

## THE REVISION OF THE VIGIL SERVICE

Nicholas Denysenko

The history of the Roman Catholic Church in the twentieth century includes significant developments in the area of liturgical reform. The meeting of the Second Vatican Council proved to be fertile ground for the formation of a theological vision that served as the foundation for sweeping reforms of the Mass and Liturgy of the Hours. It is frequently assumed that the opposite has occurred in the Eastern Orthodox churches. The Orthodox churches carry the reputation of being liturgically immobile, frequently imagined as a repository of the worship from the Eastern patristic golden age.<sup>1</sup> A degree of resistance to liturgical reform was even championed by the eminent Orthodox liturgist Alexander Schmemmann, who favored the recovery of liturgical theology, in which liturgy, theology, and piety would be "reconciled" before any attempts at reform would begin in earnest.<sup>2</sup> Despite these generally entrenched presuppositions, the history of Byzantine Liturgy manifests both liturgical diversity and clear instances of reform. Diverse liturgical practices flourished, especially in local monasteries, as attested to by each individual *Typikon*, the book which came to regulate many aspects of worship.<sup>3</sup> The contemporary *textus receptus* does not consistently reflect the rich diversity of the Byzantine liturgical

1 Robert Taft, "The Byzantine Office in the Prayerbook of New Skete: A Critique," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 48 (Rome: 1982), 356. See also Peter Galadza, "Restoring the Icon: Reflections on the Reform of Byzantine Worship," *Worship* 65 (1991) 238-55.

2 Schmemmann provides a comprehensive explication of his thesis in his essay responding to questions posed by W. Jardine Grisbrooke. See Alexander Schmemmann, "Liturgical Theology, Theology of Liturgy, and Liturgical Reform," in Thomas Fisch, ed., *Liturgy and Tradition: Theological Reflections of Alexander Schmemmann* (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1990), especially pp. 40-45.

3 Taft, "The Byzantine Office," 356.

tradition, but instead contains the structures and contents of offices that took their final shape as the result of a complicated synthesis of dual monastic traditions and the absorption of the Constantinopolitan cathedral rite.<sup>4</sup>

The basic structures of these offices became permanent fixtures in the worship of the Russian Orthodox Church with the reforms of Patriarch Nikon in the seventeenth century. No major changes have been made to the offices, with the exception of the abbreviation of several liturgical components within them. One example of such an office is the so-called "All-Night Vigil," comprising Great Vespers and Matins as celebrated each Sunday and on feast days in the Byzantine tradition.<sup>5</sup> Several scholars have outlined the historical development of this office in great detail.<sup>6</sup> The Vigil was one of many liturgical issues thoroughly analyzed by the bishops of the Russian Church as they prepared to convene for an All-Russian Council in 1905. The bishops clearly understood the Vigil as a paradigm of liturgical decadence in Russia, and made many initial suggestions for its reform. The Orthodox Church in America (OCA), the autocephalous daughter of the Moscow Patriarchate, has inherited this Vigil from the Russian Orthodox Church, though it is scarcely celebrated in North America. Two models have been proposed for the purpose of restoring Saturday evening worship in the parishes of the OCA. This paper will first review the historical paradigms for liturgical reform in the Byzantine Tradition in an effort to identify a recurring trend, and will then analyze

4 The monastic offices are represented by the Studite and Sabaitic traditions. For a more complete overview of the history of this synthesis, see Robert Taft, "Mount Athos: A Late Chapter in the History of the Byzantine Rite," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 42 (Washington, DC, 1988), 179–94.

5 Most churches of Greek and Arab origins celebrate Matins separate from Great Vespers in the morning (presumably) preceding the Eucharistic Liturgy. Most churches of Russian and Ukrainian descent celebrate the Vigil as one liturgical unit on the evening preceding the Eucharistic Liturgy.

6 The most accessible summary of the development of the All-night Vigil in English is Miguel Arranz's "N. D. Uspensky: The Office of the All-Night Vigil in the Greek Church and in the Russian Church," *SVTQ* 24 (1980) 83–113, 169–95.

the two models in light of the Byzantine tradition of reform. Special emphasis will be placed on the theological impetus for liturgical reform in its historical instances.

A brief review of the historical instances of liturgical reform in the Byzantine tradition can help articulate the historical and theological trends surrounding renewal. Byzantine liturgical manuscripts reveal a variety of liturgical practices which thrived in cathedrals (especially the Great Church in Constantinople) and monasteries. The monastic and cathedral practices dwelt alongside one another until the Iconoclast controversy reached its peak in the eighth and ninth centuries. The leadership of prominent monks such as Theodore of Stoudion (†826) was determinative in the restoration of icons, elevating the status of monasticism in Constantinople to a preeminent level.<sup>7</sup> As a part of his campaign to advocate orthodox theology, Theodore implemented new liturgical forms with contents that expounded the faith in a unique wedding of text and music. He imported monks from the monastery of St Sabas in Palestine to Constantinople, introducing a tradition of ecclesiastical poetry he perceived to be suitable for the preservation of orthodox theology.

St Sabas monastery had experienced a renaissance of creative poetry following the Persian invasions of 614. The presence and influence of the Palestinian monks led to the proliferation of new liturgical components which grew and became established as a permanent fixture of Byzantine worship. These elements are identified in the extant collections of books such as the Octoechos, Menaion, Lenten Triodion, Pentecostarion, and the actual poetry contained in the books, namely canons, stichera, tropologia, and kathismata.<sup>8</sup> The liturgical celebrations also took on a new form, as the monastic office of St Sabas was synthesized with the cathedral

7 Robert Taft, *The Byzantine Rite: A Short History* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 52–60.

8 Thomas Pott, *La réforme liturgique byzantine: Etude du phénomène de l'évolution non-spontanée de la liturgie byzantine* (Rome: CLV-Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 106–7.

office of the Great Church, resulting in a hybrid office in the Studite monasteries. While these developments might be taken for granted by contemporary students of liturgy, their significance in the history of Byzantine liturgy are tremendous. They reveal a process of liturgical reform that involves the importation of new liturgical material from a different regional practice, resulting in the fusion of two parallel yet distinct rites. The impetus for this liturgical reform was the monastic goal of advocating orthodox theology through the Church's *lex orandi*. This was accompanied by Theodore's ability to freely implement reform, as his prominent status in Constantinopolitan society empowered him to act without fear of repercussions. In other words, Theodore took action and addressed a significant need of the Church. The Studite reforms thus constitute a paradigm for liturgical reform, manifesting a pattern which will essentially recur in the other instances of liturgical reform which took place in the history of Byzantine liturgy.

The Studite forms of worship were eventually supplanted in most areas of the Byzantine world by the Sabaitic tradition. The Palestinian monks of St Sabas reworked the Studite synthesis outlined above to fit their own needs following the destruction of the Jerusalem Cathedral by Caliph al-Hakim in 1009.<sup>9</sup> This new monastic liturgy became popular on Mount Athos, which had risen to prominence with the *hesychast* movement, filling a temporary void left by the sacking of Constantinople in the Fourth Crusade of 1204.<sup>10</sup> Liturgical historians have speculated that the new form was favored over the older Studite form due to its ease of execution. When the Byzantines returned to Constantinople in 1261, Mount Athos had attained ecclesiastical supremacy, and the neo-

9 Taft, "Mount Athos," 187. Taft refers to this new liturgical form as the "Neo-Sabaitic synthesis," differentiated from the previous Studite-Sabaitic synthesis.

