IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)
Volume 31, Issue 11, Series 1 (November, 2026) 26-34
e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.
www.iosrjournals.org

Order as the Garment of Sanctity: A Constructive Exegetical and Liturgical Study of "The Ordinance of the Sacred Seats"

Martin Gyula Maichiki
Department of Sacred Liturgy, Catholic Institute of West Africa (CIWA), Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria
https://orcid.org/0009-0004-1299-5364|

Victor Jamahh Usman (Dr)
https://orcid.org/000900039188711X. /

Abstract
This article offers a constructive exegetical and liturgical reading of "The Ordinance of the Sacred Seats," a text presented in archaic ceremonial language but unsupported by any identifiable manuscript witness, critical edition, or received liturgical book. Methodological candour therefore requires treating it not as an ancient source but as a modern, constructed exemplar: a theological composition that gathers biblical, patristic, and ritual motifs into a spatial parable of ordered Communion. Through textual, intertextual, doctrinal, and contextual analysis, the study examines the ordinance's symbolism of eastward orientation, differentiated ministries, empty seats, concentric circles, memory, and silence. Augustine's tranquillitas ordinis, Basil's account of embodied tradition, the apocalyptic heavenly assembly, Catholic teaching on active participation, and recent magisterial reflection on liturgical formation supply the principal interpretive lenses. The article then relocates the argument within the Nigerian Church, where strong communal cultures, ritual precedence, linguistic plurality, contested forms of inculturation, and the Catholic Bishops' Conference of Nigeria's 2024 warning against liturgical abuse make the relation between received order and cultural creativity especially urgent. It argues that sacred order is neither ceremonial rigidity nor clerical control. Properly understood, it is the hospitable grammar by which distinct ministries become one baptismal body ordered toward Christ. The ordinance is thus historically unreliable but theologically useful, provided the Church's doctrine of legitimate development, synodal discernment, and inculturation corrects its absolutist claims. For Nigerian Catholic communities, its enduring value lies in prompting a disciplined ars celebrandi in which silence, gesture, office, music, and cultural symbols are received, tested, and integrated into ecclesial Communion.

Keywords: *liturgical order, sacred space, constructive exegesis, inculturation, Nigerian Church, ars celebrandi, active participation*

Date of Submission: 23-10-2026 Date of Acceptance: 04-11-2026

I. Introduction: The Text, the Question, and the Method

Every liturgical text arrives with a claim, usually about time: this is old, this was handed down, this is not our invention. "The Ordinance of the Sacred Seats" makes exactly this claim. It presents itself as a "Liturgical Inscription, Temple of the First Dawn," excerpted from a "Book of Ceremonies, Chapter of the Holy Assembly." It asks to be read alongside Augustine, Basil, and the documents of the Second Vatican Council as though it belonged to the same archive. Before any honest theological reading of the ordinance can proceed, we must test that claim, because exegesis is inseparable from provenance. A text cannot be read as a fourth-century liturgical fragment unless there is a fourth-century liturgical fragment to read.

The ordinance announces its governing principle through a deliberately solemn parallelism:

> In all holy gatherings,
> order is the garment of sanctity.
> No worship, no offering, nor chant shall commence.
> until the seats are placed
> according to the Pattern Divine.
> ("Ordinance" vv. 1-2)

Systematic searches of standard reference literature on Christian liturgical books, Byzantine ceremonial manuals, and patristic catenae find no ordinance matching this description, no "Temple of the First Dawn," and no "Book of Ceremonies" organized around a "Chapter of the Holy Assembly." The genuinely historical *De Ceremoniis Aulae Byzantinae*, compiled under Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos, is a real and well-attested source. Still, it governs imperial court protocol, not a theological seating scheme organized around "Singers of the Law" and "Bearers of Flame" (Constantine VII). No manuscript tradition connects the two. The safest and most honest scholarly conclusion is that the ordinance is a modern composition, written in a deliberately archaic register and assembled from recognizable fragments of the real tradition: the *tabnit* of Exodus 25:9, the four living creatures of Ezekiel 1, the elders around the throne in Revelation 4-5, the bells of Exodus 28:35, and the general cadence of monastic and Byzantine rubrical prose.

This finding does not empty the ordinance of scholarly interest; it relocates that interest. Rather than asking what the ordinance proves about fourth-century practice, this article asks two different, and, as it will be argued, more tractable, questions. First, as a work of theological composition, what does the ordinance do with the real materials of the tradition, and how faithfully does it represent them? Second, and more importantly, what can a careful, critical exegesis of the ordinance teach about the Catholic theology of sacred order, precisely because the ordinance is a distillation, a kind of theological parable, rather than a primary historical witness? The method adopted here is therefore twofold: an internal, verse-by-verse exegesis that reads the ordinance on its own terms and traces its images back to their scriptural, patristic, and magisterial sources; and an external, critical assessment that asks what is gained and what is risked when a modern text borrows the voice of antiquity to make a theological argument about space, hierarchy, and silence.

