

Sacramental Nature of Church Art and Architecture

David W. Fagerberg

Liturgical Institute Conference: *Heaven On Earth*

October 25, 2006

Ever since the invitation from Denis, I have been searching for a metaphor that captures the peculiarity of me giving a talking to a group of architects and artists. It's like Helen Keller giving a tour of the Louvre. It's like Ray Charles painting your portrait. It's like the deaf Beethoven teaching my son's aural skills class. I protest to my friends that I lack an aesthetic capacity but have learned to live with it, like an adult who can't read has learned to cope with his environment. It took me twenty-five of our thirty-four years of marriage to realize that when I see a shirt on the rack in the store, my eye apprehends only three major facts: color, sleeve length, and does it have buttons. I boast proudly that I can unerringly and infallibly distinguish a blue, long-sleeve, button down shirt from a yellow, short-sleeve, pullover T-shirt, but that's pretty much all I notice. This accounts for why I could never understand exactly what secret knowledge my wife was drinking in when she took her time before a rack of clothes. I only recently discovered that in addition to my quick summation, she goes on to see whether the shirt is cotton or polyester or a blend; the weight of the cotton and density of threads per inch; how the stitching shows a kind of detail around the collar and cuffs; whether it is the right navy blue to go with those pants or an off-aquamarine that would not go with any trousers in the western hemisphere. All I knew was that it was a pretty blue shirt.

Similarly, I have the sense that when artists and architects and even ordinarily endowed human beings look at a Church, they see things that I don't. Or, perhaps it's better to say that they can explain what they see, whereas I take it in with one gulp but can't articulate anything.

I do, however, live in the ivory tower where I articulate many other things. I parse out theological items in detail, and Denis assured me that this was my only task in this keynote. I do not have to make a sketch for you of my idea of liturgical architecture; I do not have to put up a slide show of my favorite churches; I only am charged with thinking about the theological underpinnings of *why* liturgical architecture is what it is. That I believe I can do. So I'd like to take you on a short tour through anthropology and metaphysics and cosmic liturgy, and then I will bring myself to some concrete statements about their consequence for architecture.

If we're going to talk about fundamental principles, then I feel obliged to include, sort of like bookends, both the beginning and the end – protology and eschatology. Only within such a vast scope does Christian theology fully understand the place of *anthropos* in the cosmos. (I've taken to using the Greek word "anthropos" in order to reference man as one person composed of many individually existing men and women.) And the reason for looking at these parentheses markers of beginning and end is the uncomfortable sense of original sin. We are not now what we should have been, or what we hope one day to be. And when any product is awaiting fulfillment, then you're better off starting with what "what is anthropos? What should have been the task of man and woman, and toward what end does God's providence lead?"

Fr Alexander Schmemmann describes man's unique role by calling anthropos *homo adorans* – men and women are beings capable of giving adoration.

All rational, spiritual and other qualities of man, distinguishing him from other creatures, have their focus and ultimate fulfillment in this capacity to bless God, to know, so to speak, the meaning of the thirst and hunger that constitutes his life. "*Homo sapiens*," "*homo faber*" . . . yes, but, first of all, "*homo adorans*." The first, the basic definition of man is that he is *the priest*. He stands in the center of the world and unifies it in his act of blessing God, of both receiving the world from God and offering it to God . . . The world was created as the "matter," the material of one all-embracing eucharist, and man was created as the priest of this cosmic sacrament.¹

Anthropos is a hybrid composed of both matter and spirit, body and soul, and therefore able to participate in both realms. Angels can understand the sensible world, and animals can experience it, but only *anthropos* is an embodied spirit who can both perceive and know the material world. By reason of this conjunction of matter-spirit, anthropos was placed at the top of creation in order to mediate to the world the invisible graces of God from above, and mediate to God the praise of visible creation from below. This is how Fr Louis Bouyer describes creation according to the mind of the Christian fathers:

[T]he tradition of the Fathers has never admitted the existence of a material world apart from a larger creation, from a spiritual universe. To speak more precisely, for them the world, a whole and a unity, is inseparably matter and spirit. What we call the material world is only the reflection of a reflection.