10 *Ibid.*, 190–94. Taft does not provide a conclusion for the reason the neo-Sabaitic liturgy attained prominence on Mount Athos. One possibility is the associations some monastic leaders from Mount Athos had with Palestine, such as Patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos (†1379). This also provides a link with the eventual institution of the neo-Sabaitic cursus in Constantinople.

Sabaitic system replaced the prior Studite norm there as well.<sup>11</sup> The path to ascendancy of the neo-Sabaitic liturgy is important for several reasons. First, an integral part of the new liturgy was the *agrypnia*, or All-Night Vigil, which essentially constitutes the ancestor of the Vigil service celebrated in some Byzantine churches today. Second, a similar pattern of reform is apparent in three related instances. The monks of St Sabas modified their liturgy following the destruction of the Jerusalem cathedral. Mount Athos adopted the new neo-Sabaitic liturgical form with the freedom of ecclesiastical prepotence. Constantinople appropriated the same new liturgical form in the aftermath of the invasion of 1204. These examples provide evidence that a wide variety of events and circumstances have opened the doors for new liturgical forms to evolve to meet the particular needs of local circumstances.

While the above examples provide evidence of liturgical renewal and response to particular theological and ecclesiastical circumstances, the churches of Rus' provide a different perspective. Having received Christianity in 988, Rus' immediately inherited the first Studite synthesis which flourished in the Monastery of the Caves in Kyiv and elsewhere.<sup>12</sup> The neo-Sabaitic liturgy did not arrive in Rus' until the fourteenth century, leading to some discrepancies between the way the All-Night Vigil was prescribed for celebration and its actual practice.<sup>13</sup> Miguel Arranz described specific examples of the remnants of the Studite Vigil practices which had been entrenched in Rus' for over three-hundred years, and their unique juxtaposition with the neo-Sabaitic Vigil. These practices came to an abrupt end with the liturgical reforms imposed by Patriarch Nikon (†1681) in the late seventeenth century.<sup>14</sup> His reforms permanently changed the modes of Russian worship. The ramifications of the reforms as described by Arranz provide a mere

11 Ibid., 191–92.

12 Taft, *The Byzantine Rite*, 59.

13 Arranz, "N. D. Uspensky: The Office of the All-Night Vigil," 183–84.

14 Ibid., 186, 191, 193.

glimpse into the shockwaves that reverberated throughout Russia with the reform and ensuing Old-Believers Schism:

All these traditions and those which took shape during the centuries when the *Typikon of Holy Wisdom* in Constantinople was more or less in force in Russia ceased to exist in 1682 with the edition of the *Typikon of Jerusalem* in its Constantinopolitan form. From this date, only the Sabbite tradition was permitted. The Moscovite Grecophiles, as Uspensky calls them, succeeded in ruining the heritage of a glorious past of popular Russian traditions in favor of a tradition which was supposed to be more pure but which was in reality anachronistic. This was far from a gentle change for on both sides violence was the rule.<sup>15</sup>

The events surrounding the Nikonian reforms cannot be oversimplified.<sup>16</sup> Uspensky's oblique reference to "Grecophiles" cited above obviously refers to Nikon, who wished to impose liturgical uniformity in the Russian Church to conform to the other Eastern Orthodox patriarchates. In so doing, he changed many euchological details<sup>17</sup> and pious customs to impose conformity with Greek models, labeling those who defended the old traditions as heretics, and comparing them to dubious characters such as Nestorius and Arius.<sup>18</sup> These actions, combined with Nikon's heavy-handed methods, led not only to the alienation of many believers and the Old-Believer schism, but also to mutual feelings of distrust between Tsar Alexis and Nikon, resulting in the latter's deposition at the Council of 1666.<sup>19</sup> The ecclesiastical atmosphere in Russia was further complicated by the westernizing process engendered by Tsar Peter II, who forcibly replaced the patriarchate with the Holy Synod, based on the Swedish model of a state col-

15 *Ibid.*, 192–93.

16 See Paul Meyendorff's study, *Russia, Ritual, and Reform: The Liturgical Reforms of Nikon in the Seventeenth Century* (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1991).

17 Thoroughly presented and analyzed by Meyendorff in Part II of his study.

18 *Ibid.*, 59–62.

19 *Ibid.*, 93.

lege.<sup>20</sup> The new system was effectively implemented with the *Spiritual Regulation*, and lasted through the end of the monarchy until the patriarchate was reestablished in 1917.<sup>21</sup>

The mutation of Church administration in Russia, combined with its unique historico-sociological development, resulted in consequences for its liturgical heritage. The Russian variant of the All-Night Vigil, which lasted for six-seven hours in winter and four-five in the summer (according to the *Typikon*), was greatly abbreviated to a service of no more than two-three hours, which Arranz says “no longer merits the name ‘all-night vigil’.”<sup>22</sup> Arranz also implicates Tsar Peter’s suppression of the patriarchate in contributing to the decline of the liturgy in Russia:

In the past, patriarchal celebrations had served as a model for the other bishops and the celebrations in their respective cathedrals. The Holy Synod which took over the direction of the Church from the patriarch was in no way a substitute for him in the liturgy.<sup>23</sup>

Russia’s liturgical decadence was evidenced by the fact that two of the thirteen most important cathedrals in Russia did not celebrate the Vigil, while the others celebrated it only during the summer.<sup>24</sup> Most churches greatly abbreviated the service, leading to its reduced duration.

The history of liturgical reform in Russia introduces new elements into this investigation.<sup>25</sup> The impetus for the Nikonian

20 Dimitry Pospelovsky, *The Orthodox Church in the History of Russia* (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1998), 105–12.

21 *Ibid.*, 204–5.

22 Arranz, “N. D. Uspensky: The Office of the All-Night Vigil,” 193.

23 *Ibid.*, 194–95.

24 *Ibid.*, 193.

25 The scope of this paper does not allow for an overview of the sweeping liturgical reforms implemented by Metropolitan Peter Mohyla of Kyiv in the seventeenth century. His reforms are pertinent to the issue as they comprised a major component in his comprehensive response to the crisis faced by the Orthodox Church of Ukraine in the wake of the Union of Brest in 1596, and continued polemical exchanges with the Jesuits in the struggle for ecclesiastical dominion in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For an overview of Mohyla’s context and reforms, see Paul

reforms was the confused goal of theological orthodoxy attained through the imposition of liturgical uniformity with the rest of the Orthodox world. While uniformity was eventually achieved, the consequences of the Old-Believer schism and the dissolution of the patriarchate led to a period of ecclesiastical and liturgical decline in Russia, a crisis which was seriously addressed by the bishops of the Church in 1905.

