

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1969

The Propugnaculum Ecclesiae of Josse Clichtove as a Critique of Luther's Formula Missae and as Compared to the Sacrosanctum Concilium of Vatican II

Joel H. Kuznik

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



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kuznik, Joel H., "The Propugnaculum Ecclesiae of Josse Clichtove as a Critique of Luther's Formula Missae and as Compared to the Sacrosanctum Concilium of Vatican II" (1969). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 453.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/453>

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.

THE PROPUGNACULUM ECCLESIAE OF JOSSE CLICHTOVE
AS A CRITIQUE OF LUTHER'S FORMULA MISSAE
AND AS COMPARED TO THE SACROSANCTUM
CONCILIUM OF VATICAN II

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

by

Joel H. Kuznik

May 1969

Approved by: 


Advisor


Reader

ARCH
BY
4070
C69
M3
1969
no. 12

69263

SHORT TITLE

CLICHTOVE'S PROPUGNACULUM ECCLESIAE, Kuznik, S.T.M., 1969

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND . . .	1
Purpose and Content of the Thesis	1
Luther's <u>Formula Missae et Communionis</u> :	
Historical Background	4
Editions and Translations	7
Emser's <u>Missae Christianorum assertio</u> . . .	10
Clichtove's <u>Propugnaculum ecclesiae</u> . . .	14
The Reformation in France	17
Josse Clichtove's Life and Works	22
II. JOSSE CLICHTOVE'S PROPUGNACULUM ECCLESIAE .	30
Section I: The "Indiscretion" of Luther's Attempt	30
Section II: Luther's Reasons for the New Form	33
Vatican II's Principles of Reform	39
Section III: The Apostolic Origin of the Mass	45
Vatican II on Simplicity	49
Section IV: The Question of Vernacular .	50
Vatican II on the Use of the Vernacular .	55
Section V: Chanting	61
Section VI: Luther's Criticism of Priests and the Canon	64
Section VII: The Mass as Sacrifice	67
Vatican II on the Eucharistic Sacrifice .	72
Section VIII: Masses for the Dead	77
Section IX: Defense of Ceremonial Appointments	80
Section X: Images of God and the Saints .	83
Vatican II on Sacred Art	85
Section XI: The Mass as a Good Work	89
Section XII: Names for the Mass	93
Vatican II on the Nature of the Sacred Liturgy	95
Section XIII: General Confession of Sins and Invocation of Saints	102
Section XIV: More on the Invocation of the Saints	105
Section XV: Praying to and Honoring the Saints and the Feast of the Holy Cross . .	106

Section XVI: The Gloria in Excelsis and the Collects	107
Section XVII: The Mass and Scripture in the Vernacular	110
Section XVIII: The Use of the Alleluia	112
Section XIX: Proses, Candles, Incense and the Nicene Creed	116
Section XX: The Offerings of the Faithful	118
Section XXI: The Use of Wine Mixed with Water	119
Section XXII: Luther's Reasons against Mixing Wine and Water	120
Section XXIII: The Preface	123
Section XXIV: The Words of Consecration	125
Section XXV: The Sign of the Cross, the Fraction, and the Pax	127
Section XXVA: The Final Collect and Ceremonial Freedom	130
Section XXVI: Vestments and Blessing of Vestments	133
Section XXVII: Communion at Every Mass, Worthy Reception, and Confession	136
Section XXVIII: Communion with Both Kinds	139
Section XXIX: Refutation of Reasons Given for Communion under Both Kinds	142
Section XXX: Possible Dangers of Communion under Both Kinds	146
Section XXXI: Efficacy of the Eucharist under One Kind	147
Section XXXII: Contempt for Councils, Vernacular Hymns, and the Canonical Hours. Vatican II on Participation	149
Vatican II on Communion under Both Kinds	159
 III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	 164
Luther's Intent and Methodology in Writing the <u>Formula Missae</u>	164
Clichtove's Interpretation of Luther's Motives	174
Clichtove's Critique of Luther's <u>Formula Missae</u>	178
Clichtove's Presuppositions and Methodology	189
Luther, Clichtove, and Vatican II	193
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 201

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Purpose and Content of the Thesis

In 1523, in response to confused, unguided liturgical experimentation and at the repeated, urgent request of Nicholas Hausmann (1478-1538), pastor at Zwickau, Martin Luther wrote his treatise Formula Missae et communionis. It has been considered by some to be his most significant liturgical writing, in spite of the fact that he intended it simply to be used "for the church at Wittenberg (pro ecclesia Vuittembergensi)."

It was his objective criticism of a historic and vital institution. . . . He took the local use, probably his Augustinian missal, and prepared his reconstruction without going further afield. His Formula was intended as a local program and not a general order for the whole church. It proved to be, however, of all his many works his greatest contribution to general liturgical reform.¹

In the history of Christian worship, Luther's Formula Missae et communionis made a number of important contributions to its own age as well as to the later form and content of Lutheran worship in particular.

The critical nature of the Formula is shown in its rejection of medieval corruptions, together with all ideas of obligation, sacrifice, and good works, as well as in the fact that, while seeking to preserve the historic order and much material of the Mass, the principle of freedom is stressed. It also distinguishes sharply between essential and nonessential features. . . .

¹Luther D. Reed, The Lutheran Liturgy (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, c.1947), p. 72.

While critical, the Formula is conservative. It breathes the spirit of the gospel as opposed to Roman and also to radical extremes. It counsels moderation and patience. Its conservatism is not that of timidity, but of courageous conviction. . . .

The Formula is also constructive. This is evident in its presentation of principles, in its suggestions concerning a vernacular sermon and vernacular hymns, and in its effort to approach worship from the congregational rather than from the priestly side. With respect to method, it presents a pedagogical point of view. The first thought is to express faith.²

The reaction to Luther's Formula Missae et communionis was immediate. Luther's followers greeted it with enthusiasm, but Roman Catholic theologians responded with severe criticism. Jerome Emser (1478-1527) was the first to answer Luther in his small treatise entitled Missae Christianorum contra Lutheranam missandi formulam assertio, published in February, 1524.³ But a more extensive and more compelling critique came in 1526 from the French humanist-theologian, Josse Clichtove (1472-1543), in his treatise entitled Propugnaculum ecclesiae adversus Lutheranos.

Clichtove's Propugnaculum ecclesiae is the concern and interest of this thesis. In scope, style, and content it is representative of sixteenth-century Roman Catholic theology of worship and liturgy. In answering Luther's Formula Missae et communionis Clichtove's treatise illustrates a rationale, based on authority and tradition, for the Church's worship

²Ibid., pp. 73-74.

³Theobald Freudenberger, editor, Corpus Catholicorum, XXVIII (Münster, Westphalia: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959), xi. Pp. 1-37 contain the text of Emser's work.

at that time. Clichtove's logic, his use of Scripture and patristic sources, and his understanding of that revolutionary age are enlightening commentary on liturgical practice. It is the intent of this thesis to make available by summary and translation the thought of Clichtove's Propugnaculum ecclesiae: (1) as a response to Luther's Formula Missae et communionis; (2) as a prototype of sixteenth-century theology of worship; and (3) as a contrast to the 1963 Sacrosanctum Concilium, the "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy" of Vatican II.⁴

Chapter I will provide the historical background to Luther's writing of the Formula Missae et communionis, information on its editions, important details of the Reformation in France, and finally the life and works of Josse Clichtove.

Chapter II will present the text of Luther's Formula Missae et communionis in sections as commented upon and criticized by Clichtove. Clichtove's thought will be summarized and where significant translated, with the Latin original provided for comparison by footnote. Note will be taken of important contrasts and similarities in both Luther and Clichtove to the "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy."

Chapter II will utilize the following textual materials:
 (1) an English version of Luther's Formula Missae et com-

⁴Sacrosanctum Concilium Oecumenicum Vaticanum II, "Constitutio de Sacra Liturgia," Acta Apostolicae Sedis, LVI (February 15, 1964). For the translation to be used in this paper see Walter M. Abbott and Joseph Gallagher, editors, The Documents of Vatican II (New York: Guild Press, c.1966), pp. 137-78.

munionis from the American Edition of Luther's Works,⁵ based on the Latin text of the Weimar Edition;⁶ (2) Clichtove's Propugnaculum ecclesiae, translated and summarized from an original copy available in the Concordia Seminary Library, Saint Louis;⁷ and (3) the Sacrosanctum Concilium as translated in The Documents of Vatican II.⁸

Chapter III will provide an opportunity to summarize and to criticize both Luther and Clichtove. In particular, the writer will, on the basis of specific examples, attempt to analyze and to evaluate Clichtove's argumentation, use of authorities and sources, and historical understanding, both in the context of his own time and in the light of Vatican II.

Luther's Formula Missae et communionis:
Historical Background⁹

The person most directly responsible for encouraging Luther to write the Formula Missae et communionis was his

⁵Martin Luther, "An Order of Mass and Communion for the Church at Wittenberg, 1523," Luther's Works, edited by Helmut T. Lehmann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, c.1965), LIII, 19-40.

⁶Martin Luther, D. Martin Luthers Werke (Weimar: Herman Böhlau, 1891), XII, 205-20. Hereafter referred to as WA.

⁷Jodocus Clichtoveus, Propugnaculum Ecclesiae aduersus Lutheranos (Cologne: Petrus Quentel, 1526).

⁸Supra, p. 3, n. 4

⁹A helpful and complete historical background is found in the critical introduction to the Formula in WA XII, 197-201, and in Freudenberger, pp. ix-xiii.

friend, Nicholas Hausmann, pastor of St. Mary's Church in Zwickau. On November 13, 1523, Luther sent Hausmann a copy of his recently completed treatise, De instituendis ministris.¹⁰ Luther enclosed a letter which indicated that he would soon send a form of mass for the Wittenberg congregation, from which Hausmann could work in constructing an order of worship for Zwickau. Luther would have included it with this short writing to the Utraquist Bohemians, but time had not permitted.

Hausmann's request had gone back some months. The first approach to Luther appears to have come orally through Caspar Güttel who was instructed to get Luther's advice on a number of items, but above all on an "arrangement and form of a sacred rite (institutio et ordo rei sacrae)."¹¹ On July 18, 1523, Hausmann wrote Stephen Roth (1492-1546), then studying theology at Wittenberg, to extract from Luther in his leisure advice "for reforming the country (pro reformanda patria)."¹² "Implied was the new form for worship (an arrangement and form of a sacred rite), as Luther's reply of August 19th shows."¹³ On August 19th Luther wrote Hausmann and confessed that the specific matters of inquiry had slipped his memory and that

¹⁰WA XII, 169-95, and Luther's Works, XL, 3-44.

¹¹WA XII, 197.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Freudenberger, p. xi. "Gemeint war die Neuordnung des Gottesdienstes (institutio et ordo rei sacrae), wie sich aus Luthers Rückfrage vom 19. August ergibt."

Hausmann would have to redirect his questions. The pastor from Zwickau restated his concerns and in regard to an order of worship confided, "For a long time I have been thinking of outlining a form for celebrating mass and communion, but so far I could not have been free to do."¹⁴ Luther responded to the renewed demands with the promise, "to publish some brief order, by which I will picture a form for celebrating mass, as I have written,"¹⁵ and for the meanwhile gave his friend a few important guidelines for such a new order. But by November 13th Luther still had been unable to fulfill his promise, as we have seen above. So on November 27th the persistent and now somewhat impatient Hausmann wrote Roth,

The yearly celebration of the Lord's birth approaches, and I have promised to Christ's sheep to present both forms of the sacrament, after Martin's little book has been published for this purpose. So far I cannot understand what would have prevented its publication.¹⁶

But meanwhile Luther had undertaken the task and on December 4th sent a copy to Zwickau. By December 10th Hausmann had not received it and wrote Roth,

I am always expecting to see a form for celebrating mass which Martin had promised me, especially at this

¹⁴WA XII, 197. "Ego diu meditans sum formam missandi et communicandi praescribere, nec potui hactenus absolvere."

¹⁵Ibid. "Ut brevi aliquid typis edam, quo formam missandi (ut scripsi) depingam."

¹⁶Ibid., XII, 198. "Natalis Domini anniverarius appropinquat, et pollicitus sum ovibus Christi tradere utramque speciem sacramenti, postquam libellus Martini fuerit super hac re publicatus. Quid obstiterit ne fiat, scire hactenus non potui."

time when the boy Christ is born and given to us. The people also have hoped very much that at long last they would be communicated under both forms.¹⁷

Within a few days he did receive Luther's writing and happily wrote Roth,

I rejoiced when the order for celebrating mass by Martin was presented for them who had escaped from the captivity and the furnace of Babylon, and was not astonished since these things are the sum total of the whole Christian faith and the basis of the Gospel.¹⁸

And with his expression of gratitude to Luther, Hausmann immediately suggested a translation be made. "It seems useful to me, if Martin would not be troubled, to translate this same order into the vernacular for the laity. I do not wish to disturb his style or spirit."¹⁹

Editions and Translations²⁰

Three editions of Luther's Formula Missae et communionis appeared in Latin in 1523 and 1524.

¹⁷Ibid. "Ego semper expecto videre missandi formam, quam promiserat mihi Martinus, praesertim eo tempore, quo Christus puer natus est et datus est nobis: plebeji etiam sperant aliquando hic sero nimis se communicaturos sub utraque specie."

¹⁸Ibid. "Gavisus sum, quando formula missandi a Martino offerebatur per eos, qui e captivitate et fornace Babylonis evaserunt, nec mirum, quoniam haec summa totius Christianismi est et fundamentum Euangelii."

¹⁹Ibid. "Si Martino non esset molestum pro laicis in vernaculam eandem formulam transferre, utile mihi videtur. Ego nolo stilum eius nec spiritum turbare."

²⁰Complete information on these editions and translations is found in WA XII, 201-5.

1. "FORMVLA MISSAE ET COMMVUNIONIS pro Ecclesia Vuittembergensi. MARTINI LVTHER. VVITTEMBERGAE · M C XXIII." This edition was published by Nickel Schirlentz in Wittenberg on eight quarto leaves.

2. "FORMVULA MISSAE ET COMMVUNIONIS pro Ecclesia Vuittembergensi. MARTINI LVTHERI. VVITTEMBERGAE. M. D. XXIII." This edition was printed by Wolff Köpffel in Strasbourg on twelve octavo leaves.

3. The third edition appears in a printing with Luther's De instituendis ministris and is of particular interest. For it is probably this edition to which LeFèvre d'Étaples, teacher of Josse Clichtove, refers in a letter dated July 6, 1524, in which he writes from Meaux to a friend, "De instituendis ministris ecclesie and the Formula mysse has reached us."²¹ Its title page reads: "DE INSTITVENDIS MINISTRIS Ecclesiae, ad Clarissimum Senatum Pragensem Bohemiae, MARTINVS LVTHER. EIVSDEM FORMVLA Missae & communionis pro Ecclesiae Vuittembergensi." And on leaf 28 a new title page appears: "FORMVLA MISSAE ET COMMunionis pro Ecclesia Vuittembergensi, MARTINI LVTHERI."

Hausmann's request for a German translation of Luther's work was soon realized. Luther himself did not do the translation; it was the work of Paul Speratus (1484-1554), theologian and hymn writer, who had translated De instituendis ministris. Because this German version was produced under Luther's

²¹Ibid., XII, 164.

supervision and was printed in Wittenberg, it should be considered the authentic German edition. The translation of Speratus appeared in six printings.

1. "Ein weyse Christlich Mess zu halten vnd zum tisch Gottes zu gehen. Martinus Luther. Wyttemberg. M.D.xxiiij." This printing by Luke Cranach (1472-1553) in Wittenberg contains a foreword by Speratus to the congregation at Iglau²² and was printed on eighteen leaves in quarto.

2. "Ein weyse Christlich Mess zuhalten vñ zum tisch Gottis zu gehen. Martinus Luther. Wyttemberg. M.D.xxiiii." This edition was also printed by Cranach with Speratus' foreword on twenty leaves in quarto.

3. "Eyn weyse Christlich Mess zu halten vnd zum tisch Gottis zugehen. Mart. Luther. UUttemberg. M.D.XXiiij." This printing by Nickel Schirlentz in Wittenberg contains the foreword of Speratus and comprises eighteen leaves in quarto.

4. "Ein weyse Christlich Mesz zuhalten vnnnd zum tisch Gottis zugeen. Martinus Luther. Wyttemberg. M.D.xxiiij." Fourteen leaves in quarto, with Speratus' dedication.

5. "Ein weise christlich Mesz zuhaltē vñ zum tisch Gottis zu gehen. Mar. Luther. Wittemberg. M.D.XXiiij."

6. "Eyn wyse Christlich Mess zuhalten vnd zum tysch Gottes zcu gehenn. Martinus Luther. Wyttemberg. M.D.xxiiij." Twelve leaves in quarto, without the dedication of Speratus.

²²See WA XII, 203-4.

A second translation appeared in Nürnberg which may be the work of Andrew Osiander (1490-1552), but there is no evidence for this supposition. The oldest printings are dated 1523, and it may be that this translation was prepared before the one by Speratus. It appeared in four editions.

1. "Die weysze der Messz, vnn̄d geniessung des Hochwirdigē Sacraments, für die Christliche Gemayn verteütscht. Do. Mar. Luth. M.D.XXij. Wittenberg." Published by Jerome Höltzel in Nürnberg on eighteen leaves in quarto.

2. "Die weyse der Mesz, vñ geniessung des hochwirdigen Sacramēts, für die Christliche gemain verteütscht. Do. Mar. Luth. M.D.XXij wittenberg." Twelve leaves in quarto.

3. "Die weyse der Mess vnd genyessung desz Hochwirdigen Sacraments für die Christliche gemayn verteütscht. Doct. Mar. Luther. M.D.XXIIII. wittenberg." Printed by Fr. Peypus in Nürnberg on twelve leaves in quarto.

4. "Die weyse der Messz, vnd genyessung des Hochwirdigen Sacraments, für die Christliche Gemayn verteütscht. Doc. Mar. Luther. M.D.xxiiij. Wittemberg." Twelve leaves in quarto.

Emser's Missae Christianorum assertio

Several months after the publication of Luther's writing an old enemy, Jerome Emser, reacted violently with a treatise entitled Missae Christianorum contra Lutheranam missandi formulam assertio, dated February 29, 1524.²³ Emser

²³Freudenberger, p. xi.

(1478-1527), a humanist, had studied humanities at the University of Tübingen and law at the University of Basel. Thereafter he became secretary to Cardinal Raimondo Peraudi, papal delegate in Germany to preach the jubilee indulgence for a crusade against the Turks. In 1504 Emser lectured at the University of Erfurt and had Luther as one of his listeners. Emser was present at the Leipzig disputations of 1519 and as a result became involved in a bitter literary battle with Luther whom earlier he had admired for his courage. From 1520 to 1527 he wrote eight polemical works, the targets of which included Carlstadt and Zwingli. But Luther remained his polemic preoccupation.²⁴

This man was one of the foremost opponents of Martin Luther during the early years of the Protestant Reformation. In fact, it may not be far amiss to classify him as Luther's most significant [Roman] Catholic foe during the third decade of the sixteenth century. Not only did Emser quickly produce a critique of Luther's vernacular New Testament and even a rival version of his own . . . but he also entered into a most vitriolic literary dispute with the Reformer, and, in addition, translated and published polemical works by King Henry VIII of England and Desiderius Erasmus.²⁵

Emser's Missae Christianorum contra Lutheranam missandi formulam assertio is, like Luther's Formula Missae et communionis, also dedicated to Nicholas Hausmann, Emser's "old friend" (amico veteri). Emser begins his work by expressing his surprise and disbelief.

²⁴E. C. McShane, "Hieronymous Emser," New Catholic Encyclopedia (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., c.1967), V, 329-30.

²⁵Kenneth A. Strand, Reformation Bibles in the Crossfire (Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor Publishers, c.1961), p. 21.

Dearest Nicholas, when recently there fell into my hands a little book, Luther's order for celebrating mass, newly dedicated to you and, as he says, so often sought by you, my long-standing friendship with you came equally to mind both in terms of writing you on occasion and of speaking with you on letters and issues. On that basis I have without a doubt known you to be most respectful of the old ecclesiastical system and catholic unity. Therefore I would never have the courage to believe that you would lose esteem for the original form of the [Roman] catholic Mother [Church] and would have sought from that "son of perdition" an order for making sacrifice which was different from the one handed down to us from the Apostles and their successors.²⁶

To Emser there is no just reason for changing the ancient rite of the Church which is universally accepted, when at this time man is coming to the end of the ages. "But if there would indeed be a reason for changing things, who then would intentionally act so foolishly that he would seek advice with Judas from a Caiaphas?"²⁷ Scripture itself shows that all instruction regarding divine matters must be sought from the Church and no other. Luther is an "inventor of lies (mendaciorum architectus),"²⁸ and Luther's dedication of the Formula Missae

²⁶Freudenberger, p. 1. "Cum in manus nuper incidisset, Nicolae charissime, dictatus tibi recens Lutheri de missandi formula libellus, toties, ut ille ait, a te petitus, in mentem pariter incidit vetus mihi tecum tum scribendi olim tum colloquendi de literis ac rebus acris familiaritas, qua te veteris ecclesiasticae disciplinae ac unionis catholicae observantissimum haud dubie cognovi. Quare nunquam animum inducam, ut formulatori huic credam te posthabito catholicae matris archetype a 'filio' isto 'perditionis' aliam petiisse sacrificandi formulam, quam ab apostolis et eorum successoribus per manus nobis tradita est."

²⁷Ibid. "Quod si etiam causa esset novandarum rerum, quis tamen adeo mente desipiat, ut cum Juda a Caipha consilium petat?"

²⁸Ibid., p. 2.

et communionis to Hausmann was done for deceptive reasons. Before proceeding into the body of the work, Emser makes a last appeal on the basis of friendship.

But if those episcopal titles so tickle and amuse you, that you would rather be a Lutheran bishop than a catholic priest and to abandon the most ancient rite of the Church to conspire in this new order for celebrating mass, you will at least grant me by right of an old friendship that for the sake of both existing friends you listen to each discuss the mass.²⁹

Emser's methodology is one of dialogue. A statement is quoted from Luther and then followed by a lengthier reply by Emser. "This method permits him to shape his presentation actively with spirit and wit and to pay back Luther's rudeness now and then in a similarly coarse manner."³⁰ Emser's basic argument is historical: the liturgy of the mass is of apostolic origin, but he is clearly unable to present any convincing evidence. His citations from the letters of Gregory the Great, from Isidore of Seville, and from Remigius of Auxerre are too late to support his proposition, and his reliance on Pseudo-Dionysius calls the whole argumentation into doubt. However, Emser's references to Augustine and Ambrose do show that the basis for the liturgy does lie at a

²⁹Ibid., pp. 2-3. "Sin te episcopales isti tituli adeo titillant et oblectant, ut Luteranus episcopus quam catholicus sacerdos esse malis et deserto antiquissimo ecclesiae ritu in novam hanc missandi formam conspirandum duxeris, id saltem veteris amicitiae iure mihi donabis, ut utrisque existentibus amicus utrumque prius audias de missa disserentem."

³⁰Ibid., p. xii. "Diese Methode erlaubt es ihm, seine Darstellung mit Geist und Witz lebendig zu gestalten und Derbheiten Luthers gelegentlich mit gleichgrober Münze zurück-zuzahlen."

very early point in time and that Luther's observation that nothing but the name of the mass and communion have survived from apostolic times is an oversimplification.

Command of the historical method allows one freely to expect as little of him as of his opponents or other contemporaries. The question concerning the origin of the mass liturgy which he himself had placed was too difficult that it could have been altogether resolved in a satisfactory manner with the imperfect resources of his time.³¹

Luther never replied to Emser's critique, but did write Hausmann on April 26, 1524,

he would pray against Emser that the Lord would repay him according to his works; for it would be better that he die than to continue to slander Christ. The need for rest would be brought soon enough, and Hausmann also ought to cease to pray for him.³²

Unfortunately Emser soon heard of Luther's impious wish, and therefore this was hardly the end of their literary conflict.

Clichtove's Propugnaculum ecclesiae

A critique of Luther's Formula Missae et communionis of more impressive scholarship, of more polished Latin, and of more impressive orthodoxy was written by the French humanist-theologian Josse Clichtove in 1526. It was entitled:

³¹Ibid. "Beherrschung der historischen Methode darf man freilich so wenig von ihm erwarten wie von seinem Gegner oder anderen Zeitgenossen. Die Frage nach dem Ursprung der Messliturgie, die er sich gestellt hatte, war zu schwierig, als dass sie mit den mangelhaften Hilfsmitteln seiner Zeit überhaupt hätte befriedigend gelöst werden können."

³²Ibid., p. xiii. "Er wolle gegen Emser beten, dass ihm der Herr nach seinen Werken vergelte; denn es sei besser, dass er sterbe, als dass er fortfahre, Christus zu lästern. Schnell genug werde der Elende zur Ruhe gebracht werden, und auch Hausmann solle ablassen, für ihn zu beten."

Propugnaculum Ecclesiae adversus Lutheranos per IODOCUM CLICHTOVEUM Neoportuensem tres libros continens; scil. de Missa; de sacerdotum coelibatu; de abstinentia ciborum. In Officina Simonis Colinaei, ad Insigne folis aurei e regione collegii Belvacensis sita, anno ab incarnatione domini (qui verae pietatis, sanctimoniae et abstinentiae est approbator) vicesimo sexto supra millesimum et quingentesimum, die decima octava Maii.³³

The title page of another printing reads:

Propugnaculū Ecclesie. aduersus Lutheranos: per Judocum Clichtoueum Neoportuensem, Doctorem theologum, elaboratum: & tres libros continens. Primus, ritum antiquum celebrandae missae, ab Ecclesia institutum defendit: contra nouam eiusdem mysterii agendi formulam, a Lutero recens introductam. . . . Coloniae. Anno M.D.XXVI. mense Augusto.³⁴

This quarto edition contains sixteen leaves for an introductory letter and indices and then 231 leaves of text. On CCXXXI^b there is the further identification: "Coloniae Anno M.D.XXVI. excusum in officina honesti ciuis Petri Quentel."³⁵

The Propugnaculum ecclesiae is dedicated to the bishop of Chartres, Louis Guillard (died 1565), a highly respected and zealous prelate who had made Clichtove canon of Chartres. The concern of this thesis will deal only with the first of the three books of Clichtove's document, since it is specifically an attack on Luther's Formula Missae et communionis. The other two books do not deal with any particular work of Luther,

³³WA XII, 200.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Ibid.

but are directed more generally against scattered remarks of his on celibacy and fasting.

Clichtove knew and used Emser's treatise which in his opinion

silences the Lutheran order concisely, acutely, and clearly, making his own suitable responses section by section to Luther's separate statements. These responses are indeed verbally succinct, but rich in thought and sprinkled with a variety of ideas which are very worthwhile to know. And we will strive to follow his steps in this small treatise to the extent of our ability.³⁶

Clichtove enlarges upon Emser's argument and goes to great lengths to establish, as we will see, Dionysius the Areopagite as a true disciple of the Apostle Paul and therefore as the most important witness for the form of the mass in the apostolic era.

John Cochlaeus (1479-1552) advised Luther not to answer Clichtove since the work was in Latin and would therefore not do Luther great harm among his followers. Although the writing was widely disseminated, it did not have the impact that Cochlaeus expected, and Luther did not see fit or did not find the time to reply to Clichtove's critique.³⁷

³⁶Clichtoveus, p. XIV^b. "Formulam Lutheranam succincte, argute et praeclare confutat: particulatim singulis Lutheri dictis responsiones proprias accommodans, verbis quidem breves: sed foecundas sententiis, et varietate rerum scitu dignissimarum respersas. Cuius et nos consecrari vestigia in hac elucubratiuncula pro viribus connixi sumus."

³⁷WA XII, 201.

The Reformation in France³⁸

Before discussing the life, works, and influence of Josse Clichtove, it should be helpful to consider him in the light of the Reformation in France in general.

The Reformation in France never developed into a national movement. Though the Protestants under the stress of persecution consolidated themselves into a powerful and well-organized party, they never formed more than a minority of the nation. The majority, whose attachment to the [Roman] Catholic Church was stronger than their desire for her reformation, detested the Reformers as schismatics and separatists even more than as heretics.³⁹

Most knowledgeable men at the beginning of the sixteenth century would have agreed to the need for reform. The Church in France suffered the ills and failures common to the age: secularism of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, ignorance among the common clergy, loss of discipline, and sporadic immorality among the religious communities. Nevertheless, the strong allegiance of the French people to the Church was both national and religious. Since the reign of Philip IV the Fair (1268-1314), the French maintained a somewhat independent attitude toward the papacy, and during the Avignon Captivity (1308-1378) the Popes were their obedient servants. At the Council of Constance (1414-1418) two Frenchmen, John Charlier de Gerson (1363-1429) and Peter of Ailly (1350-1420), were

³⁸A helpful summary may be found in the chapter by A. A. Tilley in The Cambridge Modern History (Cambridge: University Press, 1903), II, 280-92.

³⁹Ibid., II, 280.

responsible for the declaration that councils are superior to the Popes. The effect of the Concordat of 1516 put the French Church under the authority of the King, not under the Pope, and therefore the French had no real personal interest in revolting against Rome.

In effect there was no internal force for reform, for an important change of the Concordat of 1516 involved the nomination of bishops and abbots by the King rather than by canonical election. This "greatly increased what many regarded as the root of the whole evil, the non-residence and worldly character of the superior clergy."⁴⁰ Francis I (1494-1547) took extensive advantage of this system of patronage to provide his diplomatic service. Laymen held many abbeys, and even some bishops were not of the clergy. Possession of a number of sees and abbeys was not uncommon, and therefore this new method of patronage, more than any other factor, thwarted reform.

An external impetus for reform was necessary, and this came in the form of the Renaissance.

For it was inevitable that the spirit of free enquiry . . . should also invade the domain of religious dogma and Church institutions, and that . . . it should apply itself to the first-hand study of the book upon which dogma and institutions were ultimately based. It was inevitable also that the spirit of individualism . . . should end in questioning the right of the Church to be the sole interpreter of that book⁴¹

⁴⁰Ibid., II, 281.

⁴¹Ibid., II, 281-82.

In France the Renaissance and the Reformation were especially close. A man significantly involved in both phenomena was James Lefèvre d'Étaples (1461-1536), humanist, Aristotelian, biblical and patristic scholar.

Lefèvre's principal intellectual interests were the philosophy of Aristotle, the Pauline Epistles, patristic literature, and the tradition of medieval Christian mysticism. By means of translations, commentaries, introductions, and paraphrases he recovered, or so his contemporaries believed, both the precise meaning of the works of Aristotle and the true elegance of their style. From Aristotle he urged his readers to turn to a reverent study of Scripture, guided by the Fathers. He himself edited a variety of patristic texts and undertook a major program of Biblical research and commentary. But it was in the mystics that Lefèvre found the most satisfying nourishment of his own piety, and he crowned his scholarship with a variety of speculative mysticism derived from the two thinkers who influenced him most profoundly, Pseudo-Dionysius and Nicholas of Cusa.⁴²

In 1512 he published a Latin translation and commentary on the Pauline epistles.

This book was remarkable in two ways: first because a revised version of the Vulgate was printed by the side of the traditional text, and secondly because it anticipated two of the cardinal doctrines of Lutheran theology.⁴³

In his commentary on First Corinthians he denied the merit of works without the grace of God, and in Hebrews he appears to reject transubstantiation for a concept of real presence.

Curiously enough, Lefèvre's book went relatively unnoticed except by scholars until 1519, when Luther's Latin

⁴²E. F. Rice, "Jacques Lefèvre D'Étaples," New Catholic Encyclopedia (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, c.1967), VIII, 604-5.

⁴³Tilley, II, 282.

writings became readily available and widely circulated in Paris. In 1523 LeFèvre published a revised French translation of the New Testament, which actually was nothing new, but nevertheless helped to spread the knowledge of the New Testament.

Though the effect of Luther's writings in France was considerable, the French Reformers showed almost from the first a tendency to base their theology rather on the literary interpretation of the Scriptures than on the specially Lutheran doctrine of Justification by Faith. Moreover, the geographical position of France brought them naturally into closer relations with Bucer . . . at Strassburg, and with Oecolampadius at Basel, than with Luther at Wittenberg.⁴⁴

In 1508 LeFèvre went to the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés under the patronage of his former student and now abbot, Guillaume Briçonnet (1472-1534). There he engaged in a secluded, scholarly life until Briçonnet was appointed in 1516 bishop of Meaux which then became a center of French reform. At Meaux Briçonnet gathered a group of intellectuals, including LeFèvre, who were sympathetic to his views and worked in the diocese, "preaching Christ from the sources."⁴⁵ For two and a half years the work at Meaux continued without interference. But in 1521 the theological faculty of the Sorbonne formally condemned Luther's writings, and the Parliament of Paris declared that possessors of these writings would be subject to fine or imprisonment. The bishop of Meaux, interested in

⁴⁴Ibid., II, 283.

⁴⁵Ibid.

internal reform and unsympathetic to Luther's apparently open revolt, responded with two decrees against the writings and teachings of Luther and against heretical preaching regarding prayers for the dead and invocation of the Saints. In the absence of Francis, then a prisoner in Madrid, Cardinal Anthony Duprat (1463-1535), at one time chancellor for the King, was instrumental in getting the Parliament of Paris to appoint a commission to try the Lutherans, and many were imprisoned. In 1523 a committee of theologians detected eleven errors in LeFèvre's commentary on the Gospels. When he was summoned to appear before the Parliament of Paris on suspicion of heresy, LeFèvre fled to Strasbourg with others of the Meaux preachers.

When Francis returned from captivity, he reversed much of the action taken against the reformers. Those who still considered themselves members of the Church were recalled from exile, and LeFèvre himself was appointed tutor to one of the King's sons. There seemed to be new cause for hope among the reformers. But in December 1527 the King, desperate for money, summoned an Assembly of Notables, and when the vote for the money from a group of clergy was attached to a request for the repression of Lutheranism Francis consented. During the same period Cardinal Anthony Duprat as archbishop of Sens convened the Synod of Sens at Paris for the purpose of designing methods to suppress heresy.

The subsequent decades continued with the King's ambivalence toward the reformers, sometimes sympathetically

inclined to tolerate their activity because of political considerations involving Henry VIII (1491-1547) of England and the Lutheran princes of Germany, and at other times provoked to repression and persecution by the extremist actions of fanatics. Nevertheless, this previous section should help to give a historical and ecclesiastical background to Clichtove's literary activities in the context of the Reformation in France, in the light of the influence of LeFèvre, and in the environment of the conservative theological faculty of the Sorbonne.

Josse Clichtove's Life and Works⁴⁶

Josse Clichtove was the first Parisian theologian to direct his writings against Luther, and he did it "with scholarship and soundness, but without harshness."⁴⁷ Clichtove was one of the many well-known scholars of the Sorbonne during the first half of the sixteenth century. During his

⁴⁶The most complete biography of Clichtove generally available is found in an article by A. Clerval in the Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique (Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1908), III, cols. 237-42. This is no doubt based on Clerval's dissertation at Paris in 1894 entitled De Judoci Clichtovei Neoportuensis doctoris Parisiensis et Carnotensis vita et operibus (see F. X. Bantle, "Jodocus Clichtoveus," Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche (Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1958), II, col. 1235.