We should think therefore of the material universe as a mirror held up to the spiritual, as a garden in which these spirits are gathered and which is made over to them, since it is to their image that it has been made. It is, as it were, the fringe of their garment: the waves of its light are like the scintillating robe with which the Creator has been pleased to adorn his invisible creation.

Across this continuous chain of creation, in which the triune fellowship of the divine persons has, as it were, extended and propagated itself, moves the ebb and flow of the creating *Agape* and of the created *eucharistia*.²

As cosmic priest, mediating agape to creation and eucharistia to God, anthropos should have unified creation. Humanity's place in the cosmos turns out to be a liturgical place. Protologically (in light of the origins), anthropos is the voice of mute creation, able to put creation's praise into words because he is made after the image of the Logos, the divine Word. Men and women have reason, speech, cleverness of mind and cleverness of hand. They can see the *logoi* in creation – traces of the *Logos* left strewn through creation. They can express by word and artifact the glories of creation, thus adding material creation's voice to the cosmic hymn of praise being sung to God. Other creatures praise God by being and obedience: the stars praise God by their brilliance and keeping to their decreed orbits; the force of life praises God by

surging through grasslands and by raising trees up to the heavens; the sentient animals praise God by their own form of animate consciousness and instinctual behavior. But it is anthropos who is their priest and speaks on their behalf in liturgical song. Man and woman were created as cosmic priest and as God's vicar over creation. The liturgical role of man and woman depends upon the twin capacities of sense and intellect, body and soul. They do a liturgy which neither angel nor animal can do.

Alas, the story takes a sorrowful turn from here. Anthropos is only too easily seduced by the Tempter and led into his rebellion. Anthropos neglects to bless God for the world, and at that moment, man and woman no longer see the material world as sacramental sign of agape, and they no longer see the world as raw material for eucharist. Instead, they see the material world as an end in itself, and as something for their own manipulation and pleasure. When we forget to bless God, the world is wronged.

Maximus the Confessor speaks of five divisions of being in creation that anthropos was supposed to hold united. When anthropos failed this, instead of holding in union what is divided, he has added to the alienation that creation experiences. First, the created is divided from the Uncreated (we no longer find our end in God); second, what is perceived by the mind is divided from what is perceived by the senses (we look without seeing); third, heaven is divided from earth (the angelic and earthly creations go their separate ways); fourth, paradise is divided from the inhabited lands (Eden, our original home, is far from our current place of toil); fifth, the division of man and woman appears (the need for reproducing through sexual union is a sign of death's reign over every generation).³

Anthropos was supposed to hold these extremes of being together in himself. This was the reason, says Fr Andrew Louth summarizing Maximus, why "the human person was

introduced last among beings, as a kind of natural bond mediating between the universal poles."⁴ Anthropos could have unified these five divisions by leading them into unity. Human beings could have unified creation and God because God is man's ultimate destiny; could have unified sense and mind because he can see with both, could have unified heaven and earth because as citizen of earth his destiny is heaven; could have unified paradise and the inhabited land because his original home is paradise and he tills the land; and could have unified the man and the woman because we are capable of a unifying love in the sacrament of marriage.

Anthropos "*could have* unified these divisions," I said, but that's precisely what anthropos failed to do. The fall is the forfeiture of our liturgical career. In sin we no longer stand aright as *homo adorans*. Therefore, the Son of God took on flesh to do as second Adam what the first Adam was supposed to do, but didn't. Christ is now the unity of creation. In an act of recapitulation, the divisions that the first Adam aggravated by his fall, the second Adam redeemed by his incarnation and ascent to the Father. Maximus says that in his ascent to the Father, Christ went through the five divisions in reverse order, starting with the last first.

It is the Incarnation that now overcomes the five divisions: **sexual division** through the virginal conception, the division between **paradise and the *oikoumene*** in the words from the cross to the repentant thief and in the resurrection appearances, that between **heaven and earth** in the event of the Ascension, that between the **intelligible and the sensible** by the enduring reality of the Ascension – the presence of the sacred humanity in heaven, and that between the **uncreated and created** by his sitting at the right hand of the Father."⁵

Maximus proclaims that it is through the incarnation that human beings can again fulfill their natural role as bond of creation. The sacred humanity of Jesus is united to his divine nature in hypostatic union. (That is, he is one person – one hypostasis – with two natures.) And by this, Maximus says, "Christ fulfills the great purpose of God the Father, to recapitulate everything both in heaven and on earth in himself."⁶ *Capitus* means "head." Creation is repeated but this

time correctly; the body of anthropos receives a new head; creation is headed up and united at last in anthropos; mankind is finally headed in the right direction.

