recalling the past. The basis for this meaning is Platonic, and in general ancient Greek. For Plato, in particular, all truth is stored up in the soul. Nothing new can happen "under the sun," as the saying goes. Truth (*ἀ-λήθεια*) is an escape from forgetfulness (*λήθη*), a manifestation of what *already exists*. For this reason, the teacher does no more than to prompt the pupil to remember once again what he already knows, to extract the truth from him (Socrates' method of acting as "midwife").

This understanding is also based on common sense. None of us can comprehend what it means to "remember the future." This is because time in our experience since the Fall, is *fragmentary*, and is inevitably divided into past, present and future, in a sequence which cannot naturally be reversed because of death, which has entered the world with the fall of man. Thus the future naturally comes after the past and present, making it meaningless to "remember" it.

But what happens in a time which is freed from this fragmentation because death has been abolished? In such a case, the future is not separated from the past and the present. If indeed the future is that which gives meaning both to the past and to the present, it is then transformed into a source from which both equally draw their substance.

The future acquires "substance" (Heb. 11:1), and can be "anticipated" so as to become part of our memory. Thus it is possible to talk about remembrance of the future.

The fact that this is precisely what happens in the Divine Eucharist is as evident to the careful student of the Eucharist as it is unknown to those who approach it without an awareness of its eschatological character. Let us take a closer look at this very important subject.

The Anaphora of the Divine Liturgy used in the Orthodox Church, both that of St. John Chrysostom and that of St. Basil, includes the following phrase which is a stumbling block for common sense: "remembering then this saving commandment, the Cross, the tomb, the Resurrection on the third day, the

Ascension into heaven, the sitting at the right hand, *and the second and glorious coming again,* offering to Thee Thine own of Thine own, we hymn Thee," etc.

To remember past events (the Cross, the Resurrection, etc.) is "natural." But to "remember" something that has not yet happened (the Second Coming) cannot be explained unless it is transferred to an existential plane on which the fragmentation and necessary sequence of the three elements of time (past, present, and future) have been healed. This is precisely what happens in the Kingdom of God. In this Kingdom, everything is not turned into "present"—that would be a typically Platonic deliverance from death—but into the "future age which does not end or grow old," as St. Basil calls the Kingdom, which being the state which ultimately prevails, the "truth" in the words of Maximus the Confessor, is logically prior, since it is this that gives "substance" and meaning to both past and present. The "end" constitutes the "reason" for which both the past and the present "subsist," according to St. Maximus;[1] and in consequence the "future age which does not end" becomes, as we have already established from passages of Maximus, not an effect, as happens in time as we know it after the Fall, but the *cause* of all past and present events.[2] Consequently, remembrance of this "endless" future is not only possible, but also ontologically definitive in the realm of the Eucharist as icon of the Kingdom. This is attested both in the Gospel descriptions of the Last Supper and in the liturgical practice of the Church.

In the description of the Last Supper in Luke (22:20), a prominent place belongs to the Lord's words to His Disciples which are repeated by St. Paul (1 Cor. 11:24-25) and by the eucharistic liturgies down the ages: "Do this *in remembrance of Me*." According to our common logic, bounded as it is by our experience of time since the Fall, as described above, the meaning of this phrase would be: "Do this, *in order to remember Me*." The question, however, is whether the Lord was interested in perpetuating His memory in the minds of His Disciples (or of human beings generally) through the celebration of the Eucharist, or whether He wanted, through the celebration of the Eucharist by His Disciples (and by the Church), to link the Eucharist with the eternal memory of God in the Kingdom which He would establish.

---

[1] PG 90: 621.

[2] This matter had already been raised in the second century AD in connection with the annulment by the New Testament of certain provisions of the Mosaic Law (circumcision, sacrifices, etc.). The answer given by St. Irenaeus remains the basis for Maximus' thinking; a future event (the coming of Christ) can annul an event in the past (e.g., the sacrifices of the Old Testament), not because the latter was evil and had to disappear, but because it existed solely for the sake of the future event, which gives it meaning and substance.

This question has generated much debate among biblical theologians since J. Jeremias, in the work referred to earlier, refuted the first view with serious arguments and supported the second, to the point of formulating the extreme position that Christ gave the commandment that the Eucharist should be celebrated in order that God should remember Him (as Messiah) at the Second Coming. We shall not concern ourselves with this discussion, which is anyway not immediately relevant to our theme in all its aspects. What interests us is whether the remembrance of Christ at the Eucharist is a psychological, human remembrance of an event in the past, or whether it is linked with the future, with the Kingdom, and that not just psychologically but *ontologically*.

If we want to use St. Paul as our interpreter for the phrase "in remembrance of Me," we shall be led without a doubt to the conclusion that the eucharistic remembrance is orientated toward the Second Coming. The explanation Paul gives for the phrase "in remembrance of Me" is that ("For") in the Eucharist, "you proclaim the Lord's death until He comes" (1 Cor. 11:26). As Jeremias notes, "until He comes" is used repeatedly in the New Testament in reference to the last times (Rom. 11:25, 1 Cor. 15:25, Luke 21:24), and its meaning in this particular case is that in the Eucharist, the Lord's death is not proclaimed as an event in the past, but *in the perspective of the Second Coming*. This explains the connection of the Eucharist with the very early Aramaic liturgical exclamation *maranatha,* which Paul knows, and the significance of which we have already mentioned.

