

Christian history recounts the story, time and again, in seemingly infinite variety, yet always according to the pattern. Robin Darling Young, in an important study, noted that the stories of the earliest martyrs often depict their martyrdom as a “public liturgy.” The authors dramatize the sacrifice of persecuted Christians as an extension of the eucharistic sacrifice.²⁶ Sometimes the martyrs themselves used this unself-conscious technique—as when Ignatius expressed his wish to be ground like wheat in the teeth of the lions,²⁷ or when Polycarp prayed in the form of a eucharistic prayer at his execution, and his burning body gave off the aroma of baking bread.²⁸

Sometimes, the reality appeared in the courtroom records, as in Abitina, where the convicted Christians greeted their death sentence with liturgical acclamations: *Deo gratias!*

Martyrdom is an actualization, again, in its purest form: an imitation of Christ that is a true communion with Christ, a willing participation in his life and death—his complete self-giving. This we find everywhere in the lives of the “canonized” saints. For the martyr, the monk, and every baptized Christian must make a perfect offering of all of life, to the moment of death. Like the old law, though in a new way, the new law extends the reach of the sacrificial liturgy to every hour, waking and sleeping, spent in the kitchen, bedroom, boardroom, assembly line, or hospital bed.

In Christian lives, the scriptures are actualized, and that is how the kingdom comes to earth. Actualization is infinitely more than a private act of piety. It is transformative, not just of the believer, but of the world.

CHAPTER 7



PROCLAMATION AND *PAROUSIA*



IF THERE IS a pattern to be found in actualization through martyrdom, we might find its roots in the scriptural acts of the protomartyr Stephen (Acts 6–7). Stephen's deeds served as models for persecuted Christians in the next centuries, and Luke's account surely served as a model for future biographers of the saints.

What pattern do we find in Luke's narrative? Brought before the high priest, the elders, and the scribes, Stephen testifies at length, in what amounts to a sermon sketching the works of the divine economy since the time of Abraham. He highlights the covenants and shows the typological fulfillment of all previous history in the death of Jesus Christ. Then, at the climax of Stephen's impromptu trial comes what appears to be a supernatural interruption of the natural course of events.

Stephen, "full of the Holy Spirit, gazed into heaven and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God; and he said, 'Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the son of man standing at the right hand of God'" (Acts 7:55–56).

LETTER AND SPIRIT

Stephen, an ordained deacon in the nascent church, had proclaimed the word of the Lord. His public proclamation then culminated in the *parousia* of Jesus. Like John the Seer, who wrote while "in the Spirit on the Lord's day" (Rev 1:10), Stephen is "full of the Holy Spirit" at the moment of his apocalyptic vision. This remarkable event led to Stephen's sacrificial self-offering (7:59) and his last words, which echo those of Jesus on the cross (Acts 7:60; cf. Lk 23:34).

Stephen's testimony and self-offering surely influenced later martyrs such as Ignatius and Polycarp, men of the next generation whose way to martyrdom involved both public proclamation and voluntary sacrifice. But, apart from any extraordinary mystical gifts, did these men also share his experience of the *parousia* of the son of man?

For many people today, the difficulty in addressing that question will be an accurate understanding of the term *parousia*.



Christians have always used the word *parousia* to denote the coming of Christ, with all its attendant events, such as the judgment, the end of the world, and the renewal of the world. The word has become problematic in recent generations, however, because it evokes an ever-growing complex of associations, even among scholars. Some of these associated ideas have their origin in antiquity; others are of a more recent vintage: for example, from the millen-

nialist controversies of the ninth or the nineteenth centuries. For our purposes, it will be helpful to study the first-century usage of the word.

The Greek word *parousia* means, literally, “presence, coming, arrival, or advent.” In popular Christian parlance, it has come to mean, specifically, Christ’s return in glory at the end of time. Jesus himself used the term many times in describing that eschatological event. For example: “as the lightning comes from the east and shines as far as the west, so will be the coming [*parousia*] of the Son of man” (Mt 24:27).

Because of such passages, it can be difficult for us to think of *parousia* as meaning anything but a “coming in glory”—a dramatic divine interruption of history. But that is a theological projection onto a fairly common, and even mundane, Greek word. “Coming in glory” was not the meaning of the word in its original usage. *Parousia* could describe the visit of an emperor or king, and it was sometimes used that way. It could also describe a much less impressive event. When St. Paul, for example, speaks of his own *parousia*, he gives it a decidedly self-deprecating cast: “For they [Paul’s critics] say, ‘His letters are weighty and strong, but his bodily presence [*parousia*] is weak, and his speech of no account’ ” (2 Cor 10:10). Note that, here, all Paul means by his own *parousia* is his “bodily presence,” which he insists is unimpressive to the senses. He uses the word in the same sense in his letter to the Philippians: “Therefore, my beloved, as you have always obeyed, so now, not only as in my presence [*parousia*] but much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling” (Phil 2:12). In both passages, Paul

uses *parousia* to mean an immediate bodily presence, a presence that is real, though visually and aurally unimposing.

It is surely possible, and even probable, that Jesus used the word *parousia* to connote the same things—to mean a bodily presence that was real, but unimposing to the senses.

I acknowledge that this is not the interpretation of *parousia* given by some modern interpreters, especially among fundamentalists. But we would do well to consider the expectations of Jesus’ own generation. The Jews of his time read the Old Testament prophecies as predictions of a messiah who would come with military power, overwhelming his enemies with spectacular victories. They were not prepared for a carpenter who laid down his life as a victim. Jesus had promised repeatedly that the kingdom was coming without delay. Midway through the “little apocalypse” of Matthew’s gospel, Jesus says: “Truly, I say to you, this generation will not pass away till all these things take place” (Mt 24:35). Those utterances were canonized as scripture and read in the liturgy, without hesitation or interruption, even as Jesus’ own generation receded into history.

None of this precludes a *parousia* of Christ at the end of history. Theologians call that “coming” of Christ the “final advent” or “plenary *parousia*”—not because Christ will have a greater fullness then, but rather because humankind will be able to behold him in his fullness, with senses unveiled. “Beloved, we are God’s children now; it does not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he appears we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is” (1 Jn 3:2).

Since Christ’s coming, he is present in the world in a way

that he was not in the old covenant; yet he remains veiled in a way that he will not be veiled at the consummation of history. In its interpretation of the phrase "Thy kingdom come," the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* states: "The Kingdom of God has been coming since the Last Supper and, in the Eucharist, it is in our midst. The kingdom will come in glory when Christ hands it over to his Father" (n. 2816).¹

In his incarnation, Jesus came; and, as he passed from human sight, he promised to sustain his presence forever: "I am with you always, to the close of the age" (Mt 28:20). Thus, his *parousia*—his presence—remained with Christians, even as they prayed for its plenitude.