It is into this God-Man that we are initiated in baptism. His work becomes ours, his identity becomes ours. In the words of Augustine, “What is the Church? She is the body of Christ. Join to it the Head, and you have one man: the head and the body make up one man. . . . Let us rejoice and give thanks. Not only are we become Christians, but we are become Christ.”⁷ This is other bookend I want to use – the eschatological bookend. We were made for this, we have failed this, but we are united to the Head as the Mystical Body and await in joyful hope the final fulfillment of our identity. Christ recapitulates all things, the cosmos as well as human history. The theologian who restored this to our consciousness a generation ago was Emile Mersch, and in his historical study, entitled *The Whole Christ*, published in 1940 after twenty years' work, he writes:

The idea that the Incarnate Word is in Himself the unity and harmony not only of men, but also of the entire universe and even of material things, was to remain a favorite theme for the Fathers of the Church . . . Athanasius in particular is so penetrated with this thought that he expresses it often. He loves to repeat that Christ is the leaven of the world: *pasa ktisis, ta panta*, the whole universe is the mass that He leavens and the body to which He gives life.⁸

Three years after Mersch's death, the encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* was issued clarifying and affirming this theology of the mystical body. Pope Pius XII writes, “the reason why the only-begotten Son of the Eternal Father willed to be a son of man was that we might be made conformed to the image of the Son of God and be renewed according to the image of Him who created us . . . It is the will of Jesus Christ that the whole body of the Church, no less than the individual members, should resemble Him. [para 46].” As “the nerves extend from the head to all parts of the human body and give them power to feel and to move, in like manner our Savior communicates strength and power to His Church so that the things of God are understood more

clearly and are more eagerly desired by the faithful. From Him streams into the body of the Church all the light with which those who believe are divinely illumined, and all the grace by which they are made holy as He is holy” [para 49].

My point here is that the eschatological task of members of the Mystical Body is to continue the work enabled by the Head. This is liturgy in motion. This is heaven on earth. The word liturgy comes from *leitourgia* which comes from *laos* (people) and *ergeia* (work) and means a work done by a few on behalf of the many. Christ's *ergeia* is given to his Mystical Body to continue. The work accomplished by the Head, the second Adam, is the unification of all creation, visible and invisible. Therefore, such is the task of the Church-at-liturgy. Or, in the simpler words of my teacher, Fr Aidan Kavanagh, "liturgy is doing the world the way the world was meant to be done."

With this anthropology and cosmology in place, I can make the following propositions about Church architecture.

1. Because of the Incarnation, therefore all matter and space and time is available for liturgical use. By this recapitulation, Christ makes available to his Church Sundays and seasons, icon paint and scripture ink, altars and priests, candles and incense, water and oil, bread and wine. The Word became flesh and consecrated all matter, and all created things are available for liturgical use. Paul Evdokimov can say about the world's end "that everything is destined for a liturgical fulfillment The final destiny of water is to participate in the mystery of the Epiphany; of wood, to become a cross; of the earth, to receive the body of the Lord during his rest on the Sabbath ... Olive oil and water attain their fullness as conductor elements for grace on regenerated man. Wheat and wine achieve their ultimate *raison d'etre* in the eucharistic chalice ... A piece of being becomes a hierophany, an epiphany of the sacred"⁹ Christ was a new thing,

and it is this new thing that liturgy celebrates. Liturgy is a new humanity anticipating a new heavens and a new earth. Therefore, all space, time and matter are available for liturgical use.

