

# The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer



Bryan D. Spinks, editor

Foreword by Martin Jean

# **The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer**

*Trinity, Christology, and Liturgical Theology*

**A PUEBLO BOOK**

Liturgical Press

[www.litpress.org](http://www.litpress.org)

Collegeville, Minnesota

The cover image is a painting by Dragan Mojović and is reproduced with kind permission of Irinej, Bishop of Novi Sad and Dekan of the Faculty of Orthodox Theology of the University of Belgrade. The painting was completed in Belgrade in 1990 and was introduced into the main hall of the Orthodox Theological Faculty of Belgrade University by Bishop Danilo Krstić in 1996. From the English translation of Bishop Danilo Krstić's text explaining Mojović's painting: "The mystery of Divinity is indescribable. However, we use this intellectual 'icon' to indicate three aspects in one God . . . *The aspect of Essence*: let us envisage that the white sun is the unknowable essence of Divinity . . . *The aspect of Personhood*: let us imagine that three circles of light surrounding the sun are three Divine Persons (the Holy Trinity). The first is the Father. From Him the Son shines through, and the Spirit proceeds forth as the Third . . . *The aspect of Energy*: let us regard these silvery rays as different uncreated energies which eternally irradiate from the essence of God through three rings of light, as a gift by the Holy Trinity. One ray represents the energy of love (*agape*) . . . The other beams of radiance represent the other energies of Divinity: beauty, wisdom, truth, justice, compassion, humbleness." (The complete text of this essay is published in Episkop Danilo Krstić, *U početku beše Smisao*, Beograd 1996, 204–5 [The English translation of this collection of essays is *In the Beginning was Meaning*].)

---

A Pueblo Book published by Liturgical Press

Excerpt from the English translation of *The Roman Missal* © 1973, International Committee on English in the Liturgy, Inc. (ICEL). All rights reserved.

Unless otherwise noted, Scripture is translated by the authors. Where noted, Scripture is from the New Revised Standard Version Bible © 1989, Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Cover design by David Manahan, OSB

© 2008 by Order of Saint Benedict, Collegeville, Minnesota. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, microfilm, microfiche, mechanical recording, photocopying, translation, or by any other means, known or yet unknown, for any purpose except brief quotations in reviews, without the previous written permission of Liturgical Press, Saint John's Abbey, P.O. Box 7500, Collegeville, Minnesota 56321-7500. Printed in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The place of Christ in liturgical prayer : Trinity, christology, and liturgical theology / Bryan D. Spinks, editor ; foreword by Martin Jean.

p. cm.

"A Pueblo book."

ISBN-13: 978-0-8146-6018-8

1. Liturgies, Early Christian.
2. Jesus Christ—History of doctrines.
3. Prayer—History. I. Spinks, Bryan D.

BV185.P53 2008

264—dc22

2007034200

# Contents

Foreword: Martin Jean vii

Acknowledgments ix

Abbreviations xi

Introduction xiii

1. The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer:  
What Jungmann Omitted to Say 1  
*Bryan D. Spinks*

## **Part 1. The New Testament and Some Classical Worship Traditions 21**

2. The Binitarian Pattern of Earliest Christian Devotion  
and Early Doctrinal Development 23  
*L. W. Hurtado*
3. God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit in Early Christian Praying 51  
*Paul Bradshaw*
4. Christ in the Byzantine Divine Office 65  
*Robert F. Taft, S.J.*
5. Prayers Addressed to Christ in the West Syrian Tradition 88  
*Baby Varghese*
6. The Christology of the Anaphora of Basil  
in Its Various Redactions, with Some Remarks Concerning the  
Authorship of Basil 112  
*Gabriele Winkler*
7. The Meanings and Functions of *Kyrie eleison* 127  
*Peter Jeffery*

**Part 2. Piety, Devotion, and Song** 195

8. Christology in Early Armenian Liturgical Commentaries 197  
*Michael Daniel Findikyan*
9. Christology and Trinity: Interpreting the Lord's Prayer 222  
*Kenneth Stevenson*
10. *Sub Tuum Praesidium*:  
The *Theotokos* in Christian Life and Worship before Ephesus 243  
*Maxwell E. Johnson*
11. Prism of Glory: Trinitarian Worship and  
Liturgical Piety in the Reformed Tradition 268  
*John D. Witvliet*
12. Trinity and Christology in the Communion  
Hymns of Isaac Watts 300  
*Stephen A. Marini*

**Part 3. Some Aspects of Contemporary Protestant Worship** 325

13. "But who do you say that I am?":  
Christology in Recent Protestant Hymnals 327  
*Karen B. Westerfield Tucker*
14. *Lex Amandi, Lex Orandi*:  
The Trinity in the Most-Used Contemporary  
Christian Worship Songs 342  
*Lester Ruth*
15. Feminist Liturgical Trinities and a Generous Orthodoxy 360  
*Kathryn Greene-McCreight*

## Foreword

The Yale Institute of Sacred Music (ISM) is an interdisciplinary graduate center dedicated to the study and practice of sacred music, worship, and the arts. Since 1973, one of our chief goals has been to assemble practitioners, scholars, and artists from these fields for common learning and conversation. The meeting of sixteen presenters and several dozen other participants in 2005 around the topic of christology and trinitarian theology in liturgical prayer is one of the most successful such events, for it gathered scholars and clergy from nearly a dozen religious traditions and from over five countries.

David Tracy speaks of three great “fractures” in the modern academy: the gaps between form and content, thinking and feeling, and theory and practice. The ISM strives boldly to jump over these chasms by holding in tension the daily experience of congregant and clergy-person with the knowledge of the scholar. Oftentimes, the training of religious leaders does not embrace critical scholarship or find ways to make this knowledge useful. Likewise, scholars of religion are too often trained to be so dispassionate as to exclude the experience of religious communities on the ground.

The ISM was constituted to hold these circles in harmony so that daily life can be shaped and bettered by the learned academy and so that this academy can itself be held accountable by the forces of the culture and of human experience itself. In the liturgy, like no other place, do these worlds converge. Finally, we are all characters in a grand narrative of meaning making that spans time and space.

May the reader be enlivened by the pages within this volume as were we who experienced the conversation firsthand.