Several generations of scholars, from the nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century, told the story of the primitive church in terms of eschatological expectation and eventual disappointment, followed by ecclesiastical damage control. Jesus predicted a glorious return, which the first believers died awaiting. In the words of Alfred Loisy: Christ preached the kingdom, but left only the church.² In this view, Stephen's vision represented an ecclesiastical effort to reinterpret Jesus' eschatology, recasting it as a "realized eschatology"—a spiritualizing of a formerly material expectation.

Jaroslav Pelikan wrote forcefully against such scholars, who find a supposedly "catastrophic" sense of delay in the early texts: "Any such description is based on too simplistic a view of the role of apocalyptic in the teaching of Jesus and in

the early church. Nor is it corroborated by later texts, for one looks in vain for proof of a bitter disappointment over the postponement of the *parousia* or of a shattering of the early Christian communities by the delay of the Lord's return."³

The "catastrophic" interpretation has grown increasingly untenable with the documentary discoveries of the past hundred and fifty years. Subsequent scholarship has demonstrated persuasively that realized eschatology represents the most primitive strain of Christian eschatology—and that Christian hope for an imminent *parousia* was actually born of faith in a liturgical *parousia*. Pelikan marshaled the ancient literary and liturgical evidence and summarized the argument in a conclusive way:

That impression is corroborated by the references to the "coming" of Christ in the scraps of early liturgies that have come down to us. For example, the Benedictus of Matthew 21:9 was clearly an affirmation of the coming of the end with the promised arrival of the messianic kingdom. But at least as early as the Apostolic Constitutions, and presumably earlier, the liturgical practice of the church employed these same words to salute either the celebrant or the eucharistic presence. . . . The coming of Christ was "already" and "not yet": he had come already—in the incarnation, and on the basis of the incarnation would come in the Eucharist; he had come already in the Eucharist, and would come at the last in the new cup that he would drink with them in his Father's kingdom. When the ancient liturgy prayed, "Let grace

come [or "Let the Lord come"], and let the world pass away," its eschatological perspective took in both the final coming of Christ and his coming in the Eucharist. The eucharistic liturgy was not a compensation for the postponement of the *parousia*, but a way of celebrating the presence of one who had promised to return.⁴

Gregory Dix confirmed that this was not a later eschatology imposed on the primitive *kerygma*. Indeed, it was everywhere in the ancient *kerygma*. Dix maintained that this notion of a liturgical *parousia* was "universal" by the third century, and probably long before, since, he added, there are no exceptions to this rule: "no pre-Nicene author Eastern or Western whose eucharistic doctrine is at all fully stated" holds a different view.⁵

Consider just two examples from the ancient liturgies. The West Syrian Liturgy of St. James announces: "Let all mortal flesh be silent, and stand with fear and trembling, and meditate nothing earthly within itself: for the King of kings and Lord of lords, Christ our God, comes forward."⁶ In its oldest Greek recensions, James consistently uses the word *parousia* to describe the liturgical theophany.⁷ The Egyptian liturgy of Sarapion proclaims: "This sacrifice is full of your glory."⁸ Similar passages can be found in the liturgies of Mark, Hippolytus, the Apostolic Constitutions, John Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria, as well as the Roman Canon.⁹

What the ancients saw in the liturgy was the coming of

Christ: the *parousia*; and what they meant by *parousia* is what Catholic theology came to express as the "real presence" or "substantial presence" of Jesus Christ.¹⁰



In the liturgy—in the event that the Acts of the Apostles calls "the breaking of the bread and the prayers"—the earliest Christians experienced the glorious coming of the Lord, though there they could see him only with eyes of faith, recognizing him, as did the disciples at Emmaus, "in the breaking of the bread."

The earliest Christian vision was of Christ ascended as the heavenly high priest, offering a liturgy of praise that somehow resembled the liturgy of God's people on earth. Alan Segal observed that this notion—of a mediating priest at the right hand of God—was a motif common in Hellenistic and mystical Judaism as well. Both Jews and Christians interpreted Psalm 110 as a prophecy of the messiah who would rule as king and officiate as "a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek" (Ps 110:4). Segal found confirmation of this priestly ascension motif in the Letter to the Hebrews, which quotes Psalm 110:4 and comments: "he entered once for all into the Holy Place" (Heb 9:12).¹¹

The earliest Christian vision, then, bore striking similarities to the apocalyptic vision of Stephen. Christ the eternal priest stood, like Stephen's "son of man," at God's right hand, fulfilling the liturgy of the ancient temple and officiat-

ing at the liturgy of the church. This is not a novelty with Christianity, but rather a profound development of the ancient Israel's understanding of divine worship.

The people of Israel considered their earthly liturgy to be a divinely inspired imitation of heavenly worship. Both Moses and Solomon constructed God's earthly dwellings—the tabernacle and the temple—according to a heavenly archetype revealed by God himself (see Ex 25–27; 1 Chr 28; Wis 9:8). The prophets expressed this belief in a mystical way, as they depicted the angels worshipping amid songs and trappings that were clearly recognizable from the Jerusalem temple (see Is 6 and Ezek 1). The hymns sung by the angels were the same songs the Levites sang before the earthly sanctuary.

We find the idea in full flower at the time of Jesus Christ and expressed in the non-canonical books of Enoch and Jubilees and in the Dead Sea Scrolls. What the priests did in the temple sanctuary was an earthly imitation of what the angels did in heaven.

None of this was mere pageantry. Both the heavenly and earthly liturgies had more than a ceremonial purpose. The angelic liturgy preserved a certain order not only in the courts of the Almighty, but in the entire universe. God had given over the governance of creation to his angels, and so the world itself was caught up in a cosmic liturgy: "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory" (Is 6:3). As Israel's priests performed their temple liturgy, they—like their counterparts in heaven—preserved and sanctified the order of the cosmos.

Thus, Israel's worship overflowed to form Israel's culture.

This is what made David a man after God's own heart. He wanted to configure earthly space and time so that all of the kingdom's temporal works flowed from worship and returned to God as a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. He moved the ark of the covenant to rest as the center of his capital city, and he planned a magnificent temple as its home. He endowed the priests and their attendants richly, and he himself composed beautiful liturgies for their use.

With all of that in their cultural and historical background, the Jews of Jesus' time would have recognized the beauty of his petition in the Lord's Prayer "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," in a way that many of us today do not.

To the ancient People of God, heaven and earth were distinct, but earth traced the motions of heaven most clearly in the rites of the temple. They recognized that to worship God in this way was an awesome gift. Yet it was still only a shadow of the angels' worship—and only a shadow of the earthly worship that would be inaugurated by Jesus Christ.

