



THE FORMATION OF THE CONTEMPORARY PRAYERFUL ETHOS IN THE LIGHT OF THE LUKAN WRITINGS: FROM BIBLICAL EXEGESIS TO THE SPIRITUAL PEDAGOGY OF THE CHURCH

Ciprian STANCA

PhD. Candidate, Faculty of Orthodox Theology,
“Ovidius” University of Constanta,
ROMANIA,
Email: teeatof@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This article proposes a synthetic and applicative reading of the Lukan theology of prayer, tracing the trajectory from the exegetical conclusions established by the study of Luke-Acts to their reception in the patristic tradition and their implications for the spiritual pedagogy of the contemporary Church. Building upon the now well-established scholarly consensus that prayer in Luke-Acts functions as the privileged locus of christological disclosure, pneumatological empowerment, and soteriological transformation, the article argues that the Lukan writings do not merely describe a historical practice of prayer but constitute a normative pedagogical model whose structural features — the priority of observed prayer over taught prayer, the filial address as the ground of all petition, the posture of acknowledged dependence as the condition of genuine receptivity, and the Holy Spirit as the supreme gift toward which prayer reaches — remain formative for the spiritual pedagogy of the Church in any cultural context.

Keywords: Luke-Acts, prayer; spiritual formation; spiritual pedagogy; ethos of prayer; Orthodox spirituality; Stăniloae, Schmemmann; Kallistos Ware; Lukan theology;

INTRODUCTION

The movement from biblical exegesis to spiritual pedagogy is one of the most demanding transitions in the discipline of theology, precisely because it requires holding together two registers that academic theology has increasingly tended to treat as separate: the historical-critical analysis of texts in their original context and the normative appropriation of those texts for the formation of the living community of faith. The present article undertakes this transition with specific reference to the Lukan writings and their theology of prayer, arguing that the exegetical conclusions established by the sustained academic study of Luke-Acts carry within themselves, when properly understood, a pedagogical program of the first order — one that is not merely applicable to the contemporary Church as an external resource but constitutes, in its very structure, a model for the formation of the prayerful ethos of the Christian community in every age. The Lukan writings have received sustained and sophisticated exegetical attention in the preceding studies of this series, establishing several conclusions that the present article will presuppose and build upon. Prayer in Luke-Acts functions as the privileged locus of christological disclosure — the moments at which the identity of Jesus as Son of God becomes visible are consistently situated by Luke within or immediately following his prayer. Prayer functions as the structural vector of pneumatological empowerment — the major receptions and renewals of the Holy Spirit in Acts are consistently



preceded by and situated within corporate prayer. Prayer as commended in the specific Lukan parables is constituted by a posture of humble, acknowledged dependence before the God of mercy, rather than by religious achievement or confident self-presentation. And the catechetical unit of Luke 11:1–13 operates simultaneously as pedagogical instruction and mystagogical initiation, conducting the disciples — and through them the reader — from the observable practice of Jesus' prayer to the filial mystery that that practice discloses and communicates.¹

These exegetical conclusions are not merely of historical interest. They describe, with the precision that only close engagement with a specific and theologically deliberate text can produce, a pattern of prayer formation that bears directly on the most urgent questions facing the contemporary Church in its attempt to cultivate a genuine and sustained prayerful ethos among its members. The present article argues that the Lukan model of prayer formation is structured around five constitutive features — the primacy of example, the ground of filiation, the posture of dependence, the community as the context of formation, and the Holy Spirit as the telos of prayer — and that each of these features, while rooted in first-century narrative, opens onto enduring pedagogical principles whose contemporary relevance is confirmed and developed by the major voices of Orthodox spiritual theology.