Martin Jean





## Acknowledgments

The 2005 Conference and subsequent publications of these papers would not have been possible without the untiring work of a number of people at the Yale Institute of Sacred Music and Liturgical Press. Special thanks due to Melissa Maier, ISM manager of external relations and publications, and the special projects assistant and conference coordinator John Hartmann and his assistant Burke Gerstenschlager, for the success of the initial conference. Meticulous editing and proofreading of the papers was undertaken at ISM by John Leinenweber, and he has worked closely with Mary Stommes, Colleen Stiller and Susan Sink of Liturgical Press. A deep debt of gratitude is owed to them in making this such a successful volume.

\*\*\*\*\*

Excerpts from *The Office of Vespers in the Byzantine Rite* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1965). By permission of Darton, Longman and Todd.

Excerpts from *Prayerbook* (Cambridge, N.Y: New Skete, 1976). By permission of the Monks of New Skete.

Excerpts from "Odes of Solomon" by Charlesworth, JH (1973). By permission of Oxford University Press.

Excerpts from *Service Book of the Holy Orthodox-Catholic Apostolic Church: Compiled, Translated, and Arranged from the Old Church-Slavonic Service Books of the Russian Church and Collated with the Service Books of the Greek Church*, ed. I. F. Hapgood. 4th ed. (Brooklyn: Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese, 1965); excerpts from *Divine Prayers and Services of the Catholic Orthodox Church of Christ*, ed. and trans. S. Nassar (Brooklyn: Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese of New York and All North America, 1961). By permission of The Self-Ruled Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America.

Excerpt from *Ephrem the Syrian—Hymns*, translated and introduced by Kathleen E. McVey. Copyright © 1989 by Kathleen E. McVey. Paulist Press, Inc., New York/Mahwah, NJ. Reprinted by permission of Paulist Press, Inc. [www.paulistpress.com](http://www.paulistpress.com).

Excerpts from S. Brock, “Mary in Syriac Tradition,” in *Mary’s Place in Christian Dialogue*, ed. A. Stacpoole. By permission of St. Paul’s (formerly St. Paul Publications), UK.

Excerpts from N. Constatas, “Weaving the Body of God: Proclus of Constantinople, the Theotokos, and the Loom of the Flesh,” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* (1995) in *Vigiliae Christianae*, Volume 24 (1970). By permission of Koninklijke Brill NV.

Excerpts from *Praising God: The Trinity in Christian Worship*. © 1999 Ruth Carolyn Duck and G. Ronald Kastner. By permission of Westminster John Knox Press.

Excerpts from “Christus Paradox” in *Common Praise* (Toronto, ON: Anglican Book Centre, 1998). © 1991 GIA Publications, Inc. Used by permission.

\*\*\*\*\*

We have made every attempt to obtain permission to reprint the following and will gratefully acknowledge in future editions or reprints should the copyright holders inform us:

Excerpts from Jungmann’s *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer*. 2d rev. ed., trans. A. Peeler (Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1965).

Excerpts from Jungmann’s “The Defeat of Teutonic Arianism and the Revolution in Religious Culture in the Early Middle Ages” in *Pastoral Liturgy* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1962).

## Abbreviations

ACO	<i>Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum</i>
BELS	<i>Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae</i> , Subsidia
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
DOP	Dumbarton Oaks Papers
HBS	Henry Bradshaw Society
NPNF	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers
OCA	<i>Orientalia Christiana Analecta</i>
OCP	<i>Orientalia Christiana Periodica</i>
ODB	<i>The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium</i>
PG	Patrologia Graeca
PL	Patrologia Latina
SC	Sources chrétiennes
TLG	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</i>



## Introduction

In 1925 the Austrian Roman Catholic liturgical scholar Josef A. Jungmann (1889–1975) published a seminal work, *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer*. Basic to his thesis was that in the early church public prayer was addressed to the Father, through the Son, and in the Spirit, and that because of the Arian and miahysite/diaphysite controversies, prayer came to be addressed directly to the Son, and then to the Spirit. Jungmann's work is often cited by scholars as an authoritative work. The title of his book formed the catalyst to revisit trinitarian doctrine and christology in worship from the New Testament to the present at a conference held at Yale Institute of Sacred Music in February 2005. Scholarship since Jungmann has done much to undermine his views. In this introduction the editor revisits Jungmann's work and shows where some of its core arguments are no longer tenable.



## The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer: What Jungmann Omitted to Say

Bryan D. Spinks

*Yale Institute of Sacred Music and Yale Divinity School*

It was never a great mystery that the title of this conference is that of the English title of Josef Andreas Jungmann's groundbreaking book published in 1925 as *Die Stellung Christi im liturgischen Gebet*. The thesis of that book was one to which he returned in an essay in 1947, "The Defeat of Teutonic Arianism and the Revolution in Religious Culture in the Early Middle Ages." This conference was never intended to be about Jungmann, but rather to center on the important subjects raised by his title, namely christology and the Trinity in liturgical prayer. Yet, since Jungmann's arguments and assessment of the liturgical evidence are still from time to time quoted with authority, by those whose fields are dogmatics and systematic theology as well as liturgics, it seems fitting and right at the outset of our deliberations to reflect on what Jungmann said, and to draw attention to some factors that confirm Balthasar Fischer's comment in his Foreword to the 1989 edition of *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer*, namely, that "sound liturgical piety depends on both the *ad Christum* and the *per Christum*."<sup>1</sup>

In his 1925 book Jungmann divided his study into two parts. The first was a general survey of liturgical texts from the *Didache* and the so-called *Apostolic Tradition*, then believed to be ca. 215, through the Egyptian and Syrian Church Orders, to the great classical rites of St. Mark, and the Byzantine Rite, the Syrian Orthodox and East Syrian Rites, to the Gallican, Visigothic, and Roman Rites. He paid particular attention to the doxologies, and was generally concerned to stress that the earliest

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Jungmann, *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer*, foreword by Balthasar Fischer (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1989) x. In English translations Jungmann is variously called Josef A. Jungmann, Joseph A. Jungmann, and Joseph Jungmann.

traditions addressed prayer to God the Father through Christ as, in the words of 1 Timothy 2:5, the “one mediator between God and human-kind, Christ Jesus, himself human.”<sup>2</sup> He noted that some diaconal prayers were addressed to Christ, but generally sacerdotal prayers were addressed to God the Father. Some doxologies were addressed to the Father and the Son, and later also to the Holy Spirit as equal. In the East Syrian tradition the eucharistic prayers were addressed to the Trinity, but in the Syrian Orthodox some parts of some anaphoras were addressed to the Son as God.