By assuming human flesh, however, Christians believed that Jesus brought heaven to earth. Moreover, with his very flesh, he had fulfilled and perfected the worship of ancient Israel. No longer must the covenant-people worship in imitation of angels. In the liturgy of the new covenant, the renewed Israel—the church—worshiped *together with the angels*. Martimort explained: "This singular interplay of earth and heaven is characteristic of the Christian liturgy. There are not two liturgies, any more than there are two Churches. Rather, as the same Church is a pilgrim on earth and tri-

umphant in heaven, so the same liturgy is celebrated here below in figurative rites and without figures 'beyond the veil' in the heavenly sanctuary."¹²

In the New Testament, the Book of Revelation revealed the *shared* liturgy of heaven and earth. Around the throne of God, men and angels bowed down and worshiped together (see Rev 5:14); an angel lifted the Seer up to stand beside him (Rev 19:10). Moreover, the renewed Israel—the Christian church—was portrayed as a kingdom of priests (Rev 1:6; 5:10; 20:6), so that all were admitted to the holiest inner sanctum of the temple.

The Book of Revelation, most especially, highlights the historical and cosmological development that has taken place. Erik Peterson explained: "We see clearly that the earthly Jerusalem with its temple worship has been the starting point for these ideas and images of primitive Christian literature; but the starting point has been left behind and it is no longer upon earth that Jerusalem is sought as a political power or centre of worship but in heaven, whither the eyes of all Christians are turned."¹³

Rabbi Baruch Levine, in his commentary on Leviticus, has noted the Mass's continuity with the worship of Jerusalem's temple. After the destruction of the temple in 70 A.D., rabbinic Judaism continued with non-sacrificial worship in the synagogue; Christianity's liturgy took up the temple's sacrificial liturgy, in a renewed form. "Christian worship in the form of the traditional mass affords the devout an experience of sacrifice, of communion, and pro-

claims that God is present. The Christian church, then, is a temple."¹⁴

The tradition of the old covenant's priesthood passed into the new covenant's priesthood. In the verse that immediately precedes Stephen's story in Acts, we learn that "a great many of the [temple] priests were obedient to the faith" (Acts 6:7). The fathers understood this liturgical and sacrificial connection between the temple and the church. Eusebius tells us that John "wore the sacerdotal plate," the *petalon*, until the end of his days, as did James of Jerusalem.¹⁵ And the earliest Christian documents (*Didache*, Ignatius, Justin) agree in using overwhelmingly sacrificial language (sacrifice, altar, oblation) to describe the church's liturgy.¹⁶

In the worship of the new covenant, however, Christ himself now served as high priest of the liturgy in heaven and on earth—a liturgy led in the church by his clergy, who "preside in the place of God."¹⁷ And Christians not only imitated the angels, but actively participated in the angelic worship. The sense of angelic presence is especially acute in the primitive liturgies.¹⁸

The early Christians professed their belief in the angelic presence and power in the heavenly liturgy, the church's liturgy, and the "cosmic liturgy" of all creation. God had delegated both liturgical and cosmic ministries to the angels; but Christians now shared that liturgical and cosmic authority as they worshiped with the angels. Thus, the Book of Revelation shows liturgical action as directing human history. At the onset of wars and bloodshed, we see "the wine of

God's wrath, poured unmixed into the cup of his anger" (Rev 14:10).

The doctrine of the angels, like the arm of God, has not been shortened over time; and it remains integral to every liturgy of the apostolic churches. In the Roman liturgy's prefaces, this theme is especially strong: "And so with all the choirs of angels in heaven, we proclaim your glory and join in their unending hymn of praise. . . . Holy, Holy, Holy . . ."

Cardinal Ratzinger has noted that the New Testament's apocalyptic imagery is overwhelmingly liturgical, and the church's liturgical language is overwhelmingly apocalyptic. "The *parousia* is the highest intensification and fulfillment of the liturgy," he writes. "And the liturgy is *parousia*. . . . Every Eucharist is *parousia*, the Lord's coming, and yet the Eucharist is even more truly the tensed yearning that He would reveal His hidden Glory"¹⁹

The patristic era provides no more stunning, and extensive, presentation of the heavenly-earthly liturgy than the theological meditation found in the fourth-century Syriac *Liber Graduum*, or Book of Steps:

Since we know that the body becomes a hidden temple and the heart a hidden altar for spiritual worship, let us be diligent in this public altar and before this public temple. . . . For our Lord and his first and last preachers did not erect in vain the church and the altar and baptism, all of which are visible to physical eyes. It is through these visible things, however, that we shall be in these heavenly things, which are invisible to eyes of flesh, our bodies becoming temples and

*our hearts altars (Heb 11:3). Let us open [the door] and enter into this visible church with its priesthood and its worship. . . . Then . . . that heavenly church and spiritual altar will be revealed to us and we will sacrifice praise upon it through the prayer of our hearts and the supplication of our bodies while believing in this visible altar and this priesthood, which serves [the altar] true for us.*²⁰



The eucharist is the *parousia*. In the divine liturgy, Christ descends to the altar, and the assembly ascends to heaven with Christ. Heaven and earth, full of God's glory, unite in worship. What, then, of the other events customarily associated with the *parousia*? What of judgment? Whenever the New Testament speaks of Christ's coming, it speaks also of his judgment.

The eucharistic *parousia* is a real presence—and thus it is, necessarily, Christ coming in power to judge. His power is evident in its effects on those who receive communion. In his first Letter to the Corinthians, Paul speaks specifically of those who receive unworthily and so bring judgment upon themselves. "That is why many of you are weak and ill, and some have died" (11:30). For such unrepentant sinners, the eucharist is the final coming of Christ; it is the last judgment, and they are experiencing the curses stipulated in the covenant. A little over a generation later, Ignatius will put the doctrine in starkest terms: "Those, then, who speak against this gift of God, incur death."²¹

There is, however, an unspoken corollary to Paul's account of the judgment of sinners. With the eucharistic *parousia* comes also the judgment of the saints. If Christ's coming means sickness and death to sinners, how much more will his coming mean blessings and health to those who "discern the Lord's body"? A liturgy of ancient Egypt expresses this well at the very moment of consecration, when it asks God to make every communicant worthy "to receive a medicine of life for the healing of every sickness and . . . not for condemnation."²² This echoes the still older praise of Ignatius of Antioch, who called the eucharist the "medicine of immortality, the antidote against death."²³

It is the glorified Christ who comes in the eucharist, for communion with those who are worthy to receive the gift. For the saints, the judgment of the *parousia* is everlasting life, a share in Christ's own resurrected flesh. At the end of the second century, Irenaeus could ask: "how can they say that the flesh, which is nourished with the body of the Lord and with his blood, goes to corruption? . . . For the bread, which is produced from the earth, is no longer common bread, once it has received the invocation of God; it is then the eucharist, consisting of two realities, earthly and heavenly. So also our bodies, when they receive the eucharist, are no longer corruptible, but have the hope of the resurrection to eternity."²⁴

And what of the kingdom that the early Christians so earnestly expected to come with the *parousia*—the kingdom that Christ himself had promised? After all, it was Jesus who set such a high level of expectation in the church; and it was

Jesus who pointed to its imminent fulfillment. Indeed, it was Jesus who established the eucharist as an eschatological event—a *parousia*—a coming of the King and the kingdom. We must not miss the small but significant details in the scriptural accounts of the Last Supper. As Jesus took the bread and wine, he said to his apostles: "I have earnestly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer; for I tell you I shall not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God. . . . I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes" (Lk 22:15–16, 18). As he instituted the sacrament, he instituted the kingdom. A moment later, he spoke of the kingdom in terms of a "table" (v. 27) and a "banquet" (v. 30)—language that will recur in the final chapters of the Book of Revelation. If we are looking for familiar apocalyptic language, we will find it aplenty in Luke's account of the Last Supper, but we will find it always expressed in eucharistic terms. Jesus goes on to speak of apocalyptic trials, in which believers are "sifted like wheat" (v. 31), language that will be taken up, in turn, by the martyrs Ignatius and Polycarp.