The Russian Church faced a number of serious issues in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, which some leaders felt would be more effectively addressed with the restoration of the patriarchate.<sup>26</sup> The lay Ober-Procurator of the Holy Synod, Konstantin Pobedonostsev, whose prestige was clearly threatened by this new movement, arranged for a questionnaire to be sent to the bishops of the Church. The questionnaire was sent under the guise of addressing the pertinent issues, but with the hope of putting a halt to the movement with the backing of ultra-conservative bishops.<sup>27</sup> The responses elicited by the questionnaire surprisingly served as a "clarion call for large-scale church reform," in which thirty-two of the sixty-four bishops who responded addressed liturgical issues.<sup>28</sup> The primary liturgical topics addressed by the bishops were the problem of Church Slavonic, the need to develop a so-called "Parish Typikon," and the need for forms of worship that were suitable for society. Multiple references were made to problems associated with the All-Night Vigil, and some bishops even made modest suggestions for new models to fit the needs of the Russian Church. A review of some of the highlights from the

Meyendorff, "The Liturgical Reforms of Peter Moghila: A New Look," *SVTQ* 29 (1985) 101–14.

26 The challenges and immediate background to this critical epoch of Russian Church history are outlined in detail by James Cunningham, *A Vanquished Hope: The Movement for Church Renewal in Russia, 1905–1906* (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 1981), 66–78.

27 *Ibid.*, 133–34.

28 Paul Meyendorff, "The Liturgical Path of Orthodoxy in America," *SVTQ* 40/1–2 (1996) 43–64. This article is currently available online at <http://www.svots.edu/Faculty/Paul-Meyendorff/Articles/liturgical-path.html>.

bishops' responses can help establish the specific liturgical context of the Russian Church during the turn of the twentieth century.<sup>29</sup>

Bishop Ioanniky of Archangel suggested the publication of an abbreviated service book for the faithful with parallel Slavonic and Russian texts, and explanatory sections.<sup>30</sup> Bishop Michael of Minsk identified a number of abuses and problems associated with attempts to celebrate the All-Night Vigil:

In order to celebrate our worship as is meant, without hurrying and distinctly, one would need seven hours to complete an All-Night Vigil before a feast day, three hours for the Liturgy, and another two hours for Vespers, which adds up to twelve hours. This is celebrated at a few monasteries, and only a few at that. In some places where it is celebrated according to the rules, with all of the proper readings and hymns, the natural physical weakness of the clergy forces them to shorten it, and as a result the readings and hymns are irreverently and incomprehensibly rendered...Everyone violates the Typikon.<sup>31</sup>

Bishop Michael continued by calling for the shortening of the services so that they would be celebrated with the reverence due to them. Several bishops called for a new Parish Typikon, referring to the burdensome length of the services with their frequent and monotonous repetition. Bishop George of Astrakhan warned of the idealizing of the Typikon into something greater than it was intended to be:

The Typikon must be revised. This holy book, which was intended to regulate the forms and order of church worship, has not been revised since 1682, and not having changed since

29 The bishops' responses were published in *Otzyvy eparkhial'nykh arkhierееv po voprosam o tserkovnoi reforme* (St Petersburg, 1906). Despite several attempts, I was unable to obtain copies of this old collection. The citations will instead be taken from an unpublished Master of Divinity thesis by John Shimchick titled "The Responses of the Russian Episcopate Concerning Worship—1905 And the Liturgical Situation in America," St Vladimir's Theological Seminary, Library, May, 1980.

30 In Shimchick, 29–30.

31 *Ibid.*, 47–48.

then, has acquired in the eyes of the zealots the character of something eternally and dogmatically unchangeable.<sup>32</sup>

Bishop George emphasized the diverse history of Orthodox worship, recalling the Studite Typika within the tradition that had been supplanted by the Sabaitic Typikon. Archbishop James of Yaroslav noted that clergy who strive to fulfill the obligations of the Typikon would be unable to fulfill their pastoral duties, a theme strikingly similar to the complaints of Western Friars and Jesuits, who felt that the burden of reciting the daily office was preventing them from fulfilling academic endeavors and apostolic work.<sup>33</sup> Bishop Evlogii of Kholm proposed that the Vigil be reformed so that Vespers would be served in the evening and Matins in the morning, the Matins prayers recited after midnight as appropriate.<sup>34</sup> Archbishop James of Yaroslav hinted at a "Parish Vigil" by suggesting the following outline:<sup>35</sup>

Great Vespers	Source of Additions
Little Compline	
Polyeleos (Psalm 134–135 [135–136])	Taken from Cathedral Vigil portion of Matins
Resurrection Canon	Taken from Morning Office in Matins
Great Doxology (concludes Vigil)	Taken from Lauds portion in Matins
Matins (without above elements) served the following morning	

Archbishop James included some of the more popular aspects of components associated with Matins to assuage any reaction the faithful might have against new forms. Bishop Peter of Smolensk

32 Ibid., 56.

33 Ibid., 56–58. The Western parallel is presented by Taft in *The Liturgy of the Hours in East and West: The Origins of the Divine Office and its Meaning for Today*, 2d ed., rev., (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1986, 1993), 299–306.

34 Shimchick, 72–73.

35 Shimchick, 74. The right column contains the sources for the Matins elements appended to Great Vespers as provided by Taft, *The Liturgy of the Hours*, 280–81.

prescribed a Parish Typikon which includes a theologically pastoral statement that qualifies its purpose:

Therefore, the future council must create a definitive standard for daily parish worship which, while containing all of its fullness and profound content, would at the same time correspond to the needs and conditions of contemporary life and satisfy the religious feeling and requirement of the Orthodox faithful.<sup>36</sup>

Enough bishops commented on the need for liturgical reform with reference to the Typikon and the Vigil to conclude that the need for such reform was great. A critical concept implicit in the analysis that cannot be neglected is the barrier produced by inaccessible elements of worship. These were specifically identified by the bishops as the antiquated Church Slavonic language, the length and form of the services, the selection of their contents, and their mode of execution. The reforms proposed by the bishops contained a clear purpose of ecclesial restoration, in which the people of God would be able to fully participate in the services and thus benefit from them, strengthening the life of the Church.

The "future council" repeatedly referenced did not occur until 1917, and Archbishop Tikhon did not allow the pertinent liturgical issues to be presented to the Council for fear that the Old-Believers would immediately reject any prospect of reconciliation with the Church.<sup>37</sup> The prospects for liturgical reform were tarnished by the tactics of the Renovationalist Church, which was used and manipulated by the Bolshevik government to combat its greatest ideological threat. The Renovationalists adopted many of the proposed reforms against the orders of Patriarch Tikhon, and any contemporary call for reform or renewal often leads to accusations of Renovationalism.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>36</sup> Shimchick, 68.

<sup>37</sup> Metropolitan Evlogii, *Put' Moei Zhizni* (Paris, 1947), 297.

<sup>38</sup> Meyendorff, "The Liturgical Path of Orthodoxy," 5. See also Edward Roslof, *Red Priests: Renovationalism, Russian Orthodoxy, and Revolution 1905–1946* (Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2002), 35.