1. THE PRIMACY OF EXAMPLE: SEEING BEFORE LEARNING

The first and structurally foundational feature of the Lukan model of prayer formation is the primacy of observed example over transmitted instruction. As has been established in the preceding exegetical study, the disciples' request in Luke 11:1 arises not from an abstract recognition of their need to learn to pray, but from the concrete experience of having watched Jesus pray: "Now Jesus was praying in a certain place, and when he finished, one of his disciples said to him, 'Lord, teach us to pray.'" The teaching of prayer in Luke is not initiated by the teacher's decision to offer instruction, but by the disciple's response to what he has observed in the teacher's practice.²

This narrative sequence — see, then ask, then receive instruction — is pedagogically significant in a way that no amount of theoretical reflection on the importance of example can fully capture, because it enacts rather than merely describes the priority of witnessed practice in the formation of the prayerful ethos. The disciple who has watched Jesus pray has already been changed, in some fashion, by that watching: something has been communicated, some desire awakened, some recognition kindled, that precedes and generates the request for formal instruction. The instruction that follows — the Lord's Prayer, the parable, the imperative triad, the promise of the Spirit — is not the beginning of the disciples' formation in prayer but its second movement, building upon a first movement that was constituted entirely by proximity to the praying master.

David Crump observes that this structural priority of witnessed prayer over transmitted instruction is one of the most consistent and deliberately deployed features of Luke's redactional handling of prayer throughout the Gospel: wherever Luke introduces a prayer notice — at the

¹ The exegetical conclusions summarized here are established in the preceding articles of this series and documented in the secondary literature cited therein. For the prayer-christology nexus in the Gospel, see David Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor: Prayer and Christology in Luke-Acts*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1992; for the prayer-pneumatology nexus in Acts, see Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*, Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1996; for the prayer parables, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke X–XXIV*, Anchor Bible 28A, New York, Doubleday, 1985; for the catechetical unit of Luke 11:1–13, see Steven F. Plymale, *The Prayer Texts of Luke-Acts*, New York, Peter Lang, 1991.

² On the narrative occasion of Luke 11:1 and its pedagogical implications, see François Bovon, *Luke 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51–19:27*, transl. Donald S. Deer, Hermeneia, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2013, p. 91–93.



Baptism, before the choice of the Twelve, at the Transfiguration — the disciples are characteristically present as witnesses, and it is their witness of Jesus praying that creates the context within which the subsequent christological or pneumatological disclosure becomes visible to them.³ Prayer formation, in the Lukan model, is at its most fundamental level not a matter of technique or doctrine but of proximity — of being placed, by the community's life and liturgy, in the presence of prayer being prayed. The contemporary implications of this Lukan pedagogical principle have been articulated with particular clarity by Alexander Schmemmann, whose theology of liturgy functions, among other things, as a sustained argument for the formative priority of the Church's doxological practice over its catechetical instruction. Schmemmann's central claim — that the *lex orandi* is not merely the expression of the *lex credendi* but its generative source, that the Church learns what it believes primarily by doing what it does in the liturgy — is a theological elaboration of precisely the Lukan pedagogical principle this section has identified.⁴

For Schmemmann, as for Luke, the formation of the prayerful ethos begins not with instruction about prayer but with participation in prayer — with the transformation effected by being placed, Sunday after Sunday and day after day, in the presence of the Church's praying. Kallistos Ware, in his widely read introduction to the Orthodox spiritual tradition, *The Orthodox Way*, develops this point in a more explicitly pedagogical register, observing that the traditional Orthodox understanding of spiritual formation consistently privileges apprenticeship over instruction, the relationship with a spiritual father or mother who prays over the reading of books about prayer: "We learn to pray by praying; and we learn to pray by praying with those who already know how to pray. The tradition is transmitted not primarily through texts but through persons — through the living presence of those in whom prayer has become a way of being."⁵

2. THE GROUND OF FILIATION: PRAYER AS PARTICIPATION IN THE SON'S RELATION TO THE FATHER

The second constitutive feature of the Lukan model of prayer formation is the grounding of all prayer in the filial relationship that Jesus himself has with the Father and into which the disciples are incorporated through the teaching of the Lord's Prayer. As established in the preceding exegetical study, the address *Pater* — the single word that opens the Lukan Lord's Prayer — is not merely a formal religious address but the disclosure of a relationship: the disciples who are taught to say "Father" are being initiated into the filial mode of address that characterizes Jesus' own unique relationship with God, and their adoption of this address constitutes a participation in that relationship rather than a mere imitation of it.⁶

This theological dimension of the Lukan catechesis on prayer has consequences for the pedagogy of prayer formation that are both profound and demanding. If prayer is grounded not in the disciple's own religious effort or achievement but in the filial relationship into which the disciple

³ Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor*, p. 3–5, 256–261.

