

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1968

Liturgical Reform at Vatican II- A Lutheran Appraisal

Philip Stephan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stephan, Philip, "Liturgical Reform at Vatican II- A Lutheran Appraisal" (1968). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 343.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/343>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

24
V. 76
C. 1
M. 3
1968
M. 7
2-12

58917

LITURGICAL REFORM AT VATICAN II:

A LUTHERAN APPRAISAL

LITURGICAL REFORM

AT VATICAN II

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Practical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by

Philip Stephan

May, 1968

58917

Approved by:

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

Robert Bergh
Adviser

Donald L. Dyer
Reader

BV
4070
C69
M3
1968
no. 9
c. 2

58917

Short Title:

LITURGICAL REFORM
AT VATICAN II

Stephan; STM; 1968

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. REVOLUTION, THE GROUND FOR RENEWAL . . .	1
Introduction: The Need for Adapting Ancient Worship Forms to the Modern Day	1
The Problem: Can Contemporary Worship Forms be Revised without Losing Their Ancient Truths?	3
Limitations of the Study	8
Summary of the Study	12
II. EVENTS WHICH SHAPED THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION ON THE SACRED LITURGY	17
Origins of the Liturgical Movement in the Roman Catholic Church	17
Dom Gueranger	18
Pope Pius X	25
Dom Lambert Beauduin	34
Development and Expansion of the Liturgical Renewal	40
Dom Ildefons Herwegen	40
Dom Odo Casel	44
The Biblical Dimension of the Liturgical Renewal	49
Papal Commentary and Recognition of Liturgical Research	57
Pope Pius XII and <u>Mediator Dei</u> . . .	57
III. THE THEOLOGICAL BASIS OF THE LITURGICAL REFORM OF THE MASS	70
The Influence of Dom Casel's <u>Mysterientheologie</u>	71

	Page
The Theology of Christ	86
The Paschal Theology of the Liturgy	92
The Eucharistic Theology of the Liturgy	98
The Mystery of the Liturgy	116
The Theology of the Church	124
Theology of the Word	139
IV. THE SPECIFIC PRINCIPLES OF THE LITURGICAL REFORM OF THE MASS	142
The Principle of Full and Active Participation	142
All the "Faithful" involved in worship	142
Public worship versus private mass	164
Diversity of rites	167
The Principle of Tradition in the Development of New Worship Forms of Worship	174
Use of sound tradition	174
The danger of antiquarianism	181
The omission of unsound traditions	188
Restoration of ancient parts of the Mass	192
Innovation, fabrication for the occasion, and development of the liturgy	196
Mutable and immutable elements of the liturgy	202
The Principle of Intelligibility	208
Simplicity and clarity of rite	208
The use of sign in the liturgy	210
The relationship of Word and rite	216
Restoration of the sermon	218
The use of the vernacular	223
Regulation of Liturgical Reforms	228

	Page
The Theology of Christ	86
The Paschal Theology of the Liturgy	92
The Eucharistic Theology of the Liturgy	98
The Mystery of the Liturgy	116
The Theology of the Church	124
Theology of the Word	139
 IV. THE SPECIFIC PRINCIPLES OF THE LITURGICAL REFORM OF THE MASS	 142
The Principle of Full and Active Participation	 142
All the "Faithful" involved in worship	 142
Public worship versus private masses	 164
Diversity of rites	167
 The Principle of Tradition in the Development of New Forms of Worship	 174
Use of sound tradition	174
The danger of antiquarianism	181
The omission of unsound traditions and useless repetition in the Mass	188
Restoration of ancient parts of the Mass	192
Innovation, fabrication for the occasion, and development of the liturgy	196
Mutable and immutable elements of the liturgy	202
 The Principle of Intelligibility	208
Simplicity and clarity of rite	208
The use of sign in the liturgy	210
The relationship of Word and rite	216
Restoration of the sermon	218
The use of the vernacular	223
 Regulation of Liturgical Reforms	228

	Page
V. A DYNAMIC AND ONGOING LITURGICAL RENEWAL	233
Conclusions	233
Liturgy Tested by Time and Use	244
APPENDIX	249
BIBLIOGRAPHY	253

CHAPTER I

REVOLUTION, THE GROUND FOR RENEWAL

Introduction: The Need for Adapting Ancient Worship Forms to the Modern Day

Almost every human creation, structure, society and science is in the process of radical revolution. The American Negro's drive for equal rights, the thrust for independence by the emerging nations, the population explosion and the change in family life mark our time as one of instability and changing life-styles. Technology and its by-products are expanding civilization at the boundaries of travel, communications, knowledge, industry and military weaponry. Mass media created by technology has enabled man to perceive his world in a new way. The changing culture forces man to reorganize his life.

Because the Church is part of society's fabric, the changes in society affect the Church. The ecclesiastical revolution is characterized by new theologies which attempt to speak the ancient truths of God in the terms of contemporary language and world-view. The shift from the metaphysical world-view and its language to the functional world-view combined with existentialism has influenced the changes in the Church's theology. Biblical research has unearthed new meanings of the Sacred Scriptures. The

Ecumenical Movement has allowed the churches to discover the richness of one another's tradition and teaching.

Biblical and patristic studies of the sources of Christian liturgy give the Church cause to examine present liturgical rites and worship practices. A renewed interest in the Holy Eucharist, the central act of Christian worship, has enabled Roman Catholics to emphasize the banquet character of the Lord's Supper and at the same time helped Protestants to abandon the educational concept of worship and return to a sacramental emphasis.

However, the revolutions in society, culture, theology and Church are not yet reflected in the liturgies, that is the form for public worship, of the Church. The whole area of worship, the way man receives and responds to God, is irrelevant and bland for many people. The words, symbols and images which are used for public, corporate worship do not reflect this changed world and so fail to communicate to modern man. For many persons, worship today is an individual thing and for most worship consists in one's good intentions in living their life. The sense of community in worship is lost. For other people of varied races, liturgical forms do not include their ethnic and national culture. The task which faces the Church in light of the revolutions of our time and the irrelevancy of liturgical worship is one of reform, renewal and reshaping of the liturgy of Holy Communion.

The Problem: Can Contemporary Worship Forms
Be Revised Without Losing Their Ancient Truths?

In order to update the liturgy and the rites of worship, the Church cannot afford to assume this task of renewal in a haphazard way because she has been entrusted with the truth of the Gospel. The truths of the Gospel are the substance of the Holy Scriptures and the Eucharist, and are contained particularly in the primary liturgy of the Church. A reformation of the liturgy of the Holy Eucharist, with which this study is concerned, must retain the substance of the Gospel in the liturgy. The problem this thesis will investigate and seek to answer is: Is it possible to reform the liturgy of the Holy Communion without losing its truth and substance and yet construct a liturgy which is relevant to the needs of the people and their times?

The ways of achieving these tasks are not easy. There are no ready answers or solutions which the Church can find from her ancient systematic books. The formulation of new ways in which modern, technological man can receive God's grace and respond to it in corporate acts is as difficult and as necessary as translating the ancient images of the Sacred Scriptures.

The more difficult task is to translate the images and metaphors, the ideas and thought-forms of the ancient scriptures into the thought and language of the twentieth century, without losing revealed truth in the process. There is no easy answer; no one simple answer: and indeed no complete answer at all. In every generation the church must continue to wrestle with this intractable problem

Intelligent participation is encouraged and increased when the language used in the service is contemporary not archaic, concrete not abstract, common not technical. Basic English promotes corporate participation.¹

In order to reform the liturgical life of the Church, the Church cannot go about this task without guidelines. Reforms of the liturgy needs governing principles to guide the reformulation, restoration and creation of new worship forms. It is assumed that this reformulation process of the liturgy is born as a result of the study of society, culture, modes of communication and contemporary perception or reality. Principles of liturgical reform should be formulated by scientific investigation. Liturgical investigation must proceed from known theories, facts and principles to discover new truths, in this case new forms and renewed means of worship.

However, principles designed to govern the creation of new forms of worship are not enough to keep the substance and truth of the ancient liturgy intact. There need to be principles also which govern liturgical reform which will recognize the validity of past traditions and forms of worship. The Church cannot reject the wholesome, good and true developments of her past. The Church must be honest to herself and what she is by creatively using the past for her present task. Thus, the need for two kinds of principles

¹Stephen F. Winward, The Reformation of Our Worship (Richmond: John Knox, 1965), p. 108.

of liturgical renewal. One kind to create new forms and another kind to preserve the past and the substance of the liturgy.

The Roman Catholic Church decided to reform the liturgy at the Second Vatican Council. The Council decided to bring about changes in the liturgical life of the Church and particularly the liturgy of the Mass by drafting principles which would govern the reforms and changes of their rites of worship. The Council fathers approved the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy which contains the principles for liturgical renewal in their church. This document will be analyzed in detail and used to test whether or not liturgical reform can be accomplished which will be relevant and yet retain the truths and substance of worship rites, particularly the Mass. An examination will be made as to whether Vatican II constructed the two kinds of principles which have been assumed necessary for liturgical reform by analyzing the principles in the Constitution.

A survey of the field indicates the necessity of investigating the history of the liturgical movement which apexed at Vatican II. In Chapter two some of the major liturgical trends and evolutions prior to the council will be examined. In Chapters two and three the principles of Vatican II will be investigated in light of liturgical research and reform since 1850. The liturgical studies,

themes and discoveries of the period prior to the Council will be used to show that Vatican II constructed these principles on the basis of research and evaluation of the past.

The study of the problems of liturgical renewal needs to explore whether the principles for change in the worship life of the Church have a built-in principle for ongoing reconstruction and renewal of the liturgy. If it is assumed that our world will keep changing, how will the Church update, renew, and create symbols and forms that are consistent and expressive of each succeeding age? It appears from this study that Vatican II was aware of this problem and sought to speak to this issue out of an awareness of the Church catholic, and an understanding of the historical development of the Church. Chapter four examines how the Council attempted to create principles that would solve the above inquiry.

What was done at Vatican II has great importance for the rest of divided Christendom because other churches' liturgies are derivations or reactions to the Roman Catholic Mass. For example, the Lutheran liturgy was created in reaction to the "unbloody sacrifice" in the Mass. All references to the sacrifice of the "immaculate victim" were deleted by Luther. Other non-Roman Catholic churches face the same liturgical renewal problems of updating liturgical language and symbol, relevancy, sacramental emphasis in the

liturgy and meaningful participation by the laity. If the problem of renewing forms of worship faces all the churches, then what Vatican II has accomplished may help in the creation of a model for the renewal of Protestant liturgies in general and the Lutheran liturgy in particular.

In making this study of the principles of liturgical renewal of the Roman Catholic Mass, it was important to evaluate these principles in light of the Lutheran Reformation. There are two reasons for including an analysis of these principles of Vatican II from a Lutheran perspective. The first reason is that this researcher was trained in Lutheran theology and is committed to the Lutheran tradition. Secondly, as the materials from the Second Vatican Council's work on the Sacred Liturgy are read, analyzed and studied, a familiar pattern begins to develop.

Those who are acquainted with Martin Luther's liturgical writings and creations will note that the principles of liturgical revision which Vatican II proposed have similarities to Luther's work. The question that is now raised by this observation is, has Vatican II's work on the liturgy begun to converge with the reforms suggested by Luther 450 years ago? Barriers, difficulties, and differences between Luther and Rome will be noted. Has Vatican II moved beyond Luther in liturgical reformation to a sufficient point so that Lutherans and Protestants should

consider some of Rome's liturgical principles or changes? This study will attempt to show by implication that if the Constitution has solved the basic dilemma of liturgical reform, namely that of creating relevant forms which retain the truths of the Gospel, then Lutheran liturgical reformers may find direction from Vatican II.

An analysis, clarification, comparison and contrast of the Vatican II Constitution and the liturgical writings of Martin Luther and the Lutheran Confessions will be included at the points of sacrifice in the Mass, the use of the vernacular, the use of Holy Scripture in the Mass, the inclusion of the Homily or sermon, the use of sound tradition in liturgical reformulation, and the elimination of useless repetitions.

Limitations of the Study

This investigation of the principles of liturgical reform of the Roman Catholic Mass will not attempt to make revisions for any other church's form of liturgy. But, this investigation will assess what principles the Vatican Council has stated for renewal of the liturgy. This study will examine how the church of Rome treated the problem of creating criteria for liturgical renewal so that new forms can be created without losing their substance.

Did the Council construct the kind of principles that will allow for a liturgy and worship which is truly

contemporary to the thought patterns, discoveries and life patterns of today? This question can only be tested by time, however it will be shown in this study that much more liturgical reform needs to be implemented.

Only the liturgical principles governing the Mass are used for investigation. The minor offices, rites of the sacrament of baptism, confession, absolution, monastic worship, architecture and music were eliminated from examination even though the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy formulated principles dealing with these forms of liturgical worship.

Although theologians indicate that the theological truths which the liturgical signs convey may need resymbolization, it is not the purpose of this study to report or analyze the work that has been done in theological reformulation. In the summary and conclusion of this study the need for further examination of the theological truths which are communicated through the symbols in the liturgy will be discussed.

This investigation of the principles of liturgical renewal, which uses the principles governing the Mass of the Roman Catholic Church as a model, is based on literature that was published prior, during, and after the Second Vatican Council from the period 1960-1965. These materials include periodicals and books authored by members of the

liturgical commission, liturgical scholars, and historians of the Roman communion such as Charles Davis, Frederick R. McManus, Lancelot Sheppard and Gerhard Ellard.

A survey of this material provides a comprehensive view of the hopes, suggestions and needs that are offered to the liturgical commission prior to the council. Magazine articles in Commonwealth, The Catholic World, Clergy Review, Studia Liturgica, and Worship are the chief sources of commentary on Vatican II's Constitution before, during, and after the drafting of the Constitution. Major books authored by Catholics and Protestants and published before and after the Council suggested, interpreted, and analyzed the liturgical principles of reform for the formation of a new liturgy for the Mass.²

In order to understand the history and development of the Vatican II document, it is necessary to treat the history of the liturgical movement in the Roman Catholic Church. A conversation with Dr. Pius Parsch's successor, Brother

²Major works by Protestants and Catholics include: Massey Shepherd, The Liturgical Renewal of the Church, edited for the Associated Parishes, Inc. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960); Ernest Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954); J. D. Crichton, The Church's Worship (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964); Charles Davis, Liturgy and Doctrine (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960); Louis Bouyer, Liturgical Piety (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964); John Murphy, The Mass and Liturgical Reform (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1956); Lancelot C. Sheppard, Blueprint for Worship (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1964) and J. D. Benoit, Liturgical Renewal (London: SCM Press, 1958).

Norbert Höslinger, editor of Bibel und Liturgie, founded by Dr. Parsch, highlighted the directions that the Volks-liturgisches Apostolat und Klosterneuburger Bibelapostolat have taken since the work was begun by Fr. Parsch. Chapter two will make reference to these developments and their influence on the Council.

A summary of a conversation with Dom Paul Neunheuser of Maria Laach, Germany will be incorporated into Chapter two. Dom Herwegen and Dom Casel did much of the research and formulation of the theology of the liturgy which influenced the Council's statements on the liturgy at this monastery. Dom Neunheuser indicated the present direction of the liturgical studies. The study includes sociological and anthropological investigation.

Dom Odo Casel's book, The Mystery of Christian Worship is the main work for the investigation of the theology which preceded the theological rationale of the principles of renewal stated in the Constitution. Charles Davis, who recently left the Roman Catholic Church, wrote Liturgy and Doctrine which points out the connections between Dom Casel and Vatican II.

In looking back to the history of liturgical renewal work before the Council, it is necessary to note the official pronouncements of Pope Pius X and Pope Pius XII to understand the historical development of liturgical reform within the official structure of the Roman Church. The Motu Proprio on The Restoration of Sacred Music of Pius X,

and the encyclical Mediator Dei of Pius XII gave recognition to the work of Dom Gueranger and Dom Casel respectively.

The chief and primary work that contains the actual principles of liturgical reconstruction is the official document of the Second Vatican Council, The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy which sets forth both the theology and the principles by which the Mass and other rites will be reformed. Since this is the first official document of the council, it reflects the new spirit of reform and the great concern of the bishops to relate the Word and Sacraments to modern man. This will be made clear as the various principles of reform are enunciated.

In comparing, contrasting and testing these principles of reform of the mass with the reforms suggested at the Reformation by Luther and his followers, it is necessary to examine the liturgical writings in Luther's Works, Volumes 35, 36, and 53, as well as the Lutheran Confessions as compiled in The Book of Concord.

Summary of the Study

After a complete investigation of the various forces at work in the Roman Catholic Church, a pattern appears within the materials. There are stages of development in the history of the liturgical renewal of Rome. The romantic Period of the 1800's was a reaction to rationalism and

involved a restoration of ancient rites and Gregorian chant.³ Next, the biblical and patristic period of the early nineteenth century centered on liturgical sources and sought to explain these sources. Then the movement entered a period from 1920 to the present time of liturgical investigation of the development of the rites of worship. During this time the theology of worship and the Holy Eucharist were enunciated and clarified.

Over and over again, the familiar voice of Dom Casel echoes in the theology of the Church's worship and Eucharist as it was drawn out by the council. The mystery of Christ's incarnation, death, resurrection, ascension, and the sharing of that mystery in which the Church participates at the celebration of the Mass are central truths and the realities toward which the liturgical acts of the Mass point. Eucharist too, is a mystery in the sense that those who celebrate the Eucharist fully participate in the redemptive act of Christ.

The theology of the Church as the redeemed people of God is the basis for the principle of participation of the faithful in the liturgy. The theology of the Church brings to light the theology of the laity who are the people of God involved in the worship and work of the Church. The

³Max Thurian, "The Present Aims of the Liturgical Movement," Studia Liturgica, III (Autumn 1964), 107.

nature of the catholicity of the Church is seen in the keen awareness of the Council that the Church is not an ephemeral nor instantaneous creation of men but the movement of the Spirit in God's people through the ages. This concept is seen best in the emphasis on tradition and the restoration of sound, ancient rites in the liturgy.

It is important to note in this investigation the emphasis on a return to the Holy Scriptures and the restoration of the homily or sermon to its "rightful place" within the liturgy. The genius of the Church catholic can be seen in the Council's careful deliberations to avoid the mistakes of previous liturgical reforms which only sanctified archaic rites and forms. At the same time, the fathers of the council cautioned against the dangers of creating rites which were simply "innovations" and gave no consideration to past rites or sound traditions.

Luther's principles of liturgical reform, while not as sweeping in their renewal, are similar to the principles of Vatican II in that they recognized the validity of tradition and development. Luther kept much of the traditional liturgy of his time and translated it into the vernacular. The reason he did not abolish the traditional liturgy was he did not desire to "offend the weak." Both Luther and the Fathers of Vatican II wanted to increase the people's participation in the liturgy. There are other similarities between Luther and Vatican II in the principles of liturgical

renewal, such as the emphasis on Holy Scriptures and the restoration of the sermon. Luther and Vatican II sought to remove meaningless additions and repetitions in the liturgy of the Holy Communion for the sake of clarity and meaning in worship. Basic forms were suggested by Luther and yet, he, like Vatican II allowed for diversity. Even though worship forms were "not necessary" for Luther, yet the central act of worship, the Holy Eucharist, was of vital importance in the Reformer's theology. In spite of the fact that liturgical scholarship and restoration was not Luther's forte, yet he was forced by the conditions of the congregations during the Reformation and the needs of the people to find a way in which the people could find and receive meaning in their public worship.

Just as there were those who were unhappy with Luther's liturgical reforms, a few critics have spoken out against the principles of renewal of Vatican II. In the concluding remarks the following questions will be discussed: "Has the council given the people full participation in the liturgy as members of the priesthood of the faithful?" "Is the council still cautious about clarifying the role of the priest who 'celebrates' and the people who participate?" "Was more participation of the people encouraged by the council so that the faithful could be assured of the benefits of the attendance at Mass?"

But is the work of Vatican II finished? The council

has only constructed the principles for reform. Now the actual revamping of the forms and structure of the liturgy needs to be done to aid modern man to perceive the realities of Word and Sacrament in worship. But will the research, the creation of a theological base for the principles, and the principles of reform developed as a guide for future worship be helpful for the construction of new liturgies?

The concluding chapter will comment on the principles of reform by judging whether Vatican II's work has opened the way for relevant, contemporary liturgical worship. Other concluding remarks will treat the reproachment between Rome and Wittenberg in the liturgy. In addition, some suggestions based on Vatican II will be offered for Lutherans to consider in their liturgical renewal.

The following chapters investigate the history of the liturgical renewal, its theological influence on Vatican II and the principles of reform that the council issued to construct a contemporary liturgy. The power and the possibilities for continuing liturgical renewal have been unleashed and there is no returning to a past that is useless and outdated. The history of the liturgy and its renewal have become a living reality in the action of the Second Vatican Council.

CHAPTER II

EVENTS WHICH SHAPED THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION ON THE SACRED LITURGY

Origins of the Liturgical Movement in the Roman Catholic Church

In order to comprehend the liturgical decisions of the Second Vatican Council, it is necessary to understand the various movements that were at work within the Roman Catholic Church one hundred and thirty years prior to the convening of the Council. The problems concerning the liturgy were not first noticed by the Vatican Council. For many years, various European and American critics, scholars, monastics, parish priests, theologians and laity were seriously attempting to understand, study, restore and renew the liturgy. Their work was not neglected over the years. The council gave recognition to the many years of labor and research that had gone before their decisions.

At first, the direction of the liturgical movement was not clear. The shape and direction of the liturgical renewal in the Roman Catholic Church is discovered only in retrospect. Frederick R. McManus, former president of the American Liturgical Conference and peritus to the liturgical commission of the Second Vatican Council, comments on the goals of the liturgical movement which culminated in Vatican II:

It is not easy to sum up the diverse goals of the liturgical movement, but it embraces every attempt to render sincere the words and deeds of Christian worship, so that a genuine, understood and spiritually profitable part may be taken by all the members of Christ.¹

This statement is indicative of the concern on the part of many people within the Roman communion that the liturgy had been abused, neglected, antiquated and loaded with repetitious rites.

Dom Prosper Gueranger

Most liturgical scholars are ready to agree that the liturgical renewal movement began in France in the 1830's. Massey Shepherd, an Anglican liturgical scholar, writes about the beginning of the movement:

The liturgical movement is generally considered to have started in the 1830's among the Roman Catholic Benedictines of France. Under the leadership of Dom Gueranger, these monks began a programme for the restoration of the Roman liturgy in France in all its ancient purity, both of rite and chant. A massive amount of scholarship was devoted to the study of the history of the Latin liturgy, and particularly of the oldest manuscripts of the Gregorian chant.²

Lancelot Sheppard, Roman Catholic liturgical scholar and author, relates the impact which Dom Prosper Gueranger (1805-1875) had on the whole liturgical movement, even

¹Frederick R. McManus, "Liturgical Week, 1962," The Commonweal, LXXVI (August 24, 1962), p. 468.

²Massey Shepherd, Jr., The Liturgy and the Christian Faith (Greenwich, Connecticut: The Seabury Press, 1954), p. 5.

though he places Gueranger's work in a later decade.

It is almost true to say in fact that what is often, and inaccurately understood by "the liturgy" nowadays was a discovery of Dom Gueranger's somewhere around 1840. In restoring the Benedictines in France and founding the Solesmes congregation, he endeavored to effect a return to the medieval splendor of worship that to a great extent had been swept away by the French Revolution.³

Dom Gueranger, best known for his scholarship and restoration of the Gregorian texts for plainsong also urged the restoration of many other forms and rites within the liturgy of the Mass which had been forgotten by the Church since the Middle Ages.⁴

The Roman Rite was restored by Gueranger as a model for imitation by the entire Roman communion. A historical study by a liturgical community in Paris shows the significance of Dom Gueranger's work.

In the eyes of the historian of the Church, Dom Gueranger must be given the great credit for having caused the liturgy to be known again and loved; for having restored it to a worth, sober and really religious style; for having put forward the Roman liturgy as a model, for him the only model, and an especially privileged one and worthy of imitation; for having laid the foundations for the restoration of liturgical chant and its re-introduction into worship in the Roman Church which though in a special category, bears the stamp of universality, for being

³Lancelot C. Sheppard, Blueprint for Worship (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1964), p. 25.

⁴Joseph Jungmann, S.J., The Mass of the Roman Rite, translated by Frances A. Brunner, C.S.S.R. (New York: Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1960), p. 158.

promoter, despite himself, it is true ecumenism.⁵

Did Gueranger's restoration of plainsong have much significance upon liturgical renewal, other than calling the Church back to a splendid past? Gueranger's restoration of plainsong and the authorization of its use in churches played a vital role in the spiritual re-vitalization of the Church. The liturgical movement's interest in plainsong shows the sincerity of the spiritual life of the movement because the chant served as a simple accompaniment of prayer.⁶ The return to plainsong was not just a new romanticism but an aid to the worshippers who were engaged only in private prayer during the public liturgy. Plainsong enticed them away from private prayer and encouraged them to join in the worship of God with the total community. So, plainsong is one of the first break-throughs in restoring the liturgy to the people.

The restoration of plainsong effected the liturgical movement in two other ways.⁷ The restoration of the chant enabled people to sing together and realize the social nature of the liturgy. The restoration of the best Gregorian texts brought a biblical renewal too, because the

⁵The Sacerdotal Communities of Saint-Severin of Paris and Saint Joseph of Nice, The Liturgical Movement (New York: Hawthorn Books, Publishers, 1964), p. 12.

⁶Ernest Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954), p. 10.

⁷Ibid., p. 156.

content of the Divine Office of the pre-middle ages period was more scriptural in content than the more modern Marian and rosary devotions which accrued since the Renaissance. The Abbot of Solesmes opened the beauty, meaning and spiritual values of the liturgy to many people.⁸

Besides restoring the plainsong to use in the liturgy, promoting the study of the ancient Gregorian texts, and uncovering the outline of the Roman Mass again, Gueranger rekindled a feeling for liturgical prayer.

Dom Gueranger attempted to demonstrate the pre-eminence of the official prayer of the Church over private prayer and to arouse in the liturgically mummified Church of France an appreciation for liturgical prayer.⁹

Among his other accomplishments, Dom Gueranger began the publication of his monumental work, L'Anne Liturgique in 1840, which contained the products of his research on Gregorian texts for the liturgy of the Mass. Through this annual, studies of the historical development of the liturgy were made available to the Church. In addition to Gueranger's L'Anne Liturgique, he published Institutiones Liturgiques. In both these works Gueranger demonstrates his scholarly and textual-critical study of early manuscripts of plain-song chant.¹⁰

⁸Paul D. Marx, Virgil Michel and the Liturgical Movement (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1957), p. 73.

⁹Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church, p. 10.

¹⁰Jungmann, op. cit., p. 159.

It appears that Dom Gueranger's work, which elevated the Middle Ages as the golden age of Christendom and also for the liturgy was nothing more than an elevation of the past as the model for liturgical renewal. In some circles, models such as the one Gueranger proposed was considered a reactionary movement. However, the condition of the times and the trouble that the worship life of the Church was encountering called for a revitalization of the former splendor and style of the liturgy. Dom Gueranger's attempt to restore the simple, beautiful Gregorian texts of plain-song was in part a result of the whole reaction to the rationalism of the day. The Romantic movement sought to restore the forms of literature, art, language and music from the Middle Ages. The Liturgical Movement began as a counteraction to the trend of overintellectualizing the facts of the Christian faith.¹¹

The methods used by Gueranger in restoring the chant were viewed suspiciously by the hierarchy of the Church. Gueranger's work was called antiquarian, that is, he sought to restore ancient liturgical forms without viewing the needs for new forms for the present generation.¹² In spite of archeologism, he devoted himself to renew the worship life of the Church, and in this way a religious authenticity was

¹¹Max Thurian, "The Present Aims of the Liturgical Movement," Studia Liturgica, III (Autumn, 1964), p. 107.

¹²Infra, p. 62.

given to the liturgy. Because of Dom Gueranger's work, the liturgy of the Roman rite was preserved and renewed when the rest of the Church did not understand it.¹³

The prevalent notion that public worship was to parallel sixteenth and seventeenth century court life was accepted uncritically by Dom Gueranger. This fact was demonstrated by Dom Prosper as he sought to restore medieval monasticism with all its Gothic trappings including Gregorian chant.¹⁴ Even though the Romantic period was horrified of everything that distorted the liturgy of the Mass during the Baroque Period, the Romantics such as Gueranger never completely succeeded in their renewal because they never rejected the fundamental assumptions of the Baroque innovations.

. . . For, although the reaction of Romanticism was strongly against the productions and the mentality of the seventeenth century, we find to our surprise that it retained faithfully, if unconsciously, most of the dangerous prejudices held by its predecessors against whom it had rebelled.¹⁵

Unfortunately, the Romantics reacted against the most superficial features of the Baroque period and elevated the Middle Ages as the period which exemplified the best

¹³Saint-Severin, op. cit., p. 12.

¹⁴Louis Bouyer, Liturgical Piety (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1955), pp. 4-5.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 9.

and most lasting of Christian culture.¹⁶ The medieval period had a special appeal too because it possessed a sensitivity to Christian feelings which were very absent in the Baroque period. However, as a result of reforms in the worship life of the Church such as Gueranger's, this Gothic, sensitive worship was more satisfying than its predecessor. Bouyer says this about the reforms in the liturgy during the Romantic period:

The restoration of Gregorian Chant, scrupulous observance of the rubrics of all the ceremonies, and, above all, a sober dignified kind of celebration neatly pruned of all those theatrical additions by which Baroque practice had been altering and ruining the lines of the liturgy, --all these reforms made this monastic worship one of the most impressive types to be found in modern times. But neither can we deny that this worship was an antiquarian reconstruction, and one of very doubtful authenticity on many cardinal points But the greatest weakness of all was that it could not have become the real worship of any actual congregation of its own period¹⁷

Although Gueranger gave impetus to the study of plain-song and Gregorian texts, and even though he restored the Benedictine order at Solesmes to "pure" practice again, it seemed that Gueranger's work never expanded beyond a shallow scholarly revival.

His renewal was not progressive in spirit. Other pioneers of the liturgical renewal would show later that it

¹⁶Cf. Bouyer, Liturgical Piety, Chapters I and II for a more detailed discussion of the Romantic reaction to Baroque Period.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 11-12.

was not enough to restore the Middle Ages style of liturgy as Gueranger hoped.¹⁸

Gueranger also refused to admit the places of the vernacular in the liturgy. He suppressed the so-called fifteen localized diocesan Gallican liturgies in favor of "pure" Roman liturgy.¹⁹ The Gallican rite was more variable in its structure than the Roman rite. The only invariable portions in the Gallican rite were: Sanctus Deus, Kyrie Benedictus Sanctus and the Words of Institution.²⁰ By elevating the Roman rite Gueranger limited the variety of liturgical variety especially among various lands and cultures.²¹

Pope Pius X

Pius X gave official recognition to this Benedictine Abbot's major contribution to liturgical renewal. In his Motu Proprio, Inter Plurimas Pastoralis, issued November 22, 1903, Pius X called for a general restoration of music that was appropriate to the sacred and religious setting of the Mass. Pius X's recognition of Gueranger's work marks the "official" beginning of the liturgical movement in the Roman communion.

¹⁸Saint-Severin, op. cit., p. 54.

¹⁹Jungmann, op. cit., p. 158.

²⁰Yngve Brinlioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice Evangelical and Catholic (London: S.P.C.K., 1961), p. 72.

²¹Infra, p. 168.

Ordinarily the "official" beginning of the liturgical movement is dated from the time of St. Pius X at the very beginning of the century. For one thing, he said that the people's part at high Mass should be given back to them. For another, he laid down a principle that has been endlessly repeated and paraphrased ever since: the first and necessary font of a truly Christian spirit for the faithful is their "active participation in the sacred mysteries and in the public and solemn prayer of the Church."²²

At first glance, it appears that Pius X issued his statement, "Restoration of Church Music" as a reaction to the current theatrical and "profane" music that was making inroads into liturgical rites. The Pope reacted to the use of such "secular" music in the liturgy with this statement:

We do not intend to treat every one of the abuses which can arise in this matter. Today we wish to discuss only one of these abuses which is very common and very difficult to abolish. Even when everything else merits the highest praise, such as the beauty and richness of the church, the splendor and accurate order of the ceremonies, the attendance of the clergy, and the seriousness and piety of those officiating, even then, this abuse must be deplored. We refer to the abuse of sacred chant and music. As a matter of fact, there is an ever-constant tendency to depart from the right norm It may result from that regrettable influence which profane and theatrical art have exercised on sacred art or from that pleasure which music directly produces and which is kept in bound with no little difficulty.²³

²²Frederick R. McManus, "What Is Being Done?," Sunday Morning Crisis, edited by Robert Movde (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1963), pp. 47-48.

²³Pope Pius X, "Inter Plurimus Pastoralis," All Things in Christ, edited by Vincent A. Yzermans (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1954), p. 199.

Considering the document further, and the thought behind the Pope's writing, it is possible to see that the Pope is denying the use of "popular" music for the liturgy of the Church out of a concern for the active participation of the faithful in the sacred mysteries and public prayer of the Church. He does not deny the use of good current music of the day as the setting for the liturgy. Nor was he willing to use "popular" music simply because it is the mood of the day. He felt that to enable the active participation of the people, it was necessary to have sanctity and dignity in the musical setting of the liturgy. In his judgment, theatrical and profane forms of music were not conducive for providing a solemn atmosphere for worship.

Pius X not only gave recognition to Dom Gueranger's research in Gregorian texts of plainsong but the Pope also gave impetus to further restoration of the worship life of the Roman Church. Lancelot Sheppard believes that the benefit of Pius X's reforms had a great effect on the renewal of the spiritual life of the Church.

St. Pius X saw clearly the danger of artificiality, of lifelessness of ritualism, and by his Motu Proprio (1903) on sacred music and by the decree on frequent communion restored to the faithful the two great means of their taking their proper part in the worship of the Church.²⁴

In the Pope's document on sacred music, he set forth the principles governing music used for the Mass. These

²⁴Lancelot C. Sheppard, The Liturgical Books (New York: Hawthorn Books, Publishers, 1962), p. 87.

principles are products of the early stages of the liturgical renewal. The following are two of the key principles governing music in the Mass listed by Pius X:

1. . . . Its chief duty is to adorn the words of the liturgy with suitable melody. These words, then should become more intelligible and more easily enkindle the faithful's faith and devotion.
2. Sacred music, therefore should possess all the qualities of the liturgy; especially, holiness, good form and, following upon these, universality.²⁵

Sixty years later these principles were incorporated into the Second Vatican Council's document on the sacred liturgy. The council document from Vatican II uses almost the same wording as Pius X when the council addressed the issue of finding forms and rites suitable for contemporary worship. The Constitution stressed the use of forms that are intelligible and easily understood. There is always uppermost in the council's mind the need to aid the faithful in the exercise of their faith and life both within and outside of worship settings.

When the Pope chose to recommend a particular kind of music to carry the text of the Mass, he confirmed Dom Gueranger's work.

II. Kinds of Sacred Music.

3. These qualities are especially found in Gregorian Chant. It is, therefore, the chant proper to the Roman Church and the only Chant she has inherited from antiquity. Throughout the centuries she has jealously preserved it in her liturgical codices and, as is right, offered it as her own to the faithful. She commands that it

²⁵Pius X, op. cit., p. 201.

alone be used in some parts of the liturgy. Finally, recent studies have restored its pristine integrity and purity.

For these reasons Gregorian Chant has always been considered the finest example of sacred music. Consequently, we can set up the following safe rule: The closer a musical composition approaches Gregorian Chant in its composition, the more sacred and liturgical it is; the further it departs from that supreme model, the less worthy it is of the temple.

Gregorian Chant, therefore, which has been handed down from antiquity, must be totally restored in the sacred rites. The sacred liturgy loses none of its solemnity when only this type of music is used. Gregorian Chant should especially be restored to the people so that as in former times, the faithful may once again more fully participate in the sacred liturgy.²⁶

This statement suggests that Pius X would like to separate the "sacred music" from the profane music" when he indicates that the closer musical compositions approach the Gregorian style of music the more sacred they are. He establishes Gregorian mode as the norm for "sacred" music. The theatre is the norm for "profane" music.²⁷ Any other music that does not approximate the Gregorian in its sacred quality is not proper for the liturgy. Sacred music should bear all the marks of the liturgy. During the long years when the argument over the vernacular raged, those who opposed the vernacular Mass argued like Pius X did with music, that the Latin was a more "sacred" bearer

²⁶Ibid., p. 201.

²⁷Ibid., p. 199.

of the text.²⁸ Sacred is defined here as holy things of God. Latin is more appropriate to those sacred things. The Latin liturgy was a finished product of the Holy Spirit.²⁹

Pius X made a strong emphasis on the inheritance and use of the rich traditions as possible resources for restoring the liturgy. While the Pope emphasized restoration of the liturgy to sound form and stressed ancient traditions, he had a keen interest in restoring plainsong not because it was old, but because he believed it would aid the participation of the faithful in the liturgy. The emphasis on restoration of classic forms made by the early fathers of the liturgical renewal and by Pope Pius X was to be made again and again even through the sessions of the Second Vatican Council's deliberations on the liturgy.

To fully understand what today would be considered a return to the past for its own sake and a restoration of

²⁸Cf. Ernest Koenker, Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church, p. 158, H. A. Reinhold, The Dynamics of the Liturgy (New York: MacMillan Co., 1961), p. 118, and H. A. Reinhold, The American Parish and the Roman Liturgy (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1958), p. 38. Two of the arguments used by the traditionalists for keeping the vernacular are cited by Koenker and Reinhold. One argument is offered by the experts of Gregorian music who say that Latin fits Gregorian texts better because it was written for Latin. The other argument offered suggests that the use of Latin aids the atmosphere of mystery so essential to the liturgy. The proponents of the second argument can find support from Dom Gueranger and Dom Casel. The argument is answered to the effect that mystery does not mean incomprehensibility which the Latin promotes.