In the second part of the work Jungmann turned to consider this development. The New Testament passages were discussed to show that generally Christ’s humanity is the focus of prayer through him as mediator. The invocations to Christ and the Spirit in the *Acts of Thomas* and *John* were isolated as Gnostic aberrations, but the Cappadocian defeat of semi-Arianism, and the Constantinopolitan consolidation of trinitarian theology with the *homoousios* of the Spirit, resulted in new forms of doxologies. Public or liturgical prayer to Christ came about in a twofold manner. First, in the Syrian Orthodox and Coptic traditions Monophysite christology absorbed the humanity into the divinity. Secondly, as an overreaction against Arianism the divinity of Christ and *homoousios* were stressed by orthodoxy, and devotional prayers directed to Christ came into the liturgy. In the West this took place through the Visigothic Rite; it then came into the Gallican, and finally into the Roman Rite. Jungmann devoted a chapter to tracing how the term “high priest” for Christ in Hebrews was later transformed from meaning “mediator” to indicating the divine presence that brought about consecration at the Eucharist. The main conclusion of the work was that the primitive tradition, preserved in much of the Roman rite, and particularly the *canon missae*, was to address public liturgical prayer to God through Christ as mediator. To address Christ directly carried the danger of obliterating his humanity.

The essay of 1947 took up the same theme, though in terms of the Western Rites and in a wider cultural context.<sup>3</sup> The struggle over

<sup>2</sup> Scripture for this chapter taken from the *The New Revised Standard Version*.

<sup>3</sup> Joseph Jungmann, “The Defeat of Teutonic Arianism and the Revolution in Religious Culture in the Early Middle Ages,” in *Pastoral Liturgy* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1962) 1–101, a revised translation of “Die Abwehr des germanischen Arianismus und der Umbruch der religiösen Kultur im frühen Mittelalter.” *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 69 (1947) 36–99.



Arianism in Spain led to a zealous anti-Arianism that spread to France and elsewhere. Jungmann cited the Council of Toledo (583 C.E.) where the aim was “to ensure that equal honour and adoration is given to all three Persons of the Trinity.”<sup>4</sup> In the *Missale mixtum* he discovered examples of trinitarian statements being transferred to christology. A pronounced trinitarian emphasis is found in the Frankish liturgy. Jungmann argued that the focus on the Trinity and the anti-Arian emphasis led to a stress on the divine nature of Christ and a modalist intermingling of Christ and God. In turn this led to the cult of Mary, with her taking on the mediating role once attributed to the humanity of Christ, and to over-concern with the passion of Christ. These currents shaped not only the language of liturgy but also visual representation—of the Trinity, for example: the Father seated with a crucified Son in his lap, and the Spirit as a dove hovering above. Wide ranging effects, according to Jungmann, included the widening gulf between clergy and laity, and a quest for moral goodness replacing the concept of partaking of Christ’s holiness.

It is reasonably clear that in this essay of 1947 Jungmann attempted to paint an evolutionary grand narrative using very broad brush strokes. The accusations he made—that late medieval Western liturgy and spirituality were the direct outcome of overreaction to Arianism—are too general and simplistic to be convincing. However, he built this new essay on the foundations of the earlier work, *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer*, where he had implied that Origen’s dictum that prayer be directed to “the Father of all through Jesus Christ and in the Holy Spirit”<sup>5</sup> exemplified the true pattern of liturgical prayer.

It is somewhat odd that Jungmann—who professed the Catholic faith and therefore the *homoousios* of Son and Spirit—should have seen Origen as an authority on this particular matter; odd because many patristic scholars have seen the type of subordinationism found in Origen as an underlying symptom of the deep suspicion, and even open hostility, toward Nicene terminology by figures such as Eusebius of Caesarea. Why did Jungmann feel uncomfortable with public prayer addressed to the Son or Spirit? Did this unease account for his less-than-full treatment of the New Testament evidence, and his rush to explain the development as either overreaction to Arianism or the

<sup>4</sup> Jungmann, *Pastoral Liturgy*, 27.

<sup>5</sup> Jungmann, *The Place of Christ*, 157.

development of monophysite christology? By his own admission all traditions still addressed prayer through Christ as well as to Christ, yet he seemed unhappy with the dual tradition.

The need to redress the balance is seen in James B. Torrance's Didsbury Lectures, *Worship, Community, and the Triune God of Grace* of 1996. Like his brother, T. F. Torrance, James Torrance was concerned with the dogmatic implications of Chalcedonian christology, arguing for a God-humanward movement in Christ's divinity, and a human-Godward movement in his humanity: a double movement of grace. We are taken up in the vicarious obedient life of Christ, and we come to God in, with, and through Christ. Under the title "The Sole Priesthood of Christ," Torrance outlined Jungmann's thesis to reinforce the dogmatic point that "we come to God our Father both in Christ and through Christ, and only through Jesus Christ."<sup>6</sup>

Torrance here rightly underlined the patristic teaching that what was not assumed cannot be redeemed; the full humanity of Christ means that we are saved in, with, and through Christ. We also worship in, with, and through Christ. However, in his chapter entitled "Worship—Unitarian or Trinitarian," Torrance clearly qualified Jungmann. Trinitarian worship, argued Torrance, takes place in three ways. One is indeed that we pray to the Father, through the Son, in the Spirit. But second,

We pray to each of the three persons. We pray to the Father and to the Son ("even so come, Lord Jesus") and to the Holy Spirit (*Veni Creator Spiritus*) "who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified" (Nicene Creed). Here we see the significance of the Nicene "one in being" (*homoousios*). We only pray to one God, but we have a warrant in the New Testament and in the Church's life to pray to each of the three persons.<sup>7</sup>

The third manner, according to Torrance, is to glorify the One God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as when we sing the doxology at the end of psalmody.

The implication is not that what Jungmann said about the mediatorship of Christ is wrong, but rather that he omitted to discuss the posi-

<sup>6</sup> James B. Torrance, *Worship, Community, and the Triune God of Grace* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1996) 54–55.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

tive liturgical implications of christology and trinitarian faith. This trinitarian link with christology is muted in Jungmann, and he did not explore the implications of not addressing public prayer to Christ, and of a less-than-orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. It is to some of the evidence and implications Jungmann passed over, missed, or would not have had the slightest interest in, that I now wish to turn.