At the Eucharist, consequently, we place the events and persons of the past and the present within the context of the Kingdom which will come, and that not simply psychologically (through a movement of our imagination toward the future) but *ontologically, i.e.,* with the purpose of giving these events and persons substance, so that they are not destroyed (by time and death) and live eternally. This eternal survival of events and beings *cannot be secured by placing them in human memory*. Human memory comes and goes, because it is a created memory. When we pray as the Church that someone's memory may be eternal, we do not mean that this person should live on in our own human memory. This would have little meaning since human memory, being created, passes away. We mean that this person lives on *in the memory of God*. Only what exists in the thought of God really exists. When God pronounces the terrible words, "I do not know you" (Matt. 25:12), the consequences are not psychological but ontological; so also when He says "I will remember their sins no more" (Heb. 8:12; 10:17), the consequences are of ontological significance for those particular sins. Conversely, when God "remembers" something or someone He is not operating psychologically—it is meaningless, anyway, to introduce psychology into God's being, as Augustine did with his Trinitarian theology—but is performing a

creative and ontological activity whereby that particular being is existentially affirmed.[3]

This brings us to the eucharistic Liturgy. A basic and essential element in any eucharistic Liturgy is the *commemoration*. There is no such thing as a Eucharist which does not commemorate, in one way or another, events (principally the creation of the world and the events of Christ's life on earth), and also names. What is the meaning of this commemoration of names in the Eucharist?

As our Liturgy has developed, it is difficult to make out the meaning of the commemoration of names. There are three principle points at which names are commemorated in the liturgy today. One is at the Proskomide, *i.e.*, when the faithful hand over their gifts to the celebrants (priests and deacons) *before* the Divine Liturgy so that the Eucharist can be prepared from them. For practical reasons, this point has come to be the preeminent moment for names to be commemorated, when the particles for those commemorated are cut out, to be placed on the paten beside the Lamb, and finally put into the chalice with It.[4] The whole service as it is now performed is devoid of obvious reference to the Kingdom which is to come, and its symbolic references are mainly to the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross. This service was introduced gradually, beginning already from the eighth century, but it does not form part of the eucharistic Anaphora

[3] The words "Remember me, O Lord, when Thou comest in Thy Kingdom," which we have been repeating in the Church since the time of the thief at the right hand, bear witness that the Kingdom is the space in which our being is secured, by reason of the fact that God commemorates us, and not merely human beings (Remember, O Lord . . .).

[4] There is considerable debate over whether the particles for the Mother of God, the saints and the faithful ought to be placed in the chalice together with the Lamb at the time of communion. Judging by historical and literary criteria, it seems that such a mixing is not favored by the historical evidence. (See I. Fountoulis, "Answers to liturgical, canonical and other queries." (in Greek) *Ephemerios* 43 (1994): pp. 208, 239ff. Be that as it may, from a theological viewpoint this mixing is important. The Body of Christ in the Divine Eucharist is a body inclusive of the "many" (1 Cor. 10:17), in the first instance of the saints and faithful who are commemorated and for whom the particles are cut out to show the personal character of each one of them. Communion in the Body of Christ at the Eucharist is at the same time communion with the saints and faithful who have been commemorated (see John of Damascus, *Exposition of Orthodox Faith* 13, PG 94:1153: "It is called communion and such indeed it is, because through it we commune with Christ . . . and we commune and are united with each other through it . . . and become members one of another being of the same body with Christ." The cutting out of particles is certainly a later practice, but it is unintelligible apart from their incorporation into the Body of Christ). Without such a communion, neither the commemoration nor the placing of the particles next to the Lamb makes sense. What "washes away" the sins of those remembered is not "contact" with the Lamb, but their incorporation into Him. (A different matter, of course, is the elevation of the Lamb, who as the "one holy, one Lord," as head of the Body, is elevated and worshipped alone.)

which, as the offering and sacrifice of the eschatological Lamb, takes place later. Thus the words "Remember, O Lord" which accompany the cutting out of the particles at this time should not be regarded as the main commemoration of those mentioned, whether living or fallen asleep.

The other moment at which names are today commemorated is at the Great Entrance, principally when a bishop is celebrating. The fact that a celebrant bishop commemorates names at this time, when he receives the gifts of the people from the priests and deacons, should be connected with the fact that the bishop is not present during the preparation of the gifts (the Proskomide), since he comes into the church only at the Little Entrance. Thus this commemoration of names, too, should not be considered as the proper eucharistic commemoration, but as an extension of the commemoration at the Proskomide, which was initially performed at that time[5] and which is also not part of the Anaphora in the strict sense.[6] It is nevertheless worthy of note that the commemoration of names at this point makes a clear reference to the Kingdom: "May the Lord God remember in His Kingdom."