Despite the Russian Church's failure to implement the liturgical reforms propagated by its hierarchy in 1905–6, their contributions had an impact on the Orthodox Church. A renaissance in the study of worship flourished in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with the publication of many works still indispensable for the study of Eastern liturgy today. Mikhail Skaballanovich's analysis of the *Typikon* includes a fascinating report of the celebration of the All-Night Vigil in accordance with all of the requirements of the *Typikon* at the Kyivan Theological Academy on November 10–11 around 1911.<sup>39</sup> The celebration began at 6:00PM, and concluded at 1:50AM the following morning. This event reveals not only academic pursuit of the study of the Vigil, but also its lack of suitability for the standard parish. Three-hundred rubles would have been necessary to finance the personnel necessary for the antiphonal singing required by two choirs, and another three-thousand for the two years of preparation needed.<sup>40</sup> They were able to recruit the singers they needed from the student body, though Skaballanovich himself lamented that they fulfilled this duty despite the great risk presented to their throats, considering the continuous singing required to sustain the Vigil from 6:00PM to the morning.<sup>41</sup> The amount of preparation needed, the cost, and even the risk associated with the celebration of the full Vigil in a controlled academic setting clearly defines it as a liturgical unit suitable only for a community with the resources necessary for its competent celebration. This evidence, combined with the liturgical decline of the Russian Church and its leaders' calls for change, shows that a new Vigil was needed that fit the particular circumstances of the local community and contained the theological fullness and integrity of the received tradition.<sup>42</sup>

Prior to presenting the factors leading up to a new proposals for

39 Mikhail Skaballanovich, *Tolkovyj Tipikon. Obyasnitel'noye izlozhenoye Tipikona s istoricheskim vvedeniem. Vipusk II* (Kyiv, 1910), 330–36. He did not indicate the year in which the event took place.

40 *Ibid.*, 330.

41 *Ibid.*, 331.

42 Skaballanovich was himself apparently a proponent of a return to the complete ob-

Saturday evening in the OCA, a quick review of the characteristics of the *agrypnia* in its original monastic setting can help establish the ideal context for its celebration.<sup>43</sup> The monks of St Sabas monastery were instructed to keep Vigil on nights before Sundays and feasts.<sup>44</sup> The Vigil was supposed to begin after sunset and finish right before sunrise, and the ecclesiarch was responsible for assigning sufficient psalmody and reading to fulfill this length of time. In the incensation that opened Great Vespers, the priest proceeded to cense two other churches on the grounds of the monastery, along with the tomb of St Sabas.<sup>45</sup> Vespers was followed by a *lite* procession, returning to the two churches and the tomb, and including an anointing with holy oil. The procession stopped at the monastery bakery, where the bread was blessed and distributed to the monks along with some wine and water. The entire Vigil is marked by activities which related to the realities of the monks' lives. They needed nourishment to reserve enough energy to make it through the night and the fast preceding the Eucharist, so they blessed food and wine at the bakery during their procession. They venerated the tomb of their patron saint, and thus remembered him with incense and prayers. They needed to ensure their safety in the darkness of the night, so they made sure they had enough content in the service to make it through the night before returning to their abodes. The compilers of the *agrypnia* appropriated the pattern of creating a

servance of the Typikon, with the sung parts mostly executed by a soloist *recto tono*. This proposal was his response to calls for reform, made during a time of civil war and revolution, reflecting a need for incessant prayer. For his biographical sketch, see Peter Galadza, "Baumstark's Kievan Contemporary, Mikhail N. Skaballanovich (1871–1931[?]): A Sketch of His Life and Heortology," in Robert Taft & Gabriele Winkler, editors, *Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark* (1872–1948) *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 265 (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2001), 761–75.

43 This section follows Arranz, "N.D. Uspensky: The Office of the All-Night Vigil," 174–78.

44 Ibid. Apparently Uspensky thought that they would have difficulty returning to their caves during the night, making it necessary for them to remain in church throughout the night for their own safety.

45 The deacon leading the priest with a large candle served a practical purpose, providing him with the light he needed to go from one destination to the next.

liturgical form that meets the needs of the community's circumstances. The inheritors of the *agrypnia* live in entirely different circumstances, which require at least some modifications of the existing forms. The reduction of the Vigil in Russia serves as one example of the consequences of imposing a particular *ordo* upon a Church with specific circumstances. The suppression of traditional processions, removal of singing sections of the Psalter, the non-adoption of certain elements from the monastic tradition, and the truncation of psalms and ecclesiastical poetry due to the infusion of elaborate music all contributed to the mutation of Russia's Vigil.<sup>46</sup> They also indicated the development of new circumstances to which a legislated and inflexible liturgical unit was unable to adapt. The urgent need for reform expressed by the Russian bishops is understandable in light of the rapid decline of the Vigil.

The so-called "Metropolia" (later the Orthodox Church in America [OCA]) inherited both the reduced Vigil service and the complicated history of liturgical reform and mistrust from the Russian Orthodox Church. Alexander Schmemmann is credited with the implementation of many liturgical changes in the OCA, the fruit of Russian intellectual thought and academic prowess brought to North America from Paris.<sup>47</sup> While the results of his liturgical labors are most manifest in changes in eucharistic practice, his concern for the ability of the people to fully participate in all aspects of worship echoes the hope of the Russian bishops in 1905 to restore all forms of worship to ecclesial fullness. Schmemmann elucidated the scope of the liturgical problem in an important essay published in 1964,<sup>48</sup> in which he identified a liturgical restoration as being rooted in the ecclesiological wholeness of liturgy, where every celebration is an ecclesial one, as opposed to a private gathering with the priest.

Schmemmann reacted strongly to the instruction of Metropolitan

46 Arranz, "N. D. Uspensky: The Office of the All-Night Vigil," 193.

47 Meyendorff, "The Liturgical Path of Orthodoxy," 5.

48 Alexander Schmemmann, "Problems of Orthodoxy in America: The Liturgical Problem," *SVTQ* 8/4 (1964) 164–85.

Ireney to the clergy of the diocese of New York and New Jersey in 1972.<sup>49</sup> The instruction had prohibited the introduction of elements from Matins (or any other service) into Vespers, and had called for the observance of the complete orders of Vespers and Matins in their entirety.<sup>50</sup> Schmemmann pointed out that many of the omissions served a practical purpose, and interestingly supported a particular form of evening worship he had witnessed in some parishes:

If, as I saw it done in some parishes, Solemn Vespers on the eve of certain great feasts are followed by the festal elements of Matins (excluding the specifically “matinal” elements) this seems to me to be an intelligent way to salvage at least something of the very essence of the feast, especially in view of the absence in many parishes of trained choir directors and psalmists, making it a necessity—possibly a good thing!—to have congregational singing. It is certainly one possible way to react against the rapid disappearance of the celebration of the eves, the reduction of even the great feasts to the Divine Liturgy alone. This practice ought therefore to be discussed and regulated, but certainly not summarily condemned as a “distortion.”<sup>51</sup>

This statement speaks volumes, as it shows the problem of the disappearance of the daily office, the appearance of a new liturgical form that (presumably) attempts to address the problem, and hierarchical reaction against the development. Schmemmann’s prevailing concern for ecclesial participation and integrity is evidenced by his advocacy of congregational singing, one way in which all the faithful participate.