#### NEW TESTAMENT IMPLICATIONS

In chapter 9 of *The Place of Christ in Liturgical Prayer*, Jungmann examined the instructions and beginnings of prayer in the New Testament. He noted that Jesus directed his followers to make prayer to the Father, and to make their requests to God in his name. Jungmann put great emphasis on 1 Timothy 2:5, Ephesians 5:10, Colossians 3:17, Hebrews 13:13, Romans 1:8, and 2 Corinthians 1:20. The implications of Philippians 2:10 were only briefly conceded with the comment, "Nevertheless, the actual use of the prayer addressed solely to Christ was rather an exception."<sup>8</sup> It is not what Jungmann said here but what he omitted to say that makes his case unbalanced.

The recent book by Jerome H. Neyrey, *Render to God: New Testament Understandings of the Divine*, seems to contain much that supports Jungmann. Neyrey considers the term Father as used in the Synoptics, and concludes that it is frequently used with the idea of God as patron and Jesus as client, though also with the idea of Jesus as mediator and Israel as client. However, Neyrey concludes with two chapters, the titles of which both begin with the question, "Who Else is Called 'God'?" One chapter looks at John, and the other at Hebrews. Neyrey concludes that the Johannine community called Jesus God. On Hebrews he argues that when Hebrews 1:8 called Jesus God, and compared him with Melchizedek, the writer was making ontological not just functional statements about the divinity of Christ.<sup>9</sup> Although Neyrey does not specifically consider the address of prayer, it would seem that the implications of his discussion are that the Johannine community and the author of Hebrews would have regarded prayer to Christ as God as quite legitimate.

Neyrey's work is in the historical-critical and socio-cultural genre, and this approach is followed by Adela Collins in a paper on the wor-

<sup>8</sup> Jungmann, *The Place of Christ*, 131.

<sup>9</sup> Jerome H. Neyrey, *Render to God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004) 241–42.

ship of Jesus.<sup>10</sup> Agreeing that early Christians worshiped Jesus, she found the catalyst for this in the Greek and Hellenistic practice of offering veneration to heroes, benefactors, and rulers, and particularly in the cult of the Roman emperors.

Those working from a more canonical and narrative approach seem to find more to say, for example, Margaret Barker in her book, *The Great High Priest: The Temple Roots of Christian Liturgy*. It must be admitted that at times in this work Barker's imagination fills in gaps where we have no evidence. That, however, does not in itself invalidate all of her observations and suggestions. For example, Barker argues that the high priest functioned as Yahweh in making atonement; in fact, his role was to remove the damaging effects of sin from the community and the creation, and she sees the figure of the high priest behind the Son of Man in 1 Enoch, and behind this the high priest as representing prelapsarian Adam.<sup>11</sup> She suggests that Isaiah 53 could have been inspired by the Day of Atonement ritual, and argues that all these ideas explain the designation of Jesus in Hebrews as high priest. Elsewhere she considers the evidence that the Massoretic text has been changed to rule out early Christian interpretations, and she makes much of the tradition that Elyon and Yahweh had been Father and Son. Barker says:

If we read the Hebrew Scriptures in the way that the first Christians read them, we should understand that Yahweh was the son of God Most High (El Elyon), and the Second Person (to use an anachronism), and that Yahweh was incarnate in Jesus. Thus Gabriel announced to Mary, "He shall be called Son of God Most High" (Luke 1.32). We should know why Paul could proclaim one God, the Father, and one LORD, Jesus the Messiah (1 Cor 8.6). We should know why two early texts of the New Testament came to describe Jesus as the one who brought Israel out of Egypt (Jude 5). We should know why the Fourth evangelist believed that Isaiah's vision of the LORD had been a vision of Jesus (John 12.41). . . . We should also understand why ikons of Christ have in the halo *ho on*, the Greek form of Yahweh.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Adela Collins, "The Worship of Jesus and the Imperial Cult," in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*, ed. C. C. Newman et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 234–57.

<sup>11</sup> Margaret Barker, *The Great High Priest* (London: T&T Clark, 2003) 42–55.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 309–10.

As I have already indicated, although I find Barker's allusions and connections highly suggestive, there are times when a fertile imagination replaces solid evidence. Her conclusions, however, find endorsement from Crispin Fletcher-Louis who, after considering Old Testament and intertestamental texts, argued that "the worship offered to Jesus by early Christians must now be seen in continuity with this older tradition. Jesus functions as had the high priest, the post-lapsarian Adam and the eschatological Son of Man for some pre-Christian Jews. Jesus is slotted into a preconceived pattern, theology and even practice of worship."<sup>13</sup>

C. Kevin Rowe's essay, "Luke and the Trinity: An Essay in Ecclesial Biblical Theology," has none of Barker's speculations. His thesis is that the identity of God in the narrative of Luke-Acts compels us to speak in trinitarian terms. He focuses on the titles of Lord and Savior, which, so he argues, in the Old Testament are both crucial terms in the identity of the God of Israel. In Luke 1:5-38, it is clear that *kurios* refers only to Yahweh. He notes:

Between 1:38 and 1:39, however, there is a narrative gap during which time the conception of Jesus occurs. In light of 1:43 this narrative gap can be seen as the moment of the incarnation of YHWH, passed over in silence, but captured in the overlapping identity of the κύριος. For in 1:43 Elizabeth, filled with the Holy Spirit, addresses Mary as ἡ μήτηρ του κυρίου μου (the mother of my Lord!). This is the first time that Jesus himself appears in the narrative, and it is at this point that Jesus takes on the title/name κύριος. This dramatic moment in the narrative identifies YHWH with the human Jesus within Mary's womb by means of the overlapping resonance of κύριος. There is a fundamental correspondence between the one God of the OT and the person of Jesus such that they share the same name. The doubleness that this overlap creates in the referent of the κύριος finds its theological interpretation in an incarnational unity between YHWH and Jesus.<sup>14</sup>

Rowe goes on to note that it is impossible to speak of this incarnation without reference to the Holy Spirit, described as the power of the

<sup>13</sup> Crispin Fletcher-Louis, "The Worship of Divine Humanity as God's Image," in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*, ed. C. C. Newman et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 112-28.

