

WESTERN ORTHODOXY: An Innovation or a Reclamation?

By Fr. Stephen Empson

(Note: Fr. Stephen was an American priest of the *L'Eglise Catholique Orthodoxe de France*. When this article originally appeared in the 1980's in the journal *Axios*, this community was under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Romania.)

In response to a great number of requests for a clarification of the terminology *Western Orthodox* largely from the readership of *Axios*, we present this paper which touches upon three major aspects of Western Orthodoxy. The first consideration is ecclesiological by nature: the historical position of Western Orthodoxy in the Universal legacy of liturgical materials which issued during the first flowering of Western Orthodoxy, including the sixth-century Mass structures of Paris and Rome. We close this paper with a discussion of the current state of Western Orthodox affairs, including brief comments upon the one Western Orthodox Diocese now in existence.

For a number of reasons which are quite obvious, most Orthodox clergy and faithful have either never heard of Western Orthodoxy, or at best could not offer a workable description of it. Probably first among these reasons is the fact that the published writings on Western Orthodoxy would scarcely fill a library shelf. And most of this output exists in languages other than English. Another reason for the lack of general knowledge of this subject, at least in English-speaking lands, is the fact that the very few Orthodox catechisms and concise histories of Orthodoxy, even should they mention activity in the Christian West Roman Empire during the first millennium, do not leave the reader with an outright impression of a thousand-year Western Orthodox era. There is also a general tendency among the Eastern Orthodox to view things Western with various degrees of repugnance, perhaps forgetting that the Christian West was not always *Roman Catholic*. Most obvious of all is the fact that since the great schism of 1054, Orthodoxy was at first exclusively Eastern, and to this day remains overwhelmingly Eastern. And since the proclamation of Balsamon [1] the Eastern Church has been based liturgically upon the much evolved Byzantine Rite [2]. All of this quite naturally leads the average person into a comfortable belief that Orthodoxy was always Eastern and Byzantine Rite, and perhaps that this disproportion in the universality, or catholicity if you will, of Orthodoxy must be maintained forever.

This brings us to our first general topic: the historical position of the Western Orthodox Church. Roman Catholic seminaries have always taught that the first thousand years of the Christian West constitute Roman Catholic Church history. In a sense, of course, there is truth in such an assumption, for the Christian West was indeed in the spiritual jurisdiction of Rome, and was indeed Catholic. The Bishop of Rome was Patriarch of the West, and canonically the first-among-equals of the Orthodox episcopate [3]. However, this understanding of history is partial [4].

Orthodox seminaries have always featured courses in Church history centered upon Byzantine and Slavic evolution, and there are countless excellent texts written from this viewpoint. Rare or nonexistent are courses entitled, for example, "The History of Orthodoxy in England," or "The Evolution of Orthodox Liturgical Music in Spain". The few specialists in these and other aspects of Western liturgical development must largely refer to published material by past and present non-Orthodox scholars.

We consider our Holy Orthodox Church of Christ to be **One, Holy, Orthodox, Catholic, Universal and Apostolic**. Each of these characteristics, or parameters if you will, of our Church would require many printed pages to fully, or even adequately, describe. Our Church represents and includes within itself a **fullness** which in some cases remains to be revealed and in others escapes close scrutiny and human attempts at categorization and conceptualism.

Among the characteristics of our Church which are not so elusive is its *universality*. Let us consider this term in the context of The Universal Church. A dictionary description will not suffice in this instance, although it is worth noting that in our Webster the word "universality" indicates "a universal comprehensiveness" and "unrestricted versatility or power of adaptation or comprehension". As far as these descriptions go, they are appropriate. Certainly they refer to the period of the undivided Orthodox Church of the first millennium, which was indeed comprehensive: the Church was Eastern and Western, extending to the far corners of the entire Roman Empire. This was Our Lord's expectation [5] and the task of "evangelization" quickly gained momentum after Pentecost [6]. Even in Apostolic days we can speak of the universal Church, although the balance between East and West took on a definite shape

during the post-Apostolic era. The first Bishops or overseers took over the work of the Apostles, and inherited the Apostolic grace. Episcopal sees rooted themselves in the great centers of population: Rome, Antioch, Constantinople and Alexandria, or course, but also in Toledo, Milan, Vienna, Lyons, Paris, Poitiers, Canterbury, York, Whitby and Lindisfarne. The Church was universal, comprehensive, and certainly versatile.

We read of the great hierarchs of the East: of Saints Basil, Cyril, John Chrysostom, Photios, Athanasios and Ignatios. We also read of the great hierarchs of the West: of Saints Ireney of Lyons, Germain of Auxerre, Hilary of Poitiers, Gregory of Rome, Ambrose of Milan, Augustine of Canterbury and Wilfrid of York. As we study the exemplary lives and works of the Eastern Monastic Fathers, and pray that they will intercede to God in our behalf, we can be assured that Saints Benedict of Nursia, Martin of Tours, Odo of Cluny, Benedict Bishop of Wearmouth, Boniface of Fulda and Columba of Iona are entirely at our disposition. The absolute joy of the resurrected Christ which inspired and impelled the foundation of the Studion Monastery in Constantinople also inspired and impelled the foundation of St. Denis Abbey, Melrose Abbey and Marmoutier. Even before Isidore and Melitios projected the great Hagia Sophia, the Merovingian architects had designed a great cathedral dedicated to Saint Stephen in Paris [7]. Such was the universality, comprehensiveness and versatility of Orthodoxy; such was the balance which once prevailed. And so it is that we speak of the undivided Church: so rich in the various local expressions and manifestations of **One** Lord, **One** Faith, **One** Baptism [8].