Schmemmann’s concern about the deterioration of the festal office can be extended to Saturday evening worship in general. He frequently lamented the reduction of the Church’s liturgical life to

49 Alexander Schmemmann, “On the Question of Liturgical Practices: A Letter to my Bishop,” *SVTQ* 17/3 (1973) 227–38.

50 *Ibid.*, 235–36.

51 *Ibid.*, 235–36.

Sunday morning alone.<sup>52</sup> This decline continued after his death in 1983, as attested to by a survey sent by the Liturgical Commission of the OCA to the clergy in 1992.<sup>53</sup> 77.9% of the respondents celebrated Vespers on Saturday evenings, while 9.7% celebrated Vigil, and 9.3% had no service at all.<sup>54</sup> 54% of the priests reported that 25% or fewer of their parishioners attended the services. Most OCA parishes no longer celebrate Matins, which means that the parishioners never hear the proclamation of the resurrection Gospel (except on Pascha), even though it is prescribed for Matins every Sunday. They are also deprived of a great portion of the corpus of the Church's ecclesiastical poetry.<sup>55</sup> Paul Meyendorff echoed Schmemmann's lament on the reduction of the Church's liturgical life to Sunday morning:

We have become a "Sunday church," peopled by "Sunday Christians." The Eucharist has lost its connection to the Orthodox liturgical corpus, of which it is supposed to be the climax—something akin to reducing a fifteen-course banquet to dessert alone. And, all too often, our people reduce Christianity only to attending Sunday liturgy, making little connection between this liturgical assembly and their daily life.<sup>56</sup>

This illustration of the liturgical life of the OCA seems to provide a ripe opportunity to begin the process of proposing a Saturday evening office that is capable of retaining the integrity of the Church's tradition and facilitating the ecclesial participation necessary for a more complete eschatological encounter with God in worship. Such a model would conform to the Church's tradition of taking

52 52 Schmemmann, "Problems," 164.

53 The results of this survey appear in an unpublished Master of Divinity thesis by Terrance Wasielewski entitled "Statistical Analysis of a 1992 Survey of Liturgical Practices of Priests in the Orthodox Church in America," St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary Library, May 2001. My thanks to Ms. Eleana Silk, head librarian, for sending me a copy of the thesis. Only the survey results will be cited, hereafter as *OCA Survey 1992*.

54 OCA Survey 1992, 32–33.

55 Meyendorff, "The Liturgical Path of Orthodoxy," 8.

56 *Ibid.*, 8.

action to implement liturgical reform to meet the particular needs of the contemporary context, as illustrated in the many examples above.

A new model for Saturday evening worship was put forward by the Liturgical Commission of the OCA (LC-OCA) in 1979–1980 as part of a greater goal to provide a liturgical schema for Sunday, the *Lord's Day*.<sup>57</sup> The LC-OCA's hopes were ambitious, including the "ideal goal" of preparing "a parish Typikon for our Church."<sup>58</sup> The *Lord's Day* proposal elaborated upon the LC-OCA's understanding of the meaning of Sunday, and their identification of the obstacles to achieving their goals:

The liturgical observance of the Lord's Day—the weekly celebration by the Church of Christ's resurrection—is not only the most eminent liturgical expression of the Christian faith but the very source of Orthodox liturgical tradition and piety. Today, however, this most sacred tradition is clearly in danger of losing its truly unique position and function in the liturgical life. We face ... the abandonment by many parishes of the dominical Vespers and Matins, i.e., of that essential part of the liturgical structure of the Lord's Day which embodies and expresses the *paschal* character of Sunday, and constitutes thus the preparation finding its fulfillment in the Divine Liturgy.<sup>59</sup>

The LC-OCA identified several inconsistencies in the celebrations of the services from one parish to the next, leading to the question, "how can the celebration of Sunday be restored to the fullness of its meaning?" The LC-OCA's proposal outlined principles that would

57 I am deeply indebted to OCA Chancery staff members Alex Liberovsky, archivist of the OCA, and David Lucs, Assistant to the Chancellor for Communication and Development, for furnishing me with the contents of the Liturgical Commission files archived at the Orthodox Church in America in Syosset, NY. The contents will hereafter be cited as LC-OCA, along with the particular component and date.

58 LC-OCA, Letter from Schmemmann to members, September 1979.

59 LC-OCA, TD, "The Liturgical Celebration of Sunday, the Lord's Day," no date or author is provided, but a related document, minutes from the meeting of the LC-OCA in September 1979, had assigned this task to Schmemmann, rendering his authorship probable.

guide any recommendations for the liturgical celebrations of the Lord's Day. The first principle comes from the nature of the OCA as an autocephalous church. The church's calling is to "restore the Orthodox liturgical tradition to its true meaning," provided that all resulting actions are "faithful to the genuine and universal tradition of Orthodoxy," and practical.<sup>60</sup> The second principle called for discernment in studying the Church's liturgical tradition so that a real restoration of the underlying meaning would be made instead of an "adjustment" or "compromise." The direct object of the endeavor was the parish, and the purpose was not to "innovate," but rather to "purify" Orthodox worship.

The theological principles guiding the attempted restoration in this proposal clearly originate (at least in part) from the theological framework articulated by the bishops of the Russian Church in 1905.<sup>61</sup> The role of the OCA's autocephaly in this work is integral to the LC-OCA's understanding of their mission. As an independent Church, with no Mother Church abroad to answer to, the leaders of the OCA clearly understood their position as opportune. The document's author essentially defined their task as a vocation in determining the anthropological and sociological needs of the American context in worship. The second principle was the restoration of meaning, with diligent assurances that the new forms would contain the theological fullness inherent in the tradition. This concept appears frequently in Schmemmann's writings on liturgical reform in the Orthodox Church mentioned elsewhere. The content of the work, especially with its eschatological emphasis, betrays the influence of Alexander Schmemmann.<sup>62</sup>

An order of Great Vespers is included with the packet of materi-

60 *Ibid.*, 2.

61 LC-OCA, TD, "The Liturgical Celebration of Sunday, the Lord's Day." The pertinent text reads: "Already in 1905, virtually all Russian bishops in their 'opinions' written for the Russian Pre-Conciliar Commission acknowledged the alarming decay of the liturgical life and the urgent need for its radical restoration and purification."

62 Schmemmann is listed as the chairman of the LC-OCA in many of the documents, and vice-chairman on another.

als. Its contents reveal a departure from the rite in the *textus receptus* and include some changes present in accompanying documents. The proposed ordo with its changes is outlined in the chart below:<sup>63</sup>

<b>Liturgical Unit</b>	<b>Modifications in New Forms</b>
<b>Great Vespers</b>	
Usual Beginning (Invitatory)	
Psalm 104	Responsorial refrains are intercalated, taken from the psalm
Great Litany (Synapte)	
Collect prayer and ekphonesis	In practice, the collect is omitted
First Kathisma of Psalter	
Prayer	Usually recited quietly during entrance
Psalms 140 (141) and 141 (142)	A responsorial refrain, "Hear me, o Lord!" is added after the singing of the first portion of the psalm, with verses chanted by the chanter
Psalms 129 (130) and 116 (117)	Usual intercalation of stichera
Entrance with censer (thurible)/Phos Iaron	
Prokeimenon	Additional psalm verses are added
OT, NT, or Gospel Reading	The Gospel is taken only if the Resurrectional Vigil is not served
Kataxioson	
Evening Litany with aiteseis	Collect prayers are added
Aposticha	
Canticle of Simeon and Trisagion Prayers	
Dismissal	Only if Vespers is served alone

63 See Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours*, 278–79, for a complete listing of the components and order of Great Vespers.