⁴⁷Nouvelle Biographie Générale (Paris: Dirmin Didot Frères, 1855), X, col. 857. "Il est un des premiers qui aient écrit contre Luther; il le fit avec érudition et solidité, mais sans aigrer." There is room for doubt about the last expression.

early years under the influence of his friend and teacher, LeFèvre, Clichtove was among those who favored the renaissance of the classics and the reform of philosophy and scholastic theology. But later, when LeFèvre and other reformers were under suspicion and the attack of theologians, and especially when Luther was condemned by the Sorbonne and Leo X, Clichtove abandoned his earlier tendencies toward renewal and turned himself completely against the Lutheran errors. For this reason he received the title "Luther's hammer."⁴⁸ Besides being a literary opponent of Luther, Clichtove is "interesting because his works summarize and reflect in a comprehensive manner the whole spiritual current of his time."⁴⁹

Clichtove was born in Nieuport in Flanders in 1472 or 1473 of a noble and rich family. He began his studies in Louvain, but later moved to Paris, where eventually he studied with LeFèvre d'Étaples, who had recently returned from Italy and who was commonly regarded as the chief of the French humanists. Under his direction Clichtove received the degree of master of arts in 1492 and bachelor of theology in 1498. From 1499 he was a socius Sorbonnicus in residence at the College of Navarre with Guillaume Briçonnet, and during this period undertook advanced studies in theology and annotated

⁴⁸Clerval, III, col. 237.

⁴⁹Igino Rogger, "Josse Clichtove," Enciclopedia Cattolica (Vatican City: Catholic Library, 1949), III, 1871. "Interessa perche la sua opera riassume e riflette in maniera complessiva tutte la correnti spirituali del suo tempo."

the Sentences of Peter Lombard. In 1506 he received the degree of doctor of theology. From 1506 to 1512 Clichtove taught theology at the Sorbonne and under the direction of LeFèvre published works on philosophy, theology, and the Holy Scriptures. At the same time Clichtove made a name for himself among teachers of the liberal arts as an editor and a consultant for other scholars, and in recognition of his stature any number of authors dedicated their works to him.

From 1512 to 1515 he was directly associated with Briçonnet and LeFèvre, who in 1510 had made a trip to Germany with a group of theologians, some of whom became the first French reformers, and others of whom simply cast their lot with the Lutherans. This group aroused the animosity and the suspicion of the Sorbonne faculty. However, Clichtove was seemingly not greatly influenced by this activity in spite of his continued collaboration with LeFèvre. From 1512 to 1518 he published little but rather standard humanist and patristic works, for example, editions of St. Cyril and Dionysius the Areopagite.

In 1515 Louis Guillard (died 1565), bishop of Tournai, requested that Clichtove become his personal preceptor, which he was until 1520. In 1517 Charles V asked Clichtove to become his confessor, but the French theologian declined. Probably his most significant activity in this period was the publication of his Elucidatorium, in which he espoused three positions which came under considerable attack. (1) He

supported the suppression of the verses of the Exsultet iam angelica turba which read, "O assuredly necessary sin of Adam which was blotted out by Christ's death! O blessed sin which deserved to have such and so great a Redeemer."⁵⁰

(2) Clichtove advanced LeFèvre's questioning of

the traditional identification of Mary, "who is called the Magdalene, from whom seven devils had gone out" (Luke 8:2), with the penitent woman who anointed Jesus' feet in the Pharisee's house (Luke 7:36-50) and with Mary, the sister of Martha and Lazarus, who similarly "anointed the feet of Jesus" (John 12:1-9).⁵¹

(3) He challenged the legend regarding the three marriages of Saint Anne.⁵² The polemic response became the turning point in his life. He immediately fell under the attack of three theologians, Marc de Grandval, John Fisher (1469-1535), bishop of Rochester, who was responsible for eight books against various Lutheran heresies, and Noel Beda (died 1536), French theologian at the Sorbonne, whose uncompromising zeal

⁵⁰Liber Usualis (Tournai: Desclée and Company, 1947), p. 470. "O certe necessarium Adae peccatum, quod Christi morte deletum est! O felix culpa, quae talem ac tantum meruit habere Redemptorem!"

⁵¹Edward Surtz, The Works and Days of John Fisher (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, c.1967), p. 5.

⁵²See Frederick G. Holweck, "Saint Anne," The Catholic Encyclopedia (New York: Robert Appleton Co., c.1907), I, 538. "St. Joachim died soon after the presentation of Mary in the temple; St. Anne then married Cleophas, by whom she became the mother of Mary Cleophae (the wife of Alphaeus and mother of the Apostles James the Lesser, Simon and Judas, and of Joseph the Just); after the death of Cleophas she is said to have married Salomas, to whom she bore Maria Salome (the wife of Zebedaeus and mother of the Apostles John and James the Greater)."

finally resulted in his banishment by the Paris Parliament. Clichtove was obliged to write a series of treatises in defense of himself and of LeFèvre.⁵³

These quarrels which continued until 1520 and were inflamed by the advance of Lutheranism, impressed Clichtove greatly, who out of fear of either being deceived or being condemned with Le Fèvre d'Étaples, or of being accused of sympathies toward the heresy, recanted, was reconciled with the Sorbonne and was determined thereafter on a rejection of the principles of the innovators with an almost exclusive concentration on Luther.⁵⁴

At this point he broke his relationship with LeFèvre, who in 1520 was associated with Guillaume Briçonnet at Meaux, and reestablished himself with Louis Guillard.

From 1520 and 1526 Clichtove participated in much of the action of the Sorbonne against Luther. He prompted the faculty to condemn Luther's errors and drafted for it the Determinatio facultatis theologiae Parisiensis super doctrina Lutherana hactenus per eam visa in 1521. Other polemical writings in this period include: De veneratione sanctorum, 1523; Anti-lutherus, 1524; Propugnaculum ecclesiae, 1526; De sacramento eucharistiae contra Oecolampadium, 1527; Compendium veri-

⁵³Regarding the verses of the Exsultet: De necessitate peccati Adae et felicitate culpae ejusdem, 1516. Regarding the Magdalene controversy: Disceptationis de Magdalena defensio, Apologiae Marci Grandivallis . . . respondens, 1519.

⁵⁴Clerval, III, col. 238. "Cette querelle qui dura jusqu'en 1520, et fut envenimée par les progrès du luthéranisme, impressionna beaucoup Clichtove, qui, par crainte soit de s'être trompé, soit d'être condamné avec Le Fèvre d'Étaples, soit d'être taxé de sympathies pour l'hérésie, se rétracta, se rapprocha de la Sorbonne et se détermina désormais à rejeter ses principes novateurs pour combattre presque exclusivement Luther."

tatum ad fidem pertinentium . . . ex dictis et actis in concilio Senonensi, 1528; and Improbatio quorundam articulorum Martino Lutheri a veritate catholica dissidentium et in quodam libro gallico non satis exacte et recte impugnatorum, 1533.⁵⁵

In the meanwhile Louis Guillard, now bishop of Chartres, invited Clichtove to join him there, where he became canon theologian in 1528.⁵⁶ While engaged in a number of activities and writings during this period, his principal act was his collaboration in drawing up and discussing the statutes for the Council of Sens, convened in Paris by Cardinal Duprat. Some regard this council as a prelude to the Council of Trent.⁵⁷ He remained at Chartres until his death on September 17, 1543.

Clichtove was one of the many prolific humanists and theologians of his time. His works were numerous and widely available in France and other countries during the sixteenth century. Most of the humanist writings were written early in his career under the influence and direction of LeFèvre for his own studies and for use by his own students, and they covered such areas as logic, natural philosophy, morals, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and political law.⁵⁸

⁵⁵Ibid., III, col. 242.

⁵⁶Bantle, II, col. 1234.

⁵⁷Clerval, III, col. 239.

In regard to his theological writings a number of personages--LeFèvre, who sought to apply the same scholarly methods to theology as he had to philosophy and the liberal arts; Guillaume Briçonnet, who sought to restore an understanding of mysticism; Cardinal George d'Amboise, who worked to reform the religious orders; and Louis Guillard, who strove to restore piety and order among the secular clergy--influenced Clichtove to neglect scholastic traditions and to seek a renewal of patristic and Scriptural theology. It was in this spirit that he published his works on dogmatic theology, moral theology, and asceticism. Of the many writings of this prepolemical period one should note Theologia vivificans Dionysii Areopagitae, interprete Ambrosio Camaldulensi, cum scholiis Fabri et commentariis Clichtovei, 1514, because of Clichtove's great dependence on Dionysius the Areopagite to support his evidence for the Propugnaculum ecclesiae.⁵⁹

In conclusion, it should be said that, while Clichtove was not one of the most prominent men of his time, he commanded a position of high respect among both the theologians and the men of letters who were involved in the debut of the Renaissance and the Reformation. Posterity has not remembered him, but his contemporaries regarded him highly.

⁵⁸Ibid., III, cols. 239-40 for a complete catalogue of Clichtove's writings in the liberal arts.

⁵⁹Ibid., III, cols. 240-42 for a complete catalogue and description of Clichtove's theological writings.

Erasmus, who was one of Clichtove's targets, credited him with being "the richest source of truths, highly trained in secular disciplines and in the Christian discipline."⁶⁰

⁶⁰Ibid., III, col. 242. "Uberrimum rerum fontem, saecularibus disciplinis et christiana disciplina instructissimum."

CHAPTER II

JOSSE CLICHTOVE'S PROPUGNACULUM ECCLESIAE

Section I: The "Indiscretion" of Luther's Attempt

According to Clichtove's heading for the first book of the Propugnaculum ecclesiae¹ which deals with Luther's Formula Missae et communionis,² the author has two objectives: the rejection of Luther's form for celebrating mass and the vindication of the Church's ancient form.

1. In Section I Clichtove attributes Luther's attempt at introducing a form for the mass which differs from the Church's to great indiscretion (magnae temeritati). To Clichtove who seeks to defend the Church against the brazen indignities of its enemies (duris inimicorum eius insultibus) Luther's work appears suspect, for according to his own claim Luther seeks: (a) to liberate the Church's form from mutilation; (b) to restore the mass to its uncorrupted (integram) state; and then (c) to present his own form to Christian people as a proper (legitimam) substitute. But, if the mass (ritus ipse consecrandi eucharistiae sacramenti) can be

¹Judocus Clichtoveus, Propugnaculum ecclesiae adversus Lutheranos (Cologne: Peter Quentel, 1526). Hereafter referred to as PE.

²Martin Luther, D. Martin Luther's Werke (Weimar: Herman Böhlau, 1891), XII, 205-20. Hereafter referred to as WA.

changed with impunity, is there anything in the Church that will remain unchanged and unchallenged?

2. When Clichtove read Luther's treatise, he states that he was astounded at Luther's almost insane shamelessness and audacity (impudentiam et arrogantiam eo dementiae progressam), and that now, after everything else Luther had done, he would lay his irreverent hands on the mass, mutilate it, and reveal another form which was the product of his own evil and perverse genius (alteram formam suo excogitatam ingenio malo pravoque).

3. Who gave Luther the power, Clichtove asks, to change the mass and to construct a new form? If he claims to have a divine commission, then he should present his apostolic credentials. But by what arrogance does Luther claim for himself the authority to change that which is the jurisdiction of the Pope or an ecumenical council? He is neither a pope nor a bishop, and whatever power he has is self-ascribed.

4. Clichtove warns Luther to remember Korah, Dathan, and Abiram³ lest a similar fate await him, or Saul who incurred God's wrath by assuming a priest's role in making sacrifice,⁴ or finally Uzziah who dared to burn incense in the temple and became a leper.⁵ But Luther's act of abrogating the rite of the whole Church and introducing a new one simply by his own

³Num. 16:1-35.

⁴1 Sam. 13:8-14.

⁵2 Chron. 26:16-21

authority is no less arrogant. Why does he not heed these examples? To support the weight of these and other biblical examples Clichtove cites Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite.⁶

5. Furthermore, Clichtove charges Luther has acted no differently from Ahaz who removed the golden altar from the Temple and replaced it with a bronze copy of a Damascene altar,⁷ or than Antiochus Epiphanes who acted similarly and set up the "abomination of desolation" for the people's adoration.⁸ By analogy then the Church's form for the mass is comparable to the legitimate golden altars of Solomon and the post-exilic Temple, while Luther's form is comparable to the substitute altars of Ahaz and Antiochus Epiphanes.

6. Finally, Clichtove consoles the Wittenberg congregation for ever accepting this false apostle (pseudoapostolum), because of whom they have been led away from the Church (ab uberibus piae matris suae ecclesiae catholicae). It has been polluted by his teachings; he has made of Wittenberg a Wartburg. But lest the poison spread from that synagogue of Satan to other uninfected congregations, Clichtove will now proceed to destroy that Damascene altar that Luther has built at Wittenberg and to crush the "idol of desolation" worshipped there.

⁶This spurious author claims to be Paul's convert in Acts 17:34 and the bishop of Antioch. There is no scholarly consensus on a specific identification of the author. See, for example, Berthold Altaner, Patrology (Freiburg: Herder, c.1960), pp. 604-7.

⁷2 Kings 16:10-16.

⁸1 Macc. 1.

Section II: Luther's Reasons for the New Form

Clichtove quotes Luther's opening paragraph.

Until now I have only used books and sermons to wean the hearts of people from their godless regard for ceremonial. . . . Therefore, I have used neither force. . . . Nor did I make any innovations. . . . more so because of the fickle and fastidious spirits who rush in like unclean swine without faith or reason, and who delight only in novelty and tire of it as quickly, when it has worn off. . . . Nonetheless, at the risk of bursting with anger, I must bear with them.⁹

One thought which reflects Luther's pastoral concern has been omitted.

Therefore, I have used neither authority nor pressure. Nor did I make any innovations. For I have been hesitant and fearful, partly because of the weak in faith, who cannot suddenly exchange an old and accustomed order of worship for a new and unusual one.¹⁰

1. Luther, says Clichtove, is first to be sharply criticized for calling regard for ceremonial godless. For no sensible person (nemo sane mentis) would have called the

⁹Martin Luther, "An Order of Mass and Communion for the Church at Wittenberg, 1523," Luther's Works, edited by Ulrich S. Leupold (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, c.1965), LIII, 19. Hereafter the American Edition will be referred to as AE. See WA XII, 205-6. "Hactenus libellis et sermonibus egi inter populos, ut corda primum ab impiis opinionibus ceremoniarum avocarem. . . . Proinde nihil vi. . . . tentavi, nec vetera novis mutavi. . . . maxime propter leves illos et fastidiosos spiritus, qui ceu sues immundae sine fide, sine mente irruunt et sola novitate gaudent, atque statim ut novitas esse desiit, nauseant. . . . quamvis, ut rumpar ira, ferre illos cogor."

¹⁰Ibid. "Proinde nihil vi aut imperio tentavi, nec vetera novis mutavi, semper cunctabundus et formidabundus, tum propter imbecilles in fide animos, quibus subito eximi non potuit tam vetus et inolita, nec inseri tam recens et insueta ratio colendi dei."

rites of the Old Testament godless (impious) in their time, especially in view of the frequent divine commands regarding their careful observance in the Pentateuch. In addition Clichtove cites Ezek. 44:15-16 and then says,

Who, therefore, unless he were clearly evil or mentally unstable, would call godless and profane those ceremonies of the New Testament which have been established by the guidance of the Holy Spirit, which signify more holy mysteries, and which move the people to a greater devotion for divine worship?¹¹

2. What is no less consistent with the truth, notes Clichtove, is Luther's claim that he did not make any innovations when in fact his aim was "to alter entirely and to destroy thoroughly the ancient rites of the Church, respected by antiquity itself, and the long-standing precepts of the orthodox fathers with his own newly conceived ideas."¹² Luther as an innovator is himself to be censured before all others when it comes to castigating those who are eager for change. Luther, in fact, appears to treat offensively those who at first were enthusiastic supporters of the novelty of his teachings, but went beyond him. Clichtove then quotes Luther.

But since there is hope now that the hearts of many have been enlightened and strengthened by the grace

¹¹PE, III^a. "Quis igitur nisi plane improbus et mente parum constans novae legis ceremonias magisterio spiritus sancti institutas, et sacratiores mysteriorum significativas, promoventesque populum in maiorem divini cultus reverentiam: appellaverit impias aut sacrilegas?"

¹²Ibid. "Ut priscos ecclesiae ritus, ipsa antiquitate honorabiles, vetustaque orthodoxorum patrum instituta novis suo adinventis ingenio commutet, penitusque exterminet."

of God, and since the cause of the kingdom of Christ demands that at long last offenses should be removed from it, we must dare something in the name of Christ. . . . Therefore . . . we will deal with an evangelical form of saying mass (as it is called) and of administering communion. . . . not wishing, however, to prejudice others against adopting and following a different order.¹³

3. Luther's activity, Clichtove argues, has disrupted the whole Christian world, and the offenses are daily increasing in number and extent. This is what would happen if Satan, God's enemy, would seek to improve the world.

What work therefore Luther dares and proposes is not in the name of Christ, regardless of what he says-- for Christ is the author of peace and a lover of unity as well as one who demands obedience and teaches true humility, but it is in the name of him who delights in sowing weeds with the good wheat in the Lord's field. For Luther works for him who is the sower of all heresies.¹⁴

4. Clichtove feels that it is unnecessary to prove that this is Luther's aim in proposing a new form of the mass. To abandon the old for the new may be in itself wrong and harmful. To substantiate this point Clichtove cites Aristotle's Politics,

¹³AE LIII, 20. See WA XII, 206. "Sed cum iam spes sit, multorum corda per gratiam dei illustrata esse et roborata, ipsaque res poscat, ut tandem scandala tollantur de regno Christi, audendum est aliquid in nomine Christi. . . . Quare de formula aliqua pia missandi (ut vocant) et communicandi . . . agemus . . . nulli prorsus preiudicantes, ne aliam amplecti et sequi liceat."

¹⁴PE, III^b. "Quid igitur audet opus et aggreditur Lutherus: non in nomine est Christi, licet id eius verba sonent. Nam Christus pacis est autor et unitatis amator: praedicator etiam est obedientiae et verae humilitatis magister, sed in nomine est eius: qui gaudet superseminare zizania bono tritico in agro domini. Illius enim Lutherus agit negocium: qui sator est omnium haereseon."

II.v.14., where the ancient philosopher sharply criticizes those who advance new laws in the republic because

the law has no power to compel obedience besides the force of the custom, and custom only grows up in long lapse of time, so that lightly to change from the existing laws to other new laws is to weaken the power of the law.¹⁵

Should not the same principle then apply to ecclesiastical decisions regarding the cult? Does not frequent renewal with a rejection of former patterns undermine the salvation of the faithful? The danger is that anyone who is granted such license for change will simply follow his own whims and construct a form to suit his own mind. We have the examples of John Wyclif (1330-1384) and John Huss (1369?-1415) and now Luther who follows their pattern, and this, Clichtove fears, will not be the end of variation.

But, I ask, what plague more harmful or confusion more dreadful could be brought into the Church of God than finally to have no fixed form of celebrating the divine mystery of the mass? . . . Throughout the history of the synagogue the Hebrews had a uniform rite for sacrificing and eating the paschal lamb which was a type [of the true Lamb]. Would it not be shameful and detestable to sacrifice indeed the true Lamb Christ on the altar with a rite that varies in form and because someone changed his mind?¹⁶

¹⁵Aristotle, The Politics, translated by H. Rackham (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1932), p. 131.

¹⁶PE, IV^a. "Sed quae obsecro nocentior posset induci pestis in ecclesiam dei, aut quae magis horrenda confusio: quam ut tandem nulla habeatur certa forma celebrandi divinum missae mysterium? . . . Cumque uniformis fuerit ritus apud Hebraeos immolandi atque manducandi agnum paschalem typicum: quamdiu veteris synagogae decursus agebatur, nonne pudendum esset ac abominandum ipsum verum agnum Christum immolari in altari multiformi ritu et vario, atque pro cuiusque nutu permutando?"

5. It is well known that Luther has been excommunicated, and Clichtove cites from the papal bull Ad abolendam of Lucius III (1097?-1185) a statement to the effect that those who have been anathematized are not afraid to teach differently from the Church on the sacraments. And, even if they did recant, what further measure would it take to make these innately stubborn rebels once again to accept the Church's rite?

6. St. Isidore of Seville (560?-636) warns that those who are guilty of heresy and schism and their followers should heed the fate of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram in Numbers 16, for they will perish in the flame of eternal judgment.¹⁷ St. Cyprian (died 258) makes a remarkably similar statement in an unidentifiable Epistola contra haereticos. For Clichtove these are compelling witnesses against Luther who has constructed (fabricator) this new form.

Luther continues:

We therefore first assert: It is not now 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.¹⁸

7. It is typical for heretics, notes Clichtove, to say one thing and to do another. But this time Luther, so to

¹⁷"Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum," Patrologiae Latinae, edited by J. P. Migne (Paris: J. P. Migne, 1862), LXXXIII, cols. 317-18. Hereafter referred to as MPL.

¹⁸AE LIII, 20. WA XII, 206. "Imprimis itaque profiteamur, non esse nec fuisse unquam in animo nostro, omnem cultum dei prorsus abolere, sed eum, qui in usu est, pessimis additamentis viciatum, repurgare et usum pium monstrare."

speaking, has been caught in the act. For, while he disclaims any intent at destroying all worship of God, he actually has devoted all his mental energies to the task. The record speaks for itself: he has discarded most of the sacraments; he has abolished distinctions among clergy and laity; he has eliminated the mass ceremonial and the canonical hours; and finally he has removed veneration of the saints (sanctorum venerationem) and intercessions for the dead (suffragiorum ecclesiae in defunctorum communicationem). What has Luther left intact or safe? It is obvious from his writings that he is bent on ruining the Church and that he works to crush whatever is proper and worthy of respect.

8. Who told Luther, asks Clichtove, that the Church's rite was corrupt with "wretched accretions" and that it needed to be purged and replaced by a new order? Is he the one to make such decisions, and should all defer to his good judgment?

Luther's thinking has been distorted by a perverse disposition and by an irreconcilable hatred for everything related to the Church, and he is not capable of having a proper attitude toward the rite for worshipping God which is now accepted usage. As a result he labels the kinds of holy ceremonial established by the Apostles and apostolic men as "wretched accretions." In this way then he will strive to purify this order, but the fact is that he who promises that he will rid the field of dandelions and harmful plants would with strenuous effort tear out the wheat and sow weeds in its place. Therefore let no one be deceived by Luther's empty promise that he will present a godly order for worshipping God.¹⁹

¹⁹PE, v^a-b. "Ita Lutherus sinistro, depravatus affectu et totius rei ecclesiasticae odio inexpiabili non potest de ritu colendi deum, qui nunc in usum est receptus, rectam

Clichtove then cites Ecclus. 34:4, James 3:11, and Matt. 7:16 as scriptural authority for his charges.

Vatican II's Principles of Reform

The "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy"²⁰ of the Second Vatican Council, promulgated by Pope Paul VI on December 4, 1963, marks a new era in the history of Roman Catholic worship. Its aim in reform, or more accurately, restoration (instauratio), is repeatedly stated in terms of reemphasizing and clarifying the missionary, pastoral, and didactic character and roles of the liturgy. The opening paragraph aptly and succinctly presents the scope and goal of the Council:

To intensify the daily growth of Catholics in Christian living; to make more responsive to the requirements of our times those Church observances which are open to adaptation; to nurture whatever can contribute to the unity of all who believe in Christ; and to strengthen those aspects of the Church which can help summon all of mankind into her embrace.²¹

ferre sententiam, ut quae sanctarum genera caerimoniarum ab apostolis et viris apostolicis constituta vocet pessima additamenta. Eo igitur modo repurgare hunc usum annitur: ut is, qui pollicitus se agrum lolio et noxiis herbis expurgaturum, evelleret enixo studio triticum et zizania illius loco superseminaret. Non ergo ludatur quispiam vana Lutheri pollicitatione: qua spondet se usum pium quo deus colatur monstraturum."

²⁰Quotations will be taken from the translation in Documents of Vatican II, edited by Walter M. Abbott (New York: Guild Press, c.1966), pp. 137-78. Hereafter the Constitution will be referred to as CSL and cited by chapter and article. For the original text see Sacrosanctum Concilium Oecumenicum Vaticanum II, "Constitutio de Sacra Liturgia," Acta Apostolicae Sedis, LVI (February 15, 1964).

²¹CSL, Introduction, 1.

In looking to the past and tradition the Church is not so much interested in imitating as "to find there the creative principles of a reformed liturgy,"²² for ultimately her concern is people "that they should have a living worship which they can grasp, take part in and make the centre of their lives."²³

Chapter I of the Constitution deals specifically with the reform of the liturgy. Such a restoration is met with a number of concerns.

Some seem to have thought that the Council was going to "wreck" the ancient liturgy by which the Church has lived for two thousand years. . . . There are others who think that the liturgy is more or less perfect as it is and that no change is necessary. . . . Connected with this view is another that somehow or other the liturgy will be removed from the world of sacred and exposed to the profane world.

Some think that the Mass, for instance, has always been as it is now. They are completely ignorant of liturgical history or indeed of the history of the Church altogether. They cannot distinguish essentials from accidentals.²⁴

At the outset Chapter I acknowledges the existence of both changeable and unchangeable aspects of the liturgy. That which is unchangeable are "elements divinely instituted," but there are other elements which

not only may but ought to be changed with the passing of time if features have by chance crept in which are less harmonious with the intimate nature of the

²²J. D. Crichton, The Church's Worship (New York: Sheed and Ward, c.1964), p. 3.

²³Ibid., p. 4.

²⁴Ibid., pp. 85-86 passim.

liturgy, or if existing elements have grown less functional.²⁵

There are two basic criteria for liturgical reform.

One is tradition.

That sound tradition may be retained, and yet the way be open for 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.²⁶

Fundamental to a use of tradition is a historical-theological study of the liturgy in its development and formation to determine what is essential and what is unessential. Without such a study it would be impossible "to propose changes that will be in harmony with its nature,"²⁷ for it is important "that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing."²⁸ Nevertheless, the Council's interest is not primarily archaeological, but pastoral, the second criterion. Thus the Church is concerned that

both texts and rites . . . express more clearly the holy things which they signify. Christian people, as far as possible, should be able to understand them with ease and to take part in them fully, actively, and as befits a community.²⁹

"This, as Dom Vagaggini commenting on it after the first session said, is the principle of principles of liturgical

²⁵CSL, I, 21.

²⁶Ibid., I, 23.

²⁷Crichton, p. 88.

²⁸CSL, I, 23. "Novae formae ex formis iam exstantibus organice quodammodo crescant."

²⁹Ibid., I, 21.

reform."³⁰ An understanding of the liturgy is not to be limited to scholars or clergy, but should be within the capacity of the people. This also applies to all use of signs and symbols. "If we are going to retain symbolism in our liturgy it must be meaningful and meaningful to the people. Otherwise it has no raison d'être at all."³¹ If the people are to celebrate the liturgy as a community, then "the rites . . . must be such that the people can use them, can enter into them, in a word, take an active part in them."³²

Chapter II also gives some specific directives for revision of the liturgy "so that the sacrifice of the Mass, even in the ritual forms of its celebration, can achieve its pastoral effects to the fullest."³³ This revision has two goals: (1) "that the intrinsic nature and purpose of its several parts . . . can be more clearly manifested," as well as the interrelationship of these parts; and (2) "that devout and active participation by the faithful can be more easily accomplished."³⁴ To achieve these goals the Council will use three means: (1) simplification; (2) removal of unnecessary duplications and additions; and (3) restoration.

³⁰Crichton, p. 90.

³¹Ibid., pp. 91-92.

³²Ibid., p. 92.

³³CSL, II, 49. "Ut Sacrificium Missae, etiam rituum forma, plenam pastorem efficacitatem assequatur."

³⁴Ibid., II, 50.

For this purpose the rites are to be simplified, while due care is 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. Where opportunity allows or necessity demands, other elements which have suffered injury through accidents of history are now to be restored to the earlier norm of the holy Fathers.³⁵

Furthermore, the Council does not insist on absolute uniformity of rites. In fact, "it rejects the rigid uniformity of the past and the imposition of alien forms, symbols and expressions," and it recognizes "the positive goodness of diversity in the liturgy."³⁶ For, although "notable differences between the rites used in adjacent regions are to be carefully avoided,"³⁷ "the Church has no wish to impose a rigid uniformity in matters which do not involve the faith or the good of the whole community."³⁸

Provided that the substantial unity of the Roman rite is maintained, the revision of liturgical books should allow for legitimate variations and adaptations to different groups, regions, and peoples, especially in mission lands. Where opportune, the same rule applies to the structuring of rites and the devising of rubrics.³⁹

One commentator immediately notes,

One misconception has already arisen, largely because of the expression "particularly in mission lands."

³⁵Ibid.

³⁶Frederick R. McManus, "Dogmatic Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy," American Participation in the Second Vatican Council, edited by Vincent A. Yzermans (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967), p. 178.

³⁷CSL, I, 23.

³⁸Ibid., I, 37.

³⁹Ibid., I, 38.

. . . The use of this expression in no way limits the reforms--or the adaptability mentioned here.
 . . . The principles are everywhere valid. . . .

The decision of the Council to admit flexibility and diversity . . . is in sharp contrast to the static approach of liturgical uniformity.⁴⁰

In any case, "the Council did not for a moment contemplate liturgical chaos or free experimentation."⁴¹ Authority for change rests with the Church, that is, the Apostolic See or the bishop, as the case may be. "Therefore, absolutely no other person, not even a priest, may add, remove, or change anything in the liturgy on his own authority."⁴² Innovation is not a private matter. On the other hand, revision is a continuing process. "The principles of liturgical diversity, flexibility, and adaptability means that no reform of the liturgy can be permanent or even definitive except in a relative sense: for indeed one must remember "the principle of continuing evolution of liturgical forms."⁴³

It is clear that the Roman Church has abandoned the principle of strict uniformity in rite and ceremony and observance--a principle so dear to the sixteenth century. . . . The principle is acceptance of what is now basic in ecumenical thinking about worship--the quest for unity without uniformity.⁴⁴

⁴⁰McManus, in Yzermans, p. 178

⁴¹Ibid.

⁴²CSL, I, 22, §3. "Quapropter nemo omnino alius, etiamsi sit sacerdos, quidquam proprio marte in Liturgia addat, demat, aut mutet."

⁴³McManus, in Yzermans, p. 179.

⁴⁴Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., "The Liturgy," The Second Vatican Council, edited by Bernard C. Pawley (London: Oxford University Press, c.1967), p. 164.

Section III: The Apostolic Origin of the Mass

Luther says,

We cannot deny that the mass, i.e., the communion of bread and wine, is a rite divinely instituted by Christ himself and that it was observed first by Christ and then by the apostles, quite simply and in a most godly way without any additions. But in the course of time so many human inventions were added to it that nothing except the names of the mass and communion has come down to us.⁴⁵

1. Clichtove grants Luther's thesis that Christ established the rite of the mass simply and without any additions (simpliciter et sine ulla superadietione), since the precise form in which the sacraments are to be administered was not presented by Christ in the Gospel, but later revealed by the Spirit through the ministry of the Apostles and their successors, and then only in an elementary manner. If Christ had explained everything, what need would the Church have had for the direction of the Apostles in completing the mass's form?

2. But Clichtove will not grant that the mass "was observed quite simply . . . and without any additions" by the Apostles. In substance the form of the mass was wholly established by the Apostles, although some accidents were later added to enhance the sublime mystery (sublime mysterium). But

⁴⁵AE LIII, 20. See WA XII, 206. "Nam hoc negare non possumus, Missas et communionem panis et vini ritum esse a Christo divinitus institutum. Qui sub ipso Christo primum, deinde sub Apostolis simplicissime atque piissime, absque ullis additamentis, observatus fuit. Sed successu temporum tot humanis inventis auctus, ut praeter nomen ad nostra saecula nihil de missa et communione pervenerit."

one need not take Clichtove's word for this. According to Isidore, St. Peter established the order of mass and the prayers for offering the sacrifice (ordo . . . missae vel orationum quibus deo oblata sacrificia consecrantur), which was used universally and uniformly (uno eodemque modo universus peragit orbis).⁴⁶ St. Paul confirms the fact of a universally used rite in his promise to the Corinthians, "About the other things I will give directions when I come";⁴⁷ according to Clichtove's interpretation "the other things" refer to the celebration of the Eucharist and communion. Furthermore, when St. Paul writes Timothy, "First of all, then, I urge that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for all men, for kings and all who are in high positions,"⁴⁸

he implies (in the opinion of at least several very reliable authorities) that he had taught the rite for celebrating the mass to the churches according to this order which almost all the Church respects.⁴⁹

3. Furthermore, it is well known, says Clichtove, that James, the brother of Jesus and bishop of Jerusalem, handed down the celebration of the mass in writings. Also Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite gives an extensive description of a fixed and complete form of the mass constructed at that time

⁴⁶De ecclesiasticis officiis. Not included in MPL.

⁴⁷1 Cor. 11:34b.

⁴⁸1 Tim. 2:1-2a.

⁴⁹PE, VI^a. "Insinuat se (ut probatissimorum autorum et quidem complurium est sententia) ritum missae celebrandae tradidisse ecclesiis iuxta eam formam quam pene omnis observat ecclesia."

from the apostolic rite, as well as a spiritual interpretation of individual "mysteries" of this form. From this Clichtove deduces that there never was a rite of great simplicity without any additions, but that on the contrary the rite was rich and varied in symbolism.

4. But perhaps, suggests Clichtove, some troublesome (importunus) person will object that Dionysius the Areopagite was not a convert of St. Paul, but a writer of some later period, and that the rites and ceremonies which Dionysius describes are therefore not apostolic, but the work of other, later orthodox fathers. Clichtove has already answered the first criticism in his Antilutherus of 1524 and given abundant proof that no one could have written the works ascribed to Dionysius but Dionysius the Areopagite. He is not at all reluctant to repeat the four arguments in the Propugnaculum ecclesiae, paragraphs 5 through 8.

9. From all this evidence, Clichtove asserts, it is clear that Luther speaks falsely when he says, "In the course of time so many human inventions were added to the rite of the mass that nothing except the names of the mass and communion has come down to us."⁵⁰ For whatever was set in the mass with the Spirit adding through the teaching of the Apostles was not human invention. For as Christ promised of the Spirit, "He will teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance

⁵⁰AE LIII, 20. See WA XII, 206.

all things,"⁵¹ and "When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth."⁵² Whatever the first apostolic successors and the general councils of orthodox fathers approved under the Spirit's guidance was not human invention. Certainly, if a person would allow the argument that these portions of the rite in question are done purely to honor God, to give an aura of dignity, and to instill greater reverence for worship, then he would have no doubts about admitting that these things are not human, but divine in origin.

Also since all those things which pertain to celebrating the rite of the mass are established with proper rationale and are not observed to have grown to excess, but to be restrained by certain fixed limits; and especially since the same things are observed in the same form of worship throughout the whole Christian world to this day to the extent of the same substance of its parts; and since these have continued from the very time of the Apostles to the present age unshaken, who, unless he had a weak mind, would say with Luther that "nothing except the names of the mass and communion has come down to us."⁵³

Clichtove concludes, "therefore our age truly has the same content of the mass, and not only a bare name, as this Luther barks."⁵⁴

⁵¹John 14:26b.

⁵²John 16:13a.

⁵³PE, VIIIa. "Cum etiam illa omnia quae ad celebrandum missae officium spectant: legitima ratione constant, necque supra modum excrevisse deprehendantur, sed certis quibusdam limitibus contineri. cum praeterea eadem uniformi cultu per totum orbem christianum hactenus observata sint quantum ad ipsam rerum substantiam, et ab ipso apostolorum seculo in hanc usque aetatem illabefacta perseverent: quis nisi mentis inops dicet cum Lutero nihil de missa praeter numen ad nostra tempora pervenisse?"

⁵⁴Ibid., VIII^b. "Hanc igitur et nostra aetas vere ipsam rem missae: et non tantummodo nudum nomen, ut oblatrat hic Lutherus."