There thus remains the third moment of commemoration, which is also the moment of eucharistic "remembrance" *par excellence:* this is the moment of the Anaphora. It is a real misfortune that the commemoration of names has ceased to take place at that time, and has been shifted almost exclusively to the Proskomide for practical reasons: because the entire *theological* meaning of this act is thereby destroyed. What is this meaning? If we go back again to the Church Fathers, as we always do in this study, we shall find some valuable information in Cyril of Jerusalem (*Mystagogic Catechesis* 5). Interpreting the eucharistic

---

[5] See I. Fountoulis, *Answers to Liturgical Queries*, IV (1982), pp. 289f.

[6] As a result of the non-canonical entry of the bishop into the sanctuary before the Little Entrance in order to be vested (see above, section 6 of this study), it has become the practice for the bishop celebrating to complete and "cover" the proskomide during Matins. It is not without significance that earlier bishops never did this, but "commemorated" and completed the Prothesis during the Cherubic Hymn. This order, being older, is an indication both that the service of the proskomide was originally performed at that time, and also that the bishop was not in the sanctuary prior to the Little Entrance. In general, it is doubtful whether the bishop originally had any contact or connection with the proskomide, even when this service was introduced, given that the Σκευοφυλάκιον or Πρόθεσις, where the gifts were handed over and preparation took place, was, at least in Constantinople, a special, separate building next to the church (T. Mathews, *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy* [University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971], pp. 13-18, 158f.). Besides, it is at the time of the Cherubic Hymn, not during Matins, that the washing of the bishop's hands should take place in front of the people, as a public act of cleansing and forgiveness in view of the celebration of the Eucharist. This public washing of the hands is wrongly omitted. It has a real meaning, and is attested in very ancient sources (Cyril of Jerusalem *et al*.).

Anaphora, St. Cyril regards it *in its totality* as a commemoration (remembrance). In the prayer of the Anaphora, which begins immediately after "Let us give thanks to the Lord" and the people's response "It is meet and right," "*we commemorate*," he says, "heaven and earth and sea . . . and *all creation, rational and non-rational* . . . , angels, archangels, etc."; in other words God's creation which through this commemoration participates in a certain way in the Mystery of the Eucharist. After the invocation of the Holy Spirit and the change of the elements into the Body and Blood of Christ, "upon that sacrifice of propitiation" we commemorate first the living (Churches, kings, armies, the sick and "in a word all who are in need of help," and then those who have fallen asleep, "patriarchs, prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, bishops, and, *in a word, all who have fallen asleep before us,* believing that it will be of the greatest advantage to the souls for whom the prayer is offered *when the holy and most awful Sacrifice is set forth*."

From these words and what St. Cyril writes in continuation, it follows that the commemoration both of the living and of those who have fallen asleep is organically connected with and takes its meaning from "the holy and most awful Sacrifice which is set forth," i.e., the Sacrifice which is being offered up to God at that moment. That, in consequence, is the moment for commemoration of the living and the dead which brings "the greatest advantage" to them.[7] Because then, at the holy Anaphora of the Sacrifice, those who are commemorated are placed before God "for an eternal memorial"; thanks to the sacrifice of the Lamb, they are not only forgiven, but also receive "eternal life," in other words true substance. To the question, "What does it profit a soul that departs this world with sins, or without sins, if it is commemorated during the offering?" (in other words, the perpetual rationalistic question which makes the freedom of divine grace—and the power of the Eucharist, which it disparages as a supposedly "magical" act—subject to the laws of sin), St. Cyril gives the categorical answer: we "believe" unshakably that through the Eucharist we "propitiate our God who loves mankind on behalf of them (i.e., those who are commemorated) and of ourselves," even if they are sinners, because "we offer Christ who was slain for our sins."

At this point we come to the matter of the Diptychs, and the ultimate fate of this very essential element in the Eucharist. The problem of the historical appearance

[7] A note on the so-called "episcopal memorial service": it has become the practice to have "episcopal memorial services" when the bishop is not celebrating. But if the bishop does not offer up the Sacrifice and does not commemorate during the anaphora the person for whom the memorial service takes place, then the whole point of the episcopal memorial service disappears. It becomes an episcopal "trisagion." (Within the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, it has always been unthinkable to celebrate an episcopal commemoration without an episcopal Liturgy).

and shaping of the Diptychs will not concern us here.[8] We shall simply make some remarks of a general nature which throw light on the subject of our study.