2. Everything has to pass through the hypostatic union before it's of any use to us, including church architecture. Everything in Christianity derives from the Incarnate Christ. Mersch does not hesitate to say that “the hypostatic union does not affect our Lord alone, but that it is somehow prolonged in us, the members; that we are the prolongation of the Head, and that the hypostatic union renders us divine by reason of our continuity with the Man-God.”¹⁰ In the words of Athanasius, “The Son of God became the Son of man in order that the sons of men, the sons of Adam, might be made sons of God. ... He is the Son of God by nature, we by grace.”¹¹ Therefore, says Cyril of Alexandria, “No created thing has the power to vivify The flesh of Paul, for instance, or of Peter could not produce this effect in us, but only the flesh of our Saviour, Christ.”¹² From Jesus' side, pierced on the cross, is taken the Church who is a New Eve, as the first Eve was taken from the side of the first Adam. The New Eve is to be the mother of a new humanity. Everything in Christianity is a participation in Christ, and reflects Christ, and is Christ's mystical presence in our midst, and comes from Christ's humanity, which is divinized by its union to a divine nature and shared with us as grace. Everything in Christianity flows from Christ's hypostatic union, including sacraments and priests and the people of God and Scripture proclaimed and hierarchical structures and magisterial offices – and it includes church architecture, too.

This means we cannot use any other religious building, sacrifice, or ritual as prototype for our Christian temple, altar, and liturgy. On this point we should give credit where credit is due. This was a cause championed by the liturgical movement. Josef Jungmann, writing in 1939, the same time as de Lubac and Mersch, identifies three subjects of Liturgy in the *totus Christus*:

"The first of these is Christ Himself. The second is the body of the faithful as a whole The third is the bearer of the official priesthood who stands at the altar."¹³ Further on, he repeats:

The principle subject of the Church's Liturgy is Christ Himself, the personal Christ, as He exists in heaven. He is not only the Founder of the church and of her Liturgy, He is also her foremost Priest. The priesthood of Christ in heaven is not only an honorary priesthood which He retains after His ascension ... No, Christ is really and truly Priest of the Church and as such He is active.¹⁴

Because the Incarnate one remains active in his Mystical Body, Jungmann concludes, therefore the architecture that houses the Mystical Body is different from a religious temple.

The Christian place of worship differs essentially in plan from the temples of the ancient pagan religions. The Roman and Greek temples, as also those of the Oriental races, were open edifices erected in honor of their gods. They were externally ornamented The interior of the temple was but a narrow dark cell in which the image of the deity was set up. Priests only were allowed to enter it, at the time when they had to perform their functions. No provision at all was made for the people; here the people were not bearers or repositories of divine worship.¹⁵

That the members united to the head are the subject of liturgy is affirmed succinctly in *Mediator Dei*, when Pope Pius XII defines the sacred liturgy as "the public worship which our Redeemer as Head of the Church renders to the Father, as well as the worship which the community of the faithful renders to its Founder, and through Him to the heavenly Father. It is, in short, the worship rendered by the Mystical Body of Christ in the entirety of its Head and members."¹⁶

That we have slighted the ordained priesthood, or slighted the baptismal priesthood, or reduced the scale of the cosmic liturgy to the group in attendance, or weakened the sense that Christ is the premiere liturgist, does not alter the fact that the liturgical renewal once had it right. Whatever problematics have arisen in execution, we must acknowledge the liturgical renewal's role in recalling the Church as an arena for a corporate activity.

3. This corporate activity of the Church is not the Jesus Club getting together in its club house. To think of Christian liturgy as a community religious event fails its cosmic and

eschatological dimensions (protology and eschatology). In his study of the *Angels in the Liturgy* in the book of Revelations, Erik Peterson writes that “The worship of the Church is not the liturgy of a human religious society, connected with a particular temple, but worship which pervades the whole universe and in which sun, moon, and all the stars take part [T]he Church is no purely human religious society. The angels and saints in heaven belong to her as well. Seen in this light, the Church’s worship is no merely human occasion. The angels and the entire universe take part in it.”¹⁷ If this is so, then Christian sacred architecture will look neither like other sacred architecture nor like other secular meeting halls.