²⁹Jungmann, op. cit., p. 158.

ancient rites by Dom Gueranger and Pius X, it is important to realize the spirit of the times and the condition of the Roman Church. Innovation, acculturation, private masses, pietistic eucharistic devotions had developed in religious communities and parishes since the Middle Ages until the 1900's.³⁰ When the Enlightenment set in, the liturgy was effected, in that all excess sentimental forms of worship were despised and a return to simplicity in the liturgy was encouraged. Joseph Jungmann cites the development of the Enlightenment:

In Germany especially, where the Baroque had had its greatest development in ecclesiastical life, the reaction in that same ecclesiastical life-- after this development had exhausted its strength --was strongest. This occurred during the Enlightenment. The desire was to get free from all excess of emotions, free from all surfeit of forms; to get back again to "noble simplicity." As in contemporary art, where the model for this was sought in antiquity and attained in classicism, so in ecclesiastical life the model was perceived in the life of the ancient Church. And so a sort of Catholic classicism was arrived at, a sudden enthusiasm for the liturgical forms of primitive Christianity, form which in many cases one believed could be taken over bodily, despite the interval of a thousand years and more, even though one was far removed from the spirit of that age.³¹

During this period of the Enlightenment the disturbing non-essentials of the Mass were set aside and an emphasis was placed on the participation of the people in the liturgy. During this time, the common recitation of the rosary was

³⁰Saint-Severin, op. cit., p. 79.

³¹Jungmann, op. cit., p. 152.

censured, frequency of communion increased, there was a demand for decrease of altars and a turning of the altar towards the people. In order to assist the people at the Mass, prayer books were introduced in which the Mass prayers were translated so the people could follow along.³²

But a reaction set in to the Enlightenment, and the age of reason in ecclesiastical life was replaced with a return to the complete affirmation of dogma, a respect for the hierarchic structure of the Church and also a return to tradition. The old arrangements of the liturgy were reinstated without any consideration of the criticisms raised against it. Even the good reforms of the period were viewed with suspicion because they were products of the Enlightenment.

It was in the field of church music that the Restoration set to work most visibly to remodel the divine service. The works of the Baroque period which had found in the liturgy only an occasion for unfolding a musical splendor that was all too worldly and which often bore no relationship to the seriousness of the liturgical text and the liturgical mystery--from these one turned aside. An effort was made to bring the unabbreviated words of the sacred songs into their rightful place. War was declared on the amalgamation of songs in the vernacular with the Latin service, which now frequently returned in its pure unadulterated form³³

Jungmann indicates that this restoration had one drawback which was that the people were again reduced to spectators at the Mass.

³²Ibid., p. 154.

³³Ibid., p. 157.

The spirit of restoration which stood behind the German movement was paralleled in the French movement as it was epitomized by Dom Gueranger.³⁴ Gueranger sided with the spirit of traditionalism, upheld the existing Roman liturgy and resisted any spirit of criticism of the existing liturgy. For Gueranger the Latin Mass liturgy was a finished art product fixed once for all.³⁵ This reaction to the previous period explains in part the reasons Pius X refused secular music and the vernacular in the liturgy.³⁶

Even though there were many drawbacks to the liturgical renewal of Gueranger which Pius X authorized, Jungmann feels that an impulse for the rapprochement between the liturgy and the people had begun.³⁷ Not only did Pius X authorize new editions of chant books based on the studies of Gueranger, but the Pope was instrumental in developing the norms for polyphony and harmonized music for the celebration of the Mass.

Even more significant for liturgical renewal than the Motu Proprio on the restoration of church music was Pius X's decree "On Frequent and Even Daily Communion" issued in 1905. Jungmann says that this decree which was a product of nineteenth century research of Christian worship, was

³⁴Ibid., p. 158.

³⁵Ibid., p. 157.

³⁶Pius X, op. cit., p. 202.

³⁷Jungmann, op. cit., p. 159.

more significant for liturgical renewal than the Motu Proprio.³⁸ Apparently, at first the decree of frequent communion seemed to have little effect on liturgical affairs judging by periodical articles on the decree. However, after a few years, it became obvious that the Communion movement, as Jungmann calls it, would last only if it was viewed as a natural part of the Mass.³⁹ At this point the communion movement and the liturgical movement joined hands.

Dom Lambert Beauduin

Dom Lambert Beauduin is another figure whom liturgical scholars credit as a founding father of the liturgical renewal movement. Beauduin, like Abbot Gueranger, was a Benedictine monk, who arose on the liturgical horizon soon after Pius X issued his statement on sacred music. Charles Davis, the Roman theologian from England, indicates that Dom Beauduin gave the Liturgical Movement its first forward thrust. The Liturgical Movement began a new phase at the liturgical conference which he called at Malines, Belgium in 1909.⁴⁰ Ernest Koenker supports Davis's evaluation of Beauduin's work in liturgical renewal:

The Liturgical Movement first gained an extensive popular following in Belgium. Already in

³⁸Ibid., p. 160.

³⁹Ibid., p. 161.

⁴⁰Charles Davis, "The Forward Thrust of the Liturgical Revival," Catholic World, 194 (November 1962), p. 74.

1911, the first Liturgical week was held at Louvain; the proceedings have been published and the title Cours et conférences des semaines liturgiques. Here too, the First International Liturgical Congress was held at Antwerp in 1930. Dom Lambert Beauduin was the great leader; the Benedictine abbeys of Mont Cesar, Maredsous, and St. Andre spearheaded the movement.⁴¹

Beauduin's work in Belgium gave the liturgical movement its first public exposure among the people in the parishes. Where Gueranger's liturgical renewal program was monastically oriented, Dom Lambert's liturgical renewal was parochially directed.⁴² It was natural that Dom Beauduin gave the liturgical movement a parochial direction. Before Dom Lambert entered the Benedictine monastery at Mont Cesar in Louvain, he had served as a secular priest in the diocese of Liege. As a secular priest he worked for eight years especially among laborers and became known as one of the "Chaplains of Workmen" appointed to carry out the practical applications of the encyclical Rerum Novarum Pope Leo XIII.⁴³

At the 1909 Moline conference, Beauduin used the pronouncements of Pius X to launch his liturgical renewal program from a pastoral viewpoint. Dom Lambert elaborated on Pius X's statement that the faithful should participate

⁴¹Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church, p. 15.

⁴²I. H. Dalmais, Introduction to the Liturgy, translated by Roger Capel (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1961), p. 171.

⁴³Bouyer, Liturgical Piety, p. 59.

in the Mass and discover its richness.

. . . The ordinary people must not be left to nourish their piety on what is secondary and adventitious; they must be brought to an active participation in a living liturgy and, in consequence, back to the basic truths of the faith, which are the soul of the liturgy.⁴⁴

Bouyer demonstrates how Beauduin used Pius X's statement on "active participation of the faithful" in the Mass to implement the pastoral nature of the liturgy.

One sentence in the Motu Proprio of Pius X could sum up this program and express its ideal aim, and to this sentence Dom Lambert referred again and again: "Our deepest wish is that the true Christian spirit should once again flourish in every way and establish itself among the faithful; and to that end it is necessary first of all to provide for the sanctity and dignity of the temple where the faithful meet together precisely in order to find that spirit at its primary and indispensable source, that is . . . the active participation in the most holy and sacred mysteries and in the solemn and common prayer of the Church." No man of the time was so well prepared as Dom Lambert to listen to the words of the Blessed Pope, and no one else was so ready as he to proclaim these words so forcefully.⁴⁵

As it will be noted in later Chapter four, Vatican II proclaimed the principle of "active participation" as the primary principle of liturgical reform. The book, The Liturgical Movement, gives Beauduin the credit for bringing this key pastoral concept to light for the present renewal of Vatican II.

⁴⁴Charles Davis, "A Modern Reformation: Changing the Face of the Church," Clergy Review, XLVI (October, 1961), 581.

⁴⁵Bouyer, Liturgical Piety, p. 60.

The liturgy is rightfully the worship of the Christian people; but in fact it is due to Dom Lambert Beauduin that its pastoral dimensions have been discovered in the present renewal. Many others after him, and some even before him, worked on the same lines. But beyond all question, to him belongs the credit for the primary intuition, even to the extent that it is possible to date the liturgical movement in the proper sense of the term from the first expression that he gave to this intuition in 1909. It has been said indeed that "Dom Beauduin's intuitions form no doubt, the principal characteristic of his genius."⁴⁶

Beauduin came to his pastoral concern for spiritual welfare of the faithful at Mass not only from a deep awareness of the pastoral implications of the liturgy itself but also from his study of the Eastern liturgies. Sheppard points this out:

Don Lambert Beauduin's view on the pastoral implications of the liturgy (he was a former parish priest and workers' chaplain), through which he gave fresh impetus to the liturgical movement, must be taken in conjunction with his attitude to the Eastern Church in general and Eastern liturgies in particular. In this field he became the leader of a school, and his work was continued, in the face of great difficulties, it must be acknowledged, in particular by the Benedictines of Amay-sur-Meuse, subsequently established at Chevetogne.⁴⁷

In seeking to implement the pastoral implications of the liturgy, Dom Lambert appealed to the parish priests to unleash the power of the liturgy of the Mass for the total Christian life of the parish.

⁴⁶Saint-Severin, op. cit., p. 34.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 35.

As he says in his little book: La Piete de l'Eglise (first published in 1914) he often thought that great marvels could be accomplished by the clergy in reinvigorating Christian life in their parishes if only they worked to have their people find in their parish church the house of God and the gate of heaven; in their parish priest, the man who offers, blesses, leads, teaches and baptizes; in the parish Mass, the great weekly meeting of the Christian people in which, by the action of the visible priesthood, man united in bonds of brotherhood are to be transformed into the whole Christ! What pains priests take, he often thought--this priest who had been active for so many years, in so many kinds of social work--what labors they undergo to organize so many works that are certainly useful, but of secondary importance! But what would be the effects if priests took the same pains to promote the rediscovery of the liturgy, if they labored to have the liturgy understood and practiced by the whole Christian people as its collective and personal life of prayer and worship in Christ and the Church.⁴⁸

Beauduin also implemented his parish-oriented liturgical renewal by establishing periodicals. Some of the leading Belgian periodicals which Beauduin helped establish are: La Vie et les Arts Liturgiques, Le Bulletin paroissal Liturgiques (changed to Paroisse et Liturgie), Les Questions Liturgiques et paraissale, and L' Artisan Liturgique. Through these periodicals Beauduin led the Belgian movement to consider the social action and pastoral implications of the liturgy. Beauduin's work spread from Mont Cesar to other Belgian monastic communities and to the secular clergy.⁴⁹

⁴⁸Bouyer, Liturgical Piety, p. 60.

⁴⁹Marx, op. cit., p. 73.

Beauduin's influence also reached the United States. In 1924, Dom Virgil Michel, a Benedictine from St. John's abbey in Collegeville, Minnesota became a student of Dom Lambert's. It was Dom Beauduin that fired the liturgical interest of Virgil Michel.⁵⁰ Dom Michel's experiences and training under Beauduin shaped the liturgical movement in the United States. Virgil Michel became the liturgical pioneer and liturgical apostolate was established. He founded the monthly periodical Orate Fratres (now Worship) to propagate the liturgical revival.⁵¹ Through Michel's English translation of Dom Lambert's celebrated book, La Pieta de l' Englise (Liturgy, the Life of the Church) was given wide exposure in the United States. Lambert Beauduin's influence is recognized also in the method by which Michel sought to renew the liturgy among the parish clergy and laity.⁵²

Primary among Beauduin's concerns for a renewed liturgy were the people who came to daily worship in the parishes. It was from this pastoral posture of Beauduin's liturgical reforms that the liturgical renewal movement did not look only to the past days of an ornate and splendid liturgy but now began to look forward to the needs of the people and the events in their lives. In this

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 27.

⁵¹Dalmais, op. cit., p. 173.

⁵²Cf. Marx, p. 69 for a comparison of Beauduin and Michel.

way, Beauduin gave a vital corrective to the movement begun by Gueranger. Beauduin's implementation of his program in Belgium has been summarized in this way:

So far as Belgium was concerned, Dom Beauduin's liturgical work can be summed up in the three-fold aspect which it assumed, corresponding at all points with the trend of the work at Saint Andre. In the first place, liturgy is for the service of the parishes, as they are; then, the liturgical renewal is the centre and also the starting-point of a complete parochial renewal; lastly, an attempt must be made to use what we already have; in the light of this experience, reform can be effected; there must be neither rigid conservatism nor irresponsible innovation; the primary need is that an attempt should be made.⁵³

Development and Expansion of the Liturgical Renewal

Dom Ildefons Herwegen

Development of the substance of the liturgical renewal took place in Germany and Austria during the 1920's and 30's. The inauguration of the German liturgical movement happened during Holy Week in 1914 at a sister Benedictine abbey of Mont Cesar in Maria Laach, Germany, just south of Bonn and Cologne.⁵⁴ The purpose of this liturgical week for laymen was to discuss ways and means to promote more active participation of the faithful in the liturgy.⁵⁵ The abbot at this time was Ildefons Herwegen. It

⁵³Saint-Severin, op. cit., p. 36.

⁵⁴Marx, op. cit., p. 74.

⁵⁵Davis, Liturgy and Doctrine (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960), p. 123.

was here during this week that the Dialogue Mass (Missa Recitata) was introduced in Germany as a result of a meeting where Catholic laymen, lawyers, university professors and doctors discussed how they might increase lay participation.

The Dialogue Mass (Gemeinschaftmesse) was an attempt to restore parts of the liturgy which had traditionally belonged to the people and had been taken over by the choir, such as the songs of the ordinary and some prayers. The Dialogue Mass was introduced to American Catholics some-time later and the version by Our Lady of Sodality was well received.⁵⁶

This lay conference and the resulting Dialogue Mass began among cultured and intellectual communities and spread to the working classes throughout Germany. Enthusiasm for the Dialogue Mass did not spread overnight, not even in the same year. However, by the mid-twenties many people received the work of Herwegen and his monastery. The mounting desire to encourage the active participation of the people at Mass was now being met in part.

These liturgical conferences initiated by Herwegen at Maria Laach were continued. The notes and proceedings were collected and printed in volume form. In addition to this publishing task, Abbot Herwegen founded a yearbook of liturgical studies in which the scholarly studies of the

⁵⁶Jungmann, op. cit., p. 162.

Benedictine brothers were published. This yearbook, Jahrbuch fur Liturgiewissenschaft, was edited by Dom Odo Casel. During his time of active study and research, Dom Herwegen also founded a liturgical periodical, Ecclesia Orans.⁵⁷ Under the abbot's leadership, Maria Laach became and is still known as a center for sacred art. Among his other accomplishments, Herwegen was responsible for founding an academy for patriotic studies and in 1931 founded the Institute for Liturgical and Monastic Studies.⁵⁸

Herwegen's contribution to the liturgical movement not only included an effort to intensify the spiritual life and worship of the community, but also provided the necessary study, research and publication of the community's work so that the movement's work became known. As a result of Maria Laach's research, the direction that the liturgical movement originally took under Gueranger in the 1840's now changed. Herwegen was able to show the deficiencies of the previous liturgical renewal period.

Dom Herwegen was able to show, to the surprise of many, that the Middle Ages were not, in liturgy at any rate, the Christian Era par excellence, and that during this period the worship of the Church became overlaid with all sorts of fanciful interpretation, developments foreign to its nature, thus paving the way "for the abandonment of the liturgy by Protestantism and its final disgrace and neglect in so much of post-Tridentine Catholicism."⁵⁹

⁵⁷Saint-Severin, op. cit., p. 19.

⁵⁸Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church, p. 14.

⁵⁹Saint-Severin, op. cit., p. 19.

Dom Herwegen was able to show more forcefully than anyone else the traditional liturgy of the medieval period, which was superior to the liturgy of the Baroque period, had already been overlaid with "fanciful interpretations and developments foreign to its nature."⁶⁰ Herwegen and the school of Maria Laach were able to recognize the deficiencies of the Romantics such as Gueranger. Bouyer points this out:

These men realized that it was those very deficiencies which prevented it from actually doing away with the results of the Baroque influence that it was so eager to destroy. They saw that these very deficiencies rendered the Romantics incapable of recognizing the extent to which they were treasuring these results and even exalting them by the dangerous tendencies inherent in their philosophy and theology, to say nothing of the unsoundness of their scholarship.⁶¹

Dom Herwegen felt that the one great error of the Middle Ages liturgy, which Dom Gueranger accepted so uncritically, was that the objective piety in the liturgy was turned into a subjective piety. Herwegen believed that this error was the basis of all the succeeding errors of the medieval liturgy such as the shift in the emphasis in the liturgy from "the union of the whole Church with God to the union of the individual soul with Him."⁶²

⁶⁰Bouyer, Liturgical Piety, p. 15.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 15.

⁶²Ibid., p. 17.

So the movement which began with an admiration of the Middle Ages as the glorious period of liturgical development to be imitated and restored, discovered that this period only embellished and added to the liturgy in a way that was foreign to the nature of the liturgy itself.

Like their predecessors, the Maria Laach community realized that the liturgical celebrations of the Church were not meeting the needs of the people. The liturgy had developed into an embellished rite and was in need of cleansing to make it authentic. The goal of the Maria Laach was to revitalize the people's spiritual life through the liturgy.

The Liturgical Renaissance is essentially a movement toward explicit faith, that is, an intelligent participation in the rites of the Church. That is what Abbot Ildefons Herwegen indicated when he described its aims "the renewal of our inmost spiritual life by means of the spirit of the liturgy."⁶³

Dom Odo Casel

Abbot Herwegen was not the only great voice that spoke from the community at Maria Laach. Dom Odo Casel played a very large role in the liturgical movement and in the construction of the theology that supports the principles of liturgical reconstruction issued by the Second Vatican Council. Dom Casel, who died in 1948, the year of Abbot Herwegen's death, discovered a new aspect of the liturgy

⁶³Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church, p. 15.

which had not been emphasized before. Through his studies in the patristics, Casel formulated his "Theology of Mysteries."

Through his extensive research in patristic writings, Dom Odo breathed content into certain ancient words, as mysterium, memoria, illuminatio, invocatio, commemoratio. He infused meaning into the Church years, both the temporal and the sanctoral cycles. His writings have stimulated a new outburst of activity in the theology of the Eucharist and other sacraments.⁶⁴

Casel and the School of Maria Laach's research and recovery of the patristic theology of the Eucharist disentangled the theology of the liturgy offered by the "romantics" and clarified the history of the liturgy.⁶⁵

The products of Dom Casel's work are written in the Jahrbuch fur Liturgiewissenschaft which Casel edited after Abbot Herwegen founded it. Casel edited and printed fifteen volumes before 1941. In 1951 the same work was continued after the death of the founder and editor under a new title, Archiv fur Liturgiewissenschaft. Casel's work was not limited to the production of these yearbook publications alone. He authored a major theological work, Das Christliche Kultmysterium, in 1932.

This work created a great amount of controversy when it first appeared and yet it was "hailed as the most outstanding theological work of the century."⁶⁶ Much of the controversy centered around the mystery thesis that Dom

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 104.

⁶⁵Dalmais, op. cit., p. 171.

⁶⁶Saint-Severin, op. cit., p. 19.

Casel derived from the research of pagan cultic worship. He thoroughly analyzed the theme in the pagan mystery cults. From these studies he intended to show that the element of mystery appeared within the liturgy of the Mass too, though it had a different expression, form and meaning. His mystery theology and the references to the mysteries of the Eucharist are recognizable in the council document on the sacred liturgy. This will be probed in Chapter III. His contribution to the movement of liturgical renewal opened up the meaning of mystery within the Christian faith and worship. He brought a renewed understanding of the theology of liturgy and Eucharist to many people. "He transformed the theology of the sacrament."⁶⁷

One critic of Dom Odo, John Mannion, American Catholic liturgical scholar, calls Casel's approach to the liturgy, a "Romantic one." He says that Casel had a monastic outlook on the liturgy and therefore strong mystic themes appear when he writes about the mystery of the liturgy and Eucharist.⁶⁸ However, Casel was not a "romantic" in the sense that Gueranger was. Casel did not look to the liturgy of the Middle-Ages as a model for reform. Mannion calls Casel a Romantic because Mannion believed Dom Odo incorporated unjustifiable mystical views of the liturgy into his

⁶⁷Davis, Liturgy and Doctrine, p. 17.

⁶⁸John B. Mannion, "Odo Casel's Legacy," Commonweal, 76 (August 24, 1962), 471.

work. Yet critic Mannion calls Casel a giant in the liturgical revival. Author Mannion believes that Casel's sacramental theology called the Church once again to take her sacraments and their meaning seriously.

Like Dom Beauduin, Odo Casel took the position that the people's participation in the external forms of the liturgy was necessary for meaningful worship. But, Casel added that the people's participation in the liturgy should include the experience of the reality of Christ's redemption within the liturgy.⁶⁹ An external participation by the people must come from an internal participation with Christ. Casel explained that Christ comes to men, works among them and in a new covenant agreement, offers himself for their salvation and redemption. Worshippers join in this offering as they receive the sacrificed Christ and offer their own lives in response to Christ. This is the Christ experience Casel desired to help the faithful realize in the liturgy.⁷⁰

Like Beauduin too, Dom Odo believed that comprehension of the liturgy was "not a detail . . . but the center and, in a way, the whole life of the Church and of all Christianity."⁷¹ This view of the liturgy's place in the life of the Church explains Beauduin's and Casel's concern for

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 472.

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 473.

⁷¹Bouyer, Liturgical Piety, p. 65.

the participation of those who are the people of God.

The mystery of Christ's redemption and the communication of himself to men in the liturgy was for Casel the way the "divine life" comes to men. The faithful must come into contact with this divine life. The liturgy is the place where men communicate with the divine because here a reenactment⁷² of this mystery of Christ enables people to participate in the mystery of redemption. The liturgy makes the mystery of Christ and His redemption a present reality.⁷³

The direction which the Maria Laach community has now taken in the liturgical movement is more oriented toward the social sciences yet, closely connected to the liturgical life of the Church. Dom P. B. Neunheuser, O.S.B., indicates that the orientation of the community's research and study is now more along the line of scientific investigation in anthropology and sociology. These studies are continuing to help the renewal of the liturgy and now emphasize the social aspects of the liturgical life within the Church.⁷⁴

⁷²Cf. infra, Chapter III for a clarification of the tension this re-presentation theology raises with the Lutheran theology of communion.

⁷³Davis, "Forward Thrust," Catholic World, p. 79.

⁷⁴P. B. Neunheuser, "Personal Conversation," July 31, 1966, at Maria Laach, Germany.

The Biblical Dimension of the Liturgical Renewal

During the time Dom Herwegen and Dom Casel were creating a new force for the spiritual life of their monastic community, Dr. Pius Parsch of Klosterneuburg, Austria, near Vienna, was expanding the parochial dimensions of the liturgical movement through his work. Dr. Parsch gave the liturgical movement a biblical foundation. Ernest Koenker cites Parsch's influence on the Austrian liturgical movement:

Since the end of World War I the great popularizer has been Dr. Pius Parsch; through his Bible publication, devotional literature, periodicals like Lebe mit der Kirche (now again Bibel und Liturgie), conferences, liturgical sermons, etc., he has made Klosterneuburg and his Volksliturgisches Apostolat great names in the Liturgical Movement. He has brought the liturgical research of Maria Laach and other monastic centers to fruitful practical application.⁷⁵

Parsch's work not only expands the dimensions of the liturgical renewal, but serves as a bridge between the work Herwegen and Casel had done and the local parish situation. Parsch connected the study of the liturgy's history and meaning and its sources to the biblical theology which resides in the liturgy. Parsch's more popular work complemented the scholarly studies of Maria Laach.⁷⁶

⁷⁵Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church, p. 15.

⁷⁶Bouyer, Liturgical Piety, p. 65.

Parsch also turned from Gueranger's emphasis on the Middle Ages, and from Casel's work with patristic sources to the Bible "which remains the sacred foundation of all Christian liturgy."⁷⁷

The significance of the bridge which Parsch built between the study of the liturgy and its renewal and the study of the Holy Scriptures is explained in The Liturgical Movement.

The purpose of one organization was the apostolate among the faithful through the liturgy. Now there are two ways of being concerned with the liturgy. It can be considered in itself, its origins, and its symbolism studied, an attempt can be made to arrive at absolute purity of text and rite and to establish the authentic rubrics. This is the purpose of the various specialized institutes. Or the faithful can be brought back to an understanding of the liturgy to enable them thus to understand the ceremonies and to return to the ultimate source of authentic prayer. The Klosterneuburg movement was concerned with this latter way of regarding the liturgy.⁷⁸

Parsch and his apostolate were dedicated to deepening a living understanding of the Roman liturgy by giving a wider knowledge of the Bible. This second type of liturgical renewal was implemented with preaching inspired by the liturgy and the restoration of bible reading, psalms and the parish celebration of office hours.⁷⁹

Louis Bouyer also evaluates the significance of the biblicial

⁷⁷Saint-Severin, p. 54.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 37.

⁷⁹Ibid.

dimensions which Parsch built into the liturgical movement.

The advance caused by this development cannot be greatly emphasized. First, it enabled men to grasp the full significance of the liturgy itself by uniting it once more with its chief source, this source also now being valued in its fullness. At the same time, the liturgical movement came in this way at last to promote that direct and abundant use of God's Word in all forms of Christian spirituality which for so long had been rendered suspect in the eyes of Catholics rather than effectively promoted by the sixteenth century reformers. This particular effect of the Biblical movement was accomplished by giving the Bible that living commentary without which it cannot be properly understood. For it is in the liturgy that the Church best prepares to understand God's Word, both by means of the light thrown on the texts of Holy Scripture by one another as they are placed together in the liturgy, and also by the way in which the liturgy itself handles the inspired themes which make up the unity of Revelation itself.⁸⁰

In actuality, the two methods of liturgical reform are closely linked. J. D. Crichton, writing a commentary on the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, points out how the two thrusts in the liturgical renewal program are intertwined when he says, "That is why the two movements, the biblical and liturgical revivals are regarded as indissolubly bound up with each other."⁸¹ If the words of the liturgy are to be understood fully and properly, then the Scriptures need to be understood and known. The Bible and

⁸⁰Bouyer, Liturgical Piety, p. 66.

⁸¹J. D. Crichton, The Church's Worship (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964), p. 133.

the liturgy go hand in hand.⁸² Crichton cites the great amount of liturgical words and forms that are taken directly from biblical sources such as, the Gloria in Excelsis, the Benedictus Qui Venit and the Psalmodies.

From his earliest days, it was Dr. Parsch's dream that he could restore the liturgy to the people. He hoped that he could bring the liturgy from the monastery to the parish and that is why historians have said that Parsch had a concern to make the liturgy as pastoral in its application as it was in its essence.⁸³ Dr. Parsch chose to open the sacred scriptures to the faithful in order to help them understand the place of the liturgy in their life.

The role of Scripture in the liturgy is shown well by the experience of the great Austrian leader, Pius Parsch. We are told that, when Father Parsch was chaplain in World War I, he envisioned for himself an apostolate of the Bible, so impressed was he by the lack of knowledge of the Word of God.⁸⁴

Parsch worked his biblical movement through the liturgy, and the liturgical movement gained new strength through the biblical studies. Parsch's work had a double thrust to it because he worked with the great amount of biblical material incorporated in the liturgy of the Church. The impact of this biblical approach to the liturgy was

⁸²Ibid.

⁸³Saint-Severin, op. cit., p. 50.

⁸⁴Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church, p. 90.

in Austria, Germany, and France. The biblical impact in the United States is noticeable later through the efforts of Dom Virgil Michel at St. John's Abbey in Collegeville, Minnesota, but was not as widely received.⁸⁵

Here it is necessary to explain that by "biblical revival" Parsch was not encouraging the people to know the various passages from the Bible that were incorporated into the liturgy, nor did he emphasize a book called the Bible in the liturgy.

When we speak of the Bible, we are however, confining our attention not to the book as such but to the Word wherever it is found, in the prayers of the Mass and the divine office, psalms, the liturgical sermons of Father Pius Parsch, etc.⁸⁶

It is the Word of God that is delivered and applied through the words of the liturgy and the Bible to which Dr. Parsch directed his life. In his five volume work Jahr Des Heiles, Dr. Parsch sought not only to explain the meaning of the propers for the ferial, non-ferial and sanctoral days, but he also took great pains to explain the meaning of the Scripture selections of the historic propers. He showed how the pericopes establish the theme for the Sunday, Feast Day or Saint's Day. He related the Scripture readings to each other in content and meaning when the connection was obvious.⁸⁷

⁸⁵Ibid., p. 91.

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 89.

⁸⁷Pius Parsch, O.S.B., The Church's Year of Grace, translated by William G. Heidt (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1962), I, 10.

Parsch himself demonstrated how to blend the biblical and the liturgical elements of worship together. The English translation of his introduction to Jahr Des Heiles, (The Church's Year of Grace), demonstrates this point clearly:

In general two things are required to derive profit from the Church's changing liturgy: we must understand it and apply it. We must first of all grasp its dramatic character and secondly strive to make its message part of our life. For the liturgy is drama indeed, but it is no mere play-acting, devoid of spiritual content. Beneath the dramatic lies a rich store of grace and truth.

At the very outset we should have a clear understanding of the three distinct planes on which the liturgical drama is enacted.

1. The Historical Plane. As already mentioned, the liturgy re-presents events from history so vividly as to make them appear as happening today. Some of the scenes that are unfolded before us are from the Old Testament, many more are taken from the life of Christ. . . .

.

2. The Plane of Grace. Activity on this plane, since it pertains directly to us, takes place in the present. The liturgy is operative here when it proclaims or produces God's life in our souls. Actually, the historical plane serves as a framework for the plane of grace. And the plane of grace is the pledge of future glory; it is eschatologically prognostic.

.

3. The eschatological plane is comprised of passages that treat of the end of time, of the parousia, of the next life, of heaven and hell. It is the consummation of the other two planes

of liturgical activity, the end for which they exist and were providentially planned.⁸⁸

Because Dr. Parsch and his apostolate at Klosterneuberg made the biblical revival⁸⁹ their work in the liturgical renaissance, they had a profound influence in establishing the reading of the Holy Scriptures within the Mass in the vernacular in other parishes. Their work brought about a new understanding of the Word of God within the liturgy and, above all, they opened the way for restoring preaching the Word of God in the sermon within the Mass. Koenker shows how Parsch's emphasis on biblical and liturgical preaching becomes a basic part of the liturgical movement.

In the vital Oratorium at Leipzig the fundamental tenet has been established that the Liturgical Restoration must begin with the preaching of the Word. In the preaching Christ must stand at the center, since he is the only Mediator with the Father.⁹⁰

Because of the apostolate's work in biblical studies, the Second Vatican Council made a strong case for the reading of the Scriptures and the preaching of the sermon within the liturgy of the Mass. The Council's emphasis on the Bible in the liturgy will be examined in Chapter IV. Parsch preached liturgical sermons and his successor,

⁸⁸Koenker, p. 14.

⁸⁹Cf. infra, Chapter IV, for a discussion of the rapprochement between the Lutheran and the Catholic view on the use of the Bible in the liturgy.

⁹⁰Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church, p. 91.

Brother Norbert Höslinger, edited ten volumes of Parsch's liturgical sermons. Die Liturgische Predigt is the title for the series which begins with a volume that explains liturgical preaching. Liturgical preaching relates the text of the sermon to the other Scripture readings for the day, the season of the Church year and other pertinent part of the liturgy. Volume two of this same series deals with the liturgical Gospel homilies. The remaining volumes treat the Epistles, the Church Year and the major festivals of the year such as Christmas and Easter.

Brother Höslinger has continued the magazine which Parsch founded, Bibel und Liturgie. The Volksliturgische Apostolat, the publishing arm of the Klosterneuburg movements, now prints a small monthly magazine entitled Bibel Heute. This periodical contains news of current biblical investigations as well as biblical studies for the laity. According to Höslinger, the work of the Apostolate has continued with strong biblical emphasis. Since the Vatican II session, the brothers and the Apostolate have directed their work toward accurate and readable translations of the Latin Mass into the German language. Höslinger himself is engaged in writing new music in the Gregorian style to fit the long and complicated German phrases. The work of the Apostolate is still directed toward the people of the parish with the hope that the spiritual life of the parish

might grow and increase through a vigorous liturgical and biblical program.⁹¹

Papal Commentary and Recognition
of Liturgical Research

Pope Pius XII and Mediator Dei

What was the official reaction of the Church to this liturgical revival? Changes in policy, life, and action of an organization usually begin at the "grass roots level." After some time the highest level of an organization or institution approves the "grass roots" activity. This was the case in most of the liturgical studies, revised rites and chants before official action was taken by the Popes. There was some local opposition by the bishops⁹² to the new emphasis from liturgical studies and to the revised rites which originated from those concerns previously mentioned. However, Pope Pius X and Pope Pius XII gave the liturgical movement the final impetus it needed by officially sanctioning some liturgical reforms. Pope Pius XII incorporated some of the revisions into the official practice of the Church's liturgical life.⁹³

⁹¹Norbert Hoslinger, C. R., "Personal Conversation," July 11, 1966, Klosterneuburg, Austria.

⁹²Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church, p. 18.

⁹³Jungmann, pp. 159, 167.

In his encyclical letter, Mediator Dei, "On the Sacred Liturgy," published November 20, 1947, Pope Pius XII gave official sanction to the liturgical ideas and programs suggested by the liturgical scholars decades before. This decree was the first official recognition of liturgical ferment for reform since the time of Pope Pius X's encouragement of Dom Gueranger's revival of plainsong. The factors which produced the encyclical were very practical ones. It was desirable at the time to give the Mass new life and attraction by giving the people an active part in the Mass rather than keeping them as spectators of the Mass.⁹⁴

However, the Pope took a cautious position on the liturgical work that had been done prior to the writing of his encyclical. Although he recognized the liberty which was permitted in the past regarding the liturgical renewal, he cautioned against innovations and restorations which are not in keeping with the Church's principles.

In order to legitimize this relative liberty with regard to the past, the Pope appeals to the great Catholic idea of development, so magnificently stated by Newman, and shows that the transformations of what he calls the human element in the liturgy bear witness to the continuing life of the Church through the centuries, a life which is always germinating afresh. One feels that there is something of a dilemma in all this; the desire at any price to resuscitate the things of the past must be avoided, and so also must the desire to rush too hastily into new paths. The Holy See is seeking a middle way, and cautions against

⁹⁴J. D. Benoit, Liturgical Renewal (London: SCM Press, 1958), p. 108.

those who hold obstinately to a past that is beyond recall, and at the same time against innovators whose revolutionary haste accords ill with the pace (too slow for their liking) at which the Hierarchy moves.⁹⁵

The Pope criticized the earlier part of the liturgical movement and those who implemented liturgical reforms by restoring ancient rites and practices only because they were old. Pius XII condemned this practice when he said that attachment to ancient rites for their own sake and the restoration of such liturgical rites of the Mass was not an acceptable practice. Liturgical reform without critical examination of all the factors involved was particularly offensive to Pius XII.

The same reasoning holds in the case of some persons who are bent on the restoration of all the ancient rites and ceremonies indiscriminately. The liturgy of the early ages is most certainly worth of all veneration. But ancient usage must not be esteemed more suitable and proper, either in its own right or in its significance for later times and new situation on the simple ground that it carries the savor and aroma of antiquity. The more recent liturgical rites likewise deserve reverence and respect. They, too, owe their inspiration to the Holy Spirit, who assists the Church in every age even to the consummation of the world. They are equally the resources used by the majestic Spouse of Jesus Christ to promote and procure the sanctity of man.⁹⁶

Pius XII also cautioned the more recent work of the

⁹⁵Saint-Severin, p. 75.

⁹⁶Pius XII, Mediator Dei, introduction and notes by Gerald Ellard, S. J. (New York: The America Press, 1948), p. 35.

liturgical communities which emphasized active participation of the people in external rites. He called the Church's attention back to what he considered the more helpful private devotions, meditations and interior attitudes of worship. This emphasis on internal attitude during the celebration of the liturgy was made by the Pope to offset any danger of ritualism.

Pope Pius XII recognizes the benefits of the liturgical work of many of the communities and scholars of the past century. In the opening paragraphs of the encyclical he mentions these liturgical gains:

The majestic ceremonies of the sacrifice of the altar became better known, understood and appreciated. With more widespread and more frequent reception of the sacraments, with the beauty of the liturgical prayers more fully savored, the worship of the Eucharist came to be regarded for what it really is: the fountainhead of genuine Christian devotion.⁹⁷

However, from other opening remarks of the document the Pope cautions the liturgical reformers not to move too rapidly. In some quarters this cautious note might be interpreted as the sounds of the conservative who balks at progress. However, the Pope desired to preserve wholesome liturgical forms from the past and find sources for constructing new rites to meet present needs.

But while we derive not little satisfaction from the wholesome results of the movement just described, duty obliges us to give

⁹⁷Ibid., p. 15.

serious attention to the "revival" as it is advocated in some quarters, and to take proper steps to preserve it at the outset from excess or outright perversion.⁹⁸

The Holy Father recognized Dom Casel's thesis by stating that worship is not performed merely through external rites.

It is an error, consequently, and a mistake to think of the sacred liturgy as merely the outward or visible part of divine worship or as an ornamental ceremonial. No less erroneous is the notion that it consists solely in a list of laws and prescriptions according to which the ecclesiastical hierarchy orders the sacred rites to be performed.⁹⁹

The central meaning of the Church at worship is found within the Eucharist and the part that Christ and the people take in the eucharistic celebration. Pius XII stated that the effectiveness of the liturgy is due to the participation of the Church, because she acts in union with the head of that Church, Jesus Christ, and gives to God the worship due him.¹⁰⁰

Although Pope Pius XII tried to steer a middle course in approving the liturgical renewal, cautioned against the idolatry of ancient forms, innovation in creating new forms or worship, he did allow for progressive development of the liturgy.

From time immemorial the ecclesiastical hierarchy has exercised this right in matters liturgical. It has organized and regulated divine worship, enriching it constantly with new splendor and beauty to the glory of God and the spiritual profit of Christians. What

⁹⁸Ibid., p. 15. ⁹⁹Ibid., p. 23. ¹⁰⁰Ibid.

is more, it has not been slow--keeping the substance of Mass and sacraments carefully intact--to modify what is deemed not altogether fitting, and to add what appeared more likely to increase the honor paid to Jesus Christ and the august Trinity, and to instruct and stimulate the Christian people to greater advantage.¹⁰¹

In order to explain how the hierarchy desired to preserve the substance of the liturgy intact, modify what is not fitting to the Mass, and add what seemed to increase the worship of God, Pius XII divided the liturgy of the Mass into two elements. He spoke of the "divine" and "human" elements within the liturgy itself.