It has become the practice today for the so-called "Diptychs" to be recited only when heads of autocephalous Churches are celebrating or, according to the official Calendar of the Church of Greece, when a bishop is celebrating at a great feast. This restriction serves to encourage the disuse, with the passage of time, of a very essential element in the Eucharist. In the early Church, the Diptychs had a central place and importance in the Divine Liturgy, as Chrysostom[9] and Maximus,[10] among others, testify; and as can be deduced from the case of Chrysostom's exile, at least Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch recited the Diptychs at the Anaphora, immediately after the epiclesis. This place that they had in the Liturgy is clear evidence that the Diptychs did not only have the very important purpose of showing mutual recognition and communion between the Churches (as shown by the business of removing Chrysostom's name from them); they also formed an organic part of the eucharistic *commemoration* to which we referred above.[11] Clearly since the first of these two reasons prevailed (proclamation of the unity and communion of the various local Churches), it was finally considered sufficient for the Diptychs to contain bishops only, and to be read only when heads of autocephalous Churches were celebrating. Yet the second reason (commemoration of bishops, kings and faithful people, living and departed) is equally important. The eucharistic Anaphora, as we have seen (Cyril of Jerusalem, above), requires this commemoration by its very nature.

From a single glance at the text of the Divine Liturgy which is used today in the Orthodox Church, it can be seen that at this point, at the commemoration after the epiclesis, there has been considerable confusion in the manuscripts and generally in the liturgical material.[12] In any case, what seems beyond doubt is

---

[8] The most thorough study on this subject has been written recently by the well-known liturgical scholar Robert F. Taft, *The Diptychs* (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1994).

[9] *On Acts* 21:4, PG 60:170.

[10] *Explanation of Movement* 5, PG 90:117.

[11] Metropolitan Nikodimos of Patra, *Diptychs of the Church of Greece* (in Greek) (1994), p. 90, is correct in maintaining that the exclamation "Many Years" has no place in the Diptychs, precisely because "they are dependent on the clause "again we pray Thee, remember, O Lord. . . ." The Diptychs are an organic part of the prayer for remembrance in the Anaphora, and not only indicative of ecclesial communion. The "Many Years" undoubtedly comes from a confusion of the Diptychs with the "Φήμη," and their restriction to the names of bishops only.

[12] Thus the Apostles, martyrs, etc., are commemorated before "especially for our most holy . . . Lady," and this is repeated after "especially. . . ." In the same way, before "Among the first . . ." we commemorate "the whole episcopate of the Orthodox Church, the priesthood," etc., along

that in our Church *two* categories of faithful are commemorated after the epiclesis and the consecration. One is that of those who have fallen asleep, which begins with "especially for our most holy . . . Lady," and the other that of the living, which begins with "Among the first remember, O Lord, our archbishop. . . ."[13] What we have, clearly, is a form of Diptychs which also forms the preeminent place for the eucharistic commemoration. That is when the names should be commemorated, or at least some of them, such as names of those for whom a memorial liturgy is celebrated, and, if the names are many, there should be a general reference to those who have been commemorated during the Prothesis. All these things are not mere formal rules: they underline the fact that the "remembrance" of Christ in the Eucharist includes within it all the saints and members of the Church on whose behalf this "reasonable worship" is offered.

The commemoration of the departed begins with "especially for our most holy . . . Lady"[14] and includes the recognized saints along with all the faithful. The fact that the Eucharist is also offered *on behalf of* the Mother of God, the Forerunner and the saint of the day as well as "for all those who have fallen asleep in faith, ancestors, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, Apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs," etc.,[15] demonstrates that *all the saints* stand in need of the Eucharist and have to be incorporated into it. The question had already been put by St. John Chrystostom:[16] why do we offer the sacrifice on behalf of the martyrs, he asks, since they are already saints? Despite the fact that they are saints, we make commemoration *on their behalf,* he replies, because the Lord is present at that moment, and it is a great honor for them to be commemorated at that time. The important point in this case is that in the body of the Eucharist, the sacrificed and risen body of the "new creation," the Church with her Eucharist places *together* the saints and the sinners on behalf of whom—saints and sinners alike—she offers the Sacrifice, in the one case in order to honor them and to show that the saints too are saved only as members of his Body, and in the other case in order

---

with the departed, whereas these belong to the commemoration of the living, which is repeated after "Among the first. . . ."

[13] The reading of Diptychs of the departed only is mentioned in the Areopagitic writings, but, as we have seen, the evidence for Diptychs of the living as well is ancient. Cf. also Maximus the Confessor (*Scholia,* PG 4:145).

[14] According to Taft (*The Diptychs,* p. 118), this was introduced by St. Gennadios of Constantinople (458-71), and formed the beginning of the exclamation of the Diptychs of the departed without the hymn "It is truly meet," which was added much later, once it had already become the practice to read the names silently (after the eleventh century and anyway, according to Taft, not before the sixteenth).

[15] This section today appears in the text before "especially. . . ." See note 28, above.

[16] *On Acts* 21:4, PG 60:170.

to seek their salvation, always by means of the communion of all in the one Body of Christ.

The commemoration of the living, on the other hand, begins with the phrase "Among the first . . . ,"[17] in other words with the local bishop in first place.[18] *He* is the head of the living, as the Mother of God is of the departed. Even if there are members of the Church holier than the bishop, they are not commemorated "among the first" because the body of the local Church has only one head: the bishop. The living are saved only in union with their bishop, and apart from him they have no relationship with the Body of Christ, which is offered "for eternal life." Anyone who does not commemorate his bishop at this time in the Eucharist cuts himself off from the roll of the living. For this reason, a Eucharist which is not celebrated in the name of the local bishop, or of another bishop to whom he has yielded precedence, is without salvific significance for those who perform it.