Genre and Provenance: The Ordinance among the Ordines

Liturgical cultures have always produced texts that regulate space before they regulate speech. The instructions for the tabernacle in Exodus, "according to the pattern (tabnit) that was shown you on the mountain" (Exod. 25:9), already establish the principle that the visible arrangement of a sanctuary is itself a form of Revelation, not a neutral container for it. Ezekiel's temple vision extends this logic across nine chapters of measured courts and gates (Ezek. 40-48). Revelation completes it eschatologically, with the twenty-four elders "seated on thrones" arranged "round about the throne" of the Lamb (Rev. 4:4). Real liturgical history is full of texts that translate this biblical instinct into rubric: the Apostolic Constitutions instruct that the bishop's throne stand in the midst, with presbyters seated on either side and the deacons standing near, "let the laity sit on the other side, with all quietness and good order" (Apostolic Constitutions 2.57). The *De Ceremoniis* of Constantine VII regulates where the emperor stands relative to the patriarch on each feast of the Byzantine year (Constantine VII). The Armenian and Syriac ordination and dedication rites likewise assign symbolic value to direction and station.

The Apostolic Constitutions supply a genuinely ancient example of an assembly whose spatial differentiation serves intelligibility and common prayer:

> In the middle let the bishop’s throne be placed,
> and on each side of him let the presbytery sit down;
> let the deacons stand near at hand,
> and let the laity sit on the other side,
> with all quietness and good order;
> let the women sit separately, keeping silence.
> (Apostolic Constitutions 2.57)

"The Ordinance of the Sacred Seats" belongs recognizably to this genre, which might be called the ordo of assembly: a text whose grammatical mood is imperative and whose subject is not belief but placement. What distinguishes it from the genuine examples above is that it cannot be anchored to any known community, Council, or manuscript tradition; its "Presiding One," "Wardens of Silence," and "Keepers of Memory" have no attested counterpart in the terminology of any rite this study has been able to identify, Eastern or Western. The vocabulary of "Pattern Divine" is a plausible and evocative gloss on *tabnit,* but it is a modern gloss, not an inherited technical term. This does not make the ordinance a forgery in any culpable sense -- nothing in the text

or its transmission claims documentary authorship, and it may well have been composed, as such texts often are, for retreat, meditation, or classroom use. However, responsible scholarship must say plainly what it can and cannot verify. On the evidence available, the ordinance is a twenty-first-century theological composition written in the grammar of an ancient ordo.

Exegesis of the Primary Text

The primary text, as supplied for this study, reads as an ordered sequence of twelve prescriptions governing a "holy gathering": the placement of a Presiding One at the East, Singers of the Law at the North, Bearers of Flame at the South, and Keepers of Memory at the West, four empty seats reserved around the altar, concentric rings of "the People of the Circle," Wardens of Silence stationed between the rings, and a closing double command against self-selection of seats and against alteration of the pattern. What follows is a verse-by-verse exegesis, read against the verified tradition rather than against the invented citations that sometimes accompany versions of this text in circulation.

1. "In all holy gatherings, order is the garment of sanctity." The opening line functions as a thesis statement, and it is theologically serious even though the text that carries it is not ancient. It condenses, almost to the point of paraphrase, Augustine's definition of peace in Book Nineteen of the City of God: "The peace of all things is the tranquillity of order. Order is the distribution which allots things equal and unequal, each to its own place" (Augustine 19.13). For Augustine, order (ordo) is not bureaucratic tidiness but the visible shape that love takes when it is rightly directed; a rightly ordered soul, city, or assembly is one in which each thing has been given its due place in relation to God. To call order the "garment" of sanctity, rather than sanctity itself, is a modest and defensible theological move: it treats spatial and ritual arrangement as the outward form that clothes an inward reality, echoing the general sacramental principle, well attested across Catholic theology, that visible sign and invisible grace are joined without being identical.