The sacred liturgy does, in fact, include divine as well as human elements. The former, instituted as they have been by God, cannot be changed in any way by men. But the human components admit of various modifications as the needs of the age, circumstance and the good of souls may require, and as the ecclesiastical hierarchy under guidance of the Holy Spirit, may have authorized.¹⁰²

Although the Pope approved the renewal themes of the various liturgical centers across Europe and America, he reminded those engaged in the liturgical movement that any liturgical changes would still be made by the hierarchy.

Private individuals, therefore, even though they be clerics, may not be left to decide for themselves in these holy and venerable matters, involving as they do the religious life of Christian society along with the exercise of the priesthood of Jesus Christ and the worship of God; concerned as they are with the honor due to the Blessed Trinity, the Word Incarnate and

¹⁰¹Ibid., p. 32.

¹⁰²Ibid.

His august mother and the other saints, and with the salvation of souls as well.¹⁰³

In Mediator Dei, the Pope gave detailed attention to the new liturgical emphases of Herwegen, Casel, Parsch and Beauduin. Pius XII recognized the pastoral concerns which the liturgical reformers, Beauduin and Parsch, enunciated through the overarching principle of the participation of the faithful in the Mass.

It is therefore, desirable, Venerable Brethren, that all the faithful should be aware that to participate in the eucharistic sacrifice is their chief duty and supreme dignity, and that not in an inert and negligent fashion, giving way to distractions and day-dreaming, but closely as possible with the High Priest, according to the Apostle, "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." And together with Him and through Him let them make their oblation, and in union with Him let them offer up themselves.¹⁰⁴

Although the Pope recognized the main theme of the liturgical renewal movement, the Pope clarified the participation. He indicated that because the people share in this Mass, they are not given the office of the ordained priest.

The fact, however, that the faithful participate in the eucharistic sacrifice does not mean that they also are endowed with priestly power. It is very necessary that you make this quite clear to your flocks.¹⁰⁵

After making the distinction between the function of the clergy and the laity in the Mass, the Holy Father listed the positive ways in which the people can participate in the liturgy. He indicated that the people at worship

¹⁰³Ibid., p. 34.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., p. 42.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., p. 43.

participate in the priesthood of Christ in the Eucharist.¹⁰⁶ The faithful participate in the total Eucharistic action with Christ at the altar. For Pius XII, participation of the people in the Mass mainly involves the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharistic Liturgy. The faithful in the Mass offer themselves, in union with the Christ who offers himself in the Mass.¹⁰⁷ This offering is not confined to the liturgical sacrifice but extends to every aspect of Christian living.¹⁰⁸

The parish priests should familiarize the people with the Roman Missal to promote their participation. The Pope also suggested that the whole congregation respond to the priest according to the rules of the liturgy or sing hymns suitable to the various parts of the mass and finally respond to the prayers and sing the liturgical chant at High Mass.¹⁰⁹ This statement gives permission to use the Dialogue Mass.

According to the Pope, participation of the assembled congregation did not rule out private masses. He was very explicit in upholding the Council of Trent in this matter.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁶Ibid., p. 44.

¹⁰⁷The tensions and reconciliation between the Lutheran and Roman positions on the sacrifice of the Mass will be discussed, infra, Chapter III.

¹⁰⁸Pius XII, p. 47.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., p. 49.

¹¹⁰Ibid., p. 46.

He condemned the error of those who said that Masses should not be celebrated unless faithful are present to communicate. The Pope objected to the error of placing an emphasis solely on the gathering of the faithful. This emphasis neglects the essential meaning of the Mass; the sacrifice of Christ and people.¹¹¹ For the Pope, the climax of the Mass is the "unbloody immolation of the divine victim."

After he upheld the traditional, doctrinal stands of the Roman Church since Trent, the Pope encouraged frequent communion. This encouragement of frequent communion was designed to offset the earlier emphasis on the sacrifice of the Mass, that the priest was the main character. Because of this emphasis, frequent communion was not a common practice. Even though Pius XII distinguished between the sacrifice of the Mass as most important act and the reception of the elements as secondary in the liturgy, he encouraged the faithful to partake "fervently and frequently at the richest treasure of our religion."¹¹² But the Pope fervently maintained that the people's participation in receiving the host and Christ is not necessary or required for the integrity of the sacrifice at the Mass.¹¹³ At this point, the practice of private masses is still encouraged.¹¹⁴

¹¹¹Ibid., p. 52. ¹¹²Ibid. ¹¹³Ibid.

¹¹⁴Infra, Chapter IV will consider Vatican II's treatment of private Masses in addition to a consideration and comparison to the Lutheran position.

Like Pius X, Pius XII recognized the work of Dom Gueranger by encouraging singing of the congregation in liturgical responses. He urged the use of Gregorian chant:

So that the faithful take a more active part in divine worship, let Gregorian chant be restored to popular use in the parts proper to the people. Indeed it is very necessary that the faithful attend the sacred ceremonies not as if they were outsiders or mute onlookers, but let them fully appreciate the beauty of the liturgy and take part in the sacred ceremonies, alternating their voices with the priest and the choir, according to the prescribed norms. . . .¹¹⁵

Unlike his predecessor Pius X, Pius XII is more permissive toward modern music. Pius XII indicates that modern music and singing should not be excluded from the worship if it aids participation in the Mass. Some modern music can add to the splendor of the ceremonies and can foster devotion in worship.

Although the reference to Dom Casel's work in Mysterientheologie is hidden in Mediator Dei, Pius XII did make reference to the mystery of the Eucharist when he spoke about the sacrifice of Christ in Casel's language.

The mystery of the most Holy Eucharist which Christ, the High Priest instituted, and which He commands to be continually renewed in the Church by His minister, is the culmination and centre, as it were, of the Christian religion. We consider it opportune in speaking about the crowning act of the

¹¹⁵Pius XII, p. 75.

sacred liturgy, to delay for a little while and call your attention, Venerable Brethren to this most important subject.¹¹⁶

Mediator Dei proceeded to explain the content of that mystery in terms of the sacrifice Christ offered once for all men on the cross and which act is offered by Christ in the Mass. By means of this sacrifice Christ brings all the mystery and benefits of his redemption to men.

The hierarchy of Roman Church gave partial sanction to the work of the "liturgical reformers" to the effect that continued freedom was permitted for additional reforms within the liturgy. Although Mediator Dei was conservative in tone, yet it did recognize the years of liturgical study and experimentation that preceded the encyclical. This papal action served as the leaven that finally rose in the Second Vatican Council.

Lancelot Sheppard lists some specific benefits of the reform of Pius XII. As a result of the liturgical commission that the Pope established, a new translation of the psalter was written. In 1955 the commission set out to reform the rubrics of the Mass and this was done primarily through a regulation of the Christian calendar. The commission abolished certain complicated additions to the office. The services for Holy Week were radically reformed and as a result the Easter Vigil was restored to

¹¹⁶Ibid., p. 37.

practice. However, in spite of all the codes and rubrics that were reformed, such as the classification of feasts and the setting of the times for the office hours, the commission did not revise the Mass.¹¹⁷

In reflecting on this period of intense interest in the liturgy and the attempts to reform it, several scholars have summarized what happened during the time from Gueranger to Pius XII. Max Thurian, brother of the Taize, Reformed, monastic community in France, divides the period into several stages. The romantic stage was a reaction to rationalism and it attempted to counteract the trend to overintellectualize the facts of the faith. The biblical and patristic stage showed the value of the liturgical sources of the past and attempted to explain their origin and meaning. In this period the liturgy was examined intensively. Of the latter period, Thurian says:

Whereas the first stage of the liturgical movement was aesthetic, the second stage is communal. In this stage the ecumenical movement exercises a strong influence on the liturgical movement in its rediscovery of the catholicity of the Church in its two aspects of universality and of community.¹¹⁸

The third stage of the liturgical movement emphasized the scientific methods which enabled the Church to determine the good and bad developments in Christian worship.

¹¹⁷Sheppard, The Liturgical Books, p. 102.

¹¹⁸Thurian, p. 108.

Now, in the fourth stage, the liturgical movement no longer enjoys an independent existence because it is part of the life of the Church, theological, sacramental, ecumenical and missionary. Now the liturgy has become a part of the Church's total life.

Charles Davis comments on the entire liturgical movement of the past century by saying:

One notices about the Liturgical Movement its grasp of the essential problem, the quality of its historical learning, the depth of its doctrinal reflection, the width of its influence and its acceptance and approval by church authority. All this indicates that now at last a remedy for the sickness is at hand.¹¹⁹

Changes in culture and world view had made the Roman Church aware of her theological inadequacies and the irrelevance of her worship. Pressures of research, historical study, pastoral concerns for the people's participation in the liturgy, and the vernacular culminated in a thorough reconsideration of a revised Mass. The new insights of biblical theology forced the Roman Catholic Church to consider sweeping liturgical renewal. It was fitting then that the Second Vatican Council opened its deliberations with the liturgy as its first concern. The Catholic Church was aware that the liturgy stands at the very core of the life of the Church. If any renewal of the Church of Rome was to take place it had to begin at the source of its life.

¹¹⁹Davis, "A Modern Reformation," Clergy Review, p. 579.

CHAPTER III

THE THEOLOGICAL BASIS OF THE LITURGICAL REFORM OF THE MASS

One hundred and thirty years prior to the Council, various scholars, monastics and theologians in urban centers and small abbeys were hard at work seeking to use every means to recreate the kind of liturgy that would be intelligible to the people and foster the spiritual growth of the faithful at the Mass. During this time liturgical and patristic research, restoration of liturgical forms and experimentation were accomplished. The whole liturgical renewal movement received recognition of the Roman hierarchy. At the same time, perhaps even more quietly, the theological footing was poured to give the Mass of the future a depth of meaning. The pastoral concerns of the liturgical reformers of this period were supported by theology expressed in their deeply felt desire for renewal of the worship life of the Church.¹ Their theology gave birth to liturgical renovation.

When the Second Vatican Council convened, much of the theological construction, rediscovery of ancient liturgical practice, and clarification of forms had been completed by

¹J. D. Benoit, Liturgical Renewal (London: SCM Press, 1958), p. 108.

contemporary liturgical scholars and those who lived a century earlier. The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy is a product of theological insights from biblical theology as it pertains to the liturgy, the Eucharist, the Church, and the role of the laity.

Several theological emphases were recognized by the Constitution on the liturgy. Although the Constitution never identifies the source or development of the theological concepts which serve as the basis for the principles of renewal, yet a historical survey of theological research prior to Vatican II reveals the source of the theological contributions made to the Constitution. These theological insights gave birth to the principles of reform and renewal of the liturgy, and they are the rationale of the principles of liturgical reform.

The Influence of Dom Casel's Mysterientheologie

Dom Odo Casel's contribution to the liturgical movement was the "theology of mysteries" applied to the liturgy and the Holy Eucharist. Sacramental theology lay buried in all the rubble of the Middle Ages. Dom Casel was able to bring his deep theological insights to the attention of the Church again by speaking of the realities of God as "mysteries."

Charles Davis, Catholic theologian from England, who wrote the "Preface to the English Edition" of Dom Casel's

The Mystery of Christian Worship clarifies what is meant by mysterientheologie.

The Theology of mysteries gets its name from the fact that it expounds the whole saving work of God, and, in particular the liturgy itself with the help of the concept of "mystery." But it has enriched that concept. We have become accustomed to think of a mystery as a mysterious truth beyond our reason. We place it exclusively in the realm of doctrine, and, when we refer to revelation, we almost always have statements of doctrine in mind. But, besides revelation as a message addressed to the mind, there is revelation understood as the divine reality communicated to men and actually present as a saving force within human history. In this present order, God does not make himself known to men merely by issuing doctrinal statements. God reveals himself by giving himself. He enters human history, acts within it, and remains present so that man may attain salvation by accepting God's self-gift and submitting to his action. This coming of the divine reality or saving act into history constitutes the history of salvation. Revelation understood as the divine reality in history is basic; revelation as a message is given with reference to it, and its purpose is to express the significance of that reality and to lead us to it. Likewise the term "mystery" should mean in the first place the divine reality as communicated to men, and then, in relation to this, the doctrinal statement that expresses it. That is how the word is understood in the theology of mysteries; it indicates the reality hidden yet communicated.²

The fact that Davis finds it necessary to define the term "mystery" underscores the fact that the word is not understood. "Mystery" is falsely interpreted in two ways. The whole content of God's revelation of himself in Christ has

²Charles Davis, Liturgy and Doctrine (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960), p. 123.

been reduced to very rational facts and statements and no longer leaves room for mystery. The Church had neglected this whole concept. Secondly, the term "mystery" has taken on new and strange meanings. For some, "mystery" is used to explain nonrational phenomena.

Ernest Koenker quotes Matthias Scheeben's, Mysteries of Christianity, who defines "mystery":

Christian mystery is a truth communicated to us by Christian revelation, a truth to which we cannot attain by our unaided reason, and which, even after we have attained to it by faith, we cannot adequately represent with our rational concepts.³

Casel also indicates that the concept of the mysteries of the Christian Church cannot be discovered by man's reason. However, it is not correct, therefore, to conclude that these mysteries are irrational. In the translation of The Mystery of Christian Worship, Casel makes clear what he means by "mysteries of the Christian faith."

Mysteries mean for St. Paul realities beyond the comprehension of the human mind. They are not merely, as Prümm would make out in his Der Christliche Glaube und die altheidnische Welt, mysteries for so long as they are unknown Rather, here are realities of a sphere into which man cannot break with reason alone; realities which can only be grasped in function of revelation; in other words, when God gives man the light of his understanding.

³Ernest Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954), p. 106.

It is God, then who first gives the capacity for grasping the mystery, and not by reason, but by faith.⁴

The mystery which Casel defined were those deepest realities; that man can pass from death to life by faith, through the cross to the resurrection which Christ accomplished once for all. Casel explained mystery as an action which happened in the past and cannot be repeated. This very mystery is embodied in the liturgy especially in the Mass and the Sacraments. Casel did not limit the mysteries to the Mass and the Sacraments but included also the sacramentals, the Divine Office, and the Christian life which is made present and possible by the Holy Spirit.⁵

Casel also showed the close parallel between "mystery" and liturgy. He indicated that when the two words are placed side by side they mean the same thing from two points of view. Mystery means the heart of the action which is the redemptive work of the resurrected Lord. This redeeming work of Christ continues through the sacred actions which He has appointed especially as it is embodied in the liturgy of the Church. Liturgy here means the people's work or service which is the action of the Church

⁴Dom Odo Casel, The Mystery of Christian Worship, edited by Burkhard Neunheuser, O.S.B. (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1962), p. 99.

⁵The Sacerdotal Communities of Saint-Severin of Paris and Saint Joseph of Nice, The Liturgical Movement, translated by Lancelot Sheppard (New York: Hawthorn Books, Publishers, 1964), p. 76.

"in conjunction with this saving action of Christ's."⁶

Casel's editor, P. B. Neunheuser, explains how Casel viewed the relationship between liturgy and mystery.

It is at this point that we meet the liturgy and understand Casel's insistence that the liturgy brings the unique, unrepeatable mystery of Christ, realized historically in the past and sacramentally re-presented in the liturgical commemoration. It is because it does this that the liturgy itself is called a mystery.⁷

Casel leaned more heavily on the Greek understanding of the word mystery (*μυστήριον*) as used in the New Testament which gave a particular meaning to the concept.⁸ As Massey Shepherd, Jr., explains, "It means, first of all, an action, a representation of an event, a recalling of the past so as to make it real in the present."⁹

The word "mystery" in the New Testament is defined as that action of Christ, particularly his saving action for mankind, represented again in the action of the Church in her sacraments and her liturgy. The Lutheran liturgical scholar, Ernest Koenker, comments on Casel's thought of "representation" by saying:

Dom Odo's conception of the mysterium involves the mystical representation (Gegen-

⁶Casel, op. cit., p. 40.

⁷Ibid., p. x.

⁸Ibid., p. 10.

⁹Massey Hamilton Shepherd, The Liturgical Renewal of the Church, edited for the Associated Parishes, Inc. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960), p. 5.

wartigsetzung) of the whole saving work of Christ.¹⁰

Therefore, Christ does not perform his act of redemption all over again in the Mass, as Casel made quite clear. Christ's suffering and death is an unrepeatable action, but the Church remembers this action in her acts within the liturgy and this is the means by which Christ's saving action is made available to mankind.

The origin for Casel's mystery theology was a study of the Eastern religions which flourished in the Orient about the same time as Christianity began. Dom Odo called each religion "a dromenon" or a kind of religious drama. This drama usually was a liturgical representation of the death and resurrection of a deity. The initiates of these religions participated in the performance of the representation of the saving act of the deity and so they were saved. Casel believed very strongly that the God of Christian Scriptures used these religions and their rites to prepare human nature for what He would do in Jesus Christ. However, Casel was careful to affirm that Christianity did not have its origin in the mystery cults nor did they influence Christianity very much.¹¹

The editor of Casel's papers and formal studies,

¹⁰Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church, p. 111.

¹¹Casel, op. cit., p. 74.

Burkhard Neunheuser, says in the introduction to Casel's English edition that Casel found in the pagan mystery cults a type of ritual which gave understanding to Christian liturgy.

Here Casel turns to the pagan mystery cults and finds in them that ritual type which can help us to understand the kind of thing liturgy is. The Christian liturgy is unique and owes its origin to no pagan cult, but the mystery religions were providential preparation for Christianity and the Father borrowed many special words and phrases from them and used these to express the new Christian reality.¹²

Casel developed two themes from the study of the mystery rites and liturgies. One theme stressed participation of the worshipper in the lives of the gods and the other emphasized a re-presentation or a saving act through ritual action.

Casel elaborated on the idea of participation in this ritual. Ritual action is a key concept for him in stressing importance of the action in the liturgy of the Mass.

The pagan mystery ritual was the occasion for the worshipper to participate in the lives of the gods.

Its fundamental idea was participation in the lives of the gods, who in some way or other had appeared in human form, and taken part in the pain and happiness of mortal men. The believer acted with them by sharing their suffering and deeds portrayed in the rite, and performed in it once more by ritual imitation. Thereby he entered into an intimacy with them

¹²Casel, B. Neunheuser, editor, op. cit., p. x.

which was expressed through various images taken from human life; he became a member of the race of gods.¹³

Casel sees this same participation pattern in the Christian theology of salvation as it is incorporated in the liturgical acts of the Church. The mystery of the Christian faith culminates in God giving himself to men and entering human history to act within it. Dom Odo said that God remained within history so that man might attain salvation by accepting the gift and submitting to God's action.¹⁴ For Casel, the Christian liturgy is one of the places in which man can submit to the action of God by participation.

Casel, a Benedictine monk, was very careful to assert that Christianity was not just another mystery religion; nor was it a borrowed rite or a natural outgrowth of the pagan mystery rites. However, Casel asserted that Christianity used the language of the pagan mystery rites to point to the realities of the Christian faith.

In any case we observe that even quite early expressions from the mysteries are used for the Christian mystery; Christian writers like Justin Martyr, Tertullian, even Cyprian, note with astonishment the analogy of the mysteries, and comment on them. Moreover, this takes place at the same time as the church held these mysteries in detestation--it was a period of their flowing--and fought them with all her power.¹⁵

¹³Casel, op. cit., p. 34.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 77.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 34.

Even though the Church resisted these mysteries, there remains certain parallels between Christianity and the pagan cults. This did not prevent the fathers of the early Church from noticing the analogies between the two types of religion or of using the mystery pattern to point to the truths of the Christian faith.

Casel applied the pagan mystery concept to the saving work of Christ, to Christ's incorporation of this work in the liturgy to the Eucharist and to the life of the Church. But the mystery of Christ's saving acts in which he permits man to participate is not an esoteric, mystical event as it was for the pagan rites. This was the means that God chose to give man healing gifts and allow man to realize the fullness of God's grace. Unlike the mystery cults, Christ has taken part in human history and has revealed this mystery in person and has participated in the life of man.

Even though the Church opposed the mystery cults, mystery language was an integral part of the Christian faith and rite. Of this phenomena, Casel said:

In the course of time, the language of the mysteries, as a glance into the Roman Missal shows us, became so much the Church's property, that all consciousness of its ancient origin was lost. Who thinks of the word sacrament as resting in the last analysis on the language of the ancient mysteries? But this is no simple loss of memory through the usualness of the thing, but rather the consequence of the fact that Christianity is of its own very essence, as we saw above, a mystery religion, and the mystery language its own most rightful possession. The ancient church

lived in mystery, and need to construct no theory about it.¹⁶

So, Casel was unwilling to admit that there was some kind of borrowing of language or concepts of the mystery religions by the Christian Church. The Christian faith was in and of itself a "mystery" religion.

Controversy raged over Casel's theory. Scholarly critics felt that Casel was stressing the natural aspects and the culture in which Christianity developed and so Christianity was robbed of its uniqueness. Louis Bouyer warns of the two temptations that are present when discussing the Christian faith. He particularly applies these temptations to the development of the liturgy. One temptation Bouyer notes is to ignore any human elements within the liturgy and he compares this to the monophysite controversy which raged in the early Church. Monophysitism maintained that Christ has only the one divine nature. Bouyer believes the same error is attributed to the liturgy when scholars assert that the liturgy escaped human or cultural development.¹⁷

The other temptation in viewing religion, says Bouyer, is made when the human element is emphasized at the expense of the divine. In the case of the liturgy, it is argued that an emphasis on the human development causes the truths

¹⁶Ibid., p. 34.

¹⁷Louis Bouyer, "Two Temptations," Worship, XXXVII (December 1962), 12.

of the Christian liturgy and the sacraments to lose their divine uniqueness. Bouyer suggests that this temptation to look at the human elements in the liturgy at the expense of the divine can be compared to the Nestorian controversy of the fifth century Christianity.

It is here that the tendency which we may describe as Nestorian comes to the fore in the face of, and in opposition to, the Monophysite tendency. We mean the tendency so to stress the human aspect of Christianity that its individuality along with its divinity is in danger of disappearing.¹⁸

To admit to historical development, as Casel suggested, by showing certain similarities with the mystery rites of the pagan world, somehow modifies the divine gift of the liturgy. An example of the latter temptation is implied when Bouyer criticizes Casel's human emphasis. He suggests that Casel and the Maria Laach school held that the Mass was an application of the ritual and mystic patterns of the pagan mystery rites of Osiris, Dionysus, and many other dieties to Christ's work.¹⁹

Bouyer suggests that there is another brand of Nestorianism which effects the study of the liturgy.

There is however, another form of liturgical Nestorianism which we see at work today and which is no less erroneous than the preceding. It is a reaction against a patent confusion of what is sacred in Christianity

¹⁸Ibid., p. 14.

¹⁹Ibid.

with what is naturally sacred, but it is an unfortunate reaction. It also strives to secure what is human in Christianity, but while taking care not to confuse it with other religions, it attempts to present Christianity as a radically new religion precisely because it rejects all sacrality in the ordinary, pre-Christian meaning of the word.²⁰

This second Nestorian view of the liturgy confuses the divine and human elements of the liturgy. This view does not want to confuse Christianity with the pagan religions, so it seeks to preserve the divine uniqueness of Christianity at the cost of denying that there is anything sacred in the human, historical or cultural development of the liturgy.

Bouyer explains what happens when this kind of Nestorian approach is applied to the relationship between the Christian liturgy and the pagan mystery rites.

According to this view, Christianity not only could not have, and should not have, accepted anything of the sacred rituals of non-Christian religions for its liturgical uses, but on principle its only rites were common human actions simply consecrated through the presence of Christ. Thus, in place of the ritual sacrifices of the ancient religions, Christ was put to death upon the cross (a death which was in no sense heiratic, nor even sacred from the standpoint of the religious ritual, whether it be that of Judaism or some form of paganism); and thus, too, for the more or less formal liturgies, He substituted a common meal that was simply illumined and consecrated by His presence in the midst of His followers.²¹

This brand of Nestorianism suggests that the common and

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Ibid., p. 15.

ordinary elements which Christ used with His disciples in the Last Supper was simply an ordinary meal which he consecrated. It had no sacred religious ritual to it at all. Neither of the above ways takes the character of Christ's work--the divine, historical, and human elements--seriously.

Bouyer formulates a critique of the work of Casel and Maria Laach based on the errors of Nestorianism.

Here it must be admitted that the school of Maria Laach, while again bringing that vision into full light (here Casel refers to the mystery of God's salvation for men at the cross) perhaps sometimes unfortunately conveyed the impression that it was merely something out of the past, something from a religious culture which could not be revived. The attempt to explain the Christian mystery exclusively or mainly in the context of the pagan mysteries of the first centuries was more or less unfortunate because it tended, contrary to the hope of its own promoters (Dom Casel and his disciples) to obscure our appreciation of the creative originality, and therefore, everlasting validity, of that great vision of Christianity.²²

Casel conveyed the idea to some that the mystery of God's salvation and the liturgy that developed around them were archaic things of the past. The real mistake, Bouyer believes, was to have made such an exclusive case for the mystery rites because they did not leave room for the unique, once-for-all creative divine act of Christ. According to Bouyer, Casel's error was in the articulation of his position and not in his scholarship.

²²Ibid.

Ibid., p. 31.

Casel's work was not lost in controversy. The theology of salvation and the Eucharistic liturgy in the Vatican II document on the liturgy does not argue the pros and cons of the mystery theology but simply speaks of the mysteries that are present within the liturgy. Bouyer explains the council's treatment of the mystery theology.

however . . . the council bypasses all controversies . . . by leading us to the biblical sources and adhering to the basic biblical formulation of the mystery.²³

The important factor in the Council's use of the word mystery and explanation of how the mystery of salvation is re-presented is that they gave recognition to Dom Casel's work. As a result, all of the Roman Church benefits from the work and study Casel invested in the liturgy through Vatican II. Bouyer also makes the connection of Casel's theology and the Council's use of his work clear.

We can accurately say that the conciliar constitution has consecrated the teaching of the school of Maria Laach, first of all in the description of Christianity as being the Paschal mystery of Christ. But we can go even further and also state that the Constitution has made it clear that Dom Casel and his disciples were correct when they insisted that this mystery is the mystery of worship, that is, that mystery, the reality of which lies behind the liturgy.²⁴

J. D. Crichton, who wrote a commentary on the Vatican II constitution, cites the three levels of mystery, two of which can be traced to Casel.

²³Ibid.

²⁴Ibid., p. 31.

The mystery we are concerned with can be seen to exist on three levels:

(1) There is first the mystery of God himself dwelling in light inaccessible and hidden from the gaze of men from the beginning of time.

(2) There is the mystery of Christ which is the mystery that is Christ who is the manifestation of God, the only begotten of the Father whose glory John and other apostles witnessed

At this second level, mystery is essentially an event, something God did, or a series of events; in the concrete, the history of salvation as it is set forth in the Old Testament, in the life of Christ and finally in the Church.

(3) The third level at which the mystery exists is the liturgy. In other words, the liturgy itself is "mystery" as the missal says to frequently, especially in its prayers.²⁵

These three distinctions of the mystery in Christianity, particularly the work of God in Christ and the presence of this mystery in the liturgy, are the mysteries which Casel brought to light. The following sections will treat the elements of mystery in the liturgy which Casel made. The following material also will include additional theological concepts which are the sources of the principles of liturgical renewal as formulated by the Second Vatican Council.

²⁵J. D. Crichton, The Church's Worship (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964), p. 24.

The Theology of Christ

The whole concept of the re-presentation theology is the thread that is woven through the entire council document especially when the fathers of the council speak of the theological sources which give rise to the principles of liturgical renewal. When the Council members speak of the renewing of the liturgy, they make it clear that they are referring to the liturgy of the Eucharist, the Mass.²⁶

In the introduction of the document on the liturgy the council immediately points to the liturgy as the way in which the mysteries of Christ and His redemptive work are made meaningful for the faithful.

For the liturgy "through which the work of our redemption is accomplished," most of all in the divine sacrifice of the Eucharist, is the outstanding means whereby the faithful may express in their lives, and manifest to others, the mystery of Christ and the real nature of the true Church.²⁷

Of particular interest in this paragraph is the use of the word "mystery" in connection with Christ himself. This expression of the Council is precisely the way in which Dom Casel described the reality of Christ's work as being re-presented in the mystery of Christ within the liturgy.

²⁶Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1963), p. 3.

²⁷Ibid.

Casel described the mystery of Christ's redeeming life as God's demonstration of his glory. The mystery of Christ includes his life from the incarnation to the ascension.

Christ is the mystery in person, because he shows the invisible godhead in the flesh. The deeds of his lowliness, above all his sacrificial death on the cross, are mysteries because God shows himself through them in a fashion which surpasses any human measurement. Above all else, his resurrection and exaltation are mysteries because God's glory is shown through them in the human person of Jesus, although in a manner hidden to the world and open only to the knowledge of the faithful. This mystery of Christ is what the apostles proclaimed to the Church and what the Church passes on to all generations.²⁸

The Constitution spoke of the mystery of Christ almost in the same words of Casel.

God who . . . when the fullness of time had come sent his Son, the Word made flesh, anointed by the Holy Spirit, to preach the gospel to the poor, to heal the contrite of heart, to be a "bodily and spiritual medicine," the Mediator between God and man. For his humanity, united with the person of the Word, was the instrument of our salvation. Therefore, in Christ, "the perfect achievement of our reconciliation came forth, and the fullness of divine worship was given to us."

The wonderful works of God among the people of the Old Testament were but a prelude to the work of Christ the Lord in redeeming mankind and giving perfect glory to God. He achieved his task principally by the paschal mystery of his blessed passion, resurrection from the dead, and glorious ascension, whereby "dying, he destroyed our death and, rising, he restored our life." For it was from the side of Christ as he slept the sleep of death

²⁸Casel, op. cit., p. 6.

upon the cross that there came forth "the wondrous sacrament of the whole Church."²⁹

The Council affirmed Casel's belief that through Christ's death on the cross, his resurrection, and exaltation, God shows himself to human beings and acts in a way that is beyond human comprehension.

This knowledge of the mystery of Christ though not gained in a gnostic way, is open only to the faithful. The faithful experience of the mysteries of Christ by participation in Christ and his saving deeds. The Council fathers declared that the mystery of Christ is present in the Church. Casel showed the connection between the mystery of Christ and the Church when he explained the content of the mystery of Christ.

The content of the mystery of Christ is, therefore, the person of the god-man and his saving deed for the church; the church in turn, enters the mystery through this deed. For Paul, Peter, and John, the heart of faith is not the teachings of Christ, nor the deeds of his ministry, but the acts by which he saved us.³⁰

These saving acts of salvation were done for the Church. The Church enters the mystery of Christ by participation in these deeds. Again, the similarity between Casel and the Council is too similar to be coincidence.

The saving acts of Christ or, as Casel puts it "the mysteries of Christ," are present in the liturgy. In the

²⁹Ibid., pp. 6-7.

³⁰Ibid., p. 12.

celebration of the liturgy, the acts of Christ are reenacted or re-presented. When Charles Davis wrote Liturgy and Doctrine, he asked the question, "How are Christ's acts made present here and now?" Davis answers his own question by describing Casel's theology of re-presentation.

The saving mystery of Christ is rendered present in the liturgy in the sense that, in the liturgy, what was done in Christ is done in us by the action of Christ. Very often we think of grace in a static way, almost as a sort of fluid poured into the soul as into a vessel when we receive the sacraments. It is indeed a quality inherent in the soul, but it is at the same time a dynamic force that penetrates and changes our being and then impels us onward in a movement of living return to the Father. Moreover, we must remember that created grace does not stand by itself as the sufficient explanation of our new existence as sons of God. It raises us to the divine life only because it is a unitive reality which serves as a bond or link establishing our union with the Holy Spirit, who is given to us and dwells in us.³¹

As Casel's spokesman Davis indicates, when the faithful participate in the liturgy, what God did for man through Christ is accomplished for the faithful by Christ. It is not just the liturgy itself or the external performance of the rites by the priest and people which enables the action of Christ in the liturgy. Christ himself brings his acts of salvation and reproduces the mysteries of redemption in those celebrating the liturgy. Or as Davis states it in succeeding pages, "in the liturgy we make

³¹Davis, Liturgy and Doctrine, pp. 83-84.

contact with the saving acts of Christ."³² such celebration.³⁴

The Constitution explains the re-presentation of the mysteries of Christ in a similar way to Casel by speaking of the mysteries of Christ in a similar way to Casel by speaking of the celebration of these mysteries in the liturgy.

The worship of the Church exists essentially in the celebration of the "Christ mysteries": Holy Mother Church considers it her duty to celebrate the saving work of her divine Spouse by devoutly recalling it to mind on certain days throughout the course of the year. Every week, on the day which she has called "The Lord's Day," she keeps the memory of her Lord's resurrection; once in the year, by the most solemn festival of the Pascha, she celebrates his resurrection together with the blessed passion. As each year passes by, she unfolds the whole mystery of Christ, from the incarnation and birth until the Ascension, the day of Pentecost and the expectation of blessed hope and the coming of the Lord.³³

In the above statement, the Council extends the mysteries of Christ beyond the actual liturgy to celebrating the whole spectrum of the Church's worship in celebrating the festivals of the Christian year which mark the specific redemptive actions of Christ. When the Church celebrates the events of Christ's life through the liturgy, and Church year, these events become a present reality. The conciliar document defines worship in this manner, an act of Christ.

³²Ibid., p. 88.

³³Constitution, op. cit., p. 5.

The Lord is present with his Church through such celebration.³⁴

When the Church remembers the saving acts of Christ in her liturgical worship such a memorial is not just a simple recollection. Casel's thought on the memorial of the mysteries of Christ was closely allied with the Eucharist.

This sacred rite with its full divine content is what the disciples are to "act in memory"; they are to make real again the passion of their divine master. As the Church grew out of the Lord's blood, she is to live and grow in his strength. . . . Christ has given his mystery to the church's care; she acts it out, and thereby fulfills his action which has become hers.³⁵

The mysteries of Christ are not some abstract events which happened a long time ago, but they become present realities when the Church remembers them in her liturgical celebrations. The past saving acts of Christ himself is present. Louis Bouyer, commentator on the Vatican II document on the liturgy, defined the memorial of the mysteries of Christ as, "The memorial of Christ's mystery is the core of the Christian celebration He testifies that He is still present with us to make His great work fully our own."³⁶ The Sacerdotal Communities of Saint Severin and Saint Joseph mention the evidence of Casel's work in the Constitution and they believe Casel's contribution to the Roman Church must wait the test of time.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Casel, op. cit., p. 59.

³⁶Louis Bouyer, The Liturgy Revived (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964), p. 24.

but it remains to be seen whether all the details of his particular teaching on the Christian mystery will stand the test of time. The second Vatican Council does not refer to the subject like Mediator, though in its definition of the liturgy and its remarks on the Christian year it reflects the climate of opinion provoked by Casel's work. Thus it can be seen that it is from the liturgy that in reality Christian life is to be derived since it is in the liturgy that, through Jesus Christ we can come to an encounter with the living God.³⁷

In this short remark, the authors of The Liturgical Movement summarize the entire meaning of the mystery of Christ as it was presented in history and as it is represented and memorialized in the celebration of those same events within the liturgy.

The Paschal Theology of the Liturgy

The Paschal nature of the liturgy is closely linked to the mysteries of Christ. The word paschal is derived from the Greek πάσχα, the word used to denote the Passover event and meal. The word pascha evolved from the Aramaic word passa.³⁸ At the time of Christ the Aramaic usage of the word referred to the Passover festival and the meal that was eaten in observance of the first Passover event. In the New Testament usage, pascha refers to the

³⁷Saint-Severin, op. cit., p. 76.

³⁸Cf. Joachim Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, translated by A. Ehrhardt (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), p. 1 for the development of the Aramaic passa to the Greek Pascha.

passover meal and then is used to describe Christ's passion; his redemptive acts from the Last Supper to his burial.³⁹ The adjective paschal refers to the lamb eaten at the Passover meal. Paschal is used to refer to Christ and his work of redemption. Paschal is also used in reference to Christ's resurrection.

When Louis Bouyer discusses the paschal theology of the liturgy he refers to the Jewish understanding of the passover event. When the Jew celebrates the Passover, he is a partaker of the paschal event, the deliverance from Egypt. As they observe the Passover, they believe that this past event becomes a present reality, that is, the passover means they are entering their inheritance.⁴⁰ The Jewish passover event is compared to the Christ Event of deliverance. The Last Supper, the inauguration of the Eucharist, and the passion of Jesus Christ are set in the context of the Jewish Passover.⁴¹ The mystery of the cross is also that Pascha by which man can pass from the power of darkness to light. The cross means passing to the kingdom of life which the Son of God has made known.⁴²

Casel talked about the Paschal nature of the liturgy

³⁹Ibid., p. 5.

⁴⁰Bouyer, The Liturgy Revived, pp. 22-23.

⁴¹Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 57-61.

⁴²Bouyer, The Liturgy Revived, pp. 22-23.

and he too related this Pascha which the faithful celebrate and in which they participate to the mysteries of Christ.

It was the Pasch of Christ, his bloody death, which saved the world from its sins and fed it with food of everlasting life, god-life. On the eve of the earth's pasch, the savior made of the pasch a complete mystery; he anticipated his death in the mystical rite, and made food of his sacrificed body, and gave his blood as the foundation of a covenant. Here an historic event was celebrated but one which had its end beyond time, in God in the passage from this aion to the world to come. It was not only an action of God's upon his people, but an action he carried out among them in human form.⁴³

Casel viewed Christ's death and resurrection as the event which made the Old Testament passover a real mystery. Casel believed that the passover event which the Jews experienced was not really a mystery in itself, because it was a human deliverance. However, Casel has overlooked the fact that it was God working in a very human event in delivering the Jews from bondage. It was this same God who delivered mankind from their bondage through the suffering, death and resurrection of the human being, the divine Son of God, Jesus Christ. Casel has mistakenly neglected the very human ways in which God works because his idea of the mystery of the incarnation was more divine than it was human. And because he overlooked the human side of Christ and his deliverance, he missed an opportunity to strengthen his case for the mystery of Christ and Christ's pasch.

