

Questions Liturgiques / Studies in Liturgy

Profile

Founded in 1910 by Dom Lambert Beauduin, *Questions Liturgiques/Studies in Liturgy* welcomes scholarly contributions (i.e. articles, notes, book essays etc.) in the fields of liturgical theology, the historical study of liturgy and the sacraments, sacramental theology, symbol theory, ritual studies, the phenomenology of devotional practices, the anthropology of religion and cognate disciplines. It is committed to advance high-standard scholarship and fundamental reflections in these disciplines. Although the review is rooted in the Catholic tradition, it encourages ecumenical, comparative and interreligious approaches.

Submissions

1. All manuscripts submitted for publication should entail original research and reflections. They should not be under simultaneous consideration for publication elsewhere, be it in an abridged or extended form.
2. Texts should be written in standard English or standard French. Authors for whom these are not their native tongues are required to have the language and style of their manuscripts corrected prior to submission.
3. The length of the articles in the journal ranges from approximately 3.000 up to 10.000 words. In exceptional cases longer contributions can also be accepted.
4. Next to an electronic copy, authors are requested to send two hard copies to the official editorial address. They should make sure that their texts don't bear traces which makes it possible to identify them.
5. In addition to their manuscripts authors should enclose a letter, which unambiguously reveals the authorship of a contribution. The letter must also confirm that the article is an original work, and may inform about present (academic) positions and research profiles.
6. Manuscripts should be typed in a clear font (e.g., Times New Roman 12) and make use of footnotes at the bottom of the page (not endnotes).
7. As to bibliographical references, we ask that authors consult the guidelines available at http://theo.kuleuven.be/questions_liturgiques/
8. Upon publishing, authors will be asked to write an abstract of approximately 200 words.

Assessment Procedure

All contributions are subjected to an assessment in two phases. After an internal evaluation upon the acceptability of manuscripts, they are sent out to at least two members of the editorial board for reviewing purposes. Authors will be notified whether their contributions are 'accepted', 'accepted under the condition of changes', or 'not accepted' within a reasonable time.

Editor: J. Geldhof

Editorial Board / Advisory Commission: A. Cardita – A. Goossens – T.E. Johnson – J. Leachman, o.s.b. – G. Mattheeuws – D. McCarthy, o.s.b. – G. Michiels, o.s.b. – C. Monsieur, o.praem. – K. Op de Beeck, o.s.b. – P. Post – T. Quartier – S.K. Roll – S. Van den Bossche

Honorary Members: J. Lamberts – M. Fierens, o. praem. – C. Traets, s.j.

Address: Maurits Sabbibliotheek, Sint-Michielsstraat 4 bus 3101, 3000 Leuven, Belgium

E-mail: questions.liturgiques@theo.kuleuven.be

ISSN 0774-5524
e ISSN 1783-1709

SUBSCRIPTIONS: order@peeters-leuven.be

Peeters – Journals Department, Bondgenotenlaan 153, B-3000 Leuven (Belgium)

QUESTIONS LITURGIQUES STUDIES IN LITURGY



vol. 95

nos. 1-2

Contents – Table des matières

Articles

- Myriam Wijlens and Eugene Duffy 3-7
Investigations in Ecclesial and Liturgical Reform: Peter and Paul Seminar
- Chad J. Glendinning 8-27
The Role of the Competent Ecclesiastical Authority in the Promotion of Participatio Actuosa Prior to the Second Vatican Council
- Peter De Mey 28-51
The Daily Eucharist at the Council as Stimulus and Test Case for Liturgical Reform
- Mathijs Lamberigts 52-67
The Liturgy Debate at Vatican II: An Exercise in Collective Responsibility
- Gilles Routhier 68-80
Refus et résistances à la réforme liturgique: Acteurs – Motifs – Enjeux
- Thomas R. Whelan 81-109
Liturgy Reform since Vatican II: The Role Played by Bishops in the English-Speaking World
- Eugene Duffy 110-127
The Reception of the Conciliar Liturgical Reforms in Ireland
- John Faris 128-147
Structures for Liturgical Reform and the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches
- Abstracts** 148-151
Résumés 152-155

INVESTIGATIONS IN ECCLESIAL AND LITURGICAL REFORM

Peter and Paul Seminar

The world wide enthusiasm for Pope Francis one year into his pontificate reveals the tremendous desire by so many for a renewal and reform of the Church. Fifty years after Vatican II many people still hope that the reform begun on a doctrinal level by the council would find full implementation in the decision making processes in their parishes and dioceses, and in the government of the universal Church. They feel that so far the council has been insufficiently received. The scholarly work of the Peter and Paul Seminar (hereafter PPS) – a group of internationally recognized Roman Catholic theologians and canon lawyers¹ – was established to make a contribution to the implementation of the council's call for reform and renewal. It works on the understanding that if doctrine is to shape the life of the Church and if there is to be a consistency between belief and action, then ecclesial structures and canonical institutions must assist the community in promoting and protecting its beliefs. The PPS thus focuses on reform and renewal of canonical institutions on the basis of the insights of Vatican II. Among the major goals of Vatican II was the restoration of Christian unity. The work of the PPS keeps this as its decisive focus.

1. Currently the moderators of the PPS are Eugene Duffy (Mary Immaculate College, University of Limerick) and Myriam Wijlens (University of Erfurt), other members are Ladislav Örsy SJ (Georgetown University, Washington DC), Catherine Clifford (Saint Paul University Ottawa), James Coriden (Washington Theological Union), Peter De Mey (Catholic University of Louvain, Leuven), Joseph Famerée SCJ (Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve), Thomas J. Green (Catholic University of America, Washington DC), Astrid Kaptijn (Fribourg), Chorbishop John D. Faris (Utican, NY), Henk Witte (University of Tilburg), Gilles Routhier (Université Laval Quebec), Laurent Villemain (Institut Catholique Paris). Clarence Gallagher SJ (Oxford), George Tavard AA (Brighton, MA) and Margaret O'Gara (St. Michaels' College, Toronto) now deceased were among the original group.

The PPS takes its inspiration from the insightful study of the Groupe des Dombes *Pour la conversion des Églises*.² Whereas the latter outlines on a more theoretical level the need for conversion and corresponding reform of ecclesial structures, the PPS investigates above all the practical aspect of such reform with the intention of making concrete proposals.³ The PPS first met in Ottawa in 1998 when the American canon lawyer Ladislav Örsy, SJ, convened Church historians, systematic theologians and canon lawyers from universities in Europe, the United States and Canada. They agreed to cooperate together and to bring their complementary disciplines to bear on the project. Theologians were to identify those doctrines which are in need of protection and promotion by way of institutions. Subsequently, canon lawyers were to analyse the doctrine that the existing institutions protect and promote. Historians were to assist in identifying what was developed over the course of history and help to discern what was essential and what were merely accidental accretions. The Seminar regularly invites experts to join the research project if the PPS itself does not have the necessary expertise in a particular area.⁴ The resulting dialogue between the scholars, then, enables the formulation of proposals for reform. In this process the restoration of the unity of the Church of Christ remains an overriding goal. Indeed the nomenclature chosen by the participating scholars is intended to reflect its concerns and its methods. Saint Peter reminds us of the need to search for unity and Saint Paul calls us to be creative. Thus the PPS looks creatively at how the unity of the Church may be further advanced while remaining faithful to all that is essential.

2. Groupe des Dombes, *Pour la conversion des Églises: Identité et changement dans la dynamique de communion* (Paris: Centurion, 1991); English translation: *For the Conversion of the Churches* (Geneva: WCC, 1993).

3. The website of the Peter and Paul Seminar: <https://www.uni-erfurt.de/kirchenrecht/peter-and-paul-seminar/>. For a description of the work of Peter and Paul Seminar see also Myriam Wijlens, "Peter and Paul Seminar": A Follow up by Theologians and Canon Lawyers to the Groupe des Dombes' Publication *For the Conversion of the Churches*, "Rethinking Ecumenism: Strategies for the 21st Century", ed. Freek Bakker, IIMO Research Publication, 63 (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2004) 229-241; Repr.: *The Jurist* 64 (2004) 6-20.

4. The typical methodology of the PPS is to conduct its research in three year cycles. In the first year the topic and its various aspects that need to be researched are determined. A year later the Seminar gathers to discuss a first draft of the research papers. Then in the final year the work generally concluded with a conference hosted by one of the home universities of the members. There the final papers are presented to a wider public and scholars from the host university are usually invited to participate actively in the conference and research.

In 1998 the PPS first determined which institutions are in need of reform.⁵ Once this determination was made, the Seminar then decided its methodology, namely, to study as a group one specific theme more deeply, approaching it from a variety of perspectives. In 2001 the PPS decided to concentrate on the *Collegiality of Bishops*, as a specific issue. Additional specialists, on the basis of their proven expertise, were invited to focus on areas that would complement the work of the full members of the PPS, an approach that has continued ever since.

In 2004 Georgetown University and the Woodstock Centre in Washington, DC, hosted a conference at which the work of the PPS was presented to the wider public.⁶ The findings produced by that cycle of research showed that there was a need to see the bishop not just in relation to the college of bishops, but also, and above all, in relation to the local church. Collegiality needs to be complemented by synodality. Three years later, in 2007, Saint Paul University in Ottawa graciously hosted the presentation of the findings from the next cycle of research at a conference entitled: "The Local Church and Its Leadership: Receiving the Vision of Vatican II."⁷ At the time the members of the PPS felt strongly the need for specific reforms in light of widespread concerns with regard to the liturgy, especially issues surrounding the translation of liturgical texts, discussions concerning the hermeneutics of the Vatican II, the continuously diminishing powers of episcopal conferences, restrictions imposed on laity, etc. Reflection on these made the PPS aware that a reform can only be successful when it is accompanied or even is preceded by conversion. Such a conversion is needed not just by individuals, but above all by the institution as such. The question arose: what does it take to bring about an institutional conversion? A symposium on "Conversion and Reform in View of the Unity of the Church" was held at the University of Erfurt (Germany) in 2009.⁸ At this gathering there was a strong focus on the criteria for reform or the notion of reform and renewal in Vatican II, in both its theoretical and practical dimensions.

The Erfurt conference resulted in the decision to investigate more deeply the topic of reform as such, but to focus on liturgy as a litmus test. The issue was not liturgy as such, but how reform in liturgy had taken

5. Topics identified were e.g. primacy and infallibility, episcopal conferences, mixed marriages and the Eucharist, selection of bishops. They are published in *The Jurist* 59 (1999) 329-468.

6. The papers of the meeting discussed at Georgetown University are all published in *The Jurist* 64 (2004) 1-360.

7. The studies of this conference are published in *The Jurist* 68 (2008) 321-496 and 69 (2009) 1-170.

8. The studies were published in *The Jurist* 71 (2011) 1-90 and 369-449.

place. Questions such as who initiates reform in liturgy, how and by whom is it promoted? What happens when not all agree or even object to reform? Who reacts and in what way to such objections? What might be learned from this for the desired renewal and reform of today's Church? The questions raised point to the fact that the answers would most likely be ecclesiological in nature.

The decision was made to undertake the investigation in two steps: in the first phase of this study key developments in the reform of liturgy over the course of history, with a focus on the ecclesiological aspects, up to the 20th century were explored. Furthermore, the presentations also included reports from other churches as it was felt that they might be able to shed light on the topic as well. The PPS gathered for a meeting entitled "Liturgy as Litmus Test of Reform in the Church" organised by colleagues in Leuven and held in the Abbey of Mont César in May 2012. The studies presented were published in a previous issue of *Questions Liturgiques – Studies in Liturgy*.⁹ At the Leuven meeting, it was agreed that the second phase of this cycle would focus on the process of liturgical reform in the Catholic Church at Vatican II and in the subsequent years. The objective was to identify the factors that contributed to the realization of the reform or which impeded its complete success.

For the papers published in this issue the presenters were asked to focus on the following questions: the role of actors in the reform, e.g., the role of the faithful, bishops, priests, religious orders, monasteries, theology faculties, formation centres, journals, central authority; the role of ideas and their dissemination in formation programmes and publications; the role of experience of something different from what was already known. What was the context of the reform? How was the reform proposed? How was it mediated and communicated? How was it implemented? Did it meet resistance and what was the reaction to the resistance? How and why did the intended reform succeed or not? By posing these questions it was hoped to glean some insight as to how experience, as distinct from theology or law, was possibly a decisive factor in the decision to reform the liturgy. This current issue publishes the papers produced in response to these questions. They were presented and intensely discussed at the most recent meeting of the PPS in Baltimore, November 2013. Together they highlight the complex nature of the liturgical reform, the multifaceted dimensions of its reception and something of the work that remains to be done in creating the ecclesial structures to ensure its fuller implementation. The PPS would like to express a word of thanks to the board of *Questions*

9. See *Questions liturgiques – Studies in Liturgy* 93 (2012) 153-258.

liturgiques – Studies in Liturgy for publishing its papers and thus making these studies available to a wider public.

Ever since its first meeting the PPS has focused on renewal and reform. The current pontificate invites all who belong to the Church to reflect on what reforms are needed. Ultimately the purpose of renewal and reform lies not with the Church itself, but focuses on the question how the reform can enable the Church to believe more confidently and act more faithfully so that the gospel of the Risen Christ is proclaimed more authentically and thus convincingly.

This call is taken seriously by the PPS. In its upcoming meeting in Paris in June 2014 it will reflect on the challenges that lie ahead of us in light of the work done so far.

Palm Sunday 2014

Myriam Wijlens and Eugene Duffy
Moderators of the Peter and Paul Seminar
wjlens@yahoo.de
eugene.duffy@mic.ul.ie

**THE ROLE OF THE COMPETENT
ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY
IN THE PROMOTION OF *PARTICIPATIO ACTUOSA*
PRIOR TO THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL**

Of all the aims of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, the restoration of the full and active participation of the Christian faithful is to be considered before all else in the reform and promotion of the liturgy:

Mother Church earnestly desires that all the faithful should be led to that full, conscious, and active participation in liturgical celebrations which is demanded by the very nature of the liturgy, and to which the Christian people, "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a redeemed people" (1 Pet 2:9, 4-5) have a right and obligation by reason of their baptism.

In the restoration and promotion of the sacred liturgy the full and active participation by all the peoples the aim to be considered before all else, for it is the primary and indispensable source from which the faithful are to derive the true Christian spirit. Therefore, in all their apostolic activity, pastors of souls should energetically set about achieving it through the requisite pedagogy (*SC*, n. 14).

Since the Second Vatican Council successfully ushered in many far-reaching and significant reforms of the liturgy, it is not surprising that, as Huels observes, "popular and scholarly writings, lectures and courses often look to Vatican II as the starting point, rather than the turning point, of the process that led to the restored rites of the contemporary Latin Church."¹ This is due in large part to ignorance of pre-conciliar sources of liturgical reform, and, at times, simplistic characterizations of liturgical worship prior to the Second Vatican Council.

For purposes of brevity, this presentation will be limited to just one component of these pre-conciliar reforms – and not an insignificant one – namely, those reforms introduced to promote the active participation of

1. J. M. Huels, "Participating by the Faithful in the Liturgy: 1903-1962," *The Jurist* 48 (1988) 608.

the faithful in the liturgical rites. After providing a brief historical overview of some of these early attempts, we will pause primarily in the mid-twentieth century, during the pontificates of Pius XII and John XXIII, to identify some significant advances in this regard, namely (1) Pius XII's 1943 encyclical *Mediator Dei*, (2) the 1958 instruction *De musica sacra*; and (3) the new code of rubrics introduced by John XXIII in 1960.²

There is, of course, a limitation to this approach which must be acknowledged at the outset. What follows is primarily concerned with the appropriation of liturgical reform and its subsequent legislative expression by the competent ecclesiastical authorities of the *munus sanctificandi*. Without trying to diminish the important contributions of individuals, monasteries, periodicals, academic and pastoral centres most closely associated with the liturgical movement, this presentation will focus on the end result: how such liturgical reform was received by ecclesiastical authority and given juridical expression. The purpose of this limitation is to highlight the question of juridical competence with regard to liturgical matters, so as to better understand the role of the competent ecclesiastical authority in the reform of the liturgy and, ultimately, that of the Church herself.

1. Active Participation of the Faithful: From Pope Pius X to Pope Pius XI (1903-1939)

1.1. Pope Pius X (1903-1914)

The principle of "active participation," so central to the twentieth century liturgical movement, was first endorsed by Pius X in his *motu proprio Tra le sollecitudini*. The document was intended to provide a "juridical code of sacred music," norms pertaining to singing in Church and the restoration of Gregorian chant.³ Although ambitious, the *motu proprio* is perhaps best remembered for a phrase, contained surreptitiously in the introduction, which became the cornerstone of the liturgical movement:

2. For a more extensive treatment of this subject, see C. J. Glendinning, "The Significance of the Liturgical Reforms Prior to the Second Vatican Council in Light of *Summorum Pontificum*," *Studia canonica* 44 (2010) 293-342. Portions of this study have been reproduced herewith.

3. Pius X, Apostolic letter *motu proprio* on the restoration of sacred music *Tra le sollecitudini*, 22 November 1903, in *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 36 (1903-1904) 329-339; English translation in R. K. Seasoltz, *The New Liturgy, A Documentation, 1903-1965* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966) 3-10. The original promulgated text is in Italian, although a Latin text was also published in *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 36 (1903-1904) 387-395.

It being our ardent desire to see the true Christian spirit restored in every respect and be preserved by all the faithful, we deem it necessary to provide before everything else for the sanctity and dignity of the temple, in which the faithful assemble for the object of acquiring this spirit from its foremost and indispensable fount, which is the active participation in the holy mysteries and in the public and solemn prayer of the Church.

It is worth noting that this endorsement is contained in a *motu proprio* affirming the preeminent place of Gregorian chant – “the supreme model for sacred music” – and the exclusive use of Latin (n. 7). Despite recognizing the importance of active participation, the greater part of the *motu proprio* concerns the participation of the faithful in a more passive mode, by listening attentively so as to be “better disposed to receive the fruits of grace associated with the celebration of the most holy mysteries” (n. 1). Nevertheless, Pius X’s words served as a crucial catalyst for the liturgical movement.

1.2. Pope Benedict XV (1914-1922)

Benedict XV’s relatively short papacy during the First World War resulted in relatively little liturgical innovation during his pontificate. By most accounts, Benedict XV did not substantially advance the liturgical movement.⁴ Instead, his greatest contribution to the liturgical movement consisted, largely, of seeing to completion a number of projects initiated under his predecessor, principally, the revision of various liturgical books and the promulgation of the first *Codex Iuris Canonici*. Although the 1917 Code of Canon Law (c. 2), much like the 1983 Code (c. 2) does not define the rites which must be observed when celebrating the liturgy, there are three rather minor provisions of the 1917 Code which affected the participation of the laity in the liturgy:

1. Canon 753, §2 obliged adult neophytes to assist at Mass and receive holy Communion immediately after baptism, except for grave and urgent reasons. The liturgical law of the Ritual (Tit. II, c. 4, n. 51) had only recommended this practice when convenient.

2. Canon 821 extended the time for celebrating Mass so that it should commence not sooner than one hour before dawn nor later than one hour after noon. The prior law had required that Mass begin no sooner than twenty minutes before dawn or that it end twenty minutes after noon. See H.A. AYRINHAC, *Legislation on the Sacraments in the New Code of Canon Law* (New York/London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1928) 123.

4. J. F. Pollard, *The Unknown Pope: Benedict XV (1914-1922) and the Pursuit of Peace* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 2000) 213.

3. Canon 858, §2 extended the law of Pius X⁵ [...] regarding the Eucharistic fast for sick person confined to bed for a month so that they might receive once or twice a week instead of once or twice a month, and the code expressly stated that medicine as well as liquids could be taken before Communion in this situation. The general rule binding others required a strict fast from all food and drink, including water, from midnight of the day one was to receive Communion. See 1917 code, c. 858, §1.⁶

1.3. Pope Pius XI (1922-1939)

To mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of Pius X’s *Tra le sollecitudini*, Pius XI issued the apostolic constitution *Divini cultus*, on Gregorian chant and sacred music.⁷ Pius XI proposed new legislation to ensure the promotion and protection of the sacred liturgy. The active participation of the faithful, the cornerstone of the liturgical movement, received much stronger papal endorsement:

In order that the faithful may more actively participate in divine worship, let them be made once more to sing the Gregorian chant, so far as it belongs to them to take part in it. It is most important that when the faithful assist at the sacred ceremonies, or when pious sodalities take part with the clergy in a procession, they should not be merely detached and silent spectators, but filled with a deep sense of the beauty of the liturgy, should sing alternately with the clergy or the choir, as it is prescribed. If this is done, then it will no longer happen that people either make no answer at all to the public prayers – whether in the language of the liturgy or in the vernacular – or at best utter responses in a low and subdued manner (n. 9).

Where Mass was not sung, another means of promoting participation of the faithful was by way of the *Missa dialogata*, or dialogue Mass, which was being encouraged by proponents of the liturgical movement. The celebration of a dialogue Mass encouraged the congregation to make the proper responses in unison in place of the acolyte, who had hitherto made the responses on their behalf. Although Pius XI himself acted as celebrant of a dialogue Mass in St. Peter’s in 1922,⁸ the Congregation for

5. Sacred Congregation of the Council, Decree modifying the fast for the infirm *Post editum*, 7 December 1906, *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 39 (1906) 794-795.

6. Huels, “Participating by the Faithful in the Liturgy,” 617, footnote 25.

7. Pius XI, Apostolic constitution on Gregorian chant and sacred music *Divini cultus*, 20 December 1928, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (henceforth *AAS*) 21 (1928) 33-41; English translation in Seasoltz, *The New Liturgy*, 58-63.

8. See G. Ellard, *The Mass in Transition* (Milwaukee, WI: Bruce Pub. Co., 1956) 341.

Sacred Rites discouraged its wide-scale use on the basis of potential distraction for the celebrating priests and others engaged in devotional exercises. A rescript, published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, stated the following:

Things that are in themselves licit are sometimes not expedient, owing to difficulties which may easily arise, as in this case, especially on account of the disturbances which the priests who celebrate and the people who assist may experience, to the disadvantage of the sacred action and of the Rubrics. Hence it is well to retain the common usage, as we have several times replied in similar cases.⁹

Later, the same congregation clarified that it was for the ordinary to decide whether it is advisable, in individual cases, and in light of various circumstances, to celebrate a dialogue Mass. Nevertheless, care should be taken to ensure that its celebration promotes devotion rather than cause further disturbance.¹⁰

The use of the dialogue Mass will evolve rather significantly under Pius XII. Since it presents an interesting case study for the reform of the liturgy, it will be considered below by way of conclusion.

2. Pope Pius XII (1939-1958)

2.1. *The Encyclical Mediator Dei*

The first significant document on the liturgy following the end of the war was Pius XII's famous encyclical, *Mediator Dei*.¹¹ This lengthy document – the first papal encyclical entirely devoted to the liturgy – acknowledged the “widespread scholarly interest in the sacred liturgy,”

9. Congregation for Sacred Rites, Private response concerning the celebration of a dialogue Mass, 4 August 1922, *AAS* 14 (1922) 505; English translation in *Canon Law Digest*, vol. 1, 199. Earlier rescripts can be found with analysis by I. Hanssens in *Periodica* 25 (1936) 57-89; English translation of rescripts in *Canon Law Digest*, vol. 2, 198-199.

10. Congregation for Sacred Rites, Private response to the Archbishop of Genoa concerning the dialogue Mass, 30 November 1935, *Periodica* 25 (1936), 43; English translation in *Canon Law Digest*, vol. 2, 199-200.

11. Pius XII, Encyclical letter on the sacred liturgy *Mediator Dei*, 20 November 1947, *AAS* 39 (1947) 521-595; English translation in Seasoltz, *The New Liturgy*, 107-159. Note that the original Latin contains no paragraph numeration. *Mediator Dei*'s four-fold division examines the liturgy from many dimensions, including the nature, source and development of the liturgy (nn. 13-65); Eucharistic worship (nn. 66-137); the Divine Office and the liturgical year (nn. 138-171); and, finally, by providing pastoral directives to further the liturgical apostolate (nn. 172-204).

largely the result of the “zealous and persistent labour of several monasteries within the distinguished Order of St. Benedict” (n. 4). Among the “salutary fruits” of the liturgical movement, Pius XII identified the following:

The majestic ceremonies of the sacrifice of the altar became better known, understood and appreciated. With more widespread and more frequent reception of the sacraments, the worship of the Eucharist came to be regarded for what it really is: the fountainhead of genuine Christian devotion. Bolder relief was given likewise to the fact that all the faithful make up a single and very compact body with Christ for its Head, and that the Christian community is in duty bound to participate in the liturgical rites according to their station (n. 5).

The liturgical movement was not free from abuses or excesses.¹² Concerns about the liturgical movement in Germany, for instance, resulted in the establishment of liturgical commission under the direction of the German bishops, and the distribution of a memorandum prepared by Archbishop Groeber of Freiburg im Breisgau outlining seventeen criticisms of the liturgical movement. Among these, we find:

1. The Liturgical Movement is causing division in the ranks of the German clergy. The “kerygmatics” are calling the rest of us ignorant, lazy and disobedient.

[...]

5. They criticize contemporary institutions and contemporary forms of religious life because of the undue importance they place on the forms in the primitive church.

6. They give too much attention to the Oriental Liturgies.

[...]

9. They give a new definition of the Church. The Church is no longer the “perfect society”, but some type of biological organism.

[...]

14. Some are saying that the communion of the faithful is an integral part of the Mass. Others say that Communion should not be distributed except

12. The abuses Pius XII identifies explicitly in *Mediator Dei* include “the temerity and daring of those who introduce novel liturgical practices, or call for the revival of obsolete rites out of harmony with prevailing laws and rubrics” (n. 90). Also worthy of mention are “those who make use of the vernacular in the celebration of the august Eucharistic sacrifice; those who transfer certain feast days – which have been appointed and established after mature deliberation – to other dates; those, finally, who delete from the prayer books approved for public use the sacred texts of the Old Testament, deeming them little suited and inopportune for modern times” (n. 90). For additional concerns characteristic of the time, see *La Maison-Dieu* 7 (1946) 97-114; *Canon Law Digest*, vol. 3, 350-352.

during the sacrifice. Romano Guardini even thinks we ought to allow Communion with both bread and wine.

15. They give an exaggerated importance to the liturgy and tend to identify it with the life of the Church. In apostolic times private prayer held first place, not the liturgy, and we must be careful not to be taken in by contemporary liturgists who play down private prayers: the rosary, the way of the cross, the month of Mary. We have even heard them say "a parish which lives only by these popular devotions is religiously anemic". Nothing in history justifies this statement. After all, things weren't so bad before there ever was a Liturgical Movement [...]

[...]

17. They are attempting to introduce the German language not only into the administration of the sacraments as is already allowed by the Congregation of Rites, but even want to use German at Mass. A vernacular liturgy has often served the forces of error as a weapon in the arsenal of heresy.¹³

Mediator Dei must be seen within this context. Serving both to promote authentic liturgical reform and curb its excesses, *Mediator Dei* attempts to address perceived abuses while ensuring that the genuine contributions of the liturgical movement are given concrete expression and ecclesiastical approval. Huels observes that the intent of *Mediator Dei* was not so much to condemn specific abuses, as very few abuses are explicitly identified, but to "reassert complete papal authority over the liturgy."¹⁴ Echoing the prescripts of the 1917 Code, *Mediator Dei* strongly affirms the Holy See's "prerogative to commend and approve whatever is done properly, and to check or censure any aberration from the path of truth and rectitude" (n. 9). *Mediator Dei* affirms that the sovereign pontiff alone enjoys the right to recognize and establish any practice touching on the worship of God, including the introduction, approval, or modification of liturgical rites (cf. *CIC/17*, c. 1257).¹⁵ Bishops, for their part, are to exercise vigilance and carefully ensure the exact observance of the prescriptions of the sacred canons concerning divine worship (cf. *CIC/17*, c. 1261). Private individuals, including clerics, are to refrain from introducing arbitrary changes to the liturgy (n. 58).

13. See *La Maison-Dieu* 7 (1946) 87-114. An English translation of memorandum can be found in T. Richstatter, *Liturgical Law: New Spirit, New Style* (Chicago, IL: Franciscan Herald Press, 1977) 2-4.

14. Huels, "Participation by the Faithful in the Liturgy," 618.

15. *Sacrosanctum Concilium* will derogate from c. 1257 of the 1917 Code of Canon Law, as expressed in *Mediator Dei*. No longer does the Apostolic See exercise exclusive competence to order the sacred liturgy and to approve liturgical books but, "as the law determines," this competency also belongs to the bishops and the competent territorial bodies of bishops. The 1983 Code of Canon Law reflects this change of law in c. 838.

Pius XII equally reproves any form of antiquarianism, that is, "the restoration of all the ancient rites and ceremonies indiscriminately" (n. 61).¹⁶ While the liturgy of earlier ages is worthy of veneration, "the more recent liturgical rites likewise deserve reverence and respect," for "[t]hey, too, owe their inspiration to the Holy Spirit, who assists the Church in every age to the consummation of the world" (n. 61). Pius XII warns that

[c]learly, no sincere Catholic can refuse to accept the formulation of Christian doctrine more recently elaborated and proclaimed as dogmas by the Church, under the inspiration and guidance of the Holy Spirit with abundant fruit for souls, because it pleases him to hark to the old formulas. No more can any Catholic in his right senses repudiate existing legislation of the Church in order to revert to prescriptions based on the earliest sources of canon law. Just as obviously unwise and mistaken is the zeal of one who in matters liturgical would go back to the rites and usages of antiquity, discarding the new patterns introduced by disposition of divine Providence to meet the change of circumstances and situation (n. 63).

The encyclical frequently praises the efforts which facilitate the participation of the faithful in the Eucharist.¹⁷ Pius XII extols those who, "with the idea of getting the Christian people to take part more easily and more fruitfully in the Mass, strive to make them familiar with the Roman Missal, so that the faithful, united with the priest, may pray together in the very words and sentiments of the Church" (n. 105). Dialogue Masses were also explicitly permitted:

They also are to be commended who strive to make the liturgy even in an external way a sacred act in which all who are present may share. This can be done in more than one way, when, for instance, the whole congre-

16. *Mediator Dei* provides the following examples: "Thus, to cite some instances, one would be straying from the straight path were he to wish the altar restored to its primitive table form; were he to want black excluded as a colour for the liturgical vestments; were he to forbid the use of sacred images and statues in churches; were he to order the crucifix so designed that the divine Redeemer's body bear no trace of his cruel sufferings; and lastly, were he to disdain and reject polyphonic music or singing in parts, even where it conforms to regulations issued by the Holy See" (n. 62). Ironically, some of what Pius XII had in mind is now considered normative, while the forms of liturgical worship before the Second Vatican Council – precisely what Pius XII was defending – are considered by some as representative of a new form of exaggerated antiquarianism.

17. *Mediator Dei* recalls that "all the faithful should be aware that to participate in the Eucharistic sacrifice is their chief duty and supreme dignity, and that not in an inert and negligent fashion, giving way to distractions and day-dreaming, but with such earnestness and concentration that they may be united as closely as possible with the High Priest [...] and together with him and through him let them make their oblation, and in union with him let them offer up themselves" (n. 80).

gation, in accordance with the rules of the liturgy, either answer the priest in an orderly and fitting manner, or sing hymns suitable to the different parts of the Mass, or do both, or finally in solemn Masses when they answer the prayers of the minister of Jesus Christ and also sing the liturgical chant, approved and commended when they are in complete agreement with the precepts of the Church and the rubrics of the liturgy (n. 105).

Similarly, the encyclical encourages participation by means of singing the Gregorian chant, that which is “proposed to the faithful as belonging to them also” (n. 191), along with other forms of congregational singing (n. 194).

Mediator Dei acknowledges that not all may be able to participate in the liturgy, a result of their inability to follow the Roman Missal, even in the vernacular, or understand correctly the liturgical rites and formulas employed. Structural changes to the rites themselves, however, are not proposed:

It is interesting to note that the concept to the *participation of the faithful in Mediator Dei* is essentially related not to the *rite* but to one’s *state of mind* (cf. n. 81). And so those who have difficulty understanding the liturgical rites or who do not feel like participating in the Eucharistic sacrifice “can adopt some other method which proves easier for certain people; for instance, they can lovingly meditate on the mysteries of Jesus Christ or perform other exercises of piety or recite prayers which, though they differ from the sacred rites, are still essentially in harmony with them” (n. 108). This explicit counsel of *participative parallelism* does not foresee the novelty of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* would introduce, making *ritual form* and *active participation* inseparable. It is precisely this difference that the Council sought to recover and authoritatively propose.¹⁸

Consequently, according to *Mediator Dei*, pious exercises, the recitation of prayers and meditation on the mysteries of Christ during the liturgy itself – provided they are in harmony with the sacred rites – can assist those otherwise unable to participate in the liturgy.

Mediator Dei profoundly influenced the future course of liturgical renewal and, provided the theological foundation upon which many texts of the Second Vatican Council are based. Huels observes that “[w]ith this 1947 encyclical, the liturgical movement that had been confined to a small but growing number of enthusiasts now found many of its objectives gaining formal acceptance and endorsement by the Apostolic See.”¹⁹

18. A. Grillo, *Beyond Pius V: Conflicting Interpretations of the Liturgical Reform* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2013) 23-24, footnote 22.

19. Huels, “Participation by the Faithful in the Liturgy,” 620-621.

2.2. The Pontifical Commission for the General Restoration of the Liturgy

Proof that certain objectives of the liturgical movement were garnering ecclesiastical attention, if not approval, can be found in the important work Pius XII entrusted to the Congregation for Rites. The task of preparing for general reform of the liturgy was assigned to the *Sectio historica* of the Congregation for Sacred Rites, established by Pius XI in 1930 for precisely this purpose. A working document was prepared under the title *Memoria sulla riforma liturgica* to serve as a guide for discussion of various liturgical issues. As a result of further consultation, four additional supplements were published.²⁰ Although prepared by the *Sectio historica*, these documents were utilized by a special commission, appointed on 28 May 1948, to deal with the general restoration of the liturgy.²¹ For twelve years, until its absorption into the conciliar preparatory commission, the commission held eighty-two meetings and operated in absolute secrecy.²²

The *Memoria* identifies three foundational principles for the reform of the liturgy. It should come as no surprise that these principles also find comparable expression in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. These will be identified below in parallel columns:

20. *Sacra Rituum Congregatio*. *Sectio Historica: Memoria sulla riforma liturgica*, n. 71 (Vatican City: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, 1948); idem, *Memoria sulla riforma liturgica*. Supplemento II: *Annotazioni all' 'memoria'*, n. 76 (Vatican City: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, 1950); idem, *Memoria sulla riforma liturgica*. Supplemento III: *Materiale storica, agiografico, liturgico per la riforma del calendario*, n. 79 (Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1951); idem, *Memoria sulla riforma liturgica*. Supplemento IV: *Consultazione dell'episcopato intorno alla riforma del Breviario Romano (1956-1957)*, *Risultati e deduzioni*, n. 97 (Vatican City: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, 1957). All of these documents have been reproduced in C. Braga (ed.), *La riforma liturgica di Pio XII, Documenti – 1. La “Memoria sulla riforma liturgica”* (Rome: CLV-Edizioni Liturgiche, 2003).

There was no official announcement of the commission at the time of its creation. See A. Bugnini, “Pius XII et liturgia,” *Ephemerides liturgicae* 72 (1958) 377. See also “Promemoria sull’origine della Commissione Pontificia per la Riforma Liturgica e sul lavoro da essa compiuto negli anni 1948-1953,” in N. Giampietro, *Il Card. Ferdinando Antonelli e gli sviluppi della riforma liturgica dal 1948-1970* (Rome: Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, 1998) 274-277.

22. The minutes of each of these meetings have been reproduced as an appendix in Giampietro, *Il Card. Ferdinando Antonelli*, 278-388. An English translation is also available in N. Giampietro, *The Development of the Liturgical Reform as Seen by Cardinal Ferdinando Antonelli from 1947 to 1970* (Fort Collins, CO: Roman Catholic Books, 2009) 205-316.

<i>Memoria sulla riforma liturgica</i> (1948) ²³	<i>Sacrosanctum Concilium</i> (1963)
First Principle: There must be a balance between the conflicting claims of the conservative tendency and the innovative tendency. ²⁴	23. That sound tradition may be retained, and yet the way remains open to legitimate progress 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. Also the general laws governing the structure and meaning of the liturgy must be studied in conjunction with the experience derived from recent liturgical reforms and from the indults conceded to various places. Finally, there must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them; and care must be taken that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing.
Second Principle: Since the liturgy is, by its very nature, primarily directed to the worship of God, the cult of the saints (<i>dulia</i>) must be subordinated to the divine cult (<i>latria</i>). Consequently, in the revision of the liturgical calendar, the temporal and ferial cycle must take precedence over the sanctoral cycle. ²⁵	106. [...] Hence the Lord's day is the original feast day, and it should be proposed to the piety of the faithful and taught to them so that it may become in fact a day of joy and of freedom from work. Other celebrations, unless they be truly of greatest importance, shall not have precedence over the Sunday which is the foundation and kernel of the whole liturgical year.
Third Principle: Since the liturgy forms a unitary and organic complex, the reform will have to be unitary and organic. ²⁶	21. In order that the Christian people may more certainly derive an abundance of graces from the sacred liturgy, holy Mother Church desires to undertake with great care a general restoration of the liturgy itself. For the

23. Braga (ed.), *La "Memoria sulla riforma liturgica"*, 14-19.

24. Primo principio: *Si devono equilibrare le opposte pretese della tendenza conservatrice e della tendenza innovatrice.*

25. Secondo principio: *Dato che la liturgia è, per natura sua, eminentemente latreutica, il culto di *dulia* dev'essere subordinato a quello di *latria*; conseguentemente, nel Calendario liturgico, il 'Temporale' e il 'Feriale' devono predominare sul 'Sanctorale'*

26. Terzo principio: *Dato che la liturgia è un complesso unitario e organico, conviene che la riforma sia anche unitaria ed organica.*

	<p>liturgy is made up of immutable elements divinely instituted, and of elements subject to change. These not only may but ought to be changed with the passage of time if they have suffered from the intrusion of anything out of harmony with the inner nature of the liturgy or have become unsuited to it.</p> <p>23. [...] Finally, there must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them; and care must be taken that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing.</p>
--	--

The *Memoria* proposed a general reform of the liturgy, implemented in stages. From the outset, a reform of the entire liturgy was conceived. In fact, the *Memoria*, n. 21, included a reform of all the principal liturgical books of the Roman Rite.

- I. The gradation of feasts and the Calendar
- II. The Roman Breviary
- III. The Roman Missal
- IV. The Roman Martyrology
- V. The Books of Chant
- VI. The Roman Ritual
- VII. The Ceremonial of Bishops
- VIII. The Roman Pontifical
- IX. The *Codex Iuris Liturgici*²⁷

Of course, not all of this was accomplished before the Second Vatican Council, yet the impact of this pontifical commission was enormous, resulting in noteworthy and incremental pre-conciliar developments. Worthy of mention are (1) the restoration of the Easter Vigil and a reform of the Order of Holy Week in 1955,²⁸ (2) a simplification of the rubrics for the breviary and missal in 1955, and (3) the preparation of an instruction on sacred music and its use within the liturgy in 1958. Even after the commission's dissolution, its work served as the basis for a number of

27. Braga, *La "Memoria sulla riforma liturgica"*, 19-20.

28. See P. Prétot, "La réforme de la semaine sainte sous Pie XII (1951-1956)," *Questions liturgiques* 93 (2012) 196-217.

legislative developments during the pontificate of John XXIII. Similarly, the *Memoria* and its supplements were distributed to all members and experts of the conciliar liturgical commission.²⁹

2.3. *The Instruction De musica sacra*

Shortly before the death of Pius XII and on the feast of St. Pius X, a most helpful instruction, *De musica sacra* was published by the Congregation for Sacred Rites on the topic of sacred music and its use within the liturgy.³⁰ Drawn from the principles enunciated in Pius X's *Tra le sollecitudini* (1903), Pius XI's *Divini cultus* (1928), and Pius XII's *Mediator Dei* (1947) and *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (1955), as well as incorporating the several significant changes in liturgical law during this period, this lengthy instruction, approved *in forma specifica*, provided a helpful consolidation of liturgical law to date.³¹ For the most part, the instruction contained no new legislation.

As a principal objective of the liturgical movement, active participation in the celebration of liturgy was increasingly, yet cautiously, permitted by the Holy See. *De musica sacra* marks a notable transition from mere toleration of the laity's involvement in the liturgy to a practical promotion of their active participation. By its very nature, Mass requires that all those who are present should participate, each in his/her own way (n. 22). *De musica sacra* distinguished between two forms of the Mass, the *Missa in cantu*, that is a sung Mass, and the *Missa lecta*, that is a read Mass. If the Mass is sung with the assistance of sacred ministers, it is called a "solemn Mass;" otherwise it is called a "*Missa cantata*" (n. 3). The active participation of the faithful in a solemn Mass can be accomplished in three stages. Firstly, the faithful can participate by means of chanting the simple liturgical responses that properly belong to them. These include *Amen; Et cum spiritu tuo; Gloria tibi, Domine; Habemus ad Dominum; Dignum et justum est; Sed libera nos a malo; Deo gratias.*

29. Giampietro, *The Development of the Liturgical Reform*, 30.

30. Congregation for Sacred Rites, Instruction on sacred music and liturgy *De musica sacra*, 3 September 1958, in *AAS* 50 (1958) 630-663, English translation in Seasoltz, *The New Liturgy*, 255-282.

31. The approval of an instruction *in forma specifica* is extremely rare and, arguably, counterintuitive. The purpose of an instruction is to explain the prescripts of the law more fully and urge their observance. By approval *in forma specifica*, the pope effectively raised the juridical significance of *De musica sacra* from an administrative measure of the Congregation for Sacred Rites to that of legislation with papal approbation. See J. M. Huels, "Interpreting an Instruction Approved *in forma specifica*," *Studia canonica* 32 (1998) 5-23. An alternate explanation for the approval *in forma specifica* remains Pius XII's personal involvement in the preparation of this instruction. See J. Löw, "The New Instruction," *Worship* 33 (1958-59) 13.

Secondly, participation can occur by chanting the parts of the ordinary of the Mass, such as the *Kyrie, Gloria, and Credo*. This can be accomplished through the use of simpler Gregorian melodies. Thirdly, the faithful can chant the parts of the proper of the Mass. This form of participation, which is far more complex since the proper parts of the Mass change each week, is especially encouraged in religious communities and seminaries (n. 25).

In low Masses, participation was presented in incremental stages as well. The first stage consisted of the faithful participating by means of devout attention to the principal parts of Mass. The use of a small missal was encouraged to facilitate this form of participation (n. 29). A second stage of participation consisted of the faithful offering complementary prayers or songs in common. These could be in the vernacular, provided the proper texts of the Mass are not prayed in the vernacular (nn. 30, 14c). Finally, the "third and most perfect" manner in which the faithful can participate is by offering the proper responses in Latin, that is, a dialogue Mass (n. 31). The entire *Pater noster* could be recited in Latin by both the priest and people in common at all low Masses (n. 32). While vernacular religious hymns were encouraged to complement the various parts of the Mass (nn. 14b, 33), the use of the vernacular was strictly forbidden for the proper, ordinary, and canon of the Mass. It was permissible, however, for the gospel and epistle to be read by a lector in the vernacular for the convenience of the faithful (n. 14c).