This ideal balance, this magnificent diversity within an absolute unity of Faith and Dogma could have been established and maintained only with Divine Assistance: the intimate participation of The Holy Spirit. This Divine Counsel guaranteed the undivided Church against doctrinal error. The Ecumenical Councils included Eastern and Western Fathers, who gathered together from the far points of the Empire in order to defend Orthodoxy against heresy. The Fathers deliberated, and framed the canons, always guarded and guided by the Holy Spirit. The Bishops, from East and West, were equal in grace, and the faithful, Eastern and Western, constituted the “conscience” of the Church. As long as this concept of ecclesiology prevailed, the Holy Spirit maintained the Church undivided, and the Church expanded as naturally, successfully and harmoniously as could be expected. This long period of harmony and balance gradually faded within the undivided Church in direct proportion to the gradual loss of conciliarity which occurred as the Patriarchate of Rome became the papacy and the well-known innovations and corruptions began. Although we understand that 1054 is the formal date of the Western schism, the seeds of non-conciliarity were planted in Rome long before, as we shall discover shortly.

As we now consider certain major examples of liturgical structures which took root in the undivided Church, we can continue to rejoice in the Church’s universality and power of adaptability.

There is a vast treasury of Western Orthodox liturgical materials, to a degree unexplored and to an even greater degree unused. Few of those who have worked on these liturgical materials in the past have described them in the context of Orthodoxy. Yet these materials are the very substance and structure of the Orthodox West from Post-Apostolic times henceforth. The liturgical structures and the music which adorned them command our reverence, inasmuch as they form an integral part of the written Tradition of our Church, along with the Holy Scriptures and the dogmatic and disciplinary canons. We dare to put the early liturgical structures on this plane because in each instance we have the results of the intimate participation of the Holy Spirit. Certain men in the course of time cooperated with the Holy Spirit and the Scriptures took form. Later, other men sought the participation of the Holy Spirit in order to determine the “canonical” and “deutero-canonical” books, and to point out those that were spurious. In issuing the Holy Canons at the Ecumenical Councils, we are familiar with the terminology, “It seemed right to the Holy Spirit and to us...” It was the same Holy Spirit who inspired and guided the formation of the liturgical structures of the early, forming, shaping Church.

The joyous reality of this veritable Divine participation in the formation of all the early liturgical structures of the Church should be a major consideration in the study of Liturgical Theology, yet we do not observe any such emphasis [9]. This is perhaps the principle reason that the early Orthodox liturgical structures are researched for the most part by the non-Orthodox, from a purely archeological point of view. Of course, there is a major exception to this situation, which we will discuss at the appropriate time.

We have discussed the *fullness*, the *universality*, the *versatility* and power of adaptation of our Church as it took root in the East and in the West. We considered Eastern and Western Bishops, Confessors and Abbots; we see that Byzantine domes and Gothic spires together led men of old to the contemplation and aspiration of things Divine; we

discovered that The Rule of Saint Benedict and The Rule of the Master, for example, are just as Orthodox, if you will, as the Rules of Pachomius and Saint Basil. It is necessary, before discussing actual liturgies, to suggest a cut-off date, which will enable us to confine our considerations to that period in history during which such liturgies evolved and flourished. We will suggest the year 800 as an ideal cut-off date. In this year Charlemagne was crowned as the first Western Emperor. Charlemagne condemned the Ecumenical Council of 787 in 794. During the pontificates of Popes Stephen III, Stephen IV and Hadrian I (752-795) the Patriarchate of Rome, for all practical purposes, freed itself from the East, and pursued its independent course. Year by year, in stages and degrees, the Orthodox Patriarchate of Rome became the monolithic Roman Papacy. One of the first major proofs of non-conciliarity were Rome's efforts at uniformity of liturgical practice (then and ever since).

Charlemagne and Alcuin were given the task, by Rome, of replacing all local liturgical structures in the West with the local liturgical structure of Rome. This is the type of legislation which has come to characterize the Roman Church; unilateral and devoid of the participation of the Holy Spirit. No council, Eastern or Western, was called by anyone concerning this liturgical innovation of the ninth century.