Vatican II on Simplicity

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. . . . It is to this nucleus that has been added in the course of ages the complexus of rites that we now know as the Mass of the Roman rite. In the first centuries, up to the middle of the fifth, the development was organic. . . . Later on the development became more haphazard and many things were added which . . . were out of harmony with the nature of the liturgical action.⁵⁵

We have already noted the Constitution's concern to change features of the liturgy which are incongruent additions or which have ceased to be functional; see articles 21 and 50. Basic to this concern is the conscious attempt to restore the liturgy so that it reflects its intrinsic significance and intelligibility. Directly related to this pastoral goal is simplicity. "For this purpose the rites are to be simplified."⁵⁶ With the simplification will come understanding and participation.

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 explanation.⁵⁷

⁵⁵Crichton, pp. 87-88.

⁵⁶CSL, II, 50.

⁵⁷Ibid., I, 34.

Is the goal then a restoration of a first-century rite?

No doubt it is chimerical to suggest, as Hans Küng has, that we should revert to what is to all intents and purposes a first-century liturgy. Life has moved on, the people of the twentieth century have, if not different, then certainly additional, needs to those of the early Christians. On the other hand, the greater the simplicity of the liturgy and the more closely it reflects the New Testament, the more likely we are to have a rite that will in fact speak to ordinary Christians.⁵⁸

Or as McManus puts it,

The confusing and the complex, the additions which now have no meaning, all must now be stripped from the liturgy so that its structure and outlines are clear. Neither iconoclasm nor philistinism is intended: the noble simplicity must not turn its back on past or present beauty. But the primacy must go to intelligibility in forms, with no obscurity for obscurity's sake. The sacred is not necessarily the mysterious; the mystery is to be revealed and proclaimed in human language and deeds.⁵⁹

Section IV: The Question of Vernacular

Luther goes on to speak positively of some parts of the mass, Clichtove notes, lest he become an object of hate because of a blanket condemnation of the mass. But this is typical of Luther, and yet he confuses the false with the true and undermines that which the whole Church has accepted.

Now the additions of the early fathers who, it is reported, softly prayed one or two Psalms before blessing the bread and wine are commendable. Athanasius and Cyprian are supposed to be some of these.

⁵⁸Crichton, p. 89.

⁵⁹In Yzermans, p. 177.

Those who added the Kyrie eleison also did well. We read that under Basil the Great, the Kyrie eleison was in common use by all the people. The reading of the Epistles and Gospels is necessary, too. Only it is wrong to read them in a language the common people do not understand.⁶⁰

1 - 2. Luther errs, Clichtove claims, in ascribing the chanting of Psalms at the beginning of the mass to Cyprian and Athanasius. As Dionysius testifies,⁶¹ this was the apostolic practice of the early Church based on the Old Testament custom of singing the Psalms during sacrifice, a custom dating from the time of David. See, Clichtove says, Augustine⁶² and Jerome⁶³ on Is. 66:20.

3. Furthermore, Clichtove believes, the nine-fold Kyrie eleison antedates Basil from the apostolic rite as a threefold invocation of the Trinity (triplicatam summae trinitatis invocationem). However, it has never been universal custom

⁶⁰AE LIII, 20-21. See WA XII, 206-7. "Ac primorum additiones, qui unum aut alterum psalmum ante benedictionem panis et vini levi voce orasse leguntur, laudabiles fuere, quales Athanasius et Cyprianus fuisse putantur. Deinde qui Kyrie eleison addiderunt, et ipsi placent. Nam sub Basilio magno legimus Kyrie Eleison fuisse in usu totius populi publico. Iam Epistolarum et Euangeliorum lectio etiam necessaria fuit et est, nisi quod vicium sit ea lingua legi, quae vulgo non intelligitur."

⁶¹"De ecclesiastica hierarchia," Book III, Patrologia Graeca, edited by J. P. Migne (Paris: J. P. Migne, 1857), III, col. 426. Hereafter Patrologia Graeca will be referred to as MPG.

⁶²"De civitate dei," Book XX, Ch. 21, MPL, XLI, col. 693.

⁶³"Commentariorum in Isaiam Prophetam," Book XVIII, Ch. 66, MPL, XXIV, col. 673.

that the people say the Kyrie in Greek; this is true only in the Greek rite, whereas in the Roman rite the clergy sing and the people respond. An additional difference is the exclusive use of Kyrie eleison in the Greek rite, while in the Latin rite this alternates with Christe eleison. On this, see Gregory the Great.⁶⁴

4. A third difference in the use of the Kyrie between these rites, according to Clichtove, is that, just as the Latin uses the Greek Kyrie eleison, so the Greek rite uses the Latin Domine miserere. This implies the unity and fellowship in the Christian faith among both peoples. See Rom. 10:12. In addition, both rites utilize Latin, Greek and Hebrew to confess God and to sing His praises. The Roman church did not derive this use of the Kyrie from the Greek church, but from apostolic tradition.

5. Luther further errs, Clichtove charges, when he says it is wrong to read the Epistles and Gospels to the people in a language which is unintelligible to them, even though he concedes that it is necessary that they be read. Luther's implication is that it would be desirable for Scripture to be read in the vernacular for the common people, even women and children, to understand. This has never been permitted. When the Apostles went to the Gentiles they celebrated mass only in

⁶⁴"Epistolarum," Book IX, Indict. II, Letter 12, MPL, LXXVII, col. 956. See Joseph A. Jungmann, The Mass of the Roman Rite (New York: Benziger Brothers, Inc., c.1951), I, 338-39.

Hebrew, and foreigners did not understand it. Would Luther fault the practice of the princes and founders of the church (quod ipsi principes ecclesiae et fundatores fecerunt)?

The Western church used Hebrew until the time of the Roman emperor, Hadrian, and only then for the first time did the church use Greek and later Latin.

Never did the ancient fathers proceed to other languages from Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, in which to celebrate so eminent a mystery, and quite rightly, for the Gospel asserts that the title of Christ's cross was written only in those three languages mentioned. By this the Holy Spirit would indicate to the whole Church . . . that in these three languages alone should the sublime mystery of the life-giving Passion of Christ be conducted in the very rite of the mass.⁶⁵

6. Only these three languages, Clichtove asserts, are considered suitable for use in teaching (doctrinales) and have been conventionally used to transmit both the liberal and theological disciplines to posterity. For the sake of precision and common understanding these languages became the speech of the educated and had an aura of greater dignity than the commonly used tongues. It was only reasonable and proper, therefore, that worship should use only these languages.

Otherwise the holy would be openly profaned and cheapened, if any portion of that highly esteemed rite were read in the vernacular. For all devotion and reverence for the divine words in the Epistles of the

⁶⁵PE, IX^b-X^a. "Neque unquam progressum est ab antiquibus patribus ad alias linguas ab Hebraea, Graeca, et Latina, quibus tam excellens celebraretur mysterium. Et id quidem merito, nam tribus illis linguis modo nominatis titulus crucis Christi conscriptus fuisse ab evangelista perhibetur, quo significaret toti ecclesiae spiritus sanctus . . . his solum tribus linguis mysterium sublime vivificae passionis Christi in ipso missae officio tractari debere."

Apostles and the Gospels would be lost. Indeed these same most holy words would become base and vile to the people, if the covering of the Latin language which preserves their [original] honor were removed and they were exposed to the eyes and ears of all. The people themselves would not be moved by the same devotion and reverence of spirit for these words in the vernacular as they now are.⁶⁶

If the Epistles and Gospels are indiscriminately thrown at the people, the result can only be confusion and distortion, unless there is some explanation. Can a common person perceive their thoroughly spiritual and hidden meaning? A multitude of errors and spiritual ruination will follow. To avoid these unfortunate possibilities the Church must prevent vernacular reading of the Epistles and Gospels.

7. It does not follow, Clichtove assures, that if the Western church reads the Epistles and Gospels in Latin their meaning will be inaccessible to the people. It is customary on feast days to give them ample interpretation in the vernacular, and surely the people ought to flock to these public proclamations of the Word with a burning desire to understand the Lessons. But they should not expect to hear these daily at Mass in the vernacular with little or no interpretation. For once the people have the Epistle and Gospel, they will

⁶⁶Ibid., x^a. "Alioqui prophanarentur sacra et prostitu-
erentur vulgo: si aliqua illius dignissimi officii pars lingua
vernacula lectitaretur. Periret enim reverentia illa et vene-
ratio divinorum verborum in epistolis apostolicis et evangelis
contentorum quinimmo sordescerent tandem et vilescerent popu-
lo eadem verba sacratissima: si sublato latini sermonis operi-
mento (quo condita servantur in sua dignitate) exponerentur
omnium oculis et auribus. Neque tanta populus ipse afficeretur
devotione atque animi veneratione ad eadem verba in vernaculam
traducta linguam: quanta nunc afficitur."

expect the Gloria in excelsis, the Nicene Creed, and the Lord's Prayer in their own tongue. And since curiosity knows no bounds, they will go after the Introit, the Collects and prayers of the mass, the Preface, and even the Canon. Eventually the whole mass would be in the vernacular, and that would be absurd! Additional reasons will be given later.

8. Furthermore, in order to annihilate Luther's argument, Clichtove asks, why would it not also be wrong to entrust young boys and girls with the Lord's Prayer, the Gloria in excelsis, the Apostles' Creed, the seven penitential Psalms, the hours of the Virgin Mary, the vigils for the dead, and so on? For they cannot understand them now, nor, as far as that goes, do any of their elders. Why then does Luther think that these texts must be translated? Would he condemn committing all prophecies to memory or reading them to the young in Latin? Would he disapprove of lay people who know Latin reading and hearing these texts? Would he rather such people be restricted to the vernacular also? But if he were not to think that this is necessary, why does he here make insults because the Epistles and Gospels are read in Latin? The same argument can be used on both sides!

Vatican II on the Use of the Vernacular

Can Latin be considered the "mother tongue of the Church"? There are cogent reasons why this would not seem defensible,

according to Hans Küng.⁶⁷ Jesus of Nazareth neither preached nor prayed in Latin, Greek, or Hebrew, but in Aramaic, the colloquial language of His people. Aramaic was also the liturgical language of the church at Jerusalem. The Scriptures were written in koine Greek, the vernacular of the Roman Empire, and, in fact, the ancient liturgical language of the church at Rome was Greek, not Latin. The transition from Greek to Latin came about 250 A.D., as the latter became more commonly spoken. The local vernacular was also used in the other Christian communities.

At that time, no one felt the need for a "sacred language," intelligible only to the "initiated." The very opposite was in fact the case, and the Church felt that she existed for the "little ones."⁶⁸

A little later, Küng points out,

the discipline of the arcanum, which was exercised for a certain period by the early Church in order to protect the sacred mystery of Christian worship, made no division between the clergy--that is, the educated, who understood--and the Christian people--the uneducated, who did not understand--but only between the Christians and the heathens. In the cause of general intelligibility, even bishops and popes who were educated in the classical tradition, such as Ambrose, Augustine and Gregory the Great, expressly condemned the use of classical Latin and declared themselves in favour of a language which, though not debased, was closer to that of the people.⁶⁹

During the Middle Ages national languages began to develop, but the Church continued to use Latin,

⁶⁷The Council in Action (New York: Sheed and Ward, c.1963), pp. 122-34.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 124.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 126.

either because these new dialects took a long time to become cultural dialects, or because it was believed, and at the time there was reason for it, that Latin constituted a powerful unifying factor in an era in which the first symptoms of a great centrifugal and disintegrating movement were beginning to appear.⁷⁰

With the Reformers came opposition to continued use of Latin, the translation of the Scriptures, and introduction of the vernacular into the mass.

The Church now faced another painful alternative. On the one side it was clear that the accusations of the Reformers had their raison d'être, because for the lower uneducated classes the Bible and the liturgy were no longer fonts of life as they had been in the early Church. On the other hand, a pure and simple adoption of the vernacular might seem to favor the Protestant heresy. . . . The Fathers of Trent decided to make Latin obligatory.⁷¹

However, out of concern for the people the Council of Trent directed pastors to give instruction on the liturgy, but this intent was never fully realized until the impetus of the liturgical movement of the present century. Further attempts to introduce the vernacular in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries at the time of the Jansenists also failed because of the concern to preserve the integrity of the Church's teaching. In the twentieth century the Church introduced vernacular for some rites and rituals.

The use of the Latin language is no longer regarded, as it was at the Council of Trent, as a fundamental protection against corruptions and errors in doctrine

⁷⁰William Baraúna, "Active Participation, the Inspiring and Directive Principle of the Constitution," The Liturgy of Vatican II, edited by William Baraúna (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, c.1966), I, 181.

⁷¹Ibid.

but rather as a sign of unity. Pius XII wrote in Mediator Dei (No. 60): "The use of the Latin language, customary in a considerable portion of the Church, is a manifest and beautiful sign of unity, as well as an effective antidote for any corruption of doctrinal truth." This presents another aspect of the use of Latin, for the pastoral aspect is seen in the words that follow immediately: "In spite of this the use of the mother tongue in connection with several of the rites may be of much advantage to the people."⁷²

One of the most difficult and heavily debated issues of Vatican II was the question of the vernacular.⁷³ Three views were supported: (1) complete retention of Latin; (2) use of the vernacular for all of the liturgy; and (3) maintaining Latin as the principal language with permission to use the vernacular in specified portions. Eventually the Council adopted a view similar to the third position, but with greater possibilities for the use of the vernacular.

Particular law remaining in force, the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites.

But since the use of the mother tongue, whether in the Mass, the administration of the sacraments, or other parts of the liturgy, may frequently be of great advantage to the people, the limits of its employment may be extended. This extension will apply in the first place to the readings and directives, and to some of the prayers and chants.⁷⁴

⁷²Charles Braga, "The Language to Be Used," The Commentary on the Constitution and on the Instruction on the Sacred Liturgy, edited by A. Bugnini and C. Braga (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1965), p. 113.

⁷³Joseph Andreas Jungmann, "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy," Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II (New York: Herder and Herder, c.1967), p. 25.

⁷⁴CSL, I, 36, §§1-2.

Vatican II followed the reasoning of Pius XII in preserving the Latin language for the Latin rites, yet conceding the need to permit the vernacular for pastoral reasons.

Latin will continue to be maintained in the Latin rites; but it does not specify for how long, and to what extent. . . . The official spokesman for the theological commission made clear that under the term "Latin rites" would be included the Roman, Ambrosian, Toledan, Dominican and others.⁷⁵

Note should be made of the reference to "particular laws," which implies that "concessions granted in the past remain untouched, and the door was not closed to similar concessions in the future."⁷⁶ It is indicated in paragraph three of Article 36 that such concessions are in the hands of the local bishops in consultation with the Apostolic See. According to Braga, it would be possible for a bishop to petition for permission to celebrate the whole liturgy in the vernacular, without vitiating the sense and intent of this paragraph. "The Council itself, however, although it is not opposed in principle to the celebration of the entire liturgy in the vernacular, does not go to the extent of positively conceding it."⁷⁷

The second paragraph allows wider use of the native languages in the mass, in the administration of Sacraments, and in other parts of the liturgy. "No part of the Liturgy per se is excluded from the concession of the use of the

⁷⁵Baraúna, in Baraúna, I, p. 184.

⁷⁶Ibid.

⁷⁷Ibid.

vernacular. . . . Furthermore, no element of individual parts is excluded."⁷⁸ For the Council's directive applies "in the first place" to Scripture, instruction, some prayers, and some chants.

The words "in the first case" indicate that the use of the mother tongue is not necessarily limited to the cases mentioned, but may go far beyond them, if pastoral needs require it. The Constitution does not forbid that the Canon of the Mass may be celebrated in the mother tongue. This follows very clearly from the words of the official spokesman for the liturgical commission, words approved in the plenary session: "As regards the different parts of the Mass in which the mother tongue may be used--and we do not exclude any part expressly, although consideration should be given to those Fathers who would exempt the Canon--we lay down these regulations."⁷⁹

This latitude is seen also by commentators in Article 54.

In Masses which are celebrated with the people, a suitable place may be allotted to their mother tongue. This provision is to apply in the first place to the readings and "the common prayer," but also, as local conditions may warrant, to those parts which pertain to the people.⁸⁰

This article applies to masses in which the people participate, and not therefore to private masses where Latin will be retained.⁸¹ This section of the Constitution is similar to Article 36 in designating as a starting point the use of the vernacular for the Epistle and Gospel and the Prayer of the Faithful, since these most directly involve the people.

⁷⁸Braga, in Bugnini and Braga, p. 112.

⁷⁹Baraúna, in Baraúna, p. 184.

⁸⁰CSL, II, 54.

⁸¹Braga, in Bugnini and Braga, p. 116.

The expression "in parts which pertain to the people" is taken from No. 14 (b) of the Instruction of the Congregation of Rites of September 3, 1958, which in turn refers to No. 31 of the same Instruction. According to this document, which lists four degrees of direct liturgical participation by the faithful, we can certainly point out as parts which directly concern the people, the parts of the Ordinary of the Mass (Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Agnus Dei) and the parts of the proper of the Mass (the antiphons for the Introit, Offertory and Communion, and the chants between the lessons) which are sung or recited by the people or by the choir, which for that matter is part of the people. About this interpretation there can be no doubt since the relator proposed it before the voting on the second chapter of the Constitution in the Council hall.⁸²

The remainder of the article includes an encouragement still to teach the people the Ordinary in Latin and a reference to Article 40 for procedure if more extensive use of the vernacular is desired.

The II Vatican seeks to popularize the liturgy in the best sense of the word by transferring to the popular domain of the faithful what, up to now, was little more than a privilege to a chosen elite of the clergy. . . . They are . . . inspired by no other goal than this: to make sure that all take part more actively, more consciously, and more fully in the precious treasures of the liturgy.⁸³

Section V: Chanting

1. Luther continues,

Later, when chanting began, the Psalms were changed into the introit; the Angelic Hymn Gloria in Excelsis: et in terra pax, the graduals, the alleluias, the Nicene Creed, the Sanctus, the Agnus Dei, and the communio were added. All of these are unobjectionable,

⁸²Ibid.

⁸³Baraúna, in Baraúna, pp. 187-88.

especially the ones that are sung de tempore or on Sundays. For these days by themselves testify to ancient purity, the canon excepted.⁸⁴

Clichtove is happy to note here a point of agreement with Luther, as well as later when the Reformer says, "Second, we accept the Kyrie eleison in the form in which it has been used until now, with the various melodies for different seasons."⁸⁵

2. However, since there are some Lutherans who like Wyclif and the Hussites have gone beyond Luther by condemning all chanting in the mass, Clichtove decides to defend the custom of chanting from the authority of the Old and New Testaments. David established an order of temple musicians, and the Psalms often exhort the faithful to sing praises to God. See Ps. 46:7; Ps. 96:1; and Ps. 84:4.

3. In the New Testament Christ's birth was proclaimed by "a multitude of the heavenly host praising God,"⁸⁶ and near the end the people of Jerusalem greeted him upon his entry with "Hosanna in the highest!"⁸⁷ When the scribes and

⁸⁴AE LIII, 21. See WA XII, 207. "Post vero, ubi cantus cepit, mutati sunt psalmi in introitum, tum additus est hymnus ille angelicus 'Gloria in excelsis, Et in terra pax'. Item gradualia et alleluia et symbolum Nicenum, Sanctus, Agnus Dei, Communio. Que omnia talia sunt, ut reprehendi non possint, presertim quae de tempore seu dominicis diebus cantantur. Qui dies soli adhuc priscam puritatem testantur, excepto Canone."

⁸⁵AE LIII, 23. See WA XII, 209. "Secundo Kyrieleison, ut hactenus celebratum est, variis melodiis pro diversis temporibus amplectimur."

⁸⁶Luke 2:13.

⁸⁷Matt. 21:9.

Pharisees, as now these heretics, were indignant, Jesus did not condemn the children in the temple for their praises, but commended them by citing Ps. 8:2.⁸⁸ After the institution of the Last Supper Jesus sang a hymn with his disciples.⁸⁹ Also St. Paul frequently encouraged his readers to praise God in song, for example, Eph. 5:20, and practiced what he preached by singing in prison with Silas.⁹⁰

4 - 5. Clichtove cites additional support from Isidore of Seville, Augustine, Pope Vitalian (657-672), and Thomas Netter of Walden (1370-1430).

6. Regarding the Introit, Clichtove asserts that Gregory the Great is to be credited with reducing the Psalm to one verse; this was done out of concern for the people because of the length of the Psalms and to prevent the mass from becoming unduly tedious.⁹¹ Most Introits use Psalm verses; the few exceptions which use verses from other parts of Scripture are noted.

7. Clichtove is happy to note a contradiction in Luther's statements. Earlier he has said that nothing but the names of the mass and communion are apostolic in origin, but here he

⁸⁸Matt. 21:15-16.

⁸⁹Matt. 26:30.

⁹⁰Acts 16:25.

⁹¹See Jungmann, The Mass of the Roman Rite, I, 323-24. In some places the Psalm was reduced to a single verse in the early eighth century; other places were still using the whole Psalm about 1000 A.D.

appears to admit that the Introit, the Gloria in Excelsis, the Gradual and the Alleluia, the Creed, the Sanctus, and the Agnus Dei were established in the mass by the ancient fathers (a priscis patribus). Therefore Luther's own words destroy his earlier argument. On the other hand, Clichtove infers from Luther's commendation of the Propers de tempore a condemnation of other masses, for example, of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of the saints, or for the dead, as impure and secular (impurum et seculentem) and as lacking ancient purity (alienae a prisca puritate).

Section VI: Luther's Criticism of Priests and of the Canon

After Luther's honeyed words of the last paragraph, he releases deadly poison by saying,

But when everyone felt free to add or change at will and when the tyranny of priestly greed and pride entered in, then our wicked kings, i.e., the bishops and pastors, began to erect those altars to the images of Baal and all gods in the Lord's temple. Then it was that wicked King Ahaz removed the brazen altar and erected another copied from the one in Damascus. What I am speaking of is the canon, that abominable concoction drawn from everyone's sewer and cesspool.⁹²

1. Luther errs, says Clichtove, when he claims that anyone had the power to add or change things in the mass as

⁹² AE LIII, 21. See WA XII, 207. "At ubi iam licentia fiebat addendi et mutandi, prout cuiuslibet libebat, accedente tum et quaestus et ambitionis sacerdotalis tyrannide, tum ceperunt altaria illa et insignia Baal et omnium deorum poni in templum domini per impios reges nostros, id est, Episcopos et pastores. Hic sustulit impius Ahas altare aereum et constituit aliud e Damasco petatum, loquor autem de Canone illo lacero et abominabili, et multorum lacunis ceu sentina collecto."

it suited him, because such authority rests only with the Popes and the general councils. Lower clergy, regardless of their spirituality, would never have attempted anything like this. Yet it is a mark of Luther's arrogance that he would have attempted to add and remove whatever seems necessary to him and still disclaim changing the mass out of personal motivations. Here again Luther does the very thing that he condemns others for. His own statements condemn him, and he falls under the apostolic dictum, "in passing judgment upon him you condemn yourself, because you, the judge, are doing the very same things."⁹³ See also Rom. 2:21-22.

2. Then Luther, Clichtove notes, shows his contempt for God's priests and the sacred canon of the mass. Luther has often bitterly accused priests of greed, pride, and despotism. Here Luther should heed Eccclus. 7:29-30 which exhorts men to honor God's priests. But Luther cannot restrain his animosity toward the church and its priesthood, which is a trait common to all heretics.

3. Luther does even greater injury, argues Clichtove, to the saints and the altar of the church by comparing them respectively to heathen idols and the altar of Baal and of all gods. By implication he blasphemously indicts also the church at Wittenberg, built in honor of the saints,⁹⁴ and calls it a

⁹³Rom. 2:1b.

⁹⁴It should be noted that Luther wrote the Formula Missae et communionis for the parish church at Wittenberg dedicated to St. Mary, and not for the collegiate church of All Saints.

house of all devils (domum omnium diabolorum). Such impiety demands refutation.

For who is so ignorant that he does not know that we honor the saints not as gods and as having deity in themselves, but as men conspicuous for their exceptional holiness and as those who have piously died in the confession of the one God and therefore worthy of extraordinary honor as God's friends and as cocitizens and members of the eternal King's family?⁹⁵

But if this is not sufficiently persuasive, let Luther listen to Augustine in De civitate dei.

We do not erect altars to make sacrifice to the martyrs, but to the one God who is ours and the martyrs'. In connection with the sacrifice they are named in order as men of God who have overcome the world in confession of Him, but they are not called upon by the priest who is sacrificing. To be sure he sacrifices to God, not to them.⁹⁶

Clichtove will elaborate on this discussion later.

4. Finally, Clichtove says, Luther goes into a furious rage against the canon which he calls "that abominable concoction" and compares to the altar and sacrilege of Ahaz. He condemns it on his own authority. Clichtove has already given a defense of the canon in the second chapter of his Anti-lutherus and calls attention to Emser's defense of the canon,

⁹⁵PE, XIVA. "Quis enim adeo stupidae mentis est: ut nesciat nos Christiana pietate sanctos colere non ut deos et divinum in se numen habentes: sed ut sanctitate eximia prae-fulgidos homines et in unius dei confessione pie defunctos, et proinde insigni honoratione dignos tanquam dei amicos, et concives atque condomesticos regis aeterni?"

⁹⁶Book XXII, ch. X, MPL, XLI, col. 772. "Non erigimus altaria, in quibus sacrificemus martyribus: sed uni deo et martyrum et nostro sacrificium immolamus. Ad quod sacrificium sicut homines dei qui numdum in eius confessione vicerunt: suo loco et ordine nominantur, non a sacerdote qui sacrificat invocantur. Deo quippe, non ipsis sacrificat."

Canonis missae contra Huldricum Zuinglium defensio,⁹⁷ against Zwingli, whom Clichtove calls "a wicked soldier of the Lutheran faction" (Lutheranae factionis improbum militem).⁹⁸

At the same time he acknowledges use of Emser's critique of the Formula Missae et communionis, entitled Missae Christianorum contra Lutheranam missandi formulam assertio.⁹⁹

5. Clichtove then cites Thomas Netter's De sacramentalibus which, he believes, establishes the apostolic authenticity of the canon on the authority of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, Chrysostom, Augustine, Ambrose, Haimo of Auxerre (died 855?), and others. The same work shows that the canon was in frequent use during the times of Jerome, Augustine, and Ambrose. Netter's argumentation is for Clichtove all that is necessary to restore the canon to its original honor. De sacramentalibus also contains a comprehensive commentary on the whole rite of the mass in refutation of Wyclif whose poisonous attack Luther has imitated.

Section VII: The Mass as Sacrifice

Luther heaps impiety upon impiety, Clichtove charges, by saying,

⁹⁷Schriften zur Verteidigung der Messe, edited by Theobald Freudenberger, Corpus Catholicorum, XXVIII (Münster, Westphalia: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbushhandlung, c.1959), 38-93.

⁹⁸PE, XIV^b.

⁹⁹Supra, pp. 10-14. See discussion in Chap. I and collection mentioned in n. 97.

The mass became a sacrifice. Offertories and mercenary collects were added. Sequences and proses were inserted in the Sanctus and the Gloria in Excelsis. Whereupon the mass began to be a priestly monopoly devouring the wealth of the whole world.¹⁰⁰

1. In the first place, the concept of the mass as a sacrifice is not recent. It is figuratively alluded to many times in the Old Testament and is demonstrable from the initial institution of the mass. For what did the bread and wine offered by that high priest of God, Melchizedek, prefigure?¹⁰¹ "Clearly the most holy body and blood of Christ offered at the altar under the venerable signs of bread and wine."¹⁰² What did the Old Testament sacrifice symbolize?¹⁰³ "Surely this holy offering of the Lord's Sacrament in the rite of the mass repeated without interruption until the end of the world."¹⁰⁴ Finally what did those twelve cakes of offering designate which were placed on the tabernacle table every Sabbath?¹⁰⁵ "Certainly that living bread which is daily

¹⁰⁰AE LIII, 21-22. See WA XII, 209. "Ibi cepit missa fieri sacrificium, ibi addita offertoria et collectae mercenariae, ibi Sequentiae et prosae inter Sanctus et Gloria in excelsis insertae. Tum cepit Missa esse momopolium sacerdotale, totius mundi opes exhauriens."

¹⁰¹Gen. 14:18.

¹⁰²PE, XV^a. "Plane sacratissimum Christi corpus et sanguinem sub venerandis panis et vini signis in altari offerendum."

¹⁰³Ex. 29:38-46.

¹⁰⁴PE, XV^a. "Certe hanc sacram dominici sacramenti in missae officio oblationem ad finem usque mundi frequentandam sine intermissione."

¹⁰⁵Lev. 24:5-9.

offered in the sacred rite of the altar in the sight of the divine Majesty."¹⁰⁶ See Origen, In Leviticum homilia XIII.¹⁰⁷ The Apostles also considered the Sacrament to be a sacrifice. To make this point Clichtove cites a statement which he attributes to the Apostle Andrew, "I daily offer to Almighty God the immaculate Lamb, who after being consumed by all the people remains alive and whole."¹⁰⁸ Clichtove then comments,

However, that immaculate Lamb which was sacrificed to God in a daily offering by the holy Apostle was the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist consecrated and sacrificed by him in the holy mystery of the mass.¹⁰⁹

2. The Sacrament was also considered a sacrifice and so named by orthodox fathers, and Clichtove finds it annoying to have to repeat some of their attestations here. He cites Eusebius of Emesa (died 359?), Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Augustine to validate the argument. Gratian, Decreti Pars Tertia: De Consecratione, Dist. II, quotes Eusebius as saying in part,

¹⁰⁶PE, XV^a. "Nimirum panem illum vivificum: qui quotidie conspectui divinae maiestatis offertur in sacro altaris officio."

¹⁰⁷MPG, XII, col. 547.

¹⁰⁸PE, XV^b. "Omnipotenti deo quotidie agnum immaculatum offero: qui postquam a toto populo comestus fuerit, vivus ac integer perseverat." This statement, which may come from a recension of The Acts of Andrew, is not identifiable. See Edgar Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha, edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, c.1964), II, 390-425.

¹⁰⁹Ibid. "Agnus autem ille immaculatus quotidiana oblatione a sancto apostolo sacrificatus deo: erat sacratissimum eucharistiae sacramentum ab eodem in sacro missae mysterio consecratum et immolatum."

it was necessary . . . that the offering of redemption be continuous, and that the lasting victim would live in memory and would always be present in grace: a truly unique and perfect victim.¹¹⁰

From this Clichtove concludes that only through the daily offering of the mass could the offering of redemption be perpetuated.

3. In paraphrasing a statement he attributes to Chrysostom,¹¹¹ Clichtove says,

This sacrifice which we offer on the altar is, he said, a pattern and a representation of that sacrifice which was offered for us once on the cross. And it is an established fact that we, of course, always offer the same sacrifice of the Lord's Body and Blood.

4. In a prayer Ambrose describes the sacramental mystery as an event

where Your flesh is truly eaten, where Your blood is truly drunk, where the lowest is joined with the highest, and the divine with the human, where a large number of holy angels is present, where You are miraculously and unspeakably priest and sacrifice. Therefore who could worthily celebrate this mystery unless You, Almighty God, made the offering worthy?¹¹³

¹¹⁰PE, XV^b. "Necessarium erat ut . . . perpetua esset redemptionis oblatio, et perennis victima illa viveret in memoria, et semper praesens esset in gratia: vere unica et perfecta hostia." See MPL, CLXXXVII, col. 1745.

¹¹¹According to Gratian, this statement is found in Ambrose, In epist. ad Heb. See MPL, CLXXXVII, cols. 1756-57.

¹¹²PE, XV^b. "Hoc sacrificium quod in altari offerimus: dicit esse exemplar et repraesentationem illius sacrificii quod in cruce semel pro nobis oblatum est. et id ipsum sacrificium corporis scilicet et sanguinis dominici nos semper offerre contestatur."

¹¹³PE, XVII^a. "Ubi caro tua in veritate sumitur, ubi sanguis tuus in veritate bibitur: ubi summis ima, humanis divina iunguntur, ubi adest sanctorum frequentia angelorum: ubi tu es sacerdos et sacrificium mirabiliter et ineffabiliter. Quis igitur digne hoc potest celebrare mysterium: nisi tu deus omnipotens offerentem feceris dignum?" This statement which Clichtove attributes to Ambrose cannot be identified.

Clichtove infers, therefore, that the eucharistic Sacrament is indeed a sacrifice. How else can these words be understood?

5. Augustine's opinion does not differ. Clichtove cites two passages from Scripture as allusions to the Sacrament: "Come, eat of my bread and drink of the wine I have mixed,"¹¹⁴ and "It is not good for man unless he eats and drinks."¹¹⁵ These words refer to that meal which Christ presents of His Body and Blood. That sacrifice which He offers succeeds all those Old Testament sacrifices which foreshadowed it. From Ps. 40:6, "Sacrifice and offering You do not desire," Augustine concludes that Christ's Body is offered and given to the participants in place of all those sacrifices and offerings of the Old Covenant.¹¹⁶ Many more holy fathers could be called to testify, but that has already been done in Antilutherus.

6. Concerning the collects, offertories, and proses, Luther has no just reason for discrediting them. They contain nothing unbecoming and have ecclesiastical approval. Furthermore, Luther's comment on mercenary collects and priestly monopoly is abusive and untrue. Priests do not receive money as a fee for prayers offered at the request of the faithful,

¹¹⁴prov. 9:5.

¹¹⁵Ecc1. 5:18.

¹¹⁶De civitate dei, Book XVII, Ch. 20, MPL, XLI, cols. 555-56.

but purely for physical support of life and out of respect for their ministry. When they receive money for celebrating mass there is no written agreement, no buying or selling; they are only receiving what they ought to according to divine and human law. Both Old and New Testament support this custom. See Num. 18:8, Gen. 47:20-26, 1 Cor. 9:12a, 13-14, and 1 Tim. 5:17. Luther's accusations are obviously wrong; Isaiah has aptly spoken of him and his kind, "The fool speaks folly, and his mind plots iniquity."¹¹⁷

Vatican II on the Eucharistic Sacrifice

The second chapter of Vatican II's "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy" is entitled "The Most Sacred Mystery of the Eucharist."

The chapter was deliberately entitled not "on the sacrifice of the Mass," but "the mystery of the most holy Eucharist," so as not to restrict the subject matter too much at the outset and so as to express under one title all that is contained in this sacrament: Sacrifice, Memorial of the Passion, Communion. These are too often separated from one another. The word "mystery" is not used here with reference to intelligibility but in the ontological sense (Sacred Thing, Sacrament).¹¹⁸

The opening paragraph of this chapter defines the nature of the Eucharist.

At the Last Supper . . . our Savior instituted the Eucharistic Sacrifice of His Body and Blood. He did

¹¹⁷Is. 32:6.

¹¹⁸Joseph Jungmann, "The Most Holy Mystery of the Eucharist" in Bugnini and Braga, p. 135.

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 consumed, the mind is filled with grace, and a pledge of future glory is given to us.¹¹⁹

According to this article the eucharistic sacrifice serves two functions: it perpetuates the sacrifice of the cross throughout history, and it serves as a memorial of Christ's death and resurrection for the Church. It is therefore to be considered a sacrament of love, a sign of unity, a bond of charity, and a paschal banquet. As Massey Shepherd points out, the Constitution affirms the Real Presence of Christ,¹²⁰ but never refers to transubstantiation and does not define the exact nature of the "sacrifice of the Mass."¹²¹ But, as the relator of the liturgical commission indicated,

this article does not mean to be either a detailed exposition nor a complete summary and synthesis of the eucharistic mystery. Its purpose is only that of presenting some leading notions of the mystery relevant to the pastoral principles and the reform.¹²²

¹¹⁹CSL, II, 47. "Salvator noster, in Cena novissima, . . . Sacrificium Eucharisticum Corporis et Sanguinis sui instituit, quo Sacrificium Crucis in saecula, donec veniret, perpetuaret, atque adeo Ecclesiae dilectae Sponsae memoriale concrederet Mortis et Resurrectionis suae: sacramentum pietatis, signum unitatis, vinculum caritatis, convivium paschale, in quo Christus sumitur, mens impletur gratia et futurae gloriae nobis pignus datur."