De musica sacra also identifies two instances where priests can encourage greater participation and intelligibility among the faithful by performing their own liturgical function well. Where the rubrics indicate something to be said in "a clear voice" (*clara voce*), the celebrant "should read in a raised voice" in order to ensure that "the faithful can follow the sacred action appropriately and easily" (n. 34). Similarly, "the priest celebrant and the sacred ministers, besides accurately observing the rubrics, should endeavour to execute their sung parts as correctly, distinctly and artistically as they can" (n. 94). Richstatter correctly observes that *De musica sacra* marks "the beginnings of rubrics which demand more of the celebrant than mere mechanical obedience."³² This principal will find expression in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 21:

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

32. Richstatter, *Liturgical Law*, 47.

This instruction followed upon Pius XII's strongest endorsement of the liturgical movement, which occurred when he addressed the International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy, held in Assisi and Rome, 18-22 September 1956. In his allocution to the congress, Pius XII remarked:

If one compares the present state of the liturgical movement with what it was thirty years ago, it is obvious that undeniable progress has been made both in extent and in depth. The interest brought to the liturgy, the practical accomplishments and the active participation of the faithful have developed to an extent unthought of at the time [...] The liturgical movement is thus shown forth as a sign of the providential dispositions of God for the present time, of the movement of the Holy Ghost in the Church, to draw men more closely to the mysteries of the faith and the riches of grace which flow from the active participation of the faithful in the liturgical life.³³

Like *Mediator Dei*, the instruction *De musica sacra* seeks to identify effective ways of facilitating the active participation of the faithful, especially by the use of sacred music, in keeping with the nature of liturgical worship and the observance of liturgical law.

3. Pope John XXIII (1958-1963)

Although the project of preparing a codification of liturgical law began under Pius XII and the special commission he formed for the restoration of the liturgy, John XXIII deemed it advantageous to continue. In light of the upcoming ecumenical council, he decided "that the more important principles (*altiora principia*) governing a general liturgical reform should be laid before the members of the hierarchy at the forthcoming ecumenical council, but that the abovementioned improvement of the rubrics of the breviary and missal should no longer be put off."³⁴

The *Corpus rubricarum* was not a complete codification of liturgical law, nor did it aspire to serve as such. The new code of rubrics did not directly affect, for example, the prefacing liturgical laws of the *Missale Romanum*, such as the *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae* and the *De*

33. Pius XII, Allocution to the International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy, 22 September 1956, *AAS* 48 (1956) 711-725; English translation in *The Assisi Papers: Proceedings of the First International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy, Assisi-Rome, September 18-22, 1956* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1957) 223-236.

34. John XXIII, Apostolic letter *motu proprio* approving a new code of rubrics *Rubricarum instructum*, 25 July 1960, *AAS* 52 (1960) 593-595; English translation in Seasoltz, *The New Liturgy*, 305-307.

defectibus in Missae celebratione occurrentibus.³⁵ Nevertheless, the code of rubrics was a significant and welcomed contribution.

The code of rubrics was divided into three parts: general rubrics (nn. 1-137), the Roman Breviary (nn. 138-268), and the Roman Missal (nn. 269-530). Appended to the code of rubrics was a collection of *variationes*, that is, variations by which the then-current breviary and missal as well as the martyrology may be adapted without having to print new liturgical books.³⁶ This very accommodation reveals the provisional nature of this reform in light of further anticipated reform following the Second Vatican Council. The document deliberately avoided innovation to allow major changes to be debated and resolved by the upcoming ecumenical council.

Perhaps most remarkable is the emergence of a new type of "rubrical vocabulary" which would be later employed in conciliar and post-conciliar liturgical documents. For example, the rubrical code marks a shift from a strictly juridical style to a style in which explanations are provided for the rubrics themselves.³⁷ For instance:

270. The Mass with the Divine Office constitutes the highest expression of Christian worship. Hence the Mass of itself should agree with the Office of the day. [...]

142. By their very makeup the canonical Hours of the Divine Office are ordained to the sanctification of the various hours of the natural day. Hence it is best, both for the real sanctification of the day and for the spiritually fruitful recitation of the Hours themselves, that each canonical Hour be recited at the time which most nearly approaches its own true time.

As well, exhortative, rather than prescriptive language is employed in a number of articles.³⁸ Although "facultative" rubrics existed in pre-conciliar liturgical rites, these were quite rare.³⁹ Conciliar and post-

35. F. R. MCMANUS, *Handbook for the New Rubrics* (Baltimore, MD: Helicon Press, 1961) 5.

36. A summary of changes introduced by the new rubrics for the Divine Office and celebration of Mass can be found *ibid.*, 81-83, 101-105.

37. Richstatter provides the following examples: nn. 270, 142, 145, 147. He also identifies a provision for local adaptation. See Richstatter, *Liturgical Law*, 52-53.

38. Richstatter provides the following examples: n. 142: *praestat ut ...* (it is better that ...); n. 143: *sufficit ut ...* (it is sufficient to ...); n. 144: *... anticipare licet ...* (it may be anticipated); n. 145: *... quod convenienter servatur ...* (it is fitting to observe); n. 147: *... valde opportune ... ob iustum causam ... per rationabile tempus protractum ...* (... it is most fitting that ... for a just cause ... for a reasonable length of time ...). See Richstatter, *Liturgical Law*, 52.

39. Richstatter, *Liturgical Law*, xxviii. He also discusses a distinction between "prescriptive" rubrics, which bind under sin, and "directive" rubrics, which do not, "but ap-

conciliar documents will expand this practice, necessitating a careful analysis of the various literary forms employed.⁴⁰

Finally, in the new code of rubrics, we see provision for local adaptation by the conference of bishops.

117. [...] In mission countries, however, it may be that the significance of one or another liturgical color of the Roman Church does not agree with the significance attached to that color by an ancient established tradition of the native population. In such a case, the faculty is given to the episcopal conference of that region, or of a larger territory if that is expedient, to substitute another, more fitting, color for the unsuitable color. This is not to be done, however, without consulting the Sacred Congregation of Rites.

Although the matter is not especially important, the provision is significant for two reasons: Firstly, this provision predates the actual establishment of conferences of bishops – at least in universal law. *Sacrosanctum Concilium* will follow a similar pattern by assigning various competencies to “territorial bodies of bishops” – again, before such structures are even anticipated in the law itself. This would have to wait until *Christus Dominus*, 37-38, and Paul VI’s subsequent *motu proprio Ecclesiae Sanctae*.⁴¹ Secondly, it is an early example of a provision in *universal law*, not a concession by means of a singular administrative act, which anticipates modifications for the purposes of effective inculturation of the Gospel message. Of course, this matter will receive considerable attention in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (nn. 37-40) and other post-conciliar documents. The *editiones typicae* of the liturgical books, for instance, frequently include an entire chapter on adaptations that are within the competence of the diocesan bishop or conferences of bishops. We see the beginnings of this, in a very nascent form, in the 1960 code of rubrics.

The new code affirmed the importance of active participation, but directed the reader to the 1958 instruction *De musica sacra* which dealt with these matters at greater length:

peal to a filial spirit of obedience and a sense of good order” (*ibid.*, xxix). McManus, amongst others, finds difficulty with this distinction: “It must be insisted that it is almost impossible to find rubrics in the liturgical books which are merely directive, that is, which give a direction or command while leaving complete liberty of action” (F. R. McManus, *The Congregation of Rites*, Canon Law Studies, 352 [Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1954] 136).

40. For an example of this, see J. M. Huels, *Liturgy and Law: Liturgical Law in the System of Roman Catholic Canon Law* (Montréal: Wilson & Lafleur, 2006) 233-237.

41. Paul VI, Apostolic letter *motu proprio Ecclesiae sanctae*, 6 August 1966, I, 41, *AAS* 58 (1966) 757-787.

272. Of its nature the Mass demands that all those present take part in it, after the manner proper to them.

A choice must be made, however, among the various ways in which the faithful may take part actively in the most holy Sacrifice of the Mass, in such a way that any danger of abuse may be removed, and the special aim of the participation may be realized, namely a fuller measure of worship offered to God and of edification obtained for the faithful. [...]

Despite its provisional nature, it was deemed expedient to prepare a new *editio typica* of the *Breviarum Romanum* and *Missale Romanum* in 1961 and 1962 respectively.⁴² There were no substantial textual emendations to these books; they merely incorporated the revised rubrics.

Conclusion

The principle of promoting the active participation of the faithful, so central to the conciliar constitution on the liturgy, was already a well-enshrined objective prior to the Second Vatican Council. While the same term is used throughout the twentieth century, it was understood much differently by the ecclesiastical authorities. At the beginning of the twentieth century, *participatio actuosa* was largely regarded as a means of promoting liturgical piety, that is, participation of the faithful in a more passive mode, by listening attentively and following the ritual action to best of one’s ability. Increasingly, active vocal participation was not only tolerated, but actively encouraged by ecclesiastical authorities. We see this especially in provision for the dialogue Mass, which within a span of about twenty-five years went from being benignly tolerated to actively encouraged during the pontificate Pius XII.

Since the rubrics of the 1570 *Missale Romanum* made no provision for the external active participation of the faithful, and the dialogue Mass was, in effect, an abbreviated *Missae decantatae*, or sung Mass, the faithful could be encouraged, within the existing provisions of law, to take a more active part in the celebration of the liturgy. After all, if in a *Missae decantatae* the people sing the *Gloria*, *Credo*, *Sanctus*, *Benedictus*, and *Agnus Dei*, why should they not also do so in its abbreviated recited form, the *Missae recitatae*? Increasingly, especially during the pontificate

42. *Breviarium Romanum ex decreto SS. Concilii Tridentini restitutum, Summorum Pontificum cura recognitum, cum textu psalmodiarum e versione Pii Papae XII auctoritate edita. Editio typica* (Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1961); *Missale Romanum ex decreto SS. Concilii Tridentini restitutum, Summorum Pontificum cura recognitum. Editio typica* (Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1962).

of Pius XII, this practice was accepted by the ecclesiastical authority, necessitating both rubrical and structural changes to the liturgy itself.

The development of the dialogue Mass presents a discernible pattern for the reform of the liturgy. Many reforms which are now codified began as “adaptations” – contrary to, apart from, or in accordance with the existing provisions of law. In other words, many of the liturgical reforms that now find explicit legislative expression began as factual customs, introduced by the community, which found eventual approval by the competent legislator.⁴³ Such practices have, in fact, become true ecclesiastical laws that have been duly promulgated, often in the form of an apostolic constitution, apostolic letter *motu proprio* or by means of a similar legislative act.⁴⁴ Three preconditions for the development of ecclesiastical law from existing factual customs can be discerned:

1. A creative use of variations within the existing *ius vigen*s or the development of factual customs *praeter ius* or even *contra ius* is generally discernible before formalized, structural changes are proposed to the liturgical rites. One can only discern the limitations of the law or rubrical directives when juxtaposed to the challenges of new pastoral initiatives. Laws change in light of new challenges or problems; they do not go in search of them.

2. A sufficient opportunity to appropriate the proposed change is necessary, for the faithful, those engaged in direct pastoral care, and by the competent ecclesiastical authority. When examining the promotion of the active participation of the faithful in the liturgy, it took nearly a half a century to move from where active participation was merely tolerated to where it is actively promoted and encouraged. Rarely does the ecclesiastical authority serve as the principal catalyst for liturgical reform. It responds either to grant its approval or reprobate perceived abuses.

3. A change of law or structural reform of the liturgical rite may only occur years after the practice was endorsed or introduced. Although minor changes were introduced into the liturgical books by Pius X and Benedict XV and Pius XI throughout the twentieth century, we only begin to see *significant* structural reforms to the liturgy, in response to the

43. Huels defines a “factual custom” as follows: “A *factual custom*, or custom of fact, is one that the majority of the community considers normative and binding on itself. Such customs may be difficult to remove because the community has a deep ownership of them; but nothing in the law would prevent their removal or alteration. Lacking the force of law, they can be changed or abolished by the bishop, the pastor, or other leader of the community who has the power to do so” (Huels, *Liturgy and Law*, 131). *Factual* customs are juxtaposed to *legal* customs which do enjoy legal security in canon law and possess the force of law.

44. This differs, incidentally, from the establishment of a *legal* custom, which is recognized in canon law as having the force of law (see cc. 23-28). For a helpful overview of liturgical adaptation and custom, see Huels, *Liturgy and Law*, 130-143.

efforts of the liturgical movement, in the mid-1950s. This principle continues to find expression, incidentally, in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* itself, which instructs that “there must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly requires them; and care must be taken that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing” (SC, 23). Custom, after all, is the best interpreter of law (c. 27).

This brief synopsis of pre-conciliar changes to the liturgy identifies a pattern that has consistently served in the formulation and reformulation of ecclesiastical law and custom. In the case at hand, a lack of legislative provisions regulating the active participation of the laity in the liturgical rites resulted in the introduction of certain practices by the community to facilitate such participation before the direct intervention of the ecclesiastical authority. This pattern will emerge yet again following the Second Vatican Council, even when the Holy See took a more active legislative role in reforming the liturgical rites. The reform was proposed in incremental stages, often after a period of experimentation and evaluation. Consequently, and despite some strongly-held preconceptions, the role of the competent ecclesiastical authority is not to obstruct genuine ecclesiastical reform, pertaining to the liturgy or otherwise, but to ensure that such adaptations are tested, developed, and carefully evaluated before they are given concrete juridical expression or, as the case may be, express reprobation. This is a necessary dynamic that respects the co-responsibility of the faithful and the competent ecclesiastical authority in the exercise of Christ’s priestly, prophetic, and royal function, in accord with the condition proper to each (cf. c. 204, §1).⁴⁵

Saint Paul University
223 Main Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1S 1C4 Canada
cglendinning@ustpaul.ca

Chad J. GLENDINNING

45. See Huels, *Liturgy and Law*, 131.

THE DAILY EUCHARIST AT THE COUNCIL AS STIMULUS AND TEST CASE FOR LITURGICAL REFORM

In order to study the contribution of Vatican II to liturgical reform, most scholars spontaneously will turn to the redaction history of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. In this paper I am more interested in the question of how the daily Eucharist celebrated at the beginning of each of the General Congregations was experienced by those present. Were these celebrations experienced as an illustration of the reforms proposed in the Constitution on the Liturgy, or rather as a counter-witness to the sorely needed liturgical reform? My major sources are council diaries, at least those that are attentive to this aspect of the Council's life. I especially rely on accounts of their liturgical experiences offered by two Latin rite Catholic "observers" of the Council liturgies, the French Dominican, Yves Congar and the Irish journalist and Redemptorist, Xavier Rynne; one Oriental rite Catholic Council father, the Melkite archbishop, Neophytos Edelby; and two "real" observers: the United Church of Christ representative, Douglas Horton and the Presbyterian minister, Robert McAfee Brown.

It will soon become clear that two types of Eucharistic celebrations received most attention in their diaries and chronicles: the divine liturgies celebrated in rites other than the Latin one and the opening and concluding ceremonies of each session. Especially in the first session the exposure of the mostly Latin-rite Council Fathers to liturgies celebrated by Byzantine and Oriental Catholic Council Fathers may have cured them of some of their prejudices concerning important issues of liturgical debate such as concelebration, the vernacular and communion under both species. The opening and concluding liturgies of the Council also received many comments, since as of the second session these liturgies apparently functioned as an occasion to put certain aspects of the liturgical reform of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* into practice and to draw lessons from this. In relation to the debate on the liturgy during the first session I also reread the oral and written interventions by Council Fathers in the *Acta Synodalia* and was able to retrieve a few small comments reflecting their liturgical experiences during the Council.

Two more facts need to be mentioned before I start my overview of the four sessions. In *The History of Vatican II* Hilari Riguer describes a tension between the 'Technical-Organizational Commission' and the 'Office of Sacred Ceremonies'. In the case of the former, Cardinal Testa was in favor of starting each Congregation with the singing of the *Veni Creator* followed by a moment of prayer but not with a mass. The latter was in favor of having a mass each day. Even if in the months before the start of the Council a consensus was growing not to have a daily mass, Pope John decided to remain with the latter option.¹

Also for the Protestant observer Douglas Horton the daily Eucharist as such was not a surprise:

This was just such a combination of worship and business as we should like to see in local churches everywhere. It began with a celebration of the mass. A Congregationalist might have wished that the form of this service had not been so hard and fast as to prevent it from being specifically oriented to the business in hand; but that the business in hand was laid before Christ in the often repeated and familiar words of the regular mass may be taken for granted.²

A second preliminary remark pertains to the fact that we should not forget that the Eucharist preceding each Congregation was not the only one which the Council Fathers attended. The problem is formulated sharply by Alberto Melloni: "The experience of celebrating privately in the morning, then assisting at the mass of another, and finally attending mass in St. Peter's confirmed the need to do something about a practice whose limitations all could see."³ The observers for their part gathered twice a week, early in the morning on Monday and Friday, for a prayer meeting which each time was entrusted to a different observer.⁴ Robert McAfee Brown explains the motivation for these extra prayer meetings: "This gives us a chance to express the unity we have despite our denominational differences, and it also gives us an opportunity to pray together for the work of the Council."⁵ A critical note on these services is

1. Hilari Riguer, "An Initial Profile of the Assembly," *History of Vatican II*. Vol. II: *The Formation of the Council's Identity: First Period and Intersession October 1962 – September 1963*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo & Joseph A. Komonchak (Leuven: Peeters, 1997) 169-232, at 183-184.

2. Douglas Horton, *Vatican Diary 1962: A Protestant Observes the First Session of Vatican Council II* (Cleveland, OH: United Church Press, 1964) 22.

3. Alberto Melloni, "The Beginning of the Second Period: The Great Debate on the Church," *History of Vatican II*. Vol. III: *The Mature Council: Second Period and Intersession, September 1963 – September 1964* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000) 1-115, at 56.

4. Horton, *Vatican Diary 1962*, 74.

5. Robert McAfee Brown, *Observer in Rome: A Protestant Report on the Vatican Council* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964) 27.

found in the diary of the Canadian Anglican observer, Eugene Fairweather: "In general, the Orthodox and Anglican observers are unenthusiastic about these gatherings, but one can hardly detach oneself completely from an enterprise of this character approved by the observers' meeting."⁶

First Session

Among the positive experiences written down in Council diaries on the occasion of the opening liturgy on October 11, 1962, many observers are attentive to the fact that not only Latin was being used. Xavier Rynne mentions that "the Epistle and the Gospel were chanted in both Greek and Latin, to signify the unity of both parts of the Church, East and West."⁷ On the basis of a comparison between the detailed information about the upcoming service in *La Croix* and the actual liturgy, Sébastien Antoni knew that the Roman Curia had originally selected Mt 16,13-19 as the Gospel reading to be read during the opening ceremony of the Council, a passage which tells of the promises made to Peter and his successors. Apparently Pope John himself decided that the final verses of the Gospel of Matthew, containing Jesus' promise of assistance to the entire Church, had to be read.⁸

Bishop Edelby describes in his diary how the mass is followed first by "a short office in Latin for the inauguration of the Council" and then by an abbreviated form of the *ecten*, a Byzantine supplication rite, at which the Pope and three Byzantine bishops presided. The different parts were sung and read in Arabic, Church Slavonic and Greek. Edelby adds that "the Greek ceremony pleased everyone." In his opinion this "happy innovation was the fruit of the profound love of the Pope for the East."⁹

It is remarkable, however, that the opening service also provoked many negative reactions. The following description by Rynne is a good summary:

6. Eugene R. Fairweather, *Vatican II Diary*, ed. Michael Attridge & Gilles Routhier (Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming), entry of September 21, 1964.

7. Xavier Rynne, *Vatican Council II* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1999) 46.

8. Sébastien Antoni, "La liturgie dans la vie d'un concile: un regard sur Vatican II à partir de *La Croix*," *La Maison-Dieu* 272/4 (2012) 13-42, at 20-21. Cf. Deuxième Concile Œcuménique du Vatican, *Cérémonie solennelle d'ouverture en la Basilique Saint-Pierre le 11 octobre 1962*, p. 67 (D. 'Le chant solennel de l'Évangile, en Latin et en Grec').

9. Neophytos Edelby, *Il Vaticano II nel diario di un vescovo arabo*, ed. Riccardo Cannelli (Milano: Edizioni San Paolo, 1996) 46. Cf. *Cérémonie solennelle d'ouverture*, 67-80 (E. 'La supplication en rit Oriental [Grec]').

Despite the brilliance of the opening ceremonial, it was felt that there was an incongruity between the outward show, largely reflecting the court etiquette of a by-gone age, and the pastoral purpose of the Council. Some Fathers regretted, in particular, that they were mere passive auditors of a polyphonic symphony, magnificently chanted as this was, instead of being allowed to join the celebrant in a mass that would have given better expression to the corporate feeling of the assembly.¹⁰

A well-known critic of the opening session, which he even left before the opening discourse by Pope John, was the French Dominican, Yves Congar. He immediately notices that the chants are being sung exclusively by the *Capella Sistina* from which he concludes that: "The liturgical movement has not yet reached the Roman Curia. This immense assembly says nothing, sings nothing."¹¹ He recalls Oscar Cullmann making a similar comment: "Is that what your liturgical movement is?"¹² Congar knows pretty well what could have been the alternative:

What would it have been if those 2,500 voices had together sung at least the Credo, if not all the chants of the Mass, instead of that elegant crooning by paid professionals?¹³

Congar is also dissatisfied about the lack of attention for the Word of God in Roman Catholic liturgy:

It is said that the Jews are the people of hearing, the Greeks of sight. There is nothing here except for the eye and the musical ear: no liturgy of the Word. No spiritual word. I know that in a few minutes a Bible will be placed on a throne in order to preside over the Council. BUT WILL IT SPEAK? Will it be listened to? Will there be a moment for the Word of God?¹⁴

10. Rynne, *Vatican Council II*, 48. Cf. also H. De Lubac, *Carnets du Concile*. Vol. I, ed. Loïc Figoureux (Paris: Cerf, 2007) 106: "À l'arrière, la Sedia, avec toute la valetaille en rouge, trop impérial, presque choquant."

11. Yves Congar, *My Journal of the Council* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012) 87.

12. *Ibid.*, 90.

13. *Ibid.*, 87.

14. *Ibid.* Cf. also "Journal conciliaire de Monseigneur Émile Blanchet, Première session," *Transversalités* 121 (janvier-mars 2012) 13-102, at 22-23: "La messe commence: ici des regrets, – que partagent, ils me l'ont dit, mes collègues français: d'abord, la disposition matérielle donne une impression pénible. (...) Le pape est assis le dos à l'autel du Bernin et il semble que ce soit vers lui que soient ordonnés les rites et l'honneur: et cela lui ressemble si peu! Tandis que l'autel de la messe situé entre les travées, au haut de la nef, est petit et mesquin. Il y a là un renversement de l'ordre des importances qui est choquant et qui ne peut en effet que blesser les 'observateurs' des autres confessions religieuses. Puis, trop de place donnée aux chants de la Sixtine. (...) Mais quel dommage qu'on ait substitué cette polyphonie – qu'il n'y avait qu'à écouter – à

In the comparison of diary entries reporting on the opening of the Council preceding his edition of Chenu's *Notes quotidiennes au Concile*, Alberto Melloni also incorporated the sharp criticisms by Joseph Jungmann, peritus par excellence in the field of liturgy. He believed that he participated in a liturgy from the time of Leo XIII and especially deplored that it was a Eucharist without distribution of Holy Communion. "Perhaps thus the *terminus a quo* of liturgical things had to be made visible."¹⁵ The strongest words – the only ones in his short diary commenting on the liturgy during the Council – are from the Flemish theologian Edward Schillebeeckx.

H. Mass: a liturgical blunder! No communion, no concelebration. No communal singing, just the Capella Sistina! No "Pax"!! Just a bow from the Pope! No celebration, just byzantinism! Need for liturgical renewal demonstrated by such an Opening! Several bishops: "It was a magnificent ceremony, but I couldn't identify!"¹⁶

On the day on which the debate on the liturgy starts, October 22, the attentive bishop of Aleppo noted an "innovation" in the rite of enthroning the Gospel intronization. The Gospel book was presented to the assembly and no longer *ad Orientem*.¹⁷ The next day Edelby is impressed by "the even greater solemnity" of this rite. The Gospel book is being carried in procession from the back of the Church, accompanied by two Latin hymns, *Laudate Dominum omnes gentes* and *Christus vincit*.¹⁸

Douglas Horton was impressed by the beautiful choir music:

One of the members of the choir was a boy soprano whose voice, rising out of the ensemble, carried through all the vastness of the basilica with a sweetness that was altogether enchanting. The music here would make almost anyone want to turn Roman Catholic [I would rather say 'Anglican']: it is only the little matter of theology and government that stands in the way of conversion by canticle.¹⁹

l'unisson des voix de ces deux milliers d'évêques; nous n'avons pas chanté ensemble le Credo – et ce fut une tristesse d'être privé de cette joie forte."

15. Marie-Dominique Chenu, *Notes quotidiennes au Concile: Journal de Vatican II, 1962-1963*, ed. Alberto Melloni (Paris: Cerf, 1995) 25.

16. *The Council Notes of Edward Schillebeeckx 1962-1963*, ed. Karim Schelkens (Leuven: Peeters, 2011) 3.

17. Edelby, *Il Vaticano II*, 73.

18. *Ibid.*, 75. On October 30, the Protestant observer, Douglas Horton, is quite lyrical about this hymn: "Again I was impressed by the magnificent symbol of unity in the common chanting of the hymn 'Christ is conquering' in which the two thousand and a half voices joined. The hymn has a simple melody, as sung here in St. Peter's, and the words are simple too, easily learned: "Christ is conquering, Christ rules, Christ is the Lord of all" – in Latin, of course" (Horton, *Vatican Diary 1962*, 64).

19. *Ibid.*, 43.

On October 24 the Eucharist was celebrated by the Melkites according to the Byzantine rite. Bishop Edelby, who explained the most important moments of the celebration to the audience, writes in his diary that this celebration "made a great impression, especially because the Council at this very day was discussing issues related to the celebration, the communion under both species and the vernacular."²⁰ Probably he was also reminded of the years of struggle with the Holy Office over the use of the vernacular in the liturgies in which he and his Church got involved at the end of the 1950s.²¹

Douglas Horton definitely for his part was critical about the lack of active participation in this kind of liturgy:

On the whole I thought that the Roman rite had little to learn from the Eastern at the point of congregational participation for there were no words spoken, to be caught by the ordinary man as in ordinary conversation, and there were no spoken responses for the people – a feature of the Roman rite which is of course performed with power in this great assembly of bishops. (...) The remoteness of it all from the common ways of people spoke of an esoteric clericalism. I thought that perhaps I understood the necessity for the Reformation for the first time.²²

Even in the debate *in aula* some of the Council Fathers adapted their text to insert a short reference to the liturgy celebrated by the Churches of the East in order to strengthen their pleas to give more room to the vernacular in the liturgy. My first example is a short extract from the intervention made by the archbishop of Izmir, Turkey, Joseph Emmanuel Descuffi on October 24:

Memorandum est in Liturgiis orientalibus, verba consecrationis ipsa, *ut hodie cum laetitia audivimus*, in lingua vernacula, alta voce et cum cantu recitari. Quare in Liturgia occidentali hoc nefas esse videretur? Nonne cum hoc solemniter ritu orientali aliqua similitudo optanda est?²³

A few days later bishop Ildefonso Maria Sansierra Robla from San Juan de Cuyo, Argentina, pointed to the celebrations in Oriental Catholic rites in which one can observe different ways of taking communion under both species:

20. Edelby, *Il Vaticano II*, 77.

21. Cf. Joseph A. Komonchak, "The Struggle for the Council during the Preparation of Vatican II," *History of Vatican II*. Vol. I: *Announcing and Preparing Vatican Council II*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo (Leuven: Peeters, 1995) 167-356, at 216.

22. Horton, *Vatican Diary 1962*, 49.

23. *Acta Synodalia I/1*, 416.

Communio sub utraque specie, sublato semper fidei periculo, et in bene determinatis casibus, admitta videretur ad fervorem populi excitandum, saltem feria quinta in Cena Domni. Ita tamen ut communio Sanctissima Sanguinis Domini Nostri Iesu Christi fiat non calice ad os ferendo sed alio convenienti modo a peritis in hac re determinando, *sicut vidimus fieri in quibusdam ritibus orientalibus catholicorum.*²⁴

In the same debate on the liturgy, however, bishop Calewaert of Ghent made an intervention on October 26 in favour of maintaining the Latin as liturgical language. He was impressed by the powerful Gregorian plainchant during some of the liturgies at the Council:

Tandem hisce diebus, in sessionibus generalibus Concilii Oecumenici, quam praeclare symbolum unitatis praebet Missa dialogata in qua omnes Patres ex dissitis orbis regionibus congregati eadem lingua latina recitant ordinarium Missae!²⁵

When referring to the Latin rite masses Rynne for his part notices that they are a learning process in view of implementing liturgical renewal:

When the mass, which was said each day in a different rite by different Fathers in turn, was celebrated in Latin, the whole congregation of prelates and bishops answered the prayers in dialogue form.²⁶

On November 4 the Council was convened in St. Peter's to commemorate the fourth anniversary of Pope John's coronation. Cardinal Montini, the archbishop of Milan, celebrated the mass according to the Ambrosian rite. Even if he deliberately did not want to change the liturgical norms by a papal decision and therefore continued to praise the important role of the Latin language in the Church the Pope decided to continue his homily in Italian, since this language was more easily understandable not only to the laity but even to the Council Fathers.²⁷

24. *Acta Synodalia* V/2, 52.

25. *Acta Synodalia* V/1, 474.

26. Rynne, *Vatican Council II*, 52. Rynne clearly sees the difference compared to liturgical experiences in Rome prior to the Council: "The papal master of ceremonies, Monsignor Enrico Dante, for example, had been saying mass regularly for a convent of nuns for the past thirty years. As Secretary of the Congregation of Rites, having full power in these matters, he never once allowed them to have a dialogue mass" (*ibid.*, 16). The German liturgist Balthasar Fischer mentions in his diary that the conservative Irish bishops, when arriving in Rome for the first session of the Council, no longer allowed the practice of having a *missa dialogata* in the Irish College. Cf. Andreas Heinz, "Das 'Konzilstagebuch' des Liturgiewissenschaftlers Balthasar Fischer," *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 62 (2012) 229-259, at 254.

27. "Pro certo habemus Nostram agendi rationem a vobis recte intellegi, si, cum celebretur liturgica synaxis extra Concilii ordinem normasque habenda, cui quidem, una cum clero, etiam christianus populus interest, satis esse putamus, Latino sermone

The Pope also did not neglect to express his satisfaction for the variety of rites in which the daily Eucharist was being celebrated during the Council.²⁸ Congar had heard that some people understood this to be Pope John's "discrete hints to the Council" and deems this pretty well possible.²⁹

Chenu describes in his diary how Bishop Claude Rolland from Madagascar, for whom he worked as a peritus, was shocked when returning from this celebration. In his opinion it was full of formalisms and archaic rites and any form of "communitarian act was missing. At the moment where we reclaim the active and intelligent participation in the liturgy, we 'assisted' at mass, in the most passive sense of the word. The Christian people was strictly reduced to the role of 'spectator'."³⁰

The next day Edelby is very critical about a non-Latin rite mass. He not only deplors the absence of more traditional Maronite chants, but especially the fact that the concelebrants did not receive communion under both species.³¹ The comment found in Horton's diary presuming a congruence between attention to music and lack of attention to theology would certainly have disturbed proponents of a liturgical theology such as Alexander Schmemmann, one of the Orthodox observers:

The music is so alluring that it has a certain demonic effect upon the worshiper, who becomes so caught up in it that he no longer looks for meaning in the service. This may account for the fact that in the East where music in all its loveliness has come more and more to dominate the service, there has been less and less thinking about it, less and less good theology.³²

In his entry of November 12 Bishop Edelby dedicates several lines to the biggest liturgical surprise of the day, the fact that a Latin rite mass was celebrated in the local "paleoslavonic" language used in seven Croatian dioceses. According to Edelby "this made an enormous impression on the Council Fathers." Contrary to the fears which had been expressed *in aula*

tantummodo exordium facere. Latine igitur Antistites cuncti catholici orbis salutamus, ac deinde Italico sermone fusius utemur, propterea quod a plerisque hic adstantibus intellectu est facilius, a populo scilicet, qui, magna frequentia huc una confluit ad honorandum Pontificatus diem natalem sui Pastoris atque Parentis." (http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_xxiii/homilies/1962/documents/hf_j-xxiii_hom_19621104_anniversario-incoronazione_it.html).

28. *Ibid.*: "A significazione più eloquente di unità e di cattolicità si è convenuto, ben a proposito, che il Divin Sacrificio di introduzione al lavoro quotidiano Conciliare venga celebrato da Prelati di varia nazionalità, e in successione dei vari riti: Latini e Orientali."

29. Congar, *My Journal of the Council*, 145.

30. Chenu, *Notes quotidiennes au Concile*, 89.

31. Edelby, *Il Vaticano II*, 91.

32. Horton, *Vatican Diary 1962*, 75.

by “the fanatics of the liturgy in Latin,” “the unity of the Church was not endangered by this celebration, the dogmas did not run any danger, the host was still consecrated and the chants were very beautiful.”³³ The same would be true, according to this observer, if the Latin rite mass was celebrated in other languages.

The celebration of the Eucharist in the Armenian rite on November 16 makes the Protestant observer Douglas Horton long for the simplicity of the liturgy in his own Church, which in his opinion would deserve to be generalized:

It has just come over me that the most striking and memorable rite of all to be seen here in St. Peter’s would be the celebration of the Lord’s Supper as we know it in our local village church in New Hampshire, and as it is known in hundreds of thousands of Protestant communities where Puritan simplicity is the norm. Imagine, at the head of the nave in the mighty cathedral, a table such as might be found in any home in the neighbourhood, a minister inviting to it in the entire Christian company gathered in the church, the same bread and cup being used (whether wine or grape juice) as are used in everyday life, the words of the service being in the mother tongue of the worshipers, the living Christ present, his Spirit pervading all – this, in my mind, would be an exciting event for the old basilica. (But I should add that I expect to wait a few generations before the sons of Rome agree with me).³⁴

Sebastian Tromp, who normally does not pay attention to the liturgies in his *Konzilstagebuch*, exceptionally comments on this in his diary entry on November 21: “In Vaticano Missa in ritu Ucraino cum cantu magnifico”³⁵ and he was seconded in this by bishop Edelby.³⁶

Douglas Horton praises the ideal of liturgical variation at this point:

Such variations as these, obviously fascinating to those chiefly familiar with the Latin rite, must cause some of them to wonder if the repletion of the Latin rite, day after day, week after week, might not be brightened with modification now and then.³⁷

33. Edelby, *Il Vaticano II*, 100.

34. Horton, *Vatican Diary 1962*, 118.

35. Sebastian Tromp, *Konzilstagebuch mit Erläuterungen und Akten aus der Arbeit der Theologischen Kommission für Glauben und Sitten. II. Vatikanisches Konzil*. Band II/1, ed. Alexandra von Teuffenbach (Nordhausen: Traugott, 2011) 85.

36. Edelby, *Il Vaticano II*, 115.

37. Horton, *Vatican Diary 1962*, 134. He will repeat this conviction in his *Vatican Diary 1963*, 94: “The choir sang as usual at mass this morning, and just as beautifully as ever. I have now become familiar with many of the anthems that they use and find myself enjoying them all the more. The repetition of the same words in the mass every morning, however, is a different story. I find that where ideas are concerned I can do with a change of form now and then.”

Another liturgy which made a profound impression on those present was celebrated on November 28 in the Ethiopian rite. As Rynne writes:

The rite itself was extremely ancient, going back in outline at least to the fourth century, but with many later additions and ceremonies of a distinctly African flavor. It was characterized by a constant dialogue between the celebrant and the faithful, and by moving simplicity and solemnity. (...) As the book of Gospels was enthroned, the spirited chanting of the seminarians and priests belonging to the Ethiopian College on Vatican Hill behind St. Peter’s was accompanied by the deep rhythms of African drums, the ringing of bells, and the shaking of tambourines, causing the *New York Journal American* to headline its story: ‘African drums boom in Vatican rite’.³⁸

Congar for his part has mixed feelings:

Ethiopian Mass, lasting a full hour. Strange bawling. It gave me an uneasy feeling. But I liked the enthroning of the Gospel with drumbeat and applause. Evidently, black people must be perfectly at ease with it all.³⁹

What Douglas Horton entrusted to his diary is also worth reporting. A most serious remark, referring to the anthropological context of the Ethiopian liturgy,⁴⁰ is followed by the report of a joke:

This is a very ancient rite, dating back to the beginning of the fourth century, and it is as African as an aardvark. When the celebrant and his six deacons emerged from the side room to begin the ceremony, one of the latter carried on his head a bell-shaped basket, about twice the size of his head, which contained the bread of the communion – for how else should anything be carried in Africa? (...) The music for the most part was indescribable – a kind of joyous wailing. And when, after the rite was over but the choir remained to provide music for the enthroning of the gospel, I heard the measured throb of an African drum in the midst of the

38. Rynne, *Vatican Council II*, 104.

39. Congar, *My Journal of the Council*, 213.

40. The liturgical form which the Council Fathers received on one hand made explicit mention of the “full participation of the believers” in this rite but also emphasized that the liturgy was very much “adapted” to the East African context. Cf. *Liturgia Aethiopica in Sancti Petri basilica patribus Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II praesentibus die 28 Novembris anni 1962 celebrata*, “Notae circa liturgiam Aethiopicam”: “II. *Liturgiae Aethiopicae proprietates*: a) *Primaria nota huius Liturgiae est plena participatio fidelium, quod patet ex continuo dialogo orationum inter Sacerdotem, Diaconum et Fideles.*”; “V. *Adaptatio*: Liturgia quae hodie communiter aethiopica vocatur, in suis orationibus, cantis et caerimoniis, apprime spiritui et indoli gentium illius partis Africae miro modo adaptatur. Haec enim liturgia, aethiopici populi cristianam fidem, inter diuturnas multasque difficultates et bella contra infideles per plurima saecula fovere et alere potuit et adhuc fovet atque alet.”

choir, and the rhythmic clapping of hands, I did not know whether I was on the banks of the Congo or at a camp meeting in Alabama. The measured drum-beat in the midst of the huddled African singers conjured up a different image in others. One bishop from Brazil leaned over to his neighbour (and the neighbour told me later) and whispered, "They're cooking a cardinal!"⁴¹

On the occasion of a celebration of a mass in the Malabar rite on December 3 Bishop Edelby appreciates that the presiders had made great efforts to "avoid any Latinisms" but in his opinion the mass "lacked solemnity."⁴²

The positive remark about massive plain chant by the entire assembly by Douglas Horton on December 6 perhaps reflects one of the most important learning experiences at the end of the first session:

This morning the choir usually present was not there. Its place was taken by students of the Pontifical Athenaeum of St. Anselm in Rome, who led the Council Fathers in singing the responses to familiar Gregorian chants. Though this may not have been as beautiful from the point of view of a musical critic, it was strong and more convincing, with almost three thousand worshipers participating.⁴³

The liturgical experience during the closing session of the Council on December 8 is well captured in the following reflection by Prosper Poswick, ambassador of the kingdom of Belgium to the Holy See:

La clôture de cette première session, en la fête de l'Immaculée Conception, 8 décembre 1962, n'avait rien d'une cérémonie grandiose (premier fruit peut-être d'un retour, tant désiré par les Pères, à l'authenticité et à la simplicité): pas de simples spectateurs, mais des fidèles participant activement au Sacrifice; pas de concerts d'église, mais le grégorien chanté par la communauté; pas un Credo musical mais un Credo «Acte de foi». Bref, c'était vraiment le Sacrifice de la Messe dans toute sa pureté.⁴⁴

41. Horton, *Vatican Diary 1962*, 156. Bishop Blanchet expresses his surprise as well: "Ce matin, messe éthiopienne; la plus loin de nos habitudes latines que nous ayons eue jusqu'ici. Étrangeté – pour nous – de ces tours faits, avant la messe, autour de l'autel, en agitant une sonnette: je pense à un rite magique pour chasser les mauvais esprits. (...)" ("Journal conciliaire de Monseigneur Émile Blanchet," 92).

42. Edelby, *Il Vaticano II*, 133. Cf. *ibid.*, 182.

43. Horton, *Vatican Diary 1962*, 187.

44. Prosper Poswick, *Un Journal du Concile: Vatican II vu par un diplomate belge. Notes personnelles de l'ambassadeur de Belgique près le Saint-Siège (1957-1968) et rapports au Ministère des Affaires étrangères* (Paris: François-Xavier de Guibert, 2005) 207. The ambassador also looks back to the long discussions on the liturgy: "Ce qu'il y a d'étonnant, c'est qu'une grande partie des Pères – qui jusqu'à présent ne considéraient la liturgie que comme une matière secondaire traitant uniquement des rubriques – est passée, après deux mois de contacts, par une évolution qui a demandé en elle-même une période

Second Session

When describing the opening ceremony on September 29, 1963, Rynne immediately observes the difference with the opening ceremony of the Council, one year before:

The Council's opening ceremony was impressive, if less formal than the rites at the First Session. Instead of marching in procession through St. Peter's Square, the bishops strolled casually, with mitres in hand, to their seats in the nave of the basilica. Though Pope Paul, preceded by the Swiss Guard and the College of Cardinals, was borne on the *sedia gestatoria* from the bronze doors of the papal palace to St. Peter's, he dismounted inside the basilica. In place of the papal triple tiara, he wore a mitre like the other bishops, and instead of giving the bishops the customary papal blessing, he contented himself with greeting his colleagues in the episcopate with waves of the hand as he walked down the central aisle to the Confession of St. Peter, where his throne was placed.⁴⁵

Congar is very much moved by the fact that the verses of the *Veni Creator* were sung alternately by the pope and the choir of bishops:

Paul VI intoned the *Veni Creator*. The Church found its voice once more, a voice of great waters, to implore. When the Pope then alternated the verses with the choir of bishops, it was Peter who was praying with the Twelve. It was no longer the sixteenth century temporal prince.⁴⁶

He also appreciates that the bishops were allowed to sing at least the *Gloria*, the *Credo* and the *Sanctus*, but for him listening to the *Capella Sistina* for the other parts of the ordinary was a nightmare:

In this way, in the singing as throughout the ceremony, there was an alternation between the truth of the *Ecclesia* and the ways of the *Renaissance*.⁴⁷

Poswick studies the attitude of the observers:

beaucoup plus longue" (*ibid.*, 209) As Congar mentions in his diary, when it was announced the day before that the Eucharist on the final day of the first session would be sung in Gregorian, the speaker received a round of applause (Congar, *My Journal of the Council*, 245). Riguer mentions in *History of Vatican II* that the Spanish peritus and Benedictine monk from Montserrat, Adalbert Franquesa, had made this request to the Pope in a letter (Riguer, "An Initial Profile of the Assembly," 185).

45. Rynne, *Vatican Council II*, 154.

46. Congar, *My Journal of the Council*, 318.

47. *Ibid.*

Au cours de la messe solennelle, l'attitude de ces observateurs était intéressante à observer. Ils montraient manifestement qu'ils n'étaient pas uniquement des spectateurs mais qu'ils prenaient part à la cérémonie. Plusieurs d'entre eux s'associaient aux parties chantées de la messe, notamment chez les anglicans. Ce qui m'a le plus frappé, c'était de voir l'archimandrite Vitali Borovoy, qui se trouvait précisément en dessous de moi, chantant en latin, avec la plus profonde conviction, tout le credo de l'Église romaine. Ceci confirmait ses confidences de l'an dernier, quand il déclara au cours d'un déjeuner que l'Église russe était prête à souscrire à toutes les vérités proposées par l'Église romaine.⁴⁸

One of the observers, Robert McAfee Brown, newly arrived at the Council, would have appreciated a greater amount of active participation after the debate on the liturgy during the first session:

I had not realized the relatively small degree of participation by the people in such an act of worship, and can already see why the liturgical reforms discussed at the last session, giving more part to the laity, are so important.⁴⁹

On the occasion of a mass celebrated by the new archbishop of Milan, Giovanni Colombi, in the Ambrosian rite, on September 30, Edelby observes that "all Council Fathers participated attentively. Almost nowhere I saw people praying their breviaries."⁵⁰

Attending a mass celebrated according to the Syro-Antiochene rite on October 8 gives the Protestant observer McAfee Brown for the first time the occasion to be surprised by the diversity of rites within the Catholic Church: "Nothing could do more to explode the myth that Rome is everywhere one and the same than such services."⁵¹ He also mentions a novelty within St. Peter's Basilica: "The bread and wine were brought in by laymen who also received communion – the first time this session anyone but the celebrant has received." When on October 11 mass is celebrated by a Latin American archbishop for his part bishop Edelby

48. Poswick, *Un Journal du Concile*, 310.

49. McAfee Brown, *Observer in Rome*, 20.

50. Edelby, *Il Vaticano II*, 153. Rynne already made a similar remark in the first year: "During mass very few breviaries were in evidence, for the Fathers felt that active participation in the official prayer of the Church was an essential part of their conciliar activity." Cf. Rynne, *Vatican Council II*, 52.