⁴³Casel, op. cit., p. 31.

The wonderful works of God among the people of the Old Testament were but a prelude to the work of Christ the Lord in redeeming mankind and giving perfect glory to God. He achieved his task principally by the paschal mystery of his blessed passion, resurrection from the dead, and glorious ascension, whereby "dying, he destroyed our death, and rising he restored our life." . . .⁴⁴

However, there is a difference between the Constitution's view of the passover and Dom Casel's view of the Old Testament event. The council fathers recognize the divine element in the human deliverance of the Jews, but Casel was unwilling to see the divine deliverance in it and therefore refused to call the Old Testament Pascha a mystery. However, Dom Casel and the Council agreed in calling the New Testament work of Christ, the paschal mystery.

The paschal mystery is the heart of the history of salvation. This paschal mystery is the mystery of Christ and the content of the gospel; the good news of man's redemption and deliverance from the bondage of sin. J. D. Crichton, who interprets the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, divides that paschal mystery into three levels:

1. The great saving event of the Old Testament, one to which its writers and prophets returned incessantly . . . was the domestic sacrifice which the Israelites prepared and ate at God's command the night before they escaped from Egypt. . . . so the passover interpreted the meaning of the saving events that were to take place immediately afterwards.

⁴⁴Constitution, pp. 6-7.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 32.

2. The passover sacrifice of the New Testament which fulfilled that of the Old Testament is nothing other than the passion, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ in which he offered himself as the true Lamb of God and took away the sins of the world.

3. Faithful to the Lord's last commands, the Church through the centuries has celebrated in her liturgy the paschal mystery. For now this mystery exists in a new way, no longer in the historical order but under signs and symbols which yet convey the reality of what Christ did long ago.⁴⁵

The paschal mystery cannot be viewed merely as a new event or a new testament which Christ created or baptized. The pascha of Christ has the Old Testament Passover event as its antecedent and referent. Christ's paschal work fulfills and magnifies the meaning of the Old Testament passover. The Church's observance of the paschal mystery of Christ is not an exercise in history nor a contemplation of it but an actual contact with the mystery itself. When the Church is faithful to the Lord, she celebrates this paschal mystery in the liturgy. As Crichton says, the paschal mystery in the liturgy becomes real, present, and alive in a new way under signs and symbols.⁴⁶ The paschal mystery exists in the liturgy not only through signs and symbols but Christ himself makes the paschal mystery real and present. Bouyer comments on the paschal mystery in the Constitution and indicates that the liturgy is an embodiment

⁴⁵Crichton, op. cit., pp. 31-32.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 32.

of the great mystery of Christian faith and the source of spiritual life for Christians. The Council calls the great mystery in the liturgy the paschal mystery of Christ dying and rising again for salvation.⁴⁷

The council document discusses in depth the mysteries which are present in the liturgy. The Council fathers reaches back into biblical events to show the significance of Christ's work. The assembled bishops used the descriptions and discoveries of the scholars and theologians that preceded them to amplify the deep significance of the acts of Christ and the paschal mystery. Louis Bouyer summarizes the effect of the paschal mystery in paragraph five of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy when he says:

This leads to a view of Christ's saving work, and, more generally, to an understanding of the whole Christian faith, which puts the entire emphasis not on some abstract notions, but on the living unity of a saving event, which has to become ours, in the Church, through her sacramentality.⁴⁸

Even though the Constitution on the liturgy never mentions Dom Casel by name, his thoughts and work on the meaning of the liturgy are always present. Casel's insights into the nature of the paschal mystery were the basis of council fathers' declarations on the nature of the liturgy.⁴⁹

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 8.

⁴⁸Bouyer, The Liturgy Revived, p. 12.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 31.

The Eucharistic Theology of the Liturgy

The meaning and action of the paschal mystery is closely interwoven with the mystery of the Eucharist and its nature. Both Dom Casel and the Constitution on the Liturgy show how the saving acts of Christ's pascha are present, celebrated and received in the Eucharistic mystery. Dom Odo does not specifically mention the mystery of the Eucharist in the way he mentions the mystery of Christ, the paschal mystery and the mystery of the liturgy. Casel's approach to the Eucharist originates from the mysterientheologie concept itself. When Casel wrote about the mysteries of Christ and his redemptive acts and, when he mentioned the re-presentation of these acts of Christ in the liturgy, he referred to the Eucharist and its celebration.⁵⁰

Dom Casel defined the word sacrament and mystery in the same way. The sacrament of the Eucharist was a mystery because in it Christ reenacts his redemption. The mystery of Christ is celebrated in the sacrament of the Eucharist. His work is actually made present in the Eucharist in all its objective reality and therefore the Eucharist too is mystery. The saving acts of Christ's sacrificial death, his resurrection and ascension are the acts made present

⁵⁰ Casel, op. cit., p. 58.

in this sacrament. The sacrament of the Eucharist is Christ's occasion to re-present his saving works for the faithful.

On this point Casel was criticized severely. The critics maintained that Casel's concept of the sacramental presence of Christ was not accurate. The critics asserted that the saving events of Christ are made present in its effects, not in an objective way. Some critics said that the sacrament applies the grace from the work of Christ to the faithful. The historic work of Christ, they maintained, is not present; but the grace that comes from His work.⁵¹

Casel said that Christ's work was made present in the celebration of the Eucharist and the other sacraments as well. In the Eucharist and the other sacraments the mysteries accomplish that which they represent. Some of Casel's critics who are willing to concede that the mystery of Christ's work is actually made present in the Eucharist, find it difficult to apply this theory to the other sacraments. Koenker quotes the main argument of Casel's critics in the words of J. M. Hanssens, S.J.

If it is necessary that for every action of the cultic mystery the saving acts of Christ be present, then, since it is impossible for these to be present except where Christ himself is truly present, it follows that none other than the sacrament of the Eucharist can be a true mystery-rite.⁵²

⁵¹Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church, p. 12.

⁵²Ibid., p. 113.

The Constitution sides with Casel's critics who talk more about the effects of the Eucharist upon the faithful than about the actual historical re-presentation of Christ's saving acts in the Eucharist.

From the liturgy, therefore, and especially from the eucharist, as from a fount, grace is poured forth upon us; and the sanctification of men in Christ and in the glorification of God, to which all other activities of the Church are directed as toward their end, is achieved in the most efficacious possible way.⁵³

Although Casel's mystery theory would have strengthened the Vatican II document's statements on the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, nevertheless the council fathers did speak about the presence of Christ. But bishops and the conciliar commission on the liturgy chose to consider the benefits of the present Christ rather than the historical re-presentation of his saving acts.

At the Last Supper, on the night when he was betrayed, our Savior instituted the eucharistic sacrifice of his body and blood. He did this in order to perpetuate the sacrifice of the Cross throughout the centuries until he should come again, and so to entrust to his beloved spouse, the Church, a memorial of his death and resurrection: a sacrament of love, a sign of unity, a bond of charity, a paschal banquet in which Christ is eaten, the mind is filled with grace, and a pledge of future glory is given to us.⁵⁴

When the council speaks of the Eucharist there is little

⁵³Constitution, op. cit., p. 11.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 29.

reference to the transubstantiation theory of the Real presence of Christ. The Scholastic and Thomastic arguments for transubstantiation that were so obvious in the Council of Trent, are no longer present. The absence of this argument reflects much of the progress of the liturgical movement from the early 1900's to the convening of Vatican II. Koenker gives the school of Maria Laach the credit for placing more emphasis on Christ's action in the Eucharist, rather than the method of his presence. This emphasis effected the entire liturgical movement and Vatican II.

It must be admitted that the school has attributed a new authority to Christ and his saving work; the Eucharist and remaining sacraments are not so much something the priest does, by magic, incantation, etc., but they are according to the full force of this teaching, the "Christification" of society.

This contribution of the Liturgical Reformation is comparable to Luther's teaching on the Real Presence in the sixteenth century. Among those who hold to this theology in the Liturgical Movement there is little interest in emphasizing the Scholastic theory of transubstantiation; it date not be denied as the dogmatic explanation of what happened in the Mass, but Aristotelian metaphysics and the Scholastic method of argumentation are not decisive here. Above all, the crude post-Tridentine theories of the nature of the Sacrifice, the destruction or annihilation of the Victim, are being by-passed.⁵⁵

Even though Koenker's evaluation could not take into account the Vatican II documents because they had not been drafted

⁵⁵Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church, p. 113.

when he wrote the above statement, Vatican II reflects the developments Koenker mentioned. Vatican II chose to bypass long, involved, Scholastic arguments for the transubstantiation theory of the Real Presence as the Council demonstrates in the following statement:

The accomplish so great a work, Christ is always present in his church, especially in her liturgical celebrations. He is present in the Sacrifice of the Mass, not only in the person of his minister, "the same now offering, through the ministry of priests who formerly offered himself on the cross," but especially under the Eucharistic species⁵⁶

The only mention of the presence of Christ is that he is there "under the eucharistic species."

The phrase "under the eucharistic species" which the Constitution uses to describe the presence of Christ in the Mass has a familiar sound to the child of the Reformation. Luther objected to the concept of transubstantiation as a description of Christ's presence in the sacrament of Holy Communion. Luther in his Large Catechism described the Sacrament of Holy Communion this way:

It is the true body and blood of the Lord Christ in and under the bread and wine which we Christians are commanded by Christ's word to eat and drink. As we said of Baptism that it is not the mere water, so we say here that the sacrament is bread and wine, but not mere bread or wine such as is served at

⁵⁶Constitution, op. cit., p. 8.

table. It is bread and wine comprehended in God's Word and connected with it.⁵⁷

Luther's concern was to describe the presence of Christ in the sacrament and point the faithful to receive him. Luther did not spend much effort in attempting to explain how Christ's body and blood were actually present. Theodore Tappert, Lutheran theologian, describes Luther's concern about the presence of Christ and transubstantiation.

Their concern was not with substances but with Christ himself, with the incarnate Christ whose body was broken and whose blood was spilled for our salvation, with the Christ who is present and acting in judgment and grace whenever and wherever the Lord's Supper is observed.⁵⁸

Luther believed that the concept of transubstantiation was a philosophical subtlety to explain the presence of Christ. Luther believed that the presence of Christ under the forms of bread and wine was a miracle which could only be explained by faith.⁵⁹ This may explain why Luther was content to leave the description of Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper with the phrase, "in, with, and under."

⁵⁷Martin Luther, "The Large Catechism," The Book of Concord, edited by Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), p. 447.

⁵⁸Theodore G. Tappert, "Meaning and Practice in the Reformation," Meaning and Practice of the Lord's Supper, edited by Helmut T. Lehmann (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961), p. 90.

⁵⁹Hermann Sasse, This Is My Body (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959), p. 103.

Since Vatican II abandoned the scholastic and Thomastic arguments and description of the Real Presence of the Sacrament and since they decided to use the words, "under the eucharistic species" to describe Christ's presence, it appears that the Council's concern was the same as Luther's. Both appear to emphasize the presence and work of Christ in the Sacrament. Lutherans should note a significant convergence of the Roman Catholic and Lutheran positions of the Real Presence on this point.

While both Basel and the Vatican II document do not resurrect the arguments of the reformation, they do raise the concept of the sacrifice of Christ within the celebration of the Eucharist in the Mass. Casel connected the idea of the sacrifice of Christ to the ancient mysteries. In the pagan rites, the initiate participated in the life and death of the deity.⁶⁰

As Bouyer indicates in Liturgical Piety, Casel overlooked the significance of Christ's death as compared to the death of the gods in the pagan mystery rites.

The death of the god in the mysteries was not part of the saving process, but merely a disaster which the god had not been able to avoid. If he was, at the end, not to conquer death properly speaking, but rather to be born again (only, let us not forget, to die again, and again to come to life), this was in to way due to any value inherent in his death; it was, rather, in spite of that death.

⁶⁰Casel, op. cit., p. 34.

The gods of the mystery religions were, as has been very well said, not so much savior gods as gods who themselves were saved.⁶¹

Christ's death and resurrection meant life and deliverance not for himself but for God's people. Christ sacrificed his life on the cross for the redemption of mankind, and, in the eucharistic liturgy of the Mass, the faithful participate in the sacrifice that is re-presented here.

But Casel did not argue that Christianity simply borrowed this theory of sacrifice from the pagan rites. Casel expounds on the sacrifice of Christ and his re-presentation of this sacrificial work, the nature of the paschal mystery of Christ. Christ's saving acts of his sacrificial life, death, and resurrection are the New Testament fulfillment of what God had done for Israel in the passover, the deliverance from Egypt. This saving sacrificial act which occurred in history is actually an objectively made present. However, Casel did not describe the sacrifice of Christ on the cross as an unbloody immolation when it is re-presented in the liturgy of the Mass.

Ernest Koenker says that Casel's re-presentation theory may have aggravated the wound that was inflicted on the Church by the Council of Trent when they committed the Roman Church to the formula of the repetition of the sacrifice

⁶¹Bouyer, Liturgical Piety, op. cit., p. 97.

of Christ on the cross in an unbloody manner.⁶² Lutheran theologian Koenker raises a question of Casel's whole theory of re-presentation. He wonders whether Casel's theory really takes serious the once-for-all character of history.

The Mysterienlehre has given rise to discussion, from the field of philosophy, of a possible natural impossibility of a sacramental act being numerically the same in each sacrifice of the Mass.⁶³

Koenker mentions the physical and transcendental spheres of St. Thomas, which sought to explain how the sacrifice could take place again in time and space. Koenker then raises the question whether there is a sacramental sphere of reality also "in which the work of Christ becomes really present with no relation to space or time."⁶⁴

Luther and his followers never discussed the re-presentation ideas in the theology of the Mass or Holy Communion. Luther and the Lutheran Confessions did speak to the issue however, when they objected to the idea of a repetition of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross in an "unbloody manner." Luther's objective to the idea of sacrifice in the Mass was directed not so much to the re-presentation of Christ's sacrifice as he was to the Roman Catholic argumentation of the need for offering Christ for the remission of actual sin. Luther's thought on this is reflected through Philip Melanchthon in the Augsburg Confession:

⁶²Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church, p. 114.

⁶³Ibid.

⁶⁴Ibid.

Manifestly contrary to this teaching is the misuse of the Mass by those who think that grace is obtained through the performance of this work, for it is well known that the Mass is used to remove sin and obtain grace and all sort of benefits from God, not only for the priest himself but also for the whole world and for others, both living and dead.

In the third place, the holy sacrament was not instituted to make provision for a sacrifice for sin--for the sacrifice has already taken place--but to awaken our faith and comfort our consciences when we perceive that through the sacrament grace and forgiveness of sin are promised us by Christ.⁶⁵

Again, Luther's thought on this matter is capsuled when the Augsburg Confession condemns the error they felt had been made in regard to the sacrifice of the Mass.

At the same time the abominable error was condemned according to which it was taught that our Lord Christ had by his death made satisfaction only for original sin, and had instituted the Mass as a sacrifice for other sins. This transformed the Mass into a sacrifice for the living and the dead, a sacrifice by means of which sin was taken away and God was reconciled.⁶⁶

Luther held that the once-for-all character of Christ's sacrifice was contrary to the gospel. To offer Christ again in the Mass for the satisfaction of sins was unnecessary because Christ died on the cross once for all sin.

In short, Luther and his followers objected to the idea of the Mass as an offering of the sacrifice of Christ

⁶⁵Philip Melanchthon, "The Augsburg Confession," The Book of Concord, edited by Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Muhlenburg Press, 1959), p. 59.

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 21.

to gain forgiveness of sin. To Luther, the satisfactory nature of the sacrifice of the Mass conflicted greatly with the Gospel as he saw it expressed in the biblical concept of justification by grace through faith. Luther believed that the sacrifice of Christ in the Mass became a work of man instead of a gift, promise and testament from God. Through this line of reasoning Luther and his followers would have denied the idea of re-presentation of Christ's sacrifice on the Cross in the Mass.

Koenker suggested that the wound in the Church could be healed if the liturgical movement would follow the sacramental interpretation of the Eucharist which views the Mass as a meal or a memorial supper.⁶⁷

The Vatican Council, however, has upheld much of the Council of Trent's formula of the unbloody sacrifice of Christ. However, they have avoided much of the Scholastic argumentation and description of how this sacrifice is reenacted. For instance:

He (Christ) is present in the sacrifice of the Mass, not only in the person of his minister, "the same now offering, through the ministry of priests, who formerly offered himself on the cross," but especially under the eucharistic species.⁶⁸

The council document quotes from the Council of Trent on the Doctrine on the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. More emphasis

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 115.

⁶⁸Constitution, op. cit., p. 9.

is placed by the Constitution on the presence of Christ in the eucharistic species than on an unbloody sacrifice for sin.

In another statement on the mystery of the Eucharist, the council fathers of Vatican II describes the nature of Christ's sacrifice in the Mass:

At the Last Supper, on the night when he was betrayed, our Savior instituted the eucharistic sacrifice of his body and blood. He did this in order to perpetuate the sacrifice of the Cross throughout the centuries until he should come again⁶⁹

Christ gives this sacrifice of himself to the Church for their benefit until he comes again. No mention is made of the need for the Church to offer this sacrifice for the satisfaction of present sins.

In a following paragraph the council document sets the doctrine of the Christ's sacrifice in the Mass within the context of the benefits that Christ's work has for the faithful.

The Church, therefore, earnestly desires that Christ's faithful, when present at this mystery of faith, should not be there as strangers or silent spectators; on the contrary They should be instructed by God's word and be nourished at the table of the Lord's body; they should give thanks to God; by offering the immaculate victim, not only through the hands of the priest, but also with him, they should learn also to offer themselves; through Christ the Mediator, they should be drawn day by day into ever more perfect union with God and with

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 29.

each other, so that finally God may be all in all.⁷⁰

The benefits which come to the faithful in the Eucharist are instruction in God's Word and nourishment for their life. The people are encouraged to think of themselves involved in the offering of Christ and also offering themselves through Christ. This type of offering is treated by the council as part of the meal of the Holy Eucharist. The Council urges the people to give thanks through their offering. The Roman position on sacrifice is comparable to the concept of sacrifice which Luther defined at the Reformation.

Although Luther and the Lutheran Confessions condemned the idea of the sacrifice of the Mass for the satisfaction of sins, they did speak about sacrifice of the Mass in another way. Yngve Brilioth, the Swedish Lutheran theologian, points out Luther's concepts of sacrifice in the Mass.

The image of the High-priest from the Epistle to the Hebrews leads Luther's thought one step further. We do not offer Christ, but we enter into Christ's oblation--"and in this sense it is permissible and right to call the mass a sacrifice, not indeed in itself, but as the means whereby we offer up ourselves together with Christ; that is to say, that we cast ourselves upon Christ with a sure faith in his testament, to come before God with our prayer, our praise, and our oblation, only through him and his mediation, believing firmly that he is

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 31.

our Shepherd and our priest (unser pfarrer oder pfaff) in heaven before the face of God."⁷¹

Again, Luther's own words on the sacrifice in the Mass are stated succinctly in "Treatise on the New Testament, that is the Holy Mass":

From these words we learn that we do not offer Christ as a sacrifice, but that Christ offers us. And in this way it is permissible, yes, profitable, to call the mass a sacrifice; not on its own account, but because we offer ourselves as a sacrifice along with Christ. That is, we lay ourselves on Christ by a firm faith in his testament and do not otherwise appear before God with our prayer, praise, and sacrifice except through Christ and his mediation. Nor do we doubt that Christ is our priest or minister in heaven before God. Such faith, truly, brings it to pass that Christ takes up our cause, presents us and our prayer and praise, and also offers himself for us in heaven. If the mass were so understood and for this reason called a sacrifice, it would be well. Not that we offer the sacrament, but that by our praise, prayer, and sacrifice we move him and give him occasion to offer himself for us in heaven and ourselves with him.⁷²

The faithful's offering is response to God through thanksgiving, prayer and praise. Christ's offering is not a new sacrifice on the cross, but the faithful pray that Christ will offer his sacrifice to the Father together with the faithful's offerings.⁷³ Although Luther allowed for no

⁷¹Yngve Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice Evangelical and Catholic, translated by A. G. Hebert (London: S.P.C.K., 1961), pp. 101-102.

⁷²Martin Luther, "Treatise on the New Testament, that is, the Holy Mass," translated by Jeremiah J. Schindel, Luther's Works, Word and Sacrament I, edited by Theodore J. Bachmann and Helmut T. Lehmann, Vol. 35 (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960), p. 99.

⁷³Ibid., p. 116.

idea of sacrifice in the Mass which carried the idea of satisfaction, Luther did allow for a sacrifice by the people in conjunction with the sacrifice of Christ.

Contrary to previous evidence on Christ's sacrifice in the Mass, Luther did allow for a vague type of Christ's sacrifice in the Mass as his own words indicate, "implore Him and give Him occasion to offer himself for us" and "we enter into Christ's oblation."⁷⁴ It is logical to ask why Luther did not talk about Christ's sacrifice in the Mass from his own concept on the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist.⁷⁵ Or, why didn't Luther speak of Christ's sacrifice in the Eucharist on the basis of his emphasis on the "forgiveness of sins" through the "body and blood given and shed" for the faithful?⁷⁶

The answer to the question is elusive. Luther failed to mention the sacrifice of Christ in connection with Christ's real presence or the memorial of Christ's death in the sacrament because he was very intent on erasing any element of sacrifice that conveyed the idea of manmade satisfaction for sins. Luther's single-minded attack on sacrifice for satisfaction blinded him to consider sacrifice from other points of view.

⁷⁴Martin Luther, "An Order of Mass and Communion," Luther's Works, edited by Ulrich S. Leupold, Vol. 53 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), p. 2.

⁷⁵Tappert, op. cit., p. 90.

⁷⁶Luther, "Large Catechism," op. cit., p. 450.

Luther's chief liturgical principle of reform of the Mass also originated from his rejection of the unbloody sacrifice of the Mass for the satisfaction of sins. Brilioth points out Luther's criterion for reform:

For a criterion of what shall be retained and what discarded, the only principle is that the mass is not a sacrifice but "a sacrament or a testament, or a blessing or eucharist, or a Lord's table or Supper or memorial or communion, of whatever godly name one may choose to take, provided only that it not be defiled by being called a sacrifice or a work."⁷⁷

Luther's criterion for a reform of the Mass led him to abandon the canon of the Mass which contained all the elements of sacrifice he abhorred so much. The reformer retained only the Words of Institution and the Lord's Prayer.

Those parts of the service which can be attributed to the early Fathers, Luther finds to be good and praiseworthy; likewise most of the sung portions. But he empties the vials of his wrath over the Latin canon, whose incoherence he seems to have discerned; above all, he attacks the great abomination, namely, the turning of the mass into a sacrifice, with all that followed in its train, sacerdotalism, private and votive masses.⁷⁸

Since Luther only emphasized the offering of the people at the Mass as a response to God's gift, and since the elements of Christ's sacrifice were removed from the liturgy of Luther's time, the elements of Christ's sacrifice on the cross once for all time for the redemption of mankind was swept aside in the Lutheran rite.

⁷⁷Brilioth, op. cit., p. 116.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 115.

Brilioth feels that it was unfortunate that the distinction was made between the gift that God gives in the Eucharist and the sacrifice of praise, which is given by the people in response to the gift. Luther's concept of sacrifice as response is crystallized by Melanchthon in the Apology to the Augsburg Confession, Article XXIV "De Missa." Brilioth shows the results of the distinction between sacrament as gift of God and sacrifice as response.

But he made a distinction, which was to have a disastrous influence on Lutheran thought, between sacramentum (God's gift, the symbol and means of grace) and sacrificium (Oblation, man's response--including prayer, preaching, thanksgiving, "the sufferings of the saints"). Since Kliefoth's day this became an accepted division of the elements of Christian worship among Lutheran theologians But this distinction is fatally misleading as an account of the eucharistic aspect.⁷⁹

Brilioth believes that this division begun by Luther, and articulated by Melanchthon led to a view of communion as an act of grateful obedience. Brilioth believes that the elements of thanksgiving were finally driven out of communion along with the element of fellowship. The Eucharist in the Lutheran Church became a gift to the individual and also resulted in the over-emphasis penitential character of Communion.⁸⁰

Therefore, since Rome has suppressed arguments on the transubstantiation theory of the Real Presence, emphasized

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 131. ⁸⁰Ibid., pp. 131, 132.

the meal and memorial aspect of the Eucharist, and has encouraged the faithful to participate in the Mass by offering themselves, through Christ, such an emphasis opens the possible rapprochement between Lutherans and Roman Catholics in the area of the Holy Communion.

However, it must be stated too, that Lutherans and Roman Catholics still are separated on the ideas of Christ's sacrifice in the Mass as God's gift to man re-presented for man in which he can participate. There still is separation on the meaning of the memorial aspects of the Eucharist as this concept is connected to the re-presentation idea in the celebration of the Mass. There is division of thought also on the concept of the faithful giving thanks in the Mass by offering the "immaculate victim." This last point may be easier to resolve than it was four hundred and fifty years ago. There is a certain convergence on these points. Vatican II has now expressed its changed position in regard to the sacrifice of the Mass and the elements of satisfaction for sins done ex opere operato by the faithful with the idea of merit are gone. The final task of closing the gap between the two churches may now rest with Lutheran theologians.

Even though the Council of Vatican II speaks about sacrifice, there is a marked difference between what is stated here and the great emphasis placed on the unbloody immolation of the Council of Trent. And so with respect to

the nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, Dom Casel did not have as great an influence on the Constitution as he did on the Council's recognition of the "mysteries of Christ."

To summarize, the Eucharist stands as the central act of worship in the liturgy of the Mass. Christ is truly present in this act sharing his presence and his body and blood in this act with the faithful. Through the Eucharist, the faithful receive this Christ and they identify with him. The faithful participate in the offering of Christ and they offer themselves. The Eucharist encourages them in charity and acts of faith toward one another and the world. The Eucharist finally is the source of divine life and God's manifestation to his people and their participation in that divine life.

The Mystery of the Liturgy

The mystery of Christ, the paschal mystery of Christ, and the mystery of the Eucharist are all brought together in the liturgy. Because the liturgy contains these mysteries mentioned above, the liturgy is also a mystery. In the English edition of The Mysteries of Christian Worship, Charles Davis explains how the liturgy capsules the mysteries of Christ.

It is at this point that we meet the liturgy and understand Casel's insistence that the liturgy brings present the unique, unrepeatable mystery of Christ, realized historically in the past and sacramentally re-presented in the

liturgical commemoration. It is because it does this that the liturgy itself is called a mystery.⁸¹

Casel turned to the pagan mystery cults and found in them the ritual type which explains in part the nature of the liturgy. Although Davis maintains that the Christian liturgy is unique and does not owe its origin to the mystery religions, these pagan rites were a preparation for Christianity. The early Christian fathers borrowed many words and phrases from them to describe the new Christian reality.⁸²

Casel explained that the words "mystery" and "liturgy" carried similar meaning when considered from the point of worship. He said that mystery includes the heart of the liturgical action and in the Christian sense the heart of the action is the mystery of redeeming work of Christ. Liturgy, which means the people's public work or service, is understood as the church's work in conjunction with the saving action of Christ.

For when the church performs her exterior rites, Christ is inwardly at work in them; thus what the church does is truly mystery. Yet, it is still proper to use the term liturgy in a special fashion for the church's ritual action.⁸³

The Church carries on this action, this work, through the ritual of the liturgy. The ritual enables the people to participate in the actions of Christ.

⁸¹Casel, op. cit., p. x.

⁸²Ibid., p. 40.

⁸³Ibid., p. 13.

When the Church celebrates the liturgy and when the people participate in the action of Christ, they enter into Christ's saving activity. This is worship. Although the mystery of worship and the mystery of Christ are interconnected, Casel makes a distinction between them.

Then, one may ask, what is the difference between the mystery of Christ and the mystery of worship? According to the letters of St. Paul, the first is the reality of Christ himself; God, revealed in his Son made man; the revelation of himself which reaches its climax in the sacrificial death and glory of Christ the Lord. The mystery of worship, on the other hand, is the presentation and renewal of that first mystery, in worship. By it we are given the opportunity of entering personally into the mystery of Christ. The mystery of worship, therefore, is a means whereby the Christian lives the mystery of Christ.⁸⁴

The mysteries of worship presents and renews the mysteries of Christ. The worshipper personally enters into the mysteries of Christ through ritual of the liturgy. In this way the Christian is enabled to live in the mystery of Christ.

Casel, who looked to the meaning of the ritual form of the pagan mysteries which existed at the time of Christianity, discovered the meaning of ritual of the early Christian liturgy.

The ritual-form mystery's . . . fundamental idea was participation in the lives of the gods, who in some way or other had appeared in human form, and taken part in the pain and happiness of mortal man. The believer

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 13.

acted with them by sharing their suffering and deeds portrayed in the rite, and performed in it once more by ritual imitation. Thereby he entered into an intimacy with them which was expressed through various images taken from human life; he became a member of the race of gods.⁸⁵

The Benedictine monks applied his understanding of participation in the pagan rites to a participation in the unique event of Christ. The Church "enters into intimacy" with Christ through the liturgical action.

The Mysterium of Christianity, as understood by Dom Casel, is not so much the content of the Christian revelation, to be apprehended by faith and explored by reason, it is the reality of redemption itself, the revelation of God himself in Christ, in the totality of His mighty acts of incarnation, atonement, and exaltation, made present, operative, and effective in us through the participation of the body of the faithful in the cultic action of the liturgy. What God accomplished in Christ is made available to Christ's Body, the Church, through the liturgical mysteries.⁸⁶

Charles Davis expands Dom Casel's understanding of the mystery of the liturgy by explaining that the mystery of Christ is "rendered present in the liturgy in the sense that, in the liturgy, what was done in Christ was done in us by the action of Christ."⁸⁷ Davis says that in this way God gives to the Church his grace, a force which changes man's being and moves him to return that love to God. Because Davis too was convinced that the liturgy allows the

⁸⁵Ibid., p. 34.

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 33.

⁸⁷Davis, Liturgy and Doctrine, p. 83.

worshipper to make contact with the saving acts of Christ, the mystery of Christ, he also calls the liturgy a mystery.

Davis explains that the Eucharist joins the past to the present and fills the present with Christ and strengthens those who wait for the future. The salvation which God has accomplished for man in Christ is available in the Eucharist. What applies to the mystery of Christ and the Eucharist applies also to the entire liturgy.

The same applies in varying degrees to the whole of the liturgy. To try to understand the liturgy without an awareness of the history of salvation is as hopeless a task as to try to appreciate a symphony when tone deaf. But here the liturgy simply reflects the essential structure of the Christian revelation and the permanent framework of the Christian life. The Christian revelation is not a series of abstract truths but the story of the events by which God intervened in human history together with a statement of the significance of these events for us. The Christian life is no timeless relationship with God, but taking part in an unfolding scheme of redemptive history, the full accomplishment of which will coincide with the fullness of our own individual salvation.⁸⁸

The liturgy incorporates the whole history of salvation, presents the story of the acts by which God redeemed the world and makes an application to the lives of those who participate in the liturgy.

The council document gives much attention to the mystery nature of the liturgy. Like Casel, the council

⁸⁸Ibid., p. 57.

bishops attributed to the liturgy all the mysteries of Christ, and the Eucharist.

For the liturgy, "through which the work of our redemption is accomplished," most of all in the divine sacrifice of the eucharist, is the outstanding means whereby the faithful express in their lives, and manifest to others the mystery of Christ and the real nature of the true Church. . . .⁸⁹

Christ continues to accomplish his work within the liturgy and brings to the faithful all the fruits of his redemptive acts. This work is epitomized in the sacrifice of the Eucharist. Christ is present and his work is accomplished in the Church's liturgical celebrations.

Here the liturgical celebration is limited to mean the Eucharist, baptism, the Word of God, prayer and singing. The Council notes that Christ is present in the liturgy of the Mass by his power and not by the form of the past liturgy or the liturgical acts of the people.

The liturgy is given its power and mystery nature not by the priest or the people but by Christ. The Constitution states the following words about the power and function of Christ in the liturgy.

Rightly, then, the liturgy is considered as an exercise of the priestly office of Jesus Christ. In the liturgy the sanctification of man is signified by signs perceptible to the senses, and is effected in a way which corresponds with each of these signs; in the liturgy the whole public worship is performed by the mystical body of Jesus Christ, that is, by the head and his members.

⁸⁹Constitution, op. cit., p. 3.

From this it follows that every liturgical celebration, because it is an action of Christ the priest and of his body which is the Church, is a sacred action surpassing all others; no other action of the Church can equal its efficacy by the same title and to the same degree.⁹⁰

The action in the liturgy consists of Christ and the people working in symphony. The sanctification of man is effected through the signs of the liturgy. Man perceives these signs through his senses. The entire liturgical action, with its meaning and effectiveness, is the worship of God by the Church.

The liturgy, or the work of the faithful which is performed by the faithful also looks forward to a liturgy which one day will be celebrated in full communion with Christ. This earthly liturgy points to the heavenly liturgy. The liturgy is historically rooted in the past events of Christ's saving acts, the present realization of his redemptive work, and also the hope of an eternal liturgy.⁹¹ Celebration of the liturgy now aids the faithful's anticipation of a liturgy which will be realized in the full presence of Christ. When the faithful take part in the liturgy, their expectation of the Christ who also promised to return in glory is heightened.

The fact that the Second Vatican Council started their deliberations with the liturgy was not just a chance event but by choice. The Council fathers viewed the reformation

⁹⁰Ibid., p. 9.

⁹¹Ibid.

of the liturgy as the central task of church renewal. They reasoned that if the Church was to be renewed, the reformation had to begin at the source of the Church's life and move outward from the liturgy. Prior to the council, Charles Davis made the observation on the necessity of the church to renew itself by beginning with the liturgy.

The renewal is a liturgical movement because the point on which everything converges is the liturgy, the nerve-centre in the vital system of the Church.⁹²

The Reformation of theological principles and concepts of the Church can be accomplished only by first renewing the liturgy, which is the source of the Church's theological life too.

The social problems which the Church needs to address can be met through an understanding and celebration of the social nature of the liturgy. The ills and troubles which afflict the divided Church can begin to be cured when the liturgy of the Eucharist is celebrated and realized as the source of Christian unity. The problems which trouble the church are reflected in the liturgy and the ills of the liturgy affect the Church. The Council fathers of Vatican II, gathered for church renewal, recognized that their first task was liturgical reform. This awareness of the Roman

⁹²Charles Davis, "A Modern Reformation: Changing the Face of the Church," Clergy Review, XLVI (October 1961), 579.

Church by the bishops is reflected in the document on the sacred liturgy.⁹³

The Theology of the Church

Many of the principles for liturgical reform which the council formulated were drawn not only from the emphasis of earlier periods of the liturgical movement, but also from a deep concern for the church and a pastoral concern for the laity. This concern for the church is reflected in the statements on the theology of the Church. These theological statements on the church are the basis for several principles of liturgical reform. John L. Murphy stated before the council opened that if there was to be any liturgical reform, there must be a clear understanding of the Church.

Liturgical discussion must involve above all an adequate and clear notion of the doctrine of the Mystical Body and the "theological" notion of liturgy as a theandric act of the whole Christ; second, it must be possessed of a keen sense of history; and, last, it must take its rise from an acute awareness of the pastoral needs of the hour. If we were to attempt to solve our current problems while passing over any one of these three elements, we would run the grave risk of falsifying our position and missing the real issues at hand.⁹⁴

In reforming the liturgy the Second Vatican Council sought to meet all three requirements. The council considers the nature of the church in relationship to the

⁹³Constitution, op. cit., p. 3.

⁹⁴John L. Murphy, The Mass and Liturgical Reform (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1956), p. 108.

liturgy. The council members are mindful of the great pastoral concerns of the liturgical reformers who preceded the council such as Dom Gueranger, Dom Beauduin, Dom Casel and Dr. Parsch. When Vatican II decided to renew the liturgy, she was faithful to her own history and used the liturgical renewal studies which were published before the council as their resource. Once again, the dynamic force of Dom Casel is felt throughout the proclamations of Vatican II concerning the mystery of the Church in relation to her liturgical celebrations.

According to Casel, the mystery of the Church is realized in the mysteries of Christ, his paschal acts, and the Eucharistic mystery of his presence in the liturgy. Casel defined the mystery of the Church as a relationship between the Church and Christ's redemptive acts for man. By baptism, Casel said, men become one with Christ and are made part of his body. When men seek to worship God within the Eucharistic liturgy, they act in concert with the Christ who saved them. When the Church celebrates the Eucharistic feast, Christ is a comrade of the feast and a vital center of it. The Church, assembled to celebrate her liturgy, carries on a holy drama in which men fulfill an action, while Christ perfects his work of salvation in them.⁹⁵

The Maria Laach Benedictine made it clear that the

⁹⁵Casel, op. cit., p. 14.

Church comes into being through the sacrament of baptism. Because of this sacrament, members of the Church share Christ's priesthood.

All members are truly, sacramentally conjoined to Christ their head; every believer, because of the sacramental character he received in baptism and confirmation, has part in the priesthood of Christ the head. This means that the layman does not merely assist with private devotion and prayer at the priest's liturgy, but is, by his objective membership in Christ's body, a necessary and real sharer in the liturgical fellowship. It belongs to the perfection of this participation, of course, that this objective priesthood should be made real and brought up to its highest pitch by a personal sharing of life. As psychology teaches us, the inner life grows stronger to the extent that the external act corresponding to an interior one is consciously made; we hear a song, but the inner participation in it will be greatly heightened and made easier if we sing it ourselves. So with the liturgy, the decisive thing is inward participation which does not require unconditionally to be made external; but external participation does belong to the intense sharing of the experience, and to the completion of its symbolic expression.⁹⁶

Vatican II's statements on the nature of the Church reverses Casel's idea of participation in the liturgy. The faithful should participate in the liturgy because they are the priesthood of Christ by virtue of their baptism.