¹²⁰See ibid., I, 7.

¹²¹Op. cit., p. 159

¹²²Salvatore Marsili, "The Mass, Paschal Mystery and Mystery of the Church," in Baraúna, II, 4.

The article presupposes the doctrine defined by the Council of Trent, which taught in the Twenty-second Session on September 17, 1562, that

He, therefore, our God and Lord, though He was by His death about to offer Himself once upon the altar of the cross to God the Father that He might there accomplish an eternal redemption, nevertheless, that His priesthood might not come to an end with His death, at the last supper, on the night He was betrayed, that He might leave to His beloved spouse the Church a visible sacrifice, . . . whereby that bloody sacrifice once to be accomplished on the cross might be represented, the memory thereof remain even to the end of the world, and its salutary effects applied to the remission of those sins which we daily commit.¹²³

On the other hand, as Marsili notes, the Constitution of Vatican II

wants to avoid passing judgment on the merits of the various theological theories, that have been proposed on the specific nature of the sacrifice of the Mass and on the manner of conceiving its relation to the cross and the Last Supper.¹²⁴

The description of the mass as a eucharistic sacrifice shows that "emphasis is being given primarily to the type of sacrifice and the manner of its celebration, in as far as it is stated that this sacrifice is celebrated under the form of a thanksgiving prayer."¹²⁵ The ritual aspect is accented, and, as Crichton says, the emphasis is on the mystery, not the doctrine.¹²⁶

¹²³H. J. Schroeder, Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1955), pp. 144-45.

¹²⁴In Baraúna, II, 4.

¹²⁵Ibid.

¹²⁶Op. cit., p. 132.

The expression eucharistic sacrifice may imply two somewhat variant concepts. It can mean, first, a sacrifice that is fulfilled in a formula of "eucharist" or through a prayer of praise and thanksgiving; or second, a sacrifice which has direct value as thanksgiving for a favor received.¹²⁷

The second sense appears in Melanchthon who distinguished between the cross and the mass and considered them different kinds of sacrifice. "He defines the Cross as a propitiatory sacrifice and the Mass as a eucharistic sacrifice."¹²⁸ By implication then for evangelical theology the mass can only be considered a eucharistic sacrifice without expiatory value. On the other hand, the Council of Trent recognized only the expression, propitiatory sacrifice, and spoke of the mass as a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. Vatican II's position differs, for its concern is pastoral and, therefore, assuming the propitiatory character of the mass, it emphasizes its eucharistic nature. This emphasis

implies a memorial aspect, which is not "a simple recall (subjective memory) of the sacrifice fulfilled on the cross," but it is "presence and memory" (objective) of it and at the same time salvation (actual) because of it.¹²⁹

¹²⁷Marsili, in Baraúna, II, 6.

¹²⁸Ibid. It should be noted that the Apology of the Augsburg Confession considers the mass to be the total celebration of the eucharistic rite; see Article XXIV, §§35, 88. Furthermore, the Apology does not deny the identity of Christ's self-offering on the cross and his self-offering in the mass. See Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), pp. 349-77, or Theodore G. Tappert, translator and editor, The Book of Concord (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, c.1959), pp. 249-68.

¹²⁹Ibid.

This pastoral concern highlights the dynamic nature of the mass and gives it a threefold dimension which is typical of the Paschal Mystery.

The eucharistic sacrifice of the Church is a memorial of the death and resurrection of Christ, an actual and perpetual presence of the sacrifice of the Cross, and in eschatological tension.¹³⁰

The Augustinian concept of sacrifice is central here, namely, that the mass is a sacrifice because it is a sacrament or a sacred sign.¹³¹

The eucharistic sign is constituted by the concurrence of various elements to form a single sign, bread-wine-Word-institution. The unity of these elements is such that if one of them is lost, the sign is destroyed. . . .

In other words, while the bread and wine would be able by themselves to signify nothing but an ordinary meal, through the effect of the Word, they signify a sacrificial meal, and so there comes to be a definite kind of sacrifice. On the other hand, through the historical moment and the ritual environment in which they come to be, the bread-Word and the wine-Word add to their character of sacrifice and sacrificial meal another specific character, namely that of a paschal sacrifice and a paschal sacrificial meal.¹³²

By means of this Eucharistic Sacrifice the sacrifice of the cross is to be perpetuated.

The use of the word "perpetuaret" seems to be "neutral" and to raise no theological question as to the way in which the Lord's sacrifice is made present. . . . As

¹³⁰Ibid., p. 7. For a fuller discussion of the concept of Paschal Mystery see pp. 7-15 and Louis Bouyer, The Liturgy Revived (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, Ltd., c.1964), pp. 11-27.

¹³¹De civitate dei, Book X, ch. 5. See MPL, XLI, col. 282.

¹³²Marsili, in Baraúna, II, 7.

is well known this question of if and how the saving events of Christ's redeeming work can be made present in the Mass is hotly debated. Father E. Schillebeeckx holds that since every act of the earthly Christ was an act of the divine person, the virtue of his acts does not pass away but perdures now in heaven and through the Mass we are united with his heavenly sacrifice.¹³³

The sacrifice has been entrusted to the Church, Christ's bride.

To the Church has been left the power of initiating the ritual act, to which Christ committed himself, by which the memorial of his death and resurrection might be recalled to men of every succeeding generation and by which the power of his redeeming work might be made present to them. Through this sacrifice men of all ages might make an encounter with Christ and so have some share in his redemption.¹³⁴

Through this act of memorial and thanksgiving Christ's faithful people are to offer themselves; "by offering the Immaculate Victim, not only through the hands of the priest, but also with him, they should learn to offer themselves too."¹³⁵ For the pastoral concern of the Constitution stresses the liturgy not simply as an external, objective act, but as an event that demands the people's participation and involvement. The faithful are to offer themselves and with the priest Christ.

Section VIII: Masses for the Dead

Luther comments, "Then came the masses for the departed, for journeys, for prosperity--but who can even name the causes

¹³³Crichton, p. 133, n. 2.

¹³⁴Ibid., p. 134.

¹³⁵CSL, II, 48.

for which the mass was made a sacrifice?"¹³⁶ Luther implies, Clichtove charges, that masses for the dead originated with the monopoly of the priests and to bring relief to the souls of the dead. This is false and contrary to the teaching of all the fathers.

1. The Church's prayers for the faithful departed in the mass are not a recent innovation, but an ancient practice of the church, based on the example of the Old Testament and confirmed by the fathers of the New Testament. For biblical evidence Clichtove cites Aaron's making atonement for the people, while standing between the living and the dead;¹³⁷ Jesus' praying for the resuscitation of Lazarus;¹³⁸ and His prayer on the cross.¹³⁹

2. Clichtove cites Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, Isidore of Seville, and Augustine to prove the apostolic origin of praying for the dead.

3. From Augustine's Confessions Clichtove cites Monica's request that her sons remember her after her death at the altar of the Lord and Augustine's prayer for his deceased parents. In imitation of Augustine Clichtove prays for his parents too. For certainly Augustine and his brother would

¹³⁶AE LIII, 22. See WA XII, 209. "Hinc Missae pro defunctis, pro itineribus, pro opibus. Et quis illos titulos solos numeret, quorum missa facta est sacrificium?"

¹³⁷Num. 16:47-48.

¹³⁸John 11:41-42.

¹³⁹Luke 23:34.

not have prayed for the salvation of their mother's soul, unless they had been convinced of its legitimacy and efficacy.¹⁴⁰ Further discussion of this can be found in Antilutherus.

4. Who, asks Clichtove, would think it wrong to offer prayers at mass for safe travel, for resources to meet the needs of life in an honorable way (pro opibus ad vitae necessitatem via honesta consequendis), or for health of body and salvation of soul? Did not Christ cover these things comprehensively when he said, "Whatever you ask in my name, I will do it. . . . if you ask anything in my name, I will do it."¹⁴¹ See also John 15:16b; Luke 11:9-10; and Mark 11:24. From Christ's apparent commendation Clichtove proceeds to a number of Old Testament proofs. See Gen. 28:20-21; Gen. 32:9-12; 2 Kings 20:3; 2 Chron. 33:12-13; Prov. 30:8; Gen. 25:21; and 1 Sam. 1:11. See also Acts 12:5.

¹⁴⁰See Luther, Smalcald Articles, Part II, Article II on the mass, in Tappert, p. 295. "St. Augustine does not write that there is a purgatory, nor does he cite any passage of the Scriptures that would constrain him to adopt such an opinion. He leaves it undecided whether or not there is a purgatory and merely mentions that his mother asked that she be remembered at the altar or sacrament. Now, this is nothing but a human opinion of certain individuals and cannot establish an article of faith. That is the prerogative of God alone. But our papists make use of such human opinions to make men believe their shameful, blasphemous, accursed traffic in Masses which are offered for souls in purgatory, etc. They can never demonstrate these things from Augustine. Only when they have abolished their traffic in purgatorial Masses (which St. Augustine never dreamed of) shall we be ready to discuss with them whether statements of St. Augustine are to be accepted when they are without the support of the Scriptures and whether the dead are to be commemorated in the sacrament. It will not do to make articles of faith out of the holy Father's words or works."

¹⁴¹John 14:13a, 14.

5. If it is proper to pray privately for such necessities of life, Clichtove inquires, why not also in the mass to obtain good and to avert evil? Luther is unreasonably indignant over the many and various titles for which sacrifice is made. If he had his way, there would be no prayer for peace, rain, release from disease and from war; nothing temporal is to be included in prayers of the mass. Luther could have said nothing more absurd or foolish.

Section IX: Defense of Ceremonial Appointments

Luther continues

Nor do they cease to enlarge the canon even today: now it is for these feasts, then for others; now these actiones then other communicantes are adopted-- not to mention the commemoration of the living and the dead. And there is no end of it yet. And what shall I say of the external additions of vestments, vessels, candles, and palls, of organs and all the music, and of images? There was scarcely a craft in all the world that did not depend on the mass for a large part of its business.¹⁴²

1. Clichtove fails to understand this additional criticism against the amplification of the canon at the point "Communicantes et memoriam facientes," when this only occurs on six feasts: Christmas, Epiphany, Maundy Thursday, Easter, Ascension, and Pentecost. Since these actiones are fixed in

¹⁴²AE LIII, 22. See WA XII, 207-8. "Neque hodie cessat Canon iste augeri, aliis et aliis festis alias actiones, alios Communicantes asciscens. Ut taceam memorias vivorum et mortuorum, nondum ad finem sui auctas. Nam additamenta externa vestium, vasorum, cereorum, pallarum, deinde organorum et totius musice, imaginum, quid dicam? Nihil pene fuit in toto orbe artificiorum, quod non magna ex parte sua negocia ac suum quaestum haberet et e missa aleretur."

form and number and in use for some time, is not Luther's charge another example of his arrogance and deceitfulness?

2. If by his remark regarding increased commemoration of the living and the dead, Clichtove states, Luther is referring to additional collects being introduced into the mass, he is mistaken. For they are forbidden without ecclesiastical approval, and no one is free to make such additions by his own decision. If Luther, on the other hand, means limitless additions to those appointed portions of the canon, he is equally wrong. The number of persons commemorated is left to the discretion of the priest, but this does not mean any expansion of the text.

3. Clichtove argues that Luther's condemnation of the external appointments to the church building and the rite, added to heighten the honor of divine worship (ad divini cultus honorificentiam), is undeserved. Scripture shows that all these things are very pleasing to God (divinae maiestati pergrata). See Exodus 26 and 27 regarding appointments for the tabernacle; Exodus 28 regarding the priests' vestments; 1 Chronicles 25 regarding David's appointment of Temple musicians; 1 Chron. 15:16-22; Psalm 150 regarding the use of all musical instruments to praise God.

4. Furthermore, if we refer to the splendor of Solomon's temple (see 1 Kings 6 and 7), Clichtove says, we know that such additions have God's approval. Then why is Luther so eager to slander their use? "They attest to and greatly

inspire the devotion of the faithful, and in an extraordinary way they lead to a more honored celebration of the divine name."¹⁴³ They are symbols and means by which the inner man externally signifies his reliance on God. This is the only justification for vestments or any other appointments: they must have a spiritual significance.

5. Perhaps someone will object, Clichtove notes, that all the Old Testament appointments were rejected in the New Testament in favor of a wholly spiritual worship. But Clichtove points out what was rejected did not pertain to the basis of worship, for the initial principles of the New Testament reflect the means by which we are to worship God even more fully than in the Old Testament. Where else are we publicly to worship, if not in a house of God? And not even Luther would want such a place of worship to be devoid of all furnishings and appointments, unless he follows the Hussites' line of thought that we can have no trappings that reflect Old Testament worship.

6. Someone else may object, Clichtove suggests, that when Christ instituted the Sacrament he did not have vestments or any of the other trappings that mark the mass, and charge that those ecclesiastical leaders who were responsible for the additions were acting arrogantly in desiring to improve what Christ had done. It is true that Christ did not use

¹⁴³PE, XX^b. "Devotionem testantur fidelium atque non parum excitant: et ad honoratiorem divini nominis celebritatem mirum in modum conducunt."

these appointments, but it should be noted that they were introduced by the Apostles under the guidance of the Spirit, or, to put it another way, Christ himself introduced those additions through the Apostles. Therefore, their inclusion should not be ascribed to arrogance, but to Christian piety.

Section X: Images of God and the Saints

1. In the paragraph quoted at the beginning of the last chapter Luther has also condemned images which the faith ought to hold in veneration (debita in veneratione haberi a fidelibus). Luther here shares the opinion of the Hussites who believed that images should be destroyed to avoid idolatry (propter idolatriam) and that any veneration given to them is displeasing to God. Why does Luther struggle with the idea of having holy images in churches when they simply help the faithful to recall the suffering and holiness of the saints, to spur on sluggish faith to more ardent devotion, and to imitation of their virtues. See Ex. 25:18-20 and Num. 21:8-9. "But what else are the sacred images of the saints than venerable signs which make present for us again and bring back to memory those saints who live in the heavenly city Jerusalem?"¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁴PE, XXII^a. "Quid autem aliud sacrae sunt sanctorum imagines quam venerabilia signa: quae nobis sanctos ipsos supernae civitatis Hierusalem incolas repraesentant atque in nostram reducunt memoriam."

2. Christ himself showed by his own example that this use of images is not objectionable. Clichtove validates this claim by referring to the incident in which Christ sent a painting of himself to Abgar, the king of Edessa, who was ill.¹⁴⁵

3. From this Clichtove further argues that veneration of images is apostolic and existed from the beginning of the Church. See St. John Damascene (645?-750?), De fide orthodoxa, Book IV, ch. 16.¹⁴⁶

4. It is a civil crime to destroy statues of kings. Should it not be a greater wrong to violate the images of the eternal King, of the Queen of Heaven, and of the saints who reign with God? Such sacrilege has been condemned by synods, kings, and popes.

5 - 7. These paragraphs contain a variety of patristic and historical references to support the use and the value of images. Typical of these references is one from Gratian, Decreti Pars Tertia, De Consecratione, Dist. III, quoting the Seventh Ecumenical Council (Nicaea II) of 787.

Christians do not call venerable images gods, nor do they serve them as gods; nor do they place hope of salvation in them, and do not expect future judgment from them; but they honor and adore them to remember and recall the ancient [Christians], but do not serve them or any other creature with divine worship.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁵See Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica, Bk. I, ch. 13, in MPG, XX, cols. 119-30.

¹⁴⁶MPG, XCIV, col. 1170.

¹⁴⁷PE, XXIII^a. See MPL, CLXXXVII, col. 1790. "Venerabiles imagines christiani non deos appellant, neque serviunt eis ut deis; neque spem salutis ponunt in eis, neque ab eis

The Church's history and practice approves veneration of the images of the saints, not as a veneration of the image itself, but to recall the example and the faith of those early saints whom the images represent. Why then does Luther revive a heresy that the Church has repeatedly condemned?

Vatican II on Sacred Art

"This document which comes from the second Vatican Council is an unparalleled instance of the Church in the matter of sacred art in the whole history of Ecumenical Councils."¹⁴⁸ Previously the subject had been touched on only at the Second Council of Nicaea in 787 and the Council of Trent in 1563. The Council of Trent actually concerned itself with the veneration of images under the pressure of French churchmen who feared the Reformed iconoclasts. By continuing the thought of Pope Pius XII's Mediator Dei, Vatican II relates sacred art closely to liturgy, and the intention is to put art within the perspective of being functionally related to worship. Therefore many of the previously mentioned themes of the Constitution--namely the communal, didactic, and pastoral character of the liturgy--are as important as the specifics stated in Chapter VII on sacred art.¹⁴⁹

expectant futurum iudicium sed ad memoriam et recordationem primitivorum venerantur eas et adorant: sed non serviunt eis cultu divino nec alicui creaturae."

¹⁴⁸Valerius Vigorelli, "Sacred Art and Sacred Furnishings," in Bugnini and Braga, p. 268.

¹⁴⁹Ibid., pp. 268-69.

Up to the present, however, a true theology of sacred art has not been elaborated, especially in the West, and the attempts made on all sides have not arrived at sufficient maturity so that their propositions could be proposed to the universal Church.¹⁵⁰

The opening paragraph makes an important distinction between religious and sacred art.

Very rightly the fine arts are considered to rank among the noblest expressions of human genius. This judgment applies especially to religious art and its highest achievement which is sacred art. By their very nature both of the latter are related to God's boundless beauty, for this is the reality which these human efforts are trying to express in some way.¹⁵¹

"All art should depict something of the beauty of God. Their noblest aim is to lift up the mind of man to God."¹⁵² Beyond art which may generally or inherently reflect God is that sphere of art that attempts to speak directly of God.

This is what may be called religious, or Christian, Art. Here, however, we should issue an important warning. It is not the subject, nor even the intention of the artist which makes a work of art "Christian" or "religious"; rather, it is the way of treating it, and the result obtained.¹⁵³

What then is sacred art? "Sacred art will be not just a work of art, not even a work of Christian art, but should be such a work of art as will inspire worship."¹⁵⁴ Or to put it

¹⁵⁰Ibid., p. 270.

¹⁵¹CSL, VII, 122.

¹⁵²Jungmann, "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy," p. 81.

¹⁵³Marcos Barbos, "Sacred Art," in Baraúna, II, 250.

¹⁵⁴Ibid., II, 251.

another way, "Sacred art should be an art, not only of religious value, but also of functional value. . . . It should serve the worship of a community in a certain place and time."¹⁵⁵

The function of art is variously expressed by the Constitution itself. Sacred art aims "exclusively at turning men's thoughts to God persuasively and devoutly."¹⁵⁶ The Church's concern is the propriety of the art used in worship. Therefore it must be "truly worthy, becoming, and beautiful, signs and symbols of heavenly realities."¹⁵⁷ For that reason also "sacred furnishings should worthily and beautifully serve the dignity of worship."¹⁵⁸ But the Church does not adopt a particular style of art to fulfill these functions. Native art is encouraged, "provided that it adorns the sacred buildings and holy rites with due honor and reverence."¹⁵⁹ Truly sacred art is characterized by "noble beauty rather than mere extravagance."¹⁶⁰ And therefore to be avoided are

those works of artists which are repugnant to faith, morals, and Christian piety, and which offend true religious sense either by their distortion of forms or by lack of artistic worth, by mediocrity or by pretense.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁵Ibid., II, 252.

¹⁵⁶CSL, VII, 122.

¹⁵⁷Ibid.

¹⁵⁸Ibid.

¹⁵⁹Ibid., VII, 123.

¹⁶⁰Ibid., VII, 124.

¹⁶¹Ibid.

Because of this heavy censure of unworthy art, artists are reminded by the Council that

they are engaged in a kind of sacred imitation of God the Creator, and are concerned with works destined for use in [Roman] Catholic worship and for the edification, devotion, and religious instruction of the faithful.¹⁶²

The two predominant characteristics of sacred art must be "noble beauty" and "functional value." The former reflects the Constitution's concern for simplicity and intelligibility in the ceremonial adornments of worship, and for that reason whatever is used should have artistic integrity. To say that sacred art must be functional is to say that

it is not enough that a painting or a statue be beautiful, or even that it possess a certain religious feeling. It is necessary that it be neither artistically nor liturgically superfluous, and that it be endowed with a degree of pedagogical significance.¹⁶³

Finally, on the matter of sacred images the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy states

The practice of placing sacred images in churches so that they may be venerated by the faithful is to be firmly maintained. Nevertheless, their number should be moderate and their relative location should reflect right order. Otherwise they may create confusion among the Christian people and promote a faulty sense of devotion.¹⁶⁴

Like the Second Council of Nicaea and the Council of Trent, Vatican II upholds the veneration of sacred images, but unlike

¹⁶²Ibid., VII, 127.

¹⁶³Barbos, in Baraúna, II, 254.

¹⁶⁴CSL, VII, 125.

those earlier pronouncements it explicitly encourages moderation in number and exhibits concern about their architectural-liturgical placement.

It is not a question of seeking favor with Protestants, but rather of being consistent with what is said elsewhere in the Constitution about the simplification of rites (Art. 34) and the preponderant importance to be given to the liturgical mystery above all other exercises of piety (Art. 13).¹⁶⁵

Two things are to be avoided: that which may lead to superstition or idolatry and iconoclasm.

Section XI: The Mass as a Good Work

Luther says,

All these have been tolerated and--with the gospel revealing so many abominations--they can be tolerated until they can be completely removed. In the meanwhile we shall prove all things and hold fast what is good [I Thess. 5:21]. But in this book we are not going to prove again that the mass is neither a sacrifice nor a good work--we have amply demonstrated that elsewhere. We do accept it as a sacrament, a testament, the blessing (as in Latin), the eucharist (as in Greek), the Table of the Lord, the Lord's Supper, the Lord's Memorial, communion, or by whatever godly name you please, so long as it is not polluted by the name of sacrifice or work. And we will set forth the rite according to which we think that it should be used.¹⁶⁶

1. Clichtove does not understand whether Luther has a Gospel different from that of the medieval Church which en-

¹⁶⁵Vigorelli, in Bugnini and Braga, p. 275.

¹⁶⁶AE LIII, 22. WA XII, 208. "Transierint itaque ista et adhuc transeant revelante Euangelio abominaciones tantas,

ables him to expose the abominations he finds in the mass. Clichtove knows only the one Gospel of Christ, which uncovers no abominations because there are none. But if Luther does understand the universally accepted Gospel and makes these statements, he is guilty of injustice and blasphemy. "It is indeed typical of Luther to defend his impious, mad acts with falsely interpreted Scripture and to ascribe them to the Gospel in order that he may appear thus to be transacting Christ's business."¹⁶⁷ See 1 Thess. 5:21.

2. Luther does not want the mass to be called a sacrifice or a good work. A discussion of the concept of sacrifice has already been taken care of, so Clichtove will proceed to show the validity of the title, "good work." The sacrifices and offerings of the Old Testament were good works. See Mal. 3:4. Nothing pleases God unless it is a good work. See Gen. 8:20-21; Lev. 9:24; and 1 Kings 18:38. Because the New Testament sacrifice offers Christ's Body and Blood it is preeminent and a good work by a higher law.

donec penitus aboleantur. Nos interim omnia probabimus, quod bonum est tenebimus. Verum hoc libro dicere omittimus, Missam [non] esse sacrificium seu opus bonum, quod alias abunde docuimus. Apprehendamus eam ut sacramentum seu testamentum, seu benedictionem latine, Eucharistiam graece, vel mensam domini, vel caenam domini, vel memoriam domini, vel communionem, vel quocunque nomine pio placet, modo sacrificii aut operis titulo non polluat, et ritum monstremus, quo nobis visum est illa uti."

¹⁶⁷PE, XXIV^b. "Verum hic mos est Lutheri impietates et insanias suas sacrarum literarum perperam intellectarum praesidio munire easque euangelio attribuere: ut ita rem Christi agere videatur."

3. See Heb. 5:1. If a priest makes an offering according to a rite prescribed by God, it must be a good work. If a priest offers the "Bread of Life" (John 6:33) and the perfect sacrifice for the sins of all people according to the Church's rite received from Christ (secundum ecclesiae sanctae institutum a Christo acceptum), it also is a good work.

4 - 5. "When at the Last Supper Christ by his most heavenly might changed the bread into His holy body and the wine into His Blood . . . without hesitation he performed a good work."¹⁶⁸ See John 8:29; Matt. 3:17; Matt. 17:5b regarding God's approval of Christ and his actions. When the priest consecrates the Body and Blood in remembrance of Christ,¹⁶⁹ he then too performs a good work. No one would deny that Christ performed a good work on the cross when He died for all men. See Eph. 5:2; John 11:25; and 1 John 2:2.

But the priest performs a work on the altar when he consecrates the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist wholly similar to that which Christ completed on the cross. . . . And he offers to the Lord the same immaculate Lamb, yes, Him who bore the sins of the world, in representation and commemoration of the offering that the same Lamb once made on the cross. . . . And therefore in the mass the ministrations of that sacrifice is a good work.¹⁷⁰

6 - 7. What is a good work? Whatever is profitable for salvation--in the rite or otherwise, Clichtove suggests. Both

¹⁶⁸PE, XXV^b. "Christus in coena novissima cum panem in sacrum corpus suum virtute supercaelesti convertit et vinum in sanguinem . . . sine aliqua haesitatione opus bonum fecit."

¹⁶⁹Luke 22:19b.

¹⁷⁰PE, XXV^b-XXVI^a. "Sed consimile facit opus sacerdos

the living and the dead can profit, for the mass is celebrated for their salvation, and thus it is a source of grace. For that reason the mass can be considered a good work, also because its efficacy depends, not on the spirituality of the priest, but on the gift of Christ.

8. If alms-giving, fasting, and prayer are undeniably good works, as commended by Christ himself,¹⁷¹ Clichtove asserts, why not logically concede that the mass, that source of goodness and grace, is a good work?

For in [the mass] there is the celebration of the most revered mystery and the offering, not just of money, physical discipline, or prayer, but of the immaculate Lamb, who is the reconciliation and salvation of the whole world.¹⁷²

9. Finally, if the mass is not a good work, Clichtove asks, what is the priest doing? What benefit is it to the people? Why should they listen or come? Why pray for those in need or the dead?

10. Before closing this section Clichtove asserts that the word "mass" is of Hebrew origin designating offering or

in altari consecrans venerabile sacramentum eucharistiae ei quod Christus peregit in cruce. . . . Eundemque agnum immaculatum offert domino eum scilicet qui tollit peccata mundi in repraesentationem atque commemorationem oblationis eiusdem agni semel factae in cruce. . . . Est igitur missa immolationis illius ministerium opus bonum."

¹⁷¹Matt. 6.

¹⁷²PE, XXVI^b. "In hac enim augustissimi mysterii est celebratio et non pecuniae aut castigationis corporis aut orationis solum oblatio, sed agni immaculati qui totius mundi est reconciliatio et salus."

sacrifice. It is therefore an ancient word, taken over from the synagogue to the Church, and established in ecclesiastical usage by the early fathers. Therefore it is futile, vain, and incongruent with the truth for Luther stubbornly to assert that the mass is not a sacrifice, when even the linguistic evidence is against him.

Section XII: Names for the Mass

1 - 4. The major portion of this chapter is devoted to a refutation of Luther's contention that the mass never was a good work. Clichtove proceeds on the basis of Luther's presentation in The Babylonian Captivity of the Church (1520).¹⁷³ Luther's arguments are: (1) the mass is God's promise to us and therefore not a good work; (2) the mass is nothing else than the testament of Christ confirmed by the sacrament of His Body and Blood, and therefore not a good work; (3) the communion of one person cannot benefit another, and therefore the mass of the priest cannot benefit the people; and (4) a person cannot be baptized or marry in another's stead, and therefore the priest cannot celebrate the mass for another for his salvation.¹⁷⁴

In his reply to Luther Clichtove describes the mass as "the most admirable conversion of bread into the Lord's body

¹⁷³See AE XXXVI, 11-126.

¹⁷⁴Ibid., XXXVI, 35, 47-51.

and of wine into His blood and the offering of the same."¹⁷⁵
 Because the mass is not just the eucharistic Sacrament, but the whole rite established by the Church, the mass should not be called a testament, but preferably "to some extent a commemoration or representation of the Lord's testament."¹⁷⁶

Clichtove rejects the distinction between the communion of the people and the celebration of the priest, for the priest does not offer the sacrifice just for himself, but for all the people. They benefit through their participation, and faith is the prerequisite. But Clichtove cannot accept the conception that the mass does not benefit others; one need only look to the cross.

So we are led to believe that there is no gift of divine grace which cannot be received for others through the sacred ministry of the mass, since in it our Lord himself is truly sacrificed. In it all the treasures of grace are hidden and we all receive from its abundance.¹⁷⁷

5. Clichtove concludes that therefore the only proper names for the mass are sacrifice and good work. Luther's suggestions for names, for example, sacrament or testament, are inappropriate semantically or traditionally.

¹⁷⁵PE, XXVII^b. "Superadmirabilis conversio panis in corpus dominicum et vini in eius sanguinem eiusdemque oblatio."

¹⁷⁶Ibid. "Dominici testamenti aliqua ex parte commemorationem aut repraesentationem."

¹⁷⁷Ibid., XXVIII^b. "Ut intelligamus nullum esse divinae gratiae munus: quod non possit per sacrum missae ministerium aliis obtineri. quoniam in eo vere immolatur ipse dominus noster: in quo omnes thesauri gratiae sunt reconditi et de cuius plenitudine nos omnes accepimus."

For indeed the mass itself (if we are to take into account its whole and complete doctrine) is not a sacrament in the proper sense, but an ecclesiastical rite in which the eucharistic Sacrament is consecrated and offered to God.¹⁷⁸

Similarly Clichtove rejects the names of testament, blessing, eucharist, Lord's Supper, the Lord's Memorial, and communion.

Vatican II on the Nature of the Sacred Liturgy

The introductory articles of the "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy" aptly present the role of the liturgy in the Church's life and ministry. The liturgy is "the outstanding means by which the faithful can express in their lives, and manifest to others, the mystery of Christ and the real nature of the true Church." Daily "the liturgy builds up those within the Church into the Lord's holy temple, into a spiritual dwelling for God." And looking beyond to its missionary goal the Constitution asserts that "the liturgy fortifies the faithful in their capacity to preach Christ."¹⁷⁹

The opening articles of Chapter I detail the salvation history which is the theological background and reference

¹⁷⁸Ibid. "Enim vero missa ipsa (si totam et integram eius rationem attendimus) proprie sacramentum non est: sed officium ecclesiasticum, quo sacramentum eucharistiae consecratur et offertur deo."

¹⁷⁹CSL, Introduction, 2. "Liturgia . . . summe eo confert ut fideles vivendo expriment et aliis manifestent mysterium Christi et genuinam verae Ecclesiae naturam. . . . Unde cum Liturgia eos qui intus sunt cotidie aedificet in templu sanctum in Domino, in habitaculum Dei in Spiritu . . . miro modo simul vires eorum ad praedicandum Christum roborat."

point for all activity of the liturgy. Its basis is Christocentric. Christ is the "Mediator between God and man"; "His humanity . . . was the instrument of our salvation"; in Him we have "the perfect satisfaction needed for our salvation"; instrumental to the task was the "paschal mystery" of His Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension; and through His death came "the wondrous sacrament which is the whole Church."¹⁸⁰

One expression here needs explanation, namely, the concept of mystery. According to Crichton there are three levels: (1) "the mystery of God himself dwelling in light inaccessible and hidden from the gaze of men"; (2) the mystery of Christ who summed up the history of salvation and showed by His life and teaching the meaning of that history; and (3) the mystery as it exists in the liturgy, especially in its prayers.¹⁸¹ At the second level the mystery is seen particularly as an event, "the expression in deeds, and above all in his sacrificial death, of God's love towards men."¹⁸² This means the liturgical celebration has two functions: (1) to make present the redeeming mystery of Christ; and (2) to reveal God's redeeming purpose for men.¹⁸³

It manifests the Church, to the eye of faith it shows more clearly than anything else what the Church really is and ultimately leads men back to Christ from whom came the Church and the Church's liturgy.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸⁰Ibid., I, 5.

¹⁸¹Ibid., I, 24-26.

¹⁸²Ibid., I, 25.

¹⁸³Ibid., I, 26.

¹⁸⁴Ibid.

It is through the liturgy and the lives of those who celebrate it that those outside of the Church are to see the Church's true nature.

It is this Church that is revealed by the sign of the liturgy and this is one of the main reasons why the liturgy is in the order of sign. It is totally sacramental, it is mystery. It contains, conveys but also manifests the mystery of Christ.¹⁸⁵

When we speak specifically of the paschal mystery we are first of all talking about the heart of salvation history. For to speak of salvation history we are not to think simply of an edifying catalogue of events, but the entire action through which God redeemed humanity, particularly in Christ, "a process that continues and especially in the liturgy," whose climax is "the Mass, in which is made present the paschal sacrifice of the Saviour." And therefore it can be said that in the liturgy salvation history "is actualized" and "brought into the present."¹⁸⁶ This paschal mystery also has three levels: (1) the passover, which preceded the saving event of the Old Testament, which interpreted the meaning of the Exodus, and which served as a memorial festival and a token of God's love; (2) the passover sacrifice of the New Testament, that is, the events from the Last Supper, that new rite which interpreted Christ's actions and was the first token of His love, to His Resurrection and exaltation; and (3) the Church's celebration of the paschal mystery in its liturgy.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁵Ibid., I, 27.

¹⁸⁶Ibid., I, 27.

¹⁸⁷Ibid., I, 30-33.

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. Every time the Church celebrates the Mass she recalls . . . and makes present to men here and now the saving power of his redeeming work. . . . This is the paschal mystery of the Church which is intended through the liturgical celebration to become the paschal mystery of every Christian who, once incorporated into Christ's body, is destined to live out in his life the dying to self and the rising with Christ.¹⁸⁸

Therefore it is to be concluded that the role of the liturgy is neither to be a museum of ritualism nor an opportunity for indoctrination, but to make present Christ's saving acts, to have an encounter with Him. The liturgy then "manifests the Church" which manifests Christ, and "it is through the liturgy that the Church is seen as the sacrament of Christ's redeeming activity."¹⁸⁹ The Church is a sacrament or a mystery because she is "the sign of the encounter between God and man that has taken place in Jesus Christ."¹⁹⁰ The Church manifests Christ as an institution, for

the whole Church like Christ himself is a Sacrament because it is a sensible thing being made up of men hierarchically organized, and of sensible means, namely Scripture, preaching, the Sacraments, etc. which in some way contain, manifest and communicate . . . the invisible divine life of Christ who is present and operating in her.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁸Ibid., I, 33.

¹⁸⁹Ibid., I, 41.

¹⁹⁰Ibid., I, 40.

¹⁹¹C. Vagaggini, "General Norms for the Reform and Fostering of the Liturgy," in Bugnini and Braga, p. 66.