I have sometimes expressed this by saying liturgy is not the religion of Christians; liturgy is the religion of Christ perpetuated in Christians. The religion that Jesus enacted in the flesh before the Father is continued in the Church liturgically. Columbia Marmion wrote, “The Church . . . has a part too in the religion of Christ towards His Father in order to continue upon earth the homage of praise that Christ in His Sacred Humanity offered to His Father.”¹⁸ I conclude from this that there is no altar in the Church as the pagans knew it, but there is the *hagia trapezia* (holy table), which presents Christ, who is the altar of God. There is no sacrifice as cults knew it, but there is the Eucharist, which is the body of Christ, in which sacrifice the Church sacramentally participates. Likewise, there is no temple as religious impulse builds for the deity, but the assembly becomes the living body of Christ and the building that houses Christ's nuptial embrace of his bride is a sacred place.

4. The Church is liturgy symbol-izing the Kingdom. The Church does not exist in our minds, any more than Jesus exists as an idea. This led Fr Aidan Kavanagh to write, "Christians especially can never forget the spatial concreteness an incarnation entails. ... [Jesus] inhabited not just a time but places, streets, rooms, countrysides ..."¹⁹ The Church is an *ekklesia* – which

means a people called out. And any particular assembly is a sacramental sign of Christ's Mystical Body. There is one sacrifice at many altars; there is one Church at many assemblies. Each sacrifice is part of the one sacrifice; each assembly is part of the single *totus Christus*. The particular assembly is not its own sign, then. The particular assembly is not its own end. The particular assembly is the symbolization of a reality and truth larger than itself. Adding the suffix *-ize* turns a noun or adjective into a verb, in the sense of "causing it to be or become." To verbalize is to express verbally, to sanit-ize is to make sanitary, to jeopardy-ize is to put into jeopardy. The liturgy symbol-izes the Kingdom of God: it makes God's reign into a symbol for our participation. The Mystery passes over into the mysteries. The assembly symbol-izes the heavenly liturgy, which is an assembly of angels and archangels and saints and martyrs and the righteous. The Divine Liturgy material-izes the Kingdom of God as Jesus' flesh materialized the Logos.

5. The Church's building visual-izes this liturgy. If I say the Church visual-izes liturgy, I do not mean that Christians close their eyes and form a mental image of heads with halos and souls with wings. When I say the Church visual-izes liturgy I mean iconographers take up their brushes, sculptors take up their chisels, architects roll out their blueprints. Symbols are real, visible, material, actual things. So to call liturgy a sacramental symbol of the Kingdom is to say that the liturgy real-izes, visual-izes, material-izes, and actual-izes the very eschatological redemption that Christ is accomplishing in the world. And this requires the assistance of artists and architects. "Holy Mother Church has therefore always been the friend of the fine arts," says *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, "and has ever sought their noble help, with the special aim that all things set apart for use in divine worship should be truly worthy, becoming, and beautiful, signs and symbols of the supernatural world ..." [para 21]. What the liturgy symbol-izes, the architect

visual-izes. There is a synergistic, synthetic, living relationship between liturgy and architecture. It's not the relationship a hermit crab has to the tin can it crawls into; it's the relationship a snail has to the shell it has grown. This leads Kavanagh to write:

Raw space becomes liturgical place through the change [Christ's] presence by grace, faith, and sacrament causes As it meets for worship of the Source and Redeemer of all, the assembly is the fundamental sacrament of God's pleasure in Christ on earth Christian instinct has been to house this assembly as elegantly as possible, avoiding tents, bedrooms, and school basements. The assembly uses its place to do something in It is a vigorous arena for conducting public business in which petitions are heard, contracts entered into, relationships witnessed, orations declaimed, initiations consummated, vows taken, authority exercised, laws promulgated, images venerated, values affirmed, banquets attended, votes cast, the dead waked, the Word deliberated, and parades cheered.²⁰

The assembly uses its space to do something in; that is why the space looks the way it does. If we don't like how architecture looks, we must ask what we think we're doing.