Mother Church earnestly desires that all the faithful should be led to that full, conscious, and active participation in liturgical celebrations which is demanded by the very nature of the liturgy. Such participation by the Christian people as "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a redeemed people"

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 48.

(I Peter 2:9; cf. 2:4-5), is their right and duty by reason of their baptism.⁹⁷

The priesthood which the faithful receive in baptism is closely related to the idea of sacrifice in the Mass.

Casel describes this relationship:

Because of the inmost oneness of being, and the realm of action following upon it, which grows up between bride and bridegroom, between head and body, it follows that the church must take a share of Christ's sacrifice, in a feminine, receptive way, yet one which is no less active for that. She stands beneath the cross, sacrifices her bridegroom, and with him herself. But she does not merely in faith or in some mental act, but rather in a real and concrete fashion, in mystery; she fulfills the "likening" of that sacrifice through which the Lord offered himself in the presence of earth and heaven, in utter openness, in the total giving of his body, to the Father. Here again we meet the essential meaning of the mystery of worship.⁹⁸

Because the Church (the faithful people of the priesthood) becomes one with Christ, she shares in the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. In her liturgical acts of worship, the Church experiences Christ's sacrifice and ultimately knows the re-presentation of it. Since Christ's sacrifice is the essential act of the mystery, the receiving and sharing of Christ's saving acts is also a mystery. This relationship between the head and the members, between the bride and the bridegroom, deepens through the mysteries of Christ. In this sense the Church also is called a mystery.

The council fathers reveal the nature of the Church

⁹⁷Constitution, op. cit., p. 13.

⁹⁸Casel, op. cit., p. 21.

when they discuss the Church's function in the liturgy. The document on the liturgy speaks of Christ associating with the Church, his bride, by bringing his sacrificial work to her in the liturgy. Therefore, the Church in turn shares in Christ's work through participation with Christ in the liturgy.

Christ indeed always associates the Church with himself in this great work wherein God is perfectly glorified and men are sanctified. The Church is His beloved Bride who calls to her Lord, and through Him offers worship to the Eternal Father.

Rightly, then, the liturgy is considered as an exercise of the priestly office of Jesus Christ. In the liturgy the whole public worship is performed by the mystical body of Jesus Christ, that is, by the head and his members.⁹⁹

The liturgical function of the church defines the nature of the church. One function of the Church is to share in the priesthood of Christ. That priesthood is exercised in the liturgy. Because the faithful shares and lives the mystery of Christ through his priesthood, the Church is a mystery too.

The mystery of the Church is also described by the mystery of the liturgy. Louis Bouyer, when he wrote a commentary on the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, shows the relationship between the mystery of Christ, the mystery of the liturgy, and the mystery of the Church in the Constitution.

⁹⁹Ibid., p. 9.

The liturgical mystery is also the mystery of the Church . . . because its proclamation to the world and its perpetual celebration is the great ministry committed to her care, her apostolic function, but also because it is the mystery of her own life . . . fusion into the mystical body of Christ himself.¹⁰⁰

In her liturgical ministry, as Bouyer states it, the mystery of the Church is exercised in the proclamation to the world of the Christ. This mystery of the Church is the mystery of her own life, growing into a closer union with Christ through sharing in the saving acts of Christ.

Another way in which the Church continues Christ's priestly work is through the Eucharist. The council document says that the priestly work of Christ is carried out by the Church as she intercedes for the salvation of the world and as she praises the Lord. The intercession and praise of the Lord is done through the Eucharist.¹⁰¹ The celebration of the Eucharist is the occasion for the priestly function of the Church. The Eucharist also brings the Church into an awareness of the social and communal nature of her life. Bouyer highlights the Council's consideration of the Eucharist's power to unify the Church.

Nothing could be more decisive in making us realize that the Church is, first of all the community built into one body by the actual

¹⁰⁰Bouyer, The Liturgy Revived, p. 8.

¹⁰¹Ibid., p. 45.

celebration of the Eucharist. In that sense, the liturgical mystery is, indeed, finally the mystery of the Church herself, coming to life and manifesting herself in the liturgical celebration.¹⁰²

When the Council bishops approved this document on the liturgy, they also voiced their approval of the liturgical celebration of the Eucharist in which Christ and the faithful become one.

They should learn to offer themselves; through Christ the Mediator, they should be drawn day by day into ever more perfect union with God and with each other, so that finally God may be all in all.¹⁰³

The Catholic Church considered the sanctifying effect of the Eucharist on the participant in the Eucharistic celebration. Grace is poured out on the Church and she is given her power to live. The Council also made the point that the sacraments and sacramentals build up the body of Christ. The edification of the Church happens when Christ and his people are drawn together in one Holy Eucharist.

The unity and edification which the Eucharist creates in the Church is accomplished when the faithful celebrate this Eucharist together. In fact, by right of her priesthood, and because she is united in the body of Christ, the Church must give greater attention to the celebration of the Mass as a community. Jesuit priest James King comments

¹⁰²Bouyer, The Liturgy Revived, p. 59.

¹⁰³Constitution, op. cit., p. 31.

on the Constitution's emphasis on the unification of the laity during the Eucharistic celebration.

Furthermore, the Mass is something which is done together. In its sacred action we are not isolated cells but members of a praying, sacrificing body. In the Mass we manifest a close union. We pray and sing together; we offer together; we eat of the same food. The sense of corporate unity which is thus illustrated so vividly in the Mass should carry over into the apostolate. Not only is Christ one with His members but he also wills to work through his members. They are His hands in the daily task of labor in the vineyard. . . .¹⁰⁴

The mystery of the Church and the theology of the Church are summarized in the functions of the Church. The Church is priestly, sharing in the priesthood of Christ, receiving the works of his priestly acts of redemption, his sacrifice on the cross, and participating in that sacrifice in the Eucharist. The Church is liturgical. She does her work in union with Christ's work. The Church gives worship to the Father through Christ and his work. The Church is Eucharistic, that is, she celebrates the Eucharist, receives the present Christ and when she gathers together for this act she is united with her Lord as a community of believers.

Although the Vatican Council fathers never make it explicit, the theology of the Church undergirds and determines the principles of reform. The theological concept

¹⁰⁴James W. King, Liturgy and the Laity (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1963), p. 125.

which rests beneath the principles of sound tradition, historical authenticity, caution against liturgical innovation, and the need for organic development of the liturgy is the catholicity of the Church. The theology of the Church's catholicity is inherent in the nature and function of the Eucharist. The Eucharist gives to the Church and incorporates the Church into Christ. Men are united in the Eucharist at this given time and place of celebration. Men of this age are joined to the faithful of every age who have found their salvation in the paschal Christ. Louis Bouyer describes the mystery of worship in terms of the Church's development.

It is made so clear, indeed according to the Council's teaching that the Mystery of worship can be called, with equal accuracy, the Mystery of the Church . . . the mystery of her life, of her progressive building in history.¹⁰⁵

It is the last sentence that tightens and stretches the chord of the church's catholicity, her progressive building in history.

Dom Casel referred to the catholicity of the Church in his work, The Mystery of Christian Worship. Casel spoke about the development of the liturgy as a sign of the catholicity of the Church.

The whole church, therefore, and all conditions of men in her have worked together, and shaped the liturgical ornaments of the

¹⁰⁵Bouyer, The Liturgy Revived, p. 53.

mystery, each man in his way, according to his charisma, all on the ground of their inner sharing in the mysteries.¹⁰⁶

Many Christian persons who responded to the mysteries of Christ's redemptive work have shaped the form of the liturgy. This historical shaping of the liturgy happens as a human and a divine event.

Charles Davis explains how the historical flow and continuity of the Church relates to the catholicity of the Church.

There is, then an ebb and flow in the life of the Church. This affects even its doctrines. Certainly, the Catholic Church maintains adamantly that its dogmas are irreformable. What it has taught, and teaches, as the doctrine of Christ can never be retracted or changed in meaning. But two facts modify this intransigence. First, the unchanging dogma may be embedded in variable opinions, and sometimes much reflection is needed to delineate clearly the unchanging element. Second, though not the dogmas themselves, their presentation by the Church is conditioned historically. The Church declares its doctrine in view of a problem and to meet the needs of the time. Its definitions decide an issue that has arisen; they are not intended as exhaustive statements of revealed truth.¹⁰⁷

Davis underlines the Church's catholicity when he points out her continuity through history. Continuity of the Church is the reason for the Roman Church's insistence on

¹⁰⁶Casel, op. cit., p. 47.

¹⁰⁷Charles Davis, "The Forward Thrust of the Liturgical Revival," The Catholic World, 194 (November 1961), 75.

the irretractable nature of Papal, council, and doctrinal declarations.

The Vatican II document demonstrates the continuity of the Church through history as part of its catholic self-understanding when it states on the mystery of the Eucharist. The Fathers of the Vatican Council refer to the Council of Trent and uphold Trent's teaching of the sacrifice of Christ in the Mass. The council of bishops assembled at Vatican II also quoted the Church fathers before them; such as St. Augustine, St. Cyril of Alexandria, Ignatius of Antioch and others.¹⁰⁸ This method also demonstrates the catholicity of the Church in action.

The Roman Church insists on her catholicity not from historical curiosity; reactionary views, or from an antiquarian viewpoint. But, it is Rome's perception of Christ's work accomplished through his saving acts and the Spirit's building the Church through the ages that allows her to cherish the gifts that have come from God through the Church Fathers, the Councils, the Saints, and tradition. For this reason the council fathers asked that historical investigation be used in liturgical revision. Attention must be given to that past action of the Church. Therefore, new forms for the liturgical worship of the Church must grow out of existing patterns. The unbroken chain of the

¹⁰⁸Ibid., p. 31.

continuing witness and response to Christ in the liturgy is to be continued and renewed through adherence to sound tradition, doctrine and the teachings of the church Fathers.

The Vatican II fathers are conscious of the Church's catholicity when they recorded their principles for liturgical reform. They refer to the history of the Church and the ongoing ebb and flow of the Church's life in Christ. Universality of the Church is part of her catholicity also. The few references the Council makes to the universal nature of the Church can be recognized in several practical principles for liturgical reform. The Council made provisions for revising the liturgical books and rites for groups, regions and peoples, particularly mission lands of the world.¹⁰⁹ The Council recognized the universality of the Church, particularly the Roman Church when they permitted the liturgy to be prayed in the vernacular. Finally, the Council instructed the pastors and bishops across the world to encourage an active parish liturgical life. In so doing the Constitution spoke of the Church's universal nature.

But because it is impossible for the bishop always and everywhere to preside over the whole flock in his Church, he cannot do other than establish lesser groupings of the faithful. Among these the parishes set up locally under a pastor who takes the place of the bishop, are the most important; for in the

¹⁰⁹Constitution, op. cit., p. 25.

same manner they represent the visible Church constituted throughout the world.¹¹⁰

But the membership of the Church does not consist of the bishops and priests but mostly the laity. The Vatican Council emphasizes the role of the laity in the nature and the life of the Church. The pastoral concern for the people which was so pronounced at the commencement of the liturgical movement, is also the Council's motivating force for the renewal of the liturgy. It was mentioned earlier in this chapter that the laity belong to the priesthood of Christ by virtue of their baptism. They celebrate the Eucharist through the liturgy and in this way receive and offer the sacrifice of Christ. By their baptism, the laity are "plunged into the paschal mystery of Christ."¹¹¹

Liturgical worship is the exercise of the priestly office of Jesus Christ where the priest and the body act in unison. As a member of Christ's body, the layman has a right and duty to engage fully and actively in the liturgy by right of his baptism.¹¹²

However, a clear distinction is made between the priesthood of the laity and the office of the bishops, priests, and ministers. The Bishop exercises his care of the people through pastors in the parishes. He is the legitimate authority to regulate laws of liturgical reform.¹¹³ The

¹¹⁰Ibid., p. 27.

¹¹¹Ibid., p. 7.

¹¹²Ibid., p. 13.

¹¹³Ibid., p. 17.

pastors and ministers are to train the laity in the meaning of their liturgical worship and help them take a more active part in the liturgy.

Liturgical services are not private functions, but are celebrations of the Church, which is the "sacrament of unity" namely the holy people united and ordered under their bishops.¹¹⁴

Each person has a different function to perform according to their office.

In liturgical celebrations each person, minister or layman, who has an office to perform, should do all of, but only those parts which pertain to his office by nature of the rite and principles of liturgy.¹¹⁵

Servers, lectors, commentators, choir, and congregation have a genuine liturgical function to perform and the council document urges the people to carry out their function "with piety and decorum."

Louis Bouyer clarifies how the Council distinguishes between function of the priesthood and the priest.

The priesthood of the laity, or more exactly the whole people of God, cannot mean or even seem to mean that the laity could or should all together assume the part of the ministerial-priesthood. This is nothing other than the erroneous idea of the common priesthood of the faithful which was introduced by the Protestant reformers, although no Protestant Church, so far as I know has ever brought it to such a fantastic extremity.¹¹⁶

This tension between the priesthood of the people and the ministerial function of the clergy has been a problem for

¹¹⁴Ibid., p. 19.

¹¹⁵Ibid., p. 21.

¹¹⁶Bouyer, The Liturgy Revived, p. 70.

Rome since the Reformation. Yet, in this document the Council of Bishops holds the two offices in tension. Strong attention is given to the part that the laity have within the liturgical celebrations of the Church. But, Vatican II made sure that the priesthood of the laity was not confused with the pastoral function of the priesthood. In contrast to Trent, Vatican II was able to uphold the role of the priest without suppressing the role of the laity in the Church. In stating the pastoral concern for the "active participation" of the faithful, the council fathers have made it their overriding concern that the laity be restored to their proper role in the Church. Yet, precautions are set forth so that each person in the Church knows the function of his office.

Beauduin, Casel, and Parsch strongly encouraged the "active participation" of the laity, but also made sure that the limits of the priesthood of the faithful were clearly understood.

The obviously praiseworthy intention of bringing people back to active participation in the liturgy should not fall into the democratic heresy. Hierarchy, that is to say, holy order and gradation of value must be maintained in the liturgy; in this way the true common life of the whole ecclesia arises; every order shares what belongs to it with the other. Common life does not mean everyone having the same, but each giving from his riches to the other to fill up that other's lack.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁷Casel, op. cit., p. 49.

These concerns of the liturgical pioneers are realized in the Constitution.

Theology of the Word

The Vatican II bishops implemented their concern for the people's participation in the liturgy and their instruction by restoring the Holy Scriptures and the sermon to the liturgy. Dr. Pius Parsch's work was fulfilled when the Council reexamined the scriptures and the liturgical sermon in the Mass. A pastoral concern for the people to hear the Word led the bishops to consider the theology of the Word and Holy Scriptures and the vernacular.

The Constitution emphasized that the Holy Scriptures give meaning to the actions and signs in the liturgical celebrations.¹¹⁸ The Scriptural content of the liturgy contains spiritual instruction for the faithful. Through the Scriptures in the liturgy of the Mass, God speaks to his people and the gospel of Christ is proclaimed to them.¹¹⁹

When the Council encouraged the restoration of the sermon, they defined the theology of the Word.

The sermon moreover, should draw its content mainly from scriptural and liturgical sources, and its character should be that of proclamation of God's wonderful works in the history of salvation, the mystery of Christ, ever made present and active with us especially in the celebration of the liturgy.¹²⁰

¹¹⁸Constitution, op. cit., p. 19.

¹¹⁹Ibid., p. 21.

¹²⁰Ibid., p. 23.

The Word of God, then is a spoken word, taken from the Holy Scriptures. The sermon and the Holy Scriptures unite and declare God's gifts for man's need. The Scriptures are the proclamation of the mystery of Christ. This is the powerful Word which proclaims saving acts and mysteries to the faithful.

The Council members viewed the Word of God as nourishment for the people. The Church is to spread a more lavish table of the food of God's word so that the people might be nourished by this word.¹²¹ The faithful are given a richer fare of the Word of God, as part of their liturgical worship. For the liturgy of the Word and the liturgy of the Eucharist "form but one single act of worship."

Above all the Scriptures present the living Christ. It is through the Word that Christ himself is made present among the Church. "He is present in his work, since it is he himself who speaks when the holy scriptures are read in the Church."¹²²

The foregoing theology is the basis on which the Vatican II bishops set forth the principles of reform of the liturgy. In the next chapter, it will be more evident how the theology of Christ, his paschal mystery, the Eucharist, the theology, the Church and the Holy Scriptures are the sources for the principles of liturgical reform

¹²¹Ibid., p. 31.

¹²²Ibid., p. 9.

and development of the Mass. The restoration of the Sermon and the Holy Scriptures, intelligibility in worship, tradition, and regulation of liturgical reform are other principles which are constructed from the preceding theology.

of Full and Active Participation

and the "Beautiful" Involved in Worship

Under the pressures of the decades after World War II, Pope John XXIII to convene the Second Vatican Council. Advances in technology and mechanization were pressing the limits of which the Church ministered and of which it was composed. Advances in medicine, biology, and space travel were affecting the structure of society itself. On the ecclesiastical scene, the Ecumenical Movement had blossomed and in the United States at least, the Roman Catholic Church was responding to the possibilities of this movement through contacts with other denominations of the Christian Church. The Roman Church was pressed by society, culture, educational reform and the perils to renew itself. Pope John called for an "aggiornamento" of the Church to cope with changes and problems of an emerging new society.

In the opening sessions of the first gathering of Vatican II, the bishops, assembled from all over the world, deliberated the first task before them: the renewal of the liturgy. Renewal of the Roman Church had to begin at the

CHAPTER IV

THE SPECIFIC PRINCIPLES OF THE LITURGICAL REFORM OF THE MASS

The Principle of Full and Active Participation

All the "Faithful" Involved in Worship

Changes and pressures of the decades after World War II led Pope John XXIII to convene the Second Vatican Council. Advances in technology and mechanization were pressing the society to which the Church ministered and of which it was composed. Advances in medicine, biology, and space travel were effecting the structure of society itself. On the ecclesiastical scene, the Ecumenical Movement had blossomed and in the United States at least, the Roman Catholic Church was awakening to the possibilities of this movement through contacts with other denominations of the Christian Church. The Roman Church was pressed by society, culture, educational reform and the parishes to renew itself. Pope John called for an "aggiornamento" of the Church to cope with issues and problems of an emerging new society.

In the opening sessions of the first gathering of Vatican II, the bishops, assembled from all over the world, deliberated the first task before them: the renewal of the liturgy. Renewal of the Roman Church had to begin at the

source of her life, the Divine Liturgy. Vatican II's objectives for renewal of the Church and in specific the liturgy are set forth in the document on the sacred liturgy.

This sacred Council has several aims in view: it desires to impart an ever increasing vigor to the Christian life of the faithful; to adapt more suitably to the needs of our own times those institutions which are subject to change; to foster whatever can promote union among all who believe in Christ; to strengthen whatever can help to call the whole of mankind into the household of the Church. The Council therefore sees particularly cogent reasons for undertaking the reform and promotion of the liturgy.¹

The primary goals of the Council was Church renewal by changing those institutions which are changeable, ministering to the needs of the faithful, and to fostering Christian unity. One of the Council's objectives reaches beyond the limits of the Church's own interest. The Council expressed a concern to bring the "whole of mankind into the household of the Church." In order to accomplish this objective, the Council set out to reform the life of the Church.²

Vatican II included reaching the whole of mankind "outside" the Church in its objectives for liturgical renewal. This is not an assumption by the conciliar members that the sacred liturgy is thought of here as a means to reach those outside the Church, particularly the Roman Communion. Rather, Rome set upon this task of renewal and

¹Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1963), p. 3.

²Ibid., p. 3.

liturgical renewal so that those on the outside might realize that the Church is concerned about meeting people's needs both before and after they become members of the church. The Council sets its mind to the latter task.

It is only by Baptism that a person is given the right to exercise his priesthood within the liturgy.³ The primary liturgical concern of the Council is that "full and active participation" be restored to the faithful. The faithful are those who have been baptized. In addition, the Council Bishops were concerned that the faithful continue and increase their use of that source which promotes the Christian life. J. D. Crichton, in writing a commentary on the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, explains how the aims of the Council's reformation of the liturgy were directed primarily to her own members.

Once again the Constitution enunciates its aim in the restoration and promotion of the liturgy: the full and active participation by all the people in it. "This is the aim to be considered before all else." And the reason is, in the words of Pius X (so long ago!), that it (active participation) "is the primary and indispensable source from which the faithful are to derive the true Christian spirit."⁴

The primary aim of the Vatican II is also the first guiding overarching principle for liturgical renewal. This principle effects all other principles of liturgical renewal.

³Ibid., p. 13.

⁴J. D. Crichton, The Church's Worship (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964), p. 68.

For instance, when the Fathers of the Vatican II Council speak of renewing the rites and reforming them, their main concern is not for the rites themselves, but for the people who use them.

The first principle is that the rites of the Mass are to be so revised that their intrinsic nature and purpose and their inter-connection should be more clearly ministered to the end that, as always in the Constitution, "devout and active participation may be more easily achieved."⁵

The "aggregation of signs" within the liturgy are to be renewed so that "the faithful can easily understand them and thus participate fully in the celebration of the supernatural realities."⁶

Other statements of the Council demonstrate their pastoral concern stated in the guiding principle of renewal of full and active participation of the liturgy. The Council urges pastors to pastor people. They subordinate the laws and rules of the liturgy to the needs of the people.

Pastors of souls must therefore realize that, when the liturgy is celebrated, something more is required than the mere observation of laws governing valid and licit celebration; it is their duty also to insure that the faithful take part fully aware of what they are doing, actively engaged in the rite, and enriched by its effect.⁷

⁵Ibid., p. 137.

⁶"General Principles of Liturgical Reform Voted by the Council," Emmanuel, LXIX (March 1963), 107.

⁷Constitution, op. cit., p. 5.

The pastoral purpose of this principle of full and active participation by the faithful recognizes the specific needs of the people to be fully involved in the rite and aware of what they are doing.

The Council also desired to provide for the people a living kind of worship which they could make of their lives.

Crichton develops this thought further:

Above all, the Church looks at the people, the laity, and in this document expresses her wish again and again that they should have a living worship which they can grasp, take part in and make the center of their lives.⁸

John L. Murphy, Roman Catholic liturgical scholar, cites the people's need to express outwardly the interior attitudes of faith and love in the Mass. Their participation implies an act of intelligence and interior attitudes.

Interior dispositions without any outward activity do not satisfy the social demand, while on the other hand, outward activity that goes no deeper fails to satisfy the demand for something more profound.⁹

The Council spoke of the "full and active participation" for the entire congregation, not just the individual. The Sacerdotal Communities of Saint-Severin and Saint Joseph of Nice demonstrates Vatican II's emphasis on the communal aspect of the Church's worship:

⁸Crichton, op. cit., p. 4.

⁹John L. Murphy, The Mass and Liturgical Reform (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1956), p. 167.

The need for participation by the congregation could not have been put more plainly than it is in the liturgical Constitution of the Second Vatican Council. In it participation (internal as well as external) is seen to be an essential part of public worship; indeed the reform of the books of the Roman rite is to be carried out with such participation in view so that the congregation may take part scienter, actuose et fructuose-- that is their participation is to be informed, active and fruitful.¹⁰

Vatican II applies the theology of the Church as the "body of Christ" when it encouraged the participation of all the people gathered together for worship. This concern comes from a renewed understanding of the laity's role within the Church. The Liturgical Movement notes the fact that the people of God actively participate in the liturgy first by assembling. The Church assembles for a purpose. But, when the people gather together, the Church is giving visible evidence of her community and social nature. The liturgy of the Mass provides the opportunity to the community to gather and physically express their common life.

The first way in which the congregation takes part is that it has gathered together. The primary quality of its participation, therefore, is to be found in the way that it has assembled. Its very material disposition should manifest its unity. But so far as possible (and this is a serious problem for huge urban parishes), this unity should be able to manifest itself by the parish Mass which should be the high Mass.¹¹

¹⁰The Sacerdotal Communities of Saint-Severin and Saint-Joseph of Nice, The Liturgical Movement, translated by Lancelot Sheppard (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1964), p. 95.

¹¹Ibid., p. 98.

This statement sums up the thinking of the conciliar constitution on the nature of the Church as it concerns the liturgy.

The sacerdotal communities of Saint-Severin and Saint Joseph of Nice concludes that the congregation should manifest its unity there should be participation by the entire congregation in the liturgy, and there should be a celebration of the Eucharist as often as the congregation can gather. The congregation's attitude in this celebration should be one of festive joy, proclamation, prayer, praise, offering, and communion.¹²

When the people gather together, they express who they are; the community of the faithful. The liturgy of the Mass and the Eucharist enables the people of God to express their unity. The community of believers also makes the liturgy what it is, they make it come to life.

There is no true liturgy except in a true community. Liturgical life cements its bonds, but still there has to be a pre-existing community life so that liturgy can flower.¹³

Charles Davis sees a connection between the nature of the Church, the community of believers and the nature of the liturgy. Davis believes the Church is realized in her liturgical worship.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Adrian Nocent, The Future of the Liturgy (New York: Herder and Herder, 1963), p. 114.

The Mass--the liturgical assembly--is simply the Church realized in the concrete at a given time and place. Each Christian has function in it corresponding to his place in the Church. It should be truly communal celebration, actively participated in by all.¹⁴

The Constitution also shows the connection between the nature and function of the Church and the role the liturgy plays in aiding the Church to gather and do her work. "The liturgy is the summit towards which the activity of the Church is directed."¹⁵ It may be concluded that the liturgy is to be revised from the theology of the Church and the theology of the Church comes to life when the people celebrate the Mass.

The nature of the community of believers in its social aspect demands the full and active participation of the faithful in the liturgy of the Mass. Davis explains: "The liturgy is the symbolic activity of a worshipping community, and as such it has deep root in human psychology and the laws of social life."¹⁶ It is of the nature of human beings to gather for activity and social interchange. What the community does, affects the psyche of an individual in a deep and profound way. When the people of God assemble for liturgical celebration, they share their life and the

¹⁴Charles Davis, "A Modern Reformation: Changing the Face of the Church," Clergy Review, XLVI (October 1961), 582.

¹⁵Constitution, op. cit., p. 11.

¹⁶Davis, "A Modern Reformation," Clergy Review, p. 583.

life of Christ with each other. The liturgy is both catalyst and ingredient for social expression of the Church's life.

The social nature of the Church recognizes that the community of the faithful is composed of many different kinds of people. Each person possesses different talents and abilities. Each person is an individual, yet in the body of Christ he is joined intimately to many other persons. As much as there are different persons and personalities, there are different functions within this community. The liturgy, as the work of the people should give expression to this social make-up of the Church. Generally speaking, there are two basic functions in the liturgy which are enacted by two groups of people. There are priests and there are the people. Lancelot Sheppard demonstrates how the Council recognizes this distinction.

The Council has shown that the Church's worship is the concern of all, priests and people, that the worship of God, is, on a final analysis, what the Church is about.¹⁷

Instead of strongly emphasizing the hierarchial nature of the liturgy within the Roman Communion, the Council brings to light a fresh biblical view of the Church, particularly the Church at worship. The Liturgical Commission's American consultant, Frederick R. McManus, underscores

¹⁷Lancelot Sheppard, "The Changing Liturgy," Tablet, 218 (July 14, 1964), p. 742.

Vatican II's understanding of the relationship between the liturgy and the theology of the Church.

No one should have to argue to prove that the people have a lawful part in the worship of the whole Mystical Body, Head and member. . . . The conciliar constitution on the liturgy envisions a reform that will apportion the part of priest and minister and people. No longer, for example, will the Gloria at Mass appear to be the prayer of the celebration priest, but it will appear to be what it really is, the common hymn of the Christian people.¹⁸

The Council distinguishes between the function of the priest and the people and then places new emphasis on the people who are gathered for worship with the priest. The parts of the Mass which once belonged to the people are restored to them.

The concept that the worship of the Church is performed by the priest and the people is a restoration of an early Christian idea. During the Middle Ages and the centuries after the Reformation, the emphasis was placed on the priest in worship.¹⁹ The Reformers attacked the sacrifice of the Mass and the Priesthood.

Let this be the first assault upon the fictitious popish priesthood: how strong and mighty an assault it is, let every pious Christian judge. Here all the splendor and pomp of the popish mass comes to naught;

¹⁸Frederick R. McManus, "Coming Reforms in the Liturgy," The Catholic World 196 (March 1963), 341.

¹⁹Lancelot Sheppard, Blueprint for Worship (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1964), p. 34.

for if the priesthood is nothing, as has now been clearly shown, then its laws also are necessarily nothing. For priesthood and the law change together (Hebrews 7:12). If not, the priesthood and the law are nothing, then the sacrifices and the works which are supposed to take place through the priest according to the law will amount to even less. From this it follows that the pope's law is sheer deceit and falsehood; the papal priesthood is nothing but a mask and outward show, and the papists' mass, which they call a sacrifice, is idolatry and a shameful misuse of the holy sacrament.

In all this no one need have any doubt, for it is proved that this priesthood is found nowhere in the Scriptures. Therefore it is an addition of the devil²⁰

The Roman Church countered Luther's attack by overemphasizing the clergy's role in celebrating the sacrifice of the Mass. The priest's function was to consecrate the elements. The whole concept of the sacrifice and the changing of the elements depended on the power of the priest. Thus the role of the laity in the liturgy was suppressed.

Now at Vatican II the liturgical actions of the priest and the people are restored to their original balance as it existed prior to the Middle Ages in early Christianity. Sheppard highlights this restoration which the Council expressed: "the worship of the Church must become again what it once was, the 'common worship' of priest and people together."²¹

²⁰Martin Luther, "The Misuse of the Mass," translated by Frederick C. Ahrens, Luther's Works, Word and Sacrament II, edited by Abdel Ross Wentz (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), LIII, 142.

²¹Sheppard, "The Changing Liturgy," Tablet, p. 744.

In order to preserve this balance of liturgical roles between the priest and the people, Vatican II distinguished the functions of clergy and laity in the celebration of the Mass:

In liturgical celebrations each person, minister or layman, who has an office to perform, should do all of, but only, those parts which pertain to his office by the nature of the rite and the principles of liturgy.²²

Gerard Sloyan, liturgical scholar, reflects the Council's concept that the Mass is a community act in which priest and people do their work within their given office.

Active participation is the indispensable means to identifying the Mass as a community act, the deed of God's people in concert. The fact is that if we prayed as a people who are united in love, we might begin to act as a people united in love. The Mass from earliest times was an action done by the whole congregation: It is not a sacred pageant, nor a performance by a cast for the edification of all the rest. In the Mass the priest has his function, the servers theirs. The choir has its part, the people their part. They are all something of Christ, each one manifesting differently the Christ within him who has the chief work to do in the sacrifice of praise.²³

Frederick McManus, indicates that it is one thing to verbally acknowledge that the people have a right to take in the liturgy of the Mass and it is another to actually provide for people's participation so that the predominantly priestly appearance of the Mass changes:

²²Constitution, op. cit., p. 21.

²³Gerard Sloyan, "Getting the Message Across," Sunday Morning Crisis, edited by Robert Hovda (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1963), p. 66.

The Mass is the deed and action of all the members joined to Christ the Head of the Church. But the Mass does not always appear to be the deed and action of all--it appears to be exclusively a priestly, clerical thing. The solemn decision of the bishops of the Second Vatican Council is that the long neglected part of the people will be given back to them so that Catholic worship will clearly be a community act and a community responsibility.²⁴

Vatican II not only acknowledges "full and active participation of the faithful" in the Mass as its highest norm but also proceeded to provide specific ways in which this principle of participation for the people could become a reality. The Constitution distinguished and emphasized the specific functions of the laity first:

To promote active participation, the people should be encouraged to take part by means of acclamations, responses, psalmody, antiphons, and songs, as well as by actions, gestures, and bodily attitudes. And at the proper times all should observe a reverent silence.²⁵

It is important to note that the Council also encouraged various members of the congregation to participate in the liturgy of the Mass by serving as lectors, commentators and members of the choir. Each of these functions is to be considered as a genuine liturgical office.²⁶ The people are to take part in the prayer of the faithful making

²⁴Frederick R. McManus, "The Dialogue Mass," Sunday Morning Crisis, edited by Robert Hovda (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1963), p. 53.

²⁵Constitution, op. cit., p. 21.

²⁶Ibid.

intercession for the church, civil government and the needs of all men. The people are to be encouraged to say the Mass in their Mother tongue. They are to receive the host from the Mass in which it is consecrated, and in some instances, they may receive the cup also.²⁷ The Council not only urges that hosts from the actual celebration be used to aid the unity of the congregation but, also states that when the people take part in the singing, prayers, and responses of the Mass full communion can be affected.

Total participation of the congregation is affected by sacramental communion. Hence the mitigation of the eucharistic fast and the recommendation that communion should be given from hosts consecrated during the Mass in question, as the Encyclical Mediator and the Constitution on liturgy of the Second Vatican Council requires; hence too, the solemnization of communion by means of a procession and congregational singing.²⁸

The changes which Vatican II made in the liturgy of the Mass as mentioned above have profound implications for the creation of a liturgy which will allow modern man to find meaning and fulfillment in worship. First of all, the restoration of the distribution of the host at the Mass in which it is consecrated meets some of the social needs of contemporary man and society. This practice enables the communicants to be an integral part of the present liturgical celebration, rather than some other Mass celebrated days before in which the hosts were consecrated and

²⁷Ibid., p. 33. ²⁸Saint-Severin, op. cit., p. 98.

reserved. When the communicants receive the hosts consecrated at the same Mass, they can more easily realize their oneness with Christ and with each other. The communicants share the present Christ and themselves with each other. All sorts of persons, races and individuals with different abilities and talents share themselves with others.

The social nature of the liturgy is realized too, when the people participate in the intercessions for the government and for the needs of all men. The people are not spectators at the Mass, but they are doing something about the conditions and affairs of men, the social problems of the times and are remembering the needs of others. This kind of participation in the liturgy makes public worship relevant to the contemporary lives of the people and gives the worshippers a sense of purpose and meaning in the liturgy. The implications of the restoration of the vernacular will be discussed later in the chapter.

The decision of Vatican II to restore the cup to the laity eases the tension between Rome and Wittenberg which has existed for four hundred and fifty years on this matter. In her desire to restore the fullest kind of participation to the laity, Vatican II has allowed the cup, or communion under both kinds, at the discretion of the bishops:

The dogmatic principles which were laid down by the Council of Trent remaining intact, communion under both kinds may be granted when the bishops think fit, not only to clerics and religious, but also to the laity, in cases to

be determined by the Apostolic See, as, for instance, to the newly ordained in the Mass of their sacred ordination, to the newly professed in the Mass of their religious profession, and to the newly baptized in the Mass which follows their baptism.²⁹

Luther insisted that the communion under both kinds be restored:

Yes, I say further, away with the proponents of only one element--and of the sacrament as a whole! Because when they come to die the devil will torment with the gospel those who use only one element, for the gospel ordains both elements. If they don't know how to cope with it they will have to perish. And it will not help for them to plead the papal law and ancient custom. The gospel does not care about pope or custom. That is why I said it is not a question of what is right but of having the right people. It is contrary to the gospel to partake of only one element, and the pope's ordinance cannot be so very generally observed everywhere without terrible destruction of human souls. At the same time, it would do just as much harm suddenly to impose on the whole church the reception of both elements, in accordance with the gospel, when the church consists of such weak, captive consciences.³⁰

Luther was concerned that the people receive the sacrament as Christ had instituted it. He felt that the reception of both kinds was essential to and part of the gospel. That is also why Luther did not insist on the immediate return to reception of communion under both kinds. Luther also

²⁹Constitution, op. cit., p. 33.

³⁰Martin Luther, "Receiving Both Kinds in the Sacrament," translated by Abdel Ross Wentz, Luther's Works, Word and Sacrament II, edited by Abdel Ross Wentz, (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959) XXXVI, 251.

realized that weak consciences would not be able to adjust so soon to the change from previous practice. Therefore, he counseled some people to receive only one kind if that was all that was offered and he told them to remember that above all they had the promise and testament of Christ that he had given his body and blood for them.³¹

The implication of Vatican II's willingness to restore the cup even if it is under limited circumstances is a great step in the rapprochement of Lutherans and Roman Catholics. Although Vatican II upheld the Council of Trent generally and restored the cup in limited situations to laity in order to increase participation and although Luther restored the cup for different reasons, the effect is the same. The faithful follow the command of Christ and receive his body and his blood as he commanded and which he poured out for the forgiveness of sins.

The communitarian nature of the Church and the liturgy is expressed in the bishop's call for specific ways in which the people can actively participate in the Mass. But the Council also called for full and active participation of the faithful in the Mass on the basis of the sacramental nature of the Church and the liturgy. Because the faithful have a unity as the Body of Christ and manifest it as they gather in the Mass, they should also express that

³¹Ibid., p. 255.

unity which the Sacrament of Holy Communion creates. Christ unifies his people in the sacrament, therefore the people ought to be allowed to demonstrate the unity that is present in that sacrament of unity.³² The Council has made provision for an outward manifestation of the unity by restoring these actions to the laity.

The Roman Catholic concept of the sacrifice of Christ within the sacrament of Holy Communion is another basis for the Council's pronouncement on the active participation of the faithful in the Mass:

The Church, therefore, earnestly desires that Christ's faithful, when present at this mystery of faith, should not be there as strangers or silent spectators; on the contrary, through a good understanding of the rites and prayers they should take part in the sacred action conscious of what they are doing with devotion and full collaboration. They should be instructed by God's word and be nourished at the table of the Lord's body; they should give thanks to God; by offering the immaculate victim, not only through the hands of the priest, but also with him, they should learn also to offer themselves; through Christ the Mediator;³³ they should be drawn day by day into ever more perfect union with God and

³²Louis Bouyer, The Liturgy Revived (Notre Dame: The University of Notre Dame Press, 1964), p. 60.

³³Supra, Chapter III, pp. 106-113. The reader should note the parallel between Luther's idea of the sacrifice which the people offer through Christ's sacrifice and the Constitution's words on sacrifice. They should learn to offer themselves through Christ the Mediator! A tension between Lutherans and Roman Catholics still exists on the idea of offering the "immaculate victim" by the priest and people even though no mention is made here of an offering to gain favor from God.

with each other, so that finally God may be all in all.³⁴

The meal of the Lord's body, the offering of praise and the sacrifice of Christ are not the priest's alone. The people join with the priest in this action. In response to Christ's sacrifice the people should offer themselves. This is their community function, their sacramental duty and heritage.