Augustine's fuller account shows that liturgical order belongs to a comprehensive theology of peace rather than to ceremonial tidiness:

> The peace of the body consists
> in the duly proportioned arrangement of its parts.
> Peace between man and God is
> the well-ordered obedience of faith to eternal law.
> The peace of all things is the tranquillity of order;
> order allots each thing to its own place.
> (Augustine 19.13)

2. "No worship, no offering, nor chant shall commence until the seats are placed according to the Pattern Divine." This verse establishes precedence: form is before act. The claim has a real conciliar analogue. *Sacrosanctum Concilium* insists that "the liturgy may be able to produce its full effects" only when "the faithful come to it with proper dispositions" (Sacrosanctum Concilium, sec. 11). It further legislates that "no other person, even if he be a priest, may add, remove, or change anything in the liturgy on his own authority" (Sacrosanctum Concilium, sec. 22). The ordinance dramatizes, in narrative form, the same conviction the Council states in juridical form: readiness of disposition, including the readiness of space, precedes the efficacy of the rite. The danger, addressed more fully in Chapter Five below, is that the ordinance states this as an absolute temporal precondition -- nothing "shall commence" -- in a way the Council does not.

3. "At the Eastern Gate... the Presiding One shall sit -- facing the altar and the rising sun." Eastward orientation in prayer is one of the best-attested "unwritten traditions" in the patristic record. Basil the Great, defending customs not explicitly commanded in Scripture, writes: "we all look to the East at our prayers, but few of us know that we are seeking our own old country, Paradise" (Basil, ch. 27). Basil's testimony is significant because it shows the custom already functioning, in the fourth century, as a piece of received and only partially understood practice -- exactly the kind of inherited gesture the ordinance is trying to dramatize. The theological point is eschatological as much as it is nostalgic: facing East is simultaneously a memory of the garden and an expectation of the rising Christ, "the Sun of Justice" (Mal. 4:2). The ordinance's presider faces "the rising sun" in a way that is fully continuous with this attested tradition, even though the specific title "Presiding One" and the ceremonial apparatus around it are not.

Basil interprets embodied custom as an eschatological pedagogy whose meaning may exceed the worshipper's immediate awareness:

> Thus we all look to the East at our prayers,
> but few of us know that we are seeking

our own old country, Paradise,
which God planted in Eden in the East.
We pray standing on the first day of the week,
though we do not all know the reason.
(Basil, ch. 27)

The directional symbolism is expressed most clearly in the complementary northern and eastern stations:

At the Eastern Gate the Presiding One shall sit,
facing the altar and the rising sun.
To the North, let the Singers of the Law be seated,
their office ordered toward proclamation,
memory, and the hearing of the sacred Word.
("Ordinance" vv. 3-4)

6. "To the West, facing the fading sun, sit the Keepers of Memory." The westward assignment of memory is the ordinance's most successful piece of theological composition. It plays on a real and old association between the setting sun and mortality, and it correctly identifies anamnesis—liturgical remembrance—as an act that does not merely recall the past but renders it sacramentally present. John Chrysostom's homiletic tradition consistently insists that what happens at the altar is not an act of human memory alone but an act in which Christ himself acts through the minister (Chrysostom, On the Priesthood, bk. 3). The ordinance's "Keepers of Memory" thus stand for a genuine doctrine -- that liturgical remembering is participatory, not merely commemorative -- even if the office itself has no attested precedent.

The text balances Word and memory by assigning flame and remembrance to opposite quarters:

To the South,
let the Bearers of Flame take their place.
To the West, facing the fading sun,
sit the Keepers of Memory,
guarding what the holy assembly has received.
("Ordinance" vv. 5-6)

8. "The People of the Circle shall sit beyond the sacred boundary, in concentric rings, each facing inward." The concentric, inward-facing circle is the ordinance's central geometric image. It is the verse most directly answerable to Scripture: the seer of Revelation describes twenty-four elders "seated on thrones" arranged "round about the throne" of the Lamb, with the four living creatures nearer the centre (Rev. 4:4, 4:6). The circle is not a claim about equality so much as a claim about common orientation -- every rank, however differentiated, shares a single centre. This is the strongest and most defensible theological content in the ordinance, because it corresponds closely to a genuinely scriptural and patristic vision of ordered, hierarchical, yet unified worship.

The ordinance's circle derives its deepest warrant from the apocalyptic throne room, where rank is differentiated but every gaze is ordered toward God:

Moreover, round about the throne were four and twenty seats:
and upon the seats I saw four and twenty elders sitting,
clothed in white raiment;
Moreover, they wore crowns of gold
on their heads.
Moreover, lightning proceeded from the throne.
and thunderings and voices.
(The Holy Bible, King James Version, Rev. 4.4-5)

Its most concentrated image of invisible Communion and common orientation joins empty places to the gathered circle:

Around the altar four seats shall be kept empty,
unseen yet honoured,
for they belong to the spirits of the First Ones.
The People of the Circle shall sit beyond the sacred boundary,

in concentric rings, each facing inward.
("Ordinance" vv. 7-8)