And so it is that we suggest the year 800 as the end of the flowering of ideal Western Orthodoxy, as one by one the beautiful, effective and sacred liturgical structures of the West (save the Roman) were torn out by their roots, the seeds of which had been planted many centuries earlier by Saints and The Holy Spirit. Suddenly, the worship structures of millions disappeared from cathedrals, churches and abbeys and began to take their new places on library shelves. Genuine liturgical development ceased. Speculation and caprice followed, and even the Roman Rite in time became infused with Gallican uses [10]. At the same time the archetypal Roman liturgical chants assumed layer after layer of Gallican stylization [11] to form a tradition now known somewhat erroneously as Gregorian.

During the period of Western Orthodox florescence, the principle liturgical structures formed what we now call the Gallican family. Included in this family are the Gallican Rite, the Mozarabic Rite, the Ambrosian Rite, the West African and the Celtic Rites.

Coeval with the Gallican structures of Western Europe was the Roman Rite in the City of Rome and its environs. A number of secondary sources on the Roman Rite have presented this structure as being somewhat removed from the Gallican family from the point of view of content, style and focus. This has been the result of comparing more recent Roman MSS with older Gallican MSS, for example. We have even seen the sixth century Gallican Mass set side-by-side with the Tridentine Mass for the purpose of an accurate appraisal of the differences! The Roman structure, by the time it became "codified" by a liturgical commission under Pope Pius V in 1570, had not only taken on a considerable amount of Gallican uses [12], but had also lost some of its own original elements [13]. It is beyond the scope of this paper to present in corresponding columns the Orthodox liturgical structures of Rome, Antioch, Constantinople, Alexandria, Paris, Toledo and Milan, for the purpose of comparison. But it is sufficient to mention that in doing so, the scholar must select a particular date, such as 500 or 600, in order to arrive at reasonable conclusions concerning the differences and similarities of the several rites. From a theological point of view, we can consider the liturgical development throughout the Empire to be truly representative from the post-Apostolic period to the sixth or even the eighth century. It was a natural, uncomplicated development, which perhaps significantly took place during the period of the Councils. It is more than significant that the Council Fathers neither deliberated over current liturgical use nor framed any canons in this regard.

If the first eight centuries of the Christian era give us the most ideal picture of Orthodox *catholicity*, *universality*, *comprehensibility* and *adaptability*, from both ecclesiological and liturgical standpoints, thus presenting a truly Spirit-inspired balance within *one* Church, then it would seem that these very liturgical structures should once again take their rightful, legitimate place within the same *one* Church.

With this in mind, and having decided upon an ideal, truly representative period of liturgical development, for our purpose in the Orthodox West, we can touch upon the legacy of pre-Carolingian Christianity.

Let us begin with an exposition and brief history of the Gallican Rite which is actually celebrated in the parishes of the Orthodox Church of France. This we call the Divine Liturgy according to Saint Germain, Bishop of Paris (555-576). When we say "according to" we do not indicate actual authorship, for no early liturgies were written or composed by a single individual.

Saint Germain was born in Autun, France in 492, and became Abbot of the monastery of Saint-Symphorien in Autun. In 555 he was appointed Bishop of Paris by King Childebert [14]. This same year he outlined and commended upon the Divine Liturgy celebrated in the capital (in a style similar to the Cabasilas Commentary) and sent his observations back to the Autun monastery. For 1154 years, the *Letters of Saint Germain* remained in the monastery. In 1709, this precious MS was discovered by two Maurist Benedictine liturgiologists, Dom Edmond Martene and Dom Ursin Durand [15]. They published the *Letters* in their *Thesaurus Novus Anecdorum* in 1717. This was reproduced in **Patrologia Latina**, Volume 72, wherein also appears the biography of Saint Germain by Saint Venance Fortunat (535-600), Bishop of Poitiers. Pierre Le Brun (1661-1729), an Oratorian priest, also worked on the *Letters* and published them with commentary in 1777 [16]. Other Merovingian MS serve to substantiate the content of the Gallican liturgical structures; these fit into four convenient categories. Let us first mention the writings of the Church Fathers of Gaul:

- Saint Sulpice Severe (5th c)
- Saint John Cassian (5th c)
- Saint Gennadius (5th c)
- Saint Gregory of Tours (6th c)
- Saint Venance Fortunat (6th c)
- Saint Avit of Vienne (6th c)
- Saint Sidonius Apollinarius (6th c)
- Saint Faustus of Riez (6th c)
- Saint Caesar of Arles (6th c)
- Saint Aurelian of Arles (6th c)

each of which amplify particular aspects of the liturgical structures and church life in general during the period we now consider [17].

Secondly, we mention the local Councils of Gaul, the canons and minutes of which present valuable witnesses to contemporary liturgical practice:

- Council of Agde (509)
- Council of Lyons (517)
- Council of Vaison (529)
- Council of Macon (585)
- Council of Rouen (650)
- Council of Nantes (658)

and others, which also amplify certain aspects of church life and corroborate the manuscript of Saint Germain [18]. The writings of the Church Fathers and the Council canons and minutes are obviously closely related, and, in addition to their vivid portrayal of Merovingian church life, they give absolute testimony to the interdependence and unity that prevailed in Sixth and Seventh century Orthodoxy, a unity of Faith expressed and experienced within local liturgical structures.