51. McAfee Brown, *Observer in Rome*, 56. Cf. also the following comment by Alberto Melloni on the occasion of the liturgies of the second session: "The succession of liturgies in the various rites was for many bishops a seminar on variety that proved very helpful in getting them away from the inherited idea of 'the unity of the Roman Rite'." Cf. Melloni, "The Beginning of the Second Period," 56.

records that "four lay auditors had been invited to communicate in this mass."⁵²

On October 14, the Protestant observer Douglas Horton is attentive to an important change in the way the Council Fathers were seated in the basilica:

When we reached our places in St. Peter's this morning we found that the patriarchs, that is, the heads of the uniate churches of the eastern Mediterranean, had been given seats on a dais just to our left, opposite the cardinals – all six of them. So the drum-fire of suggestion that they be removed from the place (and by implication the status) of mere bishops was finally responded to.⁵³

Edelby mentions four innovations in the mass celebrated by the Pope on October 28 "at the small altar in the centre, amidst the Council Fathers" in commemoration of his predecessor. "1) The pope entered the basilica while walking and not being carried on the *sedes gestatoria*, as was also the case during the opening of the second session of the Council; 2) the eulogy of the deceased pope took place in the presence of his successor (...); 3) the Pope did not speak (...) but Cardinal Suenens; 4) the eulogy was pronounced in French and not in either Latin or Italian."⁵⁴ Xavier Rynne makes mention of the fact that even a Pope can make a mistake while celebrating the liturgy:

As the pope said the introductory prayers before mass, he lost his place and looked embarrassed, and this very human occurrence won him the sympathy of the audience.⁵⁵

Douglas Horton reports the joke of one of the Council Fathers: "There went the doctrine of papal infallibility."⁵⁶

After attending a mass celebrated by Ukrainian-Catholic Council Fathers on October 29 Douglas Horton became deeply aware of the fact that non-theological factors such as the extremely divergent liturgical approaches may also in the future constitute an important ecumenical problem for Orthodox-Protestant relations:

How Protestantism will ever accommodate itself to these immensely ornate, albeit honest, services, which bring the forms of a thousand years ago into today, is as much a mystery as is the answer to the companion

52. Edelby, *Il Vaticano II*, 173.

53. Douglas Horton, *Vatican Diary 1963: A Protestant Observes the Second Session of Vatican Council II* (Cleveland, OH: United Church Press, 1963) 58.

54. Edelby, *Il Vaticano II*, 189.

55. Rynne, *Vatican Council II*, 212.

56. Horton, *Vatican Diary 1963*, 98.

question, how the devotees of these pictorially copious rites will ever find value in the simple, and very severely honest, services beloved of those of a Puritan turn of mind.⁵⁷

During the debate on the Decree on Ecumenism, the same observer appreciates that the Council gladly encourages its ecumenical specialists to participate in ecumenical prayer services, but asks the secretariat to remove the restriction, “without however any participation in official worship” (*remota quavis communicatione in cultu officiali*). His objection against these words was inspired by the experience of attending liturgies from another tradition than his own during the Council:

The best understanding we observers have had of Rome has come from our presence at the formal services of worship and also the informal, incidental moments of devotion with our Roman brothers. Similarly, most of us have had Roman friends who have come to understand us better through being present at corresponding non-Roman services of worship or devotion. I am not thinking of actual communication at mass or communion: I am thinking only of getting as close as possible to mass or communion without communication, but as we enter the future I can hope that neither the phrase I have cited nor any other circumstance will be interpreted as a bar to getting acquainted mutually at the point of worship.⁵⁸

In the description by Xavier Rynne it becomes clear that the concluding mass of the second session on December 4 can be considered as an anti-climax illustrating the need for urgent liturgical reform:

On Wednesday December 4th the Second Session came to what some observers regarded as a rather inglorious end. The entrance of Pope Paul into the basilica of St. Peter’s for the final solemn ceremonies was dismaying to those who witnessed the scene. Preceded as usual by the full panoply of the papal household and liveried guards, the Eastern patriarchs ... and the college of cardinals robed in white copes and mitres, a fifth of whom seemed to be pitifully aged figures hardly able to hobble along, the pope himself appeared carried high on the *sedia gestatoria*. He seemed

57. *Ibid.*, 99.

58. Douglas Horton, “Remarks on *De Oecumenismo*” (Archives UCL, Fonds Moeller 1953) 1. For more information on the impact of the observers on the Decree on Ecumenism see Peter De Mey, “Vatican II comme style œcuménique? *De Ecclesia et De Oecumenismo* évalués par des théologiens non catholiques,” *Vatican II comme style théologique: L’herméneutique théologique du Concile*, ed. Joseph Famerée (Paris: Cerf, 2012) 149-186 and Id., “As Separated but Closely Related Brethren (*fratres seiuncti*): The Harmonious Collaboration of Council and Observers on the Decree on Ecumenism 50 years ago,” *Kommunikation ist möglich: Theologische, ökumenische und interreligiöse Lernprozesse. Festschrift für Bernd Jochen Hilberath*, ed. C. Büchner et alii (Ostfildern: Matthias Grünewald, 2013) 78-97.

acutely conscious of the tawdriness of all this faded splendor and perhaps even sorry that he had not decided to make a more appropriate entrance by walking the length of the nave on foot. As he passed down the central nave, the pope scarcely looked to right or to left to acknowledge the fitful applause from the episcopal benches. Everything suddenly seemed to have a worn-out look about it, the vestments, the uniforms, the damask-draped tribunes. By way of counteracting this impression, once he descended from the *sedia*, the pope seemed to come alive, graciously turning to the non-Catholic observers and greeting them with his customarily graceful gestures, and acknowledging the applause that came from the tribunes of the diplomatic corps, the special guests and the vast throng of people crowded in the transepts and the apse.⁵⁹

Third Session

In his report of the opening ceremony of the third session, on September 14, 1964, Rynne is first of all struck by the fact that the Pope was the presider of a concelebrated mass:

The Third Session opened on September 14, 1964, with Pope Paul being carried into St. Peter’s on his portable throne surrounded by the papal court as usual, but a happy Pauline touch was evident as soon as he reached the altar. There, dismounting from his throne, he immediately joined twenty-four waiting prelates, all vested in red, with whom he intended to concelebrate the mass, as if to anticipate, symbolically, the doctrine of episcopal collegiality, not yet proclaimed by the Council.⁶⁰

Douglas Horton for his part understands this celebration as an application of the liturgical renewal, asked for by *Sacrosanctum Concilium*:

The service itself was an event of greatest interest, being one of the first fruits of the liturgical reform promoted and decreed by this very council. The mass was celebrated not by a single priest alone, as has long been the custom for most Roman services, but was concelebrated by the Holy Father Pope Paul VI, together with twenty-four Council Fathers representing the church throughout the entire world. (...) It is curious that

59. Rynne, *Vatican Council II*, 261. Rieger also notes an initiative of the Benedictine monk Franquesa regarding the final ceremony of this session as well: “According to Franquesa, there was pressure to end the second period with a concelebration of all the Council Fathers, with the Pope presiding. Here the agreement was not unanimous, with the French bishops the ones most in favor and many Spaniards unwilling to endorse it. Although Paul VI received the proposal favorably, it could not be implemented since the rite of concelebration had not yet been approved” (Rieger, “An Initial Profile of the Assembly,” 185 n. 49).

60. *Ibid.*, 291.

concelebration, which is often seen in Eastern Orthodoxy and Western Protestant Christianity, dropped out of sight in the Church of Rome during the last centuries except in the rite of the ordination of priests and the consecration of bishops. It is a sign of *aggiornamento* that the usage is now being brought back.⁶¹

Rynne also was attentive to other peculiarities of this mass:

The basilica choir rendered the introductory motet in the plainest Gregorian chant, in striking contrast to the usual pompous polyphony, while the full congregation recited the Gloria, the Credo, the Sanctus and the Agnus Dei in alternate verses. At the offertory, the *orationes super populum*, or special prayers for the people in litany form, were re-introduced after centuries of omission, and during the canon of the mass, all the concelebrating prelates said the prayers out loud including the words of consecration over the bread and wine. Communion was received by the participating concelebrants, each of whom took a piece of one of three large hosts used for the occasion, and a spoonful of wine from the common chalice; then the sacrament was distributed to the people. While sharp liturgical eyes criticized some of the details as not in accord with the most advanced liturgical thinking, the impression on the assembled prelates and the laity was decisive.⁶²

Congar for his part notices the progress made over the years:

What progress! And how clearly the road taken by the Council is inscribed in the three celebrations:

1962: the Sistine.

1963: a combination: the Holy Father assisting from the throne.

1964: concelebration by twenty-four Council Fathers – truly a dialogue Mass, sung with the congregation; the Holy Father himself gave communion to a dozen of the lay Auditors. The communion of the concelebrants took a very long time, but one had the feeling of a common banquet. So there was a concelebrated dialogue and sung Mass.⁶³

61. Douglas Horton, *Vatican Diary 1964: A Protestant Observes the Third Session of Vatican Council II* (Cleveland, OH: United Church Press, 1965) 11. Horton maybe alludes to the information provided in the liturgical form provided by the Vatican. Cf. Deuxième Concile Œcuménique du Vatican, *Cérémonie solennelle d'ouverture de la troisième session en la Basilique Saint-Pierre le 14 septembre 1964*, 10: "La troisième session du deuxième Concile œcuménique du Vatican s'ouvre par la sainte Messe concélébrée par le Saint-Père Paul VI avec 24 Pères Conciliaires, représentant l'Église répandue dans le monde. C'est un événement de grande importance, le fruit de la réforme liturgique promue et décrétée par le Concile, et confiée par le Saint-Père au Conseil pour l'application de la Constitution liturgique. Sa signification est claire: l'Eucharistie célébrée par plusieurs prêtres au même autel, la communion au même pain et au même calice, manifestent clairement l'unité du sacerdoce et de l'Église."

62. Rynne, *Vatican Council II*, 291.

63. Congar, *My Journal of the Council*, 570.

A few weeks later Congar will have to fulminate once again against the exaggerated role of the choir in one of the Latin liturgies: "Why the blazes can't we just have a Mass that is a Mass! The Constitution on the Liturgy is already a dead letter for many."⁶⁴

A last comment on the opening liturgy comes from bishop Edelby. He too considers the celebration as a sign that the "liturgical renewal" gains force, but still points to some weaknesses. There was no deacon, the liturgical gestures were not natural, too many texts were being read in common by the concelebrants, there was no incense, the precious blood was not taken from the chalice but with a spoon and the Latin was omnipresent.⁶⁵

Edelby mentions two more concelebrations which took place in the month of October. On October 28, the Council's secretary general, Felici, celebrated mass together with priests representing twelve parishes from different countries, in order "to manifest the unity of the ordained priesthood."⁶⁶ A few days later Cardinal Döpfner, the archbishop of Munich celebrated the 25th anniversary of his priestly ordination together with twelve other bishops who celebrated the same jubilee in that year. Edelby remarks: "Concelebrations have multiplied in the Latin Church." But he also observed "a certain rigidity, following a lack of experience."⁶⁷ In *The History of Vatican II* Joseph Komonchak describes the catalyzing effect:

In the course of the third session, concelebration became less of a novelty. Four other masses would be concelebrated at the beginning of general congregations, and, of course, the closing mass was also concelebrated. Soon after the session began, the delegates of episcopal conferences considered asking for permission to concelebrate in chapels or appropriate churches, following the example of the Pope's opening mass. Two weeks later it was announced that thirty bishops residing in the same religious house had petitioned for this.⁶⁸

November 13, the feast of Saint John Chrysostom, is called by Edelby "a day of apotheosis for the entire Oriental Church."⁶⁹ The liturgy was celebrated by Patriarch Maximos IV, together with twelve bishops and prelates of the entire Byzantine Church, "in the presence and with the

64. *Ibid.*, 590.

65. Edelby, *Il Vaticano II*, 231.

66. *Ibid.*, 268.

67. *Ibid.*, 269.

68. Joseph A. Komonchak, "Toward an Ecclesiology of Communion," *History of Vatican II*. Vol. IV: *Church as Communion: Third Period and Intersession, September 1964 – September 1965*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2004) 1-94, at 7.

69. Edelby, *Il Vaticano II*, 281.

active participation of the Holy Father.” Thanks to the presence of 200 singers belonging to five choirs there was a “pan-Byzantine presence in Saint-Peter’s, at which the Pope wanted to take part while giving the blessing in Greek.”⁷⁰ It was during this celebration that the general secretary announced that the Pope would sell his tiara as a testimony of the Church’s concern for the poor.

The liturgical experience of Douglas Horton and other Protestant observers, however, was in part different:

The choral singing, *a capella*, most of it in rich polyphonic style, was pure heaven. One could hardly dream of anything lovelier. But we Protestants on the way home had to agree that though we listened, though we watched, though we admired intensely, we did not worship. It is a little hard to know why this was the case, for worship occurs when the partition between heaven and earth is broken down, and both earth and heaven had met in the music. But they had done so only in the aesthetic sphere. The realm of the will had not been penetrated. There was no meeting of the majestic purpose of God and the responding purpose of the congregation, and therefore no profound worship.⁷¹

The mass at the end of the third session on November 21 rather was a kind of anti-climax. Even the Protestant observer Douglas Horton is aware of a profound liturgical mistake which took place during a concelebration of the Pope together with 24 bishops responsible for important Marian shrines all over the world, on the occasion of the Feast of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the Temple:

The silence which usually rules the moment of the elevation of the host, grateful to all worshipers who desire to cling only to the thought of the divine sacrifice, was shattered at this mass by an orchestra of brasses in what, I suppose, was to be taken as a paean of triumph. I thought it a liturgical disaster.⁷²

70. *Ibid.*, 282.

71. Horton, *Vatican Diary 1964*, 157.

72. *Ibid.*, 197. He will repeat his criticism on the occasion of the final service of the Council, on December 8, 1965. See Douglas Horton, *Vatican Diary 1965: A Protestant Observes the Fourth Session of Vatican Council II* (Cleveland, OH: United Church Press, 1966) 181: “At the high moment of the mass, as on a previous occasion, brasses broke into a paean. To mark the death of Christ by this means still seems to me a phenomenal piece of insensitivity, but it must be said that today this was greatly mitigated, since the morning breezes and the holiday spirit of the crowd left little of worship in the ears and minds of any – except possibly the Pope, who celebrated.” Also De Lubac has mixed feelings on this celebration: “Mélange d’innovations liturgiques (ainsi, prière litanique avant l’offertoire) et de vieux style (ainsi, chant du Salve Regina par la maîtrise de la Sixtine pendant l’offertoire. Période de transition)” (cf. De Lubac, *Carnets du Concile*, 341).

Sébastien Antoni mentions a novelty in the communion rite. The way the concelebrating bishops participated in the Blood of Christ – by taking a few drops of the precious blood with a silver spoon – “was directly inspired by the Oriental way. Thus one signified that the liturgical reform to come had to translate the concrete willingness to seek rapprochement with the other liturgical traditions.”⁷³

Fourth Session

We get a good impression of the opening mass of the fourth session on September 14, 1965 in the chronicle of Xavier Rynne, even with some attention for the role of Archbishop Dante:

When the Fourth Session convened on September 14th, there was little to indicate a change of climate. From the moment when he entered the conciliar hall, however, Pope Paul indicated unmistakably his intention to direct the Council’s work in his own personal fashion. He walked down the aisle of St. Peter’s preceded by the prelates and clergy who were to take part in the opening ceremonies. Gone was the pageantry of red-coated lackeys and aristocratic chamberlains who usually cluttered up papal processions. The mass was concelebrated by the pope with 26 other bishops. The practiced eye of professional liturgists detected certain “Dantesque” departures from the established ritual (so-called because they reflected the personal innovations introduced by Archbishop Enrico Dante, for many years papal master of ceremonies before his “elevation” to the cardinalate). However it was made known that the daily masses opening each day’s congregation would conform strictly to the norms laid down by the Constitution on the Liturgy (the masses were at first all in the Latin rite, mainly in order to save time, but the custom was later resumed of varying the monotony by celebrating mass occasionally according to one of the colourful Eastern rites).⁷⁴

The general impression of Congar is also positive: “There was, all the same, something new. It was the entry of a bishop, a pastor, the entry of a priest, no longer that of a prince.”⁷⁵ Another sign of simplicity, observed by Edelby, pertains to the fact that the choir only sang one or two polyphonic motets, whereas the assembly sang the Gregorian chants together.⁷⁶ In a general reflection on the liturgies during the fourth session Congar expresses his satisfaction about the fact that, “for the

73. Antoni, “La liturgie dans la vie d’un concile,” 37.

74. Rynne, *Vatican Council II*, 450.

75. Congar, *My Journal of the Council*, 774.

76. Edelby, *Il Vaticano II*, 292.

epistle, a *lectio continua* of the Acts of the Apostles has been introduced, and, for the Gospel, of the final chapters of St John.”⁷⁷

On November 12 The Anglican Canadian, Eugene Fairweather, was extremely impressed by the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom at which Cardinal Slipyj presided: “The music was a bit ragged, but Slipyj as celebrant was magnificent, and the overall impression was one of splendour and what one might call liturgical gusto! Despite the not wholly congenial setting provided by St. Peter’s, I doubt that I had ever felt the distinctive impact of the Byzantium Liturgy so sharply.”⁷⁸

One week later, on November 19, Maxim Hermaniuk, the Ukrainian-Catholic metropolitan of Winnipeg, was very critical of the celebration of the divine liturgy of St. John Chrysostom by a Hungarian bishop in Hungarian.

The impression was, for us Ukrainians, very unpleasant. In the printed introductory comments to the Divine Liturgy nowhere was it noted, not even a word, how this rite came to Hungary, what the ancient liturgical language was of that rite, customs, etc. And the faithful of that rite were simply named in this commentary – as Hungarians – so that we poor Ukrainians, by our own hands, dig a grave for ourselves.⁷⁹

As to the concluding ceremonies of the Council the reaction could be very different. The one by Rynne was very positive:

Since both previous sessions of the Council held under Pope Paul VI had ended under a cloud, the common assumption was that the Fourth Session too would probably end badly or at least in a draw. Contrary to expectations, however, Vatican II came to a close on December 7th and 8th in something like a blaze of glory. The chief credit for his happy turn of events belonged to Pope Paul who had an eye for the symbolic and eloquent gesture, as the world now knew.⁸⁰

His words of praise pertain already to the interdenominational ‘Liturgy of the Word’ in the afternoon of December 4:

The service was unprecedented because it marked the first time that any pope had ever taken part in a similar ceremony. It consisted, appropriately, of prayers, psalms, lessons from Scripture, and hymns, the heritage of one or more of the Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox

77. Congar, *My Journal of the Council*, 778.

78. Fairweather, *Vatican II Diary*, entry of November 12, 1965.

79. *The Second Vatican Council Diaries of Met. Maxim Hermaniuk, C.S.S.R. (1960-1965)*, transl. Jaroslav Z. Skira; annotated by Karim Schelkens (Leuven: Peeters, 2012) 272.

80. Rynne, *Vatican Council II*, 568.

traditions. The lessons were read respectively in English, French and Greek by the Methodist observer Dr. A.C. Outler, the French Catholic priest Pierre Michalon, and the Orthodox observer and rector of the Orthodox parish church in Rome, Archimandrite Maximos Aghiorgoussis. The hymn “Now thank we all our God” in which all joined in English was written by the seventeenth-century Lutheran composer Johann Crüger.”⁸¹

Peter Hünemann for his part makes a few critical remarks:

Moving though the service was for its participants, it must be realized that it was not in the formal sense an ecumenical liturgy of the Word. The Pope did not preside over it with anyone else. Only in the readings did two members of other Churches play a part. It is striking that in his address Paul VI did not say a word about the texts read from the Old and New Testament and apply them to the present situation. While in the official texts the address was described as a homily, it had nothing to do with that genre. The fact that the Church stands under the word of God, as was taught in *Dei Verbum*, did not emerge at all in this liturgy with the representatives of other Churches.⁸²

Apparently some Council Fathers still had to get used to the changed attitude in view of ecumenical relations:

Professing to be scandalized, a select group of bishops apparently under the guidance of Archbishops Staffa and Vagnozzi sent a message to the pope the following morning, Sunday, expressing their amazement at the encouragement he had given to what they had been taught to believe was a *communicatio in sacris* with heretics. As one of them put it, “It may be all right for the pope to do this, but half our people would walk out on us

81. *Ibid.* Rynne also mentions an incident which took place immediately before the service: “Two hours before the ceremony several members of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, the American Paulist Father Stransky and the Jesuit Father Long, raced out to the basilica to check on the final arrangements. They found that the good Benedictine monks had erected a papal throne of magnificent, medieval proportions, and had considerable difficulty in persuading the abbot that such a display of pomp was contrary to the pope’s own wishes. Finally a straight-backed only slightly ornamented chair was substituted for the elaborate throne. When the pope arrived he seated himself in it, or stood in front of it, as the service proceeded, with the utmost simplicity; there had been no time to bind the booklet containing the service in buckram with the papal arms, so the pope was handed a simple pamphlet like the rest. He joined in the singing of the hymns and canticles as if this type of service was for him the most natural thing in the world” (*ibid.*, 568-569).

82. Peter Hünemann, “The Final Weeks of the Council,” *History of Vatican II*. Vol. V: *The Council and the Transition. The Fourth Period and the End of the Council, September 1965 – September 1966*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo & Joseph A. Komonchak (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2006) 363-484, at 468.

if we tried the same thing,” thus betraying their abysmal ignorance of what the Council had decreed.⁸³

Rynne then switches to another ecumenical event in the same week, on December 7, now one of unprecedented significance:

If it was the Protestants who were primarily moved by the significance of the service in St. Paul's, three days later it was the turn of the Orthodox to be gratified. In the course of the final public session in St. Peter's on Tuesday, December 7th, a joint declaration of the pope and the Orthodox patriarch of Constantinople Athenagoras I was read out in which both Churches removed from memory and “consigned to oblivion” the centuries' old mutual excommunications which had poisoned relations between them.⁸⁴

According to Metropolitan Hermaniuk this ceremony, which for him was more moving than the solemn conclusion of the Council, constituted “an unforgettable event in the life of the Church of Christ.”⁸⁵

As to the concluding Eucharistic celebration of the Council on December 8, Congar criticizes the liturgical drawback which he experiences while watching the final ceremony on television:

From the ecclesiological and ecumenical point of view, I felt some unease in watching the very beautiful ceremony this morning – and seeing it, thanks to TV, better than if I had been involved. The Pope got all the attention. He sat enthroned as a sovereign; everything had reference to him. He did not appear to be so much IN the Church, as above it.⁸⁶

Hünemann also becomes critical when he describes the actual mass:

After a short pause for recollection, the Pope began with the prayers at the foot of the altar. None of the moderators or members of the Council of presidents stood beside him. The Pope was accompanied instead by his almoner and the prefect of the sacristy, both members of the Curia. The epistle and the gospel were also read by Roman members of the Curia: an auditor of the Rota and a Vatican master of ceremonies. Thus a solemn papal mass, without concelebration by the Council Fathers, marked the end of the Council.⁸⁷

83. Rynne, *Vatican Council II*, 569.

84. *Ibid.*, 571.

85. *Second Vatican Council Diaries of Met. Maxim Hermaniuk*, 279.

86. Congar, *My Journal of the Council*, 874.

87. Hünemann, “The Final Weeks of the Council,” 478.

Conclusion

In his article on the liturgy in the life of the Council Sébastien Antoni repeats an important insight provided by father Jounel in a three page reflection on the Eucharistic services during the final year of the Council, already published in 1965:

One may note that the liturgical reform is anything but a law which has been promulgated but not applied. Liturgical reform enters in the sacramental life of the Church at the most elevated level: the conciliar celebration wants to serve as an example to the entire Christian people.⁸⁸

At the end of his article Antoni comes to the same conclusion which applies to this research as well:

The liturgical reform willed by the Council was also lived in the Council: the liturgical experiments carried out during the sessions went much further than minor ritual modifications. They were already the expression of the changes asked for by the Council. One therefore can consider that the liturgical reform of Vatican II is not only the application of the Constitution on the Divine Liturgy, but rather the continuation of a dynamic of reform which proceeds from the conciliar life itself.⁸⁹

Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies
 KU Leuven
 St.-Michielsstraat 4/3101
 B-3000 Leuven
 Belgium
 peter.demey@theo.kuleuven.be

Peter DE MEY

88. Pierre Jounel, “Les messes de la quatrième session du Concile,” *La Maison-Dieu* 83 (1965) 187-189.

89. Antoni, “La liturgie dans la vie d'un concile,” 41.

THE LITURGY DEBATE AT VATICAN II

An Exercise in Collective Responsibility

1. The Long Preparation of Liturgical Renewal

The literature on the liturgical movement and its implementation during the Council is impressive. The recent bibliography of Philippe Roy offers an abundance of examples.¹ As an introduction to my contribution, I would like to start with some warnings about the term “liturgical movement,” a term which, in my view, in a sense, has a problematic character. Both Dom Guéranger and Dom Beauduin were Benedictines. Both invested much of their life, time, and energy in liturgy, both are mentioned in all surveys about the liturgical movement, but it would be somewhat unfair to suggest that both shared the same view on liturgical renewal.² Even in neighbouring countries such as the Netherlands and Belgium, the liturgical movements had a different character. In the Netherlands, many orders and congregations made great efforts in order to bridge the gap between the existing liturgy and the faithful, but this was seldom done on the basis of thorough patristic research, a feature of the Belgian liturgical movement (Dom Capelle; Dom Botte). On the other hand, the Belgian liturgical movement was much more monastically oriented (cf. the Benedictines of Affligem, Maredsous and Louvain) than the Dutch movement, so it had less impact on the daily life and liturgical

1. See Philippe J. Roy, *Bibliographie du Concile Vatican II*. Préface de J.-D. Durand, *Atti e Documenti*, 34 (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2012) 262-302. More than 400 numbers are mentioned, but often, a number can consist of many titles. Moreover, several of the studies I will refer to are not present in this bibliography, again a proof that the debate on liturgy during the Council and the constitution's reception during the post-Vatican II period must be considered as an important event in Roman-Catholic liturgical life.

2. See Mathijs Lamberigts, “The Liturgical Movement in Germany and the Low Countries,” *La théologie catholique entre intransigeance et renouveau: La réception des mouvements préconciliaires à Vatican II*, ed. Gilles Routhier, Philippe J. Roy, Karim Schelkens, Bibliothèque de la Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, 95 (Louvain-la-Neuve/Leuven: Collège Érasme, 2011, 91-121, esp. 92-96 (with further literature).

celebrations of the common faithful than the Dutch movement.³ From its very beginning, the Dutch liturgical movement cooperated closely with the official Episcopal organisations. The directives of bishops and the pope were carefully followed and made visible in the Christian life of the common people. The Benedictine movement as known in Belgium showed more independence,⁴ but attracted in its beginning fewer common people than the Dutch liturgists. Already in 1911, during a conference at Breda, more than 400 people, half of them women, were present.⁵

The liturgical movement cannot be described as a consistently successful story. Up to the Second World War, what liturgical movements had in common – this is not only true for Belgium and the Netherlands, but also for Germany and Austria⁶ – was resistance, and this from different sides. Some considered the liturgical movement a threat. The success of Guardini and the Quickborn-movement at Burg-Rothenfels among the youth was criticized because it was experienced at the local level as a kind of alienation of the youth from their parishes, while Burg-Rothenfels was only meant as a place where people would be given the opportunity to recover the essence of Christian life.⁷ The views of Guardini also met with resistance from German monastic centres of liturgy, the latter not really appreciating Guardini's sympathy for popular

3. See Lamberigts, “The Liturgical Movement in Germany and the Low Countries,” *passim*.

4. See H. Lauwaert, “Verslag over de methoden van Liturgische Actie in Nederland,” *Les Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales* 15 (1930) 261-272, at 270-272. One should not forget that the Roman Catholic hierarchy was only restored in the Netherlands in 1853. The commitment to both pope and bishops played an important role in the identity building of the Catholics in the Netherlands. Louis van Tongeren, “From Liturgical Movement to Liturgy on the Move: the Reform of the Liturgy and the Development of Liturgical Studies in the Roman Catholic Netherlands in the Twentieth Century,” *Patterns and Persons: A Historiography of Liturgical Studies in the Netherlands in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Louis van Tongeren, Marcel Barnard, Paul Post & Gerard Rouwhorst, *Liturgia condenda*, 25 (Leuven/Paris/Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2010) 25-68, at 28-29. I am well aware that one cannot reduce the Belgian liturgical movement to the activities of Benedictines; see Lamberigts, “The Liturgical Movement in Germany and the Low Countries,” 98-100.

5. Cf. Richard Bot, *Zingt allen mee: 65 jaar Liturgische en Kerkmuzikale Beweging in Nederland: Een liturgie-documentaire studie naar de ontwikkeling en het liturgisch functioneren van de rooms-katholieke kerkmuziek in Nederland van 1903 tot en met 1969 onder invloed van de idealen van de Liturgische Beweging* (Tilburg: Nederlands Instituut voor Kerkmuziek, 2003) 120.

6. See the critiques as formulated by Dietrich von Hildebrand, *Liturgie und Persönlichkeit*, Bücher der Geisteserneuerung, 4 (Salzburg: Pustet, 1934). After Vatican II, he became one of the most vehement critics of the liturgical renewal.

7. See the examples given in Paul Leemans, *Over Romano Guardini* (s.l., 2005) 193-221, at 214-215.

devotion.⁸ In this regard one should mention the critiques of the Benedictine monk, O. Casel (1886-1948), who in many surveys of the liturgical movement is mentioned as a catalyst of the liturgical renewal.⁹ Further, most faithful were seemingly happy with their devotional practices and the use of the missal. They were not waiting for an active participation in liturgy.¹⁰ Guardini suffered the same fate as Dom Beauduin, who was criticized by his confrere, the Benedictine J. Picard.¹¹ Moreover, the liturgical movement was considered to be a threat to popular devotions, while some forms of the liturgy it promoted were experienced as too elitist. Jesuits criticized the holistic character of the liturgical spirituality, so characteristic of the Benedictines and considered it a rival to their own Ignatian spirituality.¹² In other words, at least before World War II, the liturgical movement, à la Guardini, was criticized by both monastic liturgical professionals and by promoters of popular devotion.

After World War II, especially with the publication of *Mediator Dei*, one gets the impression that people's attitudes were changing. It is true, the reception of the encyclical *Mediator Dei* was less positive in the German speaking world than, for example in Belgium and the Netherlands.¹³ Parsch's reaction was negative: he considered the encyclical as an attack on his liturgical work,¹⁴ and *Mediator Dei* can

8. *Ibid.*, 209-211. At the same time, people in parishes were very much influenced by Guardini's approach; see, e.g., with regard to the experiments in Freiburg, Michael Quisinsky, "Das II. Vaticanum in der Pfarrgemeinde: Der Freiburger Pfarrer und Theologe Eugen Walter (1906-1999) zwischen Liturgischer Bewegung und Konzilsrezeption," *Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv* 128 (2008) 161-203, at 168. The Beuron Benedictine A. Hammenstede, "Rapport sur le mouvement liturgique en Allemagne," *Les Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales* 15 (1930) 294-307, at 304 was of the opinion that personal devotions, valuable as they might be, were not comparable with active participation in the Eucharist.

9. Already in 1921, Casel had founded the *Jahrbuch für Liturgie*.

10. See L. J. Rogier & N. de Rooy, *In vrijheid herboren: Katholiek Nederland 1853-1953* (Den Haag: Pax, 1953) 656; 825.

11. Beauduin's reaction was published in *Les Questions Liturgiques* 2 (1911-1912) 529-536; with regard to Picard, see Raymond Loonbeek & Jacques Mortiau, *Un pionnier, Dom Lambert Beauduin (1873-1960): Liturgie et unité des chrétiens*, UCL Recueil de travaux d'histoire et de philologie (Louvain-la-Neuve: Collège Érasme, 2002) 136-137.

12. See O. Rousseau, "Rond het jubileum van de Liturgische Beweging – 1909-1959," *Tijdschrift voor Liturgie* 43 (1959) 345-361, at 354-355; André Haquin, "Dom L. Beauduin et le congrès des œuvres catholiques de Malines: À l'occasion du centenaire du Mouvement liturgique belge (1909-2009)," *Questions Liturgiques* 91 (2010) 18-36, at 31-33.

13. The impact of the Encyclical was less impressive than the enthusiasm shown for it; see Lamberigts, "The Liturgical Movement in Germany and the Low Countries," 100.

14. Theodor Maas-Ewerd, "Zur Reaktion Pius Parschs auf die Enzyklika 'Mediator Dei'," *Mit sanfter Zähigkeit: Pius Parsch und die biblisch-liturgische Erneuerung*, ed.

certainly be read as a kind of "take-over" and control by central Roman offices. But the fact that Pius XII made a positive statement about liturgy (although centralizing the process of renewal), gave an impetus to the liturgical movement.

Through the theological work of figures like Josef Andreas Jungmann, Hugo Rahner, and Lucien Cerfaux, the interest in a theology of the community was stimulated, in which the place of the people of God and its role in the liturgy, a crucial issue of the liturgical movement, were rethought.¹⁵ An important role in the liturgical reflection in Germany was played by the liturgical institute, founded at Trier. One of its members, Balthasar Fischer, (1912-2001) studied with Jungmann in Innsbruck and Ildefons Herwegen in Maria Laach. He obtained his Habilitation in Bonn with Th. Klauser as promoter. He thus knew the trends in liturgy and, like many leading liturgists at that time, he was very familiar with patristics. After the war, his institute developed contacts with the *Centre de la Pastorale liturgique* at Paris, an institute that played a similar (stimulating) role in France and the French speaking world, and of which A.-G. Martimort was one of the leaders. The contacts resulted in the organisation of yearly conferences, the first being held in 1951.¹⁶ Soon, under the impulse of the two institutes, the scope was broadened. In 1953, the conference was organized at Lugano. Here, the archbishop of Bologna, G. Lercaro, internationally respected for his liturgical expertise,¹⁷ held a plea in favour of the use of the vernacular. For Germany, too, the many congresses played an important role in the promotion of a growing interest in liturgy. These congresses were important and fruitful meeting places for the leading liturgists at the time. In other words, interest in liturgy was growing and this in most of the continent. Questions such as the use of the vernacular were discussed in public. The presence of lay people at liturgical conferences stimulated the

Norbert Höslinger & Theodor Maas-Ewerd, *Schriften des Pius-Parsch-Instituts*, 4 (Klosterneuburg: Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1979) 199-214; cf. also Andrea Grillo, "Der Liturgiebegriff bei Pius Parsch und seine Stellung im Rahmen der Liturgischen Bewegung des 20. Jahrhunderts: Die 'unaktuelle' Aktualität einer pastoralen und 'volkstümlichen' Perspektive," *Pius Parsch in der liturgiewissenschaftlichen Rezeption: Klosterneuburger Symposium 2004*, ed. Winfried Bachler, Rudolf Pacik, Andreas Redtenbacher, Pius-Parsch-Studien: Quellen und Forschungen zur Liturgischen Bewegung, 3 (Würzburg: Echter, 2005) 191-209, at 200-203. In any case, recent literature has made clear that Parsch's critical attitude to the encyclical was well justified; for this literature, see 203-206, and esp. n. 17.

15. Lamberigts, "The Liturgical Movement in Germany and the Low Countries," 113.

16. For a survey, see Siegfried Schmitt, *Die internationalen liturgischen Studientreffen 1951-1960: Zur Vorgeschichte der Liturgiekonstitution*, Trierer Theologische Studien, 53 (Trier: Paulinus, 1992).

17. See, e.g., Nicola Buonassorte, "Una vita liturgica: Giacomo Lercaro (1891-1976)," *Rivista Liturgica* 1 (2006) 119-132.

reflection on how to realize active participation of the faithful in the liturgy.

It might well be that, just before the opening of the Council, for many of the promoters of the liturgical movement the Council might become the highpoint and end of a process. At the eve of Vatican II, Fischer of Trier, started to warn against wild expectations about liturgical reforms. Fischer made a plea in favour of prudence and against liturgical chaos,¹⁸ a sign that at least some of the promoters of the liturgical movement were of the opinion that it had reached its final goal. That the schema *De Sacra Liturgia* was well received by most of the Council Fathers is well known. That Gaetano Cicognani, president of the preparatory commission for liturgy, after long hesitation, signed the text of this schema, on February 2, but passed away three days later, is also known.¹⁹ His successor, Cardinal Larraona, head of the Congregation of Rites, was not happy with the text, in this he was very much assisted by Enrico Dante, Secretary of the Congregation of Rites, who was created a Cardinal on February 22, 1965.

During the Council, Cardinal Larraona, was the president of the Conciliar commission for the liturgy. The secretary of Larraona's Congregation of Rites, Mgr. Dante, had also been a member of the commission for the liturgy. Both Larraona and Dante very regularly objected to the document on the liturgy, not only in the Conciliar commission but also in public through interventions in the Council aula.²⁰ Already at the very beginning of the debate on the liturgy, Dante had held a plea in favor of an approval of general principles. He suggested that the concrete implementation should be the work of experts in the liturgy. He had made clear that according to him approval of any change in liturgy had to be left to Rome, clearly thinking of people like himself.²¹ It is amazing that two people, opposed to liturgical renewal, held positions where they could oppose a broad based liturgical renewal,²² especially

18. See *La Maison-Dieu* 1962/2, pp. 6-9 (April 16).

19. See the instructive remarks of Clemens Carl, "Cicognani, Gaetano," *Personenlexikon zum Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil*, ed. Michael Quisinsky & Peter Walter (Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 2012) 78-79.

20. For the obstructive role of Dante as member of the commission on the liturgy, see, among others, Reiner Kaczynski, "Toward the Reform of the Liturgy," *History of Vatican II*. Vol. III: *The Mature Council. Second Period and Intersession: September 1963-1964*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo & Joseph A. Komonchak (Maryknoll, NY/Leuven: Peeters, 2000) 192-256, at 203.207.209.

21. *Acta Synodalia* (henceforth: *AS*) I,1, 330-331.

22. In this regard, see Piero Marini, *A Challenging Reform: Realizing the Vision of the Liturgical Renewal 1963-1975* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007).

sought by people active in continents such as Africa and Latin America,²³ an aspect we will return to under the item "collective actions." The bishops of these continents often intervened as a team and tried through collective interventions to influence the Council's liturgical agenda, even though several times their interventions were not really appreciated by their "sponsors," among them the Propaganda Fide.²⁴

2. *Sacrosanctum Concilium*²⁵

There was much agreement that the document on the liturgy was one of the few schemata that met the standards required by an ecumenical "aggiornamento" council.²⁶ Surely, much is written about the change in the order of the schemata to be discussed, but on October 16, there was an agreement to start with the discussion on liturgy. This decision made clear that people wanted to give the council an "essentially pastoral stamp."²⁷

It should be said that the Council started with some surprises. The opening speech of John XXIII, *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia*, encouraged bishops such as Liénart and Frings to step up, although reconstruction of that period reveals that their interventions were less spontaneous than sometimes suggested. They obtained a postponement of the elections for

23. See, e.g., Mathijs Lamberigts, "Die Beiträge Afrikas während der Konzilsdebatte über die Liturgie," *Zeugnis und Dialog: Die katholische Kirche in der neuzeitlichen Zeit und das II. Vatikanische Konzil. Klaus Wittstadt zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Wolfgang Weiss (Würzburg: Echter, 1996) 186-207.

24. See the critique of Jan Van Cauwelaert, bishop of Inongo in *Acta Synodalia* I,2, 94-96, and the *retractatio* of Mgr. Zoa of Yaoundé, for people had warned him that critiques such as those of Van Cauwelaert might endanger the financial support of Rome for the missions; see Yves Congar, *Mon Journal du Concile*. Présenté et annoté par Éric Mahieu. Avant-propos de Dominique Congar. Préface de Bernard Dupuy (Paris: Cerf, 2002) vol. I, 199; Henri de Lubac, *Carnets du Concile*. Introduit et annoté par Loïc Figueux. Avant-propos de François-Xavier Dumortier, s.j. et Jacques de Larosière. Préface de Jacques Prévotat (Paris: Cerf, 2007) vol. I, 211.

25. For a detailed discussion of the debate on this schema during the first session, see Mathijs Lamberigts, "The Liturgy Debate," *History of Vatican II*. Vol. II: *The Formation of the Council's Identity: First Period and Intersession (October 1962-September 1963)*, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo & Joseph A. Komonchak (Maryknoll, NY/Leuven: Peeters, 1997) 107-166.

26. In this regard, Schillebeeckx's report is revealing and helpful; see Jan A. Brouwers, "Vatican II: Derniers préparatifs et première session. Activités conciliaires et coulisses," *Vatican II commence: Approches francophones*, ed. Étienne Fouilloux, *Instrumenta theologica*, 12 (Leuven: Bibliotheek van de Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid, 1992) 353-368.

27. See Annibale Bugnini, *The Reform of the Liturgy* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990) 29.

the conciliar commissions and created the time and space for consultation among the Council participants,²⁸ something which would influence the composition of the conciliar commissions, often changing dramatically the composition of a commission when compared with the preparatory commissions. This was less the case for a commission which had been appreciated for the valuable work done during the preparatory period. Indeed, half of the bishops (6 out of 13), serving as members or consultors of the preparatory commission for the liturgy, were elected: Calewaert (Ghent, Belgium), Jenny (Cambrai, France), Malula (Léopoldville, Congo), Rossi (Biella, Italy), Zauner (Linz, Austria), and Spülbeck (Meissen, Germany). The new members of the commission came from Great Britain (Grimshaw, Birmingham), the USA (Hallinan, Atlanta), Indonesia (van Bekkum, SVD, a Dutch missionary, bishop of Ruteng), Italy (Lercaro, Bologna;²⁹ abbot d'Amato, Rome), Yugoslavia (Pichler, Banja Luka), Spain (Enciso, Mallorca), and Canada (J. Martin, Nicolet). Five of the members appointed by the pope had participated in the activities of the preconiliar commission, thus in a sense expressing his appreciation of their work. From the 17 members and 37 consultors of the preparatory commission, respectively 2 and 5 obtained the status of peritus for the liturgical commissions, among them leading liturgists such as Vagaggini and Wagner,³⁰ and especially Martimort, who had an enormous impact on Mgr. Calewaert, bishop of Ghent, who, within the conciliar commission, was appointed as the president of the 6th sub-commission, which was expected to examine the remarks made by the fathers on articles 16-32 of the schema, indeed the sub-commission tackling questions such as the status and authority of Episcopal conferences and the use of the vernacular. Calewaert not only appointed Martimort as secretary of this sub-commission,³¹ but also blindly followed Martimort's suggestions, remarks, and ideas. In any case, the schema on the liturgy would not undergo dramatic changes: all in all the

28. Mathijs Lamberigts & Alois Greiler, "Concilium episcoporum est: The Interventions of Liénart and Frings Revisited (October 13th, 1962)," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 73 (1997) 54-71. With regard to the results of the consultations, see Mathijs Lamberigts & Leo Declerck, "Le rôle de l'épiscopat belge dans l'élection des commissions conciliaires en octobre 1962," *La raison par quatre chemins: En hommage à Claude Troisfontaines*, ed. Jean Leclercq, Bibliothèque philosophique de Louvain, 73 (Louvain/Paris/Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2007) 279-306 (with further literature).

29. Lercaro was elected because of his international reputation; he was not mentioned on the list the Italian Episcopal conference had prepared for the elections.