---

[17] The omission of "Among the first . . ." in the case where the head of an autocephalous Church is celebrating is justified—and actually occurred in history (Taft)—only when the Diptychs came to be viewed as commemorating bishops alone. But as we have stressed above, "Among the first . . ." is the beginning of the Diptychs of all the living (kings, lay people, etc.; see Maximus), and in consequence it is essential for the presiding bishop, when celebrating, to exclaim "Among the first remember . . . the whole episcopate," thus demonstrating that before all the living we commemorate the body of bishops. On the particular ecclesiological significance that this can have, see Maximus the Confessor (PG 90:117C-D).

[18] A problem is created when a bishop celebrates. In this case, the question arises as to whom the celebrant bishop will commemorate. This question remains a mere formality if we do not take care to give a theological grounding to our answer. What must be emphasized is that, while the priests of a local Church celebrate the Eucharist in the name of the local bishop, the bishop always celebrates in the name of his own hierarchical superior and never of the local bishop, and commemorates him alone wherever he celebrates. If the bishop celebrates in someone else's diocese then the local bishop "concedes" the presiding place at the Eucharist to him ("apart, however, from sitting on the throne"), and consequently during that Liturgy his name alone is commemorated. When bishops concelebrate, it again makes no sense for a celebrant bishop to commemorate the local bishop (whatever his rank), because this suggests that the commemoration of his own "superior" is suspended, and also that one bishop is subject to another, something that runs counter to the fundamental ecclesiological principle that bishops are equal. (The problem of "assistant bishops" creates a complication because this is a crass ecclesiological aberration, since we have here a bishop dependent on another bishop. The most canonical solution would be for him to commemorate his own "superior" wherever he celebrates, and not, as is usually done, the local bishop in each case). Consequently, when a bishop celebrates in another diocese it is he, and not the local bishop, who (by concession, of course, of the latter) is the superior and head of that Eucharistic gathering, and that Eucharist is celebrated in his name. This is not a usurpation, because it takes place by the canonical concession of the local bishop. It is a basic ecclesiological principle that the bishop, wherever he celebrates, is the head of that particular Eucharistic gathering, and is never incorporated into another local Church, nor does he suspend the commemoration of his own "superior."

In all we have said in the above paragraph, we have wanted to stress that (a) the Eucharist is the supreme commemoration of the living and the departed; (b) the subject of this "commemorating," i.e., the one who does the remembering, is not simply a human being but God Himself ("Remember, O Lord . . ."); (c) this remembrance is not psychological but ontological in its significance (it is concerned with transcending death and with substantive, true "eternal being" in Christ); and (d) this commemoration stems from the Passion of Christ and His sacrifice on the Cross,[19] but refers to and is fulfilled in the Kingdom of Christ which is to come ("Remember me, Lord, when Thou comest in Thy Kingdom"). Thus the eucharistic remembrance becomes also a remembrance of the future, *i.e.*, of the "second and glorious coming again."

We are truly alive only to the degree that God will remember us and will ultimately give us "substance" (*hypostasis*) in the Kingdom of His Son. The Eucharist, transferring us to this Kingdom, offers us the sacrifice of Christ "unto remission of sins" and also "unto eternal life," in other words as "eternal being and well-being" (Maximus), our hypostatic-personal being in the "age which does not end or grow old" (Basil).

X. The structure of the Church's "institution"

The Eucharist is not only an icon of the Kingdom, but also a revelation of the Church itself; and this because, contrary to what Western theology has maintained at various times, the Church is not confined exclusively to the period between Christ's earthly life and the Second Coming, but preexisted,[20] being linked with the preeternal will of God concerning the course and outcome of the divine Economy, and will extend "unto ages of ages" as the Kingdom of God.[21] The Church is a many-sided mystery and its definition—if it is not impossible to define—is itself many-sided and complex.[22] A "definition" which refers us not to intellectual conceptions but to actual experience is the well-known one given by Nicolas Kavasilas: "The Church is made known in the mysteries." If one can ever

[19] In reality, it contains and sums up the whole history of salvation, the divine economy. (Cf. Theodore the Studite, *Antirrheticus* I, PG 99:340).

[20] See J. Karmiris, *Orthodox Ecclesiology* (in Greek) (Athens, 1973), pp. 19f.

[21] The Church "comes into being in this life and takes its beginning from here, but is perfected in the future, when we attain to that day" (Nicolas Kavasilas, *On the Life in Christ*, 1-4, PG 150:493 and 501).