The kingdom indeed came, as Jesus had promised, within the generation of the disciples. The kingdom came as the church, which is constituted by the eucharist. The church's glory, like Christ's own glory, is not visible to bodily eyes. It is, in fact, obscured by the imperfections of its members. But recall that Christ compared the kingdom to a dragnet filled with fish and with trash; recall that he compared it to a field planted with both weeds and wheat. He could not have been speaking of the fulfillment of the kingdom at the end of time; for then there will be no mourning,

no crying, no pain, nor anything accursed (see Rev 21:4, 22:3). He was speaking about the church that the first Christians knew—the church that is the kingdom.

The *Catechism* returns to this idea repeatedly: “The Church knows that the Lord comes even now in his Eucharist and that he is there in our midst. However, his presence is veiled. Therefore we celebrate the Eucharist ‘awaiting the blessed hope and the coming of our Savior, Jesus Christ. . . .’” (n. 1404; see also n. 2816).



Catholic theology since the Protestant Reformation has, understandably, emphasized the real presence of Christ in the eucharistic elements, under the appearance of bread and wine. That doctrine, after all, was the object of attacks by Calvin, Luther, and Zwingli.

But the Second Vatican Council moved the church beyond timely apologetics, and spoke of the timeless truth of Christ’s presence in the Mass. The constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium* pointed out three modes of Christ’s presence in the Mass. He is especially present, said the council fathers, in the eucharistic species; but he is also present in the person of the officiating priest. Finally, “he is present in his word, since it is he himself who speaks when the holy scriptures are read in the church.”²⁵

Again, this is not a new idea. In the years before the council, Pierre Journel wrote of the liturgical reading of the gospel as “in fact, a theophany, an appearance of Christ

the King, the Son of God, of one substance with the Father, in the midst of the assembly.”²⁶ Josef Jungmann agreed: “It is neither accidental nor fortuitous that when the Gospel has been read at Mass we greet the Lord as though present: *Gloria tibi, Domine!*”²⁷

And the idea has strong patristic precedents. As I pointed out in an earlier chapter, the fathers often compared the reception of the word with the reception of the eucharist. Origen wrote: “We are said to drink the blood of Christ not only when we receive it according to the rite of the mysteries, but also when we receive his words, in which life dwells, as he said himself: ‘The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life.’”²⁸

As in the “public liturgy” of Stephen’s martyrdom, the church’s proclamation culminated in *parousia* and then sacrificial self-offering and communion. “It is consummated” (Jn 19:30); and yet all members of the church still “wait in joyful hope for the coming of our savior Jesus Christ.”

Inasmuch as . . . Christians are still living in this world, they expect, they wait for, this “parousia,” they pray and keep the vigil for they do not know when the Son of Man shall come. And this expectation is expressed therefore in a new fasting, in a new state of awaiting.

*This expectation, this yearning, is now constantly fulfilled and answered in the sacrament of the Lord’s Presence, in the Eucharistic banquet.*²⁹

Scripture must be read “with the church.” The Methodist theologian Stanley Hauerwas called Martin Luther’s doctrine of *sola scriptura* “a heresy rather than a help,” precisely because “It assumes that the text of Scripture makes sense separate from a Church that gives it sense.”²⁹ He noted also that this presupposition is shared as well by biblical fundamentalists and biblical critics; both “make the Church incidental.”³⁰

It has been said that “the history of doctrine is the history of exegesis.”³¹ But, through the first millennium of Christianity, we cannot find any widespread and sustained efforts in scientific exegesis. To read scripture “with the church” was to read it or hear it in the liturgy. Apostolic and patristic exegesis took place not primarily in the classroom or in the monastic cell, but in the public reading and proclamation of scripture in the liturgy. “The Fathers are pastors,” wrote Congar. “Their treatises are sermons.”³²

Even today, “with the church” remains functionally equivalent to “in the liturgy.” The liturgy is, as Pius XI taught us, the primary organ of the magisterium. The liturgy is, in the words of Congar, the principal instrument and the privileged locus of tradition. The liturgy is, as we saw in the scriptural apocalypses of Stephen and John, the place where we still encounter God’s word “in the Spirit.”

CHAPTER 9



APOCALYPSE AND MYSTAGOGY



LITURGY IS THE place where the scriptures emerge into light. Liturgy is the place where tradition lives and where the church teaches most surely. Liturgy is the place where the stream of salvation history runs swift and clear—sweeping Christians into the current of the divine and sacramental economy. Divine liturgy is the place where Christians, many millennia after the fall, the flood, the exodus, and the passion can participate directly in the fulfillment of the biblical types. Liturgy is the place where God's people have always gone to hear the covenant and to renew the covenant, with all their heart and mind, soul and body.

Yet, with the ascension of Jesus Christ into heaven, liturgy came to stand for something more than it had ever meant in sacred history. For, in heaven, according to the earliest Christian beliefs, Jesus stands forever as priest and as victim. The Christian people, sharing his nature by baptism, share in his priesthood and offer their own lives with his as an oblation. Jesus Christ presides over a liturgy that unites heaven and earth. Listen to Martimort:

LETTER AND SPIRIT

By his victorious ascension Christ had broken through the boundaries of creation; he had triumphed over time and taken human nature with him into the heavenly sanctuary where Israel had accustomed itself to seeing myriads of angels performing their service around Adonai. Henceforth, those on earth would not simply imitate what was done perfectly on 'the mountain of God,' in heavenly Zion; they would actually take part in that solemn liturgy.¹

These are the themes presented in most powerful terms in the biblical books of Hebrews and Revelation, but especially Revelation. Martimort wrote: "What the pattern of the tabernacle shown on the mountain (Ex 25:9) was for Moses, the Letter to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse are for the Church."² Little wonder, then, that "The spirit of the Letter to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse enlivens the early Eucharistic Prayers of all the Christian rites and permeates their ceremonial."³ Both books describe, in figurative and theological language, what is continuous in the covenants, old and new, and in the liturgies, old and new—and what is discontinuous. Both books address the question: In what sense did the new fulfill the old?