<sup>14</sup> C. Kevin Rowe, "Luke and the Trinity: An Essay in Ecclesial Biblical Theology," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 56 (2003) 14.

Most High. The synonym of the Holy Spirit and the power of the Most High is, says Rowe, fully consonant with the OT as an expression of the dynamism of the one Lord of Israel. God's Spirit is indeed God himself but in repetition or doubleness in the conception of Jesus. Rowe notes: "Thus in the Lukan birth narrative there is a triplicity in the life of God that is made known in the conception of Jesus. . . . This God incarnates himself in the person of Jesus with an intensity that justifies the overlapping identification and doubleness in referentiality of the single divine name κύριος,"<sup>15</sup> Rowe observes that in the *Magnificat* Mary adores God as *kurios* and as "God my Savior." The only other time *soter* is used in the gospel is 2:11, where the angel of the Lord announces the baby as their *soter*. "Regarding the two texts together in the narrative produces a unified soteriological identity between YHWH and Jesus (κύριος) in their role as savior (σωτήρ)."<sup>16</sup>

Richard Bauckham draws attention to Matthew's use of *proskunein*, which from Matthew 2:2 onward is reserved for expressing worship to Jesus.<sup>17</sup> The climax and theological rationale, according to Bauckham, is in Matthew 28:18, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me." Joel B. Green observes that Stephen and Ananias offer prayer to Jesus, and adds, "so routine, in fact, is christocentric prayer to the identity of the early Christians that they can be known as 'those who call upon the name' of Jesus."<sup>18</sup> And Larry Hurtado has much more to say on the binitarian worship of the New Testament.<sup>19</sup>

I am not suggesting or implying that there is a consensus among New Testament scholars on these issues and exegesis. My point is that Jungmann was highly selective in the New Testament texts he discussed and in the authorities he quoted, both in 1925 and in the revised edition of his work. Certainly there are texts that clearly witness to offering

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 15.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>17</sup> Richard Bauckham, "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus," in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*, ed. C. C. Newman et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 67.

<sup>18</sup> Joel B. Green, "Persevering Together in Prayer: The Significance of Prayer in the Acts of the Apostles," in *Into God's Presence: Prayer in the New Testament*, ed. R. N. Longenecker (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001) 188, citing Acts 2:21; 7:59; 9:14, 21; 22:16.

<sup>19</sup> Larry Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).

prayer to the Father through the Son, but also texts and passages that suggest, support, and invite the practice of prayer to Christ as God.

#### JUNGMANN'S LITURGICAL EVIDENCE

Although Jungmann provided a wide selection of liturgical texts, his concern was to show that public prayer addressed to Christ or the Spirit was generally located in heterodox liturgical texts, Gnostic, Nestorian, and Monophysite. Thus the liturgical evidence of the apocryphal *Acts*, together with the anaphoras of Addai and Mari, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Syriac James, for example, were cited as exceptions that proved his rule. In hindsight, his treatment of those texts was too simplistic.

The apocryphal *Acts* have preserved a number of prayers in the context of baptism, and bread only, or bread and water, eucharistic celebrations, and, as Andrew McGowan has shown, it is anachronistic to dismiss the latter as not real Eucharists.<sup>20</sup> Likewise, the term gnostic is now regarded as a blanket term covering a wide range of faith communities, many of whom regarded themselves as enlightened Christians, and it may well be the case that in many parts of Syria, Asia Minor, and Egypt, those groups later deemed gnostic represented a majority of those who considered themselves Christian.<sup>21</sup> The *Acts of John*, according to Knut Schaferdiek, comes from the second or third century; it springs from a bilingual milieu, and is possibly even of an original Syriac form and a tradition close to the *Acts of Thomas*.<sup>22</sup> The latter exists in Greek and Syriac; both of these are regarded as dependent upon a Syriac Ur-text, and are third-century works, perhaps from Edessa, but certainly representative of early Syrian Christianity. In the *Acts of John* one eucharistic prayer offered by the apostle begins, "We glorify your Name which converts us from error and pitiless deceit,"<sup>23</sup> and proceeds to give thanks to "you, Lord Jesus Christ." In a second

<sup>20</sup> Andrew McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists: Food and Drink in Early Ritual Meals* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).

<sup>21</sup> See B. A. Pearson, *Gnosticism and Christianity in Roman and Coptic Egypt* (New York: T&T Clark International, 2004).

<sup>22</sup> In *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. W. Schneemelcher; English translation ed. R. McL. Wilson, rev. ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991–92) 2:152ff. The texts of the *Acts* and introductory essays have been consulted for the discussion here. [Text modernized.]

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:200–201.

prayer the apostle John prays, “We glorify your name that was spoken by the Father; we glorify your name that was spoken through the Son,”<sup>24</sup> and the prayer seems to be addressed to the Lord, or *Adonai/kurios*. In the *Acts of Thomas* an invocation, or epiklesis, is addressed to the Holy Spirit, where the Son is seen as being begotten by the Father and Mother, or Holy Spirit.<sup>25</sup> Another prayer is addressed to the bread of life, and another directly to the crucified holy body.<sup>26</sup> In the *Acts of Peter*, which is probably late second-century, and from either Rome or Asia Minor, a short eucharistic prayer is addressed to “You God Jesus Christ.”<sup>27</sup>

It is not that these documents do not know of prayer addressed to the Father—in the *Acts of John* the “Hymn of Christ” begins “Glory be to thee, Father.”<sup>28</sup> It is true that these works seem to presuppose ideas of redemption, and of a trinity of persons, that were by later standards less than orthodox. However, these authors, and we may assume their communities too, were not on the Marcionite wing of gnosticism—which rejected the God of the Old Testament in preference for Jesus—which might otherwise account for the christomonism. They did acknowledge the Father, but clearly bear witness to public prayer addressed directly to Christ and the Holy Spirit.