<i>Liturgical Unit</i>	<i>Modifications in New Forms</i>
<b>The Order of the Resurrection or Festal Vigil</b>	
Psalm 118 or Polyeleos (Psalms 134–135 [135–136] with Psalm 136 [137] added during Lent	All of the psalm verses are included, with “Alleluia!” sung as the refrain after each
Megalynarion	On feast days only
Eulogitaria	On Sundays only
Prokeimenon/Let everything that breathes praise the Lord	
Gospel of Resurrection or Feast	Prayer of the Gospel is read aloud
Resurrection Troparia	On Sundays only
Prayer of Intercession/Collect Prayer	
Dismissal	Dismissal

This proposal seems to fulfill the principles of restoring the liturgy as elucidated in the *Lord's Day* proposal. First, the tradition of singing responsorial refrains inserted between the verses of the psalms is restored. This restoration was advanced in many of the related documents.<sup>64</sup> Many of the presidential collect prayers are returned and read aloud. The author supported the value of the prayers by quoting Simeon of Thessalonika, who presumably thought of the prayers as “paraphrases” of the psalm they originally completed in the extinct office of the Great Church, containing the psalms’ thoughts and words.<sup>65</sup> The packet also included a summary of Miguel Arranz’s study on the prayers from the Eucho-

64 LC-OCA, TD, “Part One: The Lord’s Day: Vespers,” simply calls for the restoration since it was done “in the past.” Uspensky’s work clearly showed that this practice became popular when the neo-Sabaitic Typikon was adopted by Mount Athos (Arranz, “N.D. Uspensky: The Office of the All-Night Vigil,” 182). David Anderson’s LC-OCA document (TD), “Reflections Concerning the Present Condition of Worship on Sunday,” advocates the re-insertion of all the psalm verses so that the fullness of the theology would be liturgically proclaimed in the assembly.

65 LC-OCA, TD, “Part One: The Lord’s Day: Vespers.”

logion.<sup>66</sup> The Gospel was added to Great Vespers, presumably to accommodate parishes that did not desire to add the resurrection office. The *ektene* is completely omitted from Vespers.

A proposal for a *Parish Vigil* by Paul Meyendorff helps to explain the appending of the resurrection office to the end of Great Vespers in the *Lord's Day* proposal above.<sup>67</sup> The *Parish Vigil* proposal is essentially identical to the *Lord's Day*, with only a few minor differences. Since Meyendorff attributes the proposal to Schmemmann during the latter's tenure as chairman of the LC-OCA, it can be assumed that Meyendorff's explanations come from the original proposal.

Elements from the cathedral Vigil were selected primarily to restore the high point of reading the Gospel pertinent to the resurrection or feast, and also to incorporate classically "cathedral" elements of worship, such as singing, incensations, processions, and the participation of the people in singing the refrains. None of the appended elements corresponds to the hour of the day, so the specific references to morning classically belonging to Matins are not added to the evening service. This proposal simply draws from elements clearly of cathedral provenance to begin to restore a more full weekly liturgical celebration. Only a few elements need to be tweaked for this to become a fully viable proposal. The *anabathmoi* should be inserted after the *megalynarion* on festal occasions, as has been done in Meyendorff's version. The Troparia sung after the Gospel should be prescribed for feast days, as special versicles of ecclesiastical poetry explicating the theme of the feast are prescribed for most festal celebrations. The *Parish Vigil* proposal did not suggest any changes for Great Vespers. The *Lord's Day* ordo for Great Vespers with its modifications is preferable, especially the omission of the *ektene*, since the prayer for intercession at the end

66 LC-OCA, TD, "Study and Recommendation concerning the Prayers of Vespers." The cited study by Arranz is "Les prières sacerdotales des vêpres byzantines," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 37/1 (1971), 85–124.

67 Paul Meyendorff, "Saturday Evening Worship: A Proposal," *Jacob's Well*, Spring 1995 (New York: Diocese of New York and New Jersey, Orthodox Church in America, 1995). Available online at <http://www.jacwell.org>.

of the Vigil portion contains all of the themes of the *ektene* within one prayer unit.

While Meyendorff clearly favors this proposal, he did mention two other alternatives. The first is simply to restore the Saturday night Vigil. Meyendorff believes that this is not a "viable option," as the service would be sparsely attended, and the abbreviated form inherited by the OCA would propagate the anomaly of celebrating a morning service in the evening.<sup>68</sup> Meyendorff's reservations are supported by the history of the Vigil in Russia and the particular circumstances of the OCA. An initiative to restore a form completely out of its context will not renew the liturgical life of the Church. The second option calls for simply adding the Gospel reading to Vespers, which both restores the resurrection Gospel and retains the brevity of the service. This accommodation was also made in the *Lord's Day* proposal. Meyendorff clearly favors the *Parish Vigil (Lord's Day)*, which creatively appends a unit within the tradition to another core unit. The *Parish Vigil* redaction does not address the issues of whether or not Matins should then be celebrated on Sunday mornings, the restoration of the reading of prayer collects aloud, and the singing of the Canon, a liturgical unit which has clearly risen to prominence in the Byzantine tradition even though it is currently in disarray in its execution in many parishes. The proposal implies that the *Parish Vigil* model is already "successfully" used in some parishes, which is certainly feasible since Schmemmann's article in 1973 clearly shows that some parishes were celebrating such a service.

A new model for Saturday evening worship has been published and implemented by New Skete Monastery in Cambridge, New York.<sup>69</sup> This service differs from the *Parish Vigil* above in many ways, and shares a limited amount of similarity with the *Lord's Day*. The difference is due to the fact that it was not designed to be a model for parish communities, but to meet the specific needs of

68 Meyendorff asks, "does it make sense to say 'Let us complete our morning prayer' at 7:30 in the evening?"

69 *A Book of Prayers* (Cambridge, NY: Monks of New Skete, 1988).

New Skete Monastery.<sup>70</sup> Their *Book of Prayers* includes an extended introduction which elucidates the reasoning behind their particular ordo. The core change involves the appending of the “office of the myrrh-bearing women”<sup>71</sup> to Vespers, and its description is worth reproducing here:

On Saturday evenings, in preparation for the Lord’s Day, we expand the evening office by adding to it the office of the myrrh-bearing women, which contains, among other things, the *polyeleos* psalms, the resurrection Troparia commemorating these women, and the resurrectional gospel. In the received tradition this office is inserted into the structure of Sunday matins, but by combining it with vespers, we have an appropriate and very striking preparation for Sunday without abusing liturgical principles by celebrating matins on Saturday evening. (The truly *all-night* vigils are, today, probably celebrated regularly only in the larger of the Old World monasteries.) What is then left for Sunday morning is a manageable and strictly morning office.<sup>72</sup>

The introduction goes on to state that the same office is appended to Vespers for feasts as well. The skeleton of the New Skete model for Saturday evening worship is thus essentially identical to both the *Lord’s Day* and the *Parish Vigil*, with the additional aspect of accounting for the celebration of Matins on Sunday morning.