In the early centuries, the mainstream of Christianity rejected two proposed answers to that question. One would come to be known as the "Ebionite" solution—a Jewish-Christian model that saw Christ's fulfillment as predominantly restorative of the old covenant and its law. The other proposal would eventually coalesce into Marcionism—an

anti-Jewish model that saw Christ's fulfillment as transformative—an utter rejection and replacement of Israel, the God of Israel, his liturgy, his law, and his scripture. Though the names “Ebionite” and “Marcionite” were not applied until the second century, the seeds of these movements were certainly present in the first generations. The problem of fulfillment is at the heart of Paul's arguments in Romans and Galatians; and it is the very stuff of the recurrent disputes in the Acts of the Apostles.

The matter is settled definitively, if mysteriously, in Hebrews and Revelation. There, the church articulates an understanding of fulfillment that it is both transformative and restorative—a transfiguration of the law, the liturgy, and the kingdom of Israel.

The body of Christ can serve as a paradigm. When the gospels portrayed Jesus in his post-resurrection appearances, he possessed the same body that had been beaten and bled only days before; it was restored, and yet it was also transformed. In a similar way, as the earthly temple would be destroyed, so by Christ's resurrection and ascension it would be both restored and transformed in heaven. At his ascension, Christ represented the church as he entered within the veil, once for all; and so he elevated the covenant worship of the assembly. As priest in heaven, he possessed the same body as when he had celebrated the old Passover on earth, but it was now transformed and transfigured. In Revelation, he appeared offering himself to the Father as a perpetual oblation, “a lamb standing, as if slain” (Rev 5:6)—his body is restored and yet transformed.

Jesus Christ is both victim and priest in the heavenly liturgy, which by his ascension he united with the earthly liturgy. Thus, it was in and through his body that he transformed the old covenant into the new, the old liturgy into the new, the old law into the new. The eucharistic body of Christ, then, is not simply a reappearance of Jesus' earthly body. This *parousia* is restorative, and it is transformative.

It is the presence of Christ—as “a high priest forever” (Heb 6:20) and a sacrifice “without blemish” (Heb 9:14)—that makes the difference. And this is what both Hebrews and Revelation communicate in their visions of the heavenly liturgy. Both books provide Christianity's first and foundational mystagogy—a divinely revealed “guidance in the mysteries.” Both present a vision of the sacramental economy as it came to fulfillment in heaven and earth.

Now, we may anticipate the most obvious objection. Some may scoff at this suggestion, with Martin Luther, who went so far as to question the canonical status of John's Apocalypse. Luther complained that “A Revelation should reveal something.”⁴ Revelation is indeed a difficult and sometimes obscure book.

The purpose of mystagogy, however, is not to dispel the divine mystery. Still less should a mystagogical work rationalize mystery away—or function as an extended exercise in cryptography. True mystagogy respects the divine mystery, even as it guides Christians into a more profound experience of, and participation in, that very mystery. The *Catechism* (n. 2777) captures this sense beautifully:

From the burning bush Moses heard a voice saying to him, "Do not come near; put off your shoes from your feet, for the place on which you are standing is holy ground" (Ex 3:5). Only Jesus could cross that threshold of the divine holiness, for "when he had made purification for sins," he brought us into the Father's presence: "Here am I, and the children God has given me" (Heb 1:3; 2:13).

That is the purpose of the great mystagogical teachings of the biblical and patristic ages, from Hebrews and Revelation through Cyril and Ambrose to Maximus Confessor and Nicholas Cabasilas. One and all, they reveal the mystery, without reducing it. In revealing the mystery, they reveal the new place of mankind in the covenantal and sacramental economy. Baptized into Christ's death, Christians are made "sons in the Son"—children of God. They enter the mystery, liturgically and sacramentally, with Christ himself.



In the mystagogy of the fathers, there are usually two well-developed components: an explanation of the sacramental rites, and an unveiling of the mysteries. Mystagogy of the sacraments leads believers to a deeper understanding of the liturgy and its scriptural and historical roots. The revelation of the mysteries, mystagogy proper, leads to a deeper understanding of the mysteries invisible to the eye, but perceptible by faith—e.g., the eucharistic *parousia* of Jesus Christ,

the heavenly liturgy, the presence of the angels and saints, and the fatherly Providence of God.

True mystagogy, then, unveils not only the rite, but the reality it represents (and re-presents). Mystagogy unveils not only a present ceremony, but an unfolding economy that encompasses past and future history. The subject of mystagogy is not only the sacraments, but primarily the mysteries.

But it often begins with the rites, though these require a simultaneous beginning in scripture. As Congar wrote in his monumental *Tradition and Traditions*: "It is evident to anyone who is acquainted with Scripture and the liturgy that the latter is woven out of scriptural texts and allusions. . . . Many liturgical gestures simply reproduce those mentioned in the Bible. Further, the liturgy's *ethos* is in continuity with that of Scripture."⁵

It is perhaps belaboring the obvious to point out that most of the liturgy is composed of scriptural texts. Consider a sampling from the Latin rite:

Trinitarian blessing	Mt 28:19
Sign of the cross	Rev 7:3; 9:4; 14:1; typified in Ezek 9:4
Amen	1 Chr 16:36b
Apostolic greeting	2 Cor 13:14
Dominus vobiscum	Lk 1:28; 2 Thess 3:16; 2 Tim 4:22; Ruth 2:4
Confiteor	After Ps 51; Jas 5:16; et al.
Kyrie	Mt 17:15; Mt 20:31; Ps 123:3

Gloria	Lk 2:14; many texts in Revelation
First reading	Usually from OT, Acts, epistles, or Revelation
Responsorial psalm	A psalm or biblical canticle
Second reading	Usually from NT books (not the gospels)
Alleluia	Rev 19:1–6; Tob 13:18
Gospel	From the gospels
Sursum corda	Lam 3:41
Sanctus	Rev 4:8; Is 6:3; Mk 11:9–10; Ps 118:26
Eucharistic prayer	The heart is 1 Cor 11:23–26; many other passages
The great amen	Rev 5:14
The Lord's Prayer	Mt 6:9–13
Sign of Peace	Jn 14:27; 20:19
Agnus Dei	Jn 1:29; Rev 5:6 and elsewhere
Ecce Agnus Dei	Rev 19:9
Domine, non sum dignus	Mt 8:8
Dismissal	Lk 7:50; 2 Chr 35:3
Deo gratias	2 Cor 9:15

To subject any of the eucharistic prayers to the same analysis would be to double the size of the chart. Needless to say, the Byzantine, Malabar, Maronite, Melkite, and other rites employ the same density of biblical quotation and allusion.