6. What the assembly does includes visual-izing the potency of the world. This brings me back to Maximus. The Church does not exist as a means of escape from the world; the Church is redeemed world. That, in fact, is how Olivier Clement defines it: "in its deepest understanding, the Church is nothing other than the world in the course of transfiguration"²¹ This transfiguration and redemption is the mystery of God, hidden before all ages; it was placed in motion with the covenant to Noah, and with the call of father Abraham, and by the Torah brought down Sinai by Moses. Cardinal Journet writes, "The Church made its appearance in time before Christ did. The frontier of the Church passes through each one of those who call themselves her members."²² Remember that the iconostasis contains images of the Church of the Old Testament. The Church may have been born at Pentecost, but its moment of conception was earlier, and Israel is the Church *in utero*. This transforming grace arcs, like an electric spark between two poles, from protology to eschatology.

Therefore, if the architect will visual-ize this liturgy-in-motion, he or she must find a way to display a reunion of the divisions Maximus mentioned and that Christ united. How will you show that because Christ sits at the right hand of the Father in his human nature, creation is no longer divided from the Uncreated, because God is mankind's ultimate destiny? How will you show that because Christ has ascended with his sacred humanity into heaven, the division between the intelligible and the sensible need not make us schizophrenic, but we can see all matter in a spiritual light? How will you show that because heaven and earth were reunited by Christ's ascension, it is anthropos' commission to join the angels in praising God? How will you show that the distance between our current site of toil and the paradise that was our original home has been overcome in the baptistery which is a New Eden? And how will you show that the mortality at work in the cycle of generations has been conquered by eternal life?

7. We don't make churches as places to hide in, but as decorations on the face of the world. Chesterton pointed out this fact when he wrote, "Decoration is not given to hide horrible things: but to decorate things already adorable. A mother does not give her child a blue bow because he is so ugly without it. A lover does not give a girl a necklace to hide her neck."²³ When we appoint the calendar with holy days, and bejewel the landscape with light from stained-glass windows, and spiritualize matter in a sacramental fashion, and canonize saints who walk among us, and build edifices of splendor and glory, we do not do so because we think the world is so ugly without us. We do so in order to proclaim to the world the beauty it has from the hand of the Creator. We do so in order to display before the world the potential it was created with, and which is being secretly worked within by Christ's recapitulation. The gift of the Church to the time in which it lives is the holy day; the gift of the Church to the place in which it lives is a beautiful Church. But this requires extravagance and luxury, as all decoration requires. One of

the things people seem to have difficulty understanding, it would seem, is that the wastefulness in decoration is precisely its whole reason for being. Churches and holidays do not exist for cosmetic purposes, to disguise the ugliness of the world; they exist for decorative purposes, to expose the loveliness that should be and should be.

8. Church architecture must be true, and truth will be beautiful. We are accustomed to using the word "truth" only about propositions, but the great tradition has used the word also about reality. Not only can a fact be true or false, but a person can be true or false. This supposes that a person can succeed, or fail, in becoming the idea God had of him when God made him. Something is beautiful when it is what it is supposed to be, and shines forth (splendor) the thing's essence. We use the word *beauty* in this close connection to *truth* when we see an act of generosity or humility or kindness and say "That was a beautiful thing to do." It was a true thing. The person is beautiful for acting fully, with integrity, proportionate to his being, acting as a full human being. The saints grow more beautiful. The reason to be a saint is to become beautiful at last. The relationship between "beautiful" and "beatific" should not go unnoticed.

The world, too, can be true or false, according to whether it manifests the Kingdom of God, or is distorted into a bent caricature of itself. What it will be is in the hands of anthropos. If we bend space, time and matter to our purposes, then it fails to manifest the Kingdom and we uglify the world. The task of the architect is to build true buildings: churches that display the inherent truth in matter, which is that all things exist to be building blocks for the Heavenly Jerusalem. The church building displays to the world its potential. Maximus spoke of the world as the Church in potency, and the Church as the world in act.

