

## Besprechungen

Henryk Paprocki, *Le mystère de l'eucharistie. Genèse et interprétation de la liturgie eucharistique byzantine*. Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris 1993, iii + 555 pp.

The subtitle of this lengthy study summarizes its scope: the genesis and interpretation of the Byzantine eucharistic liturgy, expressed more fully in the author's introduction as "an historical and theological commentary on the eucharistic liturgies of the Orthodox Church which also takes into account the mutual relations and sources common to the liturgies of the entire Christian world" (p. 16).

There are many good and interesting things in this book. Several of its sections give an adequate account of the state of our knowledge of the material (e.g., pp. 293-339 on the kiss of peace, creed, preanaphoral dialogue and Chrysostom anaphora are generally representative). And apart from some lacunae noted below, P's bibliography is excellent, especially in little-known pre-revolutionary Russian sources. Furthermore, his complex-free acceptance of history and modern scholarship (pp. 31 ff. and *passim* throughout) is refreshing: P's book is totally free of the paranoia and xenophobia unfortunately characteristic of too much Orthodox religious writing today. P. openly accepts an evolutionary view of eucharistic development, is not intimidated by eucharistic prayers without the Words of Institution (pp. 32 ff.), recognizes that the Epiclesis, so seminal a part of Orthodox liturgical consciousness (and polemics) also has its history (pp. 45 ff.), expresses what is now the generally accepted contemporary view of the eucharist consecratory formula as comprising the whole prayer of blessing over the gifts and not just certain isolated words (p. 327), etc.

One can also endorse unreservedly P's concluding plea for a renewal of Orthodox liturgical studies (pp. 377-85). Unfortunately, it is not without reserve that one could accept this book as a contribution to that renewal. For P. has bitten off more than he could chew. The vast bibliography and the notes show that he is cognizant of the relevant literature. This is especially true of the older, still-important works in Russian. But that is part of the problem, for P. relies, often indiscriminately, on outdated works now superseded by more recent research, overwhelmingly from the West, where almost all reliable scholarly work on Byzantine liturgy is being done today. P. often cites the later literature, but he has clearly not mastered all the literature he cites, and he sometimes attempts to synthesize all opinions on a topic, right or wrong. In some instances the result is a hotch-potch that only one in full control of the field can sort out.

*In particular:* I would advise the reader to skip the section on the Jewish roots of Christian liturgy (pp. 23-30). P. does not successfully negotiate this still-shifting quicksand. He does not use the seminal and indispensable recent work of Jewish scholars like Joseph Heinemann, and Paul Bradshaw's *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* (Oxford 1992) was not available in time to warn P. away from this morass. In his overview of the ante-Nicene formative period (pp. 31-34) P. stands on firmer ground, though even here he is not always sure-footed: M. Metzger of Strasbourg will doubtless be surprised to read that modern scholarship has proven that Hippolytus wrote the *Apostolic Tradition* (p. 40)!

Though chapter 1 on the genesis of the Greek liturgies (pp. 43-69) is one of the more satisfying sections of the book, P's account jumps disconcertingly from place to place and age to age, and is marred by the tendency to treat "Greek liturgies" as one reality with a single history (p. 62). This is a gross oversimplification. Indeed, "Greek liturgies" is a less-than-useful category in liturgical history, where geography and culture count for much more than language in the early era when most



Christian liturgy was in Greek. There are also numerous problems of detail: in Constantinople the bishop said the Introit Prayer before the Imperial Doors leading into the nave, not "devant la porte du sanctuaire" (p. 52); the entire Third Antiphon and not just its refrain corresponds to the Latin Introit (p. 53); the Latin "Introibo ad altare Dei" (Ps 42) is in no way "le correspondant des antiennes byzantines" (p. 231); codex *Grottaferrata* Γβ VII (ed. Passarelli, *Analekta Vlatadon* 36, pp. 67-68, 157-58; cf. 36-37) does not lack the Enarxis antiphons (p. 56); the Πληρωθήτω is not replaced in Nicholas Cabasilas' commentary (ch. 41.3 = ed. SC 4bis, p. 238) by the Holy Thursday refrain (Τοῦ δεῖπνου); the Constantinopolitan ἀκολουθία ἱερατικὴ was not "composé à Antioche et à Jérusalem" (p. 60). And occasionally one finds oneself confronted with generalizations of synthesis (p. 63: "L'Église byzantine, de même que les autres Églises orientales, est restée fidèle dans sa liturgie à la tradition du christianisme primitif...") that are flatly false except in the broadest sense of fidelity to the apostolic kerygma. The common cliché that eastern liturgy in its present shape represents the apostolic tradition has long been laid to rest by modern liturgiology.