A mystagogy of the rites should begin from these scrip-

tural beginnings, not for the sake of proof-texting, but for the sake of historical grounding. Again, the liturgy is the *Sitz im Leben* of the Bible and of the fathers. It is the principle and the place of continuity for Christian tradition and interpretation.

The chart above shows how intimately the biblical Book of Revelation interrelates with the earthly liturgy. We could draw up a similar chart tracking the liturgical elements in the Apocalypse (and indeed it has been done).⁶ It is difficult to say which way the current of influence runs stronger, from the earthly rites to the Seer's vision, or vice versa. One thing is certain: the canon's final coda makes little sense apart from the liturgical worship of God's covenant people. Leonard Thompson wrote that "Even a cursory reading of the Book of Revelation shows the presence of liturgical language set in worship."

*In both Revelation and the early church, worship serves as the setting in which eschatological narratives (such as the Book of Revelation itself) unfold. Furthermore, in both Revelation and the churches of Asia Minor, worship realizes the kingship of God and his just judgement; through liturgical celebration eschatological expectations are experienced presently. Hymns, thanksgivings, doxologies, and acclamations realize in the context of worship the eschatological message. . . . The Book of Revelation, by functioning in communal worship of Asia Minor as heavenly worship functions in the book itself, links heaven and earth. The work mediates its own message."*⁷

The liturgy illuminates both the literal-historical sense and the theological and mystical senses of the Book of Revelation. Even commentators apart from the liturgical traditions have, with laborious effort, reconstructed this fact. Oddly enough, commentators within the liturgical traditions have grown somewhat fearful of the Apocalypse. Ian Boxall, in his remarkable study, *Revelation: Vision and Insight*, noted that "The Orthodox Church forbids the reading of the book during public worship, reserving the book for the spiritually mature." While acknowledging the dangers inherent in popular misunderstanding of Revelation's sometimes violent text, Boxall says, nevertheless, that liturgical suppression merely exacerbates the problem. "To remove such texts from liturgical use . . . will not necessarily mean that people will no longer read them, but that they will be read in a dangerously uninformed and unreflective manner. A liturgical context for reading, however, can minimize these dangers."⁸

What actualizes the Book of Revelation is the earthly liturgy, because the church's earthly liturgy actualizes the heavenly liturgy on earth. To participate in the church's worship is to share the prostrations and praises of the angels and saints. To read the Apocalypse liturgically is to begin to understand the Apocalypse, and how the rites of heaven direct the course of earthly history. The household of God observes an *oikonomia*—literally, a "household law." It is evident in the typological pattern of salvation history, which continues now in the church's liturgy.

The eschatological orientation—and eschatological immanence—of the liturgy is as evident in the most primitive

liturgies as it is in the New Testament's apocalypses. It is evident as well in the church's most recent teaching. The unity of heavenly and earthly liturgy is a theme that has dominated the documents of the Catholic Church since the Second Vatican Council. Nowhere is this as evident as in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Consider just a sampling of the *Catechism's* doctrine (all emphases are in the original):

"In the earthly liturgy we share in a foretaste of that heavenly liturgy which is celebrated in the Holy City of Jerusalem toward which we journey as pilgrims, where Christ is sitting at the right hand of God, Minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle." (CCC, n. 1090; quoting Sacrosanctum Concilium 8)

"[T]hrough her liturgical actions the pilgrim Church already participates, as by a foretaste, in the heavenly liturgy." (CCC, n. 1111)

"Liturgy is an 'action' of the whole Christ (Christus totus). Those who even now celebrate it without signs are already in the heavenly liturgy, where celebration is wholly communion and feast." (CCC n. 1136)

"The liturgy is the work of the whole Christ, head and body. Our high priest celebrates it unceasingly in the heavenly liturgy, with the holy Mother of God, the apostles, all the saints, and the multitude of those who have already entered the kingdom." (CCC, n. 1187)

"Finally, by the Eucharistic celebration we already unite ourselves with the heavenly liturgy and anticipate eternal life, when God will be all in all." (CCC, n. 1326)⁹

To the modern western mind—acclimated, as it is, to non-liturgical varieties of Christianity—this vision of worship can seem startling, and perhaps dubious. It has been the constant norm, however, in the apostolic eastern churches. In the Byzantine and West Syrian traditions, the pervasive belief in the actualization of the heavenly liturgy has had a profound effect on all the liturgical arts, from hymnody to church architecture and decoration.¹⁰ Pope John Paul II, in his apostolic letter *Oriente Lumen*, wrote of the Byzantine liturgy: "The lengthy duration of the celebrations, the repeated invocations, everything expresses gradual identification with the mystery celebrated with one's whole person. Thus the prayer of the Church already becomes participation in the heavenly liturgy, an anticipation of the final beatitude." A. G. Martimort observed that "The Roman rite is more restrained but no less realistic about the supraterritorial character of the liturgy."¹¹



What the Apocalypse shows is the definitive consummation of the covenant. Thus the number seven dominates the book: seven churches, the seven spirits and seven torches of fire before the throne, the seven lampstands, the seven spirits of the son of man and the seven stars in his right hand,

the seven seals, seven angels that stand before God, the seven horns and seven eyes of the Lamb, the seven thunders, seven trumpets, and seven chalices of God's wrath. The overwhelming message is that the son of man has definitively renewed the covenant. He has sevened himself by the liturgical offering of his body, once for all.

Revelation shows that the historic covenants found recapitulation in Christ. Like Adam, Jesus received the "tree of life" (Rev 22:2), thus renewing God's original covenant with the human family. As the unblemished passover lamb (Rev 5:6), Jesus fulfilled the Mosaic covenant before going on to inherit a promised land for Israel; as he and his saints occupy heaven, the blast of seven trumpets (a liturgical act), brings down the walls of the earthly city (Rev 8–9; cf. Jos 6:3–7). Like David his ancestor, Jesus ascended the throne "to rule all the nations with a rod of iron" (Rev 12:5).

In Revelation, we see the perfect fulfillment of God's covenant with his people. Every previous fulfillment, in the Old Testament, had been real, but also partial, and thus incomplete. So each covenant fulfillment was a type, driven forward, by way of anticipation, toward something greater—yet still only partial, still incomplete, still pointing to the future. Ultimately, the *parousia* stands as the final cause, the cause of all previous causes. It is the eucharistic *parousia*, in which Christ comes and breaks open the scriptures (Rev 6). But even the eucharistic *parousia* points forward to a plenary *parousia*—a day when Christ will come in glory, and we will see him as he is. G. K. Beale speaks of this final *parousia* in profound and moving terms:

When Christ appears, he will not descend from the sky over Boston or London or New York City or Hong Kong or any other localized area. When he appears, the present dimension will be ripped away, and Christ will be manifest to all eyes throughout the earth (see Mt 24:27). . . . If John were living today, he might use the analogy of a stage curtain with pictures on it, which is drawn from both sides to reveal the actors behind it. In short, the present physical reality will in some way disappear and the formerly hidden heavenly dimension, where Christ and God dwell, will be revealed.¹²

Mystagogy is what keeps the church in typological balance. The present state remains penultimate. Christians now receive God's heavenly life in the eucharist, but through transitory earthly forms that are, nevertheless, fully able to communicate divine sonship.