9. "Between each ring shall stand a Warden of Silence, to guard the space between souls." Silence as a positive, structural element of worship, rather than an absence to be filled, has real scriptural warrant. The seer of Revelation records "silence in heaven for about half an hour" at the opening of the seventh seal (Rev. 8:1), and the Catechism affirms that it is "in this silence, unbearable to the 'outer' man, that the Father draws us to himself" (Catechism, sec. 2717). *Sacrosanctum Concilium* likewise directs that "at the proper times, all should observe a reverent silence" (Sec. 30). The invented office of "Warden" personifies what the Council treats as a communal discipline; this is a legitimate act of theological imagination, translating doctrine into dramatis personae, even though no rite this study has located actually appoints such a minister.

Silence and assigned place are then presented as mutually reinforcing disciplines:

Between each ring shall stand a Warden of Silence,
to guard the space between souls.
No one shall choose their own seat,
for place is not of the will
but of the pattern received by the assembly.
("Ordinance" vv. 9-10)

12. "Let the arrangement never be altered, for the circle mirrors the heavens, and the heavens are the dwelling of Order." The closing verse makes the ordinance's strongest and most vulnerable claim. It correctly reflects a real Catholic conviction that earthly liturgy is a participation in, and not merely a symbol of, the "heavenly liturgy which is celebrated in the Holy City of Jerusalem toward which we journey as pilgrims" (Catechism, sec. 1090). However, it overstates that conviction by treating a particular, contingent spatial arrangement as though it shared in the heavenly liturgy's own unchangeableness. Chapter Five argues that this is where the ordinance's theology, however evocative, departs furthest from the Church's actual and considered teaching on liturgical development.

The closing movement binds sound, stillness, and cosmic imitation into one ceremonial climax:

When all are seated, and stillness has fallen,
the Herald shall raise the golden bell.
Let the arrangement never be altered,
for the circle mirrors the heavens,
and the heavens are without disorder.
("Ordinance" vv. 11-12)

Read together, the twelve verses trace a coherent arc: from a thesis about order (v.1), through the establishment of directional roles (vv.2-6), to the mystery of the unseen Communion (v.7), the geometry of communal worship (v.8), the discipline of silence (v.9), the theology of vocation (v.10), the sanctified sound that breaks the silence (v.11), and a closing claim to permanence (v.12). The exegesis above has tried to show, verse by verse, which of these claims rest on genuinely attested tradition and which are the ordinance's own theological improvisation. Both categories are worth studying, but only the first can be presented as historical testimony.

Patristic Resonances -- Order, Communion, and Cosmic Worship

Chrysostom's homiletic tradition contributes the ordinance's theology of anamnesis, discussed above in connection with the "Keepers of Memory." Chrysostom's central argument across the treatise On the Priesthood is that the minister at the altar is the instrument, not the source, of what takes place there (Chrysostom, bk. 3). This is a genuinely load-bearing doctrine in the ordinance's westward station of memory: to "keep memory," on Chrysostom's reading, is not a passive nostalgic function but an active participation in Christ's own self-gift, represented rather than merely recollected.

Taken together, these patristic resonances explain why the ordinance, despite its uncertain provenance, reads as theologically coherent rather than arbitrary: it assembles real and weighty pieces of the tradition, Augustinian order, Basilian unwritten custom, Chrysostomic anamnesis, and the Ezekiel-Revelation vision of ordered ranks, into a single continuous narrative. The following chapter turns from these patristic sources to the Church's own doctrinal and conciliar self-description, to ask how closely the ordinance's synthesis matches magisterial teaching.

Doctrinal and Scriptural Correlations

Sacrosanctum Concilium supplies the second major doctrinal anchor. Its insistence that "Mother Church earnestly desires that all the faithful should be led to that full, conscious, and active participation in liturgical celebrations" (Sweeney, Sylvia. 185-212. Sec. 14) is sometimes read, in popular liturgical writing of a traditionalist temper, as being in tension with an emphasis on fixed order and hierarchy; the ordinance itself seems to assume such a tension, presenting order as something to be recovered against a drift toward improvisation. However, the conciliar text does not support that opposition. The same constitution that calls for full and active participation also insists that rites "be distinguished by a noble simplicity" and "short, clear, and free from useless repetitions" (Sacrosanctum Concilium, sec. 34), and that "no other person, even if he be a priest, may add, remove, or change anything in the liturgy on his own authority" (Sacrosanctum Concilium, sec. 22). Read carefully, the Council does not oppose order to participation; it argues that genuine participation is only possible within an ordered, received form, which is close to the ordinance's own best insight, stripped of its more absolute claims about permanence.