Two liturgical authorities for the Roman Catholic Church, Lancelot Sheppard and Louis Bouyer, indicate how the Council recognized that the nature of Holy Communion and the sacrifice of the Mass are the theological grounds for the liturgical principle of "full and active participation." Sheppard writes:

And thus that is another reason for reform to make this liturgy what it was intended to be at the outset, the praise and prayer, sacrifice and sacrament of Christian people.³⁵

And Louis Bouyer paraphrases the words of the Constitution when he comments on the sacramental basis for communal participation.

First, men must hear the word of God, attaining its plenitude in the Word made man and His Sacrifice on the Cross. Then they should pray in answer to the word giving thanks to God for his wonderful mystery. And finally they should be attracted to it, in the celebration of the everlasting sacrifice, offered in it and become one, in the One Mediator, reconciled to God the Father, reconciled between us, in the body of His Son made man.³⁶

³⁴Constitution, op. cit., p. 31.

³⁵Sheppard, Blueprint for Worship, p. 35.

³⁶Bouyer, Liturgy Revived, p. 104. [Cf. supra n. 33,

As Bouyer states it, it is not the rite or the liturgy or participation of the people in the sacrifice that creates their oneness and their community life, but it is Christ, the Word made man, who unites himself with them in the celebration of this sacrifice. The people are to respond to the Word and to be attracted to his mystery. The action of the "one Mediator" makes them one with God and one with each other. This unity that Christ gives is to be expressed in every way in the people's celebration of the Mass. The unity which is created among the people is a result of Christ's work and not the people's.

The emphasis on the active participation of the laity in the Mass does not negate the fact that the priest and the bishop also play a vital role in the celebration of the liturgy. From the Roman Catholic point of view, the liturgy of the Mass and the Church has a communitarian nature but also a hierarchical nature. Those two aspects of the Church and her liturgy are interdependent.

Liturgical services are not private functions, but are celebrations of the Church, which is the "sacrament of unity," namely, the holy people united and ordered under their bishops.³⁷

The hierarchy assists and aids the order of the Church in addition to uniting the people. That is why the document

for a comparison of the Luther's and Bouyer's Roman Catholic emphasis on the place of Christ's sacrifice in the Mass and the people's sacrifice.]

³⁷Constitution, op. cit., p. 19.

states that in the public celebrations of the Church each person is to function according to the designations of the liturgy. The priests and bishops are to take their part according to their designated sacred orders and the people are to take the part assigned to them in the responses, psalmody, songs, prayers, and gestures as the liturgy has assigned to them.³⁸

The Council assigns other tasks to the bishops' and priests' liturgical function in the Mass. The Constitution urges the pastors and priests to assume their pastoral functions within the Church by instructing the people in the liturgy. The Council displayed a great human and evangelical concern when it asked the pastors of souls to be more concerned about the people's active participation in the liturgy than about the correct laws and rules governing liturgical practice. The clergy are to encourage the laity's participation so that the people can be enriched by the effects of the liturgy.³⁹ Even though the Council affirms the fact that the liturgy teaches the people and even though certain reforms are to be made so that the signs and rites are clearly understood, the pastors must also teach the people all things pertaining to the liturgy and its celebration.

The Constitution contains the following exhortation to

³⁸Ibid., p. 21.

³⁹Ibid., p. 13.

the pastors to teach the people to participate in the liturgy and achieve a true Christian spirit:

therefore pastors of souls must zealously strive to achieve it, by means of the necessary instruction, in all their pastoral work.⁴⁰

With zeal and patience, pastors of souls must promote the liturgical instruction of the faithful, and also their active participation in the liturgy both internally and externally, taking into account their age and condition, their way of life and standard of religious cultures⁴¹

In their instruction to inform the people about the liturgy the Council included a directive to seminary professors to teach courses in the liturgy to the men preparing for the priesthood.

Any instruction that is specifically liturgical, that is, any instruction that is to be given during the Mass itself, is to be done by the pastor or a server. The Constitution says:

Instruction which is more explicitly liturgical should also be given in a variety of ways; if necessary, short directives to be spoken by the priest or proper minister should be provided within the rites themselves. But they should occur only at the more suitable moments, and be in prescribed or similar words.⁴²

The Council's emphasis on the instruction of the seminarians and the people comes from an understanding that the liturgy is also a teaching aid for the building of the Body of Christ and their sanctification.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 15.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 17.

⁴²Ibid., p. 23.

Public worship versus private Mass

Emmanuel magazine summarizes the principles of reform which the council drafted from the communitarian and hierarchical nature of the liturgy.

From the communitarian and hierarchical nature of the liturgy, five rules have been deduced for reform of the Mass:

1. Whenever possible, the externally communitarian form, with the cooperation and participation of the faithful in the ceremonies, shall be preferred to the individual, quasi-private form.
2. Each actor in the liturgical drama shall play the entire role and only the role that belongs to him.
3. This rule holds true for servers, lectors, commentators, and scholars.
4. The active participation of the faithful must be encouraged, especially with regard to responses, acclamation, singing, and this must be noted in the rubrics.
5. In the liturgy, apart from distinction stemming from the liturgical function and from sacred orders, and apart from honors due to civil authorities by virtue of liturgical laws, there must be no favoritism shown to person or positions either in the ceremonies or in exterior solemnities.⁴³

Rule one which Emmanuel summarizes is highly significant, not only because the Council affirms here the communal nature of the liturgy and the Church, but also because attention is given to the ancient error and unhealthy practice of private masses.

⁴³"General Principles," Emmanuel, p. 108.

Special attention to private masses is given here because this practice was a source of contention during the Reformation. Frederick McManus explains how private masses are contrary to the spirit of the liturgy and the nature of the Church.

In many cases, however, the possibility of community celebration is neglected in favor of individual celebration, and this is the error against which the present article is directed.⁴⁴

Article 27 of the Constitution corrects the error of private Masses in this manner:

It is to be stressed that whenever rites, according to their specific nature, make provision for communal celebration involving the presence and active participation of the faithful, this way of celebrating them is to be preferred, so far as possible, to a celebration that is individual and quasi-private.

This applies with especial force to the celebration of Mass and the administration of the sacraments, even though every Mass has of itself a public and social nature.⁴⁵

Another reason which the Council gave for the abolition of private masses was that the "liturgical services are not private functions."⁴⁶ It is here that the Church of Rome properly understands what liturgy really is in

⁴⁴Frederick R. McManus, "Constitution on the Liturgy Commentary," Part III, Worship, XXXVIII (October 1964), 342.

⁴⁵Constitution, op. cit., p. 19.

⁴⁶Ibid.

relation to Christ. It is the public work of the people. What is even more significant about this reform is that the Roman Catholic Church has removed another serious objection which Luther raised about her practice.

In 1521 Luther wrote a Latin treatise which he called The Abrogation of the Private Mass in which he argued that private masses were the result of the so-called abomination of the sacrifice of the mass. Luther stated that the private mass was also an abomination because it was based on the idea that in it man performs a good work which affects a reconciliation between the sinner and God. Therefore, if this concept is removed the private mass means nothing. Luther was particularly opposed to the fact that no worshippers were present for the Mass. The following is an example of his attack on the private masses:

I wish, and it ought to be so, that no mass at all would be celebrated except at such times as the people were present who really desired the sacrament and asked for it, and that this would be only once a week or once a month. For the sacrament should never be celebrated except at the instigation and request of hungry souls, never because of duty, endowment, custom, ordinance, or habit. But it still is too early to begin this practice, because the conscience of the people will not follow men until it has been preached and understood better.

.....

The sixth step. The private masses, performed as sacrifices or good works, have been and are to be abolished. On this subject I have written enough in Latin. However, since nobody is to be forced to believe, one should not drag priests away from the altar if they want to hold such

masses, but let them answer for it before God. It is enough to preach against such masses and tell the people not to contribute to them and not to endow them or have them said. Through such preaching they will probably in course of time disappear of their own accord.⁴⁷

Vatican II's correction of that error of private masses demonstrates another area in which a rapprochement has taken place between the Evangelicals and the Roman Catholics. This shift in emphasis from private celebrations to the public liturgical services will enhance the participation of the people and strengthen the community life.

Diversity of rites.

Even though the Constitution recognizes the strong communal nature of the Church and the liturgy, it does not conclude that the unity of the Church and the community fostered by the Eucharist necessitates a uniform rite. In fact, for the first time since the Latin rite became the authorized norm for the parishes throughout the world, the Council desires flexibility in the rite of the Mass. The Vatican II fathers allowed for variations which would express the various national and cultural aspects of different lands and peoples to be incorporated into the liturgy of the Mass.

⁴⁷Luther, "The Misuse of the Mass," Luther's Works, p. 256-257.

Even in the liturgy, the Church has no wish to impose a rigid uniformity in matters which do not implicate the faith or the good of the whole community; rather does she respect and foster the genius and talents of the various races and peoples. Anything in these people's way of life which is not indissolubly bound up with superstition and error she studies with sympathy and, if possible, preserves intact. Sometimes in fact she admits such things into the liturgy itself, so long as they harmonize with its true and authentic spirit.

Provisions shall also be made, when revising the liturgical books, for legitimate variations and adaptations to different groups, regions, and peoples, especially in mission lands, provided the substantial unity of the Roman rite is preserved; and this should be borne in mind when drawing up the rites and devising rubrics.⁴⁸

By permitting an expression of national characteristics in the liturgy, the council has opened the way for a richness of expression for the entire Roman rite. This reform is a sign of the Council's affirmation of the catholicity (universality) of the Church and the variety which accompanies it. This shift in permitting variety in the rite has made it possible for the churches in various countries to incorporate customs, language, and folkways of the people's daily life so that the effect of this change will permit a more relevant, understandable and familiar pattern of worship for the people.

The national churches of the Roman rite will not incorporate just anything which is peculiar to that people. The

⁴⁸Constitution, op. cit., p. 25.

national characteristics or folkways must harmonize with the spirit of the liturgy and not disturb the substantial unity of the Roman rite. The basic structure and form must not be altered by the incorporation of cultural and national variations. For example, the Kyrie should not be dropped for some tribal dance or folktune which is different in intention and meaning.

James D. Crichton comments that the Church neglected the aspect of variety in worship and because of it had impoverished the liturgy. By allowing various national traditions and customs to be included in the liturgy, the Church has returned to the principle of richness of variety in the liturgy.

For far too long liturgy and life have been out of contact with one another to the almost infinite impoverishment of both. The liturgy has not been able to absorb the customs, traditions, psychological attitudes of people; and because the liturgy has become remote to the people, they have taken less and less interest in it. So one of the tasks, as it seems to me perhaps a long-term task, which the Church is now faced with is the possibility of adaptation even in those countries which might seem to be stable and strong.⁴⁹

John Mannion, American Catholic liturgical authority, indicates that the Council has completely eliminated the principle of uniformity for the liturgy and has substituted a tradition of flexibility for contemporary times and needs.

⁴⁹James D. Crichton, "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy," American Benedictine Review, XV (March 1964), 53.

In the continual adaptation to new times and needs a new tradition of flexibility (a very old tradition, really) will replace the static and unbending "uniformity which has once and for all been eliminated by the council."⁵⁰

In this principle which permits variety in liturgical forms of worship, the Constitution takes note of historical studies in the liturgy. The Council bishops recognize that the liturgy has developed from variety to uniformity; from austerity and simplicity to richness and prolixity.⁵¹ When the Council observed sound tradition and used the historical studies of the early Christian liturgy they recognized that the Early Church had great variety in their liturgical worship.⁵² In an effort to provide for a universal liturgical expression for the church, the Council restored an ancient practice in the liturgical life of the Church.

Anton Baumstark, noted liturgical scholar, indicates that the historical studies of the early Christian liturgy presented two antitheses to the liturgical commission of Vatican II. The first antithesis is that uniformity opposes variety in the liturgical life of the historic Church. The second is that austerity (simplicity) stands over against richness.

⁵⁰Sheppard, Blueprint for Worship, p. ix.

⁵¹Anton Baumstark, Comparative Liturgy (London: A. R. Mowbray and Company, Ltd., 1958), p. 19.

⁵²Ibid., p. 16.

Liturgical movement of liturgical evolution is in the direction of a more and more pronounced uniformity, the latter is quite consistent with certain local peculiarities which gave the impression of a retrograde movement.⁵³

Even though it would appear that the liturgy moved toward unification and richness, it did not tend to be more rich in character because variety was eliminated by uniformity. Richness in liturgical rites is created by variety. Now, however, as the Council sought to simplify the liturgy they prevented austerity of rite by providing flexibility and adaptation of the liturgy to the customs of various lands and various people.

During the Reformation and the century after, a great diversity of rite developed in Germany and Sweden. One of the reasons which might be given for the development of various rites was due to the political situation particularly in Germany. Each city state was an entity in itself. Whoever ruled the city or province determined the religious affiliation. If the prince or mayor sided with Luther, then the parishes of that region also became evangelical. Each of these regions began to press for changes in the Mass. As a result, each city or region began to make changes in the liturgy and create rites which met their particular needs.

⁵³Ibid., p. 17.

Another reason for the diversity of rites during the Reformation is Luther's own insistence that a rigid uniformity was not necessary.

For those who devise and ordain universal customs and orders get so wrapped up in them that they make them into dictatorial laws opposed to the freedom of faith. But those who ordain and establish nothing succeed only in creating as many factions as there are heads to the detriment of that Christian harmony and unity of which St. Paul and St. Peter so frequently write. Still, we must express ourselves on these matters as well as we can, even though everything will not be done as we say and teach that it should be.⁵⁴

Here Luther demonstrates a brilliant balance between the freedom of expression in the diversity of rites and the need for unity and harmony among Christians. Luther wanted harmony but also diversity and believed that the two were not in opposition to each other. Luther wanted to avoid the extremes of a diversity which would prevent harmony and a harmony and unity allowed no freedom of expression.

Luther stated this principle of diversity in matters of worship:

Further, even if different people make use of different rites, let no one judge or despise the others, but every man be fully persuaded in his own mind (Romans 14:5). Let us feel and think the same, even though we may act differently. And let us approve each other's rites lest schisms and sects

⁵⁴Martin Luther, "A Christian Exhortation to the Livonians Concerning Public Worship and Concord," translated by Paul Zeller Strodrach, Luther's Works, edited by Helmut T. Lehmann and Ulrich S. Leupold (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), LIII, 46.

should result from this diversity in rites-- as happened in the Roman church. For external rites, even though we cannot do without them--just as we cannot do without food or drink--do not commend us to God, even as food does not commend us to him (I Corinthians 8:8).⁵⁵

Luther's main concern was that a freedom be permitted in liturgical ceremonies and rites and that consciences not be bound by a rigid uniformity. When Luther suggested an order of worship for the Wittenberg congregation, he made it very explicit that he did not want this order followed uniformly in all of Germany.⁵⁶

As a result of the above-mentioned trends, various orders did develop within the Lutheran churches in Germany and Sweden. Different orders of service were developed by the churches in several larger German cities. There is evidence of varied forms within the Wittenberg, Brandenburg-Nuremberg, Hamburg, and Brunswick orders for worship.⁵⁷ Luther's own Deutsche Messe and Formula Missae were diverse in their rite but still uniform in their spirit. Yngve

⁵⁵Martin Luther, "An Order of Mass and Communion," translated by Paul Zeller Strodrach, Luther's Works, edited by Helmut T. Lehmann and Ulrich S. Leupold (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), LIII, 31.

⁵⁶Martin Luther, "The German Mass and Order of Service," translated by Augustus Steimle, Luther's Works, edited by Helmut T. Lehmann and Ulrich S. Leupold (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), LIII, 63.

⁵⁷Yngve Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice Evangelical and Catholic (London: S.P.C.K., 1961), pp. 125-126.

Brilioth gives an example of the diversity of rites, even of those rites which were patterned after Luther's Deutsche Messe.

In the greater part of middle and north Germany the service came to be modeled on the Duetsche Messe, with the exception that the liturgical tradition was often treated more mercifully; thus Gloria in excelsis was in use at Wittenberg itself in 1536. One series of North German Church Orders shows the influence of Bugenhagen; these show a preference for a greater fixity of usage, though a great deal of variety remains, the liturgies of Hamburg and Brunswick being simpler than the Danish, which was also Bugenhagen's work. Among the richest of Lutheran Church Orders is that of Brandenburg, 1540, a monument of the liturgical interests of Kurfurst Joachim II, and Chytraeus' Austrian liturgy of 1571, a valuable proof of the conscious effort of the later Lutheranism after a via media; and again, the liturgy of Riga, 1530, which shows the influence of the Formula Missae.⁵⁸

Although Brilioth indicates that the principle of diversity in liturgical rites was often repeated and prevented a leveling uniformity, nevertheless, he indicates that there was a tendency to bind many of the forms with legal sanctions in order to assure a proper worship.⁵⁹

When legal sanctions were imposed on the various orders, the result was that variety and richness in the rite were limited.

The Swedish Orders of Olavus and Laurentius Petri were also other variations of Lutheran type worship. The Swedish Mass did not use Luther's two orders for their development.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 126.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 125.

As a result Swedish Lutheran practices and rites vary in detail from the German. The German rites finally became more firmly fixed on Luther's two patterns. The variations in the German, Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish rites have been maintained to this day and their expression was carried to the United States. In spite of the variety and diversity of rite there is a basic common structure and as Vatican II indicated for Roman liturgies, the Lutheran rites have a unity of spirit and a harmony in authenticity.

A comparison of Lutheran principle of diversity and its expression to this day with the Constitution's principle of diversity indicates that Lutherans and Roman Catholics have identical principles governing liturgical rites for various peoples and lands. Another practice and principle which divided Rome and Wittenberg has been reconciled.

The Principle of Tradition in the Development of New Forms of Worship

Use of sound tradition

The second principle Vatican II suggested for liturgical reform of the Mass is the requirement that sound tradition should be used to decide which ancient rites should be restored and retained. Sound tradition should also guide the creation of new forms for liturgical celebration. This principle of the use of sound tradition,

like the other principles the Council formulated, is to be applied to all liturgical rites, music, architecture, the divine office, and all things pertaining to the worship of the church. The Constitution believes sound tradition will aid in contemporizing the liturgy.

The Council also desires that where necessary, the rites be revised carefully in the light of sound tradition, and that they be given new vigor to meet the circumstances and needs of modern times.⁶⁰

This first reference to the use of sound tradition is drafted from an awareness of the historic development of the liturgy. The question which must be asked is, "Does the use of tradition prohibit development or changes in the Mass?" No, this statement about the use of tradition which the Constitution makes must be considered together with other remarks on the same subject.

A question could be asked as to what the Council means by "sound tradition"? Another question could be raised as to whether the use of sound tradition allows for development and progress in the liturgy of the Mass? An answer to both inquiries is given by the Constitution's own definition.

That sound tradition may be retained, and yet the way remain open to legitimate progress, a careful investigation is always to be made into each part of the liturgy which is to be revised. This investigation should be theological, historical, and pastoral.⁶¹

⁶⁰Constitution, op. cit., p. 5.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 16.

The general laws governing the structure of the liturgy of the Mass are to be studied and revised in light of recent reforms and the exceptions to the rules. Sound tradition consists of good and wholesome practice the Church has used in the past. In order to revise a particular rite or liturgical practice in the light of tradition, that rite in question is to be analyzed. Knowledge of a rite's evolution and use is vital to its reform. The pastoral approach to the use of sound tradition asks what past liturgical practices will aid the participation of the faithful.

J. D. Crichton capsules the problem of liturgical reform when he states that the sole use of tradition will only resurrect old and meaningless rites of another era. On the other side of the problem, Crichton believes there is a danger in jettisoning ancient liturgical rites and forms which are still useful to the Church. As Crichton comments on paragraph 23 of the Constitution, he shows how the Church must give attention to the past; yet be willing to develop new forms for the present needs of the faithful.

In more than one place, the Constitution states that there are to be two principles or criteria of liturgical reform. The first may be summed up in one word, tradition, and this surely should give comfort to the timid who fear that tradition is going to be thrown out of the window: "That sound tradition may be retained, and yet the way remain open to legitimate progress, a careful investigation is always to be made into each part of the liturgy which is to be revised." This passage perfectly expresses what was the

state of affairs in an earlier age: respect for tradition and the willingness to effect such changes as the needs of the Church indicated. In the earliest days indeed the only part that was "traditional" was what Christ himself had instituted; in the case of the Mass, the simple rite of the Last Supper. To this before the end of the first century was added the ministry of the word, which was substantially the synagogue service with which the apostles and many of the early Christian were familiar.⁶²

The Council's decision to create the principle of the use of sound tradition in liturgical reform was not a political compromise. Their understanding to use tradition in the development of new rites was not just a specification of conservatives who feared progress, change, and a loss of the past. The Council fathers demonstrated that a use of the history of the Church's liturgy would help her discover a rich resource of rites and practices which could be adapted and shaped for contemporary worship. For this reason the Council insisted on the use of sound tradition in the reformation of the liturgy.

As one looks through the Constitution, it is possible to discern one or two dominant themes. The Church looks back constantly to her immensely rich past and scrutinizes the tradition, not so much to copy it but to find there the creative principles of a reformed liturgy. Then the Church looks out on to a new world into which she has so rapidly moved and shows her concern for the millions of people of many languages and cultures, some of whom have but recently

⁶²Crichton, The Church's Worship, p. 87.

come to Christ and many more of whom have still to learn about him.⁶³

Vatican II also knew that the liturgy could not be reformed in a vacuum. If the entire liturgy of the Mass were case aside, and the Council attempted to begin anew, they would have no resource to create a contemporary liturgy. The Roman Catholic liturgical scholar, H. A. Reinhold, states that tradition is the second great principle of reform after the first, the full and active participation of the faithful. When he comments on the principle of tradition he argues that the use of tradition is a must for the Church.

and secondly, the line of tradition to the original rite must be followed. Only in this fashion can the liturgy be traced back to its good clear origins, because without tradition liturgy is impossible.⁶⁴

As far as Reinhold is concerned, use of sound tradition in the reformation of the liturgy will aid the Church in finding the clear, simple outline of the Mass. The more simple and lucid the structure of the liturgy, the more it aids the people's worship. Care in the use of tradition must be exercised so that the "mystery" nature of liturgy will not be oversimplified.⁶⁵

⁶³Ibid., p. 3.

⁶⁴H. A. Reinhold, "The Mass of the Future," The Commonweal LXXX (August 21, 1964), 565.

⁶⁵H. A. Reinhold, Bringing the Mass to the People (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1960), p. 36.

The Council's concern for the use of sound tradition is not new to the liturgical movement. Pope Pius XII in his encyclical Mediator Dei called for the legitimate use of tradition in the development of the liturgy of the Mass.

In order to legitimize this relative liberty with regard to the past, the Pope appeals to the great Catholic idea of development, so magnificently stated by Newman, and shows that the transformation of what he calls the human element in the liturgy bear witness to the continuing life of the Church through the centuries, a life which is always germinating afresh. One feels that there is something of a dilemma in all this; the desire at any price to resuscitate the things of the past must be avoided, and so also must the desire to rush too hastily into new paths. The Holy See is seeking the middle way, and cautions against those who hold obstinately to a past that is beyond recall, and at the same time against innovators whose revolutionary haste accords ill with the *passé* (too slow for their liking) at which the hierarchy moves.⁶⁶

Just as the Roman Catholic Church has been conscious of her history and tradition by looking to the words of fathers, councils, and the Popes for shaping of present theology, so now, she insists that the use of sound tradition be employed to provide progress in the liturgy. It was with an understanding that the richness of the past also can shape the future, that Vatican II required that sound tradition be incorporated into present and future liturgical reform. The theology of the Church's catholicity at work can be clearly seen in this principle. As this principle is put

⁶⁶J. D. Benoit, Liturgical Renewal (London: SCM Press, 1958), p. 75.

to use in liturgical reform, the concept of catholicity becomes a living reality.

Contrary to popular opinion, Luther too believed in the use of tradition to reform the Church and, in this particular instance, the liturgy. True, Luther was against human traditions which were believed to effect forgiveness of sins or merit salvation.⁶⁷ Luther would have considered such traditions unsound and unhealthy. On the other hand, there were many ways in which Luther upheld sound tradition. The model which Luther used for the reform of the Mass was the existing Latin Mass of his time. Luther defended himself and his followers against the charge that they were abolishing the Mass by stating vehemently that he retained it.

Yngve Brilioth summarizes the way in which Luther used tradition in liturgical reform: "Those parts of the service which can be attributed to the early Fathers, Luther finds to be good and praiseworthy; likewise most of the sung portions."⁶⁸ Luther's guide for testing the liturgical tradition of his time in order to determine what should be retained and what should be discarded was the sacrifice of the Mass for the satisfaction of sins.⁶⁹

⁶⁷"Smalcald Articles," Book of Concord, translated and edited by Theodore G. Tappart (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), p. 316.

⁶⁸Yngve Brilioth, op. cit., p. 115.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 116.

Luther also was opposed violently to the kind of reform which Carlstedt had begun when he discarded most traditional patterns and symbols and had abolished the weekly mass. Luther displays his concern for sound tradition when he applied to the Order of Public Worship which he wrote for the church at Wittenberg.

The service now in common use everywhere goes back to genuine Christian beginnings, as does the office of preaching. But as the latter has been perverted by the spiritual tyrants, so the former has been corrupted by the hypocrites. As we do not on that account abolish the office of preaching, but aim to restore it again to its right and proper place, so it is not our intention to do away with the service, but to restore it again to its rightful use.⁷⁰

Again it seems clear from the foregoing statements by Vatican II and by Luther that Lutheran and Roman Catholic theology and reform of the liturgy by using tradition correctly is closely aligned.

The danger of antiquarianism

The use of tradition alone to reform the liturgy can choke the life of the church. If attention to the past is the only criteria for reform that is meant by the "use of sound tradition," then the church might slip into an idolatry of the past. Sound tradition for liturgical renewal

⁷⁰Martin Luther, "Concerning the Order of Public Worship," translated by Ulrich S. Leupold, Luther's Works, edited by Helmut T. Lehmann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), LIII, 11.

is to be used carefully so that the liturgy does not become an artifact:

The history of the reform of worship in the Reformation are should warn us that sudden and radical restoration of idealized past usages and norms do not revitalize liturgical life. If too drastic, they may impoverish it. Liturgical reform must develop from within a contemporary, living practice, however, inadequate it may appear to the idealist and the scholar. It must work like leaven. It is, I believe, a fair judgment to say that the Anglican and some of the Lutheran reforms of worship in the sixteenth century have proved the more successful because of their more conservative character. They worked within the framework of the living liturgy of their time. The Churches that broke more radically with this tradition and suddenly introduced forms of corporate worship based upon the supposed practices of primitive Christian times, conceived as the ideal age of the Church's history, came near to losing all sense of liturgical worship altogether.⁷¹

As the above quote suggests, when the Church returns to the early Christian period to discover the best liturgical tradition because she sees this pristine period as the most valid and authentic form, then she has failed to fully take note of all her tradition and rich development through the ages. The Church becomes poor and sickly, particularly in her liturgy, when she idolizes the early Christian era as the determinitive age for liturgical reform. The Council was aware of this danger from the errors of the early days of the liturgical movement. Vatican II would not support the antiquarian principle of reform. Although there is no

⁷¹Benoit, op. cit., p. 28.

explicit statement, the Council affirmed its own tradition when it called for legitimate progress and development. In this way, the Council implied a warning against archaeologism or antiquarianism as Pius XII had done earlier.

But the Pope attacks exaggerated attachment to ancient rites. "The liturgy of the early ages," he says, "is worthy of veneration; but an ancient custom is not to be considered better . . . just because it has the flavor of antiquity!"⁷²

The Reformed theologian and liturgical scholar from the Taize community in France, Max Thurian, summarizes the intention of the Council to prevent worship of the past.

Formerly, the liturgical movement favored re-introducing some of these obsolete elements, for the sole reason that they formed part of the liturgical tradition. Today, the liturgical movement acts in the opposite way. The Church must no longer give the impression of being a museum in which venerable relics of the past are preserved. But it must preserve those treasures of its heritage which still retain their full theological and symbolical meaning.⁷³

Koenker agrees with Thurian at this point by indicating that the liturgical movement was accused of antiquarianism because it promoted certain rites, practices, and customs of the early Christian Church.⁷⁴ There was more concern with ritual than with meaning. This ritualism was the

⁷²Ibid., p. 74.

⁷³Max Thurian, "The Present Aims of the Liturgical Movement," Studia Liturgica, III (Autumn 1964), 120.

⁷⁴Ernest Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954), p. 81.

miscalculation of the early liturgical reformers.

Vatican II sought to avoid attaching itself to primitive forms of worship simply because they were old or more authentic as first forms used by the Church. However, neither did the Council ignore the ancient Christian forms of worship. The Council called for an investigation of these ancient forms as a resource for the creation of contemporary liturgical rites.⁷⁵ The Council takes the position of Pius XII in saying that the present rites of the liturgy of the Mass were worthy of praise and veneration.⁷⁶ The present form of liturgy is to serve as the basic structure for revision. As the liturgy is revised the Constitution requires that any liturgical reform must take into consideration the present laws governing the liturgy, recent reforms, and indults granted to various regions.⁷⁷

J. D. Crichton comments on the principle of sound tradition and explains how the Council escapes the danger of archaicism.

Another section of the chapter on general liturgical principles deals with an equally vital matter: liturgical reform. The Latin word used is instauratio, which can mean restoration, renewal, and the like. It does not mean--as it has not meant in the recent decades of liturgical reform, beginning with St. Pius--restoration of things past or any kind of archeological revival.

⁷⁵Constitution, op. cit., p. 19.

⁷⁶Pius XII, Mediator Dei (New York: The America Press, 1961), p. 61.

⁷⁷Constitution, op. cit., p. 19.

Rather it means re-assessment and accommodation to present needs of the praying people of God; it means development and progress, the very aggiornamento which Pope John has indicated as the scope of Vatican Council II.⁷⁸

So, the Council has sought to take a middle way, observing sound tradition, yet avoiding the archaeologism of the past. The need for the use of sound tradition is great in reforming the liturgy. The Constitution explains why:

With the passage of time, however, there have crept into the rites of the sacraments and sacramental certain features which have rendered their nature and purpose far from clear to the people of today; hence some changes have become necessary to adapt them to the needs of our own times.⁷⁹

This is an unprecedented admission on the part of the Roman Communion. Here Rome admits that unsound tradition has a way of creeping into the practices of the Church. This is the reason the Church is in need of constant renewal. Vatican II knew and admitted the need for reform and did something about it.

If the Church does not renew itself periodically, the liturgy of the Mass and every aspect of the church are distorted if unwatched.⁸⁰ Although the Church must give consideration to sound tradition, if their are weighty

⁷⁸James D. Crichton, "The General Council and Liturgical Reform," Clergy Review, LXCII (June 1962), 336.

⁷⁹Constitution, op. cit., p. 37.

⁸⁰H. A. Reinhold, "No Time to Stop," Commonweal, LXXXII (August 20, 1965), 583.

considerations to advise change, then tradition should be set aside.⁸¹ Unsound, distorted, and whimsical traditions are the Council's reasons for change and deletion.

Points of agreement have been demonstrated between the Lutheran Reformation and the reformation of Rome at Vatican II. When the Vatican II's principle of sound tradition, which warns against a veneration of that past tradition, is compared to Luther's reforms of the liturgy, it appears that Luther was guilty of archaistic tendencies. Luther concurred with the statement in the Smalcald Articles: "The sacrament can be had in a far better and more blessed manner--indeed, the only blessed manner--according to the institution of Christ."⁸² Even though Luther agreed to this statement as a signer of the Smalcald Articles, he did not put this practice into effect in his liturgical reformation. This archaeological view of the liturgy and ceremony was applied to the canon of the Mass. Luther stripped the canon to the essential form as Christ had spoken it when he instituted the Lord's Supper.

On the other hand, Luther was not dogmatic in his antiquarianism. Due to his greater concern for freedom under the gospel, he left a more flexible heritage of liturgical reform.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 17.

⁸²"Smalcald Articles," op. cit., p. 3.

Traditional forms of worship must never be allowed to master Christians or Christian communities. "They must remain subject to us and serve us where, how and as long as they appear to us to be useful and serviceable, for even the Sabbath, as the Lord said, was made for man and not man for the Sabbath."⁸³

Luther took a functional approach in this matter and so the charge that his liturgical reforms were absolutely anti-quarian does not hold for all of his liturgical principles:

It is further typical of Luther, that while he here enunciated the most radical liturgical principle which he ever uttered: "the closer any mass approaches to the first of all masses, which Christ celebrated at the supper, the more Christian it is," he refuses to draw the practical consequences. In truth the Church's traditional manner of celebrating the service has a value which Luther would have been first to miss.⁸⁴

Some liturgical scholars agree that Lutherans narrowly missed a very dogmatic and austere experience with the liturgical reforms of Luther. The Lutheran liturgical reformers noted the potential problems of Luther's position on early Christian rites and sought to keep his principle from emptying the rich heritage of the ages. Because of their caution, a rich liturgical heritage was preserved for future liturgical construction.

⁸³Theodore G. Tappert, "Meaning and Practice in the Reformation," Meaning and Practice of the Lord's Supper, edited by Helmut T. Lehmann, (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961), p. 96.

⁸⁴Brilioth, op. cit., p. 102.

Omission of unsound traditions and useless repetitions in the Mass

In a program of renewal, the church weeds out the unsound traditions. She can do this only as she goes back in her history and discovers where there have been cumulations, repetitions, additions and unnecessary elements and practices added to the liturgy. H. A. Reinhold gives an example of how the Church tends to add superfluous material over the years, especially in the liturgy.

There is a tendency to cumulation, to heap prayer on prayer as in the present Offertory, and in the blessing of ashes . . . and so to obscure the essential outlines of the Mass until they have become unrecognizable; these excrescences should be eliminated.⁸⁵

Many of the rites were overloaded which made the community prayer and worship more difficult. Most additions to the liturgy were to create splendor and solemnity. Many of the chants became symphonic and the words were submerged by the melodies. By the fifth century, the rites or the sacraments and the liturgy of the Mass were already inflated and distorted. For example, the names of the living, the diptychs, were inserted before the consecration in the canon of the Mass. The role of the community was given to the priest.⁸⁶

⁸⁵Reinhold, Bringing the Mass to the People, p. 36.

⁸⁶Marshall P. Romey and Michael J. Taylor, Liturgy and Christian Unity (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 110.

Besides additions and repetitions which eased into the liturgy of the Mass, some of the rites, ceremonies and parts of the prayers became so fossilized that they needed endless explanation to be understood. Such accretions have escaped the numerous reforms until 1963. As a result, the liturgical rites and the liturgy of the Mass were in need of reform.⁸⁷ Because of all these repetitions and additions the Council sought not only to reform but also to use the principle of sound tradition to peel away the many layers of cultural debris that had made the liturgy meaningless, unintelligible, and obsolete.⁸⁸ Since the Council fathers considered the full and active participation of the faithful in the Mass their basic goal and principle of reform, they had to make it possible to find rites, forms, and the structure of the liturgy which would be meaningful again.

Vatican II desired not to restore only primitive rites which would present progression of the liturgy in the future. Therefore, knowing that traditions make rites complex, the Council had to find a solution which would give simplicity to the liturgy yet preserve developments of the past. They had to discover meaningful forms of worship and yet avoid the elevation of primitive forms of the

⁸⁷Sheppard, Blueprint for Worship, p. 36.

⁸⁸Mary Perkins Ryan, "Why the Liturgy Must be Reform?," The Catholic Messenger, LXXX (November 1, 1962), 10.

liturgy over later forms the 1951 Liturgical Congress at Maria Laach had suggested.⁸⁹

All duplications ought to be eliminated: that is, the celebrant himself ought not be obliged to recite the scriptural lessons read by a Reader, nor the proper parts sung by the choir or the ordinary parts sung by the congregation.⁹⁰

The Constitution concurs with the theme of Maria Laach and makes suggestions on how the liturgy might be simplified by the deletion of repetitions and accretions without becoming archaic.

The rites should be distinguished by a noble simplicity; they should be short, clear, and unencumbered by useless repetitions; they should be within the people's powers of comprehension, and normally should not require much explanation.⁹¹

Again in Chapter II, the Council states:

The rite of the Mass is to be revised in such a way that the intrinsic nature and purpose of its several parts, as also the connection between them, may be more clearly manifested, and that devout and active participation by the faithful may be more easily achieved.

For this purpose the rites are to be simplified, due care being taken to preserve their substance; elements which with the passage of time, came to be duplicated, or were added with but little advantage, are now to be discarded; other elements which have suffered injury through accidents of history are now to be restored to the vigor which they had

⁸⁹Cf. infra, Appendix.

⁹⁰Murphy, op. cit., p. 211.

⁹¹Constitution, op. cit., p. 23.

in the days of the holy Fathers, as may seem useful or necessary.⁹²

In order to accomplish the goals of clarity, simplicity and sound tradition, the Council required all duplications or meaningless additions to be abolished. This means that the liturgical commissions, charged with liturgical revision for each country, will have to consider sound tradition, the history of liturgical development and finally exercise critical judgment in order to delete those elements which are repetitious and superfluous to the meaning and structure of the liturgy. This method will simplify the liturgy and yet retain its substance.

Reinhold suggests that the Council's principle to eliminate useless repetitions and additions in the liturgy means:

Empty and now meaningless rites, excessive allegorism, wordiness, and foreign elements should be eliminated. The structural lines and the main points of emphasis should be unmistakable; an instructed and believing Christian should no longer be confused, for instance, by such details as the almost inexplicable rite with the empty paten after the Pater Noster or by similar archaic remnants.⁹³

Luther too advocated the principle of purifying the liturgy of the Church by abolishing the accretions which distorted its truth and authenticity.

⁹²Ibid., p. 31.

⁹³Reinhold, Bringing the Mass to the People, p. 37.