Similar problems emerge in chapter 2, "L'origine des liturgies eucharistiques de l'Église orthodoxe" (pp. 71-116). The present identical framework of the Chrysostom and Basil liturgies (hereafter CHR, BAS) is the result of fitting CHR into the framework of the Constantinopolitan eucharistic rite, and not because CHR "a influencé" BAS and the Liturgy of the Presanctified (hereafter PRES) (p. 73). What is said concerning the origins of CHR (pp. 73-79) will need to be reviewed in the light of my recent study in OCP 56 (1990) 5-51. If that study was too recent for P. to take account of it, the same cannot be said for Leroy's work on Ps.-Proclus (OCP 28 [1962] 288-99) of which P. seems unaware, an oversight that renders superfluous his whole discussion of the *De traditione divinae missae* (p. 75). In the section on PRES (pp. 94-113), a liturgical formulae obviously in need of a thoroughgoing modern scientific treatment, P. has brought forward many of the elements and much (though by no means all) of the literature, and pp. 113-16 on PRES and the frequency of communion are very good. But here, too, one is faced with the basic problem of the book: liturgical history is not P's forte, and, unfortunately, only the discriminating expert can winnow through this book, separating the wheat from the chaff. The treatment of the origins of PRES (pp. 96-98), largely dependent on the work of N.D. Uspenskij, is a perfect paradigm of what is problematic about P's method, mixing and jumbling a variety of irreconcilable and discrete traditions concerning presanctified communion rites outside the normal eucharistic liturgy. As if there were no distinction between the highly developed Byzantine PRES and communion at home outside the liturgy, we are told that PRES goes back to the latter (true only in the sense that any eucharist can be said to go back to the Last Supper), which P. would connect to the persecutions. Here the distinctions to be made and the nuancing demanded are simply dizzying. Byzantine PRES is a Constantinopolitan communion service attached to vespers. Peculiarities of its vespers still contain remnants betraying this genesis. Byzantine PRES has nothing to do with anchorites, Syria, Severus of Antioch, James of Edessa, Bar Hebraeus, all of whom are thrown into the blender here. Nor has it anything to do with Roman stational liturgy and its *fermentum*; nor with another, completely distinct Orthodox presanctified service called the Typika, a hagiopolite monastic communion rite for aliturgical days which lost this purpose when interpolated into Constantinopolitan monastic rules (also called "typika") precisely because Constantinople already had its native PRES. Again, it is by no means certain that the Great Entrance chant of Byzantine PRES was "transféré de la Liturgie de Chrysostome dans la Liturgie des Dons présanctifiés" (p. 100, cf. 111). And PRES is celebrated in the evening because of the fast, and has nothing whatever to do with early Christian usage in Acts 3:1, or the Temple of Jerusalem, or Jewish liturgy (101). P. could have known most of this from the recent studies on PRES or the Typika of Arranz, Funtulis, Janeras, Mateos, Winkler, some of which he cites but, from what he writes, seems not to have digested. What he does write is a terrible muddle that can only confuse the unwary reader.

In chapter 3 on "Le lieu et le temps du drame liturgique," aspects of liturgy where the Byzantine



tradition excels, P's treatment improves notably, though here too his mingling of present usage with historical data is often counterproductive and confusing, and the literature he cites is not always the latest and best (on the antimimension he omits: J. Izzo, *The Antimension*... [Rome 1975]; on the Russian iconostasis: N. Lebreque-Pervouchine, *L'iconostase*... [Montréal 1982]; on the ambo/Opisthambonos: G. Passarelli, BBGG 33 [1979] 85-91, A. Jacob, Byz 51 [1981] 306-15, A. Kazhdan, Byz 57 [1987] 422-26).