⁴ Alexander Schmemmann, *For the Life of the World: Sacraments and Orthodoxy*, Crestwood NY, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1973, p. 11–22. Schmemmann's argument for the priority of liturgical practice over theological instruction as the Church's primary mode of formation is developed most systematically in *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, transl. Asheleigh E. Moorhouse, Crestwood NY, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1986, p. 9–28.

⁵ Kallistos Ware, *The Orthodox Way*, rev. ed., Crestwood NY, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1995, p. 97. On the role of the spiritual father or mother in Orthodox tradition, see also Kallistos Ware, "The Spiritual Father in Orthodox Christianity," *Cross Currents* 24 (1974), p. 296–313.

⁶ On the filial address *Pater* and its initiatory implications, see Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor*, p. 45–49, and Joachim Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus*, London, SCM Press, 1967, p. 11–65.



has been incorporated through the gift of the Lord's Prayer — and, as Luke 11:13 makes explicit, through the gift of the Holy Spirit who enables the filial address — then the formation of the prayerful ethos is inseparable from the formation of the disciple's identity as an adopted child of the Father. To form someone in prayer is not to teach them a skill; it is to initiate them into an identity, the identity of the one who can say "Father" with the confidence of the Son.

Dumitru Stăniloae, whose systematic theology of the spiritual life in *Orthodox Spirituality* and in the third volume of his *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology* remains the most rigorous Orthodox engagement with the patristic tradition on prayer in the twentieth century, articulates this point with characteristic theological precision. Stăniloae argues that Christian prayer is constitutively different from all non-Christian forms of prayer not primarily in its content or form but in its ground: it is prayer that occurs within the trinitarian life, prayer addressed to the Father through the Son in the Spirit, such that the one who prays does not approach God from outside as a suppliant before a sovereign, but prays from within the divine life as an adopted child participating in the Son's eternal address to the Father.⁷ For Stăniloae, as for Luke, the address "Father" is not a pious convention but a theological claim of the highest order: it asserts that the one who prays stands in the filial relationship of the Son to the Father, not by nature but by adoption — and the pedagogy of prayer is, therefore, inseparable from the pedagogy of adopted filiation. The practical consequences of this for the contemporary Church's pedagogy of prayer are considerable. If prayer is grounded in filiation, then the formation of the prayerful ethos cannot be approached primarily as a matter of technique improvement or devotional habit-formation, important as these dimensions are at the level of practical implementation. It must be approached as a dimension of the broader initiation into the Christian life — the life of adopted filiation that begins in Baptism and is sustained through the Eucharist and the ongoing work of the Spirit. The pedagogy of prayer is, at its most fundamental level, a pedagogy of identity: the formation of those who know themselves as children of the Father, and who pray from within that knowledge rather than toward it as a distant goal.

3. THE POSTURE OF DEPENDENCE: HUMILITY AS PEDAGOGICAL PREREQUISITE

The third constitutive feature of the Lukan model of prayer formation is the consistent and theologically deliberate privileging of the posture of acknowledged dependence as the condition of genuine receptivity to the divine response. As established in the preceding exegetical study of the Lukan prayer parables, Luke constructs through the Friend at Midnight, the Unjust Judge and the Persistent Widow, and above all the Pharisee and the Tax Collector a coherent soteriological theology of humble prayer in which the condition of genuine prayer is precisely the abandonment of self-justification and the acknowledgment of radical dependence upon divine mercy.⁸