Thirdly, we list a number of Missals and Sacramentaries. Although the actual order of the Mass, for example, is not given in these MSS such order is indirectly given. We will find Collects and Readings for the Temporal and Sanctoral cycles, all given in a particular order. The Post-Preceps Collect (Oratio) points to the Litany which precedes it. The Post-Nomina Collect points to the Diptychs which precede it, and so forth. Among the most interesting and valuable MSS in this category are

- Missale Gothico-Gallicanum (Autun Missal)
- Missale Gallicanum Vetus
- Sacramentarium Gallicanum [19]
- The Mone Missal [20]
- The Stowe Missal [21]
- Missale Francorum
- The Bobbio Missal

Fourthly, there are the Lectionaries and Antiphonaries which have the same interest and value as the Missals and Sacramentaries, in various degrees. Among the principle MSS we quote:

The Luxeuil Lectionary [22]
The Autun Lectionary [23]
The Bangor Antiphonary [24]

There are numerous published texts which cover the nineteenth and twentieth century research on The Divine Liturgy according to Saint Germain of Paris [25]. We now present the structure of this Liturgy:

Introit (Prelegendum)
Call to Silence (Silentium)
Trisagium (Aius)
Kyrie eleison
Canticle of Zachary (Propheta)
Collects (Orationes)
O.T. Reading (Propheta)
Gradual
Epistle (Apostolus)
Benedicite (Hymnum)
Thrice-Holy before Gospel (Aius ante Evangelium)
Gospel (Evangelium)
Thrice-Holy after Gospel (Sanctus post Evangelium)
Sermon (Homelias)
Catechumen exit (Catechuminum)
Litany (Preces)
Collect of the Litany (Post-Precem)
Great Entrance (Sonus et Laudes)
Diptychs (Diptycha)
Collect of the Diptychs (Post-Nomina)
Kiss of Peace
Collect of the Kiss of Peace (ad Pacem)
Preface and Sanctus (Contestatio)
Collect of the Sanctus (Post-Sanctus)
Institution (Qui pridie)
Breaking of Bread (Confectio)
Immixture (Commixtio)
The Lord's Prayer (Orationem Dominicam)
Communion
Tricanon (Trecanum)
Dismissal [26]

At first glance the Liturgy according to Saint Germain appears quite lengthy, but in fact our average celebrations, exclusive of extended sermon and communions, require one hour.

The Gallican-type liturgies contain many proper, or changeable prayers, all very expressive and often quite colorful. Each of these prayers points explicitly to the dominant theme of the Sunday, the Feast, or the Saint. For instance, in the Missale Gothico-Gallicanum, Feast of Saint Sernin, Bishop of Toulouse (November 29) we are given two opening Collects which serve to introduce the Feast didactically, a Post-Nomina, an Ad Pacem, and a Contestatio [27]. In the Sacramentarium Gallicanum, Feast of Saint Martin of Tours (November 11) we are given an O.T. Reading, Epistle, and Gospel, in addition to the five prayers just described. The terms "Sacramentary" and "Missale" each have their proper significant semantically, although the actual Sacramentaries and Missales in question are often similar in content, even including those parts proper to the Lectionaries. The Antiquissimum Lectionarium Gallicanum [28] contains readings for 42 Sundays and Feasts and for the ordination of Deacon and of Priest, each set of readings is followed by very interesting historical notes and observations. Fascinating among the ten introductory paragraphs to this Lectionary is the discussion of Advent Sundays, which in the early Orthodox

West numbered six, as in the East. Testimony from the Mozarabic and Ambrosian Sacramentaries are given, both of which give Propers for six Advent Sundays, in addition to a quotation from Canon 9 of the Council of Macon (585) which points indirectly to six Advent Sundays, “Ut a feria Sancti Martini (November 11) usque ad Natale Domini, secunda, Quarta *et sexta* Sabbati jejunetur, et sacrificia *auadragesimali* debeant ordine celebrari.”

Another Maurist Benedictine, Dom John Mabillon, in his “Investigation of the Gallican Use” [29], discusses the history of the Divine Office in the East and West, the origin and development of Western liturgical chant.

The Missale Francorum [30] presents the rubrics and texts for ordinations, consecrations and blessings. The six orders preliminary to the priesthood mentioned in the writings of Pope Caius of Rome (+296) are ostiarius, lector, exorcist, acolyte, subdeacon and deacon. The Missal Francorum presents these six orders, and in addition, the ordination of priests, the consecration of bishops, the consecration of nuns, the blessing of widows, the consecrations of altars, chalices and patens.

The Deacon of Lyons, Florus (+860), wrote extensively on many subjects concerning church life up to and including his own time, and took a prominent part in the public defense of Orthodoxy. Among his works we find “De actione Missae” [31] which, in describing the ceremonial (rubrical) aspect of the Gallican liturgy, serves to corroborate the content of the liturgy from still another viewpoint.

There is a vast literature on the Gallican liturgical structures. There is not space at this time to even list the primary sources properly, and as to the outstanding secondary sources we must be content to mention, in addition to Martene and Durand, Pierre Le Brun (+1729), an Oratorian Priest, who in 1777 published a treatise on the Gallican liturgy [32].