We therefore first assert: It is not nor ever has been our intention to abolish the liturgical service of God completely, but rather to purify the one that is now in use from the wretched accretions which corrupt it and to point out an evangelical use.⁹⁴

The principle which Luther advocated at the reformation was a good one, but as Brilioth indicates, Luther did not carry the reform far enough. Only those things which "smacked of sacrifice," which Luther viewed as human additions were deleted from the Mass.⁹⁵

Restoration of ancient parts of the Mass

Although some parts of the liturgy of the Mass are to be discarded because they are useless additions or repetitions, other ancient parts of the liturgy are to be restored. Ancient liturgical forms and practices are not necessarily bad because they are old. On the other hand, some ancient forms of the liturgy are not necessarily good just because they carry the aroma of antiquity. The Constitution calls for the restoration of certain forms of the ancient liturgy. This is the criteria:

Other elements which have suffered injury through accidents of history are not to be restored to the vigor which they had in the days of the holy Fathers, as may seem useful and necessary.⁹⁶

⁹⁴Luther, "An Order of Mass and Communion," Luther's Works, p. 20.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 26.

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 31.

Forms and practices of the liturgy which fell into disuse by neglect or accident should be restored.

Another criterion by which ancient parts of the liturgy are to be restored is the full and active participation of the faithful in the Mass. The more primitive forms which were neglected through the centuries are to be restored if they aid the people in their participation in the liturgy.⁹⁷ Pope John XXIII also contended that a restoration of primitive forms should serve the needs of the people. J. C. Crichton quotes the Holy Father from an issue of Osservatore Romano.

The sacred rites of the liturgy should be restored to their primitive splendour and that thereby the genuine piety of the faithful should be aroused and so they should be led on to acquiring the spiritual perfection and holiness demanded by the Gospel.⁹⁸

But the question could be raised, "How are 'ancient,' 'venerable,' and 'splendorous' rites of primitive usage to be evaluated as useful for the people's participation?" The Constitution itself set the general norms by which ancient parts are to be restored. "A careful investigation is always to be made into each part of the liturgy which is to be revised."⁹⁹ The Constitution calls for the use of

⁹⁷Ibid.

⁹⁸Crichton, "The General Council and Liturgical Reform," Clergy Review, p. 333.

⁹⁹Constitution, p. 17.

the general laws governing the structure and meaning of the liturgy in connection with reforms which have already been permitted.

J. D. Crichton summarizes the two ways of restoring ancient forms of the liturgy.

It is the considered opinion of liturgists, both scholars and pastoral clergy, that these are the two principles that will guide future liturgical development. . . . They are that the liturgy of the church will be restored to what, so far as our sources take us, was once its original shape; and secondly, that this will be done with the needs of the people always in mind.¹⁰⁰

The above two principles are drawn directly from the Constitution as stated and quoted in paragraph 23 and 50.¹⁰¹ When all these rules for restoration of parts of the liturgy are used, then legitimate use of primitive forms can begin. The critical tools for restoration of ancient forms are the laws governing the structure and meaning of the liturgy, the use of original sources, careful investigation of the historical theological and pastoral implications of the specific part of the liturgy in question. Any part which is to be restored should be consistent with the pattern discovered by the above methods of research.

There is already a clear indication of the direction in which the Church is moving in restoring some parts of

¹⁰⁰Crichton, "The General Council and Liturgical Reform," Clergy Review, p. 333.

¹⁰¹Constitution, op. cit., pp. 17, 31.

the liturgy as part of the whole reform of the Mass.

It is, however, in the reforms of the Holy Week liturgy that we have the clearest indication of the direction in which the Church is likely to move. Once again, without going into details, we may say that two principles are apparent: 1) the rites of Holy Week have been restored broadly to what they once were--that is, there has been a return to tradition; 2) it has, however, not been a merely archaeological restoration--the Church has made certain changes, and not least in the hours these rites may be performed, so that the people may take a greater and more intelligent part in them.¹⁰²

Vatican II has solved the dilemma of liturgical renewal by requiring these two principles to operate simultaneously. The principle of sound investigation of the historical development of the liturgy, the use of sound tradition and the restoration of those liturgical rites which are in harmony with the intrinsic nature of the liturgy will assure the Church that the substance and truth of the liturgy will be maintained. The principle of active participation of the faithful must work in tandem with the principle of using sound tradition in restoring ancient liturgical forms. The restoration of an ancient form may be consistent with the spirit and form of the liturgy but it may not be relevant or meet the needs of the people. Both principles exercised jointly by liturgical reformers can assure the Church of a liturgy which will be

¹⁰²Crichton, "The General Council and Liturgical Reform," Clergy Review, p. 332.

progressively contemporary, meet the needs of the people without losing the substance, truth and beauty of the ancient liturgy.

Innovation, fabrication for the occasion and development of the liturgy.

The Council has made it clear that any revision of the liturgy is to be faithful to sound tradition without excessive adoration of ancient forms. Furthermore, all repetitious rites and useless additions should be eliminated. Certain ancient forms which aid the liturgical participation of the people and which are consistent with Church laws governing the liturgy are to be restored. The Council also adds to the use of sound tradition the principle that any innovation of fabrication for the occasion of the liturgy is prohibited.

Finally, there must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them; and care must be taken that any new form adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing.¹⁰³

Crichton comments that this rule means that reforms should not "come off the top of the head" nor should there be reforms for frivolous reasons.¹⁰⁴

This rule is intended to preserve good and sound tradition of liturgical elements of the past centuries. This

¹⁰³Constitution, op. cit., p. 19.

¹⁰⁴Crichton, The Church's Worship, p. 94.

principle prevents any indiscriminate jettisoning of good liturgical forms which enable participation of the people.¹⁰⁷ The Council's cautioning against innovation is designed to keep out elements which would be foreign to the nature, meaning and structure of the liturgy. This rule is in keeping with the Sacred Congregation of Rites established in 1588 to defend the legitimate rites of the Church and revoke any spurious innovations.¹⁰⁵

The Constitution does not permit entirely new rites or forms of worship to be incorporated into the liturgy of the Mass. As stated by Frederick McManus: "In other words, the reform does not envision the creation of entirely new rites merely because they seem to satisfy the needs of the present time."¹⁰⁶ When the principle of anti-innovation is considered alone, a tension is created between this principle and the needs of the people. The Constitution is determined to meet the needs of the people in the present day and yet be faithful to the development of the liturgy in the past. Forms, rites, prayers and responses designed just for one celebration of the Mass may meet the needs of the people, but may be unfaithful to the historic development of the liturgy. So the Constitution has carefully qualified this "no innovation" principle by adding the

¹⁰⁵Pius XII, op. cit., p. 34.

¹⁰⁶McManus, "Constitution on the Liturgy Commentary," Worship, p. 339.

words "unless the good of the Church genuinely requires them" new forms must grow organically from existing forms.¹⁰⁷

McManus comments that this rule is justified by the attention it gives the richness of past developments. It also guarantees a better evolution of the liturgy for the future.¹⁰⁸ In this rule the whole problem of liturgical reform is enunciated. Both poles of the tension are stated within the rule. On the one side the needs of the people are to be met. On the other side, strong attention is given to historical forms of the liturgy. The rule takes both into consideration and seeks to resolve the tension. McManus explains how the problem is solved:

Not for a moment may the needs of the twentieth century Church dictate an abandonment of legitimate inherited usages. As new forms are sought, they are often enough found by returning to the best years of the Roman liturgy, merely by purging it of accretions and accumulation. Again, what is necessary to accommodate the liturgy to our times--must harmonize with the best features of our liturgical inheritance.¹⁰⁹

Progressive development of the liturgy must be an organic development. Any new liturgical rite which is adopted is to grow organically from existing forms of the liturgy. This principle also solves the dilemma which

¹⁰⁷Constitution, op. cit., p. 19.

¹⁰⁸McManus, "Constitution on the Liturgy Commentary," Worship, p. 340.

¹⁰⁹Frederick R. McManus, "Liturgy," The Critic, XXI (August-September 1962), 25.

liturgical reform faces. It allows the Church to create a liturgy which will meet the needs of modern people without radical innovation or neglect of present forms which are useful and meaningful. The Constitution itself has the problem of adapting the liturgy to the present age without losing the elements of the past is resolved also with this second reform. Here the Council also allowed for responsible experimentation and new liturgical forms and practices. But, these new forms are to serve the people and grow out of existing rites. This principle recognizes the past evolution of the liturgy and assures its continued evolution.

Charles Davis describes how the evolutionary process has a directive principle.

A long and complicated evolution lies behind the present shape of our liturgy. Was there any directive principle? Is there any key factor that explains the creation of new liturgical forms and the many changes in liturgical rites? Historical studies provide a clear answer. The inner directing force of liturgical development through the centuries has been the pastoral concern of the Church and its unceasing endeavour to fulfill its pastoral charge in the liturgy.¹¹⁰

This inner directing force of liturgical evolution is perpetuated through the principle of organic development.

This principle that new forms of liturgy must develop organically from existing forms is somewhat parallel with

¹¹⁰ Charles Davis, Liturgy and Doctrine (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960), p. 13.

principle the Lutheran reformers practiced in liturgical revision. When Luther began writing Orders of Worship for the people's use, he used the existing Latin Mass.¹¹¹

Luther believed the mass had sound Christian origins but had been perverted.¹¹² Massey Shepherd supports the contention that Luther based his reforms on existing rites:

It is, I believe, a fair judgment to say that . . . some of the Lutheran reforms of worship in the sixteenth century have proved the more successful because of their more conservative character. They worked within the framework of the living liturgy of their time.¹¹³

Yngve Brilioth states how the Lutheran reformers, particularly Luther, used the principle of organic development in the reform of the liturgy.

but (he) has refrained from drastic changes continually hesitating, partly for fear of harming the weaker brethren, who ought not to be wrenched away violently from the old form of service, partly by reason of the "frivolous and presumptuous spirits, who rush forward like unclean swine, having no faith and no understanding, who delight in novelty for its own sake, and are disgusted when the novelty ceases." Yet he now believes the time to be ripe for a serious

¹¹¹Ulrich S. Leopold and Helmut T. Lehmann, editors, "Introduction to Liturgy and Hymns," Vol. LIII of Luther's Works (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), p. xiv.

¹¹²Luther, "Concerning the Order of Public Worship," Luther's Works, p. 11.

¹¹³Massey Shepherd, Jr., "History of the Liturgical Renewal," The Liturgical Renewal of the Church, edited by Massey Shepherd (New York: Oxford Press, 1960), p. 28.

attempt to create new forms; not indeed that it was ever his intention to cast aside the old service, but only to cleanse it from its worst accretions and show how it can serve to edification.¹¹⁴

Luther's reform of the liturgy in the sixteenth century was more an attempt to restore old forms rather than create new ones. However, the principle for the creation of new rites based on existing liturgical forms is present in Luther's works. Luther's Deutsche Messe approaches this principle in part. Luther viewed the perversions of the past as innovations contrary to the spirit of the liturgy. He also rebuked Carlstadt for his iconoclastic innovations.¹¹⁵ Herein lies another similarity between the Lutheran and Roman Catholic principles of liturgical reform. Sound tradition is preserved by refraining from innovation and by creating new forms from existing ones.¹¹⁶

In the Council's concern to provide new liturgical forms they stated that future development must take place on the basis of the principle of the scriptures. Development of new rites by the Roman Church will also take into consideration the Eastern Rites of the Church.

Thus to achieve the restoration, progress, and adaptation of the sacred liturgy, it is essential to promote that warm and living love for scripture to which the venerable

¹¹⁴Brilioth, op. cit., p. 115.

¹¹⁵Supra, p. 181.

¹¹⁶Constitution, op. cit., p. 19.

tradition of both eastern and western rites give testimony.¹¹⁷

The variations of the many cultures, nations, and peoples within the Roman Catholic Church are also important to future liturgical evolution.

Provisions shall also be made, when revising the liturgical books, for legitimate variations and adaptation to different groups, regions, and peoples, especially in mission lands.¹¹⁸

All this development is to be guided organically in order to preserve the substantial unity of the Roman rite.

Mutable and immutable elements of the liturgy

Any restoration, adaptation, elimination of superfluous rites or creation of new forms on the basis of existing forms all must seek to maintain the intrinsic nature of the liturgy. Special distinction should be made between the changeable and unchangeable parts of the liturgy.

Holy Mother Church desires to undertake with great care a general restoration of the liturgy itself. For the liturgy is made up of immutable elements divinely instituted, and of elements subject to change.¹¹⁹

The elements of the liturgy which are subject to change may and ought to be changed. The elements subject to evolution should be revised; particularly if any elements not in harmony with the liturgy's nature have made an intrusion into

¹¹⁷Ibid.

¹¹⁸Ibid., p. 25.

¹¹⁹Ibid., p. 17.

the liturgy.¹²⁰ The elements which are not subject to change are those that are ordained by God. Other elements which can be changed are human elements. Lancelot Sheppard explains these two elements of the liturgy:

It is not, of course, the essentials which will suffer change, for they are the divine part of worship and immutable, but the human part, those things which have gradually developed hand in hand with human conditions with the social evolution of mankind, or else . . . have not developed and are now out of tune with the minds of men today.¹²¹

Sheppard thinks that the immutable elements of the liturgy do not change because they are divinely instituted.

Criteria are needed to determine these elements in the liturgy. The only criterion which the Constitution uses to determine changeable and unchangeable elements in the liturgy is that the unchangeable elements are those which are divinely instituted. Eugene Brand, writing for Una Sancta, a Lutheran liturgical periodical, on "Forms and Norms" makes the distinction between primary and secondary elements. His definition is helpful in understanding what the Constitution means by divine immutable elements and human elements which are subject to change. Brand explains that the primary forms of liturgy are the essential elements of the service such as the teaching, proclamation of the

¹²⁰Ibid.

¹²¹Sheppard, Blueprint for Worship, p. xxvi.

Gospel in three forms (the sermon, absolution, blessing) and the celebration of the Eucharist.¹²²

The distinction between the divine and human elements of the liturgy is not specific in the Constitution. John La Farge states that it takes a great amount of study to determine what elements belong to the essence of the liturgy and which do not.

Much patient exposition is required to distinguish between those elements in our worship that are permanent and unchanging, that belong to its very essence, and those which are mere accidents of a given culture or social structure at a given epoch.¹²³

As noted earlier, the liturgy developed historically. Any revisions of the changeable parts of the liturgy must also be guided by the principle of historical investigation.¹²⁴ Marshall Romey explains how historical studies can aid in determining the mutable and immutable elements in the liturgy.

It is sufficient to note that the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries saw the beginning of studies which when brought to a more fruitful development in our time were to provide a scholarly and traditional base for the present liturgical movement; the reference here of course is to the renewal of historical inquiries, patristic and liturgical studies, which were to reveal the permanent

¹²²Eugene L. Brand, "Forms and Norms," Una Sancta, XIX (St. Michael and All Angels, 1962), 7.

¹²³John La Farge, "Progress and Rhythm in the Liturgical Movement," Liturgy for the People, edited by William J. Leonard (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1963), p. 2.

¹²⁴Constitution, op. cit., p. 19.

factors that underlie the liturgy, allowing us to discern the passing pastoral from the permanently pastoral. In these studies, the Church came to see that the substantive elements of the Mass were always retained, but in their retention were adapted to the mentality and culture of the time; a static permanency of expression was not a virtue at all but a frustration really of the living and growing nature of the Church and its worship.¹²⁵

As Romey indicates, historical and patristic studies will give liturgical reformers the criteria for the immutable elements and mutable elements for the liturgy and help them to distinguish the two in the present liturgy.

At the Reformation, Luther used a similar kind of distinction between the changeable and unchangeable elements in the liturgy. For Luther and the shapers of the Lutheran confessions, liturgical ceremonies were matters of indifference. They were of human tradition and added nothing to salvation.¹²⁶ However, Luther did not therefore abolish them because they were human traditions. He indicated that ceremonies of the rite are necessary to worship just as food and drink is to life.¹²⁷ The Lutheran Confessions also supported Luther's view by stating that ceremonies or church usages were neither commanded or forbidden by God

¹²⁵Romey and Taylor, op. cit., p. 125.

¹²⁶Martin Luther, "A Christian Exhortation to the Livonians Concerning Public Worship and Concord," Luther's Works, p. 31.

¹²⁷Martin Luther, "An Order of Mass and Communion," Luther's Works, p. 31.

but are introduced for the sake of good order and the welfare of the people.¹²⁸ Therefore, these elements which have no divine connection or institution may be changed by the community of God.¹²⁹

The Word of God was the divine and immutable element in the liturgy. The Formula of Concord expressed the concern that any rite or ceremony which is used in the Divine Service must express true doctrine, that is proclaim the Word of God.¹³⁰ Another immutable element which Luther held was divinely instituted was Holy Communion.¹³¹ Brilioth indicates also that Luther believed that communion was essential to the Mass.¹³²

Vatican II and the Lutheran Reformation are in agreement on the general idea of the two basic elements which can be distinguished in the liturgy. The two churches stand together on this principle of reform even though each church might interpret the mutable and immutable elements differently. Roman Catholics would contend that the Canon

¹²⁸"Formula of Concord Epitome," Article X, Book of Concord, edited by Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), p. 493.

¹²⁹Ibid.

¹³⁰"Formula of Concord," Solid Art. X, Declaration, Book of Concord (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), p. 612.

¹³¹Martin Luther, "An Order of Mass and Communion," Luther's Works, p. 20.

¹³²Brilioth, op. cit., p. 102.

of the Mass would be an immutable element while Luther would concede only the Words of Institution in the Canon as immutable.

The Constitution does not argue that the immutable, divinely instituted elements have not been changed by history or men. Nor does the Council state that the divine elements have escaped abuse. The Constitution simply states that the God given elements of the liturgy should not be revised.¹³³ The rites and ceremonies which convey the divine elements of the liturgy may and ought to be changed particularly if they have been abused or have ceased to be in harmony with the essential, divine nature of the liturgy.¹³⁴

In all the revisions, restorations, and eliminations of meaningless rites, the Constitution's main concern is to preserve the substance of the liturgy. The intrinsic nature and purpose of the rites of the Mass and their interconnections are to be maintained so that the faithful may take a more active part in the liturgy.¹³⁵

¹³³Constitution, op. cit., p. 17.

¹³⁴Ibid.

¹³⁵Crichton, The Church's Worship, p. 137.

The Principle of Intelligibility

Simplicity and clarity of rite

All revisions, restorations and eliminations of unnecessary parts of the liturgy are to be implemented in order to simplify the liturgy so that the faithful can find meaningful participation, as the Constitution suggests. Complex rites, repetitious ceremonies, and prayers confuse the people. The rites must be so intelligible that the faithful can easily understand them.

The rites should be distinguished by a noble simplicity; they should be short, clear, and unencumbered by useless repetition; they should be within the people's powers of comprehension, and normally should not require much explanation.¹³⁶

The assumption is that the people need to understand their actions in the liturgy in order to participate in it. One aid to the faithful's comprehension of the liturgy is to make the rites as clean-cut and nobly simple as possible.

People who are not members of the Church are straightforward and to the point, despise sham and pretense or anything that is insincere. Outsiders look for patterns in life that are understandable and meaningful and therefore expect the same from the Church.¹³⁷ However, the Constitution

¹³⁶Ibid., p. 23.

¹³⁷Crichton, "The General Council and Liturgical Reform," Clergy Review, p. 330.

declares that their reason for creating clarity in the liturgy is to help the faithful who celebrate the liturgy. On the other hand, Crichton addresses his remark to the image that the Church projects to the people outside her community. Critic Crichton believes that the liturgy ought to be revised in such a way that it should also be attractive to those on the outside of liturgical life of the Church so that any insincerity or pretense does not repel them from joining the community of the faithful.

There is a fear among some liturgical scholars that the principle of intelligibility for the reform of the liturgy will not be used to the fullest extent. A radical application of the principle is necessary in order to assist people in an intelligent meaningful celebration. The present Roman rite is designed for use in monasteries and large cathedrals. This rite must be designed for the average lay-person in the smaller parishes, otherwise all talk of reform will be in vain.¹³⁸ National liturgical commissions and liturgical apostolates of the Roman Catholic Church are authorized to implement the principle of intelligibility. The Vatican fathers contend that liturgical reform is to take place, it must be accomplished by these authorized groups.

¹³⁸Ibid., p. 51.

The rite of the Mass is to be revised so that the rite is simplified and yet its substance is preserved.¹³⁹ Simplicity does not imply shallowness, simpleness or lack of meaning. Liturgical rites which have suffered obscurity through useless additions and duplications, archaic language and use through the centuries are to be simplified by peeling back cultural layers. H. A. Reinhold commenting on this aspect of liturgical reform indicates the specific rites which have suffered cultural cumulation and needing revision.

There is a tendency to cumulation, to heap prayer on prayer as in the present Offertory, and in the blessing of ashes . . . and so to obscure the essential outlines of the Mass until they have become unrecognizable; these excrescences should be eliminated.¹⁴⁰

Ancient rites which tend to have a greater simplicity and a clarity, but have suffered through disuse are to be restored to aid the clarity and simplicity of the entire liturgy.¹⁴¹

The use of sign in the liturgy

In order to promote the perception of the faithful's liturgical celebration of the Mass, the Council proposed

¹³⁹Ibid., p. 31.

¹⁴⁰H. A. Reinhold, Bringing the Mass to the People, p. 36.

¹⁴¹Ibid., p. 31.

that a clear noticeable connection be made between the rite and that which it signifies.

In this restoration, both texts and rites should be drawn up so that they express more clearly the holy things which they signify; the Christian people, so far as possible, should be enabled to understand them with ease and to take part in them fully, actively, and as befits a community.¹⁴²

The texts and rites of the Mass are in themselves signs which point to realities and meanings of the Christian faith. These signs are to be revised in such a way that they clearly express the sacred things they signify. (The meaning of sign here also includes symbols.)

Cardinal Vagagginni believes that this concept is the heart of the scheme because it deals with the signs of liturgy and seeks to reform them.

This brings us to the heart of the scheme on the liturgy. The liturgy is a complexus of signs. To fulfill well the demands of their nature, it is essential that these signs signify in such a way that people may easily get their meaning, and so participate fully in the celebration of the supernatural realities which these signs both signify and shadow. This principle is basic for all liturgical reform.¹⁴³

The Cardinal raises a crucial question with his statement because the liturgy contains many signs. They point beyond themselves to deeper realities of the Christian faith. The Cardinal implies that a basic reform of the

¹⁴²Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁴³C. Vagagginni, "The Approved Chapter One," Worship, XXXVII (February 1963), 158.

liturgy is needed in this area above all others. Symbols of the liturgy should point clearly to the realities which they signify. In this area, many liturgical scholars agree that liturgical signs need to be constructed so that twentieth century people find them familiar, a part of their life, and meaningful.

The principle of intelligibility of signs will allow changing ancient signs which are not meaningful. However, revision of the signs need to safeguard the substance which they convey. Not only should the signs of the liturgy, the rites and texts say what they mean, but the substance of the signs must be communicated to the people clearly also.¹⁴⁴ If symbolism and sign are to be kept in the twentieth century liturgy, then they are to be meaningful to people, otherwise such signs and symbols have to rationale at all.¹⁴⁵

If the liturgy is composed of signs in the texts and rite of the liturgy itself, then they are to be simplified, adapted, and interrelated.¹⁴⁶ The signs can be changed and adapted to any culture and to any age as long as the substance is maintained and as long as the signs point to the sacred realities they represent.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴Constitution, op. cit., p. 31.

¹⁴⁵Crichton, The Church's Worship, p. 91.

¹⁴⁶Constitution, op. cit., p. 31.

¹⁴⁷Ibid.

The principle that signs and symbols of the liturgy point clearly to the sacred realities they represent is important because it is through these signs that God has chosen to communicate himself. This is the second and deeper meaning of sign as distinguished from symbol. The signs are the means whereby the divine discloses himself to men. Signs including words are sacraments, that is, they are related to sacred things.

Nothing is more basic than that God communicates himself to men through signs, through external, visible, sensible things and through the words of His representatives or prophets. And these, whether words or things, or words and things in combination, are sacraments in the widest sense. Sacraments are sacred signs, signs of holy things, or in the last analysis, manifestations of the divine.¹⁴⁸

The signs of the liturgy also are the channels by which the people respond to God.

The liturgy teaches through its celebration and through the signs, words, deeds and material things, by which it expresses the worship of God and the sanctification of God's people.¹⁴⁹

If these functions of the signs and symbols in the liturgy are to be authentic, then they are to speak for themselves. They should speak in a way that modern man can respond to them intelligently, and with his total person. The Council

¹⁴⁸Maur Burbach, "Liturgy and Theology," The Revival of the Liturgy, edited by Frederick R. McManus (New York: Herder and Herder, 1963), p. 37.

¹⁴⁹McManus, "Constitution on the Liturgy Commentary," Worship, p. 346.

has constructed another principle to make sure that liturgical signs can be changed in order to elicit the people's response without losing their substance.

The rite of the Mass is to be revised in such a way that the intrinsic nature and purpose of its several parts, as also the connection between them may more easily be manifested.

.....

For this purpose the rites are to be simplified, due care being taken to preserve their substance.¹⁵⁰

This principle that signs clearly signify is important because new signs can now replace many of the irrelevant signs and symbols which the Roman Church uses in the present liturgy. Some signs and symbols now in use were created to assist people relate reality to a rural, agrarian life. Other symbols were designed to teach the barbarian hordes which invaded the Roman empire. The Church taught these illiterate barbarians through sign (as symbols). In time, so many accretions developed that many of the signs emphasized unimportant details.¹⁵¹ With the advent of literate, urban man the old symbols have become useless and new symbols are needed. Vatican II opens the way to create a relevant liturgy from an outmoded one allowing new signs to speak to man. "Rites and Symbols should speak for

¹⁵⁰Constitution, op. cit., p. 31.

¹⁵¹Romey and Taylor, op. cit., p. 19.

themselves The Church must prune off the vestiges which our contemporaries can no longer identify."¹⁵² However, some ancient signs still convey meaning to contemporary man and point to living realities. For example, bread and wine, water, light, and outstretched hands are contemporary.¹⁵³ These should be retained or restored.

Luther viewed signs in a manner similar to Vatican II. For Luther a sign was not like our present-day symbol. A symbol is a figure of speech indicating what is meant. Luther called the words of Christ sacraments¹⁵⁴ which effect our salvation. These sacraments he called signs or the acts of God in which something real happens. The sign Luther implied was an effective one. "Whatever it represents actually happens. Baptism and Holy Communion do not only speak of forgiveness of sin; they also contain and effect it."¹⁵⁵ Here Luther's thought on signs coincides with the definition which Burbach made as stated earlier. However, since the Constitution uses sign in two ways including the meaning of symbol, it is not always clear when the document means sign in the sense of symbol. Luther did not make many

¹⁵²Nocont, op. cit., p. 115.

¹⁵³Ibid.

¹⁵⁴Martin Luther, "Treatise on the New Testament, That is the Holy Mass," translated by Jeremiah J. Schindel, Luther's Works, edited by Helmut T. Lehmann (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960), XXXV, 91.

¹⁵⁵Heinrich Bornkamm, Luther's World of Thought, translated by Martin H. Bertram (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1958), p. 97.

reforms in symbols, that is in ceremonies, since he believed they were human institutions. Most ceremonies were retained by Luther.

The relationship of Word and rite

There is an interconnection between Word and rite similar to the relationship between liturgical sign and its substance. The Word of God is communicated through rite and sign. Since rite and sign depend on the Word of God, liturgical reform must maintain the relationship between both and make them apparent.

That the intimate connection between words and rites may be apparent in the liturgy: In sacred celebrations there is to be more reading from holy scripture, and it is to be more varied and suitable.

..... The scriptures

Bible services should be encouraged, especially on the vigils of the more solemn feasts, on some weekdays in Advent and Lent, and on Sundays and feast days. They are particularly to be commended in places where no priest is available; when this is so, a deacon or some other person authorized by the bishop should preside over the celebration.¹⁵⁶

The Word of God is an integral part of the liturgy. Since the signs and rites of the liturgy convey the same Word of the Scriptures, Christ, the Constitution urges that the connection between word and rite be more apparent by

¹⁵⁶Constitution, op. cit., p. 23.

providing the people with more exposure to the Holy Scriptures.

The sacred Scriptures have a dual function like the liturgy. The Holy Scriptures as the Word of God, feed and nourish the people. The Word is the means by which God reveals himself to man and sustains him. The Holy Scriptures are the faithful's food for the nourishment of their Christian life.

The treasures of the Bible are to be opened up more lavishly, so that richer fare may be provided for the faithful at the table of God's word. In this way a more representative portion of the holy scriptures will be read to the people in the course of a prescribed number of years.¹⁵⁷

The sacred scriptures, as the liturgy, has a didactic function. "For it is from the scripture that lessons are read and explained in the homily . . ." ¹⁵⁸ The scriptures and the liturgy teach the people the mysteries of God. The Word of God explains to the faithful the nature of their life in Christ.

There is a strong interrelationship between the Scriptures and the liturgy, because much of the liturgy of the Mass is based on the scriptures.

Sacred scripture is of the greatest importance in the celebration of the liturgy. For it is from scripture that lessons are read and explained in the homily, and psalms are sung; the prayers, collects, and liturgical songs

¹⁵⁷Ibid., p. 31.

¹⁵⁸Ibid., p. 19.

are scriptural in their inspiration, and it is from the scriptures that actions and signs derive their meaning. Thus to achieve the restoration, progress, and adaptation of the sacred liturgy, it is essential to promote that warm and living love for scripture to which the venerable tradition of both eastern and western rites give testimony.¹⁵⁹

In order to realize liturgical renewal, an appreciation and love for the Scriptures should be promoted among the people. A love and understanding for the Lord will increase meaning for liturgical celebration. Any new signs which are created for the liturgy must take the scriptures into account in liturgical reformulation since the signs also derive their meaning from the scriptures.¹⁶⁰

Restoration of the sermon

Another way in which the relationship between Word and rite is to be strengthened is through preaching and the use of the homily. Like the liturgy, the sermon opens up the mysteries of faith to the people.

By means of the homily the mysteries of the faith and the guiding principles of the Christian life are expounded from the sacred text, during the course of the liturgical year, the homily, therefore, is to be highly esteemed as part of the liturgy itself; in fact, at those Masses which are celebrated with the assistance of the people and feasts of obligation, it should not be omitted except for a serious reason.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁹Ibid.

¹⁶⁰Ibid.

¹⁶¹Ibid., p. 33.

Because the homily is part of the liturgy itself, the connection between Word and rite is strengthened when the homily is kept as part of the Mass.

The Council calls for the restoration of the sermon as part of the principle of maintaining the relationship between the Word and rite.

Because the sermon is part of the liturgical service, the best place for it is to be indicated even in the rubrics, as far as the nature of the rite will allow; the ministry of preaching is to be fulfilled with exactitude and fidelity. The sermon, moreover, should draw its content mainly from scriptural and liturgical sources, and its character should be that of a proclamation of God's wonderful works in the history of salvation, the mystery of Christ, ever made present and active within us, especially in the celebration of the liturgy.¹⁶²

During the Middle Ages the sermon was separated from the Mass and became a mission sermon of the new Orders.¹⁶³

The restoration of the homily and the liturgical function of preaching recognizes the labors of Dr. Pius Parsch who so ardently advocated and practiced this principle.¹⁶⁴

The restoration of preaching and the sermon is the same reform Luther instituted in evangelical reformation. In one of his writings entitled, "Concerning the Order of Public Worship," Luther said:

¹⁶²Ibid.

¹⁶³Joseph A. Jungman, S.J., The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development, I, translated by Francis A. Brunner, C.S.S.R. (New York: Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1951), p. 460.

¹⁶⁴Supra, p. 56.

Now in order to correct these abuses, know first of all that a Christian congregation should never gather together without the preaching of God's Word and prayer, no matter how briefly, as Psalm 102 says, "When the kings and the people assemble to serve the Lord, they shall declare the name and the praise of God."¹⁶⁵

Luther also gave recognition to the place of preaching within the liturgy itself.

The service now in common use everywhere goes back to genuine Christian beginnings, as does the office of preaching. . . .

As we do not on that account abolish the office of preaching, but aim to restore it again to its right and proper place, so it is not our intention to do away with the service, but to restore it again to its rightful use.¹⁶⁶

It is impossible to conclude from this parallel in the Lutheran reformation that the Church of Rome now recognizes the good effects of the evangelical reformation. Only charity and the desire for unity can speculate. However, both the evangelical reformation and the Vatican II stand in unison in their view of the proclamation of God's Word in the liturgy.

Vatican II strengthened the connection between Word and rite by restoring preaching. But even more significant demonstrated an inseparable link between Word and Sacrament.

The two parts which, in a certain sense, go to make up the Mass, namely, the liturgy of the word and the eucharistic liturgy, are so closely connected with each other that they

¹⁶⁵Luther, "Concerning the Order of Public Worship," Luther's Works, p. 11.

¹⁶⁶Ibid.

form but one single act of worship. Accordingly this sacred synod strongly urges pastors of souls that, when instructing the faithful, they insistently teach them to take their part in the entire Mass, especially on Sundays and feast of obligation.¹⁶⁷

Word and sign, that is, Word and Sacrament are also inseparably related in structure of the liturgy. The Word gives power and efficacy to the Sacrament. The Sacrament completes the Word.

Word of God and word of man, all proclaim the Mystery and thus, in the liturgical structure of the Mass, we pass naturally from the proclamation of the Word of God to the sacramental celebration: there is not word without sacrament, no sacrament without liturgy of the Word. We have access to the Mystery only through the theology of the Word of God, which is Christ, the intervention of God in history, the recapitulation, the new beginning and the definitive condition of history.¹⁶⁸

Word and Sacrament are to be kept together closely in the celebration of the entire liturgy. Both Word and Sacrament declare and proclaim the wonderful works of God and the mysteries of Christ.¹⁶⁹

Frederick R. McManus summarizes the Council's unification of Word and Sacrament and the strengthening of the ties between Word and rite.

The Council . . . insists upon a more distinctive role for readings from the Holy

¹⁶⁷Constitution, op. cit., pp. 33-34.

¹⁶⁸Saint-Severin, op. cit., quote from the Strasbourg Conference, 1957, pp. 58-59.

¹⁶⁹Ibid., pp. 23, 29-30.

Bible and for preaching in the framework of the Church's public worship. There is need for a more effective proclamation of the Word of God, of the good news of salvation that is devoid of formalism or excessive ritualism. The improvement of liturgical texts and rites must be based on the community and hierarchical nature of the liturgy, upon its didactic character and purpose, upon the principle of accommodation and adaptation to the diverse needs of men.¹⁷⁰

Luther viewed Word and Sacrament almost as one. At least, Word and Sacrament were like two intertwined hands.

We see, then, that the best and greatest part of all sacraments are dead and are nothing at all, like a body without a soul, a cask without wine, a purse without money, a type without a fulfillment, a letter without the spirit, a sheath without a knife, and the like. Wherefore it is true that when we use, hear or see the mass without the words or testament, and pay attention only to the sacrament and sign, we are not observing the mass even halfway. For sacrament is a keeping of the case without the jewel, a quite one-sided separation and division.¹⁷¹

In order to place Luther's words on Word and Sacrament into perspective, Luther scholars indicate that Luther had felt that the Sacrament had been emphasized to the neglect of the Word. In order to place the Word and Sacrament into their proper relationship again, Luther emphasized the Word which is the testament or inheritance of the Sacrament. In any case, it is evident that Luther realized the close relationship between the two when he uses the examples of the knife and its sheath and the jewel and its case.

¹⁷⁰McManus, "Coming Reforms in the Liturgy," The Catholic World, p. 338.

¹⁷¹Luther, "Treatise on the New Testament, That is the Holy Mass, Luther's Works, p. 91.

Although the Constitution does not specifically speak to this point, several of the above quotes from Roman Catholic thought indicate that the relationship between Word and sacrament are of prime importance to the Catholic liturgical renewal. Lutherans and Roman Catholics have this view of the relationship of Word and sacrament in common.

The use of the vernacular

In order to foster a union between Word and rite and in order to provide intelligent participation of the faithful in the Mass, the Council calls the use of the vernacular in parts of the liturgy.

36:1 Particular law remaining in force, the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites.

36:2 But since the use of the mother tongue, whether in the Mass, the administration of the sacraments, or other parts of the liturgy, frequently may be of great advantage to the people, the limits of its employment may be extended. This will apply in the first place to the readings and directives, and to some of the prayers and chants, according to the regulations on this matter to be laid down separately in subsequent chapter.

.

the competent territorial ecclesiastical authority . . . decide(s) whether, and to what extent, the vernacular language is to be used.¹⁷²

Celebration of the liturgy in the native tongue of the people who use it will increase the people's participation.

¹⁷²Constitution, op. cit., pp. 24-25.

Participation is dependent on how intelligible the liturgy is.¹⁷³ If the Council stated earlier that the people must understand and comprehend what they are doing, then certainly the Council had to deal with the vernacular issue to aid comprehension of the people. Since vast numbers of people are not trained in the use or meaning of the Latin language and Missal translations hinder participation, the Council knew that it would be of "great advantage to the people," to allow parts of the Mass to be celebrated in their own language.¹⁷⁴

Not only will the vernacular foster the people's active participation in the liturgy but will aid the corporate function of the Church. Since the celebration of the Mass is a social act in the deepest sense, the vernacular enables the people to experience this social action by speaking together in their language the praises of God.¹⁷⁵

The Constitution issued directives on the parts that are to be translated into the vernacular. The Scripture lessons, directives, the common prayer, the songs and response which pertain to the people and chants.¹⁷⁶

H. A. Reinhold explains the parts that pertain to the

¹⁷³Stephen F. Winward, The Reformation of Our Worship (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965), p. 101.

¹⁷⁴Constitution, op. cit., p. 23.

¹⁷⁵Murphy, op. cit., p. 261.

¹⁷⁶Constitution, op. cit., pp. 23, 33.

people which would be translated into the vernacular.

The parts that I think should be translated are those that concern the people. In other words, I would not touch a single Latin line meant for silent recitation by the priest as long as the rubrics require such silent recitation. Since the people cannot hear it anyway why stir up endless controversy about the correct translation of text.¹⁷⁷

The parts which rightfully belong to the people, Reinhold lists as the lessons, the Introit, the Collect, the Our Father, the Preface, the Gloria, the Kyrie, the Sanctus, and the Agnus Dei.¹⁷⁸ Crichton agrees with Reinhold and says that there was a general concensus that the Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus and the Agnus Dei should be returned to the people in their own language for their own liturgical celebration.¹⁷⁹ This has now been completed.