This Lukan theological insistence on humble dependence as the constitutive posture of authentic prayer carries a pedagogical implication that is simultaneously obvious and demanding: the formation of the prayerful ethos requires the formation of a prior disposition, the disposition of acknowledged need before God, without which the forms and practices of prayer become, as the Pharisee's prayer illustrates, occasions for self-display rather than genuine address to the Other. The

⁷ Dumitru Stăniloae, *Orthodox Spirituality: A Practical Guide for the Faithful and a Definitive Manual for the Scholar*, transl. Jerome Newville and Otilia Kloos, South Canaan PA, St. Tikhon's Seminary Press, 2002, p. 233–267. See also Stăniloae, *The Experience of God: Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*, vol. 3, transl. Ioan Ioniță, Brookline MA, Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2011, p. 45–78.

⁸ The soteriological theology of humble prayer in the Lukan parables is analyzed in detail in the preceding article of this series. See also Kenneth E. Bailey, *Poet and Peasant and Through Peasant Eyes*, combined ed., Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1983, p. 142–156.



pedagogy of prayer is, in this dimension, inseparable from what the patristic and Orthodox ascetic tradition calls the pedagogy of *tapeinophrosynē* — humility — understood not as a psychological attitude of self-deprecation but as the theological stance of the creature before the Creator: the recognition that before God one stands always as the tax collector, not as the Pharisee.

Hierotheos Vlachos, in his widely read *Orthodox Psychotherapy: The Science of the Fathers*, develops this connection between humility and authentic prayer in terms drawn from the neptic tradition of Hesychasm, arguing that the primary obstacle to genuine prayer in the contemporary person is not lack of technique or insufficient devotional time, but the *nous* in its fallen condition of dispersal and self-preoccupation, which prevents the genuine turning of the whole person toward God that authentic prayer requires.⁹ The therapy proposed by the Fathers — and, in Vlachos's reading, the proper content of the Church's pedagogy of prayer — is precisely the therapy of humility: the gradual reorientation of the person from the self-referential circle of passion and pride toward the God-directed openness of the humble heart. This patristic and Orthodox therapeutic tradition, applied to the contemporary Church's pedagogy of prayer, suggests that the formation of the prayerful ethos cannot be adequately addressed simply through better instruction in prayer forms or more frequent opportunities for communal prayer, important as both of these are. It requires attention to the prior formation of the dispositional ground from which prayer springs: the cultivation of the awareness of need, the practice of self-knowledge before God, and the gradual dismantling of the self-sufficiency that renders the Pharisee's prayer formally intact but spiritually void. The formation of the humble heart is the precondition of the formation of the praying heart — and the Lukan insistence on this connection is one of its most enduring and most demanding contributions to the pedagogy of prayer. The patristic tradition engages this pedagogical challenge with considerable sophistication. Gregory the Great, in his *Homiliae in Evangelia*, consistently reads the Lukan prayer parables in terms of the soul's need for self-knowledge as a prerequisite for genuine prayer, observing that the Pharisee fails not in his observance but in his self-knowledge: he does not know who he is before God, and therefore his prayer is addressed to a construction of himself rather than to the living God who knows him as he truly is.¹⁰

This patristic insight — that self-knowledge before God is the ground of authentic prayer — resonates directly with the contemporary therapeutic tradition represented by Vlachos and, in a different idiom, with the phenomenological spirituality of prayer developed by writers such as Thomas Merton, whose *Contemplative Prayer* argues with similar insistence that the primary work of the formation of prayer is not the acquisition of techniques but the unmasking of the false self that prevents genuine encounter with the God who "desires truth in the inward being" (Ps 51:6).¹¹

4. THE COMMUNITY AS CONTEXT: PRAYER FORMATION AS ECCLESIAL PRACTICE

The fourth constitutive feature of the Lukan model of prayer formation is the consistently communal and ecclesial context within which prayer is taught, practiced, and renewed. As established in the exegetical study of Acts, the major pneumatological events of Luke's second volume — Pentecost, the renewed filling of Acts 4, the commissioning of the Seven, the Antiochene sending of Paul and Barnabas — occur consistently within and through the corporate prayer of the

⁹ Hierotheos Vlachos, *Orthodox Psychotherapy: The Science of the Fathers*, transl. Esther Williams, Levadia, Birth of the Theotokos Monastery, 1994, p. 45–89, 234–267.