This is the dynamism that drives history—the eschatological teleology of the covenant sequence. The economy itself is the key. It is an unfolding process of gradual and cumulative development. Each stage is anticipated in prior stages, but each stage points forward to something greater.

Mystagogy, based on the biblical Apocalypse, keeps that eschatological tension here and now. The end was the cause from the beginning. Says the *Catechism*: “From the beginning until the end of time the whole of God's work is a *blessing*. From the liturgical poem of the first creation to the canticles of the heavenly Jerusalem, the inspired authors proclaim the plan of salvation as one vast divine blessing” (CCC n. 1079).

The human person, most especially, was created for the

sake of worship. The priest says as much in a preface of the eucharistic prayer: “You made man the steward of creation, to praise you . . . with all the angels in their song of joy: Holy, Holy, Holy.”¹³ And in its liturgical consummation all the world is manifest in its created and perfected form: “creation is revealed for what it is: a complex whole which finds its perfection, its purpose in the liturgy alone. This is why *the liturgy is heaven on earth* [emphasis mine].”¹⁴

“For the creation waits with eager longing,” said St. Paul, “for the *apocalypse*—the revealing—of the sons of God” (Rom 8:19).

The liturgy reveals the children of God. The liturgy reveals the kingdom of God. The liturgy reveals the word of God most perfectly because, in the liturgy, the Word of God himself is present as the hermeneutical key.

This is the stuff of economy, typology, mystagogy. In the fourth century, the Bordeaux pilgrim traveled to Jerusalem where she witnessed the mystagogical preaching of the city's bishop. (Was it Cyril himself?) She described the scene in warm detail:

And while the bishop discusses and sets forth each point, the voices of those who applaud are so loud that they can be heard outside the church. And truly the mysteries are so unfolded that there is no one unmoved at the things that he hears to be so explained.¹⁵

Heaven has come to earth, and hearts rise up to heaven. Is it any wonder they applauded?

NOTES

as *Public Liturgy in Early Christianity* (Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 2001).

27. See Ignatius, *Romans* 4, in *The Apostolic Fathers*, ed. J. B. Lightfoot and J. R. Harmer (London: Macmillan, 1891), p. 151.

28. See *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 14–15 in Lightfoot and Harmer 207–8.

Chapter 7

1. It is interesting to note, with F. X. Durrwell, that “Scripture speaks only of the ‘coming’ of Christ; it ignores any mention whatsoever of a ‘return.’” Durrwell, F.-X., *Eucharist, Presence of Christ* (Denville, NJ: Dimension, 1974), p. 18. The word *parousia* occurs in only one place in the gospels, in Matthew 24, and there it does not mean “second coming” (a term that occurs nowhere in the Bible).

2. Alfred Loisy, *The Gospel and the Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), p. 166.

3. Pelikan I:124; see also David Edward Aune’s *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 1972): “In the Apocalypse of John . . . the final judgment is realized in present experience within the context of worship” (p. 14). “Some of the references to the ‘seeing’ and ‘coming’ of Jesus within these Discourses apparently refer to the cultic vision or epiphany of the exalted Jesus, in which the actual pneumatic experience of a cultic Christophany is clothed in the language and imagery of conventional theophanic and Parousia Traditions” (p. 15). “The cultic worship of the Johannine community provided a present experience of the exalted and living Jesus in terms of the recurring actualization of his future Parousia. This recurring culting ‘coming’ of the exalted Jesus was conceptualized in terms of traditional Christian Parousia imagery, and was directly experienced by the worshipping congregation ‘in the Spirit,’ or alternately as a presence mediated through the office of prophetic personalities” (pp. 101–2). “[T]he ‘coming’ of Jesus in the relevant passages under discussion from John 14 refers primarily to the recurring cultic ‘coming’ of Jesus in the form of a pneumatic or prophetic *visio Christi* within the setting of worship ‘in the Spirit’ as celebrated by the Johannine community. The eucharist undoubtedly forms the central moment of this setting within the cultic

NOTES

worship of the community which the exalted Jesus, now present in Parousia splendor, pronounces both blessing and woe, salvation and judgment through prophetic cult personnel” (p. 129).

4. Pelikan I:126–27.

5. Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (New York: Seabury, 1982), pp. 252–53.

6. Liturgy of St. James, ANF 7, p. 540.

7. Baby Varghese, *West Syrian Liturgical Theology* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004), p. 83.

8. John Wordsworth (ed.), *Bishop Sarapion’s Prayer Book: An Egyptian Pontifical Dated Probably About AD 350–356* (London: SPCK, 1899), p. 61.

9. For an excellent discussion of these and similar passages, see Jerome Gassner, O.S.B., *The Canon of the Mass* (New York: Herder, 1950), p. 158.

10. See Brian E. Daley, *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), pp. 12–13.

11. Segal 87–89.

12. Martimort I:248.

13. Erik Peterson, *The Angels and the Liturgy* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1962), p. ix.

14. Levine, *Leviticus* 216–17.

15. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 5.24.3. See also W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), p. 127.

16. See, e.g., *Didache* 14; Ignatius, *Philadelphians* 4; Justin, *Dialogue* 117.

17. Ignatius of Antioch, *Magnesians* 6.1.

18. Erik Peterson brings this out in his extended study of the angels and the liturgy. Danielou and Wilken have also treated the subject at length. See Danielou, *The Angels and Their Mission*; Wilken, “Angels and Archangels: The Worship of Heaven and Earth,” in *Antiphon* 6:1.

19. Joseph Ratzinger, *Eschatology* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1988), p. 203.

20. *Liber Graduum* 12.2–3. *The Book of Steps: The Syriac Liber Graduum*, trans. Robert A. Kitchen and Martien F. G. Parmentier (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 2004), pp. 120–22.

21. Ignatius of Antioch, *Smyrnaeans* 7. In regard to divine punishment, Christoph Schonborn observes: “God’s punishment is salutary.

No man is abandoned by God to his fallen nature. The punishment of being scattered, the *diaspora* of the nations, is also *a way of being healed, the possibility of being made holy.* God's original plan to make mankind his family now makes use of the solidarity of peoples and languages, of nations and races, *to prepare for his Church.*" In *Loving the Church: Spiritual Exercises Preached in the Presence of Pope John Paul II*, trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1998), p. 85, emphases in original.