Chapter 4 on "Le Mystère de la proskomidie" informs us that Constantinopolitan patriarch Philotheos Kokkinos composed the present entry prayers before the liturgy (p. 163), though in the earliest ms his diataxis contains only the final prayer of today's series (ed. Trempelas, p. 1). The section on the opening rites of the hierarchical liturgy (pp. 189-90) is entirely wrong, as P. could have known had he consulted my edition of the patriarchal diataxis with commentary in OCP 45 (1979) 279-307, 46 (1980) 89-124. Regarding the place of the Prothesis (p. 198), we are once again confronted by material from as far afield as Africa, none of which has the slightest relevance for the Byzantine rite. As for the Prothesis itself, i.e., the rite for preparing the gifts at the beginning of the Byzantine eucharist, the notion that the Prothesis Prayer of BAS in *Barberini Gr. 336* is from JAS (p. 210) is certainly wrong. P. could have spared himself some mistakes had he used G. Descoedres, *Die Pastophorien im syro-byzantinischen Osten* (Wiesbaden 1983). As it is, P's account, dependent on the old studies of Muretov, Petrovskij, etc., is totally outdated, repeating long-disproven clichés about the Byzantine "offertory" having once been located just before the Great Entrance (pp. 158, 195-97, 247, 269-70, 283), and even asserting that Chrysostom witnesses to this (p. 159), which is absolutely false. In chapter 6 P. even cites me (p. 283 note 52) as if in support of this pseudo-theory I have dispensed so much ink disproving. Failure to take adequate account of contemporary scholarly work on this question (OCP 36 [1970] 73-107; OCA 200) renders P's whole discussion of it worthless. It is not enough to include works in the bibliography. They must also be read, digested, and taken account of – not necessarily agreed with, but confronted and either followed or challenged on scholarly grounds. Otherwise progress is excluded, and the science of oriental liturgy winds up chasing its own tail.

In chapter 5 on the Liturgy of the Word, P. does not use Baldovin's seminal monograph on stational liturgy (OCA 228). And because chapters 5 and 6 (on the eucharistic part of the liturgy) retain the long outmoded and baseless terminology, "Liturgy of the Catechumens" and "Liturgy of the Faithful," P. treats the Prayers of the Faithful as the beginning of "Le mystère du sacrifice," (chapter 6, pp. 257-63) rather than dealing with them where they belong (at least structurally), as part of the "Les prières pour toute l'Église" in chapter 5. Furthermore, the Great Synapte found in some mss before the Trisagion is not called ἡ ἐκτενὴ τοῦ τρισαγίου "dans des nombreux manuscrits" (p. 242). In fact, it is not called that in any ms whatever – at least not in any of the hundreds I have examined. That is simply the marginal title added by Orlov on p. 66 of his edition of BAS (which P. cites, p. 242 note 82), and based on the traditional confusion caused by the fact that Slavonic and Russian use (wrongly) the term *ektenija* as the generic synonym for "litany". The litany in question is the μεγάλη συναπτή (cf. Mateos, OCA 191, pp. 115-18; OCA 166, pp. 293, 320), though at least one euchology ms, the 10th c. *St. Petersburg* 226, calls it αἰτήσεις τοῦ τρισαγίου (f. 16<sup>v</sup>). Again, the *Vita s. Basilii Magni* (= BHG 247-260aa) attributed to Amphilochius of Iconium (†post 394) which P. considers a fundamental source for BAS (p. 340) is not authentic (cf. CPG 3253) And the section on the diptychs would have to be revised in the light of my *The Diptychs* (OCA 238).