The fact that two of these documents are probably representative of Syrian Christianity is significant. When turning to the East Syrian tradition Jungmann made much of the fact that all three eucharistic prayers of this tradition are addressed to the Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In fact, however, Addai and Mari is addressed to the Name, as is, *pace* Jungmann, the anaphora of Theodore the Interpreter—just as we found in the Syrian eucharistic prayers in the *Acts of John*. Most of those endeavoring to find the “original text” of Addai and Mari have regarded the reference to Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as a later addition, and that the prayer was originally simply addressed to the Name. In fact, unless one is to maintain that any reference to Father, Son, and Spirit outside a baptismal context is “late,”

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:202. This can also be rendered “We glorify your name of the Father which was spoken by you; we glorify your name of Son which was spoken by you.” See M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924) 268.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:359–60.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:391 and 401.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:291.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:182.



there is no reason why the Matthean triune names should not be regarded as original to this anaphora, which is almost certainly one of our earliest eucharistic prayers, and the oldest still in use.<sup>29</sup>

However, regardless of this fact, Addai and Mari is notorious for its apparent oscillation between addressing the Father and the Son. Bernard Botte suggested that the theology of the author was monarchianism, and that his modalism was probably unconscious and not at all aggressive.<sup>30</sup> Anthony Gelston also appealed to modalism to explain this switch of address.<sup>31</sup> More recently Sarhad Jammo has suggested that the first and third sections are addressed to the Father, and the second part to the Son, though this suggestion is made on the dubious assumption that the prayer is derived from the *birkat ha-mazon*.<sup>32</sup> On the other hand, Edward Ratcliff had suggested that it was originally addressed to the Son throughout, and this is supported by its Maronite twin, Sharar.<sup>33</sup> Jungmann's argument was that eucharistic prayers addressed either in part, or entirely, to the Son are the result of monophysitism, and post-date 451 C.E. This suggestion loses its credibility when an ancient prayer is found, on the one hand, in an East Syrian community which later espoused a diophysite position, and on the other, in the Maronite Church which was Chalcedonian.

It was the Egyptian anaphora attributed to Gregory of Nazianzus, addressed throughout to the Son, that Jungmann regarded as typifying his monophysite theory. A. Baumstark had suggested that this prayer was the ancient anaphora of Nazianzus which Gregory had himself expanded, and which had been taken to Egypt by Syrian monks.<sup>34</sup> José

<sup>29</sup> The reference to "arcane knowledge of the anaphora of Addai and Mari" in R. Giles (*Creating Uncommon Worship* [Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2004]) seems an insensitive and uncumenical dismissal of an ancient Eastern Church's living liturgy. Knowledge of the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* is far more arcane!

<sup>30</sup> Bernard Botte, "L'Anaphore Chaldéenne des Apôtres," OCP 15 (1949) 266.

<sup>31</sup> Anthony Gelston, *The Eucharistic Prayer of Addai and Mari* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992) 68.

<sup>32</sup> Sarhad Jammo, "The Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari: A Study of Structure and Historical Background," OCP 68 (2002) 5–35.

<sup>33</sup> Edward Ratcliff, "The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: A Suggestion," *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1929) 23–32.

<sup>34</sup> A. Baumstark, "Die Chrysostomosliturgie und die syrische Liturgie des Nestorios," *Chrysostomika* (1908) 846–48.

Manuel Sánchez Caro made a close examination of the “I-thou” style of the Post-sanctus, comparing it with the homilies and poems of Gregory, and argued that this section could well have been written by Gregory to express an anti-Arian theology.<sup>35</sup> This was taken even further in the extended examination by Albert Gerhards, who effectively showed that this prayer had nothing specifically monophysite about it but contained much material that could be paralleled in Gregory of Nazianzus, and suggested that in some churches the eucharistic prayer had been addressed to Christ as God.<sup>36</sup>

Jungmann’s blanket assumption that being monophysite in doctrine produced eucharistic prayers addressed to the Son needs careful reconsideration. At least with regard to examples such as Syriac James, where the anamnesis is addressed to the Son, this may be due less to monophysitism and more with reflecting a tradition found in the *Acts of John* and *Acts of Thomas*, in Addai and Mari, and in Sharar—that is, a Syrian rather than a monophysite symptom.

In a study of the anaphora attributed to Severus of Antioch I have suggested that although it is impossible to demonstrate that Severus wrote all or any of the prayer, it is equally impossible to rule out the possibility. There are traces of his theological position in the prayer, be they from him or from a redactor. I have argued that the three levels of *theoria* that Roberta Chesnut identified in the theology of Severus are present.<sup>37</sup> The first of these is the *theoria* of the visible, natural universe, and the creation itself declares the wonder of God. This leads to the *theoria* of the intelligences, where the mind is led to cross the realm of angels and archangels. This in turn leads to the *theoria* of the Trinity, and divinization. These are given expression both prior to the Sanctus, and in the Post-sanctus. Nothing in the anaphora, however, conflicts with a Chalcedonian christology—the address of the anamnesis to

<sup>35</sup> José Manuel Sánchez Caro, *Eucaristia e historia de la salvación* (Madrid: Ed. Católica, 1983) 310ff.

<sup>36</sup> Albert Gerhards, *Die griechische Gregoriosanaphora: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des eucharistischen Hochgebets*. Liturgiewissenschaftlichen Quellen und Forschungen 65 (Münster-Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1984).

<sup>37</sup> See R. Chesnut, *Three Monophysite Christologies* (London: Oxford University Press, 1976); B. Spinks, “The Anaphora Attributed to Severus of Antioch: A Note on Its Character and Theology,” in *Θυσία ἀνέσσεως: Mélanges liturgiques offerts à la mémoire de l’archevêque Georges Wagner (1930–1993)*, ed. J. Getcha and A. Lossky (Paris: Presses Saint-Serge, 2005) 345–51.

Christ as God is hardly un-Chalcedonian. Although Severus was a zealous supporter of the teaching of Cyril of Alexandria, we find no trace of heavy Cyrilline technical terms in the anaphora. The theology that seems to be reflected is not *mia-physite* per se, but Severus's interpretation of sanctification. A full study of the Syriac anaphoras is still to be undertaken, but few are openly monophysite in terminology, and the address of the anamnesis to the Son is perhaps simply a continuation of a Syrian convention of having part of the anaphora address the Son, which is at least as old as Addai and Mari.

The cumulative evidence is sufficient to indicate that public prayer addressed to Christ, at least in the Syrian tradition, but perhaps also in Asia Minor, was not uncommon, and cannot be dismissed by appeals to overzealous anti-Arianism or to a non-Chalcedonian christology.