Even more vast is the literature on the Old Roman Rite, the most valuable testimony being contained in the numerous rescensions of three Sacramentaries: the Leonine, the Gelasian, and the Gregorian. Most of the Sacramentaries are of French and Swiss origin. Without elaborating on this subject, which has been widely covered by others, we will list four Gelasian Sacramentaries personally examined. The first is the Gelasian Sacramentary of Angouleme (GeA), a Merovingian MS now in the National Library in Paris, Latin Codex 816; the second is the Gelasian Sacramentary of Rheinau (GeR), dating from 800, now in the Central Library in Zurich, Codex Rheinau 30; the third is the Gelasian Sacramentary of Corbie Abbey (GeV), dating from c. 750, now in the Vatican Library, Codex R.L. 316; the fourth is the Gelasian Sacramentary of Saint Gall (GeS), a MS dating from c. 825, now in the Library of Saint-Gallen, Switzerland, Codex 348. These MSS were compared for the purpose of determining the actual content of the Roman Canon in the fifth century. Other sources were consulted in order to determine the structure of the Liturgy of the Word (Mass of the Catechumens) during this same period, principally Bishop and Wilmart [33] and of course J. A. Jungman [34], the twentieth century expert in this field.

The purpose of this research was to reconstitute the liturgy of Rome, as it was celebrated during the era of Western Orthodox florescence. The reasons for selecting this ideal and representative period are outlined earlier in this paper, and these criteria will affect our future work on the other Western Orthodox rites. When this task is accomplished, we will have a fairly accurate picture of Western Orthodox liturgical structures during the same period, prior to their contamination and compenetration.

The results of our work on the Old Roman Rite are reproduced below, and it is very satisfying to note that the Liturgy at that time was indeed a corporate offering of all the worshipers, whose intimate participation was an absolute necessity (as in all other coeval rites). No one could have been a passive spectator at a “mysterious ritual performed by a priest on behalf of others,” to quote R.F. Buxton [35], who further states in this regard, “between the eighth and fifteenth centuries the corporate community Mass in which all participated changed into an atomized multitude of individual low Masses, at which all but priest and assistant were really passive spectators.” This was of course a gradual process, part and parcel of the general “heterodoxization” of The West.

We now outline the structure of the Old Roman Rite, which we entitled *The Divine Liturgy according to Saint Gelasius, Bishop of Rome*:

Introit

Great Litany of Saint Gelasius [36]

Collects
 O.T. Readings
 Gradual
 Epistle
 Alleluia
 Gospel
 Sermon
 Solemn Prayers of the Faithful [37]
 Offertory
 Secret
 Preface and Sanctus-Benedictus
 Canon:
 Te igitur
 Memento Domine
 Communicantes
 Hanc igitur
 Quam oblationem
 Qui pridie
 Unde et memores
 Supra quae propitio
 Supplices Te rogamus
 Nobis quoque
 Per quem haec-Per ipsum
 Lord's Prayer
 Kiss of Peace
 Fraction and Commingling
 Agnus Dei (7th c)
 Communion
 Quod ore sumpsimus
 Collect and Dismissal

This liturgy was printed for our use in January 1984 and has been celebrated in New York on January 25 and June 29 to date. It is not intended for regular Sunday use in the parishes of The Orthodox Church of France and for this reason the Creed is not included. It would be positioned after the Solemn Prayers. The Gloria was chanted after the Kyrie Litany when the Bishop was present and at Easter. Western Orthodox Parishes which desire to use the Old Roman Rite on a regular basis would chant the Creed and the Gloria according to the prevailing rubrics, in this case bypassing ancient legislation. Even though they are subsequent additions to the old structure, they in no manner upset the integrity of the old Roman Rite.

With regret we must omit any consideration of other rites at this time, notably the Mozarabic and Ambrosian, and leap into the third category of this paper: the current state of Western Orthodox affairs.

Earlier in this paper we stated that Western Orthodoxy is little understood, either inside or outside of the Orthodox Church. In addition to the reasons initially given for this situation, there are others of a different nature that we will now touch upon.

We do not see Western Orthodoxy as simply a Tridentine Mass or Cranmer Communion Service superimposed upon a Byzantine liturgical structure. A Rite is very much more than a Mass, and discussions of Western Orthodoxy cannot be limited to the subject of the epiclesis [38] or of the merits of the Saints. A rite in an entire liturgical structure, including the Mass, Lectionary, Sacramental forms, Devotional forms, Liturgical music, Ordination and Blessing forms, Temporal and Sanctoral Calendars, Monastic uses: in other words, all the expressions and manifestations of Church life. These various manifestations are related to, and compliment each other intrinsically, together forming a congruous entity known as a Rite.