30. For the details, see Herman Schmidt, *Constitutie over de H. Liturgie: Tekst, genese, kommentaar, dokumentatie* (Antwerpen: Patmos, 1964) 225-228.

31. The fact that Martimort was also member of the theological sub-commission might have played a role in the appointment.

initial text is still very visible in the approved text.³² Of course, between the approval in the liturgical commission and the sending of the text to the Council participants, someone had introduced changes to the text,³³ as was made clear during the debate on the text during the Council. Further, the secretary of the preparatory commission, A. Bugnini, was replaced as secretary of the commission, probably because the president, Larraona, prefect of the Congregation for Rites, and president of the conciliar commission, found Bugnini too progressive and considered him responsible for the "(new) spirit of the liturgy schema."³⁴ In fact Bugnini was the only one of the preconiliar secretaries who was not reappointed. That Larraona did not really trust Bugnini, also became clear when he attempted to replace Bugnini on the chair of liturgy at the Pontifical Urban University. But finally, Larraona did not succeed in changing the spirit of the schema, and soon after the approval of the schema, Bugnini would be rehabilitated and became one of the key persons in the implementation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*.

From October 22 to November 13, 1962, the bishops debated the schema *De liturgia*, a long period indeed, and an experimental period too: because of the long, time consuming and somewhat painstaking discussions on this topic, the pope would give the presidents the permission to vote for the closure of a debate, once they were of the opinion that a topic was sufficiently, if not exhaustively, discussed. One of the lessons of this debate was that the Council regulations needed improvement, that the sessions should be made to proceed more efficiently (one of the reasons why Paul VI will appoint 4 moderators), and the like. However, one has to admit that the large number of interventions (more than 600 oral or written interventions) showed that the participants were interested in this issue. It should be said that many of these interventions were collective interventions, thus making clear that more than 600 bishops were really concerned about this issue. During the debates, most attention was given to the following aspects: the use of either Latin or the vernacular in the liturgy, especially in the Eucharist;³⁵ concelebration;³⁶ communion under 'both species' (an

32. See Schmidt, *Constitutie over de H. Liturgie*, 77 ff.

33. The other being that interventions were made in the text *after* it was sent to the central preparatory commission; see Aimé-Georges Martimort, "Les débats liturgiques lors de la première période du Concile Vatican II (1962)," *Vatican II commence*, 291-314, esp. 292-297.

34. See Schmidt, *Constitutie over de H. Liturgie*, 79; Lamberigts, "The Liturgy Debate," 107.

35. The approval of the use of the vernacular was a logical next step, after the approval of bilingual rituals for Africa and Asia, or the *Collectio Rituum* in Germany, only to mention a few; see Lamberigts, "The Liturgical Movement in Germany and the Low Countries," 120.

interesting case with regard to the reception of Bulls and Councils),³⁷ adaptation of the liturgy and liturgical customs to the local culture;³⁸ the reform of the breviary (with pleas pro and contra the use of the vernacular),³⁹ the missal and the ritual.⁴⁰ In light of some current debates about *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, it should be said that during the Council this document received both praise and critique. While some people praised the document for its pastoral and Biblical character, others were of the opinion that it was too vague, “verbose,” poetic, and not sufficiently precise, and this because of its pastoral tone. Some bishops were happy that the document created space for renewal, while respecting the tradition. Other bishops complained about the fact that the document seemed to take some distance from the (Latin) tradition. People appreciated that the document created openings towards a liturgical development with respect for local cultures. Especially the African bishops very much appreciated this point. However, other bishops, also active in mission territories, pleaded in favor of Latin because they considered it as a sign of unity among the faithful. Other arguments in favor of Latin run as follows: by the continued use of Latin, people would avoid changes; Latin was an excellent instrument for the preservation and promotion of unity; Latin was the language of the Roman Catholic Church; the use of Latin would be of help in order to avoid nationalism; Latin as language is superior to other languages; there is no other language in which one can better and more clearly express doctrine; the use of Latin protects and promotes the liturgical mysteries.

36. What the schema under nr. 44 said about this aspect, received support from many, including missionary bishops (considering it as a concrete expression of unity) and monastic communities. Opponents of this issue argued that overemphasis on celebration suggested that private mass was inferior. Also the distribution of stipends was invoked as an argument against concelebration; for the details, see Lamberigts, “The Liturgy Debate,” 130.

37. See the opposing views of Cardinal Ruffini and Cardinal Bea; cf. Lamberigts, “The Liturgy Debate,” 129.

38. Needless to say that this discussion had to do with rights and competences of the Episcopal conferences; see the pertinent remarks of the Indian bishop D’Souza; *AS* I,2, 318-319.

39. See Lamberigts, “The Liturgy Debate,” 137-141.

40. Darren J. Dias, “St. Lawrence Flows into Lake Ontario: Tides of Liturgical Renewal,” *Vatican II: Expériences canadiennes / Canadian Experiences*, ed. Michael Attridge, Catherine E. Clifford & Gilles Routhier (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2011) 425ff. makes clear that already in the 50s the use of the vernacular in the liturgy is growing in Canada, a clear indication that the conciliar debate about the use of the vernacular in the liturgy is partly already a debate about *existing* practices. That John XXIII himself was very well aware of the tensions between those who had never left home or Italy and those living, e.g., in the missions, is well shown in Massimo Faggioli, *Liturgy and Ecclesiology in Sacrosanctum Concilium* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012) 127.

By using Latin, Catholics distinguish themselves from the Protestants, for, according to some fathers, the use of the vernacular had in these Churches resulted in a growing fragmentation.⁴¹ In other words, not everybody was familiar with or sympathetic to two issues which the liturgical movement had promoted for many decades: the use of the vernacular and the active participation of the faithful. In light of current debates, I mention that Latin not always had been the liturgical language in the Roman Catholic Church, that it was then (and now) more and more experienced as a dead language: indeed, many fathers could not sufficiently follow the debates in the aula because of a failing knowledge of Latin.⁴²

3. Collective Actions⁴³

At the beginning of the debate on liturgy, bishops seemingly did not yet feel the need to act in tandem. Neither the Bishops of Germany, nor those of Italy, England, Spain, or India ever felt the need to intervene as a group when discussing liturgy. However, one can soon see that the phenomenon of collective interventions is appearing and even growing. It is interesting to see how several of these collective interventions explicitly state that they do not want to oblige the others to follow their wishes, but that they ask for respect for what they think is best for their own dioceses. A final remark: when a bishop speaks on behalf of himself and one or two colleagues, I do not consider this as a group activity.

With regard to the schema as a whole, two groups explicitly expressed their appreciation. The Dutch bishops acted as a group when declaring that they were very much in favour of the schema.⁴⁴ Bishop Hallinan of Atlanta made the same remark, but he said that he was speaking in the name of many but not all US bishops, thus making clear that, at least with regard to this issue, the US bishops held different opinions.⁴⁵

There was much debate about the autonomy of the local churches with regard to the liturgy and in quite a number of these interventions one can either read a protest against the use of Latin in liturgy, or put more positively, a plea in favour of the use of the vernacular. On this topic, especially bishops of the Third World regularly took the floor. Bishop

41. Lamberigts, “The Liturgy Debate,” 120-121.

42. The observers could more easily follow the debates in aula than several bishops, because the first could make use of translations, while the latter were expected to understand what was said in Latin.

43. This aspect was somewhat underestimated in Lamberigts, “The Liturgy Debate.”

44. *AS* I,1, 441ff.

45. *AS* I,2, 75ff.

Ramanantoanina was speaking on behalf of more than 300 bishops from Africa, making a plea in favour of the autonomy and responsibility of the local bishops with regard to liturgy. Twenty-eight bishops from Brazil asked for more autonomy for bishops with regard to liturgy and made a plea in favour of the vernacular.⁴⁶ Prelate Ungarelli, again a bishop from Brazil, protested, together with thirty confreres, against the priority of Latin in liturgy. Again another group of Brazilians asked for the use of the vernacular.⁴⁷ A group of SVD bishops, around Monsignor Kemerer of Posadas (Argentina) emphasized, quite evidently, the importance of the liturgy of the Word, but also made a plea in favour of the use of the vernacular.⁴⁸ The same request was made by Mgr. Kobayashi in the name of the Japanese bishops,⁴⁹ by bishop Fleitas (Paraguay)⁵⁰ and by the Brazilian Mgr. Isnard on behalf of twenty-seven bishops, the latter also strongly insisting on the importance of liturgical renewal. Pastoral and social concerns were also present in the intervention of Mgr. Botero Salazar of Medellin, Colombia, speaking on behalf of fifty-two bishops.⁵¹ And it goes without saying that the Brazilian Cardinal De Barros Camara, speaking on behalf of sixty confreres, also was pastorally inspired when emphasizing the importance of good homilies.⁵²

Motivation for the use of the vernacular was often related to the active participation of the faithful. A group of bishops around Mgr. Devoto of Goya, Argentina promoted such active participation of the faithful in the liturgy. They also asked for a simplification of it⁵³ and protested against the phenomenon of stipends and did so out of pastoral and social concern. Some other collective interventions, such as that of Mgr. Thiandoum of Dakar, successor of the Spiritan Marcel Lefebvre, on behalf of all African bishops – and among them there were a good number of European missionary bishops – protested against a *liturgia occidentalis* and explicitly related this to colonialism. The plea for simplification also comes back in the interventions of Paraguayan bishops (seven)⁵⁴ and is again repeated by the African bishop Ramanantoanina on behalf of all the

46. *AS I,1*, 489ff.

47. *AS I,2*, 217.

48. *AS I,1*, 520ff.

49. *AS I,1*, 525f.

50. *AS I,2*, 246.

51. *AS I,2*, 178ff.

52. *AS I,2*, 195f.

53. For a similar collective request, see the intervention of Mgr. Van Bekkum on behalf of 39 confreres; *AS I,2*, 317f.

54. *AS I,2*, 246.

Africans,⁵⁵ and Mgr. Scalais on behalf of the bishops of Congo (in the context of the divine Office).⁵⁶

Also with regard to the question of the concelebration and the communion under both species most of the collective interventions come from bishops of the Third World. In this regard one can mention the intervention of the Episcopal Conference of Ruanda Burundi, which not only was in favour of it, but also added how important the Scriptural readings are for the education of the faithful, another reason cited for why one should use the vernacular.⁵⁷ The Episcopal Conference of Chile, twenty-five in number, also emphasized both elements. They also explicitly referred to the responsibility of the bishops to introduce changes: “Venerabiles quidem sunt traditiones, sed si quandoquidem in animarum detrimentum vergant, mutari possunt ac debent.”⁵⁸ A request for simplification in the liturgy comes also from some Mexican bishops.⁵⁹ The bishops of Ecuador collectively asked for a simplification of the rules with regard to the reading of the mass: when one has only a few priests at his disposal, such limiting rules do not really function.⁶⁰ Nine Indonesian bishops asked for more respect for the Oriental rites and were in favour of the communion under both species.⁶¹ Mgr. Van Cauwelaert of Inongo, was holding a plea in favour of concelebration, emphasising that this form of celebration very much met the liturgical and societal aspirations of African communities.⁶²

Of course, the pleas in favour of concelebration were also made by other groups, but it is interesting that for this issue and that of communion under both species the Dutch and Indonesian bishops, often Dutch missionaries, worked together.⁶³ That Benedictines were in favour of concelebration is well known. However, the twenty-seven abbots coming from all over the world, showed, by signing the intervention of Dom Gutt, how internationally widespread this wish was.⁶⁴ It is unclear how many abbots supported the request of the general abbot of the Cistercians, Kleiner (he said he was also speaking on behalf of the Trappists), but in his speech there was a clear desire for concelebration.⁶⁵

55. *AS I,2*, 267.

56. *AS I,2*, 570.

57. Cf. *AS I,2*, 122ff.

58. *AS I,2*, 130ff.

59. *Ibid.*

60. *AS I,2*, 246.

61. *AS I,2*, 68ff.

62. See Lamberigts, “The Liturgy Debate,” 111.

63. *AS I,2*, 128ff.

64. *AS I,1*, 657.

65. *AS I,2*, 47ff.

It is also striking that the African bishops explicitly asked for the use of texts, ceremonies and symbols which are adapted to the customs, faith, spirit and praxis of their own people: "Et fiat ut antiqui ritus nostri substantialiter non mutati, tamen aspectu et forma Africani evadant."⁶⁶ They asked the Council fathers to respect the nature and character of the African people and were of the opinion that diversity in unity would be a richness for the Church.⁶⁷ Indeed, the Africans have their own traditions and ways of celebrating feasts. Therefore, they asked the liberty to create spaces where things, so typical for the African soul, such as singing and dancing liturgically could find their place.⁶⁸ The Vietnamese bishops asked the right to institute liturgical feasts at moments that the Vietnamese people celebrate important moments, such as the first day of the New Year, the mid-autumn feast, or the feast at the beginning of the harvest season (in fact a request for enculturation).⁶⁹ Similar requests were made by the Indonesian⁷⁰ and Dutch bishops, the latter asking for more liberty for the local Episcopal conferences.⁷¹ Also the Indonesian bishops asked for more recognition of the singularity of the local population,⁷² and the Paraguayan bishops were asking for freedom to develop new *praefationes*, doing justice to local cultures.

Also with regard to the Divine Office, one can see that most of the collective interventions will come from bishops from the Third World or Latin America: the bishops of Argentina, Uruguay and Paraguay collectively ask for a simplification of the Divine Office, using as arguments that their priests do not want to pray less, but better. Here, again, the African bishops asked that local Episcopal conferences be granted the right to give their priests the freedom to pray the breviary in the vernacular.⁷³ Outside Europe Latin was no longer the "language of the clergy." This became clear in the collective intervention of the bishops of Chile, who certainly agreed that a priest must be a man of prayer, but at the same time asked for a revision of the Divine Office, the use of the vernacular, and suggested that the Divine Office has to do with the life and work of priests.⁷⁴ The request is repeated by a group of bishops from Chile and Uruguay: they stressed that the use of the vernacular is needed with regard to the nuns, adding that the use of the vernacular should be

66. *AS I,2*, 308f.

67. *AS I,2*, 323f.

68. *AS I,2*, 729f.

69. *AS I,2*, 613.

70. *AS I,2*, 311f.

71. *AS I,2*, 313f.

72. *AS I,2*, 317f.

73. *AS I,2*, 466f.

74. *AS I,2*, 511.

possible for all. The intervention also makes clear that a reduction of the Divine Office's length was needed because of the many pastoral activities.⁷⁵ The Europeans also intervened. Pastoral reasons were invoked by the bishops of what was then Yugoslavia: Franic mentioned the difficult circumstances in which the priests had to work and thus asked for a kind of reduction. Surely, in opposition to many others, he still was of the opinion that Latin should be used in the private praying of priests, the vernacular in public.⁷⁶ The auxiliary bishop of Strasbourg, Mgr. Elchinger, speaking on behalf of twenty-three colleagues, was of the opinion that praying in one's own language prevents prayer from becoming tedious and boring, and can be a great help for pastoral work.⁷⁷ Also the bishop of Bruges, on behalf of his Belgian colleagues but also of bishops from abroad, submitted written remarks to the Council's secretariat. Broadly speaking, his suggestions were for a greater authority on the part of the local ordinary to grant dispensations from praying the Divine Office. He also offered his support to those who desired that priests, for whom Latin was an obstacle to prayer, should be free to read the Office in the vernacular. In so doing, De Smedt underlined the fact that the insistence on Latin for those who found it an obstacle to prayer would be to side-step the purpose of the Office altogether and to deny to such clergy the spiritual fruits which these prayers had to offer. A bilingual breviary, provided by the Episcopal Conferences and examined by the Holy See, appeared to him to offer an ideal solution.⁷⁸

A last issue that is worth mentioning is that several bishops from Latin America or the Third World were calling for more sobriety in liturgy: Christ, a modest carpenter from Galilee, should be our model in the liturgical celebrations. The Church should be a poor Church, not boasting of its eventual richness.⁷⁹ The Indonesian bishops emphasize that the Church must be a Church for all people, especially the poor. Therefore, they warn against the construction of expensive buildings and ask the rich people to help the poor. Finally, richness puts off the poor. It results in a turning away from Christ.⁸⁰ Sometimes, people come back to the so-called unanimous intervention,⁸¹ as becomes clear in the intervention of

75. *AS I,2*, 613f.

76. *AS I,2*, 420ff.

77. *AS I,2*, 513ff. Such pastoral concern (and a plea for respect for local rituals) is also present in the intervention of Mgr. Rendeiro on behalf of the Portuguese bishops (including those in the colonies).

78. For the detailed motivation behind this proposal, cf. *AS I,2*, 511-512.

79. *AS I,2*, 621f.

80. *AS I,2*, 763.

81. *AS I,1*, 657.

the bishops of Nigeria, at the time mostly Irish missionary bishops, who do not support the use of the vernacular.⁸²

4. Conclusion

It is known that the Council fathers and the conciliar Constitution on the liturgy did not pay much attention to a juridical framework or rubrics,⁸³ often a main feature of pre-Vatican II liturgical guidelines. The survey as offered here makes clear that especially the bishops from the southern hemisphere were very much in favour of a liturgy which is related to daily life, respects the sensitivities of local cultures, contributes to the building up of community, and nourishes the spiritual life of the faithful. In order to give their interventions more weight and authority, they often acted as a group. Especially the African bishops, who tried to be well organized during the Council – Cardinal Rugambwa and the bishops Zoa (for French speaking Africa) and Blomjous (English speaking Africa) would play important roles in the coordination of the African conciliar activities⁸⁴ – made use of this strategy, thus showing that individual responsibility and collective action could go hand in hand. Their interventions also revealed that the local bishops did not ask to impose their proposals on others, but asked for freedom to implement the aspirations of their own people. It was also interesting to see that in this first conciliar debate, leading Episcopal conferences, such as the German one, did not yet think collectively with regard to liturgy. Critical comments with regard to the intended renewal of the liturgy most often came from individuals (esp. bishops from Spain and Italy). In fact, one may suggest that the tensions and critiques as formulated towards the liturgical movement – the liturgical movement never presented itself as a homogenous block, as was made clear in the first part of this contribution, where it became clear that “changes” in whatever direction resulted in critical reactions – continued to exist during the Council, and thus had an impact on the implementation process. In this regard, the *Missel romain pour les diocèses du Zaïre*, published in 1989, is a good example of liturgical implementation in a local Church, the result of years of local experiments and long negotiations with Rome. This missal

82. See ASI,2, 235f.

83. In this regard, see the remarks of Paul De Clerck & André Haquin, “La constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium* et sa mise en œuvre,” *Revue théologique de Louvain* 44 (2013) 171-196, at 173.

84. See, e.g., a letter of Jan Van Cauwelaert to his missionaries, October 6, 1963 (Papers Van Cauwelaert, Center for the Study of the Second Vatican Council, Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies, KU Leuven).

clearly meets the expectations of the Congolese bishops at the Council and the faithful today. It was the result of a long and painstaking process, but in the end, the Congolese Church succeeded, where other local Churches failed, as recently was made clear by Massimo Faggioli.⁸⁵

Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies Mathijs LAMBERIGTS
 KU Leuven
 St.-Michielsstraat 4/3101
 B-3000 Leuven
 Belgium
 mathijs.lamberigts@theo.kuleuven.be

85. Faggioli, *Liturgy and Ecclesiology in Sacrosanctum Concilium*.

REFUS ET RÉSISTANCES À LA RÉFORME LITURGIQUE

Acteurs – Motifs – Enjeux

Il n'est pas simple d'appréhender de manière globale les refus et les résistances opposés à la réforme liturgique de Vatican II. Ce qui est certain, c'est que tout traitement global de la question est à éviter. Il faut non seulement distinguer les acteurs ou les groupes d'acteurs, les motifs et les enjeux d'une telle fronde, mais aussi construire une chronologie de l'expression de ces résistances de manière à distinguer divers types de résistance. En effet, ces refus et résistances procèdent d'acteurs différents, sont inspirés de motifs qui ne sont pas toujours les mêmes et comportent des enjeux qui ne sont pas toujours du même ordre. De plus, on ne peut pas examiner les refus et les résistances, individuels ou de groupes, sans considérer en même temps l'accueil des réformes liturgiques, les refus et les résistances constituant en somme le revers de la même médaille.

La première question que le chercheur doit affronter est de déterminer le point de départ ou le *terminus a quo* d'une telle enquête. Je formule une première hypothèse: l'accueil de la réforme liturgique est proportionnel à la préparation des esprits à travers les mouvements qui ont travaillé l'Église catholique au cours des années préconciliaires. G. Alberigo signalait, à propos du concile, que

sa productivité, [...] a été forte tant qu'elle a affronté des aspects et des perspectives thématiques, élaborés et même expérimentés par des mouvements préconciliaires (domaine liturgique, biblique, œcuménique) ou des requêtes mûries en contrepoint à l'inflation des prérogatives papales, à la suite de Vatican I (valorisation de l'épiscopat). Quand il s'est agi de transcender les frontières des élaborations préconciliaires pour passer de la reconnaissance de la collégialité épiscopale à l'ecclésiologie de communion, de la légitimation de l'œcuménisme au dépassement de l'uniatisme oriental, de l'immobilisme de la «*societas*

perfecta» à la confrontation ouverte avec l'histoire des hommes, la même majorité s'est trouvée en difficulté¹.

Cette hypothèse se trouve validée au plan local. En effet, en examinant la réception de Vatican II au Québec en regard de l'horizon d'attente des fidèles, je conclus n'être «pas du tout surpris de la réception de Vatican II au Québec une fois reconstruit l'horizon d'attente à partir duquel vont être lus les textes qu'il a produits. Il y des choses qui s'avèrent immédiatement recevables, d'autres qui manifestent d'emblée leur opportunité et leur pertinence, d'autres enfin qui s'avèrent moins immédiatement recevables»².

La réception de Vatican II est donc liée, au moins en partie, au niveau de préparation des récepteurs et de leur disponibilité à recevoir les réformes qu'il va proposer. Plus les attentes sont élevées à l'égard des réformes à venir (réformes attendues et espérées), plus leur accueil sera généralisé et empressé. Au contraire, plus faible est la disponibilité à l'égard de réformes qui n'apparaissent pas désirables ou souhaitées, plus grande sera la résistance. Alors que l'on accorde généralement beaucoup d'attention au processus complexe de mise en œuvre d'une réforme, la question de sa recevabilité, pourtant déterminante, est souvent négligée³. C'est à cette question que nous prêterons d'abord notre attention et, pour cela, notre examen portera sur la période préconciliaire.

1. La recevabilité de la réforme liturgique

Le refus et les résistances aux réformes liturgiques du concile Vatican II s'enracinent donc dans la période préconciliaire. On peut construire ici différentes situations types. Soit des gens, des groupes ou des régions n'ont pas été touchés par le mouvement liturgique et, de ce fait, n'ont pas développé un appétit particulier pour ces réformes qu'ils n'ont pas désirées ni même anticipées, soit des gens ou des groupes, bien qu'en attente de réformes, ne trouvent pas dans celles proposées une réponse à leurs attentes du fait qu'elles les dépassent (des réformes qui vont trop loin ou trop vite) ou qu'elles se développent suivant une logique et une

1. G. ALBERIGO, *La condition chrétienne après Vatican II*, dans G. ALBERIGO – J.-P. JOSSUA (éds.), *La réception de Vatican II* (Cogitatio fidei, 134), Paris, Cerf, 1985, 9-40, p. 23.

2. G. ROUTHIER, *Horizons d'attente dans les Églises occidentales à la veille de Vatican II*, dans *Chiesa e storia* 3 (2003) 29-52, p. 50.

3. Sur la question de la recevabilité, voir H. MEYER, *Les présupposés de la réception ecclésiale ou le problème de la «recevabilité»: Perspectives luthériennes*, dans *Irénikon* 59 (1986) 5-19.

orientation différentes de celles qu'ils entrevoyaient (des réformes qui contrecarrent et déçoivent leurs espérances).

Il peut donc y avoir, d'une part, ceux qui n'ont pas vu venir la réforme et n'y aspiraient pas et qui, de ce fait, ont été surpris ou désorientés par ces réformes inattendues qui leur arrivaient de manière subite. Cette résistance a existé dans le peuple chrétien, dans certaines régions plus que dans d'autres. Elle ne semble toutefois pas insurmontable, même si ces changements subis plus que désirés commandent de leur part désinstallément, rupture dans leur routine et adaptation. Il y a par ailleurs une résistance qui ne tient pas de l'ignorance ou de l'impréparation à ce qui sera mis en avant, mais à l'indisposition de certaines personnes ou groupes, pourtant averties, mais indisponibles au type de réformes mises en œuvre. Il s'agit là d'un autre type de situation.

Hans Robert Jauß, qui a approfondi la notion d'horizon d'attente, signale que «même au moment où elle paraît, une œuvre littéraire ne se présente pas comme une nouveauté absolue surgissant dans un désert d'information; par tout un jeu d'annonces, de signaux – manifestes ou latents –, de références implicites, de caractéristiques déjà familières, son public est prédisposé à un certain mode de réception»⁴. C'est bien le cas pour la réforme liturgique. Des signaux assez manifestes étaient donnés des réformes à venir et les réformes qui jalonnent la période qui va de la seconde guerre mondiale à Vatican II, de même que le mouvement liturgique et le discours magistériel, en constituent les signes avant-coureurs. Il faut donc présumer qu'un certain public, lui aussi averti et prévenu des réformes à venir, n'était pas disposé à les accueillir. La définition de ce groupe et sa caractérisation me semblent assez complexes. Je me demande s'il ne faut pas, ici encore, remonter au mouvement liturgique préconciliaire dont la périodisation suscite des débats et qui n'est certainement pas d'une seule et même venue.

Schématiquement – il faudrait apporter plusieurs nuances ici – il y a d'une part le mouvement liturgique issu de Solesmes et de Dom Guéranger qui, à la suite de diverses évolutions, finira par correspondre à un catholicisme antirévolutionnaire, ultramontain, intransigeant et de restauration. Les travaux de Maria Paino sur la question sont convainquants⁵. En face des temps modernes, l'époque médiévale représente ici la référence, même si l'on peut également observer un réel ressourcement patristique. Bien de son époque, la réforme liturgique proposée est alors

4. H.R. JAUB, *Pour une esthétique de la réception*, Paris, Gallimard, 1978, p. 50.

5. Voir *Liturgia e società nel Novecento: Percorsi del movimento liturgico di fronte ai processi di secolarizzazione*, Roma, Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2000. Plus récemment, Sacrosanctum Concilium: *La costituzione sulla Liturgia del Concilio Vaticano II sotto il profilo storico*, dans P. CHENAUX – N. BAUQUET (éds.), *Rileggere il Concilio: Storici e teologi a confronto*, Rome, Lateran University Press, 2012, 9-40.

liée à un programme de restauration de la chrétienté et développe une ecclésiologie correspondante: ecclésiologie hiérarchique et de la *societas perfecta* en rupture avec la culture et le monde moderne, une Église marquée par la romanité. Il y a d'autre part un deuxième versant du mouvement liturgique qui entretient des rapports complexes avec le premier. Ce mouvement, initié au début du XX^e siècle et qui se développe encore plus à partir des années '30, mais surtout après le deuxième conflit mondial, prend ses distances par rapport à l'attitude de reconquête, de restauration de la chrétienté et de rechristianisation de la société. Non seulement le rapport de l'Église au monde et à la culture apparaît sous un autre jour, mais l'ecclésiologie développée par ce mouvement est beaucoup plus communautaire et, par conséquent, moins hiérarchique. Par ailleurs, même si les deux courants rénovateurs procèdent à partir d'un retour aux sources, on peut dire que le deuxième versant s'enracine davantage dans les sources patristiques et que la référence du premier est davantage l'époque médiévale et la liturgie développée à l'époque de la chrétienté. Enfin, la conscience historique et la familiarité avec la discipline historique est plus grande chez les acteurs du second mouvement, même si on y trouve des théologiens réputés (Casel, Guardini, Bouyer, Jüngmann), ce qui construit un autre rapport, plus historien, aux sources patristiques. Enfin, non seulement ces divers mouvements avaient des positions ecclésiologiques différentes, mais elles avaient aussi des options œcuméniques fort différentes, voire opposées. Il nous faut rappeler ici que Lambert Beaudouin est également un œcuméniste et que si le mouvement liturgique est indissociable des mouvements biblique et patristique qui lui sont contemporains et du renouveau de l'ecclésiologie et de la pastorale, il ne peut être dissocié non plus du mouvement œcuménique. Le siècle qui va de 1840 à 1960 est un delta où des eaux d'origine et de nature diverses se mêlent sans que l'on puisse facilement les isoler. La complexité des évolutions va bien au-delà de la répartition schématique en deux versants que nous avons esquissée ici. De plus, les évolutions sont observables à plusieurs niveaux: évolutions de la conception du rapport Église-monde, évolutions ecclésiologiques, évolutions des rapports œcuméniques, évolutions pastorales. Tout semble bouger en même temps, même si les évolutions se font toutes en douceur et que les avancées ne sont pas exemptes de retours en arrière. Notons enfin que les «descendants» de ces divers groupes avaient déjà pris des positions contrastées en présence des développements préconciliaires en matière de pastorale liturgique et de théologie de la liturgie⁶. L'encyclique *Mediator Dei* avait du reste voulu arbitrer entre ces diverses tendances.

6. Voir P. PRÉTOT, *La réforme de la Semaine Sainte sous Pie XII (1951-1956): Les*

Sur la base de ce qui précède, on peut dire que les résistances aux réformes liturgiques postconciliaires ou aux développements d'une théologie de la liturgie sont déjà présentes avant même l'ouverture du concile et elles se déclinent de trois façons principales: il y a d'une part ceux qui n'y sont pas sensibles et, par conséquent, peu ouverts à la question. La résistance prend ici la forme de la passivité ou de la désorientation en présence de réformes inattendues ou dont ils n'étaient pas avertis. Il y a d'autre part ceux qui, pour toutes sortes de raisons, sont opposés à toutes réformes en ce domaine, la liturgie étant en principe intouchable parce que sacrée. Il y a enfin, ceux qui, bien qu'ouverts aux réformes liturgiques, sont demeurés liés au premier mouvement liturgique associé à la restauration de la chrétienté dans une posture d'opposition au monde moderne et à la culture et d'opposition à l'œcuménisme. Les véritables opposants à la réforme liturgique se retrouveront surtout dans ce troisième groupe qui est lui-même diversifié. S'il fallait ajouter un camp, on pourrait définir un quatrième groupe, lié à une esthétique particulière en matière de chant sacré (mouvement cécilien) ou d'art sacré⁷. C'est surtout une position esthétique et non la question du rapport au monde ou aux chrétiens non-catholiques qui est ici déterminante.

On peut déjà dégager quelques conclusions de ce premier parcours: la préparation des esprits dans la longue durée à travers le mouvement liturgique, les initiatives réformatrices et les enseignements pontificaux avaient rendu un grand nombre de fidèles disponibles et ouverts à la réforme liturgique que certains attendaient même avec impatience. Ceux qui n'y avaient pas été sensibilisés, malgré une certaine surprise, n'ont pas opposé de refus ou de résistance vigoureux aux réformes même s'ils ont pu être déstabilisés ou désorientés. Ils n'avaient pas d'appétit pour ces réformes, mais leur paresse ou leur installation dans un univers confortable ne les a pas conduits à organiser une résistance active.

Ma deuxième conclusion veut attirer l'attention sur le fait que la réforme liturgique est liée à plusieurs autres questions comme on l'a vu en cours de route. Elle est liée, d'une part et très étroitement, à l'ecclésiologie. En effet, les divers courants réformateurs portent avec eux des types d'ecclésiologie fort différents, sinon opposés. Une ecclésiologie ultramontaine, hiérarchique et de restauration, pour le premier, et une ecclésiologie plus communautaire et ouverte aux cultures, dans le deuxième cas. Elle est liée, d'autre part, à l'œcuménisme, surtout

enjeux d'un premier pas vers la réforme liturgique de Vatican II», dans *Questions liturgiques* 93 (2012) 196-217, pp. 210-216.

7. On verra Françoise Caussé, *La Revue «L'Art Sacré»: Le débat en France sur l'art et la religion (1945-1954)*, Paris, Cerf, 2010.

tourné vers l'Orient avant Vatican II, et cette question sera très sensible au cours de la période postconciliaire où l'œcuménisme se développera cette fois avec les Églises issues de la Réforme. Elle est de plus liée à une stratégie pastorale dépendante des ecclésiologies impliquées: pastorale de chrétienté et pastorale de masse, d'un côté, et pastorale fondée sur l'idée de communauté, de l'autre. Enfin, le rapport aux sources et à la tradition se présente différemment. Grossièrement – et il faudrait ici apporter plusieurs nuances à un propos trop schématique et binaire – la conscience historique, qui conduit à une conscience de l'historicité des formes et à une approche plus historique des textes patristiques et médiévaux, est plus développée dans un cas que dans un autre. Ce n'est pas là une question marginale. La question de l'histoire est en effet au cœur de la crise moderniste et elle sera au cœur de la posture intégriste si souvent associée au refus de la réforme liturgique. Cette question qui traverse toute la théologie du deuxième tiers du XIX^e siècle et de la première moitié du XX^e s'impose donc à la réflexion. En somme, ce parcours nous instruit sur le fait qu'il ne faut pas examiner le refus ou les résistances en matière de réforme liturgique seulement à partir d'une considération «étroitement» liturgique, pour ainsi dire, ou à partir des seules questions strictement liturgiques. La réforme liturgique charrie et traîne avec elle, lorsqu'elle ne les cache pas derrière elle, d'autres questions qui, au final, déterminent et motivent les résistances et les refus. Paul VI avait bien raison, lorsqu'il écrivait à Mgr Lefebvre, que le refus ne porte pas simplement sur la liturgie, mais se fonde, en amont, sur d'autres motifs qu'il faut savoir décrypter:

Nous ne pouvons donc pas prendre vos requêtes en considération, parce qu'il s'agit d'actes qui sont déjà posés dans la rébellion contre l'unique et véritable Église de Dieu. Cette sévérité n'est pas dictée, croyez-le bien, par un refus de faire une concession sur tel ou tel point disciplinaire ou liturgique, mais, étant donné la signification et la portée de vos actes dans le contexte actuel, agir ainsi serait de notre part accepter d'introduire une conception de l'Église et de la Tradition gravement erronée⁸.

Au sujet du concept de tradition, il ajoutait:

le concept de «Tradition» que vous invoquez est faussé. La Tradition n'est pas une donnée figée ou morte, un fait en quelque sorte statique qui bloquerait, à un moment déterminé de l'histoire, la vie de cet organisme actif qu'est l'Église, c'est-à-dire le corps mystique du Christ. Il revient au Pape et aux conciles de porter un jugement pour discerner dans les

8. Lettre de Paul VI à Mgr Lefebvre, 11 octobre 1976 (<http://lacriseintegriste.typepad.fr/weblog/1976/10/lettre-de-paul.html>)

traditions de l'Église, ce à quoi il n'est pas possible de renoncer sans infidélité au Seigneur et à l'Esprit Saint – le dépôt de la foi – et ce qui au contraire peut et doit être mis à jour, pour faciliter la prière et la mission de l'Église à travers la variété des temps et des lieux, pour mieux traduire le message divin dans le langage d'aujourd'hui et mieux le communiquer, sans compromission induite. La Tradition n'est donc pas séparable du Magistère vivant de l'Église, comme elle n'est pas séparable de l'Écriture sainte.

Voilà planté en gros le paysage avant l'ouverture du concile.

2. La période conciliaire

Même si le schéma sur la liturgie connaît un *iter* conciliaire assez harmonieux – surtout si on le compare à l'*iter* d'autres documents – la résistance et le refus se manifestent déjà au cours de la préparation et de la discussion conciliaire de ce document. Certes, comme le notait G. Alberigo, le concile a pu se montrer productif sur cette thématique qui avait été largement élaborée avant le concile. Ceci dit, le «succès» du schéma cache peut être des résistances plus profondes qu'on ne le croit. Elles sont, d'une part, politiques. Elles sont ensuite proprement substantielles. Il faudrait, si l'on voulait affiner, examiner leur provenance, ce qui serait possible en reprenant les *vota* qui se rapportent à la liturgie, les interventions à la commission préparatoire et à la commission centrale préparatoire, les interventions *in aula* et les remarques écrites. On pourrait sans doute alors reconstruire certains groupes qu'il serait facile de localiser d'un point de vue géographique ou sociologique.

2.1. La résistance politique

La résistance politique s'exprime à l'intérieur même de la Commission conciliaire. Elle est menée par le cardinal Larraona qui désigne comme vice-présidents le cardinal Giobbe et Mgr Julien, tous les deux membres de la curie, laissant du coup de côté le cardinal Lercaro, seul cardinal élu à la commission par l'Assemblée. Elle s'exprime également par le remplacement du secrétaire de la commission préparatoire, Mgr Bugnini, par Mgr Antonelli, de la Congrégation de rites, qui n'avait pas participé aux travaux de la commission préparatoire. Cela est assez surprenant, car toutes les autres commissions conciliaires avaient reconduit dans leur fonction les secrétaires des commissions préparatoires de manière à assurer la continuité des travaux.

La résistance politique s'exprima également tout au long du travail en commission. En effet, le cardinal Larraona freina constamment les travaux et la commission s'en trouva plus d'une fois quasi-paralysée. On se souvient que le 9 novembre 1962, un groupe d'experts de la commission avait envoyé une lettre au Secrétaire d'État se plaignant du mode de travail inefficace de la commission. En somme, on intervint sur la procédure et les fonctionnements quand on n'espérait plus obtenir gain de cause sur le fond.

La résistance politique s'exprima également sitôt la Constitution adoptée à travers la concurrence et le conflit (sinon la confusion) de compétences entre la Congrégation des rites et le *Consilium*⁹ chargé de mettre en œuvre la Constitution. On assiste alors à la relégation à l'arrière-scène de l'équipe Larraona-Antonelli et à la montée en puissance de l'équipe Lercaro-Bugnini. On notera que, dans les décennies qui suivirent, les attaques visant la réforme auront une dimension politique. Ce que l'on refuse et rejette, c'est la réforme Lercaro-Bugnini, ce dernier devenant la tête de Turc des opposants.

Elle s'exprima ensuite à travers le *Motu proprio* «*Sacram liturgiam*» donné sous forme de lettre apostolique et qui écornait au passage certaines dispositions de la Constitution, notamment l'article 36 § 4 qui réglait l'approbation des traductions en langue du pays de l'Office divin, disposant que cette compétence revenait à l'autorité ecclésiastique compétente sur un territoire donné. Cette «modification» de la Constitution avant même son entrée en application entretenait les pires inquiétudes pour la suite des choses, puisque c'était l'autorité même du concile qui était de cette manière contestée et mise à mal. Cela permettait donc d'imaginer que l'on pourrait par la suite, par des mesures administratives et des documents d'application, modifier la Constitution. Une brèche était alors ouverte et la suite montra qu'on s'employa sans relâche à enfoncer davantage le coin et à élargir toujours plus la brèche. Si, au cours du concile, on voulut retarder la réforme par des mesures dilatoires de nature procédurale et organisationnelle, au cours de la période postconciliaire, c'est à travers des actes administratifs qu'on voulut en réduire la portée. Je ne détaille pas jusqu'à ce jour les divers épisodes de ce contournement du concile à travers des actes législatifs, administratifs ou procéduraux. On en trouverait des exemples dans le *Code de droit canonique* (c. 838 § 3) qui exige que les traductions des livres liturgiques reçoivent la *recognitio* du Saint-Siège (cf. l'article 36 § 4 de *SC*) ou davantage encore dans l'Instruction *Liturgiam authenticam* pour ne rien dire du *Motu proprio* «*Summorum pontificum*». Le refus de la réforme liturgique

9. Sur le sujet, on verra A. BUGNINI, *La riforma liturgica (1948-1975)*, Rome, C.L.V.-Edizioni liturgiche, 2^e 1997 [1983].

s'exprime alors à travers un certain nombre de mesures visant à l'affaiblir ou à en suspendre l'application, du moins.

Manifestement, un tel refus ne peut espérer de résultat s'il n'est pas porté par une organisation solide et aux ramifications importantes et ne bénéficie pas d'appuis en haut lieu. Cela fait également partie de la dimension politique de la résistance. Celle-ci n'est pas simplement individuelle, mais elle est organisée et bénéficie de parrains en haut lieu. Avant 1969, il pouvait bien y avoir quelques résistances sourdes à la réforme liturgique, mais ces résistances étaient dispersées et n'avaient pas encore de caractère public. Très tôt cependant, cette résistance s'organisa autour de Mgr Lefebvre qui en devint le porte-étendard. Un groupe d'opposition se constitua. Par la suite, ce regroupement gagna en légitimité lorsque les cardinaux Ottaviani et Bacci attaquèrent violemment le nouvel *Ordo missae* dans le *Breve esame critico del Novus Ordo Missae* adressé à Paul VI le 25 septembre 1969¹⁰. On a compris que des oppositions individuelles et isolées n'ont pas d'impact et sont sans effet. De même, des opposants qui ne peuvent se couvrir de la légitimité d'une autorité n'ont pas de crédit. En revanche, une opposition organisée et qui bénéficie de l'autorité de cardinaux devient efficace. Elle fait du bruit, elle semble légitime, bénéficie d'un réseau, a une figure publique et médiatique, dispose d'un lieu de formation, est appuyée par une entreprise éditoriale, etc. Elle sort de la marginalité et s'impose au public. De ce fait, elle suscite de nouvelles oppositions, les fait passer de l'implicite à l'explicite ou de la résistance silencieuse et sourde à la militance, coalise les oppositions, les regroupe et les fédère.

C'est au cours de cette année 1969 que se joue, il me semble, l'opposition à la réforme liturgique. En effet, comme le raconte le biographe de Mgr Lefebvre, des jeunes du Séminaire français sont allés voir Mgr Lefebvre pour lui demander de faire quelque chose pour eux car ils n'étaient pas satisfaits de ce qu'ils recevaient au Séminaire français. Il ne s'agissait pas d'abord ou seulement d'une question liturgique, mais à nouveau, la liturgie, au plan symbolique, est vite apparue comme l'élément qui pouvait cristalliser toute l'opposition. De plus, on sait que l'on a utilisé le cardinal Ottaviani dans cette affaire. Certes, il était sans doute réservé au sujet du nouvel *Ordo missae*, mais comme il l'écrit, «je regrette seulement que l'on ait abusé de mon nom dans un sens que je ne

10. Le texte est publié dans la revue *Itinéraires: Chroniques et Documents* 67, n° 138 (décembre 1969) 22-24. Il est repris dans la *Documentation catholique* [DC] 68, n° 1558 (1970) 215-216. Sur l'histoire de ce texte, voir N. SENÈZE, *La crise intégriste: Vingt ans après le schisme de M^{gr} Lefebvre*, Paris, Bayard, 2008, pp. 75 et 76. Voir aussi, B. TISSIER DE MALLERAI, *Marcel Lefebvre, une vie*, Étampes, Clovis, 2002, p. 420. On connaît le rôle qu'ont joué dans sa rédaction Marcel Lefebvre et Michel Louis Guérard des Lauriers, dominicain proche de M^{gr} Lefebvre au cours de cette période, et qui finira sedevacantiste.

désirais pas, par la publication d'une lettre que j'avais adressée au Saint-Père sans autoriser personne à la publier»¹¹.

2.2. La résistance sur le fond et le refus substantiel

La résistance n'est naturellement pas que politique. Elle est aussi substantielle, c'est-à-dire que l'opposition tient au fond de la question et celui-ci n'est pas simplement liturgique.

Dans ses études sur la réception des œuvres littéraires, H.R. Jaub observe que non seulement une production répond à des attentes, mais il s'empresse d'ajouter qu'une œuvre artistique dépasse les attentes, les déplace et les réoriente. Pour que l'on soit véritablement en présence d'une œuvre artistique, il faut qu'il y ait un «écart esthétique» entre les attentes préexistantes et la production. Autrement, observe Jaub, si l'écart entre l'œuvre et l'horizon d'attente se rétrécit et «que la conscience réceptrice n'est plus contrainte à se réorienter vers l'horizon d'une expérience encore inconnue, l'œuvre se rapproche de l'art 'culinaire', du simple divertissement», celle-ci n'exigeant «aucun changement d'horizon, mais comble au contraire parfaitement l'attente suscitée» et «satisfait le désir»¹².