#### THE WESTERN WEAKNESS: TWO CASE STUDIES

Jungmann was at pains to argue that the Roman tradition had loyally conserved what he insisted was the older and more primitive form of public prayer, namely prayer addressed to the Father. Such a practice was reinforced in liturgical legislation from African councils; for example, Canon 21 of the Council of Hippo Regius (393 C.E.), stated: "No one shall name the Father for the Son or the Son for the Father in prayers; and when one assists at the altar the oration shall be directed always to the Father."<sup>38</sup> Two versions of this canon are found in later collections of African councils. The *Liber canonum temporibus sancti Aurelii* read at the Council of Carthage (525 C.E.) stated: "No one shall name the Father for the Son or the Son for the Father in prayers, but the intention shall be directed always to the Father; and the prayers themselves shall be discussed with the more prudent." Then, in a collection composed between 526 and 546 by a deacon at Carthage, we find the statement: "No one shall direct the oration in prayers except to the Father and he shall discuss them previously with the better instructed."

Edward Kilmartin noted that this seems to outlaw, on the one hand, prayer that presupposes the Son but names the Father, and on the other, naming the Son in prayers traditionally addressed to the Father. Following Jungmann, he suggests that both modalism and an over-reaction to Arianism are envisaged, and notes the emphatic teaching

<sup>38</sup> Citations are from E. Kilmartin, "The Liturgical Prayer in Early African Legislation," *Ephemerides liturgicae* 99 (1985) 105-27.

that *oratio*—speech in prayer—shall be directed toward the Father.<sup>39</sup> How far this African legislation had an impact on Roman usage is difficult to know. However, Jungmann was quite correct to observe that, in distinction from the Christian East, and from Gaul and Spain, the Roman tradition was reticent to address public prayer directly to Christ. Examples such as the *Agnus Dei* have their origins elsewhere, and are imported into Roman usage. But what Jungmann presented as a strength of the Roman Rite can in other contexts be seen to be a potential theological weakness.

The Reformation tradition inherited the broadly Roman medieval prayer tradition, and thus in the *Book of Common Prayer* of the Church of England, prayer was mainly addressed to the Father, or to a generic God, and only in propers for Trinity Sunday, in doxologies, and the inclusion of the Athanasian Creed, do we find full liturgical expression of a trinitarian faith. The fragility of this inherited Western tradition may be demonstrated by two leading Newtonian theologians of the eighteenth century, William Whiston and Dr. Samuel Clarke.

Whiston was Newton's successor in the Lucasian Chair of Mathematics at the University of Cambridge, and was a brilliant polymath. However, using Newtonian philosophy, or state-of-the-art methodology, he concluded that Athanasius had deceived the whole church and led it astray; as a consequence Arius was right, and the doctrine of the Trinity was a corruption of biblical teaching. Whiston was convinced that the *Apostolic Constitutions* was a genuine apostolic document. James Force observed: "With his arian hypothesis confirmed by historical research in the earliest Christian documents, Whiston, in July of 1708, wrote to inform the archbishops of York and Canterbury that as a result of a fourteen-hundred-year conspiracy, the church had been teaching false doctrine and that he, William Whiston, could prove its falsity and also show how to reform Christian teaching by bringing it into conformity with the original."<sup>40</sup> For his pains Whiston was deprived of his Cambridge chair, but, undeterred, in 1711 he published a full defense of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and in 1713 he published *The Liturgy of the Church of England reduc'd nearer to the primitive Standard*,

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 108–9.

<sup>40</sup> James Force, *William Whiston: Honest Newtonian* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985) 16.

*Humbly propos'd to Publick Consideration*.<sup>41</sup> Whiston emended the Prayer Book rites and added material from the *Apostolic Constitutions* to bring it in line with what he regarded as primitive Christianity. One of the casualties of his liturgical reforms was the doxology in psalms and canticles at Morning and Evening Prayer, replaced by "Glory be to the Father through the Son, and in the Holy Ghost"—the very formula that Jungmann championed.

The other Newtonian, a friend of Whiston, Dr. Samuel Clarke, was even more brilliant, and was tipped as a future bishop until he published his *Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity* in 1712. Though Eusebian rather than Arian, it was evident to most readers that this was a heterodox doctrine of the Trinity in which the term God was reserved for the Father, and the Son and Holy Spirit were subordinated to the first person of the Trinity. In this work of 1712 Clarke suggested how the *Book of Common Prayer* might be brought into line with his corrected doctrine of the Trinity. In later years, in a 1724 edition of the *Book of Common Prayer* now in the British Library, Clarke made his own manuscript alterations to the Anglican liturgy, in which the *Gloria Patri* was replaced by either "Glory be to God, by Jesus Christ, through the heavenly assistance by the Holy Ghost," or "Unto God be glory in the Church, by Christ Jesus, Throughout all Ages, world without end. Amen." Alterations were made to the *Te Deum*, the Litany, and Creed; the Athanasian Creed was completely struck out. God and Lord were terms interchangeable only with Father, and reserved for the first person of the Trinity.<sup>42</sup>

What is significant here is not Whiston's and Clarke's heterodoxy but rather just how few alterations were needed to make the *Book of Common Prayer* Arian or semi-Arian. It is no accident that Clarke's suggestions were taken up enthusiastically in a whole number of liturgies published for Unitarian use.<sup>43</sup> Whiston and Clarke alert us to the

<sup>41</sup> See B. Spinks, "Johannes Grabe's Response to William Whiston: Some Reflections on a Lutheran Convert's Contribution to 18th-Century Anglican Orthodoxy and Liturgy," in *Lord Jesus Christ, Will You Not Stay: Essays in Honor of Ronald Feuerhahn on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. J. Barth Day et al. (St. Louis: Concordia, 2002) 91–104.

<sup>42</sup> B. Spinks, "Trinitarian Belief and Worship: A Historical Case," in *God's Life in Trinity*, ed. M. Volf and M. Welker (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006) 211–22.

<sup>43</sup> See A. E. Peaston, *The Prayer Book Reform Movement in the XVIIIth Century* (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1940).

inherent problems in an inherited liturgical tradition that mainly addresses either a generic God, or God the Father, in prayer, and only exceptionally has prayers direct to God the Son and God the Spirit. It is not sufficient to claim Nicene and trinitarian orthodoxy in doctrine, and then to avoid expressing this in prayers and hymns in public worship. This is to invite a theoretical doctrinal orthodoxy alongside an actual public doxological heterodoxy.