Thus, heterodox worship forms inserted into the Byzantine liturgical structure lose whatever integrity they possess, and rest most uncomfortably in a setting so alien to them. Heterodox forms represent quite a different thrust and

theological focus, and inevitably require adjustments. Such forced liturgical hybridization, based upon certain imaginary needs and accommodations, is neither theologically or aesthetically satisfying, nor does it constitute a Western Rite or Western Orthodoxy. This approach, as we observe at present in America, is an unsuccessful experiment. It has basically amounted to the Byzantine observance **minus** the Byzantine Liturgy, its very culmination and synthesis.

Articles have appeared in our Orthodox journals, attempting to enlighten those interested in the subject of Western Orthodoxy. Unfortunately they have for the most part dealt with the American experiments to date. An encouraging departure from this norm appeared in *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, Volume 26, Number 2 (1982) entitled "Some Perspectives on the Western Rite" by Winfield S. Mott. This author rightly describes a Rite as consisting of an entire liturgical structure, and the entire article is both interesting and reasonable. The reader, however, is not informed as to the "Western Rite" itself: which Liturgy is included within its infrastructure and context? What would, for example, form the corresponding infrastructure and context of the Tridentine, Anglican or Lutheran "living" Liturgies? Following the fine Mott article is a brief statement by George H. M. Dye which wrongly identifies Western Orthodox liturgical use with the effects of the Renaissance. Western Orthodox use involves Western Orthodox materials. Not included in this category is the Tridentine Mass, or ideally any uses after 800, for the several reasons given previously. Fr. Dye was obviously seeking Orthodoxy as expressed in a resolutely Occidental manner, which is altogether possible and desirable, but abandoned his search long the line. At the end of his statement he dismisses his quest, saying, "... we have no need for the fundamental problems that would be associated with a western rite in the Orthodox Church".

In the same quarterly, Volume 24, Number 24 (1980) appeared a three-part article on the Western Rite. In the first, Fr. Meyendorff states that the cultural expressions of tenth-century Byzantium "are unequalled as an expression of the Tradition of the Church." This declaration reveals an overview of condescension upon this subject, and the article, intended to introduce a "debate" on Western Orthodoxy, seems to approach the subject from a distance. The second article, by Dr. Andrew J. Sopko, is entitled, "Western Rite Orthodoxy: A Case Study and a Reappraisal". The author, in his introduction, fails to adequately describe Western Orthodoxy, even what he believes it to be. The title of his article gives the reader an impression that he considers The Tridentine Mass altered and superimposed upon the Byzantine liturgical structure to constitute Western Orthodoxy. The parish whose short history is reviewed is at present an Eastern Orthodox parish, after having experimented with the impossible superimposition just described. The article contributes little to either an understanding of Western Orthodoxy or what is happening in the legitimate Western Orthodox centers. Lastly, the statement "... in Europe, western usage has also been oriented toward the Roman 'shape' with the inclusion of local variations" is completely in error, now, as it would have been if stated in Merovingian times. The third article, a closing statement by Fr. Schmemmann, takes exception to some of Dr. Sopko's conclusions. It is a lively presentation, as the readers of this outstanding theologian have come to expect. To mention, however, that Western liturgical development has always been shaped by a succession of theological clashes is somewhat exaggerated, especially considering the period of Western Orthodox florescence, long before the Renaissance, the Reformation and Trent. Fr. Schmemmann reveals no objections to Western Rite Orthodoxy, declaring wisely, "... to have such an objection would mean the loss by the Orthodox Church of her claims to universality."

Two and three decades ago those participating in Western Orthodox life in America were favored with the superb articles of Fr. Alexander Tyler Turner, whose knowledge of this subject and of many others seems unsurpassed. Each issue of *Orthodoxy* was anxiously awaited and thoroughly read. A brilliant future was projected for Western Orthodoxy, largely based upon the enthusiastic and qualified thrust of Fr. Turner. It is truly unfortunate that his movement passed into history for all practical purposes, now deprived of his energy and focus. It has been reduced to a laboratory for "Western Rite experiments". The non-expressed purpose appears to be eventual Byzantinization, revealing a type of counter-uniatism in effect. For this reason, perhaps, the present leadership of the Western Rite Vicariate in America accepts as natural the failure of its Western Rite parishes to remain Western, often stating that this is to be expected [39].

We bring this paper to a close with a brief discussion of the Orthodox Church of France, a Western Orthodox diocese under the leadership of a Western Orthodox bishop, with parishes in France, Belgium, Spain, Germany, Switzerland, North and South America. Over 100 major clergy serve in the parishes, monasteries and missions. According to its statutes and declarations (issued in 1972 by Metro. Nicholas of the Patriarchate of Romania) it is

“... an autonomous Church actually constituted in an autonomous Diocese, preserving its autonomy in spiritual and administrative questions, its Use, and in the independence of its national interests.”

Relative to the Western Orthodox criteria outlined earlier in this paper, we are happy to give the following quote concerning the activities of the Orthodox Church of France: “It seeks to bring to light again the primitive sources of the local tradition which had (in time) been disfigured by historical accretions – the tradition which blossomed within the borders of the undivided Church during the first seven centuries... before the centralization effected by Charlemagne...” [41]. The success of the Orthodox Church of France is undoubtedly due to the theological and liturgical expertise of its first leader, Fr. Eugraph Kovalevsky (Bp. John), which was coupled with extraordinary determination and courage.