Finally, Scripture itself supplies the pattern the ordinance imitates. Paul's instruction that "all things should be done decently and in order" (1 Cor. 14:40) is the classic proof text for liturgical order in the Pauline corpus. It occurs, tellingly, in a passage about the regulation of charismatic speech in the assembly at Corinth—a reminder that the biblical warrant for order was never a warrant against participation but a warrant for participation held within a shared discipline. Exodus 25:9, already discussed, supplies the ordinance's controlling image of the "Pattern Divine," and Revelation 4-5 supplies its circle. Taken together, these doctrinal and scriptural sources confirm that the ordinance is not theologically eccentric; rather, it is a compressed and occasionally overstated restatement of positions the Church actually holds, positions that themselves hold order and participation, hierarchy and Communion, together rather than as rivals.

Ritual, Anthropological, and Liturgiological Dimensions

The Nigerian Church as a Hermeneutical Location

The ordinance becomes more than an antiquarian curiosity when it is read from Nigeria. Nigerian Catholic worship is celebrated within an unusually dense field of languages, ritual memories, musical traditions, kinship expectations, and regional histories. One parish may gather people shaped by *Igbo, Yoruba, Hausa, Tiv, Efik, Edo, Gwong,* and other cultural worlds; another may be more culturally homogeneous yet include sharp differences in age, social status, devotional association, and liturgical formation. The Nigerian assembly is therefore not a space into which a finished European ritual is imported. It is a living ecclesial body whose members already understand posture, precedence, greeting, silence, rhythm, and public speech through culturally learned grammars. The theological issue is not whether culture enters the liturgy. Culture is already present whenever bodies assemble, languages are spoken, music is made, and authority is recognized. The decisive question is whether those cultural forms are evangelized and ecclesially discerned.

John Paul II describes African inculturation as a process that embraces theology, liturgy, customs, and structures while preserving what belongs to divine right and the Church's received discipline (Ecclesia in Africa, sec. 62). This twofold fidelity offers a better interpretive key than either ritual immobilism or spontaneous adaptation. The ordinance's "Pattern Divine" may symbolize the givenness of Christian worship, but it cannot canonize every inherited seating rule or cultural hierarchy. Conversely, cultural creativity cannot be defended merely because it is locally attractive. Benedict XVI insists that the Gospel may assume the face of many cultures without becoming subordinate to any of them (Africae Munus, secs. 36-37). In Nigeria, then, order becomes the garment of sanctity only after it has passed evangelical judgment.

The image of the Church as God's Family is especially important here. The African Synods valued this image because it emphasizes solidarity, warmth, welcome, dialogue, and trust (Africae Munus, secs. 7-8). Family, however, is an ambivalent liturgical analogy. At its best, it resists anonymity: older people are honoured, children belong, memory is carried communally, and the stranger is received. At its worst, the language of family can protect patronage, suppress necessary criticism, or allow social seniority to eclipse baptismal dignity. The ordinance's assigned seats expose this ambiguity. A seat may signify service received from the Church; it may also become a visible claim to privilege. Nigerian parishes should therefore ask not only who occupies a prominent place, but what ecclesial service that prominence signifies and whether the arrangement allows the whole assembly to recognize Christ as its centre.

This criterion is particularly relevant to sanctuary practice. The General Instruction of the Roman Missal directs that the priest celebrant's chair signify his office of presiding, while avoiding the appearance of a throne; seats for concelebrants and assisting ministers are to be arranged according to their functions (General Instruction, secs. 310-11). The sanctuary is thus differentiated, but its differentiation is ministerial rather than aristocratic. In a Nigerian setting, where public events often display status through elaborate protocols, reserved seats, titles, and visible entourages, the Roman liturgy offers a needed conversion of precedence. Liturgical place is not a reward for wealth, chieftaincy, political office, clerical celebrity, or contribution to a building

project. It is ordered to sacramental function and the edification of the body. The ordinance is pastorally fruitful when it unmasks self-appointment; it becomes pastorally dangerous when it sacralizes social rank.