¹⁰ Gregory the Great, *Forty Gospel Homilies*, transl. David Hurst, Kalamazoo MI, Cistercian Publications, 1990, Homily 34, p. 289–293

¹¹ Thomas Merton, *Contemplative Prayer*, New York, Herder and Herder, 1969, p. 37–56.



gathered community, never through the private prayer of individuals in isolation.¹² This consistent Lukan pattern is not incidental but reflects a theological commitment: prayer, in Luke's vision, is most properly and most powerfully a communal act, the act of a community gathered in common dependence before the Father. The pedagogical implication is direct: the formation of the prayerful ethos cannot be approached primarily as a project of individual spiritual development, though the personal dimensions of prayer formation are genuine and important. It must be approached as a dimension of the formation of the community's common life — the cultivation of a *koinonia* constituted by shared prayer, in which the individual learns to pray precisely by being incorporated into the community's praying and by discovering, through that incorporation, the depths of prayer that no individual can reach alone. Schmemmann's ecclesiology of the Eucharist develops this point with particular force. For Schmemmann, the Eucharistic assembly is not a gathering of individuals who happen to pray together but the constitutive act of the Church as the Body of Christ — the act through which the community's identity as the royal priesthood that offers the world to God in prayer is actualized and renewed.¹³ The formation of the prayerful ethos is, in Schmemmann's vision, inseparable from the formation of the Eucharistic community: one learns to pray, most fundamentally, not by attending prayer classes or reading books about prayer but by being formed into the Body that prays — by being liturgically incorporated into the community whose very mode of existence is the offering of praise and petition to the Father through the Son in the Spirit.

Stăniloae develops the communal dimension of prayer formation from a complementary angle, arguing in his *Orthodox Spirituality* that the practice of intercessory prayer — prayer for others — is not an advanced form of the spiritual life reserved for those who have already developed their own prayer to a high degree, but a constitutive dimension of Christian prayer from the outset, since the filial address "Our Father" already places the individual within a community of siblings before the common Father, and therefore makes the intercession for the community of siblings an intrinsic dimension of the filial stance itself.¹⁴

5. THE HOLY SPIRIT AS TELOS: FORMATION TOWARD THE GIFT

The fifth and most theologically profound constitutive feature of the Lukan model of prayer formation is the identification of the Holy Spirit as the ultimate gift toward which prayer reaches and the ultimate telos of the formation of the prayerful ethos. As established in the exegetical study of Luke 11:13 — the verse in which Luke's catechetical unit on prayer reaches its climax — the Father gives not merely particular goods in response to particular petitions, but the Holy Spirit as the supreme good that includes and exceeds all particular goods: "how much more will the heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him?" This Lukan pneumatological finale to the catechesis on prayer means that the formation of the prayerful ethos is, at its deepest level, not merely the cultivation of a devotional practice or even the deepening of a filial relationship, but the progressive opening of the person to the indwelling of the Spirit who is the Father's gift of his own life to the adopted child.¹⁵

¹² On the communal context of pneumatological events in Acts, see Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Abingdon New Testament Commentaries, Nashville, Abingdon Press, 2003, p. 65–67, and Turner, *Power from on High*, p. 268–275.

¹³ Alexander Schmemmann, *The Eucharist: Sacrament of the Kingdom*, transl. Paul Kachur, Crestwood NY, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1988, p. 23–45

¹⁴ Dumitru Stăniloae, *Orthodox Spirituality*, p. 289–312.