Since 1972 the diocese is under the spiritual leadership of His Grace, Bishop Germain, who was born in Stoke-on-Trent, England, on September 22, 1930. The diocese sponsors theological education at its *Institute of Saint-Denis* in Paris, which opened on November 15, 1944. Among the first faculty members were Fr. Eugraph, Fr. Alexander Schmemmann, Fr. Louis Bouyer, Fr. Lambert Bauuin and Vladimir Lossky. Nine courses are given during each of the two semesters per year; the current professors include the Bishop, Maxime Kovalevsky, Yvonne Winnaert, Fr. Pierre Deschamps, Igor Reznikov, Fr. Roger Michel Bret and Marie-Madeleine Davy. Iconography courses are given at the *Saint Luke Workshop* in Paris each week. The entire program of education of the diocese is accredited by the Academy of Paris. Correspondance courses are given by means of printed texts and tape recordings (cassettes).

The quarterly journal of the diocese is entitled *Presence Orthodoxe*, which includes a wide spectrum of subjects of general interest to Orthodox clergy and laity. Another publication in newspaper format contains articles and the parish chronicles. *Editions Friant* publishes texts of former and current theologians of the diocese, and the printing of the complete service books has been under the direction of Maxime Kovalevsky. The complete history of the Orthodox Church of France is contained in two volumes entitled *La Divine Contradiction* by Vincent Bourne.

The old edifice at 96 Boulevard Auguste-Blanqui in Paris, built as the Old Catholic Church of Saint Denis (under Utrecht), on October 13, 1946, became the Western Orthodox Parish of Saint Irene and in 1964 became the Cathedral of the Diocese.

With this brief outline on some of the activities of the Orthodox Church of France, we bring this paper to a close. We hope that the reader now has some new perspectives on Western Orthodoxy, as it is expressed and experienced in its full and dramatic splendor within the Orthodox Church of France – a veritable Orthodox reclamation from liturgical and ecclesiological points of view.

NOTES

1. In 1194 Theodore Balsamon, the rigidly pro-Byzantine canon lawyer with decidedly caesaropapistic inclinations, declared, “All the Churches of God ought to follow the custom of New Rome, that is, Constantinople. Balsamon fiercely defended the rights of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and it is only natural that he defended the Rite of New Rome in such manner.
2. The evolution of the Byzantine Rite is covered in *The Byzantine-Slav Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom* by Casimir Kucharek (Alleluia Press, 1971) and *The Byzantine Divine Liturgy* by Melitius Michael Solovey (CUA Press, 1970).
3. Implied in Canon III of the Second Ecumenical Council and in Canon XXVIII of the Fourth Ecumenical Council.
4. *The Oxford Christian Dictionary of the Christian Church*, whose entries are free of bias states the following (page 1173) on Roman Catholicism, “The term (Roman Catholicism), which denotes the faith and practice of all Christians who are in communion with the Pope, is used in particular of Catholicism as it has developed since the Reformation”. Since the declarations and precisions of Trent, Roman Catholicism is virtually a denomination.
5. Matthew 28:19-20.
6. Acts of the Apostles 2:41, 44, 46.