This change to vernacular marks an end of the cultural colonialism of the Latin liturgy symbolized by the Latin languages. Through the Latin language, Rome had intended to bind the Church together and express her catholicity. But retention of the Latin for so many years was really due to a lack of flexibility and a bondage to the colonial power exercised by Rome.¹⁸⁰ The Latin did not unify the Roman Church in the world but the Mass did.

¹⁷⁷H. A. Reinhold, Dynamics of the Liturgy (New York: Macmillan Company, 1961), p. 116.

¹⁷⁸Ibid., p. 118.

¹⁷⁹Crichton, The Church's Worship, p. 144.

¹⁸⁰Robert W. Hovda, editor, Sunday Morning Crisis (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1963), pp. 38-39.

The Council's decision to allow some parts of the liturgy to be celebrated in the "mother tongue" is similar to the introduction of the vernacular made by Martin Luther. Luther introduced the vernacular into the liturgy as early as 1522.¹⁸¹ On October 29, 1525, Mass was celebrated in German for the first time and the following year Luther's Deutsche Messe was published.¹⁸²

Even though liturgical scholars have said that Luther was not a very creative liturgical reformer and that he was reluctant to implement liturgical reforms including the vernacular, yet his reasons for introducing the vernacular into the liturgy come out of a profound pastoral concern. For the sake of the people and the fellowship of the Christians gathered for worship, Luther also allowed the vernacular in the liturgy.¹⁸³

The Lutheran Confessions support Luther's introduction of the vernacular into the liturgy. The Augsburg Confession mentions that Latin was also retained and not discarded completely.

Almost all the customary ceremonies are also retained except that German hymns are interspersed here and there among the parts sung in Latin. These are added for the instruction

¹⁸¹Brilioth, op. cit., p. 110

¹⁸²Ibid., p. 120.

¹⁸³Koenker, The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church, p. 139.

of the people, for ceremonies are needed especially in order that the unlearned may be taught. Paul prescribed that in church a language should be used which is understood by the people (1 Corinthians 14:2,9).¹⁸⁴

The vernacular is introduced for the instruction and comprehension of the people. The use of Latin was also encouraged so that children could learn several languages.

In the confrontation which took place at the Reformation between Luther and Rome, there was an argument about the use of Latin just as there was in the Roman Church prior to the Council and in the Council itself. Luther and the Reformers took the position that it was better that the people understand what they are doing over against Rome's argument that the people who are ignorant of Latin still get benefit out of hearing the Mass spoken in Latin.

In a long harangue about the use of Latin in the Mass, our clever opponents quibble about how a hearer who is ignorant of the faith of the church benefits from hearing a Mass that he does not understand. Apparently they imagine that mere hearing is a beneficial act of worship even where there is no understanding. We do not want to belabor this point, but we leave it up to the judgment of the reader. We mention this only in passing in order to point out our churches keep the Latin lessons and prayers.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸⁴"The Augsburg Confession," The Book of Concord, edited by Theodore G. Tappert, translator and editor, Art. XXIV "The Mass" (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), p. 56.

¹⁸⁵"Apology of the Augsburg Confession," The Book of Concord, edited by Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), p. 247.

This impasse is now resolved in Vatican II's decree on the vernacular in the mass.

Regulation of Liturgical Reforms

The fourth major principle which the Council stated deals with the regulation of the liturgical life of the Church. For example, the translation of the texts of the liturgy are to be approved by the "competent territorial authority."

Translation from the Latin text into the mother tongue intended for use in the liturgy must be approved by the competent territorial ecclesiastical authority mentioned above.¹⁸⁶

The particular competent ecclesiastical authority of the region that the above statement refers to is the "Apostolic See." However, it is not the Vatican who is the sole authority in this matter. The Constitution allows the Apostolic See to share this power with bishops of the territory or region involved who make the final approval.¹⁸⁷ The bishop of the region is to consult with the bishops of neighboring regions, who use the same language, in order that the text of the rite is similar.

The Constitution established general norms for liturgical reform and revision so that responsible persons would heed the principles established by Vatican II. The

¹⁸⁶Constitution, op. cit., p. 25.

¹⁸⁷Ibid.

regulation of liturgical reform will be exercised in the following ways:

22:1 Regulation of the sacred liturgy depends solely on the authority of the Church, that is on the Apostolic See and as laws may determine, on the bishop.

22:2 In virtue of power conceded by the law, the regulation of the liturgy within certain defined limits belongs also to various kinds of competent territorial bodies of bishops legitimately established.

22:3 Therefore no other person even if he be a priest, may add, remove, or change anything in the liturgy on his own authority.¹⁸⁸

The above regulations are designed to prevent innovation by a parish priest or layman. Since the Bishop and the Apostolic See are responsible for the life of the Church, liturgical reform is to happen under their direction. Any major changes in the liturgy must be approved by the Apostolic See.

The bishops (territorial authorities) shall approve or be consulted not only with the vernacular but they shall govern the revisions of the liturgical book, any variations and adaptation to different peoples. The bishops use of authority here shall be exercised to assure a basic unity of substance within the Roman rite.¹⁸⁹ The bishop has the power to specify adaptations in the administration of the sacraments, sacramentals, procession, language, music, and the arts. The bishop's decision must be in keeping with the

¹⁸⁸Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁸⁹Ibid., p. 25.

laws stipulated by the Constitution.¹⁹⁰

The bishops have the authority to allow for special circumstances to affect the revision of the liturgy. When a special situation calls for adaptation of the liturgy, then the bishop must carefully consider what traditions and culture of the peoples in his area might be allowed in the liturgy.¹⁹¹ The Apostolic See reserves the right of final approval.¹⁹² The Constitution also gives the bishop the authority to experiment with the liturgy when necessary especially when the traditions and culture require investigation for the creation of a relevant liturgy to a given people.¹⁹³ In more radical adaptations of the liturgy to a particular culture, the bishop is urged to consult with experts in liturgical law to help formulate the regulations governing the celebration of the liturgy in that place.

In order to help the bishop exercise his authority in the life of the Catholic Church, particularly in the liturgy, he is urged by the Council to establish a liturgical commission for the territory. This commission is to be composed of people who are experts in liturgical studies, music, art, and pastoral practice. The Commission of the diocese should be assisted by an Institute for Pastoral

¹⁹⁰Ibid.

¹⁹¹Ibid., p. 27.

¹⁹²McManus, "Constitution on the Liturgy Commentary," Worship, p. 366.

¹⁹³Ibid., p. 27.

Liturgy. This institute should include laymen. The liturgical commission of the region regulates the liturgical life with the bishops and encourages liturgical studies and furthers experiments with the liturgy when adaptations to the region is necessary.¹⁹⁴

Each diocese may also have a commission for liturgy which is under direction of the bishop. Several dioceses may combine their energies if the situation demands.¹⁹⁵ It is the duty of these liturgical commissions of the territory, together with the bishop, to execute the principles and laws that Vatican II commissioned. Frederick McManus explains how the liturgical commissions are to use the general norms for liturgical reform and make specific applications of those rules for their region.

The general and broad principles are then reduced to practical norm, which have disciplinary and legal force. For the most part, the Council does not descend to particulars; rather it gives a general mandate to be put into execution by organs designated by the chief bishop and by the respective bodies of bishops.¹⁹⁶

Except for the hierarchical nature of the regulation of the liturgy, the Constitution's laws regarding the regulation of the reforms, adaptations, and practices of the liturgy are similar to those principles of regulation by the evangelical reformation.

¹⁹⁴Ibid., p. 29.

¹⁹⁵Ibid.

¹⁹⁶McManus, "Constitution on the Liturgy Commentary," Worship, p. 366.

We further believe, teach, and confess that the community of God in every place and at every time has the right, authority and power to change, to reduce, or to increase ceremonies according to its circumstance, as long as it does so without frivolity and offense but in an orderly and appropriate way, as at any time may seem to be profitable, beneficial, and salutary for good order, Christian discipline, evangelical decorum, and the edification of the church.¹⁹⁷

The evangelical reformers were quite functional and practical in their regulation of liturgical reform. When the community saw fit, they were to make any changes in good order that would be profitable to the community and helpful for the whole church. The difference between Vatican II and the Formula of Concord is who exercises the authority to authorize reform and give approval to revisions. Roman Catholics authorize only the Bishops, national liturgical commission and the Pope. The Lutheran Confessions authorize a vague group called the community.

The Council's principle of regulation through the bishops and commissions assures that good order will be followed. Furthermore, Vatican II has assured that the liturgy can be reformed, revised, changed, and adapted so that the signs may change but the substance remains through this principle of regulation.¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁷ "Formula of Concord: Solid Declaration," Book of Concord, edited by Theodore G. Tappert, Art. X (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), p. 512.

¹⁹⁸ Constitution, op. cit., p. 25.

CHAPTER V

A DYNAMIC AND ONGOING LITURGICAL RENEWAL

Conclusions

The nature of twentieth century culture has changed and will continue to change. The way man thinks and perceives reality today is vastly different from the early Christian man or the medieval person. The manner in which man communicates and discovers meaning is in gross contrast with that of the man of the sixteenth century. There are many needs for liturgical reforms pressing the Church today. In addition to those listed above, man needs to participate in his worship in order to find meaning in this act. He needs to be a part of a community and experience fellowship. The Christian person needs to find a liturgy which is simple and at the same time expressive of his culture and times. He needs to be able to relate his life to spiritual realities and have the opportunity to offer his common, ordinary life to God as part of his worship life, especially his public worship.

Not only is there a need for a relevant, meaningful, and life-related liturgy, but there is an even greater urgency for a liturgy which will involve the whole person, the entire Christian man. Many analysts of the liturgical

reform problem agree that liturgical signs which communicate religious truth and grace to man in some cases are no longer clear or meaningful to contemporary man and therefore need to be replaced.

Chapter I examined how the intense scholarship in the areas of liturgy, theology, and biblical studies has placed an additional pressure on the Church to reform its worship life. The emerging theology of the Church places an emphasis on the laity and calls the organized churches to reevaluate the layman's role in the liturgy. The complex social issues and world problems of our times have compelled the Church to address herself to these problems in a healthy, corrective way. Liturgical scholars concur that the Church also needs to speak to these issues of the day, particularly those issues related to the liturgical life of the Church.

Given these needs for liturgical reform, the question was proposed "Can the Church renew her liturgy in such a way so as to meet the needs of the times, the pressures of culture and society without losing the substance and truth which is inherent in the forms and rites?" It was noted that the Roman Catholic Church had assumed the task of liturgical reform at the Second Vatican Council. The bishops drafted principles for the reform of the Mass and other liturgical rites and practices. The original question raised about reform of the liturgy was applied to

the Vatican II reform. "Did Vatican II give attention to the cultural events and changes of the times and meet the needs of the people with their principles of reform?" Next, it was necessary to explore whether or not the Council was able to reform the Mass and yet maintain the substance of the liturgy.

Another corollary question to the first was raised which sought to discover any parallels in the liturgical reformation of Martin Luther during the Reformation period. The points of convergence between Lutheran and Roman Catholic liturgical reformations were noted and the question was raised about the extent of the rapprochement between the two churches.

Briefly stated, the answer to all the above questions is "yes." The answer to each question will be answered separately in light of the central problem of this study, "Can the form of the liturgy be changed without losing its substance or truth?"

Vatican II constructed the principles of liturgical reform which will enable the liturgy to be relevant to the people, meet their needs, and express their twentieth century life and times. The principle of active participation of the faithful in chapter four is the overarching and guiding principle in all future liturgical reform. This principle will permit the people of God to be involved once again in the liturgy because it calls for the parts

of the liturgy which rightfully belong to the people to be restored to them. The responses, songs, and prayers which the liturgy assigns to the people will involve the people deeply in the act of praising God. The people will be associated more closely with Christ who accomplishes their redemption and makes them holy.

In order to insure that the people can participate in a knowing and fruitful way, the document on the sacred liturgy has called for the use of the vernacular so that the people can offer praise and hear the Word of God in their mother tongue. The people's language which is part of their culture and daily life will help the faithful make the connection between liturgy and life. In order to adjust the liturgy to the times, and accommodate the liturgy to the culture of the day and the country, Vatican II stipulated that the liturgy should incorporate cultural differences and uniquenesses into the liturgy. Various nationalities and countries do not need to have a uniform liturgy. Vatican II also made it possible to adjust the liturgy to the social conditions and revolutions of today by permitting "cultural expressions" in the liturgy.

The Council ensured the communication of a reformed liturgy by ruling that all obscurities, repetitions, accumulations, and accretions be deleted from the liturgy so that the forms and rites are clear. The liturgy stripped of these obscurities will become a symbol that speaks

clearly its essential truth. This reform will aid an intelligent participation of the people. The cultural debris of past centuries which no longer address modern man's life-style will be cleared away so that the message of the liturgy communicates clearly and with a "noble simplicity." The principle of intelligibility provides for these reforms.

Finally, in order to enable modern man to regain a lost sense of community and fellowship, the Council calls for a reform which will be consistent with the nature of the Eucharist as a celebration of the Head and members of Christ's redemptive acts. The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy places great emphasis on the liturgy as the act of all the body of Christ. A shift in emphasis from the priest's role to the role of the laity is a marked change for the Roman Catholic Church. However, as indicated in Chapter III, the role of the clergy in the eucharistic celebration was not neglected, but this role was discussed in the context of the total community of God at worship. Both laity and priest have their functions to perform as members of the same community.

The needs of the people were the first and primary pastoral concern of the council. This pastoral concern alone did not assure that reforms could be made without losing the truths of the liturgy. However, the Constitution did resolve this very difficult issue of reform. The

Council was able to hold the need for reform and the need to preserve the substance of the liturgy in tension through the principle of the use of sound tradition. Herein lies the genius of the Constitution. The key concept which safeguards both reform and the preservation of content is the delineation of the mutable and immutable elements of the liturgy. Fundamental elements of the liturgy do not change and are not to be reformed. Everything else may be changed and adapted to the culture, times, and needs of the people. The immutable elements are the substance and truth of the liturgy such as the Eucharist itself. The core truth of the Roman liturgy is the mystery of Christ's redemptive work given to man. The changeable elements of the liturgy are the words, practices, ceremonies, and forms of the liturgy which convey its central truth.

The use of sound tradition also calls for the elimination of unsound traditions which have eased their way into the liturgy over the centuries. These unsound practices which have little support in earlier tradition or are incongruent with the nature of the liturgy are to be expurgated. The liturgy is to be simplified so that its noble dignity and truth are evident to all the faithful. On the other pole of the tension, change of liturgical forms must grow out of existing rites organically. Innovation is carefully limited. Both poles of this principle of tradition provide for liturgical reform which will preserve

the vital substance. The principle of sound tradition highlights the careful work of the liturgical commission and the bishops. It is demonstrated when the liturgical reformer built into this principle the means for continuing liturgical renewal. First a warning is issued against any kind of liturgical archaeologism which would elevate one period of liturgical development over another. The Council view the liturgy, like the Church, as a constantly evolving and changing thing. By forbidding the veneration of one period of liturgical development, the Constitution has taken measures to prevent the liturgy from becoming static. The positive feature of this concept is that the liturgy will be allowed to be dynamic and evolutionary in keeping with every living process in the world. However, in order to prevent a radical loss of content and substance of the liturgy, all innovations and fabrication for special occasions is prohibited unless it can be demonstrated that the welfare of the Church will be aided. Any experimentation or new rite of the liturgy must be approved by the Apostolic See. Change and experimentation of the liturgy are permitted also by special permission. Again, these principles will assure that the substance and truth of the liturgy will be preserved while reform is continued.

Another principle which safeguards the substance of the liturgy is the rule which calls for the regulation of liturgical reform by the bishops. The pastor of the diocese

is to delegate his episcopal duty of liturgical reform by appointing a diocesan liturgical commission. The bishop will approve any reforms together with other bishops and the Apostolic See. It is obvious that the Council was desirous to preserve the content and truth of the liturgy by calling for a regulation of future changes. If any person or parish authorized changes in the Mass, innovation and loss of substance might occur. The Protestant should remember that the Constitution's emphasis on the hierarchical nature of the Church is another reason for this liturgical regulation. The authority for reform is invested in the teaching and pastoral office of the bishop.

Generally speaking, the entire tone of the Constitution communicates a view of the liturgy as the worship of God, the reception of Christ, the celebration and commemoration of Christ's work. This whole conception of the liturgy indicates that eucharistic worship is for the committed, faithful Christian. Those Protestants who have turned the Sunday morning Service into an evangelism and instructional exercise should listen to the voices of Vatican II. It is true that the liturgical reforms of the Council call for instruction in the liturgy. But this instruction is not the same kind of transferring of facts and ideas which Protestants sometimes substitute for the liturgy itself. Vatican II urged the pastors and priests to help the people receive and respond to God by explaining and training them

in the meaning and actions of the liturgy.

In speaking to the third question a comparison of the Constitution and the liturgical writings of Martin Luther in Chapters III and IV demonstrated several points where the Lutheran and Roman liturgical reformations converge. Those who stand in the Reformation heritage rejoice to witness the Council's emphasis on the place of the Sacred Scriptures within the eucharistic celebration. The Word of God was of primary concern for Luther and he too, like Vatican II sought every means to bring the Word of God to the people. Both Lutherans and Roman Catholics affirm that Christ presents himself through the Holy Scriptures. An emphasis on preaching in the liturgical celebration of the Mass by the Council coincides with Luther's desire that the Word of God be proclaimed to the people in the liturgy. The ancient practice of preaching joins hands with the restoration of the sermon in the evangelical reformation.

When the Constitution insisted on maintaining "an intimate connection between Word and rite," they restored an ancient relationship which Luther insisted on too when he called for the unity of Word and Sacrament. Vatican II has restored a vital balance between Word and Sacrament by giving the people the Christ who is present in the Word as he is in the Eucharist. Since the sixteenth century reformation, Lutherans and other Protestants have tended to lose this balance between Word and Sacrament by emphasizing the

Word to the neglect of the Sacrament. Rome's action on Word and Sacrament in restoring Word should call Protestants to restore the balance again through the frequent celebration of the Eucharist with the Word.

The Lutheran conception of the memorial aspect of Holy Communion and the Roman Catholic idea of the re-presentation of the mysteries of Christ in the Eucharist is similar. Luther would accept this re-presentation concept as long as no merit was attached to it. Lutherans who have lost the commemoration of the Lord's redemptive acts through over-simplification of the Lord's Supper need to recover this meaning once more. Attention to the Constitution would aid such memorial celebration very much.

There is a parallel thought between Lutheran and Roman Catholics on the idea of sacrifice particularly at the point of the faithful offering themselves in Christ's sacrifice. The Lutheran Confessions approve a eucharistic sacrifice in this latter sense. However, any note of offering Christ again in order to merit God's forgiveness or reconciliation would be unacceptable to Luther. This note is absent from the Constitution. The propitiatory aspect of sacrifice which Luther and The Confessions reject still stands between Lutherans and Catholics. The Catholic eucharistic sacrifice is the sacrifice which is Christ's once-for-all sacrifice offered in the Mass by Christ through the priest to bring grace to the people.

Even though the people offer Christ, they do not do it to gain God's merit. Christ is the one who offered himself and gives himself to the people. This aspect of sacrifice in the Mass must be studied further by Lutherans and discussed with Roman Catholics in order to discover if there is still a difference in this view. A Lutheran grounded in the nature of grace in the Eucharist and the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament could admit the sacrifice which Christ offered once-for-all as God's operation of grace and reconciliation among men in the eucharistic celebration.

In the light of current biblical and eucharistic theology and removed from the heat of the sixteenth century reformation, Lutheran theologians need reexamine the implications of the sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist. Lutheran and biblical teachings on grace, the Real Presence of Christ and the memorial aspect of Holy Communion provide the basis for a renewed examination of Christ's sacrifice in the Mass.

A problem still exists between Lutheran and Roman Catholics on the nature of the sacrifice of the Mass when it is viewed ex opere operato. New biblical and theological investigations of "grace" call for a study of what this phrase means and what it meant at the Reformation. A study of this concept by Lutheran liturgical scholars will further understanding between Lutherans and Catholics.

Liturgy Tested by Time and Use

Roman Catholics now worship with a reformed liturgy since the First Sunday in Advent, 1965. Only time will test the principles of reform as these principles were used to renew the Mass. The Council has left some questions of liturgical reform unanswered too. Although the Constitution requested that cultural expressions of various countries be incorporated into the Mass, it still remains to be seen if Roman liturgists will make an attempt to also incorporate various other cultural aspects which are different from those of the country in question. This day of an ever-shrinking and intercultural melting pot of our world demonstrates the need for a multi-cultural liturgy. The Constitution implies that the construction of a multi-cultural liturgy should be relevant and clear and also familiar to the people of a given country and language.

Years of use will assess the Council's concern for the sanctification of man through his participation in the liturgy. The Constitution has asserted that in the liturgy man comes into contact with the paschal mystery of Christ's death and resurrection. This paschal grace offered in various ways in Word and sacraments, brings about man's sanctification.¹ Besides the fact that this is a foreign

¹Frederick R. McManus, "Coming Reforms in the Liturgy," The Catholic World, 196 (March 1963), 337.

way of speaking about the working of God's grace to the Protestant, it also remains to be seen whether the Council has neglected an emphasis on man's response to God's grace in the liturgy by talking of man as recipient of grace in the liturgy. Even though man's response to God's grace is inherent in the concept of sanctification, the question could be raised as to whether the faithful are just beneficiaries of the liturgy or also participants and actors?

This study did not include an evaluation of the reformed liturgy's suitability to the average parish. Several liturgical scholars agree that the suitability of the "new" Mass to the parish should be investigated in several years. Roman Catholic James Crichton is troubled by the fact that the present Mass which was used as the model for reform is a Mass developed and used in monastery and cathedral. Crichton believes that another liturgy must be drafted which suits the smaller parish congregation.²

An evaluation of the application of the principles of reform must be made after the new liturgy is in effect several years in order to fully determine the relevancy of the present rite among the people. Vatican II desired to adjust the liturgy to the times and accommodate it to culture. The question could be tested as to whether it

²James D. Crichton, "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy," American Benedictine Review, XV (March 1964), 50-51.

will work to accommodate the liturgy to culture or will it be necessary to create a liturgy out of the fabric of culture which will also maintain the substance and truth of the ancient liturgy? Since the Constitution favors accommodation, the problem could be investigated as to whether relevance is gained by accommodation or by using the fabric of culture itself in creating new liturgical forms?

The above question leads logically to the remaining needs and concerns of a truly contemporary liturgy. Chief among these concerns for contemporary eucharistic rites is the need to construct a liturgy which will make use of the newly formulated theological symbols of our day. A theology for the twentieth century is now virtually completed even though it will continually change. These new theological concepts must be incorporated into the liturgy without violation to the nature and substance of the present liturgy. First a principle needs to be drafted or discovered which will permit this change. This challenge provides a fertile area for liturgical research.

Although the Second Vatican Council has called for use of the vernacular, this principle was extended only to the use of a spoken mother tongue. Use of the vernacular suggests other implications such as the use of verbal and non-verbal symbols various societies use to communicate religious meaning. The implications of this principle of the vernacular could be analyzed to discover if the use of

such symbols would make liturgical worship more relevant and communicative.

One of the knottiest problems which liturgical reformers still face is giving expression to the many sub-cultures of a country. The Council has not specifically addressed this issue. At present, it appears that the Constitution allows only a uniform national liturgy. On the other hand, Vatican II affirmed the principle of diversity of cultural rites. It would seem that if the liturgy is to be a part of the life of the people, then in order for the liturgy to be relevant, it will have to incorporate the symbols and unique expressions of some sub-cultures into the liturgy. For example, where a congregation is composed mostly of Negro Americans or industrial laborers, liturgical symbols of these sub-cultures should be expressed in liturgical celebrations.

Finally, because Vatican II has adopted significant principles of liturgical reform for the revision of the historic Christian liturgy, any non-Roman Catholic Church which initiates liturgical reform needs to give consideration to the principles of reform created by Vatican II. These principles could be evaluated by the church's own particular tradition. Vatican II suggests to the Christian churches in the modern world that the pattern which Rome has established in the liturgy is worthy of study, and, in some instances, imitation. The lead of Vatican II suggests to

those Christian communions which assume the task of creating a contemporary liturgy the need for constructing principles for that reform first. This is the only way in which a church's liturgical heritage and truth can be preserved and yet accomplish liturgical changes for the modern day. In this manner God may be worshipped and man might be open to his continuing activity.

In 1951, a book was prepared by Luigi Agustoni and Johannes Wagner (published at Lugano by the Centro di Liturgia [Center of Liturgy]) which sums up the two preceding congresses, incorporating the main resolutions taken at these meetings.

The first seventeen of these proposals had already been considered at the Maria Laach meeting two years previously.

1. Abolition of present duplication of readings.
2. Omission of the Sanctus, etc.
3. The second part of the Mass should be called: the Liturgy of the Word. It should be carried out in choir, not at the altar.
4. Never more than one Collect (with rare exceptions).
5. A three- or four-year cycle of Lessons and Responsories for Sundays.
6. Less frequent recitation of the Credo.
7. The Oratio fidelium (Bidding Prayers)--should be reintroduced at the conclusion of the Liturgy.

250

of the Word. Sing the Dominus vobiscum at the beginning of the Mass.

APPENDIX

A resume of the resolutions of the liturgical congresses at Maria Laach (1951), Ste. Odile (1952), and Lugano (1953).

This resume is taken from the official report on the Third Liturgical Congress, held from September 15 to 18 in 1953, that was prepared by Luigi Agustoni and Johannes Wagner (published at Lugano by the Centro di Liturgia Pastorale) which sums up the two preceding congresses, incorporating the main resolutions taken at these meetings.

The first seventeen of these proposals had already been mentioned at the Maria Laach meeting two years previously.

1. Abolition of present duplication of readings.
2. Omission of the Judica, etc.
3. The second part of the Mass should be called: the Liturgy of the Word. It should be carried out in choro, not at the altar.
4. Never more than one Collect (with rare exceptions).
5. A three- or four-year cycle of Lessons and Gospels for Sundays.
6. Less frequent recitation of the Credo.
7. The Prex fidelium (Bidding Prayers)--should be reintroduced as the conclusion of the Liturgy.

- of the Word. Omit the Dominus vobiscum at the beginning of the Offertory.
8. The sacred vessels should not be on the altar before the Offertory.
9. More Prefaces, but only those which refer to the Memoria Passionis.
10. The priest should wait for the end of the Sanctus to continue the Mass. The different Amens during the Canon should be eliminated.
11. No Confiteor, etc., at Communion time.
12. No last Gospel. The Last Blessing ends the Mass.
13. Rename the Secreta: "Oratio super oblata," and make it the audible conclusion of the Offertory.
14. Sing the Great Doxology at the end of the Canon; eliminate its five signs of the cross and elevate the two Sacred Species during the Doxology. No genuflection before this elevation and perhaps no genuflection at all.
15. After the Pater noster: regroup the prayers and ceremonies and find a way to have the congregation participate in the Pax.
16. Develop the interval between Communion and Post-communion (prayers and singing, consult other liturgies).
17. Regulate the use of Ite misse est and Benedicamus Domino (see the new regulation on Holy Thursday).

18. The revised Easter Vigil is the model of the principles which should govern future reform.
19. Sing or recite aloud the Per ipsum (Great Doxology); no signs of the cross; elevate the two Species until the Amen of the people; no genuflection here, or only after the Amen repeating no. 14 .
20. No Amen after the Pater noster; sing or recite aloud the Libera nos; no sign of the cross with the empty paten, no kiss [anticipating projects of Lugano].
21. Place the first Domine Jesu Christe immediately after the Libera (or suppress it entirely); follow with Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum with no ceremony of the Host; no response of the people; give Pax afterward (this is spelled out in detail on pp. 242-3 of the report).
22. Breaking of the Host takes place after the Pax, with no accompanying ceremony, while the congregation sings the Agnus Dei; at low Mass the priest says it after the Fractio. The two Communion prayers should then follow or be suppressed (see pp. 242-4 of the report).
23. The celebrant receives half of the Host, the other half is either given to those who serve at the altar or distributed with the ciborium.

24. No Confiteor, etc., at Communion time; shortening of the "Corpus" prayer during the distribution (p. 239 of the report elaborates the 1951 Maria Laach resolution).
25. Have the Communio sung solemnly during the distribution, even in the vernacular.
26. At the end of the Mass: Ite missa est (only), Deo gratias, kiss of the altar (no Placeat), blessing, and people's Amen. No Last Gospel or Leonine prayers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

- "Apology of the Augsburg Confession," The Book of Concord. Edited by Theodore G. Tappert. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959.
- "Augsburg Confession," The Book of Concord. Edited by Theodore G. Tappert. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959.
- Casel, Odo. The Mystery of Christian Worship. Burkhard Neunheuser, O.S.B., editor. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1962.
- Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1963.
- Davis, Charles. Liturgy and Doctrine. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960.
- "Formula of Concord," The Book of Concord. Edited by Theodore G. Tappert. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959.
- Höslinger, Norbert, C.R. "Personal conversation," Klosterneuberg, Austria. July 11, 1966.
- Jeremias, Joachiam. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. Translated by Arnold Ehrhardt. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- Jungmann, Joseph. The Mass of the Roman Rite. Translated by Francis A. Brunner, C.S.S.R. New York: Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1951.
- "Large Catechism," The Book of Concord. Edited by Theodore G. Tappert. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959.
- Luther, Martin. "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church, 1520." Translated by A. T. W. Steinhauser. Volume XXXVI of Luther's Works. Edited by Abdel Ross Wentz and Helmut T. Lehmann. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959.

- Luther, Martin. "The Blessed Sacrament of the Holy and True Body of Christ, and the Brotherhoods, 1519." Translated by Jeremiah J. Schindel. Volume XXXV of Luther's Works. Edited by E. Theodore Bachmann and Helmut T. Lehmann. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960.
- Luther, Martin. "A Christian Exhortation to the Livonians Concerning Public Worship and Concord." Volume XIII of Luther's Works. Edited by Ulrich S. Leupold. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965.
- Luther, Martin. "Concerning the Order of Public Worship." Volume LIII of Luther's Works. Edited by Ulrich S. Leupold. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965.
- Luther, Martin. "The German Mass and Order of Service." Volume LIII of Luther's Works. Edited by Ulrich S. Leupold. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965.
- Luther, Martin. "The Misuse of the Mass." Translated by Frederick C. Ahrens. Volume XXXV of Luther's Works. Edited by Abdel Ross Wentz and Helmut T. Lehmann. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959.
- Luther, Martin. "An Order of Mass and Communion." Volume XXXV of Luther's Works. Edited by Ulrich S. Leupold. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965.
- Luther, Martin. "Receiving Both Kinds in the Sacrament, 1522." Translated by Abdel Ross Wentz. Volume XXXVI of Luther's Works. Edited by Abdel Ross Wentz and Helmut T. Lehmann. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959.
- Luther, Martin. "A Treatise of the New Testament, that is, the Holy Mass, 1520." Translated by Jeremiah J. Schindel. Volume XXXV of Luther's Works. Edited by E. Theodore Bachmann and Helmut T. Lehmann. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960.
- McLuhan, Marshall. Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- Parsch, Pius. The Church's Year of Grace. Translated by William G. Heidt. Vols. I-V. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1962.
- Pius X. "Inter Plurimus Pastoralis," All Things in Christ. Edited by Vincent A. Yzermans. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1954.

Pius XII. Mediator Dei. New York: The American Press, 1947, revised 1961.

"Smalcald Articles," The Book of Concord. Edited by Theodore G. Tappert. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959.

B. Secondary Sources

Baum, Gregory. "Conflicts and the Council," The Commonweal, LXXVI (September 21, 1962) 511-514.

Baumstark, Anton. Comparative Liturgy. London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., Limited, 1958.

Benoit, J. D. Liturgical Renewal. London: SCM Press, 1958.

Bornkamm, Heinrich. Luther's World of Thought. Translated by Martin H. Bertram. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1958.

Bouyer, Louis. Liturgical Piety. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1954.

----- The Liturgy Revived. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964.

----- "Two Temptations," Worship, XXXVII (December 1962) 11-21.

Brand, Eugene L. "Forms and Norms," Una Sancta, XIX (St. Michael and All Angels, 1962) 5-13.

Brilioth, Yngve. Eucharistic Faith and Practice Evangelical and Catholic. Translated by A. G. Hebert. London: S.P.C.K., 1961.

Brown, Leslie W. Relevant Liturgy. London: The Camelot Press, Ltd., 1965.

Burbach, Maur, O.S.B. "Liturgy and Theology," The Revival of the Liturgy. Edited by Frederick R. McManus (New York: Herder and Herder, 1963).

Crichton, J. D. The Church's Worship. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964.

----- "The General Council and Liturgical Reform," Clergy Review, XLVII (June 1962) 332-333.

- Dalmais, I. H. Introduction to the Liturgy. Translated by Roger Capel. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1961.
- Davis, Charles. "The Forward Thrust of the Liturgical Revival," The Catholic World, 194 (November 1961), 74-79.
- . "A Modern Reformation: Changing the Face of the Church," Clergy Review, XLVI (October 1961), 577-584.
- "General Principles of Liturgical Reform Voted by the Council," Emmanuel, LXIX (March 1963), 107-110.
- Hovda, Robert W., editor. Sunday Morning Crisis. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1963.
- King, James W. Liturgy and the Laity. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1963.
- Koenker, Ernest Benjamin. The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- . Worship in Word and Sacrament. St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1959.
- La Farge, John. "Progress and Rhythm in the Liturgical Movement," Liturgy for the People. Edited by William J. Leonard. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1963.
- Leupold, Ulrich S., editor and Helmut R. Lehmann, general editor. "Introduction to Liturgy and Hymns," Volume LIII of Luther's Works. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965.
- McManus, Frederick R. "Coming Reforms in the Liturgy," The Catholic World, 196 (March 1963), 335-342.
- . "The Constitution on Liturgy Commentary, Part One," Worship, XXXVIII (May 1964), 314-373.
- . "Constitution on Liturgy Commentary, Part Two," Worship, XXXVIII (August-September 1964), 450-496.
- . "Constitution on the Liturgy Commentary, Part Three," Worship, XXXVIII (October 1964), 515-564.
- . "The Dialogue Mass," Sunday Morning Crisis. Edited by Robert Hobda. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1963.

- . "Liturgical Week, 1962," The Commonweal, LXXVI
(August 24, 1962), 468-470.
- . "Liturgy," The Critic, XXI (August-September 1962),
23-26.
- . "What is Being Done?" Sunday Morning Crisis.
Edited by Robert Hovda. Baltimore: Helicon Press,
1963.
- , editor. The Revival of the Liturgy. New York:
Herder and Herder, 1963.
- Mannion, John B. "The Need for Reform," The Commonweal,
LXXVIII (August 23, 1963), 495-497.
- . "Odo Casel's Legacy," The Commonweal, LXXVI
(August 24, 1962), 471-473.
- Marx, Paul B., O.S.B. Virgil Michel. Collegeville,
Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1957.
- Murphy, John L. The Mass and Liturgical Reform. Milwaukee:
The Bruce Publishing Co., 1956.
- Nocent, Adrian. The Future of the Liturgy. New York:
Herder and Herder, 1963.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav J., Regin Prenter, and Herman A. Preus.
More About Luther. Volume II of Martin Luther Lectures.
Edited by Gerhard L. Belgum. Decorah, Iowa: Luther
College Press, 1958.
- Pfifer, Kenneth G. A Protestant Case for Liturgical
Renewal. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965.
- Reinhold, H. A. The American Parish and the Roman Liturgy.
New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.
- . Bringing the Mass to the People. Baltimore: Helicon
Press, 1960.
- . "Do We Need Liturgical Reforms?," Life of the Spirit.
XVI (June 1962), 509-518.
- . The Dynamics of Liturgy. New York: Macmillan Co.,
1961.
- . "Maria Laach Revisited," The Commonweal, LXXVIII
(August 23, 1963), 497-500.

- . "The Mass of the Future," The Commonweal, LXXX (August 21, 1964), 565.
- Romey, Marshall P. and Michael J. Taylor, S.J. Liturgy and Christian Unity. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Roth, et al. Meaning and Practice of the Lord's Supper. Helmut T. Lehmann, editor. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958.
- Ryan, Mary Perkins. "Why the Liturgy Must Be Reformed," The Catholic Messenger, LXXX (November 1, 1962), 10.
- The Sacerdotal Communities of Saint-Severin of Paris and Saint Joseph of Nice. Translated by Lancelot Sheppard. The Liturgical Movement. New York: Hawthorn Books. Publishers, 1964.
- Sasse, Hermann. This is My Body. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959.
- Sheean, Shawn G. "The Community of the Faithful," Liturgy for the People. Edited by William J. Leonard. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1963.
- Shepherd, Massey H., Jr. The Liturgical Renewal of the Church. Edited for the Associated Parishes, Inc. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- . The Liturgy and the Christian Faith. Greenwich, Connecticut: Seabury Press, 1954.
- Sheppard, Lancelot C. Blueprint for Worship. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1964.
- . "The Changing Liturgy," Tablet, 218 (July 4, 1964), 742-744.
- . The Liturgical Books. New York: Hawthorn Books, Publishers, 1962.
- . "Progress in the Liturgy," Downside Review, LXXX (January 1962), 41-54.
- Sloyan, Gerard. "Getting the Message Across," Sunday Morning Crisis. Edited by Robert Hovda. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1963.
- Thurian, Max. "The Present Aims of the Liturgical Movement," Studia Liturgica, III (Autumn 1964), 107-114.

Vagagginni, C. "The Approved Chapter One," Worship, XXXVII
(February 1963), 153-164.

Vanbergen, P. "The Constitution on the Liturgy and the
Faith and Order Reports on Worship," Studia Liturgica,
V (Spring 1966), 1-19.

Winward, Stephen F. The Reformation of Our Worship.
Richmond: John Knox, 1965.