¹⁵ On Luke 11:13 as the pneumatological climax of the Lukan catechetical unit on prayer, see Turner, *Power from on High*, p. 193–197, and Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 912–915



Max Turner's analysis, cited in the preceding exegetical study, establishes this pneumatological dimension as a deliberate Lukan redactional contribution — Luke's substitution of "Holy Spirit" for Matthew's generic "good things" being a theologically loaded choice that identifies the Spirit as the *summum bonum* of prayer, the gift that contains all other gifts and that constitutes the fullness of what prayer reaches toward.¹⁶ The pedagogical implications of this Lukan pneumatological emphasis for the contemporary Church's formation of prayer have been developed with particular depth by Kallistos Ware, who argues in several studies that the Eastern Christian understanding of prayer as the "lifting of the mind and heart to God" (*proseuche estin anabasis nou pros theon*, Evagrius) reaches its full theological meaning only when understood in pneumatological terms: it is the Spirit who lifts the mind and heart, the Spirit who prays within the believer (cf. Rom 8:26), the Spirit who constitutes the very capacity for prayer that prayer exercises.¹⁷

This pneumatological understanding of prayer's telos has two specific pedagogical consequences worth developing. First, it establishes that the formation of the prayerful ethos is not primarily a human achievement — a matter of developing technique, discipline, or devotional intensity — but a participation in a divine work that precedes, underlies, and exceeds every human effort. The disciple who seeks to be formed in prayer is not, in the first instance, developing an autonomous capacity, but opening himself or herself to the Spirit who is already present, already praying within, already drawing the person toward the Father whose gift the Spirit is. The pedagogy of prayer is, from this perspective, more accurately understood as the pedagogy of receptivity — the cultivation of the openness, attentiveness, and willingness that allow the Spirit's already-given gift to become operative in the consciousness and the life of the person.

Second, the identification of the Spirit as the telos of prayer establishes a necessary connection between the formation of the prayerful ethos and the transformation of the whole person — what the patristic and Orthodox tradition calls theosis or deification.

Stăniloae's *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology* consistently presents theosis not as a state achieved at the end of an extended spiritual progress but as the dynamic of participation in the divine life that is initiated in Baptism, sustained through the Eucharist, and deepened through the life of prayer — a dynamic that is identical, at its deepest level, with the reception of the Spirit who is the Father's gift to those who ask.¹⁸ The formation of the prayerful ethos and the formation of the deified person are, in this perspective, not two parallel processes but a single movement: the progressive opening of the human person, through prayer, to the Spirit who transforms the person into the likeness of the Son from whom he comes and toward whom he leads.

6. TOWARD A CONTEMPORARY SPIRITUAL PEDAGOGY OF PRAYER: A SYNTHESIS

The five constitutive features of the Lukan model of prayer formation identified and developed in the preceding sections — the primacy of observed example, the ground of filiation, the posture of acknowledged dependence, the communal context of formation, and the Holy Spirit as the telos of prayer — do not constitute five independent pedagogical principles that can be implemented separately and in isolation. They form, rather, a coherent and integrated pedagogical vision in which each feature presupposes and requires the others and in which the whole is greater than the sum of

¹⁶ Turner, *Power from on High*, p. 193–197

¹⁷ Kallistos Ware, "Ways of Prayer and Contemplation: I. Eastern," in Bernard McGinn and John Meyendorff (eds.), *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century*, New York, Crossroad, 1985, p. 395–414. Ware draws on Evagrius of Pontus, *De Oratone*, 35, PG 79, 1173C, for the classic definition of prayer as the lifting of the mind to God.