Concerning the rites of communion, P. (pp. 351-53) challenges my interpretation of the Inclination Prayer of CHR (*Ecclesia orans* 3 [1986] 29-60). My admittedly hypothetical interpretation of it may well be wrong, as P. says – but certainly not because of the arguments he advances. The fact that the text of the prayer in one 11th-century ms, *Messina* 160, appends to the *textus receptus* reading τὰ προκειμένα the substantive δῶρα in no way means that gloss was *omitted*, as P. argues, from



other mss. Since the universal ms tradition (which P. has clearly not studied) supports the *lectio difficilior* of the *textus receptus*, it is methodologically unacceptable to argue that a word interpolated into only one ms must therefore have been excised from all others. What it shows, rather, is that a least one copyist agreed with me that the *textus receptus* as it stands is problematic, and he took it upon himself to correct it. Furthermore, the phrase of the prayer P. cites on p. 352 in no way "indique son lien avec l'eucharistie." Nor is the argument from other liturgies valid. It is perfectly obvious that the Inclination Prayer was ultimately worked into a prayer before communion. But the Inclination Prayer is a liturgical unit added only later to the Antiochene-type liturgical structure, and the provenance of what seems to be one of its earlier examples, that of CHR, remains a problem because its text does not refer to communion. I tried to solve that problem (perhaps unsuccessfully).

Although continental scholarship too often seems to revel in the pit-bull approach to book-reviewing, that is not the preferred Anglo-Saxon style, and I take no pleasure in being constrained to write such a negative review. But as one who has passed a lifetime studying the Byzantine eucharistic liturgy, I consider the topic too important to pass over so much misinformation in silence. The issue is not that P. is sometimes mistaken or wrong. The work of every scholar, including this reviewer's, contains mistakes, or floats theories that are later challenged or disproven. The problem is P's failure to exploit adequately the best contemporary scholarship on his chosen topic. That is why P's call for a renewal of Orthodox liturgical studies freed from the slavish imitation of the West (pp. 377-85) is misplaced. Though one must agree in viewing any slavish imitation negatively, like it or not the tradition of objective, historico-critical study of Byzantine liturgy, carried on principally in the theological academies of Orthodox Russia before the darkness fell, has been continued thereafter chiefly in the West, where, thankfully, confessional propaganda no longer masquerades as scholarship, and where scholarship is neither Catholic nor Protestant nor Orthodox but simply the objective, historico-critical search for truth. To recognize and profit from that is not slavish imitation but a recognition of reality. Orthodox attempts to make do without fully exploiting western scholarship on their own tradition can lead only to mistakes, of which P's book itself provides altogether too many examples.

Robert F. Taft

Miguel Arranz, I Penitenziali Bizantini: Il Protokanonarion o Kanonarion Primitivo di Giovanni Monaco e Diacono e il Deuterokanonarion o »Secondo Kanonarion« di Basilio Monaco, Roma 1993 (= KANONIKA 3), 207pp., US\$ 30.00, Lit. 35.000

Nach Joseph Praders rechtsvergleichendem Überblick zum Eherecht in Ost und West (KANONIKA 1) und Ivan Žužeks *Index analyticus* zum CEO (KANONIKA 2) ist in kurzer Zeit ein dritter Band der neuen Kirchenrechtsreihe *Kanonika* des *Pontificio Istituto Orientale* erschienen. Der Band enthält zwei wichtige Quellentexte zur byzantinischen Bußliturgie und Bußstrafenpraxis in griechischem Text und lateinischer Übersetzung mit einer knappen Einleitung. Das Buch bildet im Werk des bekannten Kenners der byzantinischen Liturgiegeschichte eher ein Parergon, vor allem zu einer parallel in OCP erscheinenden Reihe von Aufsätzen (Les sacrements de la restauration de l'ancien euchologe constantinopolitain II-2: Les prières pénitentielles de la tradition byzantine I-III: OCP 57 [1991] 87-143. 309-329, 58 [1992] 23-82; und II-3: Les formulaires de confession dans la tradition byzantine I-III: OCP 58 [1992] 423-459, 59 [1993] 63-89. 357-386), in denen M. A. die verschiedenen Akoluthien und Einzelgebete zur Buße in der byzantinisch-orthodoxen Tradition in griechischem Text und Übersetzung vorlegte; Rez. wünscht sich diese wichtige Ausgabe ebenfalls als Monographie.