71 In an unpublished paper (TM) titled “The Monastery and Applied Liturgical Renewal: The experience at New Skete,” Brother Stavros explains the context of the monastery: “New Skete has always been a working community. ... We monks erected all our first buildings by our own labor; we began with farm animals and eventually took up raising and training dogs and continue to market gourmet foods. ... All this physical labor, necessary for our financial survival, limits our choral prayer to the offices of Matins before the workday begins and Vespers in the evening. It also prompted us to look back at the extinct cathedral offices of Jerusalem and Constantinople for simpler forms for our adaptation to the 21st century, rather than use an Athonite model. We were and are not able to schedule and sing a two- or three hour Matins, which includes two kathismata.” I am grateful to Brother Stavros for furnishing a copy of his paper, delivered at St Nersess Armenian Seminary’s 40th Anniversary Symposium (*Liturgy in Context*) in September 2002.

71 Identical to the “Resurrectional Vigil” in the *Lord’s Day* proposal of LC-OCA.

72 *A Book of Prayers*, Introduction, xxxii.

New Skete's reform goes far beyond this particular model, as the entire structure and contents of both Vespers and Matins have been modified for particular reasons. The following charts will present only the resurrectional and festal orders of New Skete's Vespers:<sup>73</sup>

<b>TRADITIONAL VESPERS</b>	<b>NEW SKETE VESPERS</b>
Fixed Opening	Lucernarium (Behold Christ, the Light of the Universe)
Invitatory Psalm 103	Phos Ilaron
Seven Vespereal Prayers said silently by priest	Two Prayers of light
Great Synapte	Invitatory and Psalm 103 (104)
Psalmody	Two Prayers
Psalms 140, 141, 129, 116 with intercalated strophes (incensation)	Psalmody (Kathisma 1)/Two Collect Prayers (the first of the Antiphon)
Entrance with thurible/Introit Prayer	Incense Psalms (141, 142, 130, 117), all psalm verses included, intercalated strophes
Entrance Hymn/Phos Ilaron	Prayer of Incense Psalms
Prokeimenon	Prokeimenon
Three Readings (feasts only)	Reading (not specified, not limited to feasts)
Ektene	Kataxioson
Kataxioson	Aposticha
Great Synapte with aiteiseis/Peace/Prayer of Inclination	Canticle of Simeon
Lite (feasts )	Trisagion/Troparia

73 The New Skete contents are taken from *A Book of Prayers*, 49–111. The traditional model of the *textus receptus* follows Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours*, 278–82.

Aposticha	<b>OFFICE OF MYRRH-BEARERS</b> Polyeleos (no verses omitted, "Alleluia" refrain after each verse) Prayer of the Polyeleos Eulogitaria (Troparia of Resurrection) Let Everything that Breathes Prayer of Gospel and Second Prayer Gospel reading (read by senior priest or hierarch) The Canticle of Moses (Exodus 15:1–8) Resurrectional Troparia
Nunc Dimittis (Canticle of Simeon)	Synapte and Aitisis/Prayer
Trisagion/Troparia	Prayer of Inclination and second prayer
Dismissal	Dismissal

The structure and contents of the New Skete Saturday evening office comprise a new form, seemingly radically different from the traditional service of the *textus receptus*. Each change corresponds to particular liturgical principles articulated in the introduction, and they will be presented in order.

New Skete Vespers opens with the Lucernarium, a ceremony borrowed from the Byzantine Liturgy of Presanctified Gifts that is not a part of the traditional service. This was changed in order to open the service by "welcoming the light that is Christ himself,"<sup>74</sup> including the lighting of all the lamps and tapers in the church from that moment. This ceremony is of cathedral provenance, indicating a trend of appropriating historically cathedral elements from the tradition that either appear elsewhere or have fallen into disuse.

The Lucernarium is followed by the singing of *Phos Ilaron* and two prayers of light. The great synapte, which traditionally follows the invitatory psalm in the *textus receptus*, has been completely suppressed in this office, along with the *ektene*. Many of the prayers prescribed in the New Skete ordo belong to the "seven Vesperal

74 *A Book of Prayers*, Introduction, xxxi.

prayers said silently by the priest" of the traditional rite.<sup>75</sup> The litanies have been reserved until the end of the service to remain "consistent with propriety and the ancient dictum: *praise, then petition*."<sup>76</sup> The restoration of the collect prayers reflects a bold decision on the part of New Skete. Some of the prayers came from the (now extinct) *sung offices* of the Great Church of Constantinople (similar to the *Lord's Day* proposal), and others are free compositions of their own, some of which are based on the ancient Syrian tradition.<sup>77</sup> The monastery was clearly aided by liturgical scholars in their process of positioning the prayers, which came into the monastic office during the initial Studite synthesis (reviewed above), forced into one group as other elements of the rites took precedence in the new form. The introduction explicitly credits Juan Mateos, Robert Taft, and Miguel Arranz for providing the historical background which inspired the monks' practical application of the components.<sup>78</sup> The restoration was made in order to "focus the community in prayer throughout the service ... acting as their collect."<sup>79</sup> While this restorative measure removes much of the repetition of the different litanies and facilitates the fullness of the collect prayers, the change experienced by the veteran worshipper would certainly be significant.

As mentioned above, the appending of the office of the Myrrhbearers to Vespers results in a strikingly similar proposal to the *Lord's Day/Parish Vigil* proposal above. The main difference between the two is the notable inclusion of the Cantic of Moses.<sup>80</sup> This ancient song of the Church provides a foreshadowing of the

75 In practice, the prayers are actually recited silently by the priest while the singers finish Psalm 103 (104), and can be completed while the deacon intones the Great Synapte (assuming a deacon is present, which is not always the case).

76 *A Book of Prayers*, Introduction, xxxi.

77 *Ibid.*, xxx.

78 *Ibid.*, xxiii. Brother Stavros credited Arranz's studies in particular, namely "Les prières presbytérales des matines byzantines," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 37 and 38 (Rome, 1971–81).

79 Brother Stavros, "The Monastery and Applied Liturgical Renewal," 15.

80 *A Book of Prayers*, 98–100.

resurrection from the Old Testament. Its addition provides a particular flavor to this portion of the Myrrh-bearers office. Following the reading of the resurrection Gospel (chanted by the celebrant), traditionally the pinnacle of the entire liturgical celebration,<sup>81</sup> the people hear the story of the Lord's deliverance of his people from the Old Testament, and respond with a responsorial refrain after each verse. The rubrics simply say "and the refrain appointed for the celebration," which on Saturday evening is normally "Glory to Your Holy Resurrection, O Lord." This is followed by the resurrectional Troparia, and the synapte which concludes the prayers for the evening. The structure clearly adds weight to the proclamation of Scripture, favoring the canticle over the long-established Canon, but retaining the responsorial elements within the Canon by singing the refrains between the verses, instead of the individual Troparia. This constitutes a significant change, as the canticles are rarely read in church practice. The move was clearly intentional, as the monks sought to restore the balance between the Scripture and ecclesiastical poetry by reducing the total number of strophes in the entire office.<sup>82</sup>

This serves as a preview of the New Skete Matins ordo, which drastically abbreviates the Canon. Instead, the Canticle of the Three Youths (Daniel 3:57–88; 56) is chanted, and the assembly responds with the heirmos and refrain of the tone of the week (from the Octoechos) or the feast.<sup>83</sup> The Canticle of the Theotokos is retained, but the rest of the odes of the Canon are omitted.