[22] It requires a measure of arrogance to maintain that one's own definition is the definition of the Church when throughout the whole patristic period there is no definition of the Church to be found, and Orthodox ecclesiologists, such as J. Karmiris in his *Orthodox Ecclesiology*, not only avoid giving a "definition" but speak of a "vague and imperfect expression and explanation of the inexpressible and inexplicable mystery of the Church" (p. 11).

see (not "define") the Church, it will only be in the Divine Eucharist. "If anyone is able to see the Church of Christ . . . he will see nothing other than this body of the Lord's *only*. . . . It is therefore in no way unfitting that the Church should be made known here through the mysteries."[23] According to Kavasilas, there exists between Church and Eucharist not an "analogy of likeness" but an "identity of reality"[24]—this is how far the holy writer goes! This allows him and other truly Orthodox dogmatic theologians to write—without fear of being condemned for "one-sidedness"—that the Church is changed into Eucharist[25] or, in the phrase of Florovsky and Karmires, "the Eucharist makes/constitutes the Church."[26]

But as Fr. Florovsky writes, "*sacramental* (communion/community) means nothing less than eschatological."[27] In constituting the Church, the Eucharist reveals it as the *communion and community of the last times,* since "the Church bears in general an eschatological character and lives continuously in the 'last hour.'"[28] The import of this truth is not only *anthropological* (salvation and deification of man through the mysteries and within the Church) but also *cosmological*[29] and *ecclesiological.* We shall dwell particularly on this last point.

The Church is a community with a particular *structure.* It is not simply a "community of faith and hearts," as Protestant theology would have it (see the Augsburg Confession) and as it is also understood, unfortunately, by many contemporary Orthodox, who present Orthodoxy principally as a system of ideas or a form of "religion," a religious experience of the heart, avoiding its institutions and especially bishops and conciliarity. But whence does the Church derive its structure? Since it is in its nature an eschatological community, how is its structure connected with the Kingdom of God?

---

[23] PG 150:452-53. It is a wonder that no one has yet condemned Kavasilas for "Eucharistic monism"(!), after this position of his that "only" in the Eucharist is the Church revealed. It is noteworthy, however, that both he and St. Maximus prefer the language of the image ("to see") rather than giving a definition of the Church.

[24] *Ibid.*

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] G. Florovsky: "The sacraments constitute the Church" ("The Church: Her Nature and Task" in *The Universal Church in God's Design*, vol. 1 [London, 1948], pp. 42-58). More specifically, Karmiris writes: "It has rightly been observed that the Eucharist makes the Church" (*Orthodox Ecclesiology,* p. 94).

[27] Florovsky, p. 54.

[28] Karmires, p. 164

[29] See Metropolitan John (Zizioulas) of Pergamon, *Creation as Eucharist* (in Greek) (Athens: Akritas, 1993). [For an English version, see "Preserving God's Creation: Three Lectures on Theology and Ecology." *King's Theological Review* 12 (1989): pp. 1-5, 41-45 and 13 (1990): pp. 1-5. –*Ed*.]

As has happened with the Eucharist itself, so also with the institutions of the Church the entire effort of academic theology has focused on showing how the Church's various institutions and ministries are or are not connected with the earthly life and teaching of Christ and the Apostles (or indeed with Tradition). Very little effort has been put into showing how these institutions and ministries relate to the Church's eschatological perspective. And yet the fact that these ministries stemmed and continued to stem from the Eucharist[30] demonstrates that it is impossible for them not to be closely connected with the eschatological community of which the Eucharist is an image.

But what relation can the Kingdom of God have with *structure?* The concept of structure has been given a bad name not only by pietism, which puts all the emphasis on what is within man or his ethical behavior, but also by modern philosophy and thought which tends to regard any structure as an alienation of the person and his freedom.

If, however, we do not give "structure" the legal character of an authority imposed from without but connect it with the *otherness of personal relationships,* then it becomes a different matter. In the Kingdom of God *otherness of relationships will exist,* and this creates the variety and hierarchy of ministries.

To be more specific: on the evidence of Scripture and patristic writings the eschatological community, the Kingdom of God, will include the following basic elements, which constitute otherness of relationships and in this sense a structure which is existential in character:

(a) *A gathering* (*synaxis*) of the scattered people of God, and by extension a uniting "in one place" of the world which was fragmented by corruption and death. As we have already seen (section 4, above), this gathering forms an essential element in the last times, in the Kingdom of God.

(b) A gathering *centered on the person of Christ,* who on the one hand embodies the very presence of God in the world as "the image of the invisible God" (Col. 1:15), and on the other incorporates and unites "the many" in His person as the "Servant of the Lord" and the eschatological "Son of Man," or as the "firstborn of all creation . . . firstborn from the dead," as "the head of the body, which is the Church" (Col. 1:15-20).

(c) A gathering centered on Christ who, however, *is surrounded by the "Twelve" (the Apostles),* who will "sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt. 19:28; Luke 18:31).

---

[30] For more detail see Metropolitan John (Zizioulas) of Pergamon, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church: The Unity of the Church in the Divine Eucharist and the Bishop During the First Three Centuries*, trans. Elizabeth Theokritoff (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2001).