Les attentes préconciliaires ne favorisent donc pas simplement la réception de la réforme liturgique, elles peuvent également la contrarier si la réforme réoriente les attentes vers une autre expérience que celle qui était anticipée. Plusieurs attendaient une réforme liturgique. Cependant, tous n'attendaient pas la même réforme, certains n'attendaient pas cette réforme. Je ne suis pas sûr que la grande unanimité qui a couronné le débat sur *Sacrosanctum Concilium* ne cachait pas un malentendu profond. On n'était alors qu'au début du concile et, dans l'esprit d'un certain nombre, la Constitution était encore susceptible d'être interprétée dans des sens différents. La suite du concile allait déterminer de manière plus spécifique ses options sur l'Église locale, sur la participation de tous, sur le rapport de l'Église aux cultures, sur le rôle des conférences épiscopales, sur la conception du prêtre, etc. En somme, on a, déjà en 1964 mais encore plus en 1968, une réforme liturgique que certains n'avaient pas vue venir et n'attendaient pas. Les attentes devaient se réorienter.

Le *Breve esame critico del Novus Ordo Missae* dont j'ai parlé plus haut indique des points sur lesquels la réforme butait. On y observe que «le nouvel ORDO MISSAE, si l'on considère les éléments nouveaux,

11. Lettre du card. Ottaviani à l'Abbé de St-Vandrille (17 février 1970): DC 68, no 1560 (1970) 343.

12. JAUB, *Pour une esthétique de la réception*, p. 53.

s'éloigne de façon impressionnante, dans l'ensemble comme dans le détail, de la théologie de la sainte Messe, telle qu'elle a été formulée à la XX^e session du Concile de Trente [...]». Ici, c'est une conception de la tradition qui est en jeu. «Tant de choses éternelles s'y trouvent reléguées à une place mineure», ajoute le texte, «des vérités, toujours crues par le peuple chrétien, pourraient changer», si bien qu'on serait en face d'une «infidélité au dépôt sacré de la doctrine auquel la foi catholique est liée pour l'éternité».

Encore ici cependant, il faut dépasser les questions relevant strictement de la liturgie ou de la sacramentaire. En effet, la liturgie est sans doute le lieu par excellence où l'Église s'exprime, se symbolise, se manifeste ou se donne à voir, comme l'affirme *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. La liturgie apparaît ainsi comme un lieu instituant fondamental pour l'Église. Modifier la liturgie, c'est, du coup, toucher au système symbolique du groupe catholique et modifier le système de représentations de l'Église catholique. Du coup, c'est introduire des déplacements dans les conceptions de Dieu, du prêtre, de l'Église, etc. La liturgie s'avère donc le premier lieu où l'Église s'exprime en se mettant elle-même en scène et il n'est pas fortuit que Vatican II ait commencé par une discussion sur la liturgie, ce qui lui a permis d'asseoir sa réflexion ecclésiologique, qui allait se déployer par la suite¹³. Aussi, le passage à une nouvelle ecclésiologie s'exprime d'abord dans cette théologie orante qu'est la liturgie avant de se conceptualiser et de se dire à travers des discours rationnels. Pas surprenant qu'à la suite des grands conciles de réforme, la liturgie devienne un champ de bataille important et, dans cette sphère où la lutte pour le contrôle n'est pas terminée, s'affrontent différentes manières de comprendre les ministères, l'unité et la catholicité de l'Église, la participation de tous à la vie de l'Église, les conceptions de l'Église comme peuple de Dieu ou comme assemblée hiérarchique et inégalitaire, les relations de l'Église au monde, aux cultures, aux autres chrétiens, etc. Il ne faut donc pas être surpris des résistances qu'on opposera ici ou là – même encore aujourd'hui – à *Sacrosanctum Concilium* ou des tentatives de révision de l'enseignement de cette constitution – dès son point de départ et encore aujourd'hui – car la liturgie demeure un lieu symbolique par excellence où sont pétries les mentalités, façonnées les spiritualités et forgées les représentations chrétiennes et un lieu où sont mis en scène les rapports entre les chrétiens, et entre les fidèles et leur Seigneur.

13. Voir sur le sujet G. ROUTHIER, *Orientamenti per lo studio del Vaticano II come fatto di ricezione*, dans M.T. FATTORI – A. MELLONI (éds.), *L'Evento e le decisioni: Studi sulle dinamiche del concilio Vaticano II*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 1997, 485-499.

La liturgie devient pour ainsi dire l'étendard du refus du concile Vatican II. C'est l'œcuménisme qui est refusé, la conception du prêtre, etc.

3. Conclusion

L'examen des résistances et des refus de la réforme liturgique nous amène à conclure qu'il s'agit là d'un site privilégié pour étudier, plus généralement, les résistances aux réformes conciliaires quand ce n'est pas simplement le refus du concile lui-même. Cela ne tient pas simplement à la force symbolique de la liturgie à travers laquelle l'Église se représente elle-même (une épiphanie de l'Église), mais également au fait que la réforme pose à peu près toutes les questions abordées par ailleurs par le concile: le rapport au monde et aux cultures, la place centrale de la Parole de Dieu, le rapport à la tradition et à l'histoire, l'unité de l'Église et la diversité des expressions de la foi dans la catholicité avec les questions subsidiaires de la centralisation et de la romanité, le rapport aux autres chrétiens (l'œcuménisme), la conception de l'Église, ce qui inclue notamment la compréhension que l'on a du prêtre, des laïcs et de leur participation à la vie de l'Église, l'autorité des évêques et des conférences épiscopales, etc. La liturgie est donc à la confluence de toutes ces questions qui y convergent et qui s'y trouvent imbriquées.

Par ailleurs, la liturgie est au cœur de la vie de l'Église. Pour les fidèles, il s'agit de quelque chose de concret, de quotidien, quelque chose de familier et non pas une réalité abstraite. On ne peut pas facilement mobiliser les fidèles autour d'un débat théorique sur les compétences des conférences épiscopales en regard de celles de la curie romaine ou du pape, non plus sur la question de la théologie du presbytérat ou sur le rapport que l'Église doit entretenir avec la tradition patristique ou médiévale. Par ailleurs, on peut facilement les mobiliser autour de la liturgie et de questions concrètes: l'usage de la langue vernaculaire, de la communion sur la langue ou dans la main, du chant grégorien, etc. Ainsi, la liturgie peut devenir un étendard que l'on peut brandir et derrière lequel peut s'abriter toutes les contestations ou tous les refus qui n'osent pas toujours avancer à visage découvert. L'instrumentation de la liturgie au service d'autres combats est une donnée qu'il ne faut jamais oublier. Le refus de la réforme liturgique a donc une portée et une signification plus large et plus profonde. Toute étude de la question doit donc s'intéresser aux motifs et aux fondements de ces résistances et identifier précisément les refus qu'elles recouvrent sans les nommer.

Ces motifs sont non seulement divers, mais les groupes d'opposants sont eux aussi bigarrés. Il ne s'agit pas d'un front uni, malgré les

apparences. Pour parvenir à un peu de clarté dans l'analyse et espérer dénouer l'écheveau où tant de fils sont emmêlés, il faut donc sérier les questions et distinguer soigneusement les groupes. Il faut à la fois distinguer les éléments et saisir les interrelations entre chacun. Comprendre les évolutions postconciliaires à ce chapitre commande ces deux opérations intellectuelles.

Cette étude nous indique également qu'il ne faut pas faire commencer l'histoire des résistances et des refus au concile au lendemain du concile. Ces résistances sont déjà là à la veille du concile. Elles ont une préhistoire dont il nous faut tenir compte. Cette préhistoire de la réforme conciliaire est elle aussi complexe et il n'est plus permis d'écrire au singulier le terme «réforme». Il faut parler des réformes ou des courants réformateurs. Cela nous a conduit à mettre en avant le concept de «recevabilité» proche parent d'un autre concept forgé dans les études sur la réception, celui d'«horizon d'attente». Ces deux concepts, trop souvent ignorés, nous empêchent d'examiner les réformes en dehors de la prise en compte du sujet récepteur. Le succès ou l'échec d'une réforme ne dépend pas simplement de la plus ou moins bonne stratégie de ceux qui sont chargés de la mettre en œuvre. Elle dépend foncièrement de la capacité latente des sujets récepteurs à l'accueillir. Elle est donc elle-même située dans une histoire et ne se présente pas comme une création spontanée, mais elle répond à des attentes, en même temps qu'elle les dépasse et les réoriente. L'étude de l'horizon d'attente des fidèles à l'égard du concile est un domaine de recherche encore pratiquement vierge.

On le voit, penser la réforme de et dans l'Église à partir du site liturgique est très suggestif, aussi bien au plan méthodologique qu'au plan de la compréhension de l'Église que nous pouvons en acquérir.

Faculté de théologie et de sciences religieuses Gilles ROUTHIER
 Pavillon Félix-Antoine-Savard, local 846
 2325, rue des Bibliothèques
 Université Laval
 Québec (Québec)
 G1V 0A6
 Canada
 Gilles.Routhier@fts.ulaval.ca

LITURGY REFORM SINCE VATICAN II

The Role Played by Bishops in the English-Speaking World

The task suggested by the title is enormous and an impossibility, given the available space. However, an overview can offer a taste of the changing dynamic between Conferences of bishops in the English-speaking world and the Roman dicastery responsible for overseeing the Conciliar reform of the liturgy. This article will begin with a brief survey of the work of English-speaking bishops throughout the world as they responded to the reform of liturgy in their own local churches up to 1975. In this we will also give voice to concerns from English-speaking parts of the African and Asian continents – places often ignored in a Western discourse on liturgy which consequently tends to be myopic and selective when it seeks to bestow universal application on its conclusions. By examining the translation work carried out by the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL), effectively an agency of 26 English-speaking bishops' conferences, we can map elements of a changing relationship between Rome and local churches. We will note, through selected case studies, increasing frustration on the part of bishops matched by an increasing distrust of ICEL by the Roman dicastery. A few modest observations on this history will conclude the article.

1. Before 1975: Creative and Dialogic Exercise of Authority

The first decade or so after the promulgation of *Sacrosanctum concilium* (4 December 1963; hereafter *SC*) marked a time of great vibrancy and expectation regarding the reform of liturgy.¹ Initially, before the *editiones*

1. This overview relies principally on Reports from local bishops or national bishops' conferences found *Notitiae* and *Ephemerides Liturgicae*. These reports, especially those in *Notitiae* which have an 'official' character, helped at the time to create an international cross-fertilisation that emerged from a sharing of experiences. For the Roman aspect we will rely on the writings of two people who were, at different times, officials in the Roman dicastery responsible for liturgy and its reform: Annibale Bugnini, *The Reform of*

typicae of any of the official liturgical books were promulgated, bishops were occupied principally with the establishment of national and diocesan liturgy commissions; the tentative beginnings of work on the vernacular translation of interim texts; and the liturgical formation of clergy and laity.² The second half of this first decade was characterised by a flurry of work on the translation of the official Latin texts of the principal newly reformed rites which came out in quick succession from 1968 to 1972. This was accompanied by a second wave of studies of the history, theology and pastoral issues associated with these sacramental rituals, which were not just scholarly but also accessible to those in pastoral ministry. Bishops reported almost universal and, in some places, exuberant acceptance of the impending reforms, such that, once begun, the movement towards liturgical reform could not be easily halted.³ Elsewhere it seemed as if bishops were moving at a pace that almost anticipated elements of the Roman reform that was being guided by the *Consilium* tasked with directing the reform.⁴ At times Rome sought to temper expressions of local inventiveness when they came to its attention, either because it wished to retain a balance between legitimate

the Liturgy 1948-1975 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990) [Italian original: *La riforma liturgica (1948-1975)* (Rome: Centro Liturgico Vincenziano – Edizione Liturgiche, 1983); all references will be to the English translation]; and Piero Marini, *A Challenging Reform: Realizing the Vision of the Liturgical Renewal*, ed. Mark R. Francis – John R. Page – Keith F. Pecklers (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007).

2. Bishops' conferences responded to the Roman initiatives for the implementation of the reform which was formally set in motion by the *motu proprio* of Paul VI, *Sacram liturgiam* (25 January 1964; *Acta Apostolica Sedes* 56 [1964] 139-144). The First Instruction on the proper implementation of the Liturgy Constitution (*Inter oecumenici*, 26 September 1964; *Acta Apostolica Sedes* 56 [1964] 877-900) from Sacred Congregation of Rites (*Consilium*), gave an impetus and direction to the burgeoning work of reform, with a deadline set for the implementation of the first phase on 7 March 1965, a date which is significant as it marks the initial stage of the implementation of the Conciliar liturgy reform. The document addressed practical issues concerning the introduction of the vernacular in the liturgy, as well as some rubrical adaptations and simplifications which related mostly to Mass and Holy Week. Further modifications were added in the Second Instruction, *Tres abhinc annos* of 4 May 1967, which dealt chiefly with the Mass and Divine Office (text in *Acta Apostolica Sedes* 59 [1967] 442-448; *Notitiae* 3 [1967] 169-194). A Third Instruction from Sacred Congregation of Divine Worship, *Liturgicae instaurationes*, dated 5 September 1970 (text in *Acta Apostolica Sedes* 62 [1970] 692-704; *Notitiae* 7 [1971] 10-26), attempted, through exhortations and regulation, to deepen an understanding of the reform that was now in motion.

3. Bishops in The Philippines, for example, had already taken seriously the Roman directives on active participation (Sacred Congregation of Rites, Instruction, *De musica sacra et sacra liturgia*, of 1958). Their bishops' pastoral directives (1961) on the Mass had been implemented, so that participation through word, song and gestures was already part of their experience. See [The Philippines Report], *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 295-297, p. 296.

4. The creation of the *Consilium* and its history is recounted in Bugnini, *The Reform of the Liturgy 1948-1975*, esp. 49-53, 69-95; and Marini, *A Challenging Reform*, 1-116.

reform under the guidance of the *Consilium* against those who were strongly resisting it and looking for any excuse to reject it, and/or because some initiatives were ill-informed and needed serious review.⁵

A brief survey will reveal how all churches devoted much energy responding to the Roman initiatives as these were made, but with older established churches receiving the Conciliar liturgy reform differently to the younger churches.⁶

1.1. Established Churches

In general, the principal concern of the older established churches was to follow and implement as fully and faithfully as possible the Roman initiatives regarding liturgical reform. In Europe, the rush to introduce vernacular texts, by 7 March 1965 (as requested by *Inter oecumenici*), even if limited in extent, was not helped by the appearance of an interim *Ordo Missae* and its accompanying *Ritus servandus* in January 1965.⁷ The quick succession of Roman texts created a degree of uncertainty for some bishops, despite the insistence by Rome that the pace of reform at local level should be regulated by the episcopal conferences.⁸

Almost as soon as *Sacrosanctum concilium* was promulgated in December 1963 many bishops, at their national assemblies, sought to create episcopal liturgical commissions. Australia reports that their newly formed commission held its first meeting in February 1964,⁹ and in early 1965 Canada reported the establishment of two commissions, one for

5. See the comments on this by Bugnini, *The Reform of the Liturgy 1948-1975*, 257-266.

6. Our interest will be directed only to the English-speaking parts of the various geographical regions. Therefore no consideration will be given of one significant part of the Catholic Church that is found in Latin America: however, an overview of the first years can be read in Enrique Rau, "Latin America," in "Documentation Concilium. The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy Applied in Five Continents: A Survey of Progress," *Concilium* 2 (1966) no. 2, 73-75, as well as among the official reports submitted to *Notitiae* during these early years.

7. See Bugnini, *The Reform of the Liturgy*, 114-116; and notification in *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 101-102. This (interim) *Ordo Missae* constituted, theologically, an important step in the reform of the Mass as the *Ordo* in use up to now was a form of 'private' Mass at which people could be in attendance. The *Ordo Missae* of 1965, pending the more definitive Mass reform which was to appear in 1969 (and then in the 1970 *Missale Romanum*), was designed for the celebration of the entire assembly of which the presiding ordained priest was part. Thus the ecclesiology and theology of Eucharist espoused by *SC* was now inchoately expressed in ritual form, even if in an interim version. The entire text of the interim *Ordo Missae*, with accompanying Decrees, can be found in *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 79 (1965) 120-143.

8. See Heinrich Rennings, "Europe," *Concilium*, 79-82, p. 80.

9. See [Australian Report], *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 132-135, p. 132.

French and a second for English-speaking liturgy.¹⁰ In the USA a permanent secretariat for the co-ordination of the liturgical work of the bishops' conference in Washington DC was announced in December 1964.¹¹

One of the first tangible results of the reform was seen in the use of interim vernacular translations of the Mass (initially Latin was retained for the Canon and some of the parts of the Mass), and some sacramental rites (but not the sacramental form). This happened after the *confirmatio* for each text was granted by Rome.¹² Canada reported implementing the use of approved texts of the Missal and sacramental rites from France and the USA from early March to May 1965 onwards.¹³ Ireland's Report stated that, apart from the partial use already being made of the Irish language, English had been in use there since 1959 for portions of the rituals of baptism, marriage and anointing of the sick, and that an interim and incomplete English translation of the Mass was introduced in Lent 1964,¹⁴ a situation reflected also in the USA which began using vernacular in Advent 1964.¹⁵ In England and Wales, the vernacular was introduced into the Mass at the beginning of Advent 1964, and this was prepared for by an Instruction addressed to the clergy by the bishops from England and Wales, and New Zealand stated that it looked forward to an even more extensive use of the vernacular (to include the Canon

10. See [Canadian Report], *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 124-126, p. 124.

11. See Godfrey Diekmann, "The United States and Canada," *Concilium*, 75-79, p. 77.

12. It is interesting to note that, historically, the earliest permissions granted by the *Concilium* for vernacular translations – in any language – did not come from the northern hemisphere. Official records (reported through *Notitiae*) show that the first interim translation to be approved was Lithuanian (23 April 1964; Prot no 286/64), followed within weeks by Chile (Spanish; 30 April), New Zealand (English and Maori) and Thailand on 16 May 1964. On 1 May 1964 Australia, Egypt and the USA (in the order of their protocol numbers) received the required *confirmatio* for English (and, in addition for Egypt, Arabic and French). We have to wait until 15 June of that year before some other countries received permission to use vernacular: (in order of protocol numbers): Vietnam (Vietnamese, English, French and Chinese); Iraq (English and Arabic); Canada (French and English), and England and Wales. Between November 1964 and mid-1965 almost all other national conferences received the *confirmatio* for interim vernacular texts. This helps to dispel the myth that European or the North American churches were the prime movers, in all instances, of post-Conciliar liturgical reform.

13. See [Canadian Report], *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 125.

14. So, the [Irish Report], *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 230-231; although the official date on which the interim translations were approved by Rome was 4 November 1964 (Prot no 1819/64). See also, HA [Henry Ashworth], "Anglia-Hibernia," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 80 (1966) 342-343; 447; and 81 (1967) 517-519.

15. See [USA Report], *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 126-127, and see Diekmann, "The United States and Canada," 75-79.

and other parts currently permitted only in Latin).¹⁶ However, enthusiasm was not universal, and the bishops of England and Wales reported that while vernacular was accepted "some see no reason why Latin cannot be one among the other languages used from time to time in the liturgy."¹⁷

Writing in the journal *Concilium* the Australian Archbishop, Guildford Young (one of the bishops who in October 1963 helped initiate what would later become ICEL), stated that early attempts at an interim English translation of the Ordinary of the Mass by the hierarchy's liturgical committee "was marked by a departure from stylized hieratic forms of expression and special attention was given to the demands of English as spoken by a large body for people."¹⁸ Use was made in Australia of the existing English translation found in the old Baltimore Ritual, the US *Collectio Rituum* and the UK *The Small Ritual*.¹⁹

Many countries began the work of liturgical formation of clergy and people as early as January 1965 and some places had already by this time formed diocesan liturgical commissions. In 1958 (in response to the invitation set out in the Instruction *De musica sacra*), the bishops of the USA established a Commission on the Liturgical Apostolate, a move that reflected positively the strength of the liturgical movement which had been established there earlier in the century. This had its foundation in the work of, among others, Dom Virgil Michel (who established the precursor of the journal *Worship* in 1926), as well as in the annual Liturgical Weeks which began in the 1940s and continued on to the time of the Council.²⁰ The USA was among the first places to encourage the establishment of parish liturgy committees, which served to support the implementation of the reform. Some national bishops' conferences, such as that of Canada, prepared documentation and literature to facilitate liturgical formation.²¹ Many countries used homilies during a specified

16. See [New Zealand Report], *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 363-364, p. 364.

17. [England and Wales Report], *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 223-224, p. 223 [translation from Latin by author]. It was decided that a Latin Mass should be retained for those who would prefer the retention of that language. Three years later this Conference spoke of the positive experiences brought about by the continuing work of reform, but mentioned that the use of Latin and the question of maintaining reverence during liturgy remained concerns: see *Notitiae* 4 (1968) 114-116. A report from the [UK] "Association for Latin Liturgy," which was founded in September 1969, was published in *Notitiae* 11 (1975) 26-28.

18. Archbishop Guildford Clyde Young, "Australia," *Concilium*, 68.

19. See Young, "Australia," 69. Later reports continued to be positive about the work of the reform in Australia as well as its reception: *Notitiae* 4 (1968) 206-207; and *Notitiae* 16 (1990) 247-252.

20. For a history of the earlier years of liturgy reform movement in the USA, see Keith F. Pecklers, *The Unread Vision: The Liturgical Movement in the United States of America: 1926-1955* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998).

21. See Diekmann, "The United States and Canada," 77-79.

period of time to prepare people for the pending reform. Most contemporary Reports underline the importance of continuing liturgical education of clergy and people.²² However, unlike what was reported of other parts of the world, one commentator suggested that in Europe it was felt that there was insufficient time between the local issuance of directives and their implementation, with the result that, because of a lack of appropriate literature, clergy and people were not always suitably prepared for them. It was discovered that people resisted when clergy did not involve the assemblies in formation work and respectful consultation.²³

The reform was received with general and great enthusiasm, and two extremes – a small group resisting reform while another expressed a degree of impatience at the slow pace of the impending changes – did not seem to create any great difficulty in the overall scheme.²⁴

Other elements of the reform were taking shape. Early on, in England and Wales, the employment of lay readers was envisaged, this being cautiously expanded in 1970 to include women.²⁵ Communion under both kinds was introduced there by August 1967.²⁶ Other initiatives were taken regarding baptism and the celebration of marriage with a non-Catholic Christian. Archbishop Young (Australia) reported that the introduction of vernacular scripture readings in the liturgy was an occasion for realising the need for a biblical formation, while in England and Wales it was noted that the language found in OT is somewhat alien to people.²⁷ In Australia work was directed towards encouraging a new presiding style and distinction of altar and ambo. All of this helped to

22. See, for example, HA [Henry Ashworth], "Anglia: Diocesan Liturgical Commissions," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 82 (1968) 487-488; and The Antilles, "Resolutions Passed by the Episcopal Conference," *Notitiae* 11 (1975) 148-152.

23. See Rennings, "Europe," 80.

24. See Diekmann, "The United States and Canada," 76-77; [USA Report], *Notitiae* 127; and Philip T. Weller, "Status Foederati Americae Septemtrionalis," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 80 (1966) 191-192; 450-452.

25. See Brian Newns, "English Liturgical Legislation since the Council," *Concilium* 8 (1972) no. 2, 133-135, pp. 133-134.

26. That is, only in those cases permitted by the Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of Rites on Worship of the Eucharistic Mystery (*Eucharisticum mysterium* of 25 May 1967), no. 32 (text in *Notitiae* 3 (1967) 225-260: with commentary by J.-M.R. Tillard, J. Lécuyer, and S. Famoso, pp. 261-288) and this was expanded by the bishops in 1971 in response to the Instruction on the Extension of the Faculty to Administer Holy Communion under Both Kinds, *Sacramentali communione* (29 June 1970; *Acta Apostolica Sedes* 62 [1970] 664-667, and *Notitiae* 6 [1970] 322-326). See Newns, "English Liturgical Legislation since the Council," 133. Canada listed communion under both species as an element of reform that needed to be promoted alongside a revision of the *Divine Office* which would include communal celebration: *Notitiae* 4 (1968) 283-285.

27. See Young, "Australia," 69; and [England and Wales Report], *Notitiae*, 224.

encourage increased participation and served a broad catechetical function. Young concluded, "[u]nder the influence of the Vatican Council and in the atmosphere of freedom and initiative which it has engendered, the massive programme of remedying [the general lack of biblical literacy, paucity of hymns, and the enhancement of homiletic content and style] has commenced."²⁸ Conferences were taking responsibility for leading and deepening the reform.

The England and Wales Report expressed some reticence, and hoped that "the rule [would remain] that the Canon of the Mass be recited *submissa voce* by the celebrant – so that the people could have small moments to be formed in the habit of contemplation and meditation."²⁹ This Report also expressed concern that "proper teaching" regarding the office of the [ordained] priest will be inculcated in people, whereas "[t]he *munus* of the people (the priesthood of all the faithful) is sufficiently clear in the Liturgy of the Word and in other places."³⁰ The comment of the German liturgical theologian, Heinrich Rennings, regarding Europe is relevant when he observed that, "[i]n general one may say that the English-speaking countries show the greatest reluctance to implement the freedom they have been given while the French-speaking countries make a fuller use of this than anyone else."³¹

1.2. Younger Churches

In contrast to the older churches, the spirit of the reform in the younger churches in Africa³² and Asia³³ seems to have driven a desire for something deeper on the part of a number of bishops.

As was true of other parts of the Catholic world, concern for vernacular liturgy was to the fore in both Asia and Africa. The variety of languages in various countries created enormous problems (it was noted,

28. Young, "Australia," 69.

29. [England and Wales Report], *Notitiae*, 223-224. This concern was expressed also by Pakistan, calling it "a regret" that the reform did not seem to encourage silence so that the liturgy would be conducive to devotion (see [Pakistan Report], *Notitiae* 1 [1965] 297-298, p. 298).

30. [England and Wales Report], *Notitiae*, 223-224 [Translation from Latin by author].

31. Rennings, "Europe," 80.

32. For an overview of African countries see Bonifatius Luykx, "Africa," in "Documentation Concilium," *Concilium*, 69-73. Reports from bishops of various individual countries can be found in *Notitiae*.

33. For an overview of Asian countries see Paul Brunner, "Asia," in "Documentation Concilium," *Concilium*, 66-68. Reports from bishops of various individual countries can be found in *Notitiae*.

for example, that the Philippines had 76 dialects),³⁴ not facilitated by the almost insurmountable difficulties that linguistic differences with Latin posed for a formal rendition of the original liturgical prayer texts. India was able to introduce the Konkani language in October 1964 alongside the English (which had been in use since August 1964), and the Indian Report showed that vernacular worship was not new on the sub-continent as it had been in place for quite a number of years for various parts of the Roman Ritual.³⁵ Within two years of the promulgation of the Liturgy Constitution, Pakistan already had interim translations approved for 10 of its languages. That the English language was employed or understood in some way by approximately 37 per cent of the population meant that material developing in that language elsewhere could be employed more easily.

Much work was being undertaken in the area of adaptation³⁶ with Roman vesture, ritual gestures and symbols often being replaced or complemented, after some study and consultation, by corresponding elements of local culture.³⁷ There was a desire for a "deeper" level of reform that is respectful of local cultures. This was most easily applied, as a first step, to Christian marriage, funerals and baptism. The increasing role of local forms of music placed an important part of the initial reform work. In many places these initiatives were being advanced by missionaries and the caution that sometimes accompanies their work is echoed in reports.³⁸

34. Of which 8 are major languages: [The Philippines Report], *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 295-296, p. 295; see also Brunner, "Asia," 67.

35. [Indian Report], *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 119-120; 9 (1973) 75-77.

36. This is the term employed in SC 37-40, but later the word "inculturation," coined in the early 1970s and accepted as being reflective of a better theology and process, came to be accepted. See Anscar J. Chupungco, "A Definition of Liturgical Inculturation," *Ecclesia Orans* 5 (1988) 11-23.

37. In January 1968 the Pakistani bishops issued guidelines which, among other things, asked that a 'westernisation' of liturgy be avoided, and recommended the replacement of Roman style vestment with a white tunic, as well as the removal of shoes in places of worship: *Notitiae* 4 (1968) 331; and *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 82 (1968) 494. This is echoed in a very fine communication from the Indian bishops, "Problems of Experimentation and Implementation of the Liturgical Reform," *Notitiae* 5 (1969) 44-49; 365-374. Permission was granted by the *Consilium* for the Indian "adaptations" reported here in a Rescript of 25 April 1969 (Prot no 802/69).

38. For example: "Before borrowing signs and symbols from their particular cultures, it is still urgent that our clergy be imbued with the spirit of the Roman liturgy and take advantage of its pastoral potentialities if they wish to avoid mistakes that they shall later regret," Brunner, "Asia," 67. That serious reflection on "adaptation" took place can be seen in Paul Puthanangady, "Inculturation of the Liturgy in India since Vatican II," *Concilium* 162 (1983) 71-77; and his "Liturgical Renewal in India," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 91 (1977) 350-366.

The use of vernacular languages was deemed to be important in Africa because of the danger that some people would associate the unintelligibility of Latin with magic, as well as the obstacle that Latin would continue to bring to formation in the faith. Many African countries employed the language of their former colonial masters (principally English, French and Portuguese), but the need for the translation into local vernaculars was keenly felt.³⁹ Already at this early stage it was recognised that a form of "dynamic equivalence" (Eugene Nadia) was required: "... the style and *cursus* of the Roman missal prayers are so different from the African style that here something new has to be created, even if we use the themes of the Roman prayers."⁴⁰ We read that in Ghana a newly established liturgical commission had had its first meeting by July 1964 and within seven months this was replaced by three new commissions taking responsibility for liturgy, for music, and for Fante language and adaptation. The Report noted that the idea of participation was not new to them and that they desired greater freedom for adaptation. By March 1965, not only was English language introduced into the liturgy in Nigeria, but also Igbo, Yoruba, and Hausa, and special permission "was granted to allow a qualified layman [*sic*] to read the Gospel at Mass where the celebrant was a non indigenous missionary who found it difficult to speak the vernacular."⁴¹ The episcopal report from Ghana was probably one of the first in Africa to note that the creation of vernacular texts from the Latin will pose challenges on account of the different syntactic structures of the vernacular and Latin languages.⁴² However, an African author addressed the issues associated with translation, and concluded that a vernacular liturgy is "but the first step towards an indigenous African liturgy which is the expression of what lives in the depths of the African soul, and which differs in many respects from what moves the people of the West."⁴³

Bonifatius Luykx highlighted the need for liturgical formation because "liturgical renewal goes hand in hand with the renewal of instruction [catechesis]."⁴⁴ If missionaries did not receive good liturgical formation while in their Western-based seminaries, he said, then the work

39. Zambia reported positively on the experience of active participation, but noted the difficulties in multi-lingual urban assemblies when it came to choosing the language(s) for celebrating the liturgy: *Notitiae* 4 (1968) 24-26; 123-124.

40. Luykx, "Africa," 73.

41. Especially on account of its tonal character: [Nigeria Report], *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 352-353, p. 352.

42. See [Ghana Report], *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 346-349.

43. Luykx, "Africa," 73, emphasis in the original.

44. *Ibid.*, 69-73, p. 70.

of the reform would be inhibited. He noted the lack of liturgical development and openness in English-speaking countries compared with their French counterparts, especially when it comes to the preparation of missionaries. Occasionally the specialised training of African clergy in graduate liturgy schools in the USA and in Europe “has the disadvantage that some too zealous disciples take over injudiciously the customs and opinions of their Western masters or schools and find that they cannot be applied: there is a slight difference between Saint-Séverin and Africa.”⁴⁵ Congresses across the continent created a forum for sharing of experiences as well as receiving input from experts from abroad (like those held in Uganda, Congo and Ruanda). Some pastoral centres in different parts of the continent used their journals to help share good studies on various aspects of liturgy, such as AFER in East Africa.⁴⁶

A close study of the official Reports submitted by local Conferences to Rome, as well as a few contemporary submissions to journals by scholars, is revealing. The more cautious Reports were signed by missionary bishops, whereas indigenous bishops were, in general, more concerned with the contextualisation required by culture(s). Those from French-speaking African countries showed a different and more open approach to the liturgy reform than did bishops in former English colonies (whether they were indigenous or missionary).⁴⁷

1.3. The Pull of the ‘Centre’ against the ‘Periphery’

While bishops’ conferences throughout the world were preoccupied with advancing the reform of the liturgy in their territories and directing the enthusiasm of laity and clergy alike, a battle for power was being played out in the Roman liturgy offices.

The reaction against what initially seemed to be the inexorable path towards reform of liturgy that was initiated by *Sacrosanctum concilium* eventually won out, for, by 1975 a small but powerful clique in the Vatican succeeded in having Archbishop Annibale Bugnini (1912-1982) removed from his post there and exiled to Iran as Pro-Nuncio.⁴⁸ The origins of a Curial resistance to liturgical reform, including to the

45. *Ibid.*, 70-71.

46. One such article, reprinted from AFER, was “‘Africanisation’ Liturgiae,” *Notitiae* 7 (1971) 105-106.

47. Luykx explained this in part by reference to the greater availability of scholarly centres for the study of liturgy in places like Belgium, Paris, and Trier which were availed of by local clergy and missionaries of non-English-speaking backgrounds; see his “Africa,” 70.

48. Marini (*A Challenging Reform*, esp. 141-150) details the Curial efforts to sideline Bugnini. For Bugnini’s perspective on this, see his, *The Reform of the Liturgy*, 89-95.

concession of power to local episcopal authorities, goes back at least to the Council itself.⁴⁹

Sacrosanctum concilium, art. 36, permitted the introduction of vernacular languages in the liturgy (SC 36 §2), while upholding the use of the Latin language in the Latin rites (§1).⁵⁰ It is the responsibility of the local / national bishops’ assemblies to decide if and to what extent that vernacular is to be introduced in their territories, but this decision must receive the Roman *approbatio seu confirmatio* (§ 3). Once that was obtained, SC 36 §4 stated that translations were then to be approved by the bishops’ assemblies (“Conferences”), and *did not require* that these be sent to Rome for further approval. However, some seven weeks after the promulgation of the Constitution on the Liturgy by the Council Fathers (on 4 December 1963), the *motu proprio* of Paul VI, *Sacram liturgiam* (25 January 1964), reversed this and mandated that translations approved by episcopal conferences must now be submitted to the *Consilium* for its *approbatio seu confirmatio* (section IX).⁵¹ The *motu proprio* caused immediate reaction, initially from the Benedictine, Salvatore Marsili (founding President of The Pontifical Liturgy Institute at Sant’ Anselmo, Rome) who expressed grave concern at the move in the Roman dicastery to regain an authority over the approval of translations that the Liturgy Constitution conferred, unambiguously, on the local episcopal conferences. The reaction from Austria was also strong, as can be seen in this extract from a letter of the bishop of Linz, Franz Zauner: “... the Curia and parties within it are still insisting on centralization and resisting decentralization by every means at their disposal. Approval of biblical and liturgical texts in the vernacular has

49. Any good history of the Council will recount the difficult journey during most of 1962 of the *schema*, *De sacra liturgia*, where a revision made by a small subcommittee minimised the role of local authorities and thus negated any attempt at decentralisation. The revision excised references to vernacular liturgy, and the ultimate control of reform would be lodged with the relevant Roman dicastery. The Council Fathers rejected this “corrected” version of the *schema* produced by a preparatory subcommission in favour of the text of the *schema* in its original form. This is the best context for understanding the rubrical and other minor revisions that produced the *Missale Romanum* of 1962, a return to which was approved by Pope Benedict XVI in his *motu proprio* of July 2007, *Summorum pontificum*, to the delight of those who seek a “reform of the reform.” See Bugnini, *The Reform of the Liturgy*, esp. 25-27; and Marini, *A Challenging Reform*, xvi-xxi.

50. This article (drafted in 1962) must be seen in the context of SC 54 (eucharist), 63 (other sacraments and sacramentals), 101 (Divine Office), and 113 (music) – all drafted in 1963 – which were more expansive in permitting the employment of the vernacular.

51. For a detailed history of the troubled preparation of *Sacram liturgiam*, see Bugnini, *The Reform of the Liturgy*, 54-59; and Marini, *A Challenging Reform*, 1-39. Marini notes that this paragraph 4 of SC 36 was approved by the Council Fathers by a vote of 2041 to 30: *Ibid.*, 27.

always been a prerogative of the bishops ..."⁵² Very strong criticism also came from Germany, Spain, as well as from other voices in Italy. However, the strongest reaction came from France where, at a bishops' conference meeting, interim translations had been approved in mid-January 1964 (in accordance with *SC* 36 §4, and before *Sacram liturgiam* was issued). In a letter to several Curial offices, the president of the French bishops' Liturgical Commission, Archbishop Joseph-Marie Martin, reacted with firmness against section IX of *Sacram liturgiam* and effectively reaffirmed the bishops' right to approve vernacular translations on the basis that this was sanctioned by the Council.⁵³ There is no contemporaneous record in the English-speaking world of any reaction, either official (by bishops) or from scholars, to the publication of this *motu proprio*, most particularly its section IX.

From this moment onwards a struggle can be detected between those who desired to implement the reform of the liturgy mandated by the Council, and those who sought to restrict this to the most minimal changes. What was witnessed through the regular reports and communications from various episcopal conferences throughout the world, and published in *Notitiae* so that "successes" as well as problematic issues could be shared, was a movement which saw in the Liturgy Constitution the inauguration of something that could only be assessed, both pastorally and theologically, at local level, and under the competent guidance of the local church working in union with Rome. By 1975 initial hopes and aspirations were tempered by a realisation that the reform of liturgy was gradually becoming a victim to ecclesial (and Curial) politics that are sourced in divergent ecclesiologies, and, more worryingly, soteriologies. The removal of Bugnini from Rome robbed bishops throughout the world of one of their most ardent supporters and effectively placed the continuing work of liturgy reform in the hands of those who increasingly succeeded in slowing down, and eventually attempting to reverse, a movement of liturgical reform that began in the earliest decades of the twentieth century.⁵⁴

52. Cited in Bugnini, *The Reform of the Liturgy*, 59.

53. Both the letter and memorandum are reproduced in Marini, *A Challenging Reform*, 168-170.

54. After Salvatore Marsili died in December 1982, letters of correspondence from Bugnini relating to this time in his life were published in *Rivista Liturgica* 71 (1984):123-134. An overview of many of the issues which continued to play out over the past few decades is found in John F. Baldovin, *Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008).

2. English Language Translation: Towards Pastoral Maturity and Responsibility

Of the various language groups present at Vatican II, the English-speaking bishops seem to have been the first to discuss the desirability of creating a single body to prepare the vernacular liturgical texts sanctioned by Council.⁵⁵ The idea was first mooted in the autumn of 1962 and then agreed upon in principle during an informal meeting at the altar of St Josaphat in St Peter's Basilica on 2 October 1963 (with four bishops from the USA, Australia, South Africa, England and Wales), just weeks before the Liturgy Constitution was promulgated.⁵⁶ From this emerged the International Committee on English in the Liturgy (ICEL) which held its first formal meeting at the English College ("Beda") in Rome on 17 October 1963.⁵⁷ From its earliest days, ICEL employed a consultative mechanism that was broad and extensive, making use of the best of

55. *SC* 36 §3 only requested that Conferences consult with others in neighbouring regions where the same language was spoken when deciding if and to what extent it desired to employ vernacular translations. Such decisions had to be ratified by Rome. However, no proposal was made in the Conciliar text to consult neighbouring regions with regard to the translations themselves which were to be approved by the local conference without recourse to Rome (see *SC* 36 §4). The decision among English-speaking bishops was informed by pastoral common sense, as well as by a desire to share the best of expertise available within the various conferences. Similar decisions were also made regarding the French and German languages. The *Consilium* quickly realised the pastoral benefit of employing a uniform translation within language groups: see *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 195-196; Congregation for Divine Worship issued Norms to regulate this: *Notitiae* 6 (1970) 84-85; later issuing a further communication relating the Spanish and Portuguese languages: *Notitiae* 8 (1972) 38-40; 9 (1973) 70-71.

56. Much has been written on the history of ICEL. Important here is a text written by one of the only two English-speaking *periti* in liturgy at the Council, Frederick R. McManus, who was also a significant figure in the creation of ICEL: "ICEL: The First Years," *Shaping English Liturgy: Studies in Honour of Archbishop Denis Hurley*, ed. Peter C. Finn – James M. Schellman (Washington, DC: Pastoral Press, 1990) 433-459. See also in the same collection, John R. Page, "ICEL, 1966-1989: Weaving the Words of Our Common Christian Prayer," *ibid.*, 473-489.

57. See, *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 308, which reports the first meeting of what was initially known as the English Liturgy Committee, in Rome on 20 September 1965. At this meeting the first group was elected from 10 English-speaking representatives: see also *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 339-345. The representatives came from Australia, Canada, England-Wales, India, Ireland, New Zealand, Pakistan, Scotland, South Africa and the USA. In 1967 The Philippines became a member of ICEL. There are a further 15 Associate Member conferences, mostly representing places in Africa and Asia where English may be either an official language or provide a common means of communication. These are not represented on the Episcopal Board, although they participate in other ways in the work of ICEL.

linguistic, theological, patristic, biblical, liturgical, and musical expertise available in order to assist it in the task given it by its Episcopal Board.⁵⁸

A presentation of selected 'case studies' relating to the translation work of ICEL on behalf of English-speaking episcopal conferences, and coming mostly from the 1980s and early 1990s, will reveal a changing relationship between the English-speaking bishops, whom ICEL serve, and the Roman dicastery for Worship.⁵⁹

2.1. Case Study One: Pastoral Care of the Sick: Periculose

A meeting of the Advisory Board of ICEL took place in Rome on 26-31 October 1982, to which the Secretaries of the National Liturgical Commissions of the member and associate member conferences of ICEL were invited. The morning of 30 October was given over to a meeting in the offices of the Congregation for Sacraments and Divine Worship, and was represented by Archbishop Casoria, pro-Prefect, and Archbishop Noè, Secretary. A number of issues of concern to ICEL were discussed, one of which related to the English translation of the Roman *editio typica* of what is now known as *Pastoral Care of the Sick: Rites of Anointing and Viaticum*⁶⁰ – at that time in its White Book or final draft stage. Two matters, in particular, were discussed in its regard.

This draft represented the first instance in which ICEL, working under the direction of its Episcopal Board and after discussion among member Conferences, rearranged some of the material of the Latin *editio typica* so that it would “more adequately meet the pastoral demands for the celebration of these rites in various circumstances.”⁶¹ The integrity of the prayer texts and the ritual itself, as was always the case in the work of ICEL, had been fully respected, but some changes which were made included the expansion of the Latin headings and rubrics in order to make

58. At different stages it had a number of subcommittees: translations and revisions, presentation of the texts, eucharistic prayers, original texts, liturgical psalter, music.

59. As Liturgy Secretary to an Associate Member Conference of ICEL, the author attended meetings of the national secretaries sponsored by ICEL from October 1982 onwards, and was later appointed in 1999 to the Advisory Board / Consultants Committee of ICEL until December 2003 when the re-structuring of this translation agency, mandated by Rome, was undertaken. To the extent possible, the Case Studies which follow will be presented employing sources available in the public forum.

60. Corresponding to the Latin ritual book, *Ordo unctionis infirmorum eorumque pastoralis curae* (Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 7 December 1972).