Both the Church's visibility and the life of its members manifest Christ. "The Church becomes, or should become, tangible to the world through the living faith and charity of its members. They are in fact the community of the Church immersed in the world."¹⁹²

Another important concept for worship is the idea of the liturgy "as an exercise of the priestly office of Jesus Christ." For "Christ is always present in His Church, especially in her liturgical celebrations." It is important to note that Christ's presence in the sacrifice of the Mass means

not only in the person of His minister . . . , but especially under the Eucharistic species. By His power He is present in the sacraments, so that when a man baptizes it is really Christ Himself who baptizes. He is present in His word, since it is He Himself who speaks when the holy Scriptures are read in the church. He is present, finally, when the Church prays and sings.¹⁹³

Because the liturgy is "an exercise of the priestly office of Jesus Christ, "the sanctification of man is manifested by signs perceptible to the senses, and is effected in a way which is proper to each of these signs." And because of this,

¹⁹²Crichton, pp.40-41.

¹⁹³CSL, I, 7. "Cum in ministri persona . . . tum maxime sub speciebus eucharisticis. Praesens adest virtute sua in Sacramentis, ita ut cum aliquis baptizat, Christus ipse baptizat. Praesens adest in verbo suo, siquidem ipse loquitur dum sacrae Scripturae in Ecclesia leguntur. Praesens adest denique dum supplicat et psallit Ecclesia."

every liturgical celebration, because it is an action of Christ the priest and of His Body the Church, is a sacred action surpassing all others. No other action of the Church can match its claim to efficacy, nor equal the degree of it.¹⁹⁴

The expression "a sacred action surpassing all others" is taken from Pius XI's Divini cultus. Vagaggini feels that the doctrine of the liturgy's efficacy is obscure because it here fails to use the technical expressions ex opere operato and ex opere operantis Ecclesiae. These expressions, he says, express the double nature of efficacy which is peculiar to the liturgy, and in spite of their scholastic character "they express well and clearly what should be said in this matter."¹⁹⁵ The correct interpretation of this phrase can be explained in the words of Divini cultus.

It should be clear to all, then, that the worship rendered to God by the Church in union with her Divine Head is the most efficacious means of achieving sanctity (and, certainly, also according to the mind of the encyclical, of giving honor to God). This efficacy, where there is question of the eucharistic sacrifice and the Sacraments, derives first of all and principally from the act itself (ex opere operato) but if one considers the part which the immaculate spouse of Jesus Christ takes in the action embellishing the sacrifice and the Sacraments with prayers and sacred ceremonies . . . then its effectiveness is due rather to the action of the Church (ex opere operantis Ecclesiae) inasmuch as she is holy and acts always in closest union with her Head.¹⁹⁶

¹⁹⁴Ibid. "Omnis liturgica celebratio, utpote opus Christi sacerdotis, eiusque Corporis, quod est Ecclesia, est actio sacra praeclenter, cuius effecacitatem eodem titulo eodemque gradu nulla alia actio Ecclesiae adaequat."

¹⁹⁵Ibid., I, 69.

¹⁹⁶Quoted in Vagaggini, pp. 69-70.

Because of this efficacy of the liturgy and its eschatological character, the Constitution affirms the Church's missionary concern for those who do not believe, as well as for the faith and continuing repentance of believers that they may effectively help the Church to realize its goal. The liturgy then becomes according to the Constitution the focal point, for in the Eucharist "the sanctification of men in Christ and the glorification of God, to which all other activities of the Church are directed as toward their goal, are most powerfully achieved." Or, as the Constitution says at the beginning of Article 10, "the liturgy is the summit toward which the activity of the Church is directed; at the same time it is the fountain from which all her power flows." This is further emphasized.

The renewal in the Eucharist of the covenant between the Lord and man draws the faithful into the compelling love of Christ and sets them afire. From the liturgy, therefore, and especially from the Eucharist, as from a fountain, grace is channeled into us.¹⁹⁷

Two additional comments will help emphasize the significance of this centrality of the liturgy.

Full participation in liturgical celebrations (see Art. 14 and 41), participation that is as far as possible perfect both internally and externally, not only individually but also socially, is thus pointed out as the summit toward which all other things in their own manner flow. Thus the full liturgical life of the faithful is shown to be not that which should absorb everything else in the life of the Church and reduce all to itself--God forbid--but as that which

¹⁹⁷CSL, I, 10.

directs, inspires and permeates with its own spirit everything else.¹⁹⁸

And as Crichton says,

What we do in our daily lives becomes matter for offering at Mass and the Mass in turn takes up this offering and joins it to Christ's so that it becomes a source of holiness for us. All indeed leads to the summit of the Church's activity, namely the liturgy, and from it receives its power to sanctify. . . . The Christian life is seen to be all of a piece with the liturgy at its centre.¹⁹⁹

To summarize, the "liturgy is Christ's act." It is "the source of all the Church's strength and other activity." It is more than "any concept of liturgics or of merely external rites and observances formalized in routine services." Liturgy is "the moment of commitment and pledge, the starting point for all apostolic activities, the call to the Church's total mission."²⁰⁰ This is the nature of the sacred liturgy.

Section XIII: General Confession of Sins and Invocation of Saints

Luther says,

First, we approve and retain the introits for the Lord's days and the festivals of Christ . . . although we prefer the Psalms from which they were taken as of old. . . . And if any desire to approve the introits (when they have been taken from Psalms or other passages of Scripture) for apostles' days, for feasts of the Virgin and other saints, we do not condemn them.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁸Vagaggini, in Bugnini and Braga, pp. 73-74.

¹⁹⁹Ibid., p. 58.

²⁰⁰McManus, in Yzermans, p. 172.

²⁰¹AE LIII, 22-23. WA XII, 208-9. "Primo, introitus dominicales et in festis Christi . . . quamquam psalmos

1 - 4. Clichtove infers from Luther's silence that he condemns public confession of sins (confessio peccatorum publica) in which "we confess our sins to the saints of God and entreat them who pray to God for us."²⁰² This stems, Clichtove assumes, from Luther's earlier condemnation for veneration of the saints. Clichtove ascribes this public confession to either Pope Pontianus (died 235) or Pope Damasus I (305?-384), and then proceeds with the biblical warrant for public confession.²⁰³ See Lev. 16:21; Lev. 26:40; Neh. 1:6; Neh. 9:1-2; Dan. 9:20; Luke 18:13-14; and Luke 15:21-24. These are examples which the orthodox fathers followed in establishing a confession of sins before the sacrifice.

5. Someone may object on the basis of these passages, however, that confession should be made only to God in the prayers and sacrifices, and not to the Blessed Virgin and all the saints because they cannot forgive sin or offer mercy. But it is invalid to argue that whatever was not present in

malleus, unde sumpti sunt, ut olim. . . . Quod si qui Apostolorum, Virginis aliorumque Sanctorum introitus (quando e psalmis aut aliis scripturis sumpti sunt) probare volent, non damnamus."

²⁰² PE, XXIX^a. "Sanctis dei confiteamur peccata nostra, et precemur illos, qui pro nobis orent deum."

²⁰³ Although Clichtove ascribes the prayers at the foot of the altar to a very early date, evidence would seem to place the earliest traces of this practice in the ninth century. However, a final form did not develop until the thirteenth century, and even then its observance was not uniform. See Joseph A. Jungmann, The Mass of the Roman Rite, translated by Francis A. Brunner and revised by Charles K. Riepe (New York: Benziger Brothers, Inc., c.1961), pp. 199-200.

Old Testament tradition ought not be added to Christian usage.

Veneration of the saints has been added

in order that in them God, their author and sanctifier, might more fully be revered. In this kind of general confession we confess our sins to them also after [we have confessed them to] God, not indeed to receive forgiveness of sins from them as if they could justify us . . . but to beg their patronage and to have them as our intercessors and advocates before God²⁰⁴ in order to receive forgiveness of sins more easily.

6a. If we are willing to confess our sins to a common priest to receive his sage advice and his support in affliction, asks Clichtove, why not also confess the same to saints in demonstration of our humility before God and our reverence for them?

6b - 8. Turning to the matter of Introits, Clichtove views Luther's preference for whole Psalms to be read as another example of his love for novelty (novitatis amator) and his bent to place his own opinion above established practice. Luther just has to be different! If the Church now used whole Psalms, he would insist on single verses for the Introit. Finally, Clichtove castigates Luther for failing to show proper respect to the Mother of God by simply calling her "Virgin" without the ascriptions "blessed" or "holy," and rejects Luther's insistence that Introits must be taken from Scripture.

²⁰⁴PE, XXX^a. "Ut in illis amplius honoretur deus author et sanctificator eorum. Quibus in huiusmodi confessione generali etiam post deum confitemur peccata nostra, non quidem ut ab eis remissionem peccatorum tamquam iustificatoribus nostris obtineamus. . . . sed ut ipsorum imploremus patrocinium: habeamusque eos oratores et advocatos nostros apud deum pro obtinenda facilius venia peccatorum."

Section XIV: More on the Invocation of the Saints

But let no one think from Luther's previous words, says Clichtove, that he would permit the veneration of the saints. For Luther clearly says, "but we in Wittenberg intend to observe only the Lord's days and the festivals of the Lord and the feasts of all saints should be forthwith abrogated."²⁰⁵

Luther impiously despises the saints (impius sanctorum conculcator), says Clichtove, but he prefers to side with the solemnities observed by the holy catholic Church and supported by Scripture and the orthodox fathers. He cites Cassiodorus (485?-580?) on Ps. 121:1,²⁰⁶ Augustine in De cognitione verae vitae²⁰⁷ and Quaestiones super Exodum,²⁰⁸ Gregory the Great in the Prologue to his Moralia super librum Iob,²⁰⁹ and the Venerable Bede (672/673-735) on Luke 7:1-10.²¹⁰ From the fathers he shows that the saints can hear our prayers, that their prayers are helpful in appeasing God's wrath (ad miti-

²⁰⁵AE LIII, 223. WA XII, 209. "Nos Wittembergae solis dominicis et festis domini sabathissare quaeremus, omnium sanctorum festa prorsus abroganda."

²⁰⁶MPL, LXX, col. 905.

²⁰⁷MPL, XL, col. 1026.

²⁰⁸Not in MPL.

²⁰⁹MPL, LXXV, col. 524.

²¹⁰MPL, XCII, col. 416.

gandam dei iram), that they intercede for our sins, and that one may obtain from God the benefits of His grace through the assiduous patronage of the saints.

Section XV: Praying to and Honoring the Saints
and the Feast of the Holy Cross

1 - 4. Luther will no doubt be unimpressed, Clichtove notes, by all the arguments so far presented for praying to and honoring those who share in eternal glory (aeternae gloriae participes). The efficacy of the saints' prayers is established by a number of examples, for instance, Acts 9:36-41; 1 Kings 17:17-24; and 2 Kings 4:32-37. It would seem that Luther condemns those who turn to men of God in moments of desperation to get their help in receiving God's intervention. But why? And if they can pray for us, why not honor them as God's friends, dedicate buildings and altars to them, and appoint feast days in their honor? Clichtove notes that the early Church erected shrines to honor Peter, James, and John. There is no place in the Christian world that did not honor those who first brought the faith with altars and festival days. "If therefore the saints are not to be honored, the whole world is engaged in dark superstition, and Luther alone with his followers walk in the light of Christian piety."²¹¹

²¹¹PE, XXXII^b. "Si igitur non sunt honorandi sancti: totus mundus in tenebris superstitionis versatur, et solus Lutherus cum suis asseclis ambulat in luce Christianae pietatis."

5 - 6. As if Luther has not committed enough impiety, Clichtove says, he now condemns the feasts of the cross. "Let feasts of the Holy Cross be anathema."²¹² This makes it clear that Luther is hostile to the cross of Christ, the very cross in which Paul gloried.

Just as Luther mocks the sacraments of the Church, so he depreciates the holy cross which Christ consecrated with His precious Blood and in which the work of our redemption was fulfilled.²¹³

This attack marks Luther as an extremely embittered enemy of Christian religion (adversarius infensissimus Christianae religionis). Luther's refusal to celebrate these ecclesiastical feasts can only be interpreted as unwillingness to honor Christ on the cross.

Section XVI: The Gloria in Excelsis and the Collects

Luther says,

Second, we accept the Kyrie eleison in the form in which it has been used until now, with the various melodies for different seasons, together with the Angelic Hymn, Gloria in Excelsis, which follows it. However, the bishop may decide to omit the latter as often as he wishes.²¹⁴

²¹²AE LIII, 223. WA XII, 209. "Festa S. Crucis Anathema sunt." Invention of the Cross is observed on May 3rd, and Exaltation of the Cross on September 14th. See WA XII, 209. n. 4.

²¹³PE, XXXIVa. "Lutherus vero sicut ecclesiae sacramenta ridet: ita et sanctam crucem abominatur, quam Christus precioso sanguine consecravit, et in qua nostrae redemptionis opus explevit."

²¹⁴AE LIII, 223. WA XII, 209. "Secundo, Kyrieleison, ut hactenus celebratum est, variis melodiis pro diversis temporibus amplectimur cum sequenti hymno angelico 'Gloria in excelsis', tamen in arbitrio stabit Episcopi, quoties illum omitti voluerit."

1. As the Te Deum Laudamus has been used according to custom in Matins, so the use of the Gloria in Excelsis has been a long-established practice which is not subject to revision by a bishop or anyone else. The angelic praise at the Nativity should be repeated at mass.²¹⁵

Luther continues, "Third, the prayer or collect which follows, if it is godly (and those for Sunday usually are), should be retained in its accepted form; but there should be only one."²¹⁶

2. Luther sacrilegiously insinuates, Clichtove asserts, that there are some collects de tempore and de sanctis which are impious and therefore foreign to the Christian faith. Furthermore, his limitation to the use of a single collect is not in agreement with good sense or ecclesiastical practice. Clichtove assumes that perhaps Luther is seeking brevity for himself and the people. But according to established usage collects may be said in uneven numbers, for example, three, five, or more; and after the chief collect for the mass others may be said.

Luther then says,

²¹⁵Initially the Gloria in Excelsis was not intended for the mass; it was originally in the East (like the Te Deum Laudamus in the West) a hymn at Matins. Eventually the Gloria became a part of masses of a festive nature, but even in the sixteenth century it was not said in every mass. See Jungmann, The Mass of the Roman Rite, translated by Brunner and revised by Riepe, pp. 231-32, 238-40.

²¹⁶Ibid. "Tertio, sequens Oratio illa seu collecta, modo sit pia (ut fere sunt, quae dominicis diebus habentur), perseveret ritu suo, sed ea duntaxat unica."

After this the Epistle is read. . . . [However,] those parts from the Epistles of Paul in which faith is taught are read only rarely, while the exhortations to morality are frequently read. The Epistles seem to have been chosen by a singularly unlearned and superstitious advocate of works. But for the service those sections in which faith in Christ is taught should have been given preference. The latter were certainly considered more often in the Gospels by whoever it was who chose these lessons.²¹⁷

3. Luther has a compulsion to criticize what the Church approves, Clichtove argues. It has been seen from many of Luther's writings that he puts undue emphasis on faith to the exclusion of works. Faith is sufficient for salvation, and therefore Luther attacks the more frequent readings of the moral sections of Scripture. Clichtove on the other hand commends the pericopes for their diversity and points out the great need for moral instruction. Early in Christian history it was necessary to preach faith to convert the unbelievers. But now, when the faithful have been instructed since childhood, there need be a less frequent proclamation of faith and a persistent exhortation to live a moral life worthy of the Christian religion which adds to and confirms faith with works.

Luther concludes this section with a comment about the use of the vernacular.

²¹⁷AE LIII, 23-24. See WA XII, 209-10. "Post hanc lectio Epistolae. . . . raro [tamen] eae partes ex Epistolis Pauli legantur, in quibus fides docetur, sed potissimum morales et exhortatoriae, ut ordinator ille Epistolarum videatur fuisse insigniter indoctus et superstitiosus operum ponderator, officium requirebat eas potius pro maiore parte ordinare, quibus fides in Christum docetur. Idem certe in Euangeliiis spectavit sepius, quibus fuerit lectionum istarum autor."

If in the future the vernacular be used in the mass (which Christ may grant), one must see to it that Epistles and Gospels chosen from the best and most weighty parts of these writings be read in the mass.²¹⁸

4. Now, Clichtove fears, Luther will even want the whole mass and the very words of consecration in the vernacular. Nothing could be more damnable (execrabilis). Luther has been infected by the Hussites and would spread this disease throughout the world by his new form for the mass.

Section XVII: The Mass and Scripture in the Vernacular

1 - 3. Clichtove views the introduction of the vernacular as the beginning point of an undesirable revolution. If boys, girls, women, and laity (who, Clichtove recognizes, are priests according to Wyclif and Luther) get accustomed to having the Scriptures in their own language, they might proceed to administer the sacraments and consecrate the Eucharist themselves. But even if it did not go that far, this course of action might well suggest other satanic changes, and the mass would certainly lose much of the reverence and sublimity which it now holds for the laity.

4 - 7. According to Clichtove, the Latin language acts as an established boundary to protect the mass from the profane, just as the Israelites were not to touch the holy mountain.²¹⁹

²¹⁸Ibid. "Alioqui si futurum est, ut vernacula missa habeatur (quod Christus faveat), danda est opera, ut Epistolae et Euangelia suis optimis et potioribus locis legantur in missa."

²¹⁹Ex. 19:12-13a.

Whoever would want to transgress these limitations will suffer God's judgment for his audacity. See 2 Sam. 6:7; 1 Sam. 6:19; and Num. 4:18-20. God has appointed priests to handle sacred things.

No differently the priests of the evangelical law are permitted to enter the sanctuary, to see the unadorned sacred mysteries of the mass and to handle [them], as part of their duty. True, others not at all chosen for the priestly role are permitted to gaze at and to hear these same holy things enveloped with the Latin language, and they are not permitted without peril to catch sight of those things revealed and uncovered through explication in the vernacular.²²⁰

In Scripture one notes that certain expressions, for example, Amen and Alleluia, are consistently not translated; by extension of this logic one might apply this principle to the whole mass.

8 - 10. Clichtove has previously given reasons why the Epistles and Gospels should not be read in the vernacular to the people, for they would be tempted to debate and determine biblical interpretation. They lack the mental capacity to distinguish the sublime sense of Scripture. How would the laity ever perceive, for example, that the Song of Songs should not be interpreted carnally, but spiritually of Christ and His bride, the Church? Or how could they understand the Prophets whose difficult sayings have taxed the most talented minds?

²²⁰PE, XXXVIIa. "Haud aliter euangelicae legis sacerdotes intrare sanctuarium et nuda videre sacra missae mysteria contrectareque: ex officio permittuntur. Alii vero functionem sacerdotalem minime sortiti tum involuta latini sermonis operatorio sacra eadum intueri audireque sinuntur. neque impune his licet illa revelata atque detecta per vernaculi sermonis explicationem conspiciari."

What is more to be feared is that laymen will have the audacity to make their ignorance public. In imitation of this women may be tempted to teach in the Church in violation of Paul's prohibition.²²¹ The end result will be that the Church will be infected with unspeakable teachings (nefanda dogmata).

Of course some of the laity, men or women, will easily tread under foot the reception of any principle contained in the sacred codices of the Old or New Testament, especially in the Gospels or the Epistles of the Apostles, according to the simple and bare literal context. However since the principle requires a spiritual sense or thought expounded, if you will, from the armory of the sacred writings, they will twist it into a foreign interpretation and use their own opinion on a parity with that of a distinguished teacher. From there they can easily slip into serious errors which they will stubbornly struggle to defend as if they were the oracles and thoughts of the sacred page and to allure others into partnership with their errors.²²²

A look at the Waldensians, the Albigensians, and the Bohemians will justify these fears.

Section XVIII: The Use of the Alleluia

Luther comments,

Fourth, the gradual of two verses shall be sung, either together with the Alleluia, or one of the two,

²²¹1 Cor. 14:34 and 1 Tim. 2:11.

²²²PE, XXXVIII^a. "Nempe quisque laicorum sive viri sive mulieres propositionem quamlibet in sacris contemtam codicibus aut veteris aut novi testamenti, praesertim in euangelis or epistolis apostolicis: ad simplicem et nudum literae contextum accipere facile proterunt, quae tamen spiritualem exquirunt sensum, aut propositam quamvis e sacrarum literarum promptuario sententiam, ad alienam detorquebunt intelligentiam: sola sua opinione tanquam magistro primo utentes. Inde in graves facile prolabi queunt errores, quos tanquam sacrae paginae oracula sensaque pervicaciter defendere certabunt: et alios in suorum errorum consortium partesque pertrahere."

as the bishop may decide. But the Lenten graduals and others like them that exceed two verses may be sung at home by whoever wants them. In church we do not want to quench the spirit of the faithful with tedium.²²³

1 - 2. Again, Clichtove suggests, it would appear that Luther's rubrics for using the Gradual and the Alleluia are arbitrary rather than supported by proper authority. According to established practice the Gradual normally appears with the Alleluia; in Lent the Alleluia is omitted, and in the Paschal season the Alleluia verse is used without the Gradual. Clichtove fails to understand Luther's opposition to Graduals of more than two verses, since there are almost no Graduals that exceed two verses. Luther's aim is brevity rather than the devotion of the people which will be quenched not by tedium but by brevity and haste. Furthermore, Luther's appeal for brevity here is a contradiction to his earlier decision for using the whole Psalm at the Introit.

Luther continues,

Nor is it proper to distinguish Lent, Holy Week, or Good Friday from other days, lest we seem to mock and ridicule Christ with half a mass and the one part of the sacrament. For the Alleluia is the perpetual voice of the church, just as the memorial of His passion and victory is perpetual.²²⁴

²²³AE LIII, 24. WA XII, p. 210. "Quarto, Graduale duorum versuum simul alleluia, vel utrum, iuxta arbitrium Episcopi cantetur. Porro Gradualia quadragesimalia et similia, quae duos versus excedunt, cantet quisquis velit in domo sua. In Ecclesia nolumus tedio extinguere spiritum fidelium."

²²⁴Ibid. "Sed nec ipsam quadragesimam sive maiorem hebdomadam aut sextam feriam penosam aliis ritibus ostentare decet, quam alias quascunque, ne semimissa et altera sacramenti parte Christum amplius ludere et ridere velle videamur. Alleluia enim vox perpetua est Ecclesiae, sicut perpetua est memoria passionis et victoriae eius."

3 - 4. Luther wants to abrogate the custom of omitting the Alleluia in the mass and the canonical hours from Septuagesima until Easter.²²⁵ In the canonical hours the Alleluia is replaced with "Praise be to You, O Lord, King of eternal glory."²²⁶ In the mass the tract is the substitute. This interruption of the Alleluia was established with the authority of Pope Leo I (400?-461). This penitential period of approximately seventy days represents the Babylonian Captivity of the Old Testament and serves as a reminder to seek God's deliverance from our demonic captivity and slavery to sin. This period of penitence is approved by the Church, but the final fulfillment is never forgotten, even in this season of mourning. See Ps. 126:6; Tobit 13:5; and Rev. 19:1. Further support comes from Gratian, Decreti Pars Tertia, De Consecratione, Dist. I²²⁷ which endorses the omission of both the Gloria in excelsis and the Alleluia during this period.

5 - 7. Because the Alleluia is for Luther "the perpetual voice of the church," he would use the Alleluia during Lent and even Holy Week. Clichtove cites a great number of biblical examples and passages that commend grief as the proper response to Christ's innocent death for us and our sins. See Luke 23:27; Matt. 26: 36-45; Rom. 12:15; Eph. 5:2; Heb. 10:29; Job 30:25; and 2 Cor. 8:9. A failure to mourn and to honor the death

²²⁵In some medieval rites, for example, the Ambrosian rite in Milan, the Alleluia was used during Lent.

²²⁶PE, XXXIX^b. "Laus tibi domine, rex aeternae gloriae."

²²⁷MPL, CLXXXVII, cols. 1724-25.

of Christ is a sign of ingratitude toward God and is the response of the faith-less man. See Rom. 1:31 and 2 Tim. 3:3.

8 - 9. At the conclusion of Luther's paragraph he refers to mass of the Presanctified. This was a celebration on Good Friday, without consecration of the host or wine which utilized a priest's host consecrated on Maundy Thursday. Clichtove explains that the rite takes this form because "Christ himself is sacrificed on the cross according to his own and visible form; rather He offers himself to God the Father on our behalf as a fragrant offering."²²⁸ Old Testament verification comes from the rite of the Day of Atonement when the high priest alone entered the Holy of Holies to offer sacrifice.²²⁹ The principle should be no different for the New Testament rite when Christ enters the Holy of Holies and offers expiatory sacrifice for us. Therefore the priest does not offer sacrifice on Good Friday, but uses the pre-consecrated host. Luther criticizes the practice because it seems "to mock and ridicule Christ."

But he, when he calls the rite most solemnly [and] especially [appointed] for that day half a mass, . . . [and] when he also causes offense [by saying] that for the priest to eat only the blessed bread without consecrated wine is only part of the sacrament, then he, the godless man, mocks and ridicules Christ and seriously dishonors him who breathed upon the holy Church through the Spirit of truth that he should so be worshipped on this

²²⁸PE, XLI^a. "Ipse Christus in cruce secundum propriam et visibilem formam immolatus est, imo seipsum obtulit pro nobis deo patri in odorem suavitatis."

²²⁹Lev. 16 and 23:26-32.

day which recalls his Passion as he is worshipped throughout the Christian world.²³⁰

Section XIX: Proses, Candles, Incense and the Nicene Creed

Luther says,

Fifth, we allow no sequences or proses unless the bishop wishes to use the short one for the Nativity of Christ: "Grates nunc omnes." There are hardly any which smack of the Spirit, save those of the Holy Spirit: "Sancti Spiritus" and "Veni sancte spiritus," which may be sung after the noon meal, at Vespers, or at mass (if the bishop pleases).²³¹

1 - 2. Clichtove fails to understand which proses Luther finds objectionable and cites a number of examples: Laetabundus exultet fidelis chorus alleluia for the Nativity, Epiphaniam domino canamus gloriosam for Epiphany, Victimae paschali laudes for Easter, etc. How is it possible that someone who does not have the Spirit of God (spiritum dei non habet) can make a judgment on which proses grieve the Spirit? Again it must be pointed out that such matters are not under the jurisdiction of a bishop.

²³⁰PE, XLI^b. "Sed ipse, cum ritum celebratissime illi diei peculiarem semimissam vocat . . . cum etiam sugillat, alteram sacramenti partem panem scilicet benedictionis sine vino consecrato tunc sumi a sacerdote: Christum ludit et irridet impius, graviter inhonorat. qui ecclesiae sanctae per spiritum veritatis inspiravit se eo die passionis suae commemorativo ita coli debere: ut per totum orbem Christianum colitur."

²³¹AE LIII, 24-25. WA XII, 210-11. "Quinto Sequentias et prosas nullas admittimus, nisi Episcopo placuerit illa brevis in Nativitate Christi 'Grates nunc omnes'. Neque ferme sunt, quae spiritum redoleant, nisi illae de spiritu sancto: 'Sancti spiritus' et 'Veni Sancte spiritus'. Quas vel post prandium vel sub vesperis vel sub missa (si Episcopo placet) cantari licet." See Leo Schabes, Alte liturgische Gebräuche und Zeremonien an der Stiftskirche zu Kloster (Klosterneuburg-bei-Wien: Volksliturgisches Apostolat, 1930), p. 65, according to which the prandium followed high mass and sexts.

Luther continues,

Sixth, the Gospel lesson follows, for which we neither prohibit nor prescribe candles or incense. Let these things be free.

Seventh, the singing of the customary Nicene Creed does not displease us; yet this matter should also be left in the hands of the bishop.²³²

After some discussion whether the sermon in the vernacular should come before the Introit or after the Creed, Luther concludes,

Yet since we are free, this argument does not bind us, especially since everything in the mass up to the Creed is ours, free and not prescribed by God; therefore it does not necessarily have anything to do with the mass.²³³

3 - 5. Omission of candles at the reading of the Gospel would be in violation of ancient church custom. The use of incense is prescribed only for solemn masses. But neither the use of candles nor of incense should be left to the individual discretion. The long-standing practice of reciting the Nicene Creed as a public confession of faith must never be set aside or left to the bishop's decision. Furthermore, Clichtove takes exception to Luther's premise that everything up to the Creed is free and ours. They certainly are not ours nor human inventions, but established by the Apostles and their suc-

²³²AE LIII, 25. WA XII, 211. "Sexto sequitur Euangelii lectio. Ubi nec candelas neque thurificationem prohibemus, sed nec exigimus. Esto hoc liberum. Septimo, Symbolum Nicenum cantari solitum non displicet, tamen et hoc habet in manu Episcopus.

²³³Ibid. "Sed tamen liberos nos ratio ista non ligat, praesertim quod omnia, quae usque ad Symbolum in missa fiunt, nostra sunt et libera, a deo non exacta, quare nec ad missam necessario pertinent."

cessors under the guidance of the Spirit. Should anyone be free to use or omit parts of the mass at will? "But if anyone would argue with Luther that these are all together free, he would introduce total chaos in the ecclesiastical rite."²³⁴ Every priest would suit himself.

And so different ones would celebrate the mass with one rite or another in the same place, and there would be many forms and ways of performing the holy things among the churchmen of the same place. Ultimately nothing sure or fixed in celebrating the rite of the holy altar would remain, since any would arbitrarily do what he wanted.²³⁵

It is especially erroneous to say that nothing up to the Nicene Creed is prescribed by God and therefore optional with impunity, when in fact all has been prescribed by God and essential to the rite.

Section XX: The Offerings of the Faithful

Luther says,

Eighth, that utter abomination follows which forces all that precedes in the mass into its service and is, therefore, called the offertory. And from this point on nearly everything proclaims and nourishes the [notion of] sacrifice. The words of life and salvation [the Words of Institution] are imbedded in the midst of it all, just as the ark of the Lord once stood in the idol's temple next to Dagon. . . . Let us therefore repudiate anything that smacks of

²³⁴PE, XLII^a. "Quod si quis ea universa cum Lutero contenderet esse libera: maximam officio ecclesiastico inveheter confusionem."

²³⁵Ibid. "Et ita diversi prorsus alio et alio ritu missam celebrarent eodem in loco: essetque multiformis et varius apud viros ecclesiasticos eiusdem etiam loci sacra faciendi modus: Nihil denique certum relinqueretur et constans in peragendo sacri altaris officio: quoniam esset cuique pro lege sua voluntas."

sacrifice, together, with the entire canon and retain only that which is pure and holy, and so order our mass.²³⁶

Luther calls the voluntary and pious offering of the faithful, an abomination, while both the Old and New Testaments frequently commend it as God-pleasing. See Ex. 34:20c; Deut. 16:16; Ex. 25:3-7; Ex. 35:21-22; Ex. 36:6-7; and 1 Chron. 15:26. According to the Old Testament injunction the worshipper is not to come before God empty-handed, for God commanded offerings and the people gave of their goods. Who then would condemn the offering of the faithful which is done spontaneously and in imitation of the Old Testament example? Furthermore, Christ taught that we should make offerings; see Matt. 5:23-24 and Luke 21:1-4. How can Luther then condemn that which the Lord commends? And how dare Luther sacrilegiously compare the canon to heathen idols? Clichtove concludes this section with a condemnation of Luther's form for the mass and a resolution not to deviate from the Church's norm.

Section XXI: The Use of Wine Mixed with Water

Luther says,

After the Creed or after the sermon let bread and wine be made ready for blessing in the customary manner. I have not yet decided whether or not water

²³⁶AE LIII, 25-26. WA XII, 211. "Octavo, sequitur tota illa abominatio, cui servire coactum est quicquid in missa praecessit, unde et offertorium vocatur. Et abhinc omnia fere sonant ac alent oblationem. In quorum medio verba illa vitae et salutis sic posita sunt ceu olim arca domini in templo idolorum iuxta Dagon. . . . Proinde omnibus illis repudiatis quae oblationem sonant, cum universo Canone, retineamus, quae pura et sancta sunt, ac sic Missam nostram ordiamur."

should be mixed with the wine. I rather incline, however, to favor pure wine without water.²³⁷

The practice of mixing wine and water in the sacrament, Clichtove asserts, is an uncontested custom since the early Church. Three reasons support its use. (1) By his example and teaching Christ taught that the wine and water should be mixed, and in fact in the Last Supper he offered a chalice with a mixture of wine and water. Although the Gospels make no specific mention of this, we know that Christ did many things which were not recorded, but which, nevertheless, can be strongly supported by the fathers. See Cyprian's letter to his brother Cecil.²³⁸ (2) In the Passion story we see that when Christ's side was pierced blood and water both flowed from his side.²³⁹ (3) This custom signifies the mysterious union of the faithful with Christ, the wine and water representing respectively Christ and the Christian people.

Section XXII: Luther's Reasons against Mixing Wine and Water

According to Clichtove, Luther presents a number of invalid, unsound arguments why he opposes mixing the wine and water.

I rather incline, however, to favor pure wine without water; for the passage, "Thy wine is mixed with

²³⁷AE LIII, 26. WA XII, 211. "Sub symbolo vel post Canonem apparetur panis et vinum ad beneficcionem ritu solito, nisi quod nondum constitui mecum, miscendane sit aqua vino, quamquam huc inclino, ut merum potius vinum paretur absque aquae mixtura."

²³⁸MPL, IV, cols. 396, 399.

²³⁹John 19:34.

water," in Isaiah 1 [22] gives the mixture a bad connotation.

Pure wine beautifully portrays the purity of the gospel teaching.²⁴⁰

1 - 3. Clichtove attacks Luther's literal understanding of the words "wine and water" in Is. 1:22 which respectively are to be understood mystically and figuratively. A literal interpretation would be silly and insipid. The wine is to be taken for the sincerity of divine law and the purity of evangelical truth, and the water for human opinions and corrupted knowledge of heretics. As elsewhere Luther is guilty of twisting the interpretation of the text. His interpretation would never have occurred to Clichtove, for whom the sacrament represents "a transformation through the words of consecration into the true, natural blood of Christ contained under the species of wine."²⁴¹ A literal interpretation is of the flesh and not of the Spirit, for as Paul says, "The letter kills, but the Spirit gives life."²⁴²

4. Luther then says

Further, nothing has been poured out except the blood of Christ, whom we here commemorate, unmixed with ours. Nor can the fancies of those be upheld who say that this is a sign of our union with Christ; for that is

²⁴⁰AE LIII, 26. WA XII, 211. "Quod significatio me malo habeat, quam Isaias i. ponit: 'Vinum tuum (inquit) mixtum est aqua'. Merum vinum enim pulchre figurat puritatem doctrinae Evangelicae."

²⁴¹PE, XLVII^b. "Per verba consecratoria in verum et naturalem Christi sanguinem sub vini speciebus contentum transmutantur."

²⁴²2 Cor. 3:6.

not what we commemorate. In fact, we are not united with Christ until he sheds his blood; or else we would be celebrating the shedding of our own blood together with the blood of Christ shed for us.²⁴³

Paul's dictum that the natural man does not receive that which is of the Spirit of God²⁴⁴ aptly applies to Luther since he is unable to understand the concept of our union with Christ. Luther concludes that since our blood was not mixed with Christ's blood on the cross, water ought not to be mixed with wine in the chalice. But the relationship must be understood mystically and spiritually, "whereby he our mystical Head on the cross united to himself the Church, his mystical body. and sanctified it with his Blood."²⁴⁵ Luther in his delusion thinks that this concept of union is natural, rather than spiritual. This is nonsense.

5 - 7. Luther concludes this section by saying,

And though some direct attention to the water and blood which flowed from the side of Jesus, they prove nothing. For that water signified something entirely different from what they wish that mixed water to signify. Nor was it mixed with blood. The symbolism does not fit, and the reference is inapplicable. As

²⁴³AE LIII, 26. WA XII, 211-12. "Deinde quod pro nobis non est fusus nisi solius sanguis Christi impermixtus nostro, cuius ibi memoriam facimus. Ut non stet illorum somnium, qui dicunt ibi figurari unionem nostri cum Christo: Huius unionis memoriam hic non facimus. Nec sumus uniti ante eius fusionem, alioqui simul noster quoque sanguis cum sanguine Christi pro nobis fusus celebrabitur."