The impetus for the reform of Saturday evening worship at New Skete developed from the need to structure liturgical offices that fit the particular needs of the community. In this particular case, the

81 Taft, *Liturgy of the Hours*, 52. Egeria's testimony of the reading of the resurrection Gospel and the important role of the bishop in proclaiming the resurrection to the people has clearly been retained as an integral element in all models of the Byzantine Vigil.

82 Brother Stavros, "The Monastery and Applied Liturgical Renewal," 10. This also explains the reading assigned after the Prokeimenon each Saturday, an innovative rubric.

83 *A Book of Prayers*, 319–24.

works of modern scholars inspired broad and significant reform, and the monastery boldly implemented the changes. Their freedom in implementing such stark changes was founded upon their "deep and passionate interest in liturgy," and their resistance to "tendencies (towards) museum-keeping."<sup>84</sup> The most provocative qualities of their reform are the obvious preference for elements of cathedral provenance, and the appropriation of liturgical units currently used in other services and seasons, or no longer used at all. This service has not been designed to serve as a paradigm for parishes of the OCA. Monasteries have traditionally enjoyed a certain amount of freedom in creatively arranging their own liturgical ordo to fit the needs and realities of their communities.<sup>85</sup>

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, church leaders and liturgical scholars have warned of a liturgical crisis with potentially catastrophic ramifications. The history of Byzantine liturgy testifies to the ability of church leaders to creatively respond to ecclesiastical crises through the creation, modification, and appropriation of existing and new liturgical models. The actions of leaders such as St Theodore the Studite were founded upon an eminently pastoral approach to ministry. They clearly understood the abbreviated maxim *lex orandi est lex credendi*, as they ensured that the *lex orandi* would contain the forms and content necessarily to retain and proclaim the orthodox faith, and facilitate for the assembly an authentic eschatological encounter with the risen Lord. The bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church adopted the same mindset in beginning the process of reform by calling for liturgical forms and contents that would meet the needs of the people, and ensure that the liturgical services allowed the faithful to have access to their risen Lord. They consistently emphasized the All-Night Vigil celebrated on Saturday evenings because of its importance in the weekly cycle. Their work subtly identified Saturday evening wor-

84 Ibid., Introduction, xxiv.

85 Taft, "The Byzantine Office in the Prayerbook of New Skete," 338. This fact is certainly supported by the historical background to the development of a new Vigil provided above.

ship as the key bridge by which the faithful would proceed to the eucharistic assembly on Sunday morning, and some of them even offered modest suggestions as to what new form the Vigil might take to fulfill its purpose in the weekly cycle. While their work was tragically paused by the Bolshevik Revolution, it was brought to the West and expanded by liturgists such as Alexander Schmemmann, Juan Mateos, and others, who adopted the same mindset in focusing the attention of the reform on restoring the ecclesial nature of worship.

The evidence overwhelmingly reveals a great need for the renewal of Saturday evening worship in the OCA today. Two seemingly viable models can be projected as paradigms for the Church, namely the *Lord's Day/Parish Vigil* originally proposed by the LC-OCA (and anew by Paul Meyendorff), and the more extensive Saturday Vespers as celebrated at New Skete monastery. Many of the obstacles to the establishment of new, successful forms of Saturday evening worship are the same today as they were for the Russian Church in 1905, and the OCA in 1964. The chief problem lies in the Church's understanding of Tradition, and the subsequent reception of proposed models by clergy and laity alike. The problem has been accurately articulated by Peter Galadza as follows:

The entire history of Byzantine liturgy is all too often assessed from the perspective of the last five hundred years. It has become a topos to state that Eastern worship never changes...The problem...is that many Eastern Christians have come to believe that liturgical immobility is constitutive of their very identity.<sup>86</sup>

Galadza concludes his argument by asserting that any contemporary eastern Christian would not recognize the Vespers celebrated in ninth-century Hagia Sophia.<sup>87</sup> The select examples presented here clearly support this argument. Perhaps this is the reason Schmemmann exercised such restraint in promoting or implementing liturgical reforms in his lectures and writings. The *Lord's*

<sup>86</sup> Galadza, "Restoring the Icon," 246.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 246–47.

*Day/Parish Vigil* model presented above, of which Schmemmann was apparently the primary creator, is less radical in terms of the degree of change when compared to the Vespers of New Skete.

Such obstacles, however, have always presented a challenge to church leaders throughout the history of the Church. The Church's tradition contains a living witness to the principles of reform as presented here. History shows that reforms have been able to enliven and strengthen the life of the Church when they respond to particular challenges incarnated in real contexts, and contain the same presence of Christ in language, form, and ritual. The suggestions offered by some of the bishops of the Russian Church were clearly in conformity with these principles, and their work continued in the West is manifest in these two proposals.

Before new actions are recommended, a few issues need to be addressed. First, the principles for restoration need to be articulated and adopted anew. The theological foundations articulated by the LC-OCA in 1979–80 should become the criteria by which all proposals are evaluated. These principles are part of the vocation of the autocephalous OCA to restore the Church's liturgy in conformity with her tradition, and the priority of restoring the meaning of the liturgical services as an eschatological encounter with the Lord. In evaluating possible new models, the Church needs to consider the reason the cathedral tradition has been openly favored in all proposals. While it seems natural to appropriate popular and participatory liturgical components, the legacy of the monastic tradition, particularly its heritage of silent prayer, and its abundance of ecclesiastical poetry should be reconsidered in new models. A tendency to idealize elements of any particular tradition without discerning its correspondence to modern circumstances could lead to further liturgical corruption.

The final element is to define whether or not the Saturday evening assembly is intended to be a Vigil. A Vigil service implies staying awake throughout the night in anticipation of meeting the risen Lord in the Eucharist the next morning. The concept of keeping watch throughout the night is thoroughly entrenched in the

biblical and liturgical tradition of the Church. While an All-Night Vigil might not be practical for most parishes on a weekly basis, the principles should allow for the possibility of inserting some type of authentic Vigil into the cycle of the liturgical year outside of Holy Week.

With all of these factors considered, the *Lord's Day/Parish Vigil* proposal and the Vespers of New Skete should certainly be received as viable options for Saturday evening worship, as they appropriate elements from the cathedral tradition of evening worship without violating the integrity of the monastic tradition. These models effectively facilitate an authentic encounter of the faithful with their risen Lord in worship, to be crowned by the Eucharist the following morning.