22. Wordsworth 63.
23. Ignatius of Antioch, *Ephesians* 20.2.
24. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 4.18.5.
25. SC 7.
26. Pierre Jounel, "The Bible in the Liturgy," in *The Liturgy and the Word of God*, p. 17.
27. Josef Jungmann, S.J., *Announcing the Word of God*, trans. Ronald Walls (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), p. 160.
28. Origen, *Homilies on Numbers* 16.9, quoted in Olivier Clement, *The Roots of Christian Mysticism*, trans. Theodore Berkeley (London: New City Press, 1995), p. 97.
29. Schmemmann, "Fast and Liturgy," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 3:1 (1959): 2-9.

Chapter 8

1. On the similarities between Catholic and Jewish notions of tradition, see Benjamin D. Sommer, "Unity and Plurality in Jewish Canons: The Case of the Oral and Written Torahs," in *One Scripture or Many? Canon from Biblical, Theological and Philosophical Perspectives*, ed. C. Helmer and C. Landmesser (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 111. He also writes: "the shared emphasis in Jewish and Catholic thought on the continuity between scripture and tradition is noteworthy; and the implications of this continuity for biblical theology demand attention." He also writes: ". . . this examination bolsters the category of tradition as one that functions alongside scripture, or even as a category that encompasses scripture. Thus this study evinces the affinity between Catholic and Jewish approaches to the Bible. Catholic and Jewish scholars face remarkably similar tools and opportunities as they attempt to relate their scriptures, respectively, to the teachings of the magisterium and

to the apprehensions of *kelal Israel* (the community of Israel, or as it has been felicitously rendered, catholic Israel). For both groups of interpreters, the tension between scripture and tradition recedes, because for both groups the boundary separating scripture and tradition is subordinate to an overarching unity" (p. 109).

2. DV 9; CCC 80.
3. St. Basil, *On the Holy Spirit* 27, 66.
4. W. Robertson Nicoll, *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. 2 (London: Hodder and Stoughton), 1912, p. 881.
5. Augustine, Sermon 267.4. See also CCC 809.
6. Augustine, *De Trinitate*.
7. CCC 1103.
8. Varghese 79, 82.
9. CCC 1099.
10. Pius XI, private audience, cited in Vagaggini 512.
11. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 4.18.5, cited in CCC 1327.
12. Prosper of Aquitaine, Letter 8, cited in CCC 1327.
13. CCC 1124.
14. John Henry Cardinal Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (New York: Doubleday, 1960).
15. Yves M.-J. Congar, O.P., *Tradition and Traditions*, trans. Michael Naseby and Thomas Rainborough (New York: MacMillan, 1966), p. 434; italics in original.
16. Congar 429.
17. John Allen, "The Word from Rome," *National Catholic Reporter*, June 6, 2003, www.nationalcatholicreporter.org/word/archives.htm.
18. Hughes Oliphant Old, *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), p. 100.
19. See also R. Elier, *The Three Temples: On the Emergence of Jewish Mysticism* (Oxford: Littman Library, 2004), p. 141: "The Covenant depended on oath and remembrance, knowledge and testimony—remembering the Covenant and observing its proper time in the cultic calendar, re-establishing the Covenant through sacrifices and offerings brought at a set time, Shavuot, and renewing the oath of the Covenant

NOTES

or its finalization; such were the tasks of those with whom the divine Covenant was concluded.”

20. Pius XI, *Quas Primas* 82–83.

21. Max Thurian, *Visible Unity and Tradition* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1964), p. 96.

22. 1 Clement 5; Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 3.3.4.

23. R. M. Grant quoted in Karlfried Froehlich, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), p. 14.

24. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 4.26.2, quoted in Froehlich 45.

25. *Smyrnaeans* 8.

26. Dom Prosper Gueranger, quoted in Yves M.-J. Congar, O.P., *The Meaning of Tradition*, trans. A. N. Woodrow (New York: Hawthorn, 1964), p. 125.

27. Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, *Church, Ecumenism and Politics* (New York: Crossroad, 1988), p. 80.

28. Bertrand de Margerie, S.J., *The Greek Fathers: A History of Exegesis*, trans. Leonard Maluf (Petersham, MA: St. Bede's, 1993), p. 130.

29. Stanley Hauerwas, *Unleashing the Scripture: Freeing the Bible from Captivity to America* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1993), p. 27. Similarly, the Lutheran scholar Robert W. Jenson has written: “If we allow no final authority to churchly dogma, or to the organs by which the church can enunciate dogma, there can be no canon of Scripture. The slogan *sola scriptura*, if by that is meant ‘apart from the creed, teaching office, or authoritative liturgy,’ is an oxymoron.” Robert W. Jenson, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 1 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 27–28.

30. Hauerwas 26.

31. Manlio Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church*, trans. John A. Hughes (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), p. 1.

32. Congar, *Tradition and Traditions*, 448.

Chapter 9

1. Martimort I:248.

2. Martimort I:247.

3. Martimort I:248.

4. For Luther on Revelation, see Roland Bainton, *Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther* (New York: Mentor, 1950), p. 261.

NOTES

5. Congar, *Tradition and Traditions*, 431.

6. Scott Hahn, *The Lamb's Supper* (New York: Doubleday, 1999), pp. 119–20.

7. Leonard L. Thompson, *The Book of Revelation: Apocalypse and Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), pp. 72–73. Scholars as varied as Geoffrey Wainwright, David Aune, Ian Boxall, and Margaret Barker come to remarkably similar conclusions regarding the relationship of Apocalypse to liturgy. See Wainwright, *Eucharist and Eschatology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), pp. 75–76; Aune, *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 1972), pp. 14–15, 101–2; Boxall, *Revelation: Vision and Insight* (London: SPCK, 2002), 150ff; Barker, “Parousia and Liturgy” in *The Revelation of Jesus Christ* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), pp. 373ff.

8. Boxall 151.

9. See also *Ecclesia de Eucharistia* 19.

10. See Pauli Maniyattu, *Heaven on Earth: The Theology of Liturgical Space-Time in the East Syrian Curbana* (Rome: Mar Thoma Yogam, 1995). For Western applications, see Martimort I:198–99, 205.

11. Martimort I:248.

12. G. K. Beale, *1–2 Thessalonians* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003), p. 138.

13. *Roman Missal*, Preface for Sundays in Ordinary Time V.

14. *Oriente Lumen* 11.

15. M. L. McClure, and C. L. Feltoe (ed. and trans.), *The Pilgrimage of Etheria* (London: SPCK, 1919), 94.

Chapter 10

1. Danielou, *Bible and the Liturgy* 130; Mazza, *Mystagogy*, 66ff.

2. Quoted in Mazza, *Mystagogy*, 91.

3. See Book Six of Hugh of St. Victor, *The Didascalicon of Hugh of St. Victor: A Medieval Guide to the Arts*, trans. Jerome Taylor (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), pp. 135–51. Also see Grover A. Zinn, Jr., “*Historia fundamentum est*: The Role of History in the Contemplative Life According to Hugh of St. Victor,” in *Contemporary Reflections on the Medieval Christian Tradition*, ed. George H. Shriver (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1964), pp. 135–58.