7. The great Merovingian Cathedral was discovered as excavation began for an underground parking lot directly in front of Notre Dame Cathedral in Paris.
8. Ephesians 4:3-6.
9. For instance *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* by Alexander Schmemmann (Faith Press, 1965) covers the history of the Byzantine Synthesis. The origin and development of the Ordo are treated as profound problems and the liturgical situation of contemporary Orthodoxy is described as a profound liturgical crisis (page 21). The work proceeds somewhat philosophically and scientifically, and liturgical development is treated as a human phenomenon rather than a Divine manifestation.
10. In *Christian Life and Worship* by Gerald Ellard (Bruce Publishing Company, 1933) the Tridentine Mass, codified in 1570, is outlined. By that time, twenty-five Gallican prayers had been included in the Roman Mass, as well as several English, non-Roman Italian and Spanish prayers.
11. Well discussed in "Introits and Archetypes: Some Archaisms of the Old Roman Chant" by Thomas H. Connolly which appeared in the *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Volume XXV, Number 2 (1972).
12. See note 10.
13. The principle expressions of the faithful had fallen into disuse: The Great Kyrie-Litany was reduced to nine responses and no versicles, recited by the priest and perhaps sung by the choir, and the Solemn Prayers of the Faithful (the Diptychs) were reduced to Good Friday use.
14. The biography of Saint Germain, Bishop of Paris, was written by Saint Venance Fortunat, Bishop of Poitiers. The complete text is given in *Patrologia Latina*, Volume 72, columns 55-78.
15. Dom Edmond Martene (1654-1739) is best known for his monumental four-volume work *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, first published in Antwerp in 1738, reprinted in facsimile by Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim in 1969.
16. Father Pierre Le Brun (1661-1729) was one of the first specialists on the subject of the epiclesis. His principle liturgiological discoveries and commentaries are contained in *Explication de la Messe*, published in Paris in 1777 by Librairie Valade.
17. *Patrologia Latina*, Volumes 42, 58, 68, 72.
18. Karl Joseph Hefele (1809-1893) wrote *A History of the Ecclesiastical Councils* (Konzillengeschichte) in seven volumes between 1855 and 1890. (Volume II covers the Gallican Councils.) Two additional volumes were contributed by Joseph Hergenrother.
19. The Missale Gothico-Gallicanum is reprinted in *Patrologia Latina*, Volume 72, columns 225-318. The Missale Gallicanum Vetus is found in the same volume, columns 339-382. The Sacramentarium Gallicanum appears in the same volume, columns 447-580.
20. The Mone Missal, named for its publisher in 1850, is reprinted in *Patrologia Latina*, Volume 138. Scholars feel that this Missal is a fifth-century work originating in Auxerre.
21. The Stowe Missal is the oldest known Celtic Missal, possibly a sixth-century work. It is so named because it remained for a very long period in the library of Stowe House in England. This Missal was reprinted in two volumes by the Henry Bradshaw Society, 1906 and 1915.
22. The Luxeuil Lectionary, a sixth or seventh century MS representing the use of Luxeuil Abbey (founded by Saint Columbanus), was reprinted in 1944 by P. Salmon, O.S.B. It was first discovered by Dom Mabillon in 1683.
23. The Autun Lectionary, representing the use of the Abbey of Saint Symphorien at Autun was discovered and reprinted by Dom Germain Morin (1861-1946) in the *Revue Benedictine*.
24. The Bangor Antiphonary represents the use of Bangor Abbey (Ireland) and dates from the late seventh century. It is the only known surviving liturgical authority for the choir office in the Celtic Church, and is found in *Patrologia Latina*, Volume 72, columns 583-608.
25. For instance, *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church* by Neale and Forbes (1855), *Liturgie Gallicane des huit premiers siècles de l'Eglise* by L. Marchesi (1869), *The Early Gallican Liturgy* by H. Lucas (1893). Also in the works of Duchesnee, Ferotin, Batiffol, Thibaut, Jenner, Lowe, Capelle, Baumstarck, Chadwick and others.
26. The structure and spirit of the Divine Liturgy according to Saint Germain of Paris was preserved in its current use. The very few interpolations, while not found in the MS, are entirely subservient to the original structure and entirely in the same spirit. Such texts and chants serve to accompany actions and gestures which have proved useful, if not necessary, in our time. Archeologists have criticized these interpolations, while liturgical theologians have understood them as desirable concessions to current needs, tastefully accomplished.

27. *Patrologia Latina*, Volume 72, columns 250-251. Each of the five entries mentions the Saint by name.
28. *Patrologia Latina*, Volume 72, columns 171-216.
29. *Patrologia Latina*, Volume 72, columns 99-168.
30. *Patrologia Latina*, Volume 72, columns 317-340.
31. *Patrologia Latina*, Volume 163.
32. See Note 16. The fourth dissertation, beginning on page 228, covers the ancient liturgy of the Churches of Gaul.
33. Edmund Bishop (1846-1917) is best known for his work *The Genius of the Roman Rite*, which, along with some of his other studies, appear in *Liturgica Historica* (1918). One of Bishop's closest friends was Dom Andre Wilmar (1876-1941), a monk of Solesmes, best known for his edition of the Bobbio Missal (1924).
34. Fr. Jungmann's text, known in English as *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, first published in 1951, was reprinted in 1980 by Christian Classics, Westminster, MD., and his *The Early Liturgy*, written in 1949, was published by the University of Notre Dame Press in 1959.
35. See *Eucharist and Institution Narrative* by Richard F. Buxton (Alcuin Club Collections Number 58). Our quotations are found on page 45.
36. The translation we use in our Roman Mass is that of Fr. Brunner, who provided the English version of Fr. Jungmann's *The Mass of the Roman Rite* (pages 224-226 for the Great Litany of Saint Gelasius).
37. The Solemn Prayers are found in any Tridentine Missal as part of the Good Friday ritual. They are set to the ancient Roman tone in the Tridentine Altar Missal (found on pages 155-162 in the Benziger edition).
38. There has been considerable commotion over the epiclesis in Western Rite studies and discussions, which we feel is quite unnecessary. An excellent and revealing text on this subject is *Eucharist and Holy Spirit* by John H. McKenna (Alcuin Club Collections, Number 57). This text will enlighten those who would add an *additional* epiclesis to a Canon, not recognizing the one already present.
39. From time to time there appears a brief report of the Western Rite Parishes of the Antiochian Archdiocese at their annual National Assemblies, the minutes of which are published in *The Word*.
40. These two quotes are found in the *Yearbook of the Orthodox Church*.
41. 1978 edition (Verlag Alex Proc. Munich) in the entry concerning the Orthodox Church of France (Patriarchate of Romania), pages 142-144.