²⁴⁴1 Cor. 2:14

²⁴⁵PE, XLVIII^a. "Qua ipse caput nostrum mysticum in cruce sibi univit ecclesiam corpus suum mysticum: et sanctificavit eam suo sanguine."

a human invention, this mixing [of water and wine] cannot, therefore, be considered binding.²⁴⁶

Clichtove has previously demonstrated that the reference to the blood and water flowing from Christ's side argues for mixing the water and wine in the chalice. The precedent, he says, is apostolic. The water flowing from the Lord's side signifies the washing of regeneration (lavacrum regenerationis) or of baptism. It makes no difference whether the blood and water were mixed or not or whether the water flowed before or after the blood. Nevertheless, it was a common apostolic example for the Church's practice, and therefore the water and wine are not to be used separately, but combined. Again Clichtove would insist that this is not a human invention, but was observed from the beginning on the basis of Christ's own teaching and example. Therefore it cannot be regarded as an optional practice. This is another bit of Luther's contemptible insolence toward the Church and his damnable zeal for novelty.

Section XXIII: The Preface

Luther gives the formula for the Preface.

The bread and wine having been prepared, one may proceed as follows:

²⁴⁶AE LIII, 27. WA XII, 212. "Quod vero aliqui adducunt, e latere Christi fluxisse aquam cum sanguine, nihil probat. Aliud enim illa aqua significat, quam colunt per hanc mixtam aquam significari. Sed nec mixta illa fuit cum sanguine, figura insuper nihil probat, exemplum autem non constat. Quare ut humanum inventum libere tractetur."

The Lord be with you.

Response: And with your spirit.

Lift up your hearts.

Response: Let us lift them to the Lord.

Let us give thanks unto the Lord our God.

Response: It is meet and right.

It is truly meet and right, just and salutary for us to give thanks to You always and everywhere, Holy Lord, Father Almighty, Eternal God, through Christ our Lord.²⁴⁷

1 - 3. Luther is to be faulted for omitting the Secret before the Preface. He no doubt does this because of his conviction that the mass is not a sacrifice, and therefore anything that reminds him of sacrifice or offering is omitted. For the same reason Luther would omit the whole Canon. However, Clichtove's main criticism of Luther in this section is his response to the Sursum corda, "Let us lift them to the Lord" (habeamus) rather than the traditional "We lift them to the Lord" (habemus). Luther does not have the power to change a jot or tittle of the rite of the mass. Furthermore, it seems that for Clichtove the use of the indicative mood connotes the idea that the faithful have already experienced the gift of God, and the faithful should not pray as if they have not as the use of the subjunctive mood would convey.

²⁴⁷AE LIII, 27. WA XII, 212. "Apparato pane et vino mox procedatur ad hunc modum: 'Dominus vobiscum,' Respon[sio]: 'Et cum spiritu tuo.' 'Sursum corda.' Respon[sio]: 'Habeamus ad dominum.' 'Gratias agamus domino deo nostro.' Respon[sio]: 'dignum et iustum est. Vere dignum et iustum est, [a]equum et salutare, nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere, domine sancte, pater omnipotens, aeterne deus, per Christum dominum nostrum.'"

4 - 5. Clichtove further criticizes Luther's text for ending with "through Christ our Lord" and for failing to provide Proper Prefaces for the feasts of the church year. Luther's silence indicates that he sees no value in the Church's text and that he condemns and would eliminate what the Church has traditionally used.

Section XXIV: The Words of Consecration

Luther then quotes the Words of Consecration.

Who the day before he suffered, took bread, and when he had given thanks, broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take eat; this is my body, which is given for you.

After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is of the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins; ~~this~~ do, as often as you do it, in remembrance of me.²⁴⁸

1 - 4. Clichtove continues his criticism of Luther's mutilation and abbreviation of the Preface. What Luther proposes is a half Preface (semipraefationem), for this section begins with the expression, "Who the day before he suffered." The only available antecedent for the relative pronoun "who" is to be found in the ending of the previous section, "through Christ our Lord." This apparently means

²⁴⁸AE LIII, 27-28. WA XII, 212. "Qui pridie quam pateretur, accepit panem gratias agens, fregit deditque discipulis suis dicens: Accipite, comedite, Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis datur. Similiter et calicem, postquam caenavit sic, dicens: Hic calix est novi testamenti in meo sanguine, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Haec quotiescunque feceritis, in mei memoriam faciatis."

to omit the prayers and Proper Preface normally inserted at this point.

When he had polluted many holy things and defiled them with his destructive falsehoods, he, as is very well known, burst into the Holy of Holies in his arrogance and with no sign of reverence showed complete disrespect for what was there. When he had the unbearable audacity to outline for us a form for consecrating the holy bread and wine other than the holy one which the Church has provided for the use of the faithful, the many errors here presented must therefore meet extremely harsh censure.²⁴⁹

The real point of Clichtove's criticism is that here in the very act of consecration Luther has dared to change the form. This clearly diverges from what Christ gave the Church and from what the Church has used without contest since the Apostles.

5 - 6. But no less wicked, says Clichtove, is Luther's next statement.

I wish these words of Christ--with a brief pause after the preface--to be recited in the same tone in which the Lord's Prayer is chanted elsewhere in the canon so that those who are present may be able to hear them, although godly minds should be free about all these things and may recite these words either silently or audibly.²⁵⁰

²⁴⁹PE, LI^b. "Qui cum multa contaminaverit sacra suisque polluerit pestiferis erroribus, notissime in ipsa sacrorum adyta insolenter irrumpit, eaque pedibus irreverenter conculcat: cum aliam consecrandi panis et calicis sancti formam nobis intolerabili temeritate praescribit: quam sanctam in usum fidelibus proposuit ecclesia. Itaque tot hic sunt errata severissima castigatione animadvertenda."

²⁵⁰AE LIII, 28. WA XII, 212. "Haec verba Christi velim modica post prefationem interposita pausa in eo tono vovis recitari, quo canitur alias oratio dominica in Canone, ut a circumstantibus possit audiri, quamquam in his omnibus libertas sit piis mentibus, vel silenter vel palam ea verba recitare."

These words should not be spoken audibly or in the vernacular, but in secret to maintain the reverence due them. Nor should these words be chanted audibly, as is the custom with the Lord's Prayer where the priest concludes the Prayer audibly with "Lead us not into temptation," to which the people respond, "But deliver us from evil." Here again it is not a matter of individual taste, but of ecclesiastical regulation.

Section XXV: The Sign of the Cross, the Fraction, and the Pax

After omitting a paragraph of Luther in which he mentions singing the Sanctus and Benedictus and concedes the continuation of the elevation for the sake of the weak who might be offended by a sudden change, Clichtove continues his quotation of Luther.

After this, the Lord's Prayer shall be read. Thus, let us pray: "Taught by your saving precepts. . . ." The prayer which follows, "Deliver us, we beseech you. . . ." is to be omitted together with all the signs they were accustomed to make over the host and with the host over the chalice. Nor shall the host be broken or mixed into the chalice. But immediately after the Lord's Prayer shall be said, "The peace of Lord," etc.²⁵¹

1 - 2. As Hannibal was the perpetual enemy of Rome, Clichtove notes, so it seems Luther is the Church's perpetual foe,

²⁵¹AE LIII, 28. WA XII, 213. "Post haec legatur oratio dominica. Sic: 'Oremus. Preceptis salutaribus moniti etce.' omitta oratione sequenti: 'Liberam nos quesumus.' cum omnibus signis, quae fieri solent super hostiam et cum hostia super calicem, nec frangatur hostia nec in calicem misceatur. Sed statim post orationem dominicam dicatur: 'Pax domini etce.'"

the savage and persistent assailant of its proper regulations. This is particularly apparent by the way in which he strives to ruin and destroy the mass. This is the only way in which Clichtove can interpret Luther's rejection of the prayer, "Deliver us, we beseech Thee, O Lord, from all evil," which by ancient practice immediately has followed the Lord's Prayer. No doubt Luther's reaction is related to that part of the prayer which contains a commemoration of the saints and a supplication for their patronage. The sign of the cross is made over the hosts and chalice with a certain mystical significance, but Luther's elimination of this practice makes him with Satan an enemy of the cross. Clichtove defends the custom of breaking the host into three pieces to represent the saints in glory, those living in grace, and the dead, to whom the fruits of the mass are communicated.

3 - 5. After the Lord's Prayer comes the Pax Domini,

which is, so to speak, a public absolution of the sins of the communicants, the true voice of the gospel announcing remission of sins, and therefore the one and most worthy preparation for the Lord's Table, if faith holds to these words as coming from the mouth of Christ himself. On this account I would like to have it pronounced facing the people, as the bishops are accustomed to do, which is the only custom of the ancient bishops which is left among our bishops.²⁵²

²⁵²AE LIII, 28-29. WA XII, 213. "Quae est publica quaedam absolutio a peccatis communicantium, vox plane Evangelica, annuncians remissionem peccatorum, unica illa et dignissima ad mensam domini preparatio, si fide apprehendatur, non secus atque ex ore Christi prolata. Unde vellem eam nunciari verso ad populum vultu, quemadmodum solent Episcopi, quod unicum est vestigium Episcoporum priscorum in nostris Episcopis."

Clichtove fails to comprehend Luther's interpretation of the Pax Domini as a public absolution of sins, rather than simply a petition that the Lord's peace may always be present to us. What would the implication of such a statement of absolution mean, since there also are present at mass those who will not want to receive communion or who have not made confession of their sins? How can they be given remission of sins if they are not prepared for it? Perhaps Luther will respond that confession is not necessary to receive the Eucharist, but faith. We know how Luther praises his concept of faith, devoid of works, as sufficient to justify the sinful soul, without any discussion of conscience or confession or acts of penance for sins. If such faith is sufficient, why then did Paul admonish the faithful to examine themselves before communion?²⁵³ Why did Jesus wash the feet of his disciples before sharing with them the mystery of his Body and Blood?²⁵⁴ Certainly this example is given to us, so that we properly prepare ourselves by purging our hearts and minds through confession before approaching the blessed meal. Some additional discussion will come later in Section XXVII. Clichtove further fails to understand why Luther wishes the priest to face the people in saying the Pax; it is ritually impossible since the priest at this point is required to make the sign of the cross over the chalice with the three particles

²⁵³1 Cor. 11:28-29.

²⁵⁴John 13:3-11.

of the host. Finally, Luther is censured for saying the Pax is the only thing which has come from the ancient bishops; this is obviously a slur against the rest of the mass. Such a charge is untrue and contemptible.

Section XXV^A: The Final Collect
and Ceremonial Freedom²⁵⁵

Clichtove omits the section in which Luther mentions the self-communion of the priest during the Agnus Dei with the subsequent communion of the people as well as suggesting the substitution of plural pronouns in several prayers. And then he quotes Luther:

If he desires to have the communion sung, let it be sung. But instead of the postcommunion or final collect, because it almost always proclaims a sacrifice, let the following prayer be read in the same tone: "What we have taken with our lips, O Lord. . . ." The following one may also be read: "May the body which we have received . . . (changing to the plural number) . . . you who live and reign world without end." "The Lord be with you," etc. In place of the Ite missa let the Benedicamus domino be said. . . . The customary benediction may be given; or else the one from Numbers 6 [:24-27], which the Lord himself appointed.²⁵⁶

1 - 2. First of all Luther is wrong in making the use of the communion verse optional; it must never be omitted. The

²⁵⁵Because of a printing error this edition of PE has two sections identified as Chapter XXV.

²⁵⁶AE LIII, 29-30. WA XII, 213. "Si communionem cantare libet, cantetur. Sed loco complendae seu ultimae collectae, quia fere sacrificium sonant, legatur in eodem tono oratio illa: 'Quod ore sumpsimus, domine'. Poterit et illa legi: 'Corpus tuum, domine, quod sumpsimus etc.' mutato numero in pluralem. 'Qui vivis et regnas etc.' 'Dominus vobiscum etc.' Loco 'Ite Missa' dicatur: 'Benedicamus domino'. . . . Benedictio solita detur. Vel accipiatur illa Numeri vi. quam ipse dominus digessit."

same goes for the last collect of the mass that the sacrifice may be pleasing and acceptable to God. Luther's problem is again the matter of sacrifice, but that as Clichtove has shown is indeed not a matter of doubt, but of Christian piety. Therefore this last collect ought to reflect the sacrificial character of the mass according to Christ's example and apostolic tradition. See Matt. 26:30. Luther also is incorrect in changing the ending of the mass, "Go, the mass is ended." After his communion with the disciples Jesus said, "Rise, let us go hence." This indicated that the mystery of institution and the communion of the Eucharist were completed. When the Gloria in excelsis is included in the mass, the rite ends with Ite missa est; but when the angelic hymn is omitted, then the mass ends with Benedicamus domino. Luther has no authority to change the final blessing to that of Num. 6:24-27, although there is certainly nothing wrong with the text itself. The decisive principle is the Church's earliest custom; this prevents individualism and eclecticism.

3 - 4. After some speculation about whether the bread and wine might be consecrated and administered separately, Luther continues,

Thus we think about the mass. But in all these matters we will want to beware lest we make binding what should be free, or make sinners of those who may do some thing differently or omit others. All that matters is that the Words of Institution should be kept intact and that everything should be done by faith. For these rites are supposed to be for Christians, i.e., children of the "free woman" [Gal. 4:3], who observe them voluntarily and from the heart, but are free to

change them how and whenever they may wish. Therefore, it is not in these matters that anyone should either seek or establish as law some indispensable form by which he might ensnare or harass consciences.²⁵⁷

Luther closes his form for the mass with his themesong: freedom to use and to omit as one pleases. But what would remain sure and definite wherever this would happen? Clichtove fears anarchy and loss of uniformity in form and ceremonial. There must be regulation and control, as there was in the Old Testament. How much more appropriate then is it for the rite of the New Testament to have such regulation, instead of chaos and uncertainty. It is not the intent of the ancient fathers and the popes in establishing ceremonial norms to force the faithful to sin; rather those who undermine the integrity of these regulations lead them into sin, and they will suffer the consequences of their deception.

Clichtove then quotes Luther:

But even if they had decreed anything in this matter [in the Roman Church] as a law, we would not have to observe it, because these things neither can nor should be bound by laws. Further, even if different people make use of different rites, let no one judge or despise the other, but let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind Rom. [14:5]. Let us feel and think the same, even though we may act differently.

²⁵⁷AE LIII, 30-31. WA XII, 214. "Sic de Missa sentimus. In quibus omnibus cavendum, ne legem ex libertate faciamus, aut peccare cogamus eos, qui vel aliter fecerint, vel quaedam omiserint, modo benedictionis verba sinant integra et fide hic agant. Christianorum enim hii esse debent ritus, id est filiorum liberae, qui sponte et ex animo ista servant, mutaturi quoties et quomodo voluerint. Quare non est, ut necessariam aliquam formam velut legem in hac re quispiam vel petat vel statuatur, qua conscientias illaqueet et vexet."

. . . "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink,
but righteousness [and charity]."258

Clichtove then ends with an apparent paraphrase: "Neither the rites themselves nor the ceremonies commend us to God."259 Luther's words are clearly aimed at inciting the faithful by suggesting no one need submit to ecclesiastical regulations on rites and ceremonial. Paul urges that "all things should be done decently and in order."260 We are not dealing with any matters of judgment or doubt, but the anciently established rite of the mass which ought to be used as received and which cannot be changed without causing harm. The rites and ceremonies which worship God do commend us to him, when they are observed completely as established.

Section XXVI: Vestments and Blessing of Vestments

Luther says on vestments,

We have passed over the matter of vestments. But we think about these as we do about other forms. We permit them to be used in freedom, as long as people refrain from ostentation and pomp. For you are not more acceptable for consecrating in vestments. Nor are you less acceptable for consecrating

258 AE LIII, 31. WA XII, 214. "Sed nec servandum esset, si quicquam pro lege in hac re [in Romana Ecclesia] sanxissent, quod legibus h[a]ec obstringi nec possint nec debeant. Deinde, si etiam diversi diverso ritu utantur, nullus alterum vel iudicet vel contemnat, sed unusquisque sensu suo abundet, et idem sapiamus ac sentiamus, etiam si diversa faciamus. . . . 'Non est regnum dei esca et potus, set iustitia [et charitas]!"

259 PE, LVIA. "Ita nec ritus ipsi nec caeremoniae nos commendant deo."

260 1 Cor. 14:40.

without vestments. For vestments certainly do not commend us to God.²⁶¹

1 - 4. As elsewhere Clichtove here refused to accept Luther's principle of freedom. In the Old Testament we have God giving Moses direction for the priestly vestments,²⁶² and the priests were not permitted to perform their office unless properly vested. Similarly that same standard was introduced in the rite of the New Testament. See Gratian, De Consecratione, Dist. 1.²⁶³ If we look at the legal and judiciary systems we recognize that certain apparel is appropriate to the function of those responsibilities. If this principle holds in human affairs, why not more so in divine matters? And certainly it is more pleasing to God when the priest blesses the people in the sacred vestments, for it shows reverence for the divine mystery and obedience to the Church. Failure to use vestments reveals just the opposite: insolence, irreverence, and disobedience. True, the vestments in and by themselves do not commend us to God, but, inasmuch as they reflect their ministry, they do commend us to God particularly for our obedience to ecclesiastical usage. Next Clichtove takes issue with Luther's concern over pomp and ostentation; here we are reminded of

²⁶¹AE LIII, 31. WA XII, 214-15. "Vestes praeterivimus. Sed de his ut de aliis ritibus sentimus. Permittamus illis uti libere, modo pompa et luxus absit. Neque enim magis places, si in vestibus benedixeris. Nec minus places, si sine vestibus benedixeris. Neque enim vestes etiam nos deo commendant." The last sentence does not appear in AE.

²⁶²Ex. 28.

²⁶³MPL, CLXXXVII, col. 1719.

Judas and his hypocritical concern for economy.²⁶⁴ But if we look to the Old Testament we are told of the lavish vestments used by the priests of that rite, and by command of the Lord.²⁶⁵ What then is Luther criticizing for pomp and ostentation? For certainly such, if not more impressive, vestments befit the evangelical priest who sacrifices the immaculate Lamb to God in the mass. The purpose of vestments is to add splendor to the rite, to inspire reverence and devotion, to increase honor towards God, and finally to transmit an understanding of the mystical significance behind the signs of those vestments. For they commemorate the Passion of our Lord and represent the holy mystery there presented.

5 - 6. Then Luther criticizes the blessing of vestments.

But I do not wish them to be consecrated or blessed --as if they were to become something sacred as compared with other garments--except by that general benediction of word and prayer by which every good creature of God is sanctified. Otherwise, it is nothing but the superstition and mockery which the high priests of the abomination have introduced together with so many other abuses.²⁶⁶

If Luther thinks that the blessing of vestments is superstitious or wrong, then he should be reminded that Moses was commanded by God to anoint the tabernacle and its furnishings

²⁶⁴Matt. 26:6-16 and John 12:3-6.

²⁶⁵Ex. 28; Lev. 8:1-9.

²⁶⁶AE LIII, 31-32. WA XII, 215. "Sed nec eas consecrari velim aut benefici, velut sacrum aliquod futurae sint prae aliis vestibus, nisi generali illa benedictione, qua per verbum et orationem omnis bona Creatura dei sanctificari docetur, alioqui mera superstitio et impietas est per abominationis pontifices introducta, sicut et alia."

with oil.²⁶⁷ See Augustine, Sermo II in Ps. 113,²⁶⁸ and Origen, Homilia XI super Leviticum.²⁶⁹ The practice of blessing vestments has both scriptural and patristic authority. It is a mark of Luther's mockery (impietas) to refuse the blessing of profane vestments and thus designating them for ecclesiastical usage.

Section XXVII: Communion at Every Mass,
Worthy Reception, and Confession

1. Thus Luther has completed the outline of his form for the mass. Attached to this is an appendix regarding the communion of the people, in which he condemns celebration of the mass without the communion. For

just as it is absurd for a minister of the Word to make a fool of himself and in a public ministry to preach the Word where no one hears or to harangue himself among rocks and timbers or under the open sky, so it is equally nonsensical if the minister prepare and embellish a public Supper of the Lord without having guests to eat and drink it, so that they who ought to minister to others, eat and drink by themselves alone at an empty table and in a vacant room.²⁷⁰

²⁶⁷Ex. 40:9-15

²⁶⁸MPL, XXXVII, col. 1484.

²⁶⁹MPG, XII, col. 529.

²⁷⁰AE LIII, 32. WA XII, 215. "Ut . . . longe absurdissimum est, ministrum verbi sic desipere, ut verbum publico ministerio pronunciet, ubi nullus est auditor, et sibi soli inter saxa et ligna aut sub divo clamet, ita perversissimum est, si ministri publicam caenam domini parent et ornent, ubi nulli sent hospites, qui edant et bibant, et ipsi soli, qui aliis ministrare debent, in vacua mensa et aula comedant et bibant."

Luther's comparison here is not at all fitting. For the ministry of the Word is established for the instruction of those who hear it; therefore if there is no one present, the Word of God is not presented. However, the celebration of the mass does not demand communion of the people every day, but its basic nature is one of consecrating the Body and Blood of our Lord and the offering by the priest for all the people. Although the people do not always receive communion, they receive its benefits when present through the profession of a sincere faith and their union with God. Therefore the priest does not eat and drink alone, and the private mass should not be abolished, as Luther suggests when he says:

Therefore, if we really want to show [our] esteem for Christ's command, no private mass should be allowed to remain in the Church, except to sustain either weakness or necessity in this matter for a time.²⁷¹

Indeed Christ did not ordain that the private mass must be abolished. He said, "Whenever you do this, you do it in remembrance of me."²⁷² He did not say, "Whenever you do this in a public mass,"²⁷³ or, "Do this in a public mass in remembrance of me."²⁷⁴ It is Luther's heretical perversity which prompts

²⁷¹Ibid. "Quare si vere Christi institutum amplecti volumus, nulla debet missa privata relinqui in Ecclesia, nisi toleretur et hic vel infirmitas vel necessitas ad tempus."

²⁷²PE, LVIII^b. "Haec quotienscumque feceritis: in mei memoriam facietis." See Luke 22:19 and 1 Cor. 11:24-25.

²⁷³Ibid. "Haec quotienscumque in missa publica feceritis."

²⁷⁴Ibid. "Hoc in missa publica facite in meam commemorationem."

him to use the Lord's institution as support for his own depravity.

2 - 4. Then in explaining the manner of administering the communion to the people Luther makes the following suggestions, according to Clichtove's paraphrase and spot quotation. The names and manner of life of those who wish to receive communion should be known by the bishop. The bishop is to examine them about their faith, and those who fail to answer properly are to be refused the sacrament. This particularly concerns those who are clearly living in gross sin, for example, fornicators, adulterers, and so on. Luther does not condemn private confession, but considers it useful. Finally Luther is concerned that those who receive the communion be sober, but he does not require fasting.²⁷⁵

Clichtove first raises the issue about what Luther means by "bishop." If he really means a bishop, then it must be pointed out that it is not the office of the spiritual overseer to make decisions about who shall receive the sacrament. That has been placed in the hands of the parochial curate. If Luther means to equate a priest with a bishop, he is guilty of opposing the order Christ himself has established. For Luther faith alone is sufficient preparation for receiving the sacrament without any examination of life, penitence, or sacramental

²⁷⁵AE LIII, 32-34 passim. WA XII, 215-17 passim.

confession. According to Luther a man can come to the sacrament with his secret sins; they need not be forgiven through private confession. About open sins we have seen that Luther differs, but are not hidden sins as serious as the known ones? Luther errs greatly in making private confession an option for anyone before receiving the sacrament, instead of requiring it for all as has been the custom. See 1 Cor. 11:27; Matt. 22:11-13; Ex. 12:21-27; Ex. 30:17-21; and John 13:3-11. Worthy preparation must precede a reception of the sacrament. See also Jer. 11:15; Is. 1:16; and Col. 2:2-3.

Section XXVIII: Communion under Both Kinds

1 - 3. Luther seeks communion of the people and feels that enough time has now passed to introduce the communion with both the bread and wine. "Wherefore let both forms be requested and offered in simple compliance with the institution of Christ. Let those who do not wish them be left alone and let nothing be given them."²⁷⁶ Clichtove begins by presenting a number of Scripture passages from both the Old and New Testament to demonstrate that communion with both kinds is not necessary for salvation. In the Lord's instructions about eating the lamb as a type of the true Lamb there is no mention of drink,²⁷⁷

²⁷⁶AE LIII, 35. WA XII, 217. "Quare simpliciter iuxta institutum Christi utraque species et petatur et ministretur. Qui hoc noluerint, sinantur sibi et nihil ministretur ipsis."

²⁷⁷Ex. 12:1-27.

nor was it mentioned in regard to manna,²⁷⁸ but both signify the Eucharist to be received by all the people. Even when libations were offered to the Lord, for example, the cereal and sin offerings, the people never received anything, but it was reserved for the priests.²⁷⁹ Those libations represented the liquid portion of the eucharistic sacrament which is permitted only to the priests. Similarly the sprinkling of blood on the horns of the altar was a function of the priesthood, not of the people,²⁸⁰ and so this indicates likewise that only the priests should receive the Blood of Christ under the form of the wine. In the New Testament when our Lord fed five thousand from five barley loaves, there was not a word about drink.²⁸¹ After this miracle whenever Jesus exhorted the people to eat the true Bread from heaven he does so without recalling the Blood.²⁸² Why can the adversaries not be convinced by these passages? When Jesus was with the two disciples at Emmaus, he made himself known in the breaking of bread.²⁸³

3 - 7. Augustine, Clichtove notes, in his Sermo CCXXXV, In diebus Paschalibus, IV, affirms that the Lord is known in the

²⁷⁸Ex. 16:13-21.

²⁷⁹Lev. 6:14-18, 24-30

²⁸⁰Lev. 4:1-5:10.

²⁸¹John 6:5-14.

²⁸²John 6:33, 51, 57.

²⁸³Luke 24:30-31

breaking of bread.²⁸⁴ There the absent Lord has made himself known. According to the Venerable Bede, Expositio in Evangelium S. Lucae, Book VI, no one knows Christ except in the breaking of bread and unless he is a member of Christ's Body, the Church.²⁸⁵ This breaking of bread, Clichtove points out, is the eucharistic bread, as we know from the New Testament. See Acts 2:42,46. Nicholas of Lyra (1270?-1349?) supports this interpretation. Clichtove then cites a canon from De consecratione, Dist. II, which imposes penance upon a priest who spills wine from the chalice.²⁸⁶ And is there not even a greater problem that this would happen more frequently and easier with the lay people, especially with the big crowds on feast days? Out of this concern, then, it became the custom not to commune the lay people with both forms. According to an unidentifiable letter of Augustine, Pope Pius I (died 155) is to be credited with establishing the practice of communicating the lay people with only the one form,²⁸⁷ and this would seem to indicate that the Church's custom has been observed since ancient times. Another argument is associated with the fact that non-celebrating priests receive only the bread from

²⁸⁴MPL, XXXVIII, col. 1118.

²⁸⁵MPL, XCII, col. 628.

²⁸⁶MPL, CLXXXVII, col. 1742.

²⁸⁷Epistola ad Generosum decimus. Clichtove gives the year about 154. See Jungmann, The Mass of the Roman Rite, II, 382-86. The history is very complex, but the custom of withholding the chalice from the congregation did not become widely common until the twelfth century.

the officiant; should this not be even more applicable to the lay people? Furthermore on Good Friday the celebrant himself receives communion only under the form of the Presanctified Host. This example should make it conclusive that the Church's regulation provides communion under both forms only for the priest.

8 - 9. For Clichtove final evidence comes from the Councils of Constance (1414-1418) and Basel (1423-1439), where these matters were discussed because of the insurgent heretics of the time. Constance recognized that originally the Church administered the communion to the faithful under both kinds, and the change came later under the fathers. No one has the authority to change this practice, and in fact the Council decided that no presbyter was to administer the communion to the people under both kinds on penalty of excommunication. Basel simply commended the Church's practice and forbade anyone to change or criticize it.

Section XXIX: Refutation of Reasons Given for Communion under Both Kinds

1 - 2. Now, Clichtove says, the time has come to resolve some of the arguments of those who feel that it is necessary for salvation that the lay people receive the eucharistic sacrament under both forms. According to their first argument, Christ in the Last Supper committed to his disciples the sacrament under both kinds and ordained that it should be done in the same way and frequently in memory of him. See Matt. 26:26-29;

Mark 14:22-25; and Luke 22:17-20. Who therefore would deny the lay people the species of wine and thus oppose the Lord's institution and the Gospel witness? Clichtove answers: In the Last Supper our Lord did not administer the communion to lay men or women, but only to the twelve Apostles whom he had ordained priests and to whom he committed the sacred mystery that is in the mass. Most of the important authorities think there were no women present, not even the mother of our Lord, nor any of the seventy, but only the twelve. See Matt. 26:20; Mark 14:17,20; and Luke 22:14. Furthermore, when one looks at the words, "Eat of this, all of you, and drink of it, all of you,"²⁸⁸ one might be tempted to interpret this universally and indiscriminately, but those present understood it only in terms of the Twelve. Again it can be concluded that only the priests are to receive the sacrament under both kinds. The reason for this was clarified by later canons in response to occasional abuses.

The priests, as ministers of the Church in the most sacred mystery of the mass, represent the Lord's Passion, in which the precious Blood of Christ has been separated from his holy body. To indicate this suitably they are commanded to perform the consecration of the chalice after the consecration of the host.²⁸⁹

²⁸⁸PE, LXIII^b. "Manducate ex hoc omnes, et bibite ex hoc omnes."

²⁸⁹Ibid., LXIV^a. "Sacerdotes ut ecclesiae ministri in sacratissimo missae mysterio dominicam representant passionem: in qua sanguis Christi preciosus a sacro eius corpore fuit separatus. Ad quod apte designandum separatim calicis consecrationem facere iubentur post consecrationem hostiae."

See Gen. 14:18. From this it can be concluded on the basis of the Last Supper and the accounts of the Evangelists that communion under both forms was never given to lay people or non-celebrating priests.

3 - 4. The second objection raised by those who argue for communion under both kinds, Clichtove says, concerns the passage in John 6:53, "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you have no life in you." Those who support communion under both kinds therefore conclude that it is necessary for all both to eat the flesh and to drink the blood of Christ; otherwise they will be denied eternal life. This obviously implies that communion under both forms, also for the lay people, is necessary for salvation. Clichtove replies: Yes, this is what Christ has said, but it must be understood properly of a spiritual eating, "that is, a grafting into the mystical Body of Christ through faith, hope, and love, and incorporation into it, is necessary for salvation even for infants and children."²⁹⁰ Whoever eats the flesh of Christ in the form of bread also receives his blood. For Christ did not say, "Unless you will have eaten the flesh of the Son of man and have drunk of his blood in the chalice, or under the form of wine,"²⁹¹ but simply, "drink of his blood." So it can be said,

²⁹⁰Ibid. "Id est insitione in corpus Christi mysticum per fidem, spem, et charitatem, et incorporatione in ipsum: omnibus etiam parvulis et infantibus ad salutem necessaria."

²⁹¹Ibid., LXIV^b. "Nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis: et biberitis eius sanguinem in calice aut sub vini specie."

But every layman who takes the Eucharist under the form of bread alone eats the flesh of the Son of man and drinks his blood, since it is the whole Christ, perfect God and perfect man, under both sacramental forms. Therefore in every person who receives the holy communion only under the form of the bread the word of our Lord referred to above is fulfilled.²⁹²

Nothing can be concluded from either the words or the deeds of our Lord to commend administering the holy communion to lay people under both forms. The sacrament's form and substance have been determined by Christ and cannot therefore be altered even through ecclesiastical canons. True, Christ did not define the manner of communicating, that is, whether under both or one form, but he left that to be ordained through the Spirit by the Apostles and the Church.

5 - 6. The third argument given by those who advocate communion under both kinds is based on Paul's words in 1 Cor. 11:26-28.

For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes. Whoever, therefore eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of profaning the body and blood of the Lord. Let a man examine himself, and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup.

In this passage the drinking of the Lord's cup is mentioned three times with the eating of the bread; this obviously means

²⁹²Ibid. "Unusquisque autem laicus sub sola panis specie sumens eucharistiam manducat carnem filii hominis et bibit eius sanguinem, cum sit Christus totus, perfectus deus et perfectus homo, sub utraque specie sacramentali. Quare in unoquoque communionem sacram sub panis specie tantum sumente praedictum domini nostri verbum completur."

receiving the Blood of the Lord under the kind of wine. If, according to Paul's instruction, that was the usage among the Corinthian lay people, why should it not be observed now by the whole Church? Clichtove replies: Paul's main intent in these words is not to advise communion under both kinds, but, in the context of recalling the Evangelists' account of the Last Supper, to remind the Corinthians that they were to receive communion in commemoration of the Lord's passion and to examine themselves in order to receive it worthily. In some churches, for example, Carthage, it appears that they did have communion for the lay people under both kinds, but this was never universally the custom.

Section XXX: Possible Dangers of Communion
under Both Kinds

1. Those who favor communion under both kinds, Clichtove notes, argue that its introduction would be no violation of the ancient rite and that since it was the custom of the whole Church (see 1 Cor. 12) the earliest testimonies should be honored and later opinions rejected. The problems that later became a concern were, it is true, not present in the early Church, since the numbers involved were smaller then. Also at that time the faithful were giving their lives in martyrdom and were to be consoled that their blood was flowing for Christ, and therefore they were effectually inspired by the memory of the Lord's passion visibly represented through receiving His Blood from the chalice in communion. This is why the early

Church permitted in individual situations communion under both kinds.

2. Later when peace returned to the Church and its numbers had grown, it reconsidered many things, including the dangers of communing the lay people under both forms: the danger of giving the wine to the people, the danger of keeping the consecrated wine for the sick, the danger of spilling the wine while travelling to the sick, the problem of the financial expense to communicate so many, and finally the danger of the lay people falling into the error of thinking that only the Lord's Body is present in the form of the bread. For these and many other reasons which could be cited the Church wisely decided on the basis of Scripture to administer holy communion to the lay people only under the form of the bread, for the use of the bread presents none of the problems previously mentioned with the use of wine.

3. In civil law it is possible to revoke an older law which has become outmoded and to replace it with a more expedient, more practical substitute. Why is there no similar provision in the Church? Clichtove really gives no answer, but seems to suggest that change implies accommodation and expediency, rather than determination to adhere to proved principles.

Section XXXI: Efficacy of the Eucharist under One Kind

1 - 2. Another argument advanced that greater efficacy is granted to those who receive the sacrament under both kinds,

than under only the one kind. They cite, says Clichtove, Ambrose to the effect that we receive the flesh of Christ for the salvation of the body and his blood for the salvation of the soul.²⁹³ Clichtove denies the relevance of this argument, since the efficacy of the sacrament does not derive from the kinds themselves. Indeed Christ is wholly present under one kind, and equally full grace is conferred to those who receive under one kind as under two. Some authorities, such as Ambrose, may attribute different benefits to the sacrament under both kinds, but do not mean to imply that there is less efficacy with only one kind. The same implication may appear to be present in the Lord's words in John 6:54, "he who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life," but he later qualifies this in verse 58b, "he who eats this bread will live for ever." Here Christ is speaking only of the form of the bread, but attributes to it that which is available in both forms, that is, eternal life. This does not mean that the wine is superfluous, or that its use was ordained by Christ unnecessarily. For its value lies in its perfect representation of Christ's passion in which his blood flowed from the body, and it signifies the perfect nourishment given to the soul in this sacrament, which consists in both food and drink. Also it indicates the full salvation of the whole man in body and soul.