Inculturation, Authority, and the Discipline of Reception

The contemporary Nigerian debate about liturgical order became especially concrete in August 2024 when the Catholic Bishops' Conference of Nigeria addressed priests on abuses during liturgical celebrations. The bishops objected to departures that treated the liturgy as a field of personal improvisation and called ministers back to the Church's norms (Catholic Bishops' Conference of Nigeria). Their central concern may be stated succinctly: *"*The liturgy is not a private playground for personal innovation*" (*Catholic Bishops' Conference of Nigeria*).*

This admonition closely parallels the ordinance's protest against self-selected place, but the two should not be collapsed. The bishops' authority arises from ecclesial office and the Church's law; the ordinance possesses no comparable juridical standing. The ordinance can illuminate the bishops' concern only as a parable: worship is received before it is performed. Francis makes the same point by locating *ars celebrandi* in submission to the Spirit's action, freedom from individual taste, and discernment regarding cultural elements (Desiderio Desideravi, secs. 49-50). Liturgical order is therefore not the triumph of rubrics over culture. It is the process by which culture, minister, and assembly are all prevented from claiming ownership of Christ's act.

In Nigeria, this distinction protects authentic inculturation. Vernacular proclamation, indigenous melodic patterns, processional movement, culturally intelligible gestures of reverence, and appropriate forms of communal response can deepen participation. However, an element does not become liturgical merely because it is Nigerian, popular, emotionally powerful, or effective at attracting attention. *Varietates Legitimae* requires careful study, competent authority, experimentation under approved conditions, and evaluation, while preserving the substantial unity of the Roman Rite (Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments, secs. 37-51, 62-69). The procedure may seem slow, but that slowness serves Communion: it lets the local Church receive cultural gifts without making the Eucharist depend on a celebrant's personality or a single group's preferences.

The Nigerian Church's linguistic plurality further clarifies what order means. Translation is never a merely technical substitution of words; it involves cadence, conceptual range, oral memory, and the relationship between speech and song. Scholarship on Nigerian liturgical chant notes the importance of rendering texts into indigenous languages so that the faithful can participate meaningfully, as well as the role of episcopal and interdiocesan structures in coordinating such work (Okeke 6). The ordinance's "Singers of the Law" may therefore be reread as an image of disciplined proclamation: singers and readers do not own the Word but lend it an audible body. Their task is not performance detached from the rite, nor the insertion of familiar music irrespective of textual or ritual fit. It is ministerial mediation within the liturgical action.

Silence presents a more difficult contextual question. Nigerian worship often features strong vocal participation, rhythmic movement, extended song, and audible communal response. These are not defects to be measured against a culturally narrow ideal of stillness. They can embody the biblical joy of a people praising God with the whole person. Nevertheless, silence is also a liturgical act. Francis insists that it is not withdrawal into privacy but a communal symbol of the Holy Spirit's action (Desiderio Desideravi, secs. 52-53). The ordinance's "Wardens of Silence" should not be imitated by inventing a new ministry; their imaginative force lies in reminding communities that pastoral discipline must guard silence. In practical Nigerian terms, this requires presiders, choirs, commentators, and instrumentalists to resist filling every interval. Silence after readings, after the homily, during the Eucharistic Prayer where prescribed, and after Communion can allow the assembly's abundant sound to mature into reception, adoration, and interior appropriation.

Order, Hospitality, and Baptismal Equality

The ordinance's circular geometry offers a final Nigerian application. A circle facing a common centre can symbolize unity across ethnicity, language, region, and social class. However, Catholic churches are not normally arranged as literal concentric circles, and architectural symbolism must not be forced into a universal blueprint. The deeper claim is christological: the altar signifies Christ, and all ministerial differentiation is justified only insofar as it orders the assembly toward his paschal mystery. This principle matters publicly in a society where religious, ethnic, and political divisions frequently strain communal belonging. The liturgical assembly cannot solve Nigeria's conflicts by ceremonial design alone. Still, it can rehearse a different social imagination: diverse persons receive one Word, exchange one peace, approach one table, and are sent toward a common mission.

Such unity requires deliberate hospitality. Seating practices should accommodate older persons, people with disabilities, families with children, religious communities, catechumens, visitors, and those who arrive without social connections. Ushers should be formed not as controllers of territory but as ministers of welcome and order. Choir placement should support rather than replace congregational song. The sanctuary should

express liturgical function without theatrical distance, while the nave should enable visibility, audibility, movement, and participation. Where security pressures affect church buildings, integrate practical safeguards without letting fear become the dominant architectural theology. The pattern remains sacramental hospitality: ordered space should help the body gather, hear, offer, receive, and be sent.

This approach also corrects a possible clerical reading of the ordinance. *Lumen Gentium* teaches that the universal call to holiness belongs to all the baptized, whatever their rank or status (sec. 40). Distinct offices remain necessary. Still, they exist within the prior dignity of incorporation into Christ. The Nigerian Church will embody "order as the garment of sanctity" when ministers exercise authority as service, lay persons fulfil genuine liturgical ministries with formation and fidelity, women and young people are treated as full baptismal subjects rather than decorative participants, and cultural elders are honoured without displacing sacramental order. In that form, order becomes neither social exclusion nor flattened sameness. It becomes differentiated Communion.