Plato said that the splendor of truth is beauty. Beauty is truth's luster or brilliance. But splendor does not exist in the abstract – it must be concretized, made real, made hypostatic. The

splendor of God is the beauty of Jesus. And it is Christ's beauty – not the world's ambiguous beauty – that the world seeks. The Church is an icon of Jesus' splendor repeated in each glorified face, and the church building must also be an icon of Jesus' divinized humanity. Anthropos is the cosmic priest of the visible world, and he adds the splendor of created matter to the celestial praise of God when he offers it up in “reasonable worship” (Rom 12:1 – *logiken latreian*). Paul Evdokimov elaborates:

Alongside ‘kosmos noetos’ (the intelligible world) Holy Tradition sets ‘kosmos aisthetos’ (the sensible world). This latter encompasses the whole realm of what belongs to the senses in the sacraments, in the liturgy, in icons, and in the lived experience of God ... The beautiful then is as a shining forth, an epiphany, of the mysterious depths of being, of that interiority that is a witness to the intimate relation between the body and the soul.²⁴

Conclusion

Eight is a liturgical number, so I will stop here. I am talking about living in the Eighth Day, so it seems fitting to stop here. This liturgical cosmology we are talking about depends upon several things. I mean by "depend" what the word literally means, namely "to hang." This understanding of liturgy as heaven-on-earth hangs upon the several things, like a coat depends upon a peg. First, it depends on a protology that believes all being is good; second, upon an eschatology that believes everything is destined for glory; third, upon an anthropology that believes the image of God can, by grace, attain the likeness of God (which is deification); fourth, a Christology that believes the Reign of God has begun; and fifth, an ecclesiology which believes the Church visualizes the potency of the world and its final end. I mean the Church-in-motion, the Divine Liturgy, makes visible the transfiguration worked upon it by supernatural grace. Those are your marching orders.

¹ Alexander Schmemmann, *For the Life of the World* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1973) 15.

² Louis Bouyer, *Meaning of the Monastic Life*, (London: Burnes & Oates, 1955) 28.

³ In Maximus' own words, from Difficulty 41 in the *Ambigua*: "[The saints] say that the substance of everything that as come into being is divided into five divisions. The first of these divides from the uncreated nature the universal created nature, which receives its being from becoming. For they say that God in his goodness has made the radiant orderly arrangement of everything that is, and that it is not immediately plain what and how it is, and that therefore the division that divides creation from God is to be called ignorance. For what it is that naturally divides these one from another, so that they may not be united in a single essence, since they do not have one and the same *logos*, they grant to be ineffable. The second division is that in accordance with which the whole nature that receives being from creation is divided by God into that which is perceived by the mind and that perceived by the senses. The third is that in accordance with which the nature perceived by the senses is divided into heaven and earth. The fourth is that in accordance with which the earth is divided into paradise and the inhabited world, and the fifth, that in accordance with which the human person, which is the laboratory in which everything is concentrated and in itself naturally mediates between the extremities of each division, having been drawn into everything in a good and fitting way through becoming, is divided into male and female." Louth, _____ Difficulty 41, p 156.

⁴ Difficulty 41, p 157.

⁵ Louth, 73-74

⁶ 160.

⁷ Augustine in Mersch, 415.

⁸ Mersch, *The Whole Christ*, 265.

⁹ Paul Evdokimov, *The Art of the Icon: a Theology of Beauty* (California: Oakwood Publications, 1990), p. 117.

¹⁰ Mersch, 283.

¹¹ Athanasius in Mersch 284.

¹² Cyril of Alexandria in Mersch, 340.

¹³ Jungmann, *Liturgical Worship ...* (New York: Frederick Pustet Co., 1941) 31.

¹⁴ Jungmann, *Liturgical Worship ...*, 31.

¹⁵ Jungmann, *Liturgical Worship ...*, 41.

¹⁶ *Mediator Dei*, paragraph 20.

¹⁷ Erik Peterson, *The Angels and the Liturgy* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1964) 22 and 50.

¹⁸ Abbot Columba Marmion, *Life of the Soul*, (London & Edinburgh: Sands & Co., and St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1931) 284.

¹⁹ Aidan Kavanagh, *Elements of Rite*, 14.

²⁰ Kavanagh, *Elements of Rite*, 15-16.

²¹ Olivier Clement, *The Roots of Christian Mysticism* (New York: New York City Press, 1996) 95

²² Charles Journet, *The Church of the Word Incarnate* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955) xxvii.

²³ *Orthodoxy*, p. 271.

²⁴ Paul Evdokimov, *The Art of the Icon: A Theology of Beauty* (Redondo Beach, California: Oakwood Publications, 1990) 26.