²⁹³This comment attributed to Ambrose could not be identified, either in his own works or in the works of those who argue for communion under both kinds.

3 - 5. A similar argument runs that withholding the chalice is an act of discrimination (praeiudicium) against the lay people and lessens their devotion for the sacrament. Eventually this also affects their reverence for the Lord's passion. The lay people have a right to receive the form of the wine. But, Clichtove counters, there is no such injunction in Scripture, there is no human or ecclesiastical law that requires it, and there is no reason to believe that communion under the one kind is detrimental to salvation. Let it be repeated: the efficacy does not depend on the kinds themselves and is equal in either one of them. Therefore the Church's practice of communion in the kind of the bread should have no effect on the people's devotion. If anything, it should increase it. If any lay person is affected by dullness of faith, he should not blame the Church. Christ is equally present and available in both forms, and the people can be sufficiently reminded of his Passion from the one form. In conclusion, Clichtove points out that many authorities have written on this question, particularly during the Councils of Constance and Basel when this issue was hotly being debated against the heretics.

Section XXXII: Contempt for Councils, Vernacular Hymns, and the Canonical Hours

1. Luther says,

Nor is it necessary for anyone to delay this, because they keep bringing up a council at which the permission for this would again be sanctioned. We have the law of Christ on our side and are not minded

to wait for or to listen to a council in matters which manifestly are part of the gospel.²⁹⁴

Let Luther show us one word of Christ whereby he said communion must be given to the lay people under both kinds out of necessity for salvation, and then we will frankly confess that he has the law of Christ. Let him show us one word from the Gospels and we will believe him when he says this is "manifestly part of the gospel." But he will never be able to demonstrate this.

2. Luther continues,

Nay, we say more: If by chance a council should establish and permit this practice, then we would be the last to want to avail ourselves of both forms. Nay, in contempt both of the councils and its statute, we should then wish to avail ourselves either of only one or of neither, but never of both; and we would hold those to be wholly anathema who on the authority of such a council and statute would avail themselves of both.²⁹⁵

Here it is obvious that Luther is not after the truth, but that he is only interested in contradicting and degrading the councils. These statements clearly show contempt for the Spirit who directs these councils and for our Lord who, according to his promise, is present there. See Matt. 18:20 and 28:20b. Clichtove proceeds then to show from Luther's own

²⁹⁴AE LIII, 35. WA XII, 217. "Nec quenquam id morari debet, quod Concilium iactant, in quo id rursus licere sancitur. Nos Christi ius habemus et Concilia nec morari nec audire volumus in his, quae manifeste sunt Evangelii."

²⁹⁵Ibid. "Quin amplius dicimus: Si quo casu Concilium id statueret ac permetteret, tunc minime omnium nos velle utraque specie potiri, imo tunc primum in despectum tam Concilii quam statuti sui vellemus aut utra tantum aut neutra, et nequaquam utraque potiri, ac plane eos anathema habere, quicumque auctoritate talis Concilii vel statuti utraque potiretur."

words that he is prepared to deny the Gospel and that he contradicts the councils.

3. In Clichtove's final quotation from Luther, the Reformer says,

You wonder why and ask for a reason? Listen! If you know that the bread and wine were instituted by Christ and that both are to be received by all--as the Gospels and Paul testify so clearly that even our adversaries themselves are forced to admit it--and if you still dare not believe and trust in Him enough to receive both forms, but dare to do so after men decide this in a council, are you not preferring men to Christ? Do you not extol sinful men over Him who is named God and worshiped as such [II Thess. 2:3-4]? Do you not trust in the words of men more than in the words of God? Nay rather, do you not utterly distrust the words of God and believe only the words of men? And how great a rejection and denial of God the most high is that? What idolatry can be compared to the superstitious regard in which you hold the councils of men? Should you not rather die a thousand deaths? Should you not rather receive one or no form at all, than [both] in the name of an obedience which is a sacrilege and of a faith that amounts to apostasy?²⁹⁶

Luther deserves to be damned in silence rather than praised in public, to be suppressed rather than promoted. But Clichtove can see at least one goal in presenting Luther: that he

²⁹⁶AE LIII, 35. WA XII, 217. "Miraris et causam quaeris? Audi. Si tu nosti panem et vinum a Christo institutum, utrunque scilicet sumendum esse ab omnibus, ut clarissime testantur Euangelia et Paulus, ita ut et ipsi adversarii cogantur id confiteri, nec tamen audes illi credere et fidere, ut ita sumas, audes vero ut sumas, si homines in concilio suo id statu-ant: Nonne tum praefers homines Christo? Nonne extollis homines peccati super deum, qui dicitur et colitur? Nonne plus fidis in hominum verba quam in dei verba? Imo verbis dei prorsus diffidis, et solis hominum verbis credis? At quanta est ista abominatio et negatio dei altissimi? Quae idolatria tum par esse potest tuae tam religiosae obedientiae erga Concilium hominum? Nonne potius milies mori? Nonne potius unam aut nullam speciem accipere deberes, quam in tali obedientia tam sacrilega et apostasia fidei accipere?"

might be known for what he is and condemned from his own words. Why does Luther issue all this thunder and lightning, unless he aims at persuading those who have put their confidence in the councils to despair of God and to become apostates and idolaters? But it is not difficult to spot the falsehoods in Lutheran teaching, even if they quote Scripture, as we have just seen in our refutation on communion under both kinds.

4 - 6. Then Luther wants the people to sing vernacular hymns during the mass; earlier he wanted to reject the proses.²⁹⁷ His suggestion is to be detested and cursed; it can only create confusion, irreverence toward the rite, and contempt for the holy. For nothing ought to be sung in the mass except that which has been approved. This is another idea which Luther has got from the Hussites and Bohemians, and Clichtove proceeds to outline the relationship. Luther has revived all the Hussite articles, and history is repeating itself with ruination of the churches, destruction of the monasteries, sacrileges, killing of priests, and all sorts of monstrous crimes which are too horrible to mention. All these things

²⁹⁷See AE LIII, 36-37. "I also wish that we had as many songs as possible in the vernacular which the people could sing during the mass, immediately after the gradual and also after the Sanctus and Agnus Dei. For who doubts that originally all the people sang these which now only the choir sings or responds to while the bishop is consecrating? The bishops may have these [congregational] hymns sung either after the Latin chants, or use the Latin on one [Sun] day and the vernacular on the next, until the time comes that the whole mass is sung in the vernacular."

are getting a new hearing through this furious raging of the Lutherans. Clichtove fears that the battle will spread to the ends of the Christian world, and that all Bohemia and Germany will be infected by these heresies. Luther's writings have been widely disseminated. One effect of which Clichtove has already heard is action of those priests and monks who have abandoned their vows of chastity, left the monasteries, returned to the secular life, and become married. Luther is the single author and cause of all these evils. Clichtove bewails the deplorable times in which the Church finds itself, but he prays that God in his boundless goodness will aid the Church and drive this Lutheran plague away from the Christian world.

7. In closing Clichtove very briefly condemns Luther's revision of the canonical hours,²⁹⁸ and says,

So after we have completely rejected all these seditious novelties let us hold firmly to ecclesiastical regulation in the holy office of the mass and in reading the hours. For whoever has maintained this model, peace and security is upon him and with unhindered step he proceeds on the right path to him, who in a most orderly way has assigned everything a fixed number and its own boundaries and rules the whole world according to his laws. To him be honor and glory and thanksgiving throughout the ages. Amen.²⁹⁹

²⁹⁸AE LIII, 37-39. "As for the other days which are called weekdays, I see nothing that we cannot put up with, provided the [weekday] masses be discontinued. For Matins with its three lessons, the [minor] hours, Vespers, and Compline de tempore consist . . . of nothing but divine words of Scripture. . . If anything should be changed, the bishop may reduce the great length [of the services] according to his own judgment so that three Psalms may be sung for Matins and three for Vespers with one or two responsories."

²⁹⁹PE, LXXI^b. "Itaque his omnibus seditiosas novitates

Vatican II on Participation

While there is no specific section in Clichtove's work which speaks to the question of congregational participation in the liturgy, it nevertheless is represented in the principles which dictate the preservation and immutability of the sixteenth century rite with its limited congregational participation, in the attitudes which view the mass as a remote mystery and the lay people with condescension, in the question of the use of vernacular, and in the whole issue of communion under both kinds. On the other hand, it would be remiss to discuss the pastoral and didactic concerns of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy and not to highlight its emphasis on participation.

A principal thrust of the Constitution concerns the restoration of corporate, responsible participation by the entire liturgical assembly, laity as well as clergy. . . . The root of the problem lies in our need for a clearer doctrine of the Church, as a community of members one of another in the Mystical Body of Christ, each and every one endowed with charismata, gifts of the Spirit, for ministry to and edification of the whole.³⁰⁰

parientibus omnino reiectis: teneamus firmiter ecclesiasticam et in sacro missae officio et in horis legendis constitutionem. Nam quicumque hanc regulam tenuerit: pax super illum et securitas, inoffensoque pede per rectum procedet tramitem ad eum: qui omnia certo numero et propriis limitibus ordinatissime definiuit, suisque temperat totum legibus orbem. Cui sit honor et gloria, atque gratiarum actio in secula seculorum. Amen."

³⁰⁰Shepherd, in Pawley, p. 162. It should be noted that Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., is a priest of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Or as Frederick R. McManus says,

Liturgical participation, active and aware, internal and external, will be pressed home in every development of ritual change, if only because of the Constitution's principle that this participation is the aim to be considered above all others.³⁰¹

McManus sees this concern for participation as needed to help correct two vital areas of imbalance: "the loss of community sense and the corresponding emphasis upon an individualistic piety," and "the assumption by the priest of almost all the roles in the liturgy."³⁰² He immediately goes on to point out that this change is more than a matter of mechanics or techniques, but is intimately involved in the concept of the Church as a community and of the functions of the members of the community, both lay and cleric. Furthermore, the restoration of lay activity is not only liturgical, but also related to "the total mission and apostolate of the Church."³⁰³

Participation, once again, is not a matter of external techniques merely. . . . It is a matter of the most profound and inward involvement of each member of the community, the inner purpose and intent of each one to be a complete member of the praying people. The ritual and liturgical side, since the liturgy is signs, demands that this interior act be manifest outwardly to the community and for the community.³⁰⁴

As the opening of the Constitution states, "The liturgy is thus the outstanding means by which the faithful can express

³⁰¹In Yzermans, p. 174.

³⁰²Ibid., p. 173

³⁰³Ibid., p. 174.

³⁰⁴Ibid.

in their lives, and manifest to others, the mystery of Christ and the real nature of the true Church."³⁰⁵ The very nature of the liturgy demands participation of the whole Church, because in it "full public worship is performed by the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, that is, by the Head and His members." The liturgical celebration is "an action of Christ the priest and of His Body and Church."³⁰⁶ Because of the important role of the Eucharist in the life of the Church, it is necessary that the faithful come prepared with a proper frame of mind, so that they can benefit fully and not receive in vain. Furthermore, pastors are reminded not simply to be concerned with proper celebration, but, "It is their duty also to ensure that the faithful take part knowingly, actively, and fruitfully."³⁰⁷

This brings us to the second section of Chapter I, entitled "The Promotion of Liturgical Instruction and Active Participation." At the outset the Constitution declares,

Mother Church earnestly desires that all the faithful be led to that full, conscious, and active participation in liturgical celebrations which is demanded by the very nature of the liturgy.³⁰⁸

For "this full and active participation by all the people is the aim to be considered before all else."³⁰⁹ The participation

³⁰⁵CSL, Introduction, 2.

³⁰⁶Ibid., I, 7.

³⁰⁷Ibid., I, 11; see 14, 19.

³⁰⁸Ibid., I, 14.

³⁰⁹Ibid.

of the lay people is "their right and duty by reason of their baptism."³¹⁰ To insure that this high goal is realized the remainder of this section outlines the liturgical instruction of the clergy, institutes for professors of liturgy, its curricular function in seminaries and houses of religious, but above all the concern for the pastors and their responsibilities toward the faithful.

Subsequent articles describe the specific means by which the goal of participation may be realized.

In this restoration, both texts and rites should be drawn up so that they express more clearly the holy things which they signify. Christian people, as far as possible, should be able to understand them with ease and to take part in them fully, actively, and as befits a community.³¹¹

Liturgical services are to reflect the communal nature of worship, and they are not therefore "private functions," but

pertain to the whole body of the Church; they manifest it and have effects upon it; but they concern individual members of the Church in different ways, according to the diversity of holy orders, functions and degrees of participation.³¹²

Therefore, "communal celebration involving the presence and active participation of the faithful . . . is to be preferred, as far as possible, to a celebration that is individual and

³¹⁰Ibid.

³¹¹Ibid., I, 21. "Qua quidem instauratione, textus et ritus ita ordinari oportet, ut sancta, quae significant, clarius expriment, eaque populus christianus, in quantum fieri potest, facile percipere atque plena, actuosa et communitatis propria celebratione participare possit."

³¹²Ibid., I, 26.

quasi-private."³¹³ Instructions are then given to lay and clerical participants in the mass so that they may properly fulfill their functions. The people are the focus of concern.

By way of promoting 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 proper times all should observe a reverent silence.³¹⁴

In addition, for the sake of the people, the liturgical books are to be revised to include the faithful. Rites are to be simplified, and unnecessary repetitions eliminated. For the rites "should be within the people's powers of comprehension, and normally should not require much explanation."³¹⁵

Readings from Scripture and sermons take on new importance, and the vernacular new significance. This means the people can no longer be "silent spectators" at the mass.

On the contrary, through a proper appreciation of the rites and prayers they should participate knowingly, devoutly, and actively. They should be instructed by God's word and be refreshed 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 to offer themselves.³¹⁶

³¹³Ibid., I, 27.

³¹⁴Ibid., I, 30.

³¹⁵Ibid., I, 34.

³¹⁶Ibid., II, 48. "Sed per ritus et preces id bene intellegentes, sacram actionem conscie, pie et actuose participant, verbo Dei instituantur, mensa Corporis Domini reficiantur, gratias Deo agant, immaculatam hostiam, non tantum per sacerdotis manus, sed etiam una cum ipso offerentes, seipsos offerre discant."

The very nature of the liturgy requires such an active participation.

Liturgy is not a simple commemoration of a spectacle to be looked at; rather, it is an act that makes real and actual, again and again, the same saving event which is the core of the entire "history of salvation." . . . To repeat, liturgy is not a mere celebration of a past event. It is not a devout witnessing of a sacred drama. It is essentially an "action," one in which there is direct participation on the part of all.³¹⁷

Vatican II on Communion under Both Kinds

The Constitution has one statement on communion under both kinds.

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, to the newly baptized in a Mass following their baptism.³¹⁸

Jesus' institution of the Eucharist is directly related to the Jewish observance of the Passover with its separate benedictions of the bread and cup.

Subsequent testimony, relating to liturgical usage of the early Christians, all avows that they received Communion under both species. In the non-Latinized, eastern rites this practice has continued to be the absolutely general and constant rule even at the present time, whereas in the West, about the 13th century, Communion under the single species of bread became widespread, although certain instances of survival of Communion under both kinds have remained in

³¹⁷William Baraúna, "Active participation, the inspring and directive principle of the Constitution," in Baraúna, I, 135.

³¹⁸CSL, II, 55.

force here and there up until modern times, notably with respect to those ministering at the altar.³¹⁹

The practice of communion under both kinds reappeared at the end of the Middle Ages with the Utraquists in the fifteenth century and later with the Bohemian Brethren. The Church's response to these pre-reformers as well as to the Reformers themselves was hardened by the polemical issues.

To combat an excessively strong affirmation of principle, the Council of Constance in 1415, and later the Council of Trent in 1562, judged it useful to establish the legitimacy of Communion under a single species, while still reserving for the Church the possibility of returning to Communion from the chalice.³²⁰

While practically many reasons were advanced for communion under one kind, historically,

there is no reason in principle for preventing Communion from the chalice, and it was only because of exaggerated claims by the Utraquists, and later by the Reformers, that the Councils came to the defense of Communion under the form of bread alone.³²¹

The theological decisions of the Councils of Constance and of Trent impinged on a theology of sacramental efficaciousness and a theology of concomitance, that is, the concomitant presence of the body of Christ under the kind of wine and of his blood under the kind of the bread. The conclusion then was that communion under one kind was sufficient to receive the fruits of grace.

³¹⁹François Vandenbroucke, "Communion under both species and concelebration," in Barauna, II, 109.

³²⁰Ibid.

³²¹Ibid.

Regardless what historical, practical or theological justification is given for communion under the kind of the bread alone, other urgent matters enter into the decision for our time. If the rites are signs, are not their value as signs to be reconsidered? What implication would this have for communion with the signs of bread and wine?³²² Furthermore, an understanding of the Eucharist in terms of its Pass-over background shows us that the bread and wine, representative of food and drink, are all that is necessary to sustain human life, which in Scriptural mentality is not a duality of body and soul, but a single entity. Also Christ's words over the cup remind us of the eschatological significance of the Eucharist. The concerns of Vatican II add another factor:

Our conclusion is based on the concept of the active participation of the faithful in the eucharistic celebration, and we must recognize that this participation finds its full significant value (which is not the same, we have said, as the efficacy of grace alone) in communion under both species.³²³

³²²Crichton, p. 150, with reference to increased concern for the authenticity of the sacramental sign: "The sign is intended not only to secure validity but to express the total meaning of the sacrament. At the Last Supper Christ said, 'Take and eat' and 'Take and drink.' He instituted the eucharist under the signs of both bread and wine, each of which in different ways evokes his redeeming death. Through an appreciation of this the people, if they are allowed to communicate under both kinds, will be able to enter more deeply into the inner reality of the sacrament. Through the use of and contact with the total sign of the sacrament, they will be disposed to a more fruitful reception of Holy Communion."

³²³Vandenbroucke, in Baraúna, II, 110.

In principle the Roman Catholic Church has never condemned communion under both kinds, but has periodically reaffirmed the validity of communion only under the kind of bread. The right of the pope to make concessions on this point was granted by the Council of Trent; Vatican II did not need restate this. When we look at the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy we see that communion under both kinds is still exceptional and a concession. One change involves making the bishops, instead of the pope, responsible for making decisions about proper occasions for communion under both forms. The list of normal concessions is not restrictive, as the word "veluti" indicates. Possible occasions when communion under both forms might likely take place are masses of ordination or religious profession and mass after Baptism.

Since here it is only a question of examples, chosen, moreover, among cases where active participation is particularly evident, one might consider that this close participation is precisely the criterion which must guide the bishops in according concessions.³²⁴

Such possibilities might include nuptial masses, masses within religious orders, and masses for confraternities.

We need not be afraid of introducing in this way a partitioning among the Christian people, some of whom are judged fit to receive Communion under both species, others not. Rather the criterion should remain that of the "practicality" of the rite (hence in principle rather limited groups) and the preparation of the participants (whence the requirement of a certain spiritual development on their part).³²⁵

³²⁴Ibid., I, 112.

³²⁵Ibid.

Communion under one kind was once regarded as a mark of the one true Church, but Vatican II has, nevertheless, reestablished the principle of communion under both kinds.

As Crichton notes,

the Church makes it clear not only in official statements but in her very liturgy that communion under one kind is but a disciplinary regulation and that there is no objection in principle to communion under both kinds.³²⁶

³²⁶The Church's Worship, p. 150.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Luther's Intent and Methodology in Writing the Formula Missae

Luther's basic concerns in writing the Formula Missae et communionis are evident from the opening paragraphs of the treatise. Until now, Luther says, he has refrained from writing a form for the mass for pastoral reasons. He is concerned both about the "weak in faith (imbecilles in fide animos)," who would find it difficult "suddenly" to "exchange an old and accustomed order of worship for a new and unusual one,"¹ and even more about the "fickle and loathsome spirits (leves illos et fastidiosos spiritus) who delight only in novelty and tire of it as quickly, when it has worn off."² Therefore until now he has used books and sermons only

to wean the hearts of people from their godless regard for ceremonial; for I believed it would be a Christian and helpful thing if I could prompt a peaceful removal of the abomination which Satan set up in the holy place through the man of sin. Therefore, I

¹Martin Luther, "An Order of Mass and Communion for the Church at Wittenberg, 1523," Luther's Works, edited by Ulrich S. Leupold (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, c.1965), LIII, 19. Hereafter referred to as AE. See Martin Luther, D. Martin Luther's Werke, XII (Weimar: Herman Böhlau, 1891), 205. Hereafter referred to as WA. "Subito eximi non potuit tam vetus et inolita, nec inseri tam recens et insueta ratio colendi dei."

²Ibid. "Qui . . . sola novitate gaudent, atque statim ut novitas esse desiit, nauseant."

have used neither authority nor pressure. Nor did I make any innovations.³

In his own words, then, Luther seeks nothing radical. He has avoided both the use of pressure and of novelty. His first concern is pastoral, the good of his people, and for that reason he wishes to employ peaceful means to remove that which he feels is not good for his people and objectionable theologically.

Luther now feels the time has come for him to "dare something in the name of Christ" because many "have been enlightened and strengthened by the grace of God" and because "the cause of the kingdom of Christ demands that at long last offenses (scandala) should be removed."⁴ Although Luther wants nothing to do with "the frivolous faddism of some people (levitatem et abusum illorum)" and to avoid "ultimately offending others," he proceeds with "a godly form of saying mass and of administering communion (formula aliqua pia missandi . . . et communicandi)" lest he fail to provide leadership for any or appear to tacitly endorse "their universally held abominations (universas abominaciones illorum)."⁵ Luther by no means wishes to imply that his proposed form is the last word or the only word. In fact, he does not want

³AE LIII, 19. WA XII, 205. "Ut corda primum ab impiis opinionibus ceremoniarum avocarem, Christianum et commodum arbitratus me facere, si causa fierem, ut absque manibus conteretur abominatio, quam Satan per hominem peccati in loco sancto statuerat. Proinde nihil vi aut imperio tentavi, nec vetera novis mutavi."

⁴Ibid. WA XII, 206.

⁵AE LIII, 19-20.

to prejudice others against adopting and following a different order. Indeed, we heartily beg in the name of Christ that if in time something better should be revealed to them, they would tell us to be silent, so that by a common effort we may aid the common cause.⁶

Luther therefore asserts that he does not intend

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.⁷

By definition here Luther seems to regard the "mass" as the communion of bread and wine, as instituted by Christ and observed by the Apostles, "quite simply and in a godly way without any additions (simplicissime atque piissime, absque uliis additamentis)." Because of this narrow definition Luther concludes that "in the course of time so many human inventions were added to it that nothing of the mass and communion has come down to our time except the names."⁸

Luther's primary aim, then, in the revision and purification of the mass is to eliminate what he calls "offenses (scandala)" and "additions (additamenta)" so that the rite of the Church may be characterized as "godly (pia)" and "simple (simplex)." But Luther immediately indicates that certain additions which were made by early fathers (primorum patrum additiones) and which can be shown to have ancient purity (priscam puritatem)

⁶Ibid., LIII, 20.

⁷AE LIII, 20. WA XII, 206. "Omnem cultum dei prorsus abolere, sed eum, qui in usu est, pessimis additamentis viciatum, repurgare et usum pium monstrare."

⁸AE LIII, 20. WA XII, 206. "Sed successu temporum tot humanis inventis auctus, ut praeter nomen ad nostra saecula nihil de missa et communione pervenerit."

are "commendable (laudabiles)" and "unobjectionable (reprehendi non possint)."⁹ By unobjectionable Luther means those additions which are appointed or have been used de tempore, that is, on Sundays and festivals, in distinction from those additions can be identified as de sanctis, that is, for saints' days. Therefore, Luther commends and retains the Introits, the Kyrie eleison, the Gloria in excelsis, the Graduals, the Alleluias, the Nicene Creed, the Sanctus, the Agnus Dei, and the Communion Verse. What Luther finds objectionable is: (1) the canon which he describes as "brought together in a mangled and abominable way (lacero et abominabili . . . collecto)"; (2) the fact that the mass became an expiatory sacrifice (sacrificium); (3) the Offertories which for Luther "stressed the sacrificial concept";⁹ (4) "mercenary collects (collectae mercenariae)" as Luther called "the prayers (for the departed, for special favors, and so on) in the canon . . . because they were based on the assumption that the sacrifice of the mass would evoke a readier response from God";¹⁰ and (5) the tropes inserted in the Sanctus and Gloria in excelsis.¹¹

What particularly irritated Luther was that the mass had become big business and a means to an end. The mass, he said, had become "a priestly monopoly devouring the wealth of the

⁹Ibid., LIII, 21, n. 12.

¹⁰Ibid., LIII, 21, n. 13.

¹¹Ibid. In the text of the Formula Missae Luther inadvertently or mistakenly refers here to sequences and proses which were additions to the Alleluias; he apparently meant tropes.

whole world,"¹² and "there was scarcely a craft in all the world that did not depend on the mass for a large part of its business."¹³ Furthermore, Luther decries the fact that the sacrifice of the mass had been used to achieve all kinds of purposes; for that reason he will not accept the concept of the mass either as a sacrifice or a good work. He therefore finds acceptable the expressions sacrament, testament (testamentum), blessing (benedictionem), Eucharist (Eucharistiam), Table of the Lord (mensam domini), Lord's Supper (caenam domini), Lord's Memorial (memoriam domini), communion, or any other godly name, as long as the terms sacrifice or work are not used.

What revisions does Luther suggest? (1) He prefers a return to the use of whole Psalms for the Introits. (2) He retains the Kyrie eleison, with the custom of using different melodies for different seasons of the church year, and the Gloria in excelsis, whose omission is left to the discretion of the local pastor. (3) He retains the use of the collect, if it is godly (pia), but insists that only one collect is to be used. (4) Luther feels that the Epistle pericopes should be revised, because the present selections emphasize morality more often than faith. On the basis of this criterion he finds the Gospel pericopes more acceptable, but expresses the hope that if in the future the vernacular is used in the mass

¹²Ibid., LIII, 21-22.

¹³Ibid., LIII, 22. In this context Luther is speaking of external additions, such as, vestments, organs, music, images, and so on, which he does not condemn in themselves, but only the way in which they have been used for financial gain.

the best and most weighty parts (optimis et potioribus locis) of the Epistles and Gospels will be read. (5) Luther retains Graduals of two verses with or without the Alleluia, or simply the Alleluia, but he specifically discourages the use of the Graduals during Lent because of their length¹⁴ and to avoid tedium on the part of the people. He here rejects the Mass of the Presanctified and the omission of the Alleluia during Lent, which is "the perpetual voice of the church."¹⁵

Furthermore, Luther will not permit sequences or proses with the possible exception of the one for Christmas, if the pastor desires, or Sancti Spiritus and Veni sancte spiritus at Matins, Vespers, or the mass, if the pastor desires. (6) The Gospel follows with the optional use of candles and incense. (7) The use of the Nicene Creed is optional and left to the discretion of the pastor. (8) Luther is not concerned whether the sermon comes after the Creed or before the Introit, but seems to prefer the latter position, "since the Gospel is the voice crying in the wilderness and calling unbelievers to faith."¹⁶

Beginning with the Offertory Luther calls for drastic revision because

¹⁴Luther here fails to distinguish between the Gradual and the Tracts sung during Lent. In light of his comment favoring the use of whole Psalms for the Introit there appears to be a conflict here on Luther's part between understanding on the part of the people and brevity.

¹⁵AE LIII, 24.

¹⁶Ibid., LIII, 25.

From here on almost everything smacks and savors of sacrifice. . . . Let us, therefore, repudiate everything that smacks of sacrifice, together with the entire canon and retain only that which is pure and holy, and so order our mass.¹⁷

With this principle in mind Luther proceeds with his suggestions for revision. (9) The bread and wine are to be prepared for the blessing according to custom, but Luther frankly admits he is undecided about the practice of mixing water and wine; for him the reasoning and the symbolism are unconvincing. (10) Then follows the Preface, after which there is a brief silence before the Words of Institution are recited; Luther obviously prefers that the Words be chanted or spoken audibly, but does not require it. (11) The choir sings the Sanctus; during the singing of the Benedictus the celebrant elevates the bread and wine according to custom. (12) Then the Lord's Prayer and the Peace of the Lord, the Pax Domini, follows, but Luther omits all the ceremonial customarily performed at this time. (13) During the Agnus Dei the celebrant communicates himself and then the people. (14) The Communion may be sung, but Luther makes suggestions for substitution of the closing prayers, again because of his concern for implications of sacrifice. The form for mass concludes with the Salutation, the Benedicamus Domino in place of "Go, mass is ended," the Alleluia if desired, and the customary Benediction of the blessing from Num. 6:24-27.

The soundness and value of the Formula Missae et communionis rest on its pastoral intent and theological concern. Luther

¹⁷Ibid., LIII, 26.

does not claim to be a liturgical scholar, and he did not have the resources at his disposal to engage in that kind of research. It is to his credit that he makes no great claims about the significance of this treatise of his own opinions. For in his own mind the work was one product of one mind, and it was not intended to serve all purposes in all situations. Luther's information or impressions were not always accurate, nor were his suggestions always consistent, as we have seen above. But for Luther the main considerations were theological and pastoral, and occasionally that in itself creates a conflict. For example, Luther is on the one hand inclined to a seeming radicalism that says, "All that matters is that the Words of Institution should be kept intact,"¹⁸ and yet on the other hand he maintains a realistic conservation of the basic form, content and ceremonial of the mass.

A recurrent theme of Luther's presentation is freedom. If this concept is to be considered one of the treatise's virtues, it would also seem to be one factor that raises some problems. For in freedom Luther is not only concerned with a rubrical flexibility that permits the celebrant to decide, for example, whether to use the Gloria in excelsis, but with a freedom that embraces the whole decision as to the form and content of the mass. Some would argue that this is fine and defensible in principle, but that Luther's estimation of the

¹⁸Ibid., LIII, 31.

celebrant's ability to make such decisions is naively overconfident and that he fails to recognize the full ramifications of what the exercise of that prerogative could mean. Nevertheless, Luther argues for such freedom and urges an acceptance of local rites.

Further, even if different people make use of different rites, let no one judge or despise the other. . . . 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 should result from this diversity in rites.¹⁹

Luther's attitude on this issue poses the difficult question of whether unity demands conformity or similarity, whether the shape and content of the rite is to be determined at the ecclesiastical or pastor-parish level, and what relation the tradition of the rite has to contemporary understanding and expression of the Christian faith. Evidently Luther felt that for his time and situation local rites determined by the pastor were desirable, and, as we have seen, he had a respect both for tradition and for what the present demanded. But indeed the very excesses in liturgical reform to which Luther attests in this treatise challenge the realism of Luther's ideal and suggests that the use of freedom also requires guidance and controls.

Basic to such ideas is Luther's view that "the mass consists in using the Gospel and receiving the holy communion at the table of the Lord."²⁰ Or, as he says,

¹⁹Ibid., LIII, 31.

²⁰Ibid., LIII, 25. WA XII, 211. "Missa vero sit usus ipse Evangelii et communiō mensae domini."

All that matters is that the Words of Institution should be kept intact and that everything should be done by faith. For these rites are supposed to be for Christians . . . who observe them voluntarily and from the heart, but are free to change them how and when ever they may wish. Therefore, it is not in these matters that anyone should either seek or establish as law some indispensable form by which he might ensnare or harass consciences. Nor do we find any evidence for such an established rite. . . . But even if they had decreed anything in this matter as a law, we would not have to observe it, because these things neither can nor should be bound by laws.²¹

Three things would then seem to be Luther's principles of revision. (1) The indispensable minimum rite of the mass is the Words of Institution alone. The indispensable minimum action of the mass is the communion of the bread and wine. All else are additions, added in the course of history, some desirable, but all optional. (2) Christian freedom dictates flexibility, variety, and change in the form and ceremonial of the mass. Therefore details of the rite are not to be obligatory, but subject to local usage and the discretion of the pastor. (3) The mass as Luther knows it is not apostolic in origin nor is it the rite of the early Church, and for that reason no one can argue from history to defend its sixteenth-century form as inviolable and beyond criticism and revision. On this point Luther unfortunately oversimplifies the historical problem. Liturgical studies of this century have demonstrated that many of the aspects of the rite which Luther criticizes were relatively late in origin and reflect the theological views of that stage in the Church's history. Here

²¹Ibid., LIII, 31.

again what Luther states as a principle is not always his practice. For in the Formula Missae he conserves much of what may be called the historic rite of the Church in his concern to "retain only that which is pure and holy."²² Subsidiary concerns, such as, intelligibility of the rite which could be reflected in the use of the vernacular for the pericopes and in a meaningful use of symbols, occasionally appear, but above all else Luther demonstrates his pastoral concern for his people and a theological acuity for ceremonial and content of the mass which needed to be revised or omitted. These two factors would appear to be the strengths of Luther's Formula Missae et communionis.

Clichtove's Interpretation of Luther's Motives

As Clichtove states from the outset he has two motives: to reject Luther's form for celebrating mass and to vindicate the Church's rite whose form and content he regards as dating from the Apostles and the early Church. Clichtove properly understands Luther's stated intentions to purify and restore the mass to its uncorrupted form, but he regards Luther's actions as indiscreet, brazen, and indefensible. Clichtove fears that for all of Luther's claims there exist ulterior motives. For example, Luther wants to purify and restore the mass because he actually wishes to substitute his own form. Clichtove fears the results of Luther's revisions. If a man is allowed

²²Ibid., LIII, 26.

to tamper with the mass, what will protect anything else in the Church from change and challenge? But the real question is whether Luther has the authority to change the mass. Clichtove says that Luther does not have such power because of the rite's ancient origin and because that right rests with pope and councils. Luther's action in abrogating the Church's rite and replacing it with a form of his own invention is purely an exercise of self-ascribed, pretentious authority. For that reason Clichtove variously describes Luther's treatise as an example of indiscretion, audacity, irreverence, sacrilege, and arrogance. Luther is a false apostle, and his rite is the product of an evil, perverse genius.

Luther claims to shun innovation. Then what, asks Clichtove, is this new rite? Luther claims to be a peaceful man seeking peaceful means. How then does he discount all the disruptions and anarchy throughout the Church which his teachings have incited? Luther claims to seek the good of the people. But what he proposes can only produce a multitude of errors and spiritual ruination. Luther claims that he seeks only needed changes. But what he suggests will bring an irrepressible landslide of constant, expanding revision that will accept no limits. Luther seeks purification and improvement, but the result will be contamination and ruin in the Church and in the lives of its people. Luther claims to pursue the good of the Church and high ideals. How then is one to account for his vitriolic attack on priests, saints, the canon, and the mass as a sacrifice?

A look at Clichtove's interpretation of Luther and his motives will be helpful. Luther's influence has produced disruption and chaos; this is evidence that he works for Satan. Luther has devoted all his energies at destroying all worship of God; he is bent on ruining the Church and on eliminating whatever is proper and worthy of respect. Luther's thinking is distorted and disturbed by an inexplicable hatred for everything in the Church; he is in no position to make decisions, therefore, about worship. When on occasion Luther approves something in the mass he does this to avoid appearing completely negative and thus alienating his reader. Clichtove variously accuses Luther of misinterpretation, of distorting or misrepresenting the truth, and of deceitfulness. He finds Luther infatuated with novelty, arrogantly impressed with his own opinions, and insistent on being different for its own sake. Clichtove therefore regards Luther as an enemy of the Christian religion and unwilling to honor Christ. How else shall one explain his penchant to criticize whatever the Church approves? How can a godless man, one who does not have the Spirit of God, who mocks and ridicules Christ, make such decisions? How shall one overlook his repeatedly contemptuous insolence toward the Church and his damnable zeal for novelty? There can be no doubt in Clichtove's mind that Luther is the Church's inveterate foe, a savage and persistent assailant of its regulations, whose heretical perversity drives him to ruin and destroy the mass.