Critical Assessment and Pastoral Implications

A responsible scholarly treatment of the ordinance cannot end with appreciation alone. Three critical questions must be put to the text, precisely because it argues so persuasively for its own authority.

The first concerns the ordinance's claim to permanence. Its closing verse forbids any alteration "for the circle mirrors the heavens." However, the actual history of Catholic liturgical order is a history of organic and, at times, deliberate change: the shift from house-church to basilica, the gradual separation and later partial reintegration of sanctuary and nave, the medieval elaboration and the twentieth-century simplification of ceremonial, and the reforms mandated by *Sacrosanctum Concilium* itself, which explicitly calls for texts and rites to be "revised" so that they may "express more clearly the holy things which they signify" (Sec. 21). Ratzinger's own later writing on liturgical reform, frequently invoked by readers sympathetic to the ordinance's aesthetic, in fact argues for continuity of substance amid legitimate development of form, not for an absolute prohibition on change (see Ratzinger, ch. 3, on the difference between organic growth and imposed rupture). An ordinance that forbids alteration outright, rather than distinguishing organic development from arbitrary rupture, states the Church's real conviction in an exaggerated and therefore misleading form.

The second concerns agency. The instruction that "no one shall choose their own seat, for place is not of the will but of the pattern" is theologically defensible as a corrective to individualism, in the sense already traced through Luke 14 and 1 Corinthians 12. However, taken as a governing principle for a real community, rather than a poetic image, it risks naturalizing whatever hierarchy happens to be in place at the moment of writing by dressing contingent social arrangements in the language of cosmic necessity. The Second Vatican Council's own ecclesiology, in Lumen Gentium, insists that all the faithful, "of whatever rank or status," are "called to the fullness of the Christian life and to the perfection of charity," and so share a common baptismal dignity that precedes and grounds every subsequent differentiation of office (Lumen Gentium, sec. 40). A text that assigns roles by unquestionable cosmic decree, with no textual acknowledgement of the deeper baptismal equality beneath the assigned roles, offers only half of the Catholic picture. Pastoral use of the ordinance should supply the missing half explicitly.

The third concerns the text's own rhetorical strategy, which is worth naming as a matter of intellectual honesty rather than aesthetic criticism. By adopting the voice of an ancient inscription and pairing that voice, in some circulating versions of the text, with specific but unverifiable citations to real theologians, the ordinance borrows an authority it has not independently earned. This is not a uniquely modern temptation -- pseudepigraphy is as old as the Pentateuch's own opponents and as recent as internet devotional writing -- but it is one that responsible readers, and especially catechists and homilists who might be drawn to use the ordinance, should recognize and correct for. The most defensible pastoral use of the text is precisely what this article attempts: an acknowledged, modern meditation on real doctrine, valuable for its clarity and image-making, rather than evidence for how the early Church actually arranged its assemblies.

None of this forecloses genuine pastoral value. Read as a constructed exemplar rather than a document, the ordinance still offers a serviceable framework for reflection on three matters of live pastoral concern: the recovery of a shared, communal orientation in worship (echoing the Council's own concern that participation be intelligible and unified); the reintroduction of structured silence, which the Catechism and the Council both commend (Catechism, sec. 2717; Sacrosanctum Concilium, sec. 30); and the formation of ministers and laity alike in the conviction that liturgical roles are received rather than seized, provided that conviction is held together with, rather than instead of, the equal baptismal dignity of every member of the assembly.

II. Conclusion

"The Ordinance of the Sacred Seats" cannot be presented, on the evidence available, as a recovered fragment of ancient liturgical practice; no manuscript, catalogue, or scholarly citation supports that claim, and this article has tried to say so plainly rather than let the text's borrowed antiquity go unexamined. However, the

ordinance survives its own unmasking rather well. Read as what it actually is -- a modern theological composition, written in the grammar of the ancient ordo and assembled from genuinely traditional materials -- it becomes a legitimate and even useful object of exegesis, because its images are not arbitrary. Its opening claim that order is "the garment of sanctity" restates Augustine's *tranquillitas ordinis*; its eastward-facing presider restates Basil's testimony to an inherited, only partly understood custom; its westward "Keepers of Memory" restate Chrysostom's theology of sacramental remembrance; its concentric rings restate the seer's vision of the elders gathered round the throne; and its silence between the rings restates a discipline the Catechism and the Council both commend in their own voice. Where the ordinance goes beyond what it can responsibly claim -- above all in forbidding any alteration to its own pattern, and in assigning place "not of the will but of the pattern" without qualification -- careful exegesis has tried to mark the boundary between the Church's real teaching and the text's own poetic overreach.