61. See the White Book, editorial note. Although this was not what was referred to as a “second generation” text, it did help ICEL reflect on issues that would emerge in a second or subsequent revision of the translation of liturgical books, based on reviews of its work. For a discussion of “second generation” texts, see Page, “ICEL, 1966-1989,” 486-489.

the ritual book easier to use by pastors. Additional original prayer texts not found in the Latin original were incorporated.⁶²

A second issue discussed related to the use of the Latin word “periculose” in *Praenotanda* 8.⁶³ Like many Latin terms found in liturgical tradition, this term needs to be translated in the context of the theology and practice of Anointing of the Sick before the Carolingian era as well as that found in later medieval theological discussion. The basic question is, for whom is the sacrament of Anointing of the Sick intended: the sick or the dying? Typical of some conciliar texts, *Sacrosanctum concilium* 73 represents a compromise in which opposing views can see their own position reflected. The decision of ICEL was to translate “periculose” as “seriously” rather than “dangerously” (this latter being the word preferred by the Congregation for Divine Worship [hereafter, CDW]), reflecting an understanding of the sacrament that accords more with liturgical tradition and theology. Protracted correspondence for over an 18 month period⁶⁴ resulted in a compromise which was ratified at this Roman meeting. An agreement was achieved but the ritual text had to carry an extra footnote offering a rationale for the choice, explaining how it might best be interpreted in pastoral practice.⁶⁵

2.2. Case Study Two: Respect for Local Conferences

A second concern was expressed at this meeting. It was often the experience of Bishops' Conferences (most particularly from Africa and Asia) that newly translated liturgical texts, having received their canonical *approbatio*, were submitted to Rome for its *confirmatio* only to be given by the Roman dicastery for Worship to a student in a Roman university, or other person, from that language group.⁶⁶ These people were not, needless to say, privy to the discussions of the translation

62. This is in accordance with the *Praenotanda* of the *Ordo unctionis infirmorum* 38 and 39 which permit episcopal conferences to make such changes. See Page, “ICEL, 1966-1989,” 485.

63. The text stated that the sacrament is celebrated by, among others, “those of the faithful whose health is [*periculose*] impaired by sickness or old age.”

64. The initial text was sent to Rome in 1979 and was with Congregation for Sacraments and Divine Worship for 18 months before it responded with preliminary observations.

65. The note, indicated by an asterisk rather than a number, states: “The word *periculose* has been carefully studied and rendered as ‘seriously’ rather than as ‘gravely’, ‘dangerously’, or ‘perilously’. Such a rendering will serve to avoid restrictions upon the celebration of the sacrament. On the one hand, the sacrament may and should be given to anyone whose health is seriously impaired; on the other hand, it may not be given indiscriminately or to any person whose health is not seriously impaired.”

66. Marini recounts a similar experience of the Polish bishops regarding Roman approval of their bi-lingual ritual in the 1960s: *A Challenging Reform*, 27-28.

groups back in their home countries, or of the process and debate that took place in its regard by their local episcopal conferences. Yet, their opinions, when they contradicted the judgement of the Conferences (which had given the canonical vote on the matter) were anonymously reported back to the Conference as part of the reason why a proposed translation was being rejected. There was no need to elaborate on the issue at the meeting: Archbishop Noè admitted that this did happen, described it as being disrespectful of the local episcopal conference, and guaranteed that it would not happen again.⁶⁷

3. English Language Translation: Increased Roman Centralism

The first two Case Studies reveal a readiness on the part of Rome to dialogue and reach a compromise on issues raised at local level. What emerges in a second wave and under a different leadership manifests a desire to control the work of refining and deepening the reform, which might have been informed by a fear that excesses were endangering a genuine development of the liturgy. A spirit of dialogue, characteristic of the earlier years, could have been employed to address new emerging concerns in a less authoritarian manner. This might suggest that, from the mid-1980s onwards, another movement had come to the fore in Rome (and elsewhere) which was underpinned by a sense that the reform defined – rather than inaugurated – by *Sacrosanctum concilium* had now been achieved.

3.1. Case Study Three: Order of Christian Funerals

Many English-speaking episcopal conferences in late 1985 forwarded the *Order of Christian Funerals* to Rome after they had given it the required canonical vote. It took nearly 18 months before they received the *recognitio* from Rome in April 1987. What was unusual here was that the decree of confirmation was accompanied by a list of modifications (running to ten pages) that were to be made to the text that *had already received* the canonical approval (*approbatio*) of the Conferences.

Two concerns emerged here. Firstly, this was the beginnings of a practice which was, at that time, extending beyond the legal rights that

67. This issue was referred to again by delegates representing mostly African and Asian countries, present at a Roman meeting, and was behind the comments summarised in AD [Antoine Dumas], "Activités de la Congrégation: Après le Congrès d'octobre 1984," *Notitiae* 21 (1985) 212-218; 286-291, esp. pp. 214 and 216.

Rome was understood to have regarding the approval of texts.⁶⁸ A second and serious concern was that, by this action, Rome called into question, not just the ability of the episcopal conferences which constituted ICEL to make appropriate pastoral judgments relating to their local churches, but also the scholarly competence of ICEL to serve these conferences. It needs to be noted that none of the concerns raised by Rome related to the doctrinal integrity of prayer texts in the *Order of Christian Funerals*.

3.2. Case Study Four: Eucharistic Prayer A

As part of the Sacramentary Project (a revision of the English translation of the *Missale Romanum*, begun in 1982 and completed in 1998, and subsequently rejected by Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments), the Episcopal Board of ICEL requested the preparation of some new and original Eucharistic Prayers. This was fully in accordance with *Comme le prévoit* 43 which encouraged the creation of new prayers that would grow organically from the tradition of the Church and its liturgical forms.⁶⁹ "Eucharistic Prayer A" was the only original Eucharistic Prayer to have been completed (in 1984) by ICEL, and this was sent, after consultation, to Conferences in 1986 for their vote before being submitted for the Roman *recognitio*. It needs to be noted that, from the beginning, ICEL kept Rome informed of this project, sending them copies of all of the documentation at all stages as these were being forwarded to bishops' conferences and consultors.

On 7 June 1986 the then CDW wrote to the ICEL Episcopal Chair, Archbishop Denis Hurley OMI, of Durban, stating that the principal objection to the Eucharistic Prayer was because the process did not follow the procedure set out in the 1973 Circular Letter *Eucharistiae participationem*.⁷⁰ It also stated that the Congregation for Doctrine of the

68. What was initially an *approbatio seu confirmatio* became *recognitio*, and the meaning of this canonical term seems to have begun to expand from at least the mid-80s onwards. Contrary to SC 22 and 36, the Congregation now reserves to itself the right to be involved in the very translation process itself (see the Fifth Instruction on the Correct Implementation of the Liturgy Constitution of 2001, *Liturgiam authenticam* 76, 104). With the issuance of the *recognitio* along with imposed modifications, this Roman response anticipated what would be explicitly stated in LA 80. For a discussion on canonical difficulties regarding this term, see John M. Huels, *Liturgy and Law: Liturgical Law in the System of Roman Catholic Canon Law* (Québec: Wilson & Lafleur Ltée, 2006) 54-55, note 71.

69. *Comme le prévoit* is an Instruction from the *Concilium* on translation of liturgical texts, dated 25 January 1969: *Notitiae* 5 (1969) 3-12. It is significant that it was issued first in French and not Latin.

70. CDW, Circular Letter, *Eucharistiae participationem* (27 April, 1973), in *Notitiae* 9 (1973) 193-201.

Faith was currently examining the text, and when it reported back the matter would be brought to the attention of the Holy Father. However, a third, and probably the principal concern, seems to have been that this Eucharistic Prayer (and two others produced by ICEL) had been circulated in some fashion and was being used in liturgical celebrations without authorisation.⁷¹

In response, Archbishop Hurley expressed surprise that this matter had not been raised with the ICEL Episcopal Board when it met with CDW the previous November, despite the Board giving a verbal account of the approval of this Eucharistic Prayer by individual episcopal conferences. Hurley addressed all of the points raised by CDW, and underlined the ecclesiological implications of the irregular manner in which Rome has dealt with the bishops of ICEL on the matter.

One full year later (in September 1987) the Prefect of CDW, Cardinal Augustin Mayer, attached a number of observations on the text listing problems that Rome had with the English text – many because it lacked the traditional vocabulary usually associated with this genre of prayer.⁷² This letter was written, he said, in response to requests from bishops in the English-speaking world for an explanation of the refusal of the *recognitio* for this Prayer. With that letter, he stated, the matter was to be considered resolved. ICEL responded to the official letter of the CDW (and to the objections cited by the Congregation for Doctrine of the Faith) in March 1988 – but to no avail.

3.3. Case Study Five: West Africa

The Inter-territorial Catholic Bishops' Conference of The Gambia, Liberia and Sierra Leone (ITCABIC) was composed of seven bishops spread over three countries in West Africa. In 1987, after a number of years of hard work, the Conference submitted to Rome for its *recognitio* an interim translation of the *Ordo Missae* in the Mende language, a language spoken by a large number of people in Sierra Leone. The decree of confirmation was granted in July 1987, but had an accompanying list of four points being “brought to your consideration ... so that the text be suitable prior to a publication.”⁷³ Three of the points stated that certain

71. This occasioned the issuance by CDW of “Declaratio circa preces eucharisticas et experimenta liturgica,” *Notitiae* 24 (1988) 234-236.

72. Including an observation that the reference to “Mary” in the section relating to the communion of saints should have referred to the “Blessed Virgin Mary,” and that the text could be misconstrued to imply a denial of the virginity of Mary.

73. Addressed to Archbishop Joseph Ganda of Freetown and Bo (Sierra Leone) the letter from CDW accompanying the Decree was dated 4 July 1987 (Prot no 248/87) was signed by the Secretary, Virgilio Noè.

matters represented in the rubrics require the prior permission of the Holy See, and proposed that, in each of these cases such a permission would be sought.

A fourth matter related to the translation of the phrase of the *Orate fratres*, “ut meum ac vestrum sacrificium,” which had been rendered, using an alternative translation already approved for English-speaking countries, as “our sacrifice.” The comment was made that the translation of “... ‘our sacrifice’ does not render faithfully the Latin text; furthermore this translation could create confusion among the faithful regarding the doctrinal aspect.”

The response that was sent to Rome in December 1987 in relation to this question set out a number of points: (a) the word *sacrificium*, when employed in the *Missale Romanum* with a possessive, always uses the plural, *nostrum*, and, apart from this prayer, never distinguishes the presider from the assembly;⁷⁴ (b) reference was made to the fact that the approved alternative English translation permits the use of “our sacrifice”; (c) a considered opinion was offered that the use of the phrase “our sacrifice” does not in any way cause doctrinal confusion among the people in Sierra Leone; and (d) reference was made to the 1974 approved French translation⁷⁵ and the second edition of the Italian translation which supplies alternative versions of priest’s invitation which use the inclusive plural.⁷⁶

In April 1988, a letter was received from CDW declining permission to use “our sacrifice”: “As regards the translation of the ‘Orate fratres, ut meum ac vestrum ...’ it is asked to render it faithfully to the Latin text. We understand the reasons presented by your Conference for a change, but it is necessary to follow the original Latin text and to avoid any eventual confusion as much as possible.”⁷⁷ With this the matter was

74. The Latin “atque / ac” means more than “et,” and is virtually impossible to render accurately in English. The text, with early medieval monastic Gallican origins, does not enter into the Roman Mass before the twelfth century. One of its medieval forms prays, “... ut vestrum partier et nostrum sacrificium.” See Paul Tirot, “Histoire des prières d’offertoire dans la liturgie Romaine du VII au XVI siècle,” *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 98 (1984) 148-196, pp. 193-195. The provenance of this text, linguistics, as well as a theology which informs this moment in the liturgy against its long history all lead to the conclusion that the English word “our” expresses accurately the doctrinal intention of the Latin “meum ac vestrum.”

75. French text: “Prions ensemble, au moment d’offrir le sacrifice de toute l’Église.”

76. Italian text (second Italian edition), “Pregate fratelli e sorelle, perché questa *nostra famiglia* radunata nel nome di Cristo, possa offrire il sacrificio gradito a Dio, Padre onnipotente”; and “Pregate, ... perché ... *ci disponiamo* a offrire il sacrificio gradito a Dio, Padre onnipotente” (emphasis added).

77. The letter from CDW dated 16 April 1988 (Prot no 248/87 [*sic*]) was signed by the Secretary, Virgilio Noè, and addressed to Bishop Michael J. Cleary CSSp of Banjul (The Gambia), the then President of the Inter-territorial Conference.

deemed to be closed and the bishops of ITCABIC did not further challenge the Roman decision.

4. Towards an Overview and Evaluation

4.1. Diminishing Respect for the 'Local'

The aftermath of the Council was marked by an enthusiasm to implement the liturgical reform mandated by the Liturgy Constitution. Bishops throughout the world reported little resistance to changes and Conferences worked creatively to learn from one another, as demonstrated by the desire among English, French and German speaking bishops, to collaborate with other Conferences of similar linguistic groups in order to share resources and expertise,⁷⁸ as well as through the facility provided by *Notitiae*, the journal begun by the *Consilium*, to act as an organ for sharing reports of activities from local churches. It seemed possible that various linguistic and cultural groups might approach the task of incarnating the paschal mystery of Christ actualised in liturgy according to the historic and particular circumstances in which they find themselves. The internal tensions in the Curia between those who worked to facilitate the reform mandated by *Sacrosanctum concilium* and a group that resisted change came into play from before the Council began. For them, the removal of Bugnini in 1975 from the liturgy dicastery marked a "success."

The exchange of views that took place at the meeting at the offices of Congregation for Divine Worship in 1982 of members of the Advisory Board and national secretaries of conferences served by ICEL was respectful and productive. This was in marked contrast to the challenges that ICEL increasingly experienced as it tried to serve the pastoral requirements of its member conferences. At all stages ICEL acted in accordance with the principles of the Instruction *Comme le prévoit* (1969), and responded to the "adaptations" permitted by the *praenotanda* of the various liturgical books promulgated by Rome. In all cases the response was to pastoral needs discerned by ICEL Conferences at local level, and approved by the agency's Episcopal Board. However, the difficulties experienced in the communications between ICEL and the Roman dicastery occurred despite the regular and open contact that ICEL

78. Meetings of ICEL regularly included representatives from the French language translation group, the "Commission Internationale Francophone pour les Traductions et la Liturgie," as well as from the German language translation commission, "Internationale Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Liturgischen Kommissionen im Deutschen Sprachgebiet."

had with CDW. As time went on this became one-sided and English-speaking bishops would often have to wait for very long periods of time for a response to communications, and when this came it was characterised by control.

4.2. Roman Centralism

According to John Wilkins, the 1978 election of Pope John Paul II signalled a shift in the Roman Curia's attitude toward ICEL.⁷⁹ But the effects of this emerged in a slow but determined drive to bring about a new centralism in Rome, whereby local episcopal conferences increasingly seemed to become regional offices whose task was to carry out Rome's bidding. This coincided with a movement – initially small and contained – calling for a reform of the reform. A number of significant people were involved with this, including Cardinal Ratzinger.⁸⁰ Massimo Faggioli wrote that "[t]he end of Paul VI's pontificate and the election of John Paul II meant not only a new attitude toward Vatican II but also the beginning of a new indulgence toward the tiny minority of Catholic traditionalists who rejected the liturgical reform as a device for rejecting Vatican II."⁸¹ Many liturgy-related documents from the time of Paul VI, such as the Directory on Masses with Children [and its Eucharistic Prayers] of 1973⁸² – the pastoral approach to children in liturgy which permeates this text is quite radical – and *Marialis cultus* on devotion to Mary (1974),⁸³ were hardly ever referred to in official communications and were thus all but written out of memory in the subsequent decades.

4.3. Compromise of the Reform

From the first days of the pontificate of John Paul II there was a strong lobby pressing for a return to the so-called "Tridentine Mass." Seemingly

79. This happened, inter alia, through the appointment of a series of cardinal prefects in the renamed Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments: beginning with Cardinal Paul Augustin Mayer, O.S.B. and ending with Cardinal Jorge Medina Estévez.

80. For a commentary, see John Wilkins, "Lost in Translation: The Bishops, Vatican II and the English Liturgy," *Commonweal* 132 (2005) 12, 14-16, 18-20; as well as the memoirs of ICEL's Episcopal chairperson during its period of crisis, Maurice Taylor, *Being a Bishop in Scotland* (Dublin: Columba Press, 2006) esp. 131-138.

81. Massimo Faggioli, *True Reform: Liturgy and Ecclesiology in Sacrosanctum Concilium* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012) 7.

82. Dated 1 November 1973, the text of the Directory is found in *Notitiae* 10 (1974) 5-21. The presentation and decree relating to the Eucharistic Prayers are found in *Notitiae* 11 (1975) 4-11.

83. Paul VI, Apostolic Exhortation, *Marialis cultus*, *Notitiae* 10 (1974) 153-197.

in response to this, Archbishop Virgilio Noè, the then Secretary in CDW (and a former undersecretary to Bugnini), circulated a questionnaire in 1980 to all bishops worldwide concerning the use of the Latin language in liturgy. Of interest here was the inclusion of a second question enquiring about requests for the use of the “Tridentine Missal.” The results are revealing: 98.68% of the church’s episcopacy did not consider that this older Missal ought to be used, with the exception of a few bishops (11, of whom 6 were from the UK) who were in favour of conceding the use of the 1962 Missal to those small groups who petitioned for it, with another 12 bishops who reported no problems regarding this form of the liturgy in their own dioceses, but who would have no difficulty if a dispensation were to be conceded to other dioceses where the demand for the so-called Tridentine Missal existed.⁸⁴ Despite the result of this survey, an Indult was granted by Pope John Paul II in October 1984 permitting the use of the 1962 Missal, albeit in restricted circumstances.⁸⁵ All the more strange was the fact that, within a few weeks of the issuance of this Indult, there was a gathering of all Presidents and Secretaries of national liturgical commissions, sponsored by CDW, which took place in the Vatican from 23-28 October. A number of bishops from some parts of the world participating at this were unaware of the existence of the Indult, either due to delays in it being communicated to the presidents of their Conferences, or because the Conferences had not passed on a copy of this to other bishops in their territory. At this Convention, the pro-Prefect, Archbishop Mayer responded to queries from bishops on the floor who asked, with some degree of annoyance, the reason why this Indult was issued in the first place. Their view was that the Indult would undermine the progress that needs to be made regarding the legitimate reform work mandated by *SC*.

84. The results along with an analysis of the statistics were published as “Investigatio de usu linguae latinae in liturgia Romana et de Missa quae ‘Tridentina’ appellari solet,” *Notitiae* 17 (1981) 589-611. Lest this statistic be misread: 79.37% of dioceses stated that they had never received requests for use of the “old Missal,” while 5.77% of dioceses (101 dioceses) stated that individual people had requested the use of this Missal; 10.51% (or 184 dioceses) had small groups who wished to employ the Tridentine book (mostly representing groupings in the USA, Europe and Oceania), whereas 4.34% (from 76 dioceses) represented requests related to Lefebvre (with the largest numbers coming from the USA and Europe).

85. Issued by the CDW and dated 3 October 1984, the text is found in *Notitiae* 21 (1985) 9-10. There was a delay of at least one year before the Indult was published, occasioned principally by the fact that its issuance had a less than full support on the part of staff members of the Roman Worship dicastery. A senior member of this dicastery voiced strong objections to the Holy Father who responded saying that if the Indult was not issued by CDW, he would issue it himself *motu proprio*. Shortly afterwards the newly appointed pro-Prefect persuaded the senior staff member that less damage would be done by allowing it be issued by the Congregation.

In response, the reasons given by the pro-Prefect included a pastoral concern for those who converted from Anglicanism or Protestantism, or who remain attached to the “Tridentine Mass” and wished to continue celebrating it. If consideration is to be given to other assemblies who look for “profound adaptation” of the liturgy, then “compassion” is also shown to these particular groups following the lead of the Pope who had recently written an encyclical, *Dives in misericordia*.⁸⁶ In 1988, a *motu proprio*, *Ecclesia dei*, which created a forum for members of the Pius X Society, permitted the use of the 1962 Missal and referred back to the 1984 Indult.⁸⁷ The creation of an “extraordinary form” of the Roman Rite from the 1962 Missal (and related sacramental rites) was the unexpected, if logical, conclusion of this movement to reform the reform, and was given approval and impetus in the *motu proprio*, *Summorum pontificum* of 2007.⁸⁸

4.4. Redirecting the Reform

From the mid-1980s onwards, and gaining momentum in the 1990s, there seems to have been a concerted effort to move the liturgical reform in a different direction, and to reformulate how the renewal of liturgy might henceforth unfold.⁸⁹ In terms of ICEL, its preparation of a second edition of the English language version of the *Missale Romanum* increasingly came under attack from small but vocal (and, initially, mostly North American) groups. Some of these voices were beginning to be heard in Rome. Given these difficulties (especially as they raised their head in the USA and, to a lesser extent, in parts of the UK and elsewhere), the then Chairperson of the Episcopal Board of ICEL, the American Archbishop

86. The acts of the Congress are found in Congregation for Divine Worship, *Atti del Convegno dei presidenti e segretari delle commissioni nazionali di liturgia* (Padua: Messaggero, 1986), here, esp. 928-930.

87. See John Paul II, Apostolic Letter issued *motu proprio*, *Ecclesia Dei*, 2 July 1988, in *Acta Apostolica Sedes* 80 (1988) 1495-1498.

88. See Benedict XVI, Apostolic Letter *motu proprio*, *Summorum pontificum* (7 July, 2007), in *Acta Apostolica Sedes* 99 (2007) 777-781. This document generated much reaction and commentary: see, for example, John F. Baldovin, “Reflections on *Summorum Pontificum*,” *Worship* 83 (2009) 98-112; Georgia Masters Keightley, “*Summorum Pontificum* and the Unmaking of the Lay Church,” *Worship* 86 (2012) 290-310; and John M. Huels, “Reconciling the Old with the New Canonical Questions on *Summorum Pontificum*,” *The Jurist* 68 (2008) 92-113.

89. Despite this movement, most churches, at local level, continued to work with the continuing reform of liturgy. See the brief but interesting reviews given in relation to five English-speaking conferences: “*Sacrosanctum Concilium* at Fifty: Reports from Five English-Speaking Countries,” *Worship* 87 (2013): Australia (Clare V. Johnson), 482-489; Canada (Bill Burke), 490-496; England and Wales (Paul Inwood), 496-503; Ireland (Patrick Jones), 503-509; and United States (Paul Turner), 510-516.

Daniel Pilarczyk, published a number of responses to questions about ICEL in two 1994 issues of the Chicago liturgical-pastoral review, *Liturgy 90*.⁹⁰ It was hoped that these articles, among others, might help to inform a discussion and counter the misinformation about the translation of liturgical texts from Latin into English that was being spread. Increasingly what was known as the “Sacramentary Project” (the second English edition of the Roman Missal) began to flounder, despite almost unanimous approval (through their canonical vote) of the project by the 11 English language episcopal conferences. An example of this can be seen in the treatment that the bishops of ICEL received, having approved in their Conferences the translation of the second Latin edition (1992) of the Rites of Ordination. In response, a letter from Cardinal Medina of 20 September 1997 expressed “in scathing terms ... [claims] that the text was full of errors [Rome listed some 114 errors in the translation] and that liberties were taken with the original Latin text.” When Cardinal George of Chicago took over as Chair of ICEL he warned the members of the Episcopal Board that “if ICEL did not change, its present structure would be radically changed.” Episcopal members of the Board reacted to this statement of George with dismay, fear and anger.⁹¹

4.5. Changing Fortunes

History will probably record that it was the “reform of the reform” movement, with a level of Vatican support which can be best described as bordering on “official,” that ultimately worked towards the demise of the (old) ICEL with the change in its structures from December 2003 onwards, and with this, its work of continuing the liturgical reform commenced by the Council. The detractors of the (old) ICEL omit to mention that from early on the fault lines in the first English version of the Missal (in 1973) were recognised by ICEL. No acknowledgement is made that this was first major project of translation that ICEL had to embark upon, nor is concession given by ICEL’s detractors that the Missal was faithfully translated in accordance with the then existing translation norms from Rome. A revision programme was commenced by ICEL in the very early 1980s which involved a worldwide consultation of ICEL’s bishops. Through the revision process bishops reviewed prayer texts in their various draft stages, and eventually gave the entire Sacramentary (as

90. In August/September and October issues of *Liturgy 90*, of 1994.

91. R. Kevin Seasoltz, “It’s the Eucharist, Thank God,” *Worship* 85 (2011) 244-256, p. 249. This review article offers an excellent overview and commentary on ICEL from the 1990s onwards.

it was called) its approval through a canonical vote.⁹² The outgoing Consultants’ Committee was assured in 2003 that up to 80% of the work already undertaken on that project would be retained in a new translation required in order to respond to the changes introduced by *Liturgiam authenticam*⁹³ working now from the *editio typica tertia* (2002/2008) of the *Missale Romanum*. The desire of Rome, articulated by the new body of ICEL, ensured that a text emerged that was very different to that represented by the 1998 Sacramentary. This resulted in great part from the fact that the reform of the reform movement seems to be informed not just by an ecclesiology that reads Conciliar texts selectively, but a soteriology which informs a particular understanding of how grace works. The Roman requirement, articulated in the 2001 Instruction *Liturgiam authenticam*, is that the vernacular be rendered as closely to the Latin original as possible, rendering it in a more literal manner. Liturgy is judged, not on account of its being an immersion into the paschal mystery of Christ, but in terms of its fidelity to the Latin original.⁹⁴

5. Summing Up: English-Speaking Bishops and Rome

It would be true to say that, initially, Bishops’ Conferences of Europe, North America and Australia concentrated, for the most part, on making available vernacular translations of the various sacramental rituals, but most particularly of the Mass; on creating the conditions needed for active participation (including the greater employment of music); and on the need, which was recognised from the beginning (see, for example, *SC* 14-19), for the appropriate and orderly liturgical formation of clergy and laity. Bishops in Asia and Africa faced a different set of challenges, to which they responded as best they could, despite difficulties of the demands of a vernacular liturgy, such as the existence of large numbers of dialects, and poor human or other resources. However, where the older established churches were pre-occupied with implementing faithfully the

92. For an overview of the work of revision, see John R. Page, “The Process of Revision of the Sacramentary, 1981-98,” *Liturgy for the New Millennium*, ed. Mark Francis and Keith Pecklers (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000) 1-16.

93. Fifth Instruction on the Correct Implementation of the Liturgical Constitution, *Liturgiam authenticam* (March 28, 2001). An articulate apologia for *Liturgiam authenticam* can be found in Dennis McManus, “Translation Theory in *Liturgiam Authenticam*,” *Benedict XVI and the Sacred Liturgy*, ed. Neil J. Roy and Janet E. Rutherford (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2010) 116-131.

94. For a brief comment on an aspect of this translation document see, Thomas R. Whelan, “Translating the Roman Missal. 1: Translation and Participation,” *The Pastoral Review* 8 (2012) no. 5, 30-35.

Roman-led initiatives towards reform, the local churches in Asia and Africa seemed to have had a different sense of what the 'spirit' of the liturgical reform implied, and, at least under the leadership of indigenous bishops (particularly, in the case of French-speaking Africa), were somewhat impatient in a desire to adapt local culture as permitted by *SC* 37-40. They often sought a deeper level of reform not yet dreamt of by their Western counterparts who in turn could be noted for their caution. Notwithstanding the work of inculturation that took place in various parts of the world, particularly in Africa, the deepest reflection and most radical application of the principles of *SC* 37-40 occurred on the Asian continent, especially in India and The Philippines.

This movement, wherein churches at either national or regional levels were able to negotiate the pastoral and theological requirements of the Conciliar liturgical reform, was balanced by understandable movements of resistance from the central Roman dicastery. These, one could say, were "understandable" – even in ecclesial contexts – because a principal of incarnation must take account of the human condition and the political nature of all transactions, especially when these are carried out on a global level. In contrast with pre-Conciliar procedures, the Catholic Church was learning a new way of collaborating that took seriously the implications of subsidiarity and collegiality.

What becomes disturbing is the unrelenting efforts by a small group to stop, and in some cases attempt to reverse, the reforming work of bishops' conferences throughout the world. This is what seems to have dominated the work of the reform, at least from the mid-1980s onwards. A rediscovered grammar of ecclesial relationships was being ignored. The starting point of a trajectory relating to translation was from a position where the competencies of local Conferences were to be respected and they would have the authority to approve their own translations (see *SC* 36 §4) as well as develop in a responsible manner ritual incarnations of the paschal mystery in terms of the cultural practices of a people (thereby contributing to the further evangelisation of that culture, see *SC* 37-40). This trajectory did not move along the lines proposed by the Liturgy Constitution, and the Roman response from the mid-1980s to the early 2010s led to a homogenisation of liturgy which was most explicitly generated by the process of translation mandated by *Liturgiam authenticam* in 2001. The Roman control of translation detail and distrust of local Churches was the polar opposite to what the Council had proposed some fifty years previously.

With a handful of exceptions, the response of the English-speaking bishops generally seems to have been passive from the late 1980s onwards, and the active communication with Rome was carried out by their agent, ICEL. This Commission, while always respectful in its

communication with the relevant Roman dicastery, was well informed theologically, liturgically and canonically in relation to the matters it raised with Rome, and it worked in conjunction with its Episcopal Board.⁹⁵ It needs to be asked if local episcopal conferences, being aware through their episcopal representative with ICEL of the difficulties that Rome was increasingly posing for the work of this Commission, gave sufficient support to ICEL by communicating their displeasure to Rome. Because they, to a great extent, remained silent bishops must accept a degree of responsibility for permitting a situation of disempowerment to develop through their "bystander" attitude or through an omission of concern which was often interpreted as collusion. Already by the late 1990s and into the twenty first century, the crisis regarding the role of Church authorities at local level in relation to child protection in various English-speaking churches robbed them of a moral authority vis-à-vis their local geographical regions as well as depriving them of any influence in their conversations with Rome. The energies of many episcopal conferences would have been taken up with issues of child abuse and, in some cases, there was little desire to take on other questions, least of all if these involved a confrontation with Rome.

The centralising moves that increasingly characterised the various Roman offices further disempowered local bishops and their conferences. The initial excitement and drive of the post-Conciliar phase of the liturgical reform movement had dissipated, and a later generation of English-speaking bishops probably became less concerned with the detail of the work of ICEL. For many, probably, their representation through an episcopal colleague on this international Commission fulfilled their obligation and absolved them from a deeper involvement: it was the task of ICEL to battle on their behalf with the Roman dicastery. The change in the profile of episcopal appointments coupled with the fact that bishops belonging to the Conciliar generation were beginning to disappear from the scene, makes it possible to suggest that there was an growing number of bishops for whom liturgical reform and its continuing agenda was less important, or who may have been influenced (in many cases unwittingly) by a cry from a small but vocal group seeking a return to a liturgy of a bygone day.

With the acceptance of the translation procedures of *Liturgiam authenticam* over what existed before, a whole ecumenical agenda has been left to the side, but this may be symptomatic of an ecumenical winter that seems to inform the way various post-reformation churches function today. Another great loss is the prohibition to work

95. Details of this are to be found in Maurice Taylor, *It's the Eucharist, Thank God* (Brandon, Suffolk: Decani Books, 2010).

consultatively with other major language groups. However, the greatest problem, implied in all that has been said, relates to ecclesiology. Adapting the insights of De Lubac, one would say that the move in *SC* was from a position of *liturgia ab ecclesia* (where liturgy is defined canonically as something regulated by Church) to that of *ecclesia a liturgia* (reflecting the Eucharistic ecclesiology enunciated in *SC* 41-42).⁹⁶ With *Liturgiam authenticam* we now witness a return to *liturgia ab ecclesia*, but with the added overarching criterion of fidelity to the Latin original. In 1962 the Roman Curia attempted to stymie the reform of liturgy that they thought ought to be initiated by them by not supplying the complete draft text of *De sacra liturgia* to the Council Fathers, and also by attempting to pre-empt a reform by publishing the 1962 Missal and ritual. The curial retrieval of its power in *Sacram liturgiam* (of 1964), section IX (momentarily compromised by *SC* 36 §4 less than two months previously whereby bishops conferences could authorise their own translations), shifted the fulcrum in favour of the “centre” and this centralisation of authority was consolidated over the next few decades. *Liturgiam authenticam* (2001) completes the circle as it gives the Roman liturgy dicastery the authority to work directly and guide the translation work of all language groups through the establishment of a Roman agency with the power to modify and ratify, in Rome’s name, the translations produced by Commissions. Thus, the Roman agency established to guide the translation work for the English-speaking world is called *Vox Clara*. Whereas the (old) ICEL had worked on an incarnational principle that valued pastoral experience and a hermeneutic that considered the local as well as culture to be important, Rome now directs the entire process, bypassing the episcopal conferences.⁹⁷

96. The idea that “Eucharist makes the Church” was first articulated by Henri de Lubac in his *Corpus Mysticum: L’Eucharistie et l’Église au moyen âge. Étude historique* (Paris: Aubier, 1944), 104 [= ET *Corpus Mysticum: The Eucharist and the Church in the Middle Ages. Historical Survey*, trans. Gemma Simmonds (London: SCM, 2006) 88]. He expanded this in his *Méditation sur l’Église* (Paris: Aubier, 1953) 112-113; 128 [= ET, *The Splendour of the Church*, trans. Michael Mason (London/New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956) 92: “The Church produces the Eucharist, but the Eucharist also produces the Church”]. The idea is further expressed in 2006 Encyclical of John Paul II, *Ecclesia de eucharistia*, 26.

97. The problem can be seen in *Liturgiam authenticam* 104, where it states that *Rome can decide to prepare and offer a translation of liturgical prayers* to a Conference, which the local bishops must then submit to its own canonical vote before returning it to Rome for a *recognitio*. This is probably the ultimate form of negation of the role of the episcopal conference. For the Congregation for Divine Worship and Discipline of the Sacraments to forward to a Conference a translation into a language that the Conference itself did not consider pastorally beneficial (for whatever reason), would now mean that their canonical *recognitio* is little other than a token act: the episcopal conference would not feel free, in

While it was difficult for English-speaking bishops to resist the slow but persistent reversal of a movement that had a negative effect not just on liturgical reform, but on the dynamic of the church in its transactions in the name of the Gospel with the society of which it is part, one wonders if the responsibility for the disempowerment could not rest to some extent, at least, with them. Some bishops sympathised with the changed Roman moves to create a uniform liturgy, even in the vernacular. Others did not question the rationale for the proposed (or, at times, mandated) reversal of elements of the reform. Given the public, corporate and ecclesial nature of liturgy, it is difficult to see how bishops could have been totally unaware of the implications of the restrictions and controls being newly introduced by Rome.

The liturgical / Eucharistic ecclesiology that is at the heart of the Liturgy Constitution must remain the starting point for a way of “being church” and permit an organic relationship to develop that has as its aim the incarnation of the paschal mystery of Christ: this requires that bishops’ conferences assert their need to serve the Gospel in their churches while remaining in communion with the church catholic as well as with that church to which tradition gives the honour of being the first among equals.

Associate Professor of Theology
Milltown Institute
Sandford Road
Ranelagh
Dublin 6
Ireland
twhelan@milltown-institute.ie

Thomas R. WHELAN

all probability, to either reject a text or to offer its own modifications to that created by Rome.

THE RECEPTION OF THE CONCILIAR LITURGICAL REFORMS IN IRELAND

The reception of the liturgical reforms of the Second Vatican Council is obviously a wide ranging issue because it involves many dimensions of faith, the various ways in which it is both understood and expressed. It touches not only Scripture, doctrine, prayer, law, but also symbols, music, art and architecture. Reception is a communitarian concern because it involves not just the magisterium, but the whole of the Church's faithful and their pastors. When a doctrine or a liturgical reform is received it means that the pastors and the faithful welcome it, they find it life-giving and see it as an authentic expression of their faith. Ultimately, it has to be recognised as a work of the Spirit active in the community. Reception demands inculturation, because a doctrine or a practice is received according to the life and conditions of a people at a particular time. What is received is then to some extent shaped by the recipients and this is especially true for the liturgy by virtue of the fact that it is a cultural expression of a community's faith. *Sacrosanctum concilium* (SC) recognises this when it states that the Church in its liturgy wishes "to respect and foster the qualities and talents of the various races and nations" (SC 37).

A central statement of the conciliar reform was: "In the restoration and promotion of the sacred liturgy the full and active participation by all the people is the aim to be considered before all else, for it is the primary and indispensable source from which the faithful are to derive the true Christian spirit" (SC 14). The texts and rites were meant to be intelligible, and people were to be able to take a full active part in them as a community (SC 21). Therefore, in assessing the reception of the liturgical reforms, there are two dimensions to the issue. Firstly, there was the external aspect of the reform, viz., vernacular texts, reordering of liturgical space and simplified rubrics. Secondly, there was an interior aspect to the reception, a renewed sense of understanding and engagement with the liturgy. The first is more readily assessed than the second.

This essay will look at how the liturgical reforms were received in the Irish context. In order to do so, it will be necessary to sketch briefly the background to ecclesial life and liturgical practices in Ireland with a view

to understanding how the Church there was positioned to receive the reforms proposed by the Council. The dynamics and extent of the reception process will be traced by identifying the key personnel who were involved and led the reform, as well as the use of journals articles, conferences and exhibitions to prepare for and to promote the reforms. At the end some assessment will be made as to how successfully the reforms were received in Ireland.

The Irish Context

In considering the Irish context within which the liturgical reforms of the Council took place, there is a remote and proximate view to be taken. While this is not the place to rehearse the details of Irish ecclesiastical life, its art, architecture, literature and forms of religious practice, suffice it to say that by the middle of the sixteenth century it had a worthy heritage, much of which is only being brought to light in more recent times through publications and exhibitions.¹ After the Henrician Reformation in England, monasteries were suppressed, ecclesiastical properties were confiscated and eventually all forms of public Catholic worship were prohibited. Friars and diocesan clergy abandoned their houses. Many were executed, some exiled and more remained at large but travelled in disguise. When it was safe for them to do so they administered the sacraments secretly to those who sought them and Masses were normally celebrated outdoors in some secluded place or in safe houses. The medieval cathedrals and a small number of other parish churches were taken into the possession of the Reformed Church and so the Catholic Church lost its architectural and artistic patrimony. The result of this was that the religion of the majority, in terms of its liturgical celebration, was privatised and remained so until more favourable legislation was introduced by the British parliament in the early nineteenth century. The effects of the penal legislation were that people had a great respect for the Mass and their disposition during its celebration was one of silence and awe. The natural embellishments of liturgical celebration were lost and it became a much more privatised event for those who were occasionally fortunate enough to access it.

Following the relaxation of penal legislation, a major rebuilding of the Church took place from about 1830 onwards. So, in terms of public worship the Church in Ireland had to reinvent itself in the nineteenth century, a work that continued into the early part of the twentieth. At the same

1. See for example, Rachel Moss, Colmán O'Clabaigh and Salvador Ryan, *Art and Devotion in Late Medieval Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2006).

time the country experienced significant cultural and political upheaval. One of the major cultural shifts was the loss of a native language. Irish was forcefully replaced by English and this had a profound effect on the prayer life and the worship of the people.

Catholics in Ireland had a rich tradition of prayer and domestic rituals that had sustained them for several generations but this changed dramatically in the mid to late nineteenth century. Brendan Devlin captured this succinctly in an address in the early 1970s. He was commenting on the kind of priest that had emerged in the nineteenth century and whose stereotype was still recognisable in the late twentieth century:

They showed no sympathy with the inherited religious practices of their people, ... instead ... they introduced French devotions, Italian saints, English hymns backed by authoritarianism, instead of the natural authority of a normal tradition. Religion paid the price we are now coming to see, for this was the process which produced what came to be called Irish Catholicism – clericalist, moralizing, intolerant, careless of intellectual and cultural values, uncreative and unattractive.²

An influential figure in reshaping the religious landscape of the Church in Ireland was Cardinal Paul Cullen, who effected what Emmet Larkin has described as a “devotional revolution.” He discouraged all native ritual practices in favour of a much more Roman style of prayer and worship. At a Synod held in Thurles (1850), he arranged for the celebration of a pontifical High Mass and proposed this as the model for other bishops to introduce to their dioceses. As one commentator noted, he took “a model of Roman legalism, post-revolutionary French fervour and English Puritanism, imported the melange and imposed it on Irish Catholics with most unhappy consequences.”³

Later, when we consider the liturgical reforms introduced by the Council it will be interesting to note how often commentators refer to the intense devotion people have to the Mass and a privatised form of worship. Indeed, a recurring concern is that the changes to be introduced may disturb this deep reverence for the Mass. In many respects during the decade preceding the Council the Church in Ireland considered itself very well established, confident, insular and neither threatened by the decline affecting the Church in mainland Europe nor hugely influenced by the currents of philosophy or theology sweeping through the cultural landscape. It is against this background that one can consider the more immediate conditions for the reception of the conciliar reforms.

2. “The Priest, Man of Tradition,” *Doctrine and Life* 23 (1973) 537.

3. Louis McRedmond, “The Future of the Churches in Ireland 4,” *Doctrine and Life* 25 (1975) 791.

Winds of Change: The Role of *The Furrow*

Despite the general insularity of the Church in Ireland during the 1950s, there were a number of people who were well attuned to the theological and particularly the liturgical renewal movement afoot in Europe. The most significant of these was Gerard J. McGarry, professor of pastoral theology at Maynooth. In 1950 he founded a new pastoral journal for the Irish Church, *The Furrow*. He and those with him knew that the developments occurring in Europe would eventually reach Irish shores and he was anxious to prepare the Church in Ireland to embrace them, despite however much the bishops might be suspicious of them. His vision was more pastoral than theoretical. He wanted the journal to inform debate and enrich pastoral practice. Overall he was successful and part of his success lay in his personality. As a recent historian, Louise Fuller, observed, “One of his strengths was that he was in touch with the main body of his readership and, in this way, he was able to be sensitive to the old, as well as promoting new ways of thinking.”⁴ He exercised a quiet but firm leadership in the background, never writing an editorial, but always inviting questions, discussion and further reflection. Fuller goes on to say:

The style of the journal was crucial. At a time when the official Church was dogmatic and not open to question, *The Furrow* sought an exchange of views – it sought to promote enquiry and discussion. The secret of *The Furrow*'s success in steering the Irish Church towards change was that the editor was not dismissive of more conservative attitudes, and he did not expect change to come overnight – he was willing to prepare the ground slowly and carefully.⁵

He launched the journal at a time when the Irish bishops were probably at their most authoritarian and cohesive. So, he had to tread a delicate balance in the way he introduced new ideas. Probably the most sensitive of all the bishops at the time was the Archbishop of Dublin, John Charles McQuaid, in whose diocese Maynooth was located. A journal or book had to pass the censor in the diocese wherein it was either published or printed. *The Furrow* was printed in a neighbouring town that was not in the diocese of Dublin. In that way he avoided having to seek the *nihil obstat* and the *imprimatur* from McQuaid. In a later exchange between McQuaid and the Bishop of Galway, Michael Browne, in 1968, Browne noted that “*The Furrow* in my opinion is doing harm and it should be

4. Louise Fuller, *Irish Catholicism since 1950: The Undoing of a Culture* (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2002) 84.

5. *Ibid.*

made clear to Dr Lennon that he should not allow his diocese to be an escape vent for heretics.”⁶

The Furrow had a very wide readership among clergy and religious in Ireland and beyond. It was a critical medium for informing its readership of theological, pastoral and liturgical developments taking place in the rest of Europe and was one of the main means by which the Church in Ireland was, to some extent, prepared to receive the liturgical renewal mandated by the Council. In one of the earliest issues, a parish priest, who was a regular contributor and a significant proponent of liturgical reform, noted that the people of the country were reasonably well formed in doctrine because of a good catechetical formation that was regularly refreshed by sermons and parish retreats. But he also noted that the people were not engaged by the liturgical ritual. He pleaded that this now be given attention. “Let us then, once and for all, give unconditional acceptance to the principle that the Mass-rite itself, in all its concrete actuality, is the indispensable centre upon which our entire effort must turn.”⁷ Similar themes were voiced regularly by other contributors, conveying the impression that there was widespread dissatisfaction with the level of participation by the people in the Mass; they appeared reverent, aware of the real presence, of the awesomeness of what was happening but they remained entirely passive and unaware of the significance of the symbolism of the rites. This was even more obvious in the case of other liturgical and sacramental celebrations.