¹⁸ Stăniloae, *The Experience of God*, vol. 3, p. 189–234.



its parts. The primacy of observed example (the disciple watching Jesus pray) requires, for its proper understanding, the ground of filiation (the disciple incorporated through the Lord's Prayer into the filial relationship that constitutes Jesus' prayer) — otherwise the example is merely an admirable model to be imitated rather than a mystery to be entered. The ground of filiation requires, for its practical actualization, the posture of acknowledged dependence (the humble heart that has abandoned self-justification) — otherwise the address "Father" becomes a form of spiritual presumption rather than the disclosure of a received identity. The posture of acknowledged dependence is most durably cultivated within the communal context (the community of prayer in which no one prays alone) — otherwise it collapses into either individualistic self-improvement or paralyzing introspection. And the communal context of formation receives its ultimate orientation and its deepest motivation from the pneumatological telos (the Spirit as the Father's supreme gift to those who pray) — otherwise the community's prayer becomes a sociological practice without eschatological horizon. The contemporary Church's pedagogy of prayer, if it is to be adequate to the Lukan model identified through the exegetical analysis that this article synthesizes and applies, must therefore be an integral pedagogy: one that forms through example and liturgical participation before it forms through instruction, that roots the practice of prayer in the identity of adopted filiation rather than in the cultivation of devotional achievement, that cultivates the humble and dependent heart as the ground from which all prayer springs, that situates the individual's formation within the community's common prayer rather than treating individual prayer as primary and communal prayer as secondary, and that orients all formation toward the pneumatological openness in which the Spirit's gift becomes the transforming reality of the person's life. Schmemmann's liturgical theology, Stăniloae's systematic pneumatology, Ware's accessible presentation of the hesychast tradition, and Vlachos's therapeutic reading of the neptic Fathers each contribute essential elements to this integral contemporary pedagogy — elements that, taken together and rooted in the Lukan exegetical foundation this series of studies has established, constitute a rich and coherent resource for the renewal of the Church's formation of prayer in the contemporary world.¹⁹

CONCLUSION

The trajectory traced in this article — from the exegetical conclusions established by the study of Luke-Acts to their patristic reception and their contemporary spiritual-pedagogical implications — reveals the Lukan writings not as a historical document whose theology of prayer is interesting for what it tells us about first-century Christian practice, but as a living pedagogical resource whose structural features retain their formative power precisely because they describe, with the clarity that only close attention to a theologically deliberate text can produce, the enduring dynamics of genuine prayer formation in any cultural context.

The prayer of the Lukan Jesus — observed by the disciples at the Jordan, on the mountain before the choice of the Twelve, at the Transfiguration, in Gethsemane, on the Cross — is not merely an episode in the biography of a historical figure. It is, in Luke's theological vision, the visible enactment of the eternal relation between the Son and the Father, made accessible to the disciples and through them to the Church as the pattern and ground of their own prayer. To be formed in

¹⁹ The complementarity of these four contemporary voices — Schmemmann's liturgical theology, Stăniloae's systematic pneumatology, Ware's presentation of the hesychast tradition, and Vlachos's therapeutic reading of the Fathers — is itself a feature of the riches of the Orthodox theological tradition, within which these voices represent not competing approaches but complementary dimensions of a single integral vision of the Christian life as constituted by prayer.



prayer, in the Lukan model, is to be drawn progressively into this relation — to discover, through the practice of prayer in the community's liturgy, in the posture of acknowledged dependence, in the filial address that the Son has taught, and in the openness to the Spirit who is the Father's ultimate gift, that prayer is not an activity one performs but a relationship one inhabits: the relationship of the adopted child before the Father, in the Son, through the Spirit.