In consequence the Kingdom of God, the eschatological community, will be *a gathering* (of the "people of God" and the "many") in which, however, there will be an otherness of relationships determined by the difference between the three elements at least to which we have referred: the People (or "the many" or even "all things"), Christ, and the Apostles. Without these elements the eschatological community and, by extension, the Kingdom of God, is inconceivable. The Kingdom is not simply an interior experience of "hearts,"[31] but a unity of all in the person of Christ who is "the image of the invisible God"; but Christ as the Apostles make Him known and hand Him down to us, not as each individual would like Him to be or imagines Him.[32] Furthermore, within the people itself or the "many" there will be a variety of gifts, because it is not conceivable that everyone should be leveled out in the Kingdom of God. The variety and multiplicity which does not break up the unity of the body but holds it together (1 Cor. 12) will assuredly be a characteristic of the Kingdom as it is of the Church. All these things are "imaged" by the Divine Eucharist as an image of the Kingdom. Thus the following observations take on an especial significance:

(a) All ordinations to the basic *structural* ministries of the Church (layman, deacon, priest, and bishop) necessarily take place within the Divine Eucharist.[33] Baptism and Chrismation are the "ordination" of lay people—because "lay" does not mean unordained, as is commonly thought, but denotes someone who through Baptism and Chrismation is a regular member of the eucharistic

[31] The Lord's saying "the Kingdom of God is among/within you" (ἐντὸς ὑμῶν) (Luke 17:21) means, as is evident from the context: the Kingdom of God is in your midst (obviously with the presence of Christ Himself).

[32] It should be noted that in the last times "many false christs will arise" (Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22), and therefore the witness and judgment of the genuine Apostles is of decisive significance not only historically, but also eschatologically.

[33] Ordinations to the diaconate are often performed at the Liturgy of the Presanctified. This arose out of the reasoning that since at the full Liturgy the deacon is ordained shortly before Holy Communion, and the Presanctified is a service whose main purpose is the receiving of Communion, such an ordination can therefore take place in the course of it. This reasoning overlooks the fact that the performance of an ordination within the Eucharist is bound up with the entire irnaging of the Kingdom, which happens only at the complete Liturgy, as is shown in the liturgical practice of the early Church (Hippolytus, etc.). Besides, it is doubtful whether the bishop can preside at a Liturgy which does not contain an anaphora. It is not fortuitous that at the service of Vespers—and the Liturgy of the Presanctified is nothing other than Vespers in its structure—the bishop never presides as celebrant, but "is present" or stands by the choirs. In general, all the services which are not connected with the Eucharist (Matins, Vespers, etc.) are the task of the presbyters, and it is doubtful whether they should be celebrated by bishops. This is important because it shows apart from anything else that the task of the bishop par excellence is the offering of the Eucharist, in other words, the celebration of a Liturgy which includes an anaphora.

gathering with all the rights and obligations that this entails; and these two mysteries were united with the Eucharist in the early Church and were unthinkable apart from it, as with ordinations.

(b) In contrast with the rites whereby people are "set apart" for all the other orders (subdeacon, reader, etc.), which take place outside the Eucharist (at the end of Matins, usually) because they do not involve *structural* ministries, these ordinations have been regarded even from the time of Ignatius of Antioch as involving ministries which "image" the elements which, as we have seen, "construct" the eschatological community: the "multitude," i.e., the people in a *gathering,* the throne of God which is occupied by the bishop, and the Apostles, represented by the presbyters, with the deacons as an intermediate ministry. In situations where the bishop represents the Father, the deacons represent the "servant of God" Jesus (Ignatius); where the bishop represents Christ who occupies the Throne of God, they represent the "ministering spirits sent forth to serve" (Heb. 1:14), the angels, as Byzantine tradition and iconography perceived and described the deacons.

The conclusion, which is of significance for our subject, is that the Eucharist as an image of the last times—with precisely that property that provided and continues to provide the basic structure of the Church, without which, as St. Ignatius says, "it cannot be called the Church" (*To the Trallians* 3,1). These structural elements of the Church are essential and relate to its *being* (not merely its *well being*), because they *touch upon its nature as an image of the Kingdom.* In other words, the disruption of this basic structure of the Church distorts the image of the Kingdom which the Church is meant to manifest in history, and presupposes an eschatology which either (a) does not allow the *imaging* of the last times in history, or (b) does not have structural elements, in the existential rather than legal sense of the term which we referred to above. Or (c) it contains structural elements—an otherness of relationships—different from those handed down to us by our scriptural and patristic tradition and of which we gave a summary description above.[34] In this case, we should be told what these different

[34] The Greek newspaper *Kathimerini* (July 22, 1994) recently carried an article by C. Malevitsis entitled "The Bishops" in which he called for abolition of the institution of bishops because their squabbles and their gold trimmed attire are offensive, and for making do with the institution of priests (though why should we need them either?). One would have expected from Mr. Malevitsis a better knowledge of theological matters. But perhaps the responsibility belongs ultimately to the Church and to theology, which for all these years have not made it their business to show why these institutions in the Orthodox Church have "ultimate" truth and meaning. Symptoms such as Mr. Malevitsis' article will keep on appearing all the more as long as theology does not carry out its duty to interpret our dogmas and institutions and show their more general significance. When there are Orthodox theologians who regard the interpretation of dogma as a "Protestant" (!) peculiarity, one can understand why such things occur. If the

elements are and why they should replace those that we have received from tradition.[35]