Apart from contributions by local theologians and pastors, *The Furrow* invited contributions from international scholars or provided translations of important articles published by them elsewhere. Among those were Theodor Klauser, Josef Jungmann, Romano Guardini, Balthazar Fischer, Herman Schmidt, A.-M. Roguet, J. D. Crichton and Charles Davis. Reports were carried of international liturgical conferences, reviews of significant developments in liturgical practices around the world and surveys of international journals highlighted important pastoral issues under discussion in other countries. This last section was overseen by a co-founder of *The Furrow*, Sean O’Riordan, CSsR, who was lecturing in Rome from the 1950s onwards.

The Role of Doctrine and Life

A year after the establishment of *The Furrow*, the Dominicans established another journal, *Doctrine and Life*, under the editorship of Anselm

6. *Ibid.*, 87.

7. Dermot McIvor, “The Mass and the People, II,” *The Furrow* 2 (1951) 522.

Moynihan, OP, with the aim of initiating people into a deeper understanding of their faith and its implications. The idea was to support a more doctrinally based spirituality. In the very first issue the state of the liturgy in the country was addressed. Joseph Moran, OP, complained that “the liturgical movement has not influenced our Catholic life and piety as it could have.”⁸ He went on to say, “we are not attracted by new forms of piety. Love for tradition in such matters is proverbial.”⁹ From the beginning the journal was addressing the issue of active participation in the liturgical celebrations. One parish priest writing in 1955 observed:

A country that has long suffered the might of penal law and persecution has lost even the memory of her former way of worship, and is wholly unacquainted with the splendour of the liturgy cannot be expected to march step by step with countries that have preserved unbroken continuity with the music and ritual of the great cathedrals and monasteries of Europe. Individualism may be so deeply embedded in the national character that even the prayers and practices of the liturgy will fail to uproot it. There is no doubt, however, that a live popular liturgy, in which the masses of the people can take an active and intelligent part, is a vital necessity for our age.¹⁰

In 1957 editorship of the journal was taken over by Austin Flannery, OP, who, together with McGarry, was one of the main contributors to the raising of awareness of the need for an Irish liturgical renewal and a key player in the process. Both Flannery and McGarry were keenly aware of the need to engage with artists and architects who would enhance the liturgical space and raise the national standards. Flannery, in particular, had cultivated significant people from both of these areas and had them well positioned to lead a major renewal of Irish ecclesiastical art and architecture after the Council. The journal itself followed lines not unlike *The Furrow*, but was probably read more by religious than by diocesan priests. However, it was these two journals that had done most to prepare the Church in Ireland for what was to happen at the Council, even if their impact was less than their founders might have expected.

8. “An Appeal for the Liturgy,” *Doctrine and Life* 1 (1951) 28.

9. *Ibid.*, 29.

10. Joseph Fennelly, “Active Participation in the Mass,” *Doctrine and Life* 5 (1955) 177.

The Glenstal Conferences

A third major contribution to the liturgical reform, before and after the Council, was the establishment of the Glenstal Liturgical Congress in 1954.¹¹ It began with a suggestion from Thomas Garde, OP, the Dominican provincial, to the prior of the Benedictine community in Glenstal to organise a liturgical congress at the monastery.¹² The prior, Placid Murray OSB, embraced the idea enthusiastically and for the next twenty-one years this congress was to be a most influential event on the liturgical landscape. The congresses were for clergy only because the organisers believed the experience on the Continent was that people attended uplifting liturgies in monastic settings only to go home even more dissatisfied with the liturgy in their parishes. If there was to be a renewal of the liturgy, it was agreed that those who led it would have to be renewed in the first place. As with *The Furrow*, the focus was to be pastoral because it would not attract the diocesan clergy unless what was offered could be seen to benefit their parishioners. The main inspiration for the congress came from *Mediator Dei*, with its emphasis on the active participation of all in liturgy.

The first congress was held under the patronage of the local archbishop, which was regarded as important in ensuring that the project did not attract a negative reaction from the hierarchy. The focus was on the Irish context, although it was situated within the wider liturgical movement in other parts of Europe. Soon the congress attracted large numbers of diocesan clergy. It is notable that many of those who were active contributors to the congress in its early days were appointed bishops after the Council. This meant that the formation that they had received through their engagement with the congress greatly informed their own implementation of the Council's liturgical renewal.

On the eve of the Council, therefore, three people can be singled out for the contributions they made in preparing the Church in Ireland for its reception of the liturgical reforms, namely, Gerard J. McGarry, Austin Flannery and Placid Murray. There were two main methods that were used, publications and conferences. It is notable in all of this that Maynooth, which was a major seminary with about 700 resident seminarians and a Pontifical Faculty, was not a major contributor to the liturgical renewal movement. Although McGarry was a member of the theology faculty, he ensured that his journal was not seen as a project of

11. See Julie Kavanagh, "The Glenstal Liturgical Congresses, 1954-75," *Worship* 72 (1998) 421-444.

12. Glenstal is the only Benedictine Abbey in Ireland, located in Co. Limerick, in the south west of the country.

Maynooth and most of his activities in the cause of renewal were conducted outside the college.

The Role of the Bishops in Liturgical Reform

The reform of the liturgy was not a significant item on the agenda of the Irish bishops when submitting their proposals to Rome in preparation for the Council. Only nine of them suggested the celebration of the sacraments in the vernacular and one retired missionary bishop urged no concession. During the conciliar debates the Irish bishops did not make any significant contribution to the discussion on the reform of the liturgy.¹³

Following the publication of the Constitution on the Liturgy in December 1963, the bishops appointed the first Irish Episcopal Commission for Liturgy in 1964. It was assisted in its work by five advisory committees in music, sacred art and architecture, pastoral liturgy, catechetics and translations. These structures remained in place until the work of the committees was taken over by the National Secretariat for Liturgy in 1974.¹⁴

The bishops made their first statement about liturgical changes on November 10th, 1964 in a press release from Rome. They indicated their decision to introduce in stages the liturgy of the Eucharist in the vernacular. Two aspects of their brief statement are notable. The first is that this change will "help to strengthen and deepen the great traditional devotion of the Irish people to the holy sacrifice of the Mass." The second, quoting *Sacrosanctum concilium* (SC), expresses the desire that the changes will lead to a deeper understanding of the liturgy that people will not attend as "silent spectators" but that they will "take part in the sacred actions, conscious of what they are doing." The bishops were keenly aware of the traditional devotion to the Mass and were anxious not to disturb that. On the other hand they were willing to promote the vision of SC as a way of deepening that traditional devotion. It was then left to individual bishops to make announcements in their own dioceses as to how the changes would be implemented.

A survey of the pastorals issued by the bishops in their dioceses indicates a certain hesitancy and reluctance on their parts. Louise Fuller, in her survey of these, quotes the Bishop of Elphin, who stated that the

13. For example, on behalf of the Irish bishops, Archbishop McQuaid raised questions about the practicalities of distributing communion under both species to large congregations. See Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph Komonchak, *History of Vatican II*. Vol. II (Maryknoll, NY/Leuven: Orbis/Peeters, 1997) 130.

14. Sean Swayne, "Liturgical Renewal in Ireland 1963-1983," *New Liturgy* 40-41 (Winter 1983 - Spring 1984) 12-13.

changes “will be the occasion of a certain amount of confusion for the people who have been brought up and lived for many years with existing practices but we are called upon to make this sacrifice for the glory of God.”¹⁵ Fuller concluded her survey by noting: “These remarks from the bishops summed up their own attitudes and revealed their own hesitancy about changes, which, in the Irish situation, they had seen as unnecessary. They now had to convince themselves as well as the people, of their value.”¹⁶ The most hesitant of all was Archbishop McQuaid of Dublin and as a consequence reform was slow to take hold in his, the largest and the most important, diocese in the country. Inevitably, his attitude did little to encourage reception of the conciliar reforms. However, in 1963 William Conway was appointed Archbishop of Armagh, becoming primate and chair of the episcopal conference, and he was more enthusiastic for the reforms and he counterbalanced the more conservative attitude of McQuaid.

Despite this hesitancy about the significance or the introduction of the liturgical reforms there was a sense of a ferment of activity in the country in anticipation of their implementation. It was spearheaded by those who had already been active in promoting liturgical renewal. The publication of the conciliar and post-conciliar texts was done by both *The Furrow* and *Doctrine and Life*, with their respective editors playing key roles. Secondly, the preparatory work was continued by means of conferences and exhibitions, again led by those who had been actively involved in the area of reform for the previous ten years.

Despite the delay by the bishops issuing their formal statements, the liturgical renewal was under way and Liturgical Commissions were being established at diocesan, inter-diocesan or provincial level across the country. In most cases senior members of the local clergy were appointed to these as well as priests with particular competence in theology, music or the arts. It is evident from the reports submitted by these committees in the first years of their existence that they embraced the reforms suggested by SC with genuine openness and enthusiasm.¹⁷ The clergy themselves were prepared by lectures and discussions offered as part of their normal deanery or diocesan conferences. In some cases groups of priests assembled voluntarily to study SC and its pastoral implications. However, there is no sense of a very comprehensive programme having been put in place to improve their theological knowledge of the liturgy or for improving their skills in its celebration. For the most part the changes were approached from a rather practical perspective. Among the issues regularly

15. *Irish Catholicism since 1950*, 111.

16. *Ibid.*

17. “Liturgy Renewal in Ireland: A Report,” *The Furrow* 17 (1966) 297-312.

considered were: the logistics of reorienting the altar *versus populum*, installing an ambo and chair, the location of the tabernacle, the problems of multiple books that were necessary for the vernacular celebration and their provisional nature, improving the acoustics, organising offertory processions, the provision of booklets for people to follow the texts of the liturgies and the development of an adequate hymnal. In most cases serious consideration was given to a study of the Scriptures in the light of the introduction of First Testament readings and the necessity to preach on the texts rather than following a catechetical programme of instruction. The overall impression created from these reports is that the bishops, priests and their parishioners were enthusiastic in their acceptance of the reforms. The one concern that regularly occurred was that the sense of prayerful interiority that appeared to characterise congregations previously might be lost in the transition.

Serious consideration was given to how congregations might be facilitated in more actively participating in the liturgy; the vernacular was widely welcomed; in many cases a programme of homilies was developed to prepare parishioners for the changes being proposed; in many rural dioceses traditional house or station Masses were used to prepare parishioners for the changes and to encourage more active participation in the liturgy and these were often found to be more effective than the instruction given in the parish churches. Several dioceses issued directories for the guidance of clergy and people in the implementation of the reforms.

Journals and Periodicals

In January 1964, *The Furrow* published the text of SC in translation. This was followed in the May issue with commentary on various aspects of it, including ‘Christ in the Liturgy’, ‘Scripture and the Vernacular Liturgy’, ‘The Sacraments’, ‘The Problem of Liturgical Translation’, ‘The Christian Meaning of Sunday according to the New Constitution’, ‘Sacred Architecture’ and ‘Music’.¹⁸ Similarly, *Doctrine and Life* published an English translation of SC in February 1964 with extensive commentary and in 1965 published in translation a series of essays on SC by Pierre Journel, previously published in *La Maison-Dieu*. The journal continued to publish all the various instructions on the implementation of the liturgical renewal in subsequent years and this work in turn became the basis

18. *The Furrow* 15 (1964).

of the collection of *Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, edited by Flannery.¹⁹

Both *Doctrine and Life* and *The Furrow* provided critical conduits through which the on-going reform of the liturgy was communicated. The post-conciliar instructions and decrees on the implementation of SC were carried in translation and these were usually followed with expert commentary in subsequent issues. The papers from the Glenstal Liturgical Congresses were carried in *The Furrow* and reports of the proceedings appeared in *Doctrine and Life*. These journals continued to publish articles on art, architecture and music, as well as theological and pastoral commentaries on liturgical issues and the on-going reform. They also carried notices of important conferences, summer schools, seminars, lectures and exhibitions that were held around the country, all of which give an indication of the ferment of activity which accompanied the reception and implementation of the conciliar constitution. They regularly carried book reviews of publications entirely dedicated to liturgical topics, as well as surveys of international periodicals dealing with liturgy. Each had a section for news and views from readers which give an impression, too, of how the reforms were being received.

In view of the prominence given to the Scriptures not just in the liturgy, in 1970, the Dominican Publications in Dublin established a new quarterly, *Scripture in Church*. It offers commentary on the weekday and Sunday readings as an aid to preachers and celebrants. This was an important resource as most priests were used to following a catechetical programme of sermons rather than preaching specifically on the readings of the Mass.

The Role of Liturgical Studies and Formation

During the second half of 1965, *Doctrine and Life* carried a series of essays on the liturgical institutes at Paris,²⁰ Rome²¹ and Trier,²² each written by Irish priests who studied in one of them. In 1968 *The Furrow* was able to report that 15 Irish priests had studied at one or other of these institutes and many others followed in subsequent years. In fulfilment of the re-

19. Austin Flannery, OP (ed.), *Vatican II: The Liturgy Constitution* (Dublin: Dominican Publications, 1964).

20. Vincent Ryan, OSB, "The Liturgical Institute in Paris," *Doctrine and Life* 15 (1965) 395-398.

21. Gerard Tannam, CSSp, "The Liturgical Institute in Rome," *Doctrine and Life* 15 (1965) 465-468.

22. John H McKenna, CM, "The Liturgical Institute in Paris," *Doctrine and Life* 15 (1965) 532-533.

quirements of SC 15, the bishops at their meeting in June 1965 decided to appoint a professor of Sacred Liturgy to the Faculty of Theology at Maynooth. They appointed Patrick McGoldrick, a diocesan priest, who was sent then to study at the Institute in Paris. On completion of his course in 1967, he took up his position on the faculty. McGoldrick became one of the country's outstanding liturgical scholars and, in an understated fashion, contributed to the liturgical movement in the English speaking world through his work with ICEL.

It has to be noted that at Maynooth the formal study of the liturgy and liturgical practice were compartmentalised. Seminarians learned liturgical practice as part of their seminary formation, but not as part of their theological formation. The work being done by artists and architects did not feature on the syllabus in theology. In retrospect this has had a negative impact on how subsequent generations of priests, educated at Maynooth, celebrated the liturgy and often failed to do so in a way that gave full expression to it in creative and imaginative ways.

The first liturgical centre established in the country was the result of an initiative by some religious sisters in the Diocese of Kildare and Leighlin in 1969. This liturgy centre began in Carlow, transferred to Portarlinton for a number of years, and in 1973 became the Irish Centre for Pastoral Liturgy. Its director was Fr Sean Swayne, who had studied at the Institut Supérieur de Liturgie in Paris, became the national secretary for liturgy in 1973. Eventually, the centre relocated to Carlow in 1978 and remained there until 1996, when it transferred to Maynooth, where it is currently located.

This Institute for Pastoral liturgy became a very important means of implementing and inculturating the liturgical reform. Most Irish dioceses sent a number of priests to study there over the years. A large number of religious men and especially religious sisters studied there and in turn became significant agents of renewal in their own communities and parishes upon their return. The programmes of the Institute were given academic recognition by the Pontifical faculty at Maynooth eventually at Master's level.

Soon the Institute assumed the mantle of the Glenstal Liturgical Congress, establishing its own *Carlow Liturgy Seminar* in 1972. Each year national and international liturgical scholars, practitioners and theologians presented papers and workshops on liturgical themes. These were very well attended and many graduates of the Institute used it as an opportunity for their own renewal and updating.

Under the auspices of the Liturgy Commission in the diocese of Kildare and Leighlin and the editorship of Sean Swayne, in 1968, a short publication was launched, *New Liturgy: Bulletin of the Liturgy Commission*. As early as 1969 *The Furrow* noted that "members of liturgy com-

missions and others interested in following how one diocese is seriously trying to apply liturgy reform at ground level should study this modest and helpful pioneering effort."²³ After twenty-one issues this publication was adopted as the national bulletin for liturgy now just known as *New Liturgy* and is published under the aegis of the Episcopal Commission for Liturgy.

Thus two diocesan initiatives, – an Institute for Pastoral Liturgy and a bulletin – with the support and blessing of two successive bishops who were enthusiastic about ecclesial renewal, proved to be of national significance. It demonstrates that projects that are proven to be successful in the practical sphere will be more easily received by the Church in Ireland than even the best argued theoretical or theological case.

Conferences and Exhibitions

Now that the reform of the liturgy had been endorsed by the Council, the Glenstal Conference worked to facilitate a deeper understanding of what had been proposed and to further its implementation. The Congress held in April, 1964 was dedicated to an exploration of the new constitution and had as its theme, "Christ in our Midst: New Light on the Christian Life from the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy." The conference which was attended by over 200 priests seemed to capture a mood of hope and expectation in the Church at large. In a report of the congress for *Doctrine and Life*, P. J. Brophy wrote:

All sensed in the council documents the pulse of a spring urge, a Pentecostal release of energy. The record crowds at this eleventh congress sought guidance as to how to absorb for their own enrichment the treasures of the council decree and ways of sharing its encouraging message with their people. Enthusiasm and gratitude as well as the desire to seize the grace of this opportunity were keynotes of many exchanges.²⁴

The same writer raised another set of questions, which were to be prophetic in hindsight.

The solidity of Ireland's spiritual heritage, our people's love of Mass, rosary, prayer and penance is a cherished value, raising the legitimate question: Is liturgy to become a substitute for what is tried and tested? Only tact, perseverance and insights of a devoted teacher can graft on these ideas and make them thrive in the religious life of an Irish parish. The

23. Swayne, "Liturgical Renewal in Ireland 1963-1983," 18.

24. "Christ in Our Midst," *Doctrine and Life* 14 (1964) 351.

backlog of Scriptural neglect must be faced. Many would assert that this is the core and crux of the problem.²⁵

A review of the themes in subsequent years indicates how closely to the pastoral needs of the Church in Ireland the organisers remained in their choice of themes and speakers. They devoted three conferences to the scriptures and liturgy, the role of liturgy in building up the Christian community, house Masses and group Masses, a review of parishioners' experiences, as well as discussions on the sacrament of penance, the breviary and other forms of liturgical prayer. Although these were well attended, the impact reached a much wider audience as the papers presented were generally published in *The Furrow* and reports provided in *Doctrine and Life*.

In August 1964 a Congress on Sacred Art and Architecture was held at Sion Hill Dominican Convent, Dublin. It was organised by *The Church Exhibitions Committee* involving the Royal Institute of Architects of Ireland in cooperation with the German Institute for Cultural Relations. According to Sean Swayne this was "the first time a substantial number of Irish artists and architects were brought into direct personal discussion with the clergy and the public on problems relating to church design."²⁶ However, this was not the first time that artists and architects were engaged in discussion on issues relating to liturgical art and architecture. As far back as 1955 an exhibition on Church architecture was held in Newman House, Dublin, under the auspices of the Arts Council of Ireland and the papers from this published in *The Furrow*. Following from that exhibition *The Church Exhibitions Committee of the Royal Institute of Architects of Ireland* was established, which organised seminars, lectures and exhibitions that contributed to the education of clergy, architects, artists and the wider public. The *Committee* organised an exhibition of French church architecture at Maynooth and later in Belfast in 1957 which attracted over 22,000 visitors. A similar exhibition of German church architecture was held in Dublin in 1962, attracting over 25,000 visitors. In 1963 an exhibition of modern Irish sacred art was held in Dublin and St. Kieran's College, Kilkenny and was sponsored by the Royal Institute of Architects of Ireland.²⁷ The recommendations of Chapter VII of SC, "Sacred Art and Sacred Furnishings," was confirmation of the work being done by those involved in those exhibitions over the previous years. There was a significant preparation of the clergy, a wider public and the community of artists and architects to receive and implement the recom-

25. *Ibid.*

26. Swayne, "Liturgical Renewal in Ireland 1963-1983," 13.

27. Bishop Daniel Collier, "Exhibition of Sacred Art and Liturgy," *Doctrine and Life* 13 (1963) 44-45.

mendations of the Council with regard to art and architecture. Thus the Congress at Sion Hill in 1964 was a continuation of work that was well established and inevitably it was an important means of accelerating and confirming the process of reception.

The bishops, and especially Cardinal Conway, were concerned about the lack of religious imagery in the home. So, in 1974, they encouraged the mounting of an exhibition of *Sacred Art in the Home*. Seven artists were commissioned to present a limited edition of pieces for the event. The exhibition was mounted at several venues around the country and seen by large numbers of people. While it was a worthy idea, it is unlikely that it really had much impact on the ordinary faithful because one can hardly see any religious art in the home today or if there is any, it is generally of a traditional and poor quality. This in itself may be a significant indicator of how the liturgical reforms were received or not received at a personal level in Ireland.

It is notable in this context that much of the networking that had to be done to facilitate the cooperation of these artists and architects was done by Austin Flannery especially, but G. J. McGarry and Placid Murray also had significant roles to play in this context. It is also remarkable how closely the national or civil institutions worked with ecclesial personnel and institutions in exploring the various media in which the liturgical renewal might be expressed. It is indicative of how homogenous the culture was at that particular time. Yet, it was a relationship that remained in place for more than a decade after the Council, so much so that when the Exhibitions Committee came to an end in 1968 several of its members were invited to join the Advisory Committee on Sacred Art and Architecture, which was attached to the Episcopal Commission for the Liturgy. Again, one could say that the reception of the reforms was working at some sort of public level, even if at the more personal and domestic level this was less the case.

Music

For the historical reasons presented earlier, Ireland did not have a significant repertoire of liturgical music and hymnody. Therefore, much work had to be done in this area following the Council. In 1969 the Irish Church Music Association was founded by the Church Music Panel (later the Sacred Music Commission), one of the advisory groups to the Episcopal Commission, at the explicit request of Cardinal Conway. This group played an important role in the raising of standards of liturgical music in the country. Among its achievements were the publication of the *Veritas Hymnal* (1973), which replaced a much shorter hymnal that was

issued in 1966, and the publication of Mass settings by four Irish composers, namely, Seorise Bodley, T. C. Kelly, Gerard Victory and Fiontan O'Carroll, all of which are widely used in the English speaking world. They established a summer school in Church music in 1970 and which has been running ever since. It is attended by music directors and members of parish choirs from around the country. Also in 1973 a *Schola Cantorum* was established, at a diocesan second level school in Mullingar, for young boys who might eventually study music at university level and be available as church organists and musicians. The development of the music repertoire was encouraged by Cardinal Conway as a way of enabling choirs to exercise their proper ministry in the liturgy and of encouraging more active congregational participation. Each diocese had committees to oversee liturgical music, but by the mid-70s some of these had become inactive and so a group was established, Diocesan Directors of Music, to promote liturgical music in each of the dioceses and this was formed into a national association in 1976. Then in 1979 a similar group was formed for the overall promotion of liturgy in the dioceses. The two groups have since merged and are now known as the Diocesan Directors of Music and Liturgy.

Assessment of the Reception of the Reform

In general it has to be said that the mandate for liturgical reform was complied with well in Ireland, especially by the general body of the clergy and faithful, even if the bishops in general were less convinced of its need and somewhat cautious in their embracing of it. At the practical and public level – translation of texts, reorientation of church buildings and furnishings, the engagement of ministers of the Word and the Eucharist, the provision of musical settings and the installation of contemporary works of religious art – all the reforms were introduced without much resistance or controversy. This happened in part because Irish people still had a respectful attitude towards the bishops and clergy in general. Their word was accepted without much question. People complied with the directives as they were issued. However, they were not well prepared for the changes; the rationale for the changes were generally not well explained. Therefore a serious interiorization of the reforms did not occur to the extent envisaged by the Council.

One of the early criticisms of the implementation of the reforms was that it was piecemeal. There were various committees working on behalf of the episcopal conference, but the impression was that these were not as well coordinated as they might have been. Indeed the criticism has been voiced that all of the Conciliar reforms were introduced and managed by

the various Episcopal Commissions without any sense of there being any overall coordination of their efforts. "The absence of a shared vision and an overall structure handicapped the work of the Commissions."²⁸ This is probably a reflection of the fact that many of the main movers in the renewal were individuals or small groups of enthusiasts at a slight remove from the hierarchy. This was true of the liturgical reform. However, under the chairmanships of Archbishop Joseph Cunnane of Tuam and Bishop Michael Harty of Killaloe, there was a sense that all of the groups involved in the liturgical reform were encouraged and efforts were made to coordinate them. Yet despite the efforts of these two bishops, it is probably true to say that most of the other bishops in the Conference neither understood nor greatly valued the liturgical renewal nor the underlying theological principles.

However, once one begins to look at how the reforms were received interiorly by both the clergy and the faithful, a less positive picture begins to emerge. As early as 1969 various commentators were beginning to raise questions about how significant an issue the liturgical renewal was for bishops and clergy. Vincent Ryan, writing in *Doctrine and Life*, asked, "Could it be that here in Ireland we are not yet sufficiently convinced of the liturgical apostolate? Do our bishops and clergy rank it sufficiently high in the order of pastoral priorities?"²⁹ David Regan in the same year amplifies this further, "Sensing here or there a reform is needed, efforts are directed at some change in detail, quite failing to see how that could stem from some fundamental change in mentality."³⁰ And similarly, Michael Smith notes a failure "to understand the theological dimensions of the sacred liturgy and consequently its spiritual potential in the lives of people."³¹

This line of assessment that already began to emerge within five years of the reforms being introduced was sustained in the following decade. The critical issue appeared to be that people had been so steeped in a passive approach to liturgy and so many aspects of worship had been obliged under pain of sin that when these were being abandoned people found it difficult to comprehend.³² Sean Swayne observed in the early 1980s that up to that point there had been an observance of the letter of

28. Dermot Lane, "Vatican II: The Irish Experience," *The Furrow* 55 (2004) 72; for a more general discussion of reception see also, Jim Corkery, "Vatican II and Its Reception in Ireland," *Doctrine and Life* 63 (2013) 32-45.

29. "Making the Most of the Liturgy," *Doctrine and Life* 19 (1969) 552.

30. "Five Years of Aggiornamento in Ireland," *Doctrine and Life* 19 (1969) 495.

31. "Ireland's Opportunity," *Doctrine and Life* 19 (1969) 626.

32. See P. J. Brophy, "Whatever Happened Our Liturgical Dreams?," *The Furrow* 25 (1974) 213-218.

the law with regard to the reforms. "The issue now is interiorization."³³ Among the problems that he identified was that "the amount of documentation emanating from Rome on liturgical renewal has left the bishops and clergy baffled and bewildered."³⁴ In a similar vein Gabriel Daly noted that, "The success of the liturgical reforms in the Catholic Church is quite remarkable. Ingrained habits of unquestioning obedience on the part of the clergy and the laity gave the reforms a chance to take root and prove their value." However, he, too, questions the appropriation of the faith that is professed and celebrated in the liturgy.³⁵

Cultural influences had their effects, too, on the reception of the reforms. There has been a deep rooted pragmatism in the Irish Church for more than two centuries, which can manifest itself positively as sound pastoral practice, with a capacity to respond to the needs of the faithful. On the other hand, this pragmatism is the result of an underdeveloped theological tradition. As Patrick Corish has remarked, "the teachers in Maynooth [the national seminary] and the other seminaries did not have as their primary aim the production of speculative theologians, but of adequately equipped pastoral priests. The great bulk of their students would have been in agreement. They prepared themselves on the whole conscientiously to give responsible counsel and direction in the confessional and to preach the diocesan programme of catechetical instruction each Sunday."³⁶ In so far as the reforms did not achieve a deeply rooted transformation in the liturgical prayer and practice of the Church in Ireland, or at least the level of transformation that many had worked to achieve, some blame might be laid at the door of the bishops and the clergy for their general lack of interest in serious theological reflection on their own practice or that of the Church. This failure to engage in theological reflection inhibited a more deeply rooted reception of the liturgical reforms and it continues to hamper all other dimensions of the conciliar reforms up to the present time.

Mary Immaculate College
University of Limerick
South Circular Road
Limerick
Ireland
eugene.duffy@mic.ul.ie

Eugene DUFFY

33. "Liturgical Renewal: Quo Vadis?," *The Furrow* 27 (1976) 234.

34. *Ibid.*

35. "Thoughts on the Sunday Liturgy," *The Furrow* 32 (1981) 11-23.

36. *The Irish Catholic Experience: A Historical Survey* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1985) 231. Similar points are made by Vincent Twomey in *The End of Irish Catholicism?* (Dublin: Veritas, 2003) 48.

which the Eastern Code was promulgated, states that while the canons have the firmness of law, full unity of the Eastern Churches might warrant revision.

Thus it happens that the canons of the *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches* must have the same firmness as the laws of the *Code of Canon Law* of the Latin Church, that is, that they remain in force until abrogated or changed by the supreme authority of the Church for just reasons. The most serious of those reasons is the full communion of all the Eastern Churches with the Catholic Church, in addition to being most in accord with the desire of our Savior Jesus Christ himself.¹²

The *Guidelines for the Revision of the Code of Oriental Canon Law*, a set of principles adopted at the outset of the revision process to direct the elaboration of the Eastern Code,¹³ include as their third point the *Ecumenical Character of the CICO*.¹⁴ (It is noteworthy that the *Principles for the Revision of the Latin Code*¹⁵ are silent regarding an ecumenical dimension of the future Latin Code.¹⁶)

12. Translation found in *CCEC*, xxiii.

13. *Nuntia* 3 (1976) 18-24. Abbreviated as *Guidelines*. For an excellent commentary on the elaboration and appraisal of the effectiveness of the *Guidelines*, see Sunny Kokkaravalayil, *The Guidelines for the Revision of the Eastern Code: Their Impact on CCEO* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2009).

14. The third point of the *Guidelines*, found in *Nuntia* 3 (1976) 20, states:

1. The future Code shall declare that it holds good only for those who legitimately belong to an Oriental Catholic Church.

2. It must be a prime concern of the new Code to promote the fulfillment of the desire expressed by the Second Vatican Council that the Oriental Catholic Churches "flourish and execute with new apostolic vigor the task entrusted to them" (*Orientalium Ecclesiarum* n.1), both as regards the good of souls and as regards the "special office of promoting the unity of all Christians" (ibid., n. 24), -- of which unity they are called upon to be faithful witnesses according to the principles of the Decree of Ecumenism.

3. In virtue of this "special office," referred to in the previous paragraph, due consideration must be given, in the revision of CICO, to the "aggiornamento" to which the Orthodox Churches are tending in the hope of an even greater unity of Canon Law of all the Oriental Churches.

4. Therefore, in all things concerning the Orthodox Churches, the Code must be inspired by the words of Paul VI: on the "Sister Churches," the "almost full" communion, on the respect due to the Hierarchs of these Churches as "Pastors to whom has been entrusted a portion of the flock of Christ;" inspired also by the Conciliar text on their "right to govern themselves according to their own disciplines, since there are better suited to the temperament of their faithful and better adapted to foster the good of souls" (*Unitatis redintegratio* n. 16).

15. The original Latin text can be found in *Communicationes* 1 (1969) 77-85.

16. In addition to those canons that have an implicit ecumenical dimension, the *CIC* does contain three canons that mention the ecumenical movement.

This brief reflection will examine the structures for liturgical reform as articulated in the Eastern Code and ascertain their effect on the promotion of the unity of Christians.

Governance in the Eastern Catholic Churches

Because the nature and structures of the Eastern Catholic Churches remain a *terra incognita* for most Catholics, a brief description of their canonical status and of certain structures and procedures is necessary.

Concerning Eastern Catholic governance systems, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* n. 5 states:

[This synod] solemnly declares that the churches of both east and west enjoy the right, and are bound by duty, to govern themselves in accordance with their own particular rules, seeing that they are recommended by venerable antiquity, are more suited to the customs of their faithful and seem more suitable for assuring the good of souls.¹⁷

Thus, Eastern Catholic Churches have an ancient right and obligation to govern themselves in accord with their own traditions; any assessment of their governance systems must begin with this understanding.

Churches Sui Iuris

A suitable way to canonically express this ecclesiological reality eluded canonists for centuries.¹⁸ The promulgation of the Eastern Code finally resolved this longstanding terminological ambiguity by adopting the term Church *sui iuris* (*Ecclesia sui iuris*). In summary, the Eastern Code describes a Church *sui iuris* as a stable community canonically recognized by the supreme authority as having self-governing authority: the power to elect its own leadership, enact laws for itself, and resolve internal judicial issues.¹⁹ There are today in the Catholic Church 23

17. Vatican II made a similar declaration regarding the right of the Orthodox Churches in *UR* n. 16, adding the remark that the principle has not always been observed: "The perfect observance of the principle which is sanctioned by long-standing tradition, but in fact has not always been followed, is one of the essential prerequisites for the restoration of unity."

18. The *Guidelines* included a mandate for a terminological and canonical clarification of the notion of *rite* and *particular church* (in the sense of *coetus Ecclesiarum* as found in *OE* n. 2 *et passim*). See *Nuntia* 3 (1976) 22.

19. *CCEO* c. 27: "A community of the Christian faithful, which is joined together by a hierarchy according to the norm of law and which is expressly or tacitly recognized as

Churches *sui iuris*, including the Latin Church; the *CCEO* categorizes the other 22 Churches *sui iuris* as Eastern.

The *sui iuris* status of Eastern Churches is *relative* because all the individual Churches that make up the Catholic Church are subject to the supreme authority. This *sui iuris* status is also *gradated*, as not all of the Eastern Catholic Churches enjoy the same degree of autonomy in governance. The Eastern Code divides the Churches subject to it into four distinct categories:

1. The *patriarchal Churches*, treated in *CCEO* canons 55-150, possess the highest degree of self-governing authority.²⁰ Governance in these Churches is characterized by a balance of governance by an individual, i.e., a patriarch, and governance by group, i.e., a synod of bishops.²¹ In general, the synod of bishops enacts laws (*CCEO* c. 110 §1) while the patriarch gives them legal force by promulgating them (*CCEO* c. 1488; cf. *CCEO* c. 111 §1). The synod of bishops functions as a patriarchal Church's highest court (*CCEO* c. 110 §2); it also elects the patriarch, bishops and candidates for offices constituted outside the patriarchal territory (*CCEO* c. 110 §3). The patriarch exercises administrative authority (*CCEO* c. 110 §4), on occasion with the consultation, assent or consent of others that the Code requires him to obtain in a given situation.

2. The *major archiepiscopal Churches*,²² treated in *CCEO* canons 151-154, can accurately be construed as "quasi-patriarchal" Churches;²³ while these Churches lack the patriarchal title (*CCEO* c. 152) and need papal confirmation in order to install their major archbishop, they are otherwise governed in the same manner as the patriarchal Churches (*CCEO* c. 153).

3. The *metropolitan Churches*,²⁴ treated in *CCEO* canons 155-173, are structured differently than the preceding two. As its title implies, this type

sui iuris by the supreme authority of the Church, is called in this Code a Church *sui iuris*."

20. There are currently six patriarchal churches in the Catholic Church: Armenian, Chaldean, Coptic, Maronite, Melkite Greek-Catholic and Syrian.

21. *OE* n. 9 states: "The patriarchs with their synods make up a higher tribunal for all matters concerning the patriarchate, including the right of setting up new eparchies and of appointing new bishops of their own rite within the confines of their own patriarchal territory, without prejudice to the inalienable right of the Roman pontiff of intervening in individual cases."

22. There are currently four major archiepiscopal churches: Romanian, Syro-Malabar, Syro-Malankara and Ukrainian.

23. *OE* n. 10 states: "What has been said about patriarchs holds true also, in accordance with the norm of law, of major archbishops who are in charge of a whole particular church or rite." Tanner, 2:903. This principle finds expression in *CCEO* c. 152.

24. There are currently three metropolitan churches: Ethiopian / Eritrean, Ruthenian (Byzantine) and Slovak Greek Catholic.

of Church *sui iuris* is headed by a metropolitan.²⁵ Assisted by a council of hierarchs, he governs the metropolitan Church (*CCEO* c. 155 §1). This Church also possesses more limited self-governing authority than the patriarchal and major archiepiscopal Churches. Its metropolitan and bishops are appointed by the Roman Pontiff (*CCEO* c. 168) and legislation enacted by the council of hierarchs must be received (*receptio*) by the Apostolic See (specifically the Congregation for the Eastern Churches) before the metropolitan can promulgate the enacted laws (*CCEO* c. 168 §§2-3).

4. The *miscellaneous Churches*²⁶ (treated in *CCEO* cc. 174-176) have quite limited self-governing authority. The hierarch who presides over these Churches is competent in all matters relegated to particular law or the superior administrative authority, but must receive the consent of the Apostolic See (*CCEO* c. 176).

Since the end of the nineteenth century, waves of Catholic and Orthodox Eastern Christians have emigrated from their historical homelands. Although this emigration has ebbed and flowed, the majority of Eastern Catholic faithful now reside outside the historical territory of their Church *sui iuris*. The Eastern Code, in conformity with the provisions of *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*,²⁷ delineates a special canonical relationship between the faithful living outside the historical territory and their hierarchs.

Territorial Limitations

The Eastern Code divides the authority of the hierarchies of the Eastern Catholic patriarchal Churches along the lines of the territory of the patriarchal Church. The patriarch has authority over metropolitans, bishops and other Christian faithful of the Church over which he presides "according to the norm of law approved by the supreme authority of the Church" (*CCEO* c. 56; cf. *CCEO* c. 146). *CCEO* canon 150 articulates the following arrangement:

25. Patriarchs and major archbishops possess supra-metropolitan authority.

26. Currently, ten churches fall into this category: Bulgarian, Greek, Hungarian, Italo-Albanian, Ruthenian Eparchy of Mukačevo, Ruthenian Apostolic Exarchate in Czech Republic, Eparchy of Križevci, Apostolic Exarchate for Serbia and Montenegro and Apostolic Exarchate in FYROM (Macedonia).

27. *OE* n. 7a: "By the term 'eastern patriarch' is meant a bishop who possesses jurisdiction over all the bishops (including metropolitans), clergy and faithful of his own territory or rite in accordance with the norm of law and without prejudice to the primacy of the Roman pontiff."

OE n. 7c: "Whenever an ordinary of a rite is appointed outside the boundaries of his patriarchal territory, he remains attached to the hierarchy of the patriarchate of the same rite in accordance with the norm of law."

- Laws enacted by the synod of bishops and promulgated by the patriarch have the force of law everywhere *if they are liturgical laws*. Other disciplinary laws or decisions of the synod of bishops have the force of law only inside the territory of the patriarchal Church.²⁸ This arrangement affords great freedom – and imposes great responsibility – on the patriarchal Churches in their life of worship.
- The disciplinary laws and decisions can acquire the force of law outside the territory of the patriarchal Church either by an act of the eparchial bishop for his eparchy (provided that they do not exceed his competence) or by approval of the Apostolic See for a specific territory or territories, for a particular group of the faithful, or even for the entire patriarchal Church.²⁹

Mandate for Liturgical Stewardship

Unitatis redintegratio n. 15 emphasizes the crucial role that liturgy plays in fostering the reconciliation of Churches:

All should recognize that to know, venerate, preserve and cherish the rich liturgical and spiritual heritage of the eastern churches is of supreme importance for the faithful preservation of the fullness of Christian tradition, and for bringing about reconciliation between eastern and western Christians.

CCEO canon 28 §1, defining the term rite (*ritus*), lists *liturgical heritage* first among its components:

A rite is a liturgical, theological, spiritual and disciplinary heritage, differentiated by the culture and the circumstances of the history of peoples, which is expressed by each Church *sui iuris* in its own manner of living the faith.

28. *CCEO* c. 150 §2: “Laws enacted by the synod of bishops of the patriarchal Church and promulgated by the patriarch, have the force of law everywhere in the world if they are liturgical laws. However, if they are disciplinary laws or in the case of other decisions of the synod, they have the force of law within the territorial boundaries of the patriarchal Church.”

29. *CCEO* c. 150 §3: “Eparchial bishops constituted outside the territorial boundaries of the patriarchal Church, who desire to do so, can attribute the force of law to disciplinary laws and other decisions of the synod in their own eparchies, provided they do not exceed their competence; if, however, these laws or decisions are approved by the Apostolic See, they have the force of law everywhere in the world.”

Vatican II emphasized that the liturgical tradition of any Eastern Catholic Church is not the sole possession of that Church, but rather is part of the heritage of the entire Catholic Church.³⁰ This conciliar declaration found expression in the Eastern Code:

The rites of the Eastern Churches, as the patrimony of the whole Church of Christ in which shines forth the tradition coming down from the Apostles through the Fathers, and which, in its variety, affirms the divine unity of the Catholic faith, are to be observed and promoted conscientiously.³¹

The Eastern Catholic Churches are thus to be considered *stewards* of a diverse liturgical heritage that must be preserved, fostered and handed down to future generations. Some Eastern hierarchs and clerics have treated their liturgies as museum pieces that are to be preserved unchanged. Preservation, however, is only one facet of stewardship. One recalls the Gospel parable of the fearful servant punished for burying the talent (Mt 25:14-30). Liturgy is living (*res viva*) and so must be allowed to grow, adapt and change. Responsible stewardship requires a delicate balance between *preservation* and *reform*. As we shall see, the possibility of reform – albeit quite necessary in some Eastern Catholic Churches – is complicated because of ecumenical concerns.

Preservation of the Liturgy

Let us examine liturgical preservation first. Preserving liturgical patrimony requires first of all an accurate knowledge of the liturgy and proper observance of it.

30. *OE* n. 1: “The catholic church highly esteems the institutions, liturgical rites, ecclesiastical traditions and way of Christian life of the eastern churches. For in them, as renowned for their venerable antiquity, shines forth a tradition which exists through the fathers from the apostles and which constitutes part of the divinely revealed and undivided heritage of the whole church.”

UR n. 17b: “This synod thanks God that many eastern daughters and sons of the catholic church, who preserve this heritage and wish to express it more faithfully and completely in their lives, are already living in full communion with their brothers and sisters who follow the tradition of the west. It declares that all this heritage of spirituality and liturgy, of discipline and theology, in its various traditions, belongs to the full catholic and apostolic character of the church.”

31. *CCEO* c. 39.

Hierarchs

Oversight of liturgical celebrations belongs primarily to the hierarchy. *CCEO* canon 40 §1³² places an obligation on hierarchs who preside over the Churches *sui iuris* (i.e., patriarchs, major archbishops³³ and metropolitans) and other hierarchs “to care with the greatest diligence for the faithful and accurate observance of their own rite.” The patriarch is competent to issue encyclical letters regarding the rite to his entire Church.³⁴ In the case of metropolitan Churches *sui iuris*, the responsibility is entrusted to the council of hierarchs.³⁵ The Eastern Code places a great responsibility on the eparchial bishop with regard to the liturgical patrimony, declaring him to be the moderator, promoter and guardian of the eparchy’s entire liturgical rite.³⁶ He is to be vigilant in this function, lest abuses creep in.³⁷

Clerics and Members of Institutes of Consecrated Life

While the Code assigns hierarchs the responsibility of oversight of the celebration of the liturgy, clerics and members of institutes of

32. “Hierarchs who preside over Churches *sui iuris* and all other hierarchs are to care with the greatest diligence for the faithful and accurate observance of their own rite; nor are they to allow changes to be made in it except by reason of its organic progress; they are nonetheless to keep in mind mutual goodwill and the unity of Christians.”

33. For the most part the canonical figure of the patriarch and major archbishop are canonically equivalent. See *CCEO* c. 152: “What is stated in common law concerning patriarchal Churches or patriarchs is understood to be applicable to major archiepiscopal Churches or major archbishops, unless the common law expressly provides otherwise or it is evident from the nature of the matter.” For the purposes of this study, one can presume that the major archbishop is also to be included when treating a patriarch.

34. *CCEO* c. 82 §1, 3^o: “By his own right the patriarch can issue encyclical letters to the entire Church over which he presides concerning questions regarding his own Church and rite.”

35. *CCEO* c. 169: “The council of hierarchs is to see that the pastoral needs of the Christian faithful are provided for; in these matters it can determine what seems opportune to promote the growth of faith, to foster common pastoral action, to regulate the morals, to observe their own rite and ecclesiastical discipline.”