The larger lesson of this study is methodological as much as theological. Sacred order, in the tradition this ordinance imitates, is genuinely a locus of Revelation rather than a matter of ceremonial preference; the tranquillity of rightly ordered love, the discipline of shared silence, and the communal turning toward a single centre are not incidental to Catholic worship but among its most serious claims about what worship is. Those claims deserve study on the strength of their real sources, Augustine, Basil, the Council, and the Catechism, rather than on borrowed strength from an invented antiquity. To "sit according to the Pattern Divine," understood rightly, is not to submit to an unchangeable ancient decree that never existed, but to enter, again and again, into a communal order that the Church has received, tested, revised, and continues to receive as a living gift.

Works Cited

[1]. Apostolic Constitutions. Translated by James Donaldson, in Ante-Nicene Fathers, edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, vol. 7, Christian Literature Publishing, 1886.
[2]. Augustine. City of God. Translated by Henry Bettenson, Penguin Classics, 2003.
[3]. ---------- The City of God. Translated by Marcus Dods, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, vol. 2, edited by Philip Schaff, Christian Literature Publishing, 1887.
[4]. Basil the Great. On the Holy Spirit. Translated by Blomfield Jackson, in Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, vol. 8, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace, Christian Literature Publishing, 1895.
[5]. Catechism of the Catholic Church. 2nd ed., Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1997.
[6]. Chrysostom, John. On the Priesthood. Translated by W. R. W. Stephens, in Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, vol. 9, edited by Philip Schaff, Christian Literature Publishing, 1889.
[7]. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos. De Ceremoniis Aulae Byzantinae. Edited by Johann Jakob Reiske, Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, 1829.
[8]. Guardini, Romano. The Spirit of the Liturgy. Translated by Ada Lane, Crossroad, 1998.
[9]. Hippolytus of Rome. The Apostolic Tradition. Translated by Burton Scott Easton, Cambridge University Press, 1934.
[10]. The Holy Bible: Revised Standard Version, Catholic Edition. National Council of Churches, 1966.
[11]. Kavanagh, Aidan. On Liturgical Theology. Pueblo Publishing, 1984.
[12]. "Lumen Gentium: Dogmatic Constitution on the Church." Second Vatican Council, The Holy See, 21 Nov. 1964, www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html.
[13]. "The Ordinance of the Sacred Seats." Text supplied for scholarly analysis. No manuscript witness, published edition, or verifiable historical source has been identified; this study treats it as a constructed liturgical exemplar of unknown authorship and date.
[14]. Ratzinger, Joseph. The Spirit of the Liturgy. Translated by John Saward, Ignatius Press, 2000.
[15]. Benedict XVI. Africae Munus: Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation on the Church in Africa in Service to Reconciliation, Justice and Peace. The Holy See, 19 Nov. 2011, www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_ben-xvi_exh_20111119_africae-munus.html.
[16]. Catholic Bishops' Conference of Nigeria. "On Abuses during Liturgical Celebrations." Nigeria Catholic Network, 15 Aug. 2024, www.nigeriacatholicnetwork.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/On-the-Abuse-of-the-Sacred-Liturgy.pdf.
[17]. Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments. *Varietates Legitimae:* Fourth Instruction for the Right Application of the Conciliar Constitution on the Liturgy. 29 Mar. 1994, www.cultodivino.va/content/dam/cultodivino/documenti/Varietates-Legitimae.pdf.
[18]. Francis. *Desiderio Desideravi*: Apostolic Letter on the Liturgical Formation of the People of God. The Holy See, 29 June 2022, www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_letters/documents/20220629-lettera-ap-desiderio-desideravi.html.
[19]. General Instruction of the Roman Missal. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011.
[20]. John Paul II. Ecclesia in Africa: Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation. The Holy See, 14 Sept. 1995, www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_14091995_ecclesia-in-africa.html.
[21]. Okeke, Benedict. "Inculturation of Liturgical Chants in Nigeria." Journal of African Studies and Sustainable Development, 2023, pp. 1–8, eprints.gouni.edu.ng/4794/.
[22]. "Sacrosanctum Concilium: Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy." Second Vatican Council, The Holy See, 4 Dec. 1963,
[23]. Sweeney, Sylvia. "The Role of the 20th Century Women's Movement in Liturgical Renewal in the Episcopal Church." Anglican and Episcopal History, vol. 92, no. 2, 2023, pp. 185–212.
[24]. www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19631204_sacrosanctum-concilium_en.html.
[25]. The Holy Bible. King James Version, Oxford UP, 1769.