Viewing the Church's ministries and institutions as an image of the Kingdom has the consequence that the institutions cannot be understood and cannot function except *in relationship* with one another. Since each institution and each ministry *forms a part of an image,* if one of these ministries isolates itself and exalts itself so as to say to the others, "I have no need of you" (1 Cor. 12:21-24), the result is a *distortion of the whole image.* The image of the Kingdom is a unified one, and the ontology of the ministries requires interdependence and relationship between them, as St. Paul emphasizes dramatically in his First Epistle to the Corinthians (Chapter 12). It is not possible, for instance, for the bishop to exist without the presbyters and the people, nor for the presbyters and people to exist without the bishop. This protects the Church both from episcopal "despotism" or "clericalism" and "presbyterianism," and also from "laicism"—aberrations which have come into being historically when the iconic-eschatological approach contained in eucharistic ecclesiology has given way and been replaced by an individualistic and legalistic ontology of the ministries. Proof of this is found in the fact that in the Orthodox Church, *the Eucharist alone* has preserved the interdependence of the Church's ministries, theoretically at least, since it is forbidden to celebrate the Eucharist without a gathering of the people, without the people's "Amen,"[36] and without priests and a bishop—even if it is only with the bishop's antimension and the commemoration of his name. None of this makes any sense outside the Eucharist, where every ministry (lay people and

---

Fathers of the Church had done the same and left dogmas with no interpretation as to their significance for our existence, Christianity would have been relegated to the dustbin of history long ago.

[35] For instance, why confine ourselves to the priest alone? Protestantism rejected bishops because it could not find them in the New Testament, in accordance with the axiom *sola scriptum* (it is now tentatively beginning to reexamine the issue). But to choose the priest out of tradition and to reject other elements purely and simply because they are psychologically or morally offensive is not good theology—even Protestant theology. We suspect that such ideas conceal a view of the Church as an establishment for serving religious needs, experiencing "the sacred" and relating to "the divine"; in which case, indeed, the priest is both essential (cf. ancient Greek and Eastern religions) and also sufficient for this purpose. Is, however, Christianity a "religion," and can there be a kinship between it and other religions on the basis of the idea of "the sacred" and "the divine"?

[36] What Cyril of Alexandria writes is characteristic (PG 74:893): the presence of the laypeople's "Amen" at the Eucharist is essential. "In order that what seems to be lacking in the priests may be supplemented by the measure of the laity, and that God may as it were accept the small with the great as a unity of the Spirit." The "Amen" is the sacred right of the laity, and it is wrong that it is usually exclaimed by the clergy during divine services. It goes right back to the first apostolic Churches (1 Cor. 14:16) and to the first centuries (See Justin, *First Apology* 65).

clergy) operates without any gathering or interdependence. The Eucharist, as a gathering of the people around the bishop and the presbyters, preserves and expresses in history the image of a world which will have transcended its death-bringing fragmentation and corruption thanks to its union and incorporation into Him who, according to the testimony of His Apostles, has by His Cross and Resurrection united what was sundered, gathered His world "into one," and thus established His Kingdom.[37]

This is the image which the Church ought to show, both to itself and to the world, as it celebrates the Eucharist and composes its institutions. This is the greatest vision and the most important proclamation that the Church has to offer; a vision and proclamation of faith, hope and love. This is why it should guard this image "like the apple of an eye" against any deviation or distortion.[38]

To be continued…

[37] It is not fortuitous that in the patristic tradition (Maximus, Anastasius of Sinai, Theodore the Studite, *et al*.), "synaxis" is a technical term and denotes the Eucharist without any explanation. This follows from the connection between the Eucharist and the Kingdom, which is also a "synaxis." See section 4 above.

[38] The distortions which the Church can undergo often extend even to the structure of the prayers in the Divine Liturgy and the order in which these are read by the clergy. Thus it has become customary for the Litany of Fervent Supplication and dismissal of the catechumens to be read secretly during the Trisagion, whereas their place is after the Gospel, as the conclusion to the section of the Liturgy at which the catechumens are allowed to be present. In this way it becomes almost a joke, when the celebrants whisper among themselves "Ye catechumens, bow your heads unto the Lord," etc. (!) (as if they themselves were the catechumens), or again whisper among themselves the petitions of the Litany which manifestly call upon the people to respond with the triple "Lord, have mercy"! But where one really has the sense that everything has been turned upside down is when the prayer of the Anaphora which begins "It is meet and right to hymn Thee . . ." has already been read secretly by the celebrant before he gives the exhortation, "Let us give thanks to the Lord" (usually during the Creed); or when there are several priests celebrating and they "share out" parts of the Anaphora between them, reading them all simultaneously! Thus the sequence and structure of the Eucharistic Anaphora are destroyed, and this is why it is necessary to correct deviations of this sort.