36. *CCEO* c. 199 §1: “As the moderator, promoter and guardian of the entire liturgical life in the eparchy entrusted to him, the eparchial bishop must be vigilant that it be fostered to the greatest extent possible and be ordered according to the prescriptions and legitimate customs of his own Church *sui iuris*.”

37. *CCEO* c. 201: “§1. Since he is obliged to safeguard the unity of the entire Church, the eparchial bishop is to promote the common discipline of the Church as well as to urge the observance of all ecclesiastical laws and legitimate customs.”

§2. The eparchial bishop is to be vigilant lest abuses creep into ecclesiastical discipline, especially concerning the ministry of the word of God, the celebration of the sacraments and sacramentals, the worship of God and the cult of the saints, as well as the execution of pious wills.”

consecrated life are obliged to observe their own rite faithfully and to acquire a greater knowledge and more complete practice of it.³⁸ In the celebration of the sacraments, the liturgical books are to be observed accurately.³⁹ The minister is to celebrate the sacraments according to the liturgical prescripts of his own Church *sui iuris*, unless the law or the Apostolic See gives permission to celebrate according to a different rite.⁴⁰ Protopresbyters (*CCEO* c. 278 §1, 3^o) and rectors of churches (*CCEO* c. 309) are to see that the sacraments and divine praises are celebrated according to the norm of law.

Situated in the canons on formation for ministry, *CCEO* canon 350 §3 states, “Liturgy is to be taught, taking into account its special importance inasmuch as it is a necessary source of doctrine and of a truly Christian spirit.” In some cases, a seminarian may study in the seminary of another Church *sui iuris* or a in a common seminary for several Churches *sui iuris*. *CCEO* canon 343 states that such seminarians are nevertheless to be formed in their own rite, with any custom to the contrary reprobated.

Lay Persons

Lay persons too are responsible for safeguarding the liturgical patrimony of the Eastern Churches. They are to foster the knowledge and appreciation of their rite and to observe it everywhere unless there is an exception provided by law.⁴¹ *CCEO* canon 405 encourages lay persons to study their own ritual patrimony in order to foster good will, respect and effective collaboration among the various Churches *sui iuris*:

Lay persons should study zealously their liturgical, spiritual, theological and disciplinary patrimony, so that mutual goodwill, esteem and unity of action between the lay members of different Churches *sui iuris* is fostered, and so that the variety of rites does not harm the common good of the society in which they live, but rather may daily contribute to that same good.

38. *CCEO* c. 40 §2: “Other clerics and members of institutes of consecrated life are bound to observe faithfully their own rite and to acquire always a greater knowledge and more complete practice of it.”

39. *CCEO* c. 674 §1: “In celebrating the sacraments, that which is contained in the liturgical books is to be observed accurately.”

40. *CCEO* c. 674 §2: “The minister should celebrate the sacraments according to the liturgical prescripts of his own Church *sui iuris*, unless the law establishes otherwise or he himself has obtained a special faculty from the Apostolic See.”

41. *CCEO* c. 40 §3: “Also, the other Christian faithful are to foster the knowledge and appreciation of their own rite and are bound to observe it everywhere unless an exception is provided by the law.”

While the canon focuses on the relations among the various Churches in full Catholic communion, the principle is also applicable in relations with non-Catholic Churches. An understanding of one's own ritual patrimony and an appreciation for the legitimate differences in the ritual patrimony of others can foster better relations among the Churches and individual faithful.

Reform of the Liturgy

Despite the conventional wisdom that the Eastern Churches are less inclined to modify their liturgies, liturgical reform has taken place.⁴² Liturgical changes can include: the abolition of a rite, re-establishment of a practice, complete or partial modification of a rite, introduction of new elements, approval of an existing practice, re-ordering of a liturgical element or adaptation of an external element.⁴³

In the patriarchal / major archiepiscopal Churches, liturgical laws are the joint responsibility of the patriarch and the synod of bishops. As mentioned above, the synod of bishops possesses legislative authority while the patriarch is competent to promulgate the law.⁴⁴ Once promulgated, liturgical laws enjoy the force of law throughout the patriarchal Church.⁴⁵ This arrangement reflects the traditional Eastern approach to Church governance that the patriarch and synod of bishops have a joint responsibility.

As mentioned earlier, reform of Eastern Catholic liturgies is to take place only with great caution. *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* states:

42. Cyril Vasil', "Norme riguardanti l'edizione dei libri liturgici," *Ius Ecclesiarum Vehiculum Caritatis: Atti del simposio internazionale per il decennale dell'entrata in vigore del Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium, Città del Vaticano, 19-23 novembre 2001*, ed. Congregazione per le Chiese Orientali (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2004) 370: "Nonostante l'opinione generale, largamente diffusa, secondo la quale le Chiese orientali son più tradizionaliste e meno propense a rinnovamenti ed adattamenti liturgici rispetto alla Chiesa latina, tuttavia anche nella storia di queste Chiese si è testimoni di varie riforme e mutamenti liturgici."

43. See Thomas Pott, *La réforme liturgique byzantine. Étude du phénomène de l'évolution non-spontanée de la liturgie byzantine* (Rome: CLV-Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000) 88-89.

44. *CCEO* c. 112 §1: "The promulgation of laws and the publication of decisions of the synod of bishops is the competence of the patriarch."

45. *CCEO* c. 150 §2: "Laws enacted by the synod of bishops of the patriarchal Church and promulgated by the patriarch, have the force of law everywhere in the world if they are liturgical laws. However, if they are disciplinary laws or in the case of other decisions of the synod, they have the force of law within the territorial boundaries of the patriarchal Church."

All eastern Christians should know and be certain that they may and should always preserve their own lawful liturgical rites and way of life, and that changes should be made only by reason of their proper and organic development. All things are to be observed with the greatest fidelity by the eastern Christians themselves.⁴⁶

One can see that the emphasis is on faithful preservation of the liturgical rites: changes are to be introduced or allowed only if they are organically consonant with the rite.

The *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches* provides guidance in appraising the *organic consonance* of a given development:

The organic progress, in every Church *sui iuris*, implies taking into account first of all the roots from which the heritage of these Churches was initially developed, mainly in Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, Armenia, and in the ancient empire of Persia; and secondly, the manner in which such traditions were transmitted, adapting to the various circumstances and places but maintained in a coherent, organic continuity. [...] Any renewal, in fact, should be coherent and agree with sound tradition, in such a way that the new norms do not appear as an extraneous body forced into an ecclesiastical composite, but blossoming as though spontaneously from already existing norms.⁴⁷

The Eastern Code introduces a reason for even greater caution to be observed: the effect on the unity of the rite lived by both Catholics and Orthodox:

Hierarchs who preside over Churches *sui iuris* and all other hierarchs are to care with the greatest diligence for the faithful and accurate observance of their own rite; nor are they to allow changes to be made in it except by reason of its organic progress; they are nonetheless to keep in mind mutual goodwill and the unity of Christians.⁴⁸

It may come as a surprise to some that the reform of Eastern Catholic liturgical life can actually be counter-productive in promoting the unity of Eastern Christians; a change in the liturgical life of an Eastern Catholic Church creates a difference – and a distance – between it and its Orthodox counterpart. Ecumenical initiatives – in my opinion, correctly –

46. *OE* n. 6; Tanner, 2:902.

47. Congregation for the Eastern Churches, *Instruction for Applying the Liturgical Prescriptions of the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches* (Vatican City: Congregation for the Eastern Churches, 1996) n. 12.

48. *CCEO* c. 40 §1.

follow the intuitive approach that a shared prayer life contributes to the unity of Christians.⁴⁹ The Maronite Church, lacking an Orthodox counterpart, has not been bridled with such a restriction and has undergone significant post-conciliar reform.

Nevertheless, many would assert Eastern rite liturgies – as was the case with the Latin rite liturgy – are in need of reform. It might be unfair to keep the Eastern Catholic Churches in “liturgical limbo” until the unity of their communities is achieved. So, let us now proceed with an examination of the structures and procedures for possible *reform* of Eastern liturgies.

Liturgical Books

CCEO canon 3 stipulates, “The Code, although it often refers to the prescripts of the liturgical books, does not for the most part determine liturgical matters; therefore, these prescripts are to be diligently observed, unless they are contrary to the canons of the Code.”⁵⁰ While the Eastern Code does not generally determine liturgical matters, it does at times legislate concerning them. If the prescripts of the liturgical books are contrary to the canons, the provisions of the canons are to be observed.

CCEO canon 656 §1 requires that “in liturgical celebrations, only books that have received ecclesiastical approval are to be used.” To canonists of the Latin Church, this might appear an obvious and necessary preventative against divergent liturgical texts; however, the context is different in the Eastern Catholic Churches. Many of the Eastern Churches – Catholic and non-Catholic – celebrate the same rite. In many cases, the Eastern Catholic Churches, unable to acquire enough approved⁵¹ liturgical books for themselves, avail themselves of the Eastern Orthodox liturgical books instead. Such actions are contrary to the letter of *CCEO* canon 656 §1, but in keeping with the spirit of accurate observance of the rite (cf. *CCEO* c. 40 §2). Actually, this practice, which in some cases is now a custom, promotes the unity of

49. The *raison d'être* of the English Language Liturgical Consultation is the creation of common texts so that the various ecclesial communities would at least be *praying* in the same way. See <http://www.englishtexts.org/>.

50. The counterpart to this canon is *Codex Iuris Canonici auctoritate Ioannis Pauli PP. II promulgatus* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1983) c. 2: “For the most part the Code does not define the rites which must be observed in celebrating liturgical actions. Therefore, liturgical laws in force until now retain their force unless one of them is contrary to the canons of the Code.” English translation from *Code of Canon Law, Latin-English Edition: New English Translation* (Washington, DC: CLSA, 2001).

51. By “approved” one is referring to approval by the competent Catholic authorities treated in in *CCEO* c. 657 §1.

Christians: the Catholics and the non-Catholics are praying the same prayers.

CCEO canons 656 and 657 provide for the publication of liturgical books for use in the Eastern Catholic Churches.⁵²

Approval of Liturgical Texts

CCEO canon 656 §1 states that books used for liturgical celebrations must have *ecclesiastical approval*.⁵³ *CCEO* canon 657 §1 then articulates the procedure to be followed in obtaining the approval:

The approval of liturgical texts, after prior review of the Apostolic See, is reserved in patriarchal Churches to the patriarch with the consent of the synod of bishops of the patriarchal Church, in metropolitan Churches *sui iuris* to the metropolitan with the consent of the council of hierarchs; in other Churches this right rests exclusively with the Apostolic See, and, within the limits set by it, to bishops and to their legitimately constituted assemblies.

Approval is comparable to a legislative act placed by the hierarchies of the Eastern Catholic Churches.⁵⁴ In the patriarchal and major archiepiscopal Churches, the approval is given by the patriarch with the consent of the synod of bishops. Given the importance of the approval of liturgical texts, the patriarch is not competent to give the approval independently: he needs the consent of the synod of bishops. Such an arrangement reflects the authentic Eastern traditions whereby the patriarch and the synod of bishops exercise a collegial responsibility for the ritual patrimony of their Church.⁵⁵

52. For further information, see also Alphonse Raes, “Livres liturgiques des ‘Églises orientales,’” *Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique* (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1957) 6:606-611; Vasil’, “Norme,” 363-391.

53. *CCEO* c. 656 §1: “In liturgical celebrations, only books that have received ecclesiastical approval are to be used.” The second paragraph of the same canon states: “Books of prayers or devotions, intended for the public or private use of the Christian faithful, require ecclesiastical permission.”

One notes the distinction between *ecclesiastical approval* and *ecclesiastical permission*. The Eastern Code delineates three levels of ecclesiastical intervention: (1) *Ecclesiastical permission*: the text is free from error in faith and morals; (2) *Ecclesiastical approval*: the text conforms to the authentic teaching of the Church; (3) *Praise and blessing*: the first and second points plus commendable. See George Nedungatt, “Ecclesiastical Magisterium (cc. 595-666),” in *A Guide to the Eastern Code: A Commentary on the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, ed. George Nedungatt (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2002) 485.

54. Nedungatt, “Ecclesiastical Magisterium,” 486.

55. See *Nuntia* 17 (1983) 53.

In a similar fashion, in the metropolitan Churches *sui iuris*, the metropolitan can approve liturgical texts with the consent of the council of hierarchs. In the miscellaneous Churches, only the Apostolic See is competent to approve liturgical texts.

The canon includes a most significant clause regarding the approval process: “with prior approval of the Apostolic See.”⁵⁶ This *ius vigilantiae* on the part of the Apostolic See over the publication of liturgical texts for use in the Eastern Catholic Churches is a long-standing tradition.⁵⁷ Oversight over the publication of liturgical texts originates in the encyclical *Demandatam* given on 24 December 1743, which Pope Benedict XIV addressed to the hierarchy of the Melkite Greek-Catholic Church regarding certain liturgical innovations.⁵⁸ The encyclical mandated that Melkite patriarch Cyril VI Tanas consult with the Apostolic See prior to the publication of liturgical texts.⁵⁹ When a dispute arose over whether this disposition was for only the Melkite Greek-Catholic Church or applicable to all the Eastern Catholic Churches, the Roman Curia took the approach that the Pope intended this for all the Eastern Catholic Churches.⁶⁰ The role of the Apostolic See was solidified in the incomplete pre-conciliar codification project:

It is for the patriarch to review editions of liturgical books and he must be responsible for the fidelity and integrity of the text and its agreement with the approved text; and, once the authenticity is proven, he is empowered to grant the permission for publication. However, the first approval of liturgical texts is reserved to the Apostolic See.⁶¹

56. The Congregation for the Eastern Churches acts on behalf of the Apostolic See in this matter. See John Paul II, apostolic constitution *Pastor Bonus*, 28 June 1988, art. 58 §1: *AAS* 80 (1988) 875.

57. In fact, the 1754 Greek *Euchologion* was published by the Apostolic See under the authority of Pope Benedict XIV. See Benedict XIV, encyclical letter *Ex quo primum*, 3 March 1756: *Enchiridion delle Encicliche* (Bologna: EDB, 1994) 1:710-839.

58. Benedict XIV, encyclical letter *Demandatam*, 24 December 1743, in *Codicis Iuris Canonici Fontes*, ed. Pietro Gasparri (Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1923-1939) 1:795-803.

59. Benedict XIV, encyclical letter *Demandatam*, n. 21: “Nullius vero generis libros, aut folia, sine praevia approbatione et licentia episcopi Diocesanis et Patriarchae praedictorum edere possint; atque insuper nullum de rebus sacris Librum, aut folium publici iuris faciant, inconsulta Sede Apostolica. Quod si novas Librorum sacrorum ab eadem Sancta Sede iam probatorum editiones fieri contingat, onus erit Patriarchae, et Episcoporum Catholicorum, inspicere, ne ulla in re discordent ab editionibus approbatis.”

60. See Vasil’, “Norme,” 374-376.

61. Pius XII, *motu proprio Cleri Sanctitati*, 11 June 1957: *AAS* 49 (1957) [hereafter abbreviated *CS*] c. 279 §2: “Patriarchae competit librorum liturgicorum editionis recognitio, ipseque respondere debet de fidelitate et integritate textus deque eius congruentia cum textu approbato; atque, congruentia probata, in vulgus edendi licentiam

Although the patriarch had a role in the approval process, the Apostolic See possessed final decision-making authority:

It is the duty of this Congregation [of the Eastern Church] to approve for all Eastern Rites liturgical books, and to resolve questions in regard to their texts and translation; also to supervise and decide all questions concerning rubrics and ceremonies of the Divine Liturgy, the sacraments, sacramentals and the divine office.⁶²

Taking the *sui iuris* status of the Eastern Catholic Churches⁶³ and the notion of subsidiarity into consideration, the Eastern Code changed this approach. While the Apostolic See still exercises its *ius vigilantiae* by requiring prior *recognitio*,⁶⁴ approval of the text now rests with the patriarch and the synod of bishops. While this arrangement could conceivably give rise to criticism of “centralization” and “excessive control” over the lives of the Eastern Catholic Churches, a more charitable interpretation would be more realistic as well. Some Eastern Catholic Churches, lacking the personnel and resources necessary to publish liturgical texts, need the assistance of the Apostolic See to carry out their mission to be living witnesses to their traditions (cf. *OE* n.1).

Approval of Translations

CCEO canon 657 §2 treats the publication of translations of liturgical texts:

The same authorities are also competent to approve the translations of these books intended for liturgical use, after sending a report to the Apostolic See in the case of patriarchal Churches and metropolitan Churches *sui iuris*.

concedere valet. Prima autem textuum liturgicorum approbatio Sedi Apostolicae reservatur.”

62. *CS* c. 195 §2: “Ipsius est pro omnibus orientalium ritibus libros approbare liturgicos, ac dubia solvere circa eorundem textum et translationes; item omnia videre ac statuere de rubricis et caeremoniis divinae Liturgiae, sacramentorum, sacramentalum et officii divini.”

63. *Nuntia* 17 (1983) 53.

64. One notes that the *recognitio* is given prior to the *adprobatio* in order to avoid *post factum* interventions; see Pio V. Pinto, *Commento al Codice dei Canonici delle Chiese Orientali* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2001) 543: “Lo *ius vigilantiae* della Sede Apostolica nelle cose che riguardano la dogma così da vicino deve poter essere esercitato prima della *adprobatio* dei libri liturgici da parte di qualunque altra autorità, a scampo di eventuali interventi *post factum* che sono sempre molto incresciosi e che tutti debbono evitare.”

Today, a majority of some Eastern Catholic Churches' faithful live outside their Church's historical territory. Because a majority of these faithful will probably not be celebrating the liturgy in the language of their homeland,⁶⁵ the translation of texts into the vernacular is now a crucial element of liturgical reform in the Eastern Catholic Churches.

The canon places the responsibility of accurate translations in the hands of the hierarchs of the respective Churches, requiring only that the patriarchs, major archbishops and metropolitan heads of Churches *sui iuris* send a report of their actions to the Apostolic See. In the case of the Maronite Church, within the past year the monumental task of publishing a common English text (alongside Arabic and Syriac texts) for all Maronite Anglophones in the United States, Canada and Australia was completed. One can expect that the achievement will have far-reaching positive effects on the liturgical life of the Maronite Church.

The area of translation of liturgical texts for use in the diaspora of the Eastern Catholic Churches is perhaps the best *litmus test* of reform in ecclesiology. The experience of the Maronite Church can provide us with some insights. Immigration to the Americas began at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries. Other "waves" of immigration took place as a consequence of political and social turmoil in the Middle East. However, a bishop, Francis M. Zayek, was appointed to serve in the United States only in 1966. For seventy-years in the United States (i.e., three generations), the Maronite communities worshipped in Arabic, a language spoken by some and read by fewer.

One of the first tasks of the newly-appointed Maronite Apostolic Exarch was to translate the Divine Liturgy. The hierarchy in Lebanon and the Congregation for the Eastern Church had at that time already initiated tentative liturgical reforms, so the bishop was faced with the challenge of what liturgical text to translate. In the end, the liturgical text prepared by the Congregation for the Eastern Church was chosen for translation because the "patriarchal" draft was too sparse.

In wrestling with the problems of translation of liturgical texts, other issues emerged and were discussed / disputed: liturgical music, vestments, church décor, the posture of the celebrant and the faithful. One can accurately assert that the modern liturgical reform of the Maronite Church *began in the United States*. Later, the hierarchy and scholars in Lebanon began to initiate serious projects.

In the 1960's and 1970's, a fundamental point of contention was whether the Divine Liturgy should be translated into English. Many felt

65. Attempts at retaining the language of the forefathers with younger people have uneven results.

that the Divine Liturgy should be celebrated only in Arabic and Syriac (the liturgical language). If the children of the immigrants did not understand, they should learn the language.

Such an approach is more colonial than ecclesial and reflects an attitude that some held: the purpose of the Maronite Church in the United States is to support Lebanon. Of course, the Maronite Church in the United States has a special filial bond with the homeland and is obliged to be supportive. But the translation and reform of the liturgy brought to the fore the awareness that the Maronite Church is not a "Lebanese Church," but a Catholic Church with a rich ritual patrimony that can take root and flourish anywhere in the world. An Eastern Catholic Church in North America has something to contribute to the ecclesial life on that continent.

Reprinting of Liturgical Texts

Lastly, CCEO canon 657 §3 deals with the reprinting of liturgical texts:

To reprint liturgical books or their translations into another language, or even parts thereof, if intended for liturgical use, it is required and sufficient to establish their correspondence with an approved edition by the attestation of the local hierarch referred to in can. 662, § 1.

The primary concern in reprinting a liturgical text is ensuring its correspondence with the original. In the case of Eastern Catholic liturgical texts, it is the responsibility of the local hierarch of the place where the text is being published to assure that the reprinted texts corresponds to the original.

As described above, the hierarchies of the respective Eastern Catholic Churches are the ones primarily responsible for the reform of liturgy. Indeed, they are the only one competent to modify the rite and then only in the context as a corporate body, e.g., synod of bishops or council of hierarchs. Despite the fact that the responsibility and authority resides with the hierarchs, they are not the only ones who participate in liturgical reform. For this reason, let us examine a few other institutions that can bring about liturgical reform in the Eastern Catholic Churches.

Liturgical Commissions

There is a need for liturgical experts. CCEO canon 124 indicates that every patriarchal Church is required to have a liturgical commission, governed by norms approved by the patriarch and the members of which

are appointed by the patriarch.⁶⁶ In describing the components of the patriarchal curia, *CCEO* canon 114 §1 indicates that there are to be commissions attached to the patriarchal curia; the only commission specifically mentioned is the liturgical commission.⁶⁷

Patriarchal Assembly

The Eastern Code provides for an institution not found in the Latin Church: the patriarchal assembly.⁶⁸ A consultative group of the entire patriarchal Church,⁶⁹ the patriarchal assembly assists the patriarch and synod of bishops in matters of major importance, especially in the area of the apostolate and ecclesiastical discipline (*CCEO* c. 140). The patriarch is to convoke it at least every five years (*CCEO* c. 141). Participants in the assembly include bishops, rectors of Catholic and ecclesiastical universities, rectors of major seminaries, presbyters, religious and lay persons (*CCEO* c. 143 §1).⁷⁰ Persons from other Churches *sui iuris* can be invited to participate according to the norm of law (thus, can be given voting privileges). Observers from other non-Catholic Churches or ecclesial communities can also be invited (*CCEO* c. 143).

The patriarchal assembly, while only consultative, enables the clergy and faithful to express their opinions regarding worship and the liturgical life of the Church directly to the hierarchy of the patriarchal Church.

Conclusion

The Church, a two-thousand year old institution, thinks not in years but centuries. Although the Second Vatican Council concluded fifty years ago, we are still in the process of receiving and implementing its work.

66. "The liturgical commission, which every patriarchal Church must have, and other commissions prescribed for the Churches *sui iuris*, are erected by the patriarch and are made up of persons appointed by the patriarch; they also are governed by norms established by him, unless the law provides otherwise."

67. "The patriarch must have at his see a patriarchal curia, distinct from the curia of the eparchy of the patriarch, which comprises the permanent synod, the bishops of the patriarchal curia, the ordinary tribunal of the patriarchal Church, the patriarchal finance officer, the patriarchal chancellor, the liturgical commission as well as other commissions which by law are attached to the patriarchal curia."

68. The Eastern Code also provides for a metropolitan assembly that is to operate along the lines of the patriarchal assembly (*CCEO* c. 172).

69. One might surmise that the reason for the absence of such an entity in the Latin Church is simply the numbers; it would not be feasible to have representative body of 1.2 billion Christian faithful. This is not to say that regional or national assemblies should not be considered.

70. One notes that deacons are not included among the participants.

For the Eastern Catholic Churches, the past half-century has been a time of emerging from the catacombs and struggling to survive in the midst of war and upheaval. While many have not had the "luxury" of devoting themselves to liturgical renewal, they take pride in the steadfast attachment to the faith and traditions of their forefathers and are committed to serving their faithful dispersed throughout the world in the twenty-first century.

faris.jd@gmail.com

John FARIS

ABSTRACTS

Chad J. Glendinning 8-27
The Role of the Competent Ecclesiastical Authority in the Promotion of Participatio Actuosa Prior to the Second Vatican Council

It is a popular mistake, often made, to assume that the liturgical reform only commenced with the Second Vatican Council, rather than seeing it as a turning point in a process of renewal that had been going on since the beginning of the twentieth century. This article focuses on one particular aspect of the reform agenda, namely, those reforms introduced to promote the active participation of the faithful in the liturgical rites. A brief historical sketch is provided of what was done by the popes in the early part of the century and more specifically by Pius XII and John XXIII. The concern here is mainly with the appropriation of liturgical reform and its subsequent legislative expression by the competent ecclesiastical authorities of the *munus sanctificandi*. Without trying to diminish the important contributions of individuals, monasteries, periodicals, academic and pastoral centres associated with the liturgical movement, this presentation focuses on the end result: how the liturgical reform was received by ecclesiastical authority and given juridical expression. The purpose is to highlight the question of juridical competence with regard to liturgical matters, so as to better understand the role of the competent ecclesiastical authority in the reform of the liturgy and, ultimately, that of the Church.

Peter De Mey 28-51
The Daily Eucharist at the Council as Stimulus and Test Case for Liturgical Reform

This article contributes another dimension to the assessment of the liturgical reform of Vatican II that is rarely considered, namely, the experience participants had of the liturgies celebrated at the beginning of each of the General Congregations, as well as other liturgical events that occurred. Of particular importance are the opening and closing mass of each session as well as experiences of liturgies celebrated by Byzantine and Oriental rite Catholics, because these influenced how the Fathers eventually viewed issues like concelebration, the use of the vernacular and communion under both species. The essay relies on the dia-

ries of those who participated, some of the oral and written interventions by the Fathers, as well as contemporary commentary by various observers at the Council and these are tracked in chronological order. Apart from the discourse of the Council, the participants had an experience of liturgical reform in practice that shaped and conditioned their reception of *Sacrosanctum concilium*.

Mathijs Lamberigts..... 52-67
The Liturgy Debate at Vatican II: An Exercise in Collective Responsibility

The liturgical movement, prior to Vatican II, was not a homogenous project. There were variations in emphasis and approach in the European countries where it began and also among the religious communities promoting it. Liturgical Congresses across Europe in the 1950s extended the impact of the renewal movement which reached a point where there was a greater desire for vernacular liturgies and greater participation by the laity. At the Council, objections to the renewal that had been previously made began to surface and there was an attempt by the Congregation of Rites to restrict the scope of the reform. However, as the Council progressed, it can be seen that various groups of bishops, especially from Africa but also from Latin America and Asia, began to cooperate and speak collectively on the need for the liturgy to be adapted to the cultural and pastoral circumstances of their people. Thus they spoke for the use of the vernacular, concelebration and the freedom to adapt the rites to their particular situations without wanting to have their preferences imposed universally. Within the European context, especially with regard to liturgy, the Episcopal conferences, at the beginning of the Council, seemed to act less collectively. A good number of the tensions that preceded the Council and became visible in the Conciliar debates would impede a fruitful implementation, as hoped for by many.

Gilles Routhier..... 68-80
Refusal and Resistance against the Liturgical Reform: Actors, Motifs, Wagers

This article focuses in particular on methodological aspects of investigating the refusal or resistance of the liturgical reform of Vatican II. The study of refusal and resistance of reform reveals that there are different groups and motifs that do not coincide. Any such investigation begins by determining the *terminus a quo* of such a study. Crucial is the capability of recipients to receive the reform, which implies attending to the horizon of the receiver. A study must thus begin in the pre-Vatican II situation. Furthermore reform of the liturgy touches deeply on ecclesiological issues which need to be attended to. During the council the resistance was political and substantial. The liturgy is the place where the church expresses and symbolizes itself; hence a reform of the liturgy touches on this and expresses it. In *Sacrosanctum concilium* many ecclesiological reforms were implicitly approved, but only doctrinally discussed and approved in subsequent

documents. For a study on reform of and in the church, the issue of liturgy is thus very suggestive methodologically as well as in understanding the church.

Thomas R. Whelan..... 81-109

Liturgy Reform since Vatican II: The Role Played by Bishops in the English-Speaking World

This article first provides a brief survey of the work of English-speaking bishops throughout the world as they responded to the reform of liturgy in their local churches up to 1975. It outlines the concerns of English-speaking parts of the African and Asian continents – places often ignored in a Western discourse on liturgy, throwing into question the tendency to make its own conclusions universal. The article examines the translation work carried out by the International Commission on English in the Liturgy (ICEL), effectively an agency of 26 English-speaking bishops' conferences, and so maps elements of a changing relationship between Rome and local churches. Attention is drawn to the differing concerns between bishops in English-speaking hierarchies in Europe, North America and Australia and those in Africa and Asia. While the former were concerned with responding to Roman led initiatives, the latter were more interested in radical reform, taking seriously issues of inculturation that went beyond language translations. It is argued that the Roman control of translation detail and its distrust of local Churches are the polar opposite to what the Council had proposed some fifty years previously and to some extent the inertia of the bishops themselves has contributed to this reversal of ecclesiological perspectives.

Eugene Duffy 110-127

The Reception of the Conciliar Liturgical Reforms in Ireland

The Henrician Reformation impacted on the liturgical life of the Church in Ireland for the best part of three hundred years, robbing it of most of its patrimony of art, architecture and public liturgical practices. When the Church was rebuilt in the nineteenth century it was heavily influenced by Roman and French piety and sensibilities. However, the popular Irish piety, with a deep reverence for the Mass endured with congregations remaining silent and passive. During the 1950s key pastoral theologians, by means of conferences and journals, opened the Church in Ireland to the developments in liturgical renewal that were afoot on mainland Europe. These same people, using the same means, were the main movers in promoting the liturgical renewal of Vatican II. Their efforts were taken forward by others, too, by means of liturgical studies, formation projects and various publications. The bishops accepted the reforms of the Council and introduced them in their dioceses, where they were enthusiastically embraced at the practical level. There is less convincing evidence that an internal renewal occurred or that the deeper theological principles were as well received as the changes at the level of ritual and practice.

John Faris 128-147

Structures for Liturgical Reform and the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches

In agreement with Vatican II, the Eastern Catholic Churches are to be considered *stewards* of a diverse liturgical heritage that must be preserved, fostered and handed down to future generations. Responsible Stewardship implies both preservation and reform. After outlining the governance structure of Eastern Catholic Churches in general, specific attention is paid to liturgy taking territorial limitations into consideration. Liturgical laws enacted by synods of bishops and promulgated by the patriarch have the force of law everywhere. So how do the Eastern churches handle the task to preserve and reform liturgy? After outlining the role and tasks of hierarchs, clerics and religious as well as laity in the preservation of the liturgy, the reform is addressed. This is not easy due to ecumenical concerns; at times Eastern Catholic Churches use the liturgical books of Eastern Orthodox Churches, which implies that they pray the same prayers and respect the observance of the rite. But reform might be necessary at the same time. Of relevance for such reform is the approval of liturgical texts. The study outlines who is responsible for such approval. Today many faithful live outside the historical territory, which raises the issue of translations. That is most likely the litmus test of reform in ecclesiology. The Maronite Church is discussed as an example: the reform of that liturgy came through the translation process in the USA.

RÉSUMÉS

Chad J. Glendinning 8-27
Le rôle de l'autorité ecclésiastique compétente dans la promotion de la participatio actuosa antérieurement au Concile Vatican II

C'est une erreur, souvent commise, de prétendre que la réforme liturgique a seulement débuté avec le Concile Vatican II, plutôt que de considérer celle-ci comme un tournant dans le procès de renouveau qui s'est manifesté depuis le début du vingtième siècle. Cet article se concentre sur un aspect particulier de l'agenda de la réforme, notamment, celui de la promotion de la participation active des fidèles aux rites liturgiques. Un bref aperçu historique est fourni de ce qui a été réalisé par des papes dans la première partie du siècle et plus spécialement par Pie XII et Jean XXIII. L'intérêt se porte ici principalement sur l'appropriation de la réforme liturgique et sa formulation législative subséquente par les autorités ecclésiastiques compétentes quant au *munus sanctificandi*. Sans vouloir ignorer les contributions importantes individuelles, des monastères, revues, centres académiques et pastoraux associés au mouvement liturgique, cette présentation se concentre sur le constat final; comment la réforme liturgique a-t-elle été acceptée par l'autorité ecclésiastique et reçu sa formulation juridique. Le but poursuivi ici est de mettre en lumière la question de la compétence juridique quant aux matières liturgiques, et ainsi de mieux saisir le rôle de l'autorité ecclésiastique compétente dans la réforme de la liturgie et, finalement de celle de l'Église.

Peter De Mey 28-51
L'Eucharistie quotidienne au Concile comme stimulant et test preuve pour la réforme liturgique

Cet article concerne une dimension dans la fixation de la réforme liturgique de Vatican II qui est rarement considérée, notamment, l'expérience recueillie par les participants aux liturgies célébrées au début de chacune des Congrégations Générales, de même que lors d'autres événements liturgiques occurants. D'une importance particulière étaient l'ouverture et la clôture des différentes sessions aussi bien que d'expériences de liturgies célébrées selon des rites catholiques byzantins et orientaux du fait que ceux-ci pouvaient éventuellement influencer les Pères du Concile dans leur approche de la concélébration, l'usage de la lan-

gue vernaculaire et la communion sous les deux espèces. Le présent essai se base sur les journaux des participants, de certaines interventions orales ou écrites faites par les Pères, ainsi que de commentaires contemporains de différents observateurs du Concile, tenus dans un ordre chronologique. En plus du déroulement du Concile, les participants profitaient ainsi d'une expérience pratique de la réforme liturgique qui soutenait et conditionnait leur réception de *Sacrosanctum concilium*.

Mathijs Lamberigts 52-67
Le débat liturgique à Vatican II: Un exercice en responsabilité collective

Le mouvement liturgique, antérieur à Vatican II, n'avait pas de projet homogène. Se manifestaient des variations en accentuation et approche dans les contrées européennes où celui-ci débutait et se faisait ainsi connaître parmi les communautés religieuses. Des congrès liturgiques à travers l'Europe vers les années 1950 étendirent l'impact du mouvement rénovateur qui atteignit un niveau où s'exprimait un plus vaste désir de liturgies vernaculaires et de participation liturgique plus large du laïc. Au Concile des objections envers le renouveau qui avaient déjà été exprimées auparavant commencèrent à se manifester et il y eut une tentative de la part de la Congrégation des Rites de restreindre les objectifs de la réforme. Cependant quand le Concile s'affirma, on constata que différents groupes d'évêques, particulièrement d'Afrique mais également d'Amérique Latine et d'Asie, tinrent à coopérer et s'exprimèrent collectivement pour une adaptation de la liturgie aux modalités culturelles et pastorales de leur peuple. Ils prirent ainsi position pour un usage de la langue vernaculaire, la concélébration et la liberté d'adapter leurs rites à leur situation particulière sans attendre que leurs préférences soient imposées universellement. À l'intérieur du contexte européen, particulièrement quant au domaine de la liturgie, les conférences épiscopales, au début du Concile, semblent avoir agi moins collectivement. Un grand nombre de tensions qui précédèrent le Concile et qui se firent ouvertement jour durant les débats conciliaires tentèrent d'empêcher une fructueuse implantation, comme espérée par beaucoup.

Gilles Routhier 68-80
Refus et résistances à la réforme liturgique: Acteurs – Motifs – Enjeux

Cette étude se porte tout particulièrement sur les aspects méthodologiques d'une investigation quant à la résistance ou au refus de la réforme liturgique de Vatican II. L'étude du refus et des résistances à la réforme révèle différents groupes et motifs qui ne coïncident point. Cette étude commence par déterminer le *terminus a quo* d'une telle étude. Cruciale est de déterminer la capacité des récipiends d'accueillir la réforme qui se doit d'être attentive à l'horizon du récipiendaire. L'étude doit donc se constituer dans une situation préalable à Vatican II. De plus

une réforme de la liturgie comporte des implications ecclésiologiques profondes qui ont besoin d'être prises en considération. Durant le concile la résistance s'avère à la fois politique et substantielle. La liturgie est le lieu où l'Église s'exprime et se symbolise; d'où une réforme de la liturgie lui est constitutive et représentative. Dans la Constitution sur la liturgie diverses réformes ecclésiologiques ont été implicitement approuvées, mais seulement doctrinalement discutées et approuvées dans des documents subséquents. Pour une étude sur la réforme de et dans l'Église, la question de la liturgie est donc méthodologiquement véritablement suggestive aussi bien que pour la compréhension de l'Église.

Thomas R. Whelan..... 81-109
La réforme liturgique depuis Vatican II: Le rôle joué par les évêques dans le monde anglophone

Cet article présente tout d'abord un bref aperçu du travail des évêques anglophones à travers le monde en réponse à la réforme de la liturgie dans leurs églises locales jusqu'en 1975. Il souligne les apports de régions anglophones des continents africains et asiatiques – régions souvent ignorées dans les discours occidentaux, emportés par leur tendance à rendre leurs propres conclusions universelles. Cette contribution analyse le travail de traduction effectué par la Commission internationale sur l'anglais en liturgie (ICEL), effectivement un groupement de 26 conférences épiscopales anglophones, et ainsi vectrices d'un rapport changeant entre Rome et les Églises locales. L'attention se porte sur les différentes concertations entre évêques dans les hiérarchies anglophones en Europe, Amérique du Nord et Australie et celles d'Afrique et Asie. Alors que les premières se rassemblent pour répondre aux initiatives romaines, les secondes sont davantage intéressées par des réformes radicales, proposant sérieusement des solutions d'inculturation, portées au delà des traductions linguistiques. Il est fait argument que le contrôle romain de la traduction dans le détail et sa méfiance des Églises locales se situent au pôle opposé de ce que le concile a proposé cinquante années auparavant et que certaines inerties d'évêques eux-mêmes ont contribué à ce renversement de perspectives ecclésiologiques.

Eugene Duffy 110-127
La réception de la réforme conciliaire liturgique en Irlande

La réforme henricienne a empreint la vie liturgique de l'Église en Irlande pour la plus grande part de trois siècles, la spoliant fortement de son patrimoine artistique, architecture et pratiques liturgiques publiques. Quand l'Église fut rétablie au 19^e siècle, elle se trouva fortement influencée par la piété et la sensibilité romaine et française. Néanmoins la piété populaire irlandaise, avec une profonde révérence pour la messe, resta silencieuse et passive. Vers 1950 des théologiens pastoraux, à l'aide de conférences et revues, ouvrirent l'Église d'Irlande aux développements du nouveau liturgique qui se manifestait sur le continent européen. Ce même peuple, utilisant les mêmes idées, forma les principaux artisans

dans la promotion du nouveau liturgique de Vatican II. Ses efforts seront poursuivis par d'autres, par le biais d'études liturgiques et par l'élaboration de projets et de publications diverses. Les évêques acceptèrent les réformes du Concile et les introduisirent dans leur diocèse, où elles furent reçues avec enthousiasme dans le domaine pratique. Il est moins évident qu'un renouveau interne se produisit ou que des principes théologiques plus profonds furent introduits au niveau du rituel et dans la pratique.

John Faris 128-147
Structures pour la réforme liturgique et le Code des canons des Églises orientales

En accord avec Vatican II, les Églises catholiques Orientales sont considérées comme des *intendants* d'un héritage liturgique diversifié qui doit être préservé, favorisé et transmis à des générations futures. L'intendance responsable comprend à la fois préservation et réforme. Après avoir délimité la structure organique des Églises catholiques orientales en général, une attention spécifique se porte sur la liturgie qui prend les limites territoriales en considération. Des lois liturgiques formulées par des synodes d'évêques et promulguées par le patriarche ont partout force de loi. Aussi comment les Églises orientales assument-elles la tâche de préserver et réformer la liturgie? Après avoir délimité le rôle et les tâches des hiérarques, clercs et religieux aussi bien que des laïcs dans la préservation de la liturgie, le problème de la réforme est abordé. Ceci n'est pas aisé en des entreprises œcuméniques: de temps à autre les Églises catholiques orientales utilisent les livres liturgiques des Églises orthodoxes orientales, ce qui implique qu'elles font usage des mêmes prières et du même respect pour l'observance du rite. Mais la réforme doit s'opérer nécessairement en même temps. Comme application d'une telle réforme est l'approbation des textes liturgiques. L'étude souligne qui est responsable quant à une telle approbation. Aujourd'hui de nombreux fidèles vivent en dehors de leur territoire historique, de là provient le phénomène des traductions. Cela constitue fort probablement un test propice de la réforme en ecclésiologie. L'Église maronite est présentée en exemple: la réforme de sa liturgie se passe par le truchement de traductions aux USA.

Questions Liturgiques / Studies in Liturgy

Profile

Fondée en 1910 par Dom Lambert Beauduin, la revue *Questions Liturgiques / Studies in Liturgy* publie des contributions approfondies (c.à.d. des articles, notices, recensions), concernant le domaine de la théologie liturgique, de l'étude historique de la liturgie et des sacrements, de la théologie sacramentaire, de la théorie symbolique, des études sur le rituel, sur la phénoménologie des pratiques dévotionnelles, de l'anthropologie de la religion et de disciplines annexes. Elle veut promouvoir des études d'un niveau élevé et des réflexions fondamentales dans ces disciplines. Bien que la revue soit enracinée dans la tradition catholique, elle se veut ouverte à une approche œcuménique, comparative et interreligieuse.

Conditions

1. Tous les manuscrits soumis pour publication proposeront des recherches et des réflexions originales. Ils ne seront pas envoyés simultanément à d'autres revues, que ce soit sous forme abrégée ou élargie.
2. Les textes seront rédigés en un anglais ou français courant. Les auteurs dont ce ne serait pas la langue usuelle voudront bien les faire corriger quant à la langue ou le style avant de les soumettre.
3. La longueur des articles variera approximativement entre 3.000 et 10.000 mots. Dans des cas exceptionnels des contributions plus longues pourront être acceptées.
4. En plus d'une copie électronique, les auteurs sont priés d'adresser à la rédaction deux copies fermes. Ils veilleront à ce que rien n'y permet de les identifier.
5. À leur manuscrit, ils joindront une lettre, établissant d'une manière non équivoque la paternité de leur contribution. Celle-ci confirmera qu'elle est un travail original, et informera sur les fonctions actuelles (académiques) et les centres d'intérêt de leur auteur.
6. Les manuscrits seront présentés en des caractères clairs (p.ex. Times New Roman 12) et feront usage de notes infrapaginales (non point de notes finales).
7. Pour les références bibliographiques les auteurs voudront bien consulter le directoire http://theo.kuleuven.be/questions_liturgiques/
8. En plus de leur contribution, les auteurs voudront bien rédiger un sommaire d'environ 200 mots.

Procédure d'évaluation

Toutes les contributions seront soumises à une évaluation en deux phases. Après une évaluation interne sur la réceptivité de leurs contributions, celles-ci seront confiées à deux membres du comité de rédaction pour une relecture. Les auteurs seront avertis en un temps raisonnable si leurs contributions sont 'acceptées', 'acceptées sous conditions,' ou 'non acceptées'.

Directeur: J. Geldhof

Conseil de rédaction / Comité consultatif: A. Cardita – A. Goossens – T.E. Johnson – J. Leachman, o.s.b. – G. Mattheeuws – D. McCarthy, o.s.b. – G. Michiels, o.s.b. – C. Monsieur, o.praem. – K. Op de Beeck, o.s.b. – P. Post – T. Quartier – S.K. Roll – S. Van den Bossche

Membres d'honneur: J. Lamberts – M. Fierens, o. praem. – C. Traets, s.j.

Adresse: Maurits Sabbebibliotheek, Sint-Michielsstraat 4 bus 3101, 3000 Leuven, Belgium

E-mail: questions.liturgiques@theo.kuleuven.be

ISSN 0774-5524

e ISSN 1783-1709

ABONNEMENTS: order@peeters-leuven.be

Peeters – Journals Department, Bondgenotenlaan 153, B-3000 Leuven (Belgium)