The contemporary Church, in all its cultural and institutional diversity, faces the challenge of forming this prayerful ethos in conditions of unprecedented distraction, spiritual fragmentation, and anthropological confusion. The Lukan writings, read with exegetical precision and appropriated with pastoral wisdom, offer not a program to be implemented but a vision to be inhabited — the vision of a community constituted by prayer, formed through the witness of the praying master, grounded in the filial mystery of adoption, humbled before the God of mercy, and opened toward the Spirit who is the Father's own life given to those who ask.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Bailey, Kenneth E., *Poet and Peasant and Through Peasant Eyes: A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke*, combined ed., Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1983.
- [2] Bovon, François, *Luke 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51–19:27*, transl. Donald S. Deer, Hermeneia, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2013.
- [3] Crump, David, *Jesus the Intercessor: Prayer and Christology in Luke-Acts*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- [4] Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *The Gospel according to Luke X–XXIV*, Anchor Bible 28A, New York, Doubleday, 1985.
- [5] Gaventa, Beverly Roberts, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Abingdon New Testament Commentaries, Nashville, Abingdon Press, 2003.
- [6] Gregory the Great, *Forty Gospel Homilies*, transl. David Hurst, Kalamazoo MI, Cistercian Publications, 1990.
- [7] Jeremias, Joachim, *The Prayers of Jesus*, London, SCM Press, 1967.
- [8] Merton, Thomas, *Contemplative Prayer*, New York, Herder and Herder, 1969.
- [9] Plymale, Steven F., *The Prayer Texts of Luke-Acts*, New York, Peter Lang, 1991.
- [10] Schmemmann, Alexander, *For the Life of the World: Sacraments and Orthodoxy*, Crestwood NY, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1973.
- [11] Schmemmann, Alexander, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, transl. Asheleigh E. Moorhouse, Crestwood NY, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1986.
- [12] Schmemmann, Alexander, *The Eucharist: Sacrament of the Kingdom*, transl. Paul Kachur, Crestwood NY, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1988.
- [13] Stăniloae, Dumitru, *Orthodox Spirituality: A Practical Guide for the Faithful and a Definitive Manual for the Scholar*, transl. Jerome Newville and Otilia Kloos, South Canaan PA, St. Tikhon's Seminary Press, 2002.
- [14] Stăniloae, Dumitru, *The Experience of God: Orthodox Dogmatic Theology*, vol. 3, transl. Ioan Ioniță, Brookline MA, Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2011.
- [15] Turner, Max, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*, Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- [16] Vlachos, Hierotheos, *Orthodox Psychotherapy: The Science of the Fathers*, transl. Esther Williams, Levadia, Birth of the Theotokos Monastery, 1994.
- [17] Ware, Kallistos, *The Orthodox Way*, rev. ed., Crestwood NY, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1995.
- [18] Ware, Kallistos, "The Spiritual Father in Orthodox Christianity," *Cross Currents* 24, 1974.
- [19] Ware, Kallistos, "Ways of Prayer and Contemplation: I. Eastern," in Bernard McGinn and John Meyendorff (eds.), *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century*, New York, Crossroad, 1985.



ICOANA CREDINTEI

Icon of Faith. International Journal of Interdisciplinary Religious Studies

IFIJISR- IISSN 2501-3386; ISSN-L 2393-137X| <https://doi.org/10.26520/icoana>

Frequency: 2 issues/year, with possible supplementary issues.

About IFIASA

Ideas Forum International Academic and Scientific Association (IFIASA) is a cultural-educational organization of distinguished members engaged in academic and scientific research. IFIASA is a publisher, open access journals since its establishment in 2015.

IFIASA Publishing House
Târgoviște, Dâmbovița,
Romania
<https://www.ifiasa.com/>
Email: ifiasa@yahoo.com

About ICON OF FAITH

IFIJISR, is a journal published and promoted at international level by IFIASA in collaboration with members of the Faculty of Orthodox Theology and Education Sciences, "Valahia" University, Târgoviște. Icon of Faith is a Scientific, Open Access journal, with the main aim to promote a high level of Christian Theology in an intercultural context.

www.ifiasa.com/ifijsr
Email:
iconfaith_journal@yahoo.com

Abstract & Index

ERIHPLUS;
Ceeol;
CrossRef; Doi;
Ezb; WorldCat;
Google Scholar;
Philpapers;
Scilit; PubMed;
OpenAlex; Fact;
Sudoc; Ifiasa-Red;
CNCS - B CATEGORY;



Copyright information:



This work is licensed under a
[Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](#).



Publisher: IFIASA® Ideas Forum International Academic and Scientific Association.