It is clear that Luther is not interested in the truth, but only in contradicting councils, showing his contempt for the Spirit of God, and in denying the Gospel he claims to expound. Luther obviously should be damned in silence, but, if nothing else, presenting Luther's ideas in the Propugnaculum ecclesiae shows him for what he is and condemns him with his own words.

Clichtove's response to Luther is polemical and apologetic, and this undoubtedly colors his interpretation of Luther's views. Clichtove cannot look upon Luther's attempt as a revision or restoration, but as a destruction, of the mass. When on occasion Clichtove finds Luther in agreement with tradition and practice, Clichtove is suspicious of Luther's motives. Indeed Clichtove's loyalty to the Church and to what he regards to be an unchangeable rite of very ancient tradition obscures the pastoral-theological issues and makes it impossible for him to have any appreciation or sympathy for Luther's efforts. For Clichtove the mass cannot and need not be changed, and he is intent on preserving that which the Church has always used and approved. Basic to Clichtove's defense is his high regard for tradition and authority, and it is easy to see why Luther, who could be highly critical of both, would be regarded as an alien. Intimately related to Clichtove's reaction to Luther is his understanding of the historical situation and milieu. To read the Propugnaculum ecclesiae one would be led to believe that Luther is a direct ideological descendant of the heretics and traitors Wyclif and Huss and that much of the revolutionary

signs of the times were attributable alone to Luther's ideas and publications. At best this is an over-simplification of fact, for Clichtove needed only to recall the events that took place during his own lifetime to realize that much of that which he credits to Luther was spontaneously happening in various provinces of the Church. No doubt Luther's vocal and recalcitrant stand on issues, along with the dissemination of his publications, brought him much attention, but in many ways he might be more genuinely considered to be a successful spokesman of an inevitable and irrepressible thrust of the times.

In addition, it should be noted that many of Clichtove's literary traits, such as the muckraking and abusive use of critical hyperboles, were typical of the polemic literature of the times. One only has to look at Luther himself to realize this. For the modern reader who regards this as unpleasant and unfair play such literary characteristics might best reflect the utter intensity with which men took sides and fought the issues and may display the genuine humanness that is often absent in later, more antiseptic critiques.

Clichtove's Critique of Luther's Formula Missae

As it has been pointed out, Clichtove is as much interested in vindicating the rite of the Church as he is in presenting a critique of Luther. Both aspects of his endeavor are so intertwined that it is impossible to summarize Clichtove's critique without presenting the bulk of his apology.

(1) Clichtove says that Luther calls ceremonial godless; actually Luther calls the people's regard for ceremonial godless. Clichtove defends the ceremonial of the mass from both the Old and New Testaments, whose rites were respectively commanded by God and established by the Holy Spirit. It might be noted that it is one thing to point out that the observation of Old Testament rites was divinely ordained and prescribed, but quite another to assume that the sixteenth-century mass is to be equated with the rite of the early Church and that such ceremonial was established by the Holy Spirit.

(2) In spite of all his disclaimers to the contrary, says Clichtove, Luther is guilty of the very kind of innovation for which he criticizes others. He has discarded tradition and disrupted the whole Christian world, even though change in itself may be wrong and set a precedent harmful to the salvation of the faithful. Clichtove's concern is legitimate; he fears that rejection of former patterns will undermine the salvation of the lay people and that the unavoidable result will be a liturgical license which permits everyone to follow his own whims. It may not be as difficult or as problematic to decide what needs to be changed, as it is to determine when, how, and by whom such changes are to be effected.

(3) Clichtove asserts that the rite of the mass is basically apostolic. He grants that Christ established the rite simply and without additions; in substance the form of the mass was completely established by the Apostles, while only

some minor details were later added to enhance the mystery. Clichtove rather strangely suggests that if Christ had explained the mass in detail, the Church would have had no need for the Apostles to do this. Clichtove supports the apostolicity of the mass with an unusual interpretation of 1 Cor. 11:34b and 1 Tim. 2:1-2a²³ and from Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. Clichtove concludes that Luther is wrong; there never was a rite of great simplicity without any additions and whatever was added through the Apostles under the guidance of the Holy Spirit cannot be called a human invention. To prove his point Clichtove cites John 14:26b and 16:13a. The substance of the mass is, then, according to Clichtove, identical with the form developed by the Apostles, and Luther errs when he claims that the only similarity is the name of the mass.

(4) Clichtove opposes Luther's idea that the lessons of Scripture be read in the vernacular for the common people to understand. This, says Clichtove, has never been permitted, for he claims that even the Apostles celebrated mass among foreign converts in Hebrew and that the Western Church used

²³Clichtove assumes that Paul's statement in 1 Cor. 11:34b, "About the other things I will give directions when I come," implies that the Apostle was prepared to share with the Corinthian congregation a universally used rite of the mass. In this chapter Paul would appear to be more concerned with the conduct of the Corinthians than with the content and form of a rite; the Apostle's quotation of the Words of Institution serves to remind the Corinthians of the sacred nature of the Eucharist. Clichtove likewise asserts that Paul had taught the churches a universally used rite and cites 1 Tim. 2:1-2a, "First of all, then, I urge that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for all men, for kings and all who are in high positions." See Chapter II, p. 46.

Hebrew until the time of the Emperor Hadrian (117-138).²⁴ The superscription over the cross of Christ was written in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, and from this Clichtove concludes that these are the only languages to be used in the mass. Furthermore, only these three languages have been used by the educated because of their precision and for the sake of common understanding. They lend an aura of dignity and devotion that the common languages will never communicate. For the sake of the people the honor of the divine Word must be preserved through the Latin. If the Scripture is thrown indiscriminately at the people without explanation, there will be confusion, false interpretation, and spiritual ruin. Retention of the ancient languages is a preventative necessary for the good of the people. If the Epistle and Gospel are read in the vernacular, eventually the people will want the whole mass in their language, and that would be intolerable. Clichtove admits that neither adults nor their children now understand the basic liturgical texts, but he sees no reason to believe that translation will make understanding any more accessible. To the twentieth-century reader Clichtove's views may appear illogical, inconceivable, theologically indefensible, and perhaps almost arrogant. But in his defense it must be pointed out that Clichtove was speaking to a situation in which the common people were largely uneducated and unlettered, that Clichtove

²⁴As a matter of fact, of course, the Apostles did speak Aramaic, but the language of the Western Church, including the Church at Rome, was initially Greek. See Chapter II, p. 56.

was convinced that retention of the ancient language was in the interest of the people, that Clichtove viewed the mass as a mystery which was to be protected from associations with the common and ordinary things of life, and that the Scriptures were a holy and spiritual book which required the official interpretation of the Church. In fact, of course, there were educated laymen who did know Latin, but here in his own way Clichtove seeks to continue the kind of protection for the lay people that the Church had long justified.

(5) Clichtove is happy to note a point of agreement with Luther regarding chanting and also Luther's approval of the Introit, Kyrie eleison, the Gloria in excelsis, the Gradual, the Alleluia, the Nicene Creed, the Santus, the Agnus Dei, and the Communion. However, because some whom Clichtove identifies as Lutherans do condemn chanting Clichtove proceeds with a defense of chanting from the Old and New Testaments.²⁵ In Luther's approval of the propers and ordinary of the mass Clichtove sees a contradiction of Luther's earlier statement that only the names mass and communion were apostolic in origin, and from Luther's commendation of the propers for Sundays and festivals Clichtove infers a condemnation of masses for the Blessed Virgin, the saints, and the dead.

²⁵While some of these passages support the custom of singing (for example, Matt. 26:30), most are not appropriate to defend singing at all (for example, Luke 2:13 or Matt. 21:9) and are unrelated to cultic worship (for example, Acts 16:25).

(6) Luther completely rejects the canon and calls it an "abominable concoction." Clichtove has previously defended the canon in his Antilutherus and takes note of Emser's attack on Zwingli as well as his critique of the Formula Missae et communionis. Another source of support is Netter's De sacramentalibus which purportedly establishes the apostolic authenticity of the canon and demonstrates that it was frequently used during the patristic period.

(7) According to Clichtove the mass as a sacrifice is clearly prefigured in the Old Testament (for example, Gen. 14:18; Ex. 29:38-46; and Lev. 24:5-9) and demonstrable from the institution of the Lord's Supper itself. Clichtove asserts that the mass was considered a sacrifice by the Apostles and the early fathers, and he concludes that only through the daily offering of the mass could the sacrifice of redemption be perpetuated. The mass is a pattern and representation of the sacrifice on the cross.²⁶

²⁶The basic issue for Lutherans was the need to make a clear distinction between eucharistic and expiatory sacrifice; there is only one expiatory sacrifice, and that is Christ's death. A number of quotations from the Apology of the Augsburg Confession will prove helpful. Apology, XXIV, 9, does not accept the position that the mass is an expiatory sacrifice, regardless of how much evidence the opposition has gathered. "But all the quotations from the Fathers and the arguments they [our opponents] adduce are silenced by the fact that the Mass does not confer grace ex opere operato, nor merit for others the forgiveness of venial or mortal sins, of guilt, or of punishment."

According to Apology, XXIV, 12, "This position is established and proved by the impossibility of our obtaining the forgiveness of sins ex opere operato through our works and by the necessity of faith to conquer the terrors of sins and death and to comfort

(8) Clichtove defends masses for the dead and rejects Luther's claim that they originated with the monopoly of the priests. Clichtove does not reply to Luther's charge, but asserts that prayer for the faithful departed is an ancient practice of the Church, based on the example of Scripture (see, for example, Num. 16:47-48; John 11:41-42; and Luke 23:34) and the early fathers. On the premise that prayers for the dead have biblical precedent, Clichtove sees no reason why there would be anything objectionable about masses for the dead.

our hearts with the knowledge of Christ; for his sake we are forgiven, his merits and righteousness are bestowed upon us."

The Reformers distinguish sacrament from sacrifice, as Apology, XXIV, 17-18, says. "The genus common to both could be 'ceremony' or 'sacred act.' A sacrament is a ceremony or act in which God offers us the content of the promise joined to the ceremony. . . . By way of contrast, a sacrifice is a ceremony or act which we render to God to honor him."

Apology, XXIV, 19, recognizes two kinds of sacrifice. "One is the propitiatory sacrifice; this is a work of satisfaction for guilt and punishment that reconciles God or placates his wrath or merits the forgiveness of sins for others. The other type is the eucharistic sacrifice; this does not merit the forgiveness of sins or reconciliation, but by it those who have been reconciled give thanks or show their gratitude for the forgiveness of sins and other blessings received."

The only expiatory sacrifice therefore is the death of Christ. The Levitical sacrifices were only symbols of that future offering of Christ. Everything else, for example, proclamation of the Gospel, reception of the sacrament, faith, confession, and good works, are eucharistic sacrifices, or sacrifices of praise. They do not earn or transfer merit, because they are brought by those who are already reconciled. See Theodore G. Tappert, ed., The Book of Concord (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, c.1959), pp. 250-53.

(9) According to Clichtove Luther condemns the external appointments of the church building and the rite.²⁷ For Clichtove these appointments heighten the honor of worship, please God, inspire the devotion of the faithful, and serve as symbols by which the inner man externally shows his reliance on God. Such appointments must, he says, have a spiritual significance; that is their only justification. In regard to vestments, Clichtove notes their use in the Old Testament and asserts that, while Christ did not have vestments, he himself introduced these appointments through the Apostles.

(10) Luther objects to calling the mass a good work, Clichtove says, and he defends the use of the term. Nothing pleases God unless it is a good work. The sacrifices of the Old Testament were good works, and if a priest makes an offering according to the divinely prescribed rite it must be a good work, especially when that offering is the Bread of Life. Certainly when Christ changed the bread into his Body and the wine into his Blood at the Last Supper he performed a

²⁷Actually Luther's criticism is not of the external appointments, but of the big business that has been made of vestments, candles, and vessels, in the same way in which he has criticized the monopoly of the priests. In fact, Luther's attitude toward ceremonial and external appointments is, if not neutral or open-minded, positive. For example, he permits the use of candles and incense at the Gospel, he retains the use of vessels, and he says in regard to vestments (see AE LIII, 31) "But we think about these as we do about other forms. We permit them to be used in freedom, as long as people refrain from ostentation and pomp. For you are not more acceptable for consecrating in vestments. Nor are you less acceptable for consecrating without vestments."

work that was good in God's sight. Christ's death on the Cross was a good work, and the priest simply perpetuates this with the representation and commemoration of Christ's self-offering. By definition a good work, says Clichtove, is that which is profitable for salvation, and therefore the mass can be called a good work because it is a source of grace for both the living and the dead and because its efficacy depends on the gift of Christ. If the mass is not a good work and benefits no one, asks Clichtove, why continue its use?

(11) Clichtove rejects Luther's terminology for the mass and will only accept the expressions sacrifice and good work. Clichtove rejects the distinction between the communion of the people and the celebration of the priest, and he affirms that the mass is the whole rite, not just the eucharistic Sacrament. The priest offers the sacrifice for all the people who benefit from their participation through faith, just as Christ died for the benefit of others. Therefore, to Clichtove, Luther's terms are unacceptable; only sacrifice and good work properly describe the mass.

(12) Clichtove charges that Luther despises the saints, because Luther says that at Wittenberg they will only observe Sundays and festivals of the Lord. Clichtove goes to great lengths to establish from Scripture and the fathers the values in honoring the saints. Finally Clichtove calls Luther an enemy of the cross because he refuses to observe the feasts of the cross.

(13) Clichtove makes a number of minor points. The Gloria in excelsis is obligatory and not to be left to the discretion of the bishop. Clichtove infers from Luther's comments regarding the Collect that Luther is implying that some collects are not godly and therefore unacceptable; further he notes that it is custom to allow collects to be said after the chief collect in uneven numbers. Clichtove defends the Epistle pericopes from the viewpoint that it is now important that people who have been instructed in the Christian faith since childhood be persistently exhorted to live a moral life worthy of the Christian faith. Clichtove supports the Church's rubrics for the use of the Alleluia and notes the apparent contradiction here in Luther's desire for short Graduals when earlier he had encouraged the use of whole Psalms for the Introit. Clichtove fails to understand Luther's problem with the proses and condemns Luther's arbitrary attitude regarding the use of candles with the Gospel and the recitation of the Nicene Creed, since, contrary to what Luther says, nothing up to the Creed is free or a human invention, but established by the Apostles and their successors. Luther, says Clichtove, calls the offering of the faithful an abomination. Clichtove defends mixing water with wine on the basis of Scripture and Christ's example. Clichtove faults Luther for omitting the secret prayer(s) and the canon, but sees this is indicative of his attitude toward sacrifice. Clichtove is particularly disturbed by Luther's mutilation of the Preface and for his

audacity in changing the act of consecration; furthermore, these words of consecration are not to be spoken or chanted audibly. Clichtove fails to understand Luther's interpretation of the Pax Domini as a public absolution of sins; to Clichtove it is simply an assurance of the Lord's abiding presence. Finally Clichtove objects to Luther's omission of the communion verse, the final collect, his changing of "Go, mass is ended," and the substitution of Num. 6:24-27.

(14) Clichtove opposes Luther's view that condemns celebration of the mass without communion of the people, for the mass's basic nature is one of consecrating the signs and the priest's offering for the people. Even if the people do not receive communion, they receive its benefits when present. Furthermore, Clichtove disagrees with Luther on the need for communion under both kinds. This is not necessary for salvation. Clichtove then cites Scriptural and patristic evidence to support his opinion. He also raises a number of practical questions and problems. Communion under one kind, says Clichtove, is an ancient practice, and more recent councils have forbidden communion under both kinds in rejection of heretical movements. If one looks to the institution of Christ one recognizes that Christ administered the holy communion only to the Twelve, all of whom were ordained priests and to whom Christ had committed the mystery of the mass. Also it is not necessary for a person to receive both kinds because the whole Christ is present in each kind. Communion under both kinds in

the ancient church was more reasonable because of the small numbers and more necessary to strengthen those who suffered martyrdom. Later out of concern for the many practical problems involved in distributing the consecrated wine the Church limited the communion to the bread.

Clichtove's Presuppositions and Methodology

By now most of Clichtove's presuppositions and some of his methodology should be obvious.

Among his theological presuppositions his concept of the mass, especially as an expiatory sacrifice is central. The sacrifice on the altar is a pattern and representation of the sacrifice on the cross, and in the mass the priest offers the same sacrifice of the Lord's body and blood. Even the origin of the word "mass," according to Clichtove, comes from the Hebrew and designates offering or sacrifice. In the mass, Clichtove says, we have the conversion of bread into the Lord's body and wine into His blood. Furthermore, the mass is not just the eucharistic Sacrament, but the whole rite established by the Church. Since the basic nature of the mass is one of consecrating Christ's body and blood and the priest's offering of the sacrifice for all the people, celebration of the mass does not demand communion of the people. For they can receive its benefits by their presence and through faith. For Clichtove the mass can only be properly called a sacrifice or a good work.

Clichtove's primary historical argument is that the mass is ancient in origin and that its basic form and ceremonial was established by the Apostles and their successors. The substance of the mass is apostolic. Whatever was added later was added to enhance the sublime mystery and was done by Christ through the Apostles. Clichtove is never very clear or consistent in ascribing these additions either directly to the Apostles or to what he calls their successors. But whatever is in the mass is not a human invention, and Clichtove fails to understand Luther's intention to remove abominations from the mass. For Clichtove there are no abominations or offensive, unnecessary additions. Everything is apostolic (see, for example, 1 Cor. 11:34b and 1 Tim. 2:1-2a), and the mass was universally observed by the early Church.

Previously we have dealt extensively with Clichtove's understanding of Luther's motives in the historical context of the sixteenth century. For Clichtove Luther is solely bent on altering and destroying the whole mass in order to introduce his own newly conceived ideas. Clichtove feels that his interpretation is justified by the facts: Luther has discarded most of the sacraments; he has abolished every distinction between clergy and lay people; he has eliminated the mass ceremonial and the canonical hours; and he has ended veneration of the saints and intercessions for the dead. To make it worse, Luther is guilty of falsely interpreting Scripture to defend his actions, even though he claims a unique understanding of the Gospel. Clichtove finds particularly distasteful Luther's

concept of salvation through faith alone to the exclusion of works; Clichtove considers this teaching unscriptural and unacceptable. Clichtove tends to consider all the Reformers as members of a single massive plot and attributes all the excesses of all to Luther and his teachings. Clichtove tends to identify any protester as Lutheran, and he puts Zwingli in the same camp with Luther. Luther, says Clichtove, got all his ideas from Wyclif and Huss, and now there is simply a tragic repetition of unfortunate history. Clichtove sees the damage effected by the Lutherans as irreparable and spreading without restraint. The future is bleak indeed, and Luther deserves the blame for the whole disaster.

Clichtove relies heavily on authority. He says evidence for priesthood, sacrifice, and vestments can be found in the Levitical priesthood. He assumes that Scripture supports his position. Although his interpretation of Scripture is at times inappropriate (for example, his defense of the apostolicity of the mass from 1 Cor. 11:34b). He often rejects a literal interpretation in favor of a mystical or figurative one (see, for example, his interpretation of Is. 1:22 to support mixing water with the wine). On the other hand, in the discussion of communion under both kinds he insists on a literal interpretation of passages and demands that if Luther wants the lay people to receive both kinds then he should produce an explicit directive from Christ to that effect. In addition to Scripture Clichtove finds support for his position in the

fathers; his case for the apostolicity of the mass rests heavily on Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. Other authority comes from popes and councils, and Luther, Clichtove holds, is in no position to oppose their decisions or to take it upon himself to introduce change according to his own interests.

Clichtove also assumes that change in itself is undesirable. The mass is apostolic, approved by God and Church, and inviolable. It cannot be changed and need not be changed. Luther's attitudes about diversity and change can only bring ruin and chaos, anarchy and loss of uniformity in form and ceremonial. All the rite is prescribed by God, and no one, including Luther, has the right to introduce change. Regulation of the rite rests with pope and councils.

Clichtove uses a great variety of arguments. Some of these have already been presented: his use of Scripture, the argument from silence, and the citation of authorities. In addition Clichtove cites historical precedent; he is occasionally guilty of weighting his argument by misquotation or partial quotation, although at times it must be admitted that he misunderstands Luther. He argues from natural and positive law. He is inclined to accept pragmatic reasons for the practice of the church (for example, the problems involved in distributing wine). When evidence or proof is not available Clichtove is willing to make the necessary logical assumption (for example, although Christ gave no specific directions regarding the communion of lay people, he left that to be

ordained by the Apostles and the Church). When necessary, Clichtove will resort to a kind of rationalistic argumentation (for example, Christ is equally present in one kind as in both).

Clichtove's treatise is often defective historically, logically, and in terms of liturgical research, but it represents the effort of a faithful son of the medieval Church to defend the rite of the mass against what he considered a pernicious, invalid criticism and destruction of the Church's worship.

Luther, Clichtove, and Vatican II

The "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy" of Vatican II is a result of over fifty years of theological studies in liturgy and is a deliberate attempt to reemphasize and clarify the missionary, pastoral, and didactic character of the liturgy. Luther was interested in a revision and reform of the liturgy in reaction to theologically objectionable content and ceremonial, whereas Vatican II seeks a restoration of the liturgy so that it can fulfill its function in the lives of the faithful. The Constitution recognizes that the liturgy has some aspects that are changeable and some that are unchangeable, and two criteria, tradition and pastoral concern, are to be used to determine the course of the restoration. This differs from Clichtove, who saw the whole mass as immutable and apostolic. Vatican II recognizes that some features of the liturgy

must change with time, that some features had crept into the liturgy which had obscured content and function, and that texts and rites must express clearly their significance, so that the people may participate fully. The people should be able to understand the liturgy, and this includes the use of signs and symbols. The liturgy is to be an action of the people. In order that this may happen the intrinsic nature and purpose of all the elements of the liturgy, as well as their interrelationship, must be clear and recognizable to all. This means simplification, removal of duplications, and liturgical restoration. This is a considerable shift in attitude from Clichtove's time, but neither Clichtove or Luther had at their disposal the historical and scholarly information that allowed or promoted the development of these new attitudes in the twentieth century.

Clichtove had argued for a uniformity and universality of the rite of the mass; without it there could only be chaos and anarchy. Vatican II recognizes the right and the positive good in diversity of rites and does not want rigid uniformity at the expense of what is good for the community of faith. As long as the substantial unity of the rite is retained, revision should allow for variations for different groups, especially in mission lands. However, this does not mean liturgical chaos or uncontrolled experimentation because authority for change always rests with the Church and the appropriate members of the hierarchy. Innovation is not a

private matter, but revision is a continuing process. This is one issue on which both Clichtove and Vatican II would have strong differences with Luther. With the loss of a hierarchical leadership and responsibilities to authority, control of revision becomes problematic, and Luther himself, of course, recognized the problem and hoped to disassociate himself from it. It would seem that Luther anticipated that the people would follow his leadership or would use good judgment.

For Luther the use of vernacular was a desirable revision for the future; in the university churches, of course, this was not a concern. For Clichtove Latin was to be retained because of its tradition and to preserve the mystery and solemnity of the mass. The use of the vernacular was for Vatican II a very difficult issue; the decision was that Latin would remain the principal language with permission to be given to use the vernacular in specific sections. In practice the rite in the United States now uses the vernacular throughout, including four versions of the canon. The concession to use the vernacular was a pastoral one, in order that the people might participate in the liturgy more actively, more consciously, and more fully.

Clichtove had insisted that the mass be considered a sacrifice; Luther protested vehemently and wished to remove anything in the mass that smacked of sacrifice. Vatican II prefers to speak of the eucharistic sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood, but it never defines explicitly the exact nature of

the sacrifice of the mass. The eucharistic sacrifice, according to the Constitution, perpetuates the sacrifice of the cross throughout history and serves as a memorial of Christ's death and resurrection, and it is to be considered a sacrament of love, a sign of unity, a bond of charity, and a paschal banquet. In describing the mass as a eucharistic sacrifice the Constitution wants to emphasize the type of sacrifice and the character of its celebration. The accent is on the ritual aspect and on mystery, not doctrine. It has been noted that the Reformers would only accept the concept of the mass as a eucharistic sacrifice; Vatican II assumes the "propitiatory" character of the mass, but emphasizes the eucharistic character for pastoral reasons.

Vatican II regards the liturgy as the most significant means by which the faithful can express in their own lives and show to others the mystery of Christ and the true nature of the Church. In fact the liturgy strengthens the people in their ability to preach Christ, who is the center of salvation history and of the liturgy. The liturgical celebration has two functions: to make present the redeeming mystery of Christ, and to reveal God's redeeming purpose to men. Thus the whole liturgy is regarded as sacramental because it not only contains but also conveys and manifests the mystery of Christ. Indeed in the liturgy salvation history is actualized and brought into the present. For the role of liturgy is neither to be a museum of ritual nor an opportunity for indoctrination, but

to make present Christ's saving acts and to enable the faithful to have an encounter with Him. The Constitution also regards the liturgy as an exercise of the priestly office of Christ; every liturgical celebration is an action of Christ, as the priest of His Body, the Church. Therefore no other action of the Church can equal this act in efficacy, for in the Eucharist the sanctification of men and the glorification of God are most strongly effected. Or as Article 10 of the Constitution says, "the liturgy is the summit toward which the activity of the Church is directed; at the same time it is the fountain from which all her power flows."²⁸

When one looks to Luther or Clichtove one fails to sense this same high view of liturgy and worship. To be sure, Luther was not concerned about articulating a theology of worship as much as he was in purging the existing rite and making suggestions for improvement. He did, of course, have a sacramental view of both the divine Word and the Sacraments, and he would have insisted on the efficacy of both. Clichtove was content to represent the existing rite as a sacrifice in the traditional understanding of the Word and viewed the efficacy of the mass in terms of the priest's offering. If there is a weakness in the Constitution, it may be its failure to confront the traditional understanding of expiatory sacrifice directly.

²⁸Walter M. Abbott, editor, "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy," The Documents of Vatican II (New York: Guild Press, c.1966), p. 142.

For one senses a deliberate, ameliorative attempt which strives to set forth eloquently and positively the new way of looking at the liturgy without critically evaluating previous theologies of the liturgy. It would appear that what criticism is apparent in the Constitution deals more with form and development than with past substance. It would almost seem that there is a concern to reinterpret rather than to reject, and, as positive as the document is, it frankly leaves the kind of ambiguities that invite the reader to read what he wants. A comparison of commentaries makes this evident. There is no doubt that the Constitution has an entirely different thrust from that which the dominant past tradition would have allowed, but, like many committee compromises, it fails more in what it leaves unsaid than in what it succeeds in saying and in saying so well. In any case, by comparison with Clichtove or the Council of Trent, the Constitution is enough to make a Lutheran sit up, take notice, and to reevaluate his understanding not only of the Roman Catholic mass, but of his own life in the liturgy.

In looking back on Luther and Clichtove it must be admitted that both succeed best as historic representations of a theological point of view. Both Luther and Clichtove have their weaknesses in understanding the tradition and perhaps even the role of liturgy. Luther's document is intended to be a pattern, coming out of reaction to theological abuses and the failure of worship to meet the needs of people. In the

latter matter it would appear that Luther is more sensitive than Clichtove. It is to be admitted that Luther's writing does not reflect the work and detail that Clichtove's does, but on the other hand Clichtove would seem unable to meet Luther's most insightful and damaging criticism of the Church's worship. Clichtove is a defender, a loyal and obedient son of the medieval Church. His work is significant because it represents the most thorough and complete treatise on Roman Catholic worship of the period. It reflects the Scriptural exegesis, the use of the fathers, and the polemic argumentation of the age. It serves as a summary and compendium of theology of worship and ceremonial which we should otherwise not have. And certainly Clichtove displays the drama and the intensity of the Reformation conflicts. The issues and the humanness of the debate is vividly set before us.

When we look to Vatican II, we are indeed tempted to think that Luther has come of age in the Roman Catholic Church. Many of his concerns and insights have realized fruition. In some ways the Constitution realizes Luther; in other ways it surpasses him in new depth of thought and reflection on the ultimate goals of liturgy. But from all three documents much is to be learned: from Luther a theological perception and a concern for people; from Clichtove a loyalty to the Church and its tradition and an attempt to make that meaningful under severe handicaps; and from Vatican II a

new freedom and a profounder comprehension of the mysteries of God as His people seek Him and meet Him in and through the liturgy, which is the "people's work" and God's vehicle of grace.

Arystotle. The Politics. Translated by E. V. Rieu. London: Penguin Classics, 1948.
and W. H. D. Rouse. The Politics. London: Oxford University Press, 1928.

Clichtovec, Jodocus. Tractatus de Sacramentis.
Lutheranorum. Coloniae: Typographia Universitatis, 1572.

"Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy." Decree of the Second Vatican Council,
II. Edited by Walter G. Lowrie. New York: Random House, 1963.
Joseph Gallagher, Translator. New York: Random House Press, c.1966. pp. 117-24.

Erner, Hieronymus. Wörterbuch der liturgischen Terminologie.
München: Verlag der Bayerischen Liturgischen Gesellschaft, 1927.
dar Wessa. IXVII.
Theobald Probstberger.
dorische Verlagsanstalt.

Hendricks, Edgar. New Liturgical Year.
S. McI. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, c.1966.

Luther, Martin. On the Works and Ways of the
Church at Wittenberg, 1527.
by Ulrich S. Leopold. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, c.1965. pp. 19-40.

-----, "Formula Missae et Canonis Missae
bergensis." D. Martin Luther's Works.
Bohler, 1891. Pp. 10-11.

Matzger, Bruce M., ed. Revised Standard Version.
New York: Oxford University Press, 1952.

Migne, J. P. Patrologiae Latinae.
-----, Patrologiae Latinae.

Sacrosanctus Concilium Vaticanum. Decretum
de Sacra Liturgia.
(February 15, 1963).

Tappert, Theodore G., ed. Decree on the Sacred Liturgy.
Philadelphia: Archdiocese of Philadelphia, 1963.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

- Aristotle. The Politics. Translated by H. Rackham. The Loeb Classical Library. Edited by T. E. Page, E. Capps, and W. H. D. Rouse. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1932.
- Clichtoueus, Jodocus. Propugnaculum ecclesiae aduersos Lutheranos. Cologne: [Petrus Quentel], 1526.
- "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy," The Documents of Vatican II. Edited by Walter M. Abbott, general editor, and Joseph Gallagher, translation editor. New York: Guild Press, c.1966. Pp. 137-78.
- Emser, Hieronymus. "Missae Christianorum contra Lutheranam missandi formulam assertio," Schriften zur Verteidigung der Messe. XXVIII in Corpus Catholicorum. Edited by Theobald Freudenberger. Münster, Westphalia: Aschen-dorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959. Pp. 1-37.
- Hennecke, Edgar. New Testament Apocrypha. Translated by R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1964.
- Luther, Martin. "An Order of Mass and Communion for the Church at Wittenberg, 1523," Luther's Works. LIII. Edited by Ulrich S. Leupold. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, c.1965. Pp. 19-40
- . "Formula Missae et Communionis pro Ecclesia Vuittembergensi," D. Martin Luthers Werke. XII. Weimar: Herman Böhlau, 1891. Pp. 205-20.
- Metzger, Bruce M., editor. The Apocrypha of the Old Testament. Revised Standard Version. The Oxford Annotated Apocrypha. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Migne, J. P. Patrologia Graeca. Paris: J. P. Migne, 1857.
- . Patrologia Latina. Paris: J. P. Migne, 1862.
- Sancrosanctum Concilium Oecumenicum Vaticanum II. "Constitutio de Sacra Liturgia," Acta Apostolicae Sedis. LVI (February 15, 1964).
- Tappert, Theodore G., editor. The Book of Concord. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, c.1959.

B. Secondary Sources

- Altaner, Berthold. Patrology. Translated by Hilda C. Graef. Freiburg: Herder, c.1960.
- Baraúna, William, editor. The Liturgy of Vatican II: A Symposium in Two Volumes. English edition by Jovian Lang. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, c.1966.
- Bouyer, Louis. The Liturgy Revived. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, Ltd., c.1964.
- Bugnini, A., and C. Braga, editors. The Commentary on the Constitution and on the Sacred Liturgy. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1965.
- The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy of the Second Vatican Council and the Motu Proprio of Pope Paul VI. With a commentary by Gerard S. Sloyan. Glen Rock, New Jersey: Paulist Press, c.1964.
- Crichton, J. D. The Church's Worship. New York: Sheed and Ward, c.1964.
- Enciclopedia Cattolica. Vatican City: Catholic Library, 1949.
- Flannery, Austin, editor. Vatican II: The Liturgy Constitution. Fourth edition. Dublin: Scepter Books, 1965.
- Herbermann, Charles G., and Others, editors. The Catholic Encyclopedia. New York: Robert Appleton Co., c.1908.
- Hoefer, Josef, and Karl Rahner, editors. Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche. 2nd edition. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1958.
- Jungmann, Josef Andreas. "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy," Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II. Edited by Herbert Vorgrimler. New York: Herder and Herder, c.1967.
- . The Mass of the Roman Rite. New York: Benziger Brothers, Inc., c.1951.
- . The Mass of the Roman Rite. New revised and abridged edition in one volume. Translated by Francis A. Brunner and revised by Charles K. Riepe. New York: Benziger Brothers, Inc., c.1961.
- Kaulen, Franz, editor. Wetzer und Weste's Kirchenlexikon. 2nd edition. Freiburg: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung, 1884.

- Koenker, Ernest Benjamin. The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1965.
- Küng, Hans. The Council in Action. Translated by Cecily Hastings. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963.
- Liber Usualis. Tournai: Desclée and Company, 1947.
- McManus, Fredrick R. "Constitution on the Liturgy: Commentary," Worship XXXVIII (May 1964), 314-74, (August-September 1964), 450-96, (October 1964), 515-65.
- New Catholic Encyclopedia. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, c.1967.
- Nouvelle Biographie Générale. Paris: Firmin Didot Frères, 1855.
- Piepkorn, Arthur Carl. What the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church Have to Say about Worship and the Sacraments. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1952.
- Reed, Luther D. The Lutheran Liturgy. Revised edition. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959.
- Rutledge, Denys. Cosmic Theology. The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of Pseudo-Denys: An Introduction. Staten Island, New York: Alba House, c.1964.
- Schabes, Leo. Alte liturgische Begräuche und Zeremonien an der Stiftskirche zu Koster. Kosterneuburg-bei-Wien: Volksliturgisches Apostolat, 1930.
- Schillebeeckx, Eduard. The Real Achievement of Vatican II. Translated by H. J. J. Vaughan. New York: Herder and Herder, c.1967.
- Shepherd, Massey H., Jr., "The Liturgy," The Second Vatican Council. Edited by Bernard C. Paulwey. London: Oxford University Press, c.1967. Pp. 149-74.
- Sloyan, Gerard S. Worship in a New Key. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1966.
- Strand, Kenneth A. Reformation Bibles in the Crossfires. Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor Publishers, c.1961.
- Surtz, Edward, S. J. The Works and Days of John Fisher. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, c.1967.
- Vajta, Vilmos. Die Theologie des Gottesdienstes bei Luther. 3rd edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959.

- . Luther on Worship. Translated and condensed by U. S. Leupold. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, c.1958.
- Theisen, Reinold. "Mass Liturgy and the Council of Trent," Pontificium Athenaeum Anselmianum. Collegeville, Minnesota: St. John's University Press, 1965.
- Tilley, A. A. "The Reformation in France," The Cambridge Modern History. II. Cambridge: University Press, 1903. Pp. 280-88.
- Yzermans, Vincent A., editor. American Participation in the Second Vatican Council. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1967.