*LEX CREDENDI, LEX ORANDI:*

THE CASE OF VINEYARD THEOLOGY AND WORSHIP

Though the lessons of Whiston and Clarke were available to Jungmann, it is most unlikely that he would have had the slightest interest in eighteenth-century Anglican heterodox liturgical revision. Vineyard worship of course post-dates Jungmann, but one suspects that even if it had been in existence in his lifetime it would have been of even less interest than Anglican liturgy. The Vineyard movement comes out of the charismatic revival ministry associated with the American evangelist John Wimber. Central to Vineyard worship are choruses that praise God in a gathering conscious of the majesty of Christ and the power of the Spirit. As James Steven has shown, in much charismatic worship is to be found praise addressed specifically to each of the persons of the Trinity.<sup>44</sup> However, Martyn Percy's discussion of Wimber and the Vineyard songs suggests that all is not well. Percy notes:

Wimber and his song-writing colleagues are perhaps peculiar in addressing all three persons of the Trinity; in fact, no one person appears to be substantially more preferred to another. But what does emerge from even the most casual analysis of *Songs of the Vineyard* is that individuality and corporate nature of Trinitarian personhood (which might include distinctiveness in identity, functionality, space and time, yet mutuality and relationship), is dissolved. God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit assumes the same dissolved character throughout: intimate, loving, precious, refreshing, fulfilling, mighty and omnipotent, all without qualification. The data suggests that it is not so much God who is being addressed, but rather favourable concepts of God—an ideology—

<sup>44</sup> James Steven, *Worship in the Spirit: Charismatic Worship in the Church of England* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2002).

that has rooted itself in the individual and corporate identity of the worshippers.<sup>45</sup>

Elsewhere Percy observes that despite the intimacy of the songs, with their preference for addressing God as “You” and “Lord,” Jesus becomes the model for the Christian, and the power of his works is the Spirit. Emphasis is on the Spirit as unstoppable force rather than a person who gives gifts or whose presence yields fruits. Percy notes that “the power of Jesus is actually the power of the Spirit, given by the Father, working through the most effective agent possible: the person of Christ. In other words, there is a latent doctrine of subordination present in Wimber’s thinking, which is explicitly exposed when the theme of power is used as an interpretive key to his theology.”<sup>46</sup>

Indeed, Percy suggests that Wimber’s subordinationist trinitarian theology most closely resembles that of Origen.<sup>47</sup> Although “Lord” is a key word in Vineyard worship, it functions as a code word for power and authority and not as a literal description of Jesus in relation to the Father and the Spirit. In Wimber’s books and the Vineyard songs, Percy suggests, the manner in which Lordship is used tends, on the one hand, to deny the real humanity of Jesus in the life of the Trinity, and on the other, fails to give Jesus himself the same level of power that the Father or the Spirit possess. Jesus is subordinate both to the will of the Father and the power of the Spirit.<sup>48</sup> James Steven, Martyn Percy, and most recently, Pete Ward in *Selling Worship*,<sup>49</sup> all observe the tendency in Vineyard’s choruses and other similar songs to concentrate on the majesty of Jesus, and the kingship and lordship of God, and to ignore any extended narrative of salvation history, especially the concept of self-emptying and the scandal of the cross. In the context of the Vineyard songs and Wimber’s writings, the *lex orandi* can

<sup>45</sup> Martyn Percy, *Words, Wonders and Power: Understanding Contemporary Christian Fundamentalism and Revivalism* (London: S.P.C.K., 1996) 61.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 87.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 181 n. 9.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 88.

<sup>49</sup> Pete Ward, *Selling Worship* (Blatchley: Paternoster, 2005). R. Parry (*Worshipping Trinity* [Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2005]) examined twenty-eight albums produced by Vineyard Music between 1999 and 2004, containing 362 songs. Only five fall into what Parry termed “Three-person songs.”

disguise a distortion of orthodox doctrine that has a domino effect on how a Christian community envisions itself and its task in the world.

So, what does this have to do with Jungmann? The point is that Jungmann was certainly correct in stressing that the humanity of Christ must be a crucial part of liturgical prayer. Simply to address prayer to God the Son and God the Holy Spirit, be it in prose or song, does not in itself guarantee an orthodox doctrine of the Trinity or an orthodox christology. Consubstantiality of Son and Spirit with the Father cannot be separated from the consubstantiality of the Son with us. As T. F. Torrance puts it:

The saving reality with which we are concerned here is the twofold but indivisible activity of God, of God as God upon man and of God as man towards himself, the movement of saving love which is at once *from* the Father, through the Son and in the Spirit, and *to* the Father, through the Son and in the Spirit. This has already taken place once and for all in the self-giving of God to us through the incarnation of his Son and the self-offering of Jesus Christ through his ascension to the Father.<sup>50</sup>

Worship must be grounded in the *katabasis* and *anabasis* of God. However, this needs far greater articulation than simply appending “through Christ” to a prayer addressed to God. The kenosis of God in Christ and the death on the cross cannot be avoided. In a post-Moltmann context, the so-called non-Chalcedonian versions of the *Trisagion* must surely be regarded as a totally orthodox liturgical unit in which christology and trinitarian theology are fittingly juxtaposed.

In this introduction I have attempted to show that Jungmann’s concern for the human nature of Christ, as crucial as it is for soteriology, was argued at the expense of much New Testament evidence that at the very least invited the practice of addressing Christ as God. Likewise, his discussion of the early Eastern material seems to have been predetermined by his preference for what he regarded as a more primitive and still predominantly Roman form of liturgical prayer. The reluctance of the West—that is Rome and the Reformation Churches—to give fuller liturgical expression to the consubstantiality of the Son and Spirit, far from being an asset, has in fact always been a potential breeding ground for Arianism *redivivus*. But addressing Father, Son, and Spirit

<sup>50</sup> T. F. Torrance, *Theology in Reconciliation* (London: G. Chapman, 1975) 118.



without regard for the incarnation and atonement can be equally perilous. A full and sufficient *lex orandi* will give expression to both Nicene christology as well as the Nicene-Constantinopolitan trinitarian faith. It must also give full expression to the consubstantiality of the Son with us and for us, “who for us and our salvation came down from heaven.” Of course, there is much more to be said on the topics of Trinity, christology, and liturgical theology, far beyond Jungmann’s concerns, as subsequent papers I am sure will show. But by way of introduction I want to urge, with Balthasar Fischer, that sound liturgical piety absolutely depends on both the *per Christum